UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 108—PART 17

OCTOBER 5, 1962, TO OCTOBER 13, 1962
(PAGES 22457 TO 23720)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1962

J
11
.R
v.108
pt.17

Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. **LEE METCALF**, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, always in the beginning, before in this Chamber we talk to one another, we would hush our thoughts to stillness, and speak in prayer to Thee. We come because there is written upon the tablet of our hearts the golden motto inscribed upon these walls—"In God We Trust". We would that Thy light might flood our inmost selves, now so cluttered and confused, where the good and the evil, the petty and the great, the wheat and the tares, are so entwined.

May those who have been called to administer the affairs of the Nation make daily choice of spiritual integrity, amid the corruption that is in the world, through the lust for power. Being steadfast and immovable, may they contend for the right as Thou dost give them to see the right.

Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

We ask it through riches of grace in

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington D.C., October 5, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. **LEE METCALF**, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. **MANSFIELD**, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 4, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, October 5, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 919. An act to amend section 9(b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities" (the Hatch Political Activities Act) to reduce the requirement that the Civil Service Commission impose no penalty less than 30 days' suspension for any violation of section 9 of the act; and

S. 2429. An act to revise the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, V.I., and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3453) for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. **FALLON**, Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**, Mr. **JONES** of Alabama, Mr. **CRAMER**, and Mr. **BALDWIN** were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. **MILLS**, Mr. **KING** of California, Mr. **BOGGS**, Mr. **MASON**, and Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4670) to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3985. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the duty treatment of certain bread;

H.R. 9414. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that imported electron microscopes shall be subject to the regular customs duty regardless of the nature of the institution or organization importing them;

H.R. 12030. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to moneys received in payment for special statistical studies and compilations and certain other services;

H.R. 12109. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit certain natural grasses and other natural materials to be imported free of duty; and

H.R. 12470. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H.R. 3985. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the duty treatment of certain bread;

H.R. 9414. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that imported electron microscopes shall be subject to the regular customs duty regardless of the nature of the institution or organization importing them;

H.R. 12030. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to moneys received in payment for special statistical studies and compilations and certain other services;

H.R. 12109. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit certain natural grasses and other natural materials to be imported free of duty; and

H.R. 12470. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1963

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, before the Senate reaches the morning hour, I should like to ask that the supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 13290—which, on my objection yesterday, went over, and was not ordered to a second reading, now be read the second time and referred to the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the bill (H.R. 13290) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963 and for other purposes; and, without objection, the bill will be considered as having been read the second time by its title, and will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Montana does not object, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 4, 1962, pp. 22325–22326, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 2.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Georgia whether implicit in his motion is merely reaffirmation of the position he took—and on which the Senate followed him, the other day—with respect to the research project item.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is all it amounts to. The same amendment is involved in this motion. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate disagree to the action of the House in accepting amendment No. 2, as amended. The House action also involved amendments Nos. 1 and 6.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. According to the report, the House agreed to Senate amendment No. 1, and also to Senate amendment No. 6.

Mr. RUSSELL. I read the RECORD this morning; and it stated that the House receded on amendment No. 2, with an amendment which included in part the language in Senate amendments No. 1 and 6.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 2.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments Nos. 19, 44, and 47 through 54.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider its action in disagreeing to these amendments.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that statements during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader—I had hoped to discuss this matter with him before the Senate convened this morning, but he did not arrive until just before the session opened—whether he has any objection to including in the request in regard to the morning hour a provision that no reports from standing committees be received during the morning hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with that statement and with that inclusion in the unanimous-consent request, I have no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request, as amended? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate now in the morning hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I notify the attachés that this may well be a "live" quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 308 Leg.]

Boggs
Burdick
Bush
Case
Church
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Gore
Hart
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Hawaii
Mansfield
McGee
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Neuberger
Pell
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Smith, Mass.
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BOTTUM], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a U.S. representative to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT UNDER MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control (Battle) Act of 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON GIFTS AND BEQUESTS RECEIVED BY THE U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on gifts and bequests received by the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, during the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF EXTENT TO WHICH MILITARY PROCUREMENT AGENCIES AND PRIME CONTRACTORS HAVE OBTAINED CERTIFICATIONS AS TO THE ACCURACY AND COMPLETENESS OF COST DATA USED IN NEGOTIATION OF CONTRACT PRICES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of extent to which military procurement agencies and prime contractors have obtained certifications as to the accuracy and completeness of cost data used in negotiation of contract prices, dated October 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT ON BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract with Pisgah Inn, Inc., on a portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

By unanimous consent, the following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1961. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired) (Rept. No. 2282).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 9777. An act to amend Private Law 87–197 (Rept. No. 2281).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

H.R. 5698. An act to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2283).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 3789. A bill for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3790. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3791. A bill to establish a Federal Chemical Council to study and make recommendations concerning insecticides, herbicides, rodenticides, and related chemical products; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 3792. A bill for the relief of Miss Markala P. Rotofanousi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 3793. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a statutory presumption of "line of duty" incurrence of injury or disease; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3794. A bill for the relief of J. Arthur Fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3795. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide means of redress for the unlawful seizure of American property by foreign governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 3796. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 3797. A bill for the relief of Anne B. Mason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, and to provide that such building shall be designated the "Madison Memorial Library"; to the Committee on Public Works.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

MEMORIAL TO MARY McLEOD BETHUNE

Mr. JAVITS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 98) favoring a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

DELIVERY OF CERTAIN PAPERS TO ATTORNEY GENERAL OF INDIANA AND ATTENDANCE OF CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE TO TESTIFY IN A CASE PENDING BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF THAT STATE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 412) authorizing the delivery of certain papers to the attorney general of the State of Indiana and the attendance of certain former employees of the Senate to testify in a case pending before the supreme court of that State, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED FEDERAL CHEMICAL COUNCIL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in a significant and timely speech a few days ago, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff expressed the concern many Americans feel over the possible danger posed by the widespread use of chemicals in industry and agriculture. He pointed out that each year thousands of new chemical compounds are developed and between 400 and 500 are introduced for common use.

Mr. Ribicoff said:

> It would be tragic to go on polluting the soil, the atmosphere and our streams with unlimited quantities of the latest chemical compounds without careful analysis of the potential dangers and the establishment of standards and tolerances where necessary.

The chemicals which we use today combat insects, eradicate rodents, and have reduced to the vanishing point many once dangerous diseases. They have done much for the productivity of agriculture, forestry, and industry, and have thus contributed to the health and prosperity of the American people. On the other hand, the fear has often been expressed that some of these chemicals may not be as beneficial as we believe them to be, and may adversely affect the balance of nature.

Mr. Ribicoff believes that the time has come to establish a Federal Chemical Council to inquire into the uses and effects of agricultural and industrial chemicals. If apprehensions about their impact are justified, then standards and tolerances should be set for their use; if they are unjustified, then the fears of the American people should be allayed.

Mr. Ribicoff has had invaluable experience in questions of this kind. During his tenure as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, he served as Chairman of the Federal Radiation Council which set tolerances and established standards for admissible radiation, a task which did much to reduce the apprehension about radiation generally felt by the public.

In 1961, he created the Federal Pest Control Review Board with the cooperation of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, to establish requirements and standards for pest control in order to avoid the absorption of poisons into agricultural products.

The creation of a Federal Chemical Council to inquire into the ecological and other effects of the enormous quantities of chemicals used in agriculture and industry would not require extensive legislation; research in these and related matters is constantly being made by various government departments, so that a statute would merely require the coordination of such inquiries.

While present law gives the Secretary broad authority to conduct research and inquiries, the cooperation of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Defense is necessary for the work of the Federal Chemical Council; and it is not provided in the present statute. It is for these reasons that I introduce for the consideration of the Senate a proposed statute to establish a Federal council to study and make recommendations concerning insecticides, herbicides, rodenticides, and related chemical products.

I recognize that no bill introduced at this time can receive consideration before adjournment. Nevertheless, I am introducing it in order that it may be brought before Members of Congress, and that the appropriate committees can begin preparation for considering this bill. It is also my hope that the introduction of this bill will encourage the executive departments involved to think about this question and take the steps toward the establishment of such a council that present law permits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the Record and also that excerpts of remarks made by former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff before the Winsted, Conn., Rotary Club on October 1, 1962, be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and excerpts are ordered to be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3791) to establish a Federal Chemical Council to study and make recommendations concerning insecticides, herbicides, rodenticides, and related chemical products, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established an interdepartmental council to be known as the Federal Chemical Council, which shall consist of the Surgeon General (who shall be chairman) and one representative from the Department of Agriculture who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, one representative from the Department of the Interior who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, one representative from the Department of Defense who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Defense, and one representative (in addition to the Surgeon General) from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(b) It shall be the duty and function of the Federal Chemical Council to conduct a continuing study and investigation of insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, rodenticides, and related chemical products, collate information with respect to, and make tests of, such products with a view to determining whether such products are harmful to human life or health, or produce any other unintended detrimental result when used for the purpose and in the manner prescribed by the distributors thereof.

Sec. 2. On the basis of knowledge and information obtained by reason of its studies and investigations conducted under the first section of this Act, the Federal Chemical Council shall formulate and recommend to each Department represented on the Council coordinated policies and standards to be observed by the Departments so represented in discharging their respective responsibilities with respect to the regulation of insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, rodenticides, and related chemical products.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall furnish to the Federal Chemical Council such personnel, quarters, equipment, and facilities as may be necessary to enable such Council to carry out its functions under this Act.

The excerpts presented by Mr. Dodd are as follows:

Excerpts From Statement by Secretary Ribicoff

Rachel Carson has performed a valuable service to her country by spotlighting the widespread use of chemicals in our environment and pointing out many of the dangers that are now faced and those that may develop in the future.

By writing "The Silent Spring" Miss Carson has posed to the Nation a challenge that must not go unanswered. It would be tragic to go on polluting the soil, the atmosphere and our streams with unlimited quantities of the latest chemical compounds without careful analysis of the potential dangers and the establishment of standards and tolerances where necessary.

At the same time it would be just as unfortunate to condemn out of hand the agricultural or industrial use of many chemicals that are extremely valuable in ridding our food of harmful insects and preserving food so that it will be available at low cost to millions of consumers.

Three years ago the Government responded to a similar challenge in the field of radiological health when Congress authorized creation of the Federal Radiation Council, composed of the major Federal agencies having an interest in nuclear energy and its safe use. I served as Chairman of this Council, and found it to be a most effective way of bringing the various interests of the relevant Federal agencies to bear on the problems of radiation.

I believe the problems of chemicals call for the creation of a Federal Chemical Council. Such a Council is needed both to promote public health and to avoid public hysteria.

The existing Federal Pest Control Review Board can well serve as the basis for a Federal Chemical Council. The Council should be given clear statutory authorization and expert staff to conduct research. To the present board members representing the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, Interior, and HEW should be added the Department of Commerce.

Furthermore, it should be made clear that the policymaking functions of the Chemical Council should be handled by the top level of the member Departments, as is the case with the present Radiation Council.

Like the Radiation Council the Chemical Council should be given a broad mandate to formulate standards which will give due recognition both to the benefits of chemicals and their potential dangers.

A second step that must be taken is the full-speed development of the Environmental Health Center for which planning funds have already been made available. The billions we spend to increase our knowledge of outer space will be worthless if we do not take steps to learn all we can about the environment here on earth.

The Environmental Health Center will give the Public Health Service a long-needed facility to coordinate and advance scientific research in all phases of health hazards found in the environment including water pollution, air pollution, radiation hazards, and the dangers of chemicals.

The problem of chemicals has been growing in this country and it is time that it receives the serious attention it deserves. Each year, thousands of new chemical compounds are developed and between 400 and 500 are introduced for common use.

Sometimes the toxic effects of these substances are known, but often adverse effects are not discovered until injury or even fatalities occur. The threat can come from ingestion, inhalation, or simply skin contact.

And there are so many different sources from which these chemicals reach us. Their application to food products in pesticides is perhaps the best known. But many other chemicals are extensively used in the manufacture and packaging of foods. And still other substances get into food and water supplies from the disposal of wastes by chemical manufacturing.

One of the major areas where further research is essential concerns the cumulative effects of very small quantities of chemical substances. Our knowledge of the immediate effects of many chemicals is increasing rapidly, but we still know very little about the potential dangers of lifetime accumulations.

Beyond this problem are the exceedingly difficult mysteries that surround the interaction of two or more chemicals within the human body. Each may have low toxicity, but their combination may produce a major health hazard.

All of these matters deserve the serious attention of the highest levels of our Government, working closely with the best scientists in the land. I am sure that responsible manufacturers will support every effort to learn more about the effects of their products. Research that points out a hazard from one product may well disprove unfounded fears concerning another.

This is an area where we need to mobilize our research efforts and give the consuming public as much guidance as we possibly can. The Environmental Health Center can spur this research effort, and a Federal Chemical Council can supply the policy direction.

It is probably too late to take action at this session of Congress, but I believe these matters should receive a high priority when Congress convenes in January. If I am elected Senator, the matter of chemical hazards will receive my early and serious attention, along the line I have outlined.

MEANS OF REDRESS FOR UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF AMERICAN PROPERTY BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide means of redress for the unlawful seizure of American property by foreign governments. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3795) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide means of redress for the unlawful seizure of American property by foreign governments, introduced by Mr. Ervin, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1332, title 28, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsections (c) and (d) thereof as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) inserting therein, immediately after subsection (b) thereof, the following new subsection:

"(c) If the matter in controversy in any such action involves, or arises out of, an act of a foreign state in violation of general principles of international law, or of a treaty to which the United States and the foreign state are signatories, it shall be no bar to the maintenance of the action that it is brought against a sovereign state, without its consent, or that it involves the validity of official acts of such state."

(b) Section 1655, title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In any such action by an American citizen or corporation, involving or arising out of an act of a foreign sovereign in violation of the general principles of international law, or of a treaty to which the United States and such foreign sovereign are signatories, it shall be no bar to the maintenance of the action that it is brought against a foreign state, without its consent, or that it involves the validity of official acts of such state."

SEC. 2. (a) Title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting therein, immediately after section 1655 thereof, the following new section:

"§ 1655A. Lien enforcement; property of foreign states.

"It shall be no objection to the issuance of mesne or final process with respect to property, as provided by Rule 64 of the Rules of Civil Procedure promulgated under this title, that the property is owned by a foreign state, if it is used in or acquired from commercial activities by such foreign state, or has been acquired by it as a result of acts against an American citizen or corporation in violation of general principles of international law or of a treaty to which the United States and the foreign sovereign are signatories."

(b) The analysis of chapter 111, title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding thereto, immediately after the item relating to section 1655 thereof, the following new item: "1655A. Lien enforcement; property of foreign states."

The statement presented by Mr. ERVIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERVIN

In the recent debate and report on the foreign aid appropriation bill the Congress has strongly restated its determination expressed in the Hickenlooper amendment to halt expropriations of the property abroad of U.S. citizens by foreign governments receiving our foreign aid. (See remarks Senators SALTONSTALL, MORSE, HICKENLOOPER, LAUSCHE, and ALLOTT, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 2, 1962, pp. 21615–21621.) But it is not enough to deny grace of foreign aid to prevent or deter such illegal activities. It seems to me that apart from inducements of aid which may be only temporarily available our local Federal law relating to private transactions can be strengthened to protect our citizens' interest in their property abroad. This more permanent protection of U.S. private law I am convinced could be used much more effectively than is possible today without force and without drawing down the energy of the State Department. I am introducing herewith for discussion a bill representing one step in the process of improving our private law on this vital subject.

Only recently, expropriated sugar belonging to one of our nationals was found within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States in the possession of the foreign government which seized it. One of our Federal courts (the District Court of Virginia) felt itself powerless on the basis of our present U.S. law even to entertain an action to restore the property to its U.S. lawful owner. This intolerable jurisdictional impasse has been thought to be required by the doctrines of sovereign immunity and the act of state. But these doctrines, originally designed to prevent friction between nations, under present conditions invite unlawful seizure and cause strained relations.

If a seizure of property of a U.S. citizen has been made in violation of international law or of a treaty to which we are signatory, no reason of logic, fairness, or international law or morality ought to prevent U.S. courts, having the property within the U.S. jurisdiction, from having jurisdiction to restore the property to its rightful owner, or compensating him for its seizure.

Legislation pursuant to the bill I am introducing would offend no recognized principles of international law. For it has always been conceded that states may take retaliatory measures to defend themselves against violations of international law. Surely, a state may provide means for restoring to its citizen-owners property within its own jurisdiction which has been illegally taken by another state, in violation of its express obligations and agreements.

Modern enlightened authority, including our own American Law Institute, favors the view that when it is alleged and proved that property was taken in violation of international law our courts should take jurisdiction, adjudicate the merits and decree the delivery of such property. Our Federal courts have frequently indicated an invitation to Congress to direct their action in such matters.

It may be urged (cf. American Law Institute Foreign Relations Restatement S. 44) that the courts should act only if the State Department interposes no objection. But the observations of Senators HICKENLOOPER, MORSE, LAUSCHE, and SALTONSTALL in the debate on the foreign aid appropriation bill above referred to clearly indicate that under present conditions of cold war turmoil it may be of little help to our courts to require or suggest that they look to the overworked State Department for diplomatic assistance in what is essentially, for a nation which lives by law, a legal problem. Let us have what affirmative assistance the State Department, under international law, can give our expropriated citizens. But let us also by the law of our own local courts give those citizens a maximum chance to protect themselves in their own country through our own law and our own lawyers.

MEMORIAL TO MARY McLEOD BETHUNE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution with respect to the memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very worthy effort which is taking place here in the District of Columbia in connection with the recently celebrated 100th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation.

The National Council of Negro Women in its convention in 1958 voted unanimously to undertake the project of memorializing its founder, Mary McLeod Bethune, with a monument to be unveiled January 1963, commemorating a century of freedom.

Born of parents who had been slaves, her early childhood years were spent working in the fields. She was 9 years of age before she had the opportunity of attending a Presbyterian mission school, for at that time there were no schools for Negroes in her community. This intrepid pioneer became one of the country's great educators, building Bethune-Cookman College from a one-room school with orange crates as desks to a million-dollar college, located amid the Florida pines at Daytona Beach.

Mrs. Bethune was a born organizer and set in motion many groups for teachers, organized women on national levels, parents, business enterprises, religious institutes and conferences. She was a militant crusader for civil and human rights.

Mrs. Bethune occupied many important posts under four Presidents of the United States and was the recipient of eight honorary degrees from leading American colleges and universities.

On December 5, 1935, she founded the National Council of Negro Women, uniting national organizations of Negro women of the widest possible range of interests to give broad leadership to Negro women as they increasingly integrated into the spiritual, social, economic, cultural, and political life of America. Mrs. Bethune served as its first president for 14 years and gave distinguished leadership to these program objectives.

The women of America have already demonstrated a wide and keen interest in focusing attention on a symbol of belief in the dignity of the individual. And this cause is significant, not only in America but throughout Asia, Africa, and the entire world. By memorializing a great American and commemorating 100 years of progress toward social justice, we are keeping faith with our destiny and giving renewed hope to the uncommitted millions throughout the world.

It is fitting that the memorial honoring Mrs. Bethune will also commemorate the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. In her life and works she exemplified the great fruits of that historic pronouncement and it is therefore doubly appropriate that they be linked in this lasting tribute.

So keenly does the National Council of Negro Women feel the importance of this monument and historic event, that the national convention, normally called in November, has been set for December 27, 1962, to January 1, 1963, so that thousands of women from all over the United States will be in the Nation's Capital for the observance of the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation. The delegates will be working around the theme: "The Negro Woman—Her Role and Contributions Over a Century of Freedom."

I urge all Americans to join in with the National Council of Negro Women and the Commission on Civil Rights in helping to make the country aware of a memorial that gives magnificent evidence of the way in which we can give recognition to the contributions of this great American woman educator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a statement prepared by the National Council of Negro Women describing the two elements of this memorial.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 98), submitted by Mr. JAVITS, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress regards with favor the memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune to be erected, in commemoration of a century of freedom, through popular subscriptions raised by the National Council of Negro Women and located upon a site to be made available pursuant to the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune", approved June 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 154).

The statement presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

CONSULTATION ON SITE SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MARY MCLEOD BETHUNE EDUCATIONAL CENTER

OBJECTIVE

For some time the National Council of Negro Women has been in need of more adequate facilities for its headquarters operation. This need is even more acute today, but it is now part of a larger objective.

The joint resolution passed by the Congress and signed by the President of the United States gives the National Council of Negro Women the authorization to erect in the Nation's Capital the first memorial to an American Negro woman—Mary McLeod Bethune. More than a headquarters office space, we now want to build a Bethune Memorial Educational Center as a living tribute to our distinguished founder.

THE TWO ELEMENTS OF THE MEMORIAL

I. The memorial

Lincoln Park now holds the statue of Abraham Lincoln with a group of slaves with broken chains. The inscription points out that this monument was erected by emancipated citizens of the United States, who raised $18,000 to erect it in 1874. Charlotte Scott, a Negro woman gave the first $5 she had earned in her freedom to erect this monument when she learned that Mr. Lincoln was dead.

At the close of the century of freedom, January 1, 1963, we want to have erected at another point in Lincoln Park a monument to Mary McLeod Bethune, as a symbol of the progress and contributions of the descendants of those emancipated citizens. Such a piece of sculpture must capture the spirit of Mrs. Bethune to serve as an inspiration to youth and adults for generations to come.

II. The Memorial Educational Center

In the United States, there is the need for an educational center which will bring together in a creative setting, the archives and activities centered on the contribution of Negro women in American life. Hadassah, B'nai B'rith Women, University Women, to mention just a few, have developed under their auspices such facilities as best project their activities and contribution to American culture.

Mary McLeod Bethune belongs to all that is finest and best in America. Her life and work inspire the kind of service and activity so vital to the enrichment of the continuing education of adults for leadership at home and abroad. Such a center would perform many functions, as follows:

Archives around Negro women's organizations and activities in the United States.

Afford headquarters for the National Council of Negro Women and other interested women's organizations with cooperative use of basic facilities and equipment.

Serve as a center for research.

Provide a training center for the community leadership of women.

Be an adequate reception center for the many foreign visitors who constantly seek firsthand contact with Negro women's organizational activities.

Provide services essential in enhancing communication between people of many backgrounds.

Serve as a genuine clearinghouse and cultural center.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO CITY OF CHEYENNE, WYO.—AMENDMENT

Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY) submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3748) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

FIXING OF FEES PAYABLE TO THE PATENT OFFICE—AMENDMENT

Mr. KEATING submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2225) to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 13290) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE MINORITY LEADER'S REPORT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may file the minority leader's report and also to have it published as a document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE REPORT OF JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year there was published in the RECORD, and as a document, the report of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership. I ask unanimous consent that that report may be printed in the RECORD and also be printed as a document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the New York Times in a recent editorial said that I was not known as a praying man. I do not know the source of their information. Certainly I never told them such a thing. I strongly believe in prayer.

It is not my purpose now to pray from the floor of the Senate, but I do wish to quote briefly from the Sermon on the Mount as a text for the remarks I am making.

The quotation is to be found in the Book of Matthew in the Holy Bible. It reads as follows:

> Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the Children of God.

We have among Members of the Senate a man of proven ability in the art of peacemaking at its best and without the surrender of a single minute. I say this in sincere tribute to our fine leader, MIKE MANSFIELD.

He serves not only his Nation and the people of Montana in the best tradition of a U.S. Senator, but he also discharges the burden of majority leadership with great dignity and capacity.

We are closing the second difficult session of the 87th Congress, and I take this opportunity formally to express my appreciation for the extraordinary service he is rendering the Senate and the country.

I wish to state for the RECORD my own gratitude for the courtesies he has shown me; and it is my observation that consideration for individuals is among his fine characteristics.

The problems of leadership in the session now ending have been many and tedious, but I believe no one could have resolved them with more fairness and equity.

To follow MIKE MANSFIELD as leader of the Senate is to become aware of the self-discipline which he exercises. No one can accuse him of using his position to force his own inclinations on others.

He is a man of keen intellect who has been faithful to the duties of leadership. He is a peacemaker in the best sense of the word. He has my deep respect and my earnest desire to cooperate in every possible way.

I wish him well as we enter a short recess. His soul must yearn to a little peace. I hope he has it for the next few weeks, and I look forward to his leadership again in January.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the distinguished Senator from Montana, our great majority leader, for his kind and generous, albeit exaggerated, remarks.

No one is any more aware than I am of the extent to which our leader has drawn upon his great reserve of ability to express his deep friendship for the Senator from Oklahoma in formulating these remarks.

I can only say, Mr. President, that it is a challenge to any man to serve under such a great leader and to have an opportunity to help such a great leader, who has, in his service to his country in the 2 years in which he has been the majority leader of the Senate, given an example of leadership characterized by ability, patience, vision, courage, and understanding which the Senator from Oklahoma has never seen surpassed—

and I cannot think of a time I ever saw it equaled.

If anything above the ordinary has characterized the service by the Senator from Oklahoma it has been the challenge inherent in the opportunity to serve with and under such a great, able, and beloved leader as the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield].

TRIBUTES TO DEPARTING SENATORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire on this occasion to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long] who will be leaving the Senate after his term expires this year. No Senator has been more cooperative, more understanding, or more tolerant than has the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, who has made an outstanding record of public service both on the mainland and in his State of Hawaii as a Senator of the United States.

We shall miss him because of the many contributions he has made to legislation, but we want him to know that he is always welcome to return whenever he wishes to do so for we shall be glad to see him. We hope he will be willing to give us the benefit of his advice and counsel.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join in the tribute just paid by the majority leader to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long]. I think one of the finest compliments which can ever be paid to a man is to refer to him as a fine Christian gentleman. Senator Oren Long is a Christian and a gentleman. The Senate will be the loser when Senator Long does not return to the Senate next January because of his voluntary retirement. I consider him one of my precious friends.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] in the richly deserved tributes they paid to Senator Long of Hawaii. Having sat beside him in the Senate, I can say that I have never known a finer man. He possesses great patience and gentleness, and a rare insight into public issues. All of us have been enriched by our association with him during his years among us in the Senate, and all wish him well in the years ahead. I should like also to join with other Senators in expressing good wishes to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith], who will be leaving the Senate at the end of this session. He, too, has been a "seat mate" of mine, sitting only two seats away in the same row.

Senator Smith has been an outstanding Member of this body. He has always been kind and patient, hardworking and capable. I shall miss him here in the Senate and I trust that we shall see him again, because he is a genuine public servant. He should be a part of this administration, for which he has done so much, and to which he can make such a contribution.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is a singular event for an American to become the first U.S. Senator from his State. It is an honor which has been accorded to four of our sitting Senators.

On this occasion I wish to join with Senators who have already spoken in paying tribute to a most gracious, humble, able, dedicated U.S. Senator, Oren Long. During most of his adult life he has devoted himself to education, especially the education of our youth. He has brought with him to the U.S. Senate the same talents which he used in school and which have served him so well in representing his State and Nation in the Capital of the country.

The only word I know in Hawaiian is "aloha." I am very happy, along with all his colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, as Oren Long returns to his great State, to say, "aloha" to a departing friend. I hope we may have the pleasure of seeing him many times in the future.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of other Senators who have paid tributes to our departing colleagues, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long], and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith]. It has been a genuine pleasure to serve with these honorable men. I hope their departure from the Senate will not mean an end to their outstanding public service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise now to pay tribute to my colleague, Senator Benjamin A. Smith II.

When Senator Smith was appointed by the Governor of Massachusetts to fill the unexpired senatorial term of President Kennedy, I did not know Senator Smith personally. But I found him to be a nephew of a long-time friend of mine, Frank O'Brien. I also found that his father and other members of his family had been in public life in Gloucester, Mass., for many years, and that Senator Smith himself was a member of the city council of Gloucester, and was elected mayor of the city from the council.

So, Mr. President, I came to respect the appointment which the Governor had made; and as Senator Smith and I became colleagues, we also became friends.

Senator Smith has made a good and conscientious Senator. Insofar as Massachusetts is concerned, he has joined with me in several undertakings which we shall always remember. They include establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore and the provision for increased research and assistance to the fishing industry, with which he is particularly familiar.

One of the best speeches ever made on the floor of the Senate in relation to any industry was the speech which Senator Smith made on the fishing industry, its problems and its future.

Now Senator Smith is about to travel to Uganda, to be the representative of the President of the United States at the celebration of Uganda's independence. I am confident that Senator Smith will make an excellent representative of the President, and not only will help to establish a fine spirit between our country and Uganda, but also will make many friends, both for himself and for our country, in that land.

Benjamin Smith has a brilliant future ahead of him. Although he will no longer be a colleague in the Senate, he will continue to be our friend. I appreciate greatly the frankness and sincerity with which he has done such fine work in performing his duties as a Member of the U.S. Senate; and I am confident that every Member of the Senate feels, as I do, that we shall lose a valued colleague when Senator Benjamin A. Smith ends his Senatorial services at the conclusion of this session.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the tributes which have been paid to our colleague, Senator Oren Long, of Hawaii, who has chosen to retire from this body at the conclusion of this session.

Senator Oren Long came to the Senate as one of the first Senators from the State of Hawaii. He is a thoughtful, quiet, and gentle man; he is a man of great courage; and he is completely dedicated to the things in which he believes, and is dedicated to the ideals of his party. Certainly he is a most courageous representative of the interests of his State.

It has been my good fortune to serve on two of the standing committees of the Senate with Senator Long. I always found him most diligent in his attention to duty, always willing to cooperate, always friendly and helpful, and always standing firmly for the things in which he believes.

His lovely wife, Geneva, has been a great asset to him, and has become a good friend of all those who have come to know and love her.

All of us will greatly miss Senator Long and his lovely wife when they return to their beloved State of Hawaii. I hope they will find occasion to return here often, to renew the many friendships they have formed while they have been in Washington. I join all my colleagues in wishing for Senator Long and his charming wife, long, happy, and useful lives in their beautiful native State.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in honoring Senator Long, of Hawaii. It has been my privilege during the last 2 years to serve on both the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee with him. I have grown to admire and respect his perception, his close attention to arduous committee work, his dedication of sound policy and commonsense. I have valued his counsel and advice and grown to regard him as a fine friend.

But above and beyond my respect for a sincere and effective legislator, I have admired the friendliness, the kindliness of Senator Long. As we say a last "aloha" to our colleague and wish him many pleasant years of retirement, we can assure him that he will be missed in the Senate but not forgotten by those who served with him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes paid to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long]. I have come to know him and to appreciate very much his great ability and his many contributions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Oren Long is a virtuous and a friendly man. He has been a splendid Senator, and has endeared himself to all of us. We shall sorely miss him, but we hope that his future years may be fruitful and happy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Tennessee is proud of the distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii, Hon. Oren Long. He has many relatives and friends in Tennessee, and he has been a frequent visitor there.

His service in the U.S. Senate has been marked by significant contributions. His has been a constructive career, a positive record. His service in the Senate, however, but climaxes a life of service, a life filled with a unique goodness of spirit and good will.

To his honored retirement he takes the admiration and best wishes of all who have had the privilege of serving with him.

Also, Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith] has served well. Each of his colleagues, I dare say, regrets his departure from the Senate. He has grown in stature and in the affection and esteem of the Senate. It is my hope that President Kennedy will persuade him to assume a responsible position in the Government.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I was not on the floor yesterday while tributes were being paid to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith]. But I do want to associate myself with the majority leader and my colleagues in mentioning the loss the Senate will suffer with the departure of Ben Smith.

It has been my privilege to serve on one committee with Senator Smith. He was a faithful worker on that committee as he has been in his other duties.

But it was in that separate fraternity among the new Members that I came to know Senator Smith best. His friendliness and his personality endeared him to us as it did to his more senior colleagues. Each of us regards Senator Smith as a beloved friend.

Senator Smith has been a dedicated, hard working and effective Senator. He will be missed and we look forward to the time when he returns to Washington to continue what is already an illustrious career.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, yesterday a number of my colleagues took the occasion to express on the floor of the Senate their great admiration and affection for the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith]. I regret that I was not in the Chamber when this was done, because I, too, wished to express my feelings concerning my dear friend, Ben Smith. I rise today to add my weak words on this subject.

It has been my good fortune to serve on a Senate committee with Ben. He has been diligent in his work, thoughtful in his consideration of problems, friendly in his relations with his fellow Senators and with staff people, and most effective in representing his State of Massachusetts. It is remarkable what influence he has exerted in the relatively brief tenure he has had in the Senate. All of us, I am sure, are reluctant to see him retire.

I would say a word also about Mrs. Smith, the charming and devoted wife of Senator Smith. She has endeared herself to the Senate community here and will be deeply missed when she returns to Massachusetts.

We wish the Smiths much happiness and continued success in their return to their native State. We all hope that they will return here often to refresh and renew the wonderful friendships we now have.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in manifesting my affection and admiration for the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, Oren Long, who is voluntarily retiring from the Senate at the end of the present session. It has been my privilege to be seated close to him in the Senate Chamber, to come to know him, and to be closely associated with him in connection with questions of legislation. I have also had the honor to have become acquainted with his lovely wife, Geneva. Senator Long of Hawaii, who has had the distinction of being one of the first two Senators from that new State, has made a fine outstanding record in this body. We shall miss him.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I also wish to state, as I have said before in this Chamber, that another of our fine colleagues, Senator Ben Smith II, of Massachusetts, is retiring voluntarily from the Senate. We shall also greatly miss him. Senator Smith has had the distinction of serving here by appointment to fill the position vacated by the President of the United States, who was then the junior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Kennedy.

Senator Smith has been a fine Senator. We all realize that he also has a great future in the affairs of the Nation and the world. So I join with my colleagues in saluting these fine Senators, who will be greatly missed following the time when the new Congress convenes next January.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, among all the fine things and interesting experiences that the Senate brings to a newcomer are the friendships and personal relationships. It is thus with great sadness that I now pay a public tribute to our colleague, Benjamin A. Smith II. To my mind, over and beyond being a good friend of mine who has been of great help to me, he has proved himself a first-class Senator and has represented his Commonwealth with immense commonsense, good judgment, and tact.

The warm friendships that Ben established here in the Senate were perhaps best evidenced the other day at a Senators' coffee hour at the White House, when he was applauded long and loud.

I am very sad indeed to know that he is retiring this year and wish him all kinds of good luck for the future. I, for one, will miss him very much and trust that in one way or another he will be back in Washington before too long.

I hope that Ben Smith will continue to contribute of his talents and experience for the good of our country and our people. I am sure that in the days ahead that there will be opportunities when he will be called upon to continue to give of himself in the best traditions of public service.

At this time I should like also to pay my tribute, and express my regret at the departure of our colleague, Senator Oren Long of Hawaii.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to associate myself with the eulogies paid to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, Ben Smith II, and my distinguished friend from the great State of Hawaii, Oren Long. In the short time that it has been their privilege to serve in this body they have earned for themselves the respect, admiration and affection of all Senators on both sides of the aisle. It is sad that by their own decision they will not return next January to this august body. But all of us here wish to both Senators many years of good health and happiness for themselves and for their families.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to speak a word of tribute to our distinguished colleague and good friend, Benjamin A. Smith II, of Massachusetts. It has been my privilege since he has been in the Senate to serve with him on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He has worked diligently on questions of education, public health and veterans' affairs. He is a member of the Veterans' Affairs subcommittee.

When he came into the Senate he was unknown to me and to most other Senators. I had to read the Record twice to realize that he had been here only 2 years, through only two sessions, for he has made such a great imprint on the membership of this body, and particularly on those of us in the committees with which he works, and on all those in the Senate in relation to the subjects upon which he has worked, that we regard him a regular "long termer." It never occurs to us that he could have been here for only 2 years.

When he came here he succeeded a distinguished Senator, the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. He had big shoes to fill, and he has filled them with ability. He has won the esteem of all Senators.

We shall miss him. I do not pay tribute to him merely in the form of a eulogy, of someone departing, because I expect future great service from him. By my standards, he is a young man. He is only 46 years of age. He has 30 to 40 years or more of an active working time in life before him. I expect to see him in at least as high a position as he holds now, or even higher—and there are higher positions in this country, in addition to Vice President and President, because an ambassadorship outranks the office of Senator. He has his life before him at his youthful age.

He brought a certain talent to the Senate that we need. Many of us in the Senate are lawyers. I believe the majority of us are lawyers. He is a manufacturer. His degree from Harvard is that of a bachelor of science. He has had special training in business. He has brought business training and executive leadership to the Senate. He also served as mayor of his city, and in that regard he brought governmental executive talents and experience to the Senate which has been very valuable to the Senate, in his service here.

The first thing he taught me was that the city of which he was mayor was not Glowchester, which was the way I had always pronounced it, but was really "Glosster"—Gloucester.

It has been a pleasure to serve with him on committees and subcommittees, and all of us treasure his service here with us in the Senate. I believe this service here has been for him a stepping stone to what will be a great, fine career of public service.

He has added luster to the Senate in his 2 short years of service among us.

I wish to thank him particularly for his help on my cold war GI bill and on all other veterans' legislation from our committee, most of which was passed and is now law. Senator Smith has put the imprint of his good mind and dedicated spirit in these laws.

He has been of invaluable help in connection with public health bills and education bills. If Senators will study the records of the committee with respect to bills passed and pending, they will find that Ben Smith has made one of the finest contributions in 2 years in the field of education and of public health of anyone in the Senate. We will miss this conscientious, hardworking colleague on our committee and in the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who have spoken with reference to two retiring Senators, one being Senator Oren Long of Hawaii, and the other Senator Smith of Massachusetts.

I speak first with reference to Senator Long of Hawaii. In his first term in this body, the first term in which the new State of Hawaii was represented in the Senate, I think he fully met and fulfilled the three primary duties and responsibilities of a Member of the Senate.

First, he has been a devoted Member of the Senate, accepting the responsibilities of his committee assignments. He has worked diligently and competently. His recommendations and actions in committee have been generally accepted as sound by members of the committee.

Secondly, he has spoken for his own people. I think that has been most important in the first years of the existence of Hawaii as a State. It is important to have that State represented in this body and its needs made known to the Senate—not only made know in the Senate, but made a cause of action in the Senate. The work of Senator Long has contributed in great measure to launching the State of Hawaii as one of the United States.

Third, he has fulfilled another responsibility which I think rests upon every Member of the Senate, not only to represent and speak for his people in the sense of representing their particular interests, but, beyond that, projecting to the Nation and to the people of the United States their ideas, attitudes, and judgments with regard to the problems of the Nation, and, beyond that, in giving his State a voice in councils of the world.

On these counts Senator Oren Long has fulfilled the three great requirements that rest upon any Senator of the United States.

I can say the same with regard to Senator Smith of Massachusetts, who has been with us a relatively short time, but who has proved himself as a campaigner and as a politican. He has proved himself as a Member of the Senate, and has created a host of admirers and friends in the short time he has been in the Senate.

I suppose it is too much to say, in view of all the facts and the conditions existing today, that we hope to have him return to the Senate very soon; but in any case we will say that if he returns to the Senate he will be received as an old friend of Senators and as one who knows the work of the Senate.

Since that seems to be impossible, at least immediately, we hope he may return to Government in some other function. In any case, we wish him the very best.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleagues in extending best wishes and a warm aloha to the junior Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Benjamin Smith, who has decided to retire from the Senate.

It has been my privilege to serve with Ben Smith on the important Senate Committee on Public Works, where I am pleased to report he proved a most vigorous spokesman for the State of Massachusetts. I wish to commend him for his diligence to his responsibilities on this committee and to the manifold duties of a Senator. In him, the people of Massachusetts have had an able champion and an excellent representative in the U.S. Congress.

It has been a great honor for me to have made his friendship, and I regret exceedingly that he will not be with us in the next session of Congress. I do hope we shall have occasion to work together at some future time. I know I shall miss his friendly smile and his congenial personality.

To you, my friend, I say success, long life, good health, Godspeed, and aloha.

Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleagues in paying well-deserved tribute to my long-time friend and colleague, with whom I am proud and privileged to serve, the junior Senator from Hawaii, Oren E. Long.

On March 9, this year, Oren Long announced his decision not to seek reelection to the Senate in November. I was saddened at the announcement, for I know this august body will be the poorer on losing a fine citizen who was an untiring force for good government and the brotherhood of mankind. His tenure will be all too brief.

It was 3 years ago—on August 24, 1959—that Oren Long and I, side by side, took the oath of office as U.S. Senators—the first Senators from the new State of Hawaii.

I know he shared with me the deep thrill of that moment which brought the fact of statehood home to both of us. To dream of statehood the people of Hawaii had nurtured for more than half a century and for which Oren and I and so many citizens of Hawaii had labored so long had at last come true.

I know Oren shared with me, too, a deep sense of humility and responsibility to serve our State and our country to the best of our ability.

During the following months and years, it was my privilege to work hand in hand with Oren Long on many pressing matters involving the new State of Hawaii. Together we served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee where we devoted hours upon end to the exacting task of devising legislation amending 54 sections of Federal law to effect Hawaii's transition from Territory to State. We served together also on the Public Works Committee, where we were able to have Hawaii included in the provisions of the Defense Highway Act and to obtain approval of many needed projects for Hawaii.

Together we labored to persuade Congress to establish in Hawaii a Center of Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, and with the help of many friends in the Congress, we were successful. This year, the East-West Center began its second year of instruction.

Success also crowned our cooperative efforts to obtain funds for the University of Hawaii in lieu of a land grant under the Morrill Act.

Oren Long and I joined forces to obtain authorization and funds for a breakwater to protect the city of Hilo on our largest island, Hawaii, from tidal waves, which in two devastating strikes killed more than 220 persons. Again, with the help of our sympathetic colleagues in the Congress, we were successful.

We both pressed for an irrigation project on the island of Molokai to turn desert land into fertile fields in the hope that some day Molokai might become the breadbasket of our State, which now is forced to import two-thirds of the food we consume.

These are only a few of our many cooperative endeavors in behalf of our State. Although we belong to different political parties, I am happy to report that no thought of petty partisanship interfered when the serious affairs of our State were at stake.

That we attained such a fine working relationship attests in large measure to the serene and unimpeachable integrity of Oren Long and to his mellow wisdom and perspective born of his wide experience, for Oren Long came to the Senate already possessed of notable attainments, any one of which standing alone entitles him to claim success.

An educator by profession, Oren Long rose through the ranks of his chosen field after receiving his bachelor of arts degree from Johnson College, Tennessee; his master's degree in English and American history at the University of Michigan in 1916; and his master's degree in administration from Columbia University in 1922. While working on his advanced degrees, he taught high school and was in due time named principal.

During these years of education and training, Oren Long showed discerning judgment by marrying Miss Geneva Rule, of Knoxville, a capable teacher in her own right, who has been a never-failing source of encouragement and inspiration to him throughout his career. On their wedding day, Oren and Geneva Long departed for the Territory of Hawaii, little realizing that some day Hawaii would be a State and that Oren would be chosen by its people to represent them in Congress.

But I am getting ahead of my story. In Hawaii, Oren Long served as deputy superintendent of public instruction for the islands from 1925 to 1934, and then was named superintendent of public instruction, in which post he served with great distinction until 1946, when the President appointed him Secretary of Hawaii. In 1951, President Truman selected Oren Long to be Governor of Hawaii. At that time, I was serving as Speaker of Hawaii's House of Representatives. I was privileged to work closely with Oren Long in the affairs of our Territory for about 2 years until February 1953 when a change of administration in Washington resulted in a new Governor for Hawaii. On leaving the governorship, Oren Long engaged in an active campaign for statehood for Hawaii, serving as member and vice chairman of the statehood commission from 1954 to 1956.

In the latter year, Oren ran for elective office and won a seat in the Territorial senate, where he served until 1959. On July 28, 1959, Oren Long was elected U.S. Senator.

An adopted son of Hawaii, Oren Long has endeared himself to the native-born sons and daughters of the islands. Countless numbers of our children are better educated because of Oren Long's sound and enlightened leadership of our school system. They are also better citizens because of Oren Long and his belief that "understanding and tolerance and a willingness to work together do not constitute an ideal, but rather, a necessity."

Kansas-born, Oren Long also earned the gratitude of the people of Hawaii as Governor for his efficient administration, his record of steady progress, and his constant efforts toward full statehood for us. As the Honolulu Advertiser, one of Hawaii's fine daily newspapers stated in an editorial:

> His guiding light has been a deep sense of history and an abiding faith in the essential wisdom of an informed electorate.

Another fine daily newspaper in Hawaii, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, accurately observed:

> Senator Long carries with him into retirement the respect and affection of his friends on both sides of the political aisle.

A measure of the widespread esteem for Oren Long is the action of the Hawaii House of Representatives this year in adopting a resolution offering felicitations to him on his 73d birthday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution and of both editorials be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, together with a laudatory article which appeared in the Kansas City Star.

I also ask that a detailed biography of Oren Long be placed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection of the request by the Senator from Hawaii? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is not ability alone that has endeared Oren Long to Hawaii. He has won a permanent place in our hearts with his pleasing personal attributes, his gentle, kindly manner, his exemplary life, his quiet perseverance—that have proven so effective in combination. A veteran of the political arena, he shows none of the scars or bitterness of battle—remaining constantly good natured and affable. He is indeed a credit to Hawaii, to the Congress, and to all America.

It gives me great pleasure to salute you, my friend. And, while I know not what your plans for the future may be, I want to extend on behalf of Ellyn and myself our best wishes for success and Godspeed in whatever you do. I am sure I speak for all Hawaii and all your Senate colleagues and friends in Washington when I tender to you and your beloved wife, Geneva, my fond and fervent hopes that good health, long life, and enduring friendships may always bless you.

To Oren E. Long, student, teacher, doctor, Governor, Senator, and longtime friend, may I say: "May your blessings be as full as the eastern ocean, and your life as everlasting as the southern hills."

Exhibit 1

House Resolution 26

Whereas on March 4, 1962, the Honorable Oren E. Long, U.S. Senator from Hawaii, celebrated his 73d birthday; and

Whereas Senator Long has served the people of Hawaii as a schoolteacher, a principal, Superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction, Secretary of Hawaii, Governor of Hawaii, Territorial Senator, and is now serving as U.S. Senator from Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, budget session of 1962, That this body hereby conveys to the beloved U.S. Senator from Hawaii on his 73d birthday its best wishes for a long and healthy life that he may continue to serve the people of Hawaii as successfully as he has in the past; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Oren E. Long.

D. C. McClung, Abel Madeiros, Peter S. Iha, Akiro Sakima, Tadao Beppu, Dorothy L. Devereaux, Eureka Forbes, William E. Fernandes, David K. Trask, Jr., Akoni Pule, Frank W. C. Loo, Walter M. Heen, Donald S. H. Ching, Pedro de la Cruz, John C. Lanham, Namoru Yamasaki, Robert C. Pleis.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Mar. 13, 1962]

Oren Long's Career

Oren E. Long may be retiring from the U.S. Senate but we doubt that this quiet and dedicated man is ending his service to the people of Hawaii.

Senator Long has been at it for too many years—almost half a century—to call it quits now. While his name may no longer appear on a Government office door, the habit of a lifetime—the habit of service—will, we suspect, prove too strong for private citizen Long to break.

Public service, concern with the advance of his adopted Hawaii, is the distinguishing feature of the life of this transplanted Kansan.

Some have despaired on occasion of a seeming lack of dynamism and a tendency to temporize in the face of tough decisions. To a degree this has been true, but it should not obscure that throughout a long and honorable career Oren Long in his quiet and unassuming way has done much for Hawaii.

His guiding light has been a deep sense of history and an abiding faith in the essential wisdom of an informed public—traceable, quite naturally, to his many years as an educator.

A University of Michigan graduate, the Senator came here from Tennessee with his bride in 1917 as a social worker. He soon took up teaching and rose in time to head the department of public instruction, a post he held for 12 years before becoming successively secretary of Hawaii, head of the welfare department, and, finally, Governor by appointment.

After leaving the governorship in 1953, Long plunged into the statehood campaign, spending many months in Washington as a citizen-lobbyist, a role in which he was particularly effective among Southern Congressmen.

In 1956 he became a Territorial Senator and then in 1959 he was elected to the U.S. Senate, a tribute to an already full life of service.

In Washington, he played a major if quiet part in helping convert the East-West Center from idea to fact. He also did much to help persuade the Congress to give the University of Hawaii $6 million in lieu of the land grant to which the institution was entitled but had never received.

And his personal interest and concern were decisive in turning congressional attention to the shameful state of affairs in long-neglected American Samoa.

Some men seek power for power's sake. Oren Long has no doubt enjoyed the taste of power as would any man, but probably for him the greater reward has been the simple chance to help advance the public good.

His career has not been spectacular, but it all adds up to a lifetime of solid contribution to the progress of Hawaii.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Mar. 11, 1962]

Oren Long Stands Aside

Oren E. Long is bowing out of the U.S. Senate at the end of this year.

He is doing so in deference to an understanding that when the popular, ambitious young Dan Inouye sought a House instead of a Senate seat 3 years ago, Oren Long would serve one term, then step aside in favor of Inouye.

Although his announcement does not extend to other possible candidacies this fall, intimates say Senator Long has decided upon complete retirement from elective office.

By his action he removes a source of contention that could have led to a costly split in the ranks of his party. This is characteristic of Oren Long, who has found conflict disagreeable and has built his political career around the image of a "nice guy" with liberal ideas.

This is not to say that Oren Long has not, on occasion, acted with firmness and determination. But the political in-fighting has always been distasteful to him. In a sense he has remained an idealist with a firm faith that right will somehow triumph.

One finds it difficult to visualize Oren Long, still in good health, still in full possession of his faculties, retired to the public sidelines. His age, 73, is no barrier to useful public service and it is entirely within reason that his talents should be put to use outside of the rough and tumble of elective politics.

But even if he decides upon complete retirement, Oren Long will have behind him a career in public life matched by few of his contemporaries.

The Kansas farm boy, who migrated to Tennessee and the University of Michigan, came to Hawaii in 1917 with his bride as a social worker in Hilo. Two years later he became a teacher and it was in public education that he made his name in Hawaii, culminating that phase of his career with 12 years as superintendent of public instruction during a period of robust growth and significant policy development.

After a brief tour of duty as director of the Department of Public Welfare, he became Secretary of Hawaii and later Governor. When the White House changed hands in 1953, Oren Long found himself out of a job, but not for long. He entered elective politics for the first time in 1956 and won a seat in the Territorial senate where he served until his successful bid for the U.S. Senate seat in 1959 when Hawaii achieved Statehood.

Along the way he compiled a record of useful civic service in such organizations as the Boy Scouts, the Lions Club, World Brotherhood, the Honolulu Community Chest, and the Child and Family Service.

Senator Long carries with him into retirement the respect and affection of his friends and associates on both sides of the political aisle. Certainly his party has reason to be grateful for this act of abnegation—it is a contribution toward Democratic unity at a critical time in his party's history.

From Kansas Farm to Senate by Way of Hawaii

(By Jack Williams)

Washington.—The kindly, smiling man sitting in the spacious office intended for the vice president of the United States recalled the days when he chased jackrabbits on a Kansas farm.

Senator Oren Ethelbirt Long was assigned the trim suite in the new Senate Office building when Vice President Nixon decided to keep his old office. He had traveled a long way from Kansas before he ran for the Senate, and he traveled more miles to win a Senate seat than any other member.

In a long career for public service in Hawaii, Oren Long was for 2 years territorial governor, by appointment of President Truman. Last July he became one of the first two Senators from the most westerly of the 50 States, Hawaii.

His road to the islands was devious. After a boyhood in Kansas, he went to Tennessee where he was graduated from Johnson Bible College. He taught there, and earned degrees from the University of Michigan and Columbia University. On his wedding day, almost 43 years ago, he took off for Hawaii.

A DEMOCRAT FROM KANSAS

How did he become a Democrat, coming from normally Republican Kansas?

"My father was a liberal Democrat," he said, "although when I was a boy Kansas was overwhelmingly Republican. My father was a great admirer of Senator George Norris and a follower of William Jennings Bryan."

A man of disarming frankness, the Senator had a ready reply to a question about whether he had a favorite in the Democratic contest for the presidential nomination:

"With the international situation as explosive as it is, we should have in the office of chief executive experience and demonstrated capacity to give leadership and work cooperatively. In my book that adds up to Senator Lyndon Johnson, of Texas.

Asked about his reactions to climaxing an unusual and interesting career in the Senate, Long modestly appraised his accomplishment:

"What I say is not going to bring the world to a stop, but it is interesting to have this part in history."

FARM HOME NEAR ALTOONA

Long talked feelingly of his early life in Kansas. He was born March 4, 1889, on an 80-acre farm 3 miles east and 4 miles north of Altoona in Wilson County, Kans. His parents had moved there from a farm near Danville, Ill.

The pleasant days of his boyhood were in sharp contrast to the senatorial scene. The visitor to his office is greeted by a beautiful Hawaiian girl who smiles and says, "aloha." There are several Hawaiians on his staff.

In the private office of the Senator, he was found trying to accomplish the correct pronunciation of the name of Girolamo Savonarola, 15th century Florentine religious leader who caused women to cast their jewels and finery into "bonfires of vanity." He was going to refer to him in a speech to a Lions International convention: the Senator is an international director of that organization.

He laid the book aside to recall his youth in Kansas. Because of his warm memories of life on the farm and in the "deestrict school" at Earlton nearby, he has visited there every 2 or 3 years. Only one member of the family, a niece, Mrs. Max Travis, still resides in the community. She lives on the old Long farm, which has grown to 500 acres.

IN FAMILY OF SEVEN

The Senator was one of seven children. All but one still are living. They have moved to other parts of the country.

"I had an exceedingly happy life as a boy," he reminisced. "Our father allowed us to keep two greyhounds and ponies. The dogs, Ring and Lead, were matched with other dogs in our section in chasing jackrabbits. We hunted quail and cottontails. One of my happiest memories was riding a horse-drawn sleigh—a wagon bed mounted on runners—on moonlit nights.

"I skated a lot on the Neosho and Verdigris Rivers and Punkin Creek, named from its yellow water. We could skate on the Verdigris from Altoona almost to Fredonia.

"Then I can recall the big Sunday dinners, the Methodist Church, and the literary society at school. I took the affirmative in a debate, 'Resolved, Robert E. Lee was a greater general than Ulysses S. Grant.' I also remember another, 'Resolved, there is more pleasure in pursuit than possession.' "

Long completed the first 2 years of high school at Earlton. At the suggestion of an aunt in Tennessee, he went to Knoxville, Tenn., at the age of 17. There he finished high school and entered Johnson Bible College, enrolling in a nonministerial course. He spent 10 years there, 5 as a student and 5 as a member of the faculty, earning degrees from Michigan and Columbia during the time.

On June 26, 1917, he married Miss Geneva Rule, of Knoxville, also a teacher. They left that night for Hawaii where he had received an offer as social settlement worker in Hilo. After a year he became an American history teacher in McKinley High School in Honolulu.

He has played a major role in the development of education in Hawaii, serving 12 years as superintendent of public instruction in the islands after 9 years as first deputy superintendent. Hawaii has a centralized school system which, the Senator said, guarantees every child in the islands the same educational opportunity. Well-equipped schools are found in the most remote sections.

ON CENTRALIZED SCHOOLS

Should the United States have a centralized system? The Senator does not think so. The United States is too big. In Hawaii, the system has existed since 1854.

Although Long became interested in politics when he read about public figures in the seventh and eighth grades, his first active participation came when he left the helm of the island school system in 1946. He was director of the department of public welfare for a time in 1946. Then by Presidential appointment he became secretary of Hawaii.

May 8, 1951, he was appointed Governor of Territorial Hawaii by President Truman. He served until February 1953. He then became vice chairman of the statehood commission and worked, sometimes with little hope for statehood for the islands 2,500 miles west of the United States. He was a Territorial Senator from 1956 to 1959. Then he was elected to the U.S. Senate along with Hiram Leong Fong, Hawaiian-born Republican.

Biographical Sketch of Oren E. Long, U.S. Senator, State of Hawaii

Place of birth: Altoona, Neosho County, Kans.

Date of birth: March 4, 1889.

Married to the former Geneva Rule, of Knoxville, Tenn., on June 26, 1917. No children.

Parents: George Riley Long and Melissa Jeanette (Johnson) Long, both from Illinois.

Senator's Hawaii office address: Room 204, 1019 Smith Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Resident of Hawaii since 1917.

Education and training: Grammar and first 2 years of high school—Earlton, Kansas, 1896–1907. Johnson Academy, Tennessee, 1907–09. Johnson College, Tennessee, B.A., 1909–12. University of Michigan, M.A., in English and American History, 1916. Columbia University, M.A. in administration, 1922. University of Hawaii, honorary LL.D., 1951. Johnson Bible College, honorary LL.D., 1960. Phillips University, honorary doctor of humanities, 1961.

Public service: High school teacher and principal, 1912–25. Deputy superintendent of public instruction, July 1925-June 1934. Superintendent of public instruction, 1934–46. Director, department of public welfare, for a short period in 1946. Chairman, Advisory Committee on Education for Trust Territories, at the request of the U.S. Navy, 1946. Secretary of Hawaii, 1946–51 (presidential appointment). Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, May 8, 1951-February 1953 (presidential appointment—President Harry S. Truman). Member and vice chairman, Statehood Commission, 1954–56. Territorial Senator, 1956–59. Elected U.S. Senator, July 28, 1959. Member: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Chairman Interior Special Subcommittee To Study Conditions in American Samoa. Committee on Public Works. Special Committee on Aging. In 1962, appointed member Board of Visitors, U.S. Coast Guard Academy. Ranking majority member on 21-man committee, appointed by Vice President.

Community service: Member, National Education Association. Member, Hawaii Education Association. Executive Director, National Youth Association. Scoutmaster and Commissioner, Boy Scouts of America. Member of the Board, Child and Family Service. Director, Lions International. Member, National Sojourners. Member, World Brotherhood, Asia-Pacific Division, Hawaii Chapter. Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, 32°, Member of the Board, Honolulu Community Chest. Member of the Board of Regents, University of Hawaii.

COMMENTS

Education: During the period (1934–46) that Senator Oren E. Long was superintendent of public instruction, public instruction made great progress under his guidance and leadership. Molding the lives of the youths of Hawaii in the ideals of democracy was his main objective. The development of good citizens was stressed constantly, as is stated in his report to the commissioners of public instruction on July 25, 1946:

"Citizenship, as an objective, can never be an elective in the schools. It is a constant. Understanding and tolerance and a willingness to work together do not constitute an ideal but, rather, a necessity.

The record of sacrifices made by all the people of Hawaii during World War II was in part a result of this progressive education of the youth of Hawaii.

A résumé of important legislation of this period is as follows: (1) Authorized exchange of public schoolteachers from any State; (2) granted leave of absence to any teacher who has served 8 years in the public schools with guaranteed return to his former position; (3) provided the use, without charge, of school books by elementary school students; (4) extended the age of compulsory attendance from 15 years to 16½ years; (5) authorized the department of public instruction to regulate the licensing of private schools; and (6) established the single salary schedule based upon the preparation and length of service of schoolteachers.

In addition, progressive legislation was passed in the areas of pupil guidance, kindergartens, adult education, increased financial support for public education and special services, added administrative-supervisory staff, teachers' leave of absence—relative to sick leave, maternity leave, and educational leave.

Statehood: Member and vice chairman of the statehood commission. Senator LONG has always been an outspoken advocate of immediate statehood. He worked closely in the work of the constitutional convention as Secretary of Hawaii and Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii.

Governor of the Territory of Hawaii (May 1951–February 1953): Senator OREN E. LONG was appointed Secretary (1946–51) and later as Governor of the Territory of Hawaii by President Harry S. Truman in May 1951, to serve as the 10th chief executive of the Territory until February 1953. He was Acting Governor during the most troublesome period of the history of the labor movement in Hawaii. The pineapple strike occurred in 1947, and he figured in its early settlement. The dock strike occurred in 1949. As Governor he initiated a central purchasing system, and his administration generally tightened up and improved the existing machinery of government. His administration continued its effort toward achieving statehood and he devoted much time and made numerous appearances in Washington to further the cause of statehood.

U.S. Senator: Senator LONG's election on July 28, 1959, to the U.S. Senate culminated 42 years of dedicated public service to the people of Hawaii. His abiding faith and love of the people of Hawaii have always been sustained and guided by the great Hawaiian motto: "Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono—The life of the land is preserved in righteousness."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to add my few words to the praise which has been so greatly merited by Senator LONG, which I know of my own knowledge to be thoroughly merited.

I recall when he first came to my office, at the time the Territory of Hawaii was seeking statehood. He was serving as superintendent of public instruction in the Territory. Later he served as Governor. He was here frequently, and he worked assiduously in support of the effort by Hawaii to become a State.

As one of the Senators who were supporting that effort, I found it my great pleasure to make his acquaintance. I found, with pleasure, that he liked to visit in my office, and to make himself at home there, because we found we had a good many things in common, particularly the love of history and an interest in education, in which his accomplishments had been so vastly greater than had been mine.

Later, when Hawaii was admitted to statehood and I had the pleasure of going to Hawaii at the time of the celebration of statehood, I had the pleasure to learn how greatly beloved he and Mrs. Long are among the good people there, irrespective of any political implications whatsoever. Because of his many years of service as teacher, as organizer of the school system, and as Governor of the Territory, I found that everyone spoke with praise, with admiration and with deep affection for him, for the constructive services which he had rendered so fully to his people.

I am happy, Mr. President, that he was able to round out that lifetime of excellent and honorable service by coming as one of the first team of Senators to the U.S. Senate to represent the new State. He has served admirably.

He holds the respect and affection of every Member of the Senate, regardless of the side of the aisle on which we sit, and regardless of our philosophy. As every Senator knows, we who sit on either side of the aisle are not all of the same philosophy.

I regard him with the deepest of respect and affection. I shall miss him greatly. Mrs. Holland and I wish Godspeed to him and Mrs. Long. We hope they will have many years to bask in the affection of their grateful people, who are indeed grateful for the real, living service he has rendered to them throughout so many decades.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise to say that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who spoke of our colleague from Hawaii, expressed the sentiments of all of us in the Senate when he said that the service of the Senator from Hawaii had been too brief. I appreciate Senator LONG's service. I have worked with him, and I hope to have the privilege of performing one more service with him as a representative of the Senate when we attend the Interparliamentary Union meetings in Brasilia later this month, as representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Senator LONG has had a great interest in education, which he has demonstrated to those of us who serve on the Subcommittee on Education.

He holds three earned degrees, which is an unusual distinction for any man. He holds a bachelor of arts degree from Johnson College in Tennessee, a master of arts degree from the University of Michigan, and a masters degree from Columbia University. In addition, he holds three honorary degrees, of doctor of laws and of doctor of humanities.

He has brought to the Senate his kindness of spirit that shines in him to show the great spirit that he is, and the inspiration that he has been in his life to so many peoples.

He has served as superintendent of public instruction and Governor of Hawaii when Hawaii was a Territory. He has had a lifelong experience as a scholar, teacher, school administrator, has served in the highest executive office of his Territory, as Governor, and has rendered distinguished service as a Member of the Senate of the United States, and to add here one more crown of achievement to his life of service and achievement.

He has rendered service not only in the field of education, but also in the field of conservation. He has been a leader in the efforts to conserve wildlife. One of his bills, now pending, is to save from extinction the nene goose. The total population of that very rare large bird of Hawaii now numbers less than 300, and is threatened with extinction.

He has supported conservation and park bills. This Congress has created three national seashore parks out of a total of four in the Nation. It is a conservation minded Congress, with a record of creating more recreation areas for the people than any other Congress in our history.

Certainly this is a record of which any Senator could be proud. Senator LONG has participated very actively in writing that record, particularly in the fields of education, recreation, public welfare, and conservation—conservation of human resources and of wildlife and other natural resources.

We shall miss our kindly friend from Hawaii in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join wholeheartedly with my colleagues in paying due and deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague, Senator LONG of Hawaii on the occasion of his imminent departure from this body. Although we have had the pleasure of his company and the evidence of his high personal qualities for so limited a time, Senator LONG has earned the esteem of Members on both sides of the aisle by his vigorous involvement in the advancement of legislation which responded to the dictates of his best judgment in furthering the common cause of a better, stronger America. I know that I express the feelings of every Member of the Senate when I wish Senator LONG the fullest measure of fulfillment and happiness, in the fruitful years he will continue to give to his beloved State and Nation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH]. He was appointed 2 years ago to be a Member of the Senate. During his service in this body he has kept in the background to a considerable extent, but he has done an extraordinary amount of work. In my opinion, no one has made a stronger fight for the fishing industry than has Senator SMITH. He has represented his State and its interests and its needs with great diligence and industry. He has been a most conscientious, thorough, fair-minded committee member.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that in the 1960 campaign for the Presidency of the United States, Senator SMITH was a leader for the Kennedy cause in northern Wisconsin, in the crucial primary there. Not only did Senator SMITH render an outstanding service to President Kennedy, under most difficult circumstances, in the Wisconsin primary, but he deserves particular credit for his accomplishments, in view of the fact that in the primary President Kennedy was running against a solid Wisconsin favorite, the enormously popular Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey].

Senator Smith made a wonderful impression there; everyone there who saw him liked him; and many of them have gone out of their way to inform me that they regard him as an unusually fine human being. So in commending Senator Ben Smith, I speak for many of my Wisconsin constituents.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as we are about to do the country a favor and go home, there are several subjects I should like to discuss briefly.

First, I wish to join in the statements made by other Senators in praise of the service of the distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long] and the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith]. It has been a pleasure and a real privilege to serve with them, to enjoy their companionship, and to realize that in this body one can make genuine friendships which we all hope will be long standing.

Speaking in deep admiration for their services, I am very happy to have the opportunity to make this statement. I regret very much that their services will be shortly ended in this body.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join my many colleagues in the Senate in expressing my pleasure and satisfaction in having served with Senator Ben Smith and Senator Oren Long, who are leaving us. They are men of warmth, personal conviction, high integrity and, to put it in more curbstone language, very dear people.

It has been a pleasure for me to know them under these rather august circumstances. I hope that they feel that I, in common with their other colleagues in the Senate, speed them on their way for whatever life holds for them with the pleasure and satisfaction of having had the privilege of their friendship and cooperation as colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. McGEE subsequently said: Mr. President, I was necessarily detained in the conference committee dealing with the foreign aid bill, at the time when tributes were paid to our colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith]. I wish to add my tribute to those already paid him.

Benjamin Smith has been a Member of the Senate only 2 years. I do not know of another case in which a new Member of the Senate has so quickly made such a deep and constructive impact on the proceedings of the Senate as a whole and on its individual Members, in particular.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to join in wishing Senator Smith the very best in the future; and because of our high esteem for him and our complete confidence in him, I desire to express the sincere hope that it will be possible for the President of the United States to take him to his side at the White House, as a confident, as one who, as a former Member of this body, could help the President keep in close touch with the Senate, and vice versa. Senator Smith is highly qualified to render most valuable services in that connection. I would frown upon having a formal title and formal assignment given to Senator Smith in that connection, because too often titles become facades behind which too little is done, and that would not be appropriate to the outstanding character of Senator Smith.

So, Mr. President, I wish to pay my tribute to Senator Smith of Massachusetts for his great devotion in the performance of his duties in the Senate and for the perspicacity he has displayed throughout his all too brief tenure as a Member of this body.

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR HICKEY TO SENATOR SMITH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a tribute by my colleague, Mr. Hickey, to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith]. My colleague, Mr. Hickey, wishes to join in these tributes. He came to the Senate at the same time when Senator Smith did, and they have been close associates in this body.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tribute by Senator Hickey, of Wyoming

I wish to join my colleagues in voicing the respect and high esteem we share for our good friend and colleague, Ben Smith, Senator from Massachusetts.

Senator Smith's personal qualities and public abilities have contributed substantially to the Senate and to our Nation, and I am certain that this country will continue to hear from Senator Smith and benefit from his studious attention to its problems and devotion to its causes.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today a number of Senators paid their tributes to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long]. I wish to join in those expressions of friendship, admiration, and respect for the Senator from Hawaii.

Senator Long of Hawaii has had a full life of public service. The fact that Hawaii is a State is in no small measure due to the perseverance, the statesmanship, the political ability, and the hard work of Senator Long.

I wish the Record to note that Senator Long of Hawaii has been a true, progressive-minded, public servant in the U.S. Senate. He has always carefully watched for the needs of his own State. In addition, he has been a U.S. Senator in the fullest sense of that term. He has always placed foremost the interests of our Nation; and at all times he has carefully guarded the interests and the welfare of his own State. He has brought to the U.S. Senate qualities of humility, decency, sincerity, and integrity which have endeared him to each and every one of us.

I wish him many years of continued good health and happiness. I only hope that his great ability in the public service will be utilized in some other area of our Government, for the welfare of this country.

Mr. McGEE Mr. President, I desire to be associated entirely with the comments and remarks of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey]. I share completely his views in regard to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to add my tribute to those which already have been paid to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long]. Senator Long is a gentle, humble, and reverent man. He is devoted to the cause of education. He has a deep and strong feeling for its vital importance. I know he has spent most of his life in educational work. He has been a very fine teacher. During his service in the Senate, he has distinguished himself by his outstanding humility and sincerity and the great depth of his devotion to humanitarian causes and service, particularly in the field of education. He will be missed by this body.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I join Senators today in paying tribute to the distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Long], who is leaving this body. For the past 2 years we have sat in the Senate side by side. It seems strange that we should be the only two Senators on this side of the aisle who are voluntarily leaving the Senate this year. I do not know whose idea it was first.

I have enjoyed serving with Senator Long both here on the floor of the Senate and in committee. We have worked together on various projects. I have always found Senator Long to be one of the most dedicated men in this body. I am sure that he can look back on many years of great service to his State of Hawaii, both as Governor and more recently as Senator. I am sure that if the people of Hawaii follow the great tradition that they have established by sending great men such as Senator Long to the Senate, they will have great success.

I desire to acknowledge with most sincere thanks the many kind remarks that have been made about me and my work in the Senate, both yesterday and today.

It has been a great privilege to serve here with my colleagues. It has been an even greater privilege to have played a part in the 87th Congress. I believe the 87th Congress will go down in history as one that has accomplished a great deal. It will be remembered as the Congress in which was started a new view of the problems of the world under the leadership of our President, John F. Kennedy.

I know that in the years ahead I shall look back on my experience, and it will always be a source of great satisfaction to me to know that I have served with Senators during this important era of our country's history.

I could say many pleasant things about many of my colleagues, as they have said them about me. I mention only one—our distinguished majority leader, Mike Mansfield, who to me exemplifies the very finest traditions of the Senate.

Senator Mansfield has shown the greatest devotion to his duty. He has demonstrated his sincerity and his dedication to the great principles of our country and all that America stands for. With men like MIKE MANSFIELD and other Senators our country can look to the future with great confidence.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Earlier today, because of my attendance at a conference on the foreign aid bill, I was not at liberty to have my say about each of the retiring Senators—Senator SMITH of Massachusetts and Senator LONG of Hawaii. However, I shall not repeat the remarks that I made at a later point when neither one of those Senators was able to be present in the Chamber. As I speak now in their presence, I only want them to know that I shall treasure my association with them, and look forward to continuing my associations with them in whatever their pursuits may be.

I hold no one in this body in higher esteem than the two gentlemen who are about to step down from the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I can assure all of my colleagues in the Senate that I deeply appreciate all the kind and generous things that have been said about me this afternoon and earlier in the day. I particularly appreciate the tribute, because I know how sincere it is, from my colleague, the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

In common with all the other boys of my generation I was faced by the question of what trade or calling or profession I would follow. Due to personal choice in part and due to circumstances also, I became a teacher. I became a teacher partly because of an address I heard a brilliant superintendent from Atlanta, Ga., make. He was talking about young people selecting their life's work. He told about his experience. He said that he had thought about becoming a lawyer, that he had though about becoming an engineer, and that he had thought about becoming a dentist or a doctor. Then, finally, he decided that he wanted to have a part in all of these wonderful professions, and so he became a teacher. In the boys and in the girls who went through the schools where he served he realized all of these ambitions.

As I sat here this afternoon and listened to HIRAM, I recall that I was the first deputy superintendent of schools in charge of secondary education when HIRAM FONG was graduated with honors from McKinley High School; and that at a later period I was superintendent of schools and signed the diploma of DANIEL KEN INOUYE, who is Hawaii's first Representative in the House of Representatives.

To me, that brings great satisfaction. After all, we do not live apart, and our influence is felt in the lives of those with whom we have been privileged to work.

I have been very fortunate in many ways. I feel I have been fortunate in that I have had the privilege of living in three States. Every one of the 50 States is a wonderful State. I have had the privilege of living in the State of Kansas. I have had the privilege of living for a number of years in the State of Tennessee. I have had the privilege of living for almost 16 years in the newest State, the Aloha State. Now, due to circumstances, I have had the privilege of representing one of these States in the Senate. Let me say at this point that I can pay many tributes to this body, and I can join any Member of the Senate, the most eloquent and capable, in the deepest feelings that he may utter in tribute to the Senate. However, I have one tribute that I can pay to the Senate of the United States.

I am not speaking lightly and I am not speaking out of great devotion to what was for many years the Territory of Hawaii and now is the State of Hawaii. That tribute is this. This body had the courage to adventure, to believe in people who in many ways are different. Most of all, it took courage and imagination to make of a little piece of land, 2,200 miles out in the world's greatest ocean, that little Territory of Hawaii, the 50th State of this Union.

Hawaii will never be a great State from the standpoint of wealth, although it is a very prosperous American community. If it makes a contribution that is important and significant, and one that is needed at this period in the world's history, it will be in the kind of people that it has developed and is still developing, particularly in relation to one quality that this world needs more than any other, and that is the quality of understanding and appreciation and capacity to accept any man or woman regardless of name or complexion or background.

I take great pride in Hawaii in that respect. Because of that, it has been a great privilege to me to serve in the U.S. Senate.

I have been most fortunate in my seatmates—TOM DODD, on my right, and BEN SMITH, on my left. I have been most fortunate in the chairman of committees on which I have been privileged to serve. Now, as I come to the end of my brief period of service, I am most fortunate in the feeling of "aloha" which I have for all Members of the Senate.

Mark Twain once referred to Hawaii as the "loveliest fleet of islands that lie at anchor in any ocean." We hope to keep Hawaii a lovely place. When I leave and really retire—this will be the third time I have retired—when I go back to that fairest fleet of islands, one of the things to which I will look forward to is the privilege of being either at the airport or down at the wharf to greet Members of this body who have the privilege of going that way.

Aloha nui loa.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of newspaper comment during this session about the brilliance, the persuasiveness, and the effectiveness of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. No one, I think, would quarrel with those adjectives as applied to the distinguished Senator.

As the ranking Democratic member on both the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Public Works, as a member of the Democratic policy committee, as the Senator in charge of a number of extremely important and complicated bills, and also as chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, he has performed with brilliance, persuasiveness, and great effect.

One other aspect of the Senator's service, however, perhaps has received too little comment. That is it, very great range—testifying to the capacity of the Senator from Oklahoma for long, painstaking, hard work. His record in that regard equals or exceeds that of any other Member who has served here since I entered this body. In other words, he does his homework, and when he speaks on a bill he knows whereof he speaks.

I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of the measures the Senator has either managed or assisted in having passed through the Senate this year. I believe that this impressive list ought to be stated.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] managed H.R. 10606, the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962; H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962; H.R. 11737, the NASA space authorization bill; S. 2965, the Public Works Acceleration Act; S. 3773, the Flood Control Act of 1962, omnibus rivers and harbors bill; and H.R. 8874, the Du Pont stock divestiture bill.

The Senator assisted very ably with H.R. 10607, the tariff classification bill; H.R. 12154, the sugar extension bill; H.R. 11970, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; H.R. 11040, the communications satellite bill; and H.R. 12135, the highway bill.

The Senator from Oklahoma has served as a conferee on the sugar extension bill, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, the Flood Control Act of 1962, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Revenue Act of 1962, the national service life insurance reopener bill, the public welfare amendments of 1962, the NASA space authorization bill, the communications satellite bill, the fiscal year 1963 appropriation bill for public works, and the independent offices appropriation bill in respect to the NASA appropriations.

Mr. President, this was all I could find. It is a very impressive list, but I feel in my own mind that even with this list I have not encompassed all the activities of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on the floor of the Senate this year. He has made many worthy contributions. He has been a great and devoted Senator. I think what he has done this year should be given full recognition, and I heartily commend him for his many activities and for the many contributions he has made.

The State of Oklahoma and the Nation have real reasons to be proud of this Senator of the United States.

YUGOSLAV REFUGEE PROBLEM SUBMITTED BY NCWC AND INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a few days ago we were engaged in a discussion concerning the advisability of continued aid to Yugoslavia and Poland. There is one point which, perhaps, should have been made in the course of this discussion which unfortunately was not made. I refer to the fact that, since the mass exodus from Hungary in the closing months of 1956, Yugoslavia has been the chief refugee-producing country in Europe.

Because of the tendency to regard Yugoslavia as a different and more benign kind of communism, as a kind of communism that stands somewhere between Soviet communism and Western democracy, there has been a parallel tendency to regard the Yugoslav refugees not as refugees from political tyranny but simply as economic migrants seeking better job opportunities in other countries.

In consequence, the Yugoslav refugees have been subjected to infinitely more rigid screening than have refugees emerging from Poland and Czechoslovakia and other Iron Curtain countries. It is estimated that approximately half of them are returned to Yugoslavia against their will, while many more are denied the special protection and privileges that are accorded to those escapees who qualify for recognition as political refugees by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

It has unfortunately also had the effect of relegating them to the bottom of the totem pole as far as assistance from the U.S. escapee program is concerned.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that this injustice will be eliminated and that refugees from Tito's Yugoslavia will in the future be accorded the same consideration and treatment as refugees from other Communist countries.

From discussions with many people who have had firsthand contact with the problem, I am convinced that the men and women who escape from Yugoslavia do so for the same combination of motives that impell the escape of refugees from other Communist governments. They are motivated in part by economic hardship—but even this economic hardship is a peculiar feature of Communist oppression. They are motivated, too, in most cases by the persecution of religion and by the total lack of personal freedom.

Milovan Djilas in "The New Class" was emphatically of the opinion that even the modified Communist regime that existed at the time the book was written weighed oppressively on the shoulders of the entire people.

> The totalitarian tyranny and control of the new class, which came into being during the revolution—

Said Djilas—

> has become the yoke from under which the blood and sweat of all members of society flow. * * * The limitations of freedom of thought is not only an attack on specific political and social rights but an attack on the human being as such.

Since then, of course, Djilas has been in prison and the limited freedom of expression which existed for some time after the break with Stalin has come to an end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the Record at this point a statement on the plight of refugees fleeing from Yugoslavia, signed jointly by Edward E. Swanstrom, Titular Bishop of Arba and executive director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and William vanden Heuvel, president of the International Rescue Committee.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference needs no introduction. I think that all of us are acquainted with its work as one of the three great religious agencies operating in the field of foreign relief. The International Rescue Committee commands recognition as the foremost of the nonsectarian agencies in the refugee field. I believe that the combined opinion of these two organizations, with their wealth of experience in working with refugees, commends itself to our most earnest attention.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Plight of Refugees Fleeing From Yugoslavia

Prior to the erection of the Berlin wall, East Germany was not the only refugee-producing Communist country in Europe. Mass flights occurred from other areas, such as Hungary in 1956, and year after year about 10,000 Yugoslav refugees have fled that country. Yet how many Americans know that a large segment of the Yugoslavs have not been able to obtain asylum in the West and that many have been forcibly returned to Yugoslavia?

It almost appears that it required a wall and the merciless terror of the Communist police at the wall to create concern for today's refugees and to have them accepted for what they are: victims of totalitarian oppression who flee from pervasive political, spiritual, and economic devastations which they correctly identify with the Communist system.

It is the same type of refugee who is seeking freedom, whether he comes from East Germany, Hungary, or Yugoslavia. Most are young, some are very young. Although they may not be able to articulate the reason which makes them come, it is invariably a desire to escape the police state, its totalitarian control as well as its economic deprivation. A man's yearning for freedom and human dignity is quite compatible with his hope of economic betterment.

Mass flights are always an expression of disaffection and opposition, the final protest where other protests are made impossible by political terror. Where people have no other vote, they are forced to vote with their feet. Our answer to the refugee problem is an index of the political imagination and the moral temper of the West. The ambivalent attitude of the West toward Communist Yugoslavia has resulted in an ambivalent attitude toward Yugoslav refugees. Nothing can strengthen a totalitarian power so successfully as the feeling of resignation and apathy among its subjects. When we challenge the refugees' motivations, we appear unable to grasp why people would be fleeing and we seem to be turning our backs on them. When we acquiesce in the forcible return of escapees, we contribute to the feeling of hopelessness and thereby weaken the democratic cause within Yugoslavia—and without.

The age and the social background of most of the Yugoslav refugees, predominantly working class with a good mixture of peasant youth, instead of being interpreted as a symptom of the failure of the Yugoslav Government to gain the allegiance of the strata in whose name it purports to rule, have been adduced as proof of the economic character of the refugees' escape motivations. The refugees' opposition to communism is being impugned because they are poor. And because, when asked what they intend to do, they express a desire to work and to earn decent wages, it is adduced that they are not victims of Communist oppression and have not suffered from the absence of personal, political, and religious freedom. It is as if the economic hardships to which they were exposed were not manmade, the result of Communist misplanning. And it is as if a desire to work and to earn a decent living were in itself improper and shameful, an attitude which calls for the label "economic refugee," that is one who does not deserve our sympathy and can be returned behind the curtain without qualms. When misgivings do arise, they are dismissed, sometimes smugly and sometimes uneasily. The kind of repression rather than the repression itself is considered, and no attention is paid to the possibility of later retribution and the certainty that people who express their dissatisfaction with the regime by trying to escape from it will remain marked as enemies of the state. It is forgotten that the very act of escape makes a man an enemy of the state.

Everyone knows that in Communist countries, the economy is a phase of politics. In those countries where people are not free to choose their own political creed, they are not free to make their own way in the social and economic field. Freedom of initiative is either nonexistent or is permitted on a minimum scale. Savings are meaningless because sooner or later the state swallows everything. Plans for the future are better left unmade. Everyone knows what civic and family life has been reduced to. Now, with all this, when someone escapes from such distressing conditions can he really be considered an economic refugee?

Even those few Yugoslavs who are granted asylum are frequently put in a lower category than refugees from other Communist countries by the U.S. escapee program. Thus Yugoslavs either do not qualify as refugees or they are treated as second-class refugees.

Is physical persecution necessarily physical torture? The loss of freedom, political pressure and its inevitable consequence—economic misery—are also persecution; veiled persecution, daily persecution, persecution which these young people feel deeply, although they are often unable to give expression to their feelings, for lack of education, or difficulty in choosing the right words.

And when they come before the so-called screening commissions in the West, having crossed their Rubicon, although they have, for very valid reasons, chosen to be, as it were, "without family, without country, and without means," the only thing they find to say is "We came away to be free and to find work." Then we say, the West, replies: "They are young, they ran away from their parents; discipline; they are, as you can see, economic refugees."

Should we not give the matter a little more thought? There are many who are discontented with their jobs or unemployed. Do you think that they would, even with a passport, i.e., without any risk to themselves, leave Belgium, for example, leave it forever, abandoning their families, their possessions, for the unknown?

The repression of freedom of religion and other fundamental human rights in Yugoslavia differs hardly even in degree from that practiced in the U.S.S.R. itself. A further contention is that by permitting Yugoslav refugees to stay in Western Europe or by accepting them for immigration in the Western Hemisphere we are alleviating Communist Yugoslavia's economic problems and underemployment. If this were true, Tito could have done better by negotiating labor agreements with other European countries which have manpower shortages. The 10,000 refugees from Yugoslavia annually do not alter the employment picture inside Yugoslavia to any appreciable degree. Even if it were the policy of the West to aggravate the economic difficulties of Yugoslavia, as it clearly has not been, these goals should not be pursued at the expense of the refugees, the victims of Tito's brand of communism.

The subtle campaign of the Yugoslav authorities to popularize the term "economic" refugee has been more than successful. It has carried over into the language of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and that of certain officials of the U.S. Government. It has influenced the policy of countries which formerly granted asylum to these refugees to the point where substantial numbers of them are now being repatriated instead of welcomed. It has created a situation where Italy permits most of those fleeing to remain on its soil, but Austria, using U.S. equivocal policies as an excuse, forcibly returns the majority of the Yugoslav refugees. It has resulted in drastic reductions in U.S. aid to refugees from Yugoslavia. It has resulted in resentment by true democratic people from Yugoslavia who see U.S. aid helping to build a strong Communist state, but refusing to help those anti-Communist elements that escape its oppression. It has caused confusion among the Americans because policymakers fail to understand that the basic philosophy of the Communist state is the same, whether that of the Soviet Union, China, or Yugoslavia.

American policy today leaves refugees bewildered by its policy of being selective about the kind of communism and oppression from which a person must flee in order to benefit from the help of the American people.

At a time when we are granting asylum to thousands of refugees from Castro's communism, which, supported by Soviet communism, is threatening the Western Hemisphere, should the United States not take a forthright stand and give full recognition to the refugees fleeing Yugoslavia, which is today linked again with the Soviet in its conspiracy to have communism dominate the world?

EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Titular Bishop of Arba, Executive Director, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

WILLIAM VANDEN HEUVEL,
President, International Rescue Committee.

FACILITATION OF WORK OF THE FOREST SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1760, Senate bill 3235.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3235) to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, to expedite matters, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 12434 and that it be taken up, substituted for the Senate bill, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12434) to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12434) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3235 will be indefinitely postponed.

VOLUNTARY NONDENOMINATIONAL PRAYERS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the September issue of the American Bar Association Journal features an excellent article which convincingly places the recent Supreme Court edict banning the voluntary saying of nondenominational prayers in the public schools of New York in its true legal and historical perspective.

Written by Hon. Gerald Kirven of the Louisville, Ky., bar, this presentation entitled "Freedom of Religion or Freedom from Religion?" thoroughly documents the conclusion that "freedom of religion does not compel the entire denial to public school children of the influence of religion in their schools." It makes the irrefutable point that the Government "is not neutral in the matter of religion when, at the instance of one already adequately protected from compulsion, it lends its power to the suppression of religion and thereby champions the cause of freedom from religion."

This article should be read by every American who values his heritage of freedom of religion. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Bar Association Journal, Sept. 1962]

FREEDOM OF RELIGION OR FREEDOM FROM RELIGION?

(The controversial decision of the Supreme Court in banning the New York regents' prayer has led Mr. Kirven to ask whether an overzealous regard for the rights of a minority may have resulted in a distortion of the 1st amendment. The result of such decisions may be the identification of the power of Government with "antireligion," he concludes.)

(By Gerald Kirven of the Kentucky Bar (Louisville))

"The defendants (school principals) are perpetually enjoined and restrained from reading and causing to be read, or permitting anyone subject to their control and direction to read, to students in the Abington Senior High School * * * any work or book known as the Holy Bible."

This stark prohibition of the reading of the Bible in school is directly quoted from a decree of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania entered on February 1, 1962, in *Schempp, et al.* v. *School District of Abington Township, Pennsylvania, et al.,* (201 F. Supp. 815, 820).

The ground of the foregoing decree was that the Pennsylvania statute which required the reading of 10 verses from the Bible at the opening of school was an unconstitutional establishment of religion as forbidden by the 1st amendment to the U.S. Constitution made applicable to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by the 14th amendment. This was true, the court held, notwithstanding the provision of the law which allows any pupil to be excused from the Bible reading upon written request of his parent or guardian.

Without respect to the merits of the decision in the Schempp case, the decision is provocative of inquiry into the question of whether the doctrine of freedom of religion in this country is becoming a concept of freedom from religion.

AMERICA, A RELIGIOUS NATION

The first amendment to the Constitution, speaking of religion, says: "Congress shall make no law * * * prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

This is a religious Nation. The Supreme Court of the United States said so in 1892, speaking through Mr. Justice Brewer in *Church of the Holy Trinity* v. *United States,* (143 U.S. 457).

The Holy Trinity Church case involved the question of whether an act of Congress which forbade the importation of alien laborers into the United States prohibited Holy Trinity Church from hiring an English priest to be rector of the church. The Court considered the title of the act, the evil which was intended to be remedied, the circumstances surrounding the appeal to Congress and the reports of the committee of each House in concluding that "the intent of Congress was simply to stay the influx of this cheap unskilled labor."

"But beyond all these matters no purpose of action against religion can be imputed in any legislation, State or national, because this is a religious people. This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation. * * * (Quotations from the commission to Christopher Columbus, colonial grant to Sir Walter Raleigh, Mayflower Compact, fundamental orders of Connecticut, William Penn's charter, Declaration of Independence, constitutions of various States, language of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States and art. 1, sec. 7).

"There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons; they are organic utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people. (Citing cases where the courts have recognized the existence of the Christian religion in this country).

"If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs and its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. Among other matters note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies and most conventions with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills, 'In the name of God, amen'; the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath, with the general cessation of all secular business, and the closing of courts, legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day; the churches and church organizations which abound in every city, town, and hamlet; the multitude of charitable organizations existing everywhere under Christian auspices; the gigantic missionary associations, with general support, and aiming to establish Christian missions in every quarter of the globe. These, and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation. In the face of all these, shall it be believed that a Congress of the United States intended to make it a misdemeanor for a church of this country to contract for the services of a Christian minister residing in another nation?"

Much more recently, in 1952, speaking through Mr. Justice Douglas in *Zorach* v. *Clauson,* (343 U.S. 306, 313), the Supreme Court repeated the same sentiments, saying:

"We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being."

In a religious nation, religious influence is to be found in many places, including the public schools. Mr. Justice Brewer in the Holy Trinity case, supra, mentioned many of these evidences of religion, and Mr. Justice Douglas in the Zorach case referred to: "* * * [P]rayers in our legislative halls; the appeals to the Almighty in the messages of the Chief Executive; the proclamation making Thanksgiving Day a holiday; 'So help me God' in our courtroom oaths—these and * * * other references to the Almighty * * * run through our laws, our public rituals, our ceremonies * * * the supplication with with which the Court opens each session: 'God save the United States and this Honorable Court'."

To the list may be added tax exemption of churches, chaplaincies in the Armed Forces, the "Pray for Peace" postmark, the widespread observance of Christmas holidays, and, in classrooms, singing the fourth stanza of "America" which is a prayer invoking the protection of God, and the words "in God is our trust" as found in the National Anthem, and the reciting of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, modified by an act of Congress of June 14, 1954, to include the words "under God."

THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND THE REGENTS' PRAYER

That the first amendment does not prohibit public school children from joining together in acts of reverence to God was decided by the Court of Appeals of New York in *Engel, et al.* v. *Vitale, et al.* (10 N.Y. 2d 174, 176 N.E. 2d 579 (1961)).

That case involved the constitutionality of a recommendation of the board of regents, governing body of the New York public school system, that "At the commencement of each school day, the act of allegiance to the flag may well be joined by this act of reverence to God: 'Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our Country'."

Speaking through Chief Judge Desmond, the court upheld use of the regents' prayer, saying:

"* * * But it is not 'religious education' nor is it the practice of or establishment of religion in any reasonable meaning of those phrases. Saying this simple prayer may be, according to the broadest possible dictionary definition, an act of 'religion', but when the Founding Fathers prohibited an 'establishment of religion' they were referring to official adoption of, or favor to, one or more sects. They could not have meant to prohibit mere professions of belief in God for, if that were so, they themselves in many ways were violating their rule when and after they adopted it. Not only is this prayer not a violation of the first amendment (no decision of this or of the U.S. Supreme Court says or suggests that it is) but a holding that it is such a violation would be in defiance of all American history, and such a holding would destroy a part of the essential foundation of the American governmental structure.

"The 'Regents' prayer' is an acknowledgment of our dependence upon Almighty God and a petition for the bestowal of His blessings. * * * No historical fact is so easy to prove by literally countless illustrations as the fact that belief and trust in a Supreme Being was from the beginning and has been continuously part of the very essence of the American plan of government and society. * * * (Citing illustrations.) * * * As Justice Beldock of the Appellate Division wrote in this case: 'The contention that acknowledgements of and references to Almighty God are acceptable and desirable in all other phases of our public life but not in our public schools is, in my judgment, an attempt to stretch far beyond its breaking point the principle of separation of church and state and to obscure one's vision to the universally accepted tradition that ours is a Nation founded and nurtured upon belief in God.' (11 A.D. 2d 340, 206 N.Y.S. 2d 188.)

"The 'universally accepted tradition' referred to by Justice Beldock has been maintained without break from the days of the Founding Fathers, all of whom believed in the existence of God (see Cousins, In God We Trust), to the day of the inauguration of President Kennedy. It is indisputable and historically provable fact that belief and trust in a Creator has always been regarded as an integral and inseparable part of the fabric of our fundamental institutions. It is not a matter of majority power or minority protection. Belief in a Supreme Being is as essential and permanent a feature of the American governmental system as is freedom of worship, equality under the law and due process of law. Like them it is an American absolute, an application of the natural law beliefs on which the Republic was founded and which in turn presuppose an Omnipotent Being (176 N.E. 2d at 581–582)."

On December 4, 1961, in 368 U.S. 924, the U.S. Supreme Court granted a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of New York to review its decision in *Engel* v. *Vitale*. On June 25, 1962, the Supreme Court rendered its decision on the merits reversing the New York Court of Appeals. Mr. Justice Black, speaking for the Court, said:

"We think that by using its public school system to encourage recitation of the regents' prayer, the State of New York has adopted a practice wholly inconsistent with the establishment clause. There can, of course, be no doubt that New York's program of daily classroom invocation of God's blessings as prescribed in the regents' prayer is a religious activity.

"* * * [W]e think that the constitutional prohibition against laws respecting an establishment of religion must at least mean that in this country it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government."

Mr. Justice Stewart, dissenting, said:

"* * * With all respect, I think the Court has misapplied a great constitutional principle. I cannot see how an 'official religion' is established by letting those who want to say a prayer say it. On the contrary, I think that to deny the wish of these schoolchildren to join in reciting this prayer is to deny them the opportunity of sharing in the spiritual heritage of our Nation."

MINORITY RIGHTS

But the majority has no right to force religion upon those who do not wish it, hence the importance of scrupulous preservation of the right of the minority to exemption from exposure to religious influence which they do not desire. In the Schempp case, supra, the Court declined to consider the fact that children might be excused from Bible reading because "there is religious establishment in this case whether pupils are or are not excused from attendance at the morning exercises." (201 F. Supp. at 818.)

Dissenting in *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (33 U.S. 1 (1947)) (which sustained the constitutionality of transportation of parochial school pupils at public expense), Mr. Justice Jackson voiced the opinion that religion has no place at all in public school, saying:

"* * * It (public school) is organized on the premise that secular education can be isolated from all religious teaching so that the school can inculcate all needed temporal knowledge and also maintain a strict and lofty neutrality as to religion (330 U.S. at 23–24)."

Also dissenting in the same case, Mr. Justice Rutledge was of the view that:

"* * * The prohibition (of the first amendment) broadly forbids state support, financial or other, of religion in any guise, form or degree."

In a separate opinion concurring in the June 25, 1962, Supreme Court decision in *Engel* v. *Vitale,* Mr. Justice Douglas said:

"* * * The point for decision is whether the Government can constitutionally finance a religious exercise. Our system at the Federal and State levels is presently honeycombed with such financing. (Citing in a footnote chaplains in both Houses of Congress, religious services in service academies, Federal hospitals and prisons, tax exemptions of religious organizations, etc.) Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes."

FREEDOM FROM RELIGION

These views sound the cry of freedom from religion.

On the other hand, the Zorach case, supra, which tested the New York released time program (which permits public schools to excuse students during the school day to go to religious centers for religious instruction or devotional exercises), involved no compulsion. The Court accordingly held the program constitutional.

Dissenting in *Zorach,* 343 U.S. at 325, Mr. Justice Jackson warned:

"The day this country ceases to be free for irreligion it will cease to be free for religion—except for the sect that can win political power. * * * We start down a rough road when we begin to mix compulsory public education with compulsory godliness."

In the *Engel* case, 176 N.E. 2d at 581, the lower court said that the school board order requiring use of the regents' prayer "contains adequate provisions to insure that no pupil need take part in or be present during the act of reverence, so any question of 'compulsion' or 'free exercise' is out of the case."

It therefore follows that, so long as the minority is free to avoid religious influence in the public schools, the minority should not be able to invoke successfully the power of government to suppress religious influence in public schools.

It appears that in the Schempp case, a single parent was able to knock out the Bible reading in spite of the provision that his children might be excused from the ceremonies if he so requested in writing. Mr. Schempp testified that he had decided that he should not have his children excused from the ceremonies. He said that he thought his children would be "labeled as 'odd balls' " before their teachers and classmates; that the classmates were likely "to lump all particular religious difference(s) or religious objections (together) as 'atheism' " and that today the word "atheism" has "very bad" connotations as "un-American" with overtones of possible immorality. He also testified that if his children were excused from Bible reading they would have to stand in the hall outside their "homeroom" and that this carried with it the imputation of punishment for bad conduct.

As was to be expected, considerable local and national publicity grew out of the Schempp case which was filed on February 14, 1958, has gone once already to the U.S. Supreme Court, and may be still further litigated. One may wonder how the excitement of all these law suits and attendant public notice compares in effect upon Mr. Schempp's children with the consequences which he said would have resulted from his having written a note for them to be excused. In any event, the father and children have been willing to go through extended litigation, the effect of which to date is to stop the Bible reading completely.

DISTORTION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT

With relation to attacks upon religion in school, Judge Burke, concurring with the majority in the Engel case, spoke of what he called inadvertent distortion of the first amendment. Referring to the dissenting opinion, he said that it:

"* * * reads into the amendment an attempt to compel conformity in the field of education—in other words, a 'compulsory unification of opinion' in all school boards to totally reject any religious element in education and banish it from the schools. This, of course, would force on the children a culture that is founded upon secularist dogma.

"This interpretation rests on a misunderstanding. * * * According to the opinion, the separation of church and state which was intended to encourage religious interests among our people would become the constitutional basis for the compulsory exclusion of any religious element and the consequent promotion and advancement of atheism. It is not mere neutrality to prevent voluntary prayer to a Creator; it is an interference by the courts, contrary to the plain language of the Constitution, on the side of those who oppose religion. (176 N.E. 2d at 583.)"

The price of nonconformity in a religious society, if the United States indeed be a religious society, may be to endure in schools and in society at least identification as nonconformist. The alternative could be minority imposition of abolition of religious influence in schools and perhaps ultimately in society at large.

In a case not yet reported, *Chamberlin* v. *The Dade County Board of Public Instructions, et al.*, decided by the Florida Supreme Court of June 6, 1962, upholding daily Bible readings in Dade County schools, the court said that to deny the vast majority of pupils the right to hear the Bible read "because a minority might suffer some imagined and nebulous confusion, is to approach the ridiculous." Judge Caldwell, writing for the court, said that those bringing the suit had made no serious contention that their children "have suffered or will suffer any measurable psychological trauma as a consequence of the reading of the Bible, either in or out of their presence."

Provision was made in Dade County for those not wanting to hear the Bible readings to be excused.

The court said that the suit appeared to be "just another case in which the tender sensibilities of certain minorities are sought to be protected against the allegedly harsh laws and customs enacted and established by the more rugged pioneers of the Nation."

When the Congress in 1954 amended the "Pledge of Allegiance" to include the words "under God", the House report accompanying the bill (No. 1693, May 28, 1954) included these words:

"At this moment of our history the principles underlying our American Government and the American way of life are under attack by a system whose philosophy is at direct odds with our own. Our American Government is founded on the concept of the individuality and the dignity of the human being. Underlying this concept is the belief that the human person is important because he was created by God and endowed by Him with certain inalienable rights which no civil authority may usurp. The inclusion of God in our pledge therefore would further acknowledge the dependence of our people and our Government upon the moral directions of the Creator. At the same time it would serve to deny the atheistic and materialistic concepts of communism with its attendant subservience of the individual."

When *Zorach* v. *Clauson* was in the New York Court of Appeals, Judge Desmond, concurring, said:

"One of the curiosities of history is the enlarged and distorted meaning currently being given, by some, to the simple phrase of the first amendment: 'an establishment of religion.' (100 N.E. 2d at 472.)"

Cooley, "Principles of Constitutional Law" (2d ed. 1891), 213–214, said that the foregoing phrase "meant the setting up or recognition of a state church, or at least the conferring upon one church of special favors and advantages which are denied to others. It was never intended by the Constitution that the Government should be prohibited from recognizing religion."

GOVERNMENT AND ANTIRELIGION

In *Doremus* v. *Board of Education* (5 N.J. 435, 75 A. 2d 880 (1950)), an action unsuccessfully challenging Old Testament reading in school, the New Jersey Supreme Court said:

"While it is necessary that there be a separation between church and state, it is not necessary that the state should be stripped of religious sentiment. It may be a tragic experience for this country and for its conception of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness if our people lose their religious feeling and are left to live their lives without faith. * * * Our way of life is on challenge. Organized atheistic society is making a determined drive for supremacy by conquest as well as by infiltration. Recent history has demonstrated that when such a totalitarian power comes into control it exercises a ruthless supremacy over men and ideas, and over such remnants of religious worship as it permits to exist. We are at a crucial hour in which it may behoove our people to conserve all of the elements which have made our land what it is. (75 A. 2d at 888.)"

While our courts must always intercede to prevent infringements upon freedom of religion, the courts should guard against decisions which will identify the power of government with antireligion. Freedom of religion does not compel the entire denial to public school children of the influence of religion in their schools. The Government is not neutral in the matter of religion when, at the instance of one already adequately protected from compulsion, it lends its power to the suppression of religion and thereby champions the cause of freedom from religion.

Gerald Kirven is a partner in a Louisville, Kentucky, law firm. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa at the University of Virginia where he received his A.B. in 1944. In 1948 he was graduated from the University of Louisville Law School. Mr. Kirven is a member of the Bars of Kentucky and California.

OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM—CUBAN GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on Sunday, there was published in the New York Herald Tribune a letter from three eminent and respected Americans: Marx Lewis, Charles Wesley Lowry, and John O. Weaver. In the letter they outlined a program for American action in relation to Cuba.

I think their recommendations should be very carefully studied. I agree as to some of them; I am dubious as to others. But I believe they should be very carefully examined.

I welcome the decision of the administration, as of yesterday, to tighten the embargo on Cuba and to impose what may be termed a secondary boycott against Cuba—namely, the application of economic pressures to countries which continue in one form or another to trade with Cuba. I am also very glad that the complete embargo has extended to American-owned ships under foreign flags, as well as to American-owned ships under the American flag.

I believe we should be extremely careful about talking about an armed invasion of Cuba, because the effect might well be to range all of Latin America against us and pin down our resources, thus making it easier for Khrushchev to move against us in Berlin.

I believe that one of the suggestions these gentlemen have made deserves to be very carefully considered; and, personally, I find myself in sympathy with it—namely, that we should recognize, either here or in some Central American country, a Cuban Government-in-exile. Such a government, if broadly based and if from it virtually all representatives of the Batista government were excluded, would, I believe, help us to furnish a rallying point around which dissenting opinion could gather.

I have not read the arguments against the proposed creation of a Cuban Government-in-exile; but after some consideration, I think this suggestion at least commends itself to me; and if in connection with this proposal the volunteers of Latin American origin who are permitted to enter our Armed Forces could be assigned some relationship with such a Cuban Government-in-exile, I believe that would serve as a deterrent to Khrushchev and to Castro, and would have a beneficial effect.

We must prevent the spread of communism. We should seek to undermine Castroism. We wish to do this with the least possible danger of involving ourselves in war or in touching off a world conflagration; but the examples of Jefferson and Madison, in invoking nonintercourse and embargo provisions against the countries of Europe during the Napoleonic wars, may perhaps furnish an initial precedent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 30, 1962]

WE MUST ACT TO END SOVIET BOLDNESS

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

We are concerned by the deteriorating position of the United States in hemispheric and world affairs lest the fateful course of events issue in the very climax we seek to avoid; namely, general nuclear war.

The policy of watchful waiting on Castro and Soviet power in Cuba enjoined on the United States by Walter Lippmann in his column of September 18 is a counsel of notable imprudence and danger.

What has the United States been doing the past 3 years, in relation to Cuba, Berlin, and the U.S.S.R. generally, except watch, wait, and talk? This policy has occasionally been punctuated by bursts of action, notably calling up reserves after the Berlin wall, which was temporarily effective, and sponsoring an invasion of Cuba by Cubans, which was wrecked by Hamlet-like irresolution. But basically, we have chosen a course of watchful waiting and incessant "jawing."

This policy has apparently been predicated on a sweeping premise that the grand course of history was veering at long last in the American direction and that the outlook for freedom as the eventual climate of the globe was growing brighter and brighter.

The most substantial thing on the world horizon, we are convinced, is not anything American or pertinent to the march of freedom. It is the extraordinary perseverance of Communist policy and the increase of confidence and boldness on the part of Chairman Khrushchev, despite momentary tribulations in Soviet agriculture and in interstate Communist affairs.

Khrushchev's massive intervention in Cuba, amounting to a tweaking of Uncle Sam's very nose, is the sign and symbol of Khrushchevian confidence. It also represents a long step forward in the development of hard, world offensive policy on the part of the Communists. Fluidity and openness in both tactical and strategic judgments are marks of the Khrushchev mind. This means that the implications of the Cuban gambit are potentially far flung and that their depth and extent will only be revealed even to Khrushchev as events unfold. We can say with certainty (a) that the Soviet dictator is determined to have his way by hook or crook in Berlin, (b) that the possibilities of the shortest route to West Berlin being by way of Havana, are not lost on Khrushchev, (c) that the disarray and confusion over the whole Latin American scene, with the stunning loss of face by the United States, are intriguing in the highest degree to this wily politico-military strategist, and (d) that the United States remains the sheet anchor of freedom in the world and therefore the utimate, decisive target of the continuing Communist offensive.

What is to be done? We reject a simplistic answer, but we do advance a fundamental doctrine: With the Communists and also with the neutrals and with our Latin American friends, actions speak louder than words. It is here that the United States has miscalculated most seriously, in the episode of Castro and indeed in its strategy and tactics as a whole throughout the cold war period. We advocate a program of action along the following lines, emphasizing that for the moment we have worn out the power of words and that only some successes in the sphere of the deed will restore the efficacy of rhetoric even in the declaration of policy.

1. Recognize either here or in a hospitable Central American country a broadly representative Cuban Government-in-exile as the only legitimate government of Cuba, subject to a plebiscite by the Cuban people to take place within 1 year of the overthrow of Fidel Castro.

2. Assist this Cuban Government to establish an All-American Freedom Legion, to include Cubans, Latin Americans of all nationalities, and U.S. citizens who may desire to volunteer.

3. Recognize the right of this Cuban Government to resist through action by sea, air and land the Communist colonization of Cuba.

4. Set up a plan to be implemented by Cubans for dropping food packages and messages of good will and moral encouragement over various parts of Cuba.

5. Inaugurate at once an economic blockade of Cuba, enrolling in it all the shipping and supplying nations that we can influence diplomatically and economically.

6. Plan, including the clear formulation of a legal basis, for a military blockade of Cuba by sea and air. In our judgment, this drastic move will be more effective if the way is prepared psychologically by a display of American resolve through firm actions of the type outlined.

7. Finally recognizing that Cuba is but a symptom of the infection which has its source in Moscow and believing that our basic error is in whetting Khrushchev's appetite through ceaseless efforts to reach "accommodation" or find "common interests," we urge as an indispensable step the establishment of a massive and coordinated economic offensive against the Soviet empire. It should begin with a joint trade crackdown on East Germany, accompanied by a strong psychological and propaganda offensive against Soviet enslavement of this helpless people.

We write, not with a view to criticizing President Kennedy, but to rally Americans of all political persuasions to his support on a feasible action program.

We do remind any skeptics that Cuba, under the very eyes of the most powerful nation on earth, has been made a Russian colony, with a puppet status as abject as that of East Germany. This has been done in the teeth of the Monroe Doctrine, the Rio Treaty, the Bogotá Charter, and the Caracas Declaration. Furthermore, it represents in reverse the exact type of offensive action we have refused to take within the Soviet imperial and "peace" zone, in the cases of Hungary (when an independent government pled for help), Poland and East Germany.

MARX LEWIS,
Former General Secretary-Treasurer, United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union.
CHARLES WESLEY LOWRY,
President, Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order.
JOHN O. WEAVER,
Colonel, U.S. Army, Retired, Former Chief of Troop Information, U.S. Army.

FACILITATING ENTRY OF ALIEN SKILLED SPECIALISTS AND CERTAIN RELATIVES OF U.S. CITIZENS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2239, Senate bill 3361. I understand the bill is not controversial, and that its enactment is much needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "than", to strike out "December 31, 1954" and insert "March 31, 1954"; in line 9, after the word "petition", to strike out "approved by" and insert "filed with"; and on page 2, line 10, after the word "petition", to strike out "approved by" and insert "filed with"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any alien who (1) is registered on a consular waiting list pursuant to section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) under priority date earlier than March 31, 1954, and (2) is eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4) of the said Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) on a basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to January 1, 1962, and the spouse and children of such alien, shall be held to be nonquota immigrants and if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, shall be issued nonquota immigrant visas: *Provided,* That, upon his application for an immigrant visa and for his admission into the United States, the alien is found to have retained his relationship to the petitioner and status as established in the approved petition.

SEC. 2. Any alien eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) on the basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to April 1, 1962, shall be held to be a nonquota immigrant and may be issued a nonquota immigrant visa: *Provided,* That, upon his application for an immigrant visa and for admission to the United States or for adjustment of his immigrant status in the United States pursuant to section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) the alien is found to have retained his status as established in the approved petition. This section shall be applicable only to aliens admissible to the United States except for the fact that an immigrant visa is not promptly available for issuance to them because the first 50 percent of the quota of the quota area to which they are chargeable is oversubscribed by beneficiaries of petitions approved by the Attorney General pursuant to sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153, 1154) prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) is hereby amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under section 203(a)(1) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status and for the petitioner's urgent need for his services. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session."

SEC. 4. Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1259) is hereby amended by substituting the date "December 24, 1952;" for the date "June 28, 1940;".

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this bill provides a mild measure of much needed relief to two deserving categories of immigrants.

In the first category are sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters of American citizens. Under present law, these are so-called fourth preference aliens, who have been unable to join their relatives in America because of long waiting lists under the restrictive national origins quota. This bill would give nonquota status to those who have been on a fourth preference quota waiting list since before March 31, 1954. This will mean that perhaps 10,000 or more relatives of Americans would be able to come to this country freed of the quota restrictions which now bar their entry.

The second category of aliens affected by the bill is the so-called first preference group consisting of aliens who have unusual skills or qualifications which are expected to contribute significantly to our economic and cultural life. Thousands of these skilled specialists who have been approved for permanent residence in the United States, but who have, again, been barred by oversubscribed quotas, could be able to enter the country. Still others in this group, who are in the United States on only a temporary or parole basis, could be able to adjust their status to that of permanent residents.

While I am gratified that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has taken favorable action on the bill, no one should be deceived into thinking that it is anything more than a stopgap measure to alleviate only the worst of the many harsh situations brought about by our present immigration laws.

I was extremely disappointed to see the original measure amended before being reported so as to cut down the number of eligible persons among the relatives of American citizens. Those who have been on waiting lists for as long as 8 years, and who still have a wait in front of them as a result cutting back the relevant date in today's bill, will find no reason to applaud this token gesture of interest.

Nothing has grieved me more than to see another session of the Congress draw to a close without enactment of a wholesale reform of the immigration laws. This failure to act is largely the result of the administration's lack of pressure for immigration reform this year. I would hope, on such a nonpartisan issue of simple humanity and justice, that next year a broad and thoroughgoing law revision will be taken up, rather than piecemeal relief of the sort that today's bill represents.

At this date in the session, it is apparent that this bill represents the only possibility for relaxing some of the hardships caused by the present law. I shall therefore vote for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 2276), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States of certain skilled aliens whose services are urgently needed and certain relatives of U.S. citizens; and to permit the creation of a record of lawful admission for permanent residence in the cases of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952.

STATEMENT

Section 1 of the bill, as amended, would provide nonquota status for fourth preference quota immigrants registered on a consular waiting list under a priority date earlier than March 31, 1954. The fourth preference classification of quota immigrants includes brothers, sisters, married sons, or married daughters of U.S. citizens and their accompanying spouses and children.

As introduced, section 1 of the bill would have accorded nonquota status to fourth preference quota immigrants registered on a consular waiting list under a priority date earlier than December 31, 1954, and it is estimated that approximately 65,000 aliens would have benefited under that provision. As amended, the cutoff date is moved back to March 31, 1954, and it is estimated that approximately 16,000 aliens will benefit under the amended provision.

Section 2 of the bill, as amended, would provide nonquota status for certain first preference quota immigrants who are chargeable to oversubscribed quotas and in whose behalf first preference petitions were filed with the Attorney General prior to April 1, 1962. The first preference category of quota immigrants includes certain skilled specialists whos services have been determined by the Attorney General to be urgently needed in the United States because of their education, training, experience, or ability, and the spouses and children of such aliens who are accompanying or following to join them. Under section 3 of the bill, as amended, the Attorney General would be required to report to the Congress on the 1st and 15th day of each month in which Congress in in session the approval of each first preference visa petition, setting forth the basis of his approval in each case.

Section 4 of the bill, as amended, would amend section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 219), to permit the creation of a record of lawful admission for permanent residence in the cases of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952. Under existing law such an adjustment may be made in the cases of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to June 28, 1940.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, yesterday the full Appropriations Committee marked up the so-called last supplemental appropriation bill, which I understand to be House bill 13290, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. We did that in order to try to expedite the transaction of the work of Congress—realizing that at that time the bill was held at the desk, and was not then subject to our jurisdiction.

The markup was a careful and thorough one, and I was instructed by the full committee to file the report when the bill came into our jurisdiction, as it did earlier today.

Carrying out the instructions of my committee, I wish to file now, if I may, the report of the committee on H.R. 13290.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this morning when the majority leader obtained a unanimous-consent request for the morning hour, at my insistence the proviso was included that reports of standing committees of the Senate would not be received during the morning hour. I therefore make a point of order against the receipt of this bill and report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no feeling whatever about the matter. I am only trying to carry out the instructions of the full Committee on Appropriations.

I wonder if the matter could be handled on a basis that would be agreeable to all. I now ask unanimous consent that the report and the bill H.R. 13290 be held at the desk, to be received and filed at the first appropriate time procedurally for its receipt.

If there is objection to that request, I shall be glad to withdraw my request, but it seems to me that serves to give notice on the Record that the bill is ready for consideration by the Senate at such time as it may be procedurally correct for the report of the Appropriations Committee to be received and filed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike to object to the request of my distinguished friend, but I should like to discuss this subject with him before the bill takes that course.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor. May I say something which I think may clear up the problem?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not want to insist on a unanimous-consent request unless it meets the objectives which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] has in mind, with which I am in strong accord. It seemed to me that was the easy way to make the report ready for action when it was appropriate for it to be filed. I am not talking about taking the bill up; I am talking about filing the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand; but at this stage of the proceedings of Congress, time is very much of the essence. While I may yet agree to let the bill take that course, I would prefer to discuss the subject with the Senator from Florida before I consent to the unanimous-consent request.

I do not like to be arbitrary or stubborn, but there are some issues that I would be perfectly willing to stay until Christmas to straighten out properly and justly and fairly, with recognition of the rights of the Senate as a coordinate legislative body.

For that reason I ask my friend not to compel me to object to the request.

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly withdraw my request. I assure my distinguished friend from Georgia that I shall not renew the request without notifying him, nor proceed in connection with this bill further without notifying him.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is in keeping with the spirit of fairness the Senator always displays whether he is with or against one.

Mr. HOLLAND. I happen to be with the Senator from Georgia in the objectives which he has in mind.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last Friday I announced to the Senate that it was then my intention to object to the consideration of any appropriation bill which had not lain at the desk for 72 hours, in accordance with the Senate rules. I was dissuaded from following that course on the representations and the hopes of the leadership and other Senators that there would be some indication from the White House as to the disposition it would make of H.R. 10.

A week has now passed, and apparently there is no indication as to what will or may happen to this measure at the White House. Therefore, in the interest of those of us who are sponsoring this particular legislation—and we think it is most desirable legislation—we recognize that if Congress were to continue in session until after midnight on Wednesday next, by the rules of the Congress and the Constitution, H.R. 10 would become law, or; if it were acted upon prior to that time at the White House, we would have the opportunity to sustain or override a veto if such was the disposition made of the measure by the President.

Now, Mr. President, I give notice to my leadership and my distinguished colleague from Florida who is handling the supplemental appropriation bill, that I propose to object to its being considered by the Senate prior to its having lain at the desk for 3 days after having been reported from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, I will observe the suggestions made by my distinguished colleague.

I already stated to him, and also to the leadership, some time ago, when this question came up, that I intended to support my colleague in whatever effort became necessary, because I, too, am greatly interested in H.R. 10 becoming law. I now give assurance to my colleague, as I have just given it to the Senator from Georgia, that I will not attempt to call up the last supplemental appropriation bill, assuming that it would first have become eligible by reason of the report being filed, without notifying my colleague in advance.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope, in the event the President signs the bill, the distinguished Senator from Florida will give me notice before he calls up the bill, because if the distinguished Senator from Florida does not enter the objection, I intend to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought I had given my complete assurance.

Mr. RUSSELL. It cannot be called up until after it is on the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be very happy to give the same assurance to my distinguished friend from Georgia that I have just given to my own colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To make sure the full import of the words being used is understood, I would like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair as to what the exact effect will be with respect to the appropriation bill, in which the 3-day rule is involved. When can the bill first be considered in the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. The bill has not yet been reported.

Mr. RUSSELL. It depends on the time it is placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three days must intervene after the bill is reported.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further inquiry. The bill has not been reported yet; has it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Therefore, it will be 3 days from the time the bill is actually reported. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; after the bill is reported.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After the bill has been reported and is on the Senate calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I will be glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Florida says he proposes to object. Proposing to object is one thing——

Mr. SMATHERS. And I will object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And saying to the Senate that, "I shall object," and giving firm notice that the objection will be interposed, is quite another.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall object, and intend to object, unless the President should act between now and the time the supplemental bill is presented to the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one further inquiry. If the report was filed at the desk, when would the 3 intervening days expire, and when could the Senate first consider the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill could be taken up on next Tuesday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the report were filed today, the bill could not be taken up before Tuesday next?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand the rules of the Senate, the Sabbath or Holy Day does not count in the computation of time in the Senate under the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sundays are not excluded in this matter. They are only excluded from the time the bill is in the hands of the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the Presiding Officer's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sundays are not excluded in this matter. They are excluded when the bill is in the hands of the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is by reason of a special provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Constitution of the United States specifically excepts Sunday when the bill is in the hands of the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the Presiding Officer's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the bill is in the hands of the President, the Constitution makes the exception.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there are a number of precedents as to the rules of the Senate which hold that Sunday is not counted in the period of time prescribed by the Senate rules. I shall undertake to get those precedents together. While I do not anticipate that this question will arise—I hope that the Senate will not proceed before Sunday—if that question does arise, I shall make a point of order and endeavor to persuade the Senate not to deviate from the precedents in this case.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my only objective is to have the final supplemental appropriation bill cleared and in conference at the earliest feasible moment. I have already given assurance to two of my colleagues. If any other Senator wishes to have notice, either before I file the report, or before the bill is called up, I shall be glad to give the same assurance to him or to them, but I hope the number will not be too large, because I do not wish to be too greatly burdened before I proceed in the customary way to the handling of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to say, in full sincerity, I have a great deal of sympathy with regard to the bill in which the junior Senator from Florida is interested, and I have a great deal of sympathy with regard to the bill in which the senior Senator from Georgia is interested, but I fear we are boxing ourselves in a little, because if the bill is reported today the rules require that we must wait for 3 calendar days before it can be considered, unless unanimous consent can be obtained.

If the issues in which the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Georgia are interested, should by some miracle be resolved today, we would find ourselves in an awful box.

Mr RUSSELL. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope Senators will consider that danger.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not understand that we are putting ourselves in any awful box.

The only commitment I have made is to state to the two Senators, which I am very happy to do, that before I ask to file a report in the first instance and before I ask to take up the bill for action in the second instance—referring to the last supplemental appropriation bill, which is important to every Senator and must be considered before we can go home—I will give them notice. I do not think that imposes any undue burden.

If the circumstances mentioned by the Senator from Rhode Island should occur—in other words, should H.R. 10 be signed or should H.R. 10 be vetoed and sent back to the Congress, where the Senate and House can consider it—I would expect, of course, to give immediate notice to my friends and be governed by their own decisions as to what they wanted to do. They would have the right to do what they have said.

Mr. PASTORE Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The bill could be put on the calendar. That could be done now. If the bill is put on the calendar, the 3 days could begin to run. That is the point I make.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to my distinguished friend that he is probably not as much interested in having the bill cleared and enacted as I am.

It has been a pain in the neck to handle this bill under the conditions which have prevailed, while serving at the same time on three other conference committees, which are underway; that is, on the foreign-aid bill, on the public-works bill, and on the State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary bill. It has been a very onerous duty. I should be glad to be through with it.

But, under the terms of the unanimous consent granted this morning when the Senator from Rhode Island and I were working on the foreign-aid conference, as I understand, I cannot make the report during the morning hour. After the morning hour is over, as I understand, without unanimous consent I cannot make the report. I certainly expect to observe the commitments that I have made to the two distinguished Senators before I make any such offer.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

I find no fault with the Senator from Florida. All I say is that I am asking the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida to review their positions. At least, the bill would have to remain on the calendar for 3 days, if they insist on their positions. In the event that these difficulties should be cleared up, at least we would have the bill ready for immediate consideration.

If we can do that, perhaps we can get home to our families by tomorrow night.

Mr. HOLLAND. I say, heartily, "Amen" to the idea suggested by my friend the Senator from Rhode Island. I think we all want to get home to our families, and none more eagerly than the Senator from Florida.

At the same time, I realize the seriousness of the objectives which animate both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida. I think it was completely appropriate for me to give the assurances which I have given, and I intend to live up to them.

If other Senators want the same assurances, I am perfectly willing to give the assurances to them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe, for the benefit of the Senator from Rhode Island, that if the controversy in which I am interested, as to which I am doing my best to uphold the rights of the Senate as a coordinate legislative body, should be resolved, there would be no objection interposed on my part to the immediate consideration of the bill. There are toys in which a jack-in-the-box jumps out when one touches the button. If that controversy can be solved, I shall undertake to emulate the jack-in-the-box.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

I sympathize with the Senator's position. If the bill could be placed on the calendar, at least we would have to wait 3 days, against the objection of the Senator from Georgia, with whose position I agree. I will remain here until the cows come home to battle for his position.

I suggest that we do not maneuver ourselves into the position that, should those questions be resolved, we could not proceed to conclude our business tomorrow night.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am certain that, if the President acts with respect to H.R. 10, there will be no problem insofar as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned. We can then proceed with expedition, under unanimous consent or some other procedure. I do not think we are getting ourselves into any box.

Under the circumstances as I have previously stated I shall still object to the supplemental appropriations bill being considered, prior to the expiration of the 3 days after it has been reported to the Senate. This procedure is in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. While some of us are looking forward to an opportunity to be with our families, we are also looking forward to an opportunity to be with our constituents.

I should like to have the Presiding Officer, if he will, confirm what the Senator from Florida said with respect to the rules. Therefore, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Since a consent agreement has been entered into this morning which effectively bars the filing of a committee report during the morning hour, do the rules prevent the filing of such a report from a committee during the session today subsequent to the morning hour, in the absence of unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is required to report a bill after the morning hour is closed.

Mr. KUCHEL. So under the rules, therefore, unless unanimous consent were granted, speaking in plain English, if a committee report were filed tomorrow, then Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday would have to intervene, and Wednesday would be the earliest day, in the absence of unanimous consent, when the supplemental appropriation bill could be considered? Is that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is a very dismal situation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Delaware for a question, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Rhode Island in expressing the hope that at least there can be an agreement to have the appropriation bill reported, in the event that favorable circumstances develop and we wish to consider the bill tomorrow. I do not believe it would be fair to leave the bill in the committee and then report the bill tomorrow If we did so, we would receive a bill which would appropriate $2 or $3 billion without Senators even having an opportunity to see the bill or to have it in printed form. We would then consider and vote on the bill tomorrow. Some other Senator may object if the bill is not printed so that all Senators can read it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest that if a Senator will call the Committee on Appropriations, he will be furnished with the bill and the report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought the bill could be put on the calendar. I will go along with the fact that a Senator can see it. I do not object to the decision of the Senator from Georgia, but I do believe that other Senators who are not members of the Appropriations Committee should have the advantage of having the bill and the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator will have a right to object to a request that the bill not lie on the table for 3 days, if the bill is pushed on him more quickly than he thinks it should. But it makes a great deal of difference to us when the 3-day period starts to run.

The information is available in the committee. All the Senator has to do is get in touch with the staff, and he can obtain a copy of the bill and the report.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, last evening the Evening Star published an editorial on H.R. 10 which stated—

> Few tax proposals have received such sweeping congressional indorsement as that designed to encourage the establishment of approved retirement funds by self-employed persons. As forwarded to the White House, legislation would allow self-employed persons to deposit annually in such a fund up to 10 percent of earned income or $2,500, whichever is less.
>
> President Kennedy has acknowledged that the principle of encouraging this form of protection for individuals not eligible for coverage in corporate pension plans or social security "has equity," although at the same time he has pointed out that it might be included in the proposed overall tax reform program next winter. Since the plan in its present form has won such overwhelming

congressional approval, however, we think it is a reform properly authorized at the present time.

This morning's issue of the Washington Post, which is not usually very friendly to what the junior Senator from Florida advocates, published an interesting editorial on the same subject which states and I quote—

The President should not yield to those who are importuning him to veto the bill which Congress has approved to permit self-employed persons to make contributions toward their own pensions. This measure, introduced in the House as H.R. 10, would correct the manifest injustice of withholding from self-employed persons the privileges already allowed those who work for others. The yearly withholding permitted is extremely, if not unreasonably, modest.

The editorial goes on to say—

Apart from its meaning for the individual beneficiaries, the bill will result in withholding from current expenditures, funds that will enlarge the resources available for investment and contribute to the country's growth potential. The Treasury ought to abandon its die-hard resistance to a measure that has the overwhelming approval of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that both of the editorials to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGAINST THE "RAINY DAY"

Few tax proposals have received such sweeping congressional indorsement as that designed to encourage the establishment of approved retirement funds by self-employed persons. As forwarded to the White House, legislation would allow self-employed persons to deposit annually in such a fund up to 10 percent of earned income or $2,500, whichever is less. Of this contribution, 50 percent or a maximum of $1,250 would be deductible in computing income taxes. With certain controversial provisions deleted in House-Senate conference, the measure won a 361–0 rollcall vote in the House and a 70–8 vote in the Senate.

President Kennedy has acknowledged that the principle of encouraging this form of protection for individuals not eligible for coverage in corporate pension plans or social security "has equity," although at the same time he has pointed out that it might be included in the proposed overall tax reform program next winter. Since the plan in its present form has won such overwhelming congressional approval, however, we think it is a reform properly authorized at the present time.

PENSION VETO

The President should not yield to those who are importuning him to veto the bill which Congress has approved to permit self-employed persons to make contributions toward their own pensions. This measure, introduced in the House as H.R. 10, would correct the manifest injustice of withholding from self-employed persons the privilege already allowed those who work for others. The yearly withholding permitted is extremely, if not unreasonably modest, but the measure is at least a gesture toward correcting a long standing inequality. The annual cost to the Treasury amounts to $115 million, which does not seem excessive. It may be argued that legislation hereafter could expand the plan, increasing those eligible under it and adding to deductions until it might amount to as much as $600 million, but every exemption ever approved is susceptible to the reproach that it might be enlarged subsequently.

Apart from its meaning for the individual beneficiaries, the bill will result in withholding from current expenditures, funds that will enlarge the resources available for investment and contribute to the country's growth potential. The Treasury ought to abandon its die-hard resistance to a measure that has the overwhelming approval of Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Is the Senate operating under the 3-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in the morning hour, with a 3-minute limitation on debate.

The time of the Senator from Florida has expired. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Rhode Island.

DIVISION OF BERLIN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as we search for a solution to the problems of Berlin and attempt to come forth with constructive ideas, I call the attention of Senators to an article entitled "Berlin: Accepting the Division," by Geoffrey McDermott, former British Minister in Berlin for a year, which appeared in the London Observer on September 23, 1962. I ask unanimous consent that the article be published at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERLIN: ACCEPTING THE DIVISION

(By Geoffrey McDermott)

(NOTE.—Mr. McDermott was British Minister in Berlin from June 1961, until September 15 this year when he was retired by the Foreign Office as the result of a disagreement over the conduct of official policy. In this article he criticizes the machinery for Allied consultation in Berlin and offers his own ideas for a sensible policy now and in the future.)

I took up my post as British Minister in Berlin in June 1961, and saw through the critical year that followed. Having now retired from the Foreign Service I can express my views on that year, and on the future, more publicly than before. I believe it may help toward an understanding of the problem if I describe not so much the year's events, which are pretty well remembered, but the influences behind the scenes in Berlin which helped to shape the course of those events. The atmosphere varied from tense to extremely tense throughout the period: the splitting of the city by the Communists on August 13, 1961, and the subsequent wall were only some amongst the more horrific developments.

Under agreements made soon after the end of the war, not only was Germany divided into four zones but Berlin, left more than 100 miles inside the Soviet zone, was divided into four sectors, and the access routes of Britain, America, and France by air, road, rail, and water were defined and guaranteed. These arrangements constituted the occupation status of Berlin. This status was modified in turn by the setting up in 1950 of the Federal Republic, which all four Allies (and most of the rest of the world) recognize, and in 1951 of the so-called German Democratic Republic, so far recognized only by Soviet Russia and her Communist allies.

Nevertheless, the occupation status remains the basis for the presence of the Western Allies' occupation forces in West Berlin; and although the Russians inveigh against this and state that they have no occupation forces in Berlin, "the capital of the German Democratic Republic," they kept, until a week or two ago, a Soviet commandant at his own headquarters in East Berlin. In addition, under their treaty of 1955 with the "independent German Democratic Republic," they maintain some 22 divisions, with the most modern armament, within easy reach of Berlin.

ACCESS ROUTES COULD BE CUT

Militarily, therefore, the Western Allies' position in Berlin is nonsense. The Americans maintain some 6,000 men there, the British some 3,000 and the French some 2,000. Their access routes, except possibly by air, could all be cut at a moment's notice. Moreover the Western sector could be overrun and, as Mr. Khrushchev is said to have remarked to an American journalist a few months ago, all Berlin could be occupied by the Red Army within an hour. (He went on to say, a bit disgenuously, that he did not want Berlin and could not see why the Americans were so keenly interested.) But this is not, of course, the point, which is an entirely political one. The Western forces are adequate, as a tripwire, provided that Western policy is properly handled both inside Berlin and by those dealing with the Berlin question in the Western capitals.

The framework for the execution of allied policy in Berlin is the allied kommandatura. This hideous word, a German-Russian bastard, typifies an out-of-date mechanism, set up in the totally different conditions existing immediately after the war. The kommandatura consists of the three Western Allied commanders plus the three ministers who are also deputy commandants, plus, glowering over their deliberations, a photograph of the last Soviet commandant to take part in the discussions—in 1948.

In passing it is worth recalling that only 2 four-power organizations still function, both in the British sector. One is the Berlin air safety center where the Soviet representatives can attempt to cause trouble in the air corridors but which does not in fact regulate traffic in them, a job performed by the American controllers at Tempelhof. The other is Spandau gaol, where for the sake of occasional contacts with Soviet officers the Western Allies continue to pay out some hundreds of thousands of pounds a year on the grounds that the three remaining Nazi prisoners—Hess, von Schiarach and Speer—would constitute a deadly menace to the Western World if given their liberty.

But to return to the Allied kommandatura. Does it work properly? Is it, in fact, so constituted as to cope efficiently with the multifarious political problems—and practically every Berlin problem, even the moving of a platoon, is in essence political—with which it is bound to be constantly faced? A view from inside it suggests few grounds for optimism, or even confidence.

The three commandants are major generals of varying caliber and experience. The Americans are usually active, tough and modern-minded men; the British tend to be on the verge of retirement and to have little political experience. The machinery is somewhat cumbersome and in practice is made even more so since it is double and even treble banked by the necessity for reference to the ambassadors in Bonn, governments at home, a four-power ambassadorial group (including the Federal Germans) in Washington, and so on.

The Western ambassadors claim residual responsibilities as high commissioners for Germany, and as such approach the Soviet

Ambassador to the German Democratic Republic from time to time. Naturally they always draw a blank. Even in very urgent cases requests for instructions to one or all of these bodies were made. I personally favored, wherever possible, action first and instructions, approval, etc., later; and in this I was at one with the two outstanding Berlin characters, Herr Willy Brandt, the mayor of West Berlin, and Gen. Lucius D. Clay, President Kennedy's special representative in Berlin from September to May.

TOUGH, EFFICIENT BRIGADIER GENERAL

On the purely military side, too, of course, the Americans carry by far the most weight. Their forces commander, under the commandant, is at present a very tough and efficient brigadier general, who has numerous active colonels and so on to back him up. The British and the French are by no means so well staffed.

The government of Berlin consists of Willy Brandt; the president of the House of representatives, Otto Bach, and a dozen senators responsible for such matters as commerce, education, transport and so on. Their actions and policy are subject to the approval of the Allied kommandatura; in practice there is close consultation in advance on most matters, so that generally decisions are reached in collaboration with the Allies, who, in fact, assert their views firmly whenever required.

The West Berliners are happy with this arrangement because they know that it gives them a security which total dependence on the Federal Republic could not guarantee. Although, therefore, Berlin is theoretically a "land" or province of West Germany, it knows it cannot have it both ways; and under the occupation status the extension of laws and treaties to "Land Berlin" has in every case to be approved by the Allied kommondatura. The West Berliners as a whole are most friendly to the Western Allies, and call their forces in Berlin "the protecting forces."

DRASTIC STEPS BY THE COMMUNISTS

The events of August 1961 will illustrate how the machinery works. Although the Allies and the Berliners had agreed in July that some drastic steps were sure to be taken by the Communist authorities to stem the tide of refugees, their intelligence did not provide the date nor the exact nature of the steps. (To be fair, the Communists may not have decided the date themselves more than a few days before.) But early on Sunday, August 13, the Allied kommandatura met to discuss the events of the past night and policy for the immediate future, and an hour or so later summoned Brandt and his team to their deliberations.

I still think the decision not to take forward action was correct, though I will not argue it out here. But in fact little in the way of solid reaction emerged from the kommandatura's long meetings of August 13 or 14. Even after some appropriate measures had been taken, it was a direct approach by Brandt to President Kennedy which produced the first strong Allied demonstration, in the shape of the visit by the U.S. Vice President and General Clay to Berlin on August 19.

The two heroes of the Berlin scene in 1961–62 were Brandt and Clay. Brandt was described to me by a leading British Labor politician as "head and shoulders above anyone in Federal Germany." I, myself, know of no better German and have a great admiration for his judgment, force of character, courage, and cheerful cooperation. West Germany could well use a man of his integrity instead of some of the ambitious and none too trustworthy politicians of the Christian Democrat-Free Democrat coalition led by 87-year-old Chancellor Adenauer, to which Brandt's Social Democrats are in opposition. Brandt ranks No. 2 to Herr Ollenhauer. The way in which Brandt throughout these testing times also waged a markedly successful election campaign for the chancellorship against Dr. Adenauer and yet collaborated loyally with the Christian Democratic minority in Berlin, was altogether admirable.

As for General Clay—whom the Berliners remembered for his part in the airlift in 1948—he received a terrific ovation on his arrival. In boosting the morale of the West Berliners, he operated on the basis—which was proved correct—that the Russians did not want a showdown over Berlin. Thus, in October he ordered U.S. troops to make a symbolic sortie into the Soviet sector and sent U.S. tanks to the crossing point in Friedrich Strasse. As a result, Soviet tanks were forced to appear and prove once more the falsity of the Soviet claim that the German Democratic Republic was sovereign in the Soviet sector.

General Clay would, I am sure, happily have taken over supreme command of the Allies in Berlin; the Allies resisted—understandably, but perhaps unfortunately.

In view of all this it is not surprising that ever since the end of the war Berlin has been a bone of contention—"a fishbone stuck in our gullet," to quote Mr. Khrushchev—between the Western and Communist worlds.

Since 1958, when Mr. Khrushchev delivered his 6 months ultimatum demanding a settlement on his terms, it has become a possible cause of a third world war. Mr. Khrushchev's further demand to President Kennedy in June 1961, for a settlement, together with the building of the wall by the East Germans, did in fact bring the world fairly near the brink. Only American firmness prevented either war or a Western climbdown.

THE FRENCH STOOD CYNICALLY BY

When President Kennedy mobilized hundreds of thousands of extra men, and sent tens of thousands to Europe, Mr. Khrushchev realized that it was he who must climb down. General Clay told me that last autumn the American people were prepared to go to war over Berlin; and I have no doubt that this is true. The British added firm speeches, but no action; the French stood cynically by (did General de Gaulle really say "Berlin est foutu"?); the Federal Germans indulged in political maneuvers. West Berlin, and the world, were saved—until the next time; and that will be before long.

In trying to inject a note of realism into the Berlin problem, looking at history can help. In the first place, the city was only for a short time the capital of a united German Reich. Provincialism always was, and still is, very powerful in Germany. Berlin was never beloved as a capital by the Rhinelanders and Bavarians, for instance, as London and Paris are by the mass of British and French. Only for a few ill-starred years under Hitler was it the capital of the whole German-speaking world, including Austria and Sudetenland.

Today, Germany is divided into three: West Germany, East Germany, and Berlin. The first two both claim Berlin as their capital. But the deplorable separation of German from German is for one thing a direct part of the price the Germans must pay for Hitler and his war. Secondly, reunification can, to speak realistically, only come about in one of two ways in the foreseeable future—nuclear war or a complete switch of policy by the Soviet Union. (Pipedreams about a voluntary Soviet withdrawal in any other circumstances are a waste of time.) These are both exceedingly unlikely, and in either case the problem in anything like its present form will by then have disappeared.

We might also take a closer look than usual at the Germans themselves. The majority of the people of West Germany are not terribly interested in Berlin: their reasons are either selfishness or resignation. They are happy to pay conscience money in the shape of subsidies to Berlin, and leave it at that. The Federal German politicians, who in any case, are not held in high esteem by the people as a whole, work up the Berlin question constantly and irresponsibly; they frequently use it as a stick with which to beat their allies. There are good reasons for doubting the sincerity of most of them—not least that of Dr. Adenauer, who could bring himself to visit Berlin only some weeks after August 13, 1961, and has since gone there as seldom as possible.

POLITICAL BLACKMAIL

Again, a number of Germans are certainly working toward the possession of a German-controlled nuclear weapon; my views on this prospect differ not at all from those of Mr. Khrushchev.

In addition, some of these Federal politicians are not above hinting at the grossest form of political blackmail of the West—a switch to friendship with the Soviet Union as the Weimar Republic did in 1922 with the Rapallo Treaty—if the West does not rescue Berlin for them.

As for the East Germans, we need a more realistic approach to that question, too. It is true that some 3 million have voted with their feet by defecting to the West since the German Democratic Republic was set up in 1951. But only once has a small attempt at serious resistance been made, and that 9 years ago. (Contrast the spirit shown by the Cypriots, for instance, in their struggle against their own appeasers and the British.)

The facts are that some 10 percent of them are faithful Communists, and that a much larger proportion collaborate more or less actively with them. It is Germans who rule East Germany; it was Germans who built the Berlin wall, who guard it with enthusiasm, and who shoot other Germans who attempt to escape. The situation in East Germany in general is not very different from that in Rumania or Bulgaria.

As for the third category of Germans, the Berliners, they are the best of the lot, and with the best leader in Willy Brandt. The West Berliners have kept their morale and spirits high under long and relentless pressure; and if West Berlin is, as a result of hard circumstances, an artificial place, it is also a thriving and in many ways attractive one.

TACTICAL STRANGLEHOLD

For cogent political and humanitarian reasons the West cannot abandon Berlin: in a nutshell, this would lead to the collapse of NATO. Mr. Khrushchev has a tactical stranglehold on it, but the fact that he has shown himself prepared to wait proves that he realizes that his political and strategic hold is much less strong. He will not run the risk of American nuclear intervention; he is prepared up to a point to see Berlin "wither on the bough" and he will push it along in that direction by, for instance, allowing the East Germans to nibble further; they have already nibbled considerably at its life.

Consequently, there is room for negotiation. By this I mean neither acceptance of Russian demands wholesale—they would never expect that—nor, on the Western side, waffling on about "improving the situation in West Berlin." It is true that the present occupation status is satisfactory from the Western standpoint, as far as it goes, but it suffers from grave defects.

Because it is anachronistic, it is inefficient from the West's point of view, and undignified, too, because it makes the Western Powers appear always on the defensive, and nearly always ineffectual into the bargain, in Berlin. Secondly, Mr. Khrushchev is determined to abolish it, and will do so sooner or later. Thirdly, and this is the gravest aspect, as a result Berlin is a perpetual and deep danger to world peace; and this situa-

tion cannot be allowed to continue much longer.

Here then are my broad suggestions for a Berlin solution, which I believe are realistic and so stand a chance of acceptance by both sides. They could give both the West and the Communists much of what they require, and they could remove the constant ugly friction, and threat of war, from both sides.

1. The Western Powers and the Soviet Union would agree that the long-term aim is the reunification of Germany (both sides have stated this to be their policy) and the agreements would be subject to review in, say, 20 years.

2. The present German frontiers would be recognized as definitive (this is plain commonsense, and there is no advantage in "waiting for a peace treaty").

3. The German Democratic Republic would be recognized as a separate State—as indeed it already is: a German State ruled by Germans. Britain and her allies do considerable trade with it. Federal Germany does very considerable trade indeed. East German authorities already control 95 percent of people going into and out of Berlin, including, of course, all the normal, i.e., nonofficial, nations of the Western Allies, and are recognized by all concerned for these purposes. In addition, there are numerous administrative and technical matters, e.g., the running of the railways throughout Berlin and across the German Democratic Republic to West Germany, in which the East German authorities' responsibility is fully recognized by all. Herr Brandt himself favors an extension of these contacts, as he once more made clear in a recent speech.

SEPARATE ENTITY

As for the international political implications, (a) such recognition need not imply approval any more than our recognition of the regimes in other satellites; (b) it need not confer any great advantages on East Germany—the Bulgarian, Rumanian, and Hungarian regimes, for instance, have hardly achieved any great standing as a result of recognition by the West; (c) it would mean recognizing a state of affairs which will almost certainly exist for a very long time, for the reasons already explained.

4. Berlin would be recognized as a separate entity as, again, it is one already. It has nearly 3,500,000 inhabitants. In practice we should no doubt have to rest content with West Berlin: this has 2,250,000 inhabitants, or roughly as many as Denmark.

5. Berlin would make agreements with any powers she chose—except the two Germanys—to station their troops in reasonable numbers in the city. This would be similar to the agreements between the German Democratic Republic and the Warsaw Pact countries. No doubt West Berlin would choose the Western Allies, and this, with point 6 below, would insure that she would be really independent and not merely free in the Communist sense. United Nations (non-Nato) troops on their own, of course, would be worse than useless and would lead only to chaos and Communist intervention.

It is true that Mr. Khrushchev has grumbled at the presence of the Allies' troops as constituting an aggressive NATO base, but he does not believe a word of it, and chiefly wants to get rid of the occupation status. A Western advantage would be that the Allies would be represented in Berlin by ambassadors in the usual way, who would be independent of the ambassadors in Bonn and who would of course control their own forces in Berlin.

FIRSTHAND WITNESSES

6. The four powers would agree on guarantees for the access of their representatives, both civilian and military, to Berlin. The numbers would be very small compared with the total traffic between Berlin and elsewhere. East Germany could derogate sovereignty in this respect to the U.S.S.R. without any cause for complaint—such arrangements are often made between allies.

7. Some important agencies of the United Nations would be moved to Berlin. Mr. Khrushchev has shown some signs of agreeing to this. If, as is likely, this were confined at first to West Berlin, they would still be firsthand witnesses of the wall and all that goes with it, and might be expected to exercise some beneficial effect on the East Germans in this respect.

8. The three German states would become members of the U.N., giving advantages to both sides.

9. The three German states would adhere to these agreements; indeed, any number of other states would be welcome as guarantors.

These suggestions, I think, preserve the interests of all the interested parties. They also provide an opportunity of removing Berlin from the very dangerous spot which it has occupied for so many years, and will otherwise continue to occupy for many more. Berlin is well worth a visit, as the Berliners say; it might be worth a battle; it is not worth a war.

PLIGHT OF YUGOSLAV REFUGEES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is to be complimented on bringing to our attention a poignant memo concerning Yugoslav refugees, issued on behalf of the Catholic Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the International Rescue Committee. Since the Senator from Connecticut has made an excellent exposition of this subject, I want to add just a few comments.

As a former vice president of the International Rescue Committee, I, too, have followed with close interest the plight of Yugoslav refugees and I am concerned by the growing use of the term "economic refugee" when referring to Yugoslav refugees. In my judgment, no invidious distinctions shown among refugees from communism should be made. Those of us who have worked closely with refugees know very well that there are many complex reasons why a refugee would flee his native land and I believe it is manifestly unfair to determine that many Yugoslav refugees flee for isolated economic reasons, which are in no way related to the overall suffering of living under a Communist regime. The repression of freedom of religion and other fundamental human rights in Yugoslavia is just as distasteful to endure as it is in other Communist countries. One must also remember that once a man makes the decision to flee to freedom, he automatically becomes an enemy of a Communist state if he is returned involuntarily.

Mr. President, the fact that most of the Yugoslav refugees are workers and peasant youth, is, indeed, an indictment against the Yugoslav Communist regime which pretends to be the government of the proletariat and the peasant. Instead of returning these people who have "voted with their feet"—the only real way they can protest under a Communist system—we should treat Yugoslav refugees in the exact manner we treat other refugees from communism. We should welcome them as a living indictment of the failure of communism.

In our own country, we are struggling to eliminate second-class citizenship and it is my earnest hope that those who administer our refugee programs will eliminate the category of second-class refugees.

PROPOSED CONGRESSIONAL RECESS UNTIL A WEEK AFTER THE ELECTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my parliamentary nostrils this morning have smelled the smoke of a parliamentary fire that I believe is going to burn up great values within the Democratic Party unless it is extinguished very quickly.

Eleven weeks ago, representing six Senators, I went to the majority leader and warned that such a fire was likely to happen. For the past several weeks this fire has been smouldering. For the past several weeks the Congress has made a very bad legislative record because it has been legislating with adjournment jitters. In my judgment they have been weeks of a sad record for the Democratic Party, also. The leadership of the Congress both Democratic and Republican and in both Houses must assume the blame for this bad legislative record.

I should like to suggest that we can prevent further damage if the leadership, in cooperation with the administration, were to say that we will go home tonight, by recessing, preferably, until the week following the election.

That is the suggestion I made 11 weeks ago when I proposed to the Senate leaderships that we recess not later than August 20 and come back after the election. In my judgment, little legislative good will come out of the remaining days of the session in view of the present temper which prevails in both Houses.

Some of the conference reports that are coming back need a great deal of time for reflection and further consideration. There will be better conference reports after the election. The advance notice that has come to me as to what will come to us in the conference report on the public works appropriation bill demonstrates the great need for time for reflection on the report. That report will be very damaging, if the advance notice about its contents that has come to me is correct.

I hope the President of the United States will not surrender to any blackjack threat. I hope the President will live up to his obligations under the separation-of-powers doctrine under the Constitution.

Serving notice by some Senators with respect to appropriation bills, in order to keep the Senate in session until Wednesday, gives us no assurance that we shall be able to leave on Wednesday. Not only will much legislation be burned up in this parliamentary fire if it is not prevented but great damage will be done to the Democratic Party if it is not prevented by recessing or adjourning now.

The sensible thing to do is to quit tonight, with the understanding that we will come back a week following the election and then proceed to do a statesmanlike job on conference reports and other issues which is not being done now.

OUR PRESTIGE ABROAD CONTINUES TO FALL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I took this floor to call to the President's attention America's falling prestige throughout the free world. All the evidence from current events points up the fact that our rate of falling prestige is accelerating. Let me enumerate a few items:

The stability of the American dollar continues to be the concern of free Europe. De Gaulle is reported to have advised his Finance Minister that "total support" of the U.S. dollar, in intercentral bank agreements was "both inadvisable and untimely."

A German, strongly pro-American since World War II asks, "Why was America silent when India seized Goa, and continues aid to India, the aggressor?

"Why is there, in Washington, outright hostility to Portugal, a stanch ally?

"Why is there hostility toward President Tshombe, of Katanga, a strong anti-Communist who apparently believes in the right of self-determination guaranteed in the Atlantic Charter.

"Why did America force her longtime ally, Holland, to cede Irian to pro-Communist Sukarno? You actually made it physically impossible for the Netherlands to send troops to defend the natives.

"Why did you state, early in 1961, that Laos full independence was a matter of life and death for the security of east Asia and then force creation of a coalition government which will render Laos Communist within a year?"

This German friend states, "You have established the principle that aggression can pay dividends for the aggressor."

A Western European here for the recent Conference of the International Monetary Fund asked. "Why does the United States continue to follow Great Britain's lead in world affairs. They are appeasers of record, and are soft on communism up to their chins."

Following this remarks we witness Great Britain's refusal to alter trade with Castro.

Perhaps it is time to incline closer to De Gaulle and Adenauer, and unhitch our President and Secretary of State from Prime Minister Macmillan's domination.

Two hard facts recently have been reported from Mexico.

An official of the Mexican Government tells an American journalist that the impression is abroad in Latin America that the United States is so afraid of Khrushchev it will do nothing about Cuba.

The President of Mexico states the Monroe Doctrine is a "unilateral act which Mexico has never recognized." This, of course, was not the case when, less than 100 years ago, this doctrine was effective in relieving Mexico from domination by a foreign tyrant.

Again, let us assess the current situation. Indecisive and lackluster foreign policy, lack of firmness and apparent lack of conviction are running our prestige abroad downhill to new lows.

ECONOMIC COSTS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the hearings before the Joint Economic Committee in January of this year on the 1962 Economic Report, I requested of Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, an estimate of the economic loss to the United States resulting from racial discrimination in employment. Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, our first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the charter day address at Howard University on March 2, 1954, has estimated economic loss from racial discrimination to be between $18 and $30 billion annually.

Dr. Heller has now submitted to the committee his estimate, broken down into two categories. At the present educational level of the nonwhite labor force, Dr. Heller estimates that the loss in gross national product "might well be as much as 2.5 percent" or about $13 billion at today's level of gross national product. If nonwhites had the same educational levels as whites and if the economic economy fully utilized their education. Dr. Heller estimates the gain at "perhaps 3.2 percent higher"—inclusive of the 2.5 percent previously estimated—or about $17 billion at today's level of gross national product. The Council's estimate is clearly prefaced by the proviso that while these figures measure only the economic cost of racial discrimination, "this is only a minor part of the damage done to the social fabric by a deplorable practice."

The truth of this statement is undeniable. When considered against the estimate of economic loss alone, the impact of job discrimination is a vast and unbelievably retarding factor in our national life as a whole as well as in our economic growth. Perhaps these figures can bring home more vividly the meaning of this problem to the Nation, which is so much concerned presently with our level of economic growth.

I pledge myself to continue the struggle in the Congress to provide meaningful legislation to outlaw discriminatory practices in employment as elsewhere, including a Federal fair employment practices law, the elimination of discrimination in apprenticeship programs, and a statutory base for the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter I received from Dr. Heller, under date of September 25, 1962, and a copy of the report which was sent to me as a member of the Joint Economic Committee.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, September 25, 1962.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am enclosing a copy of our statement on the economic costs of racial discrimination in employment which, during the hearings on the 1962 Economic Report, you asked us to present to the Joint Economic Committee. A letter of transmittal to Chairman PATMAN is also enclosed.

As I note in my letter to the chairman, the problem of measurement in this area is a difficult one and our estimates are, at best, imprecise. I hope, however, that they will prove helpful in at least providing a rough measure of the economic loss our economy is suffering from racial discrimination in employment.

While our statement discusses primarily the economic costs of racially discriminatory employment practices, we share your concern regarding the other human and social costs resulting from the practices of discrimination. We all look forward to the time that discussions of discrimination will be found in history books, not in current economic reports.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER W. HELLER.

ECONOMIC COSTS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

The Council of Economic Advisers has prepared an estimate of the "economic loss to the United States resulting from racial discrimination in employment." This estimate is at best tentative and approximate. In the nature of the case, it is not possible to calculate with certainty what the full effects of nondiscriminatory employment practices would be, since they would bring about a substantial reshuffling of jobs and occupations among nonwhites and whites. But we believe that the order of magnitude of the figures presented here is roughly correct. It should be kept in mind that they are intended to measure only the economic cost of racial discrimination, and this is only a minor part of the damage done to the social fabric by a deplorable practice.

That there are economic losses resulting from discrimination is clear. These losses result from (1) inefficiencies in the use of the labor force resulting from failure to utilize fully the existing skills of our population; (2) failure to develop potential skills fully. This memorandum attempts to provide rough quantitative estimates of the gains that might accrue if various types of racial discrimination were eliminated. All the estimates herein are based upon a definition of "economic loss" as "amount of national product that is foregone." Measurements, therefore, relate to how much greater gross national product (GNP) could be if discrimination were eliminated (or had been eliminated in the past). Because the legacy of past discrimination affects today's occupational, geographic, and capital structure, and the skills, training, and education of the labor force, the gains would only accrue over time as the economy adjusts and the labor force is upgraded.

Part of the gain in output is attributable to increased employment of nonwhites. The calculations assume that in the absence of discrimination, the unemployment rate among nonwhites would be the same as among whites. Thus there would be a net reduction in unemployment, which could be achieved only if the level of demand in the economy were high enough to provide employment for whites and nonwhites on the same basis. One of the economic gains not measured here is the likelihood that the disappearance of discrimination in employment and education would mean a reduction in the volume of structural unemployment, and would therefore permit higher levels of output and employment without inflationary pressure.

In measuring the increase in output we have been concerned with two questions:

(1) By how much would GNP increase if the nonwhite were able to utilize his pres-

ent potential (as measured by years of education) as fully as is the white?

(2) By how much would GNP increase if the nonwhite were able to develop his capacities as fully as is the white?

Our answers to these two questions do not permit treatment of those forms of discrimination, e.g., housing, which have little, if any, direct employment effects. To the extent that removal of such discrimination may affect the economic performance of whites as well as nonwhites, it would have economic implications. The effect on economic performance does not, however, lend itself to measurement.

On the other hand, there exists a type of discrimination in employment which has little direct effect on output. This is the discriminatory practice in employment sometimes identified as "exploitation," i.e., paying the nonwhite less than the white is paid for equal work. This type of discrimination results in a redistribution of income favoring the white at the expense of the nonwhite, but with no necessary reduction in total output. The data do not permit separating out the loss to the nonwhite due to "exploitation" from the loss to the Nation in the form of decreased output.

GAIN FROM FULL UTILIZATION OF PRESENT EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT OF NONWHITES

A measure of the contribution that an individual makes to production by his labor is given by his wage and salary income. The income of nonwhites is lower than that of whites and this is the case for persons with the same number of years of education. In large part this is true because discrimination restricts the nonwhite to positions of lower productivity than he is qualified for. The elimination of such discriminaton would make it possible for nonwhites to move from lower-productivity to higher-productivity occupations, thus casuing an expansion of total output.

If nonwhites had the same labor force participation and employment rates as the white, and if they were distributed geographically and occupationally (and thus in terms of wage and salary income) as whites with the same educational attainments—if, in other words, nonwhites were able to make the same contribution to production, given their present educational attainment, GNP could be increased by about 1.8 percent.

There are several considerations that lead us to think that the gain would be somewhat higher. The shifting of nonwhites to new work roles would probably lead to the creation of additional plant and equipment (for it is assumed that on the average white workers are equipped with more capital than nonwhites). Simultaneously the creation of this new capital would be facilitated by the increased output and income of labor indicated by the 1.8 percent estimate. The income earned by this new capital should in principle be added to the gain.

Furthermore, the 1.8 percent estimate relates only to wage and salary income and does not attempt the difficult measurement of the change in the labor component of entrepreneurial income. Gains will occur in the labor productivity of the self-employed adding further to the 1.8 percent increase in GNP.

The above considerations suggest that the gain in gross national product might well be as much as 2.5 percent (about $13 billion at today's levels of GNP).

It is worth noting that today nonwhites represent 11 percent of the labor force and 10 percent of the civilian population 14 and over. Thus, it is not surprising that the estimated GNP gain is not a larger percentage of present GNP. Nevertheless, the loss does mean that we are wasting about one-third of the potential contribution of the nonwhite workers. The shift to full utilization of the present capabilities of the nonwhite population (and the resultant GNP increase of about 2.5 percent) would assist significantly in meeting our economic growth objectives in the coming years.

GAINS FROM RAISING THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

The elimination of discrimination in employment opportunities can, however, be considered in a broader framework. Not only is the nonwhite discriminated against in seeking work which enables him to utilize fully his present education, but nonwhites currently possess lower educational levels than do whites. This phenomenon—in part the result of past and present discrimination—limits the employment opportunities for the group as a whole. Furthermore, job discrimination itself contributes to lower educational attainment in a self-reenforcing manner. Thus it is relevant to ask not only how much higher GNP might be today if nonwhites were able to be as productive as whites given their present productive capacities (as measured by education), but also, how much higher GNP would be if nonwhites had been educated as fully as whites. Because we did not accomplish this educational task in the past, we can only do so in the future and the gains, therefore, can not be realized today but only over a future time span.

If nonwhites had the same educational levels as whites and if the economy fully utilized their education, GNP today might be perhaps 3.2 percent higher (inclusive of the 2.5 percent estimate reported above). This amounts to about $17 billion at today's levels of GNP.

QUALITATIVE GAINS IN NATIONAL WELFARE

Elimination of racial discrimination would yield gains that raise national welfare while not affecting the level of total output. It would permit, by reducing the level of social costs, a reallocation of output to more fruitful uses or permit more equitable sharing of community responsibilities. At present the social cost of crime and poor health is differentially associated with the nonwhite population. The reduction of these social costs would free resources for other uses. This is also true of the resources now allocated to the construction and operation of separate facilities—the result of discriminatory practices.

The elimination of discrimination would have an impact on the distribution of income among whites. Wage and salary incomes of whites in the lower paid occupations (with higher proportions of nonwhites) would tend to rise while the opposite would be true in the higher income occupations. Thus the low-income white population would also benefit and a more equal income distribution among whites would result.

Finally, the community responsibilities of taxpaying and of military service could be more equitably shared among all the citizens of the Nation. The essential characteristic of such gains is that they are related to allocation and distribution problems rather than to output considerations. But by improving allocation and distribution they do increase the total welfare of the society While they cannot be added to the GNP gain measured above, they are significant and should not be ignored.

APPENDIX ON DERIVATION OF ESTIMATES

The key figures in the foregoing memo are the percentages by which wages and salaries are assumed to rise in the two cases of (a) no change in education, and (b) a change in education.

For (a) the following method was used, based on 1949 data for individuals. (The 1959 data will not be available for several months, and only decennial census data give the necessary breakdown of income by educational level by age and sex by color.) For each age-sex group the income of nonwhites was changed to the income of whites having identical education. These changes amounted to a 3.1-percent rise in total money income. This 3.1-percent figure was applied to wages and salaries. Since wages and salaries are 58 percent of GNP, this would mean a 1.8-percent gain in GNP. This estimate was raised to 2.5 percent for the reasons given in the text.

For (b) the following method was used, based on 1960 data for families and unattached individuals. Total money income per consumer unit for first, nonwhite families, and second, nonwhite unattached individuals, was assumed to change to equal that of the appropriate white groups. Then wages and salaries were assumed to rise by the same percentage that total money income rose; namely, 4.0 percent. Since wages and salaries are 58 percent of GNP, the rise in GNP is 2.3. The final GNP increase was estimated to be perhaps 1-percent higher, or 3.2 percent, because of the additional gains, discussed earlier, due to increasing capital and entrepreneurial income.

The income data required for this study are available in terms of the standard census classification, "white," "nonwhite." The nonwhite classification includes, in addition to Negroes, American Indians, Japanese, Chinese, and others. The Census Bureau estimates that, of the 20.5 million persons in the nonwhite category in the 1960 census, 18.9 million persons (or 92 percent) were Negroes.

DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN CARRIERS AS CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Curtis conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATIVE TO CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAXES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Curtis conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF TERMINAL RAILROAD CORPORATIONS AND THEIR SHAREHOLDERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Curtis conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATE DEPARTMENT DESERVES HIGH COMMENDATIONS FOR BLOW TO CUBAN TRADE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I congratulate Secretary of State Rusk and the State Department on their ingenious action in planning to put into effect 2 weeks from now a program which will put real pressure upon our allies and other countries to stop trading with Cuba. This action comes at an appropriate time. The Senate has just watered down its proposal in the appropriation bill that came from the House which would have, outright, prevented aid to countries whose ships supplied Cuba with goods, munitions, and the like.

The proposed action on the part of the administration will be much stronger and much more effective. It is a 4-point program. This is what the program will do:

First, it will threaten any foreign shipowner with the loss of all cargo owned or financed by the U.S. Government if one of his vessels engages in the Soviet-bloc Cuban trade.

Second, the United States will close its ports to all shipowners of a country if any vessel under the flag of that country carries military goods or equipment to Cuba. Such pressure was provided in the House language of the appropriation bill; but it was an academic provision, because the administration's intelligence reports disclosed that only Soviet ships have been carrying supplies to Cuba, and that for years no Soviet vessel has docked at a U.S. port.

Third, the program will also ban from U.S. harbors any ship which, on the same continuous voyage, has delivered nonmilitary Communist cargoes to Cuba. This will be a very effective embargo provision.

Finally, the Presidential order forbids U.S.-flag ships or U.S.-owned ships to carry goods to or from Cuba.

Without taking warlike action, the Secretary of State has accomplished a real diplomatic coup, and his very effective action deserves high commendation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Reprisals for Cuba Trade Tougher Than Expected," written by Ted Szulc, and published in the New York Times of October 5, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Reprisals for Cuba Trade Tougher Than Expected

(By Tad Szulc)

Washington, October 4.—The administration's plan to penalize all shipowners who transport Soviet-bloc supplies to Cuba is tougher than was at first expected. Officials disclosed today that the plan, in the form of a four-point program, would be set in motion in 2 weeks.

The program will threaten any foreign shipowner with the loss of all cargo owned or financed by the U.S. Government if one of his vessels engages in the Soviet-bloc Cuba trade.

Under another provision, the United States will close its ports to all the ships of a country if any vessel under the flag of that country carries military equipment to Cuba.

It will also ban from its harbors any ship that on the same continuous voyage has delivered nonmilitary Communist cargoes to the Cubans.

COMPLETE BAN ON U.S. SHIPS

Finally, the Presidential order, forbid U.S.-flag ships or U.S.-owned ships to carry goods to or from Cuba.

As another part of its plan to put pressure on Cuba, the United States prepared to seek action next week in the Council of the Organization of American States. The Latin-American countries will be asked to carry out antisubversive measures discussed in last night's communique from the hemisphere's foreign ministers.

U.S. diplomats, who are pleased with the results of the informal 2-day ministerial conference here, expect to open consultations immediately on steps against Communist and Cuban subversion.

The ministers agreed yesterday that it was urgent to study "the transfer of funds to the other American Republics for subversive purposes, the flow of subversive propaganda and the utilization of Cuba as a base for training in subversive techniques."

STUDY BY SPECIAL GROUP

It was expected that the Council would instruct the special consultative committee on security, created in January by the American foreign ministers' conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay, to start the studies and present recommendations.

The United States as well as many Latin-American governments believe that one of the principal dangers presented by Cuba is training in subversion—offered to thousands of visiting Latin American youths—the export of revolutionary propaganda and the transfer of Cuban and Communist funds to revolutionary groups in other countries.

Perhaps the most difficult job facing the committee will be finding a way to prevent travel to Cuba. Many governments believe it may be politically impossible for them to forbid students to accept "scholarships" offered by the Havana regime, even though they lead to subversive training.

In general, U.S. officials believe that the tenor of the communique—which said the Chinese-Soviet "intervention in Cuba" was the hemisphere's most urgent problem—represented another step in Washington's long campaign to persuade the Latin Americans of the seriousness of the Cuban problem.

The ministerial statement said that Soviet intervention in Cuba required individual and collective action in the economic field, such as extending to other items the suspension of trade in strategic goods.

PROVISION OMITTED

A provision that the United States was particularly eager to insert in the communique was inadvertently dropped from the text of the document when it was distributed by the State Department last midnight.

It was a call upon "all other independent countries" to refrain from making ships available for the trade between the Soviet bloc and Cuba. Today, the Department issued a corrected text.

Many Latin American diplomats believe that the U.S. success in obtaining what amounted to a condemnation of the Soviet-Cuban alliance and in paving of the way for further measures was due largely to personal effort by Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Some diplomats said that under the Secretary's direction, the meeting had gone much further than the ministers had planned when they arrived.

Although the bases of the new policy have been settled by the administration, officials indicated today that many of its details were still to be worked out.

It was emphasized that for the time being the restrictions will not apply to ships bringing cargo to Cuba from non-Communist countries. Such routes account for 25 percent of Cuba's imports; the rest comes through trade with the Soviet bloc. But the possibility of extending the sanctions was not ruled out.

CARRIERS OF AID AFFECTED

Under the new program, the immediate impact will be upon allied and neutral ships that carry U.S. Government cargoes to Europe and return to the Western Hemisphere with merchandise for Cuba. The value of the shipments involved in this trade was not immediately known.

In this instance, the administration aimed its threat against individual shipowners rather than against all the ships of a nation.

In the case of ships bringing Soviet cargo to Cuba and then picking up goods in U.S. ports for a return voyage to Europe, only the individual vessels would be penalized.

The object here is to face the shipowners with the prospect of going back to Europe empty.

The provision banning from U.S. ports all the ships of a national that has allowed one of its vessels to carry military equipment to Cuba may, however, be academic.

The administration's intelligence reports indicate that only Soviet ships have been carrying military equipment to Cuba. For years no Soviet vessel has visited the United States.

The only Soviet-bloc country to maintain maritime trade with the United States is Poland and there are no indications that Polish ships have been used to carry military goods to Cuba.

Among the many details to be worked out is the definition of military equipment. Today, officials could not say whether ships carrying tents, army boots, or uniforms would be included in the definition.

In another action related to Cuba, President Kennedy signed the congressional resolution today that authorizes him to use troops if necessary to counter any acts of aggression emanating from Cuba. He also signed the resolution authorizing him to call up 150,000 reservists if needed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the proposed action is in order also because it has just been revealed that the British plan no law to bar trade with Cuba. According to the New York Times, there is no possibility that legislation will be adopted or will be passed by Parliament prohibiting British trade with Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "British Plan No Law Barring Trade With Cuba but Will Help United States Otherwise," published in the New York Times of October 5, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

British Plan No Law Barring Trade With Cuba but Will Help United States Otherwise

(By Seth S. King)

LONDON, October 4.—An authoritative source said today that Britain would continue to cooperate with the United States in a search for a formula to reduce the volume of strategic cargoes reaching Cuba in British ships.

There is no possibility, however, the source added, that the British Government will introduce legislation forbidding British ships to call at Cuban ports.

The British have apparently not ruled out the possibility of placing Cuba on the Coordinating Committee's boycott list. It consists of countries to which specified strategic materials may not be shipped by members of the committee.

The Coordinating Committee consists of all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries except Iceland—the United States, Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and Turkey. Japan is also a member.

WOULD REPRESENT SHIFT

Although the Committee's boycott list consists of Soviet-bloc countries and Communist China, Cuba is not on the list.

The placement of Cuba on the list would indicate an abrupt change in British policy. In the past Britain has often been a proponent of reducing the numbers of goods barred from sale to the Soviet bloc.

The U.S. plan to keep ships carrying arms to Cuba from calling at U.S. ports would not affect British-owned shipping, a Foreign Office source said.

For 2 years, Britain has refused export licenses to British arms manufacturers who intended to sell their products to Cuba.

"So far as we know, no British ships are knowingly carrying arms from any other sources to Cuba," a Foreign Office official said.

If the United States should bar its ports to ships carrying cargoes other than arms to Cuba, British shipping would definitely be hurt. British shippers are among the chief carriers of oil to Cuba and sugar from there.

British officials do not agree with the contention that by refusing to carry nonstrategic cargoes to Cuba, the West would force the Soviet Union to divert its ships to do this.

Neither does Britain believe that an embargo on all goods and shipping from the West would harm the regime of Premier Fidel Castro.

"We think it might actually stabilize his position," a source said, "giving him a source of sympathy from his own people and a reason to stir them up further against the West."

AGREES ON PRINCIPLE

The official said Britain agreed with the idea of preventing communism's spread from Cuba into Latin America.

"We share your alarm over this possibility," he said. "But we do not agree on the means of combating it.

"Britain is a maritime country. We believe in freedom of the seas, and the U.S. proposals cut directly across some of our oldest traditions."

The British Government does not have the authority to stop the transportation of nonbelligerent cargoes to Cuba by her ships, a Foreign Office source said.

Legislation would have to be adopted by Parliament. "There is neither any possibility that the Government will introduce such legislation nor that Parliament would pass it," the source said.

Shipping is one of this country's largest earners of foreign currency and one of its greatest industries. Nearly 3 percent of Britain's large merchant fleet is now idle, however.

CURBS URGED IN NORWAY

OSLO, October 4.—The Norwegian Shipowners Association has requested its members not to engage in shipments to Cuba. In a statement Monday, the association said that Norwegian ships had carried only civilian cargoes to Cuba.

CANADA PLANS NO BAN

OTTAWA, October 4.—The Government does not plan to forbid Canadian-owned ships to carry cargoes between the Soviet Union and Cuba, the External Affairs Minister, Howard C. Green, said today in the House of Commons.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times has published today an editorial entitled "The Embargo On Castro," which reads, in part, as follows:

> The Kennedy administration, refusing to be stampeded by advocates of direct action against Cuba, has now produced a program that might materially reduce the Soviet bloc's military and economic support without risking an armed collision or violation of international law. * * *
>
> But the United States long ago adopted the embargo policy; and as long as we maintain it in respect to our own trade with the island, there is certainly every reason to try to make it as effective as possible by methods. The present program is in fact an ingenious way of extending this embargo through the control that we exercise over the use of our own ports and over the shipment of goods exported at the cost of the American taxpayer.

I think this action is exceptionally praiseworthy. Because trade with America is of far more importance to shipowners of those countries than is trade with Cuba it will be mighty effective in choking Castro. The coup by the Secretary of State deserves our congratulations. I am mightily heartened by it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Embargo on Castro

The Kennedy administration, refusing to be stampeded by advocates of direct action against Cuba, has now produced a program that might materially reduce the Soviet bloc's military and economic support without risking an armed collision or violation of international law. This policy was discussed by Secretary Rusk with the foreign ministers of the Organization of American States at a 2-day meeting in Washington this week. It is fundamentally designed to compel foreign shipping companies to choose between the permanently lucrative American trade and the quick short-term profits they are earning by carrying Soviet bloc cargoes to Castro.

When operative, the program would bar from American ports all the ships of any country any one of whose ships was found transporting weapons and munitions to Cuba. So far as is known, the arms already imported into Cuba have in no case been brought there under the flag of a non-Communist country. But there are many vessels of non-Communist lands that have been carrying other types of supplies to Cuba. When the program goes into effect they will be prohibited from loading American cargoes in American ports for their return voyage. This means that in many cases they would be forced to recross the Atlantic in ballast without any payload. Furthermore, the owners of any foreign ships engaged in the profitable trade of carrying American surplus commodities to countries receiving grants-in-aid or loans will stand to lose their contracts if they also trade with Cuba. All U.S.-owned ships, whether flying the American flag or sailing under foreign registries, will be prohibited from engaging in the Cuban trade.

This program was born of the reluctance of many foreign maritime countries, allies of the United States, to abandon their trade with Cuba. On the ground that neither we nor they are at war with Cuba, they claim their undoubtedly legal right to carry peacetime goods to Cuba as usual. Some make the argument that an embargo is not the way to destroy Castro, and that in fact it can boomerang and even strengthen his grip on the Cuban people. This may be true; there is no guarantee that a cessation of trade with Cuba will have the desired effect on Castro.

But the United States long ago adopted the embargo policy; and as long as we maintain it in respect to our own trade with the island, there is certainly every reason to try to make it as effective as possible by peaceable methods. The present program is in fact an ingenious way of extending this embargo through the control that we exercise over the use of our own ports and over the shipment of goods exported at the cost of the American taxpayer. It is another question whether the hoped-for result will be achieved, not to mention the cost in goodwill of our maritime allies.

There can be no doubt that the transformation of Cuba into a Soviet-supported enterprise is a danger to this hemisphere, and the Latin American foreign ministers at the Washington meeting clearly acknowledged this fact. Although their assessment of the methods to be employed to combat this danger varied, they agreed on this important conclusion: "that now more than ever it is necessary to strengthen the system of representative democracy and to redouble the efforts being made to bring harmonious progress to the peoples, and the earliest and most effective improvement in their standard of living, within the framework of the Alliance for Progress, and with the most complete respect for human rights." This statement recognized the essential prerequisite in warding off the political dangers emanating from Castro's Cuba. This is really the crux of the problem so far as Latin America is concerned.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I join with the able Senator from Wisconsin in commendation of the Secretary of State and the administration upon the particular move which they have just made.

There are two other subjects as to which action should be taken promptly. I shall refer to them in a speech which I shall deliver at 2:30 this afternoon. I hope that the Senator from Wisconsin will be here so that we may exchange views.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

THE U.S.-U.S.S.R. ENERGY RACE: A SOBER WARNING

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on September 28, 1962, I placed in the RECORD portions of an article written by Howard Morgan, Commissioner of the Federal Power Commission, in which he discussed his recent trip to Russia.

Today I present for the consideration of the Senate a more detailed report on that trip, in which Mr. Morgan comments especially on the technique of the Russians in long-distance power transmission.

As I read the excellent speech by Mr. Morgan, I could not help recalling that one of our colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], had made successive trips to the Soviet Union, where he visited powerplants. Upon his return, he warned the Senate—and I considered his remarks as a warning—that the Russians were fast creeping up upon us in their production of hydroelectricity and their development of long-distance transmission. I think we owe a special tribute to the Senator from Louisiana for calling this subject to our attention; and these remarks by Commissioner Morgan again remind us of it.

Commissioner Morgan mentions names with which Americans are unfamiliar, names of places which Americans do not know how to pronounce: rivers such as the Yenisei, Angara, and Sungari; Lake Baikal; and cities such as Bratsk, Kuybyshev, Novosibirsk, and Krasnoyarsk. It is in these cities that the Russians have built huge powerplants and on these rivers that they have constructed the biggest power dams in the world. They are places which most Americans probably have never heard of.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the outstanding address delivered by Commissioner Howard Morgan before the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference at Portland, Oreg., October 2, 1962.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S.-U.S.S.R. ENERGY RACE: A SOBER WARNING

(Extracts from address by Howard Morgan, Commissioner, Federal Power Commission, before the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference, Portland, Oreg., October 2, 1962)

About 3 weeks ago I returned from a 2-week inspection trip through Russia, Siberia, and Sweden, in company with Secretary of the Interior Udall, Chairman Swidler, of the Federal Power Commission, Bonneville Power Administrator Charles F. Luce, Gen. R. G. MacDonnel, of the Corps of Engineers, and a group of highly qualified engineering experts in hydroelectric generation and high voltage transmission. The purpose of the trip was to study those two subjects and, in addition, the operation of large integrated power pools.

During the course of the trip, Mr. Khrushchev, in a conversation with Secretary Udall, issued a challenge to the United States to engage in a peaceful energy race with the Soviet Union. The challenge was of course accepted by Mr. Udall, and both the challenge and its acceptance was reported by the press. During the intervening period there has been surprisingly little editorial comment in the United States about this energy race to which we are now committed. Most of the comment I have seen reflects little understanding of the seriousness of such a contest and expresses a comfortable and complacent point of view concerning our prospects.

After a careful examination of the comparative electric power statistics of the two countries I am convinced: that we have already been in an electric energy race with the U.S.S.R. for 15 years, that while we are ahead in that race by a very wide margin, the Russians are gaining on us at an alarming rate, and that the seriousness of the race, together with the possibility that we can eventually lose it, are matters which urgently need informed public discussion in this country. I shall try to make a small contribution toward such a discussion in this talk.

* * * *

At the time of the revolution Russia was the most backward European nation in the development of electric power, but the total electrification of Russia was at once made the goal, the center and the heart of the industrialization plans laid down then, over 40 years ago. * * * During the twenties and thirties American engineers and contracting firms, together with American generator and turbine manufacturers, worked with the Russians to develop both hydro and steam generation, as well as high-voltage transmission. Lend-lease assistance helped rebuild war-damaged plants and lines, and even built a few new ones for war production during the forties. Since shortly after World War II the Russians have been self-sufficient, and have carried on an increasingly large and rapid construction program unaided; even developing enough capacity to send skilled engineers, technicians and first-rate electric equipment abroad to newly-developing areas. Today, in the generation of electric power, Russia has outstripped not only every nation in Europe by very wide margins, but every other nation in the world as well, except for the United States.

In 1927, the earliest year for which the FPC has statistics, Russia had 1,905,000 kilowatts of installed generating capacity. The United States had passed that figure in 1900. By 1946 Russia had 12,338,000 kilowatts. The United States had passed that figure exactly 30 years before in 1916. But by 1961 Russia had 74 million kilowatts, a figure equalled in the United States only 12 years earlier, in 1949.

The United States is still ahead of Russia by a wide margin, wide enough to give rise to a good deal of self-congratulation in our electric industry. In 1961 we had nearly 200 million kilowatts of capacity; the Russians only 74 million kilowatts. But a closer look at the figures is disturbing. * * * In 1932 we had almost 10 times as much capacity as they; about 43 million compared to 4,675,000. By 1961 this margin had shrunk to less than three times. There are two ways to look at this. Notice that the absolute margin had widened, while the percentage of margin had shrunk. * * *

By 1961 the United States had reached the level of about 333 percent of its 1946 capacity, or an increase of 233 percent. In the same period the U.S.S.R. had reached the level of exactly 600 percent of its 1946 capacity or an increase of 500 percent. Both these rates of growth are impressive and represent great achievements, but the latter figure represents a rate of growth absolutely unparalleled in any 15-year period in the history of the United States or, for that matter, in the history of any other important nation in the world.

* * * *

The absolute amounts of our yearly additions, while reassuring, are not as important as the percentage of existing capacity which we—and they—add each year. These percentages are ominous.

* * * *

Mr. Khrushchev knew perfectly well, before he challenged the United States to a race in the field of electric energy, that our capacity is nearly three times that of Russia, and that the annual additions to U.S. generating capacity are currently greater than those being made in Russia. Does this mean, as the complacent executives in our electric industry would have you believe, that Mr. K is out of his mind and has advertised to the world that the Soviet Union has entered a race it cannot win?

I hope I may be pardoned if I remind you that the world has by now formed an entirely different view of that wily old gentleman. He is, as we all have reason to know, an exceedingly well informed man; he knows the stakes that are involved in an energy race between the United States and the U.S.S.R.; and as a master politician he knows very well the risks of outlining policies and goals which are beyond the possibility of execution. It will pay us, if for no other reason than to avoid panic later on, to take a careful look at the same figures he has been looking at and try to understand realistically what he and his system are driving at.

What gives rise to the greatest concern among Americans who have studied these figures carefully, and who have gone to Russia for a look around, is the accelerating pace of the construction the Russians have recently built and the even faster acceleration of their plans for future construction. Both countries are planning and building on curves which rise more steeply each year, but the Russians' curve of actual construction is rising faster now than ours was 12 years ago, when we had the same capacity they presently have. What is more important, they plan to steepen their construction curve more drastically in the years ahead than some people think would be justified in the United States by the demands of our own economy. If this happens, the curves will inevitably converge, intersect, and cross.

Whether this will happen, of course, depends on a complex of economic and perhaps political factors probably beyond the ability of anyone to predict with certainty. But in 1960 a U.S. Senate committee, which toured Russia with engineering staff and studied power matters carefully, reported that "The U.S.S.R. is catching up with the United States in electric power production, the basic field in which supremacy counts heavily in peaceful economic competition or in event of war. * * * The Russians could overtake us in 1975—in 15 years—unless we speed up or they slow down."

Whatever we—or they—actually do in the years to come, I can report that they have not the slightest intention of slowing down.

* * * *

Take comfort in the fact that so far we seem to be ahead of the Russians in design, size and efficiency of steam generating units, which comprise the bulk of both their own and our power systems. One of our manufacturing concerns is now building a

1,000,000 kilowatt single-unit steam generator, and several 800,000 kilowatt units are in operation, while the Russians are only now building their largest at 300,000 kilowatts. This doesn't seem to bother them, though it actually may; it is hard to tell. They claim they would rather standardize at a moderate size and build more of them, which may or many not be the case. This would not make economic sense in our system but it is sometimes hard to be sure whether the economic factors in their system would produce the same decisions as in ours, even granting that they have the technical capacity necessary for free choice. In any case Mr. Khrushchev, in a recent policy speech, directed his engineers to step up their mastery of larger steam units, and on the basis of past experience we can realistically expect that they will proceed to do so.

But it is in the hydropower (about 20 to 25 percent of their capacity) and in extra-high-voltage and integrated transmission systems that they have made important advances, and this is what we went to see and learn about.

Russia has several very large rivers that dwarf the Columbia in size and power. On the Volga we saw the dams at Stavropol; 2.3 million kilowatts (compared to 1.9 million kilowatts at Grand Coulee) and Volgograd; 2.5 million kilowatts.

* * * * *

At Bratsk, 200 miles north on the Angara from its origin at Lake Baikal, we saw what will presently become the world's largest dam at 4.5 to 5 million kilowatts. It is now about two-thirds complete, already has 200 feet of water behind the dam (eventually it will have 350 feet or so) and is generating power with 5 of what will eventually be 20 generators.

These generators, and the turbines which drive them, are the largest in the world and were especially designed for this dam by L. A. Artemov, an English-speaking engineer now in his sixties who spent several years in America working on lend-lease during the war, has many friends here, and is widely respected in the electrical world. He is in charge of all hydroturbine and generator designs in Russia. Incidentally, as a very young man he built the first hydroplant in Russia, beginning in 1922.

We were able to see some of these turbines and generators being installed. The largest in the United States are at Niagara and have a capacity of 150,000 kilowatts. Those at Bratsk are of 250,000-kilowatt capacity. That means more than 300,000 horsepower is developed by a single turbine on a single, slow-speed shaft. At Krasnoyarsk, 200 miles west from Bratsk on the Yenisei, is a dam we did not visit because construction is just now getting well underway. This dam, when completed, will take the title of "biggest" away from Bratsk. It will generate 6 million-plus kilowatts. Its equipment, also designed by Mr. Artemov but not yet built, will produce 500,000 kilowatts per generator, or more than 600,000 horsepower per turbine. The shafts necessary to take such power are too big to forge in a single piece, so they are made of slabs of foot-thick steel, which are rolled into partial cylinders, welded lengthwise into tubes, heated in soaking pits to relieve welding stresses, and then machined to size—something over 8 feet in outside diameter and about 6 feet inside diameter. The design and construction of these shafts is a real engineering achievement by itself.

It is planned that both the Angara and the Yenisei, as well as a number of other Siberian rivers, will be fully developed from headwaters to their mouths on the Arctic in the next several years, some of the dams being larger than those I have mentioned, and some smaller. But the real giant, one planned for construction beginning 10 or 12 years from now, is on the Lena quite near its delta on the Arctic. Preliminary engineering studies, we were told, yield the astounding prediction of from 20 to 22 million kilowatts to be generated by this single dam. It is expected to electrify the entire Pacific coast of Siberia.

The secret of getting power from such remote regions to the centers of industrial production involves the thorny problem of very long-distance transmission without uneconomic line loss. So far as I can determine the longest lines in the United States are no more than 225 miles from point of generation to load centers. The distances involved in moving Siberian power to load centers are in excess of 1,500 miles. This accounts for the strenuous research and construction the Russians have been doing in the extra-high-voltage field, for in that very difficult technological field lies the answer to the problem.

The heaviest lines actually constructed in this country are at 345,000 volts (345 kilovolts) and there are not many of them. The Russians have for some years been operating 500-kilowatt lines as long as 600 miles, from Kuibyshev to Moscow and from Volgograd to Moscow. In addition, a 500-kilovolt line is in operation from Irkutsk to Bratsk, is being extended from Bratsk to Krasnoyarsk, and before that dam is complete will be extended clear across central Asia to the Ural Mountain area. Work is now going on which will eventually boost some or all of these lines to 750 kilovolts and ultimately to 1,000 kilovolts—1 million volts. All this is alternating current.

Even more challenging, and holding out the promise of even more economies, is direct current, and here too the Russians have heavy lines—eventually planned for 800 kilovolts—in operation from Volgograd to the Don River basin industrial area. We saw all this extra-high-voltage research and construction, including the world's largest direct current laboratory at Moscow, and found it all very impressive.

Finally, we were shown the control center in Moscow where, in a single room, all of the power generated and consumed in European Russia, except for two minor districts which are now being hooked up, is dispatched under computerized control on a single interconnected grid. We have two such interconnected grids in the United States, the Northwest power pool (mainly Bonneville) and the TVA, each controlling about 12 million kilowatts. In the Russian pool is almost 55 percent of the power generated in the entire nation—about 39 million kilowatts. Eventually—in only a few years—this power grid will extend clear to Siberia and will contain virtually all of Russia's national capacity under centralized, automated control. The advantages and economies of this arrangement are very large * * * and make Russian power production capacity significantly closer to ours than the current production and capacity figures indicate.

It seems safe to say that this will be even more true in the future than it is now, unless we increase our pace in this vital area. It is, of course, much more difficult for us to achieve integration than for the Russians, because our power systems are under diverse ownership; but in Sweden, which we also visited, we learned that the entire national electric capacity there is in a single integrated pool, despite the fact that it is about evenly divided between public and private ownership. This was accomplished, we were told, without doing violence to any ownership rights. Perhaps the Swedish system is one we might study with profit.

We have been challenged by the Soviet Union to an energy race and, like it or not, we are in that race. Because energy—electrical energy—is the heart of any industrial system, the outcome of this race may very well determine which nation will eventually command the largest and most productive industrial plant in the world. And it hardly needs to be said that whoever possesses the world's greatest industrial capacity can and will use that capacity to exert economic, political and military leadership in the decades to come. Our adversaries in this contest—the Russian people—are intelligent, determined, well-organized, and have increasingly excellent training and education at their disposal, in addition to abundant natural resources. If one can judge from the available evidence, it will take a great effort for either country to win this race. But the main fact for Americans to grasp at this point is that it is possible for either country—including our own—to lose the race with comparative ease.

A peaceful energy race can produce a better life for Americans, Russians, and everyone else and is certainly preferable to some of the other contests we could get into. But it is important to win such a contest, and if we are to do that we need to step up our pace sharply and keep it stepped up. Those who argue otherwise, in my opinion, are deluding themselves. * * *

We should remember that these are the same Russians our experts told us did not have the manufacturing capacity to fight a modern war. We were told, and we believed, that they didn't have the mechanical ability to maintain and operate modern military equipment in the field even if they could, with our help, produce it, and that they didn't know how to command or supply really large armies in battle. We told ourselves, and believed it, that the secrets of the atom were beyond them. How could we have forgotten that the table of atomic periodicity we studied in high school was—and still is—named the Mendeleyeff table? We were told, and we believed, that even if they should learn those secrets it would take them at least 15 years to assemble the vast manufacturing complex and master the sophisticated, technological processes necessary to make an ordinary atom bomb. As for the hydrogen bomb, that, of course, would require another 10 years or so. Have we forgotten so soon how we stood in our back yards in October of 1957, literally stunned as we watched their first sputnik twinkling in the sunset as it tumbled through space?

I am not suggesting that the Soviet Union is unbeatable in peaceful competition. Our athletes and space teams do very well, after all. But those men will tell you what I am trying to say: anyone who takes the Russians on in serious competition had better be up early in the morning and hard at work.

There is no more serious competition short of war, in my opinion, than the electric energy race to which Mr. Khrushchev has challenged us. His best engineers have given us a sober and candid statement of exactly what they plan to do and even when they plan to do it. I, for one, do not want this Nation to be lulled to sleep by the complacent among us, and then to be told 10 years from now by the same people, their complacency gone and their hair standing on end, that the only way we can stay ahead of the Russians is to adopt harsh, repressive, and dangerous economic and military measures.

I believe a free economy can meet this challenge. Whether it will do so depends, it seems to me, on how we use the time and opportunities remaining to us. Our first task is to understand now what is happening, while there still remains time to achieve the more rapid industrial growth which President Kennedy has advocated for so long. If we don't understand now, if we don't make the effort now, we can expect some very bad news in the future.

We all know the saying, "Don't look back; they might be gaining on us." We don't need to look back. They are gaining on us.

AMERICAN SPORTS LEADERS ENDORSE SENATOR HUMPHREY'S PROGRAM FOR FITNESS AND OLYMPIC VICTORY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have previously brought to the attention of the Senate the need for, first, a national fitness program, including the establishment of, in effect, a U.S. Fitness Foundation; second, a city-county-State-regional national program of athletic competitions in preparation for U.S. victory in the 1964 Olympics; and third, mediation of the now conflicting approaches of major U.S. athletic groups as to who will be in charge of what for future Olympics.

APPROVAL FROM ALL OVER UNITED STATES

My statements in the Senate were made on September 12, 1962, and September 25, 1962.

In the brief period which has elapsed, I am delighted to report, a vast and virtually unanimously favorable reaction has been received.

COMMENTS BY ADMIRAL HAMILTON

One of many such incoming messages has been from Rear Adm. Thomas J. Hamilton, former chairman, Olympic Development Committee, former head football coach of his alma mater, the U.S. Naval Academy, and former athletic director, University of Pittsburgh.

Admiral Hamilton, now executive director, Athletic Association of Western Universities, wrote to me on September 21:

> I wish to congratulate you on the excellent message you gave in support of American sports and fitness.
>
> I agree with you wholeheartedly that greater efforts should be exerted on these important issues.
>
> I quite agree with you that the national defense education law should provide greater backing for physical education and physical fitness activities. The physical education and coaching profession needs more encouragement, and there should be greater incentives to induce worthy young people into this profession.

Admiral Hamilton added this view with respect to the AAU–NCAA dispute:

> I firmly believe that the Nation's interest calls for a reorganization of the athletic administration of the Olympics and our international sports. The new federations are a step in that direction, but I do not feel we have enough time for the slow process to take place.

WARM REACTION FROM COLLEGE LEADERS

In another welcome message, Mr. Al Duer, executive director, National Athletic Intercollegiate Association, Kansas City, Mo., phoned to convey his interest in harmonizing of the views of the divergent groups. NAIA well represents smaller colleges throughout the Nation, I may add, including those of my own State. A followup letter by Mr. Duer will appear in the Record, following my remarks.

Minnesota sports leaders, active in NCAA, have likewise indicated favorable reaction to my appeal.

OFFICIAL REACTION FROM HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE DEPARTMENT

On the official front, in response to my inquiries, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze has emphasized his intention to strengthen and speed our Nation's fitness effort.

I am looking forward, therefore, to specific new actions on the part of such organizations as the U.S. Office of Education and the U.S. Public Health Service, including the National Institutes of Health. Fitness must become a 365-days-a-year responsibility of specific officials and units within HEW, as within other departments—not just a part-time, once-a-year or twice-a-year report-gathering task.

MEETING WITH U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

I have been particularly glad to meet in person with numerous individuals who have dedicated their lives to both the fitness and the Olympic program. I refer, for example, to members of the U.S. Olympics Committee, including Mr. J. Lyman Bingham, its able, longtime executive director; Arthur C. Lentz, assistant executive director; and Edward Rosenblum, Washington representative.

Meanwhile, however, no American could read the "United States 1960 Olympic Book," containing the Quadrennial Report of the U.S. Olympics Committee, without feeling a sense of pride in our American sportsmen's achievements.

The report documents American honors in the Rome Olympiad in 1960, in the Olympic Winter Games at Squaw Valley earlier that year, and in the 1959 Pan-American Games in Chicago.

I should like to note, too, that I have been happy to hear from the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States. The contributions made by the AAU to sports and fitness in our country are too well known to require reiteration.

REPRINTING OF LETTERS

I ask unanimous consent that letters from the following individuals be printed at this point in the Record:

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze.

Louis J. Fisher, president, AAU—together with an enclosed statement of policy.

A. O. Duer, executive secretary-treasurer, NAIA.

H. Dan Corbin, past vice president, recreation division, American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Washington, D.C.

A great Olympic champion, Rafer L. Johnson, now national director, university people-to-people program, located in Los Angeles.

Two State fitness chairmen, Allen P. Jeffries, in Boise, Idaho, and George W. Ayars, in Dover, Del.

Richard L. Brown, assistant director, safety service, water safety, American National Red Cross.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
Washington, September 26, 1962.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Humphrey: Thank you for your letter of September 13. I have read with interest the material you enclosed.

As Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Fitness, I share your concern for the physical fitness of American youth and adults, and your belief that much can be done to improve it. We have accomplished a great deal in the past year. Much more will be done as new programs of the Council, now being developed and published, are implemented across the country.

I also share your desire to move ahead rapidly, and I know we seek the same fitness goals for all our citizens, young and old. I will be pleased to have your cooperation in strengthening and speeding our fitness effort, and have so advised my staff.

With every best wish.

Sincerely,

Anthony Celebrezze,
Secretary.

Amateur Athletic Union
of the United States,
High Point, N.C., September 27, 1962.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Humphrey: Since my return from a meeting of the international track federation in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, I have had an opportunity to read and study your remarks on the floor of the U.S. Senate September 12 reprinted in the Congressional Record under the title "A Five Point Fitness Program for America, including a (Private) Olympic Foundation With a National Goal for Victory."

You would have been heartened at the great respect and admiration shown the representatives of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States at this meeting. I know that you have read in the newspapers where the International Amateur Athletic Federation endorsed the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States 100 percent for its administration of the sport in this country and passed without a dissenting vote a resolution aimed at the unlawful acts of an insurgent group in this country which group wasn't mentioned by name. One of the important points in the resolution was that the "IAAF reaffirms its constitutional and traditional concern that amateur athletics be controlled by amateurs for the benefit of amateur athletes."

Your remarks were so pertinent to the amateur athletic picture in the United States that I am enclosing an official statement from the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States in which we have answered your plea "to encourage the able but rival U.S. athletic groups to end what has been called a little cold war." We have been earnestly trying to accomplish this end for more than 2 years. But our efforts at a reconciliation with the National Collegiate Athletic Association have been repeatedly turned aside almost without comment.

It would be appreciated if this official statement from the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States could be placed in the Congressional Record. Also, the Amateur Athletic Union would welcome an opportunity to discuss the administration of amateur athletics with you. Our ideas and objectives coincide.

Sincerely yours,

Louis J. Fisher,
President.

Official Statement of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States by Louis J. Fisher, President

The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States is the only amateur sports organization in the Nation in which membership is open to every man, woman, boy and girl regardless of age, sex, color, creed, educational or military status. We have been proud of our "open door" policy ever since the union was founded 75 years ago. In our administration in the field of amateur athletics we have 28 allied organizations, including the NAIA, an organization of 465 colleges; the YMCA; the Catholic Youth Organization; the National Jewish Welfare Board; the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, an organization of over 80 eastern colleges.

Until 1960 the National Collegiate Athletic Association had articles of alliance with us. We mutually respected each other. In a series of meetings over the last 2 years, the Amateur Athletic Union has made an earnest effort to resolve the problems that have been conjured up by the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Every offer has been turned aside flatly as the National Collegiate Athletic Association continued to plot the overthrow of the duly constituted authority in the United States for nine Olympic sports and international competition in those same sports outside of Olympic competition. The National Collegiate Athletic Association has continued its power-grabbing drive built on a thesis of "rule or ruin."

The Amateur Athletic Union is reassured by the strong endorsement of its administration from the International Amateur Athletic Federation at the time of its congress meeting at Belgrade, September 17. We implore the National Collegiate Athletic Association to cease sponsorship of its proposed puppet United States Track and Field Federation.

As clear-thinking Americans, we are in complete disagreement with the federations' attempted method of making a change. They are stampeding their members from many of the Nation's best known educational institutions into a revolution against a recognized sports governing body which follows long-established rules and procedures that are worldwide regulations imposed on all members of these international organizations. The method underlying the formation of the federations is wrong, regardless of any merits in its objective. They are not content with an evolution by due process of law which can be accomplished within the existing framework of the Amateur Athletic Union. The backers of the federations, representing the National Collegiate Athletic Association, are afraid to test their plans in a democratic procedure.

The Amateur Athletic Union is an open and democratic organization. The proponents of the federations can accomplish every objective which they have listed merely by returning to the Amateur Athletic Union where they have always been welcome. We sincerely believe that amateur sports in America will be stronger than ever with the return of the members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. We represent the American people in the administration of amateur sports. No reprisals would be in order. On the contrary, we believe these representatives of the Nation's large colleges should take a more active part in our operations in order to present a stronger front in amateur sports.

May we point out that there is no machinery in the organization of the International Amateur Athletic Federation to permit the U.S. Track and Field Federation a hearing of any kind until after the Olympic games in Tokyo in 1964. This proposed organization in the United States has been designed to torpedo the chances of the United States for victory at Tokyo. And they want to blame the Amateur Athletic Union and thereby put the AAU out of business—this is the fact which must be made known to 187 million Americans.

The Amateur Athletic Union has always considered our young athletes the most priceless "commodity" at our command. We shall battle every inch of the way to preserve the eligibility of these young men and women within the existing regulations of the International Amateur Athletic Federation. It must be understood that the International Amateur Athletic Federation has sole jurisdiction over the conduct of the track and field events at the Olympic games. Also, only its members in more than 100 member nations can certify the eligibility of individual team personnel to the national Olympic committees around the world. The U.S. Olympic Committee has no jurisdiction over the eligibility of individual men and women and also has no jurisdiction over the conduct of the Olympic games.

At the recent congress of the International Amateur Athletic Federation, a motion was passed without a dissenting vote declaring ineligible for the Olympic games any athlete competing in any open meet which is not sanctioned by the Amateur Athletic Union.

The Amateur Athletic Union is proud of the performances of athletes under its jurisdiction at the 1960 Olympic games, as well as in recent international competitions with the U.S.S.R.

Our men and women track and field representatives bettered every performance by an American in previous Olympic games. Our men garnered nine gold, eight silver, and five bronze medals against 5-4-4 for the U.S.S.R. We clearly dominated the track and field competition as have every group of Amateur Athletic Union representatives competing in the modern Olympic games since 1896.

Our men and women swimming teams never performed better in the Olympics. The men won 6 of 10 gold medals, adding 4 silver and 3 bronze, thereby earning 13 medals out of a maximum number of 18 (we were only permitted 18 swimmers, 2 each for 9 events). The teenagers on the women's swimming team wrested laurels from Australia by winning five of nine gold medals, as well as three silver medals.

The United States shared top honors with Italy in boxing, each nation winning three gold medals. A summary of the boxing events would show that our representatives won 26 of 33 bouts.

The wrestlers also came up with their best performance in the postwar years by winning three gold medals in the freestyle competition. This performance by our freestyle wrestlers, all natives of Oklahoma, would have to be considered the most pleasant surprise for U.S. forces in the 1960 Olympics.

Basketball continued to be dominated by the Americans. We have never lost an Olympic basketball game. These men play under the jurisdiction of the Amateur Athletic Union.

Our weightlifters bettered every Olympic record set in 1956 at Melbourne and finished second to the U.S.S.R. forces which have made great strides in this sport.

Immediately upon the completion of the 1960 Olympic games, the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States began planning for the 1964 Olympics by instituting a full program of Olympic development events in those specific events in which the United States is considered subpar internationally. From reports received this summer, our athletes are displaying marked improvement over 1961, which figures indicated an improvement over what our athletes accomplished in Rome.

The AAU has shouldered the responsibility for shoring our weakness.

One word about swimming. After our performances in the 1948 Olympics, the Amateur Athletic Union embarked on an ambitious crash program known as age group swimming to put the United States back on top. Mr. Robert J. H. Kiphuth, retired swimming coach at Yale University and former Olympic coach, has attributed the resurgence of the United States in swimming to the Amateur American Athletic Union's age group program for boys and girls. Every member of the U.S. men's and women's Olympic team in swimming was either a graduate of or a current competitor in the age group swimming effort, expanded from 10,000 in 1949 to a quarter of a million youngsters swimming competitively, between the ages of 10 and 17, in 1962.

The Amateur Athletic Union also sponsors a broad-scale, mass participation AAU Junior Olympics program which embraces track and field, swimming, gymnastics and wrestling. In this way to strive to interest youngsters in these Olympic sports starting at age 10. No other single sports organization has adopted a similar program. Also the Amateur Athletic Union is the sole organization authorized by the U.S. Olympic Committee to use the word "Olympics" in any endeavor.

We recognize that sports are one common denominator for every nation. Furthermore, the Amateur Athletic Union recognizes a challenge in that other nations are developing at a faster rate than we; however, our athletes continue to register improved performances in international competition in every single sport under the jurisdiction of the Amateur Athletic Union.

Perhaps the greatest strides in the last 8 years have been in the field of gymnastics. The United States now ranks with the five top nations in the world. This improvement reflects the encouragement and opportunity for national and international competition provided by the Amateur Athletic Union for the many proficient young men and women gymnasts in our country. Of all the amateur gymnastic organizations in the Nation, only the Amateur Athletic Union continues to stress the Olympic and international program of events.

The promotion of international-style gymnastics has been carried on by the Amateur Athletic Union in spite of the laisseb flaire policy of our Nation's colleges affiliated with the National Collegiate Athletic 'Association.

Over the years the Amateur Athletic Union has played a prominent role in showing municipalities how to increase recreational facilities by the constructon of gymnasia, playgrounds, and swimming pools. We have also exerted considerable effort in promoting organized sports at the local level through our municipal facilities.

The Amateur Athletic Union is proud that it has always recognized the importance of promoting women's athletics. For many years, women's athletics—as limited as they were—were "unwanted." It was in 1922 that the Amateur Athletic Union voted to assume jurisdiction over all women's sports it now administers (basketball, swimming, synchronized swimming, gymnastics, and track and field) since no other amateur sports organization had accepted the challenge. Through the efforts of the Amateur Athletic Union, these sports for women are now included on the Olympic program. The National Collegiate Athletic Association has never expressed the slightest interest in helping to promote women's sports among its member institutions.

The Amateur Athletic Union heartily endorses the proposal of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for statewide Olympic-type competition. In fact, in accepting the presidency of the Union last December such a program was strongly urged to help promote State pride in our athletic program. Such a program represents a natural outgrowth for the many programs now in existence.

Senator HUMPHREY's recommendation for the establishment of a private Olympic Foundation has merit. As this concept is developed it should be proposed that the funds be administered by the various sports governing bodies holding the United States membership in the international federations, such as the Amateur Athletic Union. (See Appendix.) These funds should be used to develop those sports and those specific events in which we are weak against international foes.

The Amateur Athletic Union's men's track and field squads are undefeated in four dual meets with the U.S.S.R. This has been the most active track and field campaign for international competition in the history of the AAU. In addition to the meets against Poland in Chicago and the U.S.S.R. at Palo Alto over 100 AAU athletes have competed with great success in almost every European country and Japan and Central America. Our basketball teams have always shown superiority against the U.S.S.R. This year we are readying a strong men's basketball team to bring the world championship back to the United States after the tournament in Manila, December 1-15. Our men and women swimmers continue to dominate every nation in international competition. The gymnasts of the Amateur Athletic Union continue to win new friends for the United States with their fine performances abroad. This summer a group of high school wrestlers from Colorado and Oklahoma, under the direction of the Amateur Athletic Union, won all eight team matches in Japan against the finest high school wrestlers in that country.

We are striving for the same goal—victory at the Olympics. The Amateur Athletic Union values its membership on the U.S. Olympic Committee. The responsibilities of the membership is translated into an all-out effort in international competition in the years between the Olympic games.

APPENDIX

U.S. member of International Federation and sports concerned

Amateur Athletic Union of the United States is the U.S. member in the following international federations: Basketball, bobsledding, boxing, gymnastics, judo, swimming, track and field, weightlifting, wrestling.

National Archery Association: Archery.

U.S. Modern Pentathlon Association: Biathlon and modern pentathlon.

American Canoe Association: Canoeing.

American Bicycle League of America: Cycling.

American Horse Shows Association: Equestrian.

Amateur Fencers League of America: Fencing.

Field Hockey Association of America: Field hockey.

U.S. Figure Skating Association: Figure skating.

Amateur Hockey Association of the United States: Ice hockey.

U.S. Rifle Association: Pistol shooting.

National Rifile Association: Rifile shooting.

National Association of Amateur Oarsmen: Rowing.

National Ski Amateur Association: Skiing.

U.S. Soccer Football Association: Soccer.

Amateur Skating Union of the United States: Speed skating.

U.S. Lawn Tennis Association: Tennis.

U.S. Volleyball Association: Volleyball.

North American Yacht Racing Union: Yachting.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS,
Kansas City, Mo., October 2, 1962.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am very appreciative of your taking the time from your exceedingly busy schedule to write me. I appreciated talking to Mr. Julius Cahn a few days ago. I thoroughly enjoyed reading your thoughtful and most challenging statements in the interest of the fitness of American youth and the great crisis we face in the upcoming Olympic games.

Mr. Cahn inquired regarding our member institutions in Minnesota. You will be interested to know that 14 Minnesota colleges hold membership in NAIA as follows:

Augsburg College, Bemidji State College, Bethel College, College of St. Thomas, Concordia College, Gustavus Adolphus, Hamline University, Macalester College, Moorhead College, St. Cloud State College, St. John's University, St. Mary's College, University of Minnesota (Duluth), and Winona State College.

NAIA has a total membership of 460 educational institutions in 32 geographic districts and sponsors 11 national championships in as many sports. Our membership is composed of institutions of small and moderate enrollment. The major aim of our organization is that the athletic programs be an integral part of the total educational program of the institution, rather than to become an almost separate promotional or commercial adjunct.

My college training was in the field of physical education but my interest in competitive athletics led me into coaching, with some 8 years in high school administration. I feel, however, that I am more fortunate than many coaches in having the privilege of remaining in athletics after 10 years of collegiate coaching and athletic-physical education administration.

I had the privilege of serving 4 years as a member of the President's Council on Youth Fitness. I feel that much was accomplished in those early years in making the American people aware of the growing lack of fitness in our youth and in stressing the urgent need of concentrated effort to build a physically fit young America. However, I am equally concerned at the apparent loss of ethical and moral fitness of our youth—and adults. I feel that while physical fitness of youth is mandatory, without equally significant moral and ethical strength, physical strength alone will not assure the moral courage to sacrifice for our way of life nor the will to stand firm for our democratic ideals.

The serious conflict in amateur athletics is cause for the gravest concern. Strong and wise leadership is needed immediately to prevent even greater conflict and possibly irreparable damage to our national unity in sports. Few areas of our way of life are considered as so indicative of our national strength and prestige as is our competitive sports program. The Olympic games is second only to the space challenge as a major issue in the cold war. We have no choice, therefore, but to immediately put aside our petty differences and our selfish power motives to unify to accept this challenge. Unless this is done the damage will soon be so great that we cannot regain our full strength within the next few years. Programs are planned to be staged soon which will make a compromise more difficult. Every day we pursue the present course makes unity more difficult.

NAIA is not a major influence in this conflict since our membership is composed of colleges of small and moderate enrollment. We lack the strength which comes from gate receipt income and status. However, because of our firm convictions on the basic issues, we have, perhaps, been more directly in the middle of this growing crisis than any except the two major athletic powers. We have, in fact, too often found ourselves in danger of being crushed between these two giants of the athletic world.

I am completely in agreement with your statements affecting the imperative of a broad physical fitness program for all American youth as well as the absolute necessity that we effect a unified and efficient national organization to meet the increasingly difficult challenge of winning the Olympic games. I feel there is some danger in our placing before our total American youth that they must win every contest or they have failed, with no recognition for one's doing one's very best. However, we are literally in a "fight for our very lives" with communism and, given proper organization and unified effort, we can win the Olympic games without sacrificing values which are even more important to our protecting our free way of life.

The primary function of the educational institution is not the development of highly skilled athletes sufficient to support the growing professional athlete development in America nor even to concentrate upon dominating international competition, if by that process we are forced to lessen our emphasis of other values necessary to the development of the highest ethical and moral character and the idealism for great sacrifice for freedom. Should we lose these latter values, despite our physical strength, we will surely lose our vision and courage within our citizenry and leadership. However, if we develop an efficient and broad national program where every amateur athlete has equal opportunity to participate, we can develop skilled athletes with dedication to win.

This issue is pinpointed at this time and we find ourselves completely disorganized, with selfish interests making a travesty of our strength of our way of life. Let me point out that my observation leads me to believe our failure in idealism and moral courage is not in athletics alone but amateur athletics is the major experience which can instill these qualities in our youth. Again, physical fitness is a key imperative to our total strength.

A major issue in this regard is our struggle to maintain a strong and attractive amateur program in the United States. The concentration of interest and enthusiasm in support of all areas of professional sports is also threatening our amateur strength. Hundreds of athletes who would make our job easier were they to remain amateur and concentrate on sports involved in international competition are being drained off to professional sports. We must unite to revitalize our amateur program in the Nation. Our sports fans are dissipating this strength to a support of professional sports. We are in danger of becoming a strong professional rather than strong amateur sports nation. This has placed a stronger emphasis upon our college programs by the weakening of our after college amateur sports program.

There is little point at this stage in reviewing the issues which have caused the conflict. No doubt each of the major powers has some justification for their stand. Our organization has not been in full support of either organization. However, with our decision not to become a part of the "federation" movement, we were naturally in a position of seeking recognition and participation through the AAU.

We believe that the development of the "federation" program was not wise and in the best interest of the total amateur program of sports in America. We feel the major aim of the federation was to gain a balance of power over the AAU. This is indicated by their willingness to wreck the strength of the United States for the next Olympic games in order to gain their ends.

All other amateur groups were forced to take sides without any opportunity to have a part in compromising the differences. It was the original intent of the federation movement to administer the total amateur program in the United States, even to administering a program for athletes after their graduation from college. We feel this is not the function of our educational institutions and that they could not successfully carry out this program successfully.

The Amateur Athletic Union is an organization which encompasses all amateur groups. This is the only group which is so constituted that it can perform this function. It is no doubt true that, because of long administration and the success of our program in international competition until very recently, the AAU became careless and their leadership became domineering and centered in a few powerful men. This is a trend which all successful organizations follow over a long period of years.

The program you suggest of an "Olympic Foundation" whereby leaders in all walks of life organize to strengthen our national effort is a very pertinent one. This is very similar to the original intent of the Amateur Athletic Union. At present we are bogged down in a power struggle steeped in bitter emotionalism fostered by personalities and prejudices. There is surely an urgent need that some force instill new vigor and unity in our present amateur program. We need new blood, new dedication, and a far broader interest from leaders of all walks of life to meet the challenge.

We have found the AAU to be a strong supporter of our program through the years. They are at this time giving us the first opportunity we have had to have active participation in interorganizational matters affecting our amateur sports program. For reasons which I will not mention here, the NCAA has constantly refused to approve our having any part in interorganizational committees on the national level. There is much evidence at this time that the AAU is revitalizing its program and, with new leadership, I believe they can again become a strong and vital organization.

A key issue is that of representation on international sports federations. Again, the fact that this is an issue indicates selfish organizational motives. International organizations are openly critical of the subsidy to athletes program in our educational institutions. In addition, international rules declare all coaches "professionals" and thus ineligible for representation on international bodies.

The international picture is very difficult to understand. We often feel we are very powerful but in a meeting with approaching one hundred nations, our voice becomes only one of many. Changes come very gradually because of language difficulties and vast differences in philosophies. Therefore, in the immediate, it appears we must gear our amateur administration to such policies as are approved by these international bodies. However, we do have the right to determine what organizational pattern we follow in the United States, so long as it adheres to the international policies.

I firmly believe the best interests of our amateur program will be served by a broad all-encompassing national body, with major leadership from all walks of life rather than concentrated in professional sports leaders.

You are fortunate to have an administrative assistant who can read such long dissertations as this and simply mark two or three sentences for your reading.

It is my conviction that, with immediate strong leadership, a compromise can be effected before our amateur athletes are harmed seriously. I believe any meeting to work out this critical problem should involve more than the two major sports bodies and include all amateur bodies involved in this problem. I believe that many in both organizations, who are becoming more alarmed each day at impending developments, will be willing to try to effect a compromise.

Our organization stands ready to cooperate in any way possible to bring unity and avoid disaster to our amateur program. Our voice is small but, like the United Nations, small voices often sway the balance on the side of wisdom and sacrifice of organizational differences to the common good.

Again, thanks for your prompt reply to my call. I believe the urgency of this crisis demands immediate action. Only a few weeks until the federation plans on holding events which will further widen the breach.

I apologize for the long statement.

Sincerely,

A. O. DUER,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer, National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics.

STATEMENT OF A. O. DUER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF NAIA RE PROPOSED NCAA FEDERATIONS

It is the decision of our organization (NAIA) that we will not become a part of the federation movement, but will continue to support, and use our influence to bring about, a unity of all organizations within the framework of the Amateur Athletic Union.

We believe this is in the best interest of the future of our national amateur program. This position of our executive committee is not taken out of selfish organizational motives, but on the firm conviction that a unity of all major organizational interests must be achieved, rather than a destruction of our program through the present conflict.

We believe the present development of federation groups in open defiance of, and without consideration to, the Amateur Athletic Union, which has long been recognized as the "parent body" by the international governing bodies of the sports involved in this crisis, is indicative of power motives rather than a sincere concern for our national amateur program and the thousands of amateur athletics in America.

This is not to say that all coaches and organizations that have alined themselves with this federation attempt are attempting a "power grab." Many, particularly from the track group, are sincere about this move. It is our opinion, however, that the overall result of this federation movement will be many years of frustration of national unity and sports strength.

NOTE.—NAIA has 460 members—all 4-year, degree-granting, accredited colleges. NAIA sponsors 11 national championship sports events, including the oldest national intercollegiate championship basketball tournament (1937).

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HEALTH, PHYSICAL
EDUCATION, RECREATION,
Washington, September 27, 1962.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is with extreme gratification that I have been reading your splendidly conceived memoranda dealing with physical fitness for America.

The insight you display and the recommendations for the correction of some of the difficulties extant reflect on unusual grasp. By all means, the need for broadening the scope of the National Defense Education law so as to make available "long-needed assistance to the States to foster excellence in physical education" is a crying need of our times. The placing of the President's Council on Youth Fitness on a permanent basis would also add stature as well as stability to this vital national effort. In this regard, the broadening of our fitness effort to encompass the adult population would add immeasurably to this worthwhile arm of the Government. Implementation by way of increased opportunities in the out-of-doors, parks, playgrounds and seashore facilities is indeed an essential if our efforts are not to fall short of success.

All of us in the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation fully appreciate and sense the inestimable impetus that your intelligent support and initiative is providing toward the realization of a more fit America. Please do not hesitate to call on us as individuals or collectively at any time.

Respectfully yours,

H. DAN CORBIN,
Past Vice President, Recreation Division.

UNIVERSITY PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM,
Los Angeles, Calif., September 26, 1962.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you very much for sending me the information concerning the 5-point program for youth and adult fitness.

I have a very deep interest in physical education, recreation, and fitness and I agree with and appreciate the things you are doing along these lines.

Concerning the Olympic games, I think it is extremely important that we field our best team. The emphasis that President Kennedy has placed on fitness, along with your interest, will help us achieve national excellence in sports competition.

I would appreciate it very much if you would keep me informed on the progress of your program.

Sincerely,

RAFER JOHNSON.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Boise, October 1, 1962.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have just finished reading for the second time your speech of September 12 concerning physical fitness for Americans. This time I have read a reprint and note that additional copies of this can be secured by requesting same through you. I should very much like to have thirty (30) additional copies of this reprint (H–9–5–62) in order that I may provide the members of our State physical fitness committee with copies, together with some leaders in this field throughout the State.

I think your remarks are very timely and I do hope that the Congress of the United States will not ease up on this but will keep pushing, and will keep the States pushing until adequate programs are available for youth and adults and until a full recognition of the recreational needs of the people of this Nation are acknowledged.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN P. JEFFRIES,
Chairman, State Physical Fitness Committee.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Dover, October 3, 1962.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Your mighty fine speech of September 12, 1962, in the U.S. Senate in connection with youth fitness and your proposed Olympic Foundation has just come to my attention.

I commend you upon this excellent congressional statement and your high interest in the physical fitness of our children and youth.

I hope your efforts will inspire your colleagues to match your active support in supplying the needed legislation to obtain the necessary financial aid to carry out your fitness program in action.

The best of best wishes to you for continued good health and success in your physical fitness and education efforts.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. AYARS,
Director, Health, Physical and Driver Education.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1962.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In view of your interest in the President's physical fitness program as expressed in the news release covering your five point program for youth and adult fitness, we would like to call the Red Cross "Swim and Stay Fit" program to your attention.

As you may know, the Red Cross has been teaching swimming and lifesaving skills since 1914. It has issued some 23 million certificates in water safety since that time. However, in view of the national emphasis being given to physical fitness and because swimming has long been recognized as one of the best activities for building and maintaining strength and vigor, it was deemed appropriate that the American Red Cross expand its water safety program to include the "Swim and Stay Fit" activity. Inaugurated officially during September of 1961, its objective is to encourage people to swim regularly and frequently in segments of 440 yards until 50 or more miles are reached. Two of the first finishers were a man 74 years old and a boy of 15 years. As of December 31, 1961, there were 5,793 persons enrolled in the program and at that time they had clocked 31,183 swimming miles. Based on the enthusiasm and participation of additional thousands of Americans this year, we anticipate that swimmers of all ages participating in the "Swim and Stay Fit" program will exceed 500,000 swimming miles by the end of 1962.

We are writing to call this program to your attention, since we feel you will be interested in knowing about it.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. BROWN,
Assistant Director, Safety Services, Water Safety.

AAU CRITICISM OF NCAA NOT ENDORSED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with respect to the AAU's letter, I should like to state that it responds very graciously to my various suggestions.

The letter is, however, very critical of the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

How justified the criticism may be can only be judged by those who have far more familiarity with this subject than a busy Member of the Congress.

The AAU letter, including the criticism and the NAIA letter are reprinted herein—not because I wish to take sides in this issue; that would be neither fair nor sound—but rather because I believe in far more public ventilation of the problem than has thus far occurred.

By way of background, I had sent copies of my previous statements urging reconciling of AAU, NCAA and the federations to all of these groups. This was only recently, as I have not yet received official comment from several leading sources such as NCAA or the U.S. Track and Field Federation.

I feel confident that I will be hearing from them, because I know how deeply they feel on behalf of their position.

If such a reply comes in before Congress recesses, I shall be more than happy to print any rejoinder which they might wish to submit.

All sides of this issue should, I believe, receive fair and equal recognition and review.

Since Congress is about to adjourn, however, I do not wish the opportunity to be lost for the presentation of attest such messages as have thus far been received.

Let me reemphasize that it would be impossible for a Member of the Congress or any other layman who has not been in day-to-day touch with this situation to attempt to evaluate the rival groups' positions.

NCAA has been a great and constructive force in American sports. The University of Minnesota, like other great universities of our land, wants to see their position, their views on NCAA and the U.S. Track and Field Federation duly considered. I share their desire completely.

Let the debate take place; but then, let us get on with agreement toward unity.

That is Minnesota's and, I am sure, all America's view.

THE HISTORIC WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTICS: A PRECEDENT FOR A FUTURE CONFERENCE ON ALCOHOLISM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Friday, September 28, 1962, it was my privilege to join in one of the most important sessions in the history of American law enforcement.

I refer to the First White House Conference on Narcotics.

The holding of this session will, I believe, in time to come, be viewed as a landmark in the opening of an era of enlightenment on the narcotic abuse problem.

WORK OF THE PANEL ON LEGISLATION

It was my personal pleasure to serve as Chairman of the Panel on Legislation. We heard outstanding statements on where we now stand as regards Federal, State, and local statutes and the direction in which we should be moving.

The "leadoff" statement was made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. He spoke on the basis of the intensive study which has been carried out by the Judiciary Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which he is chairman. He reported on the results of a questionnaire which he had circulated throughout the Nation. He had thereby compiled the frank reactions of judges and other authorities. Overwhelmingly, they disapproved, for example, of rigid, mandatory sentences against narcotic offenders—other than organized gangsters. Senator DODD not only cited "grassroots" viewpoints, but he presented a personal statement of humanitarianism and enlightenment which was very inspiring.

Thereafter, we heard contributions from other experts, each qualified by a variety of background and experience. The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] helpfully described, for example, the procedure contemplated in his pending civil commitment bill.

We heard excellent statements on the problem as viewed from New York by the very able former U.S. attorney, Robert Morgenthau, and from California, as viewed by State Senator Edwin J. Regan.

AN ACTION PROGRAM FOR 88TH CONGRESS

But my purpose today is not just to salute the achievement which the Conference represented; rather, it is my goal to look to the future.

As President John F. Kennedy and Attorney General Robert Kennedy firmly indicated in their historic speeches to the Conference, the meetings were designed not as a talkfest, but rather to set the stage for a bold series of actions which will deal with the problem decisively.

The President and the Attorney General are not interested in token meetings or token gestures in this or any other field.

By the start of the 88th Congress, in January 1963, the President of the United States is going to send to the Congress a concrete legislative program. It will embody the results not only of the Conference, but of the follow-through thereafter by the Inter-Departmental Committee on Narcotics, as well as by additional outside effort.

ACTION AT THE COMMUNITY LEVEL

In my judgment, the Federal followthrough must be accompanied by State and local followthrough. In every judicial district of this Nation, teams consisting of members of the Federal, State, and local judiciary, U.S. attorneys, State and local attorneys, medical leaders, psychiatrists, social workers and others, should carry out an intensive program to come to grips with the narcotics problem at the community level.

NEED TO COME TO GRIPS WITH ALCOHOLISM PROBLEM

There is one particular point in terms of future parallel action which I should like to stress.

One of the splendid contributions of the Conference was to point out that the problem of abuse of narcotics is not dissimilar to a much vaster problem, that of abuse of alcohol.

In the principal "tool" of the Conference, the report which was filed by the ad hoc panel on drug abuse, attention was drawn to this fact. That report pointed out that alcoholism incapacitates some 5 million Americans. By contrast, the number of narcotics addicts is variously estimated as in the range of 50,000 people.

I should like to add that there is now underway a series of major studies by the Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism. These studies will be 5 years in duration.

The current state of knowledge on the problem is being examined. Research is being inventoried. Research needs are being identified.

When the Commission has completed what I would expect might be a definitive report, the entire professional and interested lay community would be given the opportunity to examine the findings and recommendations.

PROPOSED WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE IN 1966 OR 1967

Thereafter, it would be my hope that a White House conference might be convened to develop an action program to meet the alcoholism problem head-on. In such a conference, the active participation of State and local governments, as well as private sources, would, of course, be crucial.

This does not mean that so much as a day should be lost in the interim in strengthening existing research, education, training and control programs against alcoholism.

Fortunately, expanded efforts along these lines, many of which are under support of the National Institute for Mental Health, are underway right now.

But, it does mean this: We, today, should look forward to that day, perhaps "as far away" as 1966 or 1967, when the full leadership of no less an office than that of the President of the United States, is brought to bear on this problem.

It is unfortunate that alcoholism exacts so heavy a toll as to make it necessary that the problem be met at the highest possible level. But the fact is that American society does suffer a staggering loss from this condition and highest level action would be helpful. And the further fact is that we must experiment with new executive-legislative branch procedures in order to help meet this problem.

Ample precedent exists in the superb work of the Joint Commission Against Mental Illness which the Congress itself made possible through statute. Since then we have had a National Leadership Conference on Mental Health. Federal-State-local cooperation has improved in a manner which might not have been visualized but a few short years ago in the vast field of mental illness.

The subject of alcoholism has been one which has been for too long "swept under the rug." For a long time it was not discussed in so-called polite society. Like social disease, the challenge could not be met until the issues were thoroughly ventilated and the decision reached to meet the problem frankly and boldly.

Alcoholism, as a problem, is infinitely more difficult, infinitely more complex than the narcotics problem, for the former involves cultural, social, psychological, economic, fiscal, and other aspects, many times more subtle and formidable, if somewhat less spectacular.

Yet I believe that men of good will and understanding could and should reason out together an antialcoholism program which would be helpful to our own Nation and, indeed, to other nations.

INTEREST OF REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

This is not a new subject for the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which I am chairman. We have compiled medical reactions on alcoholism from all over the world as part of our 4-year study of international medical research.

It is from this vantage point as well that we have studied the interagency aspects of the problem of drug abuse, that is, the relationships between the U.S. Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Narcotics Bureau of the Treasury Department, among others.

REPRINTING OF FIVE ITEMS

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, first, the text of Attorney General Kennedy's address to the Conference—President Kennedy's speech, I might add, has already been published in the RECORD—second, excerpts from the ad hoc panel's report bearing on the alcoholism problem; third, the text of an editorial in the October 3, 1962, Washington Evening Star; fourth and fifth, the text of Senator DODD's and Senator KEATING's addresses.

The editorial makes a brief reference to a Senate subcommittee which I should like to elaborate. The Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, is conducting preliminary investigations with a view to holding hearings on the syndicated crime aspects of the illicit trade in narcotics. This action is being taken under that subcommittee's authority and obligation to investigate into organized crime.

It is contemplated these hearings will be held the latter part of this year or at the beginning of the next Congress.

I know that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations is going to give to this problem the same type of thorough, intensive, expert analysis which has now become the respected trademark of its work in a wide variety of fields.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY, GENERAL CHAIRMAN, WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTIC AND DRUG ABUSE, DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 28, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen, for a day and a half, this Conference has been analyzing the problems of narcotic and drug abuse. This afternoon, in the panel on legislation, the Conference will consider various courses for action in the future.

Before we do so, however, I think this is a particularly appropriate time to stop for a moment and recognize an outstanding example of the distinguished work that already has been done. I speak of Dr. Harris Isbell, for 17 years the director of the National Institute of Mental Health's Addiction Research Center at Lexington, Ky.

Dr. Isbell has been described by his Public Health Service colleagues as the "foremost world authority on the biology of narand important research while at the same cotic addiction." He has done considerable time serving as an outstanding administrator.

It is a great pleasure for me to present to Dr. Isbell the Meritorious Service Award of the Public Health Service commissioned corps.

The accompanying citation reads:

"In recognition of his outstanding accomplishments in the field of drug addiction research. Throughout his 17 years as Director of the Addiction Research Center of the National Institute of Mental Health, he has provided very effective scientific, intellectual, and moral leadership. Under his leadership, the Center has gained worldwide recognition, not only for its work in the field of drug addiction, but also as a center for research in experimental psychiatry.

"In both of these areas, Dr. Isbell has distinguished himself not only as an extraordinarily able director and coordinator of multidisciplinary research, but also as an outstanding investigator in his own right whose work in clinical pharmacology has exerted far-reaching influences on medical practice."

Dr. Isbell, please accept this medal, together with our warmest congratulations.

We are a proud and powerful Nation. There is no affliction to which we surrender. We have conquered our environment by conquering our ignorance. Sewage systems protect us from cholera and typhoid. Vaccinations guard us against other diseases. And public and private institutions, working with wide public awareness and financial support, continue to wage an unremitting campaign against cancer, heart disease, and other afflictions which we have not yet been able to defeat.

Such efforts are not limited to natural afflictions. Increasingly, we are devoting the same kind of urgent effort to socially spawned problems. The extent and effect of traffic safety campaigns, for example, is well known. And our efforts are constantly improving in such areas as mental illness and juvenile delinquency.

Yet our approach to the great social problem of narcotics and drug abuse, reflects none of the same dedication, confidence, or progress. Not only do we not have a comprehensive program; we do not have sufficient reliable information on which to base a program.

To say this about a nation which won two World Wars or which sends men into orbit sounds like lunacy or lethargy. We must soon prove otherwise, and, as I said yesterday, this Conference is a historic beginning.

We have somehow assumed that the narcotics problem is so intensely dangerous and vicious that the solution is principally punitive. This field reaches across many disciplines—psychology, sociology, economics, and medicine, as well as criminology, and yet we have persisted in letting almost the entire burden fall on the Federal Bureau of Narcotics.

We are all aware and all grateful to the Bureau of Narcotics for the remarkably effective work it has done, for so long, under Mr. H. J. Anslinger and now under his very able successor, Mr. Henry Giordano. Illicit narcotics traffic has been reduced greatly, and many racketeers who prey on the needs of addicts have been sent to prison. But law enforcement is only one aspect. The root of the problem remains.

Thoreau said, "There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root."

Our difficulty is that despite dedicated and sincere efforts, we have not been striking at the root. We spend too much time debating how to do so, without knowing where the root is, and without knowing whether we are using a hoe where a bulldozer is needed.

As you know, this Conference was not called to provide a forum for certain theories nor to reach what might at best be arbitrary solutions. This Conference is designed—as the preceding panels have demonstrated—to help us recognize what we know about the problem and, perhaps more important, how much we don't know. Our major aim is to reemphasize that we do indeed need answers and to determine how we can best find them, on a rational and national basis.

As you go into this final panel session on legislation, I hope that we can direct attention to future pooling of experience, experiment, and excitement—with the thoughts and facts gathered at this Conference as a firm foundation.

In the words of your excellent ad hoc panel report, "Difficult as is the prevention of drug abuse and the cure of addicts, the members of the panel are reasonably optimistic that the problem is not insoluble, and that in certain programs, real, if limited, success is being achieved.

"Above all else, sound information must form the basis of future legislation—legislation which is broadly directed toward the general problem of compulsive drug abuse, so that it will be both appropriate to the situation at hand and flexible to meet new and changing manifestations of this unresolved disorder."

I hope, however, that we can point the way to more than information. I hope we can also chart directions for action. You have, so far, considered the most difficult and challenging problems in the area of narcotics and drug abuse. The legislation panel provides the forum for ideas about how best to put various approaches to these problems into action.

For example, one particularly promising approach you have analyzed here is civil commitment—giving an addict treatment rather than just a prison term, with an intensive period of institutional care followed by closely supervised parole and aftercare. Throughout the period of prospective rehabilitation, criminal charges are kept pending.

There is no Federal program for civil commitment at present, but the administration supports extensive experimentation with the principle.

As Governor Brown reported yesterday, for example, the program underway in California has, so far, resulted in a remarkably low rate of relapse. Not nearly enough time has passed to warrant optimism about the long-term success of these projects and none of us can now say they are the answer. But they might very well indicate the right direction, and they warrant extensive experimental steps in that direction.

I think we all agree totally that narcotics rackeeters deserve the severest prosecution and sentencing. Under the present mandatory sentencing law they have received it and it has been effective.

Because of this law and other enforcement efforts, the Bureau of Narcotics and other agencies have been able to curtail sharply the flow of narcotics both into and within the country. As the President noted yesterday, addicts could get 100 percent, or pure heroin 35 years ago, while today, the drug is so scarce that addicts obtain only 3 to 5 percent heroin.

While the criminal should be given a prison sentence, I think we also agree, however, that the addict should be given treatment. The mandatory sentencing law applies equally to racketeers and to others, who may be peddlers only to support the cost of their own addiction. As a result, rigid application of the law has produced some notable and dramatic sentencing disparities.

Development of the principle of civil commitment might well help us find a way to plane down some of these rough edges on the otherwise effective mandatory sentencing procedure.

The legislative views you express today on such questions as these will have great importance. My hope that you can help us chart directions for action is not rhetorical.

The narcotic and drug abuse problem is not just a law enforcement problem or a medical problem. It is not just a New York problem or a California problem. It is a national problem and a mutual responsibility.

The administration has drafted positive programs for other domestic problems, ranging from agriculture to unemployment. It is the administration's intention to develop a narcotics program—and to present the start of this program to the next Congress.

The President is in the process of appointing a committee, as a followup to this Conference, to be responsible for the development of this legislative program. This committee will include expert and distinguished individuals, will work at the White House level, and will exemplify cooperation among the relevant Federal agencies.

We are extremely hopeful that we also can rely on the cooperation and support of the State, local and private agencies, organizations, and individuals participating in this Conference. With the findings of our meetings here as a foundation, we hope to translate cooperation into information, information into legislation, legislation into action, and action into success.

It is our hope, as I know it is yours, that we can defeat the problem of narcotics and drug abuse; that we can, in time, relegate the anguish and the terrible price of this affliction on the medical histories, along with the Black Death, yellow fever, and other onetime scourges of mankind.

This is a task that calls forth our best as experts, as Americans, and as human beings. We have made a good beginning. Let us now work to a speedy end.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF AD HOC PANEL ON DRUG ABUSE

ETHYL ALCOHOL

Although the subject of alcoholism is beyond the scope of this paper, a logical discussion of the broad aspects of drug abuse cannot exclude the consideration of alcohol for comparative purposes, especially in view of the similarity of its abuse characteristics to those of the barbiturates. Like the latter, prolonged and heavy dosage is required to produce physical dependence.

The magnitude of alcoholism, involving as it does the partial or complete incapacitation of an estimated 5 million Americans (a number far exceeding all other types of drug abuse combined) demands attention. In its most intense form, signs of abstinence from alcohol include severe tremors, hallucinations, disorientation, and/or grand mal convulsions ("rum fits"). When these major signs of abstinence are present, the patient frequently develops severe hyperthermia and death may follow unless prompt measures are taken to correct fluid and electrolyte imbalance and to provide sedation.

The alcohol abstinence syndrome usually exists in a milder form without delirium tremens or convulsions. The more prominent signs are tremor, weakness, perspiration, elevated blood pressure, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, anorexia, and insomnia.

These signs and symptoms are quite similar to those associated with barbiturate dependence, and the two agents are mutually interchangeable in creating or perpetuating the dependent state. In fact, many alcoholics turn to barbiturates in an attempt to conceal their problem, and avoid the social pressures which stigmatize the alcoholic.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 3, 1962]

WAR ON NARCOTICS

There was a reassuring note in President Kennedy's determination to take a new and fresh approach to the Nation's narcotics problem. From his carefully planned White House Conference came the substance of ideas which, incorporated into legislation, may in time reduce the agony and crime inherent in the drug traffic.

As the President said, the Bureau of Narcotics has performed admirably in reducing the influx of drugs like heroin. But the sad truth is that thousands of Americans still are enslaved to the habit; and there is yet no satisfactory method of breaking the hold. The two prison-hospitals designated for that purpose have tried hard. But a recent survey showed that 90 percent of 2,000 treated in the Lexington (Ky.) hospital soon fell back into the old rut.

Mr. Kennedy's Conference, led by himself and members of his Cabinet, was attended by the Nation's leading narcotics authorities. Their diverse opinions pointed up how much still needs to be known on this subject. But they also focussed attention on the need for a complete revision in concepts.

There seems to be agreement that there shall be different treatment for those who traffic in drugs, preying on others, and those who become victims of the drug habit. Attorney General Kennedy indicated that the next Congress will be asked to enact sweeping new laws, calling for "civil commitment" to hospitals of drug addicts, and even "pushers" who are not otherwise in violation of the laws. A pertinent part of this plan would be a parole system in which the onetime addict would be observed and assisted over the rough spots.

President Kennedy is appointing a committee of prominent citizens to lay the groundwork for this legislation. They also will work with a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee due to investigate narcotics in November. It would appear this is a good start toward a new, enlightened program. We hope the legislators do not overlook a relatively recent and growing danger—the promiscuous sale of drugs such as barbiturates, used in lieu of narcotics by many thrill seekers.

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD BEFORE THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTICS, SEPTEMBER 28, 1962

The White House Conference on Narcotics is at once an indication of the gravity of the narcotic problem in the United States and a symbol of the determination of the American people and its Government to do something about it. I feel deeply privileged to have been invited to speak before this panel, which is concerned with the legislative aspects of the problem.

In 1956, as a result of widespread national dissatisfaction with the growth of narcotic addiction, especially among juveniles, and because of deep frustration over the apparent failure of existing legislation to deal with the problem, a new Narcotic Control Act was passed into law. This law contained three major innovations that were expected to have a tremendous deterrent effect on narcotic racketeers.

First, it removed from the hands of judges all discretion in the sentencing of convicted narcotic offenders by providing a mandatory minimum sentence of 5 years for the first offense and 10 years for subsequent offenses, with maximum penalties of 20 years for the first offense and 40 years for subsequent offenses.

Second, it removed all possibility of parole for narcotic offenders, thus putting them in a special category in our Nation's Federal prisons.

Third, it emphasized the concern of Congress over juvenile drug use by providing up to life imprisonment or even death for adults convicted of selling narcotics to a juvenile under the age of 18.

To demonstrate the severity of this law, it should be pointed out that an illegal narcotic transaction normally involves several violations of the act, each of which could be punishable by a mandatory 5-year sentence. Thus, a first offender could be, and frequently has been, sentenced to 20 or 30 years for a first offense.

When Congress passed the Narcotic Control Act of 1956 it radically departed from the existing trend in State and Federal criminal legislation, a trend toward the individual treatment of convicted offenders with a view to their eventual rehabilitation.

Congress made this departure because it felt that the peddling of narcotics was so vicious, dangerous and contagious a crime that unusually severe and rigid methods were necessary and justified in dealing with it. If the passage of several years under this act had been accompanied by a marked decrease in narcotic crimes, we might say that the law could have justified itself. For after all, the primary purpose of law enforcement is the protection of the public; the care and rehabilitation of criminals, however important, must be subordinate. But has the law been effective?

We have now had several years of experience under it. Its degree of effectiveness is a matter of dispute. The 1956 law has proved helpful in the jailing of several large-scale narcotic racketeers. Yet the growth of drug traffic continues.

The dispute is heightened by the fact that available information on the spread of narcotic addiction is completely contradictory. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics tells us that there are 46,798 drug addicts in the entire country. But testimony before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, by responsible city and State officials indicates that there may be as many as 50,000 addicts in the City of New York alone, and from 15,000 to 20,000 addicts in the State of California alone.

Only last week the executive director of the New York City Youth Board told our subcommittee that 25 percent of the children studied by the youth board are involved in the use of drugs ranging all the way from heroin to marihuana, pep pills, goof balls, and other varieties. He told of entire neighborhoods where children were exposed to narcotic pushing "as part of their daily life." In his opinion and in the opinion of countless people with whom I have talked, who deal with this problem on a day-to-day basis, there are more narcotics illegally available today than ever before.

Therefore, I think it is clear that the severe mandatory sentencing provisions of existing law have not had the deterrent effect that was hoped for.

There is an overwhelming preponderance of opinion on the part of those who deal most closely with this act that these provisions have had a very damaging effect and should be altered.

The Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, in a joint project with the Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, sent a questionnaire to Federal district judges, Federal chief probation officers, Federal prison authorities, and U.S. attorneys inquiring into the effects of the mandatory minimum sentence provisions, and the elimination of probation and parole in the handling of narcotic offenders. The answers to this questionnaire, digested and broken down, are as follows:

Of prison wardens, 92 percent were opposed to the mandatory minimum sentence provisions; 97 percent were opposed to the prohibition of probation or parole.

Of the Federal district judges responding to the questionnaire, 73 percent opposed the mandatory minimum sentence provisions and 86 percent opposed the prohibition of probation or parole.

Of the probation officers who responded, 83 percent opposed the mandatory minimum sentence provisions and 86 percent opposed the prohibition of probation or parole.

Of the U.S. attorneys who responded, a group which understandably is predisposed toward more rigid punitive statutes, 50 percent opposed the mandatory minimum sentence provisions and 55 percent opposed the prohibition of probation or parole.

The overall figures for our survey showed that approximately 75 percent of all those who responded, people who live with this law from day to day, oppose the two basic provisions of the act and seek their modification.

Why? I will give you representative answers.

From James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons:

"Prisons, both State and Federal, in the years immediately ahead will be faced inevitably with the problems of narcotic offenders, addict and nonaddict alike, who are weighted down by the hopelessness and the bitter futility of sentences which seemingly stretch into infinity. What can the institution offer the man serving 30, 50, or 80 years with no prospect for parole or hope of mitigation of his sentence? There is a real danger that, in the effort to contain the problems which stem from the hopelessness characterizing the attitudes of such men, much of what has been achieved in the development of constructive programs for all types of prisoners may be wiped out."

From U.S. District Judge James M. Carter:

"Several years ago at a ninth circuit conference there was a unanimous vote against mandatory sentences. The mandatory sentence can work extreme injustice. I was compelled to impose a 5-year sentence on a Marine veteran of the Korean campaign who was found with three or four marihuana cigarettes. He had been drinking in Tijuana and was arrested at the border. Obviously, three or four cigarettes did not make him a peddler and these were not commercial amounts. He had a spotles civilian record and an excellent military career. He had received a Purple Heart and had been wounded in action and had a wife and children. I held up sentencing 60 days with the defendant's consent, to attempt to get the U.S. attorney to file a tax consent on a smuggling charge which would not have carried at least 5 years' sentence. I was unsuccessful. I sentenced the man to 5 years in the penitentiary without parole."

From Oliver Gasch, then U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia:

"I am opposed to the philosophy of mandatory minima. Even in narcotic cases some discretion should be allocated to the judge. The answer to the elimination of drug traffic is an ideal difficult of realization. I would recommend long conditional sentences with close supervision by parole authorities."

From Eugene F. Dupuy, chief U.S. probation officer, New Orleans, La.:

"Existing laws emphasize the punitive aspects in dealing with the illegal drug traffic. Presumably, the reason for this approach is that strict penalties are expected to serve as a deterrent and to eliminate or greatly reduce the problem. Were this premise valid, mandatory minimum sentences for all crimes would be the solution. I believe that all persons who have worked with offenders know that such an approach is doomed to failure, for it overlooks the causative factors of crime. Historically, we know that severe penalties for relatively minor offenses, such as theft of a loaf of bread, did not deter the hungry from stealing bread. Similarly, the person with mental or emotional problems who needs support, will seek that support, irrespective of social or legal consequences."

I believe that the experience of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956 demonstrates again the fact that mandatory, inflexible, general punishment statutes can never be a just or even an effective substitute for the individual discretion, within prescribed limits, of judges, prison officials, probation officers and district attorneys who, acting upon personal study of individual cases, can arrive at justice far more readily than can a blind and impersonal article of law.

The principal defect in the present law is that it makes no distinction between major narcotic pushers and narcotic addicts themselves who, in order to pay for their own drugs, become small-time drug peddlers. Under the present law, drug addicts are being imprisoned for terms of 20, 40, and 60 years, and some are being given life imprisonment. This mandatory sentencing, with no hope for parole, thwarts all efforts to deal sensibly and rationally with addicts and completely sweeps under the rug the tragic problem which they represent.

The problem of drug addiction is essentially a medical problem, a psychiatric problem. It cannot be solved by merciless prison sentences. I believe that the law should be amended to repeal mandatory minimum penalties and to restore the possibility of probation and parole for rehabilitated narcotic offenders.

I do not here suggest that the professional criminals at the vortex of narcotic racketeering be given lenient treatment. Their conscious dedication to profiting from the calculated destruction of human beings demonstrates that they are the least likely of all rehabilitative prospects, and must of their very nature be confronted with the full force of the law. But I do propose that we should reform the excessively punitive and inhumane treatment now meted out to those who are essentially the victims of the narcotic racket.

To be sure, the drug addict, while locked up in prison, only to be released at an old age or by death, does not pose a threat to society as a narcotic peddler. But this solution is so demonstrably ineffective as a deterrent to narcotic crimes, wreaks such havoc within the penal system, does such damage to the individual involved, works such violence to the principles of justice and equity which should characterize our legal code, constitutes such an affront to reason, upon which all successful law must be based, involves such an abandonment of the principle of compassion which must be at the heart of all successful social advance, presents such a stark contrast with the enlightened trend toward the rehabilitation of prisoners—that all reasonable observers will eventually agree that the tragic and many-sided toll of blind and rigid imprisonment procedures is too great to pay for the fancied and illusory gain.

I believe that the Congress should rewrite the law and give the courts the right to distinguish between professional narcotic criminals and narcotic addicts who are drug peddlers only because of the overwhelming need to finance their own addiction.

This is today an unpopular cause and those who advance it will be subject to ridicule and abuse by unthinking people. Yet I am certain that the American people, in their honest wisdom, in their mercy, and in their plain good sense, will support this cause when once they understand it.

This Conference marks a great step toward that goal and I am very proud and honored to have an opportunity to take part in it and to bring these views to you.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING AT WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTICS AND DRUG ABUSE MEETING IN STATE DEPARTMENT AUDITORIUM, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, members of the panel, ladies and gentlemen, I speak to you today, as the Senator from the State which has the greatest—some would say the most insuperable—narcotics problem in the entire country. New York is the home of more than half the drug addicts in the Nation. This curse is not only a crime breeder and a health menace, but is a personal disaster to the individuals and families contaminated by it. As you well know, its incidence is particularly acute among the youth of our cities. A survey made in 1956 at the Federal Hospital at Lexington, for example, indicated that 45 percent of their patients began using drugs before their 19th birthday. These young people are in every sense, a national resource which our country cannot afford to waste, and cannot refuse to aid.

Narcotics addiction is, first of all, a health problem and a concerted effort should be made to find a cure for the affliction. I have sponsored a bill to allocate money for this purpose to the Public Health Service, so that the same efforts which are being made in the fields of heart and cancer research can be applied to narcotics addiction. I hope this will eventually give us knowledge of how best to combat and treat the disease.

But in the meantime, we must cope with another phase of the problem. Every day, noncriminal addicts are being apprehended and placed in jails and prisons only to revert, upon release, to their old habits. The Justice Department reports that 1,646 individuals were convicted of Federal offenses involving narcotics in 1961. Many of these were hardened criminals who sell and transport narcotics, and for whom long-term criminal confinement is the only treatment. But, others are accused of only one offense: addiction. These noncriminal addicts are confined at enormous expense to the taxpayers—it costs Federal authorities approximately $2,000 to keep one man in prison for 1 year—when experts tell us that a much shorter period of hospitalization and a controlled period of aftercare—costing about $350 a year per man—is the only sensible way of curing and rehabilitating the patient.

New York has met this problem with a sensible plan for the civil commitment of drug addicts instead of a prison sentence. The State has already allocated 400 beds in State hospitals for this purpose, and next January, when the so-called Metcalf-Volker law goes into effect, a whole new experiment in the treatment of these offenders will be initiated.

I think the Federal Government should have a similar program.

Last spring, drawing upon the experience and advice of experts in our State—doctors, prosecutors, phychologists, sociologists and judges—I prepared a bill providing for the civil commitment of noncriminal addicts who were Federal offenders.

Basically, the purpose of this bill is to separate the sick from the criminal addict, and to afford the former the opportunity to receive institutionalized treatment and controlled aftercare in lieu of a prison term. The Justice Department has expressed full approval of this new yet limited approach to this problem and has recommended enactment. The procedure to be followed would be this:

Any person who is charged with violation of a Federal penal law dealing with narcotics, other than the sale or transfer of narcotics, would be informed by the committing magistrate that he may choose to submit to a physical examination to determine whether or not he is a drug addict. If he makes this election, is found to be a drug addict, and is not one of the persons excluded from the coverage of this bill, prosecution of the criminal charge which led to his arrest would be continued, and the addict committed to the custody of the Surgeon General of the United States for an indeterminate period not to exceed 36 months. It would then be the duty of the Federal Government to provide for the institutional treatment of the addict. If the Surgeon General certifies that the patient is cured of his addiction before 36 months, he would be released and then embark on what is perhaps the most crucial phase of his rehabilitation—aftercare. The bill provides for constant supervision and testing during the vital 2 years after release, the aim of this provision being both to guide and counsel the addict during the readjustment period, and to insure that his welfare and the safety of the public will not be endangered by a relapse into addiction. If a significant relapse occurs within 2 years after release, the criminal charges which had earlier been continued, would be prosecuted, but in meting out a sentence, the addict would be given full credit for the time spent in the custody of the Surgeon General. The same provision applies to addicts found by the Surgeon General to be incorrigible or not amenable to medical treatment, and who are returned to the court before the completion of the hospitalization period.

This procedure would differ markedly from the one presently used by the Federal Government, since Federal prisoners are now sent to Lexington only after conviction of a crime. Furthermore, once a cure has been effected in the hospital, the prisoner is returned to a penal institution to complete his long term under the original sentence. The only alternative open to Federal authorities at the present time is to refuse to prosecute the case criminally, and permit the accused to report to Lexington as a voluntary patient. The major flaw in this procedure, of course, is the lack of control, since voluntary patients are free to leave Lexington at any time, and even against medical advice. The purpose of my bill is to provide a middle ground for the authorities which would avoid a criminal stigma and long prison sentence for the addict, while at the same time insuring authoritative control over the patient.

Of course, many narcotics addicts are also hardened criminals, and the public interest would not be served by removing the criminal sanctions against these lawbreakers. My bill, therefore, excludes addicts from its coverage, if it appears that—

1. The offense involved the sale or other transfer of narcotics.

2. There is a prior charge of crime pending against the person.

3. The person has been convicted on one or more prior occasions of a felony.

4. The person has previously been civilly committed because of his narcotics use.

5. Facilities for hospital care or aftercare supervision are unavailable or inadequate at the time the commitment is sought.

6. It is not in the interest of justice to commit the person civilly.

I am certain that these restrictions will screen out the undeserving and the unamenable to treatment, while providing a significantly improved, noncriminal treatment for the sick addict.

This bill is presently stalled in the Senate Judiciary Committee, but if it passes—rather, I should say when it passes, for I am confident that your efforts and mine will someday bear fruit—the Federal Government must then face other questions and they are: What kind of institutional treatment is best for these addicts and what sort of aftercare facilities should be made available? I sincerely hope that the discussions and recommendations of this conference will give us guidance and suggest the kind of treatment most beneficial to the noncriminal addict. Once this bill or a similar one is passed, however, and the addict is identified as a sick man and in need of care rather than punishment, we will have circumvented the first and foremost obstacle presently in the path of his rehabilitation.

Many of you, I am sure, have worked with addicts individually, and have carried on the day-to-day struggle with sick youngsters and hardened adults. Often your work is frustrating because of the nature of the disease. Relapse is to be expected, but when it happens, it is no easier to accept because it was anticipated. The addict needs you and relies on you until he can overcome the temptation to falter again. Your patience, firmness and, indeed, friendship must take the place of drugs in his life. Let me make a promise to those of you who bear this burden in behalf of society. Convincing the public and the legislatures of the real necessity of progressive laws in this field can often be like overcoming the drug habit—it takes a long time, and the relapses are many. Let me assure you that we don't intend to accept defeat, or even setbacks. We too, are often disheartened by circumstances beyond our control—by the slow and cumbersome process of moving forward. But as you are undiscouraged and indefatigable in your efforts, so will we be. We welcome your assistance and need your advice. This legislation will be passed, if not in this session of Congress, then in the next. We are making steady progress, and will continue to press on until the patient is cured.

TRIBUTES TO WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO JAMAICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep and sincere satisfaction at the nomination, by President Kennedy, of William C. Doherty as our first Ambassador to Jamaica.

There are many reasons for this sense of satisfaction. One, of course, is based on the abiding friendship and respect that so many Members of this body have maintained for "Bill" Doherty over the years. For 21 years Ambassador-designate Doherty led the National Association of Letter Carriers in such a way that this organization is now one of the most impressive labor organizations in the land. Those of us on Capitol Hill who have worked with Bill Doherty need not be told of his transcendent ability, his integrity, his honesty of purpose, his enormous talent for friendship. All these qualities are essential to a successful Ambassador, and Bill Doherty possesses them in great abundance.

Second, it is most fitting that the United States recognize the emergent status of organized labor in our national life, by sending an outstanding representative from its ranks as an Ambassador to a friendly nation. This is even more fitting when we realize that the two major political parties of Jamaica are closely alined with labor. In fact, the reaction to this nomination in that newly independent nation has been unanimously enthusiastic. The Prime Minister of Jamaica, Sir Alexander Bustamente, expressed the sentiment of his people when he told the Kingston Gleaner, influential Jamaican daily paper, on October 1, "My Government and I welcome this appointment."

Perhaps no leader of labor in the history of the United States has had as comprehensive a background in international affairs as has William C. Doherty. Ever since 1945, when Gen. Lucius D. Clay invited him to Germany to assist in the reestablishment of free labor unions in that country, Ambassador-designate Doherty's career has been a virtual training ground for the diplomatic service. He has preached the gospel of free enterprise and responsible trades unionism throughout the free world, particularly in Latin America and in Europe. He has been responsible for a person-to-person campaign within the trades unions of the world, combating the attempted intrusions of communism in areas where such intrusions could easily have found fertile ground. He has become one of the most respected freedom fighters in the worldwide labor movement, and his reputation in this regard is even more generally known outside our borders than it is here at home.

Mr. President, the nomination of William C. Doherty as Ambassador to Jamaica is a brilliant one. It calls for congratulations not only to our friend, Bill Doherty, but also to President Kennedy for having the vision and the imagination to make the nomination in the first place.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tribute and commendations on the nomination of Mr. Doherty. I know him very, very well, and I have had many contacts with him. I do not know anyone who has a more pleasing personality. I believe he will well serve the United States wherever he goes.

So I commend the President for making this appointment.

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR II LOSSES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, yesterday I requested that a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the question of agreeing to the conference report on House bill 7283, to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses. Upon my request for the taking of a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to that report, the yeas and nays were ordered.

However, Mr. President, because I realize how difficult it is to obtain a quorum at the present time—and only for that reason—I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my request for the yeas and nays, and that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would reserve the right to object, only to make sure that the proposed rescinding of the order will not affect the order that the vote be taken at 1:30 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; this action will not affect the order that the vote be taken at 1:30 p.m.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KEFAUVER

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of the Judiciary Committee, has been described in varying terms in various sections. The preponderance of the adjectives used is always on the negative side. However, in view of the nature of the subcommittee's assignment, I believe that is to be anticipated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, two editorials—one from the New York Times of October 5; the other from the Washington Post of October 5. The editorials reflect favorably upon the subcommittee, and particularly upon its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver].

I think this is the least that can be done by a member of that subcommittee in an effort to acknowledge our appreciation of the determination and devotion of our chairman.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 5, 1962]

Steel Price Competition

The decision by the major steel producers to engage in price competition on the west coast is a most welcome development in an industry which is in need of an infusion of new vigor.

In recent years the American steel industry has been plagued by substantial excess capacity and a decline of some 50 percent in its share of the world export market. Moreover, the historical role of the United States as a net exporter of steel was reversed in 1959. Last year net imports amounted to 1.2 million tons.

Part of the difficulty is doubtless attributable to technological change. The development of new and lighter structural shapes, the widespread use of reinforced concrete and the introduction of nonferrous materials have all contributed to a relative decline in the demand for basic steel products. But critics charge that the substitution of new products for steel is accelerated by rigid pricing policies and the reluctance of the industry to engage in vigorous price competition. And they maintain that those same policies are also responsible for the industry's declining share of the world market since cheaper coking coal and access to better grades of ore more than offset the advantage conferred upon foreign producers by virtue of lower wage rates.

The price cuts were precipitated by the Kaiser Steel Corp., which announced average price reductions of $12 per ton in an effort to "make the West more competitive domestically" and "materially assist in combating foreign steel imports."

This action was promptly countered by statements from United States Steel, Bethlehem and other major producers that they would meet Kaiser's prices and remain competitive on the west coast.

While confined to a single market, it is reasonable to assume that the price reductions will soon be extended and that they will do much to expand domestic steel production, which has been running at less than 60 percent of capacity since May. And the United States Steel Corp.'s, decision to participate in the construction of a new Italian steel plant is a hopeful sign that the industry will make an effort to regain its lost share of the world export market and thereby strengthen our international balance of payments.

Senator Kefauver, the industry's sternest congressional critic, has, with good reason, hailed the west coast developments as "a return to the old style competitive price rivalry that made America preeminent in world trade."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 5, 1962]

Victory on Drug Regulation

The conference version of the drug control bill, now well on its way to becoming law, substantially strengthens the hitherto inadequate safeguards which have surrounded the development, production, testing and sale of medicines for human use. Particularly important are such provisions as the requirement for affirmative Government approval before a new drug can be marketed, the authority given the Government to ban sales of any drug posing an "imminent hazard," and the requirement that all antibiotics for human use be certified through batch-by-batch testing.

The hero of this victory is Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, who doggedly continued to push for this needed legislation despite widespread public apathy, lack of administration interest and bitter opposition from some industry and congressional sources. But all of Senator Kefauver's efforts would have been in vain if it had not been for the public shock over the revelation that a drug, thalidomide, had caused the birth of thousands of deformed babies in Europe, and even a few in this country. That mass tragedy awoke the public, the White House and Congress; and it carried the day for this legislation. But it does not speak too well for congressional responsiveness to a public need that it took such an unpredictable and essentially chance occurrence as the thalidomide disaster to secure passage of this law so closely related to the general welfare.

RESOLUTION BY UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI PROFESSORS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this morning's newspaper carried three reports from Oxford, Miss., which contain some of the most encouraging and hopeful news from that troubled city in recent days.

These stories, I am confident, represent the voice of many responsible citizens of the State of Mississippi.

I want to make it clear to these citizens of Oxford that Americans throughout the Nation are proud and grateful for this responsible plea for respect of law and protection of basic constitutional rights for all citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Resolution by Mississippi Professors

Resolved, That we, the members of the University of Mississippi chapter of the American Association of University Professors, deploring the tragic events centered about this campus during the past few weeks, do declare our beliefs:

1. While it is obvious that errors in judgment were made by those in authority on the university campus Sunday, September 30, we have evidence that the attempt of men in prominent positions to place all the blame for the riot on the U.S. marshals is not only unfair and reprehensible but is almost completely false. We encourage an investigation by the proper authorities.

2. Some news media in Mississippi have entertained irresponsible and secondhand stories in distortion of the facts and have thereby helped to provoke a general state of confusion, alarm and misdirected wrath. We join with those fellow Mississippians who resolved in Jackson on October 1, their hopes that all news media would cooperate with sane, sensible public utterances.

3. While all citizens of Mississippi and the United States of America have the right to disagree in every peaceable and legal way with the law of the land as interpreted by the Supreme Court, it is the duty of every patriotic citizen to obey the law and encourage others to obey it. We believe in the use of courts and ballot boxes to state our convictions: we oppose and deplore the useless employment of clubs and missiles against fellow citizens in behalf of any conviction whatsoever.

4. Riots, weapons and agitators have no place at a university. This university can better carry on its important part in the march toward progress and prosperity in Mississippi without any of these. With the cooperation of the overwhelming majority of law-abiding Mississippi citizens, the University of Mississippi can return in the near

future to the normally peaceful conditions essential to education in Mississippi, in the Nation, and to constructive work for the future.

Clerics Call for Day of Repentance

We, the clergy of the Oxford and university community, do hereby call upon the people of our community and the State to make Sunday, October 7, 1962, a specific time for repentance for, or collective and individual guilt in, the formation of the atmosphere which produced the strife at the University of Mississippi and Oxford last Sunday and Monday, resulting in the death of two persons and injury to many others.

Further, we do urge that this be a specific time for turning from those paths of violent thought and action to the Christian way of peace and good will, which turning is the heart of true repentance.

It is our firm belief that obedience to the law and to the lawful authority is an essential part of the Christian life. The outgrowth of this conviction in the situation in which we find ourselves can be no less than acceptance of the actions of the Court and wholehearted compliance with these as individuals and as a State.

Not only must we ourselves act in accord with these principles, but we must actively exert positive leadership and influence such as that provided on October 2 by certain businessmen of our State.

We issue this call mindful of the promise of our God:

"If My people who are called by My name shall humble themselves and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sins, and will heal their land." II Chronicles 7:14.

Oxford Mayor Accuses Patrol

Oxford, Miss., October 4.—The mayor of Oxford said today he was refused help by the Mississippi State Highway Patrol last Monday when rioting spread from the University of Mississippi campus into this town.

Mayor Robert W. Elliott said he made his appeal to a patrol officer who told him: "We have orders not to interfere."

"I would rather have had my own State patrol helping us but they wouldn't do it," Elliott said. "I feel the least they could have done was to help our own people."

"Patrolmen actually saw cars demolished and saw mobs on the streets and did nothing about it," he said.

The rioting started on the campus Sunday night and shifted to the town Monday morning.

Bands of marauders started hurling rocks and gasoline bombs and Elliott said it was then he appealed to FBI Agent Robert Cotton to call for Army troops.

"If I had it to do over again, I would do it the same way," Elliott said in an interview today. "I was trying to save my town and keep people from being killed."

Elliott said the police force of the tiny university town consists of only seven men. He said he deputized the city's 30 firemen, but even the increased force was no match for the rioters.

Elliott said when he made his appeal for help from the Army "50 or 60 persons were in town trying to burn down Negro churches."

"I had to act quickly, keep my head, and exercise good judgment."

A 24-hour guard of military policemen with bayonets fixed on their rifles still is maintained at the townhall.

Elliott said he thought the situation had calmed down enough now for the troops to begin moving out, but he added, "This is not my decision."

FOOD SURPLUSES FOR THE HUNGRY?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, all of us wish to devise a way whereby our magnificent agricultural abundance could, to a larger extent than at present, find its way to the world's hungry.

A most eloquent statement of this humane and logical concern was adopted recently by the Michigan Certified Seed Potato Growers Association, Inc., of Bellaire, Mich.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of this group, adopted at its August 6 annual meeting, be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas sources at the United Nations estimate that no less than 1 out of every 8 human beings on earth, some 390 million men, women, and children—go to bed desperately hungry every night; and

Whereas this 390 million figure includes only those whose main preoccupation every day of their lives is simply getting enough to eat to drive away hunger pains, and does not include more than 1 billion others whose diets are inadequate; and

Whereas our country has a surplus of food, which costs taxpayers a tremendous amount of money each year just to store it; and

Whereas the farmers of our country are able and willing to produce food efficiently and at low cost to help feed many of the desperately hungry people in this world: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we recommend to our Government through our two Senators that it put forth every effort to feed these terribly hungry people of the world. If one small child in this world of ours goes to bed at night hungry and undernourished, it cannot be said that our country so long as it has a food surplus is doing everything it can and should do to relieve this suffering. So long as any small children in this world suffer the terrible pain of hunger and malnutrition, if our country in the goodness of its heart provides food for the hungry, it cannot be said that we are disrupting any trade channels or hurting any country's commerce with other countries.

We are sending a copy of this resolution to our two Senators, Senator Hart and Senator McNamara.

RESTORATION OF OLD ST. PETER'S CHURCH, TECUMSEH, MICH.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the citizens of Tecumseh, Mich., a pleasant, leafy city in the southern part of the State, are engaged in a vigorous campaign to restore and preserve a lovely church that has been in the community for 129 years.

I think this is another symptom of the Nation's growing awareness of its history. As we mature, we will continue to attach more and more importance to these links with our past.

Too often in previous years our communities have tended to be impatient with their earliest structures, even embarrassed about them.

But Tecumseh realizes that old St. Peter's Church has many lessons to teach about the beginnings of the town. I believe this is a commendable project. I have personally contributed to it. Clearly this is the sort of project that should be encouraged in every community in the Nation.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS STUDENT CITES STUDENT EXCHANGE VALUE, WRITES OF HER STUDIES IN CHILE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from 1 of 14 University of Texas undergraduate students sent to Chile this summer as a part of the student exchange program.

This is a two-way exchange. The group of Chilean students who come to the University of Texas each year usually visit in my Washington office before going on to Texas to study, and the exchange Texas group often visit me en route to Chile. The intelligence, searching curiosity, and good intent of both groups have been most impressive. Usually about 16 Chilean and Texas students exchange campuses for about a month or 6 weeks a year. The student exchange program is one of our great diplomatic successes. We need to enlarge and expand it. This program is a two-way street to good neighborliness.

To illustrate the point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the following letter, dated October 1, 1962, from Miss Nina Faulkner, one of the University of Texas exchange students, describing her own deep awareness of the importance of student exchange.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Austin, Tex.,
October 1, 1962.

Hon. Senator Ralph Yarborough,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Senator: One of my purposes was to teach. I also learned.

Thus, I, as 1 of 14 University of Texas undergraduate students sent to Chile August 14, 1962, for 1 month in a U.S. State Department-sponsored exchange program, regard as a magnificent success our college seminar.

What did I learn? I learned that I am an American—and what a large world is contained in the small phrase, "I am an American."

Why didn't I understand the significance of the phrase before my trip to Chile? Because I had to be away from my country before I could view objectively its merits—and its demerits. I had to explain and defend my system of government before it could be dear to me. I had to understand the thoughts of the citizens of another land before I could understand the thoughts of the citizens of my land. I had to widen the horizons of my world comprehension before I could be grateful for my heritage.

I learned the importance of knowledge. The "ugly American" image dies when ignorance dies; the "intelligent American" image is born when education is born.

But book knowledge is not sufficient. The intelligent American supplements paper theories with practical reality. The intelligent American tries—he makes mistakes, but he knows his Chilean friends respect and appreciate his attempts to speak always in their language, to forego certain "American conveniences," and to integrate himself completely into their society. The intelligent American in another country will do "as the Romans do." The intelligent American learns to listen so that he can capture the thought waves of Chile—so that he can know in which areas unity can be strengthened between our two nations.

I learned that love is the antibiotic for the world's illness.

People are people. The fact that an ocean lies between North Americans and Chileans is insignificant. The same God, the same moon and stars, the same emotions, troubles, and aspirations that belong to the United States belong also to "Chile's Lindo." Love can traverse miles and unite hearts.

I begin my student teaching this week in an Austin secondary school. I will tell my pupils about the University of Texas goodwill program with Chile, and I will impress upon them the importance and necessity of student exchange seminars.

Cordially yours,

NINA FAULKNER.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there appeared in the September 23 edition of the St. Paul, Minn., Sunday Pioneer Press an article by Mr. Gordon Richmond concerning the agricultural conservation program.

This is an excellent article and goes a long way in clearing up the misunderstanding of so many as to the purposes and accomplishments of the ACP. I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this fine article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press, Sept. 23, 1962]

AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION PROGRAM GETS A BIG HAND

(By Gordon Richmond)

Within the labyrinth of Federal agriculture agencies, all suffering from alphabetitis and some from political punching, there is one that seems to escape controversy. This is the ACP, the agriculture conservation program.

To the city dweller, it appears at first glance to be another giveaway program, with the Government under certain conditions paying, for example, up to 80 percent of the cost of site preparation for tree planting and then paying about half the cost of planting those trees on your own land.

Yet this year some 17 million trees were planted in Minnesota with ACP financial aid. It is the big emphasis in Minnesota and took nearly a third of the seedling production of State-operated nurseries.

The ACP will share costs on farmland for these conservation practices:

Establishing a cover on land—corn, oats, sorghum, barley, buckwheat, millet or sunflowers. It will pay about 50 percent of the cost, not to exceed $5 an acre for corn and sorghums and $4 an acre for the others. This crop can not be grazed or used. Its purpose is to provide food and habitat for wildlife.

Establishing grasses and legumes, not to exceed $5 an acre. There are certain seeding requirements.

Establishing trees and shrubs for wildlife cover and food. Here the ACP will pay $2.50 per 100 trees or shrubs planted by hand and $1.75 for 100 for machine planting. However, the soil conservation service must inspect and approve.

Developing shallow-water areas for wildlife. This basically is to restore or improve wetland habitat and seems almost diametrically opposed to practices of other Federal agriculture agencies. However, it is pointed out that drainage practices in the past have been primarily on cropland as opposed to farmland. There is also apparent misunderstanding of what constitutes a pothole.

This shallow-water program may include the building of dams and extensive excavation, but it, too, must have soil conservation service approval. The Government will pay up to 50 percent of the cost and not more than $2,000 a structure. It would seem ideal for Minnesota's duck population; and experts believe more farmers will take advantage of it in the future.

The ACP may be used on land already in the soil bank.

The soil bank and the diverted acreage programs that have cost the taxpayers millions of dollars essentially are payment to keep land from production of crops now in surplus. It is a stop-gap measure and is a negative but practical approach. It's considered necessary because the farmer is unorganized and cannot control production.

The ACP in contrast produces something. Maybe it's land fertility, or erosion control, or new forest land, or greater land capacity for wildlife. Fertile land usually produces more wildlife. And compared with the soil bank programs, ACP cost is small.

There are certain limitations. No more than 5 acres per farm or 160-acre tract can be seeded for wildlife cover on cost-sharing. If a farmer owns more land, then another 5 acres per 160 may be added.

In the case of tree planting, there is no limitation beyond maximum payment figures.

Persons interested in the program may contact their county agriculture stabilization and conservation committee (ASC) which administers the program. ASC state committees of three are appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. County committees are elected by farmers. Each township elects three persons, the chairman of whom is a delegate to the county convention to elect the county committee.

The Soil Conservation Service (SCS), tied in with the program, is a technical agency staffed by civil service career people.

ROBERT E. HANSEN—A TRUE PATRIOT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr President, during the past year the State of Minnesota has been honored by the service of one of its distinguished sons in a position of unusual prominence and responsibility. I refer to my good friend and fellow Minnesotan, Mr. Robert E. Hansen, of South St. Paul, Minn., the immediate past commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

During Bob Hansen's tenure in office as head of the 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans who comprise the membership of the VFW, he provided an inspiring example of able, vigorous, and dedicated citizenship. As Members of the Senate are well aware, the VFW is an organization devoted to the service of disabled and indigent veterans, their widows, and orphans. Under Bob Hansen, the VFW once again demonstrated in a most meaningful way that the motto of the VFW, "Honor the dead by helping the living," is not an empty phrase, but rather a guiding principle for the collective and individual actions of the VFW.

It was also, for me, a source of genuine satisfaction to observe how Bob Hansen, a lifelong resident of Minnesota, repeatedly demonstrated a keen understanding of the ways in which a great veterans' organization, such as the VFW, can serve its Nation in these difficult times.

Time does not permit me now to list fully the many things which the VFW has done during the past year to advance the security of our Nation domestically and abroad. However, I would like to refer to a few examples of VFW accomplishments under Bob Hansen's leadership.

Mr. Hansen was elected commander-in-chief of the VFW at its 1961 national convention in Miami Beach in August 1961. As Members of the Senate will recall, this coincided with a most serious crisis over Berlin There was much speculation among our allies as to just how determined the American people would be in facing up to the Soviet Union in the Berlin controversy. Some questions were raised as to how strongly the United States, as a whole, would back the firm attitude then being demonstrated by the President and the NATO commander, General Norstad.

Immediately following the convention, Commander-in-Chief Hansen announced that since General Norstad had been unable, due to the Berlin crisis, to fulfill his speaking engagement at the VFW convention, where he was to receive the Bernard M. Baruch Gold Medal, the highest VFW award for distinguished service to our Nation, Mr. Hansen would present the award to General Norstad at his NATO headquarters in Europe. The presentation took place at NATO headquarters beneath the flags of the NATO nations, and was attended by senior military officers of our allied nations.

This act by Commander in Chief Hansen, on behalf of the VFW, reflected the solidarity with which this great veterans' organization, comprising such a large cross-section of our citizenry, supported our President and the NATO command. It was a most timely and constructive gesture.

During the past year Commander Hansen has carried the message of the VFW's support of our President's determination to resist the encroachment of communism to those who are in the frontlines of the struggle.

He delivered this message of courage and support to Mayor Willy Brandt in the shadow of the Berlin wall. He visited the sentry posts of the marines on guard along the "cactus curtain" which Castro has erected around our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. He met with leaders in Asia, visited the Nationalist Chinese armed forces on Formosa, and consulted with President Chiang Kai-shek. He flew, as a Naval Reserve officer, the strategically important surveillance air patrol along the waters off the Red China coast.

Throughout the past year Commander in Chief Hansen has spoken extensively on the necessity of the United States remaining strong and resolute in the face of continuing Communist aggression.

When President Kennedy announced our determination to resume atomic testing, the message of the VFW commander in chief was heartening and encouraging to the President. It is significant to note that this clear and forceful message to the President was read on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished majority leader.

Under Bob Hansen's leadership the VFW this year continued that organization's policy of serving as a strong, fair, and effective spokesman for our military personnel. During the past year the VFW, in addition to other matters affecting servicemen, worked for the following objectives in the interest of our service personnel: lifting the prohibition on dependents' travel overseas; resisting efforts to reduce commissary rights; increasing quarters allowances; resisting medical charges for service dependents in military facilities. It is noteworthy that the VFW's role in each of these issues was effective and thus contributed materially to military morale, and consequently the enhancement of our national security.

The VFW, whose members understand the importance of maintaining a powerful armed force establishment, were in the lead of national organizations in support of the National Guard and the Reserve.

Commander in Chief Hansen is to be commended for tireless and sincere efforts in the cause of protecting freedom against communism, for his timely and effective statements on matters of critical national importance, and for the inspiring manner in which he has continued to demonstrate that the VFW is a powerful factor in helping to assure the security of our Nation and the preservation of freedom.

As a longtime friend of this distinguished Minnesotan, I take this occasion to express my admiration for what has been done in his just completed year of leadership of the VFW, in the cause of good government and a strong United States. I am confident that Members of the Senate join with me in conveying to Bob Hansen, a Navy veteran, the traditional Navy accolade of "well done" for what he has done for our Nation.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PHARMACEUTICAL FIRMS AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, during the congressional consideration of the drug bill which has now been sent to the President, there were many comments made about the role of the pharmaceutical firms in conducting their business, and particularly in regard to their relationship with the Food and Drug Administration.

One of the most progressive and farsighted men in our Nation's business community, John T. Connor, president, Merck & Co., Inc., in Rahway, N.J., has spoken clearly on the desire of companies such as his to conduct themselves in the best interests of the American people, and, indeed, of the many people throughout the world who are enjoying better health as a result of the research and development in this country.

Mr. Connor, who entered the pharmaceutical field after attaining notable success in the fields of law and government, has issued a statement on the drug bill which sets a high standard for the industry.

His statement follows:

This on the whole is a sound law, reflecting many points which Merck and other pharmaceutical companies actively supported during 3 years of work with congressional committees. It serves the public interest because it will help to elevate the standards of the prescription drug industry as a whole, thus providing broader protection for the consumer. Within the framework of the new law, Merck looks forward to continuing its contributions to medical progress.

The legislation will be effective, however, only to the extent that the Food and Drug Administration is strengthened in staff, facilities, and organization to match the increased importance of its broad new medical and scientific responsibilities. It is desirable that Congress act quickly to provide the necessary funds for these purposes.

With uncertainties as to the future of the industry now resolved, it is our hope that we can resume our concentration on the essential task of discovering and developing new drugs urgently needed in the struggle against disease.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN CONNECTION WITH DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on September 11, 1962, and September 12, 1962, I called the attention of the Congress to articles written by Baltimore Sunpapers reporter Howard Norton concerning what appeared to be a rather blatant conflict-of-interests case. Immediately my distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Senator John Stennis, requested the Navy to submit a full report on the matter to him and to the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. Senator Stennis has been one of the leaders in the Congress in protecting the interests of our taxpayers and the Government from damage perpetrated by persons operating either illegally or unethically under dual allegiances and his prompt action in this case was typical of the efforts he has devoted to the problem.

Today the Sunpapers carried a front-page story about the case which Mr. Norton brought to light and since I am sure many of my colleagues would like to be brought up to date on the matter, I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Navy Inquiry Is Critical of Robinson—Conflict of Interest Is Laid to Ex-Aide, Now With Contractor

Washington, October 4.—Eugene A. Robinson, a former "special assistant" in the Navy Department, was accused officially today of violating Defense Department conflict-of-interest directives.

An investigation ordered by the Secretary of the Navy, Fred Korth, disclosed that Robinson acted for the Navy in negotiations with a defense contractor who had already agreed to employ him.

The investigation also revealed that Robinson received pay from both the Navy and the contractor for 2 weeks last spring.

CONTRACTOR REPAID

The Navy's report said that Robinson repaid the contractor, Franklin Institute of Philadelphia, the salary he received for the period and that the Navy Department also had requested repayment "of the sum paid to him for the same period."

The investigators found that Robinson resigned from the Navy Department March 19 this year and went to work for Franklin Institute the same day.

But on April 3, 2 weeks later, Robinson's employment with the Franklin Institute was rescinded and his resignation from the Navy was canceled, the report stated.

The Navy said April 3 that Robinson would not take the job with the contractor and that the Franklin Institute had been warned not to hire him.

WAKELIN HEADS OFFICE

The truth was that he had been employed by Franklin Institute for 2 weeks on that date, while he was still working at his desk in the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for research and development, James Wakelin, Jr., and apparently receiving Navy pay.

The investigators' report showed that 5 months later, on August 17, 1962, Robinson again resigned from the Navy post and went to work immediately as a "consultant" for Franklin Institute.

On September 1, Robinson was appointed chief of the Washington office of the Franklin Institute.

But on September 17—6 days after his new switch of employment was reported—Robinson was given a leave of absence from his new job, with pay, the Navy investigators found.

The Navy investigators' findings were announced tonight by Senator Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, which is also studying the case.

In disclosing an outline of the Navy's findings, Stennis said that his subcommittee staff was still reviewing and evaluating the Navy's report and that the future course of the subcommittee's inquiry would be decided after this was completed.

Stennis added that additional information on the Navy report and other phases of the matter must await this decision.

CONTRACT DEFENDED

As to the contract that Robinson helped to negotiate for the Navy with Franklin Institute, Stennis said that the Navy investigators had concluded "that the provisions included in this contract are appropriate, that the financial arrangements with the Franklin Institute are fair and reasonable, and that this is sound procurement."

Stennis noted that he had been assured by the Secretary of the Navy that the administration of the contract would be kept "under close scrutiny to insure that its continuation is at all times in the best interests of the Government."

Before acknowledging that Robinson violated Defense Department policy and regulations in taking his present job, the Navy report stated that:

"The present employment of Mr. Robinson, on work other than Navy work does not violate any of the so-called conflict-of-interest statutes."

The report did not go on to explain that the reason no conflict-of-interest statutes are being violated now by Robinson is that there are no conflict-of-interest statutes that apply even remotely to this type of situation.

In its charge against Robinson, according to STENNIS, the Navy report declared: "Mr. Robinson's negotiations with the Franklin Institute leading to his present employment did violate paragraph IV of Department of Defense Directive 5500.7 which disqualifies Department of Defense personnel from representing the Department in dealings of any kind with any business entity with which they have arranged or are negotiating for subsequent employment."

STENNIS emphasized, in releasing this review of the Navy's findings, that he would not reach any conclusions until he had "the benefit of all available facts in this matter."

The Senator said that he has directed the subcommittee staff to "review and evaluate fully this report and other information received by the subcommittee on this matter, and to furnish * * * a complete report on all aspects of the matter at the earliest possible date."

FOREIGN COMPETITION IN FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, recently, I learned that a modern Japanese fishing trawler is coming from Japan and will be fishing off our Atlantic seaboard within a week. This vessel is about four times as large as any other American trawler fishing in this area and has facilities for refrigerating its catch. It plans to sell this catch in Boston or through a Japanese firm in New York City.

No American fishing vessel in the Atlantic could ever consider fishing off the coast of Japan. Our New England fishermen will not, in fact, even be able to compete effectively with this Japanese vessel in their own waters. Our antiquated vessels cannot refrigerate their catches and do not have the capacity of this foreign trawler.

This is only one of several new threats from foreign competition which our fisheries have faced in recent weeks. Another was, of course, the news of the Soviet fishing port to be built in Cuba.

This port will be a twofold threat to this country. It will, naturally, give the Russians a ready base for their fishing vessels that are equipped for missile-tracking and other espionage work.

It also poses a serious threat to our entire Atlantic and gulf coast fishing industries. The giant Soviet fishing fleets now off our eastern seaboard will no longer have to go home for supplies and repairs. They can stay in our coastal waters and fish indefinitely.

Furthermore, they will be based within easy striking distance of our southern Atlantic and gulf coast fisheries. The Soviets have been laying the groundwork for this for some time. Last month, a 150-foot refrigerated Soviet trawler was doing exploratory fishing off the coast of Florida for menhaden. Their fishing fleets always follow close behind their exploratory vessels. This will be the first time the Soviets have competed with us in our industrial fisheries, which will represent one of the largest segments of our fishing industry.

If the Soviets take advantage of the ready access offered by their new Cuban port to the Gulf of Mexico, they will also for the first time be competing with our gulf fishermen. One group of these, the shrimp fishermen, have suffered badly in recent years from losses of stocks. We can ill afford to have another country competing for these limited stocks with equipment far more modern than our own.

The Soviets will not be the only new, foreign fleet to be fishing in that area. Cuba is going to build a large modern fishing industry with Soviet assistance. The Cubans will be given the use of up-to-date Soviet fishing vessels and technicians trained in Russia in the latest fishing techniques. Two hundred of these Cuban technicians have already left to be trained.

These facts are new. But the threat to our fisheries from foreign competition is not. During this session of Congress, a number of Senators including Senator MAGNUSON, Senator BARTLETT, Senator GRUENING, Senator PELL, myself, and others have repeatedly told the Congress of the threat which foreign competition poses to our American fishermen. It is a threat that could destroy our American fishing industry.

The Christian Science Monitor recently published an excellent series of articles which outlined in detail the competition which our fishermen face from Russia, Japan, Canada, and other countries. It also told of the sad state of the American fisheries, particularly those in New England. I would like to insert those articles at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 1, 1962]

NEW ENGLAND FISHERMEN PLY TROUBLED SEAS

(By Richard E. Neff)

A kind of lonely air clings to New England fish piers these days.

Maybe it's the squawking of the gulls, or the salt air, or the creaking of a few boats tied up at the piers that create this mood.

To be sure, there are people around, and there are fish being unloaded. But many of the boats are rusty and beaten by salty seas. The fishermen's leathery faces seem to depict not only the challenge of the sea, but also the challenge of a declining industry.

Ever so often another fishing boat gives up and goes out of business.

OPTIMISM LINGERS

While the overall picture seems to be bleak, there are, however, some optimists left in the New England fishing industry.

The head of a Boston fish processing firm is building a new fishing boat despite dire predictions of many colleagues that it will be uneconomic.

Some people in New Bedford say the rebirth of the scallop industry there might be a pattern for the rest of the commercial fisheries in New England.

There is the prospect of increased aid from Federal and State Governments.

But pessimists—far more numerous these days—wave aside these examples and point to the dark picture shown by statistics.

IMPORTS RISE

The total catch of fish landed in the United States last year was less than that of 20 years ago, though the country's population has risen during the period by 45 million. Imports from other nations have doubled since 1949, and in 1961 accounted for 44 percent of total American consumption.

In New England, Boston's fleet of trawlers (boats that seek fish which live near the bottom of the sea, such as cod, haddock, or ocean perch) declined from 120 after World War II to a present 61.

In Gloucester, Mass., the fleet has slipped from 400 to 100 over the same period, "and almost every month another fishing boat gives up and goes out of business," according to U.S. Senator BENJAMIN A. SMITH, who lives in Gloucester, in a speech this spring to the Senate.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 1, 1962]

MULTITUDES OF COD

Back in 1602, an Englishman named Bartholomew Gosnold made the first commercial fishing expedition off the Massachusetts coast, and came back so impressed by the abundance of the area that he named it Cape Cod.

A member of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Thomas Morton, wrote that he had found "Multitudes of Cod" and Francis Higgenson recorded in 1630 that "the abundance of seafood are almost beyond believing."

New England's export trade began with shipment of cod to Europe, and capital earned from such trade was important in establishing other New England industries, such as textiles, jewelry, shoes, confectionery.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 1, 1962]

COMPETITION PRODS U.S. FISHERMEN

When Soviet fishing boats appeared on Georges Bank off Cape Cod last year, they dramatically reminded Americans of the foreign competition, facing the fishing industry.

The Soviet boats, to be sure, fish primarily for herring and ship them back to the U.S.S.R. (Americans eat very little herring.)

Nevertheless, it emphasized that more nations than ever before are fishing the North Atlantic.

The steady rise of foreign competition has, more than anything else, spotlighted the weaknesses of New England (and American) commercial fisheries. In New England, imports come primarily from Canada, followed by Denmark, Iceland, and Norway.

Danish and Norwegian fishing industries were partially rebuilt with U.S. aid following World War II, and Iceland, which became completely independent from Denmark only in 1944, built its first competitive fishing fleet with American economic help.

OLD U.S. BOATS

These new fleets by contrast point up the antiquity of American boats. The average trawler in the New England fleet is 25 years old. The boat presently being built for the Boston Fleet will be the first new one in 14 years.

Older boats cost more to insure, repair, and operate. They lack capacity, refrigeration facilities (fish are highly perishable and are caught a long way from port), and living conditions that would attract new, younger men to become fishermen.

Despite sharply advancing costs, gross revenues and returns per pound of groundfish landed have declined in constant dollars during the postwar period, according to a study done last year by the Bureau of Business Research at Boston College.

American fishermen point out that foreign boats are often (though not always) built with heavy Government subsidies, sometimes around 50 percent.

FEDERAL SUBSIDY

A 1792 law restricts Americans from building boats overseas, and shipbuilding, steel, and electrical industries and workers oppose any attempt to change the law. A Federal subsidy passed several years ago pays for a third of the cost of construction in the United States (about $450,000 for a trawler), but owners assert this is not enough and are urging Congress to raise the support.

Supply of fish is another problem. The quantities of haddock and ocean perch, two of the major New England catches, is stabilized with no prospects of increase. Yet an ever greater number of boats are seeking the fish.

Also, fish on the banks closest to New England ports are not as abundant as before, and boats must go farther north, thus putting Canadian boats at an advantage over U.S. boats.

UNCERTAIN ROLE

There are other problems: lack of latest technological equipment aboard and boats, labor problems on the fish piers, lack of quality consciousness among some fishermen (that is, in handling the fish and keeping boats clean), and widely fluctuating prices for fresh fish that make the fisherman's role uncertain.

But looming larger than all other problems and in a sense, causing them all, is the industry's "free enterprise ab absurdum," according to one close observer. Boat owners and fish processors seem unwilling to combine interests.

Most boats are individually owned. In some cases, the crew, not the captain, of a boat determines what fish shall be caught on a given day. (The crew's pay depends on the take, and that day's market prices.)

JUST HUNTERS

The trouble, says Columbus Iselin of Milton, Mass., senior physical oceanographer at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, "is that fishermen are just hunters. No one owns the natural resources. The industry lacks management and engineering."

"It is a jungle," says Charles H. W. Foster, Massachusetts Commissioner of Natural Resources. "The industry has up to now lacked leadership, both from within itself, or from State or Federal Government.

"Today," he says, "the industry is somewhat like farming 50 years ago—at a point of history where individualism must give way to cooperation."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 19, 1962]

Competition Hits New England Fisheries

(By Richard Neff)

Foreign competition is one of the most important problems facing the New England groundfish industry, and that competition comes primarily from Canada's so-called Maritime Provinces—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland.

About two-thirds of fish imported into the United States comes from Canada.

While New England groundfish industry has seen a steady decline in value and volume of landings, the Canadian industry has shown substantial vitality, according to a recent survey by Boston College.

SUBSIDIES HELP

Haddock landings in the Maritime Provinces, for instance, increased from 35 million pounds in 1946 to 93 million pounds in 1956.

The marked growth of the Canadian industry is partially due to government help, from both the federal and provincial governments in the form of loans and grants for building new boats.

In Newfoundland, for instance, government subsidies run as high as 42 percent, and as much as 90 percent of cash downpayment may also be borrowed at low-interest rates.

The Boston College survey indicated clearly that without government aid most Canadian fishermen would not have been able to accumulate enough capital to build their own boats.

There are other factors in Canadian success in the U.S. market, however. One is the simple fact that the more productive fishings grounds are closer to the Maritime Provinces, so that Canadian boats can make more trips at a lower cost.

STANDARDS LOWER

Also, the lower general standards of living in the Provinces and lack of unionization among fishermen make for lower costs to boatowners.

Nevertheless, the B.C. study noted, the Canadian industry enjoys large advantage also because it has been able to organize itself, and overcome to a considerable extent the individualism that blocks progress of New England's industry.

Of the 50 New England trawlers, for example, all but 9 are individually owned.

That is, most New England trawlers bring in their catch and sell it to a processor or wholesaler for the best price it will bring, and this is one reason why prices in New England are so fluctuating.

INDUSTRY INTEGRATED

In Canada, on the other hand, all trawlers are owned by vertically integrated processors. Thus the processor and the fisherman are on the same team and the result is a stable price and a more certain profit for all concerned.

The effort by a Boston fish processor, Thomas A. Fulham, to build a new boat for the Boston fleet, thus initiating some sort of vertical integration at the Boston fish pier, could well be the future pattern of the industry, and indeed the path of survival.

Current efforts in Congress to raise the subsidies for building of new vessels are, it is granted, a necessary element in this survival.

COOPERATION NEEDED

But most of all, it is agreed, the revival of New England's fishing industry will depend upon the people in the fishing industry themselves and their capacity to pull together after centuries of internal disorganization. Modern-day competition forces a merging of effort, just as it does in so many other aspects of 20th-century economic life.

Admittedly, some inherent advantages of the Canadian industry may remain. But people of the United States are eating more fish all the time, and as the world in general looks increasingly toward the sea for its food there seems a prospect of ample opportunity for all foreign fishing nations and the New England industry as well.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 28, 1962]

Soviet Trawlers Hunt Food—Too

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

In addition to the fact that the Soviet Union has espionage capability in its fishing fleets now being extended to Cuba and the Caribbean, it has a need to increase its own and Cuba's food stocks, both admittedly in short supply.

Currently, the Soviet Union is engaged in the greatest expansion of high-seas fishing of any nation in the world, fisheries experts declare.

It plans to increase its fish production 2 million tons a year over the next 7 years. The Soviet Union, which seines a tenth of the world fish catch each year, already ranks among the leading fishery nations with Japan, Communist China, and the United States. Its annual catch has increased from 2 million to 3,700,000 metric tons in the last decade.

FLEET EXPANDS

The Soviet Union's worldwide fleet consists of some 3,000 vessels. It is adding continually to that fleet huge "mother, or factory, ships," 280 feet long, weighing 3,400 tons, and having facilities for freezing, canning, and processing of fish into fishmeal and liver oil.

These ships, some 90 of which are being built now in Poland and East Germany, are equipped with gear that permits them to haul 10-ton catches through a stern chute without damage to the fish.

Ships capable of sighting huge schools of fish with their electronic equipment can also sight submarines, track missile flights, watch coastal shipping, and interrupt communications with the same equipment. There has been evidence that Soviet fishing vessels have attempted to follow the Polaris atomic submarine.

When Soviet fishing vessels were off the Cape Cod and New England coast in late 1961, U.S. Air Force officials said they were postponing some of their SAGE radar defense tests because of the presence of the Soviet fishermen.

Other oceanography authorities say that often the Soviet fishing vessels are collecting information on water temperatures and thermal layers. Thermal layers, or levels of water of different temperatures, are important in antisubmarine warfare in that they bend or refract sound waves in the equipment that seeks out the subs.

This past summer between 200 and 300 Soviet fishing vessels put out from Murmansk to fish the banks off Labrador and Newfoundland for cod, haddock, scallops, and other shellfish that have long provided New England and Canada with a thriving industry. The Murmansk-North Banks trips take 10 days each way. The vessels ordinarily stay 20 to 30 days in the North Banks area.

RADAR VESSELS

Soviet vessels were reported in January 1962 by the Japanese in the East China and Yellow Seas—14 radar-equipped vessels headed by a 4,000-ton mother ship.

The Japanese maritime sources speculated that the Soviets, whom they never saw fishing, were surveying routes for submarine navigation or laying special equipment on the sea bottom to measure the intensity of underground and oceanic nuclear tests.

Soviet fishing fleets have worked for pilchard and mackerel off the cost of South-West Africa with full-scale groups of refrigerator and other vessels, causing considerable anxiety among established fishermen there. More than 50 Soviet ships operate there.

Besides fishing in the wide Pacific, Soviet vessels have been sighted in the North Pacific halibut banks where Canada and the United States share fishing areas off Alaska and northern British Columbia.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 28, 1962]

New England Fishermen Face New Rivals

New competition for New England fishermen is en route from Japan.

Officials of the local fishing industry have learned from the fisheries attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo that a Japanese trawler, the *Aoi Maru*, left Japan August 20 and will appear at North Atlantic fishing grounds, probably near Greenland, about October 10.

Thus Japan will become the 14th nation fishing in the North Atlantic banks. Many countries in the past few years, including the Soviet Union last year, have started fishing the banks in competition with New England fishermen, and many are selling their catch in the American market. This is the principal reason for decline of the New England fishing industry since World War II.

OCEAN OPEN TO ALL

Ocean waters outside the 3-mile coastal zone are open to all ships.

The *Aoi Maru* is 1,134 tons, about four times the size of most American boats, according to an official of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The boat reportedly will sell its catch to two Boston fish processors.

A second Japanese boat applied for permission from its government to come to the North Atlantic. This may mean that a large number of Japanese boats may be on the way in the next few years, a spokesman stated.

NO CLEAR ANSWER

But how is the supply of fish? Can the fishing banks stand to have many more boats scooping fish out of the sea?

Dr. Herbert Graham, director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries laboratory at Woods Hole, Mass., stated that there is no clear answer to these questions. Research teams from many nations are studying the problem now.

The 13 nations, including the U.S.S.R., that make up the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, have established regulations governing the size of nets.

But more boats might bring future necessity of a quota system or some other sort of international regulation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 3, 1962]

REDS SEEK TO TAP TROPIC FISH WEALTH

(By Paul Wohl)

Communist fishing fleets soon will swarm all over the world's southern oceans. Havana is only one spectacular way station on the Soviet Minister of Fisheries' frequent journeys to tropical ports.

"Fishing stations in tropical waters may become for the Soviet bloc what bunker ports were for Britain in the 19th century," one imaginative Communist food expert told this writer 2 months ago on the occasion of a committee meeting of CMEA, the Soviet bloc's Council for Mutual Economic Aid.

The U.S.S.R., with the world's largest modern fishing fleet, leads the campaign. Poland, which on April 29 delivered to Cuba its first modern fishing cutters, is in on the venture. The East Germans ultimately expect to follow suit.

MILITARY PURPOSE NOTED

Fishing in distant water, like shipping, is not a purely commercial operation. Even before World War I, passenger liners had to meet auxiliary-cruiser and troop-transport specifications of British, French, German, and Japanese admiralties. In the 1920's and 1930's Japanese fishing fleets supplied Tokyo with information which helped Japanese submarine raids during the war.

In the present age of electronics, Moscow's motor fleet of insulated tropical trawlers, fish transports, whalers, and marine-research vessels, undoubtedly also is geared to military purposes.

FOOD MAIN ISSUE

But the big issue is food from the southern oceans, which have hardly been tapped. More than 90 percent of the world's fish catch comes from the Northern Hemisphere, and the southern seas cover a 50-percent larger expanse.

Exploitation of their fish wealth is a prerequisite of survival for the world's rapidly increasing population, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) experts of the United Nations say. The country which has the lead in this endeavor has much to offer to the undernourished three-fifths of mankind.

This is what the Communists are out to do. Their own people, too, do not have enough meat. Instead of meat they are to get fish, even though today much of it remains "fish in the sky."

Fish, once it reaches the consumer, is cheaper than meat. Four calories of fodder are needed to produce one calory of meat. In order to give the present world population the necessary meat proteins, grain and fodder production would have to be five to six times larger than it is today. Since the world population may more than double before the end of the century, cattle breeding cannot meet food requirements. In addition, the U.S.S.R. has not been too successful in cattle raising. One reason more for them to try it with fish.

The richest fishing grounds are coastal shelves up to 600 feet deep in areas where warm and cold currents mingle. The Caribbean where the Gulf Stream and south equatorial current meet is one such area. Others are the west coast of equatorial Africa, the Indian Ocean off Madagascar, and the waters off west Australia and south of New Zealand.

According to FAO some of the world's richest fishing grounds are off southern California, Ecuador, and southern Brazil.

EXTENSIVE EXPLORATIONS

During the past few years the U.S.S.R. has carried on extensive explorations in the Caribbean, off Africa, and in the Indian Ocean. They say they intend to go farther in the future.

About 50 Soviet vessels currently are exploring fishing prospects in the world's southern oceans, Tass reported last June.

Soviet Minister of Fisheries Aleksander A. Ishkov, who 30 years ago started as chief fishing executive in the Black, Azov, and Caspian Seas, has held his present job since 1946, despite the fact that the Soviet fish catch seldom met the target.

From 1,900,000 tons in 1950, the catch increased to 2,700,000 tons in 1959, but last year it suddenly rose to 3,700,000. Mr. Ishkov's vision, which led him to pioneer in a development of revolutionary implications, has paid off, and the target of the current 7-year plan for 1965—4,600,000 tons—seems in reach.

However, so far neither Soviet citizens nor Poles can buy the fish they need.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the problems of the fishing industry are not insoluble and many groups are working now to get the fisheries back on their feet. One is private industry. Private firms throughout the country have taken the lead in developing new fishery products in order to expand their markets. Local and State governments are also setting up programs to assist their fisheries before they disappear entirely.

My own State of Massachusetts has, I am glad to say, been among the States that have taken the lead in this field. The legislature just passed a broad new program to coordinate all marine work and provide research funds for the fisheries. Firms in my hometown of Gloucester have developed new fish products to compete for the consumer food dollar. An entire city, New Bedford, combined forces to get the scallop industry back on its feet.

I ask unanimous consent at this point to have printed in the RECORD additional articles from the Christian Science Monitor and the Boston Globe on these subjects.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 5, 1962]

NEW TRAWLER GRACES HARBOR

(By Richard Neff)

"If one man, living in a rundown area, paints his house, the neighbors may tend to follow suit. Eventually the whole block may be revived."

Thomas A. Fulham, chairman of Fulham Bros. Inc., a fish processing firm, at the Boston pier thinks this way about his new fishing boat.

It is the *M. V. Massachusetts*, a 124-foot, $485,000 steel trawler, presently being built by the Sturgeon Bay (Wis.) Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co. Launching will be about September 15.

Mr. Fulham hopes the new boat, which will reach Boston ready for service late this year, will be a ray of hope for other disgruntled and pessimistic boatowners at the Boston fish pier.

CONFIDENCE SHOWN

Under Mr. Fulham's leadership, the Boston Fishing Boat Co., Inc., was formed by 30 stockholders in the fishing business. Built with the help of a Federal subsidy and a loan from the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., the boat symbolizes the confidence of Mr. Fulham and his associates in the future of New England (or at least Boston) fisheries.

A close observer has called Mr. Fulham's effort "the white hope of the industry."

"Look at it this way," says the Boston executive. "The supply of fish, so far as we know, will remain constant. There are ways of maintaining that supply, through careful international regulation and so forth, but there is little known of an economical way to increase the supply of fish.

TREND SEEN

"But the population in the United States and all over the world is going up. The need for protein food will go up, at the same time available land for cattle will go down. Population trends tell us we will have to turn more to the sea for our food."

Already the Sturgeon Bay Co. has indicated that it will build a second new boat for the Boston fleet, and another group has indicated interest in building a third.

Mr. Fulham's confidence and persuasion have induced others at the fish pier to invest in a central washing station and $130,000 worth of Fiberglas fish boxes to replace wooden ones. "These are small efforts, but if you knew what the state of mind has been around here, you would know how significant these improvements are," Mr. Fulham stated.

Perhaps the most significant point of his work is that a fish processor is taking an interest and financial investment in the fishing itself. Rarely does a processor wish to involve himself with many problems of the boatowners, and this lack of joint interest is one reason for the plight of the industry.

PROCESS DEVELOPED

Paul M. Jacobs, executive vice president of Gorton's of Gloucester, Inc., asserts that commercial fisheries "comprise one of the great growth industries of the United States."

He points to statistics showing that per capita consumption of fish rose in the United States from 10.5 to 11 pounds. Some question whether these figures really mean much, but Mr. Jacobs remains confident.

One reason for this confidence is Gorton's recent introduction of its new "Fresh-Lock" process of freezing qualities of flavor, texture, color, and nutrition into the fish.

Under the new process, almost no liquid is lost during the thawing of the fish, and thus little of its "fresh" quality is drained away.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 8, 1962]

NEW BEDFORD'S NEW ERA—ROLE OF SCALLOPS

(By Richard Neff)

NEW BEDFORD, MASS.—About 10 years ago, commercial fishing in New Bedford, Mass., was declining like most of the industry elsewhere in New England.

At the same period, few Americans were eating sea scallops.

While these two facts seem to be unrelated, for New Bedford they pointed the way to prosperity for at least part of this city's fishing fleet.

American consumption of scallops has increased by leaps and bounds in the intervening years—due in large part to fishermen here shifting over to this sea crop.

At one point in the decline of the fifties John Linehan, presently director of the New Bedford Harbor Development Commission, came to the town from Maine to take over as secretary of the New Bedford Seafood Producers' Association. As much as any other individual, he is responsible for the expansion of the scallop industry and for New Bedford's unquestioned leadership of that industry.

LACK OF CONTACT

He first saw the lack of contact between the city and the port. Fishermen and port officials functioned apart from other city activities. Neither city nor port cared much about the other.

Mr. Linehan began a selling job—to fishermen on the value of public relations, and to the city on the importance of the port to community economic life. Contacts were made with such groups as the Taxpayers' Association and the Board of Commerce.

"I spoke to every group that would listen to me," he stated, smilingly. The seafood producers began participating in such activities as the Community Chest and the United Fund drive.

By 1953, there was greater community support for the fishing industry. In that year, Mr. Linehan and others (he is quick to credit all who participated) decided to see if the sea-scallop market could be expanded.

A test was made in Hartford, Conn., known in the food industry to be one of the hardest places in the United States to sell new types of food. A scallop promotional campaign there was successful, and the way was cleared for a national drive.

Boat owners and the fishermen through their union agreed to contribute 1 percent of their profits into advertising scallops. Careful, selective advertising was launched through a Manchester, Conn., advertising firm. Press luncheons in major cities, recipe contests, and information to food editors were some of the means of spreading the scallop story.

As a result, by 1961 New Bedford's scallop fleet was landing a record 20,600,000 pounds of scallops valued at $7,800,000—$1,100,000 above the 1960 figure.

San Pedro, Calif., was the leading American fishing port in 1961, with $36,200,000 worth of fish landed, but New Bedford was in second place with $14,800,000 worth of fish landed. (Boston was third with $9,500,000 and Gloucester, fifth, with $6 million.

Rising American demand for scallops has caused record imports, too, but the competition has spurred New Bedford leaders to more effort. They secured a $100,000 Federal grant for a New Bedford Institute of Technology study of the scallop and flounder industry and requested a vessel-cost study from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

HELP SOUGHT

State help is being sought for a freezing plant that will make the whole New Bedford industry more competitive.

Now, another bright new era may be opening for the port. Tuna fishing began this year off Long Island, and a representative of a tuna firm on the west coast, where most tuna has been caught heretofore, said, "These are the richest fishing grounds I've ever seen."

The tuna boats are using New Bedford as one of their home ports and Mr. Linehan and other leaders are pushing efforts to make it the major east coast tuna port, despite competition from Providence, R.I., where there is already a freezing plant.

Another hope for New Bedford is the "fish flour" industry to be covered in a later article.

All phases of the New Bedford "success story"—such as the abundant supply of scallops—may not apply to other New England fishing ports. But, observers agree, the imaginative leadership and cooperation of New Bedford are badly needed elsewhere if the fishing industry is to revive.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 17, 1962]

Massachusetts Aid to Fish Industry Sighted

(By Richard Neff)

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is on the verge of doing something on the State level to help at least part of the fishing industry.

Under legislation passed this year, the Department of Natural Resources is empowered to take significant new steps to regulate and promote fishing, both commercial and sport, in the territorial waters along the 2,000 miles of Massachusetts coastline. (The 2,000-mile figure includes bays, rivers, inlets, and so forth.)

Foreign vessels are not permitted to come within 3 miles of the coastline, and it is within these waters that great possibilities await the commercial fisheries," according to Charles H. W. Foster, commissioner of Natural Resources.

POLLUTION PROBLEM

Some 15 percent of total fish landings in the State in 1958 came from within territorial waters, but these waters are faced with growing contamination that make many areas useless for commercial fishing.

One out of every 4 miles of Massachusetts coastline is now in some degree of contamination, and about 90 percent of the coast from Boston to New Hampshire is polluted enough to harm fishing, Mr. Foster stated.

"The sea," he pointed out, "is one of the last unchartered frontiers in the field of natural resources. * * * We are realizing that the ocean can no longer be considered an unlimited disposal site for the products of civilization."

NEED FOR FARMING

The need, he stated, is to "farm" the territorial waters just as one would farm land. This would involve careful research into the conditions and resources of these waters, cooperative management in nurturing these resources and correcting bad conditions and, finally, careful harvesting of the crop.

The legislation passed this year stemmed largely from work done by the Massachusetts Advisory Commission on Marine Resources, formed in early 1960 by orders of the Governor and consisting of representatives of all groups using territorial waters.

PERMANENT BODY

After considerable study and public hearings, the group reported in late 1960 and in a supplementary report in late 1961 that the territorial waters were getting no conservation; the potential coastal shellfishery (bay scallops, oysters, clams) was badly underdeveloped; water was increasingly polluted; State fishing regulations were in many ways outdated, complicated, impractical, and unenforcible; law enforcement in the waters was poor; and no budget was available to solve these problems.

The new legislation establishes a permanent nine-member Marine Fisheries Advisory Commission, comprised of representatives of all salt water interests. The commission will provide continuing communication on problems of the coastal waters.

The law also grants to the Department of Natural Resources 1 percent of the State's annual gasoline-tax revenues (about the amount paid by boat owners—roughly $900,000 at present levels) for use in solving the problems of coastal waters.

Two-fifths of this fund will go to the new Marine Fisheries Fund for management, research, promotion, and law enforcement.

EFFORTS COMPARED

State efforts prior to this legislation amounted to licensing and the services of three marine biologists, Mr. Foster reported. Under the new program, he hopes to approach the effective State efforts made elsewhere, such as in Rhode Island, Maine, Maryland, and Virginia.

"Our coastal waters," he stated, "provide an appalling conservation situation. * * * For too long we have been inward-looking. Now it is necessary to look outward toward the sea."

[From the Boston Globe, Sept. 27, 1962]

Fishing Industry Doing Better—Gorton's of Gloucester Chalks Up Big Rise in Sales; New Process Solves Freezing Problem

(By Peter B. Greenough)

Gloucester.—Here's a fish story about one that didn't get away. A business, no less.

The Gloucester fishing industry—and the city may not yet be fully aware of it—is entering a genuine renaissance. Leading it into this era of productive waters is 200-year-old Gorton's of Gloucester, Inc.

A few years back, along with everyone else in the field, Gorton's could barely chin itself on the wharf, financially. Sales in 1954 dribbled along at $7,710,000. Net income was only $996 or a penny per share of stock.

As of the end of 1962, reckoned as of last March, Gorton's sales had almost quadrupled: $28,102,000. Income after taxes was over $438,000 or a record $3.32 per share. Book value had gone from $20.77 per to $34.93. From a state of no cash dividends, the firm paid out $101,705.

The holes in this fiscal net have been repaired by a triumvirate of young businessmen in their mid-forties. They are:

E. Robert Kinney, president; Paul M. Jacobs, executive vice president; and Harvey H. Bundy, Jr., vice president and treasurer.

Under their aegis Gorton's has become a real "growth" company in a field where it is hard to believe such a situation could exist.

For the past decade, consumption of fish had been a pretty static thing in this country. It averaged, per capita, only 10.4 pounds.

(Each of us in the Bay State average, by comparison, 15 gallons of beer yearly, or 120 pounds of suds.)

Suddenly, last year, fish consumption hopped up to 10.9 pounds per capita, a 5-percent gain.

How so?

Paul Jacobs spelled it out for me during a day-long visit. The reasons are fourfold.

1. Improved quality reaching consumers;
2. A greater variety of "convenience" seafoods;
3. Increased promotional activity by the industry and individual companies like Gorton's; and
4. Medical evidence that fish in the diet helps in cardiac involvements.

Why in the first place do people eat fish? They consume it, first of all, because "people genuinely like it," says Jacobs. "There's the romance of the sea, too."

Next, the public "wants variety in the diet." Religious dictates come third. And nutrition is the fourth major selling point, Jacobs adds.

While it hardly fits in the edible category (human, that is), another factor behind increasing sales of fish products is agricultural consumption of fishmeal and fish oil.

"The poultry industry," Jacobs says, "has found that fishmeal increases growth faster and also reproductive capacity." The ground here has barely been scratched, he feels.

Gorton's, however, is more interested in feeding people and has come up with what the company thinks is a major technical coup in processing its broad line of frozen fish products.

It is called Fresh-Lock.

For 40 years the fish industry has been plagued with a phenomenon involving freezing, termed "drip loss."

When you thaw a filet of frozen fish, it gives off essential juices which contain important elements of flavor, nutrition, and even appearance. Essentially, it is the difference between the freshlike gleam of newly caught fish and the dull, softish look of the frozen variety.

Gorton's technical director, Earl P. McFey, sought for 3 years a way to end this drip loss. He finally found it in a dip of phosphate chemicals (unable to harm fish because they contain so much phosphorus anyhow).

This newly patented process locks in the valuable proteins, keeps the fish flesh firm and moist and backs up Gorton's contention that its products are "fresher than fresh."

Admittedly, this is a contentious and even a paradoxical slogan. How can a frozen product be "fresher than fresh"?

Because, argues Jacobs, "there is no fresh fish unless you catch it yourself and cook it at once."

What passes as fresh fish in most markets has been kept on ice for days or else has been frozen and then thawed. Gorton's has often proved this by making bacteria counts of the so-called "fresh" fish found in average stalls. The Gorton's line tests far purer.

This Fresh-Lock dipping process is being used on all Gorton's products (save salmon, halibut, and swordfish, which have skins that prevent the application). Nevertheless, some "50 million packages of retail fish" per year will thus be handled, Jacobs says.

"McFey's miracle," as Jacobs calls the Fresh-Lock process, is only one of the many "firsts" that Gorton's has achieved lately—gains stemming from a management that has gotten rid of the defeatist attitude so common to much of the fish industry.

Still, they aren't satisfied at Gorton's. Bundy is not happy with the current 1.6 percent return on sales. "It ought to be closer to 3 percent," which is his current goal.

There are other problems germane to Gorton's and all of Gloucester's fishing. Of these, and what is being done to overcome them, more tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the main problem our fishing industry faces, however, is competition from foreign fisheries. These fisheries receive strong government support. They can afford equipment so superior to ours that they are able—as in the case of the new Japanese trawler—to operate thousands of miles from home and deliver a product to our ports that is often cheaper and better than our own.

In order to meet this competition, the Federal Government will have to do more for our fisheries. Congress should take the lead in proposing constructive new programs to aid the fishing industry.

The groundwork for these programs has already been laid by those Senators who I mentioned earlier. Bills are now before the Congress that could put the American fishing industry back on its feet.

A number of important steps were taken this year toward assisting our fisheries. Congress approved construction of two atomic food irradiators. These could revolutionize the marketing of fresh fish products in this country. The Senate has also approved funds for additional research on fish protein concentrate. This could be of great benefit not only to our fisheries but in this country's worldwide battle against hunger.

More must—and can be—done by this Congress to help the fishing industry. This help cannot come too soon. I hope steps will be taken early in the next session to get a program underway to put this country's oldest industry back where it belongs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the morning hour is ended.

EXTENSION OF CONTRACT MAIL ROUTES UP TO 100 MILES DURING CONTRACT TERM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2280)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 10936) to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, and I submit a report thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that earlier today, objection was made to reports by standing committees during the morning hour. The morning hour has now been closed; and reports of committees are not now in order, except by unanimous consent.

Is there objection?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit this report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

WE'VE GOT TO MOVE TO SAVE COTTON

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, all Senators know that cotton production is one of our principal agricultural industries. We also know that the production of cotton has been falling off in recent years, due to various causes, one of which is the type of legislation under which the industry has been operating.

In the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the leading voice for the cotton industry and the Senator who knows more, firsthand, about that industry is our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

I am happy to note in the October issue of the authoritative Farm Journal an article, written by Senator EASTLAND, entitled "We've Got To Move To Save Cotton." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'VE GOT TO MOVE TO SAVE COTTON

(By Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi)

It's high time that we made an important decision on cotton. It's as simple as this:

Are we going to relegate cotton to a minor crop status in this country? Or are we going to get competitive, expand markets and increase acreage?

Farmers, the cotton industry, and the Government must make this decision together—and soon. I believe that if we continue our present policies, cotton is on the way out.

Take a look at this sorry picture and see if you don't agree:

The use of cotton is on the skids. A year and a half ago, the Government raised cotton prices; synthetic manufacturers lowered theirs. Since then, the use of all fibers has increased the equivalent of 3 million bales of cotton.

But cotton consumption increased only 10 percent, back to the 9-million-bale level, while other fibers increased 34 percent—a growth equivalent of 2.1 million bales (6.3 up to 8.4 million).

Exports in the fiscal year just closed slipped back alarmingly—down 1.6 million bales or 25 percent, from the year before. Prospects for next year were not improved, and could be hurt, by the new sales-for-export program.

On August 1, cotton carryover stocks had climbed one-half million bales higher than the year before—following 5 years of success in whittling the surplus by more than 7 million bales.

Foreign cotton plantings—our competition—are now significantly higher for the first time since 1956.

And finally, cotton imports threaten to swamp our U.S. mills—the outlet for two-thirds of our cotton.

All the more frightening: this situation will get much worse—in short, untenable—if we don't act soon.

The trouble is easy to find. Remember where we were in 1955? I reviewed the situation in an article for Farm Journal in June of that year. For years we had failed to sense the absolute necessity for cotton prices to be competitive. We had followed a policy of high support prices and reduced acreage, thinking it the best thing for growers. But by 1955 we had suffered serious losses to competing products at home—and our export market was all but lost, dwindling down to only 2.2 million bales—a peacetime low in the last 86 years. Our carryover had increases to 14.5 million bales—an alltime high.

Despite the boom in population, overall use of our cotton had dropped to 11.4 million bales, the lowest since 1938, not counting the war years.

Then, in 1956, we started a vigorous cotton export program. And 2 years later we passed the Agricultural Act of 1958, with its "A" and "B" choices. Essentially what we did was move toward lower supports and more acres.

These two great developments reversed the course for cotton. It began to get competitive and won back customers as markets expanded substantially; the boom in synthetics was slowed; and foreign cotton output was stabilized.

But last year the Secretary of Agriculture pulled a reverse switch. He raised price supports, which hiked the price of cotton more than 3 cents at home. Further, he raised export subsidies 40 percent—2½ cents a pound—leaving the price of American cotton in world markets higher than before.

In one sense, the increase in price supports wasn't unpopular with most cotton farmers—although it brought relatively little increase in net income to choice "A" cotton growers. But now we've had a year and a half to test the results and look into the future.

It has put us back on the track that leads to tighter controls, smaller acreages and dwindling markets.

That's why I say we are now at the crossroads, at a point where we must decide to either liquidate the cotton industry as we know it—or fight to keep our cotton acreage.

How can we save cotton? Well, it won't be easy. But it can be done if we change directions.

Some have proposed, as a solution, an additional subsidy on our domestic consumption—something in the nature of compensatory payments to make up the difference between a higher support level and a lower market price. This is utterly fantastic. We can't expect the Government to assume additional cotton program expenses. The people who urge this simply do not understand the fiscal facts of life in Washington.

You can also take my word for it that we can't even continue the present program for long at its current cost. The American people are looking askance at the present subsidies for agriculture.

I am convinced that we're wasting our time reshuffling various Government price and production schemes for the real answer. It simply isn't to be found in another gadget or gimmick in a Government program.

The only way we can solve the problem is to reduce our domestic price in order to meet our competition and reduce our export costs. To live with this we'll have to reduce the cost of cotton. Not just the cost of growing cotton, but the cost of harvesting, ginning, handling and processing cotton. This is the very heart of our problem.

I am convinced that there are tremendous opportunities to reduce costs and losses. The nearly 50 kinds of bugs that do damage all across the Cotton Belt cause losses of $350 million a year; applying chemicals adds another $150 million. Disease costs $400 million a year.

Weeds cost farmers $20 an acre for hoe labor as an average. Better herbicides would have big possibilities for reducing this 4-cent-a-pound cost.

And there is great potential in reducing boll shed, increasing the uniformity of our stands and raising our picking efficiency.

Besides this, there is enough loose motion and antiquated practices between the gin and cotton yarn and fabric to make significant savings.

It's apparent that we can cut costs and losses by 6 or 7 cents a pound.

Where can we start? Well, we know that present research efforts on both weeds and diseases are woefully inadequate. We need more research on all phases of production and marketing—which can pay off big.

Along with this, we need a clear declaration by the cotton industry, by cotton growers, and by the Government that we intend to make cotton prices competitive. Lower price supports must be geared to cuts in production costs through research and other means to maintain and increase net income. This policy needs to be announced so that our competitors and our customers, both at home and abroad, understand it.

The rewards will be more acreage, relief from the cost-price squeeze, improved income, lower Government costs, and greater benefits from an expanding economy and a rising population.

NEED FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE MALLORY RULE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the U.S. court of appeals 5 to 4 decision in Killough against United States, will certainly revive the dormant movement for legislation clarifying the Mallory rule. Before this decision, it was assumed that the Mallory rule had been sufficiently broadened in practice so as to avoid the perils to reasonable law enforcement which were first anticipated. Any such assumptions have now been shattered by the incredible decision in the Killough case.

Killough killed his wife. Killough's first confession in this case was made before he was taken before a committing magistrate. That confession was excluded at the trial, by District Judge Youngdahl; and there is no denial that this was correct under the Mallory decision. Thereafter, however, the defendant was fully advised of his rights by a committing magistrate; and, in the words of Judge Youngdahl, the defendant made another voluntary confession "after adequate time for deliberate reflection." There is nothing in the record to indicate in any way any undue pressure of any kind upon him; and he made the second confession after he had been before the committing magistrate. Despite that finding, a majority of the court of appeals, in this close decision—which was reached by a 5 to 4 vote—excluded the second confession, and reversed Killough's conviction of manslaughter for strangling his wife.

All persons who respect the law reject the notion that unlawful means are justified by lawful ends. However, it is impossible for me to understand how the use in evidence of a voluntary confession made after a defendant has been fully warned of his rights can be fairly described as unlawful.

This decision has stretched to the breaking point the sanctions against delay in arraignment. It is certain to give renewed impetus to the efforts, initiated after the Mallory decision, to restore some balance to the handling of these cases in the District of Columbia.

I bow to no one in my concern for individual rights. This concern however is not limited to the rights of defendants in criminal trials. Sometimes it seems that only their rights are considered. However, the victims of crime deserve protection, also, against the brutal denials of life and liberty involved in every assault and murder. It is not necessary to deny anyone's individual rights, in order to maintain law and order. But neither is it proper to elevate rules of procedure and the convenience of defendants to a level which forbids the most reasonable efforts to punish crime.

There is danger in too little police power, as well as in too much police power. Decisions such as this one are a threat to the security of the community and to the life and liberty of its inhabitants. They are not required by any provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I hope the Government will pursue this case to the Supreme Court, if possible, in order to give the Supreme Court an opportunity to clarify the reach of the Mallory case decision, on which there has been some difference of opinion among the Court decisions. Unless some semblance of commonsense is restored by such judicial action, Congress will have no choice but to enact corrective legislation at the earliest opportunity.

KENYON B. ZAHNER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2161, House bill 10501.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 10501) for the relief of Kenyon B. Zahner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE NEAR DONNA, TEX.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2240, House bill 683.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 683) to authorize the Donna-Rio Bravo Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Donna, Tex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 2, line 9, after the word "Mexico", to insert "and"; after line 9, to insert:

> (4) the approval of the Commissioners Court of Hidalgo County, Texas;

On page 3, after line 7, to strike out:

> Sec. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 496), this Act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge referred to in the first section of this Act is commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of enactment of this Act.
>
> Sec. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

> Sec. 4. The Rio Grande Railway and Bridge System, of McAllen, Texas, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or bridges and approaches thereto, across the Rio Grande at or near Pharr, Texas, and for a period of sixty-six years from the date of completion of said bridge, to maintain and operate same and to collect tolls for the use thereof, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river in accordance with the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491–498, inclusive), subject to—
>
> (1) the conditions and limitations contained in this Act;
>
> (2) the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico;
>
> (3) the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico; and

(4) the approval of the Commissioners of Court of Hidalgo County, Texas;
with respect to the construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge.

On page 4, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. The Rio Grande Railway and Bridge System may fix and charge tolls for transit over the bridges referred to in section 4 of this Act in accordance with the laws of the State of Texas, and the laws of the United States, applicable to such tolls, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed under the authority contained in section 4 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 494).

After line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. The Rio Grande Railway and Bridge System may sell, assign, transfer, or mortgage the rights, powers and privileges conferred on such company by this Act to any public agency, or to an international bridge authority or commission, and any such agency, authority, or commission is authorized to exercise the rights, powers, and privileges acquired under this section (including acquisition by mortgage foreclosure) in the same manner as if such rights, powers, and privileges had been granted by this Act directly to such agency, authority, or commission.

On page 5, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 496), this Act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridges referred to in this Act are commenced within three years and completed within five years from the date of enactment of this Act.

After line 11, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of certain toll bridges across the Rio Grande."

GEORGE EDWARD LEONARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2235, House bill 12217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12217) for the relief of George Edward Leonard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, in order to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

John G. Green, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis.;

Mrs. Kathryn E. Granahan, of Pennsylvania, to be Treasurer of the United States; and

Michael Stramiello, Jr., of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably 294 nominations for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the Navy. These names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

The nominations are as follows:

William L. Adams, and sundry other officers, for temporary promotion in the U.S. Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the nominations begin with postmasters and that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be considered en bloc.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to these nominations?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in my fight to have the nomination of Mr. John G. Green, to be a collector of customs for Superior-Duluth considered in this session, I have introduced a resolution to discharge the committee. Mr. Green is eminently qualified. There is no objection whatsoever to Mr. Green, though his nomination has not yet been reported. I reserve the right to object to the pending nomination so that I may inquire about this status of the Green nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I wish to state that, at his request, on two occasions during the past week, I have consulted the chairman of the Finance Committee and other members of the committee about this particular nomination, as well as other nominations pending in that committee. I was treated with every courtesy by the chairman and members of the committee whom I consulted, but unfortunately, on the last two occasions when the committee met, a quorum was not present. As I understand, the Finance Committee operates under the rule that a quorum must be present. So far as my contacts with the committee disclose, there has been no tendency to delay consideration of the proposed nomination; it was merely a matter of not having a quorum present. I believe I have correctly stated what occurred.

It is my understanding the chairman of the committee is endeavoring to poll the members of the committee on these various nominations. I express the hope that, on that assurance, the Senator from Wisconsin will withdraw the resolution and not press the matter at this time, and trust to the good faith of the committee in this matter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the majority leader from the bottom of my heart. The action on his part has been very helpful.

I also thank the chairman of the Finance Committee. This is all I can ask for. If the committee should after being polled oppose the nomination, I would let the matter go. On the other hand, if the nomination is approved by the committee, it would go to the calendar so the Senate can act. This is all I ask.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the Senator withdrawn his resolution?

Mr. PROXMIRE. With that understanding, I withdraw my resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say, in all fairness, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], did indicate to me on one occasion that he would like to be notified if the nomination was placed on the calendar. That has been my only contact with him in that regard.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I want to be sure I understand. I am withdrawing my resolution with the understanding that the committee will be polled, and if a majority of the committee favor the nomination, the name of John G. Green will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations for postmasters?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin that the senior Senator from Wisconsin, as he knows, feels very deeply about this matter. For very important reasons, he has had to return to the State of Wisconsin. He has committed to my keeping and to my responsibility whatever action may be dictated by the circumstances or whatever action may come up in the form of a resolution to discharge the Finance Committee from further consideration of the nomination. I understand now the Finance Committee has been polled, and that it proposes to submit the nomination.

I have suggested that no action be taken, however, at this time on the theory that we shall probably be in session next week, which will doubtless give the senior Senator from Wisconsin the opportunity to return to Washington.

In the statement he left with me he does not take the position that the nominee is unqualified, nor does he take the position that the Senate Finance Committee cannot report the nomination if so desired.

He feels that, as long as the incumbent has only 5 months more to serve out his announced term, courtesy and consideration would dictate that that be done. He left with me a statement, which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD as the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that no action be pressed on the nomination at the moment. I am aware of the fact that we are in a position where it is difficult to tell whether we will be in session beyond tomorrow. I would certainly not want to prejudice the junior Senator from Wisconsin in that respect, but I would have to exercise whatever rights we have under the rules in order to effectuate the responsibility the senior Senator from Wisconsin has entrusted to me. I think the junior Senator from Wisconsin appreciates that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; I appreciate it very much.

Once again I want to say it is obvious that there is no objection to the nominee's qualifications. The senior Senator from Wisconsin has given a very interesting reason, through the Senator from Illinois, for opposing approval of the nomination. This is that the person who presently occupies the customs collector position has only 5 months to serve before his term expires. It seems to me it would be unusual, and a new precedent to establish that a collector of customs shall not serve at the pleasure of the President, but shall serve for however long he wishes, even though it may intervene with the wishes of the President in appointing a new nominee. However, we can discuss this question later.

I want to add, however, I would feel very strongly that I would have to press for the consideration of this nomination along with the other nominations from the Finance Committee. At the same time, those nominations may go over until Saturday. If they do, of course, I would defer my plea for consideration of the nomination of Mr. Green. However, if the other nominations are to be considered now, in view of the possibility that we may not have another executive session, it might foreclose the consideration of Mr. Green's nomination. Therefore, I trust the majority leader would not have any of the nominations from the Finance Committee considered by the Senate without considering the Green nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution is indefinitely postponed.

The Chair reminds Senators that the question before the Senate is the approval en bloc of postmaster nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Is there objection to the confirmation of the nominations? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in response to the observation by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, it is pointed out in the statement that in the case of a U.S. attorney and in the case of at least two marshals in the State of Wisconsin, there were overages after a change in administration. In one case I think it ran 2 years and 5 months. So it is not unusual for a person to serve beyond the change of an administration.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. This incumbent, appointed by President Eisenhower March 24, 1959, has served more than a year and three-quarters under President Kennedy. However, I think in the instances given by the distinguished Senator from Illinois the delay occurred because the President at the time, President Eisenhower, had not nominated successors. The reason why those men continued those terms of service, although a new administration had come into office, was that successors had not been nominated. Nominations were not before the Senate. It was not a question of objection by a Senator of the party opposite to that of the President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reutter the hope that the nomination will not be pressed as of now. I shall be entirely fair about it, and still try to protect the rights of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. I have discussed this with the majority leader. I think he fully understands my own present dilemma.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader is doing exactly what I would do if I were in his position. I think it is the only fair way to conduct business.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I understand perfectly the position of the minority leader. I think he is doing exactly what he has to do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, have the postmaster nominations been confirmed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roderick M. White to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy with the permanent grade of lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of persons to be appointed in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TARIFF CLASSIFICATION DESCRIPTION FOR LIGHTWEIGHT BICYCLES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1656, H.R. 8938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8938) to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8938) to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO TESTIFY AND PRODUCE DOMUMENTS AT DISBARMENT TRIAL OF METRO HOLOVACHKA

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 412), as follows:

Whereas the matter of the disbarment of Metro Holovachka, Cause No. 30257, is pending before the Supreme Court of Indiana; and

Whereas the office of the attorney general of Indiana has requested that Richard G. Sinclair and John T. Thiede, former staff members of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, appear as witnesses during the trial of the aforementioned case; and

Whereas the office of the attorney general of Indiana has requested certain documents of the said former Select Committee on Improper Activities to be used in connection with the aforementioned disbarment proceeding; and

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 255, section 5, 86th Congress, the files and records of the former Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, including those requested by the office of the attorney general of Indiana in connection with the aforementioned criminal proceeding; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate of the United States no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate or processes of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; and

Whereas by the privilege of the Senate and by rule XXX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no document shall be withdrawn from its files except by the order of the Senate; and

Whereas information secured by the staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees of the Senate may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Richard G. Sinclair and John T. Thiede, former staff members of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, be authorized to appear and testify at the aforementioned proceeding; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations is authorized to comply with the aforesaid requests and deliver the requested documents in the possession of the said committee to the office of the Attorney General of Indiana for use in the aforementioned proceedings; and be it further

Resolved, That during the periods of time that the Senate is in adjournment sine die, the chairman of the said subcommittee is authorized, in his discretion, to comply with such further requests as might be received from the parties in the above-mentioned litigation which might call for the testimony of former staff members of said Select Committee or for the production of further documents in the possession of the said subcommittee, so that the ends of justice shall be met thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask my colleague if this has been cleared with the minority.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask for its clearance. Others like it have been cleared with the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is presently pending before the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana the matter of the disbarment of Metro Holovachka, former prosecuting attorney of Lake County, Ind.

By letter of October 1, 1962, the office of the attorney general, State of Indiana, has advised me, as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, that it will be necessary for Richard G. Sinclair and John T. Thiede, former staff members of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, to testify at the trial of this matter and further that certain documents from the files of the select committee will be needed as evidence during the trial.

As Senators know, by Senate Resolution 255, section 5, 86th Congress, 2d session, the files of the former select committee have been placed in the custody of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

On behalf of the Committee on Government Operations I submit this resolution, the purpose of which, under existing Senate rules, is to permit Messrs. Sinclair and Thiede to testify at the aforementioned trial and to release to the attorney general of the State of Indiana those documents of the former select committee which will be necessary for the aforesaid proceedings.

I ask that this resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 412) was agreed to.

COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR II LOSSES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7283) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe that this is a good conference report and that the bill will be signed by the President.

I hold in my hand a letter from Edward D. Re, Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, in which he states that while he does not agree with every provision, on the whole he feels that the bill is a good bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT
COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1962.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: This is in response to your oral request for the views of the administration with respect to H.R. 7283 as reported by the conference committee and now pending before the Senate. The bill in this form has already passed the House.

While not entirely satisfactory in all respects, H.R. 7283 fully meets the major objectives of the war claims legislation sought by this administration as well as achieving certain desirable secondary purposes. The major result which this bill would accomplish would be to end the long delay in settling the war claims of thousands of individuals suffering property damages during World War II, particularly those sustaining losses as the result of German actions in Europe. This would provide for a settlement of the only remaining valid unsatisfied group of claims growing out of World War II. Any further delay in payment of these claims would be highly inequitable and unjust to the many claimants who have already waited more than 17 years for payment.

Accordingly, the administration strongly recommends prompt enactment of H.R. 7283 by the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the statement of the managers on the part of the House of the conference report, which makes clear the attitude of the Members of the House toward the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7283) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS

The following Senate amendments made technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming changes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 17, and 18. With respect to these amendments the House recedes in order to conform to other action by the conference, or the Senate recedes in order to conform to other action agreed on by the committee of conference.

LATE NATIONALS

Amendment No. 5 would have authorized payment of war claims to persons presently U.S. nationals, who were not such nationals at the time the loss occurred.

Amendment No. 8 would have authorized the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to determine the amount and validity of, and provided for the payment of claims of certain U.S. nationals who, while nationals of the United States or any government allied or associated with the United States during World War II, were detained as internees, or who, while serving in the armed forces of any government allied with or associated with the United States, were interned as prisoners of war during World War II, and who have since become U.S. nationals.

Amendment No. 9 would have authorized and directed the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to receive and determine the validity and amount of claims of refugees from certain Communist countries who suffered loss or destruction of, or physical damage to, property in such countries during the period beginning May 8, 1945, and ending January 1, 1952.

With respect to amendments Nos. 5, 8, and 9, the Senate recedes, with the understanding that in the event there remains a balance in the war claims fund after the payment in full of claims provided for under this bill, consideration would be given to legislation providing for payment to these categories of persons. The committee of conference recommends that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission should proceed to make an estimate of the amount of claims that would be involved in these amendments.

SMALL BUSINESS CLAIMANTS

Amendment No. 6 would provide for payment in full, after payments have been made in full for certain death and disability claims, to claimants certified by the Small Business Administration to have been small business concerns at the time of loss, damage, or destruction to its property. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

SALE OF GENERAL ANILINE & FILM CORP.

Amendment No. 13 contains the provisions of H.R. 3460, as passed by the House of Representatives on August 9, 1962. This amendment, which authorizes the sale, in time of war or national emergency, of any property or interest claimed in any suit filed under section 9(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, in substance, will provide for the sale of the General Aniline & Film Corp. The history of the problem dealt with in this amendment is set forth in full in House Report No. 2046, 87th Congress, accompanying H.R. 3460. In view of the sizable amounts involved in this sale, the managers on the part of the House expect that the Department of Justice will advise the Congress in advance of the arrangements made by the Department with respect to such sale.

CLAIMS OF SUCCESSOR ORGANIZATIONS

Amendment No. 14 provides for the settlement of claims of successor organizations for the return of vested heirless property. A House bill on this subject, H.R. 5028, was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 24, 1962.

DIVESTMENT OF ESTATES AND TRUSTS

Amendment No. 15 provides for the divestment of the Government's interest in vested estates, trusts, insurance policies, etc. All rights and interests in such property which have not become payable or deliverable to the Attorney General prior to December 31, 1961, would be divested.

DIVESTMENT OF COPYRIGHTS

Amendment No. 16 provides for the divestment of the Government's interest in certain copyrights. This subject was dealt with in H.R. 9045 which passed the House on August 13, 1962.

This amendment, as agreed to by the conferees, also provides for the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and report to the Congress concerning claims arising out of the vesting of certain shares of the General Dyestuff Corp. These shares were vested by the United States during World War II on the theory that their ownership by an American citizen was serving to cloak ownership by German nationals. Proceedings in the court must be instituted within 1 year after the date of enactment of this bill.

OREN HARRIS,
PETER F. MACK, JR.,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
MILTON W. GLENN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I did not have an opportunity yesterday to say a word about the conference report providing compensation for certain World War II losses, on which the Senate will vote at 1:30. I find great satisfaction in the conference report in many respects, except its denial of what I consider to be equal justice to those who had the great misfortune to be refugees from nazism and other tyrannies and at the time were not citizens of the United States, when their property was seized, because, of course, they could not anticipate what would happen.

It is very unwise for us to deny these unfortunate people a measure of justice by denying it to them on the ground that they were not U.S. citizens, when their property was seized. This was an international holocaust, Mr. President, and they were driven off their lands and despoiled of their property by the most brutal tyranny the world has ever known.

Nonetheless, that has been the decision of the conferees. I shall support the conferees, because in other respects it does do justice to people who have waited for many years to have their claims adjusted.

I shall introduce legislation to give these claimants at least a measure of justice, which the managers of the House state in the report they would be entitled to receive in the event there remains a balance in the war claims fund after the payment in full of claims provided for under the conference report.

I now pledge my good faith, if I am returned to the Senate next year, to continue my fight for these unfortunate people.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The hour of 1:30 having arrived, under the order of the Senate, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TARIFF CLASSIFICATION DESCRIPTION FOR LIGHTWEIGHT BICYCLES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8938) to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. What is the pending business?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Calendar No. 1656, a bill to provide a more definite tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles.

RACE DISCRIMINATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for a few moments I wish to speak in regard to a very serious local problem that confronts the District of Columbia, but a local matter that has great ramifications throughout the Nation and throughout the world, for the problem of the shocking race discrimination that exists in the District of Columbia is hurting America around the world. Unless we bring it to an end quickly, it will do great damage to the United States in international conference after international conference, including the pending session of the General Session of the United Nations.

After conducting an intensive investigation including a 2-day hearing on the status of equal housing opportunity in the Nation's Capital, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights last week issued its report of findings and recommendations.

The basic finding of this report is that "the Washington Metropolitan area is racially segregated in its housing pattern and that discrimination—by real estate brokers, builders, and mortgage finance institutions—is the principal cause of the segregated pattern." The Commission found evidence of "a concerted refusal by members of the housing and home financing industry to deal with minorities seeking to live in certain neighborhoods and communities in the Washington area."

In addition, the Commission found that the experience of nonwhite diplomats encountering housing discrimination is a matter of serious concern to the Department of State and "threatens to interfere with the effective conduct of foreign relations."

The key recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights call on the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to issue and effectively implement a regulation prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, religious or national origin in the sale, rental or financing of housing accommodations. In addition, the Commission recommended that the Board of Commissioners require the suspension or revocation of real estate broker and apartment house owner licenses issued under provisions of the District of Columbia code. These recommendations were unanimously adopted, enjoying the support of the Commission's southern members as well as those from the North.

Twenty-one prominent civic leaders in the District of Columbia have urged the issuance of an effective District of Columbia order to end housing bias. The Washington Post of Sunday, September 30, 1962, carried the letter to the editor signed by both Democrats and Republicans urging the issuance of a housing regulation which would successfully eliminate housing discrimination from the Nation's Capital.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR AN EFFECTIVE HOUSING LAW

At long last it appears that a fair housing practices regulation will soon be issued prohibiting discrimination in the District of Columbia. The report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has recommended such a regulation and Mr. Walter N. Tobriner, president, Board of Commissioners, has indicated that such an ordinance is forthcoming.

The issue is no longer whether an ordinance will be issued or even when, but whether it will an effective and enforcible ordinance.

After so many people in the District of Columbia have publicly indicated their strong support for a regulation prohibiting housing discrimination, it would indeed be a disappointment if the Commissioners issued a housing ordinance which is ineffective or inadequate. A regulation which fails to solve the problem of housing discrimination will only frustrate and discourage Negroes and other D.C. citizens and will result in an increase in racial tension, animosity, and hostility.

It therefore becomes imperative that the ordinance to be issued by the District Commissioners contain the essential and minimum ingredients for effective administration. Experience gained under the 15 State and local fair housing laws already enacted, shows that the indispensable elements of an effective housing law are comprehensive coverage of the housing market in the area and an administrative tribunal with power to investigate and conciliate complaints and to issue enforcible orders.

1. Comprehensive coverage: It is recommended that the District of Columbia housing ordinance prohibit discrimination by real estate brokers, lending institutions, builders and property owners in the sale and rental of all housing accommodations.

2. An administrative tribunal: Experience with civil rights statutes over the past 50 years has demonstrated beyond any doubt that statutes which rely solely on criminal prosecution for enforcement have been singularly ineffective in eliminating discriminatory practices. Criminal sanctions are necessary but they cannot alone do the job. Of the 15 State and local antibias statutes covering private housing, all but two incorporate the administrative tribunal method of enforcement.

It is therefore recommended that the housing ordinance place responsibility for enforcement with an expert and dedicated administrative tribunal having powers to:

(a) Initiate, receive, and investigate complaints of discrimination.

(b) Eliminate any unlawful practices found, by persuasion and conciliation.

(c) Conduct public hearings and issue orders enforcible by means of civil remedies in the courts.

(d) Take action which will result in the revocation or suspension of the licenses of real estate brokers and apartment house owners found violating the ordinance.

(e) Execute a general public education program.

The administrative investigation and informal conciliation conference spare both parties the costly, tedious and time consuming process of litigation and insure to both parties a full and fair hearing with a minimum of publicity and public embarrassment. Over 35 State and local antidiscrimination statutes in employment, housing, public accommodations and education have proven the success of this approach. The great majority of complaints are thus settled administratively, without need for litigation. It is hoped that the District Commissioners will profit from the experiences of others and not repeat the errors of the past.

If the District Commissioners adopt a regulation which embodies these essential ingredients then the Nation's Capital may look forward in the near future to the day when all American citizens and international visitors, regardless of their color, will enjoy the freedom to select their homes where their financial means will allow and their preferences dictate. Harmonious relationships between all groups in our community will then be built on the foundation of equality of housing opportunity, fully and effectively protected by law.

Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Walter Lewis, James Heller, Monroe Freedman, John Silard, David Isbell, Rev. E. Franklin Jackson, Oliver Palmer, Thurman Arnold, David Carliner, Arnold Sternberg, Robert E. McLaughlin, F. Joseph Donohue, Carl L. Shipley, W. John Kenney, Sterling Tucker, Mrs. Todd Duncan, The Very Rev. Francis B. Sayre, Jr., Duncan Howlett, Gerhard P. Van Arkel, Marvin Kaplan.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. MORSE. The legal basis for the promulgation of a regulation prohibiting discrimination with respect to housing accommodations within the District of Columbia is section 1–226 of the District of Columbia Code—1961. This statute authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia "to make and enforce all such reasonable and usual police regulations as they may deem necessary for the protection of lives, limbs, health, comfort and quiet of all persons and the protection of all property within the District of Columbia."

A recent opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court strongly supports this conclusion. In *District of Columbia* v. *John R. Thompson Co.*, 346 U.S. 100 (1953), the Supreme Court upheld the validity of laws prohibiting discrimination in restaurants in the District of Columbia; and specifically rejected the conclusion of the Court of Appeals that Congress cannot delegate to the District of Columbia power to enact civil rights legislation. While these particular laws had been enacted in 1872 and 1873 by the Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia, the Court found it necessary in deciding the case to rule that "these antidiscrimination laws governing restaurants in the District are police regulations" which could have been amended or repealed under the authority of section 1–226.

So far as police regulations are concerned, there is no difference between discrimination in restaurants and discrimination with respect to housing. The power to regulate both restaurants and housing has been delegated for the most part to the government of the District of Columbia, and in neither case has the Congress enacted legislation which might indicate that it has reserved to itself the power to legislate concerning discrimination. Finally, there can be no doubt that discrimination in housing has an adverse effect on the health and comfort of a large segment of the population of the District of Columbia.

There can be no doubt about the legality of the proposed housing regulation. It is supported by a distinguished Commission which includes the deans of three major law schools—Dean Erwin Griswold of the Harvard Law School, Dean Spottswood Robinson of Howard University Law School, and Dean Robert G. Storey of the Southwestern Legal Center, a former president of the American Bar Association. It is supported by eminent lawyers in the District of Columbia. And it has been reported that the Corporation Counsel's Office of the District is preparing a memorandum supporting the D.C. Commissioners' authority to issue a fair housing regulation.

In spite of the overwhelming evidence of housing discrimination, in spite of the strong community support for the issuance of an antibias housing regulation and in spite of the uncontroverted opinion of legal scholars that such an ordinance would be valid, a Subcommittee on Urgent District Problems of the District Committee of the House of Representatives has issued a resolution which "recommends and requests" that the District Commissioners issue or even consider this regulation until the full House District Committee has had an opportunity to hold hearings sometime in the future.

The Evening Star of October 3, 1962, reveals the not too subtle intent of this resolution. To quote the Evening Star:

> From a practical standpoint, the directive, which presumably will come from the full committee, will be a major factor in the Commissioners' action on antidiscrimination regulations. The District government's legislative proposals must clear through the House District Committee.

To the extent that Congress has spoken on this topic, it has supported the concept of equal housing opportunity. The Civil Rights Act of 1866 provides:

> All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white persons thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property.

In the Housing Act of 1949, Congress set for itself and the Nation the goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

Thus, this resolution does not represent the intent of Congress. It is the action of a small group, intended to thwart measures which would guarantee to all citizens of the District of Columbia freedom to live where they choose.

I have no doubt that if Congress as a whole were to vote, it would endorse a fair housing regulation for the District of Columbia. I have no doubt that if the citizens of the District were to vote in a referendum, they would support a fair housing regulation.

I urge the District Commissioners to decide this issue on its merits, disregarding any threats, implied or explicits, that they will suffer retaliation if they pass the ordinance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the

RECORD at this point in my remarks a section of the report of the Civil Rights Commission entitled "Civil Rights U.S.A. Housing in Washington, D.C." The excerpt starts on page 31 and runs through page 37.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM REPORT "CIVIL RIGHTS, U.S.A.—HOUSING IN WASHINGTON, D.C."

FINDINGS

General

1. Both in 1959 and in 1961, this Commission found that housing is "the one commodity in the American market that is not freely available on equal terms to everyone who can afford to pay." This is true of the Washington metropolitan area in 1962.

2. To a large extent, the Washington metropolitan area is racially segregated in its housing pattern. While several factors contribute to this pattern of segregation discrimination is the principal one.

3. The District of Columbia and the separate political entities that constitute its suburbs are, in fact, but a single urban community where housing problems are closely interrelated. Similarly, the problems of housing discrimination in the District and its suburbs, while differing in scope and intensity, are metropolitan in character and can be met fully only on a metropolitan basis.

4. Housing discrimination in the Washington metropolitan area is generally based solely on race or color. In addition there are some areas within the District of Columbia and surrounding communities where discrimination is directed against individuals on the basis of religion and national origin.

The District of Columbia

5. The percentage of Negroes in the population of the District of Columbia has increased greatly during the past two decades. Negroes now constitute a majority of the District's population.

6. An overall expansion of housing opportunities for Negroes has occurred in the District of Columbia but expansion has been accompanied by continuing segregation. The market in sales housing, particularly, has expanded for District of Columbia Negroes principally because of the pressure of the rapidly expanding District Negro population. Adequate rental housing in the District still is largely unavailable to Negroes except in low-rent public housing, for which long waiting lists already exist, and in a few new developments not capable of meeting the demand. Free housing choice does not exist generally in the District, and nonwhites are largely confined to the least desirable housing.

7. The lack of free housing choice for Negroes in the District of Columbia, accompanied by a rapidly expanding Negro population, have been prime contributors to rapid changes from all-white to all-Negro occupancy in many District neighborhoods.

8. Several private organizations are working in the District toward the objective of neighborhood stabilization on a desegregated basis. These private groups have had some success, but their task is difficult in the absence of any effective legal restriction on discrimination. Their efforts should be encouraged as one of the most promising means of dealing with the problems.

The suburbs

9. Washington's suburbs, unlike the District of Columbia, have experienced a substantial decrease in the percentage of Negro population. A factor significantly responsible for this percentage decrease has been the lack of suburban housing available to Negroes.

10. Negroes who still reside in the suburbs are generally confined to small enclaves surrounded by the expanding white majority. The housing they occupy, though a disproportionately small percentage of all units, constitutes a near majority of the dilapidated housing.

11. In some instances the result of local governmental action, such as zoning and eminent domain, has been the forcing of Negroes out of established areas. Generally, any new housing erected is not available to Negro families.

The housing industry

12. Experience in the Washington metropolitan area substantiates the conclusion of the Commission on Race and Housing: "It is the real estate brokers, builders, and mortgage financing institutions which translate prejudice into discriminatory action."

13. Most builders of new housing developments in the Washington area—particularly in the suburbs—have excluded Negroes.

14. The Federal Housing Administration, which has been a principal factor in the expanded supply of new housing in Metropolitan Washington, has taken no action to assure that builders afford equal access to new housing regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. Those policies designed to encourage open occupancy, which the Federal Housing Administration has instituted on a nationwide basis, have not been adequately implemented in the Washington area.

15. Restrictive covenants, although judicially unenforceable, are still used and recorded in the Washington area, and are often effective in barring members from the proscribed racial and religious groups from occupying homes of their choice and within their means.

16. In the District of Columbia, mortgage credit is generally available to Negroes, but largely only for homes in all-Negro or already "mixed" neighborhoods. In the suburbs, with few exceptions, mortgage financing for Negroes is unavailable.

17. White and Negro brokers in the Washington area belong to separate real estate brokers associations—the Board of Realtors for the former and the Real Estate Brokers Association for the latter. Although the association has some white members, the board of realtors maintains an all-white membership.

18. Many realtors refuse to deal with Negroes seeking to purchase homes in all-white neighborhoods or communities.

19. Some real estate brokers in the District use "blockbusting" techniques to induce panic-selling by white homeowners and resultant neighborhood instability.

20. Several studies of public receptivity to open occupancy housing in Washington cast doubt on the contention, made by elements of the housing industry, that the Washington metropolitan population demands segregated neighborhoods. Moreover, the few examples of desegregated housing in Washington have been successful ones.

21. There is evidence of a concerted refusal by members of the housing and home finance industry to deal with minorities seeking to live in certain neighborhoods and communities in the Washington area.

Foreign diplomats

22. Racially discriminatory practices in the District of Columbia, particularly with reference to rental housing, extend to nonwhite diplomats. The prevalence of such practices has become a matter of serious concern to the Department of State, and threatens to interfere with the effective conduct of foreign relations.

23. The problem with respect to nonwhite foreign diplomats cannot be met by securing adequate housing for them alone. It involves the treatment of all nonwhites in the Washington area—including those of American citizenship.

Local government and housing

24. The aims of urban renewal and other civic improvement programs in the District are being jeopardized by the failure to secure decent, safe, and sanitary housing for the displacees who are predominantly nonwhite.

25. In the one Washington suburban community where urban renewal is in operation, it is having the effect of forcing Negroes out.

26. While public housing in the District, limited by the scarcity of available land, is faced with a fast-increasing waiting list of families, there is considerable vacant land in Washington's suburbs that could be used for public and other low-income housing of eligible families both from the District and from the suburbs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Preface

It is a basic finding of this Commission that the problem of housing discrimination in Washington is metropolitan in scope. The response to this problem must also be of a metropolitan character. In its 1961 report this Commission recommended the issuance of a Presidential Executive order on equal housing opportunity, relating to governmental involvement in housing and home finance. Such an order on a nationwide basis is needed now as it was then. With respect to the Washington area its issuance is fundamental to a metropolitan solution. The Commission reaffirms its 1961 recommendation as an important adjunct to the recommendations that follow.

Recommendation 1: That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia issue and effectively implement an appropriate regulation prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale, rental, or financing of housing accommodations within the District of Columbia.

The Commission states this recommendation in general terms because it regards the precise scope or coverage of the regulation to be a matter appropriately left to the judgment of the Board of Commissioners. Whether, for example, religious or denominational institutions, charitable or educational organizations which are controlled or supervised by a religious organization, bona fide private or fraternal organizations, or single-family dwellings, should be covered or exempted are questions which the Board of Commissioners would undoubtedly consider in drafting regulations.

Concurring statement to recommendation 1 by Commissioner Rankin in which Vice Chairman Storey joins.—I voted for this recommendation on the record of our hearing and investigation which show that a number of builders, real estate brokers and lending institutions have placed racial restrictions on where people may live. Such practices limit the freedom of choice of U.S. citizens.

As the recommendation indicates, effective elimination of these practices is a matter which should be handled by State and local boards. However, it is my hope that the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, should it elect to follow the recommendation, will not make it applicable to sales and rentals by individual owners of the homes they occupy. To do so would be to trespass on individual property rights. There are many and varied personal reasons, tangible and intangible, which may lead a homeowner to choose to sell or not to sell his house to a particular applicant. The competence of any administrative agency to determine the legitimacy of these motives is subject to considerable doubt. In my view, equal opportunity can be expanded and prejudice combated by regulation which does not tread on this dangerous ground.

Recommendation 2: That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia require:

(a) The suspension or revocation of any license to act as a real estate broker or salesmen issued under the provisions of the District of Columbia Code, sections 45-1401 to 45-1418 (1961);[1] and

(b) The suspension or revocation of any license to provide housing accommodations issued under the provision of the District of Columbia Code, section 47-2328 (1961);

for participating or engaging in any act prohibited by such regulation as may be promulgated in accordance with recommendation 1.[2]

Recommendation 3: That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia issue a regulation declaring racial and religious restrictions contained in instruments affecting the title to real property to be void and of no effect.

Recommendation 4: That the National Capital Regional Planning Council, to meet its planning responsibilities, establish a standing committee on minority housing problems to assure that the rights of members of minority groups are protected in regional plans and to work for equal access to housing for all.

Recommendation 5: That the Congress of the United States authorize the establishment of a central relocation service for the District of Columbia to serve all persons forced out of their dwellings because of highway or school construction, urban renewal, or any other governmental action. This service should include aiding displacees to find decent, safe and sanitary housing, and providing for financial aid to displaced families in order to facilitate their movement to new homes.

Recommendation 6: That the President request the Department of Justice to undertake an investigation to determine whether any acts of members of the housing and home finance industry in the Washington Metropolitan area constitute a violation of the antitrust laws of the United States; and if so, that the Department institute appropriate proceedings against such members.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum from the office of General Counsel, dealing with proposed recommendations with respect to the 1962 District of Columbia housing hearings.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1962.

To: Berl I. Bernhard, Staff Director.
From: Office of the General Counsel.
Subject: Proposed recommendations, 1962 District of Columbia housing hearings.

An opinion of counsel has been requested with respect to the legal soundness of the recommendations made by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on the basis of its 1962 hearings on housing in Washington, D.C.

It is the opinion of counsel that each recomendation is legally sound in that it is directed to an agency which is or should be concerned with the subject matter of the recommendation, and which has the legal authority to initiate and execute the recommended undertaking. This opinion is based on the following analysis.

I

"Recommendation 1: That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia issue and effectively implement an appropriate regulation prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale, rental, or financing of housing accommodations within the District of Columbia. The Commission states this recommendation in general terms because it regards the precise scope or coverage of the regulation to be a matter appropriately left to the judgment of the Board of Commissioners. Whether, for example, religious or denominational institutions, charitable or educational organizations which are controlled or supervised by a religious organization, bona fide private or fraternal organizations, or single-family dwellings, should be covered or exempted are questions which the Board of Commissioners would undoubtedly consider in drafting regulations."

The Constitution grants to Congress plenary authority to legislate from the District of Columbia, and this authority includes all the legislative powers which a State may exercise over its affairs. U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 17; *Berman* v. *Parker*, 348 U.S. 26, 31-2 (1954). In *District of Columbia* v. *John R. Thompson Co.*, 346 U.S. 100 (1953), the U.S. Supreme Court decided (a) that a law prohibiting racial discrimination in restaurants is within the police power of Congress over the District of Columbia, (b) that Congress can delegate to the District of Columbia, a municipal corporation, legislative powers as broad as the police power of Congress over it, and (c) that therefore Congress can delegate to the District of Columbia power to prohibit racial discrimination in restaurants. In the light of this decision and the fact that as of December 1961, 18 States, the Virgin Islands, and numerous cities have enacted fair housing laws,[1] several of which have been sustained in judicial decisions,[2] it seems clear that Congress could enact, or delegate to the District of Columbia authority to enact, a fair housing law.

In considering, therefore, whether the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the power to prohibit racial discrimination with respect to housing, the only question which remains is whether in fact Congress has delegated that power to them. A delegation of authority to the District Commissioners to prohibit discrimination in housing may be found in section 1-226 of the District of Columbia Code (1961):

"The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered to make and enforce all such reasonable and usual police regulations in addition to those already made under sections 1-224, 1-225, as they may deem necessary for the protection of lives, limbs, health, comfort and quiet of all persons and the protection of all property within the District of Columbia."

In Thompson the Supreme Court concluded that laws requiring equal service to those who eat in restaurants are "reasonable and usual police regulations" within the meaning of section 1-226 because they are "as local in character as laws regulating public health, schools, streets, and parks" (346 U.S. at 113), and because from the beginning Congress has delegated to the District of Columbia government power to regulate public eating and drinking establishments. This reasoning applies equally to laws prohibiting racial discrimination in housing.

The regulation of housing is certainly a matter which is as local in character as are any of those mentioned by the Supreme Court in Thompson. Congress, furthermore, has delegated to the District Commissioners the power to regulate housing to substantially the same extent that it has delegated to them the power to regulate restaurants. Among the powers relating to housing which have been delegated to the District Commissioners are the following: to require licenses for the operation of those buildings containing lodging quarters which in the judgment of the Commissioners require "inspection, supervision, or regulation by any municipal agency" (D.C. Code sec. 47-2328 (1961)), and to revoke any such license "when, in their judgment, such is deemed desirable in the interest of public decency or the protection of lives, limbs, health, comfort, and quiet of the citizens of the District of Columbia, or for any other reason they may deem sufficient" (D.C. Code sec. 47-2345(a) (1961)); to make and enforce such building regulations "as they may deem advisable" (D.C. Code sec. 1-228 (1961)); to make regulations governing plumbing, house drainage,

---

[1] Consideration might be given to prohibiting the following acts (subject, of course, to the limitations in coverage of such a regulation as may be promulgated in accordance with recommendation 1: (a) acceptance of any listings of housing accommodations for sale or rent with restrictions based upon race, color, religion, or national origin, (b) quotation of different prices for the same housing accommodations where the difference is based upon race, color, religion, or national origin, (c) refusal to show or offer any housing accommodations to any prospective purchaser or renter because of his race, color, religion, or national origin, or (d) solicitation of listings on any housing accommodations using as inducement for such listings any statement or representation concerning race, color, religion, or national origin.

[2] Enforcement of the proposed regulation might well be left to a multimember panel having the following authority: To initiate, receive, and investigate complaints; to attempt to eliminate violations by means of mediation and conciliation; to hold public hearings; and, upon a finding that a violation has occurred, to revoke the licenses referred to in the recommendation and to seek appropriate judicial remedies.

---

[1] See U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, "State Statutes, and Local Ordinances and Resolutions Prohibiting Discrimination in Housing and Urban Renewal Operations (1961)."

[2] The following decisions have held fair housing laws to be valid: *Burks* v. *Poppy Construction Co.*, 20 Cal. Rptr 609, 370 P. 2d 313 (1962); *Massachusetts Comm'n Against Discrimination* v. *Colangelo*, 182 N.E. 2d 595 (Mass. 1962); *Jones* v. *Haridor Realty Corp.*, 37 N.J. 384, 181 A. 2d 481 (1962); *Levitt & Sons, Inc.* v. *Division Against Discrimination*, 31 N.J. 514, 158 A. 2d 177 (1960), appeal dismissed 363 U.S. 418 (1960); *Martin* v. *City of New York*, 22 Misc. 2d 389, 201 N.Y. S. 2d 111 (Sup. Ct. 1960); and *New York State Comm'n* v. *Pelham Hall Apts.*, 10 Misc. 2d 334, 170 N.Y.S. 2d 750 (Sup Ct. 1958). In *Swanson* v. *Commission on Civil Rights*, No. 94802, Super. Ct. of New Haven County, Conn., July 11, 1961, 6 Race Rel. L. Rep. 841 (1961), the court stated that the fair housing law was clearly valid but held that it had not been violated. In *O'Meara* v. *Washington State Board Against Discrimination*, 58 Wash. 2d 793, 365 P. 2d 1 (1961, cert. den. 369 U.S. 839 (1962), the court held in a 5-4 decision that the Washington fair housing law was unconstitutionally discriminatory because it applied only to publicly assisted housing. In *Case* v. *Colorado Anti-Discrimination Comm'n*, Civil No. 39682, Dist. Ct. of El Paso County, Colo., June 2, 1961, 6 Race Rel. L. Rep. 835 (1961), the enforcement section of the Colorado Fair Housing Act was held unconstitutional on the grounds that it was too indefinite and uncertain and that it provided for an unlawful delegation of legislative authority to an administrative agency.

house sewers, and the use of electricity for light, heat and power purposes (D.C. Code secs. 1-725 and 1-719 (1961)); to determine the location, number, type and character of fire escapes and other safety devices to be installed in buildings containing lodging quarters (D.C. Code secs. 5-301 and 5-303 (1961)); and to supervise the licensing and regulation of real estate salesmen and brokers (D.C. Code sec. 45-1403 (1961). Congress also has delegated the power to make zoning regulations for the District of Columbia to a five-member zoning commission, three members of which are the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. D.C. Code sec. 5-412 (1961).

In addition to strong implication in Thompson that section 1-226 empowers the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enact a fair housing regulation, there are other factors which justify the same conclusion. That a fair housing regulation would be a "reasonable and usual" police regulation is amply attested to by the many fair housing statutes and ordinances which have been enacted elsewhere. See note 1, supra. It cannot be said that discrimination in housing, while in other respects a proper object of police regulation, is a matter which Congress has reserved to itself.[3] Congress has never acted with respect to housing discrimination within the District of Columbia[4] and in the case of other housing matters it has delegated to the municipal government extensive and pervasive powers of regulation.

A District of Columbia fair housing regulation, far from conflicting with congressional legislation or policy, would implement and further long-standing congressional policy. For almost 100 years Congress has required that "all citizens of the United States shall have the same right * * * as is enjoyed by the white citizens * * * to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property" (Rev. Stat. sec. 1978 (1875), 42 U.S.C. sec. 1982 (1958), derived from sec. 1 of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat. 27). This statute has been enforced in the District of Columbia. *Hurd* v. *Hodge,* 334 U.S. 24 (1948). As a further declaration of policy, also applicable in the District of Columbia, Congress declared in the Housing Act of 1949 that "the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require * * * the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" (63 Stat. 413, 42 U.S.C. 1441 (1958)). It can safely be said that the policy expressed in these enactments cannot be fulfilled completely without a fair housing law.

To summarize, on the basis of the Thompson decision and in the light of similar laws enacted by States and municipalities, a District of Columbia fair housing law would be a reasonable and usual police regulation and thus one which section 1-226 of the District of Columbia Code empowers the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate. Furthermore, such a housing regulation would be consistent with the high degree of control over housing which Congress has delegated to the municipal government and it would implement congressional declarations of policy.

II

"Recommendation 2: That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia require (a) the suspension or revocation of any license to act as a real estate broker or salesman issued under provisions of the District of Columbia Code, sections 45-1401 to 45-1418 (1961);[5] and (b) the suspension or revocation of any license to provide housing accommodations issued under the provisions of the District of Columbia Code, section 47-2328 (1961); for participating or engaging in any act prohibited by such regulation as may be promulgated in accordance with recommendation 1."[6]

This recommendation, which deals with enforcement of such a regulation as may be promulgated in accordance with recommendation 1, involves two issues: The power of the Board of Commissioners to suspend or revoke certain licenses for violation of such a regulation, and the administrative means through which the regulation may be enforced.

A. Licenses issued under the Real Estate Commission Act of 1937: The Real Estate Commission Act of 1937, as amended (D.C. Code secs. 45-1401 to 45-1418 (1961)), prohibits any person from acting as a real estate broker or salesman without a license (sec. 45-1401) and it created a Real Estate Commission (sec. 45-1403) with authority to grant, revoke, or suspend these licenses (secs. 45-1404, 45-1408). Section 1 of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952 for the District of Columbia transferred to the Board of Commissioners all the functions of the Real Estate Commission (66 Stat. 824, D.C. Code title 1 App. 81 (1961)). Thereafter the Board of Commissioners recreated the Real Estate Commission as a constituent agency of the Department of Occupations and Professions. D.C. Code title 1 App., Reorg. Order No. 59, part I (1961). As a result the District Commissioners possess all the powers originally granted to the Real Estate Commission, and the latter exists simply as an agency created by the District Commissioners to exercise these powers for them.

Under the Real Estate Commission Act of 1937 the District Commissioners now possess the following powers:

(a) To make and enforce "whatever reasonable regulations may be necessary to carry out the provisions" of the Real Estate Commission Act (D.C. Code sec. 45-1403 (1961));

(b) To deny a license to one who is not "trustworthy and competent to transact the business of a real estate broker or real estate salesman * * * in such a manner as to safeguard the interests of the public" (D.C. Code sec. 45-1404 (1961)); and

(c) To suspend or revoke the license of a licensee who has "demonstrated such unworthiness or incompetency * * * as to endanger the interests of the public." (D.C. Code sec. 45-1408 (1961).)

There can be little doubt that a violation by a licensee of a fair housing regulation promulgated by the District Commissioners would not be in "the interests of the public," and that the District Commissioners have authority to direct the Real Estate Commission to deny, suspend, or revoke a license for such a violation.

B. Licenses issued under section 47-2328 of the D.C. Code (1961): The License Act of 1902, as amended (D.C. Code secs. 47-2301 to 47-2350 (1961)), authorizes the District Commissioners to require a license for the housing business operated in any building which "in their judgment requires inspection, supervision or regulation by any municipal agency."[7] The Commissioners are also authorized to make regulations in furtherance of the License Act and to suspend or revoke a license "for any * * * reason they may deem sufficient" (D.C. Code sec. 47-2345(a) (1961)), including the "failure of the licensee to comply with the laws or regulations applicable to the licensed business" (D.C. Code sec. 47-2345(b) (1961)).

Under the authority granted them by the License Act the District Commissioners have adopted general licensing regulations applicable to all housing businesses covered by the act, and special licensing regulations relating to rooming and boarding houses, tenements, apartment houses, hotels, and convalescent nursing homes (D.C. Housing Regulations, chs. 3-8 (1956)).

The Commissioners have also delegated their authority to administer the License Act and the regulations promulgated under it to the Department of Licenses and Inspections (D.C. Code, title 1 App., Reorganization Order No. 55, pt. II (1961)).

Thus the District Commissioners have authority to revoke a license to operate a housing business for violation of a fair housing regulation, or to direct the Department of Licenses and Inspections to do so.

C. Enforcement of the proposed regulation: Under the present organization of the government of the District of Columbia the following agencies would administer and enforce the fair housing code outlined in recommendations 1 and 2: the Corporation Counsel would be responsible for bringing all criminal and civil actions to enforce the regulation (D.C. Code, secs. 1-301 and 23-101, and title 1 App., Reorganization Order No. 50, pt. I(a) (1961)); the Real Estate Commission would have authority to deny, suspend, or revoke the license of a real estate broker or salesman for violation of the regulation (see sec. II(A) supra); and the Department of Licenses and Inspections would have authority to deny, suspend, or revoke a license to operate a housing business for violation of the regulation. See section II (B) supra.

---

[3] This contention has been made with occasional success in relation to other regulations promulgated by the District of Columbia Commissioners. *Coughlin* v. *District of Columbia,* 25 App. D.C. 251 (App. D.C. 1905); *Coombe* v. *United States,* 3 F. 2d 714 (D.C. Cir. 1925) (dictum).

[4] Rev. Stat. sec. 1978 (1875), 42 U.S.C. sec. 1982 (1958), derived from sec. 1 of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14 Stat. 27, provides for equal rights with respect to the ownership and transfer of property and has been held to prohibit judicial enforcement of racial restrictive covenants within the District of Columbia. *Hurd* v. *Hodge,* 334 U.S. 24 (1948). This portion of a national enactment, however, surely cannot be said to indicate a congressional intent to save for itself the matter of housing discrimination in the District of Columbia.

[5] Consideration might be given to prohibiting the following acts (subject, of course, to the limitations in coverage of such a regulation as may be promulgated in accordance with recommendation 1): (a) Acceptance of any listings of housing accommodations for sale or rent with restrictions based upon race, color, religion, or national origin, (b) quotation of different prices for the same housing accommodations where the difference is based upon race, color, religion, or national origin, (c) refusal to show or offer any housing accommodations to any prospective purchaser or renter because of his race, color, religion, or national origin, or (d) solicitation of listings on any housing accommodations using as inducement for such listings any statement or representation concerning race, color, religion, or national origin.

[6] Enforcement of the proposed regulation might well be left to a multimember panel having the following authority: To initiate, receive, and investigate complaints; to attempt to eliminate violations by means of mediation and conciliation; to hold public hearings; and, upon finding that a violation has occurred, to revoke the licenses referred to in the recommendation and to seek appropriate judicial remedies.

[7] D.C. Code sec. 47-2328 (1961). Excepted from these licensing provisions are single- and two-family dwellings, and rooming houses offering accommodations for no more than four roomers.

In recommendation 2 the Civil Rights Commission has suggested that enforcement of a fair housing regulation might well be left to a multimember panel having authority to initiate, receive, and investigate complaints, to attempt to eliminate violations by means of mediation and conciliation, to hold public hearings, and, upon finding that a violation has occurred, to take appropriate administrative action and seek appropriate judicial remedies.

The Board of Commissioners is authorized to create such a multimember panel by section 4(a) of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952:

"There are hereby established in the government of the District of Columbia so many agencies and offices, and with such names or titles, as the Board of Commissioners shall from time to time determine. The said offices shall be filled by appointment by, or under the authority of, the Board of Commissioners" (66 Stat. 824, D.C. Code tit. 1 App. 81 (1961)).

In the "investigation or examination of any municipal matter" the District Commissioners have the power to subpena witnesses and documents and to administer oaths to witnesses summoned (D.C. Code sec. 1–237 (1961)). They can delegate these functions, as well as those created by the Real Estate Commission Act of 1937 and the License Act of 1902, to any "officer, employee, or agency of the government of the District of Columbia."[8] Thus there is no doubt that the District Commissioners have the power to create a multimember panel with the administrative powers suggested in recommendation 2.

Finally, through their power to direct the Corporation Counsel the District Commissioners have equally clear authority to require him to seek such judicial remedies as a fair housing panel might recommend on the basis of its investigations and findings (D.C. Code sec. 1–301 (1961); President's Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, sec. 1, 66 Stat. 824, D.C. Code title 1, app. 81 (1961)). One form of judicial remedy which the Corporation Counsel might seek is imposition of the fine or imprisonment penalty which the Commissioners are authorized to prescribe by section 1–224a of the District of Columbia Code (1961).

Another remedy which the Corporation Counsel might seek is an injunction against threatened or continued violations of the fair housing regulation. See, generally, 6 McQuillin, "Municipal Corporations" sec. 20.33 (3d ed. 1949); 17 id. sec. 49.58 (3d ed. 1950); Note: "Injunctive Relief Under State Civil Rights Acts," 24 U. Chi. L. Rev. 174 (1956). While no statute explicitly authorizes the use of injunctions to enforce police regulations promulgated under section 1–226, that section itself authorizes and empowers the District Commissioners to make and enforce police regulations. It has been held that a power to enforce a statute or ordinance includes a power to enjoin a violation of it even though other remedies have been provided. *City of Stockton* v. *Frisbie & Latta*, 93 Cal. App. 277, 270 Pac. 270 (Dist. Ct. App. 1928) (violation of zoning ordinance); *Kentucky State Bd. of Dental Examiners* v. *Payne*, 213 Ky. 382, 281 S.W. 188 (1926) (practice of dentistry without license). In view of this express grant of power to the District Commissioners, it is clear that the ruling of the court in *Tynes* v. *Gogos*, 144 A. 2d 412 (D.C. Mun. App. 1958), is not applicable to the present issue. If the District of Columbia has authority to enforce its police regulations by means of injunction, it can do so without having to establish the customary requisites for equitable relief such as irreparable injury or inadequacy of the remedy at law. See 57 Yale L.J. 1023, 1026–34 (1948).

Even if the District of Columbia does not have this express authority there is a substantial body of authority which supports the proposition that a public body can enjoin the violation of a regulatory measure such as the recommended fair housing regulation, even though the legislature has made express provision for other means of enforcement. The justification for this result is not the prevention of a crime, but the prevention of conduct which would endanger the public welfare or constitute a public nuisance and for which there is no adequate legal remedy.

In *City of Aurora* v. *Warner Bros. Pictures Distrib. Corp.*, 16 Ill. App. 2d 273, 147 N.E. 2d 694 (1958), the court upheld the issuance of a temporary injunction prohibiting the exhibition of a moving picture which allegedly violated a municipal obscenity ordinance containing only criminal sanctions. The court said that courts of equity "have power to enjoin criminal or immoral acts even though the offenders are amenable to prosecution and no property rights are involved, in order to protect citizens from public wrongs and to protect the public health and welfare," 147 N.E. 2d at 699. Under similar circumstances courts have upheld injunctions against the violation of local zoning ordinances (e.g., *Boise City* v. *Better Homes, Inc.*, 72 Idaho 441, 243 P. 2d 303 (1952); *City of St Louis* v. *Friedman*, 358 Mo. 655, 216 S.W. 2d 475 (1948)), against the unlawful practice of a profession (e.g., *Jones* v. *Commonwealth*, 308 Ky. 233, 213 S.W. 2d 983 (1948)); *Gardner* v. *Conway*, 243 Minn. 148, 48 N.W. 2d 788 (1951)), against the sale of drugs without a license (*State* v. *Red Owl Stores, Inc.*, 253 Minn. 236, 92 N.W. 2d 103 (1958)), against the conduct of a usurious business (*State* v. *Hooker*, 87 N.W. 2d 337 (N.D. 1957)), and against the unlawful dredging of oysters (*Clark* v. *Todd*, 192 Md. 487, 64 A. 2d 547 (1949)). On similar grounds it has been held that an individual aggrieved by the violation of a civil rights statute is entitled to an injunction against future violations of the statute even though only penal or pecuniary sanctions have been provided. *Everett* v. *Harron*, 380 Pa. 123, 110 A. 2d 383 (1955); *Orloff* v. *Los Angeles Turf Club*, 30 Cal. 2d 110, 180 P. 2d 321 (1947). Contra, *Fletcher* v. *Coney Island, Inc.*, 165 Ohio St. 150, 134 N.E. 2d 371 (1956).

Although the municipal court lacks general equity powers, *Paton* v. *District of Columbia*, 180 A. 2d 844 (D.C. Mun. App. 1962), it nonetheless possesses sufficient equitable jurisdiction to dispense equitable remedies incidental to those matters within its subject matter jurisdiction. It would therefore follow that having exclusive subject matter jurisdiction to remedy violations of a fair housing regulation, it may enjoin violations where the grant of such incidental injunctions would result in dispensation of a complete remedy. See *Sheherazade, Inc.* v. *Mardikian*, 143 A. 2d 512 (D.C. Mun. App. 1958). If however equitable relief could not be granted by the municipal court, resort could be had to the district court, District of Columbia Code, sec. 11–306 (1961); cf. *Rowe* v. *Nolan Finance Co.*, 142 F. 2d 93 (D.C. Cir. 1944).

III

"Recommendation 3: That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia issue a regulation declaring racial and religious restrictions contained in instruments affecting the title to real property to be void and of no effect."

The Board of Commissioners can declare racial and religious restrictive covenants to be void by virtue of section 1–226 of the District of Columbia Code (1961), which empowers the Commissioners "to make and enforce all such reasonable and usual police regulations * * * as they may deem necessary for the protection of lives, limbs, health, comfort, and quiet of all persons and the protection of all property within the District of Columbia."

In the discussion of recommendation 1 it was pointed out that Congress can delegate to the government of the District of Columbia legislative powers as broad as the police power of Congress over the District of Columbia, that section 1–226 represents a delegation of authority to enact police regulations, and that the regulation of housing is a matter which Congress for the most part has left to the District Commissioners. That discussion need not be repeated. The following remarks build on it and indicate why a regulation declaring restrictive covenants to be void would also be a reasonable and usual police regulation for the protection of persons and property.

In *Hurd* v. *Hodge*, 334 U.S. 24 (1948), the U.S. Supreme Court held that the enforcement by District of Columbia courts of restrictive covenants is prohibited by a statute derived from the Civil Rights Act of 1866 (Rev. Stat., sec. 1978 (1875), 42 U.S.C., sec. 1982 (1958)) and by the public policy of the United States. In spite of the substantial impact of this decision on local conveyancing practices it left unresolved or unaffected several matters which have a significant effect on persons and property within the District of Columbia.

Hurd v. *Hodge*, for example, did not invalidate restrictive covenants as such or prevent voluntary enforcement of them. The continued use of these covenants by local builders and testimony before the U.S. Civil Rights Commission attest to the continuing efficacy of restrictive covenants in causing discrimination.[9] In addition to the coercive effect these covenants have on those who sign them and the discriminatory effect they have on members of groups named in them, restrictive covenants affect property values by casting a cloud on titles to properties which are subject to them. Thus the Municipal Court of Appeals has twice held that because of the possibility of future litigation a Negro purchaser was justified in refusing to perform a contract for the purchase of land subject to a restrictive covenant. *Savage* v. *Parks*, 100 A. 2d 450 (D.C. Munic. Ct. App. 1953); *Ralph D. Cohn, Inc.* v. *Trawick*, 60 A. 2d 926 (D.C. Munic. Ct. App. 1948). In other jurisdictions property owners have been forced to engage in expensive litigation to determine what devices fall within the rule of *Shelley* v. *Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1 (1948), that State courts cannot enforce racial restrictive covenants.[10] A well-drafted regulation could remove this uncertainty.

---

[8] President's Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, sec. 3(a), 66 Stat. 824, D.C. Code tit. 1 App. 81 (1961). Section 3(b)(1) of this reorganization plan prohibits the delegation of "any function vested in the said Board by act of Congress with respect to making and adopting regulations except those pertaining to the administration of or procedure before any agency of the Government of the District of Columbia."

[9] Hearings in Washington, D.C., before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Housing 59, 62–63, 68, 76–77, 84, 199, 454–455 (1962) (hereinafter cited D.C. Housing Hearings). In *Rice* v. *Sioux City Memorial Park Cemetery, Inc.*, 245 Iowa 147, 60 N.W. 2d 110 (1953), aff'd per curiam, 348 U.S. 880 (1954), vacated and cert. denied as improvidently granted, 349 U.S. 70 (1955), it was held that a cemetery was not liable in damages for refusing to inter a non-Caucasian under a contract containing a racial restriction.

[10] *Charlotte Park & Recreation Comm'n* v. *Barringer*, 242 N.C. 311, 88 S.E. 2d 114 (1955), cert. denied, 350 U.S. 983 (1956) (automatic termination of determinable fee not the result of judicial enforcement and thus not State action); *Capital Federal Savings & Loan Ass'n* v. *Smith*, 136 Colo. 265, 316 P. 2d 252 (1957) (racial restriction providing for forfeiture for breach held unenforceable and removed as cloud on title); *Robinson* v. *Mansfield*, No. 50232, Super, Ct. County of Pima, Ariz. (1956), 2 Race Rel. L. Rep. 445 (1957) (same).

A District of Columbia regulation such as that proposed by Recommendation 3 would not be novel legislation and it would contribute to eliminating the human and economic cost of restrictive covenants (see Cal. Civil Code secs. 53, 782; Minn. Stat. Ann. sec. 507.18 (Supp. 1961); N.Y. Sess. Laws 1962, ch. 646; V.I. Code Ann, title 10, sec. 3(f) (Supp. 1962)).

IV

"Recommendation 4: That the National Capital Regional Planning Council, to meet its planning responsibilities, establish a standing committee on minority housing problems to assure that the rights of members of minority groups are protected in regional plans and to work for equal access to housing for all."

The National Capital Regional Planning Council is composed of representatives of the planning agencies of the Washington metropolitan area, and it was established by Congress to adopt "a general plan for the development of the region, to serve as a general framework or guide of development within which each part of the region may be more precisely planned by the appropriate planning agency or agencies" (D.C. Code sec. 1-1003(d) (1961)).

It is clear that there is no legal impediment to the Council's taking the recommended action, and it is equally clear that land-use planning has an inevitable impact on the quality and quantity of housing available to minority groups (D.C. housing hearings 47, 84–5, 109, 466; 4 1961 "Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights: Housing" 88 (1961)).

V

"Recommendation 5: That the Congress of the United States authorize the establishment of a central relocation service for the District of Columbia to serve all persons forced out of their dwellings because of highway or school construction, urban renewal, or any other Governmental action. This service should include aiding displacees to find decent, safe and sanitary housing, and providing for financial aid to displaced families in order to facilitate their movement to new homes."

This recommended action is clearly within the constitutional power of Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia (U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 17).

VI

"Recommendation 6: That the President request the Department of Justice to undertake an investigation to determine whether any acts of members of the housing and home finance industry in the Washington metropolitan area constitute a violation of the antitrust laws of the United States; and if so, that the Department institute appropriate proceedings against such members."

This recommendation reflects a determination that on the basis of the testimony and evidence presented to it, the Commission has probable cause to believe that members of the housing and home finance industry in the Washington metropolitan area are violating the antitrust laws of the United States. The following evidence and authorities support this conclusion.

Section 3 of the Sherman Antitrust Act makes illegal "every contract, combination in form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce in * * * the District of Columbia" (26 Stat. 209 (1896), as amended, 15 U.S.C. sec. 3 (1958)). (See generally Marcus, "Civil Rights and the Antitrust Laws," 18 U. Chi. L. Rev. 171, 208–14 (1951).) One practice that may constitute a violation of this act is the use by the W. C. & A. N. Miller Development Co. of tying arrangements in the sale of homes on tracts which it has developed. Evidence presented to the Commission indicates that this company assembles and develops large tracts of land for home sites, and that in its conveyances of new homes in these tracts it requires the inclusion of the following covenants:

"Fourth. No lot of the property hereby conveyed shall be occupied, leased, rented, conveyed, or otherwise alienated, except conveyances by deeds of trust, nor shall the title or possession thereof pass to another without the written consent of the W. C. & A. N. Miller Development Co.

"Fourteenth. That, in order to facilitate operation of the covenant numbered 'Fourth,' above, the grantee covenants for ——— heirs and assigns, that in the event, at any time he or they shall desire to lease, rent, or sell to another the said property hereby conveyed to ———, he or they will appoint the said W. C. & A. N. Miller Development Co., agent for such purpose" (D.C. housing hearings 62; see also id. 203, 204, 477).

Thus one who purchases a Miller home is required to agree to purchase Miller brokerage services when he sells this home, and this requirement is imposed by a company which has exclusive control over the supply of homes in a particular development and significant control in a much larger area over the supply of new homes in particular price ranges. Since the real estate brokerage business is "trade" within the meaning of section 3 of the Sherman Act (*United States v. National Ass'n of Real Estate Bds*, 339 U.S. 485 (1950)), this practice may constitute an illegal restraint of trade (*Northern Pac. Ry. v. United States*, 356 U.S. 1 (1958)).

Second, there was testimony that the Washington Real Estate Board and its members act in concert to prevent Negroes from moving into all-white neighborhoods. It was alleged that the board and its members consider this action to be required under the local reading given to article 5 of the Code of Ethics of the National Association of Real Estate Boards:

"The Realtor shall not be instrumental in introducing into a neighborhood a character of property or use which will clearly be detrimental to property values in that neighborhood" (D.C. housing hearings 111; id. at 191–92, 215).

To the extent that members of the Washington Real Estate Board are prevented from participating in sales to Negroes of homes in certain neighborhoods there is a clear restraint on realtors willing to participate in these sales, on the supply of housing available to Negroes, and on the demand for homes in the affected neighborhoods. See comment, "Application of the Sherman Act to Housing Segregation," 63 Yale L.J. 1124, 1140–43 (1954).

Third, there was evidence of an agreement on the part of the members of the Mortgage Bankers Association of Metropolitan Washington not to lend money for the purchase of homes by members of minority groups in white neighborhoods. In the words of Mr. John C. Holzberg, who, as president of the association, submitted a statement in its behalf:

"Applications from minority groups are not generally considered in areas that are not recognized as being racially mixed, on the premise that such an investment would not be stable and attractive to institutional lenders. In addition to this, we, as businessmen in the community, will not be a party to any action which may create unrest in a neighborhood" (D.C. housing hearings 467).

This practice may violate the antitrust laws. See comment, "Application of the Sherman Act to Housing," supra at 1125–37.

Finally, it was alleged that the separate elements of the Washington housing industry—developers and builders as exemplified by the Miller Co., brokers belonging to the Washington Real Estate Board, lenders who adhere to the policy of the Mortgage Bankers Association, and title insurance companies—cooperate consciously in their effort to exclude Negroes from certain residential areas (D.C. housing hearings 59–60, 64–6, 195, 204–5). Indeed, the uniformity of this policy of discrimination alone would justify an investigation to determine whether it is the fruit of a conscious conspiracy.

There is no doubt that from a legal point of view the evidence presented to the Commission indicates a sufficient likelihood that the antitrust laws have been violated to warrant the recommended investigation.

Respectfully submitted,

CLARENCE CLYDE FERGUSON, Jr.,
General Counsel.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial, dealing with this subject, published in the Sunday Washington Post of October 3, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR FAIR HOUSING

An arrest warrant is not a very hopeful device for widening Negroes' housing opportunities. Social legislation changes old customs most effectively when it provides for mediation, conciliation, and a variety of civil remedies. When the District's fair housing law goes into effect, it will generate a great variety of cases. There will be obvious misunderstandings. There will be actions in which the defendants turn out to be little old ladies who are frightened by lawyers. There may be a few well-heeled operators who obdurately prepare to pay fines as a cost of doing business in their accustomed fashion. The District will have unlimited opportunity to demonstrate that the best way of converting a reluctant landlord into a bitter enemy of the law is to haul him directly into a criminal court.

Fair housing statutes are now in effect in nine States, as well as in the cities of New York, Toledo, and Pittsburgh. The District, as it drafts its own law, can hardly ignore the volume of experience gained in other cities. Berl I. Bernhard, the staff director of the Commission on Civil Rights, pointed out last week that the most successful statutes provide for administrative action, with criminal prosecution reserved as a last resort in cases of the most willful and persistent violation.

The District's law ought to establish a fair housing commission with a small staff of its own. The commission would require the power to investigate complaints, to attempt persuasion and, where it fails, to issue orders. If the defendant proceeds to violate the commission's order, at that point the case is turned over to the Corporation Counsel for court action. A group of lawyers headed by Joseph L. Rauh has submitted to the District Commissioners a commendable model law.

Since it is primarily the professional real estate brokers and managers who perpetuate the pattern of racial discrimination in housing here, it is particularly important that the District's new law follow the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission regarding their licenses. As a penalty for violation by men who can easily afford fines, the Commission suggests the revocation of their licenses to sell real estate or to provide housing accommodations.

A fair housing commission would serve the interest of all parties. Complainants could get a hearing without bearing the heavy burden of proof required for criminal conviction. Defendants would have an opportunity to answer without being plunged into expensive trials. And the city would achieve faster compliance with its policy, with less hardship to the many real estate men and landowners whose old habits must now be changed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article entitled "Curb by House Seen for District of Columbia Housing Order," published in the Washington Evening Star of October 3, 1962.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Curb by House Seen for District of Columbia Housing Order

(By Sam Eastman)

The District Commissioners will be told to shelve their plans for prompt adoption of racial housing bans for Washington under a congressional committee order being drafted today.

This order, it was learned, is being drawn up by a House District subcommittee headed by Representative Whitener, Democrat, of North Carolina.

The order will direct the Commissioners to mark time on adoption of housing antidiscrimination regulations until the full House District Committee has had an opportunity to hold hearings on the controversial matter.

An unanswered question is what the Commissioners' reaction will be to the legislative directive.

WHITE HOUSE SUPPORT

From a practical standpoint, the directive, which presumably will come from the full committee, will be a major factor in the Commissioners' action on antidiscrimination regulations. The District government's legislative proposals must clear through the House District Committee.

On the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, however, the White House is supporting moves to knock down racial housing bars in the Nation's Capital.

Before leaving on a European vacation about 6 weeks ago, Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner told the city's legal office to draft regulations designed to open the doors in all-white neighborhoods to Negro residents.

These regulations would be adopted under the Commissioner's police powers.

ANTICIPATED U.S. ACTION

The legal reasoning is that fencing in Negroes in substandard dwellings by racial discrimination hurts the entire city. In draft regulations, the supporting factors cited include crime, health, group tensions, and loss of city tax revenue.

Under the plan by Mr. Tobriner, president of the Board of Commissioners, the city would dovetail its antidiscrimination moves with anticipated Federal action in this area.

The order being drafted today by the House District subcommittee complicates what already is a complex and sensitive problem for the Commissioners.

Asked what the Commissioners would do if faced with such a congressional directive, Mr. Tobriner commented:

"I couldn't say without consulting the other Commissioners."

He said he had no knowledge of the order and was taking no action until he was informed of it officially.

DRAFT PRESENTED

Yesterday, six lawyers presented a proposed model antidiscrimination housing regulation for the District to Mr. Tobriner.

Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., who acted as spokesman for the group, said that he hoped that the Commissioners will act rather promptly on the measure.

Mr. Rauh said the draft was modeled on the 15-State and city antidiscrimination housing laws and ordinances now in effect.

The group of six lawyers met with Mr. Tobriner in closed session for about an hour.

Mr. Tobriner declined to make any comment later other than to say that he is still waiting for a corporation counsel's opinion on whether the Commissioners have the authority to issue such a housing order.

FINE OR JAIL ASKED

Under the proposed regulation submitted by the six attorneys, the present Commissioners' Council on Human Relations would be renamed the District of Columbia Commission on Human Relations and would be given power to enforce the measure.

The draft stresses administrative action, but also provides a $300 fine or 10-day jail sentence for violations.

The measure would prohibit racial and religious discrimination in the sale, rental, or financing of housing accommodations in the District.

The regulation would not apply to refusal to rent part of a single-family home or to refusal to rent a room in rooming houses where the owner resides and which have a capacity of less than 10 roomers. A church or religious institution would also be permitted to refuse to rent or lease property to a person of another faith.

The draft also makes provision for revoking the licenses of real estate brokers or salesmen who violate the measure.

The five lawyers in addition to Mr. Rauh who presented the draft regulation to Mr. Tobriner are Walter Lewis, James Heller, Monroe Freedman, John Silard, and David Isbell.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a resolution adopted by the Subcommittee on Urgent District Problems of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"Whereas the Subcommittee on Urgent District Problems has had referred to it the matter of alleged plans of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to adopt and issue regulations directly or indirectly limiting the rental, lease, or sale of private property in the District of Columbia; and

"Whereas information with reference to said proposed regulations came to the Committee on the District of Columbia entirely through nonofficial sources; and

"Whereas the said subcommittee on the 3d day of October 1962, made limited inquiry of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with reference to said subject matter, said limitation of the inquiry being a direct result of the time limitation imposed by urgent legislative business in the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas any authority vested in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate such proposed regulations is the result of the exercise of the power of Congress to delegate such authority; and

"Whereas serious question exists as to whether Congress has in fact and law delegated authority to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the extent indicated by officials of the District of Columbia in conference with this subcommittee; and

"Whereas the proposed regulations would constitute a new departure in the field of the rental, lease, and sale of private property in the District of Columbia, as well as in most other jurisdictions in the United States; and

"Whereas the subcommittee is of the considered opinion that no emergency exists which requires or warrants the immediate adoption of such broad and novel regulations in the field of real estate laws; and

"Whereas the adjournment of Congress is imminent and precludes full review by the Committee on the District of Columbia of such proposed regulations prior to adjournment: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Subcommittee on Urgent District Problems of the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives respectfully recommends and requests the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to suspend and defer any action leading to the adoption of such regulations pending full and complete hearings and consideration by the Committee on the District of Columbia in the 88th Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution, which has been unanimously adopted by this subcommittee, be delivered forthwith to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia."

I, Basil L. Whitener, chairman of the Subcommittee on Urgent District Problems of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution proposed by the Honorable Joel T. Broyhill, Member of Congress, seconded by the Honorable John Dowdy, Member of Congress and unanimously adopted by the subcommittee on this 3d day of October 1962.

Basil Whitener,
Chairman.

Mr. MORSE. In concluding my remarks, I wish to say that it is perfectly evident what this House group is trying to do. It is seeking to usurp power that it does not possess. There is no place in the District of Columbia for the importation of the racial bias which has characterized the Mississippi incident. The time has come in the Capital of the United States that policies be followed which represent the point of view of the overwhelming majority of the American people. Washington, D.C., does not belong to the segregationists of the South.

In my judgment, the moderates of the South are fast increasing in power and are beginning to recognize that the Constitution of the United States must be applied equally and uniformly to all our citizens, irrespective of the color of their skins.

The attempt on the part of this group of southern Representatives to seek to bring this kind of pressure upon the District Commissioners to prevent carrying out their very clear duty must be protested. That is why I take time this afternoon on the floor of the Senate to protest it.

I have a little advice to give to the President of the United States. In my judgment this situation also has its foreign policy effects, and involves the duty of the President to carry out the foreign policy of the United States in a manner that will redound to the benefit and glory of this country.

Just as the President had a duty to take a hand in the case of the shocking denial of constitutional rights in Mississippi, so the President of the United States has an obligation to take a hand in connection with the administration of the Government of the District of Columbia, and to see to it that Members of Congress who have formed this little voluntary committee of their own, and who seek to import into the District of Columbia an attitude held by some in the South, but which has no place in the District of Columbia, is brought to a stop.

The President of the United States, charged with the foreign policy of this country, has a clear obligation to all the people of this country to make very clear that he no longer will tolerate the kind of discrimination that exists in connection with the housing program in the District of Columbia.

The time has come to make clear to business interests of the District of Columbia, and to real estate operators in the District of Columbia who have large holdings of rental property in the District, that it is unconstitutional to seek to impose this kind of discrimination upon the colored people of the District of Columbia, in regard to where they can or cannot live.

They too are free Americans, and they too have the same constitutional rights as any white person of the South. It is about time that we protect the constitutional rights of the colored people in the District of Columbia.

Therefore, I say to my President:

"You, too, have a responsibility to see to it that the District Commissioners carry out what we all recognize is the national policy of this country, and that we stop getting ourselves into the embarrassing position that we were put into yesterday with regard to an African Embassy, when a real estate owner in this city, after having entered into a lease, broke the lease and denied to employees of the African Embassy the right to live in a certain apartment. Do you believe that that kind of incident is not going to be taken note of in the United Nations? Do you think that kind of disgraceful incident is not going to be taken note of in Africa and in every underdeveloped area of the world, where the skin of the people does not happen to be white? Do you think that that kind of shameful incident is not going to feed the grist mills of the Russian propaganda machine around the world?"

We do not have time to wait any longer for the fulfillment of the enforcement of the constitutional rights due the colored people of America. We have waited 90 long years for people to adjust to the principle of equality of rights under the Constitution of the United States. Ninety years is long enough.

The time has come for this Government by law to maintain the legal rights of the colored people in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in this Nation of ours. Therefore, I say Americans will be looking to see what the District Commissioners do about this shameful situation involving discrimination in regard to housing in the District of Columbia, and they will be waiting to see what the President of the United States does about it too.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk which I will call up when the supplemental appropriation bill is considered by the Senate. It is H.R. 13290. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

THE MILITARY SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, 2 days ago we were thrilled by the remarkable feat of our newest astronaut, Mr. Walter Schirra. I congratulate him on the wonderful feat he accomplished. I also congratulate the thousands of persons who were behind the scenes in this remarkable feat of achievement in our drive forward in the so-called space race.

Mr. President, on August 20 of this year I delivered an address to this body detailing what I thought were the steps that should be taken in regard to our military space program. I have been very gratified by the response that my remarks invoked from a number of the leading citizens and thinkers in the United States today. Without exception, individuals writing to me expressed the hope and desire that our Government would get on with the job of building a military space force before it is too late.

Since my address of August 20, I have become more firmly convinced than ever that positive steps must be taken to insure the adequacy of our military capability in space.

I would like to insert here that I have no quarrel with the space programs as outlined by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I believe that our NASA programs are sound, and we must have the scientific and technical information which will be made available in the next few years by the implementation of these space projects. We must have an orderly, scientific exploration of space. I want to emphasize this fact for I did receive some slight criticisms from a congressional source that I was critical of the NASA programs; this is most certainly far from the truth. My position on the civilian exploration of space was made very clear in the address of August 20. Those who generated the criticism either did not read my speech or, at least, they did not read it in a careful manner.

The same congressional source raised the question as to what Sir Bernard Lovell, Jodrell Bank Observatory, England, one of the world's leading space scientists, thought about the Western world's building a space military force. On August 23, 1962, by cable, Sir Bernard Lovell was asked the following question:

> Would you comment by return cable on possibility that Soviets might use space advantage to block free world's planned scientific space programs or demand that they be conducted on Soviet terms? For protection of Western space programs and also for strategic reasons should not Western military capabilities be extended into space quickly?

On August 24, 1962, Sir Bernard replied as follows:

> As a first priority I think it is urgent for a major political effort to be made to stop the militarization of outer space. If this fails then the balance of military strength between East and West will deteriorate in favor of Russia, unless there is a greater appreciation of the high military potential of space in the Western world. If the effort to stop the militarization of space fails, then the outlook for refined astronomical observations from earth is grave in any case.

I know there was meticulous care in establishing the present so-called balanced space program through law back in 1958. At that time it appeared possible through a vigorous space exploration endeavor conducted solely in the interests of science exploration for the betterment of all mankind, that the most advanced and powerful nation on earth, the United States, could take the first major step toward complete disarmament by restricting the extension of the arms race into outer space. Therefore, in recognition of a national desire for peace, our national policy for the peaceful uses of outer space was established and duly announced to the world. This was done to impress upon both the "have" and "have-not" nations the example of our peaceful space endeavor and the good faith of our intentions. However, this thinking belongs with the thinking that prevailed back in 1958—prior to the brute force and the technical competence displayed by Vostoks I, II, III, and IV, and the accompanying bellicose threats voiced by the Soviet Communist hierarchy.

Mr. President, it sounds wonderful to say we have a broad program of basic building blocks to develop the technology to meet many possible contingencies as a way to provide necessary insurance against military surprise in space. This, I must say, sounds logical on the surface. However, if the Soviets choose to militate against the United States in space, by what magic formula do we eliminate the current five to seven years leadtime needed to make decisions, to forge research into technology, and then technology into an operational weapon system to comprise the so-called forces in being that will be needed for our defense. It is well to remind ourselves that the space effort of the Soviet Union is being conducted by the military forces with civilian scientific participation.

Regarding our military space effort I am reminded of those remarks that have been attributed to Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, and since denied by historians, that the secret of success in battle was "to get there first with the most men." General Forrest was recognizing sound principles of strategy that have been successful for more than 2,500 years. Certainly, we ignore those lessons at our peril. It has been pointed out by numerous writers on the subject that the desired way to apply these principles in the modern age is by strategic anticipation and development. In other words, Mr. President, it comes to my mind that if the United States is not first with the most capability, whether it be on the land, the sea, or in space, we are very likely to be there too late with too little.

The Soviets in their insidious methods of warfare and intimidation of whole populations have been, in some instances, too late with too little. I have only to mention Malaya, Greece, Korea, the Philippine Islands, the Congo, and, yes, the whole of the Middle East, but we must not forget that the Soviets learn by experience. We have only to witness the gigantic military buildup in Cuba, their determined efforts in southeast Asia, and the Communist subversive activities throughout the whole of the world. We cannot expect the Soviets to pass up the advantage of having a military space force if it will enable the masters of the Kremlin to control the world. The announced purpose of communism is world conquest. Teddy Roosevelt once said:

> Speak softly and carry a big stick.

I say, "The Russians are speaking loudly while they are trying to get a bigger stick"; that bigger stick may be space superiority.

Mr. President, I ask Senators this question: Do they honestly believe that the Soviets, whether with or without a treaty or an international agreement, would keep their word not to develop military spacecraft or to use space for warlike purposes? And it should be pointed out that they have not even made such a declaration. Most certainly, if we take the pragmatic approach to this question, we know that the Soviet word is generally not worth the paper upon which it is written.

The Soviets respect only one thing, and that is a powerful military deterrent. In the past 15 years, we have maneuvered our strategic advantage to counter the Soviets in almost any type of weaponry in which they have engaged; but each time they have come closer to winning the contest or gaining a strategic advantage. Certainly, if we believe the reports coming out of the Soviet Union by newspapers and intelligence sources, the race for missile dominance has been marked by an uncomfortably close margin.

I submit that it is a well-known fact that the Soviets lead us in the field of booster thrust for both missile and space development and have evidenced great technical capability in other areas of space science. The great danger to our security will come from the Soviet's effort to exploit this situation. An even greater danger can come from our Government's unwillingness to accept and to recognize this fact. Also, grave danger can come through resigning ourselves to negotiating with the Soviets on the peaceful uses of outer space, without being absolutely certain that they are not in the interim making preparations to use outer space for military purposes. I am most certain we can now proceed on the assumption that they are preparing military hardware for operation in outer space.

Now let us draw a parallel. What use did the Soviets make of the 3-year moratorium on nuclear testing? The answer is so obvious that I will not take the time of the Senate to discuss it.

We should never become so preoccupied that we overlook this one important fact. We must have forces that can operate in the complete aerospace. This includes the area from the earth's surface all the way up to and including outer space. My contention is, Mr. President, that it will take modern versions of missiles and manned aircraft; and it will take manned and unmanned spacecraft. Strategically, it will be of little benefit for the United States to control a good part of the earth's surface and of the atmosphere if a hostile power controls space.

Dr. Edward G. Welsh, Executive Secretary, National Aeronautics and Space Council, has said:

> A significant thing about the space gap is that it has military potential, as did the missile gap. Moreover, it is having some of the same effect on the United States as did the missile gap; namely, it is stimulating us to move faster.

On the question of Soviet military space potential, Dr. Welsh mentioned further pertinent guidelines:

> (1) Never underestimate your opposition; (2) never forget the Soviets' objectives of world domination; (3) do not minimize the military value of placing heavy objects in orbit and keeping men as well as devices in orbit for long periods; and (4) do not overlook the blackmail possibilities of weapons in space.
>
> The obvious conclusion is: A satellite does not have to contain a weapon to possess military significance. The Soviet feats have indicated a space competence which has a direct bearing upon what is necessary to defend our country and to protect our own rights in space and on earth.

Our civilian space program costs stand at over $3.5 billion for the coming year. In 1964, it promises to go to $5 billion, and for the following years even greater expenditures are forecast. With national priority and apparently no restrictions on funds, our burgeoning civilian space programs have constantly and continuously been expanded to encompass just about every conceivable project, cutting across the whole spectrum of scientific exploration.

Man-to-the-moon is the word of today. The message is unequivocally loud and clear. However, what is not clear is how do we, in respect to the words of our Chief Executive, enforce the vow to see that the moon and planets beyond are not governed by a hostile flag of conquest but by a banner of freedom and peace? And, I ask: After the moon, what then?

The objective of my six-point military space program was purposely designed toward maintaining the peace, as the Record of August 20 will clearly show.

I agree with Secretary Zuckert when he said:

> Space suggests new solutions to pressing military problems, while at the same time introducing new problems. Space-based systems may enable us to destroy ballistic missile retaliatory capability, but it would also be able to restrict our access to space.
>
> We share the hope that the space medium will not be used for aggressive purposes, but we recognize the military possibilities in space. We must, therefore, prepare ourselves to defend against any eventuality. Just as our present-day deterrent force is kept strong to maintain the peace, our space systems will be developed to add to our ability to defend ourselves and the free world and, thereby, contribute to peace.

Mr. President, I ask once again for a clarification of our national space policy in a manner that will unquestionably secure the support of the American public throughout the difficult years ahead and would serve notice to those who would bury us that the President's word stating, "We will not go unprotected against the hostile misuse of space anymore than we would go unprotected against the hostile use of land or sea," embraces the wholehearted support of every American across the width and breadth of the United States.

Mr. President, in closing, I should like to sum up by reading a number of quotes.

> Control of space will be decided in the next decade. If the Soviets control space they can control earth. We cannot run second in this vital race.
>
> * * * space science like nuclear science and all technology has no conscience of its own. Whether it will become a force for good or evil depends on man, and only if the United States occupies a position of preeminence can we help decide whether this new ocean will be a sea of peace or a new terrifying theater of war.
>
> I think that space has too many implications militarily, politically, psychologically and all the rest. No one can tell me that the United States cannot afford to do what the Soviet Union has done so successfully with a national income of less than half of ours.

Mr. President, the foregoing are quotations from the public speeches of the President of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGee in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NEED FOR TAX REFORMS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning there appears in the New York Times an article entitled "Tax Cut Expected, but Not Reforms."

Mr. President, the point stressed by the article is that it is expected that next year Congress will begin to give consideration to a tax reform sugar coated with a tax cut, but that Congress will wind up eating the sugar—that is cutting taxes but letting the tax cuts which are so badly needed go down the drain.

I quote from the article:

> The Treasury Department has reported that in 1959 gain or loss from the sale of capital assets was reported on nearly 5 million of the 60 million individual income tax returns. This suggests that substantial changes would meet stiff opposition.
>
> Proposals to limit the depletion allowance on minerals or to reduce the standard 10 percent deduction for individual taxpayers, for example, would meet greater resistance.

I earnestly hope the administration will make a strong fight for tax reform next year at the same time we consider the President's request for tax reduction, and that the President clearly conditions tax reduction on the elimination of some of the notorious inequities in the tax law. Without reform the President should use his veto.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times, entitled "Tax Cut Expected, But Not Reforms," be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tax Cut Expected but Not Reforms—Observers Believe Closing of Loopholes Will Wait

(By Robert Metz)

Washington observers are convinced that taxpayers are reasonably likely to pay taxes at lower rates next year without the unpleasantness of sterner rules on deductions and capital gains.

President Kennedy has all but promised lower taxes effective January 1, 1963. His plan, however, has been to introduce the idea along with a major reform bill that would give the tax cut an unpleasant after-taste for many taxpayers.

It now seems likely that the administration will put off major reform proposals until later. Or, if a major reform bill is introduced, the tax-cut segments may be lifted out, with the tacit consent of the administration, to be sent through Congress separately.

The Treasury Department has never revealed its thinking as to what changes should be included in a major reform package, other than to say that every provision of the law is being reexamined.

FEAR TOO-STRONG REFORMS

Treasury Department officials have conversed with tax specialists outside the Government, and have indicated that they have fears for the prospects of any legislation that carries a bigger stick than its carrot.

Some private observers have concluded that the President will propose a measure early next year that includes tax cuts of a modest denomination and some loophole-closing provisions of a minor sort. A second revision bill would follow, picking up the rest of the planned tax cuts and including the bulk of the reforms.

Other private observers are convinced that even minor loophole-closing provisions in 1963 legislative tax proposals would slow the course of the legislation until after 1963, making it very difficult to give retroactive reductions to January 1, 1963.

The goal of tax rate revision as realists see it is to reduce personal income rates from the present 20 to 91 percent spread, to perhaps 15 to 17 to 65 percent.

On the corporate side, the top rate of 52 percent would be reduced to 50 percent, perhaps a point or two more.

MAJOR CHANGES FAR AWAY

Nearly every observer on the scene is convinced that major tax reform is a goal that is very much in the future. They point out that every substantial piece of tax legislation has occurred in an even year. Successful tax legislation is invariably proposed in an odd year, just after a new Congress is seated, and it takes well over a year to finish debate in both Houses and send a bill to the President.

The latest piece of tax legislation, the Revenue Act of 1962, is a case in point. President Kennedy now has the measure before him for signature. He introduced the legislation in a message to Congress on April 20, 1961.

Observers have searched their minds for tightening provisions that could carry in a tax-cut measure. Nearly everything that occurs to them brings forth objections.

One of the biggest avenues of escape from the high tax rates is the capital gain. By shifting income into a form that qualifies as a capital gain, the tax gatherer's cut can be held to a maximum 25 percent.

The Treasury Department has reported that in 1959 gain or loss from the sale of capital assets was reported on nearly 5 million of the 60 million individual income tax returns. This suggests that substantial changes would meet stiff opposition.

Proposals to limit the depletion allowance on minerals or to reduce the standard 10-percent deduction for individual taxpayers, for example, would meet greater resistance.

FIGHT TO END IS DOUBTFUL

One commentator said: "My theory is that the administration isn't really trading reductions for loophole-closing anyway. The administration wanted the revenue-reducing investment credit in the present bill enough to insist on it, even though it couldn't get withholding.

"The President said the present set of proposals should be considered as a set, but he didn't say he would veto if it weren't."

OUR CHANCE TO SAVE AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an outstanding Wisconsin labor leader, Carl W. Griepentrog, president of the Allied Industrial Workers of America, is an able man who has done a superb job for his union. In composing an article on conservation in this country, Mr. Griepentrog makes the kind of quiet and substantial contribution to the national well being which top-flight labor leaders have made often, but which is rarely recognized.

I quote now from the last two paragraphs of this fine article by Mr. Griepentrog:

> The rest of this decade can be a historic one for the conservation of our natural resources. And organized labor has a vital stake in the outcome of the congressional battles now taking place. If we make headway in gaining new parks, new seashore and beaches, new trails and streams—we will have scored an important victory in the march of mankind toward a better life.
>
> Every foreign visitor to our shores comments on the vast, uncluttered beauty of this land, and we sing about it in that wonderful song, "America, the Beautiful." But how beautiful America remains depends a great deal on what actions we take during the next few years to save, to maintain, and to protect what God has given us.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Carl W. Griepentrog, entitled "Our Chance To Save America the Beautiful," be printed in the Record at this point, and I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Chance To Save America the Beautiful

(By Carl W. Griepentrog)

Like many others in the American labor movement I look back with satisfaction on the many years I spent at the bargaining table fighting over a dime or a quarter an hour to improve the lot of my fellow union members.

Much of labor's time and energy has been spent to improve the "quantity of living," the dollars and cents which add up to a living wage.

As a boy on a North Dakota farm I saw two things which still haunt me: crop failures and dust storms. The crop failures meant economic misery to the farmers in the Wheat Belt, and the dust storms meant the permanent loss of precious topsoil.

Preserving our land, our wildlife, our timber, our water, and our scenic beauty has always seemed to me as important as securing a better wage for the worker and a fair price for the farmer.

Economic well-being goes hand in hand with physical well-being.

Today we have won a large measure of economic security for our members. The fight is not wholly won. There is still plenty to do.

But there is another level in labor's struggle for the good life which I believe deserves emphasis and understanding—the conservation of our natural resources.

In the distant past we might afford to be cruel in the exploitation of our natural resources. But as far back as 50 years ago, President Theodore Roosevelt and his Secretary of the Interior, Gifford Pinchot, were warning that the ruthless waste of our timber would curse future generations, and they were right.

They both led a dramatic fight to save precious lands for us and for our grandchildren. Since then, little has been done to prepare a growing nation for the insatiable demands for outdoor recreation, open space, water, minerals, and timber. Today we are at a very important turning point in our history.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

The White House Conference on Conservation this year in Washington brought together many of the conservation leaders of the Nation. My organization was one of the few labor groups represented in this gathering called by Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall.

Secretary Udall put the problem very bluntly when he said that the forester was the symbol of Teddy Roosevelt's time, the CCC camp the symbol of Franklin Roosevelt, and the bulldozer and rocket the symbol of what the conservation movement is up against in this decade.

In my State of Wisconsin, giant bulldozers and scrapers are digging out tons of moraine gravel to make way for new stretches of the Interstate Highway System. For years private interests have mined gravel out of the hills which are today destined to be part of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve. This park will be an outdoor playground for millions of city dwellers and will also illustrate how the last glacier descended 10,000 years ago and left its spectacular deposits across the Wisconsin landscape.

Today the bulldozer and the power shovel slice away in the name of progress to provide for the automobile traveler, while the fight for hiking trails, overnight shelters, camping grounds, beaches, and the stocking of trout streams goes on. All these very worthwhile conservation projects play second fiddle to the clamor for bigger, wider, and faster highways.

There are some cynics who have recently suggested that the workingman and his family cares little for the outdoors except as a place to set down a boat and go roaring away in a blaze of water amusement. I disagree. I am sure that the reason many workers take off a week to hunt deer or moose is partly the satisfaction they get out of tramping through the woods.

Much of the pleasure in fishing for trout is the feel of water rushing around your legs, the sunlight filtering through the trees, and the excitement of landing a fish with reel and net.

Sebastian De Grazia in the new Twentieth Century study, "Of Time, Work and Leisure" seems to discount the pleasure man has attained in achieving shorter work hours and more free time. He argues that "moonlighting" with extra filling station jobs and puttering around the house with a paint brush occupies man's new-found freedom, instead of just plain ordinary loafing and the enjoyment of nature.

In some part, this is so, but surely we in labor do not fight for shorter workweeks just to become philosophers or to take siestas, which seems to appeal to author De Grazia.

WILDERNESS

Congress is currently faced with an historic decision on the long-debated Wilderness Act, which would keep intact in their primitive wildness some 25 to 45 million acres, less than 2 percent of all our land.

Most of my fellow trade unionists would agree with Wallace Stegner, one of our leading conservation writers, who said:

"Something will have gone out of us as a people if we ever let the remaining wilderness be destroyed; if we permit the last virgin forests to be turned into comic books and plastic cigarette cases; if we drive the few remaining members of the wild species into zoos or to extinction; if we pollute the last clear air and dirty the last clean streams and push our paved roads through the last of the silence, so that never again will Americans be free in their own country from the noise, the exhausts, the stinks of human and automotive waste."

There is nothing alien to the trade union movement in this eloquent plea for conserving the last stretches of American wilderness. Indeed, this is the sort of rousing talk our people understand and believe.

Labor supports the proposed Youth Employment Act, which includes a modest Youth Conservation Corps. Countless thousands of our own members are graduates from the CCC camps which saved so much of our land and timber during the thirties and helped provide vigorous outdoor employment to the jobless youth of those depression years.

There is not a labor man I know who does not support the purchase and designation of new national parks. It is our people who drive to these places in throngs for a welcome change of pace from the humdrum life of the cities and factories. Some critics of the Wilderness bill would have you believe that the wild, unspoiled regions of America are to be saved only for the idle rich. They use the specious argument that the factory worker can never afford to take a pack trip into the wilds of the Rockies or a canoe trip into the Quetico-Superior region of northern Minnesota.

This argument falls flat on its face when you discover how many of our own members annually visit our national parks and turn to the woods for an opportunity to "recharge" their emotional batteries.

QUALITY OF LIVING

I started this article by stating that most of us in labor spend our time fighting for those things which improve "the quantity of living"—higher wages, shorter hours, paid vacations and holidays, and all the rest.

Let me say now that we have an equal responsibility to fight to improve "the quality of living." As we work to reduce hours and enlarge the paycheck, we must also work to provide museums, symphony orchestras, parks, and libraries so the soul of man can be enriched and enlarged.

It takes no mathematical genius to realize that more money is going to have to be spent to provide more open space for our growing population. Marion Clawson of Resources of the Future, points out that "use of our great public recreation areas has actually been, and still is, increasing at the rate of 8 to 10 percent and more a year." He notes that by the year 2000, our population will be double what it was in 1950. "Many of the people who will make up the population in the year 2000 already have been born, and the stork still is working overtime."

Income after taxes, he says, averaged $1,600 per person in 1956 and will likely reach the level of $3,600 per person in the year 2000. If you add to this the new leisure and ease of travel which modern life has brought to so many of us, you can readily see that the pressures will become tremendous for outdoor recreational space of all kinds—ranging from wading pools and tennis courts, to camping grounds and swimming beaches.

All outdoor recreational space amounts to 230 million acres presently, and Clawson believes it is difficult to add more than 10 to 20 million more acres to what we already have. With our population doubling, with more time on our hands, more money in our pockets, and more cars on the road—the pressure on our State and national parks, not to mention the neighborhood city playground, will become intense.

"Overuse can ruin a recreation area as thoroughly as a bulldozer," Clawson comments, and I thoroughly agree. The rest of this decade can be an historic one for the conservation of our natural resources. And organized labor has a vital stake in the outcome of the Congressional battles now taking place. If we make headway in gaining new parks, new seashore and beaches, new trails and streams—we will have scored an important victory in the march of mankind toward a better life.

Every foreign visitor to our shores comments on the vast, uncluttered beauty of this land, and we sing about it in that wonderful song, "America, the Beautiful." But how beautiful America remains depends a great deal on what actions we take during the next few years to save, to maintain, and to protect what God has given us.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate agreed to the conference report on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which is regarded by the Senator from Oklahoma as one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been passed by the Congress in the 14 years the Senator from Oklahoma has had the honor to serve in this body.

When the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MILLS, presented the conference report to the House of Representatives yesterday, he made a statement with respect to the position of the special representative for trade negotiations who is to be appointed by the President and whose nomination must be confirmed by the Senate, as provided by the bill reported by the conferees. That statement appears on page 22279 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

In that statement, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee set forth some very important facts with reference to the responsibility of the newly designated special representative for trade negotiations with which the Senator from Oklahoma desires to associate and identify himself.

Yesterday, when the conference report was before the Senate, the Senator from Oklahoma obtained unanimous consent to place some remarks with reference to it in the RECORD, and then, due to other necessities and duties in the afternoon, was not able to do so before the day's session had ended.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the remarks of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee yesterday before the House with respect to the position of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN MILLS

Another change that the conferees agreed to was with respect to the position of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations who is to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The change made with respect to this official was made in connection with the interdepartmental agency that we set up within the executive department to advise the President on trade matters, including the initial negotiation of trade agreements.

In the House bill we left to the President's discretion the naming of the person who would be chairman of this statutory interdepartmental agency. In the bill as it passed the Senate and as it is presented to you in this conference report, this chief negotiator will be the chairman of that interdepartmental agency.

In connection with the acceptance by the House conferees of this provision, it was pointed out in conference that we do not want this chief negotiator to be so overburdened with other administrative aspects of this whole program that he cannot effectively act in the primary capacity that the Congress intends him to act—namely, as the chief negotiator for the United States in these agreements.

We provided for a special representative in order to make certain that negotiations under this act would be more effeqtively conducted than in the past. We hope that the President will extend him the maximum authority in preparing for and conducting negotiations under title II of this bill or modifying agreements.

These new responsibilities stress the fact that Congress intends that the negotiations be prepared for and carried out differently than in the past. The special representative should have at his direct disposal sufficient staff to assist him in his capacities as chief negotiator and chairman of an interagency trade organization. Staff obviously could be provided to some extent from offices in existing departments.

However, the Department of State, which did the negotiating previously and which chaired the Trade Agreements Committee is the only element now within the Government that is set up to devote a major portion of its resources and time to the negotiations. It was not our intention that this group would continue its past dominant role. Rather we intend by this legislation to place the responsibility for developing the technical information required for the negotiations in the hands of the special representative. He should have line authority over the development of information within the executive branch, calling on the relevant departments for support as needed. The procedure for hearing industry and agricultural groups, called for under the bill, should also be his responsibility, as well as the assessment of findings by the Tariff Commission.

Obviously the special representative will require a staff which spends its entire time on preparations for the negotiations and for the negotiations themselves. Because of the scope of negotiations authorized by this act, these preparations will require a more extensive examination of all tariff classifications—especially since these have recently been changed—a more careful examination of industry data, and a thorough study of market potentials abroad so that maximum benefits can be sought.

The longrun effects of negotiations under this act are so significant that it requires the undivided attention of a group of experts to make certain that we have done the best by the U.S. economy.

One other provision that was adopted in conference would permit the President, whenever nations with which we have an agreement with respect to fish conservation, or nations which refuse to enter into such agreements, follow practices which are inimical to the interests of conservation, then the President may take action to increase tariffs on fish or fish products imported from such country.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, it is the considered judgment of the Senator from Oklahoma that, under the operation of this law, there will be developed, on a basis that safeguards and maintains in its entirety the integrity of the sovereignty of the United States, which under no circumstances should ever be impaired or lessened, an association between our country and Western Europe that constitutes the greatest combined industrial power ever conceived and implemented by the mind of man.

The combined industrial power of the United States and of Western Europe, working together in the relationship which will be developed under the bill, will constitute insurance not only for the survival of the free world, but also for the continued ability of the United States and its friends in the Western World to hold back Communist aggression and strip from the Communist nations the facade of favorable attributes—of desirability and merit—which they attempt to wrongfully present, so that the Communist purpose of ruthless aggression will stand naked before the startled eyes of a constantly alert and aware world, in order that the Communist effort might be rightly appraised, correctly analyzed and interpreted, and adequately met.

In the operation of our program those are the objectives of our Government.

I know the President will administer this program with those objectives uppermost in his mind, conscious of the necessity of maintaining an environment in which all American industry may prosper and no American industry may suffer or be impaired.

It was the confidence of the Senator from Oklahoma that the President would so administer this program and confidence in the success of it under that character of administration which impelled the Senator from Oklahoma to support that program to the extent and in the manner that he did.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TARIFF CLASSIFICATION DESCRIPTION FOR LIGHTWEIGHT BICYCLES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8938) to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I address myself to the pending measure, the so-called bicycle bill. In due course I shall submit an amendment to the bill which will incorporate my own view as to what ought to happen with respect to it.

First, I should like to explain why I am concerned about it. Why should I be concerned about a bicycle bill? In the State of New York bicycle manufacturers have been diligently laying their case before me. I admire them for it. It is their duty to lay the problem before me and my duty to listen.

But why should I be worried about a bicycle bill near the close of the session? No matter what bad luck we may encounter, we are probably in the last week of the session.

Not many people are knocking on my door to do something about the bill. For all practical purposes I can say I am completely self-operative in respect to the bill. To add to the complications, I am a candidate for reelection in the coming election. Nonetheless, I believe that when one serves in the Senate, one has a national duty. I am acting in respect to the bill in pursuance of what I consider to be my duty as a Senator of the United States, for, Mr. President, in this one bill are incorporated almost all the inequities, inconsistencies, and improvidences of the foreign economic policy of the United States.

First, the bill is bad for consumers.

Second, it will complicate our relations very seriously with those with whom we deal in the world.

I will prove that. It will cause not only bad blood, but actual loss of business. Of course, the bicycle manufacturers feel that the loss of business will not fall on them, but will fall on other manufacturers. I do not say they are callous or indifferent, but, like everyone else, they feel that they must look out for themselves, and that that is the rule of business. I believe that is true until we get to Congress, where we are supposed to take a broad look at the whole subject.

Third, the day after we approved the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the pending bill would seek to undercut it. We do not wait very long. The very day after we approve the trade bill we are already trying to undercut it.

Fourth, if all these things were not sufficient, it is my honest judgment this measure would not help the bicycle manufacturers, because foreign manufacturers have shown their ability to hurdle high tariffs. The tariff is now 11¼ percent. Even if it were doubled, to 22½ percent, based upon past history, the foreign manufacturers would be able to hurdle that tariff also. They would be able to hurdle it, as they have been able to hurdle the 11¼-percent tariff.

The real answer to foreign competition is better merchandising, a better product, and better sales appeal to the American consumer. It cannot be found in erecting a somewhat higher tariff wall. That has already been pretty well recognized by many companies. Many of those who believe they are entitled to the protection of our tariff laws have sought to use the quota system; they had no real confidence that any kind of tariff increase, unless it were completely unreasonable, would do them much good.

For all those reasons, I believe the bill represents an unwise exercise of our discretion and judgment. Because I believe it is so critically important to the future of our Nation that we engage effectively in the export-import business, and expand our exports as much as possible, I think these issues need to be raised and discussed, whether or not they have the effect of killing the bill.

I understand the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Finance. I do not know that there is a great deal of support for my position. Nonetheless I feel it my duty to state it, because of my deep concern with the expansion of our exports, and because of the way we have, when something needs to be said, to say it, and implement it in the saying. It does have an effect, even though it may not have a direct impact upon the particular measure to which it is directed.

I should like to proceed now, to prove some of the statements that I have made. In the first place, I said this was a bad bill for the consumers. The purport of the bill is, by changing the definition of what is a lightweight bicycle, to change the definition which is now incorporated in the tariff laws and double the import duty on lightweight bicycles which have curved frames. It is assumed that doubling the import duty on these bicycles will raise their retail price by about $5 for each bicycle. On the estimated 300,000 bicycles that will be involved, the cost to the consumers will be a million and a half dollars.

I believe that American consumers have begun to realize what they should realize, and that is that a vital and active foreign trade is very important to them. It is a built-in governor on inefficiency. It is a built-in governor on unreasonable prices. Many millions of Americans ride bicycles. I myself ride one. Incidentally, I have been riding an American, not a British bicycle. I find an American bicycle very satisfactory, and riding a bicycle a wonderful form of outdoor exercise.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I warn the Senator that in the hearings on the nomination of Judge Cooper, which was so controversial, one of the incidents about which complaint was made about Judge Cooper was with respect to what he did when he was riding a bicycle.

I hope my colleague from New York will be very careful not to become involved in any incidents such as Judge Cooper is alleged to have gotten into on his bicycle. Bicycle riding is good exercise, in fact, one of the best; and I regret that motorcycles and automobiles make the highways a little dangerous for the bicyclist. Riding a bicycle exercises every muscle of the body. I am a strong bicycle man. I am glad my colleague shares that view.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. What caused Judge Cooper's troubles was that he rode a bicycle on a street that had buses on it. That is not a very good practice for bicycling. Central Park in New York has wonderful bicycle paths. There are many areas in our State, especially on Long Island, which are rather level and lend themselves happily to even long-distance bicycling. I thank my colleague for his very pleasant interjection.

The first point I make is that the pending bill would cost consumers an estimated million and a half dollars a year. This does not mean that American manufacturers are not entitled to proper recompense and a fair profit. However, they should stand in some relative competitive position in terms of efficiency and in terms of the makeup of the product. I believe the point which we are talking about is the relative competition as between American manufacturers and those who export bicycles to us.

The second point is that the American bicycle manufacturing industry has been doing pretty well. Generally speaking, we have designed our peril point and escape clause protections for domestic manufacturers on the basis of "serious injury," which are the words of art incorporated in the law.

According to our figures, the sales of U.S. producers in the U.S. market of bicycles have risen from 1.8 million units in 1955 to 2.6 million units in 1961. The relationship of U.S. sales to sales of foreign makes in the U.S. market has increased in that period from a ratio of 60 to 40 to a ration of 70 to 30.

I believe it is fair to say that it is for that reason that relief is sought by a change in the definition, rather than relief being sought through the invocation of the escape clause, or, if there are new negotiations, under the peril point provisions of the law.

I think this is extremely important, because the definition was not a basis—that is, the definition which is changed by the bill—or an element in the trade negotiations or in the customs designation which resulted in the Tariff Act provision which now obtains with respect to so-called lightweight bicycles. The three items which were factors in regard to defining this type of bicycle are the overall weight, the wheel circumference, and the width of tire. There is no claim that the overall weight, wheel circumference, or width of tire on the bicycles which are complained about are any different from the overall weight, wheel circumference, or width of tire of the traditional lightweight bicycle. The bicycle industry in the United States contends that the term "lightweight bicycles" is intended to mean bicycles made with frames entirely of straight tubes, which are called diamond frames.

It is contended that the American industry developed a lightweight bicycle in about 1954, having a curved top bar and a tire diameter somewhat wider than that of the traditional lightweight British bicycle. It is now claimed that under cover of the lightweight classification, the British and other producers are importing bicycles into the United States having the same curved frame and are giving them the benefit of the low duties for lightweight bicycles. It is claimed by the industry that this represents a deception; that it was never intended that those bicycles should be classed as lightweight bicycles or be covered by reciprocal trade agreements relating to lightweight bicycles, and that therefore the bill should be passed.

The difficulty with that position is that the Tariff Commission and other executive agencies of the Government do not agree—and I am confident that those who send the bicycles here would not agree; we all understand that—that the particular bicycles complained about weigh as much as or less than the traditional lightweight bicycles to which I have referred; or that the tire width is the same as or less than that of the traditional lightweight bicycle, so that it would seem to qualify under the law and under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements, but the industry claims it was never so "intended." That particular word is used.

Although this is a way in which a colorable claim upon which the bill can be based, it seems to me that the essence or thrust of the bill is to double the tariff on bicycles with respect to which domestic manufacturers believe there is competition.

I have stated the fate of the consumer. It is estimated that the consumer will pay $1,500,000 more for 300,000 bicycles than he pays now. Let us consider what will happen to other American manufacturers.

Let us understand that if the bill should become law, it will be necessary for the United States to renegotiate or terminate its agreement with the United Kingdom, an agreement which is also of substantial importance, because of the most-favored-nations clause with respect to Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, France, and Italy We must expect—and it is confidently expected that it will happen—that compensation will have to be given for the change in agreement. We shall have to give some reciprocal consideration, and this will be a disadvantage to manufacturers of other products, for if we do not provide reciprocal consideration, there will be retaliation by foreign exporters in nations which are affected.

Whatever may happen to my particular position upon the bill in the last days of this session of Congress, let me predict that if the bill becomes law, there will be the same outcry and the same headline which occurred with respect to the U.S. action on glass and carpets, when those tariffs were raised, placing a burden upon others than those particular American makers, a burden which also disrupted the opportunity for ourselves and the European Common Market to reach some kind of agreement. Let us remember that the fundamental intent of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which was approved only yesterday, is to enable the United States to reach more agreements with the principal exporting countries of the world. Yet here we are, the very next day, going the same way to obstruct that very opportunity on the part of our Government by taking action which changes studied agreements and very materially offends other nations. I do not speak of offending them in terms of their feelings, but in terms of their capability and intention to retaliate.

Such retaliation is not an idle matter. I refer to the fact that when the United States increased the tariffs on glass and carpets, the European Economic Community promptly caused retaliatory action to be taken, costing more in terms of U.S. exports than the amount by which the United States benefited by its tariff increase. The retaliation against U.S. exports was estimated to be $36 million, as compared to the advantage allegedly gained by American makers of carpet and glass in the United States, which amounted to about $27 million in exports to the United States which were lost to the same European Economic Community countries.

The tariff increases with which they retaliated were the following: $8.1 million in manmade fiber textiles; $3 million in paints and varnishes; and $25 million in polyethylene. Indeed, eight U.S. textile firms having main offices or production facilities in New York State, which exhibited their products at the fair in Frankfurt, Germany, last June, expect to lose their markets as a result of the European Common Market's retaliation against the glass and carpet tariff increases. Other firms in New York have written to me that their relatively small businesses will be wiped out or severely hurt by this retaliation.

It is believed that by reason of retaliation against the enactment of the bill and the increase in the bicycle tariff there will be a $7,500,000 to $10 million export loss by the United Kingdom and the nations in the European Economic Community. We can be absolutely certain that retaliation will take place at the very minimum in that amount, probably more. But instead of the burden falling upon the bicycle manufacturers, it will fall on some other manufacturers who have some part of the export trade which will be disadvantaged.

I say to my farm friends that they, too, had better take a pretty hard look at this proposal. What we are trying to do, more than anything else, in our relations with the European Common Market, is to have that market lift its restrictions, such as those which exist on fruits and agricultural products of that type, and not to impose restrictions on poultry and similar products. But this bill is not the way to approach them in respect of obtaining that kind of concession. This bill repeals a concession—that is the way they will define it, without any question—which they have enjoyed under a trade agreement entered into deliberately. The repercussions will not be very happy.

Again, I do not speak in terms of outraged feelings; I speak in terms of the hard coin of retaliatory action, in terms of exports and imports. One of the significant aspects of the world in which we now live is that the European Economic Community is no longer a Europe depending on the Marshall plan. It has personality and capability for conducting negotiations of its own, as was shown in the retaliatory increase in answer to the tariff increase which the United States imposed on carpets and glass.

So my prediction of retaliation is not merely conversation; it is based upon hard experience which we have already had, and upon what is very clearly indicated will be the likely outcome of enacting the bill.

Let us remember also that the agreement made with respect to these bicycles was made only 18 months ago, and that the problem will arise with the very same nations with which we had the problem of attrition, the collision of interest, as it were, in respect of the tariff increases on carpets and glass. The danger of retaliation and of the tension which will be created between the negotiating parties, is, in my opinion, a very real and present danger.

As to the last point which I made when I opened the discussion, it seems to me that we must understand now, as we are out in a trading world in which we face serious competition, that we cannot have things all our own way. The flow of trade cannot be all one way. If we wish to expand our exports—and it is essential, in our national interest, that we do so—we must also expand our imports. After all, one result cannot happen in the absence of the other.

It would be most improvident for us to bury our heads in the sand, like ostriches, and think we could undertake this sort of measure, in dealing with bicycles, by means of a redefinition which, in effect, would double the tariff and would invalidate the agreements we made only 18 months ago with other nations, and not expect them to retaliate and to doubt very seriously our purpose in enacting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

I realize that a Member of the Senate is constantly subjected to pressures from many groups, and undoubtedly such pressures have their effect, either wittingly or unwittingly. Therefore, Mr. President, this is all the more reason why some of us, especially those of us who come from great industrial States, should protest the attempt to compromise our foreign economic policy in a way which, in this case, as I see it, would be so substantial and so serious.

New York is the largest exporting State of the United States. The exports from New York State alone—without regard to transshipment and the use of the port of New York—amount to not less than $1,500 million annually. A very important part of the economy of New York State relates to the export trade. So I must emphasize to my constituents that they have a very great deal at stake, in terms of the production of goods in New York State and employment in New York State. Therefore, even though it would be much easier for me if I could accommodate—as I should like to do, if I possibly could—manufacturers in New York State who wish this bill to be passed, I cannot do so in good conscience, particularly in view of the fact that I have a fairly good economic education and I know a good deal—because of my experience in Congress and elsewhere—about the dynamics and operations of business. Someone must make the points which are being made today; and I have felt it my duty to do so.

In view of the fact that in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 we have given the President broad negotiating authority, and in view of the fact that that bill was reported—unanimously, I believe—by the Senate Finance Committee, I do not feel that Congress can properly fail to shape the measure now before us so it will accord with the purposes of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which only yesterday was acted on by the Senate.

Therefore, I have drafted an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. The amendment carries out the fundamental purpose I have in mind: to shape this bill in such a way as to have it meet the requirements of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 7, it is proposed to delete the period and to insert the following:

> *Provided, however,* That the President may further suspend the effective date of the foregoing amendment if he finds that its effect is inconsistent with the exercise of his powers under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and shall within 10 days of such further suspension notify the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of such suspension and of the reasons therefor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the amendment ties in with a very interesting and considerable deferral of the effective date of the bill. I am sure the drafters of the bill realized there would be a considerable outcry and difficulty because of the bill—in short, because of the fact that it would require that agreements solemnly made by our country under the Reciprocal Trade Act be renegotiated or called off. Therefore, the amendment is designed to take effect in accordance with the following provision of the bill:

> As soon as practicable, on a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or termination of any international obligation of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

For all practical purposes, the bill requires that, regardless of whether the negotiations to effect a modification or termination of any international obligation of the United States with which the amendment to the Tariff Act which it provides might conflict are successful or not, regardless of whether the negotiating parties agree or disagree, this amendment to the Tariff Act will take effect 6 months after the date of enactment of the measure.

It seems to me that flies directly in the face of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, because this measure would say to the President, "Even if you do not believe this is in the interest of the United States, even if within the negotiating authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, you cannot make any other arrangement with the contracting parties in this connection, even if under the terms of the agreement which you negotiated only 18 months ago you cannot renegotiate for it or compensate for it, nevertheless, regardless of whatever may be the international status of the United States with respect to trade matters, 6 months after this bill becomes law this amendment to the Tariff Act will take effect, and, ipso facto—whatever may be the circumstances—the tariff will be doubled."

Mr. President, I think that would be most unprovident, unwise, and completely inconsistent with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

For that reason, rather than in an effort to kill the bill, I have offered this amendment, which would reconcile this bill—and would do so effectively, I believe—with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and would confirm what we wish the President to do, namely, make this particular change in the definition, but leave the authority in his hands.

I can see no difference between what is provided in the bill and old-fashioned logrolling, for we would be telling the President what to do, and we would say that if he does not do it, that will be just too bad, but it will become the law, just the same.

In my opinion, at the very least, in view of the action the Senate took yesterday on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Senate should make the two patterns consistent, instead of taking the attitude that our country can do whatever it wishes with the bicycle industry; that no one else will pay any attention to such action by our country; and that we will get by with it. We would not get by with it, and there would be retaliation which would be both embarrassing and costly.

I come now to the last point. The tradition and history of efforts exactly like this one is that they do not work in the interest of the domestic manufacturer. They may work for a little while, but within a very short time the American manufacturer who is not "hep" to the effect of foreign competition softens up and goes along, on the theory that he will be bailed out. The foreign manufacturer finds methods to make up the 10 or 11 percent, whether it is out of his profits, by way of some gimmicks he introduces on his bicycles, by sales appeal, or by whatever other efforts he may make. The domestic manufacturer then finds himself where he started.

That has been the history of this kind of operation. We passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 so we could put into being a better and more effective policy, as an indication that we are living in the world and are no longer insulated in the United States.

As I said at the beginning, it would be very easy for me to agree with my colleagues on this bill, which has been reported to the Senate by my best friends, Senators for whom I have the greatest affection, and for whom I would stretch not one, but many, points if I could humanly do it. But, since I am devoted to the trade policy of our Nation, and have made it almost my complete study and concern in the 14 years of my service in the Congress, I cannot do it. I know full well that other bills of this kind have come along, but it strikes me strongly on the day after the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was passed, that we should be entertaining a measure of this character. I felt it my duty, in all conscience, to bring out the point and to submit the amendment.

As an accommodation to me, the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Kerr], my own leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], who is very much interested in the bill, and the majority leader agreed to postpone consideration of the bill until today. I told them expressly that I would appreciate its being carried over until after the Trade Expansion Act was passed, and not before. My reason for the juxtaposition is sharply evident. I was not taking any advantage of them, because we all knew that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 would become law. I thought, in all fairness, that we ought to consider a bill of this character after action upon that historic and dynamic and new departure in the trade policy of the United States.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the pending measure H.R. 8938 comes from the Senate Committee on Finance. There is now pending an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. The amendment would destroy the effect of the bill, and I trust, therefore, that it will be rejected.

A memorandum which was filed with the committee in connection with the bill carries what I think is a completely explanatory title. It says, "Proposed legislation to plug tariff loophole growing out of importation of foreign-made middleweight bicycles camouflaged as lightweight."

I think that is, in essence, the whole story now before the Senate. The problem goes back to 1947. The bill which is before the Senate would do nothing more than seek to achieve the intent of the Congress, of the negotiations, and of the agreement which was effectuated in the first instance.

It so happens that bicycles, depending upon whether they are middleweight or lightweight, derive a different form of duty. In meeting the lightweight competition, which means competition from lightweight bicycles manufactured abroad, the American producers developed a middleweight bicycle, but the foreign producers found a way of getting around the limitation, and that meant, of course, the classification and the intent which was before the Congress at the time it was considered.

I think I should say in behalf of the domestic producers that they would not quarrel about this under ordinary circumstances. The representative of the Bicycle Institute, when he appeared before the committee, said:

> If we are faced with and must take a further reduction, and if it is possible to give us adequate protection on our American machines, a small reduction in the conventional British lightweight would not be too serious. In other words, if we can get into that position where by conceding a small concession on the conventional British lightweight we can establish a proper differential on our heavyweights, it would be to our advantage to have it that way.

There is an expression of absolute fairness in approach. I think that is the supervening issue. I am as much interested in the consumer as is anyone else, but I am also interested in the principle of fairness to the American producer, who is under heavy competition, not only from British, but also from French, Austrian, Polish, German, and I suppose other producers.

I have seen the warehouses at the harbor in Chicago piled so high with packaged bicycles that one never before realized that there were that many bicycles in the entire universe.

This is, of course, not necessarily a threat, but it is a problem for the American industry. Let us not forget that industry provides jobs, and jobs are not the least consideration before this Congress at a time when there is still a big package of structural unemployment.

The bill would provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles. It would not change anything, beyond providing a proper definition, such as was intended when the first trade agreement was negotiated. In this connection, the bill seeks only to insure the application of the original trade agreement intent that bicycles classified as "lightweights" shall have frames, not including the front and rear wheel forks, of straight tubing.

The bill was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means on September 22, 1961, and was passed with the unanimous consent of the House of Representatives on April 5, 1962.

At the time the bill was passed, Chairman Wilbur Mills, of the House Committee on Ways and Means said:

> The committee (House Committee on Ways and Means) is convinced that the record made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information, the agency which heard interested parties before the trade agreement negotiations in question were started, shows that this trade agreement concession was intended to cover bicycles which are commonly known as diamond frame bicycles; that is, bicycles with frames, not including the front and rear wheel forks, consisting of all straight tubing.

And Mr. Bass, who originally introduced the bill, said:

> This bill seeks only to insure the application of the original trade agreement intent—1947—that bicycles classified as "lightweights" shall have frames—not including the front and rear wheel forks—of all straight tubing.
>
> Passage of H.R. 8938 will permit all bicycles which were originally intended to come in at the lower lightweight duty rate to continue to come in at that lower rate.
>
> As the practice directly contravenes the 1947 trade agreement intent, curved tubular bicycles of American middleweight design will no longer be permitted entry into the United States at the low lightweight duty rate. This is as it should be and follows from the initial understanding and subsequent statements of all parties, including foreign manufacturers, importers, and domestic producers.

Mr. President, that was the intent and the understanding of all concerned, including foreign and domestic producers.

Mr. Bass continued:

> Calling as it does for the application of the original trade agreement intent, this bill is of a distinctly just and equitable nature. In these circumstances, a proper lightweight tariff classification should be worked out prior to the negotiations of further general tariff reductions.

I do not believe that the bill would require any renegotiation of agreements. I do not believe it would invite any retaliation. The bill would merely try to give effect to what was the intent in 1947, and is therefore in the interest of fairness.

In view of the foregoing, as the bill seeks only to insure the application of the original trade agreement intent, as the record before the Committee for Reciprocity Information clearly indicates the correct intent, as all parties concerned are in full agreement on this point, as the bill is of a just and equitable nature, and as a proper lightweight tariff classification should be worked out prior to the negotiations of further general tariff reductions, it was urged that the Senate Finance Committee favorably consider H.R. 8938.

The committee did so, and, as I understand, the committee unanimously reported the bill.

The bill has the unanimous support of the Committee on Ways and Means. It came to the Senate without objection from the House of Representatives. It was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Finance. Therefore the bill ought to be passed without amendment; and I respectfully urge the Senate to reject the pending amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question with respect to H.R. 8938. Massachusetts has a very fine small bicycle plant at Westfield. It has been my understanding for at least the past 2 years that bicycles have been coming into the United States, not necessarily in violation of the tariff, but through an arrangement made in such a way that they enter this country under a reduced tariff when they really should not have come in under that rate. Do I correctly understand that the bill would clarify the classification description of lightweight bicycles?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Massachusetts had the floor and had addressed a question to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I had asked the Senator from Oklahoma a question in relation to the importation of bicycles. If my understanding is correct, I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. KERR. The answer to the Senator's question is "Yes." The bill seeks to correct the situation whereby foreign bicycles have been changed in design and conformation since the agreement under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act had been reached, so that bicycles which it had been contemplated would pay a higher rate now pay a much lower rate. Rather than a situation in which the bicycle has been made more competitive so that it could pay the rate under the classification, we have a situation in which the specifications have been changed so that it now comes in at a lower rate. The purpose of the bill is to correct that condition.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. I appreciate the Senator's statement, because it affects bicycles manufactured in the United States by reason of the competition which is taking place in a way which was not intended by the Tariff Act.

Mr. KERR. That was not intended by the trade agreements which were made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield the floor. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I desire to say one thing about the amendment and the statement of the Senator from New York. The Senator from New York said he feared the bill would result in retaliation. The purpose of the bill is to remove that which, in effect, was unjustified retaliation against U.S. manufacturers.

I am reminded of a cattleman who, during the 1954 agricultural recession, was talking to another cattleman. He said, "If this situation becomes any worse, I will have to rob a bank."

The other one replied, "If things don't get better, I already have."

We are not creating a situation that might provoke retaliation. We are correcting a situation in which retaliation has already occurred against an American industry and American outlets which sell the products of that American industry, which has been greatly damaged by a situation that was not contemplated by those who made the trade agreement, but which has developed by reason of foreign manufacturers and producers taking advantage of some loose language in the trade agreement which has permitted them to flood the American market with bicycles which were not contemplated to be eligible for the reduced rates which they are obtaining under the operation of the law as it is now in effect.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New York will be rejected and that the Senate may come expeditiously to a vote.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, self-respect requires me to reply, because just so much has been said as to need reply.

No one has asked me to offer my amendment. I have said this before having offered this amendment. Actually, there are manufacturers in my State of whose future, and that of their workers, I am deeply solicitous. I am also deeply solicitous about those who work in the export industries in my State.

I say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I simply do not fear retaliation. I confidently predict it.

There has been retaliation with respect to carpets and glass, and there will be retaliation on the bicycle bill. The reason why there will be retaliation is that the rates under the trade agreement that has been referred to are explicit. They refer to "bicycles." They do not refer to bicycles having curved frames or bicycles having diamond frames.

They refer to bicycles of a certain weight and having a certain tire width and wheel diameter. If any further confirmation of that is needed, Mr. Paul Kaplowitz, General Counsel of the U.S. Tariff Commission, said precisely that, as it appears on page 15 of the hearings. He said:

> Well, the only point that I would like to make is that the description in the agreement does not use the term "lightweight" but describes a bicycle in terms of specifications by weight and circumference of the wheels, the tires.

That was his statement. So I do not fear retaliation; I confidently predict it. It will be harmful and most unwise for the United States, in view of our trade policy.

I say to Senators and to the attachés that I shall be finished in about 3 minutes. I hope the attachés will invite as many Senators as are in the corridors and elsewhere to come to the Chamber. I hope to have a division vote upon my amendment, and that will settle the question. I am not a child. I know that a determined Senator in the last days of the session could kill the bill, if he insisted on doing so under the rules.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be finished in a moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New York has made a statement which I think is subject to a different interpretation, because I could have brought the bill up—either of us could have done so—at least 2½ months ago, and we would not have been faced with this situation. I think the Senate ought to know that.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will allow me to finish, I shall discuss precisely that. I was about to say, if the Senator had allowed me to finish, that it was because of the courtesy and consideration shown to me, and my respect for the legislative process, that I would not have thought of doing any such thing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. JAVITS. I am bringing the matter to an issue promptly and quickly. Actually, I had hoped to accommodate my distinguished colleague, who is most anxious to get away, as I hope the rest of us will be able to do.

It is my intention to demonstrate the point that if we desire to do something about international trade which is in accordance with the Trade Expansion Act, which was just passed, it is necessary for us to practice what we preach. Whether we do so on this bill or not—and apparently we will not—it is very important to make the point. It must be said, so that those who deal with us may know that there are many Members of this body and of the other body who understand the situation only too well. Today I may lose—and probably shall; but tomorrow, I may very well win with the same argument and with the very allies who may vote against me today, because this case has to be made, and only experience can make it.

Finally, it is said that there was an intent in the trade agreement that we should not cover this particular situation, and that all we are doing is expressing intent. The Bureau of Customs does not think so, and the executive agencies of the Government do not think so. They all have ruled exactly the other way, and they are the people who negotiated the trade agreement. If there was an intent, it was theirs, and they say flatly that there was no such intent.

Finally, Mr. President, it is argued that this bill is for the purpose of increasing employment. That is true. But Senators must also bear in mind the necessity to maintain employment in our export industries. Why has Congress passed the trade bill, notwithstanding strong opposition to it, and provided in that bill for adjustment assistance? Congress did so because it is convinced that expansion of our export trade is of paramount importance. But, Mr. President, if some of us do not fight for our export trade, it will go down the drain, notwithstanding the pious expression contained in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

For these reasons I hope my amendment will prevail. It should prevail. It merely will make this bill consistent with our action of yesterday on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mr. President, at this point I suggest the absence of a quorum. After the quorum call is begun, and after a few more Senators have entered the Chamber, I shall request that the order for the quorum call be rescinded; and then I shall request, on the question of agreeing to the amendment, that there be a division.

So, Mr. President, at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on this question, I request a division.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** A division is requested on this question; and the Senate will now proceed to divide.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8938) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12708) to increase the jurisdiction of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 507. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe;

S. 901. An act to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes;

S. 962. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes;

S. 3177. An act for the relief of Michael (Mike) Bersler;

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Ma Chin-Ying;

S. 3279. An act for the relief of Yet Gee Moy (Tsze Woo Lai) and Mee Sen Moy (Sau Ming Lai);

S. 3336. An act to incorporate the American Symphony League;

H.R. 4034. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. David V. Kyrklund;

H.R. 4670. An act to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6386. An act for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat;

H.R. 8181. An act to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia and to provide for its operation;

H.R. 8321. An act for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews;

H.R. 8662. An act for the relief of Jose Fuentes;

H.R. 9128. An act for the relief of Sergeant Ernest L. Aguilar;

H.R. 9199. An act for the relief of certain officers and enlisted personnel of the 1202d Civil Affairs Group (Reinf Tng), Fort Hamilton, Brooklyn, N.Y.;

H.R. 9804. An act for the relief of Cuyahoga County, Ohio;

H.R. 9894. An act for the relief of Loretta Shea, deceased, in full settlement of the claims of that estate;

H.R. 10415. An act for the relief of Earl T. Briley;

H.R. 11334. An act for the relief of Mary J. Papworth;

H.R. 11665. An act to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12090. An act for the relief of James Comeau;

H.R. 12539. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Cox and other employees of the Federal Aviation Agency;

H.R. 12701. An act for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.;

H.R. 12936. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Fousé and others; and

S.J. Res. 214. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period from November 26, 1962, through December 2, 1962, as National Cultural Center Week.

SUMMER RECESS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I remember the interest that both Senators have had in a subject that I had hoped to present to the Senate later, but I must do so now because of my necessary departure a little later this evening. That is the summer recess resolution that I have been advocating in this body for a considerable period of time.

The hour is late as we pay tribute to two of our retiring colleagues. One saving grace about being here this late is that it has given us an opportunity to serve longer with these gentlemen.

It should also focus attention on another point, and that is in these very difficult times we will never be through with the business of the Senate at any given time on the calendar. The sooner we come face to face with ,that harsh fact of our legislative responsibilities, the sooner can we adjust our tempo to coincide with the requirements that are being made upon us.

Mr. President, with a little uneasiness I will venture the statement that the 87th Congress is about to adjourn. Never in the history of the preceding 86 Congresses has there been so much conjecture about adjournment. From the middle of the summer on we have heard guesses, predictions, explanations, excuses, and bewildered speculation about when, if ever, the two bodies of Congress will wind up their affairs.

This statement is not made in criticism of the pace of this Congress nor any of its Members. I, for one, believe we have accomplished a great deal in this session. We have fulfilled our obligations to deliberate on the Nation's future. Such an obligation, in today's world of constantly changing international tensions, of overnight technical revolutions, and increasing complexity in day-to-day living, cannot be accomplished in a hurry. Indeed I think we would be remiss in our duties if we hurried through the calendar in order to be out of Washington before the advent of "dog days."

Mr. President, this session of Congress has demonstrated, as no amount of argument could, that legislating for the most powerful Nation on earth during the most complex and troubled times in history is a full-time job. It is time to stop kidding ourselves. It is pointless to work toward a summer adjournment. The facts of legislative life will just not permit it.

Therefore, I hereby announce again that as soon as the new Congress gets underway in January 1963, I intend to press my summer recess resolution.

This resolution, which I am proud to say has 32 cosponsors, calls for a summer recess on June 30 and a return to Senate business early in October. The return could be delayed during election years to permit those standing for reelection more time in their States. The real point of this resolution would be the acknowledgment that we have a full-time job and thus eliminate the "go-home" pressure that makes its appearance here about Labor Day.

The resolution would give Members time to visit their States with their families. One-half the Members of this body have school-age children from whom they are separated for several months of each year under the current procedure. Staff members, whose children number over 600, also suffer the same separations.

This resolution would end the current frustrations brought on by our inability to make the calendar conform to our duties. But more important, it would be recognition of a problem that needs a permanent solution.

The Reorganization Act of 1946, under whose rules we operate, provides for adjournment on July 31. It would be helpful if only we could agree to live up to that statute.

I have recently attached my name, as cosponsor to Senate Concurrent Resolution 93 which would set up a joint committee of the organization of Congress. This is a much needed step for the adjustment of our operating rules for greater efficiency in light of the vast increase in our workload. I believe that my resolution is compatible with Senate Concurrent Resolution 93 and indeed is a part of any mandate for an organizational committee.

I would suggest that the resolution I shall introduce early next session be the starting point for the consideration of the procedures by which we can make our schedules and our workload conform.

In fact it has become apparent that a constitutional amendment, similar to the one which ended the "lame duck" sessions, is in order. Such an amendment would not only provide for year-round sessions of Congress, with suitable recess during the summer months, but could make useful the time now wasted between the election of a new Congress and its convening in January by moving the latter date to mid-November.

Mr. President, we are legislating in the space age. This is an age which has reduced time and distance by unbelieveable achievements. We, who must provide guidance and direction for the most important nation in that age, must utilize our time to the fullest.

Now, to recap what I proposed to do:

First. Try to mobilize congressional opinion in support of a summer recess.

Second. Reach agreement on at least adhering to Reorganization Act of 1946 which calls for recess no later than July 31.

Third. Introduce an amendment to the Constitution which would convene the new Congress and each succeeding session as soon after the traditional November election dates as feasible.

SYLVIA PORTER STATES THE CASE FOR EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Wednesday night the Senate took a giant step toward the completion of a task which was begun with the passage of the 19th amendment. Its acceptance of the Equal Pay Act of 1962 assures women for the first time of an equal wage for equal labor.

Sylvia Porter, the noted and perceptive financial analyst, commented upon the fate of women as "second-class workers" in an article appearing in the Oregon Statesman, October 1, 1962.

The article contrasted the U.S. leadership in democracy with its backwardness in the treatment of women. I quote:

> So the great United States, leading Republic and democracy of the world, remains among the backward nations in its attitude toward women in the labor marketplace, not even recognizing on a national level the justice of equal pay for men and women doing work of equal type and value.

In her article, Miss Porter makes a compelling and eloquent case for just such legislation as the Senate has passed.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Women 'Second Class' Workers" appear at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN "SECOND-CLASS" WORKERS

(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK.—For the 18th consecutive year the Congress of the United States has considered and shelved legislation to require employers to pay women the same rates as men for identical or comparable work.

The Equal Pay Act of 1962 got further than any previous effort "to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages," though. For the first time in history an equal pay bill actually was passed by one of the Houses of Congress: the date was July 25, the place, the floor of the House of Representatives. Admittedly, the House passed the bill in a frivolous mood, amended it so that it would have permitted employers to cut the pay of men to equalize the pay of women. But at least H.R. 11677 reached a Senate subcommittee before getting the usual treatment—sudden death.

So the great United States, leading republic and democracy of the world, remains among the backward nations in its attitude toward women in the labor marketplace, not even recognizing on a national level the justice of equal pay for men and women doing work of equal type and value.

There are 24 million women in the U.S. workforce today, one-third of all workers and before this decade ends, the female workforce will be at the 30 million mark. Women have penetrated just about every occupational group, ranging from the most demanding scientific work to the least demanding service work. The average age of women workers today is 40 against an average age of 26 in grandmother's day and more than half of all women workers are married. Women constitute one-third of all college graduates, one-third of all who hold master's degrees as well as one-third of the labor force.

Yet, only 22 of our States have laws requiring equal pay for comparable work, many of these State laws are of dubious effectiveness and Congress has once again seen to it that there is no Federal equal pay law. As a result, the discrimination on pay scales because of sex continues painfully obvious.

One-third of 1,900 companies surveyed by the National Office Management Association last year frankly reported a double-standard pay scale for male and female officeworkers. In one plant in Utah studied by the Young Women's Christian Association, the hiring rate for women inspectors is $1.38 an hour, for men, $1.48 an hour and the differential rises to 34 cents as they move up the experience ladder—even though, as Miss Ruth Thomson of the YWCA told a House subcommittee, "they are required and expected to do exactly the same job under the same conditions."

Another survey of bank tellers' salaries in 1960 disclosed that women tellers with under 5 years of experience typically average $5 to $15 a week less than men in the same group—and in a bank a teller is a teller, regardless of sex. Among college graduates the differences in average salaries for men and women, when compared by occupation and type of degree, range from $290 to $1,560 a year, all in favor of men. In fact, the gap widens as education levels rise because of the barriers to promotion of women.

The evidence of discrimination is overwhelming and no one denies it. In her testimony before the House subcommittee, Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, a U.S. representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, submitted data that should make any American, man or woman, blush, for we're behind even some of the most underdeveloped lands on writing this principle into law. Japan put the equal-pay-for-equal-work principle into its constitution in 1946, Burma did it in its constitution in 1947, India in 1949, Indonesia in 1950, Vietnam in 1952, Thailand in 1956.

The explanations for our persistent failure to recognize the validity of this principle are a hodge-podge of pocketbook, prejudice, tradition and fear. Many employers are openly hostile to the action because they fear their payrolls would be hiked overnight if women's wages were the same as men's for identical work. The prejudices and traditions need no comment; you know them.

The YWCA's Miss Thomson summed it up superbly when she said to the House subcommittee:

"Is this because we want to say to the world that we hold women's work to be less valuable than that of men's? This is hardly conceivable. I prefer to believe that it merely signifies that we have just not yet caught up with ourselves." We certainly have not.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND ON CORK STOPPERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2009, House bill 12213, to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 12213) to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers.

EXPENDITURES AND THE DEFICIT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, regardless of whether this Congress adjourns sine die tomorrow night or continues into next week, we already know that it will achieve the record—enviable or not—of being the largest peacetime spender in history. We now have an estimate that we shall have authorized the expenditure of $94 billion; but the estimate of revenues has dropped from $93 billion to $85.9 billion—which will give us an estimated deficit of $8.1 billion in the period of our greatest gross national product and the largest produced income, and will push the national debt to the all-time high of more than $300 billion.

Mr. President, on January 18 of this year the President submitted to the Congress his budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. In his message accompanying his budget the President said:

> This is the first complete budget of this administration. It has been prepared with two main objectives in mind:
>
> First, to carry forward effectively the activities—ranging from defense to postal services, from oceanographic research to space exploration—which by national consensus have been assigned to the Federal Government to execute.
>
> Second, to achieve a financial plan—a relationship between receipts and expenditures—which will contribute to economic growth, high employment, and price stability in our national economy.

Mr. President, the Congress is in the final stages of completing its action on the budget submitted to it by the President; and I think that it is appropriate to comment on the two objectives on which the budget for the fiscal year 1963 was prepared.

The budget is implemented largely by appropriations included in the regular and supplemental appropriation acts considered by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives. During this session of Congress, the regular appropriation bills and one supplemental bill for fiscal year 1963 have been considered. Of course, the 1st session of the 88th Congress will have to consider one or more additional supplemental appropriation bills.

Mr. President, the budget estimates—the requests from the executive branch for appropriations—considered in connection with these 13 bills total $96,255,-

130,686. Final action has been taken on 10 of these bills, in which the Congress has made reductions totaling $2,821,901,000. It is reasonable to assume that in acting on the remaining 3 bills, reductions totaling $1,200 million will be made, to give us a total reduction of approximately $4 billion.

Mr. President, I am confident that the Congress has provided adequate funds for the realization of the President's first goal; namely, to carry forward efficiently the activities * * * which by national consensus have been assigned to the Federal Government to execute. It is up to the executive branch to use these funds efficiently in obtaining the fulfillment of this objective; and I urge them to do so.

Let us now turn to the second objective of the President's budget—"to achieve a financial plan—a relationship between receipts and expenditures—which will contribute to economic growth, high employment, and price stability in our national economy." Mr. President, it is not news to any Member of this body when I say, "We are not going to obtain this objective."

On a cash basis, the President's budget was based on receipts of $93 billion and expenditures of $92.5 billion, with a surplus of $500 million. In discussing his estimated receipts of $93 billion, the President said:

> These receipts estimates are based on the expectation that the brisk recovery from last year's recession will continue through the coming year and beyond, carrying the gross national product during calendar 1962 to a record of $570 billion.

Of course, Mr. President, the fact is that the state of our economy is not that rosy; and a more realistic estimate of the gross national product for calendar year 1962 is in the neighborhood of $555 to $558 billion. Even that will be an all-time high.

The professional staff of the Senate Committee on Appropriations has prepared at my request, after consultation with the Bureau of the Budget and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, a revised estimate of receipts for the fiscal year 1963 of $85.9 billion. This estimate takes into consideration the status of the Nation's economy and the effect on receipts of the revision of the depreciation schedules and the pending tax legislation.

Mr. President, this decrease in estimated receipts is alarming; but it is even more alarming when we look at estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1963. The President's budget is based on expenditures of $92.5 billion. However, the professional staff of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, after consultation with the Bureau of the Budget, estimates that expenditures will total $94 billion during the fiscal year 1963. Based on these revised estimates, it is clear that the fiscal year 1963 will not be a "surplus" year, but will run a deficit in the neighborhood of $8.1 billion.

There are times when deficits are not quite so disturbing—such as during all-out war or major depressions. But just as there are times when deficits are not too disturbing, there are also times when the lack of surplus is disturbing. Mr. President, I submit that the present conditions in our Nation and the conditions in the country during the preceding 2 fiscal years call for a surplus, rather than deficits.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a tabulation of surpluses or deficits, by fiscal years, and the public debt for the period, 1789 to 1963.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget totals and public debt, 1789–1963

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget receipts	Budget expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	Public debt at end of year
1789–1849	1,160	1,090	+70	63
1850–99	13,895	14,932	−1,037	1,437
1900	567	521	+46	1,263
1901	588	525	+63	1,222
1902	562	485	+77	1,178
1903	562	517	+45	1,159
1904	541	584	−43	1,136
1905	544	567	−23	1,132
1906	595	570	+25	1,143
1907	666	579	+87	1,147
1908	602	659	−57	1,178
1909	604	694	−89	1,148
1910	676	694	−18	1,147
1911	702	691	+11	1,154
1912	693	690	+3	1,194
1913	714	715	[1]−	1,193
1914	725	725	[1]−	1,188
1915	683	746	−63	1,191
1916	762	713	+48	1,225
1917	1,100	1,954	−853	2,976
1918	3,630	12,662	−9,032	12,455
1919	5,085	18,448	−13,363	25,485
1920	6,649	6,357	+291	24,299
1921	5,567	5,058	+509	23,977
1922	4,021	3,285	+736	22,963
1923	3,849	3,137	+713	22,350
1924	3,853	2,890	+963	21,251
1925	3,598	2,881	+717	20,516
1926	3,753	2,888	+865	19,643
1927	3,992	2,837	+1,155	18,512
1928	3,872	2,933	+939	17,604
1929	3,861	3,127	+734	16,931
1930	4,058	3,320	+738	16,185
1931	3,116	3,577	−462	16,801
1932	1,924	4,659	−2,735	19,487
1933	1,997	4,598	−2,602	22,539
1934	3,015	6,645	−3,630	27,053
1935	3,706	6,497	−2,791	28,701
1936	3,997	8,422	−4,425	33,779
1937	4,956	7,733	−2,777	36,425
1938	5,588	6,765	−1,177	37,165
1939	4,979	8,841	−3,862	40,440
1940	5,137	9,055	−3,918	42,968
1941	7,096	13,255	−6,159	48,961
1942	12,547	34,037	−21,490	72,422
1943	21,947	79,368	−57,420	136,696
1944	43,563	94,986	−51,423	201,003
1945	44,362	98,303	−53,941	258,682
1946	39,650	60,326	−20,676	269,422
1947	39,677	38,923	+754	258,286
1948	41,375	32,955	+8,419	252,292
1949	37,663	39,474	−1,811	252,770
1950	36,422	39,544	−3,122	257,357
1951	47,480	43,970	+3,510	255,222
1952	61,287	65,303	−4,017	259,105
1953	64,671	74,120	−9,449	266,071
1954	64,420	67,537	−3,117	271,260
1955	60,209	64,389	−4,180	274,374
1956	67,850	66,224	+1,626	272,751
1957	70,562	68,966	+1,596	270,527
1958	68,550	71,369	−2,819	276,343
1959	67,915	80,342	−12,427	284,706
1960	77,763	76,539	+1,224	286,331
1961	77,659	81,515	−3,856	288,971
1962 (estimated)	82,100	89,075	−6,308	294,703
1963 (estimated)	93,000	92,537	+463	294,920

[1] Less than $500,000.

NOTES

Refunds of receipts are excluded from budget receipts and budget expenditures starting in 1913; comparable data are not available for prior years.

Certain interfund transactions are excluded from budget receipts and budget expenditures starting in 1932. For years prior to 1932 the amounts of such transactions are not significant.

The change in the public debt from year to year is not necessarily the same as the budget surplus or deficit, as explained on p. 56.

THE UNITED STATES IS PAYING FOR SOVIET SPIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 2 days ago—on October 3—I took the floor, to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that, in the face of the persistent record of Soviet espionage via the United Nations, Secretary General U Thant had contracted to establish in Moscow a training school for prospective Soviet employees of the United Nations, to be paid for out of U.N. funds.

The sum involved for 2 years is $201,200, of which the United States will pay $64,424.

The Soviet Union will pay only $35,139.

I urged that the State Department formally demand a vote of censure of the Soviets for their provocative and conscienceless utilization of the United Nations for espionage purposes; and I urged, further, that we back up this demand by presenting to the General Assembly a documented summary dealing with the cases of the 17 Soviet citizens, most of them employees of the U.N., but some of them members of the Soviet delegation, who had been caught in the act of spying against the United States.

Finally, I warned that if the proposed funds for the U.N.'s Moscow training school were approved, such action would raise such serious doubts in my own mind about the wisdom of continuing financial support to the U.N. that I would feel constrained to raise the matter for reconsideration as soon as the new Congress convenes in January.

I am happy to inform my colleagues that on the day after I made my statement in the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], speaking for the U.S. delegation to the U.N. registered the strong disapproval of this Government of the contract that Secretary General U Thant had concluded with the Soviets.

In assailing the contract in the Assembly's Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, the Senator from Colorado said:

> What really concerns us is that the Secretary General is forced to go the length of entering into this unusual arrangement—and to commit funds to it—in order to secure language experts from a member state like the Soviet Union. Surely the Soviet Union is not a country which requires United Nations technical assistance to train language experts for United Nations service * * * and surely the costs involved in running this program are ruble costs and do not require the expenditure of foreign exchange.

Presumably under instructions from the State Department, the Senator from Colorado refrained from voting on the item; and it was overwhelmingly approved by the Committee. As matters now stand, therefore, we are committed to pay one-third of the cost for this training program for prospective Soviet U.N. employees—or, to be more exact, we are being called upon to foot the bill for the training of future Soviet espionage agents who will shortly come to our country, cloaked in U.N. diplomatic immunity.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is an outrageous situation; and I have today sent to the Secretary of State a letter urging, among other things, that the United States refuse financial support for this item in the U.N. budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the text of an article which appeared in today's issue of the Baltimore Sun, together with the text of my letter to Secretary Rusk.

There being no objection, the article and the letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
October 5, 1962.

The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In the face of the persistent and conscienceless use of the U.N. by the Soviet Union for purposes of espionage against the United States, I wish to propose that the American delegation formally raise this matter in the General Assembly; present the General Assembly with a documented summary covering the 17 Soviet citizens who have been caught participating in such espionage; and request that the General Assembly censure the Soviet Union for abusing the hospitality of the United States and for thus recklessly endangering the prestige and reputation of the United Nations.

I believe that somehow we must find a way of facing up to this problem, because nothing will more rapidly destroy the confidence of the American public in the U.N. than the continuation of Soviet espionage via its U.N. personnel, on the wholesale scale of recent years.

I also wish to protest against the Secretary General's commitment to use U.N. funds to pay for a prospective training program in Moscow for Soviet language experts to be employed by the U.N. I wish to protest, particularly, over the fact that the United States will be called upon to pay its traditional share of U.N. operations, which in this case would amount to $64,424 over a 2-year period. I note with satisfaction that Senator Gordon Allott, speaking for the U.S. delegation, assailed this plan at the meeting of the Budget Committee yesterday. But, apparently under instructions from the State Department, he abstained from voting, so that now we are committed to the project.

I respectfully urge, Mr. Secretary, that the United States refuse to contribute to the financing of this project.

In support of my recommendations, I enclose copies of my statements on the subject, the first one made on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, October 3, the second one prepared for delivery today.

With all best wishes,
Sincerely,
Thomas J. Dodd.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 5, 1962]

U.S. Hits U.N. Job Training—Plan Calls for Russia To Train Translators

(By Paul W. Ward)

New York, October 4.—The U.S. Government belatedly registered official disapproval here today of a contract that U Thant, the United Nations chief executive, made with the Soviet Government last March 28.

The contract, in effect since that date, provides for the training in Moscow of Soviet nationals to take jobs here as United Nations interpreters or translators at the rate of 22 a year.

It also provides that the expense of the operation be shared by all the world organization's members, including the United States, which must pay 32.02 percent of the total bill, or nearly twice as much as the Soviet Union (17.47 percent).

DENOUNCED BY DODD

Washington's disapproval was voiced in the General Assembly's 108-member Budgetary Committee by Senator Allott, Republican, of Colorado, less than 24 hours after Senator Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, speaking in the U.S. Senate's debate on a $100 million appropriation to buy U.N. bonds—had denounced Thant's project as one for "training prospective Soviet spies against the United States."

The critique the State Department allowed the Colorado Republican to voice in his maiden speech as a U.S. delegate here was also the first the Kennedy administration has ever directed publicly at Thant, whom it is touting for election this fall to a full 5-year term as the United Nation's Secretary General.

Senator Allott was, however, confined to voicing "concern" in Washington's behalf about Thant's contract with the Kremlin and not allowed to press the issue to a vote.

REQUEST APPROVED

In consequence, Thant's request for $101,200 to pay the staff and students at the Moscow school this year was approved by the committee with Senator Allott recording an "abstention" and all the other committee members preesent giving tacit assent.

None seconded the U.S. delegate's critique or otherwise took heed of Senator Dodd's warning yesterday that, if Thant's request were approved here, it would raise such serious doubts in my mind about the wisdom of continuing financial support to the United Nations that I would feel constrained to raise the matter for reconsideration as soon as Congress reconvenes in January."

Senator Dodd, who stressed that he had voted to have the United States absorb half the United Nations' $200 million bond issue, keyed his speech to the Sunday Sun's September 30 publication of the details of Thant's contract with "the Moscow Pedagogical Institute for Foreign Languages."

RIGHT TO BE CONSULTED

He also appended to it a Justice Department list of 16 Soviet nationals expelled from the United States in recent years for engaging in espionage while stationed here either as United Nations employees or as Soviet delegation attachés.

In addition, he called upon the State Department and the U.S. delegation, which Adlai E. Stevenson heads here, to "monitor the United Nations expenditures more closely" and also "make abundantly clear" to Thant that, since the United States pays roughly a third of the world organization's operating expenses, "we have a right to be consulted" in advance of his undertaking projects like the one in Moscow.

Albert F. Bender, Jr., a senior adviser on Stevenson's staff, is a member of the Assembly's Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions which Thant had consulted before entering into the contract last March and again before asking for the $101,200 appropriation approved today and, yet again, before including a $100,000 appropriation request for the same purpose in his budget for 1963.

COMPLAINT MADE

On Wednesday Bender protested the Sunday Sun's identification of him as the U.S. representative on that Committee, which at no point raised any objection to Thant's Moscow project.

Bender said that, like all the Committee's 11 other members, including A. F. Sokirkin, of the Soviet Union, he sits in his individual capacity as an expert.

Yesterday he had to resume his role as a U.S. representative in the Budgetary Committee and, as such, ask Bruce Turner, the United Nations controller, for a detailed explanation of Thant's Moscow training school project.

Bender, who referred to it as "this unusual program," got in reply from Turner the same explanation Thant previously had made to the 12-man Advisory Committee.

BECAUSE OF OUR CONCERN

Displacing Bender in the Budgetary Committee today, Senator Allott rose to say—after a whole set of Thant's supplementary appropriation requests for the current year, including the one for Moscow's training school, had been approved en bloc—that "we abstained because of our concern" about that particular $101,200 item.

"We recognize the obligation imposed on the Secretary General to secure (a) trained language staff * * * (and) we respect his judgment that the program in question is the most efficient and economical open to him," the Colorado Republican asserted, adding:

"What really concerns us is that the Secretary General is forced to go the length of entering into this unusual arrangement—and to commit funds to it—in order to secure language experts from a member state like the Soviet Union. Surely the Soviet Union is not a country which requires United Nations technical assistance to train language experts for United Nations service * * * and surely the costs involved in running this program are ruble costs and do not require the expenditure of foreign exchange."

TREATED AS FINANCIAL ISSUE

Still treating the issue as solely a financial one, Senator Allott continued:

"The controller has characterized this program as imaginative. I will not say that he is wrong but simply that perhaps my imagination is better than his. I can imagine the Soviet Government paying the entire cost of this program so that no United Nations financial contribution would be required."

But "we are also concerned," the U.S. delegate asserted, "that this action may set a precedent for a pattern of future action which we would regret. We realize that the Secretary General is committed to this program for the present. We sincerely hope that the entire matter will be reviewed and reassessed before the 1964 budget estimates are prepared (a year hence)."

Sokirkin retorted that the Soviet Union is not in need of any "technical assistance" from the United Nations and that the contract it has made with Thant is beneficial, instead, to the world organization.

He and Senator Allott were the only participants in today's committee meeting to speak for or against that contract. Thant himself made no mention of it in a long statement he presented at the meeting's outset today.

Sokirkin and his Communist coadjutors from Eastern Europe concentrated their fire on Thant's request for a "supplementary" appropriation of $11,000 to cover the 1962 pay and expenses of Sir Leslie Munro, a New Zealander, as the Assembly's "special representative on the question of Hungary."

They forced a separate vote on that item by way of demonstrating their hostility to Sir Leslie, and the result was 41 to 18 in favor of the $11,000 appropriation with 19 members abstaining and 30 marked absent.

The vote on the bloc of $295,000 "supplementary" appropriations, including the one for the Moscow training school, was 67 to 0 with 11 abstentions. Since there was no rollcall only the U.S. abstention was officially attributable to Thant's contract with the Kremlin.

Thant concentrated on trying to fix the committee's attention on the threat of financial bankruptcy hanging over the world's chief peacekeeping organization, As of August 31, its "unpaid obligations"—$104,600,000 including accounts payable and $37,100,000 in borrowings from funds set up for other purposes—exceeded its "net cash resources" by $106,400,000 he said.

EMPHASIZES POINT

He also estimated that by this year's end the organization's "unpaid obligations" will have risen to $224 million.

He stressed that these figures do not include allowance for the debt accruing to the United Nations as a result of its bond sales. Nor does the budget, calling for net expenditures of $71,825,700, which he has submitted for next year.

Representing an increase of $3,700,000 over the organization's 1962 budget, the one for 1963 stands to have added to it before the year's end some $4,500,000 to cover amortization of the United Nations bond issue.

Forty-seven of the organization's 108 members as of yesterday had committed themselves—along with 4 nonmembers, West Germany, Kuwait, Switzerland, and South Vietnam—to buy $73,505,257 worth of the bonds.

The United States is commited, in turn, to match their aggregate purchases, once the House of Representatives approves the $100 million appropriation the Senate voted for that purpose yesterday.

The world organization is similarly commited to cease by December 31 its attempts to sell up to $200 million worth of the bonds, to pay 2 percent interest on them and to begin retiring them in 1963 at the initial rate of 3.1 percent a year.

"Due largely to the bond issue, the organization's cash difficulties have been, at least temporarily, overcome," Thant told the Assembly's Budgetary Committee today.

It would be a grave mistake to conclude, however, that the financial crisis, in the shadow of which the United Nations has uneasily existed these past few years, has somehow miraculously evaporated.

On the contrary, it is all too clear as matters now stand that, even assuming the most favorable developments, particularly in the Congo, there will be only the most limited possibility by 1963 of meeting ongoing costs of any major peace-keeping operation while liquidating past indebtedness.

Meanwhile, there were these additional developments here.

1. Speaking in todays' round of the Assembly's annual general debate, Frank Aiken, Ireland's Foreign Minister, dwelt at length upon the organization's financial peril and wound up by suggesting that—as a last resort—the Assembly annually "empower our Secretary General * * * to borrow * * * up to the full amount of the cost of implementing all the decisions of the United Nations in that year."

2. With Nationalist China's member abstaining, the Security Council voted 10 to 0, to nominate the People's Republic of United Nations lineup and, thereby, started a movement that, scheduled for completion by the Assembly Monday, will increase by one the number of members advocating Communist China's admission to membership.

3. President Osvaldo Dorticos, of Cuba, paid a ceremonial visit to Thant's headquarters and arranged to shift his scheduled speech before the Assembly Monday from afternoon to morning and thereby avoid interference with the induction ceremonies in Algeria's behalf that are slated for later that day.

4. Stage managers for the Assembly's main 108-member committee, which is to hold its first meeting of the current session tomorrow afternoon, promoted behind scenes a compromise formula which they hope will prevent an East-West procedural clash at the outset.

The formula would give the atomic tests issue first place on the committee's business calendar and, assigning general and complete disarmament to second position, would allot third place to Moscow's avowedly anti-American proposal for Assembly condemnation of propaganda favoring preventive war.

It would also require the United States to swallow its objections to according that Soviet proposal treatment as other than part of the whole disarmament issue. It would require, in addition, that the Kremlin reciprocate by entering into a gentlemen's agreement not to let Sovie-bloc delegates exploit the war propaganda item during the prospective debates on nuclear tests and disarmament.

SUPPORT FOR TRANSIT BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I regret very much that the Congress has not seen fit to give approval this year to the administration's urban transit bill, which I sponsored with 21 other Members of both sides of the aisle.

This modest piece of legislation is an urgent necessity if we are to cope with rising tide of traffic congestion and the steady decline and deterioration of rail and bus transit service in our urban areas. I am confident that the measure will ultimately prevail as the urgency of this problem becomes more evident.

To document the attitudes of New Jersey toward this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that editorials from several of the leading newspapers of my State and another publication be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, Sept. 25, 1962]

URBAN DWELLERS ARE TOO PATIENT

How long, Mr., Mrs., or Miss Commuter, will you sit in a traffic jam before you are angry enough to write your Congressman about it?

How long will you endure a 3-hour trip to the shore, swim an hour on a busy summer weekend, and then endure another 3 hours—most of them in slow-moving traffic—getting home?

How long will you keep your own temperature down while your auto boils over waiting in a line of stagnating traffic on some viaduct or inside or at either end of the Holland or Lincoln Tunnel?

U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, wondered about these questions in a talk to New Jersey newsmen the other night. Frankly he does not know the answers.

But he does know that the same reluctance to complain to Congress about urban traffic jams exists in Chicago, Los Angeles, or wherever more people wanting to get from place to place far exceed the transit systems that should be helping them move around an urban region.

He has tried throughout this drawn-out session of Congress to get enough steam up to win approval for his $500 million, administration-backed transit bill to help untangle mass transit messes such as are progressively strangling places like the New York metropolitan region.

But it's no soap.

The votes he has needed in Washington have not been there because Congressmen and Senators from similarly affected metropolitan regions around the country have heard nothing from their constituents on the matter. Commuters apparently won't even drop a note in a mail box, even if they sit by one an hour at a time in a traffic jam.

Earlier this year WILLIAMS' staff had 1,000 letters a week from people who didn't like legislation that would have required a firm to withhold taxes on dividends before the dividend checks were mailed out. These people did not realize they pay the tax anyway; they just wanted to get the money in their hands at least before they paid same back to Uncle Sam.

That steamed them up and the measure was defeated. It takes that kind of push into every legislator's office on the Hill to get action.

But the letterwriters in the Nation's burgeoning metropolitan areas are not writing about time-consuming traffic jams and creaking railroad systems. WILLIAMS sees little chance to get action on his bill this session and promised only to try again next year.

Last year's $50 million program helped provide money for the upcoming New Brunswick demonstration project which involves a second commuter-only rail station off Jersey Avenue. This may prove that commuters will forsake crowded highways and ride trains if they can park their cars free at the station.

WILLIAMS says much more can and must be done to solve an urban area's transit problems, but he has no idea how to fire up popular support if almost daily traffic jams won't do it.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Oct. 1, 1962]

DELAYED AGAIN

Efforts to mount a fresh attack on the urban commuter transit mess suffered a setback by the failure of Congress to enact the transportation measure put forth so hopefully by the Kennedy administration and pushed so energetically by New Jersey's Senator WILLIAMS.

The consensus is that it would take something tantamount to a "miracle" to get the bill through the House and Senate this year. And there appears to be no "miracle" forthcoming.

The measure would provide Federal financial assistance to start the wheels moving in some new directions for giving the commuter a better break. In so doing, it should be noted, more than the commuter would be getting a break. The future prosperity and well-being of the great metropolitan areas of the Nation are, in substantial measure, dependent on solving what commonly is described as the "commuter crisis."

Failure to enact the measure at this session has been particularly serious, because local programs have, to varying degrees, been held up pending the outcome of action in Washington.

New Jersey, for instance, has a $6-million-a-year program of aid to commuter railroads—merely to keep service from further deterioration. If this money could be used as matching funds under a Federal assistance program, the State certainly could expand its horizons far beyond the current limitations.

It appears now that the best that can be done is to start planning for another try next year. Let's hope that efforts this year at least have paved the way for speedy action the next time around.

[From the Bergen (N.J.) Evening Record, Sept. 21, 1962]

THE LAST EFFORT FOR TRANSIT AID

One word, "amen," is all that needs to be said about Senator WILLIAMS' plea on the Senate floor for the administration's $500-million mass-transit legislation:

"A little money will go a long way. But that little money is absolutely essential. Plans and studies we have had plenty of.

The missing ingredient is and always has been money.

The legislation contemplates Federal seed money grants so called in the amount of $100 million the first year of the program and $200 million each of the next 2 years. As highway construction money goes these days, that's peanuts. Why, it would cost something on the order of $100 million to build a mile or so of superhighway in Manhattan. But Mr. Williams is talking about gap money—the few millions that make a difference between starting work on a transit project, a rail or bus or rapid-transit project, and with a shrug locking the plans in a pigeonhole. He can see ways in which Federal money totaling only $16.5 million would enable a $50-million transit project like the 12-mile line between Philadelphia and its Camden suburbs recently projected by the Delaware River Port Authority through use of surplus funds. Not every area has a port authority. Not all port authorities have surpluses to use. In San Francisco, where the voters are to decide in November on a $790-million rapid-transit program, it is calculated gap money in the amount of $20 million a year over 10 years would produce a $600 million saving to taxpayers in bond principal and interest, traffic control costs, and the like.

Mr. Williams is going to have heavy going in the conservative blocs of both parties. They are not convinced that his definition of urban areas qualifying for help is strict enough to prevent a smalltown mass attack on the Federal money. They are not convinced that publicly assisted transit is necessary, despite his insistence that free enterprise transportation needs help and would get it; some 145 transit companies have abandoned service in the last 7 years, and 60 cities of 25,000 population or more have no public transportation whatever. Senator Williams is making an eloquent case. But it may be that here again we shall have to wait for the kind of eloquence which is crisis or catastrophe.

[From the Trainman News, Oct. 1, 1962]

DETERIORATION

It appeared at presstime that the administration's $500 million mass transit bill would die on the vine, so to say, for lack of affirmative action in this session of Congress.

The measure, designed to pump new life into the Nation's metropolitan commuter systems, was approved some time ago by the Senate Banking Committee and only recently was sent back to the Senate Commerce Committee in a move engineered by Senator Frank J. Lausche, Democrat, of Ohio.

Several days ago, the Commerce Committee reported out the bill, but without recommendation.

And there it was.

"Too many of our legislators have no sense of urgency at all about the stakes involved," declared Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, who introduced the bill and has battled for enactment.

"If this bill does go down, we will have wasted another year and done nothing to keep our deteriorating metropolitan commuter systems from deteriorating still more," he said.

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE AVAILABLE TO SERVE ALL PARTIES AND CANDIDATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on September 12, 1959, Senator Warren Magnuson, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, announced the appointment of a Subcommittee on Freedom of Communications. This was done pursuant to statements in debate on the floor of the Senate on the 1959 amendment of the equal-time provision of the Federal Communications Act in response to inquiries from Senators as to what safeguards there would be if the former equal-time provisions of the Federal Communications Act were amended as was being proposed and as was done in 1959.

The subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was composed of Senator Gale McGee, Senator Hugh Scott, and me. Senator Magnuson said at that time:

> It will be the duty and function of this subcommittee to insure freedom, fairness, and impartiality in the treatment of news by media operating under Government license. The subcommittee will receive information and complaints concerning the operation of communications media. In this sense, the subcommittee will be a watchdog subcommittee.

The subcommittee was set up originally as a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

On February 24, 1960, in the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the subcommittee was re-created as a subcommittee of the Subcommittee on Communications.

Later in 1960, on April 14, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported out Senate Resolution 305, which defined the jurisdiction of the subcommittee and authorized an appropriation for the use of the subcommittee. This resolution was adopted by the Senate on June 14, 1960.

Beginning in August 1960, the subcommittee sent to all congressional candidates and all candidates for statewide office throughout the country a letter advising of the existence and function of the subcommittee. When, in the fall of 1960, the election campaigns got underway, the subcommittee staff established a working relationship with the Federal Communications Commission staff and made arrangements for the subcommittee to be supplied with reproduction copies of all complaints or inquiries relating to politics made to the Commission in 1960. At the same time, liaison was set up whereby the subcommittee was advised daily by the Commission of all complaints or inquiries received and of the action taken by the Commission.

On October 14, 1960, the subcommittee addressed a letter to the more than 5,000 radio and television stations in the country, requesting reports to the subcommittee within 24 hours of political complaints received by the licensees during the last 3 weeks of the campaign.

With the opening of the 87th Congress, the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee was reappointed by Senator Magnuson, operating with the same jurisdiction granted by Senate Resolution 305 under the broader grant of authority to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by Senate Resolution 74 passed by the Senate on February 13, 1961.

In 1962, the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee was again reappointed by Senator Magnuson and is presently operating with the same jurisdiction granted by Senate Resolution 305 under the broader grant of authority to the Commerce Committee by Senate Resolution 251 passed by the Senate on February 7, 1962.

Mr. President, one of our primary concerns has been the use of radio and television as a communications link between candidates for public office and the people. We are now in the midst of election campaigns in every State in the Union. Radio and television licensees have a special responsibility in an election year to serve the public so that the public is informed on all sides of public questions.

In 1960, the Congress suspended the "equal opportunities" provision of section 315(a) for the period of the 1960 presidential campaign with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. There are those who contend that it is necessary to repeal the section 315—the so-called equal time provision—in order that face-to-face debates or other like presentations would be made possible in U.S. senatorial elections, congressional elections, State gubernatorial elections, and the like. I would like to point out that, in two-thirds of the contests for these offices in the United States this year, there will only be two candidates and that radio and television licensees can offer and make available public service time to the two candidates in those races just as they did in 1960 in the presidential campaign, if they so desire.

The subcommittee intends, following the November elections, to circulate a questionnaire to the radio and television stations across the Nation for a summary of their records in presenting political candidates. The performance of licensees in seeing that the public is informed, and, in those cases where there are only two candidates for a given office, just what steps were taken by the licensees to help to inform the public, is a matter of great concern to a Senate dedicated to freedom and fairness, of which this subcommittee is the representative. The subcommittee, as a "watchdog committee," would also like to know which licensees make available time on a commercial basis and which licensees refuse to sell time for political purposes. The subcommittee has been advised that there are licensees who refused to sell any time for political speeches or discussion programs, in what appears to be a flat violation of their obligation to operate in the public interest. Some licensees will only sell political spots or commercials of less than 1-minute duration. Some radio licensees contend that their "news and music" format precludes the sale of political time.

In 1959, when Congress amended the "equal time" requirements with regard to newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and certain news events, it was not the intention of the Congress that, under the umbrella of "editorial discretion" the licensee would be allowed to discriminate in favor of one candidate and against another. The subcommittee intends to do some spot checking of licensees to see how, in the discretion of licensees the broad powers granted them under the 1959 amendments are used.

As in 1960 the Senate Subcommittee on Freedom of Communications will be in operation during this campaign and election; and its staff will be available to consult and advise any and all candidates who may have complaints of discrimination or unfair treatment. This subcommittee, from the beginning, has been a strictly bipartisan operation. The fundamental principle which has motivated us is that the American people have a right to be informed fairly on all sides of public questions. Only by hearing opposing positions on public issues of interest, importance or, perhaps, survival, can the American people exercise their collective judgment intelligently at the ballot box.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to repeat the last paragraph from the "Recommendations" section of our report, filed April 17, 1962:

> Let there be free and open discussion; let the public hear both sides of the controversial and critical issues of our time, and this dialog will better maintain Americanism and the way of life it represents than anything else we can do. We must practice at home the freedom we preach abroad. We can convince only by example; let us make of our example the most of which we are capable.

The recommendations from which I quote are from part VI of the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee report on the presidential election of 1960, filed as a part of this subcommittee's report under the resolutions creating this subcommittee.

The subcommittee report—Senate Report 994, September 13, 1961—has been presented in six parts as follows:

Part I, "The Speeches, Remarks, Press Conferences, and Statements of Senator John F. Kennedy, August 1 through November 7, 1960," filed September 13, 1961.

Part II, "The Speeches, Remarks, Press Conferences, and Study Papers of Vice President Richard M. Nixon, August 1 through November 7, 1960," filed November 28, 1961.

Part III, "The Joint Appearances of Senator John F. Kennedy and Vice President Richard M. Nixon and other 1960 Campaign Presentations," filed December 11, 1961.

Part IV, "The 15-Minute Radio and Television Network Newscasts for the Period September 26 through November 7, 1960," filed December 12, 1961.

Part V, "Hearings Before the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee, March 27, 28, and 29, 1961," filed January 9, 1962.

Part VI, "Recommendations," filed April 17, 1962.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND ON CORK STOPPERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12213) to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, with respect to H.R. 12213, I desire to make a brief statement.

Cork insulation is a material particularly suitable for low-temperature applications, such as cold-storage rooms, refrigerator cars and trucks, refrigerated warehouses, ice cream hardening rooms, fur storage vaults, and similar places requiring illustration. After cutting and fitting, cork insulation is also used for pipe coverings in vessels for the U.S. Navy, for ammunition plugs for guns on naval cruisers, and other slow-fire ammunition used by the Navy.

Cork stoppers are cylinders of cork which are used for closing bottles, jars, flasks, and similar containers.

Information indicates that cork insulation and cork stoppers are no longer produced in the United States. The former domestic producers of these products support this legislative proposal to temporarily suspend the duties on these items. The duties would be suspended for 3 years.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed at the end of the bill to add a new section to read as follows:

> That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one orthicon image assembly imported for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment, which is a committee-approved amendment, having been approved unanimously by the Committee on Finance, is to authorize the Medical College of Georgia to bring in duty free one orthicon image assembly.

I ask unanimous consent that a telegram addressed to me from Dr. Rufus F. Payne, Superintendent of the Medical College of Georgia, be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Augusta, Ga., *September 27, 1962.*

Hon. Herman E. Talmadge, *Senator,*
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Talmadge: This is in reference to our telephone conversation concerning assistance in waiver of import duties on specialized X-ray equipment needed in research activities at the Medical College of Georgia.

This equipment is a Marconi type image amplifier which uses an orthicon type camera and a mirror optical enlarger in place of an image intensifier tube. This system gives an image resolution of 1025 lines and uses a 12-inch viewing screen.

There are several American manufacturers such as Westinghouse, Phillips, Machlett, and others who either manufacture image amplifiers or who assemble such equipment from imported parts. All of these systems, however, use an image intensifier in their circuits which causes distortion of the image. These systems have a screen of only 9 inches and can resolve only 525 lines. They are not satisfactory to properly perform the research activities to which we are obligated under a grant from the National Institutes of Health. There is no other known source of supply for equipment having these performance specifications.

Any report to the contrary is based upon either misinformation or misunderstanding of the specifications required. This misunderstanding may be based on the fact that the American systems employ an orthicon camera to make a picture from the image intensifier whereas the Marconi system does not employ this intermediate image intensifying system but makes its picture from the X-ray screen which is amplified by a mirror optical system.

Perhaps my reference to Duke University was in error. They are in the process of purchasing identical equipment but have not yet secured waiver of import duty. Tulane University did secure relief for the purchase of different type equipment.

To recapitulate: Our specifications call for a 12-inch viewing screen with a system capable of image resolution of 1,025 lines which does not use image intensification as an intermediate step. There is no American made equipment which can meet these specifications.

Your assistance will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours

Rufus F. Payne, M.D.,
Superintendent, Medical College of Georgia.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, what is an orthicon image? Is that a medical term?

Mr. TALMADGE. Yes. An orthicon image assembly is a highly specialized piece of scientific equipment which permits televised examination of the human body. Although some types of this equipment are manufactured in this country, no domestic manufacturer produces this particular machine with the specifications required.

I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Finance Committee voted to accept this amendment. As chairman, I will accept it and include it in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. What is the Senate about to vote on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge].

Mr. TALMADGE. The amendment would authorize the Medical College of Georgia to bring in some medical equipment at a cost of approximately $32,000, which will be free of a tariff duty of approximately $3,100. This equipment is not produced in this country.

Mr. MORSE. I am all for that.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator.

I ask the Chair to put the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, at the end of the bill, to add a new section to read as follows:

That section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1301a), is further amended by changing the period at the end of the first sentence thereof to a semicolon and adding the following provision: "*Provided*, That for the purpose of this section none of the following and no combination of the following shall constitute manufacture or production when applied to textiles or textile products: Any process or treatment or combination thereof having the purpose of water-proofing, shower-proofing, adhesive laminating, lining, ornamenting, imparting resistance or repellency to water, stains, creasing, or insect damage, or having the purpose of preserving or changing size, color, texture or laundering or cleaning characteristics or having any other purpose or purposes similar to the foregoing."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is the bill still subject to amendment?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have an amendment pending if the Senator will permit me to comment on it.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

Mr. TALMADGE. This amendment was called to the attention of the Senator from Georgia by the Department of Commerce. The Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Gudeman, sent me a letter enclosing a draft of the suggested amendment, with a statement of the facts in the particular case that motivated the Senator from Georgia to offer this amendment before the Finance Committee. It was unanimously agreed to by the Finance Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Under Secretary of Commerce be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., September 24, 1962.

Hon. Herman E. Talmadge,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Talmadge: There is enclosed a proposed amendment to section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1301(a)), as amended, together with a statement of the purpose of the proposal and the need therefor.

The Department of Commerce urges enactment of this proposal at this session to put an end to an artificial uneconomic practice which is injurious to our woolen industry and which results in a considerable loss in duty to the Treasury of the United States.

Your assistance in obtaining consideration of this measure by the Congress is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Gudeman,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the domestic wool textile products industry is currently being adversely affected by substantial increases in low-priced imports. There are no quotas or other restraining actions on woolen textile products, except for tariffs. It appears likely that import pressures will continue and that the ratio of imports to domestic consumption, already high at 17.2 percent for the year ending July 1962, will rise further by the end of the year.

Apart from the basic import problem of imports from legitimate foreign manufacturing countries, for which the administration is currently exploring solutions, we are facing this year a new and very serious problem. Section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1301(a)), provides that articles manufactured in the insular possessions of the United States are to be entered into this country duty free if they do not contain foreign materials to the value of more than 50 percent of their total value.

Under this section there have been established two operations in the Virgin Islands, which import large quantities of Italian woolen fabrics, give them a waterproofing treatment there, and then ship them to the United States where they enter duty free. They pay in the range of 60 cents for the fabric and sell them in the United States for about $1.25. Despite the fact that the best waterproofing treatments cost only a few cents, this pricing, which both provides a generous markup and contributes to disruption of the domestic woolen market, is possible because of the duty-free status.

Imports of Italian fabric waterproofed in the Virgin Islands by these two operations totaled over 6 million square yards in the first 7 months of 1962. These operations employ less than 100 persons each and total costs do not exceed the range of 20 cents per square yard. The fabric is being used in some instances for skirts and trousers so that the waterproofing is actually of little or no value. The operations obviously exist solely to take advantage of the duty-free benefits of section 301 and are doing little to add to the economy of the Virgin Islands. Loss of duty to the U.S. Treasury arising from this operation was in excess of $4 million in the first 7 months of this year.

Meanwhile, these duty-free imports amounted to nearly 20 percent of regular woven fabric imports in the first 7 months of this year and are therefore a major factor contributing to rising imports of woolen textile products and to the hardship being caused to many domestic woolen mills.

This amendment to section 301 would preclude from the definition of manufacture or production as used therein the present processing and related uneconomic operations. It would not preclude substantive processing and manufacture of benefit to the insular possessions.

Mr. President, I have before me a telegram addressed to "Hon. Harry Byrd, chairman of the Finance Committee, Senate Office Building," which reads as follows:

Endorse amendment to H.R. 12213 regards textiles from Virgin Islands.

Governor Paiewonsky.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, provided the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] who has the floor concurs.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am very familiar with this situation. I am also familiar with what has been happening. I am familiar with the amendment.

I heartily endorse the amendment, and I hope the Senate will approve it. We who are interested in the woolen textile industry have been trying for a long time, through administrative intervention, to stabilize the importation of woolen goods. Excessive import has depressed the American woolen market to the point that it is on the verge of bankruptcy. For a long time we tried to stabilize imports of woolen cloth to this country predicated on the importations for fiscal year 1961. Since that time the importations have increased more than 17½ percent.

Today we are plagued by a loophole. The purpose of the amendment is to close this loophole and to stop the abuse which is now being inflicted on American industry.

What is being done in the Virgin Islands is merely the sprinkling—the alleged showerproofing—of cloth which essentially does not have to be waterproofed. The only purpose is to submerge the American market with woolen cloth coming from various countries of the world, and, I regret to say, particularly from Italy at this time. The cheap cloth is sent to the Virgin Islands and, because the Virgin Islands participates to some extent in waterproofing the cloth, it then comes to the United States duty free. A case on this subject is now pending before the Bureau of Customs. There is a loophole, which should be closed.

I heartily endorse the amendment, which I think should be adopted. What is being done defeats the purpose of section 301.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator for his invaluable comment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

Mr. TALMADGE. I now yield, with the permission of the chairman of the committee, to the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts, and then I will yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me. As a representative of Massachusetts, whose people are greatly interested in the woolen industry, I endorse what the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Rhode Island have said. What is involved is another method of getting around our tariff laws at the expense of textile manufacturers in our country. I understand that the Treasury Department supports the amendment which the Senator from Georgia has offered. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. TALMADGE. I appreciate the comment by the able and distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I now yield to the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, I should like to ask a factual question, and then, if I may, I should like briefly to express my view to the Senator.

I understand that the original problem with respect to the Virgin Islands was on shower proofing so-called cravenetted material. There has been included in the amendment the laminating, lining, and ornamenting of textiles.

Is that a Virgin Islands problem, or something of a different type? I think the record should be clear.

Mr. TALMADGE. It represents a Virgin Islands problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Of the same kind?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I have been importuned to interpose an amendment to the amendment, or otherwise to act with respect to it. Incidentally, I have not entertained the importuning on a rather interesting ground, which I should like to lay before the Senator, because I think the question can be answered.

Though it is true that the Commerce Department has made its representation, it is also a fact that representatives of the Bureau of Customs have said that this is a practice which is within the customs laws and that, therefore, the people who are engaging in this practice are entitled to a hearing almost on civil liberties grounds.

I have no intention of opposing the amendment or of offering an amendment to the amendment, but I should like to ask the Senator a question. I am really asking the Senator from Virginia the question, but directing it to the Senator who has been kind enough to yield to me.

I seems to me that we ought to be able to say to these people, on the record, "In view of the fact that Congress is quitting, though this may not be a loophole, at least there is a prima facie case"—as we lawyers say—"that it ought to be closed up."

The chairman of the committee could say, "If you feel aggrieved, we will give you a hearing the minute the Congress returns, or perhaps during the recess, if you wish to present some kind of letter requesting it, stating the fact that you ought to have a hearing, that you have been aggrieved, that there are substantive facts which have not been considered. There is no desire to foreclose you, except for the problem of time. We are going home, and this does look like a serious loophole. That is the explanation."

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I say to the Senator from New York that the Finance Committee has never refused a hearing, but I will not guarantee that we could obtain a quorum during the recess.

Mr. JAVITS. In any case, there would be an audience.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. There would be an audience.

Mr. JAVITS. The committee has a staff. The chairman is always available. Purely on the grounds of civil liberties, when people complain that they have not had a hearing and that we are passing substantive legislation without a hearing, they should be given that much satisfaction. We could say, "If you will come in, those in authority will hear your case."

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator from Virginia will do everything possible to provide a hearing, provided we can obtain a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not wish to put words into the mouth of the Senator, but I am sure that the Senator from Virginia will do what is tantamount to giving them an audience.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Finance Committee has always done that. We will do it in this case.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The suggestion made by the Senator from New York is a perfectly reasonable and fair one, and I think the Senator got a perfectly fair and cooperative answer from the Senator from Virginia, which would in no way prevent the adoption of the Talmadge amendment, which would plug the loophole for now.

If any case can be shown that any wrong or injustice is being committed, that would require further action on the part of the Congress in the next session. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. TALMADGE. I think that is entirely correct. Since I have been honored to serve on the Finance Committee, the distinguished and able chairman of the Finance Committee has never refused a hearing to anyone who has requested it, to my knowledge, on any subject.

I will say further that some of the individuals who are interested in this matter came to see me, because I had offered the amendment in the committee. I told them that the Finance Committee had acted unanimously to plug the loophole on the request of the Government of the United States, but that if any of them had a problem which might involve a hardship, so far as I was concerned, as one individual member of the Finance Committee, I would be happy to consider it next January.

Knowing the members of the Finance Committee as I do, their high sense of honor and high sense of dedication, I can assure the able Senator from Oregon and the able Senator from New York that the Finance Committee will hear anyone on any matter of interest at any time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I had not quite completed my comment.

I have done my best to consider the pros and cons of this issue. I have come to the conclusion that the Talmadge amendment should be adopted.

I received information from Mr. R. A. Ward, of the woolgrowers in my State, this afternoon by telegram.

In the telegram it is set forth that the Talmadge amendment is necessary to protect a very important economic segment of the economy in my State; namely, the wool segment. Therefore, I shall support the amendment.

I am perfectly satisfied with the procedure which has been agreed upon between the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], which will give the Virgin Islands people at least an opportunity to prove their case for further action by the Congress, if they can make the facts stick.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator from Oregon. I am deeply grateful to the Senator for his very effective support.

Mr. SCOTT rose.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania desire to ask me a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, if the Senator will be good enough to yield to me in order to clarify something.

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. It is my understanding that the amendment the Senator has offered has the approval of the Department of Commerce. In the amendment before the word "laminated" I see the word "adhesive." I assume the Senator would distinguish between the words "thermo" and "adhesive" as they would apply to the process of lamination. Is that correct?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

Mr. SCOTT. As I understand, the definition of adhesive lamination is a liquid adhesive which allows the gluing of two things together, and thermo lamination involves melting a part of one substance by flame and then adhering that substance to a piece of textile. I am told that that is the difference.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, mention has been made that an opportunity for a hearing would be available to anyone who feels aggrieved by the amendment. Apparently that is the attitude of the majority of the Senate. However, I wish to raise a question about American manufacturers who have entered into agreements of purchase with producers in the Virgin Islands on the assumption, which was a perfectly valid one, that the introduction into the United States of rainproved material of the kind described was within the authority of section 301.

A manufacturer has communicated with me, advising that cutting off this source of fabrics would adversely affect our operation and cut down on our employment capacity. He, too, has made the point that the subject of the amendment has never been given a hearing.

Are we not in the position of locking the door before we find out whether the horse is there or not? Why should we change the law until there has been a hearing?

Mr. TALMADGE. I point out to the Senator from Michigan that all the amendment would do would be to close a loophole in the law. The material would still be available. All that those dealing in the material would have to do would be to pay the import duty when they bring it into the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. We can only understand the amendment when we understand the reason for the proposal. We have been reasonably successful in trying to protect the American textile industry. We have worked out agreements as to exports. We have been rather successful in stabilizing the importation of these goods. The minute we arrive at a point of stabilization, however, the manufacturers of such material as that about which we have been speaking began to look through the law books to see if they could find a loophole. That is precisely what they have found. They have worked out a phony process of waterproofing the cloth. It is cloth which does not have to be waterproofed and never was intended to be waterproofed.

But merely to create a gimmick by which the goods could be imported on the basis that the value of the goods had been processed in the Virgin Islands so that it could come in duty free. So those engaged in the trade have discovered an out-and-out loophole.

Mr. President, there is an emergency. We should meet it now, because since the start of the year they have brought in from the Virgin Islands 7 million yards of cloth.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct. It is a gimmick to avoid paying the proper duty on the importation of this product.

Mr. HART. As I indicated earlier, I understand the attitude of the Senator, but I still believe I am not illogical in suggesting that those who are complying with the letter of the law might be damaged, and they should have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to be heard, I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

Sec. 2. (a) Paragraph 1101(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1001, par. 1101 (b)) is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Karakul wools, and other wools of whatever blood or origin not finer than 40s, may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse without the payment of duty by a manufacturer, processor, or dealer upon the filing of a bond to insure that any wool entered or withdrawn thereunder shall be used only in the manufacture of pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass: *Provided*, That a tolerance of not more than 10 per centum of such wools other than Karakul not finer than 44s may be allowed in each bale or package of wools imported as not finer than 40s."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to wool entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I believe that the committee has considered the amendment and approves of it. I shall not belabor the question. If the Senator from Virginia is willing to accept it, I shall be glad to have it go to a vote.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The amendment has the approval of the committee, and the Senator from Virginia will be glad to accept it.

Mr. BUSH. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3642, introduced by Senator Bush on August 15, 1962, proposed that paragraph 1101(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1001, par. 1101(b)) be amended to permit the duty-free entry of certain coarse wools which are not produced in significant quantity in this country, provided that the wools so imported were to be used in the manufacture of "pressed felt for polisihng plate and mirror glass."

In order to forestall any possibility—however remote—that imports pursuant to S. 3642 might result in injury to our domestic wool industry, the bill should be made even more restrictive. To that end, there is attached hereto a suggested amendment to S. 3642. It would strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute new language. While designed to accomplish the same objective as S. 3642, the amendatory language by its terms is more restrictive and thus provides still further insurance against injury to the domestic wool industry. The new language specifies that wools admitted free of duty for use in the manufacture of "pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass" shall be limited: first, to Karakul wools without any specification as to coarseness, and second, to wools of any other blood or origin provided they are not finer than 40s (as to these other wools a tolerance of 10 percent not finer than 44s would be allowed in each bale or package of wools imported as not finer than 40s).

This amendment will make it even more certain that the wools to be thus imported free of duty will have no counterpart among wools produced in this country. Karakul wools are not to be found in our domestic wool production, nor are wools of any other blood or origin that are so coarse as to be "not finer than 40s."

A similar legislative proposal in this area (H.R. 9161) would permit the duty-free entry of wools "not finer that 46s," provided they were to be used in the manufacture of "polishing felts." All of the various executive departments and agencies having an interest in that bill reported to the House Ways and Means Committee that they would not object to the enactment of the legislation. The Tariff Commission recommended that the end use be described more precisely by substituting "pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass" for "polishing felts." Adoption of this suggestion is reflected in S. 3642 as introduced by Senator Bush and is incorporated word for word in the amendment now proposed to S. 3642.

It is understood that no department or agency in the executive branch would have any objection to the amendment proposed here. The reasons for this are obvious. In commenting on H.R. 9161, the Department of Agriculture, for example, concluded that it would have no objection to passage of the bill because the wools that would be imported thereunder are not available in significant quantities domestically and are, therefore, essentially noncompetitive with domestic wool. The unavailability of competing domestic wools is, as indicated above, made all the more certain by the greater restrictions that would be imposed by the new amendment. Duty-free importation would be limited to Karakul wools which are not found in our domestic production and to other wools provided they are not finer than 40s. Present law permits the duty-free entry, for other specified end uses, of wools not finer than 46s and this same restriction would be applied, under H.R. 9161 and S. 3642, to pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass. The proposed amendment, however, would limit duty-free importation for use in the manufacture of pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass to wools of a coarseness not finer than 40s and the amendment, accordingly, is more restrictive on its face than the similar legislation as to which earlier this year the Department of Agriculture, the Tariff Commission, and other agencies of the executive branch reported favorably.

Another important element of protection for the domestic wool industry that is present in the proposed amendment should also be emphasized. It is the condition that duty-free entry is permitted only if the wools in question are to be actually used in the manufacture of pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass. The amendment requires the posting of a bond to insure that the wools entered duty free are in fact used for the purpose specified. The protective feature—specifying an end use and requiring the posting of a bond to insure that end use—is drawn directly from present law (paragraph 1101(b)). In fact, all of the language of the proposed amendment is an exact parallel of the first sentence of paragraph 1101(b) except (1) for the specification of Karakul wools by name and (2) the more restrictive "not finer than 40s" instead of "not finer than 46s". Finally, the pressed felt industry has advised that it is actually impossible to make pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass unless very coarse wools, Karakul wools or other wools not finer than 40s, are used. This fact, together with the mentioned safeguards that are built into the amendatory language, make an abuse of the privilege that would be granted impossible.

The need for this bill is very real. The tariff on imports of felt products made abroad from these same coarse wools, including foreign made pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass, was recently reduced by 20 percent in the multiple country tariff negotiations held in Geneva earlier this year. Even before that 20-percent tariff reduction, foreign made felts of the kind in question were being imported at prices substantially below domestic production costs for such felts. The legislation proposed will be of material help in restoring a degree of competitive balance as between our own and foreign producers.

Needless to say, this bill is of great importance to the American felt industry. It is also of importance, however, to the American woolgrower for the felt industry is a substantial consumer of domestic wool. The best interests of the American woolgrower are plainly served if the felt industry remains strong and able so that it can continue its purchases of domestic wools. The legislation at hand, amended as proposed, will advance that objective materially.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the appropriate place in the bill, it is proposed to add:

Sec. —. (a) For purposes of the Tariff Act of 1930, the rate of duty specified in paragraph 1506 of such Act applicable to brooms made of broom corn shall be based upon the American selling price (as defined in section 402(e) of such Act) of the domestic article.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) For purposes of section 336(f) of the Tariff Act of 1930, the provisions of subsection (a) shall be treated as having been proclaimed under section 336(c) of such Act.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the amendment would carry out the recommendation and unanimous opinion of the Tariff Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the Tariff Commission's report appearing on pages 12 and 9 and its conclusion, including the signatures of members of the Tariff Commission, on pages 4 and 5, be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Talmadge in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Page 12:

"U.S. IMPORTS

"U.S. imports for consumption of all brooms provided for in tariff paragraph 1506 increased from 102,200 dozen, valued at $300,281 in 1955, to 258,457 dozen, valued at $729,354 in 1960 (table 5)."

Page 9: "171 concerns produce more than 90 percent of the total U.S. output, according to the National Broom Manufacturers & Allied Industries Association. Of this number, 139 concerns are commercial producers and 32 are workshops for the blind. In addition there are approximately 175 one-man-shop operators who were referred to by witnesses at the Commission's hearing but whose identities are not on record."

Pages 4 and 5:

"CONCLUSIONS

"The Commission finds it shown by the investigation—

"1. That the duty of 25-percent ad valorem expressly fixed by statute for brooms made of broomcorn, applied on the presently applicable bases of dutiable value under section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930, does not equalize the differences in costs of production, including transportation and other delivery charges to the principal markets in the United States, of the domestic articles and the like or similar foreign articles produced in the principal competing country;

"2. That such differences in costs of production cannot be equalized by the maximum permissible increase in such rate of duty as provided in section 336(a) of the said act; and

"3. That in order to equalize such differences in costs of production to the fullest extent permissible under section 336, it is necessary that the rate of duty of 25 per centum ad valorem be applied to brooms made of broomcorn on the basis of the American selling price as defined in section 402(e) of the said act.

"Appended hereto is a summary of the information obtained in the investigation.

"Respectfully submitted,[1]
"Ben Dorfman,
"*Chairman.*
"Joseph E. Talbot,
"*Commissioner.*
"Walter R. Schreiber,
"*Commissioner.*
"Glenn W. Sutton,
"*Commissioner.*
"J. Allen Overton, Jr.,
"*Commissioner.*"

Mr. CURTIS. The amendment has been approved by the committee, and at the direction of the committee I have offered it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Washington [Mr. Magnuson and Mr. Jackson], I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Sec. 2. (a) Section 201 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1201) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Par. 1830. Limestone, crude, not suitable for use as monumental, paving, or building stone; limestone chips and spalls; and limestone, crushed or ground."

(b) Paragraph 203 of section 1 of such Act (19 U.S.C., sec. 1001, par. 203) is amended by striking out "Limestone (not suitable for use as monumental or building stone), crude, or crushed but not pulverized, 5 cents per one hundred pounds; lime" and inserting in lieu thereof "Lime".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act.

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the distinguished Senators from Washington relative to the amendment offered in their behalf be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Jackson Regarding Amendment to H.R. 12213

I rise to present an amendment for Senator Magnuson and myself to place on the free list imports of crude limestone. All the interested Departments (Interior, Commerce, Labor, State, and Treasury) have submitted favorable reports on the amendment to the Committee on Finance. These reports demonstrate that the amendment will greatly benefit certain U.S. industries dependent upon these imports—such as cement, paper and pulp, and metallurgical—while causing no injury to U.S. crude limestone producers.

Imports of crude and crushed limestone are small in volume, come entirely from Canada, and are consumed by U.S. industries located in the border States. In 1961, nearly three-fourths of imports were consumed by cement and other industrial plants located in the State of Washington.

These imports result from the fact that several of these border areas are deficient in commercial deposits of limestone. Since limestone is a commodity of low-unit value, with the cost of transportation relatively high, nearby Canadian quarries are the only economic source of this raw material for these U.S. industries.

High transportation costs and low-commodity value prevent the Canadian imports from moving more than short distances inland or into U.S. localities having ample supplies of crude limestone. Imports are thus essentially noncompetitive with domestic production. I am advised that in 1960, according to Tariff Commission figures, imports of crude or crushed limestone were less than one-quarter of 1 percent of U.S. production in the border States themselves.

The existing duties, about 22 cents per ton or about one-seventh of imported crude limestone costs, are merely an added burden to the costs of certain U.S. industries which, in any case, must import. At the same time, because these imports are noncompetitive, the duties are not needed for protection of domestic industries.

I commend this needed proposal to your attention as one beneficial to the consuming U.S. industries, and request your favorable consideration.

H.R. 12213

(Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. Jackson (for himself and Mr. Magnuson) to the bill H.R. 12213 to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers)

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 201 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C., sec. 1201) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" 'Par. 1830. Limestone, crude, not suitable for use as monumental, paving, or building stone; limestone chips and spalls; and limestone, crushed or ground.'

"(b) Paragraph 203 of section 1 of such act (19 U.S.C., sec. 1001, par. 203) is amended by striking out "Limestone (not suitable for use as monumental or building stone), crude, or crushed but not pulverized, 5 cents per one hundred pounds; lime" and inserting in lieu thereof "Lime".

"(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senators from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 10-3-62 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Florida will be stated.

---

[1] Commissioner Dowling participated in this investigation and subscribed to the conclusions set forth above, but was absent on leave at the time this report was submitted to the President.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

Sec. 2. Wood particleboard which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after July 11, 1957, and before May 25, 1961, shall be classified for duty purposes as wallboard under paragraph 1402 of the Tariff Act of 1930, if not excluded from classification under such paragraph by reason of any processing specified therein. The entries involved shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930, be liquidated or reliquidated in accordance with the preceding sentence, except that no refund shall be allowed thereby, unless claim therefor is filed with the collector of customs concerned within one hundred and twenty days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the amendment relates to a circumstance that developed by reason of bad advice. I have talked the matter over with the able chairman of the committee. I understand that he is willing to take the amendment to conference.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record at this point an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

During the period July 11, 1957, to May 25, 1961, certain imports of wood particleboard were imported and classed as wallboard for duty purposes. The advice was that imports in standard wallboard sizes would be classified as wallboard at a reasonable tariff rate.

Later on, it was found that the exporter had allowed an inch or so extra on shipments to this country so that any damage to the edges, incurred in shipping, could be trimmed off.

This, apparently, was a good will gesture on the part of the exporter. However, the Customs ruled that this extra inch took these shipments out of the standard wallboard sizes and, instead of a 5 percent duty, the importers suddenly found themselves confronted with a duty of about 400 percent.

This great increase was not made known until after the merchandise had been sold under the assumption that the duty would be 5 percent.

I am advised that the importer in Florida will be bankrupt if this great increase in duty is collected. Had he known that the tolerance of 1 inch was going to make a difference of about 395 percent in the duty, he would, by all means, have had the panels trimmed before shipment.

I want to make it clear that the amendment reassessing the rate at 5 percent will apply only to entries of particleboard made within the time limit specified. It will have no application to entries made since the middle of 1961, nor to any made in the future. Adoption of the amendment will prevent an injustice to one or two importers which has developed through no fault of their own. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Part 3 of title V of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'DAY-CARE FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN OF MIGRANT AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

" 'Sec. 529. (a) For the purpose of enabling the United States, through the Secretary, to further cooperate with State public-welfare agencies which have included in their plans for child-welfare services provisions calling for the providing of day-care facilities for the children of migrant agricultural workers, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for each succeeding fiscal year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the sum of $750,000, which shall be used exclusively for the establishment and operation of such day-care facilities.

" '(b) On November 1, 1962, and thereafter at the beginning of each fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964) the Secretary shall allot the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) to States as follows: He shall allot to each State the plan of whose child-welfare agency calls for the providing of such day-care facilities an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for such year as the total number of children of migrant agricultural workers who were in such State during the preceding fiscal year (as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the best data available to him) bears to the total number of such children who were in all such States for such preceding year (as so determined).

" '(c) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) and the allotments available under subsection (b), the Secretary shall from time to time pay to each State the public-welfare agency of which includes in its plan for child-welfare services provisions calling for the providing of day-care facilities for the children of migrant agricultural workers an amount equal to the Federal share (as determined under section 524) of such portion of the total sum expended under such plan (including the cost of administration of the plan) as is attributable to the providing of such day-care facilities. Such amounts shall be payable in the manner provided by section 523(b).

" '(d) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (b) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Secretary will not be required for carrying out the provisions of its State plan relating to the providing of day-care facilities for the children of migrant workers shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Secretary may fix, to other States which the Secretary determines (1) have need in carrying out the provisions of their State plan which call for the providing of such facilities for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under such subsection and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts during such fiscal year in carrying out such provisions. Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (b).

" '(e) In no case shall a State receive Federal financial assistance with respect to the same expenditure under this section and the preceding sections of this part.

" '(f) For purposes of this section—

" '(1) The term "migrant agricultural worker" means an individual (A) whose primary employment is agriculture, as defined in section 3(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(f)), or performing agricultural labor, as defined in section 3121(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 3121 (f)), on a seasonal or other temporary basis, and (B) who establishes with his family for the purpose of such employment a temporary residence;

" '(2) The term "child" means a child who makes his home with his parent or the individual who stands in loco parentis to the child; and

" '(3) The term "day-care facility" includes (A) day-care centers whether provided directly by the State (or any political subdivision thereof) or indirectly through a purchase of care or other basis, and (B) individualized care provided through foster home services.

" '(g) No funds appropriated under the authority of subsection (a) shall be payable to any State which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for day-care facilities, any residence requirement which excludes any otherwise eligible child physically present in the State.' "

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I offer the amendment on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Carroll], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

This amendment to the bill H.R. 12213 would add a new section to part 3, title V of the Social Security Act, providing grants to States for material and child welfare services. The new section would be entitled "Day-Care Facilities for Children of Migrant Agricultural Workers," and would authorize $750,000 annually in grants to States having large numbers of migratory farmworkers and hence significant need for assistance in the provision of day-care facilities and services for migratory farm children. In order to assure that the moneys only go to areas of need, the moneys appropriated under the new section would be allotted to States by a formula based on the number of migratory farm children within the State.

The Federal funds would be allotted among States on a matching basis in accordance with the matching formula now contained in the child welfare services section of the Social Security Act. Under such formula, the Federal grant would vary according to the State's per capita income, but in no case would the grant be less than 33⅓ percent or more than 66⅔ percent. State residence requirements would not bar otherwise eligible children from benefits. Welfare services and benefits, for which migratory farm children are currently eligible under section 521 of the Social Security

Act, would continue to be available after enactment of this bill. The cost of section 521 benefits would not be considered as part of the grants authorized by this bill.

The amendment, in its substantive provisions, is identical to the bill, S. 1131, which has been favorably recommended for enactment in a formal report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This day-care provision was passed.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement bearing on the background of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHILD WELFARE

BACKGROUND

Approximately 100,000 to 150,000 children under the age of 14 accompany their parents on their yearly migration for agricultural work. Because one wage earner's income is rarely enough to support a family, it is usually the case that the wife, and often the older children, work also. Infants and younger children, if they are left at the home camp, are usually tended by a woman too old or too sick to work, or by an older child—perhaps only 9 or 10 years old himself. Sometimes infants are taken to the field with their parents, and left for the whole day with little shelter, care, or attention. In short, these children are generally left uncared for and when care is provided, it is usually inadequate.

In a study made by the Children's Bureau in 1960, the overwhelming consensus of State welfare agencies was that day-care centers are desperately needed for children of migratory agricultural workers. Some States have already allocated part of their State child welfare appropriations for day-care facilities for migratory children. Yet, today, in the entire Nation, there are still only 24 licensed day-care centers which primarily serve children of migratory families. Thirteen of these centers are in New York State alone. The combined aggregate capacity of all 24 centers would probably serve fewer than 1,000 children.

Aside from day care, an equally serious situation exists in the area of child welfare work. Migratory families and their children have a greater than average number of social problems. However, in the 39 counties estimated to have 5,000 or more migratory workers, 10 do not have any service available from a full-time public welfare worker. Ten others either have one full-time worker for the county's total population, or services only on a shared basis with one or more counties.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Children of migratory farm workers should be provided better care and protection while their parents are at work in the fields. The Federal Government should stimulate establishment and maintenance of day-care facilities for children of migratory agricultural workers by making financial assistance available for this purpose to States. Such assistance should be made available to States on a matching basis by a formula which makes allowance for the State's total number of domestic migratory workers.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator's amendment relates to social security. We are considering a tariff bill. I am willing to accept it and take it to conference. However, I wish to point out that this relates to a social security bill and we are considering a tariff bill. It may be subject to a point of order in conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2229, H.R. 10117.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "subsection," strike out "(c)" and insert "(h)"; in line 6, after the word "subsection," where it appears the first time, to strike out "(d)" and insert "(i)"; in the same line, after the word "subsection," where it appears the second time, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(g)"; at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(h)"; and at the top of page 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. At the option of the taxpayer, exercised after the date of enactment of this Act and not later than December 31, 1962, intangible drilling and development costs paid or incurred may be deducted as expenses. The option provided by this section shall not apply in any case to which the regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate in accordance with section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (or the regulations recognized and approved by the Congress in H. Con. Res. 50, Seventy-ninth Congress) apply, but such option shall apply with respect to such costs paid or incurred in the first taxable year ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall be binding upon the taxpayer with respect to subsequent taxable years in the same manner and to the same extent as if it had been exercised under the regulations so prescribed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, H.R. 10117 relates to the qualification of certain pension trusts under the Internal Revenue Code. Under existing Treasury regulations, a qualified pension trust may not include benefits for sickness, accident, hospitalization or medical expenses for retired employees and retain qualification for income tax exemption or for deductibility of employer contributions made under the retirement plan.

On the other hand, the existing law permits contributions under accident and health plans for employees to be deducted by employers and excluded from gross income of employees.

H.R. 10117 would eliminate the prohibition against qualified pension trusts including sickness, accident, hospitalization or medical benefits for their beneficiaries. It would permit these benefits and pension benefits to be funded together under a single trust provided separate accounts are kept—so the contributions for the sickness, et cetera, benefits can be ascertained and their reasonableness determined—and provided the sickness, et cetera, benefits are subordinate to the pension benefits.

The amendment would become effective for taxable years ending after the date of enactment. Revenue effects would be negligible because the bill primarily simplifies administration of plans for medical benefits and for pension benefits by making separate trusts unnecessary.

The House bill was amended by the Committee on Finance in only one important respect. A new section was added to permit a special election to deduct intangible drilling and development expenditures. Under regulation a taxpayer must make an election to deduct intangible drilling and development costs for the first year for which they are incurred and the election is binding for all subsequent years. If he does not make the election for the first year, he is given no further opportunity to make it but is required to capitalize those expenses.

Under the committee amendment a taxpayer who did not exercise his option within the time prescribed by regulations is granted a new option which he must exercise not later than December 31, 1962. This option, if exercised, would apply for taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this act and would be binding for all subsequent years in the same manner and to the same extent as if it had been made under appropriate Treasury regulations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 5123(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to application of special tax on retail dealers in liquor where business is conducted in more than one location) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

(3) LIQUOR STORES OPERATED BY STATES, POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS, ETC.—A State, a political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia shall not be required to pay more than one special tax as a retail dealer in liquors under section 5121(a) regardless of the number of locations at which such State, political subdivision, or District carries on business as a retail dealer in liquors."

(b) Section 5113(b) of such Code (relating to application of special tax on wholesale dealers in liquor to liquor stores operated by States, political subdivisions, etc.) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or Territory" and "Territory," each place such terms appear, and

(2) by striking out "if such liquor store" and inserting in lieu thereof "if such State, political subdivision, or District".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall take effect on July 1, 1962.

And to amend the title to read as follows: "An Act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, and for other purposes."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my amendment is really H.R. 2016, which was referred to the Committee on Finance. Its history in that committee I shall relate shortly. It provides that States and political subdivisions which operate retail liquor stores be required to purchase only one $54 Federal retail liquor dealer's tax stamp for the State each year, instead of being required to purchase one $54 retail tax stamp for each retail store location operated by the State or political subdivision thereof.

In 1959 the enactment of the so-called Forand bill included a provision that this same privilege to the State and political subdivisions thereof would be extended with reference to wholesale Federal tax stamps. Therefore, the pending bill is in conformity with and an extension of the previous legislation passed by the Congress.

Paralleling this bill is a recent ruling by the Internal Revenue Service that each officers' or noncommissioned mess which sells such beverages in different locations on the same base be required to purchase only one such stamp.

If this legislation is passed, the 17 control—monopoly—States which operate approximately 2,382 State stores would save approximately $151,952 annually and in addition there would be a future saving for each additional State retail outlet opened by the respective States.

To the Federal Government, as well as to the States, an administrative saving would be brought about by the elimination of the processing of these respective tax stamps for the States.

Also, the municipalities in the following license States would have an approximate annual saving of: Maryland, $864; Minnesota, $12,960; and South Dakota, $5,994.

I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, at this point a listing of the total State stores and agencies in the 17 control States and Montgomery County, Md.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total State stores and agencies in the 17 control States and Montgomery County, Md.

State	State stores	State agencies	Total stores	Cost of Federal retail tax stamps
Alabama	75		75	$4,050
Idaho	111		111	5,994
Iowa	189		189	10,206
Maine	72		72	3,888
Michigan	94		94	5,076
Montana	153		153	8,262
New Hampshire	48		48	2,592
North Carolina	188		188	10,152
Ohio	286	58	344	18,576
Oregon	35	145	180	9,720
Pennsylvania	675		675	36,450
Utah	25	56	81	4,374
Vermont	27	16	43	2,322
Virginia	175		175	9,450
Washington	86	162	248	13,392
West Virginia	130	13	143	7,722
Wyoming	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Montgomery County, Md.	13		13	702
Total	2,382	450	2,832	152,928
Less 1 Federal retail tax stamp per State at $54				972
Net saving to the States				151,956

[1] Wholesale only.

Mr. MORSE. I point out that Oregon and Virginia are among those States. With respect to the subject of State licenses in regard to the selling of liquor, people in many States feel this is the best way to handle the sale of liquor in their States and think it is the best way to keep under fair and reasonable regulation the many problems that arise with regard to the sale of liquor. It has worked out remarkably well in my State. I believe the Senator from Virginia will testify that it has worked out remarkably well in the State of Virginia.

Senators will find there is universal approval of the regulatory program which the 17 States have adopted. The Federal Government should cooperate with them. I do not believe it should, in effect, place a stamp collection burden on them by requiring a stamp for each one of their outlets.

The important thing is to see to it that one stamp is purchased for the State beverage departments. I ask the Senator from Virginia if he will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

It has the backing of the Liquor Control Commission of my own State, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the telegram I received to this effect from the commission chairman, Mr. Hugh Kirkpatrick of Lebanon, Oreg.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEBANON, OREG., *September 18, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Your support of H.R. 2016 is very important to State of Oregon. Passage of this bill in the Senate will result in over $9,000 annual saving to the State. Please contact Senate Finance Committee members urging them to support this bill. Senator BYRD and Senator BENNETT are control State Members. Your help is needed. For complete information regarding the bill you can call Mr. Buscher at his office, National Alcoholic Beverage Control Association, Washington, D.C.

HUGH KIRKPATRICK,
Chairman, Oregon Liquor Control Commission.

Mr. MORSE. It is my understanding that the Senator from Virginia looks with favor upon my amendment and understood that such an amendment would be offered on the floor of the Senate to a bill which had been considered by the Committee on Finance.

I ask the Senator from Virginia if he will accept the amendment and take it to conference. I have discussed the liquor stamp problem in connection with States which have their own liquor monopolies. As the Senator knows, this question was discussed in the Committee on Finance. It was expected that the amendment would be offered on the floor of the Senate. My understanding is—and I hope the Senator will correct me if I am mistaken—that the Senator from Virginia looks with favor upon the objectives of the amendment. I ask him if he will take it to conference.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The loss to the Treasury would be very small.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; there would be a small loss to the Treasury. I am also advised that the administration does not look with disfavor upon my amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Oregon for offering the amendment and express the hope that the conference will be able to retain it.

Mr. MORSE. Besides Michigan, the following States and one county in Maryland, exercise their own control over the handling of liquor: Alabama, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming; and Montgomery County, Md.

I think Congress should provide those States and county with this amount of help and cooperation.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. It should be said that the Treasury opposes the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Treasury opposes the amendment; but I believe there is support for it in the Department of Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment. I ask that the amendment not be read, but that it be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"Sec. . (a) Section 1341(b) of the Internel Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules applicable to computation of tax where taxpayer restores substantial amount held under claim of right) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

" '(4) For purposes of determining whether paragraph (4) or paragraph (5) of subsection (a) applies—

" '(A) in any case where the deduction referred to in paragraph (4) of subsection (a) results in a net operating loss, such loss shall, for purposes of computing the tax for the taxable year under such paragraph (4), be carried back to the same extent and in the same manner as is provided under section 172; and

" '(B) in any case where the exclusion referred to in paragraph (5)(B) of subsection (a) results in a net operating loss or capital loss for the prior taxable year (or years), such loss shall, for purposes of computing the decrease in tax for the prior taxable year (or years) under such paragraph (5)(B), be carried back and carried over to the same extent and in the same manner as is provided under section 172 or section 1212, except that no carryover beyond the taxable year shall be taken into account.

" '(5) For purposes of this chapter, the net operating loss described in paragraph (4)(A) of this subsection, or the net operating loss or capital loss described in paragraph (4)(B) of this subsection, as the case may be, shall (after the application of paragraph (4) or (5)(B) of subsection (a) for the taxable year) be taken into account under section 172 or 1212 for taxable years after the taxable year to the same extent and in the same manner as—

" '(A) a net operating loss sustained for the taxable year, if paragraph (4) of subsection (a) applied, or

" '(B) a net operating loss or capital loss sustained for the prior taxable year (or years), if paragraph (5)(B) of subsection (a) applied.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1962."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, section 1341 was enacted in 1954 as a relief provision. As indicated in the 1954 Senate Finance Committee report, under prior law if a taxpayer was obliged to repay amounts which he had received in prior years and had previously included these amounts in income because it appeared that he had an unrestricted right to these amounts, he could take a deduction for the full amount in the year of restitution. As indicated by the Senate Finance Committee report, however, the deduction allowed in the current year may not compensate the taxpayer fully for the taxes attributable to this amount in earlier years. The income in the earlier years may have been subject to a higher rate of tax than the taxpayer's current tax rate.

To compensate for this problem, the 1954 Code provided that the taxpayer was to recompute his taxes for the prior years, excluding from income for those years the amount he now has to repay—the amount which was initially included in income in those past years. This alternative computation applies only if it results in a lower tax than the deduction for the current year.

Section 1341 of present law achieves the desired objective where the restoration of the claim of right item does not result in a net operating loss—or net capital loss—in the year of restoration. However, where it does result in such a net operating loss, merely reducing the income to zero in the year of restoration does not fully compensate the taxpayer for the year paid in prior years with respect to this income item. However, for purposes of this computation, the Internal Revenue Service has held that under present law no carryback or carryover is permissible if the deduction is taken in the current year, the year of restoration.

A similar problem may also arise under the alternative computation where the taxes recomputed for the prior years excluding from the income for those years the amounts which had to be restored. For purposes of this alternative computation, the Service has interpreted existing law as permitting net operating losses—and net capital losses—to be carried back or forward but not beyond the current taxable year of restoration. As a result, since net operating loss carrybacks and carryovers are not fully available under either of these alternatives, taxpayers can be worse off with this so-called relief provision than if it did not exist.

This amendment adds two special rules to be used in determining the tax to be paid under section 1341. The first paragraph added provides that where the regular rule, namely, deducting the amount restored in the current year, results in a net operating loss, in determining whether the regular rule or the alternative rule applies is to be carried back, to the same extent and in the same manner as would be true of any regular loss incurred in the taxable year which was wholly unrelated to a claim-of-right restoration. This first paragraph also provides that where the alternative rule applies, namely, excluding the amounts restored from the prior years in which they arose, any net operating loss, in determining which of these two rules applies, is to be carried back from those years, or forward from those years to the current taxable year, in the same manner as could an unrelated net operating loss arising in those years.

The second paragraph provides that where not all of a net operating, or capital, loss is used in years prior to the current taxable year in the computation I have referred to above, any loss still unused is to be available as a carryover to years after the current year. However, such a loss may be carried forward only to the extent an ordinary net operating loss could be carried forward from the year from which it is considered to have arisen. Thus, if the deduction has been taken in the current year there would be 5 years in which the carryforward could be used. If the alternative rule had been used, however, the carryforward would be available for 5 years from the prior year. If this prior year were the second year back of the current year, this would mean that 3 of the 5 carryforward years would still remain after the current year.

Representatives of the Treasury Department have indicated to me that the Treasury recognizes the equity in this proposal and does not have any objection to the enactment of such a provision. The drafting changes, which the Treasury in the past has requested, have been made.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in full in the RECORD and that it not be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a)(1) Section 7608 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to authority of Internal Revenue enforcement officers) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(b) Enforcement of Laws Relating to Internal Revenue other than Subtitle E—

" '(1) Any criminal investigator of the Intelligence Division or of the Internal Security Division of the Internal Revenue Service whom the Secretary or his delegate charges with the duty of enforcing any of the criminal provisions of the internal revenue laws or any other criminal provisions of law relating to internal revenue for the enforcement of which the Secretary or his delegate is responsible is, in the performance of his duties, authorized to perform the functions described in paragraph (2).

" '(2) The functions authorized under this subsection to be performed by an officer referred to in paragraph (1) are—

" '(A) to execute and serve search warrants and arrest warrants, and serve subpenas and summonses issued under authority of the United States;

" '(B) to make arrests without warrant for any offense against the United States relating to the internal revenue laws committed in his presence, or for any felony cognizable under such laws if he has reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing any such felony; and

" '(C) to make seizures of property subject to forfeiture under the internal revenue laws.'

"(2) Such section is further amended by striking out 'Any' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a) Enforcement of subtitle E and other laws pertaining to liquor, tobacco, and firearms.—Any'.

"(b) The amendments made by section (a) shall take effect on the day after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to add a new section to 7608 of the Internal Revenue Code giving criminal investigators of the Intelligence Division and of the Internal Security Division of the Internal Revenue Service charged with the duty of enforcing internal revenue laws, the power to execute and serve search warrants and arrest warrants, to make arrests without warrants under certain circumstances and seize property subject to forfeiture under the laws of the United States relating to the internal revenue. The existing authority is now given to employees of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division of the Internal Revenue Service.

Criminal investigators of the Intelligence Division are charged with investigation of alleged criminal tax law violations, including tax fraud, assaults on employees, and racketeer and wagering tax investigations. Criminal investigators under the supervision of the Assistant Commissioner in Charge of Inspection are charged with the investigation of alleged criminal law violations by service employees, acting individually or in conspiracy with outsiders, and investigations of nonservice persons whose criminal actions may adversely affect the integrity and reputation of the service.

At present it is doubtful that these criminal investigators have any greater power than a private citizen to arrest without a warrant or to serve arrest warrants under State law. On April 25, 1960, the U.S. district court at Boston suppressed the evidence obtained by special agents of the Intelligence Division in raids on alleged gambling establishments for the enforcement of the wagering tax laws. The court stated that the criminal investigators of the Intelligence Division of the Internal Revenue Service do not have statutory authority to make arrests without warrant, that the arrests were unlawful, and, therefore, that the evidence obtained as a result of the arrests should be returned to the defendants.

The enforcement of the wagering tax provisions of the code entails the surveillance and raid type of enforcement efforts, including the obtaining and execution of search warrants. An anomalous situation arises when the investigator on a raid may execute the search warrant but cannot execute the accompanying arrest warrant or make an arrest unless a felony or a breach of the peace is being committed in his presence.

By authorizing the criminal investigators to perform certain enforcement functions, the bill will facilitate the performance of the important law enforcement activities with which these officers are charged. The specific statutory authority granted under the bill is similar to the existing statutory authority provided for other law enforcement officers performing comparable duties.

The amendment does not contemplate any change in the usual audit and investigating procedures in civil cases. It will apply only to criminal investigations and criminal cases. The officers authorized to make arrests must carry identifications to make it clear that their authority includes this power.

Mr. President, the Treasury Department and the Director of the Internal Revenue Service have requested this authority as being incidental to the enforcement of the criminal laws. I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I ask that the amendment not be read but that it be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so orderd.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"Sec. . (a) Subchapter A of chapter 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to import taxes on petroleum products) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'Sec. 4522. Exemption.

" 'No tax shall be imposed under section 4521 on any article which is sold for use as fuel on vessels of the United States employed as common carriers on the high seas or the Great Lakes pursuant to certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission.'

"(b) The table of sections for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

" 'Sec. 4522. Exemption."

"(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to articles sold after the date of the enactment of this Act."

On page 2, line 2, after the word "pension" and before the word "plan," insert the words "or annuity."

On page 2, lines 21–22, strike the words "trust instrument," and substitute the word "plan."

On page 2, after line 22, insert the following new sections:

"Sec. 2. Amend section 404(a)(2) to read as follows:

"(2) Employees annuities.—In the taxable year when paid, in an amount determined in accordance with paragraph (1), if the contributions are paid toward the purchase of retirement annuities or retirement annuities and medical benefits as described in section 401(c) and such purchase is a part of a plan which meets the requirements of sections 401(a) (3), (4), (5), and (6) and if refunds of premiums, if any, are applied within the current taxable year or next succeeding taxable year towards the purchase of such retirement annuities or such retirement annuities and medical benefits.

On page 2, line 23, strike out "Sec. 2" and insert "Sec. 3". On page 3, line 1, strike out "Sec. 3" and insert "Sec. 4".

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the amendment relates to the bill itself. It is in the nature of a clerical amendment to carry out what was originally intended. As passed by the House, the bill specifically refers to a qualified pension plan which makes use of a trust.

The bill does not, however, expressly refer to a qualified annuity or insured plan. Essentially, the Federal income tax laws have treated qualified pension plans, whether trusteed or insured, the same.

There is no reason why H.R. 10117 should not follow this approach, and I believe that its failure to do so is an inadvertence. My amendment merely makes certain that the provisions of the bill shall apply equally both to trusteed and annuity or insured plans.

The Treasury Department has written to the chairman of the Finance Committee a letter stating that it has no objection to this amendment.

I hope this amendment, which will maintain the traditional approach our tax law takes to these qualified plans, will be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a letter approving this amendment, addressed to the chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], from Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Treasury Department,
Washington, October 1, 1962.

Hon. Harry F. Byrd,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Finance,
Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in reference to your request for the views of the Treasury Department on a proposed amendment to H.R. 10117 to allow qualified annuity or insured pension plans to provide medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families.

As passed by the House of Representatives, H.R. 10117 specifically permits a qualified pension plan which makes use of a trust to provide medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families. The bill does not, however, expressly refer to a qualified annuity or insured plan. Representatives of the life insurance industry have submitted to us a proposed amendment which would specifically grant qualified annuity or insured plans the same treatment as qualified pension trusts in regard to provision for medical and other benefits. A copy of the proposed amendment is enclosed.

Historically, the same treatment has been provided to qualified pension plans, whether trusteed or insured. Accordingly, the Treasury Department has no objection to the adoption of the proposed amendment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

Stanley S. Surrey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I now send to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. . (a) Subchapter A of chapter 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to import taxes on petroleum products) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 4522. Exemption.

"No tax shall be imposed under section 4521 on any article which is sold for use as fuel on vessels of the United States employed as common carriers on the high seas or the Great Lakes pursuant to certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission."

(b) The table of sections for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 4522. Exemption."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to articles sold after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to carry out the same objective as the measure previously passed by the Senate. The previous legislation permitted vessels engaged in coastwise commerce that were common carriers to have the same privilege with respect to bunker fuel as a vessel which went from the Atlantic to the Pacific or one which traveled to foreign ports.

The Senate passed the previous measure. In conference, a question was presented in reference to the effect on foreign oil import quotas, because of the manner in which the solution was sought. The Senate receded on that particular amendment. Pursuant to the discussion which followed, this amendment is now drawn, to bring the same relief to these shippers, in a way which will not in any way change or involve the matter of import quotas on petroleum.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, this amendment was considered this afternoon in the conference with the Ways and Means Committee. The amendment has been revised; and I think that in its revised form it is acceptable. So I shall accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I have at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add the following new section to the bill.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 824(a)(1)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as added by the Revenue Act of 1962, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or one-half of such amount in the case of a taxpayer who elects to compute the concentrated windstorm, etc., premium percentage under paragraph (2)(A)(iii)".

(b) Section 824(a)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as added by the Revenue Act of 1962, is amended by striking out "arising, either in any one State or within 200 miles of any fixed point selected by the taxpayer," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "arising—

"(i) in any one State;

"(ii) if the taxpayer so elects, within 200 miles of any fixed point selected by the taxpayer; or

"(iii) if the taxpayer so elects, within 400 miles of any fixed point selected by the taxpayer,".

(c) This section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962.

Mr. MILLER. My amendment is designed to overcome a hardship which exists under section 824 of the Internal Revenue Code, as added by the Revenue Act of 1962, in the case of mutual insurance companies doing casualty underwriting. This section of the bill is designed to reduce the amount of underwritten income subject to tax on the basis of losses. Under the phrasing of the language of the bill, as I understand, only one insurance company in the United States will be put at a competitive disadvantage. This particular company does business in an area approximately 400 miles wide and 1,000 miles long. The section of the code provides for relief in the case of business done within a 200-mile radius.

My amendment provides for an election, whereby an insurance company—there would be only one such insurance company—can elect to make its computation within a 400-mile radius, but will then receive only half the benefits.

This amendment is necessary in order to keep one insurance company from suffering competitive disadvantages which I am sure were not intended by the proponents of the original bill. I have conferred with the manager of the original bill and with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and I understand that the amendment is acceptable to both of them.

I hope this amendment will be agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the amendment has been rejected by the Ways and Means Committee, and was disapproved by the Finance Committee. So I hesitate to accept the amendment and agree to take it to conference.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Virginia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. . That section 6 of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 8) is amended to read as follows:

"COVERED PERIOD

"SEC. 6. In the case of any individual, the covered period referred to in sections 3 and 4 is the period—

"(1) beginning on whichever of the following is the later:

"(A) April 8, 1961, or

"(B) the day after the date on which any applicable agreement is entered into under section 7 or 8, and

"(2) ending—

"(A) on February 28, 1963, or

"(B) on May 31, 1963, in the case of an individual who (for a week beginning before March 1, 1963) had a week with respect to which temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable under section 3, reimbursement was payable under section 4, or reimbursement would have been so payable but for the fact that the unemployment compensation was payable under title XV, with the exception of the period—

"(3) beginning—

"(A) on April 1, 1962, or

"(B) on July 1, 1962, in the case of an individual who (for a week beginning before April 1, 1962) had a week with respect to which temporary extended unemployment compensation was payable under section 3, reimbursement was payable under section 4, or reimbursement would have been so payable but for the fact that the unemployment compensation was payable under title XV, and

"(4) ending on November 3, 1962."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it appears that this amendment will be the last amendment to the pending measure. I have discussed with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and with the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the possibility of obtaining a limitation on the time available for the further consideration of the amendment.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that 15 minutes be allotted for the further consideration of the amendment—with 10 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and 5 minutes to be under the control of the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this amendment extends the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961 for 4 months. Eligibility for the unemployed to qualify for benefits under the act expired last April. This amendment would extend it from November 4, 1962, to March 1, 1963, to be followed by a 3-month phaseout period during which those who qualify before March 1 can continue to receive benefits.

The act of 1961 provided up to 13 weeks of additional benefits for those exhausting their rights under State programs. This amendment does not change the law in any respect, except by extending the dates of eligibility.

The amendment will not impose a new tax. The program will be financed from the estimated $172 million surplus which will accumulate under the special Federal unemployment tax provided in the act of 1961.

An estimated 600,000 long-term unemployed will be eligible for benefits under the 4-month extension, at an average weekly benefit amount of $31.70.

Over 120,000 unemployed per month have exhausted their benefit rights under State programs since eligibility for TEUC benefits terminated April 1, 1962.

The rate of unemployment, seasonally adjusted, was 5.8 percent for the month of August; 934,000 had been unemployed 15 weeks or more and 593,000 had been unemployed 27 weeks or more in August. This was higher than in June or July, when the numbers were 584,000 and 576,000, respectively.

Mr. President, in regard to the need for this program, I see no significant difference between the situation today and the need which existed in 1961 or 1958, when the Congress approved temporary unemployment compensation programs. In 1958 there were 4,681,000 unemployed. In June of this year there were 4,463,000 unemployed.

Those who are out of work and who exhaust their benefit rights under State programs this winter will be just as much in need as were those who were unemployed in 1961 or in 1958, when this program was in effect.

It seems to me that we leave ourselves in a somewhat embarrassing position if at this point we fail to extend these benefits out of revenue which has already been levied for this purpose, inasmuch as we have already acted to grant so many millions of dollars of tax relief in order to provide benefits for those who are self-employed; and inasmuch as we have already provided, for the benefit of the large corporations, relief by means of the investment credit and accelerated depreciation. In my judgment we should provide that funds already collected for the purpose of extending benefits to the unemployed be allocated for their use during the winter months of 1962 and 1963.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will yield to the Senator in a moment, if I may make one more point.

I remind Senators that the amendment which I am offering was not the subject of hearings by the Senate, but it was considered by the Ways and Means Committee. It failed by a single vote to come out of the House Ways and Means Committee. If it had, there would have been favorable action on it.

There is no need for hearings, because the facts now are generally the same as they were in 1961 and in 1958, and we need not apologize to the Ways and Means Committee, because we impose no tax in what we propose.

On March 1 last year the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act—which my amendment would extend for 4 months—passed in the House by a vote of 392 to 30, and on March 16 the Senate passed it by a vote of 84 to 4.

It seems to me, in view of the votes taken last year and the fact that the same situation exists today, no argument should be made against the proposal based on the fact that no hearings were held and that this is not a proper time to act.

I yield now to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with every word the Senator from Minnesota has spoken. We can take judicial notice of the pockets of unemployment that pockmark the whole economy from coast to coast. There is not a Senator who is not aware of serious pockets of unemployment in his State. It is true in every State. We have an emergency situation for which emergency funds were appropriated in the first place.

I ask the Senator from Minnesota this question: Is it not true that there is about $125 million in the Treasury unspent that was appropriated originally in connection with this program?

Mr. McCARTHY There will be $172 million that either has been collected or will be collected under the existing tax provision.

Mr. MORSE. With the winter months coming, and each of us knowing that in the winter months there is an increase in the level of unemployment, I do not understand how Congress could even think of adjourning without providing for the use of that money to take care of the very serious unemployment pockets which, as I have said, pockmark our country.

Those of us who support the amendment are pleading not only for the unemployed, but for the businessmen in the areas where unemployment exists. Originally there was a great deal of opposition on the part of businessmen to unemployment insurance. Today not one in a dozen businessmen can be found who opposes unemployment insurance, because they know that unemployment insurance, like social security, has come to be the great equalizer of the Main Streets of America in time of depression and unemployment.

I think the Senator from Minnesota is deserving of high compliment for the leadership he is taking in this respect. I hope his amendment will be adopted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. I reserve the remainder of my time. Will the Presiding Officer tell me how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am opposed to this amendment. Twice Congress has enacted programs for temporary extended unemployment compensation benefits—once in 1958 and again in 1961. That legislation was called antirecession. In both of those periods we were in recessions. We are not in a recession now.

In March 1961, when the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act was approved, there were 5,495,000 unemployed workers throughout the Nation and 3.5 million of them were eligible for unemployment compensation. In September 1962, there were only 3,512,000 unemployed, and of these only 1,507,000 would be eligible for unemployment compensation. Only individuals who are eligible for unemployment compensation and who exhaust their regular benefits would be entitled to extended benefits.

This amendment should not be adopted. The situation which prevailed when the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961 was adopted does not exist now. When Congress acted in March 1961, the unemployment rate was very nearly 7 percent. At the present time, it is under 6 percent. Moreover, the number of unemployed individuals who exhausted all their State benefits in 1961 was nearly triple the current rate and was expected to get worse. According to estimates made by the Secretary of Labor in 1961, the number of exhaustions per month was as follows:

March	240,000
April	290,000
May	300,000
June	310,000
July	300,000

The Secretary of Labor stated in public hearings that under the proposed extension the number of exhaustions would be only about 100,000 a month. Under these circumstances, I do not believe a case has been made for further extending this temporary program. If the program is extended, the precedent will be established for Federal intervention in unemployment compensation administration in nonrecession periods, and this in turn could lead to federalization of the entire State unemployment compensation programs.

The House Ways and Means Committee rejected an amendment similar to this in executive session following hearings. The hearings convinced them this legislation was not wise.

We do not know how many of the unemployed who have exhausted their regular State benefits would qualify for Federal benefits under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1962 or the Manpower Training Act of 1962.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I urge the attachés to call Senators on both sides to get them to the Chamber, because I understood there will be a yea and nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have been asked to request a yea and nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Minnesota has 4 minutes remaining and the Senator from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will approve this amendment. It is a poor thing at best, but it is the very least we can do at this stage. The Senator from Minnesota deserves great credit for bringing it up, though he knows and I know that we both think what ought to be done, really, and what should have been done a long time ago, is a deep revision of the unemployment compensation system, established Federal standards countrywide, which are up to date and modern, to take care of the problems of the people of this country.

Since that seems to be impossible, and the efforts to do so over the many years have been uniformly unsuccessful, the least we can do is not to adjourn without taking this essential action.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, is the Senator from Minnesota willing to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to make a short statement first.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia quoted the Secretary of Labor as saying that exhaustions have been running something under 100,000 per month or that such might be expected. I note that the statement made by the Secretary seems to have been rather optimistic. That was his estimate, but the number has been running approximately 120,000 to 125,000 since last April.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I say to the Senator that the estimate he calls optimistic was made not long ago, on August 22.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. I say, the Secretary was unduly optimistic.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. He has not made any correcting statement.

Mr. McCARTHY. He has been corrected by the statistics. In the course of this long session it has been possible to count the number of exhaustions. The chairman quoted the Secretary accurately, but the Secretary's estimate was below the actual figures for the past 4 months. The number of exhaustions is running approximately 20 percent higher than the estimate made by the Secretary.

Mr. President, I should like to quote briefly from an article published in the New York Times today, which notes:

> The national unemployment rate remained at 5.8 percent of the total labor force in September, the Labor Department reported today.
>
> The Department's labor market experts had expected a drop because of the freakish circumstances that pushed the rate from 5.3 percent in July to 5.8 percent in August.
>
> The fact that the decline did not materialize was regarded by Government experts as bad economic news.

Certainly that is bad economic news for the unemployed, and bad economic news for those who will be without work this winter.

It is also stated in the article:

> Mr. Wolfbein said that he hoped the unemployment rate would go down this month, but added that he did not forsee any big change in either direction.

On the basis of the statistics and the facts which are significant, the record is bad. The temporary unemployment compensation extension is, in my judgment, nearly as necessary this year as it was in 1961 and almost as necessary as it was in 1958, on a purely quantitative basis. If we approach it on what might be called the qualitative or personal basis, trying to meet the needs of those who are unemployed, it is as necessary for those who are out of work today as it was for those who were out of work in 1961 and in 1958 when we met their needs by legislative action

Questions have been raised about the accuracy of data on unemployment. This matter has been studied by the Special Committee To Appraise Employment and Unemployment Statistics, appointed by President Kennedy last November. The Committee made its report last week, and its conclusion is that the level of unemployment in the United States is not exaggerated by the official statistics.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Committee's letter of transmittal to the President be printed in the Record, and also that the article from the New York Times be printed.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the letter of transmittal to the President]

As you stated in your letter of appointment, the official statistics on employment and unemployment are of vital importance as measures of the economic health of the Nation. In recognition of this, the Committee has subjected the official system of collecting, processing, and reporting data on employment and unemployment to an exhaustive study. The Committee has also attempted to evaluate the data now available in terms of the anticipated future expansion in the uses to which these statistics will be put. Finally, the Committee has had prepared the most searching international comparison of unemployment rates, which has yet been made.

We are happy to be able to report to you, on the basis of this intensive scrutiny, that the United States has the most comprehensive system of statistics on employment and unemployment of any country in the world. In view of the public debate that preceded the appointment of this Committee, we believe it is appropriate to reproduce here one of our most important conclusions:

"After careful investigation, the Committee has unanimously and categorically concluded that doubt concerning the scientific objectivity of the agencies responsible for collecting, processing, and publishing these data is unwarranted. The Committee remains highly impressed by the professional qualifications and the scientific integrity and objectivity of those responsible for the system of reporting the official data on employment and unemployment."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 5, 1962]

Unemployed Rate Remains at 5.8 Percent—Drop Expected Last Month Did Not Materialize

(By John D. Pomfret)

Washington, October 4.—The national unemployment rate remained at 5.8 percent of the total labor force in September, the Labor Department reported today.

The Department's labor market experts had expected a drop because of the freakish circumstances that pushed the rate from 5.3 percent in July to 5.8 percent in August.

The fact that the decline did not materialise was regarded by Government experts as bad economic news.

There were some brighter aspects in today's preliminary report on last month's labor market, however.

The number of workers unemployed for 6 months or longer dropped by 116,000 last month to 477,000. This was the first time in 2 years that the number had been below 500,000. Labor Department experts were unable to say whether those who left the ranks of the long-term unemployed had found jobs or had simply stopped looking.

August's sharp rise in the unemployment rate, which is adjusted seasonally, was attributed to two factors.

One was the inclusion among the unemployed, for technical reasons, of large numbers of teachers who planned to return to work in September.

The other was the fact that the count was taken in a week of unusually high unemployment in the automobile industry. This was caused by production shutdowns to prepare assembly lines for the manufacture of the new models.

Those factors were eliminated last month, according to Seymour L. Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor. He said that a drop in the unemployment rate among adult men from 4.9 to 4.6 percent reflected the return of large numbers of automobile workers to their jobs. The teachers were also presumed to be back in the classroom.

What kept the overall unemployment rate from declining, according to Mr. Wolfbein, was that adult women entered the labor force in unexpectedly large numbers, and many teenagers remained unemployed.

RECORD EMPLOYMENT

The unemployment rate among adult women rose from 5.8 to 6.1 percent in September. Among teenagers, it rose from 12.2 to 13.2 percent. The effect was to offset the decline in the unemployment rate among adult men and leave the overall rate unchanged.

Total unemployment, at 3,512,000, was 410,000 below the August level. This was about what was expected as an overall seasonal decline. Unemployment was 573,000 less than in September 1961, when the rate was 6.8 percent. It was 124,000 above September 1960, when the rate was 5.7 percent.

Total employment declined by about 1,100,000 in September, the Labor Department said. This was a larger drop than was expected for the season. An unusually large number of teenagers, about 2 million of them, left the labor market to return to school. This was about 300,000 more than was expected.

Despite the decline, however, total employment, at 68,668,000, was a record for the month. The nonfarm sector of the employment statistics was also a record at 63,103,000.

The total labor force declined by 1,516,000 last month to 72,179,000. This was a drop slightly larger than expected at this time of the year. Over the year, the labor force showed a growth of 1,056,000.

Mr. Wolfbein said that he hoped the unemployment rate would go down this month, but added that he did not foresee any big change in either direction.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the remainder of my time and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that when the Senate adjourns tonight it will adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Does the Senator have any idea as to the situation next week, as to the number of days involved? I am not asking this facetiously.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish I knew myself. It looks as though we shall be here anywhere from next Tuesday to next Saturday.

AMENDMENT OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 WITH RESPECT TO MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question. I do not know whether there are 51 Senators available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure there are.

Mr. MILLER. That answers the question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope there are.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if there are not that many available, will not the Senate have to adjourn until tomorrow, to complete the call of the roll on the pending amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It could adjourn until Monday to complete the vote, if necessary, but I hope the Senator will not hold such thoughts in his mind—unless they are true.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Carroll], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hickey], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Carroll], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez], the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Smith], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Greuning]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Bottum], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Capehart], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allot] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a U.S. representative to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 309 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Beall
Burdick
Bush
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Humphrey
Javits
Keating
Kerr
Kuchel
Long, Hawaii
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Scott
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NAYS—15

Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Ellender
Ervin
Holland
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Miller
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Stennis
Talmadge
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—45

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Bottum
Butler
Cannon
Capehart
Carlson
Carroll
Chavez
Clark
Cotton
Eastland
Engle
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hickenlooper
Hickey
Hill
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kefauver
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pearson
Smith, Mass.
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Wiley
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

So Mr. McCarthy's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], who was unavoidably detained on official business, I announce that if the Senator from South Carolina had been present and voting when the vote was taken on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from South Carolina would have voted "nay."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1288. An act to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1563. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Georgia-South Carolina, to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes;

S. 2454. An act to amend the housing amendments of 1955 to make Indian tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the housing amendments of 1955.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7781) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8874) to authorize certain banks to invest in corporations whose purpose is to provide clerical services for them, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1658) to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3389) to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10129) to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees.

TRIBUTE TO EUSTACE CULLINAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of San Francisco's most illustrious senior citizens, Eustace Cullinan, was signally honored on September 30 in a feature story printed in the San Francisco Examiner. The story, written by Anita Day Hubbard, tells of an inspiring career spent in public service and also serves as a reminder to those who approach their sunset years that they can still contribute significantly to the public welfare, despite the encroachments of advancing age.

Mr. Cullinan's career is particularly interesting to me because it was so closely alined, in earlier years, with the late Senator Hiram W. Johnson, whom California greatly revered and respected.

I ask unanimous consent to have this delightful story of a delightful personality reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REWARDING CAREER

(By Anita Day Hubbard)

Eustace Cullinan was 19 in 1895 when he came back to his hometown from Notre Dame University in Indiana with an A.B. degree, took a job as a reporter on the old San Francisco Bulletin, under the crusading editor Fremont Older, enrolled in Hastings College of Law, won his law degree in 1898, and was admitted to the California Bar that year.

The University of San Francisco gave him a master's degree in 1907.

In the meantime he had graduated long since from reporter to top editorial writer on the Bulletin.

After he opened a law office with his classmate, Thomas W. Hickey, he kept on writing pungent editorials dealing with the turbulent political and civic problems of the period, in which the Bulletin played a potent role.

He is 86 now, with a spectacularly successful career in the law, a long and well-documented influence in the history of the State and city to his credit, and still writes a clever column of reminiscence in the Recorder, legal newspaper here.

He is active senior partner in the law firm of Cushing, Cullinan, Hancock, and Rothert, with offices in the Shell Building, pursues his scholarly hobby in the study of medieval calligraphy, and reads voluminously, with an emphasis on history.

He was born in San Francisco, on January 26, 1876.

His grandfather had come to the States from Ireland in the 1840's. His father arrived in San Francisco in 1862, and set up as a commission merchant. His mother, New York born, was of Scotch-Irish descent.

His formal education completed, his law office opened and his newspaper career long launched, Eustace Cullinan decided that politics was interesting.

He persuaded one of his clients, M. J. Hynes, to run for public administrator, managed the campaign and won it.

By the next election time, Abe Reuf had taken over as political "boss," and Hynes lost out, but come next election, Hynes, with Cullinan as mentor, went back in, and stayed for 23 years.

From his first essay into the political scene, Eustace Cullinan was always active.

For the 22 years of James Rolph, Jr.'s, mayoralty, and his 4 years as Governor, Cullinan was his close adviser. He was in the intimate circle of Hiram Johnson's term as Governor, and later on played an important role in the administration of Gov. Frank Merriam. He never accepted a salaried appointment from any of them.

His legal career has always been active and challenging.

After he had defended several libel suits successfully for the Bulletin, the owner, R. A. Crothers, along with a number of others who had been burned out in the big holocaust of 1906, found that their insurance, placed with a large German and an Austrian company, had been completely defaulted.

Young Cullinan set out for Europe, with some $300,000 in claims, tried the suits in the companies' own jurisdiction, and came back triumphantly with a full settlement from all of them.

He has been much in demand as a trial lawyer, and well known as a gifted orator, an important factor in the courts of those days.

He served for 5 years on the committee of examiners of the State bar, has published many articles in legal journals, was a member of the American Law Institute, wrote the State Bar Act of California, and a book on "Preparation for Trial of Civil Cases," with Herbert W. Clark of San Francisco, which ran through many editions. He was chairman of the advisory and editorial committee on bar examinations and admissions, a substantial part of the monumental "Survey of the Legal Professions," published in 1952.

He served for 31 years as trustee of the San Francisco Public Library beginning under the mayoralty of James D. Phelan, and as director of war savings for San Francisco during World War I, among other unsalaried public services.

He is a two time past president of the Bohemian Club, where he is still an active member.

In 1902 he married Katherine F. Lawler, niece of Chief Justice Matt I. Sullivan and Associate Justice Jeremiah F. Sullivan of the supreme court of California.

They had four sons, Judge Eustace Cullinan, Jr., Matthew, an engineer, both deceased, Vincent, now his father's law partner, and Gerald, who took a Master's degree at Oxford and is now head of an important public relations firm in Washington, D.C.

There are four grandchildren. The oldest, Terence, graduate of Stanford, has just been granted a Fulbright scholarship.

Mrs. Cullinan died in 1960 after more than 57 years of marriage. The board of supervisors adjourned in her memory.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that at a time when I was not in the Chamber, the Senate acted today, as did the House later, upon S. 3361, the only immigration bill of any general character I regret to say, which may be enacted in this session of Congress.

The bill deals with several items; one is the category of approved first preference applicants, approximately 10,000, whose quota numbers are oversubscribed under our outmoded immigration laws and whose skills are critically needed for our national defense effort. On that subject I introduced a bill, S. 2956, on March 8, 1962. In substance it is identical to the language incorporated in S. 3361, which was passed today, but which was not introduced until May 1962. I am delighted that this job has been done, which is so essential to our national security.

I also express my pleasure at the admission of some 16,000 fourth-preference immigrants, which is also provided for in the bill which was passed.

Nevertheless, I again point out that we are derelict in not having passed general immigration legislation, to deal with the injustices and inequities of the McCarran-Walter Act. The President has not asked for it, and he should have asked for it. This is one of the great pieces of unfinished business of Congress.

I also point out that if the people of New York return me to the Senate, I shall do my utmost to make this one of the real struggles in any ensuing term of office I have here.

I believe that the honor and dignity, the national interest and natural humanitarian feelings of the people of the Nation dictate that we must do away with this immigration law, with its injustices and inequities, upon which so many of us agree, but about which, somehow or other, we cannot break through the hard crust of getting action because of the opposition and because of the situation with respect to high committee positions that we have encountered. I pledge myself to the people of New York, if they return me to the Senate next year, to dedicate myself to do my best about this situation.

IMMIGRATION BILL REVISED TO UNITE FAMILIES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate passed S. 3361, which provides for the nonquota admission of certain aliens with special skills and training and for certain relatives of American citizens. I commend the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for the sponsorship of this measure. It will grant permanent residence status to several thousand highly skilled specialists—engineers, scientists, and others whose services are urgently needed in our economy. It also will make possible the reunification of several thousands of families presently separated because of the limitations of our general immigration statutes.

This is the second time in the 87th Congress that it has been necessary to enact legislation to circumvent the strictures of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I would like to note that similar legislative action has been necessary in every Congress which has convened since the 1952 act was passed. Obviously an act which requires supplemental action so frequently has failed to fulfill the requirements of public policy, and it is time that we reexamine it in its entirety.

In March of this year, 25 Senators joined me in the sponsorship of S. 3043 to completely revise our present immigration quota system based on national origins. I have been greatly encouraged by the warm response the bill has met. It has received the endorsement of a number of the leading religious and social organizations active in the field of immigration. It has received favorable editorial comment in several of the leading newspapers and news magazines of the Nation. Most gratifying of all, has been the unsolicited responses of hundreds of individuals throughout the United States expressing their warm approval of a fairer and more equitable method of selecting those immigrants who will be welcomed to our shores.

The bill introduced last March was the product of many months of painstaking study and extensive consultation with leading authorities in the immigration field. I believe it is a very good bill. Nevertheless, consultation has continued. The bill has provided a specific proposal which has stimulated broad public discussion and study of immigration policy. The months since its introduction have been most productive in creating public awareness of the need for a constructive forward-looking immigration policy.

When Congress reconvenes in January of 1963, I shall reintroduce the bill—possibly with some minor changes prompted by the detailed study which has been possible over the past several months. The basic elements and objectives of the bill will remain unchanged.

It is my hope that at the time of reintroduction of the bill many more Senators will join us in its sponsorship. I am convinced that the people of America will give their enthusiastic endorsement to an enlightened immigration policy which will better serve our Nation in the achievement of its goals.

WESTERN LAND AND PEOPLE CONFERENCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, more than 1,700 rural leaders from the western region of the Nation gathered in Portland, Oreg., on October 1 and 2 at the western regional Land and People Conference sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The purpose of the Conference was for the Department of Agriculture to have a means of counseling with rural leaders to find ways and means of strengthening rural America, of providing for adequate family farming, and stimulating economic growth throughout the rural areas of the Nation.

The Conference featured Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman as keynote speaker, a regional speaker, 10 rural leader panelists, and 4 discussion groups. The Conference was reported in some detail in the Oregon Journal on October 3 by Journal Staff Writer Jerry Tippens. I asked unanimous consent to place Mr. Tippens' account of the conference in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT GIVES TOOLS FOR AID—LAND MEET ATTENDED BY 1,700

(By Jerry Tippens)

Rural areas development provides rural America with the tools to overcome many of its economic problems.

That was the consensus of more than 1,700 persons who attended the Land and Peoples Conference of the United States which concluded here Tuesday.

Representing seven Western States, they listened to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and a series of other experts, then expressed their opinions in group discussions Monday night.

Discussion leaders said that along with the RAD program other important phases of rural economic recovery were found to include the multiple-use concept of land use, such as that applied to national forests, the introduction of commercial recreation as a function of the family farm, and total area development planning.

John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, used the recommendations to summarize the wishes of the Conference.

This was the second of five Land and Peoples Conferences. From them, Freeman hopes to find a basis for an acceptable farm program, create a better understanding between urban and rural people, and inspire rural communities to take advantage of RAD to better their standards of living.

John R. Allen, Mesa, Ariz., who led a discussion on strengthening rural development, said his group found a general misunderstanding of the RAD concept. It consists of, he said, local organization and planning in a self-help program utilizing Federal assistance where it is needed.

He said his group called for a better adjustment to change, pointing out that some farms are not too small to be sound economic units, and others are too big, extending beyond family farming management.

Dean Ernest Wohletz, of the University of Idaho College of Forestry, who headed a discussion on new uses of land, water, and conservation in expanding income, said recreational development on the family farm offers a major potential. Federal benefits will reach their maximum effect by applying multiple use to family farms and family forests, he said.

But his group feels RAD must be made more easily understood and better communications established between local committees and Government agency heads who make up the technical advisory panel. There is a need for technical assistance and better education, he continued. Fees must be established on public recreation areas to make private developments profitable, the group suggested. A more complete network of access roads is the answer to public use, Wohletz said.

Dean F. E. Price, Agriculture Extension Service director at Oregon State University, whose discussion group dealt with planning economic development, said a thorough community-side plan is the most valuable document a community can have. His group believes hundreds of copies should be printed to give to anyone who might help.

The area of planning should not be too small, he said, telling of a county that had four separate groups working independently. They began to make notable progress when they combined, he said. Cooperation between RAD committees and chambers of commerce is vital, he asserted.

He said there are countless State and Federal agencies who can help RAD programs, but a start at a local level is needed before their assistance is available.

One suggestion his group made is that a better source of information of participating agencies be established in each State. Communities that have already a prepared plan can assist other communities who are looking for a way to get started, he recommended.

Joe Dwyer, of the Washington State Department of Agriculture, said his group of rural-urban planning believes zoning is necessary for orderly development as suburbs spread to rural areas. Without planning, he found, problems range from a new tax base to the breakdown of community traditions and communications.

CONFIDENCE FELT AS PARLEY ENDS

An underlying confidence in the future of rural America was punctuated by the enthusiasm for two new concepts in attacking problems of farms and forests as the seven-State Land and Peoples Conference closed here Tuesday.

They are rural-areas development and the multiple-use approach to all rural lands.

From the millions of words expressed by most of the 1,700 in attendance, these two thoughts emerged as dominant.

John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, who had the task of funneling the questions asked, the answers given, and the opinions expressed into a workable plan of action, found them to be the consensus of the convention.

Baker's summary picked out the key points of the proposals presented by four discussion leaders who had led massive discussion groups Monday night. It was there that the grassroots farmers, businessmen and local leaders of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, California, Arizona, Utah and Nevada expressed themselves.

Their viewpoints were based in part on addresses they had heard during the day when a parade of speakers dealt with a variety of problems and solutions.

But it was Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, chairman of the convention, who built the enthusiasm.

He recognized the cost-price squeeze of the farmer, the number of rural people forced from their homes by a sagging economy, and their lack of training for other work.

Then Freeman, a practical politician who carried his experience in dealing with farm problems from his service as Minnesota Governor to the Kennedy Cabinet, formed a plan of attack.

He inspired the conference with ideas of a self-help program sparked by local initiative and leadership, and advanced the proposal to make recreational developments a commercial function of family farms and forests.

The audience went for it.

Rural areas development, which, in the practice of the Government's alphabetical games, has been shortened into a new word, RAD, is a self-help program. Some areas have already put it into effect. But most, the Conference showed, knew little about it.

The Conference cleared it for them. It is not a Government-control program. It exists for rural communities who will take the initiative to organize, study their economic predicaments, determine possible solutions, and form a plan of action. RAD provides assistance, technical and financial, through existing agencies for the communities that are willing to help themselves.

Multiple use is a practice borrowed from forests, using lands to meet as many needs as possible. These include crops, grazing, watersheds, wildlife habitat, and recreation.

Now, Freeman pointed out, Farmers Home Administration financing is available to individual farmers to develop commercial recreation enterprises. An expanding population with increasing leisure time makes recreation a major potential for the family farmer, he said.

"In summarizing the accomplishments of this Conference," the soft-spoken Baker said, "I believe we want to build a firm foundation for permanent prosperity for rural America. We oppose the use of poverty as a weapon to force economic adjustment. We want to use our land, water, forests, all of our natural resources, to stabilize the income of the family farmer so that he may share in the standard of living of the rest of the Nation."

Some of the proposals put forth by Conference panelists and participants included:

The need for assistance in determining a community's economic situation, analyzing its shortcomings, finding its strong points, and establishing a development plan.

Assuring that the economic development plan covers an entire community and not just segments of it.

Establishing a source of information in each State which lists State and Federal agencies that might be of assistance to local communities.

Advance zoning and planning for orderly growth as suburban areas expand into rural areas.

Increasing fees on public recreation areas so that private developments will be profitable.

Improving technical assistance for RAD.

Forming a better system of information to publicize the opportunities created by RAD.

Greater effort in research for use of forestry and agricultural products, and finding new markets.

The first Land and Peoples Conference was held in St. Louis. Others are scheduled in Denver, New Orleans, and Philadelphia.

Freeman and Baker believe the Conferences may open up ideas to be presented as part of a farm program. They should also improve understanding between urban and rural people and emphasize the interdependence of the two, the Agriculture Department officials believe.

One thing Freeman expected from the Conference was obviously accomplished. About 1,700 persons went home fired with enthusiasm and new ideas to stimulate economic development programs in their own communities.

THE OREGONIAN ON FIRE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on October 3 I answered the Oregonian's misleading editorial on the location of the Forest Service fire research laboratories. Today I received a letter from Secretary Freeman, which explodes the Oregonian's charge that political influence affects the location of these laboratories.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Secretary Freeman be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of Agriculture,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1962.
Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish you to know that I have read your remarks in the Congressional Record for October 3 when you comment on the allegations of political influence in locating forest research facilities and I welcome your statement.

I know of no instance where the decision to locate such facilities was made on the basis of political influence. Rather, as you indicate, the location of research facilities is based on the needs of an efficient operating program—nearness to the problem, availability of cooperating State agencies to enhance the pace of research, and the location of operational programs at State and Federal levels.

I am sure many Oregonians are aware of the various research and administrative facilities which the Department now operates in Oregon and those which are now under construction or which are planned for construction in Oregon.

Your efforts to facilitate cooperation between the communities in Oregon, where Forest Service installations are located, and the Department and to speed these projects through the Congress deserve the warm praise of the people of your State.

Sincerely yours,
Orville L. Freeman,
Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article published in the September issue of Western Timber Industry, entitled "Corvallis Forestry Laboratory Dedication August 22 Draws Crowd."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Corvallis Forestry Laboratory Dedication August 22, Draws Crowd

Corvallis, Oreg.—An experiment station which may develop the knowledge for enormous increases in the ability of timberlands to produce wood fiber was dedicated at Corvallis August 22.

More than 200 foresters, scientists, and educators gathered for the ceremonies which marked the beginning of the program in a $500,000 building which will later be tripled.

Dr. George M. Jemison, Deputy Assistant Chief for Research of the U.S. Forest Service, in making the dedicatory talk, commented that a strong forestry sciences research program, with participation from the Federal Government, private industry, and Oregon State University, cannot help but "enrich the base for a broad and profitable use of all forest resources."

"We expect to expand and supplement programs until we have adequate research in insect and disease control, silviculture of important forest types, forest tree improvement, and water management," he predicted.

Plans for the laboratory were prepared under supervision of Robert W. Cowlin, Director of the Pacific Northwest Forest & Range Experiment Station, U.S. Forest Service, Portland. Building design was by A. P. DiBenedetto, Forest Service architect.

A maximum use was made of a wide variety of structural and decorative wood products in the design.

The initial staff will consist of 35 people of whom 24 are forest scientists. Robert H. Ruth who has been a project leader in the Corvallis Research Center will be project leader. George J. Booras, contract specialist for region VI, will be in charge of administrative services. Annual operating budget will approach $650,000.

Mr. MORSE. In my speech of October 3 I pointed out that the Corvallis Laboratory was one of several forest laboratories in Oregon that the Oregonian had forgotten to mention when it was criticizing the Forest Service for the location of a laboratory at Riverside, Calif., one at Macon, Ga., and one at Missoula, Mont., making the charge that they were located out of political influence, seeking to leave the impression that the Oregon delegation in Congress was not doing for Oregon what the Oregonian thought could be done by so-called political influence.

The senior Senator from Oregon has never sought and will never seek to exert political influence on any project in the sense referred to by the Oregonian, because each State is entitled to projects on the basis of their merits, and only on the basis of their merits. I shall vote for Oregon projects on the basis of their merits, just as I voted for the Corvallis Laboratory, dedicated on August 22 which was placed in that city in accordance with scientific judgment. It will add a payroll of about $650,000 to our State. I am proud of the work I did, together with my colleagues from Oregon, the late Senator from Oregon, Mr. Neuberger, and his successor [Mrs. Neuberger], to insure the completion of the laboratory on schedule.

Perhaps the Oregonian will want to accuse me of playing politics to get the Corvallis Laboratory; or I wonder if they still will charge that I am not supposed to have any influence in regard to the effort put forth to get a laboratory located in Corvallis and at Bend.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2284)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 712) to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 712) to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, under the terms of the joint resolution, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission would be required to report its findings and recommendations to Congress and the President not later than June 30, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 712) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, there will not be the third reading of the pending measure, Calendar No. 2229, H.R. 10117, to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans. The bill will go over until Monday, possibly Tuesday, in the best interests of all concerned.

To the best of my knowledge, there will be no further votes tonight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader what he anticipates by way of Senate business on Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as I can see, I should think there would be conference reports on the foreign aid appropriation bill, the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill, and the public works bill, and whatever other conference reports may be available.

The calendar has been pretty well cleared. There is not much more on the calendar that can be taken up. So in a sense we are marking time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has an order been entered for the time the Senate will convene on Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; the order is that after the Senate adjourns this evening, it will adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the pending bill be brought up on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should say either on Monday or Tuesday, at a time which will be most convenient to the particular Senators concerned, including the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and other Senators.

ENTRY OF ALIEN SKILLED SPECIALISTS AND CERTAIN RELATIVES OF U.S. CITIZENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes, which were, on page 3, strike out lines 14 through 16, inclusive, and on page 3, after line 16, insert:

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104) is hereby amended to read:

"(b) There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Consular Affairs, to be headed by an administrator (with the title of Assistant Secretary of State), with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. KEATING conferees on the part of the Senate.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO FILE REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, earlier in the day a colloquy ensued on the floor of the Senate relative to the last supplemental appropriation bill. I have already advised the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] that I intend to file the report on the bill without fail as soon as possible after the convening of the Senate on Monday, or even prior thereto, if that be within the rule. I desire that all Senators be advised of that fact.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank my colleague.

NOMINATION OF REPRESENTATIVE KATHRYN GRANAHAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I heartily endorse the nomination of Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania, to be Treasurer of the United States. Her nomination was reported favorably this afternoon by the Committee on Finance and will be on the Executive Calendar on Monday. I am certain that she will do honor to the post of Treasurer of the United States.

I served in Congress for many years with KATHRYN GRANAHAN. She is a woman of very attractive personality and has made innumerable friends.

The nomination of a woman to this high Federal post is recognition of the fact that there are many more qualified women who could and should be appointed to more posts in Government than are now being appointed.

NEED FOR REVISION OF SENATE RULES

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I desire to echo the statement made by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that we must again do our level best to amend the archaic and often inoperable rules of the Senate. I believe a hard battle must be waged next January for the amendment of rule XXII. I think it is obvious that only the abstention of certain Senators from the floor enabled the cloture petition to succeed this year. I believe the original obstacle still prevails, so far as the clearance of civil rights measures to the floor is concerned. In that and other matters, I believe the rules of the Senate should be made more realistic in accordance with the needs of Congress and the rights of the people involved.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President——

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Madam President, it was the hope of a number of Senators that the sine die adjournment would occur tomorrow. However, we now know that will not be possible.

However, before the sine die adjournment of the 87th Congress, certain Senators, including myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], wish to know about the situation in regard to the determination of certain Senators to work for a change in rule XXII at the beginning of the 88th Congress, in January 1963. A letter signed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and myself has been sent to certain Senators, in order to alert our colleagues as to our intention to request their support of our effort in January 1963, to bring about a change in rule XXII.

There has been a clear demonstration of the need for a clear-cut antifilibuster rule which would permit a majority of the Members of the Senate to proceed to vote after full and fair debate. The time to make this proposal is at the opening of a new Congress. We hope other Senators will join us in supporting that effort.

It is said that the successful cloture vote this year demonstrates the workability of the present antifilibuster rule. However, I disagree with that argument. It is apparent that the present rule will not be successful if there is strong opposition to ending debate on a measure of considerable controversy. For example, I do not believe that under the present rule there is a real chance to obtain the necessary two-thirds vote in order to end debate and obtain action on meaningful civil rights legislation.

The letter which has been sent is very much in line with the statement I am making now. As I have said, the letter was signed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and myself.

We are seeking the advice of Senators in regard to how to proceed in January. We hope that in January we shall be able to arrive at a consensus of opinion as to the type of rule change to be proposed, and we hope to be able to enlist the support of the overwhelming majority of Members of the Senate. We feel strongly that such a change in the rule is needed; and I shall do my best to secure the adoption of a rule change which will make it possible to have the vote on a controversial measure taken after full and fair debate has been had, so that a majority of the Senate will be able to work its will.

Mr. HART. Madam President, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, he and I have addressed to a number of our colleagues a letter indicating our intention again to join—at the opening of the next Congress—in the endeavor to obtain an effective anti-filibuster rule.

Very considerable progress has been made in the past 10 years in bringing to the attention of the Senate and the Nation the difficulties which are presented when a majority of the elected Members of this body attempt to get to a vote, after a full and fair debate, on a proposition to which there is strong sectional opposition.

Madam President, the precedents already established at the opening of Congress in previous years clearly indicate that this is the orderly and proper time for the Senate to consider the rules which will govern its procedures. Both party platforms support a change in the antifilibuster rule. Both party platforms support meaningful civil rights legislation. There is no doubt in my mind that a further modification of rule XXII must occur if, in fact, we expect the Congress to meet its responsibilities in the area of long overdue civil rights legislation.

Efforts have previously been made to change the rules. The record shows a growing number of supporters. Such a rule change was first proposed at the opening of Congress in January 1953. In that year, those seeking to take up the rule question at the opening of the 83d Congress mustered only 21 votes. In January 1961, 48 Senators wanted to change the rule at the opening of the 87th Congress.

There are those who would argue that the experience this year on the cloture vote during the debate on the communications satellite bill demonstrates the workability of the present rule. But I believe it would be a real pipedream to imagine that the filibuster used today by those who represent strong sectional interests could be effectively broken under the present cloture rule.

I hope that in the weeks and months ahead we shall be able to develop support for such a change. At the opening of the 88th Congress, the Senate will have an opportunity to free itself from a most restrictive practice, one which prevents the Senate from meeting its responsibilities at mid-20th century in the critical area of legislation necessary to protect basic human and civil rights.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, on our side, in the absence of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who is taking the lead in the matter on our side, I wish to state that five of us are today sending to our Republican colleagues a letter which is precisely the same as the letter which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] have sent out. At the moment I can name only four of those five; they are the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], my colleague [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself.

In this connection, we have an informal liaison with Senators on the Democratic side; and we shall give our utmost support in the fight to amend rule XXII.

I hope that the change in the rule which will be made in January will be in accordance with the so-called Douglas plan, which provides that after 30 days of debate, debate may be ended by the affirmative votes of a constitutional majority of the Senate.

At the time of the debate on the satellite bill and the successful cloture vote in connection with that bill, I said I thought the invoking of cloture at that time would not be harmful to the attempt we proposed to make in January 1963, to amend rule XXII. I stated that I felt sure that the cloture vote on the satellite bill would clearly indicate that an attempt to invoke cloture under the present rule could be successful only when a very special situation existed; namely, only when a substantial number of Senators were willing to absent themselves, rather than participate in the vote on the question of invoking cloture; and I said that that situation was a clear indication that, in terms of dealing with legislative proposals generally, it is necessary that rule XXII be amended. In short, I stated that the action taken by the Senate in invoking cloture in connection with the debate on the satellite bill constituted an important precedent in favor of effecting an amendment to rule XXII.

I hope that we shall be able to repeat that argument most strongly at the time of the convening of the new Congress in January, which is the proper time, according to the rulings by former Vice President Nixon, for changes in the rules to be made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I join the Senator from New York in expressing the hope that by means of a bipartisan effort, we shall be able to succeed in this endeavor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Madam President, as I have said, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who is taking the lead on our side in connection with the letter, is due to return to the Chamber in a moment or two.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I discussed this subject with the Senator 2 days ago, and it was clearly understood that on the Republican side, action similar to that already taken on the Democratic side would be taken. In short, we are working together, and also with our respective groups; and, as I have said, in January the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]—who has been a strong leader in this fight—and other Senators will join forces in the effort to agree on the rule change we shall propose and to agree on the strategy we shall follow; and, in light of our experience during the past year, I think that at that time we shall be in a better position than ever to proceed with the fight to make such a change in the rule.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree that it is fair to say that we are pledging a bipartisan effort to amend rule XXII, in order to endeavor to reduce the power of the filibuster, and in order to give us a more effective means of effecting cloture; and we are pledging that we will undertake that effort at the opening of the new Congress, which—according to the rulings by former Vice President Nixon and according to the Constitution—is the proper time to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In January, when we make our bipartisan effort to change rule XXII, we shall surely be met with the argument that in 1962, the effort to invoke cloture was successful, and therefore no change in the rule is needed. However, that is a fallacious argument. All of us know that the method by which cloture was obtained in 1962 could have been successful only on this one issue, and only then because a substantial number of Senators were willing to absent themselves from the Chamber and not participate in the cloture vote. It would not enhance the prestige of the Senate to continue under a rule that necessitates that if cloture is to be invoked, certain Senators must absent themselves. Obviously, this is the only way by which cloture could have been obtained in the debate on the communications satellite bill.

In short, it is still absolutely essential that a meaningful change be made in rule XXII to make possible the enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation.

I am sure that the rule envisioned by the distinguished assistant majority leader and the other interested Senators will allow more than ample time for debate on any issue on earth. I stress that I am referring to earth-bound issues, like civil rights, not esoteric subjects that are off in outer space. Madam President, certainly there must come a time, in a government of the people, when their legislative body can come to grips with this very fundamental problem. It must not be stymied by a minority, with the result that minority rule, rather than majority rule, exists in the Congress.

I pledge myself to the majority leader and to the other Senators that I will exert my full efforts to bring about a meaningful change in rule XXII at the beginning of the next session.

THE CHANGING SITUATION IN CUBA

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I wish to discuss for not more than approximately 15 minutes the changing situation in Cuba.

At the outset I wish to state that, like many others, I am greatly pleased with the progress which has been made in recent days, and particularly with the announcement made yesterday by the Secretary General of the Organization of American States and by our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, at the conclusion of the meeting of foreign ministers representing the Latin American countries.

I cannot help but think that the resolution which they have adopted demonstrates a unanimity which has thus far been lacking, and demonstrates an awareness on the part of the countries of Central and South America of the real menace of communism in Cuba to all those countries.

I was delighted to see that such countries as Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina were willing to go along with such a strongly worded resolution. I think, overall, it means that great progress has been made.

I think much of the credit for it is deserved by the President of the United States. I was not privileged to be at the luncheon which was held in the White House on, last Tuesday, I believe, at which he invited all the foreign ministers of the Western Hemisphere. It is my information that he talked to them in rather straightforward and stern language about the need for action on the part of the Central American countries, particularly the Caribbean countries, and all the other countries in the Western Hemisphere for united and strong action in opposing the Communist government of Cuba. What he had to say in the White House had a great deal to do with the satisfactory results which we saw were accomplished only yesterday, when the foreign ministers wound up their meeting.

I also wish to take a moment to congratulate the Secretary General, Mr. Jose Mora, for his leadership and his expressed belief that the time had long since passed when all the countries of the Western Hemisphere, all the countries of the American States, should do more than they had done with respect, first, to proscribing Communist activities in the Western Hemisphere, and, second, getting rid of communism in Cuba. I congratulate Secretary General Mora for the statement he made and the leadership which has been provided. My only regret now is that it did not occur a little sooner. However, I am happy that it has finally happened.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, September 27, 1962, entitled "The Menace in Cuba."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Menace in Cuba

The threat in Cuba grows apace. Now we have been told by Fidel Castro and his mentors in the Kremlin that a special port is to be built down there to service and supply a Soviet "fishing" fleet made up of as many as 130 trawlers. Actually, of course, as the State Department has indicated and as Pentagon sources have warned, the development certainly involves much more than a desire by the Russians to catch seafood in waters they have never tried before.

To begin with, the following facts, among others, need to be kept in mind: (1) The normal Soviet fishing grounds in this hemisphere have been limited up to now to the North Atlantic. (2) Most Russian trawlers are semimilitary in the sense that they are elaborately equipped with radar and other devices designed to spy upon such things as our Polaris missile launchings. (3) A Cuban port for these vessels could easily accommodate Red submarines and Red torpedo boats. And (4) the ports thus could serve the Kremlin as a sort of naval base that would be almost within shouting distance of our shores and capable of threatening the Panama Canal, vital inter-American shipping lanes and places like Cape Canaveral.

True, it may be argued that the United States—with its base at Guantanamo, its awesome arsenal of nuclear weapons, its wide variety of missiles, its great fleet of bombers, and its amphibious forces—has little or no reason to fear the building of such a port, which could be wiped out as easily and as swiftly as a fly can be swatted. But that is not the real point of the matter. The real point is that the Kremlin, with studied arrogance, has chosen to be deliberately provocative to an exceptionally intense and dangerous degree. It has done so by ostentatiously ridiculing the Monroe Doctrine, by using the insufferable Fidel Castro to make captives of the betrayed Cuban people, and by planting itself, noisily and insolently, on a foothold in the Western Hemisphere—a foothold from which it apparently intends to launch a war of subversion and indirect aggression against the Americas.

All this brings to mind these recent words of President Kennedy: "If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way * * * then this country will do whatever must be done." Unhappily, that time seems to be rapidly approaching, if it is not already here. Our friends and allies should respond accordingly. Some of them have suggested that only the United States needs to worry about the matter. They could not be more wrong. The menace is global, and it must be met head on by all men and nations who still cherish freedom.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "With One Voice," which calls attention to the great statement made by the ministers representing the Western Hemisphere.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

With One Voice

In an admirable show of unanimity, 19 Latin American Republics have joined with the United States in emphatically, clearly, and bluntly condemning Sino-Soviet intervention in Cuba. There are no weasel words in the final communique released by the foreign ministers who have been informally conferring in Washington. Messrs. Castro and Khrushchev have accomplished the unlikely miracle of bringing countries as diverse as Costa Rica and Brazil, Mexico and Uruguay into fundamental accord on the single most controversial question before the hemisphere.

The communique explicitly condemns Soviet intervention in Cuba and states that the threat this poses to the hemisphere requires "the adoption of special measures, both individual and collective." It calls on hemisphere governments to intensify countermeasures against Communist-Cuban subversion. Significantly, the declaration extends sympathy to "the victims of the present regime" and expresses the hope that the island will soon return to a form of government compatible with the principles of the inter-American system.

This unanimous declaration makes it abundantly clear that the real issue in dispute is not Fidel Castro or the social system that prevails in Cuba today. It is instead Soviet intervention. The Castro regime thus stands unanimously judged a satellite for a hostile foreign power—and the fact that Mexico, Brazil and Chile joined in this condemnation should have massive impact on hemisphere opinion.

The declaration also opens the way for the kind of collective response envisaged by the Rio Pact, a response that would comport with international law and not violate a single treaty. While the United States did not obtain agreement on an airtight economic embargo at this stage, a consensus is forming that will surely lead to collective sanctions. Meanwhile, bilateral agreement ought to be reached with Chile on ending yearly purchases of some $10 million worth of Cuban sugar.

Meanwhile, the proposed closing of U.S. ports to foreign ships carrying goods to Cuba could also have a palpable psychological effect in releasing North American frustration. If European countries do not respond to requests for an embargo, the United States can show the earnestness of its intent by unilateral action. Hopefully this can demonstrate to the Europeans that Washington does not see the Cuban conflict in terms of a feud with a flyweight dictator but rather as a direct confrontation with Soviet power.

Despite expectations to the contrary, the informal foreign ministers meeting did yield important results. Credit for this belongs to all who participated, but it is noteworthy that the final communique reflected the suggestions made on Sunday by Secretary General Jose Mora of the Organization of American States. Let it also be remarked that Secretary of State Rusk showed sure political instincts in helping to find the unifying denominator in an assembly of 20 nations.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, before I discuss the resolutions which I proposed in the Senate, I wish to say that while we greatly appreciate what has been stated at the foreign ministers' meeting and the demonstration of a hardened attitude with respect to Fidel Castro and Communist Cuba on the part of those countries, I am sure we also appreciate the fact that the administration recently announced that it would be the policy of our Government to tell the other nations of the world whose shipping has been carrying goods into the Communist-controlled country of Cuba, and then has come to the United States to pick up additional goods to carry back home, that their ships will no longer be welcome in our ports; that, in some measure, ships that deal with Cuba and carry goods into Cuba, no matter of what nature, will be looked upon as outlawed ships as far as the United States is concerned. I think that will have a salutary effect on the free people of this hemisphere. I think it will further restrict the activities of Fidel Castro and communism in Cuba. It will put great pressure on him. I congratulate the administration on the adoption of that particular program. I am happy that I, along with others, recommended that such a course be adopted by the administration about 2 or 3 weeks ago.

However, I think we all recognize that we still need to take further action. So far as I am concerned, I do not really believe that, in the final analysis, merely the adoption of the resolution of the foreign ministers of the Western Hemisphere nations, standing by itself, will bring down Castro or bring down communism in Cuba. I think we need to go further.

In that connection, I recently introduced in the Senate two resolutions dealing directly with Communist Cuba.

One resolution called for U.S. recognition of a Cuban revolutionary government-in-exile. The second urged the U.S. support in the establishment of an inter-American military alliance.

If adopted, I believe that these resolutions would be positive and effective steps leading toward the eradication of communism from this hemisphere.

I think they are logical next steps which we should take in view of our objective and the objective of the free people of this hemisphere in getting rid of Castro communism in Cuba.

More important even than that, these recommendations would demonstrate that the American people have made up their minds on a vital issue—that we will no longer tolerate the existence of aggressive communism in any form in any part of this hemisphere, and that we have set about to do something realistic about it.

Once that resolve is made, then the resolution which I offered can be made a viable part of our national policy. These resolutions are not a magic formula. They are not a roadmap to utopia. They are a means to an end—if we choose to take action against the Communists.

There is, of course, another alternative—to do nothing. That is to say, to sit, and hope, and wish that Castro would fall and communism will disappear, and let it go at that. If that is our choice, then communism will soon dominate, in my judgment, other sections of our Western Hemisphere through subversion and Red-fomented internal upheaval, and the threat to the peace and security of our neighbors to the south, and to us, will be increased 100 times over that which it is today.

But assuming that action of some kind will be taken, and that it will be intelligent and reasoned, looking toward elimination of communism in Cuba, then I strongly recommend consideration of my two suggestions embodied in the two resolutions.

With regard to the resolutions, I ask unanimous consent that Senators BUTLER, HOLLAND, HICKEY, LONG of Louisiana, SCOTT, THURMOND, TOWER, and YOUNG of North Dakota be named as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 393, introduced by me on September 18 resolving that it be declared to be the sense of the Senate that the U.S. Government should support the formation of an inter-American military alliance joined by all nations in the Western Hemisphere who voluntarily wish to do so, take such action as may be deemed necessary to drive communism out of this hemisphere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. I also ask unanimous consent that Senators ALLOTT, BUTLER, HOLLAND, HICKEY, LONG of Louisiana, SCOTT, THURMOND, TOWER, and YOUNG of North Dakota be named as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 394, introduced by me on September 18, resolving that it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should recognize as the true government of Cuba, a Cuban revolutionary government-in-exile, whose avowed purpose is to lead the Cuban people in the liberation and recovery of their homeland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let us first consider the resolution calling for the establishment of a Cuban revolutionary government-in-exile. The resolution itself says:

> *Resolved*, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Senate that the United States should recognize as the true government of Cuba a Cuban revolutionary government-in-exile whose avowed purpose is to lead the Cuban people in the liberation and recovery of their homeland.
>
> *Further resolved*, That the United States should recognize only a Cuban revolutionary government-in-exile which agrees, prior to recognition by the United States, that it will, upon the liberation of Cuba, transfer its power and authority to the Cuban people by the holding of free elections.

The first objection raised against this resolution is that there is no precedent for the United States recognizing an exile government other than one which was established and subsequently was forced to abandon its native territory.

May I say that this statement is incorrect. For instance, during World War I, a Czechoslovak National Council was formed for the purpose of waging a war of independence for Czechoslovakia, then merely a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The Council was founded on the Cleveland Agreement of 1915 and the Pittsburgh Pact of 1918, which served to unify diverse exile elements. On September 3, 1918, the United States recognized the Czechoslovak National Council as a de facto belligerent government. This meant that we recognized an organized opposition to the de jure government of the territory in question.

I would like to stress that the United States took an important hand in working toward the establishment of this government and that its founding agreements were signed in two American cities. I might also add that strong and effective diplomatic relations were established between the United States and this newly recognized government and that it actually received six U.S. loans.

In addition to U.S. recognition, the Czechoslovakia National Council was ultimately recognized by Great Britain, France, and Italy.

A second example occurred during World War I when the Poles, under the leadership of Paderewski, and with the cooperation and aid of the Polish movement in Chicago, formed a Polish National Committee for the purpose of attaining a free Polish state, since 1863 under the occupation of Russia. On November 1, 1918, the Polish Army was recognized by the United States as a cobelligerent, under the supreme political authority of the Polish National Committee.

Again during World War II another Polish Government-in-exile was recognized by the United States during the Nazi occupation. This government was not the Polish Government which existed prior to the invasion, since many Polish leaders were detained in Poland or Rumania by the Germans, and the exile government was formed by other Polish leaders.

Although the United States did not give formal diplomatic recognition to the Free French movement during World War II, in August of 1943 it did recognize the French Committee of National Liberation—Charles de Gaulle's movement—as administering certain French oversea territories.

It is for international lawyers to appreciate these distinctions between formal recognition of an exile government by the United States and the partial recognition given to such exile groups as De Gaulle's which had neither continuity nor a relationship with any previous government in France. The important thing is that the United States showed its overwhelming desire to cooperate in an extraordinarily close manner with the Free French movement and its leader who was ready to oppose a totalitarian conquest of his country.

The term "government-in-exile" may acknowledgedly be misleading. What is needed is a Cuban juridical personality under international law; and it is in this sense that the resolution should be interpreted.

It should be noted that this proposed government or authority is to be created and recognized by the United States for a single purpose, well defined in the resolution; to wit: for the purpose of leading the Cuban people in the war of national liberation in which they have been engaged during the past 2 years against their Communist oppressors. Such an authority, it must be clearly understood, cannot and shall not pretend to govern the Cuban people, once their liberation has been assured. It was for an identical purpose that the United States recognized and supported the Czechoslovak National Council in 1918.

A second argument raised against my proposal is that recognition of a government-in-exile would give Castro an excuse to abrogate the treaty concerning the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay.

This is an argument which has been made to the able Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], when he has advocated the recognition of a Cuban Government-in-exile. There are those who say that would give to Fidel Castro authority to abrogate the treaty which we have entered into with the previous Cuban Government for a long-term lease at Guantanamo Bay.

Any government holding itself out to be the representative of the state and accepted as such by other states is bound to observe the rules of international law and to abide by the treaty obligations of the state. The continuity and character of the state as an "international person" undergoes no change because of a change in the governing body which represents it. This is a unanimous accepted principle of international law. Were this not so, treaties would be abrogated by every election or other change occurring in any government.

Again according to one of the keystones of international law, in any such two-nation agreement, when no specific time limit is established for the duration of the treaty—which was the case at Guantanamo Bay, then the treaty itself holds in force unless it is cancelled by both parties.

That is a well-established principle of international law.

As a practical matter, the upholding of our treaty rights in Guantanamo depends in the final analysis not on the Castro government's interpretation of international law, but on the Marine garrison at Guantanamo.

Therefore, Madam President, I do not feel that this argument, made against the recognition of a government-in-exile on the basis that we might lose our rights in Guantanamo Bay, has any merit whatever.

A third criticism of my resolution is that recognition of a government-in-exile would end the current U.S. representation in Havana through the Swiss Government, thereby preventing us from the protection, representation, and so forth, of any U.S. citizens remaining in Cuba.

To this objection, let me say that whatever representation we have in Cuba today, through the fine and cooperative offices of the Swiss Government, in the last analysis is effective only to the extent that Castro, or more precisely Khrushchev, wants it to be effective. Whatever cooperation we might seek—and there are times when these can be justified, such as in the case of American craft being shipwrecked off the coast of Cuba—can only be obtained at the sufferance of the Castro government.

To the plea that we would, by recognizing a government-in-exile, be jeopardizing the safety of Americans still in Cuba, I recall on several occasions the State Department has urged that Americans should leave the country and that the U.S. Government could no longer guarantee their protection.

Ours would certainly be a hobbled, ineffective, and distorted Cuban policy if we were to shape it to the needs of a handful of Americans who have been urged by our Government to leave Cuba, but who do not do so for some personal reason of their own.

A final argument against a government-in-exile is that the Cuban refugees are too disorganized to form a government-in-exile worthy of recognition.

In the previously stated examples of Czechoslovakia and Poland during World War I, Poland during World War II, and the Free French movement during World War II, there was a great deal of controversy, competition, and strife between various elements of the exiled groups. Masaryk, Paderewski, and De Gaulle had to struggle mightily for the unity of their people, and it is difficult to say just how the promise of recognition by the United States interacted with the unification attempts.

The fact remains that the task of exiles to form a united political front is an extremely delicate and thorny one, which is disguised by the fact that all exile elements have a common purpose, and therefore should have no insurmountable difficulties in working together. If recognition were held out as a promise to the Cuban exiles, the condition being that they form an effective, unified, viable organization, it would necessarily exert tremendous pressures in the direction of this desired unity. As it stands, there is now no real reason for unity.

To further supplement that particular argument, I point out that we should remember that at the time of the unfortunate Bay of Pigs invasion all the Cuban exile groups at that particular moment, when they realized the battle had been joined, forgot their political differences and immediately joined up, tried to volunteer, and tried to get into the fray. Unfortunately, at that time there was not a sufficiently well-trained organization to receive them.

At that point I should like to add that I have heard it said that one of the reasons we should not go forward and exercise any kind of force in the case is that if we should do so, it might turn other Latin American nations against us. It is a significant fact that at the time of the invasion at the Bay of Pigs, while the outcome was still in doubt for some 48 hours—72 hours in some areas, in the understanding of some countries—not a single Latin American country criticized the action which was taken. The first time any criticism came about was when it became evident that the operation was a failure. Many of my Latin American friends have told me that when the invasion was in progress and they thought the United States was really supporting it, they had the first good feeling that they had had about the United States and what we were willing to stand up and do than they had had in almost 2 years. Many of them said that they walked down the street feeling a great deal more proud of their association with the United States.

However, unfortunately, when the operation began to collapse and we withdrew our support, those people began to slink back into their corners. It was then that the so-called liberal forces far to the left egged on by the Communists, began to get their governments to criticize the United States for the part which we had taken, because it then appeared that the United States would not stand firmly in support of its friends.

So the contention that we could not get the Cuban exiles or the Latin American people to stand with us should we recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile is not borne out by the facts, reason, or logic.

Today the United States has opened its military service for the admission of Cuban refugees. Though the program has been in effect for only a short time, already somewhere between 2,500 and 3,000 young Cubans have joined. They come from every political climate. What they are interested in is action. I cannot help but believe that if the day should come when the United States should urge upon these foreign political groups that they get together—putting them in a room, if need be, and saying, "You must come out with some leadership or else we will pick someone"—we would hear no more argument among the divided political groups, particularly when they understand that the government which is recognized by the United States is only a government of liberation and will itself dissolve and not seek political power after the liberation of Cuba has been accomplished.

I think it is appropriate to bring up at this time the fact that one of the soundest and most influential organizations in matters of national security and foreign affairs is the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. It is, I believe, extremely significant that the Veterans of Foreign Wars at its recent national convention, the latter part of August 1962, in Minneapolis, Minn., unanimously adopted a resolution urging the recognition of governments-in-exile as a means of countering Communist aggression.

This action by the VFW, which has a national membership of 1,300,000 oversea combat veterans, reflects a firm knowledge and grasp of the issues involved in our continuing crises stemming from Communist aggression.

Furthermore, this VFW action demonstrates a clear realization on the part of this great veterans organization that there are things that can and should be done in order to sustain the spirit of those who resist Communist aggression to take the initiative from the Kremlin strategists, and, as a result, enhance our ability as a nation to persevere through to victory against the Red tide of conquest.

Because of its importance and pertinency to the current crisis, I wish to refer at this time to Resolution 227, calling for U.S. recognition of governments-in-exile and support thereof.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 227—SUPPORTING FOREIGN GOVERNMENTAL LEADERS WHO OPPOSE COMMUNISM

Whereas the ruthless march of Communist aggression has overthrown various governments which have resisted Communist encroachment; and

Whereas various governmental leaders have left their countries rather than submit to Communist oppression and serve as puppets of the Red rulers; and

Whereas those who have refused to stay and serve the Communist cause of conquest have continued in foreign lands their resolute resistance to communism; and

Whereas the vigorous anti-Communist actions of such leaders, who have refused to serve as Red puppets, have been a source of inspiration to freedom-loving peoples everywhere, and a source of embarrassment to Communist aggressors; and

Whereas the cause of freedom would be well served by recognizing the heroism and determination of such governmental leaders in exile; and

> Whereas recognition of such fighters against aggression would be both morally and strategically sound: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the 63d National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States,* That the United States officially recognize such Red-displaced governments as governments-in-exile, and extend to such persons and governments moral, diplomatic, and material support.

Mr. SMATHERS. At that particular point, with respect to the Cuban Government-in-exile, I hear people who are experts on the question—and increasingly everyone is becoming an expert, which is only right, because we are giving the question more and more attention—say that what we really need is not a Cuban Government in exile, but an indigenous revolution from within Cuba. We are told that that is really the way to overthrow Fidel Castro.

Madam President, I could not agree with that statement more. But I maintain that the only possible way in which we shall ever bring about any kind of successful revolution in Cuba is through some outside help. I doubt if it ever could be successful without some outside help. But we will not have any kind of pressure upon the Communists within Cuba and on Fidel Castro's government until we are able to get some help to the people of Cuba. They must have guns, sustenance, and the equipment that is needed to put pressure on Fidel Castro.

I submit that there is no other way to get the equipment to the people in Cuba except through a government-in-exile.

I do not believe the United States wishes officially to say, "We are going to try to move in ourselves at this particular moment," for obviously that would bring us into open war between ourselves and Cuba.

What I am about to say is not intended to be in disparagement of the CIA. I do not believe the CIA, in the manner in which it operates, is equipped to bring large numbers of weapons, ammunition and equipment to the freedom fighters in Cuba. The only way that could be accomplished would be through a Cuban Government-in-xile, or whatever else we wish to call it. It should be a government that the United States can recognize as we recognize the government of Chiang Kai-shek. We give to Chiang Kai-shek upward of $500 million in equipment every year to oppose the Red Communist government on the mainland of China. If we can do that, we can at least give some amount of help to the Cuban juridical government, whatever we wish to call it, and no matter where it is located.

We can do it legally. Cubans outside their country have ways and means of sending the equipment into Cuba. I am told that it is much more difficult to get the equipment away from the shores of the State of Florida. There is much more difficulty in getting by our own immigration officials and sheriffs, who try to prevent Cuban patriots from going to Cuba with the kind of equipment they expect to use to overthrow Castro. It is more difficult to get it out of the State of Florida than it is to get it to the shores of Cuba.

If we were to recognize a government-in-exile, that government could call on us for help, and we could openly and frankly give that government the help which it would require, and it could be used to bring pressure on Fidel Castro.

My second resolution says "that it be the sense of the Senate that the U.S. Government supports the formation of an inter-American military alliance, joined by all nations in the hemisphere who voluntarily wish to do so, for the purpose of carrying out the principles previously enunciated."

First, I think it would be well to point out that the resolution does not contemplate a general alliance of the Organization of American States within the framework of the Organization of American States, because such an alliance already exists.

Nor does time allow the United States entering into a protracted series of negotiations involving many nations in the hemisphere which have demonstrated less concern with the penetration of Communists into the hemisphere than has the United States, and hence do not consider themselves endangered by the presence of an extra-continental power in the Caribbean. This resolution is primarily directed to those nations in the hemisphere who already consider themselves, their governments, and their peoples harassed and menaced by aggressive Soviet military and subversive power, exercised through the puppeteering of Castro Cuba.

The resolution which I offered the Senate does not propose to exclude any American state, nor to pressure nor entice those who presently remain indifferent to the Soviets in the Americas. This resolution rests on the principle of self-protection recognized by international law and by the Charter of the United Nations. It contemplates a military pact or understanding which would properly function when the danger of aggression becomes imminent.

It has been a traditional practice in international relations to consider mobilization of military forces by a neighboring country as a preparation for aggression indeed, as in itself an act of aggression. And in such cases, the response can be no other, pending further developments, but an equal mobilization on the part of the country or countries so menaced. Under the circumstances, and if the military buildup in Cuba continues, it is but natural that the Caribbean nations proceed without delay to mobilize their forces of land, sea, and air at least in the same proportion as Cuba has already done.

That has already happened. Cuba has on its shores many more arms and munitions and many more men than it could possibly need for the maintenance of law and order in Cuba. I do not know what is a defensive weapon or an offensive weapon. I have never seen a rifle or a mortar, or even a missile used for defense which could not be used for offense as well, by aiming it in a different direction. Certainly the time has come when the nations of the Caribbean should be looking to their own defenses and means of protecting themselves, if these weapons, sometimes called defensive weapons, which Cuba has in great abundance, are turned into offensive weapons.

In other words, it is time for these people to meet the challenge of arms with arms. Any other course on the part of the governments so affected would be a delinquency in duties to their own people. Such being the case, they not having a Soviet Union to support them and to supply them with large sums of money and large stores of equipment, they should join with other nations which are equally endangered; and it is likewise logical and proper that they should join in so disposing their forces that the enemy may best be deterred or vanquished.

That is the purpose of the resolution.

I think it is highly significant that the Finance Minister of Panama, Dr. Gilberto Arias, proposed in Miami on September 23, which was 5 days after I introduced my two resolutions in the Senate, a meeting of 10 Central American and Caribbean nations to establish a United Front Against Communism in Cuba. He went on to say that other Latin-American countries and the United States should be called on to support measures to contain the Communist regime of Fidel Castro, and he further urged, according to the front-page article in the New York Times of September 24, "the formation of a NATO-type military alliance for defensive as well as offensive purposes, if such need arises."

Dr. Arias said that—

> Although he could not at present commit the Government of Panama to the 10-nation meeting, he felt sure the proposal would have its approval as well as that of the other regimes concerned.

He declared that the 10 countries—Panama, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Colombia, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti, were "in the path of Communist aggression and must now take a united and positive stand to protect their own security.

He went on to say that—

> The recent intensifications of the Communist take-over in Cuba once more confirms that Moscow proposes to use that Caribbean island for the propagation of communism throughout the Western Hemisphere. The threat of communism resulting from the establishment of a Soviet base of operations in Cuba could seriously deter private investment in the Caribbean area.

The other day I read an article which apparently was based on facts obtained from the Department of Commerce, to the effect that in 1957 there was invested in that year in Central and South American countries from the United States $1,200 million. In 1961 private capital going into Central and South American countries dropped to $147 million. I am satisfied, as we all are, that the reason we have seen that drop is because of the threat of confiscation on the part of some of these countries and also the fear that a government of the type of Fidel Castro's government will take over in some Central and South

American countries, and therefore people up here, who would normally make an investment there will not make it under the conditions which obtain now.

I point out that the alliance which I have proposed is different from NATO or SEATO. NATO assumes that the interests of all member countries will continue the same and to the same degree. However, in the hemisphere, there are also regional responsibilities and commitments. Those nations in the Caribbean which feel themselves threatened must be permitted to act in their own defense without the approval, but with the acquiescence, of the hemisphere as a whole.

Such an arrangement would be a refinement of the Rio Treaty, and perhaps should be formally written into it at a subsequent date. It would provide that those Caribbean nations that feel most threatened by Castro and the Soviets would meet to decide on what steps—diplomatic and military—they should take. Temporary integration of military forces, for example, could be undertaken to meet a specific threat.

Furthermore, there would be no need for a forum of Caribbean nations, which would lend itself to debate, evasion, and delay, as no country would need to participate in any action unless it should feel itself threatened, and feel that it was desirable for it to participate.

However, some collective defense mechanism must be formed. The presence, legally sanctioned, of other Latin American troops will be extremely important when the time comes to force out communism in Cuba. There is also the point to be made of international legality in the preparation of a force to take the island. Castro claims today we are training an invasion army. If we recognized an exile government and got open commitments from Caribbean allies, we could boast of the fact that we were taking action to meet a regional threat.

Regarding my second resolution, I have seen and heard much interesting and some illuminating comment on the proposal.

But I think none of these is more pertinent than the urgent recommendation by Panama, which I cited earlier, calling for the formation of a NATO-type organization.

I have since heard that in addition to the 10 nations cited by the Panamanian spokesman as being most directly threatened by Soviet Cuba and, therefore, most interested in such an alliance, Peru might also give support to this type of endeavor. Of all the commentary that I have heard, none is more valid or more pointed than the fact that the nations most endangered are seriously considering joining themselves in a mutual security alliance.

In the Washington Post of September 19, there appeared an article objecting to my resolution and quoting certain "U.S. civilian and military officials" as objecting to the plan, although it did not give any specific names.

I only bring up this point because in discussing my proposal with various, and obviously not the same, U.S. military and civilian officials, I found that they held a different view than that expressed in the article. The military and civilian officials with whom I discussed the alliance, I might add, were all highly qualified in their respective fields as well as being experienced and knowledgeable in Latin American affairs.

Let me briefly answer some of the objections which have been made to the alliance which I have proposed.

First, it has been said that such an organization would circumscribe our country's freedom of action. This is not true. No such special alliance in the past has limited anybody's country's action, and if there were any doubt about this point, it could be made clear in the treaty itself that nothing in the treaty would hinder the taking of unilateral action by any of its signatories when anyone of them felt that its security was endangered, and that the alliance was not acting fast enough.

If this kind of alliance would inhibit action, you would find that those who take the so-called "soft line on Cuba," would favor it, while those who take the so-called "hard line on Cuba" would be opposed to it. Actually, it is for this very reason—that the alliance might hasten appropriate military action—that we find the so-called soft-liners against it. It am proud that for 3½ years I have either been accused of, or praised for, being a "hard-liner on Castro's Cuba."

Secondly, it has been objected that such an alliance as I propose is not needed because there are no large enemy land forces in Cuba or Latin America.

Such an objection is irrelevant. One of the basic designs of such an alliance would be not with respect to land, sea, or air forces, but to the threat of internal subversion.

It is to meet just this kind of subversion that it is essential that we secure the assistance of other Latin American powers so that we will not be required to use American soldiers in combat against the nationals of a once friendly country.

Third, the Washington Post article contends that the Rio Treaty calls for "joint military action in the event of military aggression committed against an OAS member," and thus, there is no need for a new alliance.

However, the fact is that the OAS is a regional organization with the United Nations as its parent body. Hence, collective military action cannot be committed through OAS, because such a measure would have to be ratified by the Security Council of the United Nations, and there, of course, it would be blocked by the inevitable Soviet veto.

Finally, the purposes of an alliance such as I propose would be political as well as military. I do not think there has been a single NATO commander who has maintained that his military force was alone adequate to prevent Soviet aggression.

It has rather been the political unity which this force represented which has been important—a political unity which has now led on to an economic unity—the Common Market, in Europe, with the promise of further strengthening and formalizing the political ties of the member nations.

There has been much talk about a Central American common market. Actually, our Government has formally advocated the establishment of a Central American common market.

Also, there has been considerable talk about a subsequently to-be-formed Western Hemisphere common market. I think all such common markets are within the realm of possibility within our lifetime; and it might well be that such a military alliance as is proposed could, as was in the case in Europe, lead to similar economic and political gains, since the purpose of the alliance, military though it may be, must be political in nature if it is to combat Soviet aggression in the new world.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York, who for many years has demonstrated a realistic interest in and understanding of the problem.

Mr. KEATING. I am grateful to the Senator from Florida. I shall detain the Senate but a moment. The purpose of my intrusion is to congratulate the Senator from Florida on a very thoughtful and clear analysis of his views concerning what further action should be taken.

I am entirely in accord with his views that the informal meeting of the ministers of the OAS is not sufficient. I am gratified by the progress which I feel is now, rather belatedly, being taken. I congratulate Secretary Rusk on the achievements to date. I shall discuss this subject more fully on Monday or Tuesday—probably Monday. I shall not go into it now.

I wish to emphasize one thing in particular which the Senator from Florida said. My information is exactly the same as the Senator's. At the time of the unfortunate Bay of Pigs episode, there was, as the Senator said, no criticism of the United States until the invasion failed. If we had supported it and it had succeeded, it is my judgment, based upon what I consider to be good information, that the countries which then began to criticize us would have supported us. They would have supported any forceful action. They might for local political purposes have had some criticism to voice; but they would in effect have supported our leadership. Moreover, they would have respected us for it.

The Senator from Florida has had many more dealings with Latin American nations than I have had, but I am sure he agrees that they desire to respect the United States, and that respect is the most important quality which we can inculcate in the Latin American countries, as in any other nation, friend or foe.

I wish to ask the Senator from Florida about one phase of his remarks. I assume that this subject has been researched by the Senator. It is not clear to me that the OAS must have its action ratified by the United Nations in order to be effective. In other words, the Senator's view is that the OAS of its own initiative cannot take any concerted action unless it has been approved by the United Nations.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from New York has asked if research has been done on this subject. It has. The finest Cuban lawyers now in exile—and they comprise most of the Cuban bar—and who live in my State, have taken it upon themselves to research the subject and present me with briefs. They came to the inescapable conclusion that officially they cannot act in a military fashion without first having the approval of the United Nations. That is what makes valid our other military alliance. That is why we became a party to NATO. We can thereby have our own organization and decide on our own volition when we wish to move.

Mr. KEATING. Is it the Senator's view that OAS is in a different category from NATO?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes. NATO is merely a voluntary organization entered into by the countries of western Europe and the United States. It is military in its purpose. It is designed to stop Communist aggression, and if need be by fighting Communist aggression. That is its purpose.

The United Nations was established for many other reasons, as was OAS. OAS is generally a political-economic-cultural group having certain military rights; but those military rights must be cleared through the United Nations.

I regret to say that in my comments I did not give the exact section of the OAS charter which makes reference to the fact that these types of military action must be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations. However, I shall supply the Senator from New York with that information.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to have it. My thought was that all that was necesary was to notify the Security Council of the activities which had been undertaken. If, of course, the Security Council could agree on another course of action, that could supersede OAS moves, but the Security Council is not likely to agree on such a point.

Mr. SMATHERS. That was also my impression, as the Senator will remember. The Senator from New York and I on several occasions have talked about this subject and the need for doing something about it.

It was a speech I had made, urging the OAS to do something, which caused the Cuban lawyers to submit to me the briefs which they had prepared. They said, in effect, "You will never be able to get the OAS to do anything, because there are certain large countries that will not do anything anyway, including countries such as Brazil and Mexico." That was when I shifted from the idea that we ought to apply pressure to the OAS to take action.

I said the time had come when another organization should be established, similar to NATO, one which would be independent of the United Nations and could operate when its members decided that the time had come to operate in a military fashion.

Mr. KEATING. That information comes to me as somewhat of a surprise, as it relates to international law. I do not want to end the colloquy on the thought that there is any difference of opinion between the Senator from Florida and myself about the need for additional forceful action in this crisis. I should like to have him cite the reference which he has made and also should like to see the brief.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall supply that information to the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Again, I commend the Senator for a highly thoughtful and fine address.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from New York for his kind remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I shall take a moment to say a word about the comments of the Senator from New York with respect to the views of the Senator from Florida.

I was not able to hear all of the Senator's address; but judging from what I have heard and also from my consultations with the Senator from Florida, I know of his deep concern over the situation in Cuba, in the Caribbean, and throughout Latin America. I, too, wish to say that the need for specific, definite, understandable action certainly exists. Such action is long overdue. I am pleased to see that the recent Conference of Foreign Ministers produced at least a more clearcut statement of policy on the part of all the participating countries represented by them, and I am particularly pleased with the statement made by our Secretary of State in regard to shipping to Cuba.

This subject has been discussed at some length in Congress. I believe these discussions are really helpful; I believe they help point out the possible alternatives to be followed by a responsible government.

Many times there is criticism of proposals or statements in regard to one situation or another. Certainly there have been very helpful discussions in regard to what should be done about Cuba and about subversion and possible aggression by Castro's communism, based in Cuba. I believe those discussions have given the State Department, the National Security Council, and the President a better insight into the possible alternatives, and have given opportunity for freer discussion of their possible effects.

It is true that the Senate does not have responsibility for the Nation's foreign policy; but the Senate does contribute to it. The Senate does not execute or administer it, but in a way the Senate helps to design it.

It is my view that although some of us may be somewhat scarred or cut up a little, as is said in the political parlance, because we offer suggestions, yet from the trials by fire in debate in the legislative body, good suggestions can—and do—come forth.

Mr. SMATHERS. I completely agree with the able Senator from Minnesota. He has made many valuable contributions by means of the suggestions he has made—as has the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and in some instances I have seen some of the things I have discussed subsequently become the national policy. I like to think that the policies are partly the result of the suggestions we make. I believe it is desirable, and is a much healthier situation, to have suggestions made by Members of Congress in the discussion of foreign policy—even though, as the Senator has said, we do not have the responsibility for the foreign policy. However, I believe it is very helpful to have our views reach the Secretary of State, the President, and his assistants.

I would shudder if I thought the President and the Secretary of State could obtain information only from persons who have long been in the State Department. In this connection, I do not criticize any particular person; but I have long deplored the fact that when a new President comes into office, of the approximately 19,600 employees in the State Department, the new President—regardless of whether the President be Mr. Truman, Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Kennedy, or any other—can appoint fewer than 200 persons in the State Department. Consequently, most of the administrative officials in the State Department continue year after year, with the result that some of them strongly defend papers they prepared 10 years before.

Therefore, if the President and the Secretary of State obtained their information only from the State Department, I think the country would be in really bad state.

So I agree that these discussions are most helpful. We know the foreign policy is not our responsibility, in the final analysis; but I agree that our suggestions can be helpful and constructive.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Several efforts have been made to delineate the role of the legislative body in connection with the formulation of foreign policy. Dr. Charles Hyneman, whom I knew first when I was attending Louisiana State University, is one of the foremost experts in the Nation in regard to the role of Congress in the formulation of foreign policy. I mention this because if it is said that the foreign policy is the responsibility of the executive—although it is indeed his responsibility in terms of administration and execution—yet ultimately a successful foreign policy must have public support; and in this country that is not obtained merely by announcing the policy and stating, "This is it." Instead, support for it is obtained by discussing it, arguing about it, and putting it together—sometimes even in a disorderly manner—as the result of discussions, both public and private.

In that connection, the Senator from Florida has done very well, indeed. I suppose that at times we may be in disagreement—but only in degree, not on the fundamentals. Certainly the Senator from Florida has made important contributions.

As to the discussion in regard to the OAS, I hope the Senator from Florida is mistaken in the interpretation that the OAS could take action without the concurrence of the United Nations. I am not in a position to make a definitive statement about that matter; however, I know that at the recent conference at Punta Del Este, provision was made for a group within the OAS to take collective action for its common defense.

One of the things I have discussed with various Senators, including the Senator from Florida, is the possibility of a collective-action program with the Caribbean nations in the immediate vicinity of Cuba. I was delighted to note, the other day, that the President of Costa Rica—and, earlier, also one of the officials of Panama—suggested that there should be a kind of alliance or collective-security pact in the Caribbean area. I believe that should be done. Furthermore, I believe it should be more than a political pact; I think it should have some military overtones.

As my colleagues know, the other day I was very much surprised to hear a responsible official of our Government say that we are now working on a program, on a cooperative basis, between our country and Latin American countries, for political propaganda. At that point I "blew my stack," and almost "went into orbit," as we say, because I could not imagine that our country would wait from 1958 to 1962 to put into effect a counterpropaganda program. Certainly we should long ago have been doing that—using pamphlets and journalists and radio and television commentators—in other words, to make use of counterpropaganda, call it what one will. We cannot do that alone. We must do it in cooperation with our Latin American brothers and neighbors. In fact, they should be out in front, with our country backstopping. For example, I do not think we have done nearly enough to encourage the freedom fighters inside Cuba. I believe there is a way to help the freedom fighters inside Cuba; and if commentators sympathetic to such attempts—such as Howard K. Smith and others—have reason to point out the inadequacy of what is being done, it seems to me to be clear that more should be done, and we should be able to do it.

These suggestions, regardless of their merits—certainly are worthy of consideration by the Government; and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has been in the forefront in that connection. I compliment him for it.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his generous references to me.

OFFICIAL TRAVEL—USE OF AMERICAN FLAG AIRLINES

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, on September 6, 1962, the Senate passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 53, expressing the sense of Congress that, when travel on official business is to be performed on civil aircraft by legislative and Government employees, the travel shall be performed on U.S.-flag air carriers, except where travel on other aircraft (a) is essential to the official business concerned, or (b) is necessary to avoid unreasonable delay, expense, or inconvenience.

This resolution passed the House on October 1. Legislation requiring use of U.S.-flag vessels when travel is by sea has been on the statute books for some time.

Madam President, the Agency for International Development, under the able leadership of Mr. Fowler Hamilton, has recently issued a general notice to its officers and employees, further implementing this policy with respect to air travel. This is an excellent policy, and Mr. Hamilton and his associates should be commended for their leadership in adhering to it.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the policy statement be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the policy statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1962.

Subject: Official travel—Use of American flag airlines:

It is the policy of this Agency to use American flag airlines for travel by AID employees and dependents whenever such facilities are available and their use would not delay the traveler more than 24 hours.

Authorization to use other than an American flag airline will be made only on the basis of a written justification by the traveler, approved in writing by the Administrator, Deputy Administrator for Operations, Deputy Administrator for Administration, Assistant Administrators, or U.S. AID Mission Directors and AID representatives.

The approved justification must be prepared in an original and one copy. The copy is to be presented to and retained by the office making the travel arrangements. The original is to be submitted with the employee's travel voucher.

Manual orders 561.1 and 563.1 will be revised as necessary.

This notice applies to all travel commencing on or after October 8, 1962.

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENTS—STUDY BY SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, my purpose in speaking today is to report to the Senate regarding an important study conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Disarmament on the economic impact of arms control agreements.

I think the subject is very pertinent and timely in view of the fact that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency represents this Government at Geneva and at the United Nations on the troublesome problem of arms control and disarmament. We surely ought to have within our pattern of thought the operation and plan of disarmament, and what it means to our economy and to the economies of other countries.

I do believe that it is in the public interest that the major conclusions and results of the study be reviewed. Our Government has already shared with the United Nations much of the information developed in the study, and the executive branch has made full use of the data. The full text of the study is confidential. It has been published and made available to the various agencies of the executive branch and Members of Congress. My remarks are in a general nature and in no way violate the confidential nature of the report.

First, let me say a word about how the material for this study was collected.

The subcommittee, with the assistance of a number of economists and statisticians, designed a questionnaire which was sent to 439 companies engaged in defense business in varying degrees. This questionnaire asked for factual information about each company's involvement in defense work and it also requested opinions regarding any possible adjustments a company might need to make if its defense business should end or be curtailed.

The questionnaire divided defense work into 17 different defense items, such as aircraft production; components for missiles; production of fissionable material for weapons purposes; research, development, test, and evaluation on different weapons; and production of ships, tanks, artillery, and weapons of chemical and biological warfare. Defense work on space, electronics, and communications separate from individual weapons systems, and for construction of military facilities was also included. For each defense item the questionnaire requested figures for total sales, defense sales—these divided into prime and subcontract defense sales, unfilled orders, employment—divided into scientific and technical, production, and all other employees, and three categories of costs—payroll, material and supplies, and contract work.

A company was asked to furnish the above information on a consolidated basis for the company as a whole and also for each plant at which defense work was being undertaken. The information was to be supplied for 1959. Defense work for purposes of the study was defined as any contracts with the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the now defunct Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Contracts with private companies and institutions by the Space Administration and the Civil Defense Office, however, were so small in 1959 as to be negligible for the purpose of the study.

Three different groups comprised the 439 companies receiving questionnaires. One group consisted of all companies—other than transportation, fuel, and service companies—which constituted the group of the 100 largest defense contractors any time during the past 5 years, that is, from 1955 to 1959. The second group consisted of 150 companies, characterized as big business, which did defense work but which were not among the 100 largest contractors. The third group was made up of 150 small business companies doing some defense work.

I realize that many businessmen dislike filling out Government questionnaires. Eighty percent of the companies, nevertheless, returned completed questionnaires. This is almost a record. The fact that 370 companies with 1,193 separate establishments doing defense work completed questionnaires for the subcommittee is a great tribute to the willingness of American industry to assist the Government in planning for economic adjustments in the event disarmament agreements should be reached. Let me add parenthetically, lest some clever mathematician calculate that 370 out of 439 is more than 80 percent, that we permitted some companies which were highly decentralized to submit separate reports and, therefore, a few companies are treated in this manner.

I do wish to emphasize that I was highly gratified by the substantial time and energy expended by so many companies in compiling the data we were seeking. It is unfortunate that the companies cannot obtain copies of the study to see the composite results of their labors. These companies, representing to a considerable degree a cross section of the companies doing defense work, sold to our Defense Establishment anywhere from a few hundred to several hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of talent and goods to keep our country strong and able to meet any military emergency. Yet, by answering our questionnaire, they were also willing to contribute their effort to helping the Government calculate the problems of adjustment that might be anticipated in the event of a disarmament agreement.

There are some who say that American industry is opposed to disarmament, that it is so interested in defense work that it would not support workable and effective disarmament agreements. The people who disseminate and believe such nonsense do not know American industry. The companies represented in the subcommittee's study accounted for some 85 percent of the total amount of procurement and research and development purchased by the Government from private industry for defense purposes. Not one, I repeat, not one of these companies even hinted it opposed a disarmament agreement on grounds that it would cause them economic difficulty. Many, in fact, thanked the subcommittee for making its study. They felt that such a study was further evidence that the United States was sincerely dedicated to the goal of finding an end to the armaments race in which we are now engaged with the Soviet Union. I want my colleagues to know of some of the opinions expressed by American industry.

One leading defense company said it—

> Wholeheartedly supports efforts to find some satisfactory formula for controlled disarmament. It is our firm conviction that the long-range effects of any progress toward that goal can only result in benefit to the whole economy of the country. If the billions now being spent on weapons and warning systems can instead be devoted to lifting still further the levels of living of people; if the tax burden can be reduced and the threat of inflation met; if the hundreds of thousands of scientific-engineering-management teams that are now dedicated to the proposition that the United States shall not be second in any area vital to the national security could once more turn their innovative talents to the competition for the favors of king customer—and if this can be accomplished by an orderly reduction over a reasonable period of time—the results would be invigorating not only to the American economy but also strengthening to the economy of the entire free world.

And another company stated:

> There is no doubt that a sudden withdrawal of defense business would create severe problems for our company and its employees. At the same time we do not believe that such problems of transition should constitute a barrier to a workable and effective arms reduction program. If that can be achieved on a basis that will not reduce the security of the United States, the problem of economic dislocation incident thereto should not be allowed to be an obstacle. The ingenuity of industry and Government should be equal to the challenge of such a problem.

A third defense company wrote:

> The Soviet Union is now convinced that any extensive disarmament would cause so great an economic depression in the United States that the result would be the destruction of the capitalistic system. Therefore, the Soviet leaders do not believe that the United States is sincere in its disarmament proposals. Extensive Government planning to deal with the economic problems arising from drastic disarmament would go a long distance toward convincing the Soviet Union of United States sincerity in the field of arms control.

These quotations come from spokesmen for American industry. They were contained in comments which were received from companies at the time they submitted their questionnaires. They strengthen the view that American industry is behind the efforts of our Government to achieve workable and effective disarmament measures with the Soviet Union. American industry, furthermore, as the subcommittee's study demonstrates, would not in any way oppose or postpone disarmament because of any temporary economic dislocations brought about by the cessation of defense production and procurement.

I want now to turn to some of the principal findings of our subcommittee's economic impact study.

DEFENSE SPENDING IN RELATION TO TOTAL ECONOMY

When we compare the defense budget with the total amount of goods and services produced in the United States we find that defense expenditures take only about 9 to 10 percent. When we compare the amount of defense employment covered by the study with total manufacturing employment, plus certain other industry groups included in the study, the ratio of defense to total employment is 1.2 million workers doing defense work to a little over 21 million engaged in these manufacturing and other related industries. Since the study did not cover all workers engaged in defense work the 1.2 million is undoubtedly somewhat low, but it is unlikely that the total figure for defense workers would be increased by more than a few hundred thousand. In addition, however, there are many service industries located in defense communities which depend upon the existence and continued operation of plants now producing for defense.

Another way of gaging the importance of defense work to the total economy is to compare the number of companies participating in the study with the 500 largest corporations. Of these 500 corporations, which did over $197 billion worth of business in 1959, about one-fourth participated in the economic impact study. The entire 370 companies accounted for over $80 billion in sales, of which almost $22 billion came from defense contracts. The $22 billion of defense work done by the 370 companies represents about 85 percent of the amount spent by the Defense Department for the purchase of military hardware and research and development. This amount, though large as a lump sum expenditure, is small compared with the total manufacturing of American industry, namely $357 billion or about 6 percent.

By mentioning these figures I would not want to mislead anyone by suggesting that, just because the percent of defense spending and employment is low relative to total manufacturing output and employment, no economic problems would be encountered as a result of a comprehensive disarmament agreement. Even a 10-percent reduction in output and employment could have serious economic repercussions. Therefore, although the total amount devoted to defense is a small part of the total economic picture, it is very important that we know ahead of time how we would plan to adjust to any significant reduction in defense spending. Planning now and conducting the appropriate studies could make a major difference in keeping our economy at a high level during any transition period in which defense spending was decreasing and other levels of economic activity were increasing.

CONCENTRATION OF DEFENSE WORK

The military industrial complex that former President Eisenhower warned the country against is one which appears to be centered in a few hands and in a few key places.

By this I do not mean to suggest that there are not important military installations in almost every State which might be affected by a disarmament agreement. The Defense Department states there are about 6,700 separate military installations in the United States and abroad, although may of these are small in terms of the number of personnel at them. Nor do I mean that there are not thousands and thousands of companies engaged in defense business. The Defense Department estimates there are about 18,000 companies doing defense work directly with the Government, and this does not include the many others that do defense work indirectly, that is, under contract with defense companies which are prime contractors. What I do mean is that by far the bulk of defense work is performed by a very few business concerns.

Twenty-four companies accounted for 70 percent of the entire defense expenditures represented by the study. In other words, of almost $22 billion in defense spending about $16 billion went to 24 companies. There were four companies each receiving over $1 billion in defense sales. Four companies received from $750 million to $1 billion. Another 4 companies received from $500 million to $750 million, and 12 companies received from $250 million to $500 million. Most of this revenue came from direct prime contract sales to the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission, but $2.3 billion was received from subcontracts with other prime contractors. One can see, therefore, that these big companies take in some of each other's wash, so to speak. They not only receive money from the Government for defense, but they also receive money from each other. Instead of defense money being spread around throughout many companies, it tends to become even more concentrated in a few companies.

By awarding such a large portion of defense work to so few companies, the Government is promoting the concentration of economic power. From an overall economic standpoint it would be preferable to have the impact of any reduction in defense spending spread more evenly throughout the economy and the country. And today, when weapons systems have become so complex, we have transferred to some of these industrial and technological giants great power and influence over the development of these weapons systems. The continued concentration of economic power and the loss of the Government's decisionmaking power over aspects of defense policy are trends in the defense effort which should worry us.

The fact, however, that so much defense work is done by so few companies gives us, at least, a ready handle in terms of preparing for any adjustments due to arms control and disarmament agreements. We know where to start. We should first look to these companies in order to plan any future shift in production and research and development from defense to peacetime pursuits. These 24 companies have 347 plants doing defense work. We should determine how these plants can help meet some of the priority economic needs of the country. The technology of defense has become highly specialized, and we must study how this technology can be adapted to other uses. Many of these specialized plants, for example, could shift their emphasis to the continued and intensified exploration of outer space. I am confident that little or none of the specialized knowledge developed during the past decades of defense production would be lost in a world at peace.

We should also know where these plants subcontract and how these subcontractors would be affected. If we did nothing more at this time than to have a full understanding of the impact of various disarmament agreements on these 24 companies and their 347 defense plants, we would be way ahead in our planning for economic adjustments. When I say "we" I mean Government and industry working in cooperation and partnership. Most of the defense companies, the subcommittee study showed, believed they could make their own adjustments without any large assistance from the Government. Many of the very large companies, however, felt that Government participation was necessary. Only a few of the companies covered by the study had conducted studies of how reductions in defense spending would affect their businesses.

CONCENTRATION BY STATE

Recent reports on defense spending reveal how defense spending is concentrated. It is concentrated by State and it is concentrated by industry. I shall first talk about concentration by State.

Many of us in the Congress have known that the defense effort has followed that popular phrase, "Go west, young man." It might even be said that it has responded, "California, here I come." Twenty-three percent, almost one-fourth, of the defense business represented by this study was done, not just contracted for, but done, in California. When the Department of Defense reports on its production contracts, it usually pinpoints the location of the company's main office, but it frequently does not reveal the location of the plant which actually does the work. This defect is to a large extent remedied for the purposes of the subcommittee's study, which shows that California led all States as the principal producer and supplier of eight of the major defense categories into which the subcommittee's questionnaire was divided. They were new aircraft production, production of aircraft parts and modification of old aircraft, production of missiles and components, production of ground-based equipment for missiles, space vehicles, research and development on missiles, research, and development on aircraft, and the production of steel for defense uses.

California also has the largest concentration of military personnel and civilian employees of the Department of Defense. Even then, however, the ratio of defense employment to total manufacturing employment in California, 26 percent, is not as high as in some other States such as New Mexico, 53 percent, Arizona, 28 percent, and Washington, 27 percent.

After California the 10 States with the highest defense sales are New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Texas, Washington, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and Maryland. Some States which are highly industrialized do not rank high in defense sales. They are Michigan, Missouri, Indiana, and Illinois. Except for Ohio the bulk of the defense industry in the United States is along our coasts, especially in the Northeast and the Southwest. The Midwest, commonly looked upon as a principal center of industry, is obviously busy producing things other than armaments. The seven Midwestern States of Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, Missouri, and Minnesota just barely received together what New York alone received from defense business, about $2.5 billion and this is less than half what is expended in California.

I note, as was pointed out in an article in the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 30, that the share of the Midwest in our defense industry has risen only because of our increased emphasis on more conventional armaments in the past year.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the impact of disarmament obviously would fall unevenly throughout the several States. And yet, as I mentioned earlier, spokesmen for industry or labor have not raised their voices against the national security goal of the United States to end the arms race just as soon as effective agreements can be worked out with the Soviet Union and other countries.

INDUSTRIAL GROUPS AND DEFENSE

The subcommittee's study disclosed that the aircraft industry, of all industries, was the most heavily involved in defense. Thirty-three of the 370 companies participating in the study were classified as being involved in the aircraft industry. Together they accounted for almost half of the $22 billion worth of defense products sold. They were supplying defense needs in electronics, ships, and atomic weapons in addition to aircraft, missiles, and space vehicles. They even produced 14 percent of the total supply of tanks covered by the study.

The aircraft industry is the only industry covered by the study where the amount devoted to defense exceeded by a large margin the amount devoted to commercial enterprise. Only one of the 33 companies sold less than 50 percent of its total output to defense; 23 sold from 75 to 100 percent to defense. Less than 17 percent of total sales came from nondefense orders. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Department of Defense should be working closely with the aircraft industry to determine what shifts would be undertaken in the event of disarmament to maintain this aspect of the economy at a high level of production and employment.

Companies covered in the study engaged in shipbuilding and in electrical machinery are also heavily active in defense work, but not to the same degree as the aircraft industry. The 13 companies in the shipbuilding industry represented in the study sold more of their output to the Defense Department than to nondefense customers. These shipbuilding companies and nine nonprofit educational and scientific research agencies, as well as engineering and architectural services, were the only industries in addition to aircraft where defense sales exceeded commercial sales.

The electrical machinery industry covered by the study included 71 companies and received the second largest amount from defense. A little over one-third of its $15 billion in total sales came from defense work. Of almost 800,000 employees, 322,000 were engaged in defense activities. The largest defense item of this industry was not associated with any specific type of weapon, but with electronics and communications in general.

In contrast to the aircraft, shipbuilding, and electrical machinery industries and educational and research agencies, all other industries covered by the study were much less involved in the defense effort. Motor vehicle companies appear to be engaged in defense production only to a minor degree compared with their commercial output. None of the 15 automotive companies covered by the study received in excess of 25 percent of their business from defense. Of $22 billion in sales received by these 15 companies in 1959, only 4 percent was defense. Of a total employment of almost 728,000 in 1959, only 37,000 persons were engaged in defense work.

Other industries covered by the study in which defense work was substantially below nondefense production included machinery except for electrical machinery; primary metals; rubber, tires and plastics; chemical and allied products; construction; professional scientific and control instruments, photographic and optical goods, watches and clocks; fabricated metal products; railroad equipment; stone, clay, and glass products; ordnance and accessories; textile mill products and apparel; and food and beverages. It should also be remembered that if all companies in these industries were included, the ratio of defense to total production would be very much lower. The companies represented by the study by no means comprise the total number of companies in an industry.

If the industries, companies, and individual plants covered by the subcommittee's study could devote their full capacity to producing peacetime goods and services and conducting research and development for nondefense purposes, there is vast potential for the betterment of our citizens and our country, and also I must add, for the citizens of other countries. Companies devoting their full attention to producing for the American market would contribute directly to the increased well-being of the U.S. consumer. But, in addition, companies expanding their trade abroad both in regular commercial channels and in partnership with Government programs for the economic development of countries in Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa would also indirectly result in economic betterment to our own people.

The need in the United States alone for expanded public facilities is tremendous. The House Committee on Public Works, in its recent report, No. 1756, of June 2, 1962, stated:

> Any reasonably comprehensive calculation will reveal that a staggering outlay is needed to meet the problem. One economist has estimated that we need to invest $40 billion a year for the next 25 years in public capital investment. * * * Even the most conservative estimates on how much money should be allocated by this Nation to meet this problem call for an average annual outlay in excess of $25 billion.

The burden of proof as to whether or not an economy that is heavily engaged in defense production can shift from defense production to the production of strictly peacetime goods rests upon the totalitarian countries. I think it would be well for the United States and the other free countries to remind the world, at the United Nations, in every Assembly meeting, that ever since the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, the Soviet Union has had a vast program of militarism, arms production, and conscription and recruitment of manpower for the army, navy, and air force of the Soviet Union. In other words, the Soviet Union has never had a peacetime economy. The Communist countries have never had any experience whatsoever in terms of overall, complete peacetime production.

This country proved after World War II that it could demobilize a huge Military Establishment of manpower and machines, of industrial equipment and factories, go to a peacetime establishment and move quickly into one of the greatest periods of prosperity and economic expansion that the world has ever known.

We have demonstrated to the world that we know how to disarm, and that we know how to convert from armaments production to peacetime production. I challenge the Soviet Union to give any such demonstration or evidence.

I say this because I have heard critics say that we had better be very careful about discussing the economic impact of disarmament on our economy. I have heard it said that if we discuss this subject too much, we are likely to give the Communists some propaganda. To the contrary, if we discuss the economic impact of disarmament on our economy, we shall reach the conclusion that not only is it possible to make such a conversion without serious dislocation, but it is also possible to have a vastly improved economy, one in which economic expansion moves rapidly, and in which the production of goods and services increases for the common good.

The Soviet Union and other totalitarian countries have had no experience in moving from a vast production of armaments into peaceful production. Therefore, I challenge them to show how they could make that shift without a very serious dislocation of their economy. Possibly that is why the Russians are so reticent and so unwilling to engage in sincere and conscientious discussions in the field of arms control.

I sometimes wonder why we do not press this challenge upon them. I sometimes wonder why we, in our discussions and in our own propaganda, do not tell the world factually and honestly that the Soviets have never disarmed, that they have never been without a military program, that they always have had millions of men under arms, that they have always had a large section of their total economic productive capacity dedicated to arms production.

Yet the men in the Kremlin parade before the world as peacemakers. They try to make the world believe they want peace. They talk about peace when they know they have never had it and do not want it; that they have not had an economy based on peace, and that they have never planned an economy based on peace.

I believe that the Disarmament Subcommittee's study has given evidence that the United States could, and would, be delighted to shift to full peacetime production of goods and services and a full civilian economy without a severe economic dislocation from maintaining a heavy armament program. One beneficial result of the study is to clear the air further of any doubts that the American economy was too heavily involved in armament production to be able to shift without difficulty to nonarmament activities.

Economic problems can be solved if Government and industry have the wisdom and the will to plan ahead. The Congress should do its share by reviewing the extent to which new or modified legislation is needed. For example, an important step would be taken if the Senate acted favorably upon Senate Resolution 375, introduced by Senator HART and 14 cosponsors, of whom I am privileged to be one. This resolution would authorize a study of the economic implications of the $50 billion annual defense expenditures.

Planning is essential. We must look ahead. The subcommittee's studies demonstrate that many of the industries that were studied were planning ahead. They knew what they wanted to do. They have demonstrated their capacity to shift from defense production to peacetime production. They have done this even as the flow of contracts for defense items have been withdrawn from one company or area of America and placed in another company or area of America. We have had some experience, in a very realistic sense, with arms control and disarmament.

The involvement of American industry, our study has shown, is uneven as to number of companies, the distribution of defense sales by State, and the concentration by industry group. It is also uneven as to weapons product, with the greatest share going into missile production, missile research and development, aircraft production, and aircraft research and development. A diversion of resources, funds, and personnel in these companies, States, and industry groups producing for defense can be accomplished without undue loss of economic growth or unemployment. But we need to start planning now in conjunction with the 2 dozen or so key defense companies which account for the major share of defense procurement, research and development.

We need to start now, not so much because any comprehensive disarmament agreement is imminent. But we should place in motion activities which themselves may have a healthy impact on our effort to reduce the pace of the armaments race. The United States must do all it can to persuade the Soviet Union that arms control and disarmament are in the best national interests of both of our countries. We today have the confidence and the strength to lead the nations of the world into a system of collective security which is based more on international cooperation and the peaceful settlement of disputes, and less on the maintenance of costly, dangerous, and destructive armaments.

Often in the past we have used the phrase, "We must negotiate from strength." I submit that the United States, from a military, political, and economic vantage point, now has the strength from which serious, sustained, and reasonable negotiation is feasible. We should employ this strength and confidence wisely. The future of our country and that of our fellow man may depend on our ability to use our wisdom in this paradoxical juncture of great peril and even greater opportunity.

EXHIBIT I

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 30, 1962]

DEFENSE CONTRACTS RISE TO $25 BILLION IN FISCAL 1962; AREA TOTAL FALLS 16 PERCENT

(By John G. Norris)

Total Defense Department contract awards reached $25 billion in the last fiscal year—a 13-percent increase over the year before—while Maryland, Virginia, and District of

Columbia orders dropped by 16 percent, or $206 million.

This was disclosed in a Pentagon report released yesterday, a report that predicted a continuing rise in arms orders to $27 billion this year, extending to "every major category of military hard goods."

The report, giving a geographic distribution of defense contracts during the fiscal years 1960 through 1962, has obvious economic and political implications.

Midwestern States, it revealed, staged a comeback; California—the leader with 23.8 percent of all Pentagon contract dollars—held its own; Massachusetts gained; New York lost proportionately but was up slightly in volume.

The political impact of the report, made public as election campaigning waxed hot, could be considerable. President Kennedy lifted from it in advance of publication last week to tell West Virginia voters that the total value of defense orders placed in their State has almost quadrupled since he took office in early 1961.

West Virginia awards rose from $36 million in fiscal 1960 to $134 million in fiscal 1962, which ended June 30.

Maryland dropped from a total $528 million in 1961—and $516 million in 1960—to $469 million last year. The Free State held 2.5 percent of the overall $20.4 billion of defense awards in 1960 and in 1962 received but 1.9 percent of the $25-billion pie.

A Pentagon spokesman said the decline in Maryland "was the result of many factors, including a shift of considerable Martin-Marietta Co. research and development work to its Colorado and Florida plants and fluctuations in shipbuilding."

Virginia was down from a total $505 million in awards in fiscal 1961 to $446 million in 1962, though still above the $422 million in 1960. The Old Dominion proportion declined from 2.3 percent of all awards in 1961 to 1.8 percent last year. Pentagon officials said a decline in the volume of Newport News Shipbuilding Corp. work and Hercules Powder contracts influenced the drop.

Contracts awarded to companies in the District of Columbia rose from $95 million in 1960 to $150 million in 1961 and $182 million last year, to a surprising 0.7 percent of the national total. Most of the actual money, however, is spent elsewhere.

The report updates in part a long-range analysis of the Nation's changing defense industry pattern that was published last June. It showed that the Midwest, center of major defense production in World War II and Korea, had lost the major share of Pentagon dollars to the Pacific, Mountain and East Coast States.

Midwestern leaders had been aroused by Defense Department officials' comments that the Midwest had not been alert to the changing character of military orders—mounting research and development work and complex, custom-built weapons, and the much decreased mass production of Army-type equipment.

Midwesterners have been meeting frequently with Pentagon chiefs, university scientists and industrialists to try to stimulate in their region the close association between college brainpower and industry that has caused the shift of defense orders to Massachusetts and California.

The Midwest comeback noted in the current report, however, stems from the Kennedy administration's emphasis on conventional warfare, which has brought heavy orders from Army weapons built in that area. Contract awards in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin are up from $2,371 million in fiscal 1960 to $3,168 million last year.

Pentagon officials have no complete answer for Maryland's overall decline in defense orders, a decline that came despite large defense research orders.

California awards rose from $4,839 million in fiscal 1960, to $5,277 million in 1961 and $5,993 million last year.

YOM KIPPUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Yom Kippur, or the Day of Atonement, coming at the end of the high holidays that mark the beginning of the Jewish year, is the day upon which is concentrated that repentance and resolution of amendment appropriate to such a time. In fasting, prayer, and worship, the Jewish people on this occasion acknowledge their wrongdoings of the past year, and express their determination to compensate for injuries done, so far as may be possible, and to live better lives for the coming year.

This is no festive occasion, appropriate for greetings and congratulations. It is appropriate to the occasion, however, that we who are not of the Jewish religious community should remind ourselves that the spirit of this observance is proper and beneficial to all men, and that it would be well for us all to join our prayer with those of the Jewish people, that we all may lead better lives, and the world benefit thereby. The lesson of Yom Kippur, central in the Christian as well as the Jewish tradition, is contained in the passage from the Book of Isaiah that is read in the synagogues on this day:

> Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh? Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily: and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy reward.

Mr. President, I know men of all faith share these sentiments. With the oncoming of Yom Kippur, we should reflect and ponder these eternal truths.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 5, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 136. An act for the relief of Dinko Dorcic;

S. 320. An act to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce with a State;

S. 453. An act for the relief of Robert J. Scanlan;

S. 507. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe;

S. 689. An act for the relief of Karl Heinz Agar;

S. 901. An act to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes;

S. 962. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Marie Margaret Arvanetes;

S. 1651. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to delegate the function of approving contracts not exceeding $100,000;

S. 1999. An act for the relief of Anna Marie Erdelyi;

S. 2568. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1950, to extend the regulatory authority of the Federal and State agencies concerned under the terms of the Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, signed at Washington May 31, 1949, and for other purposes;

S. 2667. An act for the relief of Sebastiana Santoro;

S. 2687. An act for the relief of Robert D. Barbee;

S. 2690. An act for the relief of Mona McIsaac Downey;

S. 2697. An act to waive certain time limitations prescribed in chapters 33 and 35 of title 38, United States Code, in the case of certain veterans and eligible persons ordered to active duty with the Armed Forces, or whose period of duty with the Armed Forces was involuntarily extended, on or after August 1, 1961;

S. 2711. An act for the relief of Tasia Demetropoulou (Dimitropoulos);

S. 2753. An act for the relief of Duk Man Lee and Soon Mal Lee;

S. 2777. An act for the relief of Arild Ericksen Sandli;

S. 2795. An act to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that any such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia;

S. 2836. An act for the relief of Carmelo Rafala;

S. 2902. An act for the relief of Sumiko Takahashi;

S. 2908. An act for the relief of Rosa Fumarola Balice;

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Raymond Chester Hendon;

S. 2950. An act for the relief of Dwijendra Kumar Misra;

S. 2992. An act for the relief of Michelangelo Comito (Nati);

S. 3085. An act for the relief of Paul Huygelen and Luba A. Huygelen;

S. 3177. An act for the relief of Michael (Mike) Bessler;

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Ma Chin-Ying;

S. 3265. An act for the relief of Despina Anastos (Psyhopeda);

S. 3267. An act for the relief of Gunter Heinz Hillebrand;

S. 3275. An act for the relief of Anna Sciamanna Misticoni;

S. 3279. An act for the relief of Yet Gee Moy (Tzse Woo Lai) and Mee Sen Moy (Sau Ming Lai);

S. 3295. An act for the relief of Mathew Lengyel (also known as Brother Paul S.V.A.);

S. 3336. An act for the relief of Lazaro Loyola Arinque, Jr.;

S. 3338. An act to incorporate the American Symphony League;

S. 3390. An act for the relief of Naife Kahl;

S. 3452. An act for the relief of Doctor Hassan M. Nouri;

S. 3504. An act to provide for alternate representation of secretarial officers on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 3557. An act for the relief of Betty Sandra Fagann;

S. 3600. An act for the relief of Chao Hua-Hsih; and

S.J. Res. 214. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period from November 26, 1962, through December 2, 1962, as National Cultural Center Week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, under the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, October 8, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 5, 1962:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

John W. Tuthill, of Illinois, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the European Communities, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria.

James Wine, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast.

United Nations

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida.
George V. Allen, of North Carolina.
Mrs. Mildred McAfee Horton, of New Hampshire.
Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland.
John H. Morrow, of New Jersey.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:

Henry S. Commager, of Massachusetts.
Herbert W. Hill, of New Hampshire.
Eugene H. Jacobson, of Michigan.
Robert A. Kevan, of Virginia.
Joseph B. Platt, of California.

Post Office Department

Kenneth P. Steinreich, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

In the Navy

Under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

U.S. Marshal

Frank Udoff, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maryland for the term of 4 years, vice Gerald F. Bracken.

Postmasters

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CONNECTICUT

Warren A. Holbrook, Amston, Conn., in place of S. G. Turshen, deceased.

GEORGIA

Joseph M. Rush, Kingsland, Ga., in place of J. C. Casey, retired.

IDAHO

Berniece B. Evans, McCammon, Idaho, in place of C. S. Thornley, retired.

ILLINOIS

Robert A. Smith, Elvaston, Ill., in place of J. N. Cunningham, retired.

William H. Haycraft, Franklin, Ill., in place of W. A. Tranbarger, transferred.

Russell W. Martin, Hanover, Ill., in place of A. E. Young, deceased.

Carl H. Vaughn, Kinderhook, Ill., in place of M. E. McCarl, retired.

G. Kenneth Furrer, San Jose, Ill., in place of F. E. Smith, retired.

W. Rex Butler, Saybrook, Ill., in place of E. E. Tipsord, transferred.

Donald E. Howe, Warrensburg, Ill., in place of F. M. Binkley, retired.

INDIANA

N. Artelle Lassiter, Windfall, Ind., in place of M. E. Martin, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Joseph L. Thomas, Glendale, Ky., in place of L. M. Stuart, retired.

John S. Humphrey, Jr., Jeffersontown, Ky., in place of R. H. Dickson, deceased.

MISSOURI

Kestner E. Story, Matthews, Mo., in place of R. M. Radcliffe, retired.

NEBRASKA

Blaine T. Larsen, Beaver Crossing, Nebr., in place of P. C. Geis, transferred.

Wilfred L. Kozisek, Bruno, Nebr., in place of E. L. Spatz, retired.

Elgar R. Dempcy, Eustis, Nebr., in place of A. R. Montgomery, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Mabel P. Wood, Barnegat Light, N.J., in place of F. B. Engelsen, resigned.

Henry P. Hofstetter, Pine Beach, N.J., in place of C. J. Gray, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edith C. Swann, Olivia, N.C., in place of M. T. Brazo, retired.

OHIO

Carl J. Richards, Mesopotamia, Ohio, in place of L. L. Ford, deceased.

Max R. Westfall, North Lewisburg, Ohio. in place of L. D. Overfield, deceased.

Frank J. Carpenter, Swanton, Ohio, in place of W. J. Pinkstone, retired.

OKLAHOMA

J. Hugh Bryant, Sand Springs, Okla., in place of C. C. Evans, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas F. Doyle, Marion Center, Pa., in place of R. M. Dodson, retired.

TENNESSEE

Harvey G. Fitzgerald, Humboldt, Tenn., in place of E. H. Gibson, retired.

Roscoe M. Hill, Luttrell, Tenn., in place of J. C. Davis, retired.

VIRGINIA

Charles A. Ashe, Gloucester Point, Va., in place of N. H. Tillage, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Theodore F. Holtzheimer, Blaine, Wash., in place of W. V. Cowderoy, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 5, 1962:

Federal Trade Commission

A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1962.

U.S. Coast Guard Academy

Roderick M. White, to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy with the permanent grade of lieutenant in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants

James B. Allen
W. Paul Yeager
J. Austin Yeager
John D. Bossler

Postmasters

ALABAMA

Guessna G. Harrell, Enterprise.
Hugh Moses, Hamilton.

ARIZONA

Dorman J. Bryce, Casa Grande.
Ben L. Gibbons, Chinle.
Lorum E. Stratton, Snowflake.

ARKANSAS

Thelma S. Butler, De Witt.
Jerry W. Starling, Magazine.

CALIFORNIA

Clyde E. Avery, Blythe.
Robert H. Petty, Laton.
George A. Newcomb, Laytonville.

COLORADO

Adelyn R. Burdick, Lyons.
Wallace R. Thompson, Wiley.
Hugh L. Grauerholz, Yuma.

CONNECTICUT

John J. Falvey, Groton.

DELAWARE

Jackie Hickman, Bethany Beach.
Lillias E. Carson, Clayton.
Hazel D. Grier, Woodside.

FLORIDA

Josephine C. Blondheim, Atlantic Beach.
Richard A. Monahan, Boynton Beach.
Elizabeth R. Steed, Lynn Haven.

GEORGIA

James J. Smith, Alma.

IDAHO

Maurice W. Drevlow, Craigmont.
Clifford L. Davis, Iona.
Luis Berriochoa, Mountain Home.

ILLINOIS

Dru A. Tighe, Aledo.
Harry H. Semrow, Chicago.
Jack L. Brandt, Geneva.
Bessie L. Finley, La Rose.
Mary F. Hall, Mahomet.
Max Martin, Newman.
Frank J. Wiedemann, Ringwood.
John B. Rushing, Simpson.
Rita F. Winkler, South Elgin.
John E. Sollars, Jr., Wellington.

IOWA

Mildred L. Lisk, Lynnville.
Lawrence V. Benda, Waterville.

KANSAS

Lawrence A. Baalman, Hoxie.
Daryl E. Daniels, Johnson.
Lawrence Meidinger, Leona.

KENTUCKY

Raymond Ison, Blaine.
Edith L. Cole, Columbus.
Mayme B. Moore, Dixon.
W. Ardel Fields, Hickman.
John H. Carlberg, Muldraugh.
Frank C. Dillon, Paint Lick.
James D. Syers, Sturgis.

LOUISIANA

Joseph R. LeBlanc, Delcambre.
William H. Davis, Jr., Lacombe.
Charles E. Miller, Livingston.
Joseph M. Accardo, Patterson.

Lois N. Farrar, Lillie.
Malcolm J. Donaldson, Reserve.
Mary M. Hedrick, Waterproof.

MAINE

Thomas W. Churchill, Kezar Falls.

MARYLAND

John L. Carlson, Annapolis.
Lenwood C. Moss, Brunswick.
Olive S. Parsons, Garrett Park.
Herbert H. Colburn, Havre de Grace.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mary E. Baumann, Hinsdale.
Thomas P. Costin, Jr., Lynn.
John P. Callahan, Lynnfield.
Walter Kashtan, West Mansfield.
Francis R. Raymond, Williamstown.

MICHIGAN

Roy A. Hierholzer, Grand Haven.
John S. Kilbride, Midland.
Wilfred F. Jacques, Paradise.
Ida L. Orosz, Scotts.

MINNESOTA

William G. Nixon, Claremont.
Elton D. Schlueter, Gibbon.
Mary J. Derito, Mountain Iron.
Enna A. Kallroos, Squaw Lake.
Harry A. Grande, Ulen.
Leonard J. Buelt, Waltham.
Herbert T. Peterson, Williams.

MISSISSIPPI

Dell T. Frazier, Beulah.
Mark Rayborn, Jr., Lumberton.

MISSOURI

Dorothy A. Fritts, Amsterdam.
David E. Adams, Bellflower.
Joseph O. Green, Bernie.
Gilbert Bradley, Creighton.
Major L. Sapp, Holts Summit.
Glen J. Henry, New Cambria.
Dorothy L. Koenke, Syracuse.
Howard R. Smith, Vandalia.

MONTANA

Lucille E. Schumm, Edgar.
James S. Torske, Hardin.
Thomas C. Martin, Hobson.
Violet B. Wood, Joplin.

NEBRASKA

R. Daniel DeVries, Douglas.
Emanuel Roth, Gering.
Homer L. Craig, Peru.
Elsie A. Baxa, Western.

NEVADA

William G. Godecke, Minden.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

John D. Fitzgerald, Plaistow.

NEW JERSEY

John W. Wright, Cape May Court House.

NEW MEXICO

Patsy A. Chavez, Navajo Dam.

NEW YORK

Raymond O. Barker, Hudson Falls.
Edna V. Monica, North Bangor.
Betty M. Tyrrell, Severance.
Dorothy L. Varley, Thomson.

NORTH CAROLINA

Roy C. Williams, Jr., Angier.
Robert L. Lane, Butner.
William M. Carver, Durham.
D. Victor Meekins, Manteo.
Rosa J. Vernon, Milton.
Charlie J. Ussery, Norwood.
Edward A. Griffin, Sanford.

NORTH DAKOTA

Howard W. Pletan, Steele.

OHIO

Conrad A. Bayer, Cleves.
Wanda M. Keylor, Fairview.
Ellen L. Garner, Jerry City.
Glenn A. Opfer, Lagrange.
Evelyn D. Piccin, Lansing.
Florence M. Pontious, Laurelville.
Jeanne D. Pyles, New Hampshire.
A. Cooper McCauslen, Steubenville.
Victor Videmsek, Willoughby.

OKLAHOMA

Orville A. Linduff, Drumright.

OREGON

James R. Landers, Beaverton.
Lawrence J. Armbrust, Creswell.
Phyllis Hill, Detroit.
Sister Joseph Mary Basick, Marylhurst.
George B. McClure, Vale.
Chester T. French, Waldport.
Nathaniel L. Green, Yachats.

PENNSYLVANIA

Bertram L. Ream, Elizabethtown.
W. LeVerne Wolf, Geigertown.
Ruth M. Rosencrance, Greeley.
Allen G. Gombert, Jr., Parryville.
Vincent E. Schields, Shohola.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mary E. Creech, Blackville.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Donald J. Stransky, Chamberlain.
Irve C. Hanson, Pollock.

TENNESSEE

Ernest M. Warmbrod, Belvidere.

TEXAS

William M. Patterson, Ballinger.
Mary S. Sparks, Beckville.
Harbert S. Byers, Celeste.
Mary B. Lee, Charlotte.
Varner Stevens, Childress.
James E. Carpenter, Comanche.
Ernest L. Davis, Dimmitt.
June D. Moye, Donna.
Louise W. McMullen, Keltys.
Lloyd F. Hurt, Kingsbury.
Jerry W. Canaday, Lone Star.
Ralph E. Archer, Lyford.
Roland A. Johnson, McCamey.
Ulman Bruner, Mineola.
William L. Brinkley, Mount Enterprise.
J. Hayes Johnson, Jr., Mount Pleasant.
Spencer C. Beavers, Jr., Muleshoe.
Marvin G. Handrick, Thorndale.

VIRGINIA

Robert W. Nash, Brodnax.
Kerry P. Sutherland, Grundy.
Garland M. Tyree, Somerset.
William E. Howerton, Stuarts Draft.
Shirley C. Carroll, Swope.

WASHINGTON

Carrie M. Milne, Thornton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Evelyn D. Lightner, Cass.
Ronald B. Mills, Mount Storm.
Harold E. Starcher, Ripley.
James W. Michael, Rivesville.
Grady D. Owens, Summit Point.

WISCONSIN

Rudolph P. Anich, Ashland.
Joseph T. Kurylo, Hales Corners.
Robert K. Dusek, River Falls.

WYOMING

Elmer M. Reibeling, Burns.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Nahum 1: 7: *The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and He knoweth them that trust in Him.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, grant that through the attitude and avenue of prayer our life may find focus and its true perspective.

May there be vouchsafed unto us a deeper insight as to its real meaning and a clearer vision that its majesty is revealed when we live nobly and usefully.

We earnestly beseech Thee that the motto, "In God We Trust," which now adorns this Chamber, may strengthen and sustain us when, at times, we feel that the human order is being swept bare of peace and good will.

Kindle within our minds and hearts Thy divine light which can never be eclipsed or extinguished, and that trust in Thee which will supplant all feelings of doubt and despair.

Inspire the Members of Congress to measure up to their obligations and opportunities and be girded with those capacities and resources that will enable them to command and control whatever exigencies and emergencies they may encounter.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7781. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad; and

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide protection for the golden eagle.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2900. An act to provide for the representation of certain defendants in criminal cases in the U.S. district courts;

S. 3024. An act to extend the maximum maturity of Veterans' Administration-guaranteed or insured home loans from 30 to 35 years;

S. 3459. An act to authorize the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of State; and

S.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the housing amendments of 1955.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. On September 21 I introduced H.R. 13202 which provides that no Federal financial or other assistance may be extended to any educational institution which discriminates against students or prospective students on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin.

When I introduced this bill I pointed out that the University of Mississippi was receiving $236,374 for three educational programs alone. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has said that no further money will go to the University of Mississippi "until the situation is clarified."

This is an important step toward eliminating racial discrimination in education. The University of Mississippi last year received a total of $3,500,000 in loans and grants from the Federal Government. For too long a time the Nation, through Federal tax funds, has been supporting schools which discriminate. I believe that the administration's action and the passage of H.R. 13202 would be a significant step in affording equality to all our citizens.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

JOHN W. HOLTON

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, every Member will agree with me, I am sure, that the fine work of staff members here in the House of Representatives, in its committees, and in the offices of its Members is an indispensable element of the legislative process. These people are the unsung heroes in the business of making laws.

I take this time to advise the House that one of the finest and most capable persons ever to serve the House or any of its Members, John Holton, legislative assistant to the Speaker, is leaving the House of Representatives to accept employment with the American Bankers Association. All of us rejoice that John has been called to employment which will give him opportunities for personal advancement, greater remuneration, and better opportunity to provide for himself and his family. Yet all of us are very sad indeed to be deprived of the benefit of his wise counsel, his efficient service, and his vast knowledge of and experience in the work of this House.

I have had the honor of knowing John and his family for many years. When I was a student at the University of Oklahoma his father was a member of the faculty of the school of religion, which was associated with the university. It was flattering indeed to me when I first came to Capitol Hill to be remembered by John after so many years had gone by. His fine Christian parents gave him that priceless heritage of integrity and character that have characterized all of his fine public service. There is no one in public or private occupation whose moral standards are higher, whose personal conduct is more exemplary, whose devotion to duty and right is more consistent.

There is no one associated with this House in any capacity who has better judgment or greater ability than this fine man. All Members who have been here for a long time know that John Holton was Speaker Rayburn's assistant for many years and that he was widely known in this House as the Speaker's right-hand man.

Having also served Speaker JOHN McCORMACK during this session, John Holton has the unique distinction of having served two great Speakers during his 20 years of work in the House.

Speaker Rayburn's penchant for identifying and developing the talents of young people was well known; his judgment was never more aptly demonstrated than through the achievements of John Holton.

John came to Washington to attend law school in 1939. He worked for Mr. Rayburn for 15 years in increasingly responsible assignments, with a period of time out for a 3-year tour of duty as a naval officer during World War II.

As the Speaker's administrative assistant, John worked at the top level of the legislative process. We know that he is knowledgeable, perceptive, and dedicated. We know that his talents have contributed to some of the most important work done in this House during the last 20 years.

Members have been able to rely upon information he gave them. Employees have been able to turn to him for a ready answer or sound advice.

John's ability is greatly admired, but it is his composure and good humor which have endeared him to all who know him—and that probably includes most of the Members and employees of the House of Representatives. Perhaps John acquired this attitude of serene good will from the two great Speakers whom it has been his honor to serve. I have no doubt that his exposure to the influence of these great and good men is responsible to some extent for those qualities we so much admire in John today.

I know the Speaker regrets to see him leave this House as we all do. I know also that he shares our confidence that John will continue to do outstanding work.

His new employer has chosen a servant worthy of his hire. John's fine service here in the House will always give him a place in the hearts of each of us. The latchstring will always be out for him as long as he lives. We all wish him and his loved ones good health, long life, and prosperity as he goes forth to his labors in another vineyard.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for my colleagues on this side of the aisle—and certainly for myself—when I say I want to join in this expression of appreciation to John Holton for his services to the House of Representatives these many years.

We all know that what is ultimately accomplished here depends in large measure on establishing and maintaining a working relationship among all of us, and particularly among those who share leadership obligations.

No one, in my opinion could have done a finer job in his capacity as administration assistant to the Speaker than has John Holton.

No one could have asked for finer cooperation than he has given all of us through the years.

We all know John as a modest person, rather on the quiet side.

But we have come to know him also as a man of highest competence and complete integrity.

I would be surprised if John is leaving the Hill with a single enemy.

On the contrary, I am sure he is leaving countless friends, including me, who are truly sorry to see him go.

But all of us wish him the very best of luck in his new assignment.

He will be a great asset to his new employers and I have no doubt he will be highly successful in his newly chosen career.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is going to miss John Holton. Over the years, those of us who have come to know John Holton have come to recognize his great efficiency and his dedication. The work of the whip's office, I am afraid, is going to be tremendously increased as a result of John Holton's leaving, because now John will not be there to assist us.

Mr. Speaker, Speaker Rayburn once said that "service" was the most beautiful word in the English language. I think John has exemplified this, not only in service to the great Speaker Rayburn, but in equal devotion and dedication to Speaker JOHN McCORMACK.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] pointed out, John Holton is patient, he is trustworthy, he is diligent, he is reliable, he is calm when others might not be quite that calm.

During his 20 or more years he has served all of us. I think that I express some of the sentiment which has already been so eloquently expressed by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], in saying we shall miss him greatly, but we wish him well in all of his new endeavors, and we shall all help him in any way that we can.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those who have spoken so eloquently of one of the most loyal employees it has been my privilege to come in contact with in the nearly 30 years I have been a Member of this body. I know of the great assistance John Holton was to our beloved late Speaker Rayburn, particularly in the last years of his service in this body.

John Holton typifies the kind of a public servant, the kind of a Government employee, we all like to see, particularly in positions of importance. Would that there were more like him.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in his new work he will be greatly successful, and I wish to state that our loss is the great gain of his new employer. In his new work I wish him happiness. I know he will be successful.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, whenever a new Congress convenes, it is never quite the same as the one that preceded it. New Members come; old friends fail to return; old issues die or are solved; new issues rise in their place. All of this, I am sure, will be true when the 88th Congress convenes.

One of the chief factors which gives the House of Representatives continuity from session to session and Congress to Congress is the dedicated, able group of professional staff members who quietly and efficiently conduct the business of the Members and Officers of the House and the work of its committees. Many staff members are longtime veterans on the Hill and contribute invaluable service to the Congress in the performance of its tasks.

One individual familiar to all of us who will not be returning for the 88th Congress is John W. Holton, Legislative Assistant to the Speaker. Mr. Holton, from Sherman, Tex., originally entered into duty as an employee of the House of Representatives 23 years ago as an elevator operator. Since that time, he has served the House in a number of capacities. His service has been continuous except for 3 years during World War II when he was in the U.S. Navy.

In the minds of most Members he will always be closely identified with our late and beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn. He worked for Speaker Rayburn for 15 years. He was his administrative assistant for 8 of those years. For the last year he has served as legisaltive assistant to the present Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. In these capacities he has always been of great assistance, not only to the Speaker, but to the membership at large.

Mr. Holton is accepting a position with private industry upon adjournment of the 87th Congress. I would like to take this opportunity to commend John Holton on his outstanding service to the Congress and to State, not only for myself, but for the Members of the House as a whole, that we have appreciated his good work and that we shall miss having him with us during the next Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of all who have spoken today about John Holton. He has been a tremendous asset here because of two very special qualities of character—integrity and stability. Other people might lose their poise, but not John Holton. He is dependable under all circumstances and conditions. I treasure the ties of friendship which have existed between us through the years.

I join with other friends of John Holton in wishing him much success and happiness in his new assignment. It is traditional that John Holton does a good job in whatever assignment he finds himself.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, John Holton has made an outstanding name for himself, occupying responsible positions and in close association with the late Speaker Rayburn, and also with me. His loyalty to Speaker Rayburn was known by all and recognized by all as one of the finest qualities any human being could possess. His loyalty to me has been deeply appreciated, and is something I shall always treasure.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make extended remarks about his career, which has been covered. I simply want the RECORD to show that I value very much the contributions he has made to me during this year as Speaker of the National House of Representatives.

I wish for him and his loved ones every happiness and success in the future.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Speaker who knows John Holton perhaps better than anybody else in the House, since the death of the late distinguished Speaker Rayburn.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleagues in commending the fine service of John Holton as one of our right-hand faithful employees of this House?

Do you know what his resignation points up to me above everything else? Here are these fine, energetic, capable, honest young employees; you cannot blame them for resigning and going to private industry where they will get employment, with more security, and be paid from 25 percent to 50 percent more than the Congress and the Government does for the same or similar types of work. We are going to have to wake up in this Government, not only in the House and Senate for our own employees, but throughout the Government. We are going to have to pay comparable salaries in these jobs that rate GS-14, GS-15, GS-16, GS-17, and the superjobs, so-called. I hope, when we do that in another year or two or even before that, that John Holton will come back home where he belongs.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my colleagues in the high compliments that have been paid John Holton.

I know that every Member of this House has learned with great regret, mixed with good wishes, that we are about to lose one of our ablest staff members, who has served with quiet distinction and efficiency for over 20 years. I refer, of course, to John W. Holton, legislative assistant to our distinguished Speaker.

John Holton has devoted his career to the Congress of the United States, and to the public service, with dedication equal to that of the great men whom he has assisted.

A native Texan, born in 1917, John came to Washington upon graduation from college in Abilene, Tex., in 1939. His service in the House began in the same way as that of other leading public servants in this Nation, first as an elevator operator and then as a member of the Capitol Police. He has had the great good fortune to have trained under our outstanding Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, and to have lived and worked closely with the leadership of the House over the years of his service.

In his 15 years with the late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, his abilities were invaluable not only to the Speaker but to the membership and public at large.

Our present distinguished Speaker has been fortunate in having the benefit of Mr. Holton's experience.

As we wish him Godspeed and good luck in his new endeavors, we will sorely miss him.

John Holton exemplifies the highest qualities of that group of men and women so essential to the effective operations of this body—the congressional staff.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in these expressions of goodwill and Godspeed to John Holton. John Holton is a fine and highly capable gentleman. It has been my pleasure to know him all the years I have been here in this body. He was a faithful and loyal employee of the late beloved Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn of Texas, and during the past year of the present distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. As far as I personally am concerned, he has always been kindly, considerate and cooperative. I wish him success and good health in his new career.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a man who fulfills the responsibilities of his office with greater zeal and fidelity than John Watson Holton, I have never heard of him. He approaches his job in a spirit of self-sacrifice and of loyalty which infects everyone with whom he comes in contact. I recall one time when our late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, said to me:

> I can't make any mistakes with John Holton on the job.

Efficiency and devotion to duty may be found in numerous instances but when it is coupled with a self-effacement and a humble spirit, such a character becomes majestic and can never be forgotten. It is indeed most fitting and proper that such a man held the confidential responsibilities that he did as the assistant to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. He enhanced in no small measure the work of the House of Representatives and in many instances over the years has kept things running with smoothness and dispatch.

He will be greatly missed by his many friends but what is their loss is the indisputable gain of the American Bankers Association where his activities will be centered in the days to come. I hope he will not forget his friends on the Hill but will come back and visit them from time to time, thereby renewing their courage and keeping fresh a spirit of friendship which is treasured by all. May John Holton's future be filled with many rich blessings and success and happiness, and I trust his new affiliation will be a most prosperous one.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], has taken this time to publicly proclaim the high regard that this House has for John Holton, and to pay tribute to the high degree of excellent service he has given since he came to Capitol Hill some 23 years ago.

He has been referred to as "the right arm" of our late beloved Speaker Rayburn, and described as Mr. Sam's "confidant." These titles surely connote a position of trust and confidence that is peculiarly and singularly of transcendent importance to the special tasks that he performed under Mr. Rayburn. May it be added that he brought these same attributes to his assignment under the present Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

John Holton indeed has held as important a position under Speakers Rayburn and McCORMACK as could come to any man. He did his job with ability, loyalty, and industry. And in serving his Speakers, he as well served the entire membership of this House with kindness, courtesy and fine consideration. He was ingratiatingly helpful to all who passed his way.

Mr. Speaker, all of us regret his leaving the Hill but we all rejoice that he is anxious and happy to accept a new responsibility with a greater challenge to his talents and personality. We wish him and his lovely family continued good fortune, good health, and a tremendous measure of success in the years ahead.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the magnitude of the work involved in making wheels of legislation turn is a fact which is perhaps rarely noticed or appreciated by the individual man on the street, and all too rarely noticed even by scholars or students of the Congress. Those of us who are privileged to serve in the Congress have a full knowledge and appreciation of the really vital function which is performed by those employees of the House of Representatives and of the various committees and offices who are placed in positions of responsibility.

I can say with great sincerity that one of the most trusted, valuable and efficient employees on Capitol Hill has been and is John Holton, who now serves as the chief legislative aid to our great and distinguished Speaker, and who served in that same capacity for so many years under our former Speaker, Mr. Rayburn.

I know personally the tremendous trust which our late beloved and respected Speaker placed in John Holton over the years, and I also know personally of the similar trust which our present great Speaker places in him.

It is with mixed feelings that I have learned that John Holton has decided to accept a position outside the Government. The organization for which he will work is indeed fortunate; by a similar token, the loss of the Congress will be a real one. We regret that he will no longer be an employee of the Congress, but we extend to him congratulations and very best wishes for an equally successful career in private industry, which will certainly occur; for one of his personal charm and capabilities will succeed in any endeavor.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, John Holton on a great number of occasions has been helpful and extended many courtesies to me. He is a true public servant and will be missed in this House. I wish him well and thank him for his service to our country. He has done his work well in the friendliest manner. I have gained much in knowing John Holton.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, someone at one time said, "the greatest men are often those of whom the noisy world hears the least." The more I have reflected on that statement the more I have come to appreciate the profundity of truth of those few words.

This truly may be said of John Holton, and others like him, who loyally and ably serve, as he has for many years, on the staff of the Congress. The noisy world may not have heard of him. Nor did he wish to be heard. "Work unseen be more than you seem" has been his guiding philosophy. And those of us who know him, and know how ably and loyally seved our late Speaker, appreciate that John is indeed more than he may seem to be to the noisy world. His work may have gone unseen by many, but it has not gone unseen by every Member of Congress who has been privileged to serve with our late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

As legislative clerk and later as administrative assistant to Speaker Rayburn, John's service went beyond serving the Speaker. While he was on the Speaker's staff, he was really on the staff of all of us. At least, that is the way he looked upon his position in his continuing efforts to assist all of us. Nothing was too big nor to small for him to undertake, and everything he undertook was done exceptionally well.

I shall miss John Holton. I shall miss him greatly. I extend to him my very best wishes in his new position.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the departure of John Holton, former administrative assistant to the former distinguished Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn—and presently assistant to the Honorable Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK—to a new career with the American Bankers Association, removes from these sacred halls a brilliant personality that has contributed much in dedicated services to his sponsors, the Members of the House and the Nation.

In his quiet, gentle way, John effected many a contributory imprint on the legislative business of the House. Speaker Rayburn, relied many times on his advice and judgment in legislation. He was truly his right arm in determining many controversial matters, and the former speaker so admitted publicly on many occasions. Speaker Rayburn was no one who failed to give credit where credit was due.

I personally am greatly indebted to John Holton, he was the one who upon my admission to the House of Representatives, extended a helping hand in an advisory capacity and facilitated any request pronto upon the Speaker's office. He, in his scholarly way, commented upon the speeches given or papers introduced in the RECORD. His kind words of praise on contributing corrective comments reflected his personal interest and knowledge of what was going on in the House of Representatives.

No request was disregarded—he made one feel at home and as though one was needed in our complex House operation. His day-to-day interest carried many new Members through the depressing periods of disgusting experiences in a fast moving body.

It is no wonder that Speaker McCORMACK continued to rely upon his valued services through the remainder of the 86th and 87th sessions of the Congress.

As a lawyer gifted with astute and analytical reasoning powers with a basic understanding of the law and a circumspect and inventoried knowledge of personalities and events he cannot but be successful in his new employment.

A legislative history of the Congress during all these years of service could yet be written by a person like John Holton. Its authenticity would go unquestioned for he participated and formulated its work so closely with his employer Mr. Sam. It is unfortunate that John has not to this date penned his impressions together with anecdotes and personal colloquies about Mr. Sam. After all he acted as his personal confidant for 20 years—1942—with the exception of 3 years in the service.

The decision to leave his duties here must have been a difficult one. I shall miss his friendly smile and valuable advice. Above all, the Members of the House holding him in highest esteem are perplexed at his sudden decision to enter other fields. We wish him success and extend to him our hearty congratulations even though in this hour we feel a pall of sadness in losing the comradery of a good friend and of a distinguished public servant. We bid him a fond adieu, with the blessings of the Almighty, a fruitful career in his new venture.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, with the 2d session of the 87th Congress coming to a close, we are reminded that John Holton will not be with us in the next session.

During his tenure as administrative assistant to our beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn, he served with distinction and integrity. John is never one to indulge in self-aggrandizement, by virtue of his position in the Office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, but in a quiet and unassuming way is a stalwart friend to the entire membership in the U.S. House of Representatives.

John Holton's presence will be missed in the 88th Congress. However, I am sure that I voice the feeling of all the Members in wishing him success and happiness in his new endeavor.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to John W. Holton, who is leaving Capitol Hill after 19 years of distinguished service.

John has played an important role in the workings of the Congress during these years while he has served as administrative assistant to the late Speaker Rayburn and then as legislative assistant to Speaker McCormack. He is a very able, bright, capable and diligent man who not only has carried out his duties efficiently but has been a real friend to many Members.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss John Holton very much—he has served well and is respected by all. The American Bankers Association is very fortunate indeed to have him on their staff and to have the benefits of his wisdom and talents. We wish him the very best of good luck and every success.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with those who have expressed admiration for John Holton. He is admired and respected by all who know him. Known not alone for his ability and legislative experience, John's reputation is founded upon good character and stanch integrity. Everyone knows that when John Holton makes a statement it is an honest statement, and that whatever he does it is in accordance with principles of honor and decency.

I join with my colleagues in wishing for John a most successful career in his new undertakings. He will be missed here, and we shall look forward to seeing him now and then and watching him perform in his new surroundings.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in wishing John Holton well.

Every Member of the House has a great deal of respect and much admiration for John Holton as a man of integrity and character. All of us appreciate his pleasant personality and his very cooperative spirit which he has always manifested.

It has been my great privilege to have known John Holton as a friend from the day I came here, almost 14 years ago. Many times when I have been in Texas and needed to call someone for guidance and help one of the first persons who has come to my mind has been John Holton, and I have not hesitated to call him. Each time he has been extremely helpful and his advice and guidance have been excellent.

He enjoyed his association with the beloved Speaker, Mr. Rayburn, which was afforded few men. As we all know, Mr. Rayburn relied upon John Holton not only as his aid but as a confidant. Our Speaker, Mr. McCormack, recognized John's talents when he retained him as his legislative assistant.

As he leaves this public service, John Holton has the knowledge that he has the deep respect and admiration of all of us. Not only do I wish him well, but I express the hope that our friendship, which has meant so much to me, will continue.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues who have expressed their appreciation to one of the most loyal employees in the House of Representatives, John W. Holton.

I have found John Holton to be most capable, courteous, industrious, and considerate. During my years in the House, whenever I have had occasion to call upon him for assistance and advice, I have found him to be sincere, cheerful, and cooperative.

As assistant to the late Speaker Sam Rayburn and then as legislative assistant to you, Mr. Speaker, he has proved to be a loyal and efficient employee. I want to extend to him my sincere congratulations and wish him every success in his new career in private industry. The American Bankers Association is fortunate to have John W. Holton on their staff.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress draws to a close—or so I have heard—the House is losing one of its most valuable employees, a man who has long been a faithful and helpful friend to many of us. I refer to John Holton, for many years an aid to former Speaker Sam Rayburn, and during the current session legislative assistant to the present Speaker. John has been named Federal legislative counsel in the Washington office of the American Bankers Association, a position for which he is eminently fitted by training and temperament. John Holton will be missed by House Members not only because of the services he has rendered to so many individuals, but also because of his outstanding personal qualities. I join other Members in wishing him well in his new endeavor and I take this opportunity to thank him publicly for his friendly and willing assistance to me on many occasions.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to extend my most sincere good wishes to John W. Holton, for success in his new responsibilities. I am confident that the qualities that have contributed so much to his fine work in the House of Representatives and that have endeared him to so many of us, will assure him of still greater accomplishments in the future.

During the years he has been here I have been happy to consider John as my friend, and he has been a friend to hundreds of Members throughout the years and likewise has received their friendship in return. His devoted service with the late Speaker Rayburn and our present beloved Speaker has redounded to the benefit of the entire House. Although I am sorry that he will not be with us in the future, I am extremely pleased that he will be in a position where his fine talents and personality will serve him well.

I wish John Holton all the good things in life that he so eminently deserves, and I am sure that all the Members who have known him join me in this expression of our regard.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the host of John Holton's friends in wishing him all the success possible in his new adventure in private life. I know he will make a great record in connection with any private enterprise in this country, as we have all had an opportunity to review his records here in the House of Representatives during the past 20 years.

I don't know of any man who enjoys the respect and full confidence of all the Members of the House more than John Holton.

I personally will miss him.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words in praise of John W. Holton, who is soon to leave this House, where he has been employed for many years as an aid to former Speaker Sam Rayburn and during the present session as legislative assistant to the present Speaker.

In John's departure, the House is losing one of its most valuable employees. He is a loyal and faithful friend, and a man who has distinguished himself here on the Hill by his conscientious and efficient discharge of his responsibilities. He is eminently fitted and qualified for his new post of Federal Legislative Counsel in the Washington office of the American Bankers Association.

I join with his hundreds of other friends in the Congress in wishing him success and happiness in his new career.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the Record and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the subject of the service and character of John W. Holton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SENATOR EASTLAND OF MISSISSIPPI

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been much concerned about the events in Mississippi in the last few weeks. I think all of us are also very pleased that things have quieted down and that voices of moderation are being heard.

I come from an area which has integrated schools. We have had integrated schools for many years. This does not say all our problems are solved by any means. But not only I but the people of my district are pleased when we see other areas of the country meet this problem of integration in a calm, reasonable, intelligent, mature way.

I want to say how pleased I am at the fine example that Senator EASTLAND has set when his own son attends an integrated school within just a few miles of Washington, D.C., in the great State of Virginia. I think this example of his own son attending a school where a Negro is also in attendance is something to be admired by all of the people in the United States who want to really settle this problem in a decent, reasonable way. I commend the Senator from Mississippi for setting this kind of very fine example.

THE GENERAL WALKER CASE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as each day passes the shocking abuse of legal processes by our Government in the General Walker case becomes more and more apparent. I want to state again that I am not an attorney and I am not judging the guilt or innocence of General Walker on whatever charges he may be brought into court. I am defending, with every fiber of my being, his right as a citizen of the United States of America to every legal protection under the law. The shocking truth is that his rights have been and are being ruthlessly trampled underfoot in the Government's haste, for some hidden reason, to rob this man of his freedom.

Let me recapitulate the stages of this tragedy—in part it is almost comic, but the overtones of the operation of a police state, are terrifying. To list the bill of particulars as they are now unfolding:

First. General Walker was never permitted to be represented by counsel at any stage of the proceedings, contrary to the Constitution and the history of American legal procedures.

Second. He is being denied the right to bail in spite of the fact that under the statute cited for his incarceration there is no prohibition against release on bail.

Third. Bail of $100,000 was exceedingly unrealistic.

Fourth. Unusual delay is being encountered in acting upon the writ of habeas corpus. A matter that is ordinarily acted upon within from 24 to 48 hours is being dragged into days.

Just briefly allow me to recite the timetable in the Walker case as I have been able to uncover it. He was arrested around noon on Monday, October 1, in Oxford, Miss. At 2 p.m. he was taken before a commissioner of the district court in Oxford and was told he would be given one and a half hours to secure legal counsel. General Walker explained that his attorneys were out of State and could not possibly be present in that short time. Upon being assured that his case would be heard in Mississippi, General Walker waived the preliminary hearing. He was allowed one telephone call to his brother, George Walker, who immediately began to make arrangements to make the bond. At 4:30 General Walker was put in an automobile and taken to the airport at Oxford. Here the tragic comedy of errors quickened. The driver of the automobile got lost and when he finally found the airport he parked at the wrong end of the field from which the plane was to receive the prisoner. The plane carrying General Walker left Oxford around 6 p.m. and arrived at Springfield, Mo., at 6:55 p.m. Those meeting the plane—I have not been able to identify them but it would certainly be prison officials or U.S. marshals—told General Walker they had expected him at 4:30 p.m. This evidently prearranged schedule indicates that legal shortcuts were being planned and executed from the moment the General was placed under arrest.

On Tuesday it was learned that General Walker was sent to the prison at Springfield, Mo.—usually reserved for mental and psychiatric cases—not through a court order but on the basis of a telegram to the U.S. marshal from the Director of Prisons of the U.S. Government. A court order was issued Tuesday afternoon, sometime around 2 p.m. in Mississippi, by a judge who had never seen General Walker, that he be held for psychiatric examination. This ruling was made on the basis of a telegram from Washington, D.C., from a psychiatrist who had never seen nor examined General Walker.

Mr. Speaker, I shudder at the implications of this case. This man has been deprived of every protection under the law. Can any Member of this body defend that kind of action? Dare any responsible official of the Government continue to deny this man his freedom in the face of these illegal acts? Are we to uphold constitutional rights for minority groups, for Communists, for proven traitors against the U.S. Government, and then ignore them completely for General Walker? We dare not let this happen. For your sake and mine and for the sake of the precious freedoms we are sworn to uphold, I beseech you do something now, do everything possible within the jurisdiction of this body, to demand that the rights of equality under the law of General Walker be reinstated, that he be permitted his freedom on bail, and then let him be tried in open court on the charges against him and that an unbiased court, acting in the true tradition make the final decision. To do less will be to sound the death knell of liberty for these United States and all its people including those who are now so eager to legally lynch General Walker.

Is this vengeance against one who disagrees with the administration?

An interesting parallel may be seen in the case of Soblen, the convicted Communist spy, who was granted freedom after conviction on $100,000 bail. Yet Edwin Walker, convicted of nothing, has been consigned to a mental institution without a hearing with bail set at $100,000 but not permitted to post the bail.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask our distinguished and able colleague from Texas just one question?

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am under the 1-minute rule; is that not correct?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

INCREASE JURISDICTION OF MUNICIPAL COURT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12708) to increase the jurisdiction of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 23, strike out "one hundred" and insert "twenty-five".

Page 5, line 1, after "as" insert "otherwise".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING PROTECTION FOR GOLDEN EAGLE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 489) to provide protection for the golden eagle, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after "egg" insert "thereof".

Page 3, line 4, after "That" insert "on request of the Governor of any State, the Secretary of the Interior shall authorize the taking of golden eagles for the purpose of seasonally protecting domesticated flocks and herds in such State, in accordance with regulations established under the provisions of this section, in such part or parts of such State and for such periods as the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect such interests: *Provided further,* That".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PRINTING 185,000 COPIES OF CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND AMENDMENTS THERETO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the resolution (H. Con. Res. 583) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, one hundred and eighty-five thousand copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto, suitable for distribution as provided for by section 8 of the Act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 508; Public Law 86-650), as amended by S.J. Res. 60, to immigrants admitted for permanent residence.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE FOR POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN MAINE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8853) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for the State and local policemen and firemen.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 218(p) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "Maine," after "Kansas,".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8853, which was introduced by our colleague from the State of Maine, the Honorable STANLEY R. TUPPER, is to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain old-age, survivors' and disability insurance coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen.

Under present law, the provision permitting such coverage of services performed by employees of a State—or of any political subdivision thereof—in any policeman's or fireman's position covered by a retirement system of the State or local government, when the members of the system vote in favor of coverage, has been extended to 17 specified States and all interstate instrumentalities. These 17 States are: Alabama, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington. The pending bill would simply add the State of Maine to this list.

Existing law provides adequate assurance that old-age, survivors' and disability insurance coverage will be extended only to groups of policemen or firemen who want such coverage. Under the present referendum provisions of the Social Security Act, members of a State or local government retirement system group have a voice in any decision to cover them under old-age, survivors' and disability insurance. In addition, existing law contains a declaration that it is the policy of the Congress that the protection afforded members of a State or local government retirement system not be impaired as a result of the extension of old-age and survivors' insurance coverage to members of the system.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for asking that H.R. 8853 be taken up by the House. This bill will amend title II of the Socical Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement for State and local policemen and firemen.

The bill would extend to the State of Maine the provision in present law which makes social security—old-age survivors and disability insurance—coverage available already in 17 States and in all interstate instrumentalities to policemen and firemen who are members of a State or local retirement system.

If H.R. 8853 is approved, Maine policemen and firemen now covered by a retirement system—all present and future members—may be also covered by social security if a majority of the eligible employees approve such coverage.

The State legislature in my State of Maine voted in favor of such permissive coverage. The Maine Law Enforcement Association, made up over every branch of law enforcement officers in the State of Maine—1,070 members—support the bill, and I have received many communications from individual policemen and firemen from my State in favor of this legislation.

It should be emphasized that Maine policemen and firemen now under a retirement system will be able, if they choose, to supplement their retirement income under this legislation.

I think it is appropriate that these public servants who protect lives and property of others throughout their working years be given the opportunity to participate in the social security system as well as their other retirement system.

We all know that the pay for police and firemen does not often compensate for the long hours and frequent risk of their lives. This bill will help in my State to make these jobs more attractive.

The State of Maine is proud of the excellence of our State and local law enforcement departments and of our local fire departments.

H.R. 8853 will help to maintain and improve upon these organizations.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS IN HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 819).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the transcript of the proceedings in the Committee on Banking and Currency of Thursday, September 27, 1962, incident to the presentation of a portrait of Hon. Brent Spence to the Committee on Banking and Currency be printed as a House Document with illustration and suitable binding.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 821 LAID ON THE TABLE

The SPEAKER. On yesterday the House passed Senate bill, S. 3631. A similar House bill (H.R. 10569) to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis, was laid on the table.

Without objection, the rule (H. Res. 821) providing for consideration of the House bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

POSTAL SERVICE AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT OF 1962

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2532)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7927) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962'.

"PART I—POSTAL SERVICE

"Title I—Postal rates

"First-Class Mail

"SEC. 101. Section 4253(a) of title 39 United States Code, is amended by striking out the words 'four' and 'three' wherever appearing in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'five' and 'four', respectively.

"Airmail

"SEC. 102. (a) Section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out the word 'seven' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'eight';

"(2) by striking out the word 'five' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'six';

"(3) by increasing each of the rates under the heading 'First pound over 8 ounces or fraction thereof' in the table in subsection (d)(1) by 8 cents;

"(4) by striking out paragraph (2) of subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(2) The rate of postage on air mail of the first class weighing in excess of eight ounces shall be the rate provided by subsection (a) for each ounce not in excess of eight ounces, plus 5 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof in excess of eight ounces, but in no case less than the rate provided under paragraph (1) for air parcels.'

"Second Class Within County of Publication

"SEC. 103. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4358 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

" '(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the rate of postage on publications admitted as second-class mail when addressed for delivery within the county in which they are published and entered is as follows:

" '[In cents]

	" 'Mailed after January 6, 1963, and prior to January 1, 1965	Mailed after December 31, 1964
" 'Rate per pound	1	1¼
Minimum charge per piece	⅛	⅛

" '(b) The rate of postage on the following publications admitted as second-class mail when mailed for delivery, within the county in which they are published and entered, by the letter carrier at the office of mailing, shall be—

" '(1) publications issued more frequently than weekly, one cent a copy;

" '(2) publications issued less frequently than weekly—

" '(A) weighing two ounces or less, one cent a copy;

" '(B) weighing more than two ounces, two cents a copy.'

"Second Class Beyond County of Publication

"SEC. 104. (a) Section 4359(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(b)(1) Except as provided by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), the rates of postage on publications mailed in accordance with subsection (a) are as follows:

" '[In cents]

	" 'Mailed after January 6, 1963, and prior to January 1, 1964	Mailed during calendar year 1964	Mailed after December 31, 1964
" 'Rate per pound:			
Advertising portion:			
Zones 1 and 2	3.4	3.8	4.2
Zone 3	4.4	4.8	5.2
Zone 4	6.4	6.8	7.2
Zone 5	8.4	8.8	9.2
Zone 6	10.4	10.8	11.2
Zone 7	12.0	12.0	12.0
Zone 8	14.0	14.0	14.0
Nonadvertising portion	2.6	2.7	2.8
Minimum charge per piece	.6	.8	1.0

" '(2) The postage on classroom publications is 60 per centum of the postage computed in accordance with paragraph (1).

" '(3) The rates of postage on publications of a qualified nonprofit organization mailed in accordance with subsection (a) are as follows:

" '[In cents]

	" 'Mailed after January 6, 1963, and prior to January 1, 1964	Mailed during calendar year 1964	Mailed after December 31, 1964
" 'Rate per pound	1.6	1.7	1.8
Minimum charge per piece	.125	.125	.125

" '(4) In lieu of the minimum charge per piece prescribed by paragraph (1), the minimum charge per piece to be paid by the following publications (other than publications to which paragraph (2) or paragraph (3) is applicable) shall be as follows—

" '(A) publications mailing fewer than 5,000 copies per issue outside the county of publication—one-half cent per piece;

" '(B) any issue of a publication the advertising portion of which does not exceed 5 per centum of the entire issue—.55 of a cent per piece when mailed after January 6, 1963, and prior to January 1, 1964, .65 of a cent per piece when mailed during the calendar year 1964, and .75 of a cent per piece when mailed after December 31, 1964.'

"(b) Section 4359(e)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'and fraternal,' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'fraternal, and associations of rural electric cooperatives, and not to exceed one publication published by the official highway agency of a State which meets all of the requirements of section 4354 and which contains no advertising'.

"(c) Section 4360 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

"Second-Class Transient Mail

"SEC. 105. Section 4362 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'two cents' and inserting in lieu thereof 'four cents'.

"Controlled Circulation Publications

"SEC. 106. Section 4422 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out '12 cents a pound or fraction thereof' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '12½ cents a pound or fraction thereof when mailed after January 6, 1963, and prior to January 1, 1964, 13 cents a pound or fraction thereof when mailed during calendar year 1964, and 13½ cents a pound or fraction thereof when mailed after December 31, 1964'.

"Third-Class Mail

"SEC. 107. Section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by amending subsections '(a), (b), and (c) to read as follows:

" '(a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, and subject to the minimum charge per piece provided in subsection (b) of this section, the postage rates on third-class mail are as follows:

" 'Type of mailing	Rate	Unit
	Cents	
(1) Individual piece	4	First 2 ounces or fraction thereof.
	2	Each additional ounce or fraction thereof.
(2) Bulk mailings under subsec. (e) of this section of:		
(A) Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions and plants.	12	Each pound or fraction thereof.
(B) Other matter	18	Do.

" '(b) Matter mailed in bulk under subsection (e) of this section is subject to a minimum charge for each piece of 2⅝ cents when mailed subsequent to January 6, 1963, and prior to January 1, 1964, 2¾ cents when mailed during calendar year 1964, and 2⅞ cents when mailed after December 31, 1964, except that the minimum charge per piece on such matter mailed by qualified nonprofit organizations is 1¼ cents.

" '(c) The pound rates on matter mailed in bulk under subsection (e) by qualified nonprofit organizations are 50 per centum of the pound rates provided by subsection (a).'

"(2) by striking out 'subsections (a) and (b) of' wherever it appears in subsection (d).

"(3) by striking out '$20' and 'twenty pounds' in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof '$30' and 'fifty pounds', respectively, effective January 1, 1963.

"Fourth-Class Mail

"SEC. 108. Section 4552(b)(5) of title 39, United States Code, relating to size and weight limitations on fourth-class matter mailed to or from certain areas, is amended by striking out the words 'Territory of Hawaii' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'States of Alaska and Hawaii,'.

"SEC. 109. Section 4554 of title 39, United States Code (relating to books, films, and similar educational materials), is amended by striking out that part of subsection (a) which precedes paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the postage rate is 9½ cents a pound for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof when mailed after January 6, 1963 and prior to January 1, 1964, and 10 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof when mailed after December 31, 1963, except that the rate now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection on—".

"Fees for Second-Class Entry and Registration

"Sec. 110. Section 4357 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$25' in subsection (a) (1) and inserting in lieu thereof '$30';

"(2) by striking out '$50' in subsection (a) (2) and inserting in lieu thereof '$60';

"(3) by striking out '$100' in subsection (a) (3) and inserting in lieu thereof '$120';

"(4) by striking out '$10' in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof '$15';

"(5) by striking out the second sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The fee for each additional entry is $15, except that if the additional entry is made within zones 3 to 8, inclusive (determined from the office of publication and entry), of the zones established for purposes of fourth-class mail, such fee shall be $50.';

"(6) by striking out '$20' in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof '$25'; and

"(7) by striking out the last sentence in subsection (d).

"Permit Fees for Mailing Without Stamps

"Sec. 111. Section 4052(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out '$10' and inserting in lieu thereof '$15'.

"Fixing of Fees by Postmaster General

"Sec. 112. Section 507 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(12) the issuance of a permit for prepayment of postage without stamps.

" '(13) the entry, re-entry, or additional entry of a periodical publication as second-class mail.

" '(14) the registry of a news agent.

Fees prescribed by the Postmaster General under paragraphs (12) to (14), inclusive, shall be collected in lieu of the corresponding fees established under section 4052(b) or 4357.'

"Keys and Other Small Articles

"Sec. 113. Section 4651(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out '5 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '6 cents'.

"Method of Determining Gross Receipts

"Sec. 114. Section 711(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'Public Law 85–426' and inserting in lieu thereof 'any Act of Congress enacted on or after May 27, 1958'.

"Standards for Determination of Qualifications of Applicants for Positions of Postmaster

"Sec. 115. In evaluating the qualifications of applicants for positions of postmaster, the United States Civil Service Commission shall give, with respect to each applicant, all due and appropriate consideration to experience in the postal field service, including seniority, length of service, level of difficulty and responsibility of work, attendance, awards and commendations, and performance rating.

"Title II—Postal policy

"Sec. 201. (a) Section 2302(c)(4) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'deemed to be attributable to the performance of public services under section 2303(b) of this title' and inserting in lieu thereof 'determined under section 2303 of this title to be attributable to the performance of public services'.

"(b) Section 2303(a) of title 39, United State Code, is amended—

"(1) by amending the headings so as to read

" '§ 2303. Identification of public services and costs thereof';

"(2) by striking out paragraph 1(A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(A) reduced rates for certain publications as provided by section 4359 of this title;';

"(3) by striking out paragraph 1(C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(C) second class mailing at postage rates as provided by section 4358 of this title;'; and

"(4) by striking out paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(2) 10 per centum of the gross cost of the operation of third-class post offices and the star route system, and 20 per centum of the gross cost of the operation of fourth-class post offices and rural routes.'

"(5) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The terms "total loss" and "loss" as used in this section mean the amounts by which the total allocated costs incurred by the postal establishment in the performance of the public services enumerated in this subsection exceed the total revenues received by the postal establishment for the performance of such public services.'

"(c) Section 2303(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The Postmaster General shall report to the Congress, on or before February 1 of each year beginning with the year 1963, the estimated amount of the losses or costs (or percentage of costs) specified in subsection (a) incurred by the postal establishment in the then current fiscal year in the performance of the public services enumerated in such subsection. The aggregate amount of the losses or costs (or percentage of costs) specified in subsection (a), incurred by the postal establishment in any fiscal year in the performance of such public services, shall be excluded from the total cost of operating the postal establishment for purposes of adjustment of postal rates and fees, including any adjustment pursuant to the provisions of section 207(b) of the Act of February 28, 1925, relating to reformation of classification (39 U.S.C., 1958 ed. 247).'

"(d) The table of contents of chapter 27 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out

" '2303. Identification of and appropriations for public services.'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

" '2303. Identification of public services and costs thereof.'.

"Title III—Miscellaneous

"Eligibility of Certain Organizations for Second-Class Entry

"Sec. 301. Section 4355(a) of title 39, United States Code is amended—

"(1) by inserting after the words 'State board of health' in subparagraph (3) a comma and the words 'or a State industrial development agency',

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (9) and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon and the word 'or'; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph (10):

" '(10) published by any public or nonprofit private elementary or secondary institution of learning or its administrative or governing body.'.

"Educational Materials

"Sec. 302. Section 4554 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out paragraph (5) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(5) sound recordings, including incidental announcements of recordings and guides or scripts prepared solely for use with such recordings;';

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon;

"(3) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following:

" '(7) printed educational reference charts, permanently processed for preservation; and

" '(8) looseleaf pages, and binders therefor, consisting of medical information for distribution to doctors, hospitals, medical schools, and medical students.'

"(4) by striking out the word 'students' ' immediately preceding the word 'notations' in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and in paragraph (2) of subsection (b);

"(5) by inserting after the words 'loaned or exchanged' in paragraph (1) of subsection (b) the following: '(including cooperative processing by libraries)';

"(6) by striking out:

" '(D) bound volumes of periodicals;

" '(E) phonograph recordings; and'

in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof:

" '(D) periodicals, whether bound or unbound;

" '(E) sound recordings; and'; and

"(7) by striking out 'and catalog of those items' in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof 'scientific or mathematical kits, instruments, or other devices and catalogs of those items, and guides or scripts prepared solely for use with such materials'.

"Reading and Other Materials for Blind Persons

"Sec. 303. Sections 4653 and 4654 of title 39, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

" '§ 4653. Publications for blind persons

" '(a) The following matter may be mailed free of postage—

" '(1) books, pamphlets, and other reading matter, including pages thereof:

" '(A) published (whether prepared by hand, or printed) either in raised characters or in sightsaving-size type, or in the form of sound recordings, for use of blind persons;

" '(B) in packages not exceeding the weight prescribed by the Postmaster General;

" '(C) containing no advertising or other matter whatsoever;

" '(D) unsealed;

" '(E) sent—

" '(i) by an institution, agency, publisher, organization, or association (including a library or school and including organizations or associations of or for blind people), not conducted for private profit, as a loan to blind readers, or when returned by the blind reader to the lender; or

" '(ii) to a blind person without cost to the blind person; or

" '(iii) to an institution, agency, publisher, organization, or association (including a library or school and including organizations or associations of or for blind people), not conducted for private profit, to be furnished to a blind person without cost to such blind person.

" '(2) magazines, periodicals, and other regularly issued publications:

" '(A) published (whether prepared by hand, or printed) either in raised characters or in sightsaving-size type, or in the form of sound recordings, for use of blind persons;

" '(B) containing no advertising;

" '(C) for which no subscription fee is charged.

" '(b) There may be mailed at the rate of postage of 1 cent for each pound or fraction thereof—

" '(1) books, pamphlets, and other reading matter including pages thereof:

" '(A) published (whether prepared by hand, or printed) either in raised characters or in sightsaving-size type, or in the form of sound recordings, for use of blind persons;

" '(B) in packages not exceeding the weight prescribed by the Postmaster General;

" '(C) containing no advertising or other matter whosoever;

" '(D) unsealed;

" '(E) sent—

" '(i) by an institution, agency, publisher, organization, or association (including a library or school and including organizations or associations of or for blind people), not conducted for private profit, on a rental basis to blind readers, or when returned by the blind reader to such organizations, at a price not greater than the cost price thereof; or

"'(ii) to a blind person at a price not greater than the cost price thereof; or

"'(iii) to an institution, agency, publisher, organization, or association (including a library or school and including organizations or associations of or for blind people), not conducted for private profit, to be furnished to a blind person at a price not greater than the cost price thereof.

"'(2) magazines, periodicals, and other regularly issued publications:

"'(A) published (whether prepared by hand, or printed) either in raised characters or in sightsaving-size type, or in the form of sound recordings, for use of blind persons;

"'(B) containing no advertising;

"'(C) when furnished by an institution, agency, publisher, organization, or association (including a library or school and including organizations or associations of or for blind people), not conducted for private profit, to a blind person, at a price not greater than the cost price thereof.

"'§ 4654. Reproducers, sound recordings, and other materials and appliances for the preparation of reading matter for blind persons

"'(a) Reproducers, or parts thereof, for sound recordings for blind persons which are the property of the United States Government may be mailed free of postage when sent for repair, or returned after repair—

"'(1) by an organization, institution, public library, or association for blind persons, not conducted for private profit;

"'(2) by a blind person to such an agency not conducted for private profit;

"'(3) from such an agency to an organization, institution, public library, or association for blind persons not conducted for private profit; or

"'(4) to a blind person.

"'(b) The Postmaster General may extend the free mailing privilege provided by subsection (a) of this section to reproducers or parts thereof for sound recordings for blind persons, braille writers and other appliances for blind persons or parts thereof, that are the property of—

"'(1) State governments or subdivisions thereof;

"'(2) public libraries;

"'(3) private agencies for the blind not conducted for private profit; or

"'(4) blind individuals.

"'(c) The Postmaster General may also permit the mailing free of postage of paper, records, tapes, and other materials for use by the recipients for the production (whether by hand or printed) of reading matter either in raised characters or sightsaving-size type, or in the form of sound recordings, for use of blind persons, where such materials are the property of—

"'(1) State governments or subdivisions thereof;

"'(2) public libraries;

"'(3) private agencies for the blind not conducted for private profit; or

"'(4) blind individuals.'

"Repeals and Technical Amendments

"Sec. 304. (a) The following provisions of law are repealed:

"(1) The third proviso in section 3 of the Act of October 30, 1951, as amended by the Act of June 23, 1959 (73 Stat. 89; Public Law 86–56);

"(2) Sections 204(d), 204(e)(1), and 204(e)(2) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, as amended by the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 479; Public Law 86–644);

"(3) Sections 4361 and 4652 of title 39, United States Code.

"(b) Section 4359(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out '4358, 4361, and 4362' and inserting in lieu thereof '4358 and 4362'.

"(c) Section 4451(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out '(a)(2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a)(3)'.

"Communist Political Propaganda

"Sec. 305. (a) Chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'§ 4008. Communist political propaganda

"'(a) Mail matter, except sealed letters, which originates or which is printed or otherwise prepared in a foreign country and which is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to rules and regulations to be promulgated by him to be "communist political propaganda", shall be detained by the Postmaster General upon its arrival for delivery in the United States, or upon its subsequent deposit in the United States domestic mails, and the addressee shall be notified that such matter has been received and will be delivered only upon the addressee's request, except that such detention shall not be required in the case of any matter which is furnished pursuant to subscription or which is otherwise ascertained by the Postmaster General to be desired by the addressee. If no request for delivery is made by the addressee within a reasonable time, which shall not exceed sixty days, the matter detained shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General directs.

"'(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "communist political propaganda" means political propaganda, as defined in section 1(j) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(j)), issued by or on behalf of any country with respect to which there is in effect a suspension or withdrawal of tariff concessions pursuant to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 or section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, or any country from which any type of foreign assistance is withheld pursuant to section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

"'(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable with respect to (1) matter addressed to any United States Government agency, or any public library, or to any college, university, graduate school, or scientific or professional institution for advanced studies, or any official thereof, or (2) material whether or not "communist political propaganda" addressed for delivery in the United States pursuant to a reciprocal cultural international agreement under which the United States Government mails an equal amount of material for delivery in any country described in subsection (b).'

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'4008. Communist political propaganda.'

"Effective Date

"Sec. 306. Except as otherwise provided, the foregoing provisions of this part shall become effective on January 7, 1963.

"Notice With Respect To Obscene Matter Distributed by Mail and Detention Thereof

"Sec. 307. In order to alert the recipients of mail and the general public to the fact that large quantities of obscene, lewd, lascivious, and indecent matter are being introduced into this country from abroad and disseminated in the United States by means of the United States mails, the Postmaster General shall publicize such fact (1) by appropriate notices posted in post offices, and (2) by notifying recipients of mail, whenever he deems it appropriate in order to carry out the purposes of this section, that the United States mails may contain such obscene, lewd, lascivious, or indecent matter. Any person may file a written request with his local post office to detain obscene, lewd, lascivious, or indecent matter addressed to him, and the Postmaster General shall detain and dispose of such matter for such period as the request is in effect. The Postmaster General shall permit the return of mail containing obscene, lewd, lascivious, or indecent matter, to local post offices, without cost to the recipient thereof. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to authorize the Postmaster General to open, inspect, or censor any mail except on specific request by the addressee thereof. The Postmaster General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

"PART II—FEDERAL SALARY REFORM

"Title I—General policy

"Short Title

"Sec. 501. This part may be cited as the 'Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962'.

"Declaration of Policy

"Sec. 502. The Congress hereby declares that, whereas the functions of a Federal salary system are to fix salary rates for the services rendered by Federal employees so as to make possible the employment of persons well qualified to conduct the Government's programs and to control expenditures of public funds for personal services with equity to the employee and to the taxpayer, and whereas fulfillment of these functions is essential to the development and maintenance of maximum proficiency in the civilian services of Government, then, accordingly, Federal salary fixing shall be based upon the principles that—

"(a) There shall be equal pay for substantially equal work, and pay distinctions shall be maintained in keeping with work and performance distinctions; and

"(b) Federal salary rates shall be comparable with private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work.

Salary levels for the several Federal statutory salary systems shall be interrelated, and salary levels shall be set and henceforth adjusted in accordance with the above principles.

"Implementation of Policy

"Sec. 503. In order to give effect to the policy stated in section 502, the President: (1) shall direct such agency or agencies, as he deems appropriate, to prepare and submit to him annually a report which compares the rates of salary fixed by statute for Federal employees with the rates of salary paid for the same levels of work in private enterprise as determined on the basis of appropriate annual surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and, after seeking the views of such employee organizations as he deems appropriate and in such manner as he may provide, (2) shall report annually to the Congress (a) this comparison of Federal and private enterprise salary rates and (b) such recommendations for revision of statutory salary schedules, salary structures, and compensation policy, as he deems advisable.

"Sec. 504. (a) Whenever the President shall find that the salary rates in private enterprise for one or more occupations in one or more areas or locations are so substantially above the salary rates of statutory pay schedules as to handicap significantly the Government's recruitment or retention of well-qualified persons in positions compensated under (1) section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1113(b), (2) the provisions of part III of title 39, United States Code, relating to personnel in the postal field service, (3) the pay scales for physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration under chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, or (4) sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of

1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867 and 870), he may establish for such areas or locations higher minimum rates of basic compensation for one or more grades or levels, occupational groups, series, classes, or subdivisions thereof, and may make corresponding increases in all step rates of the salary range for each such grade or level: *Provided*, That in no case shall any minimum salary rate so established exceed the seventh salary rate prescribed by law for the grade or level. The President may authorize the exercise of the authority conferred upon him by this section by the Civil Service Commission or, in the case of employees not subject to the civil service laws and regulations, by such other agency or agencies as he may designate.

"(b) Within the limitations specified in subsection (a), rates of basic compensation established under such subsection may be revised from time to time by the President or by such agency or agencies as he may designate. Such actions or revisions shall have the force and effect of law.

"(c) Any increase in rate of basic compensation established under this section shall not be regarded as an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 701(a) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and section 3552 of title 39 of the United States Code.

"SEC. 505. The functions, duties, and regulations of the departments and the Civil Service Commission with respect to this title, the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the provisions of part III of title 39, United States Code, relating to personnel in the postal field service, the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and the provisions of chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code relating to personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, shall be subject to such policies and rules as the President may issue. Among other things, the President's policies and rules may provide for—

"(1) preparing and reporting to him the annual comparison of Federal salary rates with private enterprise rates,

"(2) obtaining and reporting to him the views of employee organizations on such annual comparison, and on other salary matters,

"(3) reviewing and reporting to him on the adequacy of the Federal statutory salary structures for the Federal programs to which they apply,

"(4) reviewing the relationship of Federal statutory salary rates and private enterprise salary rates in specific occupation and local areas, and

"(5) providing step-increases in recognition of high quality performance and providing for properly relating supervisory salary rates paid under one system to those of subordinates paid under another system.

"*Title II—Pay System of the Classification Act of 1949*

Short Title

"SEC. 601. This title may be cited as the 'Classification Act Amendments of 1962'.

"Basic Compensation Schedules

"SEC. 602. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (74 Stat. 298; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The compensation schedules for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"'COMPENSATION SCHEDULE I

"'(To be effective for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and ending immediately prior to the applicable initial effective date of Compensation Schedule II set forth below)

"'Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,245	$3,350	$3,455	$3,560	$3,665	$3,770	$3,875	$3,980	$4,085	$4,190
GS-2	3,560	3,665	3,770	3,875	3,980	4,085	4,190	4,295	4,400	4,505
GS-3	3,820	3,925	4,030	4,135	4,240	4,345	4,455	4,580	4,705	4,830
GS-4	4,110	4,250	4,390	4,530	4,670	4,810	4,950	5,090	5,230	5,370
GS-5	4,565	4,725	4,885	5,045	5,205	5,365	5,525	5,685	5,845	6,005
GS-6	5,035	5,205	5,375	5,545	5,715	5,885	6,055	6,225	6,395	6,565
GS-7	5,540	5,725	5,910	6,095	6,280	6,465	6,650	6,835	7,020	7,205
GS-8	6,090	6,295	6,500	6,705	6,910	7,115	7,320	7,525	7,730	7,935
GS-9	6,675	6,900	7,125	7,350	7,575	7,800	8,025	8,250	8,475	8,700
GS-10	7,290	7,535	7,780	8,025	8,270	8,515	8,760	9,005	9,250	9,495
GS-11	8,045	8,310	8,575	8,840	9,105	9,370	9,635	9,900	10,165	--------
GS-12	9,475	9,790	10,105	10,420	10,735	11,050	11,365	11,680	11,995	--------
GS-13	11,150	11,515	11,880	12,245	12,610	12,975	13,340	13,705	14,070	--------
GS-14	12,845	13,270	13,695	14,120	14,545	14,970	15,395	15,820	16,245	--------
GS-15	14,565	15,045	15,525	16,005	16,485	16,965	17,445	17,925	--------	--------
GS-16	16,000	16,500	17,000	17,500	18,000	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
GS-17	18,000	18,500	19,000	19,500	20,000	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
GS-18	20,000	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

"'COMPENSATION SCHEDULE II

"'(To be effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and thereafter)

"'Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,305	$3,410	$3,515	$3,620	$3,725	$3,830	$3,935	$4,040	$4,145	$4,250
GS-2	3,620	3,725	3,830	3,935	4,040	4,145	4,250	4,355	4,460	4,565
GS-3	3,880	3,985	4,090	4,195	4,300	4,405	4,525	4,650	4,775	4,900
GS-4	4,215	4,355	4,495	4,635	4,775	4,915	5,055	5,195	5,335	5,475
GS-5	4,690	4,850	5,010	5,170	5,330	5,490	5,650	5,810	5,970	6,130
GS-6	5,235	5,410	5,585	5,760	5,935	6,110	6,285	6,460	6,635	6,810
GS-7	5,795	5,990	6,185	6,380	6,575	6,770	6,965	7,160	7,355	7,550
GS-8	6,390	6,600	6,810	7,020	7,230	7,440	7,650	7,860	8,070	8,280
GS-9	7,030	7,260	7,490	7,720	7,950	8,180	8,410	8,640	8,870	9,100
GS-10	7,690	7,945	8,200	8,455	8,710	8,965	9,220	9,475	9,730	9,985
GS-11	8,410	8,690	8,970	9,250	9,530	9,810	10,090	10,370	10,650	--------
GS-12	9,980	10,310	10,640	10,970	11,300	11,630	11,960	12,290	12,620	--------
GS-13	11,725	12,110	12,495	12,880	13,265	13,650	14,035	14,420	14,805	--------
GS-14	13,615	14,065	14,515	14,965	15,415	15,865	16,315	16,765	17,215	--------
GS-15	15,665	16,180	16,695	17,210	17,725	18,240	18,755	19,270	--------	--------
GS-16	16,000	16,500	17,000	17,500	18,000	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
GS-17	18,000	18,500	19,000	19,500	20,000	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------,
GS-18	20,000	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom Compensation Schedule I of the General Schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall, subject to the provisions of paragraph (10) of this subsection, be initially adjusted, effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act, as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act at the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh scheduled rate, or at the first or second longevity rate of a grade below grade 4 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be advanced as follows: Employees in step 1 to step 2 of the new schedule; step 2 to step 3; step 3 to step 4; step 4 to step 5; step 5 to step 6; step 6 to step 7; step 7 to step 8; the first longevity step to step 9; and the second longevity step to step 10.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act at the third longevity rate of a grade below grade 4 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive basic compensation at the highest rate of the appropriate grade plus an amount equal to the value of the maximum within grade increment provided for that grade in effect on and after such day.

"(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act at the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh scheduled rate, or at the first, second, or third longevity rate, of grade 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, or tenth rate of the appropriate grade in effect on and after such day.

"(4) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act at the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, or sixth scheduled rate, or at the first, second, or third longevity rate of grade 11, 12, 13, or 14 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, or ninth rate of the appropriate grade in effect on and after such day.

"(5) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act at the first, second, third, fourth, or fifth scheduled rate, or at the first, second, or third longevity rate of grade 15 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, or eighth rate of such grade in effect on and after such day.

"(6) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period, which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act at the first, second, third, fourth, or fifth rate of grade 16 or grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding first, second, third, fourth, or fifth rate of the appropriate grade in effect on and after such day.

"(7) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act at the rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate of such grade in effect on and after such day.

"(8) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade of the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates, as specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of this subsection, in effect on and after such day.

"(9) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate for his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate for his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the rate of the new schedule, in effect on and after such day, prescribed by paragraphs (1) through (6) of this subsection for employees at the maximum longevity rate or at the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, for his grade, or (B) if such rate is less than his existing rate, (i) the lowest rate of the new schedule or his grade which equals or exceeds his existing rate or (ii) if there is no such rate, his existing rate.

"(10) Service of officers and employees performed immediately preceding the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act, in the grade of the General Schedule in which their respective positions were placed on such day, shall be counted toward not to exceed one step increase under the time in grade provisions of subsection (a) of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949 as amended by this Act.

"(11) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which began on or after the date of enactment of this Act, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, Eighty-third Congress), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, and by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960, he shall receive an aggregate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, (C) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, (D) the amount of the increase provided by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960, and (E) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purpose of section 208(b) of such Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of such employee.

"(c) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom Compensation Schedule II of the General Schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted, effective as of the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

"(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, as in effect on and after such date, he shall receive (A) the rate of the new schedule prescribed for employees at the maximum rate for his grade, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, Eighty-third Congress), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, and by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960, and the amount of the initial increase provided by this section, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, (C) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, (D) the amount of the increase provided by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960, and (E) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purpose of section 208(b) of such Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of such employee.

"Step-Increases

"Sec. 603. Title VII of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1121–1125), relating to step-increases under such Act, is amended to read as follows:

"*'Title VII—Step-increases*

"'Sec. 701. (a) Each officer or employee compensated on a per annum basis, and occupying a permanent position within the scope of the compensation schedules fixed by this Act, who has not attained the maximum rate of compensation for the grade in which his position is placed, shall be advanced in compensation successively to the next higher rate within the grade at the beginning of the next pay period following the completion of (1) each fifty-two calendar weeks of service in salary rates 1, 2, and 3, or (2) each one hundred and four calendar weeks of service in salary rates 4, 5, and 6, or (3) each one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of service in salary rates, 7, 8, and 9, subject to the following conditions:

"'(A) That no equivalent increase in compensation from any cause was received during such period;

"'(B) That his work is of an acceptable level of competence as determined by the head of the department; and

"'(C) That the benefit of successive step-increases shall be preserved, under regulations issued by the Commission, for officers and employees whose continuous service is interrupted in the public interest by service with the Armed Forces or by service in essential non-Government civilian employment during a period of war or national emergency.

"'(b) Any increase in compensation granted by law shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a).

"'Sec. 702. (a) Within the limit of available appropriations and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission, the head of each department is authorized to grant additional step-increases in recognition of high quality performance above that ordinarily found in the type of position concerned. Step-increases under this section shall be in addition to those under section 701 and shall not be construed to be an equivalent increase in compensation within the meaning of subsection (a) of section 701.

"'(b) No officer or employee shall be eligible under this section for more than one such additional step-increase within any period of fifty-two weeks.

"'Sec. 703. This title shall not apply to the compensation of persons appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.'

"General Compensation Rules

"Sec. 604. (a) Section 802(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1132(b)), relating to the salary to be received by an officer or employee who is promoted or transferred to a higher grade, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Any officer or employee who is promoted or transferred to a position in a higher grade shall receive basic compensation at the lowest rate of such higher grade which exceeds his existing rate of basic compensation by not less than two step-increases of the grade from which he is promoted or transferred. If, in the case of any officer or employee so promoted or transferred who is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade under any provision of law, there is no rate in such higher grade which is at least two step-increases above his existing rate of basic compensation, he shall receive (1) the maximum rate of such higher grade, or (2) his existing rate of basic compensation, if such existing rate is the higher. In case any such officer or employee so promoted or transferred is receiving basic compensation at a rate saved to him under section 507 of this Act upon reduction in grade, such officer or employee shall receive (A) basic compensation at a rate two steps above the rate which he would be receiving if such section 507 were not applicable in his case, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation, if such existing rate is the higher.'

"(b) Section 802 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"'(d) The Commission may issue regulations governing the retention of the rate of basic compensation of an employee who together with his position is brought under this Act. If any such employee so entitled to receive a retained rate under regulations issued pursuant to this subsection is later demoted to a position under this Act, his rate of basic compensation shall be determined in accordance with section 507 of this Act, except that service in the position which was brought under the Act shall, for purposes of section 507, be considered as service under this Act.'.

"(c) Section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1133), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 803. Each employee in a position under this Act, who regularly has responsibility for supervision (including supervision over the technical aspects of the work concerned) over employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time by wage boards or similar administrative authorities as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates, may, in accordance with regulations issued by the Commission, be paid at one of the scheduled rates for his grade which is above the highest rate of basic compensation being paid to any such prevailing-rate employee regularly supervised, or at the maximum rate for his grade, as provided for in such regulations.'.

"Salary Retention

"SEC. 605. Section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (72 Stat. 830; 5 U.S.C. 1107), is amended—

"(1) by striking out '(other than grade 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule)' in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of such section; and

"(2) by striking out '(B) in the same grade or in the same and higher grades;' in paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of such section; and by inserting in lieu thereof '(B) in any grade or grades higher than the grade to which demoted;'.

"Top Grade Positions Under Classification Act of 1949

"SEC. 606. (a) Section 505(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 1105(b)), relating to the limitation on numbers of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of such Act, is amended by striking out 'not to exceed an aggregate of nineteen hundred and eighty-nine' and substituting in lieu thereof 'not to exceed an aggregate of twenty-four hundred, in addition to any professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine which may be placed in such grades'.

"(b) Section 505(j) of such Act is amended by inserting after the word 'positions' the following: '(in addition to any professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and professional positions in the physical and natural sciences and medicine which may be placed in such grades)'.

"(c) Section 505 of such Act is further amended by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsections:

"'(k) The Attorney General is authorized, without regard to any other provision of this section, to place a total of ten positions of Warden in the Bureau of Prisons in grade 16 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by subsection (b).

"'(l) The Attorney General is authorized, without regard to any other provision of this section, to place a total of eight positions of Member of the Board of Parole in grade 17 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by subsection (b).'

"Conforming Changes in Existing Law

"SEC. 607. (a) The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

"(1) Section 104 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 234; 5 U.S.C. 592(d), authorizing grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 for the position of Budget Officer of the Department of Commerce so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

"(2) Section 206 of the Public Works Appriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 360; 5 U.S.C. 483–2), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to place the position of Director, Division of Budget and Finance, in grade 17 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

"(3) The second paragraph under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in title III of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 364, 10 U.S.C. 1335, note), authorizing the Chief of Engineers to place the position of Chief of the Programs Branch, Office of the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, in grade 17 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

"(4) Section 24(d) of the Area Redevelopment Act (75 Stat. 62, 42 U.S.C. 2521(d), authorizing five positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 for agencies performing functions under that Act.

"(5) The fourth sentence of section 3(a) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1120; 16 U.S.C. 742b(a)), relating to the annual salary of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife in the Department of the Interior, which reads: 'He shall receive compensation at the same rate as that provided for grade GS–18.'.

"(6) That part of section 207 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 200; 7 U.S.C. 1857), relating to the annual salary of an agricultural surplus disposal administrator in the Department of Agriculture, which reads: ', at a salary rate of not exceeding $15,000 per annum,'.

"(7) Section 1102 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 971; 5 U.S.C. 1073), relating to the submission of reports with respect to the rates of compensation under, and the administration of, such Act.

"(b) The second proviso of the paragraph under the heading 'FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM' and under the subheading 'SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS' in title II (the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1956) of the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Apprations Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 273; Public Law 133, Eighty-fourth Congress; 5 U.S.C. 298a) is amended by striking out 'three positions' and inserting in lieu thereof 'one position'.

"SEC. 608. (a) Each position specifically referred to in, or covered by, any repeal made by section 607(a) of this title shall be placed in the appropriate grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in accordance with the provisions of such Act.

"(b) Positions in grade 16, 17, or 18, as the case may be, of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, shall remain, on and after such effective date, in their respective grades, until appropriate action is taken under section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 as in effect on and after such effective date.

"Savings Provisions

"SEC. 609. (a) The changes in existing law made by this title shall not affect any position existing immediately prior to the effective date of any such changes in existing law, the compensation attached to such position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his entitlement to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken in accordance with this title.

"(b) The incumbent of each such position immediately prior to the effective date of this title shall continue to receive the rate of basic compensation which he was receiving immediately prior to such effective date until he leaves such position or until he is entitled to receive compensation at a higher rate in accordance with law. When such incumbent leaves such position, the rate of basic compensation of each subsequent appointee to such position shall be determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"Effective Dates

"SEC. 610. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, the provisions of this title shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Title III—Postal field service employees

"Short Title

"SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the 'Postal Employees Salary Adjustment Act of 1962'.

"Postal Field Service Schedules

"SEC. 702. Subsection (a) of section 3542 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) There are established basic compensation schedules for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedules and for which the symbol shall be "PFS". Each such schedule shall be in effect for the period specified with respect to such schedule. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with these schedules.

"'POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE I

"'(To be effective for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and ending immediately prior to the applicable initial effective date of the second PFS schedule set forth below)

"'PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$3,595	$3,725	$3,855	$3,985	$4,115	$4,245	$4,375	$4,505	$4,635	$4,765	$4,895	$5,025
2	3,905	4,040	4,175	4,310	4,445	4,580	4,715	4,850	4,985	5,120	5,255	5,390
3	4,230	4,375	4,520	4,665	4,810	4,955	5,100	5,245	5,390	5,535	5,680	5,825
4	4,565	4,725	4,885	5,045	5,205	5,365	5,525	5,685	5,845	6,005	6,165	6,325
5	4,965	5,130	5,295	5,460	5,625	5,790	5,955	6,120	6,285	6,450	6,615	6,780
6	5,365	5,545	5,725	5,905	6,085	6,265	6,445	6,625	6,805	6,985	7,165	7,345
7	5,805	6,000	6,195	6,390	6,585	6,780	6,975	7,170	7,365	7,560	--------	--------
8	6,285	6,495	6,705	6,915	7,125	7,335	7,545	7,755	7,965	8,175	--------	--------
9	6,805	7,030	7,255	7,480	7,705	7,930	8,155	8,380	8,605	8,830	--------	--------

" 'POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE I—Continued

" '(To be effective for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and ending immediately prior to the applicable initial effective date of the second PFS schedule set forth below)

" 'PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
10	7,395	7,640	7,885	8,130	8,375	8,620	8,865	9,110	9,355	9,600		
11	8,045	8,310	8,575	8,840	9,105	9,370	9,635	9,900	10,165			
12	8,840	9,135	9,430	9,725	10,020	10,315	10,610	10,905	11,200			
13	9,725	10,050	10,375	10,700	11,025	11,350	11,675	12,000	12,325			
14	10,705	11,060	11,415	11,770	12,125	12,480	12,835	13,190	13,545			
15	11,780	12,170	12,560	12,950	13,340	13,730	14,120	14,510	14,900			
16	12,955	13,385	13,815	14,245	14,675	15,105	15,535	15,965				
17	14,260	14,730	15,200	15,670	16,140	16,610	17,080	17,550				
18	15,500	16,000	16,500	17,000	17,500	18,000	18,500					
19	16,750	17,250	17,750	18,250	18,750	19,250						
20	18,000	18,500	19,000	19,500								

" 'POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE II

" '(To be effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and thereafter)

" 'PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$3,690	$3,820	$3,950	$4,080	$4,210	$4,340	$4,470	$4,600	$4,730	$4,860	$4,990	$5,120
2	4,010	4,145	4,280	4,415	4,550	4,685	4,820	4,955	5,090	5,225	5,360	5,495
3	4,345	4,490	4,635	4,780	4,925	5,070	5,215	5,360	5,505	5,650	5,795	5,940
4	4,690	4,850	5,010	5,170	5,330	5,490	5,650	5,810	5,970	6,130	6,290	6,450
5	5,085	5,255	5,425	5,595	5,765	5,935	6,105	6,275	6,445	6,615	6,785	6,955
6	5,500	5,685	5,870	6,055	6,240	6,425	6,610	6,795	6,980	7,165	7,350	7,535
7	5,950	6,150	6,350	6,550	6,750	6,950	7,150	7,350	7,550	7,750		
8	6,440	6,655	6,870	7,085	7,300	7,515	7,730	7,945	8,160	8,375		
9	6,965	7,200	7,435	7,670	7,905	8,140	8,375	8,610	8,845	9,080		
10	7,650	7,900	8,150	8,400	8,650	8,900	9,150	9,400	9,650	9,900		
11	8,410	8,690	8,970	9,250	9,530	9,810	10,090	10,370	10,650			
12	9,270	9,575	9,880	10,185	10,490	10,795	11,100	11,405	11,710			
13	10,210	10,545	10,880	11,215	11,550	11,885	12,220	12,555	12,890			
14	11,240	11,610	11,980	12,350	12,720	13,090	13,460	13,830	14,200			
15	12,370	12,780	13,190	13,600	14,010	14,420	14,830	15,240	15,650			
16	13,625	14,075	14,525	14,975	15,425	15,875	16,325	16,775				
17	15,000	15,495	15,990	16,485	16,980	17,475	17,970	18,465				
18	15,500	16,000	16,500	17,000	17,500	18,000	18,500					
19	16,750	17,250	17,750	18,250	18,750	19,250						
20	18,000	18,500	19,000	19,500								’

"Rural Carrier Schedules

"SEC. 703. (a) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) There are established basic compensation schedules which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedules, and for which the symbol shall be "RCS". Each such schedule shall be in effect for the period specified with respect to such schedule.

" 'RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE I

" '(To be effective for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and ending immediately prior to the applicable initial effective date of the second RCS Schedule set forth below)

	" 'Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carriers in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,027	$2,127	$2,227	$2,327	$2,427	$2,527	$2,627	$2,727	$2,827	$2,927	$3,027	$3,127
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	75	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91	93	95	97
For each mile of route over 30 miles	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24

" 'RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE II

" '(To be effective for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, and thereafter)

	" 'Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carriers in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,080	$2,180	$2,280	$2,380	$2,480	$2,580	$2,680	$2,780	$2,880	$2,980	$3,080	$3,180
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	77	79	81	83	85	87	89	91	93	95	97	99
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25’

"(b) Section 3543(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(c) The Postmaster General may pay such additional compensation as he may determine to be fair and reasonable in each individual case to rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes.'

"(c) The first sentence of section 3543(f) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: 'In addition to the compensation provided in the Rural Carrier Schedule, each rural carrier shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to—

" '(1) 12 cents per mile for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled, or

" '(2) $4.20 per day, whichever is greater.'

"(d) Section 3543 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding thereto new subsections (i) and (j) as follows:

" '(i) Each person serving as a substitute of record on the effective date of this subsection shall be placed in step 2 of the Rural Carrier Schedule and he shall be advanced by step-increases, on the basis of time on the rolls prior to the effective date, in accordance with the schedule of step-increases provided in section 3552, except that no such person shall be so advanced to a step higher than the step to which a regular carrier with the same length of service would have advanced prior to such effective date. Thereafter, he shall be advanced by step-increases, pursuant to the provisions of sections 3552 and 3553 of this title. On and after the effective date of this subsection, each substitute rural carrier shall be paid the daily rate, based on the step attained by him, for the route on which service is performed.

" '(j) Each temporary rural carrier who, on the effective date of this subsection, is serving on a vacant route pending the appointment of a regular rural carrier shall be placed in step 2 and shall be advanced by step-increases on the basis of any prior substitute or temporary rural carrier service in accordance with the schedule of step-increases provided in section 3552.'

"Fourth Class Office Schedules

"SEC. 704. (a) Section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) There are established basic compensation schedules which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedules, and for which the symbol shall be "FOS", for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class. Each such schedule shall be in effect for the period specified with respect to such schedule. Each such schedule is based upon the gross postal receipts as contained in returns of the post office for the calendar year immediately preceding. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with these schedules.'

"(b) Section 3544(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The basic salary of postmasters in fourth-class post offices shall be readjusted for changes in gross receipts at the start of the first pay period after the beginning of each fiscal year. When a post office is restored to a gross receipts category held by it prior to relegation to a lower gross receipts category, the postmaster's basic salary may be adjusted to the highest salary step held by him when the post office was in the higher gross receipts category. In all other cases, in adjusting a postmaster's basic salary under this section, the basic salary shall be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by the postmaster at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If there is no such step the basic salary shall be fixed at the highest step for the adjusted gross receipts of the office. Each increase in basic salary because of change in gross receipts shall be deemed the equivalent of a step-increase under section 3552 of this title and the waiting period, for purposes of advancement to the next step, shall begin on the date of adjustment.

“ ‘FOURTH CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE I

“ ‘(To be effective for the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this act and ending immediately prior to the applicable initial effective date of the second FOS schedule set forth below)

“ ‘Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$3,277	$3,386	$3,495	$3,604	$3,713	$3,822	$3,931	$4,040	$4,149	$4,258	$4,367	$4,476
$900 to $1,299.99	3,003	3,102	3,201	3,300	3,399	3,498	3,597	3,696	3,795	3,984	3,993	4,992
$600 to $899.99	2,457	2,540	2,623	2,706	2,789	2,872	2,955	3,038	3,121	3,204	3,287	3,370
$350 to $599.99	1,911	1,973	2,035	2,097	2,159	2,221	2,283	2,345	2,407	2,469	2,531	2,593
$250 to $349.99	1,366	1,410	1,454	1,498	1,542	1,586	1,630	1,674	1,718	1,762	1,806	1,850
$200 to $249.99	1,092	1,128	1,164	1,200	1,236	1,272	1,308	1,344	1,380	1,416	1,452	1,488
$100 to $199.99	820	846	872	898	924	950	976	1,002	1,028	1,054	1,080	1,106
Under $100	545	562	579	596	613	630	647	664	681	698	715	732

“ ‘FOURTH CLASS SCHEDULE II

“ ‘(To be effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after Jan. 1, 1964, and thereafter)

“ ‘Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$3,426	$3,540	$3,654	$3,768	$3,882	$3,996	$4,110	$4,224	$4,338	$4,452	$4,566	$4,680
$900 to $1,299.99	3,140	3,243	3,346	3,449	3,552	3,655	3,758	3,861	3,964	4,067	4,170	4,273
$600 to $899.99	2,569	2,655	2,741	2,827	2,913	2,999	3,085	3,171	3,257	3,343	3,429	3,515
$350 to $599.99	1,998	2,063	2,128	2,193	2,258	2,323	2,388	2,453	2,518	2,583	2,648	2,713
$250 to $349.99	1,428	1,474	1,520	1,566	1,612	1,658	1,704	1,750	1,796	1,842	1,888	1,934
$200 to $249.99	1,142	1,179	1,216	1,253	1,290	1,327	1,364	1,401	1,438	1,475	1,512	1,549
$100 to $199.99	857	884	911	938	965	992	1,019	1,046	1,073	1,111	1,127	1,154
Under $100	569	588	607	626	645	664	683	702	721	740	759	778’.

“SEC. 705. Section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘§ 3552. Automatic advancement by step increases

“ ‘(a) (1) Each employee in levels 1 through 6 of the Postal Field Service Schedule, each employee subject to the Rural Carrier Schedule, and each employee subject to the Fourth Class Office Schedule, who has not reached the highest step for his position, shall be advanced successively to the next higher step as follows:

“ ‘(A) To steps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service; and

“ ‘(B) To steps 8 and above—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

“ ‘(2) Each employee in the postal field service in level 7 or above of the Postal Field Service Schedule, who has not reached the highest step for his position, shall be advanced successively to the next higher step, as follows:

“ ‘(A) To steps 2, 3, and 4—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of fifty-two calendar weeks of satisfactory service;

“ ‘(B) To steps 5, 6, and 7—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of one hundred and four calendar weeks of satisfactory service; and

“ ‘(C) To steps 8 and above—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of one hundred and fifty-six calendar weeks of satisfactory service.

“ ‘(3) The receipt of an equivalent increase during any of the waiting periods specified in this subsection shall cause a new full waiting period to commence for further step-increases.

“ ‘(b) Any increase in basic compensation granted by law on or after the date of enactment of the Postal Employees Salary Adjustment Act of 1962, to employees in the postal field service shall not be deemed to be an equivalent increase in basic compensation within the meaning of subsection (a) of this section.

“ ‘(c) The benefit of successive step-increases shall be preserved, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, for employees whose continuous service is interrupted by service in the armed services.’

“SEC. 706. Section 3554 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘§ 3554. Compensation of certain temporary employees

“ ‘Temporary employees hired for a continuous period of one year or less for a position in the postal field service shall be paid basic compensation at the entrance step of the position to which they are appointed.’.

“SEC. 707. Section 3559 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘§ 3559. Promotions

“ ‘An employee who is promoted to a position in the Postal Field Service Schedule which is not more than two salary levels above the salary level of the position from which promoted shall be paid basic compensation at the lowest step of the higher salary level which exceeds his existing basic compensation by not less than two steps of the salary level from which promoted. An employee who is promoted to a position in the Postal Field Service Schedule which is more than two salary levels above the level of the position from which promoted shall be paid basic compensation at the lowest step of the higher salary level which exceeds his existing basic compensation by not less than three steps of the salary level from which promoted. If there is no step in the salary level to which the employee is promoted which exceeds his existing basic compensation by at least the amount of the specified difference, the employee shall be paid the rate for the maximum step of the salary level to which promoted, or his existing basic compensation, whichever is higher.’.

“SEC. 708. Subsection (a) (4) of section 6402 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘(4) delivery and collection service may not be established or extended under a star route contract on a rural route except when such rural route does not meet the minimum standards established by the Postmaster General, and becomes vacant, and’.

“SEC. 709. Section 3101 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting paragraphs (5) and (6), and inserting in lieu thereof, the following:

“ ‘(5) “basic salary” and “basic compensation” means the rate of annual or hourly compensation specified by law, exclusive of overtime and night differential.’.

“SEC. 710. Subsection 3541(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by (a) inserting in paragraph (3) thereof, after ‘rural carriers,’ the phrase ‘(other than substitute rural carriers,)’ and (b) adding a new paragraph (5) as follows:

“ ‘(5) To compute the daily rate of basic compensation for substitute rural carriers, the annual rate of compensation shall be divided by 304.’.

“Conversion as of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this act

“SEC. 711. (a) The basic compensation of each employee subject to Postal Field Service Schedule I or Rural Carrier Schedule I, as the case may be, on the effective date of such schedule shall be determined as follows:

“(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical level and step he was in prior to the effective date of such schedule, except that employees in the first four levels of the Postal Field Service Schedule and employees (except employees subject to section 3543(j) of title 39, United States Code) in the Rural Carrier Schedule shall be advanced as follows: Employees in step 1 to step 2 of the new schedule; step 2 to step 3; step 3 to step 4; step 4 to step 5; step 5 to step 6; step 6 to step 7; step 7 to step 8. If changes in level or step would otherwise occur on the effective date of such schedule without regard to the enactment of such schedule, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion under this paragraph.

“(2) In addition to conversion under paragraph (1) of this subsection, each employee shall be advanced one additional step for each longevity step which he had earned on or prior to such conversion.

“(3) Credit toward the next step-increase (other than toward longevity steps) earned by an employee who had not reached step 7 or who is not advanced to step 7 under paragraph (1) prior to the effective date of such schedule shall be creditable under subsection 3552(a) and section 3553 of title 39, United States Code, toward further step-increases if no step-increases were granted pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection. Credit earned toward longevity step-increases prior to the effective date of such schedule shall not be creditable toward further step-increases pursuant to subsection 3552(a), and section 3553 of title 39, United States Code.

“(b) The basic compensation of each postmaster subject to the Fourth Class Office Schedule I on the effective date of such schedule shall be determined as follows:

“(1) Each postmaster shall be assigned to the same receipts category and numerical step he was in prior to the effective date of such schedule. If changes in receipts category or step would otherwise occur on the effective date of such schedule without regard to the enactment of such schedule, such changes in receipts category or step shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

“(2) Postmasters who, as of the effective date of this schedule, have not reached step 7, shall retain credit for advancement to the next step under section 3552(a) and section 3553 of title 39, United States Code, if no step-increases are granted pursuant to paragraph 3 of this subsection. Credit earned toward longevity step-increases prior to the effective date of such schedule shall not be creditable toward further step-increases under section 3552(a) and section 3553 of title 39, United States Code.

“(3) For each longevity step earned on or prior to the effective date of such schedule postmasters shall be advanced one step.

“(c) If the existing basic compensation of any employee subject to the Postal Field

Service Schedule, Rural Carrier Schedule, or Fourth Class Office Schedule, as the case may be, is greater than the rate established by subsection (a) or (b) of this section, he shall be placed in the first step of such schedule which exceeds his existing basic compensation; if the existing basic compensation is greater than any numerical step, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

"Conversion as of the First Pay Period Beginning on or After January 1, 1964

"SEC. 712. The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule II, Rural Carrier Schedule II, or Fourth Class Office Schedule II, as the case may be, on the effective date of such schedule shall be determined as follows:

"(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained prior to the effective date of such schedule. If changes in levels, receipts categories, or steps would otherwise occur on the effective date of such schedule without regard to enactment of such schedule, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

"(2) If existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this section, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation; if the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

"SEC. 713. Subject to section 711(c) and 712(2) of this title, rates of compensation fixed by reason of section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, shall not be increased by this title, notwithstanding any provision of such section to the contrary.

"Basic Salary in Cases of Assignments of Postal Employees

"SEC. 714. (a) Section 3335(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'The Postmaster General may pay, as he deems advisable, in cases of such assignments, a basic salary computed in accordance with the provisions of such section 3559 without regard to the requirement in this subsection of assignment for more than thirty days in a calendar year.'.

"(b) Each payment of an increase in basic salary which was made prior to the date of enactment of this section for services performed for periods of thirty days or less in any calendar year in the course of an assignment referred to in section 3335(b) of title 39, United States Code, by a postal field service employee assigned to duties and responsibilities of a higher salary level, and which would have been authorized by such section 3335(b), if such services had been performed in the course of such assignment after the completion by such employee of thirty days of service in any calendar year in such higher salary level, are hereby validated to the same extent as if such services had been performed after the completion of thirty days of service in any calendar year in the course of such assignment. Payments of increases validated by this subsection shall be considered as basic salary for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251–2267).

"Salary Protection Revision

"SEC. 715. (a) Section 3560(a)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(1) basic salary and salary level, with respect to the Postal Field Service Schedule,'.

"(b) Section 3560(b)(4) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '(4) who, for two continuous years immediately prior to such reduction in salary standing, served in the postal field service with any salary standing higher than the salary standing to which he is reduced; and'.

"(c) Section 3560(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (B) and inserting '; or' in lieu of such period, and

"(2) by adding at the end of such section 3560(c) the following paragraph:

" '(C) the amount of the rate in the lowest salary standing which such employee held during the two years immediately preceding such reduction in salary standing augmented by each step increase which he would have earned in such salary standing and by each increase provided by law in such salary rate.'.

"(d)(1) Subject to paragraph (2) of this section, the amendments made by this section to sections 3560(a)(1), 3560(b)(4), and 3560(c) of title 39, United State Code, shall apply only with respect to reductions in salary standing occurring on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

"(2) Payments not authorized by section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, which were made prior to the date of enactment of this Act to employees in the postal field service in connection with reductions in salary standing and which would have been authorized under such section 3560 if the amendments made by this section to subsections (b)(4) and (c) of such section 3560 had been in effect at the time such payments were made, are hereby validated to the same extent as if such amendments had been in effect at such time.

"Rules for Special Compensation

"SEC. 716. Chapter 41 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately following section 3105 a new section 3106 as follows:

" '§ 3106. Special compensation rules

" 'In order that the basic compensation schedules in sections 3542, 3543, and 3544 of this title may be used equitably and with maximum effect to attract and motivate employees, the Postmaster General may prescribe regulations pursuant to which he may, within the limit of available appropriations, grant to any officer or employee before the expiration of the periods prescribed by section 3552, step-increases in recognition of extra competence: *Provided*, That no officer or employee shall be eligible under this section for more than one such additional step-increase within any period of fifty-two weeks, and such increase shall not be considered to be an equivalent increase.'

"Personnel Requirements

"SEC. 717. (a) Section 3301 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 3301. Personnel requirements

" 'The Postmaster General shall determine the personnel requirements of the postal field service, and fix the number of supervisors and other employees in that service, except that there may not be at any one time more than one assistant postmaster employed at any post office or a total of 70 employees assigned to salary levels 18, 19, and 20 in the postal field service.'

"(b) Section 1310(a) of the Act of November 1, 1951 (65 Stat. 757), as amended, which fixes a ceiling on permanent employees in the Federal Government, is amended by inserting after the word '*Provided,*' the following: 'That increases in the number of permanent personnel in the Postal Field Service not exceeding 10 per centum above the total number of its permanent employees on September 1, 1950, shall not be chargeable to this limitation: *And provided further,*'.

"Conforming Amendment

"SEC. 718. (a) The table of contents of chapter 41 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding after the heading entitled 'Employees generally,' the following:

" '3106. Special compensation rules'.

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 45 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting '3558. Longevity step-increases'.

"Repeals

"SEC. 719. Sections 101 through 105 of the Act of July 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 296, Public Law 86–568), and section 3558 of title 39, United States Code, are repealed.

"Effective Dates

"SEC. 720. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, the provisions of this title shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act, except that section 712 (conversion rules for second postal field service salary increases) shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964.

"Title IV—Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration

"SEC. 801. (a) Section 4103 of title 38 of the United States Code, relating to the appointment and annual salaries of the Chief Medical Director and certain other officers of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out the words 'not to exceed eight Assistant Chief Medical Directors' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'not to exceed five Assistant Chief Medical Directors, such Medical Directors as may be designated to suit the needs of the Department,'.

"(b) Such section is further amended by striking out subsections (d) to (i), inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '(d) Each Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director and shall be paid a salary of $20,000 a year.

" 'One Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be a qualified doctor of dental surgery or dental medicine who shall be directly responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operations of the Dental Service.

" '(e) Medical Directors, during their period of service as such, shall be paid a salary of $18,500 minimum to $19,500 maximum a year.

" '(f) The Director of Nursing Service shall be a qualified registered nurse, appointed by the Administrator, and shall be responsible to the Chief Medical Director for the operation of the Nursing Service. During the period of service as such, the Director of Nursing Service shall be paid, effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after—

" 'the date of enactment of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, a salary of $14,565 minimum to $17,925 maximum a year;

" 'January 1, 1964, a salary of $15,665 minimum to $19,270 maximum a year.

" '(g) The Administrator may appoint a chief pharmacist and a chief dietitian. During the period of his service as such, the chief pharmacist and the chief dietitian shall be paid, effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after—

" 'the date of enactment of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, a salary of $14,565 minimum to $17,925 maximum a year;

" 'January 1, 1964, a salary of $15,665 minimum to $19,270 maximum a year.

" '(h) Except as provided in subsection (j), any appointment under this section shall be for a period of four years but persons so appointed shall be subject to removal by the Administrator for cause.

"'(i) Reappointments may be made for successive like periods.

"'(j) The Administrator may designate a member of the Chaplain Service of the Veterans' Administration as Director, Chaplain Service, for a period of two years, subject to removal by the Administrator for cause. During the period that any such member serves as Director, Chaplain Service, he shall be paid a salary, as determined by the Administrator, within the minimum and maximum salary limitations prescribed for grade GS–15 positions by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Redesignations under this subsection may be made for successive like periods. An individual designated as Director, Chaplain Service, shall at the end of his period of service as Director revert to the position, grade, and status which he held immediately prior to being designated Director, Chaplain Service, and all service as Director, Chaplain Service, shall be creditable as service in the former position.'

"Physicians, Dentists, and Nurses

"SEC. 802. Section 4107 of such title 38 relating to the minimum and maximum rates of annual salary of certain physicians, dentists, and nurses of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"'(a) (1) Effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning or or after the date of enactment of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, the grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"'Physician and Dentist Schedule

"'Director grade, $16,000 minimum to $19,000 maximum.

"'Executive grade, $15,250 minimum to $18,750 maximum.

"'Chief grade, $14,565 minimum to $18,405 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $12,845 minimum to $16,245 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $11,150 minimum to $14,070 maximum.

"'Full grade, $9,475 minimum to $11,995 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $8,045 minimum to $10,165 maximum.

"'Nurse Schedule

"'Assistant Director grade, $12,845 minimum to $16,245 maximum.

"'Chief grade, $11,150 minimum to $14,070 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $9,475 minimum to $11,995 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $8,045 minimum to $10,165 maximum.

"'Full grade, $6,675 minimum to $8,700 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $5,820 minimum to $7,575 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $5,035 minimum to $6,565 maximum.

"'(2) Effective on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964, the per annum full pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"'Physician and Dentist Schedule

"'Chief grade, $15,665 minimum to $19,785 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $13,615 minimum to $17,215 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $11,725 minimum to $14,805 maximum.

"'Full grade, $9,980 minimum to $12,620 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $8,410 minimum to $10,650 maximum.

"'Nurse Schedule

"'Assistant director grade, $13,615 minimum to $17,215 maximum.

"'Chief grade, $11,725 minimum to $14,805 maximum.

"'Senior grade, $9,980 minimum to $12,620 maximum.

"'Intermediate grade, $8,410 minimum to $10,650 maximum.

"'Full grade, $7,030 minimum to $9,100 maximum.

"'Associate grade, $6,090 minimum to $7,890 maximum.

"'Junior grade, $5,235 minimum to $6,810 maximum.

"'(b) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position.'

"SEC. 803. (a) Section 4108 of such title 38 which formerly prescribed the maximum amount of pay and allowances for medical, surgical, or dental specialists of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is amended, effective on the date of enactment of this Act to read as follows:

"'§ 4108. Administration

"'Notwithstanding any law, Executive order, or regulation, the Administrator shall prescribe by regulation the hours and conditions of employment and leaves of absence of physicians, dentists, and nurses.'

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 73 of such title 38 is amended by striking out

"'4108. Specialist ratings.'

and inserting in lieu thereof.

"'4108. Administration.'

"Directors of Hospitals, Domiciliaries, and Centers

"SEC. 804. Section 4111(b) of such title 38, relating to the annual salary of certain individuals serving as director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center, is amended, effective on the date of enactment of this Act, to read as follows:

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the per annum salary rate of each individual serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center who is not a physician in the medical service shall not be less than the rate of salary which he would receive under section 4107 of this title if his service as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center had been service as a physician in the director grade. This subsection shall not affect the allocation of any position of director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center to any grade of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, except with respect to changes in rate of salary pursuant to the preceding sentence, and shall not affect the applicability of the Performance Rating Act of 1950 to any individual.

"SEC. 805. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, this title shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Title V—Foreign Service Act of 1946

"Short Title

"SEC. 901. This title may be cited as the 'Foreign Service Salary Reform Act of 1962'.

"Foreign Service Officers

"SEC. 902. The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867), is amended to read as follows:

"'On the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of the Foreign Service Salary Reform Act of 1962, the per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$18,975	$19,650	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Class 2	15,900	16,400	$16,900	$17,400	$17,900	$18,400	$18,900
Class 3	13,440	13,885	14,330	14,775	15,220	15,665	16,110
Class 4	11,150	11,515	11,880	12,245	12,610	12,975	13,340
Class 5	9,315	9,620	9,925	10,230	10,535	10,840	11,145
Class 6	7,705	7,960	8,215	8,470	8,725	8,980	9,235
Class 7	6,475	6,690	6,905	7,120	7,335	7,550	7,765
Class 8	5,540	5,725	5,910	6,095	6,280	6,465	6,650

"'On the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, the per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$18,975	$19,650	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Class 2	15,900	16,400	$16,900	$17,400	$17,900	$18,400	$18,900
Class 3	14,265	14,735	15,205	15,675	16,145	16,615	17,085
Class 4	11,725	12,110	12,495	12,880	13,265	13,650	14,035
Class 5	9,695	10,015	10,335	10,655	10,975	11,295	11,615
Class 6	8,090	8,355	8,620	8,885	9,150	9,415	9,680
Class 7	6,810	7,035	7,260	7,485	7,710	7,935	8,160
Class 8	5,795	5,990	6,185	6,380	6,575	6,770	6,965'

"Foreign Service Staff Officers and Employees

"SEC. 903. Section 415 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 415. (a) Effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of the Foreign Service Salary Reform Act of 1962, there shall be ten classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, referred to hereafter as staff officers and employees, and the per annum salaries of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$13,440	$13,885	$14,330	$14,775	$15,220	$15,665	$16,110	$16,555	$17,000	--------
Class 2	11,150	11,515	11,880	12,245	12,610	12,975	13,340	13,705	14,070	--------
Class 3	9,315	9,620	9,925	10,230	10,535	10,840	11,145	11,450	11,755	--------
Class 4	7,705	7,960	8,215	8,470	8,725	8,980	9,235	9,490	9,745	--------
Class 5	6,910	7,140	7,370	7,600	7,830	8,060	8,290	8,520	8,750	$8,980
Class 6	6,225	6,435	6,645	6,855	7,065	7,275	7,485	7,695	7,905	8,115
Class 7	5,610	5,800	5,990	6,180	6,370	6,560	6,750	6,940	7,130	7,320
Class 8	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910	6,080	6,250	6,420	6,590
Class 9	4,575	4,725	4,875	5,025	5,175	5,325	5,475	5,625	5,775	5,930
Class 10	4,110	4,250	4,390	4,530	4,670	4,825	4,980	5,135	5,290	5,445

"'On the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, the per annum salaries of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"'Class 1	$14.265	$14,735	$15,205	$15,675	$16,145	$16,615	$17,085	$17,555	$18,025	--------
Class 2	11,725	12,110	12.495	12,880	13,265	13,650	14,035	14,420	14,805	--------
Class 3	9,695	10,015	10,335	10,655	10,975	11,295	11,615	11,935	12,255	--------
Class 4	8,090	8,355	8,620	8,885	9,150	9,415	9,680	9,945	10,210	--------
Class 5	7,295	7,535	7,775	8,015	8,255	8,495	8,735	8,975	9,215	$9,455
Class 6	6,570	6,785	7,000	7,215	7,430	7,645	7,860	8,075	8,290	8,505
Class 7	5,890	6,085	6,280	6,475	6,670	6,865	7,060	7.255	7,450	7,645
Class 8	5,270	5,445	5,620	5,795	5,970	6,145	6,320	6,495	6,670	6,845
Class 9	4,715	4,870	5,025	5,180	5,335	5,490	5,645	5,800	5,955	6,110
Class 10	4,215	4,355	4,495	4,635	4,775	4,915	5,060	5,215	5,370	5,525

"'(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, classify positions at levels below class 10, and establish salary rates therefor at lower rates than those prescribed by this section, for American employees recruited abroad who are not available or are not qualified for transfer to another post and who perform duties of a more routine nature than are generally performed at the class 10 level.'

"Conversion

"SEC. 904. Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this title at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, shall receive basic compensation on and after the effective date of this title at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State: *Provided*, That staff officers and employees shall be transferred to the new staff classes established by this Act as follows:

"Present class under section 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946	Corresponding new class under section 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended
FSS- 1	FSS- 1
FSS- 2	FSS- 1
FSS- 3	FSS- 2
FSS- 4	FSS- 2
FSS- 5	FSS- 3
FSS- 6	FSS- 3
FSS- 7	FSS- 4
FSS- 8	FSS- 5
FSS- 9	FSS- 6
FSS-10	FSS- 7
FSS-11	FSS- 8
FSS-12	FSS- 9
FSS-13	FSS-10
FSS-14 and below	(1)

"[1] Remain at present class and salary rate until revised pursuant to new section 415(b).

"Conforming Amendments

"SEC. 905. The heading of section 642 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 is amended by deleting the words 'and longevity' and section 642 is amended by deleting '(a)' in the first paragraph and by deleting subsection (b) in its entirety.

"Effective Date

"SEC. 906. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this title, this title shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Title VI—Miscellaneous salary provisions

"Revision of Salary Limitations for Certain Scientific and Professional Positions

"SEC. 1001. (a)(1) Section 2(b) of the Act of August 1, 1947 (Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress, as amended (75 Stat. 789; 5 U.S.C. 1161-1163)), relating to the rates of compensation of certain scientific or professional positions, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The per annum rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall not be less than the minimum rate of grade 16 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, nor more than the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of such Act and shall be subject to the approval of the United States Civil Service Commission.'.

"(2) The first section of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) the Librarian of Congress is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than eight scientific or professional positions in the Library of Congress, each such position being established to carry out research and development functions of the Library which require the services of specially qualified personnel. Section 2(a) shall not apply to positions established under this subsection.'

"(b) Section 1581(b) of title 10 of the United States Code, relating to the rates of compensation of certain scientific or professional positions in the Department of Defense, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Subject to the Civil Service Commission's approval as to rates, the Secretary may fix the compensation for positions established under subsection (a). However, the per annum compensation may not be less than the minimum rate of grade 16 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, nor more than the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of such Act.'.

"(c) Section 4 of the Act of May 29, 1959 (73 Stat. 63; Public Law 86-36), as amended by section 204 of the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 791; Public Law 87-367), authorizing scientific and professional positions in the National Security Agency, is amended by striking out ', as amended by paragraph (34) (B) of the first section of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1456; Public Law 85-861)'.

"(d) The proviso contained in the first sentence of section 208(g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 210(g), relating to the rates of compensation of certain scientific, professional, and administrative personnel in the Public Health Service, is amended to read as follows: ': *Provided*, That the rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this subsection shall not be less than the minimum rate of grade 16 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, nor more than the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of such Act, and shall be subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission.'.

"(e) The proviso contained in the second sentence of section 12 of the Act of May 29, 1884 (62 Stat. 198 as amended and supplemented; 21 U.S.C. 113a), authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to employ and fix the compensation of technical experts and scientists for research and study of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases, is amended to read as follows: ': *Provided*, That the number so employed shall not exceed five and that the maximum compensation for each shall not exceed the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.'.

"(f) Section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 429; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), as amended, authorizing the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish and fix the compensation of four hundred and twenty-five scientific, engineering, and administrative positions, is amended by striking out, in the second sentence, ', except that (A) to the extent the Administrator deems such action necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities, he may appoint and fix the compensation (up to a limit of $19,000 a year, or up to a limit of $21,000 a year for a maximum of thirty positions) of' and by inserting in lieu thereof ', except that (A) to the extent the Administrator deems such action necessary to the discharge of his responsibilities, he may appoint and fix the compensation (at not to exceed the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or, for a maximum of thirty positions, not to exceed $21,000 a year) of'.

"(g) That part of the proviso in section 161d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (71 Stat. 613; 42 U.S.C. 2201), fixing a limit of $19,000 on the compensation of scientific and technical personnel, is amended by striking out the words 'up to a limit of $19,000)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'up to a limit of the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended)'.

"(h) Section 302(f) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 746; 49 U.S.C. 1343 (d)), as amended, authorizing the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to select, employ, and fix the compensation of 23 positions at rates not to exceed $19,500 per annum, is amended by striking out '$19,500 per annum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the highest rate of grade 18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(i) Section 2 of the Act of June 14, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 441; 66 Stat. 43; 22 U.S.C. 290a), relating to the compensation of the United States representative and alternate on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, is amended by striking out 'Such representative shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum and any such alternate shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $10,000 per annum', and inserting in lieu thereof 'Such representative and any such alternate shall each be entitled to receive compensation at one of the rates provided by section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended,'.

"(j) Section 104(b) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 530; Public Law 87-256) authorizing the fixing of the compensation of not to exceed ten employees without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) The President is authorized to employ such other personnel as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act, and of such personel not to exceed ten may be compensated without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of the general schedule established by such Act. Such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.'

"(k)(1) Section 625(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 449; Public Law 87-195), as amended, is amended by striking out 'and of these, not to exceed eight may be compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate provided for grades of such general schedule but not in excess of $19,000 per year' and inserting in lieu thereof 'but not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of such general schedule'.

"(2) Section 625(c) of such Act is amended by striking out 'and of these, not to exceed three may be compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate provided for grades of such general schedule but not in excess of $19,000 per year' and inserting in lieu thereof 'but not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of such general schedule'.

"(l) Section 7(b) of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 615; Public Law 87-293) is amended by striking out 'and of these not to exceed two may be compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate provided for grades of such general schedule but not in excess of $19,000 per year' and inserting in lieu thereof 'but not in excess of the highest rate of grade 18 of such general schedule'.

"Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committee Employees

"SEC. 1002. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by title II of this part for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"Assistant United States Attorneys

"SEC. 1003. (a) The last paragraph of section 508 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

" 'Assistant United States attorneys and attorneys appointed under section 503 of this title—not more than $17,500.'

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of assistant United States attorneys whose basic salaries are fixed by section 508 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased by 7½ per centum effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Employees in the Judicial Branch

"SEC. 1004. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604(a)(5), or section 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or section 107(a)(6) of the Act of July 31, 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2206(a)(6)), are hereby increased by two amounts, the first amount to be effective for the period beginning as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and ending immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, and the second amount to be effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, and thereafter, which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title II of this part in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by two amounts, the first amount to be effective for the period beginning as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and ending immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, and the second amount to be effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, and thereafter, which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title II of this part in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(c) Section 753(e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation to be effective for the period beginning as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and ending immediately prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, and a second new limitation effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964, and thereafter, which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by title II of this part in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"Employees in the Legislative Branch

"SEC. 1005. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 7 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

"(b) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on October 16, 1962, to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (d), the rates of gross compensation of the elected officers of the Senate (except the Presiding Officer of the Senate), the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by 7 per centum.

"(d) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'SENATE' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86-568), is amended to read as follows:

" 'No officer or employee whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of $8,880 per annum, or gross compensation at a rate in excess of $18,880 per annum, unless expressly authorized by law.'

"(e) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 7 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

"(f) Each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased automatically, or is not permitted to be increased administratively, by reason of any other provision of this section, shall receive additional compensation at the rate of 7 per centum of the rate of his total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section.

"(g) The limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 7 per centum. The amount of each such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

"(h) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and the following).

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no rate of compensation which exceeds $21,500 shall be increased by this section, and no increase provided by this section shall cause the gross rate of compensation (basic plus additional compensation authorized by law) or the total annual compensation of any officer or employee to exceed $21,500.

"(j) Insofar as the provisions of this section apply to officers and employees whose compensation is based on a monthly pay period which begins on the first day of the month, such provisions shall become effective on October 16, 1962.

"Saving Provision

"SEC. 1006. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, no rate of basic, gross, or total annual compensation or salary shall be reduced by reason of the enactment of this Act.

"Absorption of Costs

"SEC. 1007. (a) The departments, agencies, establishments, and corporations in the executive branch shall absorb the costs of the increases in basic compensation provided by this Act to the fullest extent possible without seriously affecting the immediate execution of essential functions.

"(b) No request for additional or supplemental appropriations to meet the increases in basic compensation provided by this Act shall be transmitted to the Congress unless it is accompanied by a certification of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the amounts requested are necessary to provide for the continued execution of essential functions of the department, agency, or corporation concerned.

"(c) Pursuant to the objective of this section, heads of the executive branch activities concerned are directed to review with meticulous care each vacancy resulting from voluntary resignation, retirement, or death and to determine whether the duties of the position can be reassigned to other employees or whether the position can be abolished without seriously affecting the execution of essential functions.

"(d) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be held or considered to require (1) the separation from the service of any individual by reduction in force or other personnel action or (2) the placing of any individual in a leave-without-pay status.

"Effective Date

"Sec. 1008. Except as otherwise expressly provided, this title shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

"Ceiling provision

"Sec. 1009. Except as provided in section 1005, no rate of compensation which exceeds $20,000 per annum shall be increased or established by or pursuant to this Act and no increase made by or pursuant to this Act shall cause any rate of compensation to exceed $20,000 per annum.

"PART III—ADJUSTMENT OF ANNUITIES

"Sec. 1101. (a) The annuity of of each person who, on the effective date of this section, is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund shall be increased by 5 per centum of the amount of such annuity.

"(b) The annuity of each person who receives or is entitled to receive an annuity from the civil service retirement and disability fund commencing during the period which begins on the day following the effective date of this section and ends five years after such date, shall be increased in accordance with the following table:

"If the annuity commences between—	*The annuity shall be increased by—*
"January 2, 1963, and December 31, 1963	4 per centum
"January 1, 1964, and December 31, 1964	3 per centum
"January 1, 1965, and December 31, 1965	2 per centum
"January 1, 1966, and December 31, 1966	1 per centum

"(c) In lieu of any other increase provided by this section, the annuity of a survivor of a retired employee or Member of Congress who received an increase under this section shall be increased by a percentage equal to the percentage by which the annuity of such employee or Member was so increased.

"(d) No increase provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

"(e) The limitation reading 'or (3) the sum necessary to increase such annuity, exclusive of annuity purchased by voluntary contributions under the second paragraph of section 10 of this Act, to $2,160' contained in section 8(c)(1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended by the Acts of July 16, 1952 (66 Stat. 722; Public Law 555, Eighty-second Congress), and August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1043; Public Law 747, Eighty-third Congress), shall not be effective on or after the effective date of this section.

"(f) The limitation contained in the next to the last sentence of section 8(d)(1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, as enacted by the Act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 692; Public Law 369, Eighty-fourth Congress), shall not be effective on and after the effective date of this section.

"(g) The increases provided by this section shall take effect on the effective date of this section, except that any increase under subsection (b) or (c) shall take effect on the beginning date of the annuity.

"(h) The monthy installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

"Sec. 1102. (a) Section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(t) The term "price index" shall mean the annual average over a calendar year of the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.'

"(b) Such Act is further amended by redesignating section 18 as 19, and by inserting after section 17 the following new section:

"'Cost-of-Living Adjustment of Annuities

"'Sec. 18. (a) After January 1, 1964, and after each succeeding January 1, the Commission shall determine the per centum change in the price index from the later of 1962 or the year preceding the most recent cost-of-living adjustment to the latest complete year. On the basis of such Commission determination, the following adjustments shall be made:

"'(1) Effective April 1, 1964, if the change in the price index from 1962 to 1963 shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2, 1963, shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"'(2) Effective April 1 of any year other than 1964 after the price index change shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2 of the preceding year shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"'(b) Eligibility for an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

"'(1) Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 10(d)), which annuity commenced the day after the annuitant's death, shall be increased as provided in subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) if the commencing date of annuity to the annuitant was earlier than January 2 of the year preceding the first increase.

"'(2) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 10(d)), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

"'(3) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under this section to a child under section 10(d), the items $600, $720, $1,800, and $2,160 appearing in section 10(d) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section, and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 10(d) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death. Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, the provisions of this paragraph shall apply as if such first increase were in effect with respect to computation of a child's annuity under section 10(d) which commenced between January 2 of the year preceding the first increase and the effective date of the first increase.

"'(c) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

"'(d) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.'

"Sec. 1103. (a) Section 9(g) of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(g) The annuity as hereinbefore provided (excluding any increase because of retirement under section 7) for any married employee or Member retiring under this Act, or any portion of such annuity designated in writing for purposes of section 10(a)(1), shall be reduced by 2½ per centum of so much thereof as does not exceed $3,600 and by 10 per centum of so much thereof as exceeds $3,600, unless the employee or Member notifies the Commission in writing at the time of retirement that he does not desire his wife or husband to receive an annuity as provided in section 10(a)(1).'

"(b) Section 10(a)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) If an employee or Member dies after having retired under any provision of this Act and is survived by a wife or husband to whom the employee or Member was married at the time of retirement, such wife or husband shall be paid an annuity equal to 55 per centum of an annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 9, as may apply with respect to the annuitant, or of such portion thereof as may have been designated in writing for such purpose by the employee or Member at the time of retirement, unless the employee or Member has notified the Commission in writing at the time of retirement that he does not desire his wife or husband to receive such annuity."

"(c) Section 10(b) of such Act is amended by striking out '50 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '55 per centum'.

"(d) Section 10(c) of such Act is amended by striking out '50 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '55 per centum'.

"(e) Section 10(e) of such Act is amended by striking out '50 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '55 per centum'.

"(f)(A) Section 1(j) of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by substituting a comma for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: 'or such unmarried child between eighteen and twenty-one years of age who is a student regularly pursuing a full-time course of study or training in residence in a high school, trade school, technical or vocational institute, junior college, college, university, or comparable recognized educational institution. A child whose twenty-first birthday occurs prior to July 1 or after August 31 of any calendar year, and while he is regularly pursuing such a course of study or training, shall be deemed for the purposes of this paragraph and section 10(d) to have attained the age of twenty-one on the first day of July following such birthday. A child who is a student shall not be deemed to have ceased to be a student during any interim between school years if the interim does not exceed four months and if he shows to the satisfaction of the Commission that he has a bona fide intention of continuing to pursue a course of study or training in the same or different school during the school semester (or other period into which the school year is divided) immediately following the interim.'

"(B) The third sentence of section 10(d) of the Act is amended to read as follows: 'The child's annuity shall commence on the day after the employee or Member dies, and such annuity granted under this Act or under the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended from and after February 28, 1948, or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) his attaining age eighteen unless incapable of self-support, age (2) his becoming capable of self-support after eighteen, (3) his marriage, or (4) his death, except that the annuity of a child who is a student as described in section 1(j) shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) his marriage, (2) his death, (3) his ceasing to be such a student, or (4) his attaining age twenty-one.'

"SEC. 1104. Section 1101 of this part shall take effect on January 1, 1963. The amendments made by section 1103 (except subsection (f)) shall not apply in the case of employees or Members retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if these amendments had not been enacted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7927) entitled "An act to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the House bill and the text provided by the Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

The text of the House bill related only to postal rates.

The Senate amendment to the House text consisted of three parts.

Part I of the Senate amendment, consisting of three titles, related to postal rates. Title I of part I covered postal rate increases. Title II of part I contained amendments to the postal policy provisions of the postal laws. Title III of part I contained certain miscellaneous amendments to the postal laws.

Part II of the Senate amendment, consisting of six titles, related to Federal salary reform. Title I of part II contained a statement of policy with respect to Federal salary reform. Title II of part II contained provisions revising the pay system of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Title III of part II revised the compensation schedules of title 39, United States Code, and contained certain related provisions, with respect to postal field service employees. Title IV of part II of the Senate amendment contained salary increases for physicians, dentists, and nurses, and other personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. Title V of part II revised the salary rates for personnel in the Foreign Service under the Department of State prescribed by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. Title VI of part II contains certain miscellaneous salary provisions which, in effect, revise the compensation rates for the following groups of employees: (1) certain scientific and professional employees; (2) agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees; (3) assistant U.S. attorneys; (4) employees in the judicial branch; (5) employees in the legislative branch.

Part III of the Senate amendment contained provisions making adjustments in annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended.

The conference substitute, with the exceptions to be noted, is in general the same as the Senate amendment. Except for technical and minor drafting changes, the differences between the text of the House bill and the conference substitute are discussed below.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

Increased postal revenue

Postal revenue will be increased by $600.3 million per annum when all of the postal rate adjustments provided by part I of the conference substitute are placed in effect. Such increased revenue and the public service policy provisions of the conference substitute will—when adjustment in rates and conditions of mailability of fourth-class mail for which the Postmaster General has petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission (as required by law) shall be approved—eliminate the postal deficit.

Such increased postal revenue provided by part I of the conference substitute is approximately $20 million less than the aggregate annual increased postal revenue of $620 million which would have been provided by the postal rate adjustment bill recommended to the House of Representatives by the Postmaster General and presented for consideration by the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on January 23, 1962.

A table comparing present and proposed postal rates follows:

Comparison of present and proposed postal rates (new revenues based on 1963 volume)

[New revenues based on 1963 volume]

Mail class	Postage rate unit	Present rate	First year (1963)		Second year (1964)		Third year (1965)	
			Rate	New revenues	Rate	New revenues	Rate	New revenues
First class:				*Millions*		*Millions*		*Millions*
Letters	Per ounce	4 cents	5 cents	$409.6	5 cents	$409.6	5 cents	$409.6
Drop letters	do	3 cents	4 cents	1.8	4 cents	1.8	4 cents	1.8
Cards	Per card	3 cents	4 cents	26.4	4 cents	26.4	4 cents	26.4
Total				437.8		437.8		437.8
Airmail:								
Letters	Per ounce	7 cents	8 cents	16.0	8 cents	16.0	8 cents	16.0
Cards	Per card	5 cents	6 cents	.3	6 cents	.3	6 cents	.3
Parcel post	Per pound	By zones[1]	(1) (2)	4.9	(1) (2)	4.9	(1) (2)	4.9
Total				21.2		21.2		21.2
Second class:								
In-county:								
Free mail	Per pound	Free	1 cent (lb.) ⅛ cent (min.)	.9	1 cent (lb.) ⅛ cent (min.)	.9	1¼ cents (lb.) ⅛ cent (min.)	1.5
Pound-rate matter	do	1 cent						
	Minimum per copy	⅛ cent						
Per-copy-rate matter	Per copy	1 cent or 2 cents.	Present rates	.3	Present rates	.3	Present rates	.3
Outside county:								
Regular publications:			3 annual 4-percent increases					
Editorial	Per pound	2½ cents	2.6 cents (lb.)		2.7 cents (lb.)		2.8 cents (lb.)	
Advertising:			3 annual 10-percent increases (adjusted)					
Zones 1 and 2	do	3 cents	3.4 cents (lb.)	6.4	3.8 cents (lb.)	14.2	4.2 cents (lb.)	22.6
Zone 3	do	4 cents	4.4		4.8		5.2	
Zone 4	do	6 cents	6.4		6.8		7.2	
Zone 5	do	8 cents	8.4		8.8		9.2	
Zone 6	do	10 cents	10.4		10.8		11.2	
Zone 7	do	12 cents	12.0		12.0		12.0	
Zone 8	do	14 cents	14.0		14.0		14.0	
	Minimum per copy	½ cent	0.6 cent (min.)[4]		0.8 cent (min.)[4]		1 cent (min.)[4]	
Nonprofit publications	Per pound	1½ cents	1.6 cents (lb.)	.8	1.7 cents (lb.)	.6	1.8 cents (lb.)	.9
	Minimum per copy	⅛ cent	⅛ cent (min.)		⅛ cent (min.)		⅛ cent (min.)	
Classroom publications:								
Editorial	Per pound	1½ cents	60 percent of regular rates	.3		.6		1.0
Advertising:								
Zones 1 and 2	do	1½ cents						
Zone 3	do	2 cents						
Zone 4	do	3 cents						
Zone 5	do	4 cents						
Zone 6	do	5 cents						
Zone 7	do	6 cents						
Zone 8	do	7 cents						
	Minimum per copy	⅛ cent						
Transient rate	First 2 ounces	2 cents	4 cents	1.1	4 cents	1.1	4 cents	1.1
	Each additional ounce	1 cent	1 cent		1 cent		1 cent	

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparison of present and proposed postal rates (new revenues based on 1963 volume)—Continued

[New revenues based on 1963 volume]

Mail class	Postage rate unit	Present rate	First year (1963)		Second year (1964)		Third year (1965)	
			Rate	New revenues	Rate	New revenues	Rate	New revenues
				Millions		*Millions*		*Millions*
Fees:								
Original entry—circulation under 2,000		$25	$30	.03	$30	.03	$30	.03
Original entry—circulation 2,000–5,000		$50	$60		$60		$60	
Original entry—circulation over 5,000		$100	$120		$120		$120	
Reentry		$10	$10		$10		$10	
Additional entry		$10	$15 (zones 3–8, $50)		$15 (zones 3–8, $50)		$50 (zones 3–8, $50)	
News agent registry		$20	$25		$25		$25	
Total				9.3		17.7		27.4
Controlled circulation	Per pound	12 cents	12½ cents	.3	13 cents	.6	13½ cents	1.0
	Minimum per piece	1 cent	1 cent		1 cent		1 cent	
Total				.3		.6		1.0
Third class:								
Single piece	1st 2 ounces	3 cents	4 cents	34.5	4 cents	34.5	4 cents	34.5
	Each additional ounce	1½ cents	2 cents	10.3	2 cents	10.3	2 cents	10.3
Bulk rate:								
Regular:								
Circulars, etc	Per pound	16 cents	18 cents	3.1	18 cents	3.1	18 cents	3.1
	Minimum per piece	2½ cents	2⅝ cents	13.2	2¾ cents	26.3	2⅞ cents	39.5
Books, catalogs, etc	Per pound	10 cents	12 cents	3.9	12 cents	3.9	12 cents	3.9
	Minimum per piece	2½ cents	2⅝ cents	.5	2¾ cents	1.0	2⅞ cents	1.5
Nonprofit:								
Circulars, etc	Per pound	16 cents	9 cents	−1.7	9 cents	−1.7	9 cents	−1.7
	Minimum per piece	1¼ cents	1¼ cents		1¼ cents		1¼ cents	
Books, catalogs, etc	Per pound	10 cents	6 cents		6 cents		6 cents	
	Minimum per piece	1¼ cents	1¼ cents		1¼ cents		1¼ cents	
Bulk mailing fee	Calendar year	$20	$30	2.6	$30	2.6	$30	2.6
Total				66.4		80.0		93.7
Fourth class:								
Educational materials	1st pound	9 cents	9½ cents	.5	10 cents	1.0	10 cents	1.0
	Each additional pound	5 cents	5 cents		5 cents		5 cents	
Library materials	1st pound	4 cents	Present rates		Present rates		Present rates	
	Each additional pound	1 cent						
Total				.5		1.0		1.0
Keys, etc	Each 2 ounces	5 cents	6 cents	.1	6 cents	.1	6 cents	.1
Federal Government mail	Applicable class rates			20.5		21.0		21.0
Permit fees for mailing without stamps		$10	$15	.2	$15	.2	$15	.2
Mail mix adjustment				−3.0		−3.0		−3.0
Total new postal revenues, all classes				553.2		576.5		600.3
Estimated public service allowances				[3]375.0		[3]374.0		[3]373.0

---

[1] Air parcel post law requires payment of not less than 1st-class rates for 1st class sent by air.

[2] Present parcel post schedule plus 8 cents per piece. First-class matter above 8 ounces, 64 cents for first 8 ounces plus 5 cents for each additional ounce or the published parcel post rate if higher.

[3] Consists of total loss on free and reduced rate mail, additional public service on in-county mail, and the amount deemed attributable to third- and fourth-class post offices and rural and star routes.

[4] When number of copies mailed for delivery outside the county is fewer than 5,000, the minimum per copy is ½ cent.

On magazines containing less than 5 percent advertising the minimum charge per copy is 0.55 of a cent during 1963, 0.65 of a cent during 1964, and 0.75 of a cent thereafter.

Salary increases

Part II of the conference substitute places in effect major provisions of the Federal statutory salary reform proposal submitted to the Congress by the President earlier in the current session. The essential requirements of comparability of Federal and private enterprise salary rates, internal alinement of Federal salary schedules, and annual review and adjustment of salaries recommended by the President are provided by part II of the conference substitute. The chief differences between such part of the conference substitute and the President's recommendations are (1) salary adjustments under the conference substitute are in two phases, spaced 15 months apart, instead of three annual phases as recommended by the President, and (2) the three highest grades of the Classification Act of 1949 and the three highest levels of the postal field service schedule receive only one upward adjustment, leaving the final determination of the appropriate salaries for such grades and levels for consideration in the next Congress.

The conference substitute also provides comparable salary adjustments for employees in the judicial branch, agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees, congressional employees, and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action. This is in conformity with the policy adopted by the Congress in all recent salary increase legislation.

The conference substitute provides salary increases which, when all are in effect, will average 11.2 percent for postal field service employees and 9.6 percent for classified employees and certain others.

Cost of salary increases

The annual cost of the salary reform provisions of the conference substitute will be $1.049 billion beginning with the calendar year 1964, when the salary adjustments provided for therein become fully effective. The salary reform legislation recommended by the President would have cost $1.054 billion a year beginning in the calendar year 1965. The annual cost of Federal civilian salary reform provisions contained in H.R. 9531, as reported favorably by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service but not acted upon by the House, would have been $1.469 billion beginning with the calendar year 1964—a difference of $420 million savings under the conference substitute.

Civil service retirement annuities

Part III of the conference substitute—

1. Provides a 5-percent increase, effective January 1, 1963, in all annuities then payable from the civil service retirement fund which commenced on or before that date.

2. Applies the increase on a graduated reduction basis to all annuities which commence in the 4-year period following January 1, 1963, in keeping with the practice followed in the last previous enactment of this kind.

3. Provides that the proper proportion of the increase granted an annuitant will accrue to his survivors.

4. Excludes from the increase annuity amounts purchased by voluntary contributions.

5. Removes the ceilings on increases imposed by certain previous enactments.

6. Provides the future adjustments in the event the calendar year average of the monthly Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics increases not less than 3 percent.

7. Raises from $2,400 to $3,600 the portion of annuity to which the reduction of 2½ percent applies when electing survivorship benefits.

8. Increases the ratio of survivorship benefits from 50 to 55 percent.

9. Reverses present procedure by providing that in the future survivorship benefits will be automatic unless an adverse election is made.

10. Extends the right of membership benefits for children to the end of any school year in which a child attains the age of 21 years so long as the child pursues full-time studies in a school, college, university, or

comparable recognized educational institution. This change is in keeping with provisions of veterans' benefit laws.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TEXT OF THE HOUSE BILL AND THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

Part I.—Postal service

Title I.—Postal Rates

Both the House bill and part I of the conference substitute provide increases in postal rates and certain changes in the public service features of postal policy under chapter 27 of title 39, United States Code.

First-class mail: Section 3 of the House bill and section 101 of the conference substitute both provide for increases in the rate on first-class letter mail from 4 to 5 cents for each ounce or fraction of an ounce, in the rate on drop letters from 3 to 4 cents for each ounce or fraction of an ounce, and in the rate on each post card and each postal card from 3 to 4 cents.

Airmail: The amendments made by section 4 of the House bill increase the postage rates on airmail letters from 7 cents to 8 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof and on airmail postal and post cards from 5 cents to 6 cents. The existing requirement of minimum first-class ounce rates for air parcel post first-class matter is retained, but the existing minimum rate of 3 cents an ounce on such matter is eliminated.

Section 102 of the conference substitute increases the postage rate on airmail letters from 7 to 8 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof, and on airmail postal and post cards from 5 to 6 cents.

In keeping with the increase of 8 cents on airmail weighing 8 ounces, the first pound rate for air parcel post (other than first-class matter) is increased 8 cents. Air parcel post rates for first-class matter will be the regular 8-cents-an-ounce rate for each of the first 8 ounces, and the regular first-class letter rate of 5 cents an ounce for each ounce or fraction thereof over 8 ounces, but in no case less than the air parcel post rate for other matter.

SECOND-CLASS MAIL WITHIN COUNTY OF PUBLICATION

Section 5 of the House bill removes the requirement, in connection with free-in-county mail, that publications must be printed in the county in which published.

Section 103 of the conference substitute eliminates free-in-county mailings and extends to all such within-county mailings for calendar years 1963 and 1964 the existing 1 cent per pound and one-eighth cent minimum charge now applicable to certain categories of within-county mailings. At the start of calendar year 1965, the pound rate would be increased to 1 and one-fourth cents. The minimum charge per piece would remain at one-eighth cent. Existing per-copy rates applicable to publications issued less frequently or more frequently than once a week when mailed for delivery by letter carrier at the office of mailing are left unchanged.

SECOND-CLASS MAIL BEYOND COUNTY OF PUBLICATION

Section 6 of the House bill imposes a piece rate charge of one-half cent effective July 1, 1962, and a piece rate charge of 1 cent effective July 1, 1963, to be paid in addition to existing pound rates.

Section 104(a) of the conference substitute increases second-class pound rates and the minimum charge per piece of publications for delivery outside the county of publication except that the current minimum charge of one-half cent per copy is not changed in the case of publications mailing less than 5,000 copies per issue outside the county of publication. The increase in pound rates on the nonadvertising portion is in three annual increments of 4 percent each year. The increase in pound rates on the advertising portion is in three annual increments of 0.4 cent each. The schedule provides increases after 3 years of 40 percent in zones 1 and 2; 30 percent in zone 3; 20 percent in zone 4; 15 percent in zone 5; and 12 percent in zone 6. The existing rates of 12 cents and 14 cents in zones 7 and 8, respectively, are not changed.

Any issue of a publication the advertising portion of which does not exceed 5 per centum of the entire issue will pay .55 of a cent per piece when mailed after January 6, 1963, and prior to January 1, 1964, .65 of a cent per piece when mailed during calendar year 1964, and .75 of a cent per piece when mailed after December 31, 1964.

Subsection (a) except as noted above also increases the minimum charge on the above publications in annual increments over a 3-year period from one-half cent to six-tenths of a cent, eight-tenths of a cent, and 1 cent respectively.

Subsection (a) also fixes the postage rate on classroom publications at 60 percent of the regular rate. The rate applicable to the total content of publications of qualified nonprofit organizations (advertising and nonadvertising portions alike) is maintained at 1 cent per pound less than the pound rate applicable to the nonadvertising portion of regular publications. This produces a rate for these publications of less than 50 percent of the pound rates described above and the minimum per piece rate is retained at the present one-eighth cent.

Subsection (b) of section 104 extends the nonprofit rate to publications of official State highway agencies which meet all requirements for second-class entry and which contain no advertising. However, only one such publication in any State could be mailed at this rate. Also, the nonprofit rate is extended to associations of rural electric cooperatives.

Subsection (c) repeals existing law to the extent necessary to give effect to the changes in rates discussed above.

Second-class transient mail:

Section 105 of the conference substitute increases the postage rate on the first 2 ounces of transient mail from 2 to 4 cents.

The House bill has no comparable provision relating to transient mail.

Controlled circulation publications:

Section 8 of the House bill increases the rate to be paid by controlled circulation publications from 12 cents a pound to 14 cents a pound.

Section 106 of the conference substitute increases the pound rate on controlled circulation publications from 12 to 12½ cents the first year, to 13 cents the second year, and to 13½ cents thereafter.

Third-class mail:

Section 9 of the House bill provides increases in rates for third-class mail as follows:

(1) The piece rate on single mailings is increased from 3 cents on the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof to 4 cents.

(2) The pound rate on all matter mailed in bulk (except books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants) is increased from 16 to 21 cents. The pound rate on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants is increased from 10 to 18 cents except in the case of mailings by qualified nonprofit organizations which remains at 10 cents. The minimum rate per piece for other than qualified nonprofit organizations is increased from 2½ cents to 3½ cents.

(3) The minimum rate on pieces of odd size is increased from 3½ cents to 4½ cents.

Section 107 of the conference substitute provides increases as follows in rates for third-class mail:

(1) The piece rate on single mailings is increased from 3 cents on the first 2 ounces or fraction thereof and 1½ cents on each additional ounce or fraction thereof to 4 and 2 cents, respectively.

(2) The pound rate on all matter mailed in bulk (except books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions and plants) is increased from 16 to 18 cents. The pound rate on books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions and plants is increased from 10 to 12 cents. The minimum rate per piece in either instance is increased in three annual increments—first to 5⅝ cents, a year later to 2¾ cents, and a year following that to 2⅞ cents.

Section 107 continues in effect the present minimum per piece charges on bulk third-class mailings by qualified nonprofit organizations and provides that the pound rates for such mailings shall be 50 percent of the regular pound rates for bulk third-class mailings as embodied in the conference agreement.

In addition to the foregoing, this section raises the fee for a third-class bulk mailing permit from $20 to $30 and increases the minimum weight requirement from 20 to 50 pounds. This should have been adjusted in 1958 when the weight for third-class mail was increased from 8 to 16 ounces. One of the requirements for the bulk third-class pound rates is that such mail be in quantities of 20 pounds or of not less than 200 pieces. When the weight limit was 8 ounces a minimum of 40 such pieces was necessary, but when the weight limit was raised to 16 ounces only 20 such pieces was necessary to comply with the minimum weight limit. This is entirely too small a number of pieces to justify the bulk pound rate. Thus, in the future, to obtain the bulk third-class rate, it will be necessary to mail a minimum of 50 pounds or 200 pieces.

Fourth-class mail:

Section 108 of the conference substitute restores to the States of Alaska and Hawaii the benefits of certain provisions relating to the maximum size and weight of fourth-class parcels mailed at or for delivery at first-class post offices which they enjoyed prior to their admission as States. Under these provisions, such parcels could be as large as 100 inches in length and girth combined and could weigh as much as 70 pounds. These are the maximums which are already applicable generally to parcels mailed at or for delivery at second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices or rural and star routes, and to parcels mailed at or for delivery at Army, Air Force, or Fleet Post Offices. The conditions which led to the original extension of these maximums to Alaska and Hawaii while in territorial status have not been altered by statehood and those maximums should be restored.

Section 109.—This section provides an increase in fourth-class postage rates on books, films, and similar educational materials from 9 cents for the first pound to 9½ cents during the first year and to 10 cents thereafter. The existing rate of 5 cents on each additional percent will continue wtihout change.

The postage rates on fourth-class library materials would remain at 4 cents on the first pound and 1 cent for each additional pound.

The House bill contains no provisions similar to sections 108 or 109 of the conference substitute.

Fees for second-class entry and registration:

The House bill made no change in fees for second-class mail.

Section 110 of the conference substitute provides increases as follows in second-class mailing fees:

	Existing fee	Proposed fee
Circulation:		
Not over 2,000	$25	$30
2,000 to 5,000	50	60
Over 5,000	100	120
Reentry	10	15
Additional entry	10	[1] 15 [2] 50
News agent	20	25

[1] Zones 1 and 2.
[2] Zones 3 to 8.

Permit fees for mailing without stamps:

Section 111 of the conference substitute increases from $10 to $15 the permit fee for mailing without stamps.

The House bill contains no provisions on this matter.

Fixing of fees by Postmaster General:

Section 112 of the conference substitute gives the Postmaster General the authority to adjust second-class entry and registration fees and permit fees for mailing with printed postage indicia in the future.

The House bill contains no provisions on this matter.

Keys and other small articles: Section 113 of the conference substitute increases from 5 cents for each 2 ounces to 6 cents for each 2 ounces the postage rate on keys and other small articles mailed without the prepayment of postage. The House bill contains no such provisions.

Method of determining gross receipts:

Section 11 of the House bill and section 114 of the conference substitute both provide that increased revenues derived from the rate increases shall be excluded in determining compensation and allowances of postmasters and other employees and classes of post offices.

This is similar to the provision contained in the 1958 Postal Increase Act.

Qualifications of postmasters:

Section 115 of the conference substitute requires the Civil Service Commission, in evaluating the qualifications of applicants for positions of postmaster, to give appropriate consideration to experience in the postal field service.

The House bill contains no provisions on this matter.

Title II—Postal Policy

Section 2 of the House bill revises and strengthens the statement of congressional policy with respect to postal rates and fees originally enacted as the Postal Policy Act of 1958 and now contained in chapter 27 of title 39, United States Code.

Subsection (a) clarifies and strengthens the language of such policy with respect to the determination of postal expenses attributable to the performance of public service by the Postal Establishment.

Subsection (b) makes several important changes in the existing provisions of law with respect to identification of public services rendered by the Postal Establishment and the determination of the costs of such public services which shall be excluded from postal expenses for purposes of fixing postal rates and fees.

The first such change (sec. 2(b) (1) and (2)) provides that "the estimated calculated loss" from operation of third- and fourth-class post offices, star routes, and rural routes shall be held and considered to be an item of public service rendered by the Postal Establishment. Under present law, the "loss" on star routes and third- and fourth-class post offices is designated as an item of public service.

The second such change (sec. 2(b)(3)) supplies a needed clear definition of the terms "loss" and "total loss" as applied to revenues and expenses of the public service items specified in the law—a definition which was not included in the Postal Policy Act of 1958. This definitive language, coupled with the remaining provisions of section 2 of the bill, will provide standards and guidelines which are necessary for the Postmaster General to determine the amount of public service charges to be excluded from postal expenses each year for purposes of considering the need for adjustments in postal rates and fees.

The amendment made by section 2(c) requires the Postmaster General, on or before February 1 of each year beginning with the year 1962, to report to the Congress the amount by which costs of the public service items set forth in the postal policy provisions exceed revenues from such public service items and specifies, further, that the amount so determined and reported shall be excluded from the total cost of postal operations for purposes of adjustment of postal rates and fees. The last sentence of the amendment requires that the amount so determined and reported (and thus excluded from total operating costs for rate and fee purposes) shall be not less than 7½ percent of the total current budget of the Post Office Department.

The amendment made by section 2(d) is a technical amendment which conforms the table of contents of the appropriate chapter of title 39, United States Code, with the amendments made by the remainder of section 2 of the bill.

Section 201 of the conference substitute makes changes necessary to clarify and strengthen the statement of congressional policy with respect to postal rates and fees contained in chapter 27 of title 39, United States Code. Further, certain technical changes are made necessary by the elimination of free-in-county mailing under section 104. This section resolves a problem of long standing by providing a formula for use in determining the amount that shall be considered public service costs in the operation of star and rural routes and third- and fourth-class post offices. The conference substitute provides that 10 percent of the gross cost of the operation of third-class post offices and the star route system, and 20 percent of the gross cost of the operation of fourth-class post offices and rural routes shall be attributable to public service.

Title III—Miscellaneous

Eligibility of certain organizations for second-class entry:

Section 301 of the conference substitute adds publications of State industrial development agencies and public or nonprofit elementary and secondary schools to the list of those entitled to second-class entry without the necessity of having a bona fide list of regular subscribers.

The House bill contains no provisions on this matter.

Educational materials:

Section 10 of the House bill makes certain technical changes in the preferential educational and library material rate listings to reflect the substantive changes made by Public Law 86-644, approved July 14, 1960. The subsection also supplies corrective language to clarify the purpose and intent of that part of section 4554(c) of title 39, United States Code, which extends the preferential library materials rates to scientific or mathematical kits, instruments, and devices, and catalogs and guides or scripts relating to their use. The existing preferential rates of 9 cents a pound for the first pound or fraction thereof and 5 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof on educational materials and 4 cents a pound for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent a pound for each additional pound or fraction thereof on library materials are retained.

Section 302 of the conference substitute provides corrective language to clarify the purpose and intent of that part of section 4554(c) of title 39 relating to the inclusion of guides, scripts, and catalogs with scientific or mathematical kits, instruments, or devices and sound recordings.

The conference substitute adds looseleaf pages, and binders therefor, consisting of medical information for distribution to doctors, hospitals, medical schools, and medical students to the educational materials category.

Reading matter and other materials for blind persons:

Section 303 of the conference substitute revises sections 4653 and 4654 of title 39, United States Code, which relate to the mailing of reading and other materials for the use of blind persons. The changes made in these sections are designed to accomplish the following:

(1) Existing law permits the free mailing to blind persons of books with raised type and recordings. This section would add books printed in sightsaving size type to this category. It would also make clear that the term "recordings" includes sound tapes.

(2) Under present law public libraries and public institutions for the blind may mail free of postage books being loaned to blind persons. This section extends this privilege to any nonprofit organizations which lends books to the blind.

(3) Extends the same free mailing treatment to reading materials mailed to nonprofit organizations for the use of blind persons as when sent directly to the blind persons.

(4) Existing law permits magazines furnished to blind persons at cost to be mailed at the rate of 1 cent a pound. This section extends that rate to other reading materials furnished to blind persons at cost. It also makes it applicable where the materials are sent to nonprofit organizations for the use of blind persons.

(5) Under present law sound reproduction devices owned by the United States which have been loaned to blind persons may be returned by those persons for repair at a postage rate of 1 cent a pound. The Postmaster General has authority to extend this rate to reproducers owned by States, public libraries, nonprofit agencies, and blind persons themselves. This section would eliminate the 1-cent-a-pound charge and permit free mailing of these devices. It also authorizes the Postmaster General, in his discretion, to extend free mailing privilege to the sending by State agencies, public libraries, private nonprofit agencies for the blind, and blind persons themselves, of paper, records, tapes, and other materials owned by them for use by the recipients for the production of reading matter in raised characters or sight saving size type, or in the form of recordings, for the use of blind persons. The House bill has no similar provision.

Repeals and technical amendments:

Section 9(c) of the House bill and section 304 of the conference substitute repeal section 3 of the act of October 30, 1956 (Public Law 86-56). Also, paragraph (3) of the conference substitute repeals the following substantive provisions of law:

(1) Section 4361 of title 39, which authorizes publishers to mail proofs of advertisements at second-class zone rates applicable to advertising portions.

(2) Section 4652 of title 39, which permits public mailing of the Congressional Record

from the District of Columbia at the rate of 1 cent per copy.

Communist political propaganda:

Section 12 of the House-passed bill contains a provision which would amend section 505 of title 39, United States Code (international postal arrangements) for the purpose of excluding Communist political propaganda from the U.S. mails.

This section in the House bill also contains provisions designed to accomplish this purpose with respect to mail originating within the United States as well as mail originating outside the United States. Under these provisions mail matter determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda which is financed or sponsored by a Communist-controlled government is nonmailable within the United States, except as fourth-class mail.

During extensive hearings on section 12 of H.R. 7927, widely divergent views were expressed as to the need for such a provision and the form any such provision should take. Following extended deliberations in executive session, the committee has agreed upon what it considers to be an appropriate substitute which meets many of the objections expressed during the hearings, and which is designed to provide a workable solution to the problem of Communist political propaganda arriving for distribution in the United States.

Section 305 of the conference substitute consist of a modification of S. 2740, introduced by Senator BUSH on January 25, 1962, which would have had the effect of reinstating the program of screening Communist political propaganda substantially as that program was conducted prior to March 17, 1961.

Section 305 of the conference substitute provides for a program under which, with certain exceptions, Communist political propaganda coming into the United States from foreign countries would be intercepted and would be delivered only upon the request of the addressee within a reasonable time, which shall not exceed 60 days.

Section 305 specifically provides that mail matter, except sealed letters, originating in a foreign country and which is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be Communist political propaganda, shall be detained by the Postmaster General upon its arrival for delivery in the United States, or upon its subsequent deposit in the U.S. domestic mails, and the addressee shall be notified that such matter has been received. Such detention would not be required in the case of any matter which is otherwise ascertained by the Postmaster General to be desired by the addressee.

Exempted would be matter addressed to Government agencies, to libraries, or to colleges, universities, graduate schools, scientific or professional institutions for advanced studies, or any individual connected therewith. Likewise, material addressed for delivery in the United States pursuant to a reciprocal international agreement under which the U.S. Government mails an equal amount of material for delivery in a Communist country, would be exempted.

In order to furnish guidelines to the Secretary of the Treasury as to what constitutes Communist political propaganda, the entire definition of political propaganda contained in the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1948 is incorporated by reference and related to matter issued by or on behalf of any country from which tariff concessions have been withdrawn under section 5 of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951 or section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, or which is denied assistance under section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

Effective date: Section 13 of the House bill provides an effective date of July 1, 1962. Section 306 of the conference substitute provides that, except as otherwise provided, the provisions of Part I—Postal Service shall become effective January 7, 1963.

Obscene matter distributed by mail:

The House bill has no provisions on this subject.

Section 307 of the conference substitute authorizes the Postmaster General to detain and dispose of mail containing obscene, lewd, lascivious, or indecent matter.

PART II—FEDERAL SALARY REFORM

Part II of the conference substitute relates to Federal salary reform.

Title I—General Policy

Title I of part II contains a statement of Federal salary policy.

Section 501 provides that part II may be cited as the "Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962."

Section 502 sets forth the policy of the Congress that pay of Federal civilian personnel shall be established upon the principles of equal pay for substantially equal work with pay distinctions maintained in keeping with work and performance distinctions; and that Federal salaries shall be comparable with salaries in private enterprise for the same levels of work.

Section 503, pertaining to the implementation of the above policy, provides that the President shall have prepared and submitted to him an annual report comparing salary rates paid to Federal employees with rates paid for the same levels of work in private industry as determined through annual surveys of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. After seeking the views of employee organizations the President shall make an annual report to the Congress containing the comparison of Federal and private enterprise salary rates and such recommendations for revision of statutory salary schedules, salary structure, and compensation policy as he deems advisable.

In further implementation of the stated salary policy, section 504 provides that whenever the President or his designee finds that the salary rates in private enterprise for an occupation in any particular location are so substantially above the salary rates of Federal statutory pay schedules as to handicap significantly the Government in recruiting and retaining well-qualified persons in positions under the pay systems of the executive branch covered by the conference substitute, the President, or his designee, may establish for such location higher minimum rates of basic compensation. Corresponding increases may be made in all step rates in the salary range for the applicable grade or level; however, the minimum salary rate established under this authority may not exceed the seventh compensation rate prescribed by law for the grade or level involved. The President may authorize the exercise of the authority conferred upon him by this section by the Civil Service Commission or, in the case of employees not subject to the civil service laws and regulations, by such other agency as he may designate.

Section 504 also provides that such rates may be revised from time to time and that such actions or revisions shall have the force and effect of law.

Section 504 further provides that any increase in basic compensation established under this section shall not be regarded as an "equivalent increase" in compensation within the meaning of section 701(a) of the Classification Act of 1949, or section 3552 of title 39, United States Code.

Policies, rules, and regulations of the President: Section 505 further implements the salary policy by authorizing the President to prescribe policies, rules, and standards in order to carry out the policy and purpose of the conference substitute with respect to the several Federal salary systems covered by the conference substitute and in order to provide adequate supervision and control by the President over the functions, duties, and regulations of the respective authorities in the executive branch in connection with the administration and operation of the four major salary systems and the provisions of this title.

Title II—Pay System of the Classification Act of 1949

Title II of part II of the conference substitute pertains to the pay system of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Section 601 provides that title II may be cited as the "Classification Act Amendments of 1962."

Section 602 contains the compensation schedules for the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the salary conversion rules for the two phases of the salary adjustment plan which would become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment (first phase) and on January 1, 1964 (second phase).

Section 602(a) prescribes the compensation schedules. The schedule contains 10 regular steps in lieu of 7 scheduled and 3 longevity rates currently provided for GS–1 through GS–10; 9 rates for GS–11 through GS–14 in lieu of 6 scheduled and 3 longevity rates; 8 rates for GS–15 in lieu of 5 scheduled and 3 longevities; and 5 rates for GS–16 and GS–17 in lieu of the 5 rates currently provided by the Classification Act. Grade GS–18 continues to have a single rate. Because the number of regular step rates is increased, the current provisions for longevity step increases in title VII of the Classification Act of 1949 are no longer needed and are repealed in subsequent sections of the conference substitute.

Section 602(b) specifies the rules adjusting existing pay rates to the rates of the new schedules. Employees generally are to retain the same relative place within the new grade range as they had within their former grade range.

Paragraph (10) of section 602(b) provides that service immediately preceding the effective date shall be counted toward not to exceed one step increase under the time in grade provisions of section 701(a) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended by the conference substitute.

Paragraph (11) of section 602(b) applies to each officer or employee who is receiving immediately prior to the effective date of section 602, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2(b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation, determined under section 208(b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, and by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960. Such officer or employee will receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (1) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under the savings provisions of section 208(b) of the act of September 1, 1954, referred to above, and (2) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, and (3) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958, and (4) the amount of the increase provided by section 112 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960, and (5) the amount of the increase made by section 602 under compensation schedule I in the maximum rate of his grade. This rate will remain in effect for such officer or employee until he leaves his position or until he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the amendment or any other law. However, when the position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any later appointee thereto will be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Paragraph (11) of section 602(b) also contains a provision to the effect that, subject to the possibility that any such officer or employee may leave his position or may become entitled to aggregate compensation at a higher rate, the amount of the increase provided by section 602 is to be held and considered, for the savings purposes of section 208(b) of the act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of the officer or employee.

Step increases:

Section 603 amends title VII, "Step Increases" of the Classification Act of 1949. Title VII currently provides two types of step increases: (1) Periodic step increases under section 701, and (2) longevity step increases beyond the scheduled maximum rate of the grade under section 703. As amended by the conference substitute, title VII provides for (1) periodic step increases, and (2) additional step increases to be granted in recognition of high quality performance.

Section 701 now provides periodic step increases, for employees below the maximum rate of the grade, for each 52 calendar weeks of service if the amount of the step increase is less than $200, or 78 weeks of service if the employee's position is in a grade in which the step increase is $200 or more. As amended, section 701(a) provides for periodic increases at all grades following the completion of (1) 52 calendar weeks of service in salary rates 1, 2, and 3, (2) 104 calendar weeks of service in salary rates 4, 5, and 6, and (3) each 156 calendar weeks of service in salary rates 7, 8, and 9.

Paragraphs (A) and (C) of section 701(a) which relate to eligibility for step increases are in existing law. Paragraph (B) requires, as a prerequisite to within-grade advancement, that the employee's work is of an acceptable level of competence in contrast with the present wording that the employee has a current performance rating of "satisfactory" or better.

Subsection (b) of the revised section 701 is present law.

The new section 702 of the Classification Act of 1949 in the conference substitute authorizes, in subsection (a), additional step increases in recognition of high quality performance above that ordinarily found in the type of position concerned. Such additional step increases could be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission and, under subsection (b), would be limited to not more than one within any period of 52 weeks.

Current provisions of sections 703 and 704 of the Classification Act of 1949, relating to longevity step increases, are no longer needed since these steps have been included in the regular rate range for the respective grades. The provisions are therefore repealed. Section 703 of the amended title VII which is already in existing law (as sec. 705) provides that title VII shall not apply to persons appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Title VII currently does not have a section 702.

General compensation rules:

Section 604(a) revises section 802(b) of the Classification Act of 1949 to provide that when an employee is promoted to a position in a higher grade he shall receive basic compensation at the lowest rate of the higher grade which exceeds his existing rate by not less than two step increases of the grade from which promoted. This subsection also specifices the action to be taken if there is no rate in the higher grade two step increases above the employee's existing rate, or if he is receiving a rate saved under section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949 on reduction in grade. Existing law provides only a one-step increase upon promotion or transfer to a higher grade. A similar proposal is included in H.R. 1010 which passed the House of Representatives on August 22, 1961.

Section 604(b) adds a new subsection (d) to section 802 of the Classification Act of 1949. There is no present authority for saving the basic compensation of an employee who, together with his position, is brought under the Classification Act from some other Federal pay system (such as the wage board system), if his salary rate is in excess of the maximum rate of the classification grade in which his position is placed. The new subsection would authorize the Civil Service Commission to issue regulations to permit the retention of salary in such instances. It includes special provision applicable in case of subsequent demotion in grade.

Section 604(c) substitutes a new section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949. Because of the more comprehensive provisions in section 504 of title I, part II, of the conference substitute, the present provisions of section 803, authorizing advanced entrance rates of the grades for appointments in shortage occupations, are unnecessary and therefore are being deleted. Section 803, as amended, provides that under regulations of the Civil Service Commission, any employee under the Classification Act who regularly has responsibility for supervision, including technical supervision, over wage board employees may be paid a rate for his grade above the highest rate paid to any such prevailing rate employee.

Salary retention:

Section 605 amends section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949 which provides for the retention of salary when an employee is demoted to a lower grade. The amendment in paragraph (1) extends application of the provisions of section 507 to employees in all grades of the Classification Act of 1949 by omitting the language of existing law which excludes application of the benefits to employees in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18. The amendment in paragraph (2) strikes out "B in the same grade or in the same or higher grades;" in paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of such section 507 and inserts in lieu thereof "(B) in any grade or grades higher than the grade to which demoted;". This change in language will permit salary retention not now permitted under section 507 where there may have been a series of promotions followed by a demotion or a series of demotions.

Increase in number of top grade positions under the Classification Act of 1949:

Section 606 amends section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949. Subsection (a) increases from 1,989 to 2,400 the limitation on the number of positions the Civil Service Commission, under section 505(b) of the Classification Act, may authorize to be placed in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule, and excludes from this limitation engineering research and development positions and positions in the physical sciences, natural sciences, and medicine. Subsection (b) excludes these same types of positions from the number of positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 now authorized for the Department of Defense in section 505(j) of the Classification Act.

Section 606(c) authorizes the Attorney General to place a total of 10 positions of warden in the Bureau of Prisons in grade 16 of the general schedule. This increases by four the number of such positions which may be assigned to GS-16. This subsection also authorizes the Attorney General to place a total of eight positions of member of the Board of Parole in grade 17 of the general schedule. Presently only one such position is in grade GS-17 and the other seven are in grade GS-18.

Section 607 repeals certain provisions of law authorizing (1) incumbency allocations to top Classification Act grades, and (2) certain positions to be placed in top grades of the act or to have an equivalent salary.

Section 608(a) provides that each position covered by a repeal provision in section 607 shall be placed in the appropriate grade of the general schedule of the Classification Act, in accordance with the provisions of that act.

Section 608(b) provides that positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule immediately prior to the effective date shall remain in such grades until appropriate action is taken under section 505 of the Classification Act.

Savings provision:

Section 609 contains the usual salary savings provisions.

EFFECTIVE DATES

Section 610 provides that except as otherwise expressly provided the provisions of title II of part II shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment.

Title III—Postal Field Service Employees

Section 701 cites this title as the "Postal Employees Salary Adjustment Act of 1962."

Employees under the Postal Field Service schedule:

Section 702 provides two postal field service schedules. Schedule I would be effective the first pay period after enactment and schedule II, the first pay period after January 1, 1964. The salary schedules for the postal field service follow the pattern established for other statutory pay systems in that they are based on the principle of industry comparability for levels of work.

The structure of the proposed schedules is generally similar to that of the Classification Act of 1949. It replaces both annual salary steps in the present PFS schedule and longevity rates which is accomplished by the addition of step increases to the PFS schedule.

Employees under the rural carrier schedule:

Section 703(a) establishes two new schedules for determining rural carrier pay, the first effective on the first pay period after enactment and the second on the first pay period after January 1, 1964. It also combines the present salary steps and longevity steps into a single 12-step schedule.

Pay rates for the RCS schedule were determined by adding the amount of increase provided for PFS-4, step 7, to the present step 7 rate for the 42-mile route, and adjusting other rates for that route to the corresponding rates for PFS-4.

Section 703(b) amends section 3543(c) of title 39, United States Code, which authorizes payment of additional compensation to rural carriers on heavily patronized routes, by eliminating the existing provision permitting such payment only if the route does not exceed 61 miles in length, as well as the provision limiting the additional compensation to an amount which when added to the basic salary for the maximum step for the route would equal the basic salary for the maximum step for a 61-mile route.

Section 703(c) amends section 3543(f) of title 39, United States Code, to increase the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers from 10 cents to 12 cents a mile or from $3.50 to $4.20 a day, whichever is greater.

Section 703(d) changes the method of compensating substitute rural carriers. Under the present system these carriers are paid at the rate of the carrier in whose absence they are serving. Under the new provisions, substitute carriers will be paid on the basis of their own service in the same manner as regular carriers.

Postmasters under the fourth-class office schedule:

Section 704 amends section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, the code to provide two new compensation schedules for postmasters in fourth-class post offices, one effective the first pay period after enactment and the other effective the first pay period after January 1, 1964.

The proposed schedules continue to relate compensation to receipts categories. The first schedule provides an increase of 10 percent above current salary rates. The second schedule adds another 5 percent or a total of 15 percent over existing rates. Subsection (b) extends to postmasters of the third- and fourth-class salary restoration rights now enjoyed by other postal employees.

Automatic advancement by step increases:

Section 705 amends 39 U.S.C. 3552, which relates to advancement of employees by step increases.

Under subsection (a), 39 U.S.C. 3552, the schedule of advancement is established. The present schedule of advancement provides for increases based on 52 weeks of service in a step until the highest step in the level is reached. In levels PFS–1 through PFS–6 this form of advancement is continued for the first six increases; the next five increases are attained after a 156-week waiting period for each. In all levels above PFS–6, under the new schedule, the employee will be advanced to steps 2, 3, and 4, on the basis of 52 weeks of service in each step, to steps 5, 6, and 7, on the basis of 104 weeks of service, and to steps 8 and above, on the basis of 156 weeks of service. The conference substitute does not continue the limitation on the advancement of substitutes assigned to road duty. It has been the practice of the Post Office Department to credit service by such a substitute in step 4, PFS–5, and, upon placement in a position not subject to the limitation, the employee would be advanced in step in the new position on the basis of such service, if otherwise proper. The removal of such limitation will permit these substitute employees who were not advanced beyond step 4 of salary level PFS–5 by reason of the limitation, to be given credit for all their service in step 4 and given the appropriate step increases at the time of conversion.

Subsection (b), 39 U.S.C. 3552, codifies and makes permanent a provision of law common to salary increase legislation affecting postal employees. In effect, it provides that statutory increases in basic compensation are not equivalent increases for purposes of determining eligibility for advancement under subsection (a).

Subsection (c), 39 U.S.C. 3552, reenacts the last sentence of 39 U.S.C. 3552 (a) as a separate subsection.

The current provisions of 39 U.S.C. 3552 (b) are, in effect, repealed by this amendment. Under present service conditons, withholding of advancement by step increases from substitutes in PFS–5 assigned to road duty cannot be justified.

Temporary employees: Section 706 amends 39 U.S.C. 3554 by deleting the phrase "under the postal field service schedule" and inserting in its place the phrase "in the postal field service." The purpose of this change is to permit the payment of compensation to temporary rural carriers serving under limited appointments in the same manner as to other postal field service employees. In effect, this change will continue the present method of compensation of these carriers.

Promotions: Section 707 amends 39 U.S.C. 3559 in its entirety. The present method of promotion guarantees to each employee a minimum increase equivalent to the difference betwen step 1 of the level from which promoted and step 1 of the level immediately above. The new provision will guarantee to each employee promoted to a higher level a minimum increase equivalent to two step increases of the level from which promoted; if the employee is promoted to a level more than two levels above the level of his position, he will receive a minimum increase equivalent to three step increases.

Rural routes: The purpose of section 708 is to remove the limitation on the present authority of the Postmaster General with respect to the establishment or extension of star routes in areas previously served by rural routes. Under present law such substitution may not be made if a qualified rural carrier can be obtained. This change will permit the Postmaster General to exercise administrative discretion in the selection of the more efficient or economical service.

Miscellaneous provisions:

The new salary plan abolishes longevity steps and provides for recognition of long service through addition of within-grade steps. Therefore, the distinction made in sections 3101(5) and 3101(6) of title 39, between basic salary and basic compensation, is no longer valid and section 709 eliminates this distinction.

Section 710 amends 39 U.S.C. 3541 to provide a method for determining the daily rate of compensation of substitute rural carriers. By using a factor of 304, the number of days of service on a rural route in a year, holiday pay is prorated throughout the year against the actual service of the substitute rural carrier. In this respect, pay treatment of these employees will be consistent with that afforded other substitute employees.

Conversion rules:

Section 711 provides the rules for the conversion of existing salaries to the new pay schedules which would become effective on the first day of the first pay period after enactment. The conversion method generally will place each employee in the numerical step which he attains immediately prior to the effective date of the new pay plan, plus an additional numerical step for each longevity step attained immediately prior to conversion.

Credit is preserved toward the next within-grade or automatic step increase earned by employees prior to conversion if they were not given an additional step increase by reason of longevity steps attained prior to conversion. Such credit will be applied toward fulfillment of the requirements of the new advancement schedule. No credit earned toward longevity steps will be carried over. No employee's salary will be reduced on conversion.

In addition, to provide a greater salary increase for present employees, each employee in levels PFS–1 through PFS–4 or under the rural carrier schedule will be advanced one extra step on conversion.

Section 712 provides for the conversion of employees to the schedules to become effective in January 1964 according to the numerical step attained immediately prior to the date of conversion. Where existing compensation exceeds the rate for the numerical step, the existing compensation is retained if conversion cannot be made to a scheduled step.

Section 713 amends section 3560 of title 39, United States Code, as added by section 201 of the act of September 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 569, Public Law 87–270), which provides, among other things, that employees in protected rates will be given statutory increases applicable to the salary standing from which reduced. The purpose of section 713 is to make clear that, inasmuch as the new salary plan involves basic structural changes for employees now under the PFS, RCS, and FOS schedules, this particular feature of 39 U.S.C. 3560 cannot be given application at the time of conversion to the new schedules. Salaries of employees in protected rates as of the date of conversion will be converted under sections 711 and 712 of the conference substitute, as appropriate.

Basic salary in cases of assignments of postal employees: Section 714 amends section 3335(b) of title 39, United States Code, so as to clarify the intent of Congress with respect to the authority of the Postmaster General to authorize higher level compensation. This amendment is required to remove objections of the Comptroller General, as stated in his decision of February 1, 1962 (B–138999), to the Department's application of the present statutory provision and to validate payments that have been made.

Salary protection:

Section 715 extends existing salary protection provisions to all levels of the postal field service schedule and clarifies their application to certain situations.

Section 716 contains a new compensation rule which will permit the Postmaster General to make exceptions to the schedule of automatic advancement provided in 39 U.S.C. 3552 in recognition of exceptional competence. This provision will require implementation by regulations to be issued by the Postmaster General.

Top grade positions and Whitten amendment:

Section 717 removes PFS–17 from the controlled position group and grants the postal field service a 10-percent exemption under the Whitten amendment.

Section 718 contains two conforming changes to the table of contents of title 39, United States Code.

Repeals: Section 719 repeals those provisions of Public Law 86–568 which contained salary increases for postal field service employees, effective July 9, 1960. It also repeals 39 U.S.C. 3558, which provides for the present system of longevity compensation; the new pay schedules supersede the longevity system in its entirety.

EFFECTIVE DATES

Section 720 specifies the effective dates of the various sections in title III.

Title IV—Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration

Title IV relates to physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration who are subject to a separate pay system prescribed by chapter 73 of title 38, United Stats Code. The revisions made by this title not only take into account the Bureau of Labor Statistics findings but also reflect the results of extensive studies of the Veterans' Administration concerning the need for a modernization of the entire grade and salary structure of the Department of Medicine and Surgery to recognize the numerous organizational and functional changes which have taken place in the Department since its inception in 1946.

In recognition of the nature of their occupations and the variability of assignments in a clinical setting, the grade and salary of physicians, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery are determined on the basis of an individual's qualifications and professional attainment. Notwithstanding this fact, comparison of the qualification and skill requirements for like occupations under the Classification Act corroborate extension to the Department of Medicine and Surgery schedules in the manner indicated in the conference substitute bill of the salary scale proposed for the Classification Act system. Appropriate differentiation in pay between recognized skill levels as well as executive and managerial levels is maintained. Internal relationships of pay between the D.M. & S. system and the Classification Act system are also continued.

Section 801 amends section 4103 of title 38 of the United States Code. It reduces the maximum number of Assistant Chief Medical Directors from eight to five and modifies the provisions pertaining to directors of service and chiefs of division. In lieu of these positions, a new position level of Medical Directors is established. The salaries of the Assistant Chief Medical Directors, the Director of Nursing Service, the Chief Pharmacist, and Chief Dietitian are appropriately adjusted in line with other increases proposed by the conference substitute. The statutory positions of the Deputy Director of Nursing Service, Chief Physical Therapist, and Chief Occupational Therapist are eliminated. The duties of the first-named position will be filled by a nurse of the Assistant Director grade. The salaries for the positions of Chief Physical Therapist and Chief Occupational Therapist will be set in the future under the Classification Act of 1949.

Section 802 amends section 4107 of title 38, United States Code. In subsection (a) of section 4107, the former schedules entitled "Medical Service" and "Dental Service" have been combined and retitled "Physician and Dentist Schedule." The existing schedules have provided identical grades and pay scales and their continued separation serves no purpose. The junior grade of the former schedules has been eliminated, and two new grades—the director grade and executive grade—have been established. The schedule now titled "Nursing Service" has been retitled "Nurse Schedule." Two new grades—the assistant director grade and chief grade—have been established, and the former grades of assistant director and senior grade have been retitled "Senior grade" and "Intermediate grade," respectively.

The amendment also provides the pay scales for the physician and dentist schedule and the nurse schedule to be effective on the first day of the first pay period after enactment and after January 1, 1964.

The amendment of section 4107 of title 38 of the United States Code specifies the intended use of the two new grades—director and executive—in the physician and dentist schedule.

Section 803, which amends section 4108 of title 38 of the United States Code, repeals the present provision providing for an allowance equal to 15 percent of the pay of persons rated as medical, surgical, or dental specialists under the provisions of that section, since the latitude which will be afforded within the pay range of each grade will permit appropriate recognition of specially qualified individuals. The current subsection (b) of 4107 of title 38, without change, has been redesignated as section 4108 for purpose of greater clarity and as a matter of drafting convenience.

Subsection (b) of section 803 is a perfecting amendment to the table of contents at the head of chapter 73 of title 38, to reflect the change in the catchline of section 4108.

Section 804 amends section 4111(b) of title 38 to provide that the per annum salary rate of a director of a hospital, domiciliary, or center who is not a physician in the medical service shall not be less than the rate of salary he would receive if such service as a director had been as a physician in the director grade. Except with respect to change in rate of salary, the subsection does not affect the allocation of any such position to any grade of the Classification Act or the application of the Performance Rating Act of 1950 to any individual.

Section 805 provides that title IV shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period after enactment except as otherwise expressly provided.

Title V—The Foreign Service Act of 1946

Section 901 provides that title V may be cited as the "Foreign Service Salary Reform Act of 1962."

Section 902 amends section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 by adjusting upward the per annum salary rates for the eight classes of Foreign Service officers. No change is made in the number of classes and, with the exception of class I, which has two salary rates, the general pattern of seven rates for each class is continued. As in other sections of this title, the schedules of per annum salary rates, provided by this section, are to be effective in two phases at the beginning of the first pay period after enactment and after January 1, 1964.

Section 903 amends section 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 by revising the structure of the Foreign Service Staff salary schedule and embodying certain changes directly comparable to those made in the revision of the Classification Act of 1949.

There are at present 22 classes in the Foreign Service Staff schedule. The proposed schedule of 10 classes would eliminate the unnecessary and seldom-used classes in the current schedule. Since custodial, maintenance, and the most routine clerical functions are performed almost exclusively by alien employees at Foreign Service posts, there is little need for U.S. citizen employees at the level of duties represented by classes 14 through 22. Since classes 14 through 22 are to be abolished, it will be necessary to give the Secretary the authority contained in proposed section 415(b) in order that persons in such classes may continue to be employed at appropriate rates. The new section 415(b) would give the Department all needed flexibility in this respect, should it be desirable in unusual circumstances, to employ American personnel at lower rates for duties less difficult than those of FSS–10. Within the proposed Foreign Service Staff salary schedule, 10 salary rates are proposed for the lower 6 classes, and 9 for the upper 4. This conforms with Classification Act of 1949 salary ranges proposed at similar salary levels. Section 903 prescribes two schedules of per annum salaries for staff officers and employees to be effective the first pay period after enactment and after January 1, 1964.

Section 904 provides for the conversion of Foreign Service personnel from their present salary rates to those established by the conference substitute.

Section 905 repeals section 642(b) of the Foreign Service Act relating to longevity step increases for Foreign Service staff officers and employees and makes minor conforming changes in the heading and identification of the section in the Foreign Service Act. Since the new Foreign Service staff schedule provides 9 or 10 rates for within-class increases, this section is no longer needed.

Section 906 provides that, except as otherwise expressly provided, title V shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period after enactment.

Title VI—Miscellaneous Salary Provisions

Section 1001 increases the salary limitations for certain scientific, professional, and other positions to accord with the salary ranges of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949. In most cases the salary range stated in the laws which are amended has a $19,000 maximum. The amendments proposed would tie the maximum to grade 18 of the general schedule.

Subsection (a) of section 1001 revises the salary range in section 2(b) of Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended, from $12,500–$19,000, to a range from the minimum salary of grade GS–16 to the highest rate of grade GS–18, and authorizes eight such positions in the Library of Congress.

Subsection (b) amends section 1581(b) of title 10 of the United States Code, relating to certain scientific or professional positions in the Department of Defense, to provide a minimum rate for such positions as the minimum rate of GS–16 and a maximum rate equivalent to GS–18 pay.

Subsection (c) extends the new range to positions now paid at $12,500 to $19,000 in the National Security Agency.

Subsection (d) amends the proviso in the first sentence of section 208(g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, which relates to compensation rates of certain scientific, professional, and administrative personnel in the Public Health Service to provide a minimum rate of grade GS–16 and a maximum at the pay of grade GS–18.

Subsection (e) establishes a maximum rate, equivalent to the pay of grade GS–18 for five positions of technical experts in the Department of Agriculture engaged in research in foot-and-mouth and other animal diseases.

Subsection (f) amends section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide that the Administrator may fix the rates for certain excepted positions at not to exceed the pay of grade GS–18 of the Classification Act of 1949. Thirty of these positions may continue to be paid up to $21,000.

Subsection (g) amends the proviso in section 161(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to permit the fixing of salaries of scientific and technical personnel up to a limit of the pay of grade GS–18 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949. The present limit is $19,000.

Subsection (h) substitutes the GS–18 rate in place of $19,500 as the top salary for 23 positions in the Federal Aviation Agency.

Subsection (i) authorizes use of Foreign Service salary rates for paying the U.S. representatives and alternate on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization in place of present maximum salaries of $12,000 and $10,000.

Subsection (j) sets the GS–18 rate as the maximum salary for certain positions established under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, not authorized to be paid up to $1,000 more than the rate of GS–18.

Subsection (k) fixes the GS–18 salary as the maximum rate for certain positions under the Foreign Assistance Act which may now be paid up to $19,000 a year.

Subsection (l) fixes the GS–18 salary rate as the top salary for certain Peace Corps positions now paying up to $19,000 a year.

Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees: Section 1002 extends to agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees the salary increases provided by the conference substitute for corresponding Classification Act of 1949 salary levels.

Assistant U.S. attorneys: Section 1003 raises from $15,000 to $17,500 the maximum amount which can be paid to assistant U.S. attorneys and provides for an increase of 7½ percent in their existing rates of compensation.

Employees in the judicial branch: Section 1004 authorizes, for employees of the judicial branch, salary increases corresponding to those proposed in the statutory salary systems in the executive branch.

Officers and employees in the legislative branch: Section 1005(a) provides an increase of 7 percent to officers and employees in or under the legislative branch.

Subsection (b) provides for the automatic adjustment, effective October 16, 1962, of the compensation of employees in the office of a Senator to the rate nearest that being received by such employees immediately preceding such effective date unless the disbursing office of the Senate is notified to the contrary within 15 days after the date of enactment. Such notice, when given, would give effect to the increase.

Subsection (c) provides an increase of 7 percent in the rates of basic compensation of the elected officers of the Senate (not including the presiding officer) the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the legislative counsel and senior counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the official reporters of debates of the Senate, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate, except that no such salary may be raised to an amount above $21,500.

Subsection (d) increases the limitation fixed by law on the compensation of employees of the Senate by the amount necessary to pay the additional compensation provided by the conference substitute bill.

Subsection (e) provides that the provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to employees engaged in folding speeches and pamphlets whose compensation is subject to the new limitation.

Subsection (f) covers elected officers of the House of Representatives (other than Members) and certain other officers of the House of Representatives who are not covered by other provisions of the conference substitute bill. Subsection (f) covers the following officers and employees of the House of Representatives:

(1) The Assistant Parliamentarian No. 1 of the House of Representatives, whose total rate of per annum compensation is now prescribed by House Resolution 339, 84th Congress, section 103 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 370; Public Law 624, 84th Cong.), and section 117(g) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960 (pt. B of title I of the act of July 1, 1960; 74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86–568);

(2) The following elected officers of the House of Representatives, whose total rates of per annum compensation are now prescribed by House Resolution 486, 84th Congress, section 103 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 370; Public Law 624, 84th Cong.), section 4(k) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 209; Public Law 85–462), and section 117(g) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960 (pt. B. of title I of the act of July 1, 1960; 74 Stat. 304: Public Law 86–568); the Clerk of the House, the Sergeant at Arms of the House, the Doorkeeper of the House, and the Postmaster of the House;

(3) The chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, whose total per annum compensation is now prescribed under authority of section 302(c) of the act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 793; Public Law 87–367);

(4) The legislative counsel of the House of Representatives, whose total per annum compensation is now fixed in accordance with a provision relating to the legislative counsel of the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 251; Public Law 85–75) (as modified by secs. 4(c) and 4(m) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 208 and 209; Public Law 85–462)), and section 117(g) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960 (pt. B of title I of the act of July 1, 1960; 74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86–568);

(5) The coordinator of information of the House of Representatives, whose total per annum compensation is now fixed under House Resolution 183, 80th Congress, section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948 (61 Stat. 377; Public Law 197, 80th Cong.), section 2(e) of the act of October 24, 1951 (65 Stat. 612; Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), section 4(c) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 176; Public Law 94, 88th Cong.), section 4(l) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 209; Public Law 85–462), and section 117(g) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960 (pt. B of title I of the act of July 1, 1960; 74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86–568);

(6) Two printing clerks, one for the majority caucus room and one for the minority caucus room, who total per annum compensation is now provided for on a present incumbency basis in the paragraph under the heading "House of Representatives" and the subheading "Special and Minority Employees" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1958 (71 Stat. 247; Public Law 85–75), as modified by a comparable provision in each annual appropriation act for the legislative branch, the latest such provision currently being the paragraph under the heading "House of Representatives" and the subheading "Special and Minority Employees" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1962 (75 Stat. 325; Public Law 87–130);

(7) Four minority employees of the House in positions referred to in House Resolution 486, 84th Congress, whose total per annum compensation is now fixed under such resolution and section 103 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 370; Public Law 624, 84th Cong.), section 4(r) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 209; Public Law 85–462), and section 117(g) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960 (pt. B of title I of the act of July 1, 1960; 74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86–568).

The above list of officers and employees within the purview of subsection (f) is not necessarily all-inclusive.

It may be noted, in connection with House officers and employees in the categories covered by subsection (f), that three employees in comparable categories are granted increases in compensation under section 1005 (a) rather than subsection (f). These employees are as follows:

(1) The Chaplain of the House of Representatives, whose present rate of total per annum compensation consists of a per annum basic rate prescribed by section 6 of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956 (69 Stat. 508; Public Law 242, 84th Cong.), and additional compensation provided by the various pay increase laws covering legislative branch employees generally, including section 117 (a) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960 (pt. B of title I of the act of July 1, 1960; 74 Stat. 303; Public Law 86–568);

(2) The Assistant Parliamentarian No. 2 of the House of Representatives whose present rate of total per annum compensation consists of a per annum basic rate provided by House Resolution 277, 82d Congress, and section 277 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 478; Public Law 471, 82d Cong.), and additional compensation provided by the various pay increase laws covering legislative branch employees generally, excluding the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 but including section 117(a) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960 (pt. B of title I of the act of July 1, 1960; 74 Stat. 303; Public Law 86–568);

(3) The clerk to the House Parliamentarian, whose present rate of total per annum compensation consists of per annum basic rate fixed under House Resolution 486, 85th Congress, and section 103 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 453; Public Law 85–570), and additional compensation provided by the various pay increase laws covering legislative branch employees generally, excluding the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958 but including section 117(a) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1960 (pt. B of title I of the act of July 1, 1960; 74 Stat. 303; Public Law 86–568).

Subsection (g) increases the limitations on gross rate per thousand and gross rate per hour per person payable to employees of the House of Representatives engaged in folding speeches and pamphlets by an amount equal to the increases granted to legislative employees under the conference substitute.

Subsection (h) makes clear that the increases provided by section 1005 are to be considered part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Subsection (i) provides that notwithstanding any other provision of section 1005, no rate of compensation which exceeds $21,500 shall be increased by such section, and no increase provided by such section shall cause the gross rate of compensation (basic plus additional compensation authorized by law) or the total annual compensation of any officer or employee to exceed $21,500.

Subsection (j) provides that, insofar as the provisions of section 1005 apply to officers and employees whose compensation is based on a monthly pay period which begins on the first day of the month, such provisions shall become effective on October 16, 1962. The purpose of subsection (j) is to insure that officers and employees in the legislative branch will receive pay increases at approximately the same time as other officers and employees covered by the conference substitute.

Saving provision: Section 1006 provides, in effect, that no provision of the conference substitute shall operate to reduce any rate of salary, pay, or compensation of any officer or employee covered by the conference substitute.

Absorption of costs: Under section 1007, the departments and agencies are directed to provide for absorption of the costs of salary increases from available funds of the executive departments, but this section is not to be considered to require any employee to be separated from the service or placed in a leave-without-pay status.

Effective dates: Section 1008 provides that title VI, except as otherwise expressly provided, is to become effective on the first day of the first pay period after enactment.

Ceiling provisions: Section 1009 makes it clear that, except as provided in section 1005, this act will not cause any rate of compensation to exceed $20,000 per annum.

Part III.—Adjustment of annuities under Civil Service Retirement Act

The House bill contained no provisions such as are contained in the conference substitute under Part III, Adjustment of Annuities.

An explanation of part III of the conference substitute is set forth below.

Section 1101(a) provides a 5-percent increase, effective January 1, 1963, in all annuities then payable from the fund which commenced on or before that date.

Subsection (b) extends this initial increase on a graduated percentage basis to all annuities which commence in the 5-year period following January 1, 1963, in accordance with the following schedule:

Annuities commencing between—	*Are increased from commencing date by—*
Jan. 2, and Dec. 31, 1963	4 percent.
Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1964	3 percent.
Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1964	2 percent.
Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1966	1 percent.

Subsection (c) provides that the percentage increase granted a retiree under subsection (a) or (b) will apply to the annuity subsequently granted his survivor.

Subsection (d) excludes from the 1963 increase annuity amounts purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

Subsections (e) and (f) remove the ceilings on increases to retirees imposed by the 1952 and 1955 annuity increase laws. Under the annuity increase act of July 16, 1952, as amended by the act of August 31, 1954, no retiree's annuity (exclusive of that purchased by voluntary contributions) could be raised beyond $2,160. The act of August 11, 1955, similarly provided that no regular annuity could be increased under its terms beyond $4,104. These increase ceilings are repealed and made no longer effective on and after January 1, 1963. Each retiree affected by one or both of these ceilings who is still on the annuity rolls will be entitled to have his annuity rate reestablished as of January 1, 1963, as though these ceilings had never existed. This reestablished rate, plus a 5-percent 1963 increase, will be payable from and after January 1, 1963.

Subsection (g) states effective date provisions for increases.

Subsection (h) provides that monthly annuity rates after adjustment will be fixed to the nearest dollar.

Section 1102(a) adds a new subsection to section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act to define the term "price index" as the calendar year average of the monthly Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Subsection (b) renumbers present section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act as section 19 and inserts a new section 18. New section 18 embodies an automatic annuity adjustment plan.

The new section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act provides for future adjustment of annuities as follows:

Subsection (a) directs the Civil Service Commission to annually determine, after January 1, 1964, and each succeeding January 1, the percentage change in living costs from 1962 or from the year preceding the most recent cost-of-living adjustment to the latest complete year. Depending on the price index change, adjustment actions ensue.

Subsection (a)(1) provides that if the price index change from 1962 to 1963 equals a rise of at least 3 percent, an increase will be allowable, effective April 1, 1964. All annuities which began before January 2, 1963, will be increased by the percentage rise in the price index, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.

Subsection (a)(2) provides for automatic increases in annuities effective April 1 of any later year after the percentage change in the price index has equaled a rise of at least 3 percent. All annuities payable from the fund as of April 1 which commenced earlier than January 2 of the preceding year will be increased by the percentage rise in the price index, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.

Subsection (b) states the general rule that eligibility for an increase is governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable as of the appropriate April 1 effective date, but with these exceptions to the rule:

Under subsection (b)(1), a retiree's survivor (other than a current act child survivor) on the roll as of the first cost-of-living increase, whose annuity started the date after the retiree's death, will receive the initial increase provided the retiree's commencing date of annuity was earlier than January 2 of the year preceding the first increase.

Under subsection (b)(2), the annuity of a retiree's survivor (other than a current act child survivor), which starts the day after the retiree's death and after the effective date of the first cost-of-living increase will be increased from commencing date by whatever percentage increase the retiree was receiving at death.

Under subsection (b)(3), a special method is provided for increasing annuities of child survivors under the current act. These annuities are unique in that they are not the product of years of service times percentage of average salary. The child's rate is the lesser of (1) a set percent of average salary or (ii) a dollar amount which cannot reflect living cost salary increments. Thus, for these annuities, the cost-of-living annuity adjustment must be built into the benefit formula. The following provisions are made for child-survivor annuities which commence after the effective date of the first cost-of-living increase:

Existing formula		Increase provided—proposed increase
Spouse surviving	No spouse surviving	
40 percent of average salary divided by number of children.	50 percent of average salary divided by number of children.	Cumulative cost-of-living percent granted after commencing date of retired parent's annuity. Inapplicable to children of employee, because his average salary includes living cost adjustments which pass on to children.
$1,800 divided by number of children.	$1,160 divided by number of children.	Cumulative cost-of-living percent currently authorized. Applicable to children of retiree and employee alike, because salary living cost adjustments can never pass on to children.
$600	$720	Cumulative cost-of-living percent currently authorized. Applicable to children of retiree and employee alike, because salary living cost adjustments can never pass on to children.

Provision is made for applying these formula changes to any child's annuity which commenced in the 15-month period before the effective date of the first increase as if such initial increase had been in effect. Resulting rate adjustments would start on the effective date of the initial cost-of-living increase.

Subsection (c) excludes from cost-of-living increases annuity amounts purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

Subsection (d) provides that monthly annuity rates after cost-of-living increase will be fixed at the nearest dollar.

Section 1103 amends sections 1(j), 9(g), and 10(a)(1) of the Retirement Act to revise and liberalize provisions for children survivors and election of reduced annuity with benefit to widow or widower.

The present section 9(g) of the act permits a married person retiring for any reason to irrevocably elect, in lieu of single life annuity, a reduced benefit carrying with it a survivor annuity to spouse, the choice to be made at time of retirement. The retiring individual may designate all or any portion of the single life annuity (excluding any increase because of disability retirement) as the base for annuity to spouse. To partially support the added survivor protection the retiring individual accepts, for life, his or her annuity reduced by 2½ percent of the first $2,400 and by 10 percent of any amount over $2,400 designated as the base for survivor annuity. Under the present section 10(a)(1), the named spouse becomes entitled to 50 percent of this base amount as widow's or widower's annuity, starting the day after the retiree's death and continuing until remarriage or death.

Under the conference substitute, section 9(g) of the act is amended to accord the retiring married employee a reduced benefit carrying with it a survivor annuity to spouse, unless he affirmatively elects to receive in lieu thereof the single life annuity. In the absence of the life annuity election, the total annuity (excluding any increase because of disability retirement) or such lesser portion as may be designated at time of retirement will be used as the base for annuity to spouse, and the individual will receive, for life, his or her annuity reduced by 2½ percent of the first $3,600 and by 10 percent of any amount over $3,600 which serves as the base for annuity to spouse. Section 10(a)(1) of the act is amended to accord the named spouse 55 percent of the amount used for the survivor base as widow's or widower's annuity, which would start the day after the retiree's death and continue until remarriage or death.

Subsections (c), (d), and (e) similarly amend subsections (b), (c), and (e) of section 10 of the act to uniformly accord a named survivor or a spouse survivor 55 percent, instead of 50 percent, of the annuity in respect to the deceased former employee or member.

Under existing law survivorship benefits paid to a child cease when the child attains the age of 18, marries, or dies except that such benefits may continue past the age of 18 if the child is incapable of self-support due to a disability incurred before attaining the age of 18.

Subsection (f) of section 1103 of the conference substitute amends section 1(j) of the Retirement Act. The substitute retains all present termination provisions but adds the further exception that benefits may continue to the end of the school year in which the child attains the age of 21 only so long as the child pursues a full-time course of study in a high school, trade school, technical or vocational institute, junior college, college, university, or comparable recognized educational institution.

This change in the Civil Service Retirement Act is in keeping with veterans' benefit laws which provide for the continuance of benefits between the ages of 18 and 21 to unmarried children while taking an approved course of instruction.

Section 1104 specifies January 1, 1963, as the effective date for section 1101 and provides that amendments made by section 1103, except subsection (F), will not apply to employees or members retired or otherwise separated prior to date of enactment.

Tom Murray,
James H. Morrison,
Robert J. Corbett,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman will take ample time to explain the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I will take ample time to anyone to explain the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7927, to adjust postal rates and for other purposes, passed the House on January 24, 1962. It was amended in the other body to include Federal salary adjustments and increases in civil service retirement annuities.

The conference substitute contains the most important and far-reaching provisions for postal financing, Federal civilian salary reform, and civil service retirement annuities that have been presented in a single legislative measure.

Postal revenues will be increased by $600 million when all of the postal rate adjustments become effective. This added revenue and the public service policy provisions—first approved by the Congress in 1958 and modernized in this bill—will eliminate all of the postal deficit which exists in the first-, second-, and third-class mail categories. The remaining deficiency—primarily in parcel post operations—will be eliminated when the Interstate Commerce Commission approves adjustments for which the Postmaster General has petitioned to make fourth-class revenues equal costs within 4 percent, as required by law.

The increased postal revenue to be provided by part I of the conference substitute is approximately $20 million less than the increased revenue of $620 million which would have been provided by the substitute provisions for H.R. 7927 recommended last January by the Postmaster General and presented to the House under my name. The bill passed by the House, however, increased those revenue provisions by $71 million by the adoption of an amendment raising the third-class bulk minimum charge per piece an additional one-half cent.

SALARY INCREASES

Part II of the conference substitute places in effect major provisions of the Federal statutory salary reform proposal submitted to the Congress by the President earlier in the current session. The essential requirements of comparability of Federal and private enterprise salary rates, internal alinement of Federal salary schedules, and annual review and adjustment of salaries recommended by the President are provided by part II. The chief differences between the conference substitute and the President's recommendations are, first, salary adjustments under the conference substitute are in two phases, spaced 15 months apart, instead of three annual phases as recommended by the President; and, second, the three highest grades of the Classification Act of 1949 and the three highest levels of the postal field service schedule receive only one upward adjustment, leaving the final determination of the appropriate salaries for such grades and levels for consideration in the next Congress.

The conference substitute also provides comparable salary adjustments for employees in the judicial branch, agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees, congressional employees, and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action. This is in conformity with the policy adopted by the Congress in all recent salary increase legislation.

COST OF SALARY INCREASES

The annual cost of the salary reform provisions of the conference substitute will be $1.049 billion beginning with the calendar year 1964, when the salary adjustments provided for therein become fully effective. The salary reform legislation recommended by the President would have cost $1.054 billion a year beginning in the calendar year 1965. The annual cost of Federal civilian salary reform provisions contained in H.R. 9531, as reported favorably by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service but not acted upon by the House, would have been $1.469 billion beginning with the calendar year 1964—a difference of $420 million savings under the conference substitute.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ANNUITIES

Part III of the conference substitute—

First. Provides a 5-percent increase, effective January 1, 1963, in all annuities then payable from the civil service retirement fund which commenced on or before that date.

Second. Applies the increase on a graduated reduction basis to all annuities which commence in the 4-year period following January 1, 1963, in keeping with the practice followed in the last previous enactment of this kind.

Third. Provides that the proper proportion of the increase granted an annuitant will accrue to his survivors.

Fourth. Excludes from the increase annuity amounts purchased by voluntary contributions.

Fifth. Removes the ceilings on increases imposed by certain previous enactments.

Sixth. Provides for future adjustments in the event the calendar year average of the monthly Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics increases not less than 3 percent.

Seventh. Raises from $2,400 to $3,600 the portion of annuity to which the reduction of 2½ percent applies when electing survivorship benefits.

Eighth. Increases the ratio of survivorship benefits from 50 to 55 percent.

Ninth. Reverses present procedure by providing that in the future survivorship benefits will be automatic unless an adverse election is made.

Tenth. Extends the right of survivorship benefits for children to the end of any school year in which a child attains the age of 21 years so long as the child pursues full-time studies in a school, college, university, or comparable recognized educational institution. This change is in keeping with provisions of veterans' benefit laws.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend approval of the conference substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of this conference report, there are four main points which we can very briefly clarify. I might, by way of preface, point out that in a bill of this kind there is perhaps no provision to which some objection cannot be found. Obviously, when you are considering something as complicated as postal rates, when you are into something as complicated as salary schedules, the job of eliminating inequalities, the job of keeping everything in balance, it is very difficult, particularly when there are groups that feel these pressures one way or the other.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, according to the report, section 1310, an act of several years ago, commonly known as the Whitten rider, has been amended in connection with the total number of permanent Federal employees.

The Postmaster General conferred with me as to this, and we worked this out with the staff of the appropriate committees, and the allocation of permanent positions to the Post Office Department was changed from the total fixed by the act, and was such as to prohibit some additional plans for the Post Office Department where they now hire temporary employees. He felt that because we are allocating as large a percentage as the law permits, that some adjustments should be made.

In connection with it, I assured the Postmaster General in view of the fact that he could not get a higher allocation that I, personally, would have no objection to an increase of 10 percent in the postal service in permanent jobs.

Second, they said that it would save money and would not change the total overall ceiling.

It is my information that what is in the conference report represents an increase in the total number of permanent positions in question of 10 percent, which is a far different story; that the total number of permanent employees would be raised from something like 1 to 1.1 million.

Could the gentleman from Pennsylvania advise me at this point and could the gentleman make certain that the record shows it and tell us all he can about it at this time?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman that I had an earlier conversation with the gentleman. The gentleman has been very reasonable and considerate of this situation. The gentleman recognizes that the volume is increasing by leaps and bounds, and that the number of new post offices which we need demands this.

I shall be happy to clarify this situation, as it relates to this conference report.

Mr. WHITTEN. I shall thank the gentleman if the gentleman will do it in that way. I have read the hearings and have tried to make it out, but my latest information is that it applies across the board rather than to our intention to allocate these positions.

Mr. CORBETT. The conference report provides merely for an increase in the number of permanent employees in the postal field service. The provision to which I refer is on page 29 of conference report No. 2532 and reads as follows:

> (b) Section 1310(a) of the Act of November 1, 1951 (65 Stat. 757), as amended, which fixes a ceiling on permanent employees in the Federal Government, is amended by inserting after the word "*Provided,*" the following: "That increases in the number of permanent personnel in the Postal Field Service not exceeding 10 per centum above the total number of its permanent employees on September 1, 1950, shall not be chargeable to this limitation:".

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I understand in the bill as it passed the Senate there was a provision requiring the Civil Service Commission to give consideration to the experience which employees had in the postal services where they were applicants for appointment as postmaster. This is a very desirable provision, and as I see it there had been a clear-cut expression in regard to it.

I am just wondering whether or not that provision was left in the conference report?

Mr. CORBETT. I assure my colleague that provision was left untouched by the conferees. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania wholeheartedly, that any other arrangement would have been unwise. If we are not going to recognize experience in career training, we have gotten into a very unhealthy situation.

Mr. WALTER. I trust that this will serve as notice to the Civil Service Commission as to what the intent of the Congress is, and that they will pay attention to it in determining eligibility.

Mr. CORBETT. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman for his work on the conference committee and to compliment the conferees as well for coming up with as good a bill as we could expect at this time.

It has been a pleasure for me to be one of the team working with the gentlemen for these pay raises and although I do not agree with the postal rate raises in many instances I know that this is the best we can do now. Would the gentleman agree that this is about the best bill we can get for these Government employees and postal workers to bring them up to the level of industrial and business pay?

Mr. CORBETT. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman for his very kind observations and hope that he is not expressing a minority opinion. As we all know, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, during all his years of service in the Congress, has been in the forefront of the continuing fight to secure reasonable and adequate salaries for all our Government employees. It has been a pleasure for me to have worked closely with him in this endeavor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to get to the main features of the bill, and then if I have time I should be glad to yield further.

First, the part of the bill dealing with postal rates is a large section of this measure. These rates are coupled with a realistic appraisal of the value of the public service features, and will result in the Post Office Department having a real surplus rather than its traditional deficit. Even with the pay raise provided in this bill for postal workers I want to emphasize the fact that the new revenues provided and a proper estimate of public service cost will leave the Post Office Department at long last in a surplus situation.

Now with regard to the salary situation, the pay features of this bill. It is somewhat different from the administration's proposals. However, it does do these two things to a degree. In the lower grades it brings salaries up to meet the increased cost of living. In the higher grades the attempt is made to introduce the philosophy of comparability. There is an attempt made, incomplete as it is, to make the pay of people working for the Federal Government comparable to what they would secure in private industry.

So I think this should be emphasized, that we recognize that every year or every 2 years we have this matter of pay raises and we have the matter of postal rates to consider. Some may say that this bill was considered in haste. That kind of charge simply is not true, because the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both the House and the Senate are in almost constant session when Congress is in session, on these subjects, hearing one witness after another and having executive sessions. So while the action may have been fast, the consideration was very long and very painstaking.

Mr. Speaker, the only other feature of the bill that needs to be mentioned is the fact that it recognizes that our older, retired employees are the true victims of the inflation. They need help. This bill authorizes a 5-percent increase in their retirement annuities, but because of the action yesterday does not make available the funds. It also authorizes a permanent change in the annuity situation by gearing future adjustments to increases in the cost of living which will be beneficial to those who have served our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, having studied this bill carefully, worked on the conference report and on the hearings, I can very sincerely recommend its overwhelming passage by this body.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman.

REPORT ON 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 87th Congress has set a record, at least as to length. More than 9 months in continuous session makes it the longest election-year congressional session in history, with the exception of certain wartime sessions which ran year around.

The House of Representatives, in this session, passed something over 550 bills out of the more than 4,500 measures introduced. It has been said before, but it is worth repeating, that bare statistics do not adequately picture the long hours spent by each of us in committee work. It is, of course, in committee where the major part of the work of Congress is done. The 4,500 measures introduced had to be studied and analyzed and discussed in committee. Those which were favorably reported out of committee were again studied and debated on the floor of the House.

I am privileged to serve on what I believe to be the most powerful subcommittee of the House—Defense Appropriations. The larger part of our entire national budget is spent on the military, and as appropriations originate in the House, our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee has unique and great responsibility. I have a keen interest in the work of this important committee, and I feel that here is one of my chief services as a Representative in Congress.

I can report to you that every member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee works diligently in what he believes to be the best interests of his country.

My report on the 2d session of the 87th Congress follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Complete bipartisan cooperation was evidenced in the unanimous vote for our national defense appropriations. This year, it was $48,136,247,000, the highest defense appropriation in peacetime history. In addition to this amount nearly $1.4 billion was appropriated for military construction.

As I have mentioned, I am a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and it was this committee's job to examine every item proposed, and prepare the necessary legislation. On our shoulders—13 of us—rests the responsibility of making the difficult initial decisions affecting the defense budget.

ATOMIC ENERGY AND SPACE

We approved over $3 billion for atomic energy experiments and development. Nearly $4 billion was appropriated for the space program. We also passed the Communications Satellite Act, establishing a commercial communications satellite system with Federal support. This was designed to improve global communications and contribute to better international understanding and world peace. Incidentally, this measure survived a filibuster by a small group of Senators who usually favor Government ownership and control over free enterprise.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Cuba: Both Houses of Congress passed a resolution expressing the determination of the American people to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Communist regime in Cuba from extending its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere. A move to make the language even stronger failed to pass.

Trade: One of the most important pieces of legislation to be enacted by the second session was the Trade Expansion Act. Its main provision authorizes the President to cut tariffs across the board up to 50 percent and to eliminate entirely tariffs on goods of which the United States and the European Economic Community account for 80 percent of the free world trade. Under the provisions of the legislation, the President may raise duties if, in his opinion, such boost is needed to protect domestic interests. The bill also provides for certain tax and loan aid to industries damaged by foreign competition, and for extra unemployment compensation for workers who lose their jobs as a direct result of tariff reductions.

Foreign aid: The Congress looked at foreign aid with a very critical eye this year. There has been general disenchantment with the program. Examples of waste and mismanagement were numerous. The House made a very deep cut in the appropriation. The Senate restored some of the funds, but the final figure of nearly $4 billion was still considerably lower than that requested by the administration.

U.N. bonds: After much debate, Congress agreed to the U.S. purchase of United Nations bonds, not to exceed $100 million. The bond issue was designed to relieve the financial pressures on the U.N. caused by the refusal of some member nations to pay their share of the expenses for U.N. operations in the Congo and the Middle East. Let us hope that nations can be compelled to pay their just dues, and that the bond issue will not create a precedent.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Tax reform: The new tax bill, as finally passed, was not the bill recommended by the President. Again heeding the voice of the people, who sent in letters to their Congressmen by the tens of thousands, Congress struck out the provision for the withholding of taxes on interest and dividends.

Self-employed pensions: The bill as finally agreed to would allow the self-employed individual to provide himself a pension plan wherein he could deposit up to $2,500 a year and make half of his annual deposit tax exempt. The final version of the bill did not provide so great an incentive to establish voluntary retirement programs as originally designed. However, it did equalize the pension position of the company employee and that of the self-employed person. The House and Senate conferees deleted some Senate amendments which would have had a damaging effect on company pension plans and profit-sharing plans.

Postal rates: Congress passed the bill to raise by 1 cent the basic postal rates on first-class mail and raised the rates on second- and third-class mail on a graduated scale. Under the provisions of the bill, Communist propaganda would not be delivered unless addressee, after notification, advises he wants it. Libraries and certain professional institutions would be exempt from this provision.

Federal pay raise: Civil service and postal employees, under the provisions of legislation passed by both Houses, would get about a 10 percent salary increase in two stages, and legislative employees would get a 7 percent increase, this is designed to make the Federal worker's pay comparable to that paid for similar work in private industry. Federal retirees would receive a 5-percent boost.

Public works: The public works acceleration bill was designed to provide public works and employment in areas of high unemployment. The President had requested $1.5 billion for this program; this was cut almost in half.

Ohio projects: An appropriation of $1,553,000 was voted to continue the Cleveland Harbor improvement program. Also included was an item of $75,000 to continue the Army Corps of Engineers' technical study of the feasibility of constructing Tinkers Creek Dam to prevent flooding of the Cuyahoga River.

Antipoll tax: A constitutional amendment doing away with poll taxes was passed by the Congress and submitted to the States for ratification. To become law the constitutional amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the States. This was the only major civil rights measure to be approved during this session.

Retraining: The Manpower Retraining Act, passed and now in effect, provides funds for the retraining of persons whose job skills are no longer in demand, and for on-the-job training.

Drug protection: Additional requirements were imposed by legislation to improve procedures of drug manufacture, testing, inspection and informing the medical profession and the public. Under the new law, drugs must be shown to be effective as well as safe. Furthermore, a drug suspected of being hazardous may be withdrawn from public use.

Housing for elderly: The Senior Citizens Housing Act, passed and enacted into law, authorizes an increase of $100 million for direct loans for urban rentals and another $100 million to broaden the rural housing program for the elderly.

Mass vaccination: Another piece of legislation passed by Congress is the Vaccination Assistance Act, which launches a 3-year program of special grants to States for mass vaccination against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus.

Federal aid to education: The bill designed to provide assistance to primary and secondary schools never came out of committee. Though the House originally passed the college aid bill, providing for grants and loans to public and private colleges for construction of buildings to be used for science, engineering, and general classroom purposes, but not for chapels, divinity schools or sports facilities, the student scholarship provision was not acceptable to the House. The conference report was recommitted so no final action was taken.

Health care for aged: The Senate defeated the administration-backed bill to provide medical care for the aged under social security. Among objections to the bill was the fact that it covered only those older people already under social security, leaving some millions of needy older people unprotected, while, at the same time, providing care for many wealthy people who need no help, all at the expense of the working taxpayer. The medicare bill, usually referred to as the King-Anderson bill, did not do many of the things generally expected of it. It made no provision for doctor or surgeon fees, and the patient would have to bear the first $90 of hospital expenses plus a $20 diagnosis fee. We already have medical care legislation, the Kerr-Mills Act, providing for Federal and State cooperation in taking care of all medical expenses of the aged who need financial help. Approximately half of the States are already operating a Kerr-Mills program. Some of those who opposed the King-Anderson bill felt that private and nonprofit groups should be given a chance to provide the needed services, with possibly Federal aid to the needy in the payment of premiums. Congress will certainly be considering alternative solutions to this very real and important problem in the next session.

OTHER MEASURES WHICH FAILED

The youth employment bill, resurrecting the old Civilian Conservation Corps idea died in committee.

The creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs was defeated by the House early in the session.

The administration's farm bill was killed in the House, and a less controversial substitute passed.

The wilderness bill never received final consideration.

The mass transit bill to provide Federal aid to communities for traffic problems did not receive final consideration.

FOR THE FUTURE

The 88th Congress will inherit many leftover legislative problems from the 87th Congress—among them, taxes, labor, medical care for the aged, aid to education, mass transportation, a youth employment program, tighter controls over farming, marketing, stock sales.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 7927, the postal-Federal pay bill.

The bill has three important objectives: first, it is designed to carry out the President's recommendations for an upward adjustment in postal rates sufficient to reduce significantly the postal deficit; second, it provides an increase in the annuities for persons now on the Federal retirement rolls; and third, it puts into effect—to a limited extent—the principal aspects of the President's recommendations for needed reforms in the major statutory pay systems in the Federal service.

In the section dealing with retirement annuities, the bill provides for a 5-percent increase, effective January 1, 1963, in all annuities payable from the civil service retirement funds. This increase will affect 600,000 persons who are retired Federal employees or the survivors of former Federal employees. In addition, the bill protects these persons against increases in the cost of living by requiring that annuities be raised by another 3 percent whenever the cost of living rises by that much. This provision tying annuities to the cost of living index is the most important feature of this section and is a major step in insuring that retired Federal employees—those people who have devoted their adult lives to dedicated Government service—will have the type of security in retirement that they need and rightfully deserve.

In addition, the bill provides a two-step pay raise for the 1.6 million Federal and District Government employees, of which 250,000 live and work in the Washington Metropolitan area. The total raise for these employees amounts to approximately 10 percent, averaging $603 for classified workers and $584 for postal workers. This is a well-deserved raise and long overdue, in my opinion.

But the most significant point of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not merely a pay raise bill. It is, indeed, much more than that, for it incorporates a number of reform features which are long overdue. In short, the bill contains the most significant steps that Congress has ever made to make the income of the Government worker comparable to that received by a person in private industry holding a similar job.

In order to meet its responsibility to the public a Federal salary system must pay enough to permit competent staffing so that the national security is not endangered and so that the public service is not degraded, but it must also pay no more than is necessary for this purpose and to provide equity for the Federal employee.

To insure fair treatment for the Federal employee, the salary system must provide equity among Federal employees and between them and their counterpart in private employment. The system in addition must provide for executive discretion to meet individual and special needs, to use pay for motivating employees and to initiate general adjustments as required, in order to make sure that the system is adaptable to the changing conditions and in order to stimulate peak performance.

The existing Federal salary spread from the entry professional or administrative level at GS-5 to the top career level at GS-18 is entirely inadequate by modern standards. A Federal employee from the time he first starts his Federal service can anticipate a maximum increase of only four and one-half times for a lifetime of service—and that is only true if he is one of the relatively few who reaches the very top. By contrast, his equal in private enterprise can expect to increase his beginning salary by six or seven times, without even having to reach the very top bracket in his profession.

Additional problems in the existing system are created by the fact that inequities now exist among the various Federal pay systems—for instance, supervisors under the Classification Act system are sometimes paid less than their subordinates who are under the wage board system.

The bill which we are being asked to approve here today, Mr. Speaker, incorporates reforms which affect all four Federal statutory systems—employees paid under the Classification Act, the Postal Service Compensation Act and the Foreign Service Act, and physicians, dentists and nurses of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

This bill will do away with many of the equities which I have just recounted. It will do this through the adoption of two principles which will be basic to the whole Federal pay structure from now on: the comparability principle and the internal alinement principle.

Under the comparability principle, Federal salary rates will be comparable to those in private enterprise for the same level of work. This principle takes into account the effects of such legitimate pay considerations as the cost of living, the standards of living and productivity, as those factors are resolved into the going rate over bargaining tables, and the other salary determining processes used throughout the country. Under the bill, comparability for the more specialized salary systems will be established by appropriately relating key levels with grades of the Classification Act.

The internal alinement principle, on the other hand, rests on the two concepts of equal pay for equal work and pay distinctions in keeping with differences in work and quality performance. Equal pay for equal work is already in effect and it works well, but pay distinctions for differences in work are not adequate under any of the Government's statutory salary systems.

The proposed schedules would regularize and generally enlarge the differences in salaries between successive grade levels of positions. In addition, the bill would improve the provisions for within-grade increases and make them more meaningful.

However, Mr. Speaker, it would not be sufficient to make these changes now and expect them to endure for all time, because the inequities would soon show up again. So the bill includes a provision which insures that the Federal employee will from here on out be treated fairly with regard to salary. The bill requires the President to submit an annual report to Congress on the relationship of Federal salaries to those in private enterprise and he is also required at the same time to make recommendations for the adjustment of salary schedules, structure, and policy he considers advisable in order to maintain equity.

It would be unrealistic, Mr. Speaker, to assume that this bill eliminates all the inequities in the Federal pay systems. This bill, like all major legislation, has its shortcomings.

Its most serious defect is that it does not solve the pressing problem of salaries at the higher executive levels. It is my hope, and I understand the intention of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, that the next session of Congress will be able to make further improvements in the Federal pay system so that we can pay the most valuable civil servants what they deserve. I hope then, for instance, we will be able to create new top-level civil service posts—a GS-19 and a GS-20.

Let us remember that a high turnover rate in the Federal service would be more expensive in the long run than paying these employees sufficient salaries now.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this conference report. It is badly needed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross.]

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this is a culmination of a legislative travesty. Hearings before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on pay increase legislation were carried on for weeks, and I do not think anyone can say that the gentleman from Iowa was not faithful in attending those hearings. I can remember time after time when the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa, and two or three other Members, mostly on the minority side, constituted the committee that listened to the testimony given by a long list of witnesses before the committee. I thought at times, and I say this deliberately, that the Members of the majority were boycotting the hearings.

Here we are today dealing with pay-increase legislation that in very few respects resembles the legislation upon which we held hearings and which was voted out by the committee. I say again that the entire history of this legislation is a travesty, for the House has never considered any part of it except the postal rate increase. Frankly, I do not know what is in this bill, and so in the limited time allotted to me I must ask a few questions.

Am I correctly informed that the increases go to 21 percent, as high as 21 percent for some Federal employees in the upper brackets? Will someone who is an expert on this bill now tell me?

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman is incorrect. The increase is no more than 15 percent for anybody.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps I am incorrectly informed, but I doubt that to be the case.

Do I understand correctly that some employees of Members of the Senate will under this bill get $18,800 a year?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman is correct in that observation, because, as the gentleman well knows, the other body wrote that section of the bill to meet their peculiar needs.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand correctly that for all practical purposes the lid has been taken off supergrades? How many super grades have been provided in this bill, may I ask?

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield, my understanding is that it provides for an increase from 1989 to 2400, an increase of 411. In addition, it excludes from the limitation now in effect engineering, research, and development positions, and positions in the physical sciences, natural sciences, and medicine, which means withdrawal completely from those.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is speaking of Public Law 313, Scientific and Professional Employees?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am.

Mr. GROSS. Neither the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen], nor the gentleman from Iowa had anything to do with the fast conference that was held. We have to try to get some information from some source concerning this bill, and apparently we are going to get very little from those who ought to know.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman recalls a conference in the last session in which we were conferees and we were successful finally in putting some kind of a lid on the increase in supergrades.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and we thought we were making a concession in the pay bill that was reported out of the committee—I did not vote for it—a concession of 51 supergrades to be put into the civil service pool. We thought we were making quite a concession at that time. I am sure the gentleman remembers that.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman is right. The gentleman from Michigan did not vote for that, either.

Mr. GROSS. So there are 411 identifiable supergrades under this bill, and there may be 1,000 or more when the provisions dealing with Public Law 313 are taken into consideration.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa for asking these questions and to hold up his hands in the hope that he will get some information so that those of us who do not even have the privilege of serving on the committee will know what is in this conference report.

Mr. GROSS. I will say again to the gentleman. This bill in very few respects even resembles the bill upon which the committee held long and protracted hearings day after day; which was approved by the committee; and then died a strange death.

Mr. JONAS. The RECORD ought to show also, if the gentleman will permit, that this House has never acted on a pay bill.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right.

Mr. JONAS. And we have never had an opportunity to debate one or find out what was in it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this bill will increase the taxes on the public by raising postal rates by more than $600 million; it will increase the pay of Federal employees, including those of Members of Congress, by more than $1 billion; it will increase retirement and annuities by hundreds of millions of dollars, and last but not least it will increase the retirement paid to Members of Congress. This bill deals in $2½ billion; a major portion of it has never before been discussed in the House and yet it apparently will be approved in less than an hour with almost no explanation as to specific provisions.

Under these circumstances I have no alternative than to vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one point and that is about the necessity of raising the salary rates for Government employees. We are living in a dangerous world, in a world which needs specialists to do the job of government. The taxpayers are going to have to pay for these specialists under prime contract arrangements with defense industries or under the research, planning and management arrangements like the Federal Government has with the Rand Corp., MIT, California Institute of Technology, University of California and other university institutions throughout the United States where higher than civil service classification salaries are paid. This situation exists today and nothing you can do can change it because you have to have that type of skilled and trained manpower to do the job that needs to be done in this highly technical and scientific world today, if we are going to meet the challenge of communism.

I just want to say that if you gentlemen do not give to the Government the right to pay the salaries to get the people in Government to evaluate these highly complicated and scientific programs which the Government is financing to the tune of billions and billions of dollars, then you are going to have low-grade, incompetent people passing judgment on programs which will waste uncounted billions of dollars.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee, chairman of this committee, for bringing forward a piece of legislation which is realistic on this point.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, time does not permit a lengthy discussion of this important legislation which is now pending before the House in the form of a conference report on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. This legislation is far short of being the kind of bill which we should have approved. The challenge was here but this Congress has failed to respond and has yielded to pressures on all sides so that in the closing minutes of this session we are forced to approve an inadequate bill which is, however, better that nothing at all.

This legislation will be characterized by its supporters as the greatest achievement in postal rate and Federal pay reform in half a century. But by those who have observed the dilatory tactics and the strong measures which have been taken to water down the postal rate bill and to deprive 1,600,000 postal and other Federal employees of their rightful and just compensation and to deny 600,000 civil service annuitants of adequate annuities, this bill will be known as the most dishonorable compromise of postal rate and Federal pay principles to be approved by the Congress in many years.

We had an opportunity—which apparently we have lost—to have enacted legislation in all areas covered by this bill of which we could have been justly proud, but rather the enactment of this measure will require lengthy legislative procedures during the next Congress to complete the job which we have only begun with the enactment of this legislation.

Had the President been more courageous, had the White House staff been less concerned with political advantage and more concerned with principles and had the Members of this Congress, in the other body as well as in this body, been more devoted to the ideals which were so eloquently expressed in the halls of this Congress last January, we could have approved legislation today which would have been a credit to our Nation in terms of fiscal responsibility and provided a just and fair compensation schedule for 1,600,000 Federal employees.

With respect to the postal rate provisions, last year the Postmaster General came before our committee and recommended increases in postal rates which were needed to eliminate a postal deficit amounting to over $800 million annually. As he marched up the hill, he described the great obligation Congress has to balance the postal budget; he called for fiscal integrity and responsibility in the affairs of the postal service; and he summoned his colleagues from other parts of the executive branch to help him in his objective to solve for once and for all the gigantic postal deficit which had been sought to be eliminated by his predecessors on many occasions. When the heat began to develop it became clear that the administration was stealing away silently in the fog of confusion. To the surprise of many Members of Congress the postal revenues in the compromise bill, which was finally endorsed by the administration, had been reduced over a hundred million dollars and they appeared willing to back down even further. The bill which was finally approved by our committee followed the administration's proposal in only one or two categories of mail. The first-class increase was not reduced nor was there a reduction in the proposed increase in airmail rates but in every other category the administration agreed to retreat from its original proposal. Even in its dissipated form, when the bill was presented to the Rules Committee, the administration sought to have a closed rule applied which would have prevented perfecting amendments on the floor.

The ignoble history of the rate bill was not yet over. It then came to rest in the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee where it has languished in solitude since January of this year while every day that goes by the American taxpayer loses $2 million and the postal deficit goes up and up finally to be added to our national debt. Now when the autumn leaves begin to fall the postal rate bill reappears in the House after our colleagues in the other body have had more than 8 months to deliberate and to consider it.

In its resurrected form the postal rate bill now provides about $90 million less in annual revenues for the Post Office Department than was approved by the House of Representatives in January of this year. I am certain the conferees on the part of the House did all they could to maintain the position which was so strongly expressed by the House of Representatives and I deeply regret the necessity for our conferees to yield to the Senate and to deprive our postal service of much needed revenues.

Thus we have won only a partial victory against fiscal irresponsibility in terms of eliminating the postal deficit.

Let us examine briefly the other provisions of the bill which we are called upon today to approve or to disapprove—a bill which can neither be amended nor improved by the able members of our committee who spent many days in hearings and in deliberations on pay increases for postal employees and classified employees and in considering the important measures relating to increased annuities for retired Federal employees and their survivors.

It is clear from what the other body has done in connection with pay increases that they established an arbitrary ceiling on the amount of funds which could be spent and from that they constructed pay schedules for postal and other Federal employees without regard to actual need or salary comparability. In fact, the Senate ignored the President's recommendations in many respects concerning proper pay adjustments, particularly in the upper grades.

Of course, this discussion is rather academic because we are now faced with the question of approval or disapproval of the bill. I will support the pay provisions of the conference report because this is the only thing that can be done in order to give immediate pay adjustments to postal and classified and other Federal employees. However, I wish to make it clear that I believe the pay recommendations of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House were superior in all respects to those which are contained in the conference report or in the bill which was approved by the Senate.

During our deliberations on postal pay increases, I proposed and secured the adoption of an amendment which preserved longevity credit for postal employees. I was pleased to learn that the Post Office Department reversed its position and now supports my amendment which is included in the provisions of the Senate bill and is in the conference report.

It is useless to point out those areas where increases should have been granted higher than those proposed in the conference report or in the Senate bill because the way in which this bill reaches the House there is nothing we can do except to take the Senate version of pay increases.

I earnestly hope that during the next session of Congress this matter will be fully explored and that proper adjustments will be made to bring the salaries of postal and other Federal employees in line with the recommendations of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in all levels in the postal service and all grades in the Classification Act.

Testimony before our committee was overwhelmingly in favor of the increases which were approved by our committee and all of the evidence presented to the committee showed a need for the kind of pay increases which we approved and the kind of flexibility which the administration had recommended in connection with pay adjustments. Unfortunately, the Senate version and the conference report do not contain all of these provisions relating to flexibility for administrative pay adjustments when such action becomes necessary.

In my judgment, it is pennywise and pound foolish for us to ignore appropriate and proper salary adjustments for our Federal employees who, under the terms of the conference report, will receive less compensation than their counterparts in private industry.

Statutory pay systems have failed to meet the needs of today's Federal service. Absence of an accepted standard for Federal salaries and a procedure for periodic review and adjustment coupled with rigid statutory rules of pay administration, deprive the systems of the adaptability so essential in a period of rapidly changing conditions.

Major inequities exist between the Federal employee and his equals throughout the national economy. Comparison can now be made directly between private salaries and those in the Classification Act, which has a broad occupational coverage having many counterparts in private employment. Findings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics national survey of professional, administrative, technical, and clerical pay reported in 1961 provide the data. This annual survey clearly shows that the greater the level of difficulty and responsibility, the greater the gap between public and private pay. Private salary averages consistently exceed Federal salaries. At the lower professional levels of GS–7 and GS–9, the difference is quite noticeable. For example:

National average rate in private enterprise	Classification Act rate range		
	Grade	Minimum	Maximum
$6,648	GS–7	$5,355	$6,345
7,776	GS–9	6,435	7,425

At the upper professional levels there is an even greater lag of Federal salaries:

National average rate in private enterprise	Classification Act rate range		
	Grade	Minimum	Maximum
$13,152	GS–13	$10,625	$11,935
$15,362	GS–14	12,210	13,510
$19,348	GS–15	13,730	15,030

Further evidence of this trend was furnished by the Civil Service Commission's 1960 study of salaries paid in 21 large nationwide firms for personnel, finance, research and development, law, and plant management positions with responsibilities equivalent to those of Federal positions in grades GS–16, GS–17, and GS–18. This study showed these serious disparities:

Federal Government		21 firms, major salary clusters
Grade	Salary range	
GS–16	$15,255–$16,295	$20,000–$30,000
GS–17	16,530– 17,570	27,500– 37,500
GS–18	18,500	32,500– 45,000

Many State and local jurisdictions now have exceeded the Federal Government's pay rates. For example, California, Georgia, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania all have career salaries higher than the highest Classification Act and other top statutory salaries. The same is true of Los Angeles City and County, Denver, Detroit, the St. Louises, San Francisco, and Philadelphia. In cities with populations over 500,000, city managers average $22,950 and school superintendents average $25,869, about 25 and 40 percent, respectively, above the top Classification Act salary.

These are but a few of the reasons why the conference report does not completely solve the Federal employee pay problems.

The Senate included in this bill the provisions of the so-called Clark retirement bill which provides an increase of 5 percent in the annuities of retired civil service employees and their supervisors. Here again the House is in the distressing position of either accepting this amendment or depriving 600,000 civil service annuitants of an upward adjustment in their annuities which is long overdue. Our committee determined that the increase in civil service annuities should be at least 7½ percent, but unfortunately we could not negotiate this matter in conference because 5 percent was the highest amount which could be considered. This places Members of the House in a position of either voting for this provision as written or voting against the conference report in its entirety. Since it cannot be amended, I will support this provision with the understanding as I indicated in connection with the pay features of the bill that further consideration should be given this matter during the next Congress.

I have long advocated the principle that when pay adjustments are made for Federal employees similar adjustments should be made in the annuities of retired Federal employees and their survivors. This is the policy which is followed in connection with the policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia. I am delighted that the Senate committee adopted a proposal which is in line with my recommendations and legislation which I have introduced to include increases in annuities for civil service annuitants when pay increases are granted Federal employees.

With respect to the annuity portion of the bill there is a particularly meritorious provision which raises from $2,400 to $3,600 the portion of annuity to which the reduction of 2½ percent applies when electing survivorship benefits.

While the bill approved by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee includes a number of other features which in my judgment are meritorious and omitted from the Senate bill and the conference report, I am supporting this measure because I recognize the practical impossibility of improving this legislation at this time.

As I stated at the outset this legislation is not the best we could have secured. Under present circumstances, the lateness of the hour, the manner in which this bill reaches the House, the failure of the Senate to act more promptly, the amount of pressures which have been brought to bear both in connection with postal rates and Federal pay and a host of other problems which have complicated an otherwise straightforward and proper course of action, it is rather futile to insist upon changes and improvements now in this important legislation .

Mr. Speaker, I shall support the conference report because I think it is a step forward in the direction of fiscal responsibility in the postal service and toward proper recognition of our dedicated and conscientious Federal employees for the important and vital activities which they perform above and beyond the call of duty daily throughout the world in the service of our Nation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the temptation to "go along" with this three-in-one omnibus Federal pay-postal rate-retirement pay bill is very strong.

There is no question in my mind that H.R. 7927 is going to pass and be signed into law.

There is no question that some of the specific pay raises provided are justified. Indeed, I offered a 7-percent, across-the-board increase amendment in committee. There is undoubtedly a good case for the retirement pay increase and in different circumstances there could be much justification for postal rate increases, which I supported last January.

Under the kind of package deal provided here it is not surprising to find that it contains features which will greatly please the AFL–CIO on the one hand and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on the other hand.

The former always wants pay increases and the latter has been clamoring for the rate increases for years.

The simplest, the easiest, and the pleasantest course is to take a deep breath, swallow hard, and vote "aye."

But, Mr. Speaker, there are some other very serious considerations.

All that I hope to do is to record a few of the more important ones.

First. We are setting some extremely dangerous precedents in the legislative procedures we are following in this matter.

During debate Monday on the resolution sending this bill to conference I stressed the fact that there has been no opportunity for any meaningful debate on the floor of the House with respect to two of the three major provisions of this omnibus bill. This is the case despite very lengthy and laborious hearings by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the pay bill together with subcommittee hearings on the retirement pay bill.

So far as Members of the House having any benefit from those hearings, it is "love's labor lost."

I think the gag rule procedure we are following is infinitely worse because this is a 3-in-1 deal to say the least. It involves three basically distinct and basically unrelated items of major legislation. In truth, it could be accurately said that it involves at least four such items of legislation because the usual procedure has been to consider the postal pay and the classified pay legislation in separate bills.

The irony of this procedure is further underscored by the fact that adherents of opposing views regarding the pay bill themselves are having to pay tribute in the form of tax dollars to secure what they believe desirable. Thus, the administration is having to accept larger pay increases in the lower grades in order to get the substantially higher increases it wants in the higher grades. Conversely, those who feel that the pay increases ought to be concentrated primarily in the lower grades are having to accept the excessive increases in the upper grades. This is the penalty for gag rule handling of pay legislation.

So much for the procedural precedents we are establishing today.

Second. Now let us direct attention to some of the substantive features of this omnibus legislation.

This House should understand that we are doing more in the pay section of this bill than merely increasing salaries. We are adopting a completely new and revolutionary philosophy of Federal pay—and we are doing it without any opportunity for meaningful debate of that philosophy.

Simply stated, this consists of the premise that Federal pay should be based on the principle of comparability with the pay scales of private enterprise. As was pointed out by critics of this principle during debate in the other body, this comparability base does not include the salary scale in other governmental units, particularly at the State level. Certainly this is a factor which should be carefully weighed if there is to be a valid comparability.

There is a further serious aspect involved in this comparability principle. We are tying the Federal pay system and scale to a private enterprise pay system and scale very gravely influenced by two inflationary factors. First of these factors is the pay increases—certainly sometimes excessive—imposed by union pressure. The other factor—and this relates particularly to the higher salary levels and to the pay scale of scientists and engineers—is the inflationary effects on private pay systems of the numerous and vast cost-plus contracts which the Government itself has with private enterprise.

I can envision as the effect of this comparability principle an extremely serious inflationary trend which will be reciprocal as between Government and private enterprise pay systems with the result that the sky will be the limit for both.

Third. As I mentioned during the debate on Monday, the House should be on notice that this pay legislation, if enacted, sets the stage for very substantial pay increases next year at the top of the classified pay system, in the Executive Pay Act, and in the salaries of the Federal judiciary and Members of Congress. There is not the slightest question that this is the intention and there is not the slightest question in my mind that the pressures for such increases in the next Congress will be irresistible.

In that connection I cite the following statement in the Senate committee report on this bill. After pointing out that this bill eliminated the administration proposal for new grades GS–19 and GS–20, the committee said:

> The committee does not disagree with the objectives of the administration's bill in these respects. Rather than establishing grades GS–19 and GS–20, however, the committee believes that appropriate salary levels for the relatively few career positions of this order can be determined in a more appropriate manner if done in conjunction with a reform of top level executive salaries which were not included in the proposals submitted by the President and a consideration of the executive pay problem in its full dimensions at one time rather than by treating one part now and the rest later. * * *
>
> Consequently the committee urges the President to recommend for consideration at the next session of Congress appropriate increases in Federal executive salaries at all levels. Such a recommendation should include salaries for all ranks up through the levels of heads of executive departments. In addition, it should include proposals for a rational relationship between executive salaries under the Executive Pay Act and those under other Federal schedules.

Obviously, the stage is being set for substantial financial reward for top officials of Government who have demonstrated their total incapacity for achieving governmental solvency. In a word, we are to reward ourselves for our consistent record of deficit financing.

Fourth. This leads me to my final observation. This entire legislation is a sorry commentary on fiscal inconsistency.

On the heels of the Government's refusal to permit a 5-percent price increase for the steel industry, we are voting a 25-percent price increase for first-class mail and substantial price increases for the other classes of mail.

We match a purported effort to balance the budget of the Post Office Department through rate increases with an offsetting increase in the labor costs of the Department. At the same time, key leaders of this administration openly proclaim that in present circumstances increasing deficits are in order in the overall operations of the Federal Government. And we add to those deficits by a billion-dollar pay increase. At the same time we are experiencing alarming increases in the number of Federal employees, some 160,000 in 19 months, and this bill further removes manpower ceilings.

We have already voted one tax cut and propose to consider very substantial additional tax cuts next year—which will further greatly increase the national deficit—and, at the same time, through postal rate increases we add substantially to the cost of business and particularly of small business.

Meanwhile, so far as the retirement pay program is concerned, we add to a retirement program which already has an unfunded liability of $33.7 billion a further increase of $1.6 billion of unfunded liability.

What kind of fiscal insanity is this? Where are we headed?

Again I say, the simple, easy, pleasant course is to "go along" with what is apparently inevitable. However, there is another inevitability that concerns me—to wit, the consequences of the fiscal policies of this Administration and this Congress to the economic security and survival of this Nation.

I remind this House of a statement attributed to a Swiss banker by the eminent columnist Constantine Brown writing earlier this year:

> The core of your trouble is the frenzied public expenditures and your inability to come near to balancing your budget. * * * If you were not such a wealthy country you would be rated according to all banking standards as a poor credit risk. * * * I believe that unless you trim your sails considerably in domestic and foreign expenditures you are facing the most serious crisis in your existence. And should this occur you will drag us down with you.

It is out of concern over these consequences that I shall vote "no" on this legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on section 305 of this conference report, which is entitled

"Communist Political Propaganda." The House had a very strong, well thought-out section in its bill known as section 12, the so-called Cunningham amendment. Like the House version I want to say that this amendment in the conference report is a very strong and worthwhile amendment to stop the free delivery of Communist propaganda in the United States by our postal system. In my opinion it will stop at least 95 percent of Communist political propaganda from being delivered in the United States. It is going to be easily administered; it is going to stop this vicious material from coming into this country and being delivered free. Section 305 of the conference report accomplishes the same thing as would section 12 in the House-passed version.

I certainly want to congratulate all of the Members of the House for the position they have taken in support of the House position, and I should like to express my appreciation to the Members of the Senate who also recognized this problem and strongly supported the House position. This conference report represents a 100-percent victory as far as stopping this material coming from overseas and being delivered is concerned.

There is one small area having to do with Communist propaganda issued by the Soviet Embassy in this country and delivered to addressees in this country which is not covered. However, this is a rather minor matter, and it can be given consideration later. So I say the language in this conference report is very strong, it will stop the free delivery and the entry through the postal system of at least 95 percent of this vicious Communist propaganda coming in from abroad. The main reason I say 95 percent is because it does make provision for certain Government agencies and universities to receive it to answer a legitimate problem that is so that they may study this material and do research on it.

Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in support of the strong language that is in the conference report.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman on the time he has spent in working on this very difficult problem. Those of us who have been interested in accomplishing what we hope this language will accomplish have always been fearful we would run into constitutional objections. The language in the instant measure that the Committee on Un-American Activities included in its bill, we feel sure, meets that objection. However, I have always felt that maybe the committee leaned over too far in anticipating what the Supreme Court would do. After all, nobody can foresee what the Supreme Court will ever do in any case.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the distinguished chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, in regard to the diligent efforts which have been made by our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], to make sure that Communist propaganda is kept out of the U.S. mails. I have contacted Mr. CUNNINGHAM many times in connection with his efforts. Had it not been for the staying qualities of the gentleman from Nebraska, the language would have been much less strong than it is as now written. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on which I have the privilege to serve, approved the original Cunningham amendment; I voted for it. Representative CUNNINGHAM has made many contacts in the House and Senate. I emphasize that Representative CUNNINGHAM has spent hours and hours in pressing for the adoption of a strong anti-Communist mail amendment. He has succeeded in a great way. I commend him once again.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the rate bill passed this House on January 24, 1962. Many of its provisions are well understood by us. Those that are not will be better understood from personal experience after January 7, 1963, when the new rates go into effect. Therefore, I would like to address myself briefly to the pay rates section of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out specifically that the report on which the salary increases were recommended was made and filed in late 1961, based upon figures brought out in 1960. While some constructive comparability has been attained in this field in this measure, by the time the final section goes into effect on January 1, 1964, it will be 3 years out of date. So, therefore, I say to the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, we are not giving a reward today. What we are doing when we vote for this report is to correct a gross inequity, so far as we are able to, to assist our dedicated Federal employees and retirees in their efforts to maintain their dignity and a decent standard of living to which they are entitled as first-class citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that tonight, as we go to bed, those of us who vote for this bill will be able to sleep a little better.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, what I hope to do in the brief time allotted me is review the remarks of previous speakers and to pull this entire bill into sharp focus.

First of all, regardless of what may be said, this is a Dr. Jekyll-Mr. Hyde creation. A pay raise to many Federal employees is overdue. A pay raise to others is unjustified. The bill does not present the long overdue reevaluation of Federal manpower practices. But at the same time it is a bill which we know must be passed. The facts of life dictate its passage. So, we are in effect passing an imperfect bill, with full realization of its virtues and defects.

Mr. Speaker, this bill perpetuates the inequities in the present Federal salary schedules and with reference to Federal personnel policies. The Federal employees deserve to have a sound, long-range salary structure without having to depend on the whims of Congress in election year periods. This is especially so of the Post Office Department, where politics is a traditional disrupting factor.

Mr. Speaker, one of the good features in this bill is the Cunningham amendment. I am surprised that it was kept in as good form as it has been. Certainly it was necessary for the Congress to include this amendment to correct the tragic blunder the President committed in March 1961, when he permitted the Communists to flood the country with unsolicited propaganda. Another noteworthy provision in the bill is the increase in the annuities for retired Government workers. The increase in the cost of living caused by excessive Government spending has deprived them of the purchasing power of their fixed income. However, as a further example of the bill's inconsistencies, even with the passage of the bill, post office employees—the average carrier, the average clerk, in my district, will still be underpaid, and will still have financial problems.

In many other parts of the country a post office position is a prize possession. Postal positions are sought after. But this bill does not take into account the cost of living in metropolitan areas that adversely affects the career postal employee. This is one of the reasons why pay raise legislation should not follow an across-the-board principle. I would suggest to the Congress that we start working in 1963 and come up in 1964 with an intelligent, long-range reevaluation of the Federal salary and personnel structure. If we do not meet this obligation in 1964 we will continue a disservice to the employees and in the process the public is not served, either.

One point that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised, should be repeated; that is, that the largest increases in salaries go to the political appointees. They do not go to the career employees. They do not go to the man who has given his lifetime to public service. They go to the political appointees who are serving, not to advance the cause of the entire Federal operation, but merely to serve a short-sighted political end. This is another inequity in the bill.

One of the tragedies in the election year salary bills is the manner in which the representatives of Federal employee groups, especially postal department organizations, betray their members for short-sighted purposes. The only way that we can improve the operation of Federal Government agencies is to encourage career personnel to remain in this service so that we might benefit from their experience and knowledge. Adjustments in pay schedules that depend on the election year fancy of the Congress is hardly an adequate system of keeping skilled career personnel.

May I also point out a very dangerous precedent set in this legislation. That is the coupling of the salary with the rate bill. The increase in first-class and air mail will not meet with much public opposition this year, but for practical purposes, we have reached the ceiling of increases within those categories. The second- and third-class rate increases will be absorbed by the users of the mail, but again future increases will be most difficult to come by. The claim is made that the increase in postal rates exceeds the cost of the postal salary increases, and, therefore, the two justify each other. Does this mean that future salary increases for postal employees will come only as rates are increased?

I hope I have given the Members food for thought as we move to pass this conference report. Certainly, our Post Office and Civil Service Committees should give immediate attention to these questions as soon as the next Congress convenes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I renew my point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 277]

Adair
Alexander
Anderson, Minn.
Anfuso
Aspinall
Avery
Bailey
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blitch
Bolling
Boykin
Breeding
Bromwell
Brown
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Curtin
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Dingell
Dominick
Dooley
Elliott
Findley
Fogarty
Frazier
Garland
Griffiths
Gubser
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Kearns
Kee
Kilburn
King, Utah
Knox
Laird
Loser
McDonough
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Magnuson
Maillard
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Moulder
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Peterson
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Saund
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Siler
Sisk
Slack, Jr.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Ullman
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wright
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

POSTAL SERVICE AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT OF 1962

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, as has already been said and repeated, this is not a perfect bill. But it is the best that we can get accomplished at this session. I regret that we have not been able to meet the new standards that we have attempted to meet, which would be comparability. I regret that in the lower brackets and in the higher brackets we have in every instance failed to raise the Federal pay and the postal pay schedules to that comparable paid to employees in private industry who have similar responsibilities and who perform similar work.

We are indeed, with the figures at which we have arrived, at least 3 years late—at least 3 years late. So, we are not even catching up in our responsibilities to pay Federal employees and postal employees comparable to what they should be paid, if their responsibilities and their chores are compared with private industry.

Mr. Speaker, in the lower grades I have always contended that Uncle Sam should be the best kind of an employer. He should not pay any better than, but he should pay as good as the better wages and the better salaries of industry. In the higher brackets, of course, we cannot expect the Government to pay the same type of compensation which is paid in the higher brackets of industry. But in this bill, as has been said, we have done the best we can and I think it is a good job. But I do regret that we have been so tardy in increasing the annuities payable to retirees. I think that the increase should have been a good deal more. I regret, too, that of all the people who are to realize some increase in benefits or increase in pay in this bill, the people who least can afford to wait are having to wait the longest, and they are the retirees. Indeed, the retirees will get an increase, but they will not get it until next year. They will not get their increase until the Committee on Appropriations can meet and can vote that increase. I assume that the Committee on Appropriations will vote the increased appropriation to apply as of the effective date of the bill, January 1, 1963.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as my dear friend, the gentleman from Louisiana has said a few days ago, this is our only opportunity. If we are in favor of paying just wages and just salaries to Federal employees and postal employees, and somewhere near a rightful annuity to the Federal employees, this is our only opportunity. If we are in favor of improving these standards, we will vote for this bill. If we are against an improvement in these benefits and these standards, we will vote against this bill. This is our only opportunity. I shall vote for the bill and I recommend to my colleagues that you vote for the bill.

I hope that next year we can provide a more adequate increase of annuities for the widows, especially those who are receiving less than $50 per month.

Now let us pass this bill today.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have now come to the final decision on this pay raise legislation. Those who are opposed to this legislation have tried to bring up confusion as a reason to be against this bill and argue about the way the hearings were held and the way the bill was reported out.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any bill that has been before this House at this session where there were more witnesses or more hearings or where the entire subject was gone into to the fullest extent, than this bill which was reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The same thing applies to the other body.

The other body passed this bill out of its committee by an overwhelming majority of the members of that committee. This bill is just about the same bill in the form that you find it now as the Senate passed it. The House bill which was passed out of our committee by an overwhelming majority is about 90 to 95 percent of the bill in conference and the compromise which is now before the House. So I say this: The Senate has passed the bill; those who are for giving the Federal employees equal pay as compared to those in like jobs in private industry will vote for this conference report. If you are for giving the Federal employees a fair and reasonable wage as compared to similar jobs in private industry, then you are for this bill. If you are not, then you should vote against the bill.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman and the committee for coming here with a bill which will finally give a fair wage to Government employees and to postal workers. I associate myself with the gentleman in his remarks.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman. Members can now vote either yea or nay exactly how they feel about this bill. I feel sure it will pass by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in support of this legislation with the same reservation I have on nearly every bill we consider here in the House. I recognize that this is far from being a perfect bill, but after months of study and consideration of it, I am persuaded that the good outweighs the parts I, personally, would just as soon were not included.

Since we must either vote for or against the entire bill as it now stands, I will have to cast my vote for it. It comes to us in the form of a conference report and we cannot make any amendments or alter it in any way.

There is justification for approval of this measure because of a number of factors involved and I mention only a few.

First of all, and this is one of the really important, if not the most important consideration here, we are able with this bill to establish a program under which Communist political propaganda coming into the United States from foreign countries would be intercepted and would be delivered only upon the request of the addressee. This bill expressly provides that mail matter, especially sealed letters originating in a foreign country, which is determined to be Communist political propaganda will be detained by the Post Office. I have never been in favor of our subsidizing the propaganda of the Communist countries and with this bill, we are finally taking a strong stand against it.

Who can possibly oppose this? Some things in this life have more value than the dollar.

This is a bill which, finally, involves long-needed salary reform. Some people will actually have their salary cut. The adjustments which are being made here are the result of a study begun in 1959, comparing the compensation of Federal employees with those in private industry doing the same or similar work.

I think the postal workers, for instance, are not receiving wages comparable to industry and if we are going to make more and more demands on the post office, as we do every year, for increased and improved services, then we have to pay for it.

We cannot be put in the position of penalizing people for working for the Federal Government.

It is not reasonable to hold Government employees at fixed salaries, yet allow industry, year after year, to raise the salaries of their employees. The cost of living creeps up every month and, if we are to keep qualified men on the job, we are going to have to keep a respectable ratio established.

The rising cost of living affects the elderly retired folks even more than it does those who are still laboring. This bill corrects a very serious situation with them, too.

This measure has the support of such diverse groups as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and Tax Foundation, Inc. It is widely supported by the management of many of our largest industries.

The Senate vote of 78 to 3 indicates complete bipartisan support and I think the vote here in the House will reflect that same attitude.

There will be, no doubt, those who will be able to pick at the bill and find flaws in it. I do myself. I am not satisfied with the section that raises the postal rates. Some raises are too much; some are too little. But under the rules for consideration of the measure, the bill cannot be amended so the final question for all of us to consider is: does the good outweigh the bad?

As Members of Congress, we serve as the employer of every Federal employee and we must answer that question.

I have examined this bill and it is my opinion that the good outweighs the doubtful provisions.

Therefore, I am casting my vote for it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana is exactly right, and as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I can testify that our committee worked long and hard over a period of months here in the House to develop this much-needed legislation.

The measure we have today passed in the House of Representatives is an excellent bill, embodying both necessary postage rate revision and equitable, essential pay reform. It is a major step forward in Federal pay policies, incorporating the long-neglected philosophy of comparable pay for comparable work.

Certainly it is in the best interests of all of our citizens individually and the Nation as a whole to assure the presence in the Post Office Department and the Federal Civil Service of the highest caliber employees, and this outstanding pay reform legislation is definitely a step in the right direction.

I have been privileged to have been able to fight for this bill from the beginning, both in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and on the floor of the House, and I am proud of my role in obtaining for our valued Federal employees a pay revision commensurate with their outstanding service to the citizens of the United States.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not imagine I shall add anything to my popularity either here or at home, by this speech, but I feel under some obligation to state the facts. Mr. Speaker, this bill started out as a revenue-raising bill, to get the deficit cut down in the operation of the Post Office Department. I supported that legislation on the floor of this House. It went over to the other body and now has come back with a pay increase for Federal employees.

Here are the facts, and if you are interested I hope you will listen. This bill, if you pass it, and you are going to pass it, because of the popular appeal and the lobbying of the Federal employees, will bring in revenue of $600 million under the increased rates for postage. Its cost will be $1,108 million, or an additional deficit to be added to the current deficit of $508 million a year. In other words the net result of this legislation is that the taxpayers in addition to paying higher postage rates will be taxed an additional $508 million. Those of you who talk about fiscal responsibility, those of you who talk about trying to save this Government, who are opposed to inflation, had better take a look at this situation and what you are doing. Like you, I would like to support this, but I cannot do so, in good conscience.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that this House cannot, with responsibility, meet its obligation to the postal workers. It is difficult to believe that it is necessary to bring a bill to the House floor so important to the welfare of those who serve us in Government in the closing days of this session of Congress under pressure of time and circumstance that certainly do not work in the best interest of either the Government or the people involved.

There are many things I do not like in the bill but I shall support the bill as the best we can expect from this 87th Congress. I have spoken to various members of the committee about the deficiencies in this legislation and am sorry that we did not consider the bill of significant proportion enough to have given it priority in the earlier days of the session.

My foremost objection to this bill is that the ones who need an increase in pay most are those who are the recipients of the least increase. I do not feel we can justify an increase of $3,460 to one group of Government workers whose annual income is $15,810 over that of a mail carrier who, having equal years of service and whose annual salary is $3,920, receives an increase of but $120!

While it is understood the employee receiving $15,810 has a responsibility greater than that of the employee who earns $3,920 the adverse conditions under which a postal carrier fulfills his duty, is not to be compared with the relative ease in which the $15,810 employee fulfills his duty, yet the increase in annual pay to the $15,810 employee is only $460 less than the annual pay of the carrier.

The second objection I have to the bill is that the pay increase for the carrier is tied to the postal rate increase. When this House set the minimum wage for a worker in private industry at $1.15 per hour, there was no suggestion that he may or may not earn it. Yet we insist that the postal workers' wage be tied to increase in the cost of handling mail.

My third objection to the bill is that it provides for pay increases in stages rather than an increase needed now.

I trust we will take a serious look at salaries of Government and postal employees next year before personal political considerations are associated with the decisions.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 7927, a bill to increase the postal rates and Federal employee salary benefits. I do this with a real sense of regret, not for the very well deserved classes of the postal workers, especially at the lower levels, or the needed tightening of the distribution of Communist mail in this country or because of the adjustment in postal rates for those classes of mail which have not been fully paying their share of Post Office expenses, but primarily because this is a poor method of legislating very important increases for all of our Federal employees without proper consideration of the impact that this bill will have on our Federal budget.

I especially wish to commend my good colleague from Nebraska with whom I personally worked in committee to include section 305 which provides a good method for screening out Communist political propaganda distributed in this country. The gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman CUNNINGHAM, was gracious enough to allow me to work with him in committee to see that this was included in the original postal rate adjustment bill and finally, to make sure that the Senate sustained the House position on this very important section. This action to screen Communist propaganda in no way denies adequate constitutional protection to those in the printing business and/or foreign organizations who care to distribute appropriate literature in this country.

However, it does allow the Postmaster General and the Attorney General to move vigorously to prevent the heavy impact of insidious Communist propaganda in this country and lessens the possibility of free postage to overseas Communist organizations. The gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman CUNNINGHAM is to be commended for his unceasing effort to maintain this section in the bill and we are all aware how many forces worked equally with diligence to remove this needed screening process.

I introduced, earlier in the session, H.R. 9455, which was very similar in nature to Congressman CUNNINGHAM's provisions and I am pleased that those of us on the committee who worked with the gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman CUNNINGHAM, were successful on a very close vote in including this in the bill. I am not sure the other body would have done the same had the House not insisted on this important amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the further point that it is the postal workers who once again are carrying this bill through the Congress because the overwhelming number of American people realize how deserved their increases are. Unfortunately, other Government employee organizations are receiving unmerited increases in this bill and are riding the coattails of fair and just increases for our postal service. I am not saying there are not increases merited in other Federal systems of employment because there are, but the postal workers' salary participation lags far behind other Government services.

I think it is unfair that the sentiment behind proper increases for the postal service should be responsible for carrying through unmerited increases in other Federal services. I expressed this objection in committee, and I express it now.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 278]

Adair
Alexander
Anfuso
Aspinall
Avery
Bailey
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blitch
Bolling
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Bromwell
Brown
Burke, Ky.
Celler
Chiperfield
Curtin
Dawson
Derounian
Dingell
Dominick
Dooley
Elliott
Evins
Findley
Fogarty
Frazier
Garland
Griffiths
Gubser
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Utah
Knox
Laird
Loser
McDonough
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Magnuson
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller George P.
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Peterson
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Saund
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Ullman
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Yates
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 325 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

POSTAL SERVICE AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT OF 1962

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHANSEN) there were ayes 205, noes 15.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 20, answered "present" 2, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

YEAS—312

Addabbo
Albert
Alford
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Broyhill
Bruce
Buckley
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Coad
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Durno
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garland
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reece
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex'
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rousselot
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Shelley
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Utt
Vanik
Van Zandt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Walter
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—20

Abbitt
Abernethy
Alger
Beermann
Burleson
Colmer
Curtis, Mo.
Devine
Fisher
Ford
Gathings
Gross
Johansen
Jonas
Marshall
Martin, Nebr.
Poff
Taber
Tuck
Winstead

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Church
Ray

NOT VOTING—101

Adair
Alexander
Anfuso
Aspinall
Avery
Bailey
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blitch
Bolling
Boykin
Breeding
Bromwell
Brown
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Curtin
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Dingell
Dominick
Dooley
Elliott
Evins
Findley
Fogarty
Frazier
Griffiths
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven

Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Utah
Knox
Laird
Loser
McDonough
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Magnuson
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller,
  George P.
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Peterson
Poage
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Saund
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Siler
Smith, Va.
Spence
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Ullman
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Yates
Zelenko

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Brown.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Short.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Denton with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Peterson with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Clem Miller with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Breeding with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Magnuson with McDonough.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Scranton.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Evins with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mrs. Weis.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. **CHURCH**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **CHURCH**. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on H.R. 7927, since the conference report contains an increase in retirement pay which would, if passed, be of personal benefit to me upon my retirement at the close of this 87th Congress, I regretfully accepted the necessity of disqualifying myself from voting and voted "present."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **MURRAY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10501. An act for the relief of Kenyon B. Zahner.

H.R. 12217. An act for the relief of George Edward Leonard.

H.R. 12434. An act to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 5700) entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Curtis to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8952) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Curtis to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12599) entitled "An act relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Curtis to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7283) entitled "An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment No. 2 to the bill (H.R. 12648) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message further announced that the Senate further insists on its amendments Nos. 2, 19, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54 to the above-entitled bill.

USE OF MOBILE TRADE FAIRS

Mr. **BONNER** submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3389) to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of the mobile trade fairs:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2538)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3389) to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), is amended by adding immediately after section 212(A) thereof (46 U.S.C. 1122a) the following new section:

" 'Sec. 212. (B) (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall encourage and promote the development and use of mobile trade fairs which are designed to show and sell the products of United States business and agriculture at foreign ports and at other commercial centers throughout the world where the operator or operators of the mobile trade fairs exclusively use United States flag vessels and aircraft in the transportation of their exhibits.

" '(b) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide to the operator or operators of such mobile trade fairs technical assistance and support as well as financial assistance for the purpose of defraying certain expenses incurred abroad, when the Secretary determines that such operations provide an economical and effective means of promoting export sales.

" '(c) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 per fiscal year for each of the three fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1965. In addition to such appropriated sums, the President shall make maximum use of foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States to carry out the purposes of this section.

" '(d) The Secretary of Commerce shall submit annually to the Congress a report on his activities under this Act.'

"Sec. 2. Section 104(m) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately before ', and (B)' the following: 'or section 212(B) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936'."

And the House agree to the same.

That the title be amended to read as follows: "To amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs."

HERBERT C. BONNER,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
BOB CASEY,
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAIR ENGLE,
E. L. BARTLETT,
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3389) to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The conference substitute is in large part the same as the amendment of the House to the Senate bill. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline except for minor technical and clarifying changes made necessary by reason of the conference agreement.

The House amendment authorized the Secretary of Commerce to encourage and promote the development and use of mobile trade fairs which are designed to show and sell the products of U.S. business and agriculture at foreign ports and other commercial centers throughout the world, and which, to the extent they are transported by vessel, shall be transported by vessels of U.S. registry. The conference substitute adds language to include U.S.-flag aircraft as well as vessels for the transportation of the mobile trade fairs.

The House amendment authorized appropriations for each of the 3 fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1962, and ending June 30, 1965, together with foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States when made available by the President. The conference substitute retains the appropriation provision, and includes in substance the provision of the Senate bill granting discretionary authority to the Secretary of Commerce to provide the operator or operators of the mobile trade fairs technical and financial support for the purpose of defraying certain expenses incurred abroad when he determines that such operations provide an economical and effective means of promoting export sales.

The conference substitute adds a new subsection which would require the Secretary of Commerce to submit annual reports to the Congress on activities under the act.

The committee report on the House amendment expressed the opinion that the administration of the mobile trade fairs program proposed by the bill should be carried out through the Maritime Administration, rather than through other agencies within the Department of Commerce concerned with trade promotion through the use of land-based, international trade fairs, trade centers, and trade mission programs. In a letter dated September 27, 1962, the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce made the following comments to Senator CLAIR ENGLE, chairman of the managers on the part of the Senate, with reference to the above-mentioned report:

"The Secretary does not believe it is at all desirable, by legislative history or express statutory language, to restrict administration of such program to any given bureau within the Department. It is by no means certain that this sort of program would now or at all times in the future be best administered by the Maritime Administration. Neither do I suggest that such a program, if provided by Congress and if funds are appropriated, would not in fact be administered by the Maritime Administration. The point I would emphasize is that this feature of administration should not be fixed by statute or legislative history but rather be left to the best judgment and discretion of the Secretary of Commerce in the light of events which may develop in the future.

"Accordingly, we would recommend that any legislation on this subject enacted by Congress should clearly provide, both in its express terms and in any legislative history, that administration is to be accomplished through such bureaus or offices in the Department of Commerce as the Secretary finds most suitable for the task."

The managers on the part of the House recognized the justification for the views of the Department of Commerce in regard to the desirability of leaving full discretion in the Secretary as to the best method of administering the program. However, the managers on the part of the House wish to emphasize their belief that, insofar as concerns mobile trade fairs transported by U.S.-flag vessels, the Maritime Administrator should participate in the coordination of plans for carrying out the program, irrespective of the particular bureau within the Department having overall responsibility for administration.

The managers on the part of the House expressed the view, concurred in by the managers on the part of the Senate, that official travel by U.S. officers or employees concerned with the administration of the mobile trade fairs program shall be on U.S.-flag ships or aircraft where such ships or aircraft are available, unless the necessity of the mission requires the use of a ship or aircraft under foreign flag.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
BOB CASEY,
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 3389) to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are all of the amendments germane to the subject matter of the bill as it left the House?

Mr. BONNER. The bill as it came over from the Senate included aviation. The House Committee struck out aviation, and it went back to the Senate. We went to conference. The Senate insisted on the inclusion of aviation.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House does not have jurisdiction over aviation. However, I have cleared this with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House, and it was unanimously agreed to. The matters pertaining to aviation will be referred hereafter to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should aviation be used in this matter. This passed practically unanimously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING ENTRY OF ALIEN SKILLED SPECIALISTS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania explain this legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was approved by Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary early in this session but was not acted upon largely because the Senate did not show any indication of getting around to taking it up.

The bill moves the date of registration up to March 31, 1954, for brothers and sisters and married sons and daughters of citizens of the United States where they have applied for an immigrant visa under the law and did not get a quota number.

The second section of the bill provides for entry or the adjustment of immigrant status of those skilled aliens whose services are urgently needed in the United States. Many of these people have been certified by the Defense Department and defense contractors that they are needed. We have been dealing with some of them on a piecemeal basis in the form of private legislation. This bill makes it possible to adjust the status of the people who are presently in the United States and have first preference petitions approved, and makes entry possible for those who, in similar status, still remain abroad.

I understand that the gentleman from West Virginia is going to offer an amendment that will strike section 4 from the bill.

It is a good amendment. The purpose, of course, is to not make it profitable to hide out for a prolonged period of time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] if the provision in the bill which would accept persons who are in this country or who are otherwise qualified for admission and with skills that are urgently needed in this country, would also apply to persons brought here for training under exchange programs and who under present law are required to leave the country for at least 2 years after their training before they are eligible to ask for an adjustment of status?

Mr. WALTER. No; it would not. The educational exchange visitors are under obligation to their governments and to their countrymen. We feel very strongly that they ought to return home and be for at least the 2 years of service to their respective countries. They agreed to do so before they came to the United States as exchange students or as visitors.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] use the phrase "hide out," and in what way?

Mr. WALTER. Well, under the law, where an alien has been in the United States prior to June 28, 1940, and where upon application it is found that he is of good moral character and is not a criminal or subversive, then his status may be adjusted regardless of how long he has been in hiding.

The other body changed that date from June 28, 1940, to December 24, 1952. We do not think that this should be done. We think it puts a premium on the ability to hide. If there are meritorious cases, then we feel we can deal with them adequately through existing suspension of deportation laws or through private legislation. As a matter of fact, I do not think there were more than 15 such cases brought to the attention of your committee under section 244(a)(4) of the immigration code, in this session.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman one final question:

How many people would the gentleman estimate would be involved in this and blanketed under this bill?

Mr. WALTER. In the first place, you must remember that most of the beneficiaries of first preference petitions are in the United States at the present time, they are here, and I doubt very much that proceedings to deport them have been instituted. In the other category—the sons and daughters and brothers and sisters of citizens of the United States—I think the total number is about 16,000. But they are only made eligible to enter. It does not mean that that is the number that will be actually coming.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I support S. 3661, a bill to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens. I regret that the lateness of the session prevents us from improving upon this bill.

While this bill helps, it does not do enough. It permits only a trickle to come when what we need is a stream. Our country was founded by Europeans, immigrants explored our West and built our railroads, our roads, our buildings and much industry. Our economy has been strengthened by the contributions made by the flow of people with skills. Our Nation has been defended by our manpower, our youth, many of whom were sons of recent immigrants.

The Senate amendment to the House provision, in section 1 of the bill which changes the registration date from December 31, 1954, back to March 31, 1954, closes the door to 45,000 people who have been patiently waiting to rejoin their relatives, their parents, their brothers and sisters. Those who made these changes are experts in figures but they do not apparently understand emotions or strong family ties. This cutback on date is shortsighted and detrimental to our relations with peoples who seek to rejoin their families. I am unhappy by this cutback but I am pleased for the extension of registration date of 3 months to March 31, 1954. In the next session I shall continue to fight on to see to it that amendments are made so that families are reunited as was promised during the presidential campaign.

I applaud the committee's action in giving nonquota status to skilled workers. This provision will clear up the long lists of first quota preferences which consume the numbers which might be available to second, third, and fourth preference and nonpreference applicants. This provision will permit 7,000 families to come to the United States. From my observations skilled workers can find employment in Europe and need not come here. However, family connections and relatives lure people to our shores.

We in the United States should never forget that we can use new bloodstreams. We must know that the economically poor, the farmer of Italy, France, Germany, or other European country desires to come to the United States, the land of opportunity. This bill offers little to these people who need to emigrate. Southern Senators and Congressmen who oppose liberalization would prefer taking bracero or Mexican labor rather than Europeans who want to settle on the farm. More than 400,000 braceros or Mexican laborers filter through the Southwest and South to work the farms and then to move on. The Senators and Congressmen from the Southwest and Southland oppose the entry of needy Europeans on the pretext that our country does not need laborers yet they vigorously support the entry of transitory Mexican workers by the hundreds of thousands.

How long will our legislators be blind to what our country needs? We must open our doors to those yearning to be free. We must open our doors wide to let democracy in. A door slightly ajar is not enough. We need a wide open door and an open immigration policy.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, because of my unceasing efforts and long and continuing interest in immigration and related problems, which are of utmost concern to the 14th Congressional District of New Jersey, and my constituency, I take the floor of the House of Representatives today in defense of S. 3361, which has only this morning obtained Senate approval. I have steadfastly worked to bring about this much needed amendment of our existing immigration law. The bill which is under consideration today is one in which I am vitally interested and wholeheartedly endorse.

This bill is designed to facilitate the entry into the United States of certain skilled aliens, whose services are urgently needed. Before anyone could be considered for entry under this provision of the bill, the Attorney General must have approved the petition after a fully and complete investigation of the alien skilled specialist involved and after the Immigration and Naturalization Service has ascertained that the American petitioner has fully documented the need for that person's services. It is estimated that approximately 16,000 aliens will be admitted under this provision, if enacted into law. In addition, it will facilitate the entry into the United States of brothers and sisters, married sons and daughters and their respective families of American citizens.

Its primary purpose is to admit highly skilled and professional workers into this country to fill an urgent need for employment. They may only be granted admission after obtaining an employment clearance and assurance given that there is a shortage of such workers here in the United States and/or to fill employment in defense work vital to our national defense and economy.

In my congressional district, there are numerous families which will be reunited if this legislation is enacted into law. I sponsored a bill in the House during the present session, H.R. 12569, similar in content to the bill under consideration at this time.

I wish to associate myself with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, who has been the leader in the fight for liberalization of our immigration laws, particularly with respect to the reunification of families. I wish to thank him personally for his leadership in the House, and the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, for his leadership in the Senate, and I beseech my colleagues to join with us to assure the passage of this legislation.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], in support of S. 3361. This bill is an amended version of the companion bill I filed dealing with the same subject matter, an act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and other purposes, as amended. The services of these skilled aliens is urgently needed and will result in reaping untold benefits to our Nation. I understand that the bill as amended, would provide nonquota status for fourth preference quota immigrants registered on a consular waiting list under a priority date earlier than March 31, 1954. The fourth preference classification of quota immigrants includes brothers, sisters, married sons, or married daughters of U.S. citizens and their accompanying spouses and children. As amended, the cutoff date is moved back to March 31, 1954, and it is estimated that approximately 16,000 aliens will benefit under this amended provision. Section 2 of the bill would provide nonquota status for certain skilled specialists whose services have been determined by the Attorney General to be urgently needed. This would affect another few thousand aliens and allow for their lawful entry into the United States of America.

Section 4 of the bill, as amended would amend section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended—66 Stat. 219—to permit the creation of a record of lawful admission for permanent residence in cases of aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952. Under existing law such an adjustment may be made in cases of aliens who entered the United States of America prior to June 28, 1940.

This bill liberalizes the Immigration Act and will allow entry of approximately 25,000 persons and will aid in bringing together and uniting families that have been separated as the result of our present laws. It will prove helpful to many who have relatives in Italy, Portugal, and Greece. I support the bill and I will continue to fight for the liberalization of our Immigration laws in order that justice will prevail.

I also wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the Member from New Jersey, the Honorable DOMINICK V. DANIELS, and the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for their successful efforts in bringing about the enactment of this much needed legislation. Let us pray that this is the dawn of a new era for those who have waited so long to enter our shores.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the chairman of the Immigration Committee, Mr. WALTER, in support of this most worthwhile legislation which I know merits the approval of the House. This bill is one that our chairman has worked on for a considerable period of time since he was aware of the present need of this legislation. S. 3361 is similar to a bill filed in the House that I cosponsored with others that will facilitate the entry into the United States of certain skilled aliens whose services are urgently needed and certain relatives of U.S. citizens. This bill will permit the creation of a record of lawful admission for permanent residence in the cases of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952.

It would provide nonquota status for fourth preference quota immigrants registered on a consular waiting list prior to March 31, 1954. As you know, Mr. Speaker, this classification includes brothers, sisters, married sons, or married daughters of U.S. citizens and their accompanying spouses and children.

Another section of this bill provides nonquota status for certain first preference quota immigrants registered prior to March 31, 1954.

Immigrants created and developed our Nation. Their hunger for freedom has found a fulfillment here that has not as yet been equaled in any other part of the world.

Our people's regard for humanity, their faith in the worth of every individual, is nourished by the varied racial and cultural contributions that come to us in the person of immigrants who are welcomed to our open society.

By helping aliens to join the family circle of their close relatives in the United States, we shall strengthen our Nation with the love and gratitude of those who are reunited in freedom.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will bring much happiness to many of our people and I sincerely hope that the House will support this measure without any undue delay.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been consistently advocating, over the past 15 years, improvement in and modernization of our immigration laws, I am impelled by a strong sense of duty to urge approval of this bill, S. 3361, new before us.

A similar bill was considered and approved by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and we are pleased that the Senate saw fit to act upon the measure earlier today.

The first section of this bill extends the date of registration 3 months, to March 31, 1954, for brothers and sisters and married sons and daughters of citizens of the United States where they have applied for an immigrant visa, under the law, and did not receive a quota number. Although the Senate would not agree to our proposed registration date of December 31, 1954, the date established in this measure will, at least, permit some 16,000 to be reunited with their families in this country if they so desire. In the next Congress, I most earnestly hope that the registration date will be further extended to cover all of those qualified applicants, who have been patiently waiting, to rejoin family members and relatives in this country.

The second part of this measure provides for admittance, or the adjustment of immigrant status, of those skilled aliens whose services are urgently needed in the United States. The Department of Defense and defense contractors have testified to the essential need for these individuals and the Labor Department has established that they would not be competing for jobs with American workers. This section of the bill will greatly reduce the work of the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate where this problem has been dealt with, over a long period, in a piecemeal fashion by use of private bills for practically each individual involved. Under the provisions of this measure, the State Department and Immigration and Naturalization Service will have the authority to process these applicants and make the adjustment in their immigration status.

Mr. Speaker, none of the fundamental requirements, such as good character, non-Communist affiliation, integrity, et cetera, for persons to enter this country are being waived by this legislation.

This is a good, sound measure entirely within the traditions of our immigration policies and I most earnestly hope it is promptly approved without further delay.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief statement on the stopgap immigration bill—S. 3361—that is now making its way through the House and Senate. This is good legislation—so far as it goes—and I am in favor of it. But I should like to make it clear that bills of this type are not satisfactory to me or to my colleagues who would like to see a major overhaul of our immigration policies, especially with respect to the national origins quota provisions of the law.

The bill would facilitate the immigration of certain skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens. First, it would grant nonquota immigrant status to fourth preference aliens—that is, the brothers, sisters and married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens—who have been registered on a consular waiting list since March 31, 1954. An estimated 16,000 aliens would be allowed admission under this provision. These aliens, in my opinion, deserve to enter the United States. They have been separated from their family members—brothers, sisters or parents—for a long time and have been seeking to rejoin them for over 8 years.

Second, the bill gives nonquota status to skilled aliens in the first preference class on whose behalf petitions were filed with the Attorney General prior to April 1, 1962. I am told that some 7,000 immigrant families would be granted admission for permanent residence under this provision and that most of the skilled aliens affected are already in the United States, many of them doing vital defense work right now.

NOTE.—At the time of this writing the bill is scheduled for a conference to be held on October 9 on the differences between the bill as passed by both Houses. These differences are: First, the House deleted a provision to permit the creation of a record of lawful admission for permanent residence for aliens who entered the country before December 24, 1952; and second, the House inserted a provision that the head of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs be designated an Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome this legislation, but it is just a further bit of evidence, in my opinion, of the need to correct the basic inequities in our immigration quota system. It will help to meet the backlog on the oversubscribed quota lists, but it is nothing more than stopgap, backdoor legislation. When are we going to face up to reality and admit that we must drastically revise our quota provisions and establish an immigration system that is both sound and equitable?

Until we do so we cannot honestly say that our immigration law is at one with the inspired words of Emma Lazarus which are inscribed on the Statue of Liberty:

> "Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
> The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me.
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any alien who (1) is registered on a consular waiting list pursuant to section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) under priority date earlier than March 31, 1954, and (2) is eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4) of the said Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) on a basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to January 1, 1962, and the spouse and children of such alien, shall be held to be nonquota immigrants and if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, shall be issued nonquota immigrant visas: *Provided,* That, upon his application for an immigrant visa and for his admission into the United States, the alien is found to have retained his relationship to the petitioner and status as established in the approved petition.

SEC. 2. Any alien eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153) on the basis of a petition filed with the Attorney General prior to April 1, 1962, shall be held to be a nonquota immigrant and may be issued a nonquota immigrant visa: *Provided,* That, upon his application for an immigrant visa and for admission to the United States or for adjustment of his immigrant status in the United States pursuant to section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) the alien is found to have retained his status as established in the approved petition. This section shall be applicable only to aliens admissible to the United States except for the fact that an immigrant visa is not promptly available for issuance to them because the first 50 per centum of the quota of the quota area to which they are chargeable is oversubscribed by beneficiaries of petitions approved by the Attorney General pursuant to sections 203(a)(1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153, 1154) prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) is hereby amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "The Attorney General shall forward to the Congress a report on each approved petition for immigrant status under section 203(a)(1) stating the basis for his approval and such facts as were by him deemed to be pertinent in establishing the beneficiary's qualifications for the preferential status and for the petitioner's urgent need for his services. Such reports shall be submitted to the Congress on the first and fifteenth day of each calendar month in which the Congress is in session."

SEC. 4. Section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1259) is hereby amended by substituting the date "December 24, 1952;" for the date "June 28, 1940;".

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania going to accept the amendment?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. This is a good amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE: On page 3, strike out lines 14, 15, and 16.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Add section 4 to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 104(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1104) is hereby amended to read:

"(b) There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Consular Affairs, to be headed by an administrator (with the title of Assistant Secretary of State), with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

BREAKTHROUGH IN DESTROYER DESIGN BY BETHLEHEM STEEL CO.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts, join me in this statement.

Bethlehem Steel Co. has developed a breakthrough in destroyer design that offers such improvements in cost and performance as to constitute a quantum jump in the art.

Compared to present ships, the new design features the following:

First, 20 to 25 percent higher speed—40 knots top speed.

Second, 50 to 60 percent greater cruising range without refueling—8,000 miles.

Third, comparable armament but increased military effectiveness because of 1 and 2.

Fourth, reduction in complement to about one-half.

Fifth, better sea-keeping ability.

Sixth, improved reliability.

Seventh, lower first costs when produced in numbers.

Eighth, substantially lower operating costs.

One feature of the design is the integration of standard aircraft jet engines as prime movers to drive marine propellers. Cold start to 40 knots in about 4 minutes. Steam destroyers require hours for buildup to full power.

This ship has all-around mission capability but could be especially suited to antisubmarine warfare.

Bethlehem Steel Co., Quincy, Mass., has proposed under date of August 2, 1962, to build one ship on a research-and-development basis and is prepared to deliver in 24 months.

The necessity of retaining highly trained personnel possessing unusual skills becomes of prime importance with the delivery of the USS *Bainbridge.* An immediate start of work would accomplish this end.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the Members and hope that those who are responsible for appropriating funds will recognize this great advance made in the new construction of this new type of antisubmarine warfare which will prove to be so helpful to the Nation in time of war.

I express the hope that the Navy will take advantage of this new breakthrough by Bethlehem Steel Co.'s shipbuilding division.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, at the time the vote was taken on the bill H.R. 7927 I was called from the floor to answer a long distance telephone call from a service wife in California. I missed the vote. Had I been here I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the vote on the conference report on the bill H.R. 7927.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE]?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, last evening I missed the rollcall No. 276. This is only the second rollcall I have missed in this Congress. I was here until quite a late hour last evening and when I left I was under the impression the House had completed its legislative business.

Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

SECTION 362(b) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1288) to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following language be added to section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C.A. 360):

"The Commission may, upon a finding that the public interest would be served thereby, waive the annual inspection required under this section from the time of first arrival at a United States port from a foreign port, for the sole purpose of enabling the vessel to proceed coastwise to another port in the United States where an inspection can be held: *Provided,* That such waiver may not exceed a period of thirty days."

Mr. **MACK**. Mr. Speaker, section 362 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934 requires that every U.S.-flag vessel must have its communications equipment prescribed by the act inspected at least once each year by the Federal Communications Commission. This bill would authorize the FCC, upon a finding that the public interest would be served thereby, to waive for a period of not to exceed 30 days the required inspection and to permit the vessel to proceed coastwise to another port in the United States where the inspection will then be held.

Enactment of the legislation has been recommended by the Federal Communications Commission and has been urged by the shipping industry because the present inflexible inspection requirement frequently causes vessel operators to suffer costly delays due to the unavailability of inspection personnel at the original port at which the vessel docked.

The 30-day waiver authorized by this legislation would make it possible for such vessels to proceed to another port where the inspection would then be conducted.

The committee knows of no opposition to this legislation which passed the other body during the 86th Congress and again during the present Congress.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOANS FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. **MULTER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 235) to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a $50 million fund that is being carried over or would be carried over, if the extension is granted.

Mr. **MULTER**. If this resolution is adopted it will extend the life of the existing statute until June 1963, continuing to make available moneys authorized and appropriated to the extent of $32.5 million.

Mr. **GROSS**. Did I understand the gentleman to say $32.5 million?

Mr. **MULTER**. Yes.

Mr. **GROSS**. I was under the impression that it was $50 million.

Mr. **MULTER**. The original amount authorized and appropriated was $50 million, but as of this date $32.5 million remains unexpended.

Mr. **GROSS**. So there has been spent $17.5 million?

Mr. **MULTER**. Spent and lent, yes.

Mr. **GROSS**. This merely continues the remainder of the fund until next June?

Mr. **MULTER**. That is correct.

Mr. **GROSS**. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **BECKER**. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a further question of my good friend from New York. What was the $17.5 million used for since 1955 and what will the remaining $32.5 million be used for? Did the money go to cities that applied for it?

Mr. **MULTER**. Most of it was in loans; a small part of it was in grants.

This provision was enacted last year as an amendment to the act of 1955. It was the first time we provided for mass transportation loans and grants. There have been expended for that purpose loans of $10,500,000, and there are loan applications on hand presently for about $300,000. The balance of the funds was expended for grants to municipalities that sought to improve their mass transportation facilities.

Mr. **BECKER**. That is what I wanted to get at. Where did it go principally? The gentleman said what it was, but where did it go?

Mr. **MULTER**. Philadelphia and Chicago had their loan applications processed and granted.

Mr. **BECKER**. In what amount?

Mr. **MULTER**. The total was $10,500,000. There is pending a $500,000 application by the city of Fresno for a loan.

Mr. **BECKER**. So what the gentleman is requesting now is an extension of the use of this money to June 1963—$32,500,000 that can be applied for transportation loans and grants?

Mr. **MULTER**. For loans and grants. The maximum amount is $32,500,000 for both loans and grants.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202(d) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "December 31, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1963".

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOANS TO INDIAN TRIBES FOR PUBLIC WORKS OR FACILITIES

Mr. **MULTER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2454) to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make Indian tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. **BECKER**. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask just for information, in what way is this going to help our Indians, because they have been sadly neglected. We have Indians in New York. We have some in upstate New York.

Mr. **MULTER**. This merely clarifies an omission in this particular title of the Housing Act. The 1955 act was intended to include all public agencies. Unfortunately, due to what I believe is a misinterpretation of the law, Indian tribes even though recognized by law as public agencies are held not to be eligible for such loans. This will make no change in the law except to make clear that they can qualify on the basis of the same standards as apply to any other applicant.

Mr. **BECKER**. Will this in any way aid the Labre Mission on the Sioux Reservation in the Dakotas?

Mr. **MULTER**. I know nothing about that particular situation. This concerns public works and community facilities in connection with housing developments.

Mr. **BECKER**. Even if they live in tents, is not that a housing development? Would not the gentleman call tents out there a housing development?

Mr. **MULTER**. I am not familiar with the situation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. **BECKER**. I hope my colleague will look into it.

Mr. **GROSS**. Reserving the right to object. Mr. Speaker, would this permit the Indians to use funds to accelerate public works?

Mr. **MULTER**. This would merely say that an Indian tribe is a qualified applicant and may file an application, but they have to meet all the other requirements. They must show they have a good project which meets all the qualifications all others must meet. They have to show they are financially responsible and competent to undertake the work, that the project is a good one, and that there is reasonable assurance that they will repay the loan. Then the application will be processed.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That section 201 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by—

(a) striking out in the first paragraph "subdivisions" and inserting in lieu thereof "subdivisions, and Indian tribes";

(b) striking out in the second paragraph "States," and inserting in lieu thereof "States, and Indian tribes,"; and

(c) striking out in the third paragraph "of States," and inserting in lieu thereof "of States, and Indian tribes,".

SEC. 2. Section 202 of such Act is amended by—

(a) striking out in clause (1) of subsection (a) "same State)," and inserting in lieu thereof "same State), and Indian tribes";

(b) inserting ", or an Indian tribe" before the period at the end of the second sentence in subsection (c).

SEC. 3. Section 207 of such Act is amended by striking out in the first sentence "instrumentalities" and inserting in lieu thereof "instrumentalities, and Indian tribes".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARK HILL RESERVOIR, GEORGIA-SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1563) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Georgia-South Carolina, to the Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

As I understand, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to convey some 285 acres of land presently held by the Federal Government in the reservoir area to the Boy Scouts. This land is in Georgia. The committee considered the matter. It was initially made part of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill and was considered by the Committee on Public Works that it should be taken up as a separate matter. It was passed unanimously by the Committee on Public Works, but I believe with the understanding that it was not the intention of the committee that this should set a precedent with regard to the conveyance of other public lands at no cost to other agencies, which could be considered a precedent otherwise.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is correct.

OMNIBUS PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATION BILL TIED UP BY PUBLIC POWER GRAB

Mr. CRAMER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think this would be a propitious time in that this was initially a part of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill to say that with the objection of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, thus necessitating having to get a rule from the Committee on Rules, and approved by a House vote, I believe it should be understood that the problem involved in this legislation is the $725 million added by the other body largely for public power projects.

The Burns Creek Project at $52 million, which was stricken in the House.

The Knowles Dam which is extremely controversial at an eventual cost of $258 million.

Devils Jumps, $151 million.

Bruces Eddy, $186 million.

Trotters Shoals project, South Carolina, which had not even cleared the engineers yet, $78 million. That makes a total of possibly $725 million.

I say that this has created the problem in the public works authorization bill, bringing up these controversial projects at the last minute without any public hearings and without the House having an opportunity to express its will on the matter and including Burns Creek turned down by the House just the other day and prior to the other body's action. I say that this time at the last minute without even public hearings that this is an attempt at one of the largest public power steals in the history of this country, without giving private enterprise an opportunity to even have their applications considered, which are pending in a number of instances before the Federal Power Commission, and if in fact we are either first, delayed in adjourning as a result of this logjam; second, if, in fact, good projects in the rivers and harbors bill and flood control are not authorized as the result of this logjam, then I say the responsibility rests very clearly with those people who insist on putting in controversial projects and largely public power projects without proper hearings and without an opportunity for the people who are concerned about it to be considered, without proper recreational considerations, without proper flood control considerations or proper private enterprise and competitive considerations to be considered. It is their responsibility, if we do not have an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill in this session of the Congress.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. And there is also included in this public works omnibus bill projects that the House committees have repeatedly turned down.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Many of these projects that this House, through its committees or otherwise, has turned down, some of them a number of times, had obviously no adequate consideration. I personally feel that to try to force them into this omnibus bill through this procedure is unjustifiable and the facts show that it imperils the good projects.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this whole matter of the rivers and harbors bill has been a matter of extended discussion by the House. The gentleman from Florida is one of the conferees. Certainly he would have full and ample opportunity to register his protest to all the items that were contained in the bill that we passed yesterday, and certainly it seems to me that this is not the proper moment to contest the rivers and harbors bill which was a matter of extended discussion by the Members.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman, further reserving the right to object, that Burns Creek, Knowles Dam, Devil's Jump, Bruce's Eddy, and Potter's Shoals projects were not considered in the House, were not considered in committee and, therefore, they are not subject to the suggestion the gentleman made. I do not know whether we will even get a chance to consider them in conference in that a rule under the present situation is necessary and which results from loading down the bill in truly pork-barrel fashion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman whether the gift of the 285 acres of land proposed to be given to the Boy Scouts in this bill is of such nature that the Boy Scouts could sell the land.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the provisions of the bill, the land is given for the use of the Boy Scouts.

Mr. GROSS. Then there is a reversionary provision in it?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There is a reversionary provision in the bill. If it is not used for the purpose set forth, it reverts to the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Incorporated, Boy Scouts of America, without monetary consideration therefor, but subject to the conditions of this Act, the area or areas he determines to be available for conveyance within the two hundred and eight-two acres of land leased to the said Boy Scouts Council at the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Georgia-South Carolina, under lease granted January 1, 1961, numbered DA–09–133–CIVENG–61–316.

SEC. 2. Title to property authorized to be conveyed by this Act shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon, if the Georgia-Carolina Council, Incorporated, Boy Scouts of America—

(1) has not commenced the development of such property for recreation and camping purposes within the three-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) shall ever cease to use such property for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to grant to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Incorporated, Boy Scouts of America, such rights-of-way for public access and utility lines across any property of the United States as may be necessary to facilitate the development and use of the property conveyed under authority of this Act for recreation and camping purposes.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property herein authorized shall be subject to the right to flood due to the fluctuation of the water level of the Clark Hill Reservoir project and to such other conditions, reservations, and restrictions as the Secretary of the Army may determine to be necessary for the management and operation of said Clark Hill Dam and Reservoir project.

Sec. 5. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the Georgia-Carolina Council, Incorporated, Boy Scouts of America.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICE CORPORATIONS OF BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 8874) to authorize certain banks to invest in corporations whose purpose is to provide clerical services for them, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert: "any activity other than the performance of bank services for banks."

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman to state the purpose of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The purpose of this bill is to allow banks to invest in a separate corporation for the purpose of doing bookkeeping and clerical work necessary through the use of new electronic data processing machines which are now available. It will be very helpful to the banks in many ways, be a saving to them, allow good profits, allow them to give better service, which we all desire, and be very helpful in other ways.

Mr. WIDNALL. In other words, it will be very helpful to the small banks in helping them do their bookkeeping and get out some of the burdensome reports they must mail out in the matter of dividend and interest payments.

Mr. PATMAN. That would be considered one of the objects.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is not this the bill the gentleman from Texas objected to yesterday or the day before?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I did, but the Senate amendment is a good one, and I no longer object to it since the only question here is on the Senate amendment and it is all right. There are other questions raised by this bill that should be looked into in the future.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider and House Resolution 828 was laid on the table.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a letter addressed to Chairman Spence from the Secretary of the Treasury regarding this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1962.

Hon. Brent Spence,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Reference is made to your request for my comments on H.R. 8874, as amended, "to authorize certain banks to invest in corporations whose purpose is to provide clerical services for them and for other purposes."

H.R. 8874 would authorize national banks, district banks and State member and nonmember insured banks to invest an amount not in excess of 10 percent of capital and surplus in the stock of corporations organized to perform bank services for them. Modern day banking requires the performance of a huge volume of data processing activities. High speed equipment designed to handle this work is being acquired by many banks. However, such equipment is very expensive, and small banks are often not able to acquire it. This places them at a severe disadvantage with their larger competitors. Thus, there is a need to change those provisions in our laws affecting national banks and State member banks which prevent such banks from jointly investing in the stock of corporations organized to acquire such equipment. If small banks are permitted to obtain the use of this equipment, their competitive capabilities will be strengthened, to the benefit of the banking industry and the Nation's economy.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas Dillon,
Secretary of the Treasury.

AUTHORIZING THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES TO CONVEY BY QUITCLAIM DEED A PARCEL OF LAND IN PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7781) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad, with Senate amendments therto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

On page 2, after line 19, insert:

"Sec. 2. That the first paragraph of section 1 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain lands in the State of Iowa', approved October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 805), is amended and supplemented to read as follows: 'That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell and convey to the State of Iowa, by quitclaim deed, at fair market value as determined by him, subject to all outstanding rights, and subject to the condition that the property shall be used for public purposes, all the rights, title, and interest of the United States to those certain tracts of land containing approximately 4,649 acres of land, more or less, located in Van Buren, Lee, Appanoose, and Davis Counties, Iowa, in:'."

On page 2, after line 19, insert:

"Sec. 3. (a) That, upon the application by the State of Minnesota and the agreement by the State to exchange for such lands State-owned lands in the Superior National Forests, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire not to exceed one thousand acres in sections 3, 4, 9, and 10, township 121 north, range 26 west, Wright County, Minnesota. Upon such acquisition the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to exchange such lands for State-owned lands in the Superior National Forest suitable for administration as a part thereof and having a value not less than that of the lands in Wright County to be exchanged therefor as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be needed to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this section."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas please explain these amendments?

Mr. BROOKS. I may say that the bill transfers to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department some land on which they have a fire station in return for the services they render the National Government. We passed this bill in the House. There are two Senate amendments, one of which is in essence a House bill passed by the House which concerns the transfer of some land in Iowa. The other amendment, in essence, allows the State of Minnesota and the Secretary of Agriculture to work out an exchange of land on a fair value basis.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say for the benefit of the Members that this has cleared on this side of the aisle.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that the bill introduced by me and attached to this bill in the Senate as an amendment, namely H.R. 11111, is for the purpose of making sure that Federal land eligible for transfer in Iowa will not be used to produce agricultural commodities that are subject to Government programs or would add to commodities considered to be in surplus. We do not want to find this land being rented back to the Federal Government in the future under some agriculture program used in a manner that would be inconsistent with our land-use policies. To be consistent with national land-use policies and needs, the land should be used only for public purposes and principally for recreational purposes.

It was not my intent to prohibit the sale of ripe timber but it would prohibit the sale of timberland or of timber for any purpose not consistent with making the land better serve the public for recreational purposes. It was the intent of the bill that such limitations as would adequately protect this purpose be inserted in the transfer documents. This, of course, would also be considered by the appraisers of the property for it would reserve an interest to the public in general and thus be less than a fee simple title. This would, of course, reduce the appraisal value.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AIRCRAFT LOAN GUARANTEES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10129) to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2534)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10129) to amend the Act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of September 7, 1957 (Public Law 85-307; 71 Stat. 629), is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.'

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of such Act of September 7, 1957, is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'Board' the first place it appears in the first sentence of such section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary';

"(2) by inserting 'Civil Aeronautics' immediately preceding 'Board' the second place it appears in such first sentence;

"(3) by striking out the term 'United States' each place it appears in clause (c) of such first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place 'forty-eight contiguous States'; and

"(4) by striking out 'Board' where it appears in the second sentence of such section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary'.

"SEC. 3. Section 4 of such Act of September 7, 1957, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$5,000,000' in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof '$10,000,000'; and

"(2) by striking out 'Board' in subsections (e) and (f) and inserting in lieu thereof in each of such subsections 'Secretary'.

"SEC. 4. Section 5 of such Act of September 7, 1957, is amended by striking out 'Board' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary'.

"SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act of September 7, 1957, is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'it' the first place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'him';

"(2) by striking out 'it' the second place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'he'; and

"(3) by striking out 'Board' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Secretary'.

"(b) Section 6 of such Act of September 7, 1957, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

" '(c) The Secretary shall make available to the Comptroller General of the United States such information with respect to the loan guaranty program under this Act as the Comptroller General may require to carry out his duties under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921'.

"SEC. 6. Section 7 of such Act of September 7, 1957, is amended by striking out 'Board' in subsections (b) and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof in each of such subsections 'Department of Commerce'.

"SEC. 7. Section 8 of such Act of September 7, 1957, is amended by striking out 'five' and inserting in lieu thereof 'ten'.

"SEC. 8. Section 410 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1380), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to the guaranty of loans by the Secretary of Commerce under the provisions of such Act of September 7, 1957, as amended, but the Secretary of Commerce shall consult with and consider the views and recommendations of the Board in making such guaranties.'

"SEC. 9. (a) All orders, determinations, rules, regulations, permissions, approvals, agreements, rulings, directives, and privileges which have been issued, made, or granted, or allowed to become effective, by the Civil Aeronautics Board, or any court of competent jurisdiction, under any provision of law amended by this Act, or in the exercise of duties, powers, or functions which, under this Act, are vested in the Secretary of Commerce, and which are in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or repealed by the Secretary of Commerce or by any court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

"(b) The provisions of this Act shall not affect any proceedings pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board on the date of enactment of this Act; but any such proceedings shall be continued before the Secretary of Commerce, orders issued therein, and payments made pursuant to such orders, as if this Act had not been enacted; and orders issued in any such proceedings shall continue in effect until modified, terminated, superseded, or repealed by the Secretary of Commerce, or by operation of law.

"(c) The provisions of this Act shall not affect suits commenced prior to the date of its enactment; and all such suits shall be continued by the Secretary of Commerce, proceedings therein had, appeals therein taken, and judgments therein rendered, in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Civil Aeronautics Board or officer of the United States, in relation to the discharge of official duties, shall abate by reason of any transfer of authority, power, or duties from the Board or officer to the Secretary of Commerce under the provisions of this Act, but the court upon a motion or a supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such transfer, showing the necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the Secretary of Commerce.

"SEC. 10. (a) The officers, employees, and property (including office equipment and official records) of the Civil Aeronautics Board which the Bureau of the Budget, after consultation with the Board, shall determine to have been employed by the Board in the exercise and performance of those powers and duties vested in and imposed upon it by the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 629), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, and which are vested by this Act in the Secretary of Commerce, shall be transferred to the Department of Commerce upon such date or dates as the Bureau of the Budget shall specify. The transfer of personnel under this section shall be without reduction in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate after the end of the fiscal year during which such transfer is made to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned.

"(c) All records transferred to the Secretary of Commerce under this Act shall be available for use by him to the same extent as if such records were originally records of the Secretary."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OREN HARRIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
JOHN B. BENNETT,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
STROM THURMOND,
NORRIS COTTON,
HUGH SCOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10129) to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text, and the House disagreed to the Senate amendment.

The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the House bill and the Senate amendment thereto.

The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are explained below, except for clerical corrections, incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

Existing law referred to in this statement is the act entitled "An act to provide for Government guaranty of private loans to certain air carriers for purchase of modern aircraft and equipment, to foster the development and use of modern transport aircraft by such carriers, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1957 (Public Law 85-307; 71 Stat. 629). The authority to guarantee loans under this act expired September 7, 1962.

HOUSE BILL

The bill passed by the House proposed to change existing law in the following respects:

1. It extended for five years from September 7, 1962, the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to guarantee aircraft purchase loans.

2. It increased from $5 million to $10 million the ceiling on the amount of loans which could be guaranteed and outstanding with respect to the same carrier.

3. It required the Civil Aeronautics Board to furnish the Comptroller General such information with respect to the loan guarantee program as he might require to carry out his auditing duties under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921.

SENATE AMENDMENT

The Senate amendment, which was a substitute for the text of the House bill, also proposed to extend the loan guarantee program for five years from September 7, 1962, and to increase from $5 million to $10 million the ceiling on the amount of loans which could be guaranteed and outstanding with respect to the same carrier. In addition, however, the Senate amendment proposed to change existing law in the following respects:

1. It made scheduled all-cargo carriers eligible for loan guarantees, with a ceiling of $15 million per carrier on the amount of loans which could be guaranteed and outstanding, subject to certain conditions relating to the type of aircraft purchased with a guaranteed loan and the use of such aircraft by the purchasing carrier.

2. It transferred from the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Secretary of Commerce the responsibility for administering the loan guarantee program.

The Senate amendment also contained appropriate provisions for the transfer from the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Department of Commerce of property and personnel utilized by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the administration of the loan guarantee program, and appropriate transitional provisions preserving existing agreements, rules, and regulations, and pending administrative and judicial proceedings, involved in the loan guarantee program.

CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

The substitute agreed to in conference follows the provisions of the Senate amendment transferring from the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Secretary of Commerce the responsibility for the administration of the loan guarantee program, together with appropriate transitional provisions preserving existing agreements, regulations, and proceedings, and appropriate provisions transferring property and personnel utilized in such program.

Aside from the transfer of administrative responsibility, the conference substitute follows the provisions of the House bill extending the loan guarantee authority for five years from September 7, 1962; increasing from $5 million to $10 million the ceiling on loans to one carrier which may be guaranteed and outstanding; restricting the class of carriers eligible for loan guarantees to those originally included in existing law; and requiring that information with respect to the loan guarantee program be made available to the Comptroller General.

Oren Harris,
John Bell Williams,
Samuel N. Friedel,
John B. Bennett,
William L. Springer,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the conference report continues the aircraft purchase loan guarantee to help the local service and some of the other smaller airlines to provide better service and to reduce their need for subsidy.

With one exception, the bill adopted in conference follows the House bill passed September 10. The exception is that administration of the program is transferred from the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Secretary of Commerce, as proposed by the Senate.

A second Senate amendment, to make the four certificated all-cargo carriers eligible for guaranteed loans, was not agreed to.

Thus, the bill agreed to in conference accomplishes the following:

First. The authority to guarantee approved loans made by eligible carriers is extended 5 years from September 7, 1962.

Second. The amount of loans which can be guaranteed and outstanding for any one carrier is increased from $5 to $10 million.

Third. Administration of the program is transferred to the Secretary of Commerce.

4. The Secretary is required to furnish the Comptroller General of the United States information with respect to the loan guarantee programs required to carry out the auditing duties of the Comptroller General under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921.

There has been no criticism of the Civil Aeronautics Board regarding the handling of this program. The transfer from the Board to the Secretary of Commerce is justified on the grounds that approval of these loans is an administrative matter. The Board is an independent regulatory agency. The executive branch should have some voice in approval of these loans. Each loan approved is a potential charge on the Treasury of the United States, a matter of concern to the executive branch as well as the Congress.

The transfer is recommended by the Department of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget.

In a report to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the General Counsel of the Treasury had this to say:

> The Department is of the opinion that, if the guarantee authority is to be extended, it should not continue to be vested in a quasi-judicial body. The duty of the Civil Aeronautics Board to protect the interests of the Government as a guarantor of an air-carrier creditor, or as an air-carrier creditor itself when funds have been paid out as a consequence of a guarantee, would conflict with the duties of the Board to the public in discharging its quasi-judicial functions.

This transfer was recommended by the President April 5, 1962, in his message to Congress on transportation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING THE TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1658) to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 2319)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1658) to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Gambling Devices Act of 1962.'

"Sec. 2. (a) Subparagraph (2) of paragraph (a) of the first section of the Act of January 2, 1951 (64 Stat. 1134; 15 U.S.C. 1171), is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) any other machine or mechanical device (including, but not limited to, roulette wheels and similar devices) designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling, and (A) which when operated may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or (B) by the operation of which a person may become entitled to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property; or'.

"(b) Subparagraph (3) of paragraph (a) of the first section of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ', but which is not attached to any such machine or mechanical device as a constituent part'.

"Sec. 3. The first section of such Act is further amended by striking out 'Alaska, Hawaii' in paragraph (b) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof 'the District of Columbia', and adding at the end of such section the following new paragraphs:

"'(d) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" means commerce (1) between any State or possession of the United States and any place outside of such State or possession, or (2) between points in the same State or possession of the United States but through any place outside thereof.

"'(e) The term "intrastate commerce" means commerce wholly within one State or possession of the United States.'

"Sec. 4. The first paragraph of section 2 of the Act of January 2, 1951, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'nor shall this section apply to any gambling device used or designed for use at and transported to licensed gambling establishments where betting is legal under applicable State laws: *Provided further*, That it shall not be unlawful to transport in interstate or foreign commerce any gambling device into any State in which the transported gambling device is specifically enumerated as lawful in a statute of that State'.

"Sec. 5. Section 3 of the Act of January 2, 1951, is amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 3. (a) (1) It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in the business of manufacturing gambling devices, if the activities of such business in any way affect interstate or foreign commerce, to manufacture any gambling device during any calendar year, unless, after November 30 of the preceding calendar year, and before the date on which such device is manufactured, such person has registered with the Attorney General under this subsection, regardless of whether such device ever enters interstate or foreign commerce.

"'(2) It shall be unlawful for any person during any calendar year to engage in the business of repairing, reconditioning, buying, selling, leasing, using, or making available for use by others any gambling device, if in such business he sells, ships, or delivers any such device knowing that it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce after the effective date of the Gambling Devices Act of 1962, unless, after November 30 of the preceding calendar year, and before the date such sale, shipment, or delivery occurs, such person has registered with the Attorney General under this subsection.

"'(3) It shall be unlawful for any person during any calendar year to engage in the business of repairing, reconditioning, buying, selling, leasing, using, or making available for use by others any gambling device, if in such business he buys or receives any such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce after the effective date of the Gambling Devices Act of 1962, unless, after November 30 of the preceding calendar year and before the date on which he buys or receives such device, such person has registered with the Attorney General under this subsection.

"'(4) Each person who registers with the Attorney General pursuant to this subsection shall set forth in such registration (A) his name and each trade name under which he does business, (B) the address of each of his places of business in any State or possession of the United States, (C) the address of a place, in a State or possession of the United States in which such a place of business is located, where he will keep all records required to be kept by him by subsection (c) of this section, and (D) each activity described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection which he intends to engage in during the calendar year with respect to which such registration is made.

"'(b)(1) Every manufacturer of a gambling device defined in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of the first section of this Act shall number seriatim each such gambling device manufactured by him and permanently affix on each such device, so as to be clearly visible, such number, his name, and, if different, any trade name under which he does business, and the date of manufacture of such device.

"'(2) Every manufacturer of a gambling device defined in paragraph (a)(3) of the first section of this Act shall, if the size of such device permits it, number seriatim each such gambling device manufactured by him and permanently affix on each such device, so as to be clearly visible, such number, his name, and, if different, any trade name under which he does business, and the date of manufacture of such device.

"'(c)(1) Every person required to register under subsection (a) of this section for any calendar year shall, on and after the date of such registration or the first day of such year (whichever last occurs), maintain a record by calendar month for all periods thereafter in such year of—

"'(A) each gambling device manufactured, purchased, or otherwise acquired by him,

"'(B) each gambling device owned or possessed by him or in his custody, and

"'(C) each gambling device sold, delivered, or shipped by him in intrastate, interstate, or foreign commerce.

"'(2) Such record shall show—

"'(A) in the case of each such gambling device defined in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of the first section of this Act, the information which is required to be affixed on such gambling device by subsection (b)(1) of this section; and

"'(B) in the case of each such gambling device defined in paragraph (a)(3) of the first section of this Act, the information required to be affixed on such gambling device by subsection (b)(2) of this section, or, if such gambling device does not have affixed on it any such information, its catalog listing, description, and, in the case of each such device owned or possessed by him or in his custody, its location.

Such record shall also show (i) in the case of any such gambling device described in paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, the name and address of the person from whom such device was purchased or acquired and the name and address of the carrier; and (ii) in the case of any such gambling device described in paragraph (1)(C) of this subsection, the name and address of the buyer and consignee thereof and the name and address of the carrier.

"'(d) Each record required to be maintained under this section shall be kept by the person required to make it at the place designated by him pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(C) of this section for a period of at least five years from the last day of the calendar month of the year with respect to which such record is required to be maintained.

"'(e)(1) It shall be unlawful (A) for any person during any period in which he is required to be registered under subsection (a) of this section to sell, deliver, or ship in intrastate, interstate, or foreign commerce or own, possess, or have in his custody any gambling device which is not marked and numbered as required by subsection (b) of this section; or (B) for any person to remove, obliterate, or alter any mark or number on any gambling device required to be placed thereon by such subsection (b).

"'(2) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to make or cause to be made, any false entry in any record required to be kept under this section.

"'(f) Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall, at any place designated pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(C) of this section by any person required to register by subsection (a) of this section, at all reasonable times, have access to and the right to copy any of the records required to be kept by this section, and, in case of refusal by any person registered under such subsection (a) to allow inspection and copying of such records, the United States district court for the district in which such place is located shall have jurisdiction to issue an order compelling production of such records for inspection or copying.'

"Sec. 6. The Act of January 2, 1951, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'Sec. 9. None of the provisions of this Act shall be construed to apply—

"'(1) to any machine or mechanical device designed and manufactured primarily for use at a racetrack in connection with parimutuel betting,

"'(2) to any machine or mechanical device, such as a coin-operated bowling alley, shuffleboard, marble machine (a so-called pinball machine), or mechanical gun, which is not designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling, and (A) which when operated does not deliver, as a result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or (B) by the operation of which a person may not become entitled to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or

"'(3) to any so-called claw, crane, or digger machine and similar devices which are not operated by coin, are actuated by a crank, and are designed and manufactured primarily for use at carnivals or county or State fairs.'

"Sec. 7. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its enactment."

And the House agree to the same.

Oren Harris,
John Bell Williams,
Harley O. Staggers,
Samuel N. Friedel,
John B. Bennett,
William L. Springer,
J. Arthur Younger,
Managers on the Part of the House.

James O. Eastland,
Estes Kefauver,
Olin D. Johnston,
Everett M. Dirksen,
Roman L. Hruska,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1658) to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as agreed to in conference is in most respects like the House amendment to the Senate bill. The conference agreement does, however, make the following changes of substance in the House amendment:

1. A proviso is added to the first paragraph of section 2 of the act of January 2, 1951. This provides that it shall not be unlawful to transport in interstate or foreign commerce any gambling device into any State in which the transported device is specifically enumerated as lawful in a statute of that State. The language of this proviso is similar to that suggested as a possible amendment to this legislation while it was pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee by the Deputy Attorney General in his letter to Senator James O. Eastland dated July 25, 1961 (S. Rept. 645, 87th Cong., pp. 4 and 5).

2. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) of proposed section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, as contained in the House amendment, would require annual registration on the part of any person who engages in the business of repairing, reconditioning, buying, selling, leasing, using, or making available for use by others any gambling device, if (1) in such business he sells, ships, or delivers any such device knowing that it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce, or (2) in such business he buys or receives any such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce.

The bill as agreed to in conference modifies these paragraphs so as to require annual registration on the part of any person who engages in the business of repairing, reconditioning, buying, selling, leasing, using, or making available for use by others any gambling device, if (1) in such business he sells, ships, or delivers any such device knowing that it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce after the effective date of this legislation, or (2) in such business he buys or receives any such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce after the effective date of this legislation.

3. Under the House amendment, proposed section 3 of the act of January 2, 1951, would have included a subsection (g) and a subsection (h). Subsection (g) provided for the granting of immunity to persons who assert their constitutional privilege against

self-incrimination with regard to the maintenance of the records required by this legislation or testifying with respect thereto before any grand jury or court of the United States.

Proposed subsection (h) would have required the Attorney General to make such regulations as might in his judgment be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of January 2, 1951, as amended by this legislation. Any violation of such a regulation would have been punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

Both subsection (g) and subsection (h) are omitted from the bill as agreed to in conference.

4. The House amendment added a new section 9 to the act of January 2, 1951. This section lists machines and devices which would be specifically exempted from the coverage of the act. Among the machines and devices specifically exempted under the language of the House amendment are so-called claw, crane, or digger machines which are not coin operated, are actuated by a crank, and designed and manufactured primarily for use at carnivals or county or State fairs. The only change made in this proposed section 9 by the bill as agreed to in conference would be to include within its scope devices similar to such claw, crane, or digger machines.

Oren Harris,
John Bell Williams,
Harley O. Staggers,
Samuel N. Friedel,
John B. Bennett,
W. L. Springer,
J. Arthur Younger,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida (interrupting reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Senate bill S. 1658 has been thoroughly considered by the Congress for a period of some 2 years. This bill passed the other body last year. It passed the House on June 29, 1962, by a vote of 348 to 1.

The conference report was unanimously adopted by the other body on September 28, 1962. Now it is up to us to consider this report and I hope it will pass.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House will recall, this bill would amend the act of January 2, 1961—64 Stat. 1134; 15 U.S.C. 1171—generally referred to as the Johnson Act, which relates to the transportation of slot machines and certain other coin-operated gambling devices across State lines, in order to extend the provisions of the act to additional gambling devices not now covered; namely, machines and mechanical devices—including, but not limited to, roulette wheels and similar devices—designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling, and (A) which when operated may deliver, as a result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or (B) by the operation of which a person may become entitled to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property.

The conference agreement made four changes in the bill as it passed the House. The first change was the inclusion of a proviso stating that it shall not be unlawful to transport in interstate or foreign commerce, any gambling device as defined in the Johnson Act, into any State in which the transported device is specifically enumerated as lawful in a statute of that State.

The second change would require annual registration on the part of any person who engages in the business of repairing, reconditioning, buying, selling, leasing, using, or making available for use by others any gambling device if first, in such business he sells, ships, or delivers any such device knowing that it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce after the effective date of this legislation; or second, in such business he buys or receives any such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce after the effective date of this legislation. The language underscored is the amendment made by the conferees to this particular provision.

The third change is to delete from the House amendment, a provision for first, granting of immunity to any person who asserts his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination with regard to the maintenance of records required by this legislation or testifying with respect thereto before any grand jury or court; and second, the authorization to the Attorney General to make such regulations as might to his judgment be necessary to carry out the provisions of the Johnson Act, as amended.

The fourth change is the addition of a new section to this legislation which lists machines and devices that would be specifically exempted from coverage under this act.

The Attorney General has requested this legislation in order to assist the States to enforce their laws prohibiting the transportation of such gambling devices and to combat organized crime. The Attorney General has informed the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the proceeds from the operation of gambling devices, particularly from pinball machines designed and manufactured for gambling, is one of the financial mainstays of organized crime. Racketeers have infiltrated to a greater or lesser extent all phases of the gambling industry including manufacturing, distribution, ownership of gambling devices, and ownership of the locations where such devices are placed. Primarily because of the inhibitory effect of the Johnson Act on the interstate distribution of slot machines, the racketeers have concentrated their efforts largely upon developing pinball machines as gambling devices because they are not covered by existing provisions of the act.

Adoption of this conference report will strengthen our fight against organized crime and racketeering.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the conferees for the action that they have taken on this conference report. The particular passage of the bill in which I am interested is subsections (g) and (h) which the conferees have stricken. Those provisions would have provided for immunity and also authorized the Attorney General to adopt regulations punishable by criminal penalties. A number of the members of the Judiciary Committee were concerned about those concepts being included in the legislation.

If the gentleman will permit, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask at this point to insert in the Record a letter that I addressed to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, Oren Harris, on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

July 10, 1962.

Hon. Oren Harris,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: You will recall that I discussed with you two paragraphs of S. 1658 to prohibit interstate transportation of gambling devices, namely, section 4(g) commencing on page 13, line 18 and continuing to page 14, line 11, and section 4(h) on page 14, lines 12 through 15. The text of these two paragraphs appears also on page 12310 of the Congressional Record of June 29, 1962. The paragraphs read as follows:

"(g) No person shall be excused from maintaining the records designated herein, producing the same or testifying before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a criminal penalty or forfeiture. But upon asserting the privilege against self-incrimination any individual may be required to open the records required to be kept by this section to inspection or to testify before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto: *Provided,* That no such person shall be criminally prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing disclosed as a result of the inspection of such records or testimony with respect thereto. No witness shall be exempt under this subsection from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this subsection.

"(h) The Attorney General shall make such regulations as may in his judgment be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and the violation of any such regulation shall be punishable as provided in section 6 of this Act."

In effect, subparagraph (g) provides that with respect to the offenses in S. 1658 a person may be compelled to give evidence notwithstanding that it may tend to incriminate him and grants immunity from prosecution to such person for or on account of any transaction, matter or things so disclosed.

Subparagraph (h) in effect grants the Attorney General sweeping power to adopt "such regulations as may in his judgment be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act" and makes the violation of such regulations a criminal offense.

These provisions, of course, are limited to the specific field of transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce. Nevertheless, they establish a precedent which might lead to extension of these grants of authority in other fields of Federal criminal law.

The Judiciary Committee has, in fact, had pending before it the following bills providing for compulsory waiving of the privilege against self-incrimination and granting immunity to witnesses: H.R. 1246, H.R. 3021, H.R. 8615, and S. 1665. These bills have been extremely controversial. For example, they are violently opposed by labor unions, and the Judiciary Committee has informally determined to take no action on immunity bills in this session of Congress.

So far as I have been able to discover, the Congress has never vested in any executive officer the power to pass criminal laws such as is provided in subparagraph (h) above cited.

I have not had an opportunity to conduct as thorough research as I would like, but it is my impression that the Congress may not delegate to an executive official authority to adopt regulations punishable as a crime because, in effect, this is a delegation of the criminal-law-making power. Whether it is unconstitutional or not, I believe it would be extremely unwise for Congress to vest such vast authority in an executive official, and while the power in question is applicable only to the transportation of gambling devices, in my judgment it would establish a precedent which could well lead to the extension of this principle to other fields of Federal criminal jurisdiction.

In addition, it should be pointed out that no criteria or standards are established guiding the adoption of regulations by the Attorney General, but completely unbounded authority is granted to adopt such regulations "as may in his judgment be necessary." Conceivably, the Attorney General might by regulation (a) authorize wiretapping, (b) prohibit obstruction of investigations, and adopt any other additional sanctions similar to those contained in bills pending before the Congress which the Congress has not seen fit to pass. Conceivably the Attorney General could adopt a regulation fixing salaries of attorneys in the Department of Justice, an authority which Congress expressly repudiated in the first session of the 87th Congress.

I have searched the hearings, the report and the debate and find no specific reference or discussion of the implications of subparagraphs (g) and (h). Subsequent to the passage of the bill I called these implications to the attention of my colleagues, including those on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It is clear to me that if attention had been focused on the paragraphs and their far-reaching implications, it is likely they would have been deleted either in committee or by the House itself.

It should be noted that S. 1658 as it passed the Senate contained the two paragraphs in question although the House version did change the phraseology slightly. At first blush it might appear that since both the Senate version and the House version contained these provisions there was no controversy to be settled by the conference.

I am advised, however, by the Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, that since the action of the House committee was to strike out all of the Senate language and substitute new language, the entire new language was in conference and any part of it could be deleted but could not be augmented.

It is my hope that the conferees will see fit to delete subparagraphs (g) and (h) from S. 1658 during the conference.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

I want to say that the committee felt it was most helpful to have the gentleman's advice on this legislation and, as he has stated, those two provisions were stricken by the conferees.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Would the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] assure me that the bill now is in proper legal shape, as I was the one vote opposed to the bill. The gentleman indicated that some changes have been made in it.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me so I may answer the gentlewoman from New York?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I will say that the conferees, by striking these two sections very substantially improved the measure.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But the gentleman could not say it is perfect yet?

Mr. MEADER. I do not know that I can read the gentlewoman's mind. She was the only Member of the House who voted against the bill—348 to 1.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That is correct. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my distinguished colleague from Florida that as I am sure he recalls I had the privilege of testifying on behalf of this type of bill, and introduced one myself, not only in this session but in the last session of Congress. This is one of a series of anticrime bills for the purpose of fighting organized, syndicated crime in this country, which is estimated to have a take of about $22 billion annually in the United States. This is one of a series of five bills that have been passed in this session of Congress and which I introduced to accomplish that objective; is that not correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think the gentleman is correct. It certainly is a bill that will do much to fight organized crime.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I think we have brought back to the House a much better bill than was originally passed. I am especially pleased that we eliminated subsection (h). That was the section which gave to the Attorney General the right to "make such regulations as may in his judgment be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and the violation of any such regulation shall be punishable as provided in section 6 of this act."

As a matter of fact, when the bill was first passed the Attorney General was given the power to make regulations which would have the full effect of law. The conferees removed that clause. I think in that way they greatly improved the bill. I recommend that the House approve the conference report.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman from California.

I think that certainly adds a great deal to this legislation.

In conclusion, I want to say that the leadership of our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, has certainly been responsible for this legislation's being brought to the House. I am sure it is going to be helpful in fighting organized crime in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to support the conference report. Although I originally introduced legislation to accomplish this same objective and testified in favor of this bill itself when it was being considered in committee, it so happens that when S. 1658 was before the House in the original House version I was unavoidably absent on official business, and therefore could not be formally recorded in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my public career I have fought consistently against organized gambling. It provides the funds for much more elaborate and sinister criminal operations. It is the most prevalent and direct source of municipal corruption.

As mayor of Schenectady, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the record which I compiled in the drive to wipe out organized gambling from our city. As a Member of Congress I am also proud to be in a position to continue this same fight on the national level by having a share in the enactment into law of legislation like this, designed to break the back of organized gambling by excluding its operations, and its supporting functions, from interstate commerce.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the conference report on S. 1658, and wish to commend the Senate-House conferees for the action they have taken on this important legislation.

For many years, I have been active in the legislative fight to combat organized crime. During my years in the New York State Senate, I introduced legislation which initiated the State crime commission and was the sponsor of many bills toughening the laws on narcotics and other similar vicious forms of crime. I was also identified with a law which created the bistate commission that has made great strides in sweeping the New Jersey and New York waterfronts clean of corruption.

I am sure that we are all well aware of the menace of organized criminal activity. The "syndicate" has pervaded the country to a frightening degree and I applaud every move the Attorney General has made to counter this menace. I also agree with him and other experts that much more needs to be done. Organized crime thrives on the proceeds of the gambling and narcotics rackets. It is a bloated octopus whose tentacles reach around every major city and State feeding on billions of dollars sucked from the Nation's economy.

A great advance was made with the enactment of the Attorney General's anticrime program during the first half of this Congress, particularly in three bills, S. 1656, covering transmission of bets, wagers, and related information; S. 1657, prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia; and S. 1653, prohibiting travel or transportation in aid of racketeering enterprises. As the Attorney General testified before the committee, this bill, S. 1658, which is similar to my measure, H.R. 8410, will greatly complement the program and will make even further strides in cutting off the funds now being used to finance organized crime. This fact has been recognized by Congress and after slightly varying versions were approved by each body, a Senate-House conference unanimously agreed on the strengthening amendments to S. 1658, which will serve to paralyze organized gambling by hitting hard where it hurts most—in the pocketbook. This is commendable action, and I sincerely hope that acceptance of this conference report by each body of Congress, and approval by the President will remedy the situation that has prevailed for far too long.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind you that 11 years of experience have proven that the existing Johnson Act is inadequate.

Organized crime has learned to get around that act by using new machinery which does not fall under the provisions of this existing statute. They have developed gambling machines which are not coin operated, which do not pay off directly or indirectly and do not have a drum or reel as in the older, more conventional slot machines which were in use when the Johnson Act passed Congress. The forces for law and order thus find themselves impotent and ineffectual against the modern, systemized methods of evasion employed by the armies of crime.

The bill, as accepted in conference, will add breadth and scope to the fight against this evil. In effect, it will modernize the laws to better combat the modernized evasions of the present law. It will counteract the criminal advances, it will put vigor and strength on the side of the law enforcer. Not only does it deal with specific machinery, but it also sets down clear and precise language as to the individuals legally involved in trafficking in gambling devices. These sections will clear up the difficulties that were highlighted by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Five Gambling Devices* (346 U.S. 441 (1953)), and enable the Justice Department to work more effectively.

The goals of the legislation are quite clear. By striking at a major source of syndicate income, we are attempting to eliminate or minimize the size of gambling profits. If we can succeed in that, then organized gambling will cease to be the destructive force that it has become. I do not think that anyone can debate the soundness of this logic.

I wish to emphasize that the measure is so worded that devices designed for amusement purposes are not included. There is also exception made for parimutuel machines and other devices manufactured for racetracks and other gambling establishments in areas where gambling is legal under State law.

Mr. Speaker, we have not legislated against the vacationer who occasionally drops 50 cents in a pinball machine. But, unfortunately, the day of the harmless one-armed bandits is gone. Now the callous, vicious men who control organized crime run our gambling devices. I repeat that if we are ever to eradicate this menace, we must remove the profit motive. Thousands, millions of dollars are squandered each year—money that is used to line the pockets of the men who plan a murder as calmly as we might plan a golf date.

We must start now on the road toward the achievement of an effective, well-rounded fight against crime in America. This legislation is a long step on that road.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk, following the sine die adjournment, by the Committee on Government Operations or its subcommittees may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 87th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO BERLIN

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 827 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 570) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin. After general debate, which shall be confined to the concurrent resolution, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the concurrent resolution shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said concurrent resolution except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 280]

Adair
Alexander
Anfuso
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Bailey
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolling
Boykin
Breeding
Bromwell
Brown
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Curtin
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Dooley
Downing
Elliott
Evins
Findley
Fisher
Fogarty
Frazier
Garland
Goodell
Griffiths
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Lesinski
Lindsay
Loser
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Magnuson
Mason
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller,
George P.
Morrison
Mosher
Moulder
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Peterson
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Ryan, Mich.
Saund
Saylor
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Steed
Sullivan
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Ullman
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Whitener
Williams
Willis
Yates
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 307 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight tonight to file conference reports on the following bills: H.R. 5700, H.R. 8952, and H.R. 12599.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk of the House following the sine die adjournment by the Select Committee on Export Control may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 87th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not present on the record vote on H.R. 7927. I would like to have the RECORD show that had I been present I would have voted "aye."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Judiciary Committee have until midnight tonight to file its report on Senate Joint Resolution 208.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO BERLIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]; and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule making in order the consideration of the so-called Berlin resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is, I regret to advise the House, a closed rule. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of the fact that this is a closed rule I am at least happy that we have finally gotten to the floor of this House a resolution that will put the Congress of the United States, the only voice that the people of the United States have, on record behind the President of the United States in a declaration of a firm policy in dealing with the Soviets on the question of Berlin.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this comes as a sort of aftermath, a letdown from the Cuban resolution which passed this body and the other body almost unanimously a few weeks ago.

The fact is that this resolution should have been considered long before the Cuban resolution. But nevertheless it is here today and for that I am grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be making any self-serving declarations but I do want to recite certain historical facts so far as this humble Member of this body is concerned with reference to this resolution.

In 1947 I introduced a resolution which would have put the Congress on record in favor of a firm policy in dealing with the masters in the Kremlin. When we had a Berlin crisis during the Eisenhower administration I introduced a resolution specifically to put the Congress on record as backing President Eisenhower in his statement that we would not "budge an inch" on Berlin.

By the way, that resolution is practically the same as the resolution you have here today.

Mr. Speaker, in 1961, last year, I again introduced this resolution that would put the Congress on record as backing this President, President Kennedy.

If you will pardon these preliminary remarks, I merely mention this to advise the House and let the House know of the keen interest and the earnestness I have on this and the conviction that it ought to be done.

I tried to offer this resolution as an amendment to the Cuban resolution when the matter was before the Rules Committee. It would have been much better if it had been done at that time. But the powers that be would not accept it.

Some people say, "Well, we don't need it now." Let us see if we do. Let us see where we are. We passed a very much similar resolution with reference to Cuba a few weeks ago. Suppose we stop there. What would be the reaction in the Kremlin? Would Mr. Khrushchev be justified in taking the position that we as Members of Congress were concerned only with Cuba because Cuba is right here at our doorstep, and therefore we were not concerned with Berlin?

What would be the reaction, if we did not pass this resolution, of the people of Germany and our European allies? Would they be justified in taking the same position that the Kremlin might take, that we were interested only in Cuba because Cuba is on our doorstep? Of course, you know and I know that they are both on our doorstep. There is not a great deal of difference between Cuba and Berlin when we recognize the advances that have been made in communications and the weapons of warfare.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to have this resolution before this Congress for the reasons I stated and for many other reasons I would like to state. But I want to emphasize again that the Congress should make a firm declaration and not leave it to the executive branch, because the Congress speaks for the people.

Mr. Khrushchev said a few weeks ago that he would not press the Berlin matter at this time because of the elections in this country. In other words, he would let it go until after the November 6 election. Now this Congress will not be in session at that time—I hope—and the Congress should answer this arrogant insult now.

Another thing I would like to call your attention to is that Mr. Khrushchev is playing the same game here that is traditionally played by all heads of state, either in a cold war or in a hot war, namely, to try to drive a wedge between the people and between their constituted leaders. Woodrow Wilson did it in World War I and to some extent no doubt was successful in arraying the people of Germany against the Kaiser. And that policy has been followed right down through history to my personal knowledge since that time.

I think it would be a very wholesome thing for this Congress to go on record unanimously in backing the President and in declaring a firm policy. To me this represents a step forward toward abandoning the appeasement policy that has been followed in the conduct of our foreign affairs since the end of hostilities following World War II. We have permitted the masters of the Kremlin to call the signals while we have run the defensive plays. It is happening now. Somebody may say—Well, you are declaring war. We are not declaring war, although we have some pretty strong language here, but I do not think it is too strong. I would possibly be for even stronger language. But bear this in mind—that Russia wants neither war nor peace. She wants to keep us off balance while she is calling the signals to do something in Berlin today—in Cuba tomorrow—in Formosa the next day—in Laos the next and so on. Always calling the signals. Now we cannot always be on the defensive. You cannot win a cold war any more than you can win a hot war or a diplomatic victory by permitting the enemy to call the signals while you run the defensive plays. So I think the least we can do here before we go home is to put this Congress on record as supporting a firm policy in dealing with the Kremlin masters. Mr. Speaker, I hope the resolution will be adopted without a dissenting vote.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of House Resolution 570 and it has been ably gone into at some length by my good colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, a member of the Committee on Rules, who has made a great study of this whole subject and who, as he told you, has spoken on the subject ever since 1947.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to speak at any length on this resolution. It is very similar to the one we passed a week or so ago on Cuba. In my estimation, this resolution is a better resolution because it is a little stronger. I do not know whether it is going to really accomplish all that we intend to accomplish, but as I said when the House was considering the Cuban resolution, it certainly can do no harm.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out the change that the House made in this resolution, and I think it is a good change, made by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, in the original resolution. This resolution read:

> That the Congress support the President in his determination to prevent by whatever means may be necessary any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union or others, and to defend the rights and freedom of the people of Berlin.

That is a far weaker statement than what we have in this resolution. Under subparagraph (c) we say:

> That the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms.

That is a very strong statement. That is a statement that gives the President, it seems to me, all of the power that he could possibly need or desire. He does not, of course, come to us for that power; it is not necessary, but it is certainly better, as has been well said, that the people of the United States should be standing solidly back of their Commander in Chief in these days—and I do not speak lightly of this—within the next few months or weeks, rather, when this Congress may not be in session he may have to use strong measures on this Berlin situation.

There is every reason and every justification for this. We are bound by treaty—and so is the Soviet Union—and as far as any of us know, that treaty has never been abrogated. Under that treaty we not only have a right to be in Berlin, nay, it is our duty to be in Berlin; and it is also our duty to see that we go back and forth into West Berlin. The Soviet Union is bound to permit this just as much as we are bound to let them go into East Berlin, although, of course, the latter is very much easier.

We need not go back to the old story, we need not go back to the question of why we are there, why West Berlin is surrounded by hostile people and by hostile troops. That should have been taken care of many years ago. This whole situation is water over the dam, but that is no reason why we should abrogate our rights in West Berlin any more than we should abrogate them in Cuba, in Laos, or anywhere else in the world. We believe that a treaty is a treaty. We believe that a treaty is something not only to be upheld by our opponents but to be upheld by ourselves even by force of arms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard].

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I will not need the 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it was recently called to my attention that there was a phrase contained in the Appropriations Committee report on the foreign aid bill that I fear, if the record is not corrected, might be misleading. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point an exchange of correspondence between the State Department and myself on this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The correspondence referred to follows:

September 21, 1962.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: An old friend and distinguished Californian, Mr. George Mardikian, today called to my attention the following phrase that appears on page 29 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations (Rept. No. 2410) on the foreign aid and related agencies appropriations bill, 1963: "and assistance to citizens of Egypt who wish to return to Soviet Armenia."

I discussed this matter both with Mr. Passman and a member of the subcommittee staff and was advised that it was the committee's impression that the United States was assisting Egyptian citizens to go behind the Iron Curtain. As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, it is hard for me to believe that such a program does exist.

If, as I suspect, an error has been made I would appreciate information from you so that I may make some effort to correct the record.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

W. S. Mailliard,
Member of Congress.

Hon. William S. Mailliard,
House of Representatives.

Dear Congressman Mailliard: I am pleased to reply to your letter of September 21, 1962.

You are correct in assuming that there is no U.S. program to "assist Egyptian citizens to go behind the Iron Curtain." Recent government decrees in Egypt have placed both foreigners and those who have acquired Egyptian citizenship in a disadvantageous economic situation and many of these persons are currently obliged to seek resettlement in other countries.

To the extent that the United States can assist these persons, programs to do so will be undertaken subject to approval by the Congress and the appropriation of funds for these purposes. Under no circumstances would the United States assist any of these persons to seek and secure resettlement behind the Iron Curtain.

Frederick G. Dutton
(For the Secretary of State).

Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1962.

Hon. William S. Mailliard,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Mailliard: We appreciate the interest in our refugee and migration programs which prompted your writing to the Secretary as you did on September 21.

The statement concerning refugees from the United Arab Republic, as contained in the House Appropriation Committee's report, does not indicate the correct purport of the testimony of the Department's witnesses who appeared before the committee in support of the administration's request for funds for the several refugee and migration programs.

The Department had requested approval for an item of $200,000 to assist in the resettlement and reestablishment of refugees who leave Egypt for other countries because of the growing difficulties they are encountering as the result of increased nationalism and restrictive governmental measures which have closed their businesses or made employment restrictive if not impossible. These refugees are all of European background. Many of them are Armenians. Some of them have acquired Egyptian citizenship. After departing from Egypt for Greece or Lebanon, where most of them go, they are accepted by those countries as political refugees. They thereby come under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The President has determined under the provisions of Public Law 87–510 that it is in the interest of the United States to help these people become resettled.

The Department's witnesses pointed out to the committee the urgency of a small amount of U.S. assistance to combat the Soviet campaign to entice the Armenian group back to the Soviet Union.

The knowledge that the United States and other countries, working through international organizations and private voluntary agencies, are willing to assist in their resettlement will help many of these people to decide to move to Western countries rather than to accept the alternative of going to the Soviet Union.

Therefore, the statement contained in the committee's report, "and, assistance to citizens of Egypt who wish to return to Soviet Armenia," cannotes the exact opposite to the Department's aims, since the Department would never countenance the expenditure of U.S. funds for assisting in the movement of refugees to the Soviet Union.

I trust that this explanation clarifies the basis for the request for funds which the Department made to the committtee.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Gilbert). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 570.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 570, with Mr. Stratton in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I would like to express appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] for his cooperation in making possible House consideration of this resolution during the present session of Congress. Also to the cosponsors, particularly those who contributed to the drawing up of the resolution, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan], and the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

Mr. Chairman, over the last 4 years the Soviets have stepped up their threats on Berlin.

For 4 years, since November 10, 1958, the Soviet Union has continued to apply pressure in an obvious effort to make it increasingly difficult—if not impossible—for the United States, the United Kingdom, and France to continue to exercise our rights in Berlin.

The goal of the Soviet campaign is—without any doubt—the complete subjugation of the people of Berlin.

The Western Allies' occupation zones in Berlin—which we know as West Berlin—are an island of freedom and prosperity in a sea of Communist totalitarianism and misery. West Berlin is a bone sticking in Khrushchev's throat. He is determined to get rid of that bone by forcing the Allies out of Berlin.

Just recently, Khrushchev renewed his pressure on Berlin. On August 23 he abolished the office of the Soviet commandant of East Berlin—ostensibly turning over the supreme authority in the Soviet sector to the East Germans.

He also said that he did not intend to do anything about signing a separate peace treaty with East Germany until after our elections. In that statement, in effect, he served notice that he intends to continue to transfer Soviet responsibilities in Germany to the puppet East German regime, thereby further undermining the legal basis of the Allied position in Berlin.

On our part, we have stood firm in insisting on our rights in Berlin—and in holding the Soviet Union responsible for any violation of those rights.

Our Government's position on this issue has been made clear to the world. It has been restated repeatedly by the President, by the Secretary of State, by the Secretary of Defense and by other high-ranking officials of the executive branch.

The only voice that has not been officially heard on this issue is the voice of the U.S. Congress.

In the 4 years since Khrushchev initiated his campaign to abdicate the Soviet Union's responsibilities in Berlin, and to undermine the legal basis for our presence in Berlin, the Congress has not come forth with a clear, unequivocal statement on this subject.

It is to remedy this situation—and to let the Soviet Union know that our Nation stands united behind the administration's firm policy on Berlin—it is for these reasons that the Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously reported House Concurrent Resolution 570 and recommends its adoption by the House.

The wording of the resolution is simple and to the point.

The whereas clauses reaffirm our policy with respect to Berlin and Germany as a whole, and cite the basis for our rights, and our presence, in Berlin.

The operative clauses express the sense of the Congress that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin constitutes a fundamental political and moral determination; that the United States would regard as intolerable any violation by the Soviet Union—directly or through others—of those rights in Berlin, including the right of ingress and egress; and that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union—directly or through others—and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

This resolution embodies a clear expression of our national policy and purpose on the Berlin question. It will clearly show Khrushchev and the world that we are behind the President in his determination to protect freedom in Berlin.

I urge that the resolution be adopted overwhelmingly by the House for the following reasons: first, because the situation in Berlin confronts our Nation with a grave crisis—graver than any we have faced in recent years; second, because the Congress has not—until now—expressed its views on this issue—a situation which may lead the Soviet leaders to misunderstand our intentions, or to miscalculate our resolve; and, third, because the Congress will not be in session later this fall when Khrushchev—and he has already served notice that he will do so—when Khrushchev will renew his pressures on our presence in Berlin.

These are three valid reasons why the resolution should be adopted now—not 3 months, or 6 months hence.

I believe that in the interest of peace—in the interest of the cause of freedom—we should, we must, overwhelmingly adopt this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I would be delighted to yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin for the gentleman's excellent statement on this resolution. I know the gentleman has worked very hard to bring it to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks, and I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 570, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States and our allies should continue to stand up for our rights in West Berlin.

Any recapitulation of what has happened over the past few years would be superfluous. All of us are well aware of the threats, the intimidation, the tension to which the citizens of West Berlin have been subjected in recent history.

In times of extreme danger and under extreme provocation, the citizens of Free Berlin have conducted themselves admirably.

The "salami tactics" used by the Soviet Union and their East German puppets have been successful to a degree.

But the Reds have not penetrated West Berlin, nor have they shaken the resolve of its citizens to remain where they are, deep behind the Iron Curtain, a shining symbol of freedom.

Despite the raising of the wall of shame, separating East and West Berlin into two armed camps, some 11,000 have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain and are enjoying freedom today.

Those who are "voting with their feet" in Berlin today, despite the murders at the wall, the shootings, the brutal attempts to halt these refugees, are an example for all the world to see.

This flight to freedom at the risk of life itself is a lesson we must remember, that freedom is worth dying for, fighting for, struggling for, despite the odds and despite attempts to stifle it under the blanket of regimentation.

Thankfully, our gallant allies are with us in this stand. If anything, they have taken a stronger attitude than we have in combating this menace of a Communist takeover.

We have every right to be in West Berlin. The people of Berlin want us there. We will remain there, at this outpost of freedom, and we will stand firm.

These words, this resolution, we are acting on today are only as strong as our resolution and our will to stay in Berlin.

Let us not falter nor hesitate in our responsibility.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, no disease goes on forever. There comes a point when the patient either begins to improve or he dies. The same thing, I think, applies to wars. No war goes on forever. All wars end, including cold wars. This cold war is going to end, too. But how? And when? Our survival depends on our ability to influence the answers to those questions.

Mr. Chairman, if a point comes when people widely believe that one side is gaining and the other side is losing, that is the moment of peril. Unless that trend in people's thinking with respect to the trend in events can be promptly reversed, then the deterioration of the side that is losing proceeds at a rapidly accelerating rate.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect this cold war is approaching something like that sort of climax or moment of decision. Which side will weaken first?

The first fact is that the Communists are failing in many ways and places. They have not been able to achieve their economic and social objectives, and therefore their leaders are under great pressure to do something dramatic. Therein lies the immediate danger. Communism has failed to give better lives to the people under its rule. Its great appeal down through the decades has been that people in capitalist countries were oppressed and downtrodden and were unable to get ahead. They were denied equality of opportunity and improved livelihood and rewards. Communism would end all these inequities. It would give the people greater amounts of food, shelter, clothing, better education, travel, transportation, culture, and an end to all wars. Utopia would come under communism.

But what has happened? Communism simply has not delivered not only in other countries taken over by Communists, but in the Soviet Union itself there are food shortages. They do not have inadequate land. They have not had bad weather, droughts, or floods. It is due to bad management. It is the fundamental unsoundness of the whole Communist philosophy and system that has brought the Communists to the verge of great failures at home.

Look at Eastern Europe—Bulgaria, Rumania, and Poland, which were breadbaskets that always exported grain in the past. Today all of them have food shortages; again, not because of natural disaster, but because the Communist system cuts the nerve of the energy and initiative and enterprise of human beings. They do not work as hard to produce more as they do under freedom, because even if they do produce more, it is taken away from them and they cannot use it to improve their own condition and that of their families and their communities.

In Communist China it is worse. For a long time the myth was widely disseminated and widely believed that the Chinese people were better off under communism. They had not been accustomed to democratic privileges anyway. They did not mind tyranny as long as the government was efficient and enabled them to have greater food supply, consumer goods, better education, et cetera. Fortunately, there were stubborn people who had been there, who were sure this could not be true, and who refused to accept the line. They were right.

One conviction that has kept me going all these years is that in the end facts always impose themselves. The cruel facts with regard to the supposedly better conditions in Red China have now imposed themselves. They are exposed for the blindest to see. They show that communism has failed miserably to produce what it promised to produce. As a result, it is not only failing at home; it is losing its attraction internationally. That is the second fact.

So many of the newly independent countries, and there are now about 50 which have gotten their independence since the end of the war from the disintegration of the old European colonial system of the past—had the feeling that maybe communism was the way they should take. I used to hear this in China more than 25 years ago. Young patriotic Chinese would say, "You Americans could take the free enterprise way because you started first; you were ahead. But we are behind: We have got to achieve quick development; we have to make rapid progress. Free enterprise with decentralization of government will be too slow. We have got to have a powerful government that will manage things for us. Much as we regret it, we new governments and underdeveloped people must accept strong central controls, whether you call it socialism or communism."

So here are these 50 countries.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 281]

Adair
Alexander
Anfuso
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bailey
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolling
Boykin
Breeding
Bromwell
Brown
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Colmer
Corbett
Curtin
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Dooley
Downing
Elliott
Evins
Findley
Fogarty
Frazier
Garland
Grant
Griffiths
Gubser
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Jarman
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Lesinski
Lindsay
Loser
McDonough
McIntire
McMillan
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Magnuson
Mason
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Morse
Moulder
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Peterson
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Ryan, Mich.
Saund
Saylor
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sibal
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Sullivan
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Tuck
Ullman
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Watts
Weiss
Whalley
Whitener
Williams
Yates
Zelenko

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STRATTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Concurrent Resolution 570, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 294 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Minnesota had 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I hope nobody will blame me for this interruption of your duties in your offices, which I am sure are a good deal more important than my remarks. But not more important than the resolution before us. When the quorum call was initiated, I was trying to present some of the reasons why I believe the passage of this strong resolution declaring our firmness on the matter of our rights in Berlin and of the freedom of its people, is exceedingly important, especially at this particular time. I had pointed out that communism is failing economically and socially in the countries that are under its control. It is failing in its propaganda particularly in certain parts of the world, including more and more of 50 some new countries that have gotten their independence in the last 17 years. Most of them began with primitive agriculture; primitive or nonexistent industry; primitive education; primitive health measures; primitive communications, and primitive transportation. They were in great need, still are. Communism offered magnificent promises. It has had a great appeal—especially so because in many of these countries there still is deep distrust of and resentment against the white people of Western Europe who controlled them from without in the only colonialism they have known. It was natural that they were attracted to communism; they had not been under its imperialism. But the significant thing is that today there is profound disillusionment regarding communism in the two-thirds of the world that has newly won its independence. The people have seen the contrast between East and West Germany; they have seen Hungary, China, Tibet—and now Cuba. They have found that their native Communists are loyal to Moscow and Peiping, not to their own country. They are disenchanted with respect to communism as the way for them to take.

At the very time communism is failing economically and socially, our system, the system where men are free to operate on their own with a minimum of Government controls is gaining spectacularly. Look at West Berlin as against East Berlin. Look at free Europe; the economic growth within the European Common Market is the most extraordinary phenomenon in our world today. Look at the relatively booming conditions in Hong Kong and Japan, both free, as against Red China, where everything is totally controlled.

Never were the wrongness and unsoundness of communism and the fundamental rightness and soundness of our own system of free enterprise more visible, more apparent to all than today.

The irony is that just when so many of the people of the world have almost no confidence in communism as the answer to their problems, and have greater confidence in our system of free enterprise than ever before, many in the United States should be giving the impression of lack of faith in ourselves and in our own philosophy. Unfortunately, we have too often given the appearance of weakness or uncertainty. Many want us to abandon free enterprise, which works, and turn more power over to our own Government—the system that does not work. Some of our leaders have talked big and then backed down, accepting the Communist terms they earlier denounced. In our efforts to avoid war, we have made it more likely. We have encouraged our enemies and discouraged our friends. It is understandable that many believe our people are so divided, so confused, so softened up, that we will force our own Government to make further concessions in Cuba or Berlin or whatever other dangerous places, in order supposedly to avoid trouble.

So, Mr. Chairman, while the Communists are losing economically and socially at home, they are still gaining politically and diplomatically and militarily in their pressures around the world, not because they have more to offer, but because they understand power. They know that prestige today depends not upon goodness, but upon willingness to use power daringly. It is their will, their toughness, their initiative that is gaining them alarming victories.

It was just over a year ago that some 25 neutral countries met in Belgrade, right after the Soviet Union had built the wall in Berlin and resumed testing in cynical violation of its pledges and of the moratorium. But those neutrals did not denounce the Soviet Union as they had denounced us. Many Americans, in resentment, exploded that the neutrals had "let us down after all we had done for them." I talked later to some of the delegates. One of them said, "We did not let you down until you let us down. We are little countries. We cannot substantially influence the outcome of the world struggle. We have got to try to ride out the storm and get along with whoever prevails. You could prevail, but you are not. It is the Soviet Union that is gaining ground around the world."

In effect he was saying that the neutrals had conducted a Gallup Poll among themselves and decided that the Communists were winning and the free world was losing. They saw no choice but to accept what seemed inevitable and get on the Communist bandwagon.

Another said, "We cannot follow the leadership of a country that does not lead"—meaning us.

So, Mr. Khrushchev, driven by failures at home, is under terrific pressure to try to get a stampede going among the countries in the free world, to get a rout started of the governments that have been and would like to be on our side if they could be sure we would be firm and strong and steadfast. He is trying to shake their confidence in the United States—and too many here at home are helping him, however unintentionally.

Mr. Chairman, this is the moment of peril when we have got to make sure that this adversary on one hand, and our allies and the neutrals on the other do not mistake our patience for weakness, do not mistake our love of peace and our desire to get civilized settlements as evidence of cowardice or undependability.

These are the main reasons, Mr. Chairman, that we should pass this resolution unanimously; first, to tell our avowed enemy that he must not make the mistake of overreaching himself in Berlin, because if he does, the United States will go to war and destroy him. That is one reason why the Committee on Foreign Affairs when it was considering the resolution word by word, included in lines 13 and 14 on page 3 the words "including the use of arms" so that it reads:

> The United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others.

We put in the same language that is in the Cuban resolution, so that nobody in Europe, on our side or on the other side, could have any idea we are pulling away from our commitments, our obligations, in Berlin and are prepared to do less there than in our own hemisphere.

There are three such rights that are so vital to our own interests that they cannot be compromised or negotiated away:

One is our right to be in Berlin, the right of our presence there, under binding agreements freely entered into by the Soviets. Our forces are there, not as a privilege but as a right.

Second, the right of access, the right of free ingress and egress.

Third, the well-being of the people of Berlin, the viability of their economic and political life. They have to be given a chance to live, not shut off or cut off so that they wither on the vine. They must be free to do what they have been doing and what free men can and will do when they have a chance. Their hope must not be snuffed out and the several millions of people reduced to despair.

This is a strong resolution, stronger than when originally introduced by our chairman [Mr. ZABLOCKI], myself and others. It is of the greatest importance that we speak with one voice today in plain, clear unmistakable terms to avoid any possible misunderstanding that could cause Mr. Khrushchev to overreach himself in overconfidence, or cause our allies to fall away in loss of confidence. Either would increase the danger of war. This is not a measure to bring on war, this is a measure to prevent war and to preserve freedom.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this resolution is to make clear to everybody where we stand and how far we are prepared to go with respect to Berlin.

> The congressional session is nearing an end and we have to face the fact that the Soviet Union is likely to stir up a new crisis in Berlin before the new Congress convenes next January.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs believes, and I am sure this belief is shared by every Member of the House, that the Congress has an obligation to do what can be done to prevent any misunderstanding of the position of the United States on the part of the Soviet dictators.

> Ever since the end of World War II the Soviet leaders have done their best to becloud the issues and to spread confusion regarding Berlin. This resolution should eliminate some of this confusion.

The problem is not just that the governments of other nations throughout the world may not have a clear idea of the U.S. position, but there is a great danger that the Communist leaders, as a result of their maneuvering, misrepresentation and propaganda, may have succeeded in confusing themselves as to what the basic issues are and where the United States stands.

The U.S. policy with respect to Berlin is based on the fact that we have certain rights there because we, together with our allies, won the war. These rights were agreed to at that time by the victorious allies, including the Soviet Union. Nothing has happened since that time to alter these rights.

The United States also has a commitment to the people of Berlin. They have bravely and continuously resisted Soviet pressure, and have indicated in many ways that they are counting on us to back them up. The most important point is that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of these rights or of our commitment to the people of Berlin.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs devoted a good deal of time to the drafting of this resolution. Every word has been carefully considered. The problem has been to be sure that the language of the resolution makes our position so clear that the Russians will not misunderstand it.

I am convinced that the people of the United States are more completely in agreement as to the stand we should take with respect to Berlin than on any other aspect of our foreign policy.

There has been no problem in drafting the resolution, of reconciling dissenting views of what our policy should be or how far we were prepared to go in defending our position. The resolution as reported says clearly and concisely what should be said. I feel sure it will be unanimously approved.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I appear before this House to state my intention to vote for this resolution.

It, unequivocally, states this Nation's moral obligation and political objective to preserve the freedom of Berlin against Khrushchev's threats.

His strategic plan is to alienate West Germany from its pro-Western orientation.

He plans thereby to disintegrate our only reliable military alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

In the process, he would destroy the European Common Market and prevent the realization of a European political, economic and military power complex, capable of frustrating Soviet-Communist objectives.

This resolution contains grave potential consequences. By implication the President is empowered to commit the U.S. military forces for preserving the freedoms of Berlin and of West Europe.

The commitment of military troops could progressively develop into limited war or into all-out nuclear war.

We must become fully prepared for this possibility. Mr. Chairman, we must also recognize that this resolution comes to this House, due to a growing perception on the part of our people that this Nation is in mortal danger.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, this Nation is in peril.

The life of every man, woman, and child in this Nation is at stake in the present climatic phase of the total war being waged by the Soviet-Communist forces.

World events make it obvious that the balance of world political and military power is shifting to the Soviet-Communist forces.

The worldwide progression of Soviet-Communist protracted crises is now culminating in the Berlin and Cuba pincers movement.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is an act of near desperation. It is the inevitable result of a 30-year failure on the part of our Government to comprehend the new forms of war conceived and waged by Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev.

As a consequence of our lack of understanding, this Nation has failed to formulate, agree upon, and pursue righteous international and national goals.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed for the past 30 years:

Military supremacy and the policy of containment; NATO and our other military alliances; massive retaliation and the United Nations; summit meetings and cultural exchange; foreign aid and the Peace Corps; disarmament negotiations and the Disarmament Agency; international loans and gifts, and atoms for peace.

These policies have been, and are today, defensive, self-deceptive, and self-defeating.

Now, Mr. Chairman, our Government, outside of this Congress, does not have any organizational apparatus capable of analyzing, evaluating, and revamping our goals, policies, strategies, tactics.

This Congress has delegated to the National Security Council the vital function of coordinating policies and advising the President upon national security.

The Central Intelligence Agency is responsible to the National Security Council. The Central Intelligence Agency is essentially an intelligence gathering and disseminating agency.

The National Security Council has never been given authority commensurate with its assigned responsibilities.

Today, the National Security Council is a nonfunctioning agency in the field of national security.

Mr. Chairman, the State Department has become, almost exclusively, the sole and dominating general staff for the development and execution of policies, objectives, strategies, and tactics to counter the Soviet-Communist world politico-military offensive.

The State Department is built around the diplomat. It is designed for traditional diplomacy, foreign representation, negotiation, and reporting.

The exacting and extensive requirements for waging a political, psychological, economic, and paramilitary conflict against the highly organized and specialized Soviet-Communist forces are beyond the capabilities of the State Department.

The State Department has deliberately undermined and vitiated, time after time, the efforts of this Congress to commit the United States to firm policies and to realistic action for confronting the Soviet-Communist world aggressions.

Mr. Chairman, as much as we respect the Department of Defense, it must be conceded that the Defense Department is not empowered, organized or staffed to wage political, psychological, and economic war. Nor can it coordinate these forms of war with paramilitary and military war.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this resolution, this Congress is exercising its constitutional mandate to provide for the common defense.

The resolution is a statement of a national and international political and military commitment on the part of the United States.

It is not a procedural foreign policy formulation. It defines vital interests of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have grave reservations concerning the implementation of this resolution.

This resolution is not self-executing.

If the State Department undermines the full purposes of this resolution, it will remain a scrap of paper.

If this resolution is unwisely implemented, we may find ourselves in an unwanted or unnecessary war.

Or, we may find our Government continuing to surrender, slice by slice.

Under our present State Department organizational structure for dealing with the Soviet-Communist master planners, how can we hope for an effective implementation of the congressional intent embodied in this resolution?

Let us never forget that the State Department will make the underlying decisions and recommendations for the implementation of this resolution. They will assess the relative military power and intentions of the United States and the Soviet in relation to the larger political framework.

They will calculate the relative risks of possible politico-military actions.

They will plan and evaluate alternative politico-military strategies and tactics.

The State Department organization to whom this Congress is entrusting the implementation of this resolution, is the same organization, essentially the same personnel, whose miscomprehensions, misjudgments, miscalculations and failures have brought this Nation to its present perilous position.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is not intended to thrust this Nation into an all-out nuclear war.

Our basic goals are freedom, survival, and a just peace.

The purpose of this resolution is to preserve our freedom, our survival and to restore world peace.

Any damn fool can miscalculate this Nation into war.

Any damn fool can surrender this Nation of the process of conciliation, appeasement and concession.

But, a high order of skillful statesmanship is required to avoid both war and surrender, and still gain our political objectives.

A great test of political leadership is to make certain that, if by any miscalculation a war arises in pursuing our political objectives, this Nation will win that war.

Mr. Chairman, Khrushchev has presented us with the ugly dilemma of Cuba and Berlin.

Cuba is an immediate crisis from the standpoint of distance. The threat out of Cuba consists of the Soviet buildup of a triple nuclear weapons system aimed at the United States. The time estimate for completion is 6 months to 1 year.

Berlin is a more immediate threat from the standpoint of time.

In essence, it is a political offensive aimed to disintegrate Western Europe. Khrushchev will trigger this crisis in a matter of months.

Now, Mr. Chairman: This resolution only seeks to give a partial solution to a small part of the total global politico-military war.

The nation must find a total solution to the total dangers posed to all of the free world by the Soviet-Communist campaigns.

Mr. Chairman, Khrushchev's challenge has forced us into a now or never decision.

The adoption of this resolution is an essential immediate action.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress will not be fully discharging its responsibilities to provide for the common defense and the survival of our people, by the mere passage of this resolution.

We must create the means and methods for a successful global confrontation of the total Soviet-Communist forces.

Mr. Chairman, this last Wednesday I introduced a bill to establish a new Cabinet post to be known as the Department of National Security and International Affairs.

The basic purpose of this department is to provide the organizational structure required to assist the President and the Congress in formulating national objectives and developing an integrated strategy to defend against the international Communist political, psychological, economic and military conflict being waged against the free world.

This bill proposes to centralize into one agency the responsibility of coordinating and overseeing the execution of this Nation's efforts in the prosecution of this politico-military war.

This bill would create an organizational structure tailored to carry out its crucial functions.

This bill would give the Department of National Security and International Affairs sufficient power and authority to act promptly, decisively, cohesively, and effectively.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress, this Nation must have an organization upon whom we can rely for assuring our survival.

Mr. Chairman, the State Department is committing this Nation to national suicide.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this resolution. It is helpful that our Congress should at this time affirm our purpose in resisting the Communist threat in Berlin.

Important as Cuba may be and crucial as may be the struggle in Vietnam, the fact remains that Berlin is the vital keystone of the arch of opposition to this pressure.

It is conceivable that we might suffer setbacks in southeast Asia without fundamental change. If we were to retreat in Berlin, however, the whole structure of Western Europe and the combined alliances of the free world would collapse.

The eyes of the world are upon Berlin and a surrender to the Communists there would be a signal to other peoples in the world that resistance was no longer practical.

The people in the captive nations are examples of such national groups who find encouragement and hope in our continued presence in Berlin. A failure to maintain our rights there would remove a major source of hope for these historic and friendly peoples.

It is helpful, therefore, to demonstrate that we are standing firmly behind our President in his determined maintenance of our position in Berlin.

There can be no question that this position will be continued and so as it is continued, there will be a gradual strengthening of the free world and an ultimate weakening of the Communist world.

This will provide a portion of the breathing time which we require to demonstrate fully the superiority of our free system and the basic weakness of the Communist system. It will be a major contribution to a peaceful world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am generally in accord with the sentiments expressed here this afternoon in connection with this resolution. I favor it in all its terms, except that I am not yet prepared to support a unified Germany at this time. In one of the "whereas" clauses it says that the purpose of the United States is to encourage and support the establishment of a free and unified Germany.

This is a step I am not prepared to take at this time.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Does the gentleman not feel that if we did not pursue our basic policy of a free, unified, and democratic Germany we would be making a fundamental change in our basic policy that established our country, namely, recognition of the principle of the right of self-determination as the means by which self-government is obtained? And incidentally, if we would follow the gentleman's policy would we not necessarily have to adopt a policy in opposition to a unified, free, and democratic Korea and also against a unified, free, democratic Vietnam?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I do not think there is any connection between the one and the other, because, as I said, I favor this entire resolution except for that one word "unified" at this time. I am satisfied to go along with a free and democratic Germany. I am satisfied to let the President and the administration determine when and under what circumstances there is to be unification, if there is to be any. Aside from the foregoing, I am prepared, and am supporting the resolution.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 570. It is highly constructive for the Congress to express the strong support of the American people of our President and State Department in a firm policy with regard to the occupation of Berlin.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time partly to speak on some matters that have not yet been referred to.

Let us tell the world that the Congress resents the intrusion of the Communist masters in the Kremlin into our internal affairs in this country by the suggestion that Mr. Khrushchev will postpone certain actions and his proposed peace treaty with East Berlin until after the congressional elections this November.

Mr. Chairman, let us tell the world that this country's attitude does not depend on the outcome of the congressional elections, and that we regard it as imprudent for anyone to make such a suggestion. Let us tell the world that whether the Congress is in session or not, we now as representing the American people have taken a stand which we know will meet with their approval, whether we Members are in Washington or whether we are back in the "hustings" conferring with our constituents.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts upon his stand and upon his statement.

With reference to the question that has been raised about Mr. Khrushchev wanting to wait until after the election, is it not reasonable to assume from that that he is implying that if your party that is now out of power were to come into power in the Congress, you would be pursuing a different policy?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman. I think it is an impudent suggestion.

May I add also that in my personal opinion this is not the first time Mr. Khrushchev has tried to intrude into American politics. Such conduct, in my opinion, occurred in the year 1960.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I am sure there is another objective which he has in mind. By talking this way, he seeks to create the impression in the minds of millions of people that he is the one who is in control of the situation; it is he who decides when to act or not to act; and if we have a little extension of peace and quiet, it is due to his graciousness, not to our power or resolve.

Mr. Chairman, this is what the Chinese Communists did when they failed in 1958 to get Quemoy. They announced they would shell it every other day. Some in the West said this was unexplainable conduct. No, it was not unexplainable; it was very smart. They had been defeated. Yet they sought to appear before all the people of Asia as masters of the situation. By saying, "We decide to shell this day and not that day," they were seeking out of defeat to snatch an element of psychological victory. That is one thing Khrushchev is also trying to do in Berlin today.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, and agree with him. It has been my great privilege and pleasure to serve with the gentleman on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I have looked to his leadership while serving on that committee on many occasions.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I refer to the remark of the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. St. George, made during the consideration of the rule, when she said that this amendment was stronger than the original resolution. I would like to point out that we have added a second "whereas" clause, which was not in the original resolution, which reads:

> Whereas it is the purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a friendly, unified, democratic Germany.

Mr. Chairman, it has long been our policy to support self-determination for people, and that is what this clause emphasizes. I am glad this clause was added because the Kremlin masters are continually harping on their objectives, and I think it is good for this country to emphasize its objectives even though they are opposed by the other side, and not immediately attainable.

A similar statement of policy was recently made before the General Assembly of the United Nations when it was said that a permanent solution of the problem of Berlin could be found only in the context of a free and unified Germany.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge adoption of this resolution which supports President Kennedy's determination to defend our rights in Berlin. I consider it a privilege to be able to cosponsor this resolution and strongly urge its adoption.

Recently, when I asked the people in my district whether they thought the United States should in any way yield its position in Berlin, 93 percent said under no circumstances or conditions should we yield. This overwhelming reply clearly demonstrates how thoroughly the American people support President Kennedy's position that the Communists shall not drive us out of Berlin.

This is a timely resolution and I commend the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Congressman Morgan], for bringing it up today in the closing days of this Congress, so that we can serve notice on Khrushchev that if he has any intention of disturbing the situation in Berlin between now and the time Congress reconvenes, he will have to suffer the full consequences.

There is no question that a free Berlin symbolizes the determination of the free world and the United States in particular to stop any further advances of communism. We have basic rights in Berlin and we are going to preserve these rights at all cost.

It is very significant that on this very important issue all Americans have joined to serve notice on the Kremlin that when the security of America and the honor of America are at stake, we work as Americans, irrespective of political party.

This resolution firmly supports President Kennedy's determination to hold our position in Berlin even if we have to use arms to accomplish this. I am confident that this is the only language Khrushchev understands.

Berlin is important because it symbolizes our determination to stop Communist aggression at all cost. There can be no doubt that if Berlin should fall completely behind the Iron Curtain, it would not be long before the Communists would attempt aggression against all of West Germany. There is nothing Khrushchev would want more than to capture the rich and highly developed industrial potential of West Germany. If the tragic event should ever occur; if the Soviets should ever capture West Germany's natural resources, it would be a matter of short time before all of Europe fell into Communist hands. That is why it is so important today to retain our position in Berlin.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to include the text of the resolution at this point and express my hope that it will be overwhelmingly approved.

The resolution follows:

H. Con. Res. 582

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is and has been to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas it is the purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Germany; and

Whereas in connection with the termination of hostilities in World War II the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union freely entered into binding agreements under which the four powers have the right to remain in Berlin, with the right of ingress and egress, until the conclusion of a final settlement with the Government of Germany; and

Whereas no such final settlement has been concluded by the four powers and the aforementioned agreements continue in force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress—

(a) that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin constitutes a fundamental political and moral purpose;

(b) that the United States would regard as intolerable any violation by the Soviet Union directly or through others of those rights in Berlin, including the right of ingress and egress;

(c) that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this resolution. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Curtis] for a very fine statement and to express my regret that he is not going to be with us next year, that he is not running for reelection. I should like to say that I am sure I speak for Members on both sides of the aisle when I say that he has been a very valuable member of our committee and has contributed in many ways to sensible solutions of some of the delicate and difficult questions with which we have been presented.

Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with those who urge that we act in overwhelming support of this resolution. Its purpose is to reiterate and to reemphasize this country's unequivocal support of our rights in Berlin, and our willingness to back up the people of Berlin.

The main questions which have been raised involve the necessity for this action, and whether now is the time for Congress to express its sentiments, I myself feel the Cuba resolution, just recently passed, was far more necessary, and certainly no one could question the timeliness of the Cuba resolution.

On the other hand, the situation in Berlin has been critical at least since the air blockade of that city. And this country's response to that Soviet challenge has been unequivocal, and our determination to stand firm has been made clear repeatedly. Surely no one could have misunderstood the significance of the Secretary of Defense's statement about the use of nuclear weapons, a statement which he made immediately after his return from a trip to Berlin.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, it can be argued that U.S. policy regarding Berlin is already crystal clear, whereas our position with respect to Soviet penetration of Cuba is only slowly developing. Certainly the circumstances in both these areas are vastly different. To my mind, however, it does not follow that adoption of this resolution regarding Berlin is not appropriate or necessary. On the contrary, this resolution should have immediate benefits.

The gentleman from Minnesota just now made a most eloquent speech in favor of this resolution. I agree with much of what he said. Nonetheless, there seems no great reason to be unduly optimistic over what he described as the failings of the Communist system. Indeed, it is because of the Communists' continuing efforts to repudiate their wartime agreements, their troublemaking all over the world, and their refusal to recognize their commitments in Berlin and elsewhere, that we find a justification for this resolution. This cold war has continued for so long that we have almost come to take it for granted. Passage of this resolution will serve as a reminder that this country is united in its determination to maintain our rights, in Berlin and elsewhere, despite Communist pressures.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the resolution before the House is a sound, responsible, and timely expression of Congress on Berlin, on Germany and on our intentions as a nation with respect to a Russian generated international problem.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for introducing this resolution and for his skill and patience in bringing it finally before the House for consideration. It was my pleasure to introduce a resolution and to appear before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of it. I will vote for this resolution.

Members may recall my opposition to a resolution on Berlin during the first session of this Congress.

That opposition was based upon my conviction that the resolution then pending was too narrow, too negative, and could be interpreted as a very fundamental change in our policy toward Germany as a whole.

My conviction led me to introduce a resolution which confirmed our longstanding policy commitments for a free, united, and democratic Germany.

Regretfully, a set of circumstances developed in which reasonable compromise, worked out by the parties in direct interest, did not come before the House for a vote.

My major objections of last year have been met by the present resolution.

The preamble makes it clear the United States will continue to encourage and support a free, unified, and democratic Germany.

The resolve clauses make it crystal clear that we will stand up for our rights in Berlin and that we will fulfill our long standing and often repeated commitments to the people of all Berlin whose courage and fortitude in support of freedom's cause have strengthened our common purposes.

Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago, speaking in the well on the Cuban crisis, I expressed concern with the reports presently circulating that Khrushchev believes we lack what it takes to stand up for our rights.

This is a false and dangerous assumption by the Russian leader. It was that kind of false assumption on the part of Hitler which led to World War II. It would be a tragedy of immeasurable magnitude if we stood by and allowed a repeat of that black chapter of history.

We now have before us a resolution carefully calculated to relieve the Russians and their leader of that dangerous and false assumption about the United States.

I hope Congress will respond with a clear and united voice on this vital issue. I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution. I think it is a good resolution. It certainly puts the world and the Soviet leadership on notice that our rights in Berlin are not up for grabs through negotiation or any other means. I think we can, regardless of the label we wear—Republican, Democrat, conservative, or liberal—at this critical hour assure the President of the United States that in the days that lie ahead when decisions are made that require courage and determination we stand as one in the risk involved in those decisions and pledge our wholehearted support behind him and behind his leadership.

This is a good resolution. I am pleased to congratulate the members of the committee, and pledge my vote to it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this resolution and I am proud to be one of its sponsors.

Mr. Chairman, only a few hours ago today I had the opportunity of meeting and talking with the remarkable man who in many ways symbolizes the determination of the people of West Berlin to remain free. I refer to Mayor Willy Brandt who was in Washington today to see President Kennedy before returning to his divided city.

I assured Mayor Brandt that I was confident that the House of Representatives would overwhelmingly pass today this concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that, as the resolution reads, "the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary including the use of arms, any violation of our rights in Berlin by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to defend the rights and freedom of the people of Berlin."

Mr. Chairman, here on the floor of the House in August—on the anniversary of the rearing of the "wall of shame" that divides the free world from the Communist world in Berlin, several of my colleagues and I spoke at length on the failure of communism as symbolized in the wall.

I believe it is appropriate that we should consider this resolution on Berlin today for at least two reasons. First, having just passed a resolution affirming the determination of the United States to resist any effort by Castro to attack us or to export his revolution to other countries in Latin America, we should not at the same time turn our gaze away from that tense situation in Berlin where armed American and Soviet soldiers confront each other daily.

Second, I believe it wise that we utilize the forum of this House to continue to pound away at the self-exposure of communism by the rearing of the Berlin wall—a wall built not to keep others out, but to keep those who have lived under communism and know what it is really like, from fleeing to freedom.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 13, several Members of the House set forth some of the important facts on the success of West Germany and the failure of Communist East Germany. Today I want to take a few minutes to present further material on the striking contrast between freedom and slavery, side by side in Berlin.

THE WALL

The world has known great walls in the past; they were erected to repel invaders and barbarians.

The wall in Berlin is unique; its object is to prevent the men and women behind it from reaching freedom.

Between 1946 and August 13, 1961, 4 million East Germans "voted with their feet" to breathe the free air of the West. In doing so they exercised one of the guarantees embodied in the constitution of the so-called German Democratic Republic: "Every citizen is entitled to emigrate"—article 10, section 3. They chose to live in the West; where they are free to determine the course of their lives and those of their children; where political liberty is a living reality; where economic well-being, in professions and occupations freely chosen and pursued, is a fact; where the basic human rights are guaranteed and respected by a democratically constituted West German Government.

Before the prison wall was erected to prevent their escape from East Germany, the East German people chose to leave this puppet state in such numbers that the Soviet-occupied areas of Germany were the only territory in Europe, if not in the whole world, showing a constant decrease in population. They left ancient homes to reject life under a government which represents not the governed but rather a foreign master and an alien philosophy which brutally violates the very "rights" it enshrines in a showcase constitution.

BEHIND THE WALL

Behind the wall—in the East German prison—the grimness of life is attested to almost daily by the desperate escape attempts which have, as we so well know, often ended in tragedy.

Behind the wall, life continues more regimented than before—economically, politically, socially. And to insure the docility and obedience of the imprisoned, the East German Government has found it necessary to establish one of the most heavily militarized states in the world. For every 16 persons in the Soviet Zone of Germany, there is one bearing arms. The size of this East German military machine reflects its ironic dual purpose. The Ulbricht regime has built up its forces not just to defend the homeland, but primarily to suppress the population in case of open revolt. The uprising of June 1953 has most certainly not been forgotten.

The wall has denied the East German people the only free ballot they have known; they can no longer "vote with their feet." It was certainly the expectation of the Ulbricht regime that the wall, coupled with a stringent emergency law and conscript labor decrees, would eliminate the economic problems which have haunted East Germany.

This expectation has not been realized.

BEFORE THE WALL

Before August 13, 1961, the East German regime could threaten and cajole the workers and farmers, but it could never enforce its decrees with the rigidity of the other Communist areas. "Under conditions of the open frontier before August 13," as Ulbricht candidly acknowledged on November 28, 1961, "it was difficult to always enforce these laws consistently in the practical implementation of our policy."

Subsequent to August 13, however, the East German Communists moved quickly to enforce obedience. On August 25 they issued two decrees which authorized movement of persons and conscription for agricultural labor by the police, the militia, party organs or any regime organization. Shortly thereafter, on September 20, the decree instituting martial law throughout East Germany was issued.

With these weapons in its hands, the regime began an all-out industrial production drive, enforced "voluntary" norm increases and drafted workers to meet a constantly deteriorating agricultural shortage.

Intensive efforts have been made during the past year to increase East German agricultural production. Yet planning and production figures in 1962 in many agricultural sectors have fallen below the levels of 1961 which was itself an extremely unsatisfactory year. The planners have been confronted with formidable organizational obstacles to plan fulfillment. The regimentation of collectivized agriculture has not produced the desired results. The decentralization of ownership and control of agricultural machinery to the collective farms has yielded no measurable gains. Inadequate care and upkeep of machinery, moreover, continues to elicit the criticism of the authorities. And indiscipline among farmworkers remains a matter of concern.

PRODUCTION DRIVE FAILS

In industry too the production drive has failed. Faced with the receding prospects of attaining the original 7-year plan goals, the East German planners have prescribed an increased dosage of austerity. To make possible at least the attainment of the increased capital accumulation goals, retrenchment in the consumer sector is the dominant theme of the 1962 East German economic plan. The East German population will pay in terms of fewer industrial consumer goods and less food.

The East German regime thus finds itself confronted with a serious dilemma. The relaxation of repression would increase the difficulties of political control. On the other hand, economic goals will be difficult if not impossible of attainment in an atmosphere of continued repression.

But is this not the dilemma which confronts all totalitarian societies? Freedom is incompatible with the successful functioning of a Communist society. Yet without freedom, the very incentives which are essential to the successful functioning of any society are lacking.

WHOM DOES THE WALL PROTECT?

With unparalleled cynicism, the East German rulers have attempted to depict the wall as a protective device. Whom does it protect? The answer is clear for all the world to see. Before the escape hatches were closed on August 13, 1961, the human stream flowed in one direction only; it fled the tyranny of the East; it sought the liberty of the West. In doing so, it was exercising a right which is unequivocally stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—clause 13, paragraph 2—adopted by the United Nations General Assembly:

> Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own.

In response to a letter from the mayor of Berlin to the Congress of Cultural Freedom, 33 authors of world repute on August 29, 1961, signed a declaration containing the following passage:

> It is one thing for a social order to force its citizens, by the millions, to seek asylum elsewhere. It is still more reprehensible to cut off their escape by means of walls and wire across city streets, to threaten them at the point of bayonets, to shoot at them in flight as if they were runaway slaves.

The wall epitomizes the degradation of the human spirit which is part and parcel of totalitarian regimes. But more importantly, it represents a confession of defeat on the part of those who ordered its construction. They have been compelled to demonstrate to the world that the relationship they have to the people they rule is that of the warden to the inmates of a prison.

USIA ARTICLES ANALYZE EAST GERMAN TYRANNY

For Members of this House interested in fuller consideration of the Berlin wall and the cause of freedom as embattled there, I have obtained from the U.S. Information Agency a series of articles that have been distributed to newspapers and magazines overseas. Because they

have not previously been made available within this country, I shall later ask unanimous consent to include these articles in the Congressional Record following my own remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my hope that this House will overwhelmingly adopt the resolution before us. Mr. Khrushchev must have no doubt that the United States is determined to maintain the rights and freedom of the people of Berlin. Not only their rights and freedom but the rights and freedom of the people of the United States and of our free world allies is at stake.

Sixteen Years Under Communism—the Chronicle of a Subject People

(By Eric Michelsen)

When Walter Ulbricht walled up the people of East Germany and destroyed all means of escape from the Soviet Zone in mid-1961 he produced a climax to 16 years of Soviet-style suppression.

In 1945, when the Red army marched in to occupy East Germany, it brought along a crew of 10 German Communists, many of whom had become Soviet citizens. Led by Ulbricht, this team was to carry out a long-range plan of complete sovietization.

From 1945 to 1949 the Soviets made no pretense about running things themselves. In 1949 and 1950 some responsibilities were ostensibly handed over to the German Communists. Soviet power, however, has continued to remain in the background as events of 1953 and 1961 have demonstrated.

Control of the political apparatus was the first Soviet concern. In 1946 Soviet authorities arranged and enforced a merger of the Communist Party and the Social Democratic Party into the German Socialist Unity Party (SED). By 1950, after all the democratic elements from the Social Democratic Party had been purged or silenced, the SED emerged as a so-called "party of the new type": a rigidly organized and centrally controlled duplicate of the Soviet Communist Party.

Alongside the SED the Communists created a counterfeit Christian Democratic Union, a Liberal Democratic Party and a National Democratic Party. Since 1950 these groups have been amalgamated into the "national front," led and controlled by the Communists. Elections ever since have been on the basis of a "unity list" of the national front, with the Communists picking the candidates and the voters offered no choice.

To extend their control and indoctrination into every aspect of social life, the Communists also set up mass organizations.

The Free German Trade Union (FDGB) exists as a state-controlled labor union to drive the workers to greater productivity, not to protect their economic interests. The Free German Youth (FDJ) indoctrinates the youth and creates a monopoly on all sports and recreational facilities. Membership is essential for admission to institutions of higher learning or special training.

The German Women's League (DFB) dominates every aspect of women's political and social life. The Cultural League (KB) concentrates on the indoctrination of East German culture with the Communist line.

Through the use of terror, indoctrination, and intimidation by secret police, the Ulbricht regime early set about destroying any form of life outside of Communist Party control.

The dreaded Ministry for State Security (MSF), established in 1950 to put a German Communist facade on Soviet power, established its agents in factories, farms, schools, all organizations and even the military.

Education was turned into rigid indoctrination in Marxism-Leninism with scholastic advancement based on ideological purity rather than ability.

The churches, as a source of moral strength for the population and therefore a threat to the regime, have been, from the very beginning, under constant attack.

Nowhere has Soviet domination been more obvious than on the question of German reunification. While this is a widespread and fervent wish of the whole German people, Soviet desires alone have determined the course of East German Communist policy.

When World War II ended, the United States, Britain, France, and the Soviet Union agreed on the reconstruction of a unified, free and democratic Germany. The Communists tested their strength in a free election only once—in a Berlin city election in 1946. The result was a resounding defeat.

By 1949 it was obvious that free elections toward reunification would not be allowed in the Soviet Zone. The Western Allies therefore went ahead and held free parliamentary elections in their zones in September of that year.

The Soviet reaction was to establish their puppet "German Democratic Republic" the following month which claimed authority over all of Germany. The Soviet line now demanded that any settlement on reunification be made between the two administrations.

The Allies again insisted on free elections. Knowing they would lose any democratic vote, the Soviets proposed, in November 1950, the formation of an all-German Constituent Assembly with equal representation from East and West Germany—despite the fact that the population of the East Zone was only one-third that of the Federal Republic.

When the Allies again proposed free elections in July 1955, the Soviets stated that they would result in "a violation of the vital interests" of the Eastern Zone. Again they insisted on parity between East and West.

Since then, as East Germany has been increasing ties, both economically and politically, to the Soviet empire, the line has changed to the theory of "two Germanys."

Soviet control of East German development has just been as strongly pronounced in the economic sphere. Since 1945, when the Red army carried out a detailed plan of confiscation, economic policy has been subject to Soviet rather than German interests.

Immediately after World War II the Soviets dismantled German industrial plants and sent equipment, raw material and human skill to the Soviet Union. An identical process was carried out in agriculture through the wholesale confiscation of agricultural products, livestock and timber.

After 1947 Soviet economic policy began to change. Some of the dismantled factories were rebuilt, and reparations were taken from current production. Starting in 1949 the Communists began systematically to strengthen public enterprises while confiscating private business.

In January 1951, a 5-year plan was announced whose overall objective was to double the industrial output as compared with 1936.

Production quotas, however, were set in terms of Soviet, not German, needs. The main stress was on increasing the output of heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods, which remained below average needs even in the planning stage.

The execution of the plan was based on the exploitation of additional manpower sources through an increase in production norms and the diversion of self-employed people and women into manual labor.

Considerable unrest during 1952 and 1953 was created by the deterioration of the economic situation and the increasing shortage of consumer goods, combined with rising prices and bad working conditions.

Matters came to a head on July 16, 1953, when building workers in East Berlin started demonstrations against decrees ordering more work for less pay. This demand touched off strikes, resulting in the anti-Communist uprising throughout East Germany.

Soviet tanks and 20,000 troops were rushed in to put down the uprising. Nearly 600 persons were killed and 1,744 wounded in 2 days of bitter street fighting. An estimated 50,000 Germans were arrested in the next 2 weeks while East Germany was ruled by the Soviets under martial law.

Little is now heard of the much-touted 7-year plan which went into effect in 1958. As it became apparent that its goals were unrealistic, the Communists quietly dropped their slogan, "We will beat West Germany in per capita consumption by 1961."

An East German worker still has to work three times as long as his West German counterpart to buy a pair of shoes.

A man's suit costs an East German about twice as many working hours as a West German.

There are 67 automobiles in West Germany for every 1,000 persons, compared with 8 for every 1,000 in the East.

For the East German farmer, life under communism has had an extra degree of hopelessness. Tied to his land by tradition as well as by economic need, he has been more reluctant than the worker to flee oppression. Nevertheless, more than 120,000 left their farms between 1953 and 1958 rather than be forced into collectives.

Despite the crippling effect collectivization had on the national economy, Ulbricht has stubbornly pursued it. By 1958, 69 percent of the farms were under state control. Another 18 percent were accounted for during 1959. In April 1960, the process was completed.

The results were a considerable drop in agricultural production. Plans for the production of milk and pork could not be fulfilled. Potatoes and sugarbeets were rotting in the fields in mid-December of 1960. It is estimated that the 1961 crops will be below those of the year before.

One of the most important factors in the deterioration of the East German economic situation has been the steady flow of refugees out of the Soviet Zone. Since 1945, approximately 4 million persons have fled, leaving about 16 million under Communist control.

Of the refugees who fled to the West, 73.3 percent were less than 45 years old and 48.1 percent younger than 25 years. At the close of 1961, 64.8 percent of the remaining population was either too old or too young to work. By 1965 this category will rise to over 75 percent when the East German labor force will have decreased by approximately 600,000 workers.

The impact of this loss was brought out by the announcement, on March 19, 1961, that the Soviet Zone's aircraft industry would be abandoned. East German Planning Chief Bruno Leuschner, disclosing this failure, also admitted that general 1961 goals were unfulfilled because of "difficulties" in raw material delivery, lack of manpower reserves, a serious backlog in the building industry and bottlenecks in the production of consumer goods.

Religious Persecution in East Germany Fails To Destroy Church

(By Eric Michelsen)

Despite 15 years of religious persecution, the Communist regime has been unable to destroy religious life in East Germany.

With all the machinery of a totalitarian state in their hands—social and political pressure, police prosecution, economic deprivation—the East German Communists are finding that their antireligious campaign is one of their least successful undertakings.

The main brunt of the campaign is felt by the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church which represents about 85 percent of East Germany's 16 million population. The Christian churches, as a unifying force among the peoples of Western and Eastern Germany, as well as a rallying ground against Communist rule, have become a prime obstacle to Communist domination.

Tactics during the summer of 1961 made clear that the immediate Communist objectives were to split the Eastern church from the Western, sever all ties between them, and convert the Soviet Zone segment to a docile organization. The border action of August 13 divided the country in a physical sense; Walter Ulbricht's regime apparently hopes to make the division a spiritual one as well.

The man who has stood as a symbol of the unity of the Evangelical Church, and who has therefore been the prime target of the Communist regime, is Lutheran Bishop Otto Dibelius. Until 1961 he was the bishop of the Diocese of Berlin-Brandenburg, chairman of the council of the Evangelical Church in Germany and president of the World Council of Churches. His diocese, which included West Berlin, East Berlin, and the East German Province of Brandenburg, was one of the few remaining links between the two parts of Germany.

Bishop Dibelius had already been barred from East Germany when, in the fall of 1959, he issued a theological letter in which he said he could not regard the East German authorities as "powers" ordained from God to whom Christians owed obedience. As a result of this letter, in 1960 the East German Communists barred the bishop from East Berlin.

Other efforts to continue the unity of the Evangelical Church have been harassed by the Communist regime. It banned East Zone meetings of the all-German Evangelical Church Assembly which had been planned for July 1961 in both sectors of Berlin; only religious services could be held in the Eastern sector.

Over the years Communist antireligious activity has been especially active among the youth. Although freedom of belief is guaranteed in the East German Constitution—article 44 grants "the right of the church to impart religious instruction in schoolrooms"—a regulation of the Ministry of Education, issued in 1958, stipulates that "all persons who instruct or teach students outside the school or otherwise outside the school curriculum * * * must adopt a positive attitude in their conduct toward the State of Workers and Peasants. Concerning the admissibility of these persons * * * the director of the school alone decides." Furthermore, the state allows only teachers who are "in a position to impart to the youth of the nation a scientific-atheistic perspective."

Reminiscent of Hitler's Nazi religious ceremonies, the Communists have instituted political rituals to replace church rituals. There is an atheistic celebration of namegiving (in place of baptism), a Communist "consecration" of youth (in place of confirmation), a Communist marriage ceremony, and a Communist burial service.

Ulbricht, who was described as "the Moses of the Socialist future," even handed down "10 commandments" at the Fifth Congress of the East German Communist Party. Though political in content, the biblical language is a conscious imitation of the Ten Commandments of the Hebrew and Christian religions.

Commandment 2, for example, states: Thou shalt love thy fatherland and always be ready to commit thy whole strength and ability to the defense of the workers' and peasants' power.

Commandment 5 says: Thou shalt in the construction of socialism (communism) conduct thyself in the spirit of mutual assistance and comradely cooperation, honor the collective and take its criticism to heart.

In 1958 Communist authorities began an intensified campaign to increase the number of children taking part in the "confirmation" ceremony and the preparatory classes preceding it. The campaign was accompanied by clear indications that failure to take part would bar a child from higher education and advancement in life.

In December 1959, the Communist youth organization FDJ distributed a 320-page book for use during the Christmas holiday. It outlined "the Socialist (Communist) way of celebrating the anniversary," declared that "man has no need of spiritual blessing" and urged the replacement of the Star of Bethlehem by the Red star. Included with each copy was a phonograph record mocking the traditional Christmas ceremonies.

The East German Communists have also used repressive measures to physically destroy the churches and deprive them of ministers.

The Catholic Bishop of Magdeburg, in a pastoral letter in December 1959, expressed regret that he had not been given permission to build wooden churches in the parishes of Moeser and Krostitz, whose Catholic populations are without a place of worship. Material for the churches, a gift from the Archbishop of Paderborn, had arrived 2 years before, but the East German authorities had made various excuses for refusing permission to build.

The regime has also used outright terror against ministers. In 1953, for example, there were 72 churchmen in prison serving terms ranging from 6 months to 12 years for the crime of "activities inimical to the state." In one case, several sermons by Bishop Dibelius were found in the study of an East German minister. He was sentenced to 8 years' imprisonment. Another clergyman was sentenced to 10 months when medicine "of Western origin" was found in his possession.

Another form of harassment concerns the recruitment of the clergy. Those theological students who have persevered in overcoming obstacles to complete their studies are forced to take an unqualified oath that they will support the Communist state. In order to bypass this, the church used to send its ministerial candidates to West Berlin or West Germany. The state countered by refusing them reentry permits.

An intensive program of spying on ministers and priests has begun. The regime has prepared "priests' cards," containing not only a priest's name and personal record, but also details of his sermons. Official and private utterances of the priests are also recorded.

Special groups of "reliable citizens" have been established in district councils in East Germany to gather information about priests and establish close contacts with them in an attempt to "convince" them of the correctness of the policy of the Communist regime toward the church.

The campaign against the church has had some results—about 1,000 parish posts are vacant—but the overall Communist campaign has not been successful. About 5,000 Evangelical pastors remain and since 1949 only 200 ministers have left the country, most of them with church permission.

Dr. Kurt Scharf, chairman of the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany, summarized the situation on October 11, 1961, in this way:

"A deep distrust against everything, especially against those responsible for the August 13 measures, prevails among the Soviet Zone people. In this situation a hunger for and a confidence in the church as the only institution able to offer comfort and hope has become stronger than ever."

WALTER ULBRICHT: EAST GERMANY'S COMMUNIST CHIEF

(By Andrew Keller)

By never questioning orders from Moscow and avoiding important decisions himself, Walter Ulbricht has remained at the top of East Germany's Communist hierarchy for 16 years, through dramatic changes in leadership in other satellites of the U.S.S.R. and in the Soviet Union itself.

His talent for sniffing the wind from the Kremlin and responding as expected has been called the main secret of his power and durability. While Ulbricht has functioned as a martinet at home, he has always been a puppet in Soviet affairs.

An example of his quick compliance with Moscow's wishes was provided following the 22d Congress of the Soviet Communist Party which, in October 1961, denounced Stalin and the "cult of personality."

Reacting at once to Premier Khrushchev's renewed emphasis on "collective leadership," Ulbricht began trying to cover the tracks of the "cult of personality" he had built around himself at home.

Factories, schools, hospitals, farms, streets and an army regiment named after Ulbricht symbolized the cult, fostered to counteract the actual public hatred of Ulbricht's dictatorship in East Germany. The cult had been epitomized in a party slogan: "We are all Walter Ulbricht."

After the Moscow congress, Ulbricht and his apologists began to plead that the rule of East Germany has been collective and not personal all along. One propaganda official told a meeting November 2, 1961, "When Comrade Ulbricht speaks with his great ability to analyze the situation, it is not just his own opinion but the opinion of the politburo and the central committee."

Earlier, on August 13, 1961, Ulbricht had eagerly complied with Moscow's orders to shut the border between East and West Berlin and stanch the flow of refugees draining the Communist regime of its productive manpower.

West Berlin's Mayor Willy Brandt at that time drew attention to the dual role of Ulbricht as one controlled from without but dictating from within.

The Soviet Union had "loosened the leash a little on their dog Ulbricht and allowed him to send tanks into Berlin," Brandt told a protest rally.

The closing of the border, Brandt also said, was "a new version of the occupation of the Rhineland by Hitler. The man today is called Ulbricht."

Like Hitler, Ulbricht is a master of techniques for suppressing his opponents, and his victims have been many. One biographer has declared that "in order to come to power and stay in power Ulbricht has betrayed everyone, everywhere."

According to Wolfgang Leonhard, a former subordinate who broke with the Communists, Ulbricht's main characteristic is "a complete lack of any kind of feeling." He asks for strict obedience and exacts it with the harsh efficiency that East Germans have called his "sergeant's method."

The popular hatred of Ulbricht stems largely from his primary allegiance to the Soviet Union. The East Germans hold him responsible for suppressing civil liberties and imposing economic hardships only to further the interests of the Soviet Union. During the 1938–45 period when Ulbricht resided in the U.S.S.R., they point out, he formally became a Soviet citizen.

East Germans have expressed their hatred of Ulbricht most eloquently by fleeing from his control. Those who stayed have laughed, when they dared, at their machinelike, unsmiling leader. Regarding the paunchy figure of a staid man affecting dignity, some have called him a "stuffed marionette." Others have mocked his broad Saxon accent or called him "the Beard," making fun of the goatee which he sports, it is said, to enhance his slight resemblance to Lenin.

Walter Ulbricht was born in 1893 as the son of a Leipzig tailor. His formal education was limited to elementary school and at the age of 14 he was apprenticed to a woodworker.

He joined the Social Democratic Party in 1912 but shifted to the German Communist Party when it was founded in 1919. His comrades soon noted his stubborn affinity for Moscow's line and dubbed him "Tovarish Woodenhead."

They also noted the craftiness and duplicity which prompted Klara Zetkin, an early leader of the German Communists, to exclaim in 1925: "May fortune preserve our party from the calamity of one day seeing this man swept to the surface."

Moscow aided in Ulbricht's emergence to the surface by providing him with training at Comintern headquarters in secret police tactics and the cell system of party organization. Back in Germany, Ulbricht applied his lessons in attempts to infiltrate labor unions and agitate strikes.

In 1928 Ulbricht became a Communist deputy in the German Reichstag. When First Secretary Ernst Thaelmann appointed Ulbricht head of the Berlin-Brandenburg party committee 2 years later, he was quoted as saying: "Ulbricht is a bureaucrat, and he always will be, but the decisive thing is that he'll never fight against me."

Germans are convinced that, surreptitiously, Ulbricht did fight—that he betrayed Thaelmann and others to the Gestapo when the Nazis came to power in 1933 and later deliberately blocked their release from prison and thwarted plans to aid their escape.

Ulbricht himself fled to Prague and then to Paris after the Nazis took control. Upon outbreak of the Spanish civil war, he rushed to Spain. There, hundreds of miles from the fighting, he directed the liquidation of anti-Communist Germans in the international brigades fighting on the side of the Loyalists.

In 1938 Ulbright was assigned to a Comintern job in Moscow, where he remained about 7 years. Within this period he managed to win the personal support of Stalin.

During World War II, Ulbricht's talent for sycophancy won him a key post in the National Committee for a Free Germany, a Moscow front set up by the Soviets to indoctrinate German prisoners of war and spread propaganda.

The committee provided the nucleus for the German administration established by the Soviets in Berlin at the end of World War II. Ulbricht returned to the city May 2, 1945, heading a secret, 10-man group of Moscow-trained Germans and wearing the uniform of a Red army colonel. Ulbricht's band went to work seeking out old party members and collaborators and placing them in key posts in an improvised municipal government.

With Soviet support, Ulbricht extended his influence into East Germany. He removed or won over political rivals and in 1946 created the Socialist Unity Party (Communist), with himself as chief.

When the East German regime was formed in 1949, Ulbricht took on concurrent duties as deputy premier, exerting his influence through the aged President Wilhelm Pieck and the pliable Premier Otto Grotewohl. In a government reorganization in February 1960, following the death of Pieck, Ulbricht became chairman of a new Council of State.

Ulbricht directed the massive Soviet economic exploitation of East Germany which in June 1953 caused the people to rise and shout: "The Beard must go." East Germans revolted against impossible work norms, reduced pay, and meager diets.

It took 2 days for some 25,000 Soviet troops to crush the rebellion. Fifty thousand persons were arrested, 569 killed and 1,744 wounded, by official government count. Ulbricht commented: "It is only a family quarrel, of no concern to the West."

WORLD INTELLECTUALS CONDEMN ULBRICHT'S BORDER CLOSING

Thirty intellectual leaders, representing 19 nations, have succinctly condemned as a violation of human rights the Communist closure of the border dividing East and West Berlin.

The condemnation came in response to an appeal by West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt to the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Brandt had asked the International Congress to bring to the attention of world opinion the gravity of the August 13 border closing.

The reply, in the form of a letter signed by 30 intellectual leaders, cited the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states: "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own." The declaration was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948.

Much of the intellectuals' letter was devoted to the aspect of refugee flights. Between 1949 and mid-1961, more than 4 million East Germans fled their homeland, by far the greatest number of them going through the open border in Berlin. The Communist action in sealing that border cut the flow to a trickle.

The letter noted that "human beings, no less than nations, have a right to self-determination" and should not be shot at in flight "as if they were runaway slaves."

The signers included such notables as Eduardo Santos, former President of Colombia, new publisher of the newspaper El Tiempo; Jorge Lois Borges, prominent Argentine writer; Erice Verissime of Brazil; Victor Raul Haya de la Torre and Luis-Alberto Sanchez, both of Peru; author Stephen Spender and historian Hugh Seton-Watson of Britain; Ignazio Silone of Italy; Denis de Rougemont of Switzerland; Prof. Raymond Aron and Manes Sperber of France; Sidney Hook and J. Robert Oppenheimer of the United States.

Dr. Davidson Nicol of Sierra Leone; Essayist Ezekiel Mphalele of Nigeria; A. K. Brohi of Pakistan; Asoke Mehta, M.P., Mindo Masani, M.P., and Jayaprakash Narayan, all of India; Prof. Maung Maung of Burma; Michio Takeyama and Yoshihiko Seki of Japan; and Raul Manglapus of the Philippines.

Following is the text of the letter:

"Even in a world which has become hardened to the spectacle of inhumanity, the news and pictures from Berlin have shocked men and women everywhere. Oppression and discontent exists on many continents, and the tragedy of exile is a fate suffered by many people and races. Yet the events on the frontiers of your city profoundly trouble the conscience of the world. It is one thing for a social order to force its citizens, by the millions, to seek asylum elsewhere. It is still more reprehensible to cut off their escape by means of walls and barbed wire across city streets, to threaten them at the point of bayonets, to shoot at them in flight as if they were runaway slaves.

"This is not a matter of politics or ideology or of social philosophy. It is a matter of the most elementary respect for a human right—and one which all the nations of the civilized world are on record as having recognized. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, states this right unequivocally (clause 13, par. 2): 'Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own.'

"We know with what emotion you and your fellow Berliners have, over the years, watched so many of your countrymen abandon their homes, their livelihoods and, often, their families, in the East, in order to establish a new and more humane existence elsewhere. You have often explained to us how mixed the motives have been. The refugees have not always been running from persecution and hunger; sometimes the motivation was a mixture of fear and hope and confusion. But this fact surely demonstrates that what is involved is a human right, transcending all narrowly political and economic considerations.

"Human beings, no less than nations, have a right to self-determination. Men and women want to have a share in determining where and how they should work, and what they may believe; fathers and mothers want to determine for themselves how their children should be brought up and what their lives should be like; citizens want to share in determining who their rulers and public representatives should be.

"Deprived of the right to be able thus to shape their own lives some men become rebels, others become refugees. Both recourses are understandable human responses to an intolerable situation, whether in the heart of Africa or in the heart of Europe.

"As we follow the news of what has been happening at the Brandenburg Gate, along the East-West frontier of your city, we cannot help being reminded of the lines in Pushkin's "Boris Godunev," where the czar gives instructions to 'take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced by barriers * * * that not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow fly.' For this reactionary and unnatural command is being reechoed today, and grotesquely enough by men who pretend to speak in the name of the universal liberation of mankind.

"Barbed wire and bayonets are not the decor of any new and higher freedom. We shall not cease to insist that all pretentions of all governments and powers be measured against the right of all human beings to a life of freedom and dignity."

CONCRETE, BARBED WIRE, AND DEATH STRIPS RESTRICT EAST GERMANS

(By Eric Michelsen)

While two Soviet Army divisions ringed Berlin, the East German Communists, on the morning of August 13, 1961, built their wall through the center of the city and sealed off the people of East Berlin from all contact with West Berlin. The steady westward flow of refugees—some 4 million since 1945—was virtually stopped.

The building of the wall was an exercise in shock tactics. Shortly after 2 a.m., steel-helmeted Communist troops with rifles and machineguns mounted guard at 80 points along the border where streets offered easy access to the Western sector.

Closely supervised by the troops, workmen began tearing up the paving blocks. Then they blocked off the streets with barbed wire and concrete slabs.

By dawn, the world's 10th most populous city—3,423,000 people—and the second largest in area—870 square kilometers—had been cut in two. Though divided politically, Berlin had previously been one city in the economic and social sense. Until August, some 53,000 East Berliners had commuted daily to West Berlin for work at good West German wages. Some 30,000 West Berliners worked in the East.

All this ended when, at 1 a.m. on August 13, the German Communists closed down the giant network of subway and elevated train lines which crisscrossed between East and West.

Now thousands of lives have been disrupted. Husbands caught in the Soviet sector no longer see their wives and children in the West. Parents and children were separated from each other. Workers lost their jobs. Marriage plans were canceled because one partner lived in the Communist sector. Even much needed medical supplies have been kept from the East Berlin population.

The German Communists have long been expert in building barriers. In 1952 they set up double barbed wire fences, plowed strips and machinegun towers around the perimeter of the Western sector, sealing the rest of East Germany from West Berlin. Simultaneously, they severed East Germany from the West by similar barriers stretching from the Baltic Sea to the border of Czechoslovakia.

The new barrier, known to East and West Berliners as "Ulbricht's Chinese Wall," is a 45-kilometer chain whose links are concrete, brick, barbed wire, and water. It slices off the Soviet Zone of Berlin and marks the complete encirclement of the Western sector.

The city itself is a rough circle in the center of Communist East Germany and 160 kilometers from the border of the German Federal Republic. The wall runs from the East German border in the north to the East German border in the south, separating the Soviet-controlled eastern third of the city from the remainder, which is protected by the United States, Britain, and France.

The wall starts in the north as a double line of barbed wire strung on parallel concrete posts two meters high, with more barbed wire tangled between.

Twelve miles north of the Brandenburg Gate, between the Luebars District in the West and the Rosenthal District in the East, the barbed wire runs through miles of potato fields and small garden plots with summer cottages.

The wall pushes south into industrial sectors on the east side of an elevated railway embankment. At Kopenhagener Strasse, a railroad siding ends abruptly at a street crossing. Barbed wire has been strung along the top of an old brick wall beside the railway and the tracks are piled with stone, rubble, and bricks.

A little farther, the side of a bombed-out building and the back fence of a factory have been topped with wire and incorporated into the wall.

As the wall nears the congested center of Berlin, east-west streets are sealed off with slabs of pink-brown concrete 25 centimeters thick. The slabs are topped with two, three or more layers of granite cubes, mortared in place, and 60-centimeter-high iron bars strung with more barbed wire.

The same wall runs through bombed-out areas on the border and even down the center of streets that form a dividing line between East and West Berlin.

In Bernauer Strasse, the Communists have capped with broken glass the weathered bricks of an old cemetery. Rough boulders fill the gate, which used to open on a West Berlin street. No longer can West Berliners visit the graves of relatives or bury their dead.

Here and on a few other streets, the apartment houses themselves are part of the wall. They are in East Berlin, but their windows face the West. Their doors and lower floor windows have been bricked over and blocked. Because dozens of people have jumped from the upper floors of buildings facing West Berlin—some to their death—the Communists have forcibly removed all residents.

Near Garten Strasse the Communists have built a watchtower, manned by armed guards, which gives the area the appearance of a prison or concentration camp.

At the Brandenburg gate, the towering triumphal arch which marks the geographical center of the city and which for 16 years was the principal point of crossing in the divided city, the barriers include a concrete slab wall 2½ meters high and 2 meters wide. Steel-rail tank traps imbedded in concrete reinforce stretches for hundreds of meters.

Close by Brandenburg gate, a canal cuts at right angles across the border. The water is the wall, banked on the Communist side with more barbed wire reinforced with a 2-meter concrete wall. A number of refugees have died, shot in the back by the Communist guards, while attempting to swim the canals or the River Spree which runs along the border in some places.

To make sure that no one escaped, the Communists started in October to construct a "death strip" along the 45-kilometer length of wall. They have razed buildings, torn up streets and cleared the entire area behind the wall for a width of 100 meters. In front of this open area double and sometimes quadruple rows of 2-meter concrete posts strung with barbed wire have been constructed. Behind the 100-meter strip are earthen breastworks and a continuous line of trenches which provides a partly concealed communications line. The death strip is mined and the trenches are manned by guards armed with rifles and machineguns.

As in all coercive measures, the building of the wall is a continuing process. New deterrents are added as individuals escape to the West.

Until the Communists built their death strip 20 or more East Germans managed to escape across the wall each night. After that, however, the number of successful escapes reported by West Berlin police dropped to an average of three or four.

TERROR TACTICS FOLLOW EAST GERMAN BORDER CLOSING

(By Eric Michelsen)

The Ulbricht regime in East Germany, immediately after closing its Berlin border last August 13, launched a new and intensified campaign against opposition elements that had shown no signs of abating by early 1962.

Mere expression of anti-Communist sentiment, in many cases, led to imprisonment on such vague charges as "incitement to murder and espionage." Widespread arrests on a variety of political charges soon began to crowd prisons and labor camps with East Germans considered by the Communist authorities to constitute a threat to the party's program.

Within 2 weeks, the number of East Germans in the Buetzow-Dreibergen prison increased from 800 to 1,300, according to the prominent German newspaper, Die Welt.

"The prison for those awaiting trial and the women's prison in Barnim Street in East Berlin are overfilled," the paper stated, "largely with persons who were arrested in connection with the events of August 13."

In an attempt to impress the population with the necessity of obedience, the regime staged several show-trials, exploited with full television coverage and ending with sentences heavy enough to serve as "examples." Sentences ranging up to 8 years were imposed for nothing more than "singing songs of incitement."

By early September, more than 1,000 persons had been sentenced to prison. In addition, more than 100 persons were sent to forced labor camps for "labor education."

The Ulbricht regime also began the forcible relocation of whole villages and families. At the end of September all buildings in the East German village of Rottenbach, near the West German border, were demolished and the entire population was removed to the interior. A family living in Gross Glienicke, a suburb of Berlin, was deported for "praising conditions in West Berlin," according to the Communist press. Another family in the border village of Seeburg was expelled for watching Western television programs, the East German Communist Maerkische Volksstimme reported on September 1.

Perhaps the most frightening of the regime's repressive measures in the closing months of 1961 was the use of 10- to 14-year-olds as spies and informers. In October the Communists announced rewards of footballs and athletic suits for members of the regime-run "Young Pioneers" who would betray persons trying to escape from East Germany.

The youngsters also were instructed to report television aerials set to receive Western programs—regarded as proof of subversion by the Ulbricht regime.

The Communist regime, as a matter of fact, has incessantly tried to win over the youth of East Germany since 1946. There has been daily political indoctrination in the schools, and all extracurricular activities and sports have been used for propaganda and "educational" purposes by the Communist controlled "Young Pioneers" and "Free German Youth."

Despite these efforts, however, the Communists have been remarkably unsuccessful. It has been precisely in the age bracket of 18 to 25 that most resistance has occurred. Over the past 16 years, half of all refugees escaping from East to West Germany have been less than 25 years old. Since the 1961 seal-off, especially young people have been in the forefront of East Germany's anti-regime element.

Seeking to break this resistance, the regime has concentrated its repressive machinery upon youth. Young people have been forced to "volunteer" for the East Germany Army as well as for industrial and farm labor brigades. Those who refuse have been dealt with summarily. Three youths in Teltow, near Berlin, were arrested by the State Security Service in October 1961 when they refused to volunteer for the army. At about the same time, four Greifswald students were expelled from the university because they failed to report for farm labor assignments.

The Communists also have attempted to ferret out the slightest ideological deviation among university students and teachers.

In September a student at Leipzig University was expelled and a number of faculty members at the Dresden Technical College were ousted for "doubting" Communist propaganda. They were also accused of carrying on subversive activities.

The Communist regime makes no secret of its determination to destroy independent thought. Wilhelm Girnus, the Communist controller of Soviet Zone universities, stated openly in October: "There is no German scholarship any longer. There is only Socialist (Communist) scholarship and capitalist scholarship." So-called "capitalist," or independent study, is the No. 1 target of the Communist school campaign.

Along with the academic community, members of other professional groups have been subjected to a corresponding degree of increased pressure. In the 7-year period from 1954 to August 1961, more than 17,000 engineers fled the Soviet Zone. At first this loss of technical skill forced the Communists to handle the remaining engineers with a degree of moderation. Since August, however, the regime applied harsh measures to this group as well.

As an example to others, two engineers at the "black pump" combine were fired from their jobs just because they exchanged letters with friends in West Germany, reported the Communist publication Neues Deutschland on September 6.

At the beginning of 1962, all regime critics or potential critics still in East Germany were faced with the discouraging prospect of more of the same kind of treatment—which already has made the Soviet Zone a no-man's land for all but the most obedient of Communist subjects.

EAST BERLIN: HEADQUARTERS FOR COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE

(By Eric Michelsen)

East Berlin and the Soviet Zone of Germany have become the rallying ground for almost every espionage organization operating in the Communist orbit.

Besides Walter Ulbricht's Ministry for State Security (MFS), a giant organization charged with espionage abroad and repression at home, there flourish the subversive apparatuses of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria, all coordinated and dominated from Moscow.

The main targets of espionage for these organizations are West Germany and the rest of Europe from Sweden to Turkey.

The Soviet Zone of Germany also serves as a training and dispatching area for Communist agents scheduled to serve in South America, Iran, Algeria, and West Africa. Details on the network of espionage have been provided over the years by defectors from communism.

The largest in size is the MFS which was established in 1950. From its headquarters on Normannenstrasse in East Berlin, it carries out its activities through a staff of some 22,000 officers.

Moscow pulls the controlling strings through a hard core of German Communists who acquired Soviet citizenship during the war.

Since 1957 the head of the MFS has been Erich Mielke, who had joined the German Communist Party in the 1920's. On August 9, 1931, he was accused of shooting two unsuspecting Berlin police officials. To escape prosecution, he fled to the Soviet Union where he became a Soviet citizen.

He returned to Germany with the Soviet Army in 1945, after an absence of 14 years, and went into secret police work with training visits to the Soviet Union. He continues as top man of the MFS, despite the double murder charge against him.

The chief of the MFS is in turn subject to the control, supervision, and exploitation of an "Advisors' Section" of the U.S.S.R. Committee of State Security (KGB), permanently assigned to East Germany.

The MFS is organized into some 15 departments which, besides carrying on espionage work outside of the Soviet Zone, also infiltrate every aspect of human life within Communist controlled Germany. They are responsible for a massive program of kidnaping, subversion, and propaganda, as well as for the conventional brand of espionage.

Espionage operations are conducted mainly by Main Department II, comprising more than 800 master spies who recruit and control some 16,000 agents abroad, mostly in West Germany.

Recruiting of spies is done by a wide variety of methods in both West Germany and the Soviet Zone, including the threat of reprisals against relatives in the zone. Extortion, bribes, various forms of coercion and pressure are standard practices. Since it frequently resorts to criminal techniques, the MFS has also released many inmates of Soviet Zone prisons who have in turn agreed to act as agents.

The missions assigned these agents are predominantly of a military and political nature. About 25 percent of all missions are directed against the West German State of North Rhine-Westphalia where the Ruhr industry and the seat of the Federal Government are located. The second most important area is West Berlin where more than 16 percent of all German Communist agents operate.

Since the end of the war, West Berlin and West German authorities have counted 255 cases of successful kidnapings, at least 143 planned or attempted kidnapings and 6 assassination attempts by East German agents.

The Soviet Union maintains two separate espionage organizations in East Germany. The largest is a branch of the U.S.S.R.'s secret police system, the Committee of State Security (KGB), which is the lineal descendant of the Cheka, GPU, OGPU, NKVD, and MGB. In Karlshorst, East Germany, the KGB has a force of some 700 recruiting agents and several hundred communications and administrative personnel. It ranks as the second largest espionage body in the world, exceeded only by the KGB parent organization operating inside the U.S.S.R.

The other Soviet espionage service in East Germany is the Military Intelligence Service (GRU) of the U.S.S.R.'s Ministry of Defense.

The elite of the GRU is also stationed at Karlshorst with a force of more than 150 officers and related personnel. Its mission is to collect strategic military information on the NATO countries.

The GRU also has headquarters in Wuensdorf, near East Berlin, with a staff of over 100 and field headquarters in Schwerin, Leipzig, Magdeburg, Chemnitz, and East Berlin.

Corresponding to the Soviet Union's two espionage organizations in East Berlin are those of the satellite countries. Czechoslovakia is represented by its State Security Service of the Interior Ministry (StB) and Staff Section II of the Ministry of Defense. The Hungarian regime has the State Security Ministry (AVH) and Department IV of the Ministry of National Defense (Katpol). Poland's espionage is handled by the Security Directorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs (UB) and the Second Directorate of the Polish Army's General Staff (O-2).

Rumania and Bulgaria are likewise represented, the former by the General Directorate of State Security (DGSS), the latter by the State Security Service (DS). Both use East Berlin to direct the espionage operations run by their trade missions in Frankfurt-am-Main, West Germany.

Even the North Koreans and Communist Chinese have espionage services in East Berlin. They, too, engage in activities against West Berlin and West Germany, in cooperation with the Ulbricht regime.

The extent of domination of these satellite operations by the Soviet Union's espionage machine was highlighted in 1959 by the exposure of a Soviet plan to embarrass the Western allies.

Near the end of December 1958, a highly secret meeting was held at the Moscow office of the KGB. The Soviet chief of counterespionage, a General Gribanov, presided at the meeting, which was attended by high officials of the satellite spy services.

Gribanov outlined a plan to prove the Soviet charge that West Berlin was a center for Western spy operations. He proposed that the Soviet bloc sacrifice a number of its agents in West Berlin and the German Federal Republic to convince the world that Soviet propaganda was true.

Many of these Communist agents had infiltrated low-level Allied intelligence and military installations. By recalling a sizable number and presenting them as returned penitent agents of the West, Gribanov hoped to affect world public opinion.

It soon became obvious that the satellite countries were to sacrifice their espionage organizations for a Soviet propaganda play. They were to supply the great majority of these "Western agents." Only a handful would be supplied by the Soviets.

The result was a concealed satellite revolt. Only the German Communists were willing to cooperate. Although they dared not openly reject the Soviet plan, the satellite services did everything they could to delay action. Files were mislaid, conferences delayed, and value of agents played down.

After months of delay and confusion, Soviet officials called another meeting at Karlshorst in East Berlin in February 1959. The possibility of international negotiations on Berlin had made them even more anxious to bring off their propaganda coup. But once again the satellites balked.

The Soviet unit lost patience and demanded cooperation on a government level from both Poland and Czechoslovakia. Khrushchev was expected to speak personally to his counterparts in Warsaw and Prague.

The Soviet scheme misfired, however. A series of expulsions of Soviet and satellite diplomats from Switzerland, Belgium, France, and Argentina on espionage charges, plus the defection of an East German Communist espionage official, in the spring and summer of 1959, made their plan look foolish.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS HAUNT ULBRICHT REGIME

(By Eric Michelsen)

The Ulbricht regime's failure to solve the economic problems haunting East Germany continues despite the Berlin wall, martial law and conscript labor decrees.

Before August 13, 1961, the East German regime could threaten and cajole the workers and farmers, but it could never enforce its decrees with the rigidity of the other Communist areas. There was always escape to the West and, since 1946, 4 million East Germans had taken advantage of it.

"Under conditions of the open frontier before August 13," Ulbricht acknowledged on November 28, 1961, "it was difficult to always enforce these laws consistently in the practical implementation of our policy."

After August 13, however, the East German Communists moved quickly to enforce obedience. On August 25 they issued two decrees which authorized forced movement of persons and conscription for agricultural labor by the police, the militia, party organs or any regime organization. Shortly thereafter, on September 20, the decree instituting martial law throughout East Germany was issued.

With these weapons in its hands, the regime began an all-out industrial production drive, enforced "voluntary" norm increases and drafted workers to meet a constantly deteriorating agricultural shortage.

The results of the production drive soon proved a failure. Towards the end of 1961 total production fell off 7.7 percent in comparison with the same period in 1960.

A lag in the production plan for industry, especially in the metal industry, was admitted by Alfred Neumann, chairman of the East German Economic Council, at a meeting of the Communist Party Central Committee held October 10 and 11, 1961. He also spoke of arrears in the cotton spinning mills and pointed out notable deficits in the heavy and electrical engineering industries. He warned that radical corrective measures were necessary, one of which was a continuous work week.

The drop in production has caused other problems for the East German Communists. Since production has fallen behind wages, there has been an inflationary cycle in the Soviet Zone. The frequently uneven flow of production led to paid idle periods, Karl Mewis, the East German planning chief, pointed out at the same October meeting. This, he said, created purchasing power not backed by productive work.

"Owing to all these phenomena," Mewis said, "and other expenditures over and above the plan, purchasing power has been increased without a simultaneous increase in goods available. These difficulties have been increased by norm changing, poor work organization, and inadequate labor discipline, which upset the payment-by-performance law."

To overcome this drop in production and halt the inflationary trend, the regime ordered increased production quotas while keeping salaries at the same level. The Communists also began a drive to extend the workweek. An editorial in the Communist newspaper Neuer Tag published at Frankfurt-am-Oder in East Germany declared, on October 11, that a worker had no right to 2 days off every week.

To remove any doubt as to the purpose of this production drive, Rolf Berger of the Communist trade union executive board pointed out, on November 1, "It is erroneous to assume that an increase in labor productivity will increase the earnings of the workers * * * the socialist (Communist) state * * * is entitled to the benefits and not the individual."

After months of intensive pressure, things had not changed. "In many enterprises of the machine-building industry," Neumann was forced to admit on November 3, "the production level is below plan level. More time is being used for the required output. This means that the wage fund is used up and production tasks are not carried out."

The slowdowns have apparently been deliberate. One industrial plant, Neumann reported, bought a highly modern, electronically controlled machine tool. The plant's best worker was assigned to the machine. Soon afterward, however, the grinding wheel and shaft were broken. "Later," Neumann said, "when the technical director again surveyed the work of the grinder, he found that the worker operated this very modern machine as if it were an old-fashioned one. He switched off all modern devices of the machine and worked as he was accustomed to before."

Another form of economic sabotage by East German workers has been deliberate waste of material. At the Halle Pump Works, for example, the scrap-to-finished-product ratio had usually been 9 percent. By October, it had gone up to 16 percent.

These incidents of slowdowns and acts of sabotage in the industrial sector have occurred to an even greater degree in agriculture. The first collectivization drive between 1953 and 1958 drove 120,000 farmers to freedom in West Germany. When agriculture was completely collectivized in 1960 more than 7,000 farmers and their families fled to the West.

Those who remained reacted by means of passive resistance. They delayed planting, plowed under crops, slowed down harvesting and hoarded foodstuffs. The results were a considerable drop in agricultural production. Potatoes and sugarbeets were rotting in the fields in mid-December of 1960.

The situation a year later appeared even worse. Estimates pointed to a 10 percent drop in production toward the end of 1961 as compared with the same period in 1960. Reports of slowdowns by East German farmers have appeared in numerous provincial newspapers of the Communist Party. They have complained of "serious shortcomings" in the harvesting of wheat, potatoes and sugarbeets and in dairy production as well as in the planting of fall crops.

"By now," reported Hans Reichelt, East German agricultural chief, on November 2, "only 41 percent of the sugarbeets have been uprooted and 60 percent of these removed from the fields. * * * The sugar factories which had reserves for 2 days last week now have scarcely a 1-day reserve.

"Potatoes must still be gleaned from 140,000 hectares of agricultural land. Only 67.6 percent of the winter grain has been sown and only 13 percent of the winter plowing done."

A week later, on November 8, the East German radio admitted there were 220,000 tons of sugarbeets less than during the same period in 1960. It also stated that the 1961 potato and corn crops "fell short of expectations."

Potatoes, which were once the staple of the German diet, have become so scarce that early in November some regional authorities declared two potatoless days a week for an indefinite period.

This breakdown in agricultural production plus the Communist self-engendered war scare led to increased shortages on the consumer market. There has been a buying scare since the building of the wall. A tremendous run has occurred on pork, flour, coffee, cocoa, spices and, since the failure of the harvest, potatoes.

The Communists have tried to stem this drain by imposing prison sentences of up to 3 years for hoarding, but with little effect.

East Zone One of World's Most Heavily Armed States

(By Mark Piros)

For every 16 persons in the Soviet Zone of Germany today, there is one person bearing arms, making the relatively small area one of the most heavily militarized states in the world.

Estimates in October 1961 put the total strength maintained by Walter Ulbricht's Communist regime at 638,000 men, including the militia, with expansion constantly underway.

Additionally, at least 400,000 Soviet Army troops, permanently stationed in East Germany, stand ready to support Communist military planning. Their commander is Marshal Ivan Konev, one of the Kremlin's top soldiers.

In an area of 16 million persons, the Soviet Zone's own forces amount to about 4 percent of the population. If the West German Republic, for example, were to mobilize forces on a similar scale, it would have to have an army of some 2 million men. Instead, it has 350,000 troops for a population three times the size of East Germany's.

The permanent Soviet contingent in the zone raises the number of armed men to 6 percent of the population.

The size of the East German military machine reflects its ironic dual purpose. The Ulbricht regime has built up its forces not just to defend the homeland, but primarily to suppress the population in case of open revolt.

Reports from the Soviet Zone indicate that a large portion of the training programs has hinged on riot and civil war tactics ever since the anti-Communist uprising of June 1953. Thousands of refugees have expressed their belief that the uprising was never repeated solely because of the zone's heavy militarization.

East Germany's official armed forces, including ground, naval, and air units, are designated as the "National People's Forces" (NVA). But NVA strength is reinforced by a further array of military and paramilitary organizations. The overall figure of 638,000 men breaks down in this way:

NVA, 180,000 (including 45,000 frontier guards incorporated in mid-1961); alert police, 30,000; people's police, 78,000; and, militia, 350,000.

Military experts hold that even the figure of 180,000 for the NVA fails to give a true picture of its strength. All NVA members are trained for frontline duty. Supporting jobs, normally performed by military personnel, are done in East Germany by salaried civilians. These employees include typists, drivers, telephone operators, mechanics, and even stretcher bearers.

Additionally, all troops discharged in the past have been compelled to join the reserves, with refresher training for a period each year. The strength of this force is not known, but is estimated to number at least as many men as the NVA.

Since the summer of 1961, when the regime launched a strenuous recruitment drive, East Germany's armed strength has increased steadily. Early in October, the Communist regime decreed that military tours of duty has been extended by 6 months.

On October 19, the regime stated that 253,000 members of the heavily supervised Communist youth organization had "voluntarily" pledged to serve in the armed forces. Indications were that at that time only a fraction of these had actually been inducted.

In Communist parlance, recruitment for the armed forces has always been on a "voluntary" basis. Again, refugee testimony indicates that in practice, there has been no way to avoid volunteering.

Since the border closing of August 13, 1961, the recruitment campaign has been accompanied by pressure from party circles reminiscent of that used on farmers during the 1960 land collectivization campaign. Young workers have been told that if they do not enlist, they will lose their jobs or suffer other penalties.

Officials have also boasted that youngsters below military age have been mobilized into more than 4,000 "order groups" to aid the regime. Members are apparently expected to act as informants, exposing ideological "border-crossers." Among their tasks has been the seeking out of homes whose television aerials are placed so as to receive programs from West Berlin or West Germany.

In addition there is the "Association for Sport and Technics", which provides premilitary training for young people—as glider pilots, motorcyclists, parachutists, etc.—about to enter the armed forces. The association is directly under the authority of the East German defense ministry. Its strength is estimated at 400,000, with about 90 percent of them male.

The 1953 uprising, subdued by Soviet tanks and troops, has been a decisive factor in determining the present makeup of the East German military. To "restore order" after the uprising, Soviet officers were put in command of the East German units. They remained to handle military training, and geared most of it to the methods of dealing with a rebellious population.

As late as 1958 there were two Soviet officers, wearing East German uniforms, assigned to each regiment. Today, three out of four officers holding the rank of colonel or above have been trained in the U.S.S.R. and young permanent officers can expect eventually to be sent to the U.S.S.R. for from 2 to 5 years of training.

The Soviet Union has sponsored and guided East German forces from the beginning, starting even before the end of World War II by training captured German officers. "Police" units, assigned to garrisons, were organized as early as 1947. By 1959—before there was a single West German soldier—the Soviet Zone forces numbered 51,000 men, equipped with Soviet tanks and heavy artillery.

Soviet arsenals have supplied the East German forces, through the Warsaw Pact machinery, with heavy equipment capable of firing nuclear missiles. However, there has been no indication that the East Germans have been entrusted with the nuclear warheads. The equipment was in evidence during the Warsaw Pact maneuvers held during the autumn of 1961 in East Germany—in part near the West German border.

The overriding concern of the Ulbricht regime has always been to insure the political reliability of armed forces members. Each man—even in the factory militias—has been carefully screened and indoctrinated.

Nevertheless, many East German troops have shown that in times of genuine stress, their first loyalty is to the German people, rather than the Communist regime. This was strikingly proved in East Berlin after the border closing.

Hundreds of escaping East Berliners have testified that they owe their safe flight across canals or barbed wire to the sympathy and cooperation of border guards.

Some troops, of course, obeyed the regime's "shoot to kill" orders, but many others deliberately looked the other way or fired into the air when their countrymen fled past them.

Scores of other guards have used their advantageous positions to leap the barriers themselves and find freedom in West Berlin.

Emergency Law Strips Legal Facade From Ulbricht's Rule

(By Eric Michelsen)

The Soviet Zone's emergency law, issued September 20, 1961, strips the last remnants of the legal facade from the rule of Communist Party Chief Walter Ulbricht.

The law, reminiscent of the 1933 enabling law which handed over full power to Adolf Hitler, officially destroys whatever theoretical rights East Germans were promised under the constitution of 1949, adopted 3 years after the Communists took over.

The law gives Ulbricht, as chairman of the State Council, the right to declare a "state of defense" or "emergency" any time he wishes and places the entire control of government and military activities in the hands of the National Defense Council, also headed by Ulbricht. Thus, all economic and military power, even in time of peace, can officially be placed in the hands of one man.

The first indication that an emergency measure was in the offing came August 11, 1961, when authority was granted to take those "necessary measures" to close East Berlin to the West. Then, on August 25, the "Ordinance on Residence and Job Assignments" went into effect. That ordinance is so loosely worded that any movement of persons within East Germany can be made or prevented by the police, the militia, party organs or any state or party organization.

The ordinance specifically adds that "residence restrictions may be linked with corrective labor." The August 25 document revealed one of the real purposes of the sealing off West Berlin: not only to keep East Germans from fleeing, but also to impose a new, stricter system of state-directed work assignments upon the East German population.

Labor shortages on collectivized farms as well as in industry—created by the flight of millions of refugees—have steadily crippled the East German economy. The Ulbricht regime had long sought the power to shift workers at will as an instrument for dealing with the economic crisis.

In theory the executive organs of the East German regime are responsible to the elected legislative representatives and are bound by the specific powers granted them by the constitution. In practice, however, this has never been the case. All power has always rested with the ruling committees of the Communist Party and the state executive organs. Now, according to the September 20 decree, even the pretense of constitutional rights has been wiped out. The decree provides that "all state organs must implement the measures decided by the National Defense Council" and stresses that "the state council is not bound by the constitution."

While not stated explicity, the law clearly provides for universal conscription. "Service for the protection of the Fatherland," it states, "is an honorable national duty of * * * citizens." It goes on to declare that this service "can be rendered in the National People's Army, in other armed organs, and in civil air defense." All males from 16 to 65 years old and all females from 16 to 60 may be drafted for air-raid warden service.

Provisions are also made for the rationing of foodstuffs and other goods, requisitioning of all motor vehicles, houses and property, and for placing industry on a wartime basis. In case civilian authorities are unable to carry out these functions, the law provides that "the heads of the offices and units of the National People's Army may directly require the rendering of services from the persons obliged to do so."

The law also ties these services to the demands of the entire Soviet bloc since it specifies that "services to be rendered to the National People's Army under this law may also be used in favor of the armed forces of allied states."

Although the East German Communists have now openly demonstrated their contempt for basic human vaues, consistent violation of constitutional rights has characterized the regime since the beginning of Soviet occupation. The 144 articles of the Soviet Zone Constitution of October 7, 1949, make an impressive document but have always provided unrealistic reading for East Germans.

For example, article 1 states: "Germany is an indivisible democratic republic." The Communist doctrine of two German states, exemplified by the Communist insistence on a separate Soviet-East German treaty, belies this principle. The principles of "personal freedom" and "inviolability of one's residence" proclaimed in article 4 have been constantly flaunted by wholesale arrests and mass deportations.

All East Germans have the right to form clubs and associations under article 12. In reality, no one is permitted to form even a birdwatchers society except under Communist domination.

The "right to strike," guaranteed in article 14, was proved to be a sham when East German workers, exercising that right on June 17, 1953, were run down by Soviet tanks and jailed by the hundreds.

"All peasants are guaranteed the right to own their soil," states article 24. However, during the past 12 years, hundreds of thousands of peasants have been pressed against their will onto collective farms.

While article 35 proclaims that "All citizens have equal access to education," in reality thousands of young people are excluded from higher education for no other reason than that their fathers may be "politically unreliable."

The list of violated rights can go on and on: "freedom of the arts and sciences," "freedom of the press," "secret elections," and so forth. But, by far the most cynical clause in the constitution, especially in the light of recent events, is article 10, which reads: "Every citizen has the right to emigrate." This right has never been recognized. But, in the 12-year life of the constitution, some 3½ million East Germans have taken it into their own hands.

One of the most far-reaching sections of the law wipes out any legal rights which workers theoretically held in East Germany. All norms of wages, hours or production may be established since "during the state of defense, increased work performances are required in all spheres."

The law also declares that "every citizen capable of working may be called upon * * * to render personal services outside his place of residence" and that "the Council of Ministers may issue regulations concerning the legal status of workers and working conditions irrespective of the * * * labor code."

Finally, it provides that "the right to appeal is excluded for conflicts arising out of wage claims and claims to payment for services." A 3-year prison sentence can be given to anyone who does not work hard or well enough either "intentionally or unintentionally."

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution although I believe it ought to have denounced the infamous "Berlin wall."

I wonder if my bifocals deceive me. I have read this resolution backward and forward and I can find no mention of the United Nations in it. Can it be possible the House will act on one resolution dealing with an international subject and the United Nations will not appear in it?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Yes, it is possible. This is the Berlin resolution.

Mr. GROSS. It is absolutely true and I have made no mistake? My bifocals do not deceive me? We are not going to rely on the United Nations in any way in this resolution; is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted that the gentleman can give me that answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the concurrent resolution under consideration affirming congressional support of President Kennedy's statement of U.S. position on the Berlin question.

It is essential that we continue the exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin in order to maintain the freedom of over 2 million people in West Berlin.

This constitutes a fundamental policy and a moral obligation. A Soviet invasion of these basic rights would be intolerable.

The President's forthright reply to the Soviet aide memoir on Germany expresses accurately the desire of the United States to take all of the steps necessary to defend its legal rights against constant Soviet abrogation.

I strongly support the President in his reply to Khrushchev and believe he made the right answer.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support this resolution because it indicates that the United States is resolute. We are making it abundantly clear that we have learned the lesson of history, and that the time has come to say to tyranny: "You will advance no further."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Johnson].

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 570 which states that our Nation is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms to fulfill our commitments to the people of Berlin, with respect to their resolve for freedom.

We can, we must, and we will stand firm in Berlin. For it is in Berlin that Khrushchev is attempting to consolidate his iron grip on Eastern Europe and to extend their communist influence into Western Europe.

I, for one, do not believe the Soviet Union wants war. She has suffered devastating economic reverses and uses the media of space spectaculars to mollify the deteriorating morale of her people. The memories of mass destruction of whole cities and vast regions of the U.S.S.R. are still fresh in the minds of the Soviet people, and they do not desire to invite a nuclear holocaust. By bluff, bluster, and brinkmanship, Premier Khrushchev has led his people close to a position in which there is no way out from catastrophe. Premier Khrushchev understands only one thing, and that is strength. I believe that our Nation possesses the most powerful military machine in the world. We have built this machine not to threaten any Nation, but it certainly is a force which can prevent any concessions to those who would imprison and enslave people.

In the interests of millions of people who live on both sides of the wall that runs through Berlin, we cannot and should not refuse to negotiate, but we cannot and must not concede 1 inch of free territory, we cannot and must not surrender one iota of the freedom of West Berlin, and we cannot and must not demonstrate to the world that we will sacrifice our democratic heritage by surrendering our right of occupation in Berlin today.

West Berlin is part of the Western World, and its freedom cannot under any circumstances be traded. The free people of Berlin are not pawns in an international game of geopolitical chess.

We cannot recognize, nor do I believe we intend to recognize, the validity of any steps taken or attempted by the Soviet Union to alter the original four-power agreement on Berlin—including, above all, our right of access both to and within Greater Berlin.

America does not need to ask for new legal rights in Berlin. She has them already. In fact, our basic demand is that the old rights we had be respected.

In order that the Kremlin's policy would not make for the repetition of the fatal errors that preceded the Second World War, Congress today is making it a matter of record that we intend to stand firm to our commitments and to fight if necessary.

We have placed our full faith and trust in God, and resolutely face the future with determination to win the cold war and make this world a safer and better place in which to live.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to indicate my wholehearted support of this resolution because I believe it will not only serve notice to Mr. Khrushchev that we value freedom and will not acquiesce while anyone is forced by circumstance to exchange it for chains, but it will serve notice to our friends throughout the world that we mean what we say. If our acts measure up to our intents expressed in this resolution we will recapture the support of those neutrals who have been neutral toward Russia simply because it was not quite clear to them that we were serious in our determination to support freedom's cause throughout the world.

I congratulate the Committee on Foreign Affairs for bringing this resolution before the House. And giving us the privilege as well as allowing us the opportunity to accept our responsibility in this regard.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I support the Berlin resolution which is before us today. I fully agree with the basic principles contained therein.

It was my privilege and pleasure to have been at Idlewild Airport on Friday, September 28, 1962, to meet the Honorable Willy Brandt who had come here to be an honorary parade chairman for the annual Steuben parade held in New York City on September 29.

Immediately after his arrival, Mayor Brandt held a news conference at which I was present. At that news conference Mr. Brandt stated that he would be meeting, during his stay in the United States, President Kennedy. The mayor further stated that he would not ask President Kennedy for a reaffirmation of the U.S. stand on Berlin for to ask for reaffirmation would mean that the people of Berlin did not believe or have full faith in our original statement on Berlin. He said that perhaps the Russians may need a reaffirmation of our basic stand on Berlin, but the people of Berlin have full faith in this stand and position of the United States.

I therefore, support this resolution on the basis of its proposition of the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Germany and to again show, not to the people of Berlin, as stated by Mayor Brandt, but to the Soviet Union that we are with our President in his beliefs and program for Berlin.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution. In spite of all the recent serious developments in Cuba—and I have been deeply concerned about these and have consistently urged that we pursue a firm and forthright policy to resist all Communist aggression in Cuba—Berlin remains the single most serious and critical area in our worldwide struggle against communism.

This has been so ever since I have been a Member of this House. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services I first visited Berlin in April 1959. I saw for myself our troops in Berlin as well as our forces in West Germany. I crossed over into East Berlin, before the wall went up, and saw the oppression and despair and poverty in that beleagured city. I returned to Berlin again last fall, after the wall had been erected, and saw the damage that that Communist action had caused to the people of Berlin. I went into East Berlin again, and found there the same tragedy and despair.

Mr. Chairman, I have always felt that we must stand firm in Berlin. I backed up our determination when Mr. Eisenhower was President, just as I have supported that same policy under President Kennedy.

This is a strong resolution. But it should be a strong resclution and I am glad it is strong. For we are faced with a very serious crisis in Berlin. The only proper way to face that crisis is with a clear demonstration of the unity and determination on the part of our people to insist on all our rights, no matter what the cost may be.

Mr. Chairman, in days to come this resolution may well prove to be one of the most important actions of this Congress, and one of our best guarantees of a peaceful future.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 570. During the debate on the Cuban resolution on September 26, 1962, I remarked that—

> Many wars in the past have been caused by misunderstandings—particularly when other nations have not fully realized that the United States will go to war if its security is directly threatened.

I support this resolution because, like the Cuban resolution, it makes crystal clear that the United States of America is ready to resort to arms if necessary to protect our rights and commitments in Berlin.

I believe that this resolution, which I am confident will be adopted by unanimous vote, demonstrates the unshakable determination of the American people not to yield to Soviet pressure in Berlin. By this means we are taking a step to preserve the peace, instead of slipping down the road to war. History teaches the lesson that weakness, shilly-shallying, appeasement or lack of firmness lead to war. A clear-cut declaration such as contained in this resolution increases the chances for peace.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing bellicose or saber rattling about this resolution. It is a simple, calmly expressed, and lucid declaration which leaves no question where the United States stands.

While the Soviet Union has repeatedly attempted to becloud the Berlin issue with a smokescreen of propaganda, there has arisen the danger that other nations might misinterpret our position in Berlin. The time has therefore come to reaffirm the policy of our Government, and also to make it clear that we intend to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

Mr. Chairman, in the year 1947—15 years ago this summer—I returned to France and Germany to retrace the steps of some of our combat units in World War II with which I had been associated. Walking down a country road in Normandy, a French peasant stopped me and asked: "Américain ou Anglais?" When I responded that I was an American, he shook his finger and predicted ominously: "Bientôt la guerre avec les Russes." He was convinced that soon America would be at war with the Russians.

Fifteen years have elapsed since that incident. The cold war has blown hotter at times, the tensions have increased, Americans have lost their lives in defense of freedom, but there has been no real armed conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States of the type my French friend predicted. We have preserved the peace because we have determined to remain firm, and to build up the forces of freedom. We have preserved the peace because we have had the courage to help people help themselves through our foreign aid program. Finally, we have kept the peace because the leaders of our Nation have made it unmistakably clear where we stand.

When history is written in the future, I believe it will credit resolutions such as we are passing today with making a great contribution toward keeping the peace. We are not trying to scare, bully, or threaten any nation. We are merely restating our fundamental rights, and our resolve to preserve these rights.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give enthusiastic support of House Concurrent Resolution 570 and join with my many colleagues of this body to declare our resolute determination not to budge one iota in Berlin.

The world has known from past experiences that America will be patient and considerate, but she will never relinquish her rights. Our patience dare never be interpreted as weakness. Our rights are just; our pledge to our allies and to the people of Berlin and West Germany, and for that matter to the peoples of all the free world, will be honored.

Only a few days ago, we made known through this body, and to all the world, our stand on Cuba. We can do no less than also to make crystal clear to all the world our firm stand on the Berlin situation. If our foe wants to provoke us to action, action he will get, but the regrets will reach into eternity.

I commend the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, its chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] for preparing this resolution and permitting us to express our united affirmation of its contents.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 570, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin, and I most earnestly hope it will be unanimously and promptly adopted.

It appears to me that our approach to the endorsement of this resolution should be on the basis of having nothing to lose and very likely a great deal to gain, considering the past record of the Russian Government.

If there should be any doubt in the minds of the Kremlin leaders, this resolution clearly, precisely, and forcefully expresses the strong convictions of a united American people that we will continue to encourage and support a free, unified, and democratic Germany.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution also strengthens the hand of the President in dealing with this Berlin situation because it serves notice upon the Russian dictators that this Congress and the people of the United States stand solidly behind our Commander in Chief.

With the same patriotic spirit and fortitude with which we passed a similar resolution on Cuba, and as a complement to that resolution, let us speedily and without dissent adopt this Berlin resolution as a matter of right, of honor, and of free world leadership.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, under the rule the House concurrent resolution is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment is in order except amendments offered by the direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and such amendments shall not be subject to amendment.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 2, after "concurring," strike out the remainder of page 2 and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 3 and insert the following:

"That it is the sense of the Congress—

"(a) that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin constitutes a fundamental political and moral purpose;

"(b) that the United States would regard as intolerable any violation by the Soviet Union directly or through others of those rights in Berlin, including the right of ingress and egress;

"(c) that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the only amendment in order is the amendment offered by the committee.

The gentleman can rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall take the 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the remarks of the members of the committee, and I also read the commitee report. Frankly, I was a little bit shocked, as I was in regard to the Cuban resolution, at the failure to discuss or define in any sense what are these rights that are listed in here, British, French, and United States rights in Berlin.

The question my people are particularly asking, and not only my constituents, but people around the country, is whether these rights have not already been transgressed.

As I read the various treaties and pacts that have been entered into between Russia, the United States, Britain, and France, the right of a free city and access to east and west Berlin was one of these basic rights. This is documented in the State Department's white paper on Berlin. This disturbs me very much, as it did in the case of Cuba, why this Congress in the resolution avoided facing up to the issue itself: What is the Monroe Doctrine? Do we stand for it or do we not? What are we going to do about it? And in this instance again.

I shall vote for the resolution. It is very strong for the future; but on the other hand I must confess my chagrin and my shock at the Foreign Affairs Committee having avoided discussing a basic issue one our people are concerned about the Berlin wall. I, as one of their representatives, recognize that I will not be able to say much toward clarifying this resulting from this resolution and the debate on it. I will just leave it at that.

I notice the emphasis on the rights of the United States, British, and French. In the part of the language stricken was reference to the rights and freedoms of the people of Berlin. I think U.S. citizens, the people in my district, are very much interested in the rights of the people of Berlin. I certainly am, and I am sorry that this resolution has nothing to say about that. That aspect is likewise stricken from the resolution.

I do not share the accolades that have been bestowed here on this resolution.

Mr JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I may say this matter of just what our rights are was discussed at some length in the committee. Probably it should have been spelled out in the committee report. But, because there has been public discussion for 2 or 3 years of the irreducible minimum of our rights, or vital interests as they have been called to the point that the term "vital interests" has become a word of art, it was felt unnecessary to spell them out. The three vital rights are our continued presence in Berlin, free access, and the right to insure that the people in Berlin can survive—their well-being, the viability of their economic and political life.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think you should have added these rights and spelled them out quite clearly, the right of having a free city, the right of one Berliner to go from one section to the other section of Berlin. And let me say, as I said before, when you allow one principle to be violated it is very difficult to stand on other principles.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. The gentleman said we have not recognized the rights of the people of Berlin. I refer him to clause (c) where it says that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I point out to the gentlemen that the resolution refers to the resolve of the people of Berlin for freedom, not any rights of the Berlin people. I was talking of rights not resolves. I think the points have been made. I thought the record ought to be clear.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. This same situation occurred in connection with the Cuban resolution. The gentleman, along with others, myself included, tried to strengthen it. It put a rubber stamp on the status quo. There is nothing in the resolution that condemns the building of a wall or permitting one ingress or egress point. It is the same problem that existed in the Cuban resolution. It is a rubber stamp of approval. That is my interpretation of what has already happened in Cuba, and we have not declared it to a military buildup, involving about $200 million of war material, which in itself is a violation..

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ZABLOCKI: On page 3, line 7, strike out the word "purpose" and insert in lieu thereof "determination".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the preamble to read:

"Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is and has been to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

"Whereas it is the purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Germany; and

"Whereas in connection with the termination of hostilities in World War II the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union freely entered into binding agreements under which the four powers have the right to remain in Berlin, with the right of ingress and egress, until the conclusion of a final settlement with the Government of Germany; and

"Whereas no such final settlement has been concluded by the four powers and the aforementioned agreements continue in force: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),"

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 570 and add my fervent plea to those of my colleagues for a strong, firm stand by the United States on the Berlin issue.

I myself have personally visited the Berlin wall on several different occasions and have witnessed the faith and hope of the West Germans that the United States as their stanch ally will not abandon them to the Communist menace.

Many have castigated the United States for the so-called selling down the river to the Russians of the Czechs, the Hungarians, and other Eastern European people after the termination of World War II.

Let us now demonstrate the solidarity of the people of the United States by an overwhelming vote of their Representatives in the House in favor of this resolution which states in no uncertain terms that we will not tolerate a Russian attempt to remove the Western Allies from their rightful place in Berlin and we will meet such a threat with force if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. STRATTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. Con. Res. 570) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin, pursuant to House Resolution 827, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 0, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

YEAS—312

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Alford
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Broyhill
Bruce
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Church
Clancy
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Doyle
Dulski
Durno
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garland
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Keith
Kelly
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Libonati
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Ray
Reece
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rousselot
Rutherford
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Santangelo
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shelley
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Utt
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Walter
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—123

Adair
Alexander
Anfuso
Aspinall
Avery
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolling
Boykin
Breeding
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Curtin
Dawson
Denton
Dingell
Dominick
Dooley
Downing
Elliott
Evins
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Frazier
Glenn
Griffiths
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Utah
Knox
Laird
Lesinski
Lindsay
Loser
McDonough
McIntire
McSween
MacGregor
Magnuson
Mason
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Morrison
Moss
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Konski
Passman
Peterson
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Ryan, Mich.
Saund
Saylor
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Siler
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Sullivan
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Ullman
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Whitener
Williams
Yates
Zelenko

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Brown.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Short.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Peterson with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Clem Miller with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Breeding with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Scranton.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Scott with Mrs. Weis.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Knox.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Chiperfield.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3705) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if the gentleman will explain to us what this measure does.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill granting a 10-percent increase to the members of the police department and fire department in the District of Columbia. It has been cleared with three of the ranking minority members of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 480), as amended (sec. 4-823, et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The annual rates of basic compensation of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the following schedule of rates:

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Longevity step 7	Longevity step 8	Longevity step 9
Class 1:									
Subclass (a) Fire private. Police private.	$5,650	$5,950	$6,250	$6,550	$6,850	$7,150	$7,450	$7,750	$8,050
Subclass (b) Private assigned as— Technician I. Plainclothesman.[1]	5,920	6,220	6,520	6,820	7,120	7,420	7,720	8,020	8,320
Subclass (c) Private assigned as— Technician II. Station clerk. Motorcycle officer.	6,100	6,400	6,700	7,000	7,300	7,600	7,900	8,200	8,500
Class 2:									
Subclass (a) Fire inspector.	6,550	6,850	7,150	7,450			7,750	8,050	8,350
Subclass (b) Fire inspector assigned as— Technician I.	6,820	7,120	7,420	7,720			8,020	8,320	8,620
Subclass (c) Fire inspector assigned as— Technician II.	7,090	7,390	7,690	7,990			8,290	8,590	8,890
Class 3 Assistant marine engineer. Assistant pilot. Detective.	6,900	7,200	7,500	7,800			8,100	8,400	8,700
Class 4:									
Subclass (a) Fire sergeant. Police sergeant.	7,450	7,750	8,050	8,350			8,650	8,950	9,250
Subclass (b) Detective sergeant.	7,890	8,190	8,490	8,790			9,090	9,390	9,690
Subclass (c) Police sergeant assigned as— Motorcycle officer.	7,930	8,230	8,530	8,830			9,130	9,430	9,730
Class 5 Fire lieutenant. Police lieutenant. Detective lieutenant.	8,350	8,725	9,100	9,475			9,850	10,225	
Class 6 Marine engineer. Pilot.	8,915	9,290	9,665	10,040			10,415	10,790	
Class 7 Fire captain. Police captain. Detective captain.	9,475	9,850	10,225	10,600			10,975	11,350	
Class 8 Assistant Superintendent of Machinery. Battalion fire chief. Deputy fire marshal. Police inspector.	10,975	11,375	11,775	12,175			12,575	12,975	
Class 9 Deputy Fire Chief. Deputy Chief of Police. Fire marshal. Superintendent of Machinery.	12,575	12,975	13,375	13,775			14,175	14,575	
Class 10 Fire Chief. Chief of Police.	17,000	17,400	17,800	18,200			18,600	19,000	

[1] Service as such for over 60 consecutive calendar days."

SEC. 2. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members to whom the first section of this Act applies shall be adjusted as follows:

(a) Each officer and member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this Act at one of the scheduled service or longevity rates of a class or subclass in the salary schedule in the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service or longevity rate in effect on and after the effective date of this Act, except that:

(1) Each private who immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was serving in service step 6, or longevity steps 7 or 8 in any subclass in class 1, and had a total of thirteen or more years of service as of the first day of the first pay period which began after January 1, 1958, shall, on the effective date of this Act, be advanced from service step 6 to longevity step 7, or from longevity step 7 to longevity step 8, or from longevity step 8 to longevity step 9, as the case may be, and receive the appropriate scheduled rate of basic compensation for such step in the subclass in which he is serving. Any active service immediately prior to the effective date of this Act which each such private has rendered in the service step or longevity step from which he is being advanced will be credited to him for subsequent advancement purposes under the provisions of section 401 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, except that such active service provision shall not apply to any private assigned as detective, class 1, subclass (c), immediately prior to the effective date of this Act.

(2) Each private who, immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, was serving in a position bearing the title of station clerk in class 1, subclass (b), shall be placed in the corresponding title in class 1, subclass (c), and shall receive basic compensation (1) at the service step or longevity step in subclass (c) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, or (2) at the longevity step to which he is entitled under the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section. Any active service which each private so assigned as station clerk has rendered in the service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this Act will be credited to him for subsequent advancement purposes under the provisions of section 303 or section 401, as the case may be, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended.

(3) Each private who immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was serving in a position bearing the title of detective or precinct detective in class 1, subclass (c) or subclass (d), shall on the effective date of this Act, after the application of the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, be placed in and receive basic compensation at a scheduled rate in class 3, with the title of detective as follows:

From—	To—
Detective, class 1, subclass (c):	Detective, class 3:
Service steps 1, 2, 3, and 4	Service step 1.
Service step 5	Service step 2.
Service step 6	Service step 3.
Longevity step 7	Service step 4.
Longevity step 8	Longevity step 7.
Longevity step 9	Longevity step 8.

From—	To—
Precinct detective, class 1, subclass (d):	Detective, class 3:
Service steps 1, 2, and 3	Service step 1.
Service step 4	Service step 2.
Service step 5	Service step 3.
Service step 6	Service step 4.
Longevity step 7	Longevity step 7.
Longevity step 8	Longevity step 8.
Longevity step 9	Longevity step 9.

In computing the time served by each officer or member so assigned from detective, class 1, subclass (c), to detective, class 3, on the effective date of this Act for purposes of advancement to the next higher scheduled service step or longevity step as provided in section 303 or 401, as the case may be, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, such time shall commence as of the effective date of this Act. Any active service which each officer or member so assigned from precinct detective, class 1, subclass (d), to detective, class 3, has rendered in the service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this Act will be credit to him for subsequent advancement purposes under the provisions of section 303 or section 401, as the case may be, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended.

(4) Each private who immediately prior to the effective date of this Act was serving in a position bearing the title of detective sergeant in class 1, subclass (e), shall on the effective date of this Act, after the application of the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section be placed in the corresponding title in class 4, subclass (b), and shall receive the scheduled rate of basic compensation at a service step or longevity step as follows:

From—	To—
Detective sergeant, class 1, subclass (e):	Detective sergeant, class 4, subclass (b):
Service steps 1, 2, and 3	Service step 1.
Service step 4	Service step 2.
Service step 5	Service step 3
Service step 6	Service step 4.
Longevity step 7	Longevity step 7.
Longevity step 8	Longevity step 8.
Longevity step 9	Longevity step 9.

Any active service which each officer or member so assigned as detective sergeant has rendered in the service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this Act will be credited to him for subsequent advancement purposes under provisions of section 303 or section 401, as the case may be, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended.

(5) Each officer and member who, immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, was in class 3, subclass (a), as corporal, or in class 3, subclass (b), as corporal assigned as motorcycle officer, shall, on the effective date of this Act be placed in and receive basic compensation at a scheduled rate in class 4, subclass (a), or class 4, subclass (c), as the case may be, with the title of sergeant as follows:

From—	To—
Corporal, class 3, subclass (a):	Sergeant, class 4, subclass (a):
Service steps 1 and 2	Service step 1.
Service step 3	Service step 2.
Service step 4	Service step 3.
Longevity step 7	Service step 4.
Longevity step 8	Longevity step 7.
Longevity step 9	Longevity step 8.

From—	To—
Corporal assigned as motorcycle officer, class 3, subclass (b):	Sergeant assigned as motorcycle officer, class 4, subclass (c):
Service steps 1 and 2	Service step 1.
Service step 3	Service step 2.
Service step 4	Service step 3.
Longevity step 7	Service step 4.
Longevity step 8	Longevity step 7.
Longevity step 9	Longevity step 8.

In computing the time served by each officer or member so assigned from corporal to sergeant or from corporal to sergeant assigned as motorcycle officer on the effective date of this Act for purposes of advancement to the next higher scheduled service step or longevity step as provided in section 303 or 401, as the case may be, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, such time shall commence as of the effective date of this Act.

(6) Each officer or member who was a sergeant in class 4 immediately prior to the effective date of this Act, and who was a sergeant prior to July 1, 1953, shall be advanced to and shall receive the scheduled rate of basic compensation for longevity step 9 in class 4. Each officer or member who was a sergeant in class 4 immediately prior to the effective date of this Act and who was promoted to sergeant after June 30, 1953, and prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, shall, if immediately prior to the effective date of this Act he was serving in longevity step 7 or service step 4 or any lower service step, be advanced to the second higher scheduled step in class 4 above such step in which he was so serving or if, immediately prior to the effective date of this Act he was serving in longevity step 8 he shall be advanced to longevity step 9 in class 4, and shall receive the scheduled rate of basic compensation for the step to which he is advanced. Each officer or member who was a sergeant in class 4 immediately prior to the effective date of this Act and who was promoted to sergeant on or after the effective date of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, shall be advanced to and receive the scheduled rate of basic compensation for the next higher scheduled step in class 4. Any active service which each such sergeant has rendered in the service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this Act will be credited to him for subsequent advancement purposes under the provisions of section 303 or section 401, as the case may be, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended,

(7) Each officer or member receiving basic compensation at scheduled longevity step 9, in classes 5 through 10, respectively, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, shall be placed in and receive the rate of basic compensation at the scheduled longevity step 8, in classes 5 through 10, respectively, of the above schedule.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 203(b) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, is amended by deleting therefrom "Fire Marshal".

(b) Title II of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 204. The aid to the Fire Marshal shall be included as a fire inspector in class 2, subclass (a)."

(c) The first sentence of section 304 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Any officer or member who is promoted or transferred to a higher class shall receive basic compensation at the lowest schedule rate of such higher class which exceeds his existing rate of compensation by not less than one step increase of the class from which he is promoted or transferred: *Provided*, That any such officer or member serving in a subclass other than subclass (a) of any class (who is not assigned as a detective sergeant in class 4, subclass (b)) shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled rate of such higher class which exceeds by one step increase the rate shown for subclass (a) in the same step in which he was serving in the class from which promoted: *Provided further*, That such scheduled rate in the higher class shall not be less than his existing rate of pay."

(d) Section 401(a)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Not more than three successive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in classes 1 through 4, nor more than two successive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in classes 5 through 10; nor shall any officer or member be granted a longevity step increase above the maximum scheduled longevity step in the subclass in which he is serving or, if there are no subclasses in his class, in the class in which he is serving."

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period beginning after January 1, 1963.

With the following committee amendments:

(1) On page 2, insert quotation marks (A) immediately before the caption "SALARY SCHEDULE"; (B) immediately before the subheading "Salary class and title"; and (C) immediately after the footnote immediately preceding line 1 of page 2.

(2) On page 2, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members to whom the amendment made by the first section of this Act apply shall be adjusted in accordance with this section, and on and after the effective date of this Act section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 shall not apply to any such officer or member whose rate of basic compensation is so adjusted in accordance with this section. Such rates of basic compensation shall be adjusted as follows:".

(3) On page 10, after line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, United States Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes', approved September 8, 1960 (Public Law 86–734) is hereby repealed."

And on page 11, line 1, strike out "SEC. 4." and insert "SEC. 5."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker the House District Committee unanimously reported Senate bill 3705 with amendments which will give the members of the Police and Fire Departments here in the District of Columbia a substantial increase of approximately 11 percent.

We are all very proud of our Police Department and understand the Fire Department ranks second to none in the United States. We are extremely proud of the record made by the present Chief of Police, Robert V. Murray, and our committee adopted a resolution commending him for his outstanding work under difficult circumstances as Chief of Police here in the Nation's Capital.

I am certain that every member of the District Committee would like very much to see the members of the Police Department receive a higher salary than we are recommending in this bill; however, we understand this amount is all that the finances of the District of Columbia will permit at this time without substantially increasing property taxes and other taxes here in the District of Columbia.

I have had the privilege and the pleasure of sponsoring several salary increases for policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia and my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, as chairman of the House subcommittee which acts on affairs pertaining to policemen and firemen, has spent a great deal of valuable time in research work in an effort to assist the policemen in solving crime here in the Nation's Capital.

In my opinion, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge DAVIS, deserves the commendation of the entire Congress and the good people of the Nation's Capital in his outstanding efforts to solve crime in the District of Columbia. He has been a great supporter of the Police Department and has held practically all the hearings on proposed legislation which would increase the salaries of policemen and firemen during the past 10 years.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1955

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman take some time to explain this bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this action on the part of the House reduced the bill passed by the Senate by approximately 4 percent. The act passed by the Committee on the District of Columbia will increase teachers' salaries by 10.1 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks the District of Columbia will be able to provide the funds to pay the increase or will there be an added load on the taxpayers all over the country?

Mr. McMILLAN. I may say to the gentleman that is the reason we reduced this pay increase from 14 percent to 10 percent, so that the District Commissioners would have sufficient funds.

Mr. GROSS. The taxpayers took on a pretty good load earlier in the day, as far as the House is concerned, with an increase to Federal employees, and the House Members are well taken care of. They have increased their retirement. So the taxpayers took on a pretty good load earlier today. I hope this will not be an addition to that.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think the Commissioners understand I have no intention to raise salaries in the District of Columbia too far.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 521, ch. 569), as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 is amended by striking everything after the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following salary schedules:

"Salary class and position	Service step 1 (minimum)	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9
Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$25,000								
Class 2: Deputy superintendent	17,400	$17,800	$18,200	$18,600	$19,000	$19,400	$19,800		
Class 3: Assistant superintendent; president, teachers college	15,000	15,325	15,650	15,975	16,300	16,625	16,950	$17,275	$17,600
Class 4: Director, curriculum; dean, teachers college	13,240	13,565	13,890	14,215	14,540	14,865	15,190	15,515	15,840
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	11,420	11,745	12,070	12,395	12,720	13,045	13,370	13,695	14,020
Group B, master's degree	11,920	12,245	12,570	12,895	13,220	13,545	13,870	14,195	14,520
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,120	12,445	12,770	13,095	13,420	13,745	14,070	14,395	14,720
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial and adult education.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Psychiatrist.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	11,480	11,805	12,130	12,455	12,780	13,105	13,430	13,755	14,080
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,680	12,005	12,330	12,655	12,980	13,305	13,630	13,955	14,280
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									

"Salary class and position	Service step 1 (minimum)	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9
Class 6—Continued									
Group C. etc—Continued									
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization School.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	$10,720	$11,045	$11,370	$11,695	$12,020	$12,345	$12,670	$12,995	$13,320
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,920	11,245	11,570	11,895	12,220	12,545	12,870	13,195	13,520
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Director in elementary education.									
Director, special education.									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	10,160	10,485	10,810	11,135	11,460	11,785	12,110	12,435	12,760
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,360	10,685	11,010	11,335	11,660	11,985	12,310	12,635	12,960
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization School.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Director, school attendance.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	9,220	9,545	9,870	10,195	10,520	10,845	11,170	11,495	11,820
Group B, master's degree	9,720	10,045	10,370	10,695	11,020	11,345	11,670	11,995	12,320
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,920	10,245	10,570	10,895	11,220	11,545	11,870	12,195	12,520
Assistant director, food services.									
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	9,280	9,605	9,930	10,255	10,580	10,905	11,230	11,555	11,880
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,480	9,805	10,130	10,455	10,780	11,105	11,430	11,755	12,080
Assistant director, adult education and summer schools.									
Statistician.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	8,840	9,165	9,490	9,815	10,140	10,465	10,790	11,115	11,440
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,040	9,365	9,690	10,015	10,340	10,665	10,990	11,315	11,640
Assistant director, audiovisual.									
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	8,400	8,725	9,050	9,375	9,700	10,025	10,350	10,675	11,000
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,600	8,925	9,250	9,575	9,900	10,225	10,550	10,875	11,200
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	7,520	7,845	8,170	8,495	8,820	9,145	9,470	9,795	10,120
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,720	8,045	8,370	8,695	9,020	9,345	9,670	9,995	10,320
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Psychiatric social worker.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									

"Salary class and position	Service step 1 (minimum)	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8
Class 14:								
Group A, bachelor's degree	$6,155	$6,430	$6,705	$6,980	$7,255	$7,530	$7,805	$8,080
Group B, master's degree	6,655	6,930	7,205	7,480	7,755	8,030	8,305	8,580
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	6,855	7,130	7,405	7,680	7,955	8,230	8,505	8,780
Class 15:								
Group A, bachelor's degree	5,000	5,275	5,550	5,825	6,100	6,375	6,650	6,925
Group B, master's degree	5,500	5,775	6,050	6,325	6,600	6,875	7,150	7,425
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	5,700	5,975	6,250	6,525	6,800	7,075	7,350	7,625
Attendance officer.								
Census supervisor.								
Child labor inspector.								
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.								
Counselor, placement.								
Instructor, laboratory school.								
Instructor, teachers college.								
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.								
Librarian, teachers college.								
Research assistant.								
School psychologist.								
School social worker.								
Speech correctionist.								
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools."								

"Salary class and position	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13	Longevity step X	Longevity step Y
Class 14:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$8,355	$8,630	$8,905	$9,180	$9,455		
Group B, master's degree	8,855	9,130	9,405	9,680	9,955		
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,055	9,330	9,605	9,880	10,155		
Class 15:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	7,200	7,475	7,750	8,025	8,300	$8,650	$9,000
Group B, master's degree	7,700	7,975	8,250	8,525	8,800	9,150	9,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,900	8,175	8,450	8,725	9,000	9,350	9,700
Attendance officer. Census supervisor. Child labor inspector. Counselor, elementary and secondary schools. Counselor, placement. Instructor, laboratory school. Instructor, teachers college. Librarian, elementary and secondary schools. Librarian, teachers college. Research assistant. School psychologist. School social worker. Speech correctionist. Teacher, elementary and secondary schools."							

(2) Section 2, subsection (a), is amended by striking from the third sentence "December 31, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1962"; by striking from the fourth sentence the words "counselor in the vocational high schools, counselor in the junior high schools", and the words "school social worker,", and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the same sentence the following: ", and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was appointed on probationary or permanent status before January 1, 1963, to a position as a nonshop teacher in a vocational education program, or counselor in the vocational high schools, or counselor in the junior high schools may continue to be employed in such a position, and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was on the list of eligible candidates for any such position before January 1, 1963, may continue to be eligible for such position until the expiration of such eligible list"; and by striking from the fifth sentence "December 31, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1962".

(3) Section 2, subsection (b), is amended by striking the figure "18" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "15".

(4) Section 4 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Each teacher, school officer, or other employee in the service of the Board on January 1, 1963, who occupies a position held by him on December 31, 1962, under the provisions of this Act, shall be placed in a salary class covered by section 1 of this Act as indicated at the end of this section. Any employee in group A, B, or C of his salary class on December 31, 1962, shall be assigned to the same letter group of the salary class to which he is transferred on January 1, 1963.

"Title and class of position on December 31, 1962

Superintendent	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
Assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers College	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College	4
Chief examiner	5
Dean of students, teachers college	5
Executive assistant to the superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Director, food services	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools)	6
Director, curriculum	4
Director, elementary education (administration)	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	6
Director in elementary education	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety	6
Director, industrial and adult education	5
Director, special education	7
Principal, senior high school	6
Principal, vocational high school	6
Principal, junior high school	7
Registrar, teachers college	7
Principal, Americanization School	7
Principal, junior high school	7
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools	8
Supervising director, athletics	8
Supervising director, curriculum	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget and legislation)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools)	7
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study and attendance)	8
Supervising director, reading clinic	8
Supervising director, subject field	8
Director, school attendance	8
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction	9
Principal, elementary school	8
Principal, Capitol Page School	8
Principal, health school	7
Principal, laboratory school	7
Assistant principal, senior high school	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school	8
Assistant director, food services	9
Assistant principal, junior high school	9
Assistant principal, Americanization School	9
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Assistant principal, elementary school	11
Assistant principal, health school	14
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction	13
Assistant director, evening and summer schools	11
Principal, veterans high school	8
Assistant director, practical nursing	13
Assistant director, subject field	13
Statistician	11
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	16
Assistant professor, laboratory school	16
Chief attendance officer	15
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Clinical psychologist	15
Supervisor, elementary education	13
Psychiatric social worker	16
Attendance officer	18
Census supervisor	18
Child labor inspector	18
Coordinator, practical nursing	18
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools	18
Counselor, placement	18
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	18
Instructor, laboratory schools	18
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools	18
Librarian	18
Research assistant	18
School psychologist	18
School social worker	18
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College	18
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	18

"Title and class of position on January 1, 1963

Superintendent	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
Assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers College	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College	4
Chief examiner	5
Dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Executive assistant to the superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Director, food services	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent	6

"Title and class of position on January 1, 1963—Continued

Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools)	6
Director, curriculum	4
Director, elementary education (administration)	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	6
Director in elementary education	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety	6
Director, industrial and adult education	5
Director, special education	7
Principal, senior high school	6
Principal, vocational high school	6
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school	6
Registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Principal, Americanization School	6
Principal, junior high school	6
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools	8
Supervising director, athletics	8
Supervising director, curriculum	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation)	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools)	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance)	6
Supervising director, reading clinic	8
Supervising director, subject field	8
Director, school attendance	8
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction	9
Principal, elementary school	6
Principal, Capitol Page School	6
Principal, health school	6
Principal, laboratory school	6
Assistant principal, senior high school	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school	8
Assistant director, food services	9
Assistant principal, junior high school	8
Assistant principal, Americanization School	8
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	11
Assistant principal, elementary school	8
Assistant principal, health school	8
Assistant director, audio-visual instruction	11
Assistant director, evening and summer schools	10
Principal, veterans high school	6
Assistant director, practical nursing	11
Assistant director, subject field	11
Statistician	10
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Assistant professor, laboratory school	13
Chief attendance officer	12
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College	11
Clinical psychologist	12
Supervisor, elementary education	11
Psychiatric social worker	13
Attendance officer	15
Census supervisor	15
Child labor inspector	15
Coordinator, practical nursing	15
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools	15
Counselor, placement	15
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	15
Instructor, laboratory schools	15
"Title and class of position on January 1, 1963—continued	
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools	15
Librarian	15
Research assistant	15
School psychologist	15
School social worker	15
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College	15
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	15"

(5) Section 6, subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) On January 1, 1963, each permanent employee assigned to salary classes 2 through 15 in accordance with section 1 and section 4 of this Act shall be assigned to the same numerical service step on the schedule for his salary class, or salary class and group, under this Act as he occupied on December 31, 1962, except that employees assigned to salary class 15 on January 1, 1963, who on December 31, 1962, were on service step 13 shall be assigned to service steps for their respective groups as follows: An employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed fourteen years of creditable service but less than sixteen years shall be assigned to longevity step X, and an employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed sixteen years of creditable service shall be assigned to longevity step Y. In determining years of creditable service for placement on service steps, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the placement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned or who are brought under this Act in accordance with the provisions of section 5."

(6) Section 6, subsection (b), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ", except that each employee in salary class 15 shall advance from service step 13 to longevity step X on July 1 following the completion of fourteen years of creditable service; from longevity step X to longevity step Y on July 1 following the completion of sixteen years of creditable service: *Provided,* That beginning with the step increase normally due July 1, 1963, the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer.".

(7) Section 7, subsection (a), is amended by striking the figure "18" and inserting in lieu thereof "15", by striking the figure "17" and inserting in lieu thereof "14", and by striking the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Employees newly appointed or reappointed to positions of assistant professor (salary class 13), chief librarian and associate professor (salary class 11), and professor (salary class 8) shall receive one year of placement credit for each year of satisfactory service, not in excess of five years, in a position of the same or higher rank in a college or university of recognized standing outside the District of Columbia public schools, as determined by the Board."

(8) Section 8, subsection (a), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ", except that beginning with any such step increase normally due subsequent to June 30, 1963, the Board of Education, on written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such increase in salary for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer."

(9) Section 11, (1), is amended by inserting after the word "increment" the words, "or longevity increment".

(10) Section 13, subsection (a), is amended by striking the classification and pay rates for educational employees in the summer and evening schools and inserting in lieu thereof the following classification and pay rates:

"Classification	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	Per Diem		
SUMMER SCHOOL (REGULAR)			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools, and instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	$20.18	$22.70	$25.22
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	23.21	26.11	29.00
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	26.23	29.51	32.78
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools	29.26	32.92	36.57
Supervising director, and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	29.26	32.92	36.57
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	32.29	36.32	40.35
	Per Diem		
VETERANS' SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL CENTERS			
Teacher	$30.27	$34.05	$37.83
	Per Period		
EVENING SCHOOLS			
Teacher	$5.04	$5.54	$6.16
Assistant principal	7.15	8.03	8.93
Principal	7.89	8.86	9.86".

(11) Section 13, subsection (b), is amended by striking "January 1, 1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1963".

(12) Section 14 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. Each employee assigned to salary class 15 in the schedule provided in section 1 of this Act, each assistant professor in salary class 13, each associated professor in salary class 11 and each professor in salary class 8 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in ten monthly installments in accordance with existing law."

(13) Section 15 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 15. On and after January 1, 1963, the Act entitled 'An Act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia', approved March 5, 1952, as amended, shall apply to employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed in salary classes 6 through 14, inclusive, under this Act, except the following: Executive assistant to deputy superintendent and assistants to assistant superintendents in salary class 6; dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College, professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, director, school attendance, and registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 8; assistant director, department of food services, in salary class 9; statistician, in salary class 10; associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, and chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 11; and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 13."

(14) Section 16 is amended by striking "January 1, 1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1963"; by striking "salary class 18" and inserting in lieu thereof "salary class 15"; by striking "chief librarian and assistant professor, salary class 14" and inserting in lieu thereof "assistant professor, salary class 13; and chief librarian, salary class 11".

SEC. 102. The provisions of section 101 of this title shall become effective as of January 1, 1963.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) The annuity of each person who, on the effective date of this section, is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund shall be increased by 5 per centum of the amount of such annuity.

(b) The annuity of each person who receives or is entitled to receive an annuity from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund commencing during the period which begins on the day following the effective date of this section and ends five years after such date, shall be increased in accordance with the following table:

If the annuity commences between—	The annuity shall be increased by—
January 2, 1963, and December 31, 1963	4 per centum.
January 1, 1964, and December 31, 1964	3 per centum.
January 1, 1965, and December 31, 1965	2 per centum.
January 1, 1966, and December 31, 1966	1 per centum.

(c) In lieu of any other increase provided by this section, the annuity of a survivor of a retired employee who received an increase under this section shall be increased by a percentage equal to the percentage by which the annuity of such employee was so increased.

(d) No increase provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

(e) The limitation contained in the next to the last sentence of section 5(c)(1) of the Act entitled "An Act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia", approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended, as enacted by the Act of July 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 487), shall not be effective on and after the effective date of this section.

(f) The increases provided by this section shall take effect on the effective date of this section, except that any increase under subsection (b) or (c) shall take effect on the beginning date of the annuity.

(g) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

SEC. 202. The Act entitled "An Act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia", approved August 7, 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 21. Whenever used in this Act the term 'price index' shall mean the annual average over a calendar year of the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

"SEC. 22. (a) After January 1, 1964, and after each succeeding January 1, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall determine the per centum change in the price index from the later of 1962 or the year preceding the most recent cost-of-living adjustment to the latest complete year. On the basis of such Commissioners' determination, the following adjustments shall be made:

"(1) Effective April 1, 1964, if the change in the price index from 1962 to 1963 shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2, 1963, shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(2) Effective April 1 of any year other than 1964 after the price index change shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2 of the preceding year shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(b) Eligibility of an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the funds as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

"(1) Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 9(b)3), which annuity commenced the day after the annuitant's death, shall be increased as provided in subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) if the commencing date of annuity to the annuitant was earlier than January 2 of the year preceding the first increase.

"(2) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 9(b)3), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

"(3) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increases under this section to a child under section 9(b)3, the items $600, $720, $1,800, and $2,160 appearing in section 9(b)3 shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section, and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 9(b)3 shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death. Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, the provisions of this paragraph shall apply as if such first increase were in effect with respect to computation of a child's annuity under section 9(b)3 which commenced between January 2 of the year preceding the first incerase and the effective date of the first increase.

"(c) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

(d) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

SEC. 203. (a) Section 5(b)(1) of the Act entitled "An Act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia", approved August 7, 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "55 per centum" and by striking out "$2,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,600".

(b) Section 9(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "one-half" and inserting in lieu thereof "55 per centum of".

(c) Section 9(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "one-half" in the three places where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof in the first two places "55 per centum of" and in the third place "55 per centum".

(d)(1) The third sentence of section 9(b)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The child's annuity shall commence on the day after the employee dies, and such annuity granted under this Act or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) his attaining age eighteen unless incapable of self-support, (2) his becoming capable of self-support after age eighteen, (3) his marriage, or (4) his death, except that the annuity of a child who is a student as described in section 9(c)(2) shall terminate on the last day of the month before (A) his marriage, (B) his death, (C) his ceasing to be such a student, or (D) his attaining age twenty-one."

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the benefits resulting from enactment of this amendment shall be paid from the teachers' retirement and annuity fund.

(e) Section 9(c)(2) of such Act is amended by substituting a comma for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "or such unmarried child between eighteen and twenty-one years of age who is a student regularly pursuing a full-time course of study or training in residence in a high school, trade school, technical or vocational institute, junior college, college, university, or comparable recognized educational institution. A child whose twenty-first birthday occurs prior to July 1 or after August 31 of any calendar year, and while he is regularly pursuing such a course of study or training, shall be deemed for the purposes of this paragraph and section 9(b)(3) to have attained the age of twenty-one on the first day of July following such birthday. A child who is a student shall not be deemed to have ceased to be a student during any interim between school years if the interim does not exceed four months and if he shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioners that he has a bona fide intention of continuing to pursue a course of study or training in the same or different school during the school semester (or other period into which the school year is divided) immediately following the interim."

SEC. 204. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the benefits made payable under the Act entitled "An Act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia", approved August 7, 1946, as amended, by reason of the enactment of this title shall be paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund.

SEC. 205. Section 201 of this title shall take effect on January 1, 1963. The amendments made by section 203 shall not apply in the case of employees retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if these amendments had not been enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out line 3 and all that follows down through line 15 on page 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The Act entitled 'An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 521, ch. 569), as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 1 is amended by striking everything after the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following salary schedules.

“ ‘Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9
Class 1:									
Superintendent of Schools	$19,000								
Class 2:									
Deputy superintendent	16,500								
Class 3:									
Assistant superintendent	14,350	$14,600	$14,850	$15,100	$15,350	$15,600	$15,850	$16,100	$16,350
President, teachers college.									
Class 4:									
Director, curriculum	12,700	12,950	13,200	13,450	13,700	13,950	14,200	14,450	14,700
Dean, teachers college.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	11,000	11,250	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000
Group B, master's degree	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,700	11,950	12,200	12,450	12,700	12,950	13,200	13,450	13,700
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial and adult education.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Psychiatrist.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050	12,300	12,550	12,800	13,050
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,250	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	10,350	10,600	10,850	11,100	11,350	11,600	11,850	12,100	12,350
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050	12,300	12,550
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Director in elementary education.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850	11,100	11,350	11,600	11,850
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,050	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance).									
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Director, department of school attendance.									
Principal, Capitol page school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, veterans high school.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Principal, boy's junior-senior high school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	8,940	9,190	9,440	9,690	9,940	10,190	10,440	10,890	10,940
Group B, master's degree	9,440	9,690	9,940	10,190	10,440	10,690	10,940	11,190	11,440
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,640	9,890	10,140	10,390	10,640	10,890	11,140	11,390	11,640
Assistant director, food services.									
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	9,030	9,280	9,530	9,780	10,030	10,280	10,530	10,780	11,030
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,230	9,480	9,730	9,980	10,230	10,480	10,730	10,980	11,230
Assistant director, evening and summer schools.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Statistician.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	8,620	8,870	9,120	9,370	9,620	9,870	10,120	10,370	10,620
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,820	9,070	9,320	9,570	9,820	10,070	10,320	10,570	10,820
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	8,210	8,460	8,710	8,960	9,210	9,460	9,710	9,960	10,210
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,410	8,660	8,910	9,160	9,410	9,660	9,910	10,160	10,410
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	7,395	7,710	8,025	8,340	8,655	8,970	9,285	9,600	9,915
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,595	7,910	8,225	8,540	8,855	9,170	9,485	9,800	10,115
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Psychiatric social worker.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.’									

“ ‘Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13
Class 14:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	$6,030	$6,285	$6,540	$6,795	$7,050	$7,305	$7,560	$7,815	$8,070	$8,325	$8,580	$8,835	$9,000
Group B, master's degree	6,530	6,785	7,040	7,295	7,550	7,805	8,060	8,315	8,570	8,825	9,080	9,335	9,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	6,730	6,985	7,240	7,495	7,750	8,005	8,260	8,515	8,770	9,025	9,280	9,535	9,700
Census supervisor.													
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.													
Instructor, teachers college.													
Instructor, laboratory school.													
School psychologist.’													

“ ‘Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13	Longevity step X	Longevity step Y
Class 15:															
Group A, bachelor's degree	$5,000	$5,260	$5,520	$5,735	$5,950	$6,165	$6,380	$6,595	$6,810	$7,025	$7,240	$7,455	$7,670	$8,190	$8,710
Group C, master's degree	5,500	5,760	6,020	6,235	6,450	6,665	6,880	7,095	7,310	7,525	7,740	7,955	8,170	8,690	9,210
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	5,700	5,960	6,220	6,435	6,650	6,865	7,080	7,295	7,510	7,725	7,940	8,155	8,370	8,890	9,410
Attendance officer.															
Child labor inspector.															
Counselor, placement.															
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.															
Librarian, teacher's college.															
Research assistant.															
School social worker.															
Speech correctionist.															
Coordinator of practical nursing.															
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.’															

“(2) Section 2, subsection (a), is amended by striking from the third sentence ‘December 31, 1957’ and inserting in lieu thereof ‘December 31, 1962’; by striking from the fourth sentence the words ‘counselor in the vocational high schools, counselor in the junior high schools, and the words ‘school social worker’, and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the same sentence the following: ‘, and except that a person not possessing a master's degreee who was appointed on probationary or permanent status before January 1, 1963, to a position as a nonshop teacher in a vocational education program, or counselor in the vocational high schools, or counselor in the junior high schools may continue to be employed in such a position, and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was on the list of eligible candidates for any such position before January 1, 1963, may continue to be eligible for such position until the expiration of such eligible lists’; and by striking from the fifth sentence ‘December 31, 1957’ and inserting in lieu thereof ‘December 31, 1962.’

“(3) Section 2, subsection (b), is amended by striking the figure ‘18’ where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure ‘15’.

“(4) Section 4 is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘SEC. 4. Each teacher, school officer, or other employee in the service of the Board on January 1, 1963, who occupies a position held by him on December 31, 1962, under the provisions of this Act, shall be placed in a salary class covered by section 1 of this Act as indicated at the end of this section. Any employee in group A, B, or C of his salary class on December 31, 1962, shall be assigned to the same letter group of the salary class to which he is transferred on January 1, 1963.

“ ‘*Title and class of position on December 31, 1962*

Superintendent	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
Assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers college	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College	4
Chief examiner	5
Dean of students, teachers college	5
Executive assistant to the superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Director, food services	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools)	6
Director, curriculum	4
Director, elementary education (administration)	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	6
Director in elementary education	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety	6
Director, industrial and adult education	5
Director, special education	7
Principal, senior high school	6
Principal, vocational high school	6
Principal, junior high school	7
Registrar, teachers college	7
Principal, Americanization School	7
Principal, junior high school	7
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools	8
Supervising director, athletics	8
Supervising director, curriculum	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget and legislation)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools)	7
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study and attendance)	8
Supervising director, reading clinic	8
Supervising director, subject field	8
Director, school attendance	
Supervising director audio-visual instruction	9
Principal, elementary school	8
Principal, Capitol Page School	8
Principal, health school	7
Principal, laboratory school	7
Assistant principal, senior high school	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school	8
Assistant director, food services	9
Assistant principal, junior high school	9
Assistant principal, Americanization school	9
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Assistant principal, elementary school	11
Assistant principal, health school	14
Assistant director, audio-visual instruction	13
Assistant director, adult education and summer schools	11
Principal, veterans high school	8
Assistant director, practical nursing	13
Assistant director, subject field	13
Statistician	11
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	16
Assistant professor, laboratory school	16
Chief attendance officer	15
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Clinical psychologist	15
Supervisor, elementary education	13
Psychiatric social worker	16
Attendance officer	18
Census supervisor	18
Child labor inspector	18
Coordinator, practical nursing	18
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools	18
Counselor, placement	18
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	18
Instructor, laboratory schools	18
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools	18
Librarian	18
Research assistant	18
School psychologist	18
School social worker	18
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College	18
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	18

“ ‘*Title and class of position on January 1, 1963*

Superintendent	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
Do	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers College	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College	4

"'*Title and class of position on January 1, 1963*—Continued

Chief examiner	5
Dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Executive assistant to the superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Director, food services	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools)	6
Director, curriculum	4
Director, elementary education (administration)	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	6
Director in elementary education	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety	6
Director, industrial and adult education	5
Director, special education	7
Principal, senior high school	6
Principal, vocational high school	6
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school	7
Registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Principal, Americanization School	7
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools	8
Supervising director, athletics	8
Supervising director, curriculum	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools)	7
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance)	8
Supervising director, reading clinic	8
Supervising director, subject field	8
Director, school attendance	8
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction	9
Principal, elementary school	8
Principal, Capitol Page School	8
Principal, health school	7
Principal, laboratory school	7
Assistant principal, senior high school	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school	8
Assistant director, food services	9
Assistant principal, junior high school	9
Assistant principal, Americanization School	9
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	11
Assistant principal, elementary school	10
Assistant principal, health school	9
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction	11
Assistant director, adult education and summer schools	10
Principal, veterans high school	8
Assistant director, practical nursing	11
Assistant director, subject field	11
Statistician	10
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Assistant professor, laboratory school	13
Chief attendance officer	12
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College	11
Clinical psychologist	12
Supervisor, elementary education	11
Psychiatric social worker	13
Attendance officer	15
Census supervisor	14
Child labor inspector	15
Coordinator, practical nursing	15
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools	14
Counselor, placement	15
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	14
Instructor, laboratory schools	14
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools	15
Librarian	15
Research assistant	15
School psychologist	14
School social worker	15
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College	15
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	15'

"(5) Section 6, subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) On January 1, 1963, each permanent employee assigned to salary classes 2 through 15 in accordance with section 1 and section 4 of this Act shall be assigned to the same numerical service step on the schedule for his salary class, or salary class and group, under this Act as he occupied on December 31, 1962, except that employees assigned to salary class 15 on January 1, 1963, who on December 31, 1962, were on service step 13 shall be assigned to service steps for their respective groups as follows: An employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed fifteen years of creditable service but less than eighteen years shall be assigned to longevity step X, and an employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed eighteen years of creditable service shall be assigned to longevity step Y. In determining years of creditable service for placement on service steps, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the placement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned or who are brought under this Act in accordance with the provisions of section 5.'

"(6) Section 6, subsection (b), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ', except that each employee in salary class 15 shall advance from service step 13 to longevity step X on July 1 following the completion of fifteen years of creditable service; from longevity step X to longevity step Y on July 1 following the completion of eighteen years of creditable service: *Provided*, That beginning with the step increase normally due July 1, 1963, the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of "satisfactory" from his superior officer.'.

"(7) Section 7, subsection (a), is amended by striking the figure '18' both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '15', by striking the figure '17' and inserting in lieu thereof '14', and by striking the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Employees newly appointed or reappointed to positions of assistant professor (salary class 13), chief librarian and associate professor (salary class 11), and professor (salary class 8) shall receive one year of placement credit for each year of satisfactory service, not in excess of five years, in a position of the same or higher rank in a college or university of recognized standing outside the District of Columbia public schools, as determined by the Board.'

"(8) Section 8, subsection (a), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and insert the following: ', except that beginning with any such step increase normally due subsequent to June 30, 1963, the Board of Education, on written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such increase in salary for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of "satisfactory" from his superior officer.'

"(9) Section 11, (1), is amended by inserting after the word 'increment' the words, 'or longevity increment'.

"(10) Section 13, subsection' (a), is amended by striking the classification and pay rates for educational employees in the summer and evening schools and inserting in lieu thereof the following classification and pay rates:

"'Classification	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	Per diem		
SUMMER SCHOOL (REGULAR)			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	$19.72	$21.69	$23.66
Instructor, teachers college	21.69	23.86	26.03
Assistant professor, teachers college	22.68	24.94	27.21
Associate professor, teachers college	25.64	28.20	30.76
Assistant principal	26.62	29.28	31.94
Principal, supervising director, and professor, teachers college	28.59	31.45	34.31
	Per diem		
VETERANS' SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL CENTERS			
Teacher	$29.58	$32.54	$35.49
	Per period		
EVENING SCHOOLS			
Teacher	$5.04	$5.39	$5.79
Assistant principal	6.49	7.16	7.84
Principal	6.97	7.69	8.51

"(11) Section 13, subsection (b), is amended by striking 'January 1, 1958' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1963'.

"(12) Section 14 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 14. Each employee assigned to salary class 15 in the schedule provided in section 1 of this Act, each assistant professor in salary class 13, each associate professor and chief librarian in salary class 11 and each professor in salary class 8 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in ten monthly installments in accordance with existing law.'

"(13) Section 15 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 15. On and after January 1, 1963, the Act entitled "An Act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved March 5, 1952, as amended, shall apply to employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed in salary clauses 6 through 14, inclusive, under this Act, except the following: Executive assistant to deputy superintendent and the assistant to the assistant superintendent in salary class 6; assistants to the assistant superintendent in salary class 7; dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College, professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, director, school attendance, registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College, and assistants to the assistant superintendents, in salary class 8; assistant director, department of food services, in salary class 9, statistician, in salary class 10; associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, and chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 11; and assistant professor, salary class 13.'

"(14) Section 16 is amended by striking 'January 1, 1958' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1963'; by striking 'salary class 18' and inserting in lieu thereof 'salary class 15'; by striking 'chief librarian and assistant professor, salary class 14' and inserting in lieu thereof 'assistant professor, salary class 13; and chief librarian, salary class 11'.

"SEC. 102. Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended', approved September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 913), is repealed.

"SEC. 103. Sections 101 and 102 of this title shall take effect as of January 1, 1963."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I regret that the House Committee on the District of Columbia provided only a $4.2 million pay raise for District teachers rather than the $6.2 million raise recommended by the District of Columbia Commissioners, and which has been passed by the Senate.

How can the House, which has just voted a pay raise for District police and firemen to place them near the top of such salaries paid in the largest cities, consider voting for a scale which will not place teachers in the same relative position?

The recruitment and retention of qualified teachers for the District of Columbia Public School System is equally important as the recruitment and retention of police, firemen, qualified engineers, scientists, and other professional personnel for the Federal service which has been making great inroads into the teaching field. We must make teaching an attractive occupation through the respect and status that go with it and the tangible rewards to come from it.

The needs of today's era demand for our children quality education which will result only if the very best teachers are employed. Quality, however, is not found in the bargain basement. The mere survival, or "get-by," wages which have been paid to District teachers will not suffice for today's demands, let alone tomorrow's.

How do District teachers fare under their present salary scale? There are three classifications in the pay scale for teachers—A.B. degree, M.A. degree, and M.A. plus 30 credits—with maximum salaries of $7,095, $7,633, $7,848. When compared with salaries paid in the largest cities, these salaries rank 16th in all three classes. The present minimum salaries of $4,800, $5,300, and $5,500 rank the District in 11th, 7th, and 8th place respectively. The present scale places the District at the bottom of the list of all of the salaries paid to teachers in the metropolitan area.

Where will the bill under consideration before the House today rank District teachers?

It will be said here today that the bill before the House places the District at the top of the list in salaries paid to teachers in the Metropolitan Area. I think I can prove to you that such is not the case. The best salaries in this area are paid in Montgomery County, where maximum salaries for teachers are $7,990, $9,165, and $9,400 which are achieved in 14 years. Salaries offered under this bill for teachers in the District in the 14th year would be $7,670, $8,110, and $8,370. With longevity increments, the District teachers at the end of 19 years can achieve salaries of $8,710, $9,210, and $9,410. With the career increment, however, teachers in Montgomery County can achieve in 14 years salaries of $8,930, $9,890, $10,105, and $10,575, respectively. You will note that Montgomery County has a fourth salary class which is not offered to teachers in the District of Columbia. It is my understanding that, at the present time, approximately one-fifth of the teachers in Montgomery County are on the career-increment scale.

I just do not see how anyone can say that the scale offered to District teachers today ranks in first place with Montgomery County when in that county, maximum salaries are achieved in 14 years, and in the District of Columbia in 19 years.

I might point out, too, that in the 14th and 15th years of experience, the salaries offered to teachers in this bill are outranked by those paid in Prince Georges County, Arlington County, and Falls Church.

When compared with salaries paid in the largest cities, these minimum salaries will place the District in the same relative position as those in the Senate version. In maximum salaries, however, the picture is quite different. Although you will probably be told, or have been told here today, that in maximum salaries this bill will rank the District in a relatively higher position when compared to the large cities. I must point out again that District teachers will have to teach 25 years to earn them. In the other large cities, the maximums are achieved in a period of 9 to 14 years in the vast majority of instances. The median number of years in the large cities in which the teachers achieve maximum salaries is 12 years.

What would S. 1447, the $6.2 million raise passed by the Senate, do for District teachers:

First. It would give District teachers salaries which would compare favorably with salaries paid teachers in the metropolitan area, but which would still be outranked by Montgomery County in a number of respects.

Second. In comparison with the other 22 largest cities, as far as teachers' salaries are concerned, it would rank the District sixth, fifth, and sixth, respectively, in the minimum salaries; and in maximum salaries, the District would rank third, fourth, and third.

Third. It provides beginning salaries of $5,000, $5,500, and $5,700, an increase of $200 in each class which, although not enough, will place the beginning salary on a more nearly competitive basis with those paid in business, industry, and the Federal service.

Fourth. Maximum salaries are $9,000, $9,500, and $9,700 for the three classes of teachers to be achieved in the 17th year of teaching. These maximums are exceeded by New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego with maximums for the top class of $10,445, $10,250, $10,140, and $10,000, respectively. Furthermore, they are achieved in the 13 years. In the 13th year, the District teachers will be earning $8,300, $8,800, and $9,000, respectively, in the three salary classes—considerably less than the maximums in the cities already mentioned.

There is a large number of school districts in this country, in the group less than 500,000 in population, where maximum salaries paid to teachers range above $10,000 and as high as $13,248.

Since many experienced teachers are leaving the District's classrooms for better paying positions, and competent young people are refusing to enter teaching, the importance of professional salaries for teachers in the District cannot be overemphasized. One-third of the teachers in the District at the present time are on temporary status. From the best available facts, which I am sure do not present a complete picture, the following experienced teachers left the school system since June 1962:

Elementary level: Eighteen teachers and one principal who were employed during 1961 and 1962 are now teaching in nearby counties.

Secondary level: Thirty-five teachers left to take positions in nearby counties.

In addition, on the elementary level, there were 36 applicants for teaching positions in the District of Columbia schools for the present year who agreed to take positions; and, of these, 21 later declined in order to take positions in nearby counties, and 15 to take positions in other States. Also, there were 14 additional teachers on the secondary level who passed the examinations to teach in the District, but took positions elsewhere.

How can this House vote for the classified employees of the Federal and District Government, and for police and firemen of the District, salaries comparable to those paid in business, industry, the professions, and the Federal service, and vote substandard salaries for teachers? It was said in the hearing on this bill that the District may face a deficit of $2 million next year. Is it fair to expect teachers, who pay taxes like everyone else, to subsidize this deficit, or a portion of the school budget, or indeed any portion of the District budget, while other employees of the local and Federal Governments enjoy a higher standard of living?

Who will deny that the destiny of the Nation is shaped in its classrooms? Surely we will all agree that, if today's children, the Nation's most precious resource, are to cope adequately with the tremendous problems they will face tomorrow, they must be taught and developed to the very fullest extent of their capacities by highly trained, intelligent teachers with the finest of educational backgrounds. Although the value of attracting the highest caliber of beginning teacher and of retaining the experienced successful teacher has long been recognized, there has been a decided lack of recognition that such will be achieved only when paid for by a professional salary scale.

When one considers the human minds in our classrooms, it is certainly reasonable to assume that teachers are of the utmost importance to the Nation. Is it not reasonable, also, to assume that the Congress of the United States should take the lead to emphasize this fact by voting a professional salary scale for the teachers of the District?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the House District Committee would all be very happy to see all the school teachers in the District of Columbia receive a much higher salary than the proposed legislation provides. However, we are of the opinion that the 10.1-percent increase is all that the District Commissioners can spend for this purpose without substantially raising property taxes and all other taxes here in the District of Columbia. We feel that the District Commissioners should be able to take care of the 10.1-percent increase without additional taxes.

The District Committee has purposely waited until this late date to take action on the salary increase bill for policemen, firemen, and teachers to see if the Congress passed a Federal employees' salary increase bill this year and also what average amount would be paid these employees so that any action we should take in connection with other employees in the District would not be out of line with the salary increase received by the classified employees.

I have had the privilege and pleasure of requesting the House of Representatives to increase the salaries of District teachers on numerous occasions since I have been a member of the House District Committee. I have always voted for proposed salary increases for teachers and when I first became a member of the House District Committee the teachers all received an entrance salary of approximately $1,700 per annum. Now they are receiving an entrance salary of approximately $5,000.

We understand there will be a general salary increase for executives in the Government departments when Congress reconvenes in January and we certainly will see that the salary of the Superintendent of Schools along with the District Commissioners' salaries are substantially increased at that time. It was the opinion of the committee that the Superintendent's salary should not be increased above the District Commissioners' salaries and the salaries for both these offices should be increased at the same time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether or not there are further conference reports or unanimous-consent requests to be considered this evening.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have one more bill I desire to call up from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The bill has already passed.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that if a Member is on his feet, that is insufficient. The gentleman did not address the Chair.

Mr. FULTON. I was saying "Mr. Speaker," and was not heard. I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman asks unanimous consent to vacate the action, the Chair will entertain a request. But the passage of the bill had been completed.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet addressing the Speaker, but I was not recognized.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know what is in the gentleman's mind when the gentleman is on his feet.

Mr. FULTON. I was saying "Mr. Speaker," right straight through. I am sure it is the custom of the House to be recognized when a point of order is being made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the action whereby the bill was passed will be vacated.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. FULTON. I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Does the gentleman insist upon his point of order?

Mr. FULTON. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 260, nays 9, not voting 166, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

YEAS—260

Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Baldwin
Barry
Bass, Tenn.
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Boggs
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broyhill
Bruce
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Church
Clancy
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, John W.
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Doyle
Dulski
Durno
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Feighan
Fenton
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Keith
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Libonati
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reece
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rousselot
Rutherford
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Santangelo
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shelley
Shriver
Sibal
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taylor
Thomas
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Utt
Vanik
Wallhauser
Walter
Westland
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—9

Abbitt
Alford
Colmer
Gathings
Gross
Johansen
Ray
Waggonner
Winstead

NOT VOTING—166

Adair
Alexander
Anfuso
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bailey
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boland
Bolling
Boykin
Breeding
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Cahill
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Curtin
Davis, James C.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Dooley
Dorn
Downing
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Frazier
Garland
Glenn
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.

Horan
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Lesinski
Lindsay
Loser
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Magnuson
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Moorehead, Ohio
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Nedzi
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Passman
Peterson
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Ryan, Mich.
Saund
Saylor
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Ullman
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Watts
Weaver
Weis
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Williams
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Michel.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Siler.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Pirnie.
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Baker.
Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. MacGregor.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Brown.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Knox.
Mr. James C. Davis with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Peterson with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Teague of California.
Mrs. Riley with Mr. Short.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Thompson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Harding with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Breeding with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Clem Miller with Mr. Hall.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Garland.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Chipefield.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Dominick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTIVE SALE PRICE FOR PURPOSES OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes.

DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACT CARRIERS AS CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE

Mr. MILLS submitted conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF TERMINAL RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. PASSMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for the foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

BURNS CREEK

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, from time to time, both on the floor of the House and before various committees of the House, statements have been made that everyone in Idaho is in favor of the Burns Creek project.

I have always maintained that the hope of this country is in our youth and my hope was reaffirmed when I received a letter from Bill Byrne, student body president of the Rigby High School, of Rigby, Idaho.

This thoughtful letter I commend not only to my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest, but to the entire country:

RIGBY HIGH SCHOOL,
Rigby, Idaho, October 1, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: On behalf of the Rigby High School U.S. Government class, I would like to thank you for the excellent work you are doing to curb socialism in our Government. We feel the U.S. Government should step back and let free enterprise once again compete without fear of Government deterrents. In our opinion, the United States is the mightiest nation on earth, but it will lose this position unless the U.S. Government stops competing with private enterprise.

I just finished watching a film by Representative HARDING, from Idaho, who degraded you for stopping passage of the Burns Creek bill. We not only thank you for this, we salute you.

With best wishes, I am,

BILL BYRNE,
Student Body President.

Mr. Speaker, so long as young people of our country are cognizant of the socialistic attitude of the present Members of Congress, there is still hope to keep this Republic alive.

EYES ON THE STARS; FEET ON THE GROUND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in a short time your gavel will fall, bringing an end to the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

Democratic leadership here and in the White House has produced many worthwhile accomplishments. Last year, during the first session, we enacted 33 major pieces of legislation as part of the New Frontier program of the sixties. This year we have continued the excellent record of enacting progressive and farsighted legislation in the public interest in spite of the obstructionism of the reactionaries in our midst, most of whom make up the Republican Party.

One could perhaps understand an opposition minority party which offered rational substitutes for legislation with which they disagreed. An opposition party which opposes for the sake of political gain has no right to exist. Too many Members of the minority party in this Congress forget that once elected they represent all of the people and that it is their duty to serve them, not their party. They have no right to oppose destructively what is good for the country.

Constructive opposition is welcome. But constructive opposition proposes alternatives to good programs, not resistance to them. The obstructionists of the 87th Congress, however, can best be described as "do-nothings." Their only action has been negative; their only aim to defeat legislation proposed by the majority party. Their opposition has been blind and obstructive. The examples of such negativism are many. I shall cite only a few.

Seventy-four percent of the Republicans in the House voted against the Area Redevelopment Act; 84 percent voted against the housing bill; 82 percent voted against raising the minimum wage; 99 percent voted against the farm bill which will save the country at least a half billion dollars a year; 92 percent voted against consideration of the proposed Department of Urban Affairs and Housing; 75 percent voted against the college aid bill; 75.5 percent of them voted to gut the trade bill; 53 percent voted against the water pollution control act; 91.4 percent voted to recommit the Cuban resolution.

And what have these negativists offered in place of this program? The answer is "Nothing."

In reviewing the past 2 years, an objective observer will have to concede that this Congress has made one of the most enviable records in American history. The New Deal, which was characterized by recovery, and the Fair Deal, characterized by a sense of responsibility toward the average citizen and a maturing of America's attitude toward her responsibilities on the international scene, have now been logically succeeded by the New Frontier, reemphasizing Government's responsibility to the individual citizen, but also rightfully insisting that the citizen has a duty to his country.

Some of the accomplishments of this 2d session of the 87th Congress follow:

ABOLITION OF POLL TAXES

It was my honor during this session to be a cosponsor of one of the most important pieces of civil rights legislation in the history of our Nation. I refer to the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to outlaw the poll tax. As soon as three-fourths of the States ratify this amendment as recommended by Congress, it will become the law of the land.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Important legislation adopted for the more efficient running of our Government included the establishment of an Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President to coordinate all Federal functions in this vital field.

A bill requiring Defense Department procurement contracts, whenever feasible, to be on a competitive basis also repealed authority for negotiated contracts.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

One of the most important and far-reaching programs adopted this session is the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This bill gives the President a 5-year authority to cut tariffs and to abolish tariffs on certain goods. If these directives should hurt domestic business, the President may raise tariffs again or provide assistance to industry and workers affected by increased imports. This assistance includes Federal unemployment compensation at higher rates for a longer period of time plus retraining and relocation allowances. Aid for business firms will be provided in the form of loans, loan guarantees, technical assistance, and tax benefits.

A foreign aid authorization for 1963 includes military support funds, development loans and grants, and specific sums for the Alliance for Progress. The obstructionists have succeeded in whittling these sums down in the appropriation bill. We hope the damage that may result can be kept to a minimum.

The Congress has reaffirmed this country's faith in the United Nations by authorizing the President to lend it $100 million through the purchase of bonds. This legislation contains safeguards which provide that the sum we lend must be matched by other nations. The statement which has been made many times recently that our purchase of U.N. bonds would reduce the liability of the Soviet Union and other Communist nations, is wholly without foundation. The Communist bloc will still be liable for their dues and assessments, and if they do not pay them within 2 years, they will lose their right to vote in the General Assembly. This has always been the rule in the U.N. It will continue to be enforced.

In an effort to strengthen the world's currencies the Congress adopted legislation authorizing the United States to lend up to $2 billion to the International Monetary Fund as our part of a worldwide 10-year, $6 billion program. This is but one of many steps taken to strengthen the dollar on the international market and to give the lie to those clamoring for its devaluation.

THE PEACE CORPS

One of the brilliant successes in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration is the Peace Corps. Created by Executive order in March 1961, and given congressional endorsement in the Peace Corps Act of September 1961, this organization has become world famous. As of June 20, 1962, the Peace Corps had 1,051 volunteers overseas in 17 countries and commitments in 34 countries. Many more countries have requested volunteers and the Corps is presently doing everything it can to meet these requests. The most heartening and dramatic endorsement of the Corps is the fact that its members do not go to any country that does not request them.

Many more volunteers are needed. I have urged those of my constituents who are interested in the Peace Corps to write to me for further information about the program for volunteers. Let me emphasize that age or formal education is not a criterion in making application. The Corps needs people of all ages; it needs people with all skills; it needs not only the college graduate but the graduate of industrial schools and technical schools; it needs plumbers, bricklayers, farmers, and people with many other skills.

CUBA

To further aid the resettlement of refugees from Iron Curtain countries and those seeking asylum from Cuba, Congress has authorized up to $10 million for urgent refugee and migration needs.

In a dramatic resolution reaffirming our country's opposition to the establishment of non-American spheres of influence in this hemisphere, the Congress expressed United States determination to prevent by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, the extension from Cuba by force or threat of force of its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere. The resolution further states our determination to prevent the creation in Cuba of an externally supported military threat to the internal security of the United States.

Despite all the demagoguery of the Republicans, this administration refuses to fight to the last drop of your blood. Fight we will, if we must, but only if we must, because there is no other way.

In addition, the House adopted resolutions urging that the Organization of American States reevaluate the role of Cuba in inter-American affairs and consider the imposition of sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

We have given the President the authority to act in any emergency that may occur while Congress is out of session so that he may call up 150,000 reservists and to extend, for a period of not more than 1 year, enlistments which would expire during that period.

Because of the Cuban situation and other crises arising around the world, it is essential that the President be able to act without calling Congress back into session first. We hope that the President will not be required to exercise this authority; but if he must, he is authorized to act.

A bill authorizing the procurement of essential missiles, naval vessels, and aircraft for fiscal 1963 has been enacted. These funds will be spent in carrying out the peacekeeping responsibilities of the United States in the free world.

Other bills authorized the construction and improvement of our Armed Forces bases, installations, and military family housing units.

Additional authorizations were enacted for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including planetary and lunar exploration.

We are fast closing the gap caused by the shortsightedness of the Eisenhower administration.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The Communications Satellite Act of 1962 creates a privately owned corporation to launch and operate a worldwide system of communication relay satellites. This system, exemplified by Telstar, will be a model of the free enterprise system to the rest of the world.

In an effort to combat the persistent high level of unemployment in those areas of our Nation which have been bypassed by the general economic recovery, a public works bill was passed to undertake and accelerate Federal public works and for matching grants to States that engage in such projects.

A manpower retraining program has been enacted. Pockets of unemployment have made it essential that the Department of Labor appraise the Nation's manpower requirements and resources and develop a program which will insure the maximum utilization of the skills and potentialities of American workers. This bill empowers the Secretary of Labor to retrain people whose jobs have been eliminated due to automation or other causes.

Amendments to the Internal Revenue Code were embodied in a bill which provides tax incentives for business expansion. The bill as it passed the House contained a provision for withholding taxes on dividends and interest. The Senate eliminated this method of collection. I testified against it before the Ways and Means Committee. I also opposed the proposed new tax base of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. Although it was modified, I still think it is not good.

FEDERAL SALARY AND ANNUITY INCREASES

In an effort to bring the salaries of Federal employees more in line with those in private industry, the Congress enacted a bill granting an average pay raise of 10 percent for 1.6 million Federal employees. The increase will be in two steps: the first to be effective around October 15, 1962, and the second on January 1, 1964.

Included in the same bill is an increase of 5 percent in the benefits received by 600,000 civil service retirees and their survivors. This annuity increase becomes effective January 1, 1963.

I have always supported measures granting civil service employees the benefits to which they are entitled. I was pleased to be a cosponsor of the legislation increasing salaries for Government workers and for increasing civil service annuities.

Also included in the bill is a postage rate increase including an increase in the rate charged for junk mail.

We increased the lending authority of the Small Business Administration for business loans and disaster loans and raised the lending authority for investment company loans. The SBA was given jurisdiction to make the loans authorized by the new Trade Expansion Act.

I am pleased to report that in fiscal 1962 small business firms were awarded 17.7 percent of Defense Department prime contracts. This is significant progress which, coupled with the set-aside program, has contributed greatly to assuring small business its fair share of Government contracts. The increase was the result of President Kennedy's directive of March 15, 1961, requiring the Defense Department to increase the share of military prime contracts awarded to small business. This is a first step to reverse the small business setbacks brought about by the Eisenhower administration.

A valuable addition to pension legislation adopted during this session is the Self-employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act. This measure permits self-employed individuals and owner-employees temporarily to exclude a portion of their earnings from income taxes when these amounts are set aside for retirement purposes. This legislation demonstrates again the leadership of the Democratic Party in the field of social and economic programs. This is not a tax giveaway, but a postponement of the tax. It merely begins to approach the tax advantages of corporate and Government systems.

The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 provide an increased Federal share of old-age assistance and assistance to the blind and disabled effective October 1, 1962. It also provides grants for training of welfare personnel, an increase in aid to dependent children and an expansion of child welfare services. The main object of increased Federal assistance in this area is to help those persons receiving public assistance to help themselves. This is an excellent program, but it will fail without the assistance of each State and local government throughout the country.

A significant and progressive enactment is the Senior Citizens Housing Act. Recognizing that older citizens face special problems in meeting their housing needs because of their limited incomes and because of difficulty in obtaining liberal, long-term mortgage credit, we set up a revolving fund to make direct loans to nonprofit groups at low interest rates for construction of rental and cooperative housing for persons over age 62 in urban areas.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

A vastly important bill which was enacted this session is one which amends the Food and Drug Act. This requires adequate controls in the manufacture and marketing of drugs. Rigid procedures are prescribed which must be followed before a drug is approved for public sale. One of the most important features of this new law requires advertisements of prescription drugs to contain factual information about the efficacy of the drug, the quantitative formula with each active ingredient listed and the side effects of the drug.

As late as the 1940's the advertising of prescription drugs was factual and was presented without the techniques of Madison Avenue. Today, advertising, using pictures of pretty girls and happy people, swell the journals of the American Medical Association and other scientific groups.

The impact of these advertisements is tremendous in persuading physicians to order medicines for their patients. In fairness, both to the physician and to his patient, the advertisement of a drug should not be allowed to express only the good points and to leave the bad to some promotional material that the physician may or may not see at a later time. If the advertisement can give a brief description of the merits and advantages of using a particular prescription drug, space can be found for a fair summary of any relevant side effects, contraindications, cautions, and related information.

It seems to me that it is not asking too much to make the picture of the beautiful woman, or the happy child, or his relieved parents a little smaller in the interest of providing the physician who orders the medicine for his trusting patient, a minimum word of caution about possible adverse effects.

MISCELLANEOUS

Other legislation gave tax concessions to those who suffered property damage in storm disaster areas.

Of importance to New York City and other urban areas is extension of the authorization of grants to State and local governments for continued research in the field of air pollution. This is a concerted effort to eliminate smog and other pollutions from the air of our cities.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Bills which were passed during this session to aid the veterans of our Nation's wars accomplished the following:

Increased the lump sum readjustment payments to members of Reserve components involuntarily released from active duty.

Equalized per diem travel rates of servicemen with those of Federal career employees.

Permitted members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, and grants.

Authorized Veterans' Administration hospital and medical care for peacetime veterans with noncompensable service-connected disabilities.

Extended the period of vocational rehabilitation for blinded veterans until 1975.

Permitted for 1 year the granting of National Service Life Insurance to veterans with service-connected disabilities. This bill originally provided the opportunity to all veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict—a provision which I have long supported. Unfortunately, the law as enacted provides the opportunity only to veterans with service-connected disabilities.

Other legislation adopted provides an increase in the rates of compensation for service-connected disability payments to almost 2 million veterans; increases the basic allowance for living quarters for members of the Armed Forces, and increases compensation for blinded veterans.

THE PROGRAM AHEAD

There is still a great deal that needs to be done. Some of the bills that will be considered in the 88th Congress are as follows:

Voting rights: One of the most important measures will be a bill to prohibit the use of literacy or other tests as a stratagem to deny voting rights to some of our citizens. This important bill narrowly missed passage in the Senate this session and heads the list of civil rights proposals to be brought up during the next Congress.

Urban affairs: An important plan, which was rejected by a Republican-Southern Democrat coalition, will certainly be brought up again in the next Congress. This is the President's reorganization plan creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

It is my view that the Supreme Court decision requiring reappointment in the States to give adequate and fair representation to urban areas will insure the election of many new Members of Congress committed to this proposal, as well as much other liberal and progressive legislation.

Medicare: Medical care for the aged—the King-Anderson bill—will certainly receive top priority in the next Congress. It is my conviction that the American people will endorse that program at the polls in November by reelecting Members who support this program and by defeating those who oppose it. This legislation will be enacted in the next Congress because it is a program which is wanted and needed.

Many elderly citizens cannot afford and do not receive the health care they need. The principal aim of the medicare program is to provide our older citizens with protection against the excessive costs of hospital care—costs which can wipe out the life savings of an aged couple in a very short time.

It is beyond dispute that the greatest single threat to the economic security of older people is the unpredictable cost of illness. In 1946 the average hospitalization care cost per day was $9.39; in 1961 the cost had risen to $34.98 per day. People 65 and over have health care costs twice as high as those of younger people, yet their annual income averages only half as large. Only about half of these same people, 65 and over, have hospitalization insurance, and many of the policies offered to older persons provide only limited benefits under restricted conditions and at excessively high rates.

The Kerr-Mills law, which was adopted in 1960, provides medical assistance to those who can prove that they are poverty-stricken. We must now adopt the King-Anderson bill which would provide the same assistance to those who need it without forcing them to sacrifice everything they possess, including human dignity.

The charge that the medicare program is socialized medicine is ridiculous. It is simply a national program to help older people prepay hospitalization and related health care bills. It is not a means of providing these health services.

Nothing in the bill would in any way change the existing practice of hospitals which requires that patients be admitted only on the order of a physician. There would be no interference with the doctor-patient relationship. Every patient would be free to choose, just as he does now, his doctor, hospital, or nursing home.

Mass transportation: A vital program to those who live in urban areas, to be taken up next session, is a bill which I had the privilege of sponsoring—the Urban Mass Transportation Act. This administration proposal would authorize Federal grants to meet part of the cost of providing improved mass transit, both public and private, in urban areas. Under the bill, which I reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee on July 3, 1962, a total of $500 million, spread over 3 years will be appropriated for Federal grants for mass transportation facilities and equipment. The Federal grants will not exceed two-thirds of those project costs which cannot be financed by revenues. The remaining one-third must be contributed in cash by the community. This is an extremely important piece of legislation which will benefit the city of New York as well as every other urban area in our Nation. Because of the backlog of work in the Senate, it was necessary to postpone final action until next year.

Youth Employment Opportunities Act: This bill provides for a Youth Conservation Corps. A corps of 12,000 is envisaged in each of the first 3 years to be composed of young men between the ages of 16 and 22. This proposal will undoubtedly be considered in conjunction with any "Domestic Peace Corps" plan that the President may send to the Congress. It is now under consideration by a special executive committee.

Medical school construction: The proposed Health Professions Educational Assistance Act provides a 10-year program of grants for the construction of medical, dental, and public health teaching facilities. It authorizes new facilities for doctors, dentists, and public health personnel and for the rehabilitation of existing facilities.

College Academic Facilities Act: The College Academic Facilities Act will provide matching grants for 5 years for improvement and extension of badly needed college facilities.

Aid to elementary and secondary schools: A general aid to education bill providing for the construction of facilities for public elementary and secondary schools is still on the agenda and will certainly come up again early in the next session. What form it will take cannot now be predicted, but it is hoped that the controversy created this year by those who see this proposal as a church-state issue instead of an educational issue will be avoided next year. Whether teachers' salaries will be included in the bill is another issue the outcome of which cannot be predicted at this time. These issues must be resolved soon so that we can move forward and get on with the job of providing adequate educational facilities for all of our students in the shortest possible time.

MY RENOMINATION

I was indeed gratified that the members of my party in the 13th Congressional District in Brooklyn saw fit to nominate me to a ninth term in the House by an overwhelming vote. I appreciate the honor and more especially their approval of my record. If I am elected, I hope to justify their confidence by continuing to work for the enactment of those programs which are in the best interests of all of the citizens of our country.

COMMITTEES

During this session I continued to serve on the House Committees on Banking and Currency, Small Business, District of Columbia, and the Joint Committee on Defense Production, as a member of the Democratic study group and as zone Democratic whip.

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

A Member of the House of Representatives serves in that body at the discretion of his constituents. In addition to his legislative responsibilities, his duty to them requires him to assist them with whatever problems they may have relating to the Federal Government. As the elected Representative of all the people of my district, whatever their political affiliation, I have urged them to share their views with me and to bring to my attention those problems with which I can assist them by writing to me at my office in Washington: 1305 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

CONCLUSION

Our country today is better off than when this Congress met and this new administration took office. Our economy is the soundest in the world. Business is good. Employment is higher; unemployment is lower. Spendable income and savings have never been higher. But we will not rest on our oars. Things can be better. Unemployment must be further reduced. Working and living conditions can be improved. This can be a more peaceful world. With God's help, we will move forward.

PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because just about every Member on my side of the aisle and on the other side has been inquiring as to what the program would be for tomorrow and what we might expect for next week.

Before I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma—and I shall be glad to yield to him—I want to make a statement.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that many of us had earnestly hoped that while an adjournment sine die would have been very late tomorrow night, to have to stay on here next week is going to make it very difficult for many Members.

I do not think it has to do particularly with political advantage one way or the other, but I feel that the people of this country who elect Members of Congress to come down here to represent them ought to be given some fair opportunity to see the candidates, to hear the candidates, and to find out what they stand for, what they are for and what they are against.

I must say that the prolongation of this session of Congress to the point that we do not adjourn until the latter part of next week will leave us only about 3 weeks before the election. I say that certainly is, in my opinion, not conducive to the best interests of the country.

Having said as much as I care to say on the subject, because we are all interested, can the majority leader tell us what to expect tomorrow and as much as he can on what to expect next week? We will appreciate it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, of course, I share the disappointment of the gentleman that we will not be able to adjourn tomorrow. We had hoped that we would be able to do so. But I think the American people will salute the Members of Congress who have remained here in spite of campaigns and personal difficulties and political problems to finish the business of the Congress in this session.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has advised he will call up the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill.

On Monday there will be no legislative business.

Following Monday there will be various conference reports which will be brought to the floor as they are ready for floor consideration.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman know of any new legislation that is in the offing that possibly might be brought up next week?

Mr. ALBERT. I know of no new legislation, and certainly there is no new major legislation I know anything about. There may be unanimous-consent requests. But I am sure if there is any major legislative business initially brought to the floor next week, it will be under unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HALLECK. One word further. I understand that there are at least two more conference reports on appropriation bills that could be called up tomorrow. Can the majority leader give us any information as to why they cannot be called tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. We are programing the conference reports which the Committee on Appropriations has advised us it is ready to submit to the floor.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it the gentleman refers to the program for Tuesday. Do I understand there will be no record votes on Monday next?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct, there will be no legislative business on Monday. Monday is a religious holiday.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to when we might expect this session to adjourn?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman asked me that question last week, and I said I was optimistic about this week.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman did.

Mr. ALBERT. If I repeated that statement, the gentleman might have reason to wonder if I am playing a phonograph record; but, at the risk of having the gentleman think that, I will say I am optimistic about adjournment next week, but I could not make a commitment to the gentleman because I am not in a position to do so.

Mr. GROSS. The distinguished majority leader in the other body is on record, according to the United Press, as saying the session may last anywhere from next Tuesday to the following Saturday and beyond.

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot speak for the majority leader of the other body.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to make one further observation. A few people are getting around the country doing some campaigning, and I do not object to that particularly. All I hope is that some of us will get a chance to go back home before the snow flies and get to the point where we can make plans for Thanksgiving.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman does pretty well all year around.

AGRICULTURAL SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE CONGRATULATORY SPEECH

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I have always considered it a great honor to serve here in the Congress as a Representative of the people of the First Congressional District in Idaho and in so doing, serve our Nation in some small way, but I would like to call attention to a group of men back in the State who are serving the people in a much greater way. The men I am talking about are the community and county ASCS farmer-elected committeemen in each of the counties in the Gem State that administer and carry out our farm programs on the county level.

These ASCS farmer-committeemen, who are elected at the county level are men who have earned the respect and confidence of their fellow farmers, neighbors and businessmen.

They have a civic responsibility which they are anxious to fulfill, not only for the benefit of agriculture in general but because of the overall and longtime dedication to the welfare of our Nation and the American way of life.

We talk about the farm problem—and too often that is all we do about it. These are the men who must come up with the solutions as to what to do about them, and these men in Idaho have done more than come up with mere paper solutions, because all over the Gem State there is concrete evidence of their practical accomplishments. They are not reluctant to come to grips with these problems and it is here that these problems are solved. These are the men who must face the farmer who is unhappy; these are the men who must explain our oftentimes complicated farm programs to the farmer so that he might take advantage of them; these are the men who have the responsibility, in my opinion, of preserving our national economy through their efforts to maintain our agricultural economy. It is these men I want to salute today and thank them for their efforts in the past which have resulted in the greatest agriculture in the world. It could not have happened without them and it will not continue without them.

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 I introduced H.R. 11479, a bill to eliminate racial and religious discrimination in housing in the District of Columbia. At that time I pointed out that the testimony before the housing hearings of the Civil Rights Commission proved that within a stone's throw from the seat of our Government, Americans are being denied the opportunity to live in decent housing because of their race.

I am happy to report that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are now considering issuing an ordinance prohibiting racial and religious discrimination in housing in Washington. There is no question that such an ordinance should be issued.

This city is the Capital of the Nation, and it is intolerable that discrimination should exist here. Because of discrimination, there are in Washington some of the Nation's worst slums, and these slums are growing. In those concentrated areas of despairing humanity there is a high crime rate, and many other social maladies, for which we pay an exorbitant price in money as well as in human welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the practice of discrimination in housing in our Capital has affronted and afflicted the diplomatic representatives of half the nations of the earth. They are daily confronted with insults because of the color of their skin and thus with the blatant contradiction between our democratic assertions and the nefarious practice of racial discrimination.

The dollars we pour out in aid are poured out in vain as long as we allow the representatives of those countries we aid to be treated as inferior.

The eyes of the world are upon us. The world knows about the insane fury of bigotry in Mississippi. The administration has taken firm steps to control that bigotry. Let us control it in the Capital of the Nation as well. We must act in accordance with the principles we have proclaimed to the world. These principles must be upheld in the Capital of the United States.

I call upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to immediately issue the ordinance prohibiting discrimination in housing.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for many years editorial columnist Lawrence A. Collins, Sr., of the Long Beach Independent Press Telegram has been a close student of the problem of medical care for elderly Americans. His interest in this subject was current long before the problem became one of general national attention. Based on long study and the accumulation of large quantities of hard to come by statistics, Mr. Collins suggested a carefully worked out solution to the problem in two of his recent columns. The plan calls for individuals paying an amount up to the first 5 percent of their annual income for their medical expenses, thereafter for payment of 80 percent of the balance thereof from general government revenues, with the proviso that in no case would an individual pay more than 10 percent of income for complete medical care in any one year.

The full details of the Collins' plan which deserves careful study by all who are truly interested in a fair solution to this pressing problem are contained in the following columns appearing in the Independent Press Telegram September 30 and October 1:

DEDUCTIBLE MEDICAL PLAN FOR THE AGED

(By Lawrence A. Collins, Sr.)

Four arguments in opposition to the President's medicare bill were (1) that it would cover many people who could afford to pay their own bills, (2) that it was a first step toward socialized medicine, (3) that the measure provided for only a minority of medical expenses for the aged, and (4) that most of these people are already covered by medical insurance.

We believe the first three are valid arguments. But, regarding the medical insurance coverage for those 65 or older, we disagree. It is true many of them have medical insurance. But the coverage is inadequate and the cost is prohibitive for the great majority of the older citizens. One policy widely advertised for the aged by some of our largest insurance companies costs the individual $78 a year. It provides a maximum of $10 a day for 31 days hospital—a maximum of $200 for surgery and $100 for miscellaneous in-hospital expenses.

The wider medical coverage of group plans for younger people is denied all but a few of those who are retired and over age 65. But many of them believe they have insurance programs that provide much greater protection than is the actual coverage of the policies. The costs of adequate coverage are far above the ability of 75 percent of the older people to pay.

It is first necessary to understand what is the ability to pay. The most comprehensive statistics we have seen are in the recent 186-page study by Blue Cross in its "Financing Health Care for the Aged." This organization covers more people with medical insurance than any other private agency. It must be assumed its statistics are conservative—if anything, favoring the ability of the people to pay for insurance—or directly pay their medical bills. It is therefore revealing to see how small are the annual incomes of individuals aged 65 or older.

Here are statistics in the study taken from the Bureau of Census 1960 for all persons aged 65 or older:

[In percent'

	Male	Female	Average
Less than $1,000	27.1	73.9	52.7
$1,000 to $1,999	32.0	16.8	23.9
$2,000 to $2,999	17.3	4,5	10,2
$3,000 to $5,000	11.8	3.4	7.2
$5,000 and over	11.8	1.7	6.3

This would indicate that 75 percent of all aged as individuals have less than $2,000 a year income. Only 6.3 percent on the average have more than $5,000 a year. The statistics also show that net assets for spending units (a man and wife or with children with the head aged 65 or over) as 20 percent less than $1,000, 15 percent from $1,000 to $5,000, 22 percent from $5,000 to $10,000, 43 percent over $10,000.

These assets include home ownership and other salable assets of the families whose head is 65 years or older. Where the man and wife are both age 65 or older the individual assets would be half of the above.

The Blue Cross study estimates the annual total medical cost for all people aged 65 or older averages $177 a year per individual. This cost is broken down as follows:

Physician service, $55, equals 31 percent of total.

Hospital care, $49, equals 28 percent of total.

Medicines, $42, equals 23 percent of total.

Dental care, $10, equals 6 percent of total.

Other medical costs, $21, equals 12 percent of total.

The above statistics, we believe, give a fair understanding of the ability of persons over 65 years of age to pay their medical bills. On the average, more than half can pay the average cost out of income. But, when faced with above normal or catastrophic medical costs, they are faced with liquidating their meager savings or be in debt for the rest of their lives. It is for the above average medical costs the older people need protection.

The Kennedy medicare plan for the aged, according to his estimates, would cost $1,100 million in the first year. Insurance actuaries estimate the cost to be at least double this amount. This cost was to cover only hospital costs for 90 days after $10 a day for the first 9 days to be paid by the patient. It also provided for nursing home and house visits of nurses. It provided nothing for the family physician, surgery, medicines, or miscellaneous other costs in or out of hospitals. It is estimated this medicare program would have provided no more than one-third of the average medical costs for all those over age 65. (Blue Cross study shows average annual total medical cost for age 65 and over individuals as $177. Multiplied by 17 million in that category would total $3,000 million—thus the President's estimate of $1,100 million is about one-third of total costs.)

By comparison, a total coverage of medical costs for the aged based upon their paying the first part of their total bills up to 5 percent of their total income and 20 percent of the amount above that deduction—would give protection against catastrophic medical and hospital bills—at a cost to Government of considerably less than the President's King-Anderson bill. It would call for the individuals to pay the amount of their bills they are capable of paying without undue hardships. It would cause them to be more watchful of their medical costs and use of hospital facilities. It would be an added safeguard against doctor and patient collusion.

The Blue Cross study indicates that about half of the 17 million aged are now in the less than $1,000-a-year income category and are now eligible for medical care. This would be under the Kerr-Mills, old-age assistance, veterans, and other State and local programs. Under the Kerr-Mills coverage, for example, California has $80 million budgeted, of which the Federal Government provides half. On a national basis this will total about $1,000 million. But there is little or no coverage for the other half of the aged with incomes above $1,000 a year.

The plan suggested here would provide that coverage on the basis of ability to pay for these 8,500,000 individuals over age 65. The basis of the plan is that the individual pays the first 5 percent of annual income for all medical costs in a year and that the plan would pay 80 percent of the balance.

Under this deductible plan this group would pay a substantial part of the total cost. But it would protect them against catastrophic illnesses and accidents where the total costs would impoverish them. Those with normal medical costs would not be affected. They would only present bills for payment when they totaled more than 5 percent of their annual income.

This, we believe, is what the great majority of the older people want. Some expect all their bills to be paid, regardless of where the money comes from. But the great majority want protection only from the catastrophic costs they cannot pay. In Monday's Independent and Press-Telegram column we will present statistics to show how this cost would be handled and why it would be the least costly to Government and greatest protection yet offered in a plan for the aged. To our readers who are interested we suggest they clip this column to compare with the one that follows.—L.A.C.

DEDUCTIBLE MEDICAL PLAN FOR THE AGED

(By Lawrence A. Collins, Sr.)

In our Sunday column we outlined a plan for an overall medical program for the aged based on their paying the first 5 percent of annual income for their total medical bills. Thereafter, this plan would provide for payment of 80 percent of the balance—with the provision that in no case would the individual pay more than 10 percent of income for complete medical care in any one year.

Based on a Blue Cross study "Financing Health Care for the Aged" we find 52 percent of all individuals 65 or over have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. The average per person for all medical costs for this group is $177 a year. Half of the 17 million aged are now eligible for medical care under the Kerr-Mills, old-age assistance, veteran and other Government programs., Therefore, these statistics are for the other half who have more than $1,000 a year income. The costs for this 8.5 million aged would, therefore, be 8,500,000 times $177 or an annual total cost of $1.500 million a year.

These costs under this proposed plan would be covered as follows on the 5 percent deductible basis:

Fifty percent of 8,500,000 with incomes of $1,000 to $1,999 a year would pay an average of $75 a year as first costs, or for 4,250,000 at $75—total payment, $318,750,000.

Twenty percent of 8,500,000 with incomes of $2,000 to $3,000 a year would pay an average of $125 each for these 1,700,000 persons, or a total of $212,500,000.

Fifteen percent of 8,500,000 with incomes of $3,000 to $5,000 a year, or 1,275,000 individuals would pay an average of $200 medical bills, or $255 million.

Another 15 percent or 1,275,000 individuals in the above $5,000-a-year income would pay an estimated average of $400 a year before being covered. It is doubtful this group would take advantage of the plan. It may be assumed, therefore, the average cost of medical care of $177 a person used in this survey would be saved by the program. Therefore, we use for this purpose: 1,275,000 × $177 = $225,675,000.

Estimate of amount that would be paid by aged individuals with incomes above $1,000 a year on the 5 percent deductible basis, $1,011,975,000.

Deducted from total estimated cost of $1,500 million would leave a deficit of $488,075,000 of which 20 percent would be paid by the individual, or $97,615,000; leaving to be covered by Government, $390,460,000.

The cost to the Government would not be greatly increased if the plan provided that in cases where medical bills totaled more than 10 percent of the individual's income in any year, that would be the maximum to be paid by the individual. This would be protection for those where the 20 percent payment after the 5 percent deductible ran into very large amounts. These would be the catastrophic cases that can impoverish the older people. But it would provide that they pay the part of their bills they can afford to pay without having to go into debt or liquidate such assets as they may have.

The plan as presented should be a Federal and State plan. The Kerr-Mills plan endorsed by the doctors is such a plan. But it takes care only of those aged who are classed as indigents. It does not protect the more fortunate of the aged who have larger incomes. But when it is considered 75 percent of all individuals 65 or over have less than $2,000 a year income—or $4,000 for a couple—it is evident they cannot pay catastrophic medical bills. Only 6 percent of such individuals have $5,000 or more a year income.

If such a plan was adopted with the Federal Government contributing half the cost and the State the other half, the cost to California would be an estimated $25 million a year—a minute portion of the $2,885 million State budget. It is probable a portion of this $25 million could be saved by adapting the plan to the present medical aid to the aged now in effect in the State. By the State-Federal combination each State's needs could be supplied in accordance with the conditions prevailing in the respective States.

It would be necessary for the Government payments to be made on a fee schedule. Such a schedule could be based on the average charges for the different categories of hospital, dental, medicines, physician and surgery prevailing in the respective States. Such fee schedules are now in effect in policies of most insural plans.

It would also be desirable that the Government payments be made direct to the patient who, in turn, would pay the doctor. This would make the patient more cognizant of what his bills amounted to and also maintain the doctor-patient relationship which is largely lost where the Government pays the bills direct. If it is argued this may mean some bills would not be paid to the doctor—the answer would be the same condition now exists concerning those that would be covered under the plan. It is probable the doctors would prefer such a system.

It would be entirely voluntary. The older person would deal with the medical care agency only after he had accumulated in 1 year bills large enough to make him eligible for payment of bills. He would then give evidence of medical bills and his income. Agencies for handling such cases are already in effect for other programs for medical care for the aged.

In closing, we can only say we have made this effort only because we believe some such plan is the only alternative to socialized medicine. We believe the older people would accept such a plan as a real protection from catastrophic medical bills. It does not satisfy those who feel Government should pay all their bills. Neither does it satisfy those who are opposed to any governmental assistance to the aged.

To those who question the statistics, or the plan's feasibility, we can only say we have confidence in the statistics in the 186-page Blue Cross study. We are dedicated to the principle that those of our population who have reached the end of their earning years should be protected from medical costs they cannot afford. Furthermore, we believe in the principle that all people should do for themselves all those things they can do—and only then should Government be called upon for assistance. In this plan, we believe these principles can be achieved.—L.A.C.

TOLL TRAPS AND THE EFFECT OF TOLL ROADS ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM—THOROUGH CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION NEEDED

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been deeply concerned about the extent to which "toll traps" have been and are being inserted into the national system of interstate and defense highways. This not only violates the concept of a toll-free Federal-aid highway system; it makes the road users pay twice—gas taxes and tolls. It also adversely influences the planning and construction of needed highway improvement since highway officials try to avoid building highways which would compete with toll facilities.

In our own State of Florida the State road department has inserted a 44-mile section of toll road into Interstate Route 95, between Miami and Jacksonville, and at one time proposed to insert a 77-mile section of toll road into Interstate Route 75 which serves the Tampa-St. Petersburg area. The proposal was finally abandoned, after I exposed it to public scrutiny last year in hearings before the Highway Investigation Subcommittee. However, it is obvious that the paternalistic attitude of the Florida State Road Department toward the Sunshine State Parkway, a toll facility, is delaying and perhaps preventing badly needed highway improvements including an interstate highway serving Cape Canaveral. In a letter made public in connection with the issuance of toll revenue bonds, the chairman of the Florida State Road Department solemnly affirmed the policy of the department to construct and improve all roads in the State of Florida, but then added this amazing qualification:

> * * * except when the construction of any competing highway, or the improvement of any existing highway paralleling any portion of the existing parkway or of the aforesaid extension, in the same traffic corridor, would reduce the driving time or improve the convenience to such an extent that through traffic which might otherwise use the parkway or the aforesaid extension would be substantially diverted therefrom.

The extent to which this "exception" has become the tail that wags the dog is shown by the pattern of scheduled Federal-aid highway projects on highways which might be expected to divert traffic from the Sunshine State Parkway or its proposed extension.

On U.S. 27, Federal-aid highway projects are approved, authorized or underway at only two locations: the Miami area and adjacent to Lake Okeechobee. The State has informed the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads that it intends to proceed with another project on U.S. 27 near Frostproof but this has not yet been approved by the Bureau.

On State Route 50, between Cocoa and Orlando, a single project for construction on 6.4 miles is underway.

On U.S. 1, between Fort Pierce and the Georgia State line, Federal-aid projects are authorized or underway at only three locations: Titusville, Melbourne, and Vero Beach.

On Interstate Route 95 between Fort Pierce and Daytona Beach, critically important from the standpoint of national defense, Federal-aid projects are authorized or underway on only 57.3 miles of the 132-mile distance. These projects are only for preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition. And the projects are not consecutive, but cover unconnected segments of 21.7, 10.3, and 25.3 miles, leaving gaps of 15 miles between Melbourne and Cocoa, and 26 miles between Titusville and New Smyrna Beach.

These gaps are immediately north and south of Cape Canaveral which, as you know, is the primary site for our space exploration program and for the improvement of which the Federal Government is expending millions of dollars. In view of the fact that National System of Interstate and Defense Highways was sold to the American public because of its essential defense aspects, it is inexcusable that gaps should be left in the highway route which serves the most critically important site in our defense system.

According to the Bureau of Public Roads, as of this September no Federal-aid projects were even programed for the improvement of other highways which could be used as free alternates to the Sunshine State Parkway, such as State Route 710 from West Palm Beach to Okeechobee and U.S. 441 to Orlando, or U.S. 192, and State Route 60 which carry traffic from U.S. 1 toward the interior of the State.

It is obvious that the chairman of the Florida State Road Department meant exactly what he said—the State road department is carrying out its policy of not improving roads to reduce the driving time or improve the convenience to such an extent that through traffic which might otherwise use the toll road or the extension thereof would be substantially diverted therefrom. My charges that this would be the result, made some months ago, were met with cries of "false" and "foul" by the State. Now, the facts prove me correct. No competing highway serving Miami is being planned, but the opposite is true. Any alternative routes to southeast Florida are being stalled and disjointed.

Another example of the way in which the sensible development of our highway systems is being adversely affected by the paternalistic toll road is found in West Virginia. Last year, the State of West Virginia was granted an additional highway route out of the severely limited mileage remaining in the 41,000 miles authorized by Congress. The icing on this particular cake was the manner in which existing interstate routes were revised and the new route placed on a location different from that originally requested by the State, all with the obvious objective of funneling the theoretically toll-free interstate system routes into a toll road, the West Virginia Turnpike. The effect of this action is as follows:

First. Revision of Interstate Route 64 in West Virginia increases interstate travel from 96 miles to 116 miles, and inserts a 54-mile toll section into a previously toll-free route.

Second. Routing of interstate Route 79 through Charleston, W. Va., instead of Beckley increases travel from about 246 miles, 32 miles of which would be over toll facilities, to 269 miles, 86 miles of which will be over toll facilities.

Third. These combined actions result in funneling three interstate routes—I-64, I-77, and I-79—into a single highway—a two-lane toll road—which does not meet interstate standards. No arrangements have been made for financing necessary improvement of the toll road.

Fourth. By utilizing the toll road as a part of the Interstate System, the mileage of new free highways to be constructed is reduced by about 65 miles. At an estimated cost of $1,264,000 per mile, with the Federal share being $1,137,600 this would indicate a saving to the Highway Trust Fund, and a loss to West Virginia, of approximately $73,944,000.

This is a deplorable situation which is not limited to Florida and West Virginia, but exists nationwide. More than a year ago, I introduced a bill—H.R. 6324—to require congressional approval for the inclusion of toll roads, bridges and tunnels as a part of the Interstate Highway System. Hearings were held on this bill, but no further action was taken. However, there are encouraging indications that something may yet be done. In a recent letter putting forth the views of the Department of Commerce with respect to House Joint Resolution 555, it was stated:

> Consideration by the Department of Commerce of both House Joint Resolution 555 and H.R. 9376 has led to the belief that the general situation relating to highway toll facilities and the applicable provisions of Federal law indicates the desirability of further study by the Congress and possible revision of such provisions of law.

The highway users are becoming more and more concerned about this situation. Many individuals and groups, including the American Automobile Association, feel that in view of the heavy taxes imposed upon the highway users by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, the motoring public is entitled to a system of toll-free highways—at least those highways on the Interstate System constructed after the 1956 act. It is not keeping faith with the public to impose heavy taxes for the construction of highways which, under the Federal law, are supposed to be free of tolls of all kinds, and then permit the insertion of toll traps at strategic points.

As I mentioned earlier, I introduced a bill on this subject more than a year ago. In my opinion, the time has come when we should and must take action. A careful and searching congressional review of this problem is long overdue. Under these circumstances, I feel that the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives should undertake a detailed investigation of the entire subject of toll facilities on the routes of the Federal-aid highway system. As a member of that committee, I intend to press vigorously for such an investigation.

For my colleagues' further information, I submit the following on the subject of the interstate highway locations in West Virginia:

In October of 1961, approval was given to a new interstate highway route and the revision of an existing route in West Virginia. Serious questions are now being raised by citizens of West Virginia and others as to whether the proposed locations of the new and revised route are desirable, economical, or in compliance with the terms and intent of Federal law.

It has been charged, among other things, that:

First. Interstate highways in the State are being routed, unnecessarily and possibly illegally, through toll traps;

Second. Construction of interstate highways along the presently approved locations may not be in compliance with statutory requirements, including those relating to traffic service, geometric and construction standards, national defense, and so forth;

Third. The locations of interstate routes in West Virginia were chosen with a view toward improving the financial condition of the West Virginia Turnpike, rather than providing the best traffic service.

Fourth. Abandonment of previously selected locations will result in waste of substantial sums of money already spent for surveys, and so forth, on such locations.

While no doubt there are considerations on both sides of the question, there is much to support these charges.

APPROVED INTERSTATE ROUTES IN WEST VIRGINIA

At the present time there are four approved interstate highway routes traversing West Virginia. Two of these—I-64 and I-70—run east and west, while the other two—I-77 and I-79—run north and south.

The east-west routes were approved in August 1947. I-64 ran from the Ohio-West Virginia State line near Huntington, W. Va. to Charleston, thence in a southeasterly direction to the Virginia State line near White Sulphur Springs. I-70 crossed the West Virginia panhandle at Wheeling.

On October 18, 1957, the Secretary of Commerce announced the addition of 2,102 miles of new routes to the Interstate System. These included I-77, a north-south route from Canton, Ohio, to Charlotte, N.C. This route crossed the West Virginia State line near Parkersburg and ran southerly to Charleston, thence along the West Virginia Turnpike to Princeton, and easterly to the Virginia-West Virginia State line.

By letter dated December 10, 1957, West Virginia requested additional Interstate mileage for a route extending from the Pennsylvania-West Virginia State line near Morgantown, W. Va., southerly to a connection with I-77 near Beckley. No action was taken on this request.

By telegram dated October 9, 1961, West Virginia formally requested readjustment of interstate mileage within the State by first, revising I-64 between Charleston and the Virginia State line to route it via Beckley, Lewisburg, and White Sulphur Springs, and second, providing a northerly interstate route connection between Charleston and the Pennsylvania State line near Morgantown.

By telegram dated October 18, 1961, the Bureau of Public Roads advised that the State's request of October 9 had been approved. The requested northerly connection constitutes an extension of I-79, which runs from Washington, Pa., across Pennsylvania to Erie.

INTERSTATE ROUTES INVOLVED

The questions presented relate specifically to I-79 and the portion of I-64 between Charleston and White Sulphur Springs. The questions may be briefly stated as follows:

First. Was it proper to revise I-64 to route it from White Sulphur Springs to Beckley and thence to Charleston via the West Virginia Turnpike, instead of its original, more direct route which did not follow the turnpike?

Second. Was it proper to route I-79 to a connection with I-77 at Charleston, rather than at Beckley, as was originally requested in 1957?

INTERSTATE ROUTE 64

As originally approved in 1947, this route extended in a fairly direct line from Huntington to Charleston to White Sulphur Springs. The portion of the route between Charleston and White Sulphur Springs was approximately 96 miles in length, and was to be a completely toll-free highway, constructed with 90 percent Federal funds.

Under the 1961 revision, I-64 was routed from Charleston to Beckley via the West Virginia Turnpike, thence easterly to the Virginia State line near White Sulphur Springs. The length of this routing is approximately 116 miles, with about 62 miles to be toll free, and 54 miles along the West Virginia Turnpike—a toll road.

It has been stated that abandonment of the original location results in the waste of some $670,000 previously spent on surveys, engineering studies, and so forth. The Bureau of Public Roads advises that Federal aid projects totaling $500,000 have been approved for surveys, engineering studies, and so forth, on the original location, and that some $413,000 Federal funds have actually been paid to the State on these projects.

From the standpoint of Federal financing, this revision means that the highway trust fund will bear the cost of constructing only 62 miles instead of 96—a difference of 34 miles. The estimated average cost per mile of constructing previously designated interstate highways in West Virginia is $1,264,000, with the Federal share being 90 percent, or

$1,137,600. This would indicate a saving to the trust fund of approximately $38,678,400 because of the revised routing of I-64.

From the standpoint of traffic service the revision means that motorists using I-64 between Charleston and the Virginia State line will have to travel 116 miles instead of 96—an increase in mileage of 20 miles, or about 20 percent. In addition, traffic using I-64 will have to pay tolls on approximately 54 miles of the West Virginia Turnpike instead of having a completely toll-free route.

INTERSTATE ROUTE 79

As originally requested by the State in December 1957, this route would have extended from the Pennsylvania State line near Morgantown, W. Va., to a connection with I-77 at Beckley—a distance of approximately 203 miles. The route of I-77 south from Beckley to the Virginia State line, a distance of approximately 43 miles, includes about 32 miles of the West Virginia Turnpike. Thus, the total interstate mileage between the Pennsylvania State line and the Virginia State line along this route would be about 246 miles, of which about 32 miles would be over a toll facility.

The route of I-79 as requested by the State on October 9, 1961 and approved on October 18, 1961, runs from the Pennsylvania State line near Morgantown, W. Va., to a connection with I-77 at Charleston—a distance of approximately 172 miles. The route of I-77 south from Charleston to the Virginia State line, a distance of approximately 97 miles, includes the entire 86 miles of the West Virginia Turnpike.

Thus, the total interstate mileage between the Pennsylvania State line and the Virginia State line along this approved route is about 269 miles, of which about 86 miles are over a toll facility.

From the standpoint of Federal financing, the approval of the route to Charleston, rather than Beckley as originally requested, means that the highway trust fund will bear the cost of constructing only 172 miles instead of 203 miles—a difference of 31 miles. At an estimated average cost per mile of $1,264,000—Federal share $1,137,600—this would indicate a saving to the trust fund of approximately $35,265,000.

From the standpoint of traffic service, the approval of the route to Charleston, rather than Beckley means that traffic using the route from the Pennsylvania State line to the Virginia State line near Princeton, W. Va., will travel 269 miles instead of 246 miles—an increase of 23 miles or nearly 10 percent. In addition, such traffic will have to pay tolls on the full length of the West Virginia Turnpike—about 86 miles—instead of approximately 32 miles.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SERVICE TO CHARLESTON, W. VA.

Approval of the revision of I-64 between Charleston and the Virginia State line near White Sulphur Springs does not provide better traffic service to Charleston. On the contrary, the revision lengthens the route by about 20 miles—or 20 percent—and inserts a toll section of about 54 miles into a previously toll-free route.

Approval of the extension of I-79 from Washington, Pa., through Morgantown, W. Va., to Charleston, instead of Morgantown to Beckley, does not appreciably improve traffic service to Charleston. In fact, I-79 duplicates traffic service provided Charleston by other interstate routes. Previously designated Interstate Routes 77, 70, and 79 connect Charleston with Washington, Pa., as well as Pittsburgh, Erie, and Cleveland, Ohio, and the estimated travel distance between these places and Charleston is only 7 miles longer by previously designated routes than by the newly approved route.

WEST VIRGINIA TURNPIKE

The most striking thing about the present location of interstate highways in West Virginia is the extent to which traffic is funneled into the West Virginia Turnpike. Except for Interstate Route 70, which simply crosses West Virginia's "panhandle" at Wheeling, all of the interstate highways traversing the State lead into the West Virginia Turnpike. Three interstate highways—I-64, I-77 and I-79—converge into the turnpike from the north and west. For a distance of at least 54 miles, the turnpike carries the traffic of three interstate highways. Interstate highway traffic between Charleston and points south of West Virginia must use the full 86-mile length of the West Virginia Turnpike.

The West Virginia Turnpike is a two-lane toll highway constructed about 1954 from the proceeds of bonds issued in 1952. At last reports the highway was in poor condition, although numerous holes, cracks, and bumps may have been repaired by this time. The financial condition of the turnpike is precarious. No bonds have been retired, and interest payments have been consistently delinquent.

The 1961 Interstate System Cost Estimate—House Document No. 49, 87th Congress; see table 3—indicates that the sum of $41,504,000 will be needed to bring the turnpike to interstate standards. It is significant that this estimate was based upon interstate routings in effect in 1960, at which time only Interstate Route 77 followed the turnpike. Since development of this estimate, Interstate Route 79, funneling traffic into the turnpike, has been approved, and Interstate Route 64 has been rerouted to include about 54 miles of the turnpike. This action may necessitate additional lanes, and additional costs.

Federal funds cannot be used for the construction or improvement of toll roads. See sections 129 and 301 of title 23, United States Code. The Federal Highway Administrator has stated that:

> * * * the turnpike is obviously the interstate location between Charleston and Princeton, and certainly no other interstate location in the same corridor would be developed competing with the turnpike.

In view of the precarious financial condition of the turnpike, it is unlikely that the turnpike commission will be able to improve the highway to interstate standards. Apparently no arrangements, tentative or otherwise, have been made for financing the necessary improvement of the highway. West Virginia State Road Commissioner Burl Sawyers has been quoted as saying that:

> With regard to the capacity of the West Virginia Turnpike as an interstate route, it would be our hope that the Congress will take the necessary steps to provide funds for increasing the capacity of the turnpike in the latter phase of the interstate program.

This would not only require a change in the Federal law, but also a departure from the basic concept that all highways constructed with Federal-aid funds shall be free from tolls of all kinds.

In addition to the matter of improving the West Virginia Turnpike to interstate standards, a question exists as to the wisdom of funneling three interstate routes into a single highway. Severance of this highway by natural or other causes would effectively block traffic on the three interstate routes.

SUMMARY

First. Revision of Interstate Route 64 increases interstate travel from 96 miles to 116 miles, and inserts a 54-mile toll section into a previously toll-free route.

Second. Routing of Interstate Route 79 through Charleston, instead of Beckley increases travel from about 246 miles, 32 miles of which would be over toll facilities, to 269 miles, 86 miles of which will be over toll facilities.

Third. These combined actions result in funneling three interstate routes—I-64, I-77, and I-79—into a single highway—a 2-lane toll road—which does not meet interstate standards. No arrangements have been made for financing necessary improvement of the toll road.

Fourth. By utilizing the toll road as a part of the Interstate System, the mileage of new free highways to be constructed is reduced by about 65 miles. At an estimated cost of $1,264,000 per mile, with the Federal share being $1,137,600 this would indicate a saving to the highway trust fund and a loss to West Virginia of approximately $73,944,000.

PERTINENT PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY LAWS

Section 101(b), title 23, United States Code:

> It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highway systems, including the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, since many of such highways, or portions thereof, are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, for the national and civil defense.
>
> It is hereby declared that the prompt and early completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, so named because of its primary importance to the national defense and hereafter referred to as the "Interstate System," is essential to the national interest and is one of the most important objectives of this act. It is the intent of Congress that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over the period of availability of the 13 years' appropriations authorized for the purpose of expediting its construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary tunnels and bridges, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, under section 108(b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374), and that entire system in all States be brought to simultaneous completion. Insofar as possible in consonance with the objectives, existing highways located on

> an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible, it being the intent that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce.

Section 103(d), title 23, United States Code—part:

> The Interstate System shall be designated within the United States, including the District of Columbia, and it shall not exceed 41,000 miles in total extent. It shall be so located as to connect by routes, as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and, to the greatest extent possible, to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

Section 109(b), title 23, United States Code:

> The geometric and construction standards to be adopted for the Interstate System shall be those approved by the Secretary in cooperation with the State highway departments. Such standards shall be adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. The right-of-way widths of the Interstate System shall be adequate to permit construction of projects on the Interstate System up to such standards. The Secretary shall apply such standards uniformly throughout the States.

Section 129(b), title 23, United States Code:

> Upon a finding by the Secretary that such action will promote the development of an integrated Interstate System, the Secretary is authorized to approve as part of the Interstate System any toll road, bridge or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on the Interstate System, when such toll road, bridge or tunnel is located on a route heretofore or hereafter designated as a part of the Interstate System. No Federal-aid highway funds shall be expended for the construction, reconstruction or improvement of any such toll bridge or tunnel, except to the extent permitted by law on or after June 29, 1956.

Section 301, title 23, United States Code:

> Except as provided in section 129 of this title with respect to certain toll bridges and toll tunnels, all highways constructed under the provisions of this title shall be free from tolls of all kinds.

ABUSE OF COPYRIGHT LAWS AND CRIPPLING FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have become increasingly concerned with the abuse of and apparent deficiencies in the U.S. copyright laws as ranking Republican on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents and Copyrights. One of the primary causes of the growing controversy lies in section 8 of the present copyright statute which provides that:

> * * * no copyright shall subsist * * * in any publication of the U.S. Government, or any reprint, in whole or in part, thereof.

The difficulty in establishing a uniform construction of the code is being aggravated and brought to the fore, on one hand, by increasing use of copyright by the Federal Government and its employees, and, on the other hand, by strong objections to such copyright use by an aroused segment of the newspaper and publishing industry.

Certainly, works produced by the Government should be open to the widest possible dissemination. However, in viewing the vast panaroma of Government-produced and Government-financed publications, it becomes evident that the situation is not always either black nor white—public or private. In the many shaded areas, it is difficult to define what is and what is not an official "Government publication."

While the courts have expressed various opinions, the weight of authority has defined "Government publications" as works produced by the Government. As interpreted by the Copyright Office, this means that works produced for the Government by its employees may not be copyrighted regardless of who publishes it. This being the generally accepted construction of the law, I must state that I am at a loss to understand the propriety of copyrighting a number of Government publications prepared by Federal employees which have been published by private commercial concerns. A recent example of this is the copyrighting of an "Official Guide" to the White House which was prepared by the White House Curator and the staff.

It has frequently been argued by those who use or abuse copyrighting that the Government Printing Office is not technically equipped to print certain documents of Government departments and agencies in a satisfactory format. This, in turn, has required the utilization of the services of private commercial publishers who exert the privilege to impose a copyright in order to prevent competitors from photocopying their work and thereby underselling them. Their position, of course, has some merit. And, most assuredly, the public interest demands that the widest possible distribution be given to the work product of Government departments and agencies—particularly in the area of scientific research. But, this does not alter the fact that the present copyright law is being strained, if not openly abused. For this reason, I urge that a most careful investigation be undertaken during the next Congress looking toward strengthening or modifying the copyright laws so that the rights of publishers are fairly balanced against the best interests of the public.

The second, and equally controversial aspect of the copyright laws, involves the numerous issues concerning the relative claims of Federal employees and the Government. Under fire is the current practice, in some Government agencies, of permitting private interests which produce works under a Government contract or grant to secure copyright, with the Government merely retaining a license to publish. A related question in need of authoritative study is the propriety of granting a copyright to an individual on writings which emanate as a byproduct of a federally financed contract.

Perhaps the most vexatious and difficult question to resolve is found in the borderline case which arises when a Government employee, still active in his official capacity, prepares a work on his own time, but draws upon information or experiences related to the performance of his job. Permitting individuals to derive a personal financial gain from activities paid for by all the citizens of this country bears grave ethical and moral implications. The prohibition of such activities may well be warranted.

The present administration has shown distressing inconsistency and vacillation in its position on this issue. Shortly after taking office, the President was reported to have expressed his displeasure at this practice of Government employees selling personal stories about their experiences in Government service. As a matter of fact, a "code of ethics" was issued in the form of an Executive order prohibiting Presidential appointees from receiving payment for articles and speeches. However, in direct contradiction to his own order, the President of the United States has written a book containing a selection of his public statements made both before and after taking office. Entitled, "To Turn the Tide," it states, "Copyright 1962 by John F. Kennedy." After public castigation for this attempt to profit from official statements, the White House, with apparent embarrassment, announced that the copyright was an error and that it would be deleted in future editions. But the Kennedys are not to be denied, it seems. After making an around-the-world tour at taxpayers' expense, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy set forth his experiences in the book, "Just Friends and Brave Enemies." Prefacing the work is the following copyright line:

> Copyright 1962 by Robert F. Kennedy. All rights reserved. The protected parts of this book may not be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews. * * * Public speeches and documents included in the book are in the public domain.

The last sentence is no doubt intended to preclude the difficulties encountered by the President, but, unfortunately, nothing in the book specifically designates those speeches and documents which are includible in the public domain. Anyone seeking to use the "public" portions of the book does so at his own risk. This is just another example indicating that action must be taken to put an end to this practice of allowing high Government officials to copyright and profit from their Government-provided experiences.

The abuse is not confined solely to the higher echelons of this administration because others are being given similar clearance.

Court pronouncements on this subject have been unsatisfactory. A case involving copyrighting of speeches by a Navy atomic energy expert is now before a Federal court. The fundamental issue in this case involves an attempt to establish a workable scheme that will indicate the limits of the right of Government-employee-authors to copyright works created by them. A clear line must be drawn between what is personal and what is official, but the likelihood of a clear-cut and lasting criteria springing from this case is remote. Until this, as well as other misuses of and deficiencies in our copyright laws are given thoughtful consideration and corrected by the administration, the Copyright Office, and the Congress, we will be faced with an evergrowing complex of problems which should be of concern to us all and should receive the attention of Congress.

I have introduced a resolution calling for such an investigation today.

SUMMARY OF THE WORK OF THE U.S. CONGRESS, 1961–62

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, although Congress is actually still in session, I feel it is appropriate at this time to submit a report to my constituents reviewing the activities of the 87th Congress. Of course I will put special emphasis on those activities that were of more or less direct interest to our people, our families, and our communities in eastern Kansas, in what is now the Second Congressional District and what will be the new Third Congressional District.

At the very beginning of this report, your Congressman wants to make it crystal clear than anything he has accomplished for the Nation, for the district, or for individual constituents, has been accomplished by him as the servant of the people of the Second Congressional District—soon to be the Third Congressional District—of the great State of Kansas. He has had the assistance and direct support of literally hundreds of individuals and groups throughout the district, as well as the professional help of what is, without question, the hardest-working and ablest staff in any congressional office in the land.

The touchstone of my service and representation has been a deep, abiding, and informed concern for individual persons. Individuals have feelings, they have pride and dignity, and it is only when their servants, in places of public trust, keep these facts in mind, and govern themselves accordingly, that the people get good government.

In that spirit, I offer the following initial comments on some issues of the day:

Cuba: It has been my feeling, freely expressed, that the Cuban problem has been mishandled. A vein of indecisiveness has run through our Government's approach to this problem, and the American people resent it deeply, and are profoundly frustrated by it.

Cold war: The handling, by the New Frontier, of the whole complex of problems and challenges of the cold war has given rise to a somewhat similar feeling—although not quite so acute—of frustration on the part of the people. The vein of indecisiveness seemingly imbedded in the administration can and must be removed.

Relations with Congress: A significant feature of the past 2 years has been the failure of the administration in its effort to gain support for New Frontier legislation in a Congress dominated and controlled by the same party. The New Frontier versions of Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged, withholding of interest and dividends, mandatory control farm legislation, and many other similar bills, were defeated by a Congress composed of 329 Democrats and only 210 Republicans.

Handling unemployment: The most acute and personal problem of our society—unemployment—has not responded at all well to the ineffective measures so far taken by the administration. The Manpower Development and Training Act, in the preparation of which your Congressman had an important part, and which was passed by Congress many months ago, has not been effectively implemented. I have introduced legislation designed to supplement this law by permitting tax deduction of expenses incurred in acquiring new skills. The upgrading of our workers' skills is evidently the constructive answer to the problem of 6,000 new jobs being created each week as a result of technological advance, while 5,000 workers each week are added to the unemployment rolls of the Nation. Getting the jobless man fitted for the manless job is certainly one of our biggest and most acute challenges for the next few months and years.

Committees: As every Member of Congress knows, our committee work is the backbone of all congressional activity. I have the unique distinction of being the only Member of the Congress to serve on three standing committees of the House: Post Office and Civil Service, Veterans' Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It has been a distinct honor and a high privilege—as well as a great deal of demanding and satisfying work—to have served on these three committees. In addition, I have served on five standing subcommittees and four special subcommittees.

As member of the Republican policy committee's special task force, Operation Employment, I was privileged to present a special study to the House, on the question of ways and means to help strike at the roots of our Nation's persistent unemployment. The work of this special task force was substantially influential in the legislative background of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Keeping in touch: One of the crucial problems of our times is the problem of communication between the people and their representatives in positions of leadership—governmental and otherwise. The scientific and technological revolution is so explosive that no citizen can keep up with important developments in all fields. During my service in the Congress here in our Nation's Capital it has, therefore, been one of my principal purposes to make extraordinary efforts to keep in touch with the people I serve.

To that end, I have sent out a periodic newsletter, with a circulation of about 19,000. I distributed a highly successful questionnaire designed to ascertain the opinions of constituents on pending legislation and other important problems, mailed to 118,000 individual addresses with the intent of reaching every family in the district. I made 25 trips to Kansas, on weekends and during recesses, traveling over 70,000 miles and appearing and speaking in person before over 150,000 persons. In a weekly question-and-answer column, run in most of the newspapers in my district, I attempted to keep my constituents up to date on everything of current interest to them here at the seat of the National Government. I provided all radio stations whose listening areas included any part of my district, with a weekly taped news comment. Our office has provided all news media covering the district with frequent releases on issues before Congress, and other subjects which concern the district.

In addition to all that, I maintain a district congressional office in the Federal Building, in Kansas City, Kans., with two outstanding professional full-time servants of the people of the district—Mr. Richard L. Bond, my executive assistant, and Mrs. LaRue Boyd, my secretary. These two fine congressional staff members have multiplied and extended our service to the people of the district at least a hundredfold, over anything that has ever been provided before, in our congressional district, and I know their service has been warmly received by all our citizens.

Service to the district: Your Congressman and his staff have helped with the problems of more than 1,000 individuals—with the Social Security Administration, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, the Veterans' Administration, the Immigration Service, the Federal Communications Commission, the Bureau of Employees Compensation, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Small Business Administration, the Justice Department, and many other bureaus, departments, and agencies of the Government.

I have initiated numerous special mailing projects, to convey helpful and important information to constituents. This has involved over 14,000 individual items sent out of the congressional offices in Washington and Kansas City.

In addition, I have answered over 6,500 specific requests for information or material about Government activities, programs, and publications.

Your Congressman has participated vigorously in efforts to bring greater job opportunity, job security, better jobs, and more prosperity to our district through industrial, agricultural, and educational development. I have made a concerted effort to call attention nationally to our present and future industrial development potential through speeches and meetings with Government and business officials.

As a direct result of your Congressman's initiative, the Small Business Administration sponsored, together with one of the largest and most active of the Nation's space age contractors, a small business forum in our district to help our businessmen and industrialists get more benefit from space age industrial activity. As a direct result of this forum, more subcontracts will be placed in our area, more and better jobs will be created and preserved, and industrial taxpayers will carry a larger share of local real estate taxes—eveyone in our area will benefit.

Federal impact on local communities: Too often we tend to talk and think of Federal legislative issues in terms of high-flown oratory or phrases that are relatively meaningless to the hard working, conscientious family member. I take this occasion to review my Federal legislative, and other, activities in terms of their impact on local communities.

Douglas County: This, of course, is my own home county, where my family and I maintain our home on route 2, approximately 3 miles south of Lawrence.

Supported and voted for authorization, and planning and construction appropriations, for Clinton Dam and Reservoir on the Wakarusa and Lawrence flood control devices on the Kaw River. Supported and voted for authorization and appropriations to provide funds for schools burdened by Federal activities in Eudora, Lawrence, and Baldwin. Supported and voted for college academic facilities bill of 1962, which, if enacted into law, would provide Federal matching grants for construction of academic facilities at the University of Kansas in Lawrence and Baker University at Baldwin.

Worked and voted for the Housing Act of 1961, and appropriations authorized therein, under which the Housing and Home Finance Agency has made college housing loans to the University of Kansas in Lawrence and Baker University in Baldwin. Actively supported and voted for the legislation under which the FAA airport support program is proceeding with benefits to the airport at Lawrence. Under the Omnibus Housing Act of 1961, which I voted for, the city of Lawrence has received a grant for municipal planning.

Supported and voted for the Small Business Administration in all its activities. A business firm in Lawrence has received an $18,000 participation loan during the SBA program.

Kansas City: Supported and voted for authorization, and planning and construction appropriations, for all flood control projects on the Kaw River, every one of which is absolutely vital to the safety, well-being, and progress, of Kansas City. Worked with Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission to gain Federal approval of the Kansas City research, development, and production pool.

Supported and voted for authorization and appropriations to provide funds for schools burdened by Federal activities in Kansas City.

Worked and voted for the Housing Act of 1961, and appropriations authorized therein, under which the Housing and Home Finance Agency has made college housing loans to the University of Kansas Medical Center in Kansas City, and made a Federal planning advance to begin survey and planning activity for the Silver City urban renewal project in Kansas City.

Under this same legislation, a financial aid contract has been entered into between the Public Housing Administration and the housing administration of Kansas City, under which Kansas City can borrow up to 90 percent of the total development cost for new low-rent homes, and planning funds have been made available for other new low-rent homes.

Worked and voted for the legislation under which the Federal Aviation Agency airport support program is proceeding, with benefit to the Kansas City airport.

Voted for the military construction bill of 1961, which contained a provision for the construction of an Army Reserve Training Center in Kansas City.

Supported and voted for the Small Business Administration in all its activities. A business firm in Kansas City has received a $25,000 direct loan under the SBA program.

Johnson County: Worked with the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission to gain Federal approval of the Kansas City Research, Development, and Production Pool, which makes it possible for Johnson County firms to engage in contracts with the Government for the production of articles, supplies, equipment, and materials needed for the defense program.

Supported, worked, and voted for authorization and appropriations for Merriam and Blue River flood control projects.

Vigorously supported legislation to provide funds for schools overburdened by Federal activities in Olathe, De Soto, Gardner, Spring Hill, Lenexa, Edgerton, Shawnee Mission, Overland Park, Shawnee, Prairie Village, and Mission.

Supported and voted for legislation and appropriations under which the Housing and Home Finance Agency recently extended an interest-free loan to Overland Park for preliminary planning of storm drainage facilities.

Worked and voted for the legislation under which the FAA airport support program is proceeding, with benefits to the Olathe Airport.

Voted for the military construction bills of 1961 and 1962, under which the Olathe Naval Air Station is continuously maintained and improved.

Initiated and helped promote and sponsor the Martin small business educational forum at Merriam, designed to open the door to larger defense-space dollar participation by businesses and industrialists in our area through increased subcontracting.

Miami County: Supported, worked, and voted for authorization and appropriations for Osawatomie flood control project, and Hillsdale Dam.

Vigorously supported legislation to provide funds for schools overburdened by Federal activities in Louisburg.

Supported and voted for legislation and appropriations under which the Housing and Home Finance Agency provided a loan to Louisburg for a sewage system.

Worked and voted for the legislation under which the FAA airport support program is proceeding, with benefits to the airport facilities at Osawatomie and Paola.

Franklin County: Supported, worked, and voted for continuing appropriations for Ottawa flood control project and for Melvern and Pomona flood control projects. Supported and voted for college academic facilities bill of 1962 which (if enacted into law) would provide Federal matching grants for construction of academic facilities at Ottawa University in Ottawa.

Vigorously supported legislation to provide funds for schools overburdened by Federal activities in Wellsville.

Worked and voted for the Housing Act of 1961, and appropriations authorized therein, under which the Housing and Home Finance Agency has made a college housing loan to Ottawa University in Ottawa.

Worked and voted for the legislation under which the FAA airport support program is proceeding, with benefits to the airport at Ottawa.

Supported and voted for the Small Business Administration in all its activities. A business firm in Ottawa has received a $15,000 participation loan under the SBA program.

Federal impact of a general nature: Needless to say, many of the above-mentioned actions have had and will have a much broader impact than the impact within the community where a facility is located. And of course many congressional actions—such as the Freeman farm bill—will have a powerful impact throughout not only our own congressional district, but throughout the entire midcontinent area.

The 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs, which I actively worked for and supported, were programs that were mostly beneficial to the people of eastern Kansas.

The Trade Extension Act of 1962, probably the single most important achievement of the Congress, which had my all-out and enthusiastic support from the beginning, will result in sharply increased exports from Kansas to the rest of the world. This will benefit all of our people, whether they are directly engaged in agriculture or manufacturing or some other gainful activity, because agriculture and manufacturing are the backbone of our whole economy in eastern Kansas.

On the other hand, the 1962 Freeman farm bill, which I could not support, and which was tailored by the representatives of the cotton, peanut, and tobacco areas of the Nation, will ultimately work against the interests of our traditional grain and meat producing areas, such as Kansas.

Then of course the Federal Judgeship Act, which I supported, has a broad impact throughout our entire State. It resulted in the appointment of an additional Federal district judge in Kansas, a measure greatly needed to insure against unreasonable delay in justice.

Your Congressman voted for the bill to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development and to extend laws relating to community facilities. This measure has already had its impact in a number of our communities.

Of tremendous importance to our district and to the entire Lawrence and Kansas City industrial-residential complex is the public works appropriation bill which I fought for and which contains funding for construction of Perry Dam, near Perry, Kans. This vital flood control project has been authorized, and under planning, since the early 1950's. Funds for actual construction have never been appropriated until this year, and certainly this step represents the realization of the work and dreams of scores of area citizens who have worked and fought for years for this project.

National and world issues: Two of the finest legislative accomplishments of this or any Congress in recent memory were passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and the Peace Corps Act. Both these measures had your Congressman's all-out support, from the beginning. In addition to the local benefits coming to Kansas under the Trade Act, this fine law will also promote the strength and unity of the free world. It will help U.S. producers to penetrate the rich markets of Western Europe. It will build up the economic strength of the non-Communist nations as a counterweight to the population strength of the Sino-Soviet bloc. Incidentally, I was one of those fighting—successfully—to exclude all Communist nations from most-favored-nation treatment under the Trade Act.

The Peace Corps has been one of the most successful, down-to-earth, and effective instruments ever devised and operated in the field of foreign policy of the United States. And the ideology of the Peace Corps has been just as popular here at home as the work of the Corps has been abroad.

Your Congressman also joined in support of the 1961 amendments to the Social Security Act, which increased minimum benefits from $33 per month to $40 per month; supported the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; supported the resolution urging the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of Cuba in that Organization; introduced a bill to permit an increase from $1,200 to $1,800 in outside earnings allowable annually to recipients of social security old-age insurance; worked for establishment of a Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives; voted for the bill to increase compensation for disabled veterans; helped formulate and voted for the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; worked and voted for the drug amendments of 1962, to help prevent recurrences of the thalidomide tragedies; and voted and spoke out vigorously for resolution urging a policy of action with respect to the situation in Soviet Cuba.

Unfinished business: During adjournment, I will be traveling in all the communities that make up the new Third District. These include Jefferson County, Kansas City, Johnson County, Douglas County, Franklin County, Miami County, Linn County, and Anderson County.

My aim will be to meet with as many people as possible in each community. Of course, your congressional offices in Washington as well as in Kansas City will be open and fully staffed, as usual, to provide the full range of Federal congressional services. Both our offices are organized with the aim of serving and working for you.

The 88th Congress, which convenes in January 1963, will have before it these following critical issues: Prevent inflation, reduce taxes, controls over dishonest business practices, reduce foreign aid, Federal aid for medical care, increase social security benefits, cut Federal spending, Federal aid to education, and a tougher policy with Russia and Cuba.

Your Congressman sincerely would like to hear from you on these and any other issues that are of importance to you and to the Nation.

MAJOR HIGHWAY ACTS OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables and charts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the 87th Congress has been responsible for two major highway acts which, taken together, represent a significant legislative achievement in providing a sound and adequate Federal-aid highway program.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 dealt principally with the national system of interstate and defense highways, although some of its provisions—notably the revenue provisions—had the supplemental effect of strengthening the program for the improvement of those primary, secondary, and urban roads which make up what is commonly known as the A-B-C systems.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, which we expect to send to the President within the next few days, deals principally with the A-B-C highways, but some of its provisions will have an impact on the interstate program.

Thus the two acts dovetail, each one supplementing the other. So the Members of the 87th Congress can look back, at adjournment time, on a record of solid accomplishment in the field of highway legislation.

Inasmuch as our attention has been focused on the A-B-C program during the second session of the Congress, it is appropriate now to report on the status and progress of the interstate program. In 1961, there was a critical need for legislation to firm up the financing of the interstate program and to keep it on schedule. The legislation was enacted. How do we stand now? Was the legislation effective?

I am pleased to report that the legislation has enabled the States to make steady progress, that the interstate program is on schedule in relation to the availability of funds, that the costs of the program are closely in line with the cost estimates, and that the sections of the Interstate System which have been completed are providing extensive benefits to the motoring public and to the national economy.

STEADY PROGRESS REPORTED

As of June 30, Federal-aid funds were obligated to specific projects which, when added to those projects already completed, represent slightly more than one-third of the total work contemplated under the program. These obligations, past and present, cover 59 percent of the total preliminary engineering work, 49 percent of the right-of-way acquisition, and 30 percent of the actual construction. In total, this work represents 34 percent of the total cost of the Interstate System as developed in the 1961 cost estimate.

This 34-percent figure summarizes a 6-year record of accomplishment in a program which, according to the 1961 act, should be substantially completed by the end of calendar year 1972—a 16½-year construction period, dating from the start of the accelerated national highway program. Considering the fact that the program, as gauged by the schedule of authorizations, has not yet hit its peak tempo, this is a good record of accomplishment.

At the end of the first 6 years of the program, a total of 12,550 miles of the 41,000-mile system had been improved and opened to traffic. As shown by the accompanying table—table 1—not all of this mileage can be credited to the interstate program. It includes 4,524 miles improved with other public funds or constructed as toll roads, and there are about 3,000 miles, the majority of which was built with noninterstate money, which will require additional improvement to meet the standards adequate for the traffic expected by 1975.

The work completed and the work in progress represents a total investment of $13.5 billion—again, about one-third of the total estimated cost of $41 billion.

COSTS ARE HELD DOWN

The long-term upward trend in prices creates a problem for almost every long-range program, since the best of cost estimates are likely to be upset by inflation.

Highway construction, of course, is not immune from inflationary pressures. Over the 10-year period, 1952-61, the cost of labor and materials used in highway construction increased by 28.7 percent. However, contractors' bid prices declined 4.1 percent during the same period. This decline was contrary to the trend which resulted in a 48.7 percent increase in the cost of construction generally during the same decade.

The fact that highway construction costs have not increased is due to aggressive steps taken by the highway industry to hasten the introduction of advanced equipment, improved materials, and new construction methods, and to intense competition among contractors.

The latest Interstate System cost estimate, submitted to Congress early in 1951, was based on prices based on average low bid prices in each State during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. The estimate included the cost of all work for which funds had not been committed by December 31, 1959.

So the work for which commitments were made from January 1, 1960, to the present, is work which was included in the 1961 cost estimate, and an analysis of the costs thereof offers an opportunity to check the accuracy of the cost estimate. The comparison, for work obligated from January 1, 1960, through June 30, 1962, is as follows:

	Actual total cost	Ratio of actual to estimated cost
	Millions	*Percent*
Preliminary engineering	$226	106.4
Right-of-way	1,244	103.0
Construction	4,679	99.6
Total	6,149	100.5

The relationship of these items to the total program is shown in the accompanying table—table 2.

BENEFITS ARE EXTENSIVE

For various reasons, the Interstate System is being built in disconnected segments. These short segments are frequently very helpful in easing certain local traffic problems. They also play a part, of course, in the expeditious movement of interstate traffic, but the full benefits of the system will not be realized until it is fully connected up.

There are some segments, now completed, which are long enough to connect cities a considerable distance apart. Baltimore, this summer, opened its beltway, providing, along with the previously opened Harbor Thruway, a complete expressway ring around the city.

Where the longer segments have been opened, they are fully living up to expectations. The Baltimore Beltway, for example, is carrying substantially more traffic than had been anticipated at this early stage, and it is proving to be an economic catalyst for the development of commerce and industry along its path.

It has been estimated that, by 1980, the completed Interstate System will afford annual savings in operating and accident costs of about $5.1 billion per year, in addition to time cost savings of $6.6 billion. And, by 1980, the Interstate System will be saving 9,500 lives per year.

All of these anticipated benefits can be realized earlier, obviously, if the system is built ahead of schedule. Equally true, partial benefits will accrue as the system approaches completion. The benefits already are substantial, and we look forward to greater benefits each year.

TABLE 1.—*National system of interstate and defense highways—Status of improvement as of June 30, 1962*

State	Open to traffic								Work in progress with interstate funds			Remaining mileage	Total designated system mileage
	Completed to full or acceptable standards			Improved to standards adequate for present traffic			Toll facilities	Total open to traffic	Under construction	Engineering or right-of-way	Total underway		
	With interstate funds	With other public funds	Total	With interstate funds	With other public funds	Total							
Alabama	101.2		101.2	19.4	32.1	51.5		152.7	189.6	148.1	337.7	384.4	874.8
Alaska													
Arizona	242.8	0.1	242.9	110.7	188.0	298.7		541.6	22.5	314.0	336.5	282.9	1,161.0
Arkansas	40.7		40.7		2.8	2.8		43.5	102.9	355.3	458.2	16.1	517.8
California	236.9	24.3	261.2	185.5	210.0	395.5	14.0	670.7	163.2	1,102.1	1,265.3	242.2	2,178.2
Colorado	167.9	4.1	172.0	71.5	34.9	106.4		278.4	43.1	150.6	193.7	475.9	948.0
Connecticut	45.4	71.1	116.5	5.3	17.7	23.0	19.5	159.0	28.6	105.8	134.4		293.4
Delaware	.6		.6	.6		.6	2.3	3.5	5.8	19.6	25.4	11.6	40.5
Florida	138.8	1.5	140.3				42.4	182.7	146.5	162.3	308.8	628.5	1,120.0
Georgia	141.5	17.5	159.0		75.2	75.2		234.2	193.4	77.0	270.4	599.0	1,103.6
Hawaii					5.8	5.8		5.8		7.3	7.3	35.4	48.5
Idaho	90.3		90.3	44.1	37.3	81.4		171.7	98.5	216.9	315.4	125.0	612.1
Illinois	237.8	20.5	258.3	25.2	133.6	158.8	151.3	568.4	116.3	582.8	699.1	319.0	1,586.5
Indiana	135.5		135.5	7.4	2.8	10.2	156.9	302.6	114.2	416.5	530.7	287.6	1,120.9
Iowa	203.5		203.5	21.5		21.5	3.6	228.6	56.5	211.8	268.3	211.7	708.6
Kansas	222.2		222.2	16.0	19.8	35.8	187.1	445.1	4.2	115.3	119.5	236.5	801.1
Kentucky	90.2		90.2	7.9	8.5	16.4	39.6	146.2	88.7	151.0	239.7	310.2	696.1
Louisiana	41.6	3.6	45.2		6.3	6.3		51.5	170.0	207.8	377.8	253.3	682.6
Maine	53.0	1.2	54.2		3.0	3.0	60.3	117.5	28.3	23.3	51.6	142.9	312.0
Maryland	34.1	32.2	66.3	40.4	28.5	68.9	11.3	146.5	19.3	120.0	139.3	67.9	353.7
Massachusetts	59.6	6.0	65.6	.2	27.5	27.7	125.8	219.1	41.8	98.9	140.7	102.6	462.4
Michigan	334.8	126.4	461.2		5.6	5.6	4.4	471.2	259.3	100.2	359.5	247.2	1,077.9
Minnesota	37.9		37.9	55.1	2.3	57.4		95.3	111.9	360.6	472.5	330.3	898.1
Mississippi	42.9		42.9	13.1	13.8	26.9		69.8	223.3	76.4	299.7	308.7	678.2
Missouri	170.4	2.0	172.4	71.2	141.6	212.8	3.2	388.4	150.6	533.7	684.3	32.0	1,104.7
Montana	133.4		133.4					133.4	124.3	336.4	460.7	586.3	1,180.4
Nebraska	57.1		57.1		12.9	12.9	.3	70.3	61.2	241.7	302.9	116.6	489.8
Nevada	78.3		78.3	17.5		17.5		95.8	68.4	159.8	228.2	210.0	534.0
New Hampshire	61.2		61.2	2.0	2.8	4.8	21.6	87.6	18.2	15.7	33.9	92.3	213.8
New Jersey	17.1	11.9	29.0	13.7	14.4	28.1	54.1	111.2	34.6	108.7	143.3	121.4	375.9
New Mexico	211.1		211.1	91.4		91.4		302.5	77.3	191.8	269.1	433.6	1,005.2
New York	165.1	50.0	215.1	16.1	7.8	23.9	505.6	744.6	116.3	146.7	263.0	219.6	1,227.2
North Carolina	264.0		264.0	38.8	52.0	90.8		354.8	75.7	158.3	234.0	180.0	768.8
North Dakota	163.7		163.7	28.2	11.2	39.4		203.1	43.1	96.7	139.8	225.0	567.9
Ohio	324.3	19.8	344.1	20.4	66.7	87.1	207.5	638.7	126.0	536.7	662.7	193.8	1,495.2
Oklahoma	136.5		136.5	25.3	24.6	49.9	174.3	360.7	103.8	148.9	252.7	180.6	794.0
Oregon	237.2	25.1	262.3	27.5	178.4	205.9	.8	469.0	80.7	10.3	91.0	171.3	731.3
Pennsylvania	238.1	54.5	292.6		1.7	1.7	362.1	656.4	164.8	418.5	583.3	335.8	1,575.5
Rhode Island	10.7	9.7	20.4	.2	.1	.3		20.7	5.3	16.6	21.9	28.3	70.9
South Carolina	216.5		216.5	20.5	7.9	28.4		244.9	90.0	67.3	157.3	276.7	678.9
South Dakota	111.9		111.9	56.2		56.2		168.1	83.1	171.1	254.2	256.5	678.8
Tennessee	69.1	1.7	70.8	8.5		8.5		79.3	233.0	310.9	543.9	424.4	1,047.6
Texas	701.2	52.4	753.6	99.4	135.7	235.1	29.8	1,018.5	269.6	1,052.7	1,322.3	685.7	3,026.5
Utah	57.1		57.1	16.1	1.9	18.0		75.1	68.0	289.0	357.0	502.8	934.9
Vermont	41.5		41.5					41.5	32.2	79.0	111.2	171.2	323.9
Virginia	73.5	31.9	105.4	20.9	37.6	58.5	37.3	201.2	195.2	107.8	303.0	548.9	1,053.1
Washington	72.3	8.3	80.6	138.5	54.4	192.9	.3	273.8	72.5	247.2	319.7	132.1	725.6
West Virginia	29.5		29.5				85.9	115.4	39.0	78.3	117.3	290.0	522.7
Wisconsin	168.1		168.1		39.5	39.5		207.6	48.0	196.9	244.9		452.5
Wyoming	140.7		140.7	38.4		38.4		179.1	188.0	77.6	265.6	469.9	914.6
District of Columbia	.5	.1	.6	1.9	.1	2.0		2.6	4.5	4.9	9.4	16.1	28.1
Total	6,649.3	575.9	7,225.2	1,376.6	1,646.8	3,023.4	2,301.3	12,549.9	4,801.3	10,926.8	15,728.1	12,519.8	[1]40,797.8

[1] The system is limited to 41,000 miles by law. The small balance is held in reserve for adjustments as final locations are selected and projects built.

TABLE 2.—*Interstate System authorizations through June 30, 1962*

[Millions of dollars]

Item	Total cost of work authorized				
	Actual through June 30, 1962		Estimated remaining work as of June 30, 1962		Total Interstate System costs per 1961 estimate
	Amount	Percent of total item costs	Amount	Percent of total item costs	
Preliminary engineering	$632	59	$447	41	$1,079
Right-of-way	3,093	49	3,182	51	6,275
Construction	9,591	30	22,305	70	31,896
Subtotal	13,316	34	25,934	66	39,250
State highway planning and research					574
Public roads administration and research					357
Contingencies					819
Total					41,000

AIR SAFETY

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress, which we are on the verge of adjourning, I have on numerous occasions extended my remarks to comment on the matter of air safety and what I regard as the delinquencies of the man charged with improving air safety, Mr. Najeeb Halaby. I have repeatedly called attention to errors of judgment which I feel Mr. Halaby has made in his position of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

In recent weeks I have held my peace on this situation for it has developed that a subcommittee of this House has begun an investigation of a few of the several matters to which I earlier called attention. I welcome this development, and I trust that the Subcommittee on Government Activities of the Committee on Government Operations will continue to pursue this subject until all of the evidence is reviewed.

There is every reason to be persistent in this examination of the effectiveness of FAA and those who have accepted the duty of making it effective. Few functions of Government bear so directly and in such a complicated, technical way on the daily safety of so many tens of thousands of Americans. I am impressed with the infinite technicalities of air travel and with the monumental burdens imposed on those who preside over the intricate regulations of these.

But these technicalities and these burdens excuse no delinquencies; they pardon no oversights; they forgive no errors.

That this is a technical and burdensome situation makes it all the more incumbent on those who make the laws that they not turn an agency loose to deal with it unobserved and unexamined. The power vested in this civilian agency has much to do with the lives and fortunes of people and whereas we have given it by law the right to deal authoritatively and unilaterally with these, we should not permit it to operate as an authority only unto itself.

Mr. Halaby, who is a forceful, tough-minded man, has denied directly or by silence most of the charges I have made on errors and deficiencies within FAA, which he himself this week characterized in the press as an agency having "dictator-like authority."

I say any Agency of this Government that has "dictator-like authority" is one we should watch with a very close eye.

An Administrator of such an Agency has been placed in a dictatorial role, and this in itself is a strange anomaly in our democratic Government. An Administrator who conceives of himself as cast in the role of a dictator should be one from whom we demand a very precise and regular accountability. To do less than this is to forfeit our own responsibilities.

Mr. Halaby, if he is anything, is an outspoken man. And this week he has been particularly talkative to the gentlemen from the press. He has discussed his personal life and the fact that he is not able to meet his expenses on the salary the Congress pays him; that he has "never been deliberately arrogant or insulting to a Congressman"; that he inadvertently gets into hot water sometimes when he does not know what motivates a congressional complaint or suggestions, or what he imagines is the local politics of a situation.

Mr. Halaby has even said to the press for the first time that he guesses "there's some merit in the criticism that I've spoken too hastily at times—like when I called one Congressman a freshman acting like a freshman." I am not sure whether this is an apology, a retraction or an expression of regret over a hasty remark. Inasmuch as I am the Congressman involved, I would want to accept the statement in any way he meant it. But these personal considerations do not bear on the question of air safety except to the extent they might reflect an injudicious temperament on the part of one who styles himself as having "dictatorlike authority" over matters of air safety. However, the important issue is how this Agency and its Administrator are discharging their responsibilities under the law.

Mr. Halaby, in his talks with the press this week, has for the first time, to my knowledge, put his finger on what he considers is a cause of FAA not having the efficiency and performance he apparently now acknowledges it should have. He has suggested that he does not have the right high-echelon people to help him with his tasks. He is quoted as saying:

> If I could double the salaries of my own key officials I could save 10 times that amount just in improved efficiency and performance. The biggest problem in the Federal Aviation Agency and all government is attracting the right high echelon people. You can't do it without some monetary incentive in most instances.

I can only read this statement in one of two ways. Either Mr. Halaby is dissatisfied with the top assistants he now has, or he is saying that we should pay them more money in order to give them the incentive to improve what he calls their efficiency and performance.

Mr. Speaker, if we ignore all that has been said in these recent weeks, if we disregard the charges of breakdowns in our air traffic control system, the poor employee morale, the fruitless research contracts, the laxity of governmental ethics, the absence of planning, the wasteful expenditures, the hazards of unproven equipment—if we ignore all these, we should now pay attention to what Mr. Halaby is saying about his Agency.

When a top Government administrator publicly states that his Agency, operating in a crucial, vital area of human safety, is not as efficient or performing as well as he would like because salary schedules are too low or because out of all his 44,000 employees he still does not have the right people, we must listen.

Our ears to do this listening can be the Subcommittee on Government Activities, and I trust they will listen and tell us shortly what they hear.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. **BARRY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS** of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most forceful and intelligent economists, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, formerly Chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers, recently made some suggestions for the improvement of the Employment Act of 1946 that deserve the careful and thoughtful consideration of every Member of Congress.

Stressing the importance of economic issues, Dr. Burns' speech discusses the machinery for economic policymaking established by the Employment Act and suggests some ways of strengthening this machinery. Dr. Burns has made an important contribution by urging that the objectives of the Employment Act be broadened to include other important goals of national policy, such as the achievement of price stability, a higher rate of economic growth, and a strengthening of the international foundations of our prosperity and security. Dr. Burns also makes some observations on our unemployment insurance system and economic stabilization policy that deserve careful consideration.

Another important contribution of the speech was Dr. Burns' suggestion for the creation of an ad hoc committee on the economic report and the creation of an Economic Policy Board that would bring to economic matters the authority and prestige which the National Security Council brings to matters of defense.

I was particularly happy because of my own deep interest in the subject to see that Dr. Burns strongly stressed the importance of improving our economic statistics. He voiced my own opinion that in seeking to wipe out unemployment, we are still frustrated by an almost total lack of statistics on job vacancies.

Dr. Burns' speech is so important and makes such a useful contribution to our thinking about current economic problems that I include it at this point in the RECORD:

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE EMPLOYMENT ACT

(By Arthur F. Burns, John Bates Clark professor of economics at Columbia University and President of the National Bureau of Economic Research)

The Employment Act of 1946 was originally designed to cope with the problem of minimizing unemployment. However, with the passage of time, it has acquired something of the force of an economic constitution. The President, his Council of Economic Advisers, the Congress, in some degree the entire executive and administrative establishment of the Federal Government, including the Federal Reserve Board, now function under this "constitution" when major economic policies are developed. Governmental activities in behalf of the national economy, especially when they involve new tools, have always been a matter of interest to our Association. It may therefore be useful on this occasion to take a broad look at the machinery for economic policy-making established by the Employment Act and to reflect on some ways of strengthening this machinery.

I

Let me begin by recalling the early history of the Employment Act. As World War II drew to a close, many public-minded citizens became fearful that the return of peace would bring a return of mass unemployment such as existed during the 1930's. Gradually, the thought emerged that just as unemployment was eliminated during the war, so the resources of Government could be used to avoid sizable unemployment under peacetime conditions. To give expression to this thought, Senator Murray in January 1945 introduced a bill called the Full Employment Act of 1945.

In its declaration of policy, the Murray bill stated that "all Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment," and that "it is essential that continuing full employment be maintained in the United States." Accordingly, the bill laid down the requirement that the President transmit to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session a "national production and employment budget." This budget was to cover an interval starting 6 months later and ending not less than 18 months later.

For this interval in the future the national budget was to set forth, first of all, an estimate of the size of the labor force. Next, an estimate of the gross national product corresponding to full employment was to be presented—that is, the dollar value of the Nation's total output of commodities and services, which would provide employment opportunities for the entire labor force. A third requirement was an estimate of what the gross national product would be in the absence of new governmental programs or policies. Fourth, in the event that this prospective output fell short of the amount required to assure full employment, the President was to recommend to the Congress measures for stimulating private expenditures. Fifth, if these measures were still deemed insufficient to remove the deficiency in the national budget, the President was to recommend Federal expenditures to close the budgetary gap—in other words, Federal spending was to be increased in the amount needed to bring total output to a full-employment level. Finally, in case the national budget indicated a prospective output which exceeded the required full-employment output, the President was to recommend to the Congress "a program for preventing inflationary economic dislocations."

This bill and its highly novel national budget aroused a great deal of public discussion. Some men viewed it as a practical mechanism for attending systematically and with forethought to the problem of protecting the Nation against the ravages of depression and unemployment. Others, while favorably impressed with the aims of the bill, doubted whether economic knowledge had reached sufficient precision to make the law workable. Still others saw the bill as a device for turning America into a regimented, socialistic economy. Such fears were entertained by a large section of the House of Representatives. The House therefore proceeded with a bill that was more to its liking.

Since the bills passed by the Senate and House differed, they went to a conference committee which devoted 11 days to hammering out a compromise. The bill that finally emerged made no reference either to full employment or to inflation. It made no reference to a national production and employment budget, or to numerical goals or targets of any kind. It made no reference to any obligation of the Federal Government to fill a gap between prospective output and a full-employment output. It said nothing about the specific means to be used for stimulating economic activity. It did, however, carry a sweeping and historic declaration of policy; namely, that it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to foster "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

Other portions of the conference bill dealt with procedures. An economic report by the President was required, to be presented to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session and to be supplemented, as need may arise, at other times. The purpose of this report was to review the condition and prospects of the Nation's economy, to appraise existing Federal activities that bear on production and employment, and to present a program for carrying out the objectives of the proposed law. In performing these duties the President was to be assisted by a new agency, the Council of Economic Advisers. Also, a committee drawn from both the Senate and the House was to be established to advise the Congress with regard to the recommendations of the economic report and to make such additional findings as it might from time to time deem desirable.

This conference bill, which became law in February 1946, was hailed by the liberals of the Senate as a victory for their side, just as it was hailed by the conservatives of the House as a victory for theirs. Both groups were able to do this because the only way of breaking the deadlock in the conference was to use language that was general enough to admit of more than one interpretation.

II

Whether because or in spite of its massive ambiguities, the Employment Act has proved a useful framework for the management of our national prosperity. With few and only minor changes, the machinery for economic policymaking laid down by the act has persisted to the present time. There have been critics who at times have wanted to scrap or drastically alter this machinery, and they came close to doing so in early 1953. But the number of critics or sceptics has diminished with the years, and the Employment Act is now looked upon with favor by nearly every articulate group in our Nation.

To be sure, there is still a wide range of opinion about the precise contribution of the Employment Act to our national life, just as there is a range of opinion about the manner in which the act has been administered by successive Presidents. I believe, however, there is broad agreement that the act has introduced elements of order and planning in economic policymaking that previously did not exist; that the act has served to raise the standards that we commonly apply to our Nation's economic performance; that the act has stimulated useful analytical work by economists and factfinding by statisticians; and that the machinery of the act has helped high Government officials to think about production, employment, consumption, investment, and finances in terms of the operation of the whole economy, not merely this or that of its parts. It will also be generally acknowledged, I think, that the act has played its part in changing the character of the business cycle—that is, in making its downward phase both shorter and milder, in limiting the incidence of unemployment, and in blunting the effects of recessions on the lives and fortunes of individuals.

These are significant achievements by any reasonable yardstick. And yet I dare say that if the Employment Act were legislated anew, it would have a different emphasis from the law that we have. Many Americans are nowadays seriously concerned about the discrepancy between our Nation's rate of economic growth and that of Russia, Germany, France, Japan, and other countries. For this concern there are many reasons, not the least being an uneasy feeling that our Nation's prestige and even its security may suffer as a consequence of the lagging growth rate. Theories of economic growth have of late been proliferating and clashing. Although little agreement has as yet emerged, one broad principle is beyond question—namely, that a nation's economic growth depends ultimately on how much work people do and how efficiently they do it. Yet the Employment Act nowhere expresses concern about industrial waste or the need for its avoidance. Indeed, you will look in vain among its passages even for the word "efficiency."

The same applies to inflation. Since 1945, the price level of the commodities and services produced in our country has risen, year after year, virtually without interruption. The index stood at 75 in 1946, at 100 in 1954, at 111 in 1958, and at 117 earlier this year. This persistent rise of the price level has worked hardships on many people, it has distorted the financial accounts of business firms, and it has reduced our Nation's ability to sell in foreign markets at a time when a huge export surplus is required to finance military expenditures abroad and the foreign aid programs. Yet you will look in vain in the Employment Act for any reference to the importance of maintaining stability in the general level of prices, or even for any mention of "inflation" or the "price level."

Of late, many Americans have gained fresh awareness of a fact which fortune had permitted us to slight over a long generation; namely, that our Nation is not self-sufficient. We are now relearning the lesson that, in order to manage our economic affairs successfully, we must be mindful of the needs and trading policies of other nations, of the size of our gold stocks and the short-term balances that foreign governments and citizens hold here, and of the levels of labor costs, interest rates, and prices in our country relative to those in other nations. Yet you will look in vain in the Employment Act for any mention of the outside world, or of the need to conduct economic policies, both domestic and foreign, so as to enable us to discharge the political, economic, and military responsibilities that history has thrust upon us.

The reasons for these reticences of the Employment Act are not far to seek. In 1946 Americans still had vivid memories of the great depression of the 1930's when the unemployment rate, even in a relatively good year like 1937, averaged over 14 percent. Many citizens feared that the years ahead would be darkened by depression, while few foresaw that we were on the threshold of a great inflation. In 1946, the extraordinary performance of American industry during the war was so fresh in people's minds that it was natural to take rapid improvements of efficiency for granted. In 1946 the United States alone possessed the atom bomb, Russia was a ruin, and we had no clear warning of the territorial, military, and economic expansion of communism that has occurred since then. In 1946 the nations of Western Europe and Japan were near collapse. We did not foresee how quickly they would rebuild, modernize, enlarge, and diversify their manufacturing capacity, or that their businessmen would soon challenge ours, often with substantial success, in world markets and even in our own market. In 1946 the entire world accepted the dollar as the supreme symbol of safety, strength, and stability. Few, if any economists anticipated the uncertainty that has lately arisen about our ability to bring the balance of international payments into equilibrium.

Clearly, both the international scene and qur own have changed profoundly since World War II, and so too have some of our economic problems. However well suited the Employment Act was to a time when public thought was so largely focused on the problem of unemployment, it can fit the needs of our own time only by a free interpretation of its provisions or by formal amendment. The broad language of the act, as well as precedent and tradition, favor the former approach. After all, while the Act declares that it is the policy of the Federal Government "to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power," it also states that the methods used are to be consistent with the "needs and obligations" of the Government, with "other essential considerations of national policy," and with the "general welfare." In view of these omnibus provisions, no President has ever felt seriously inhibited in emphasizing whatever economic problems he chose, provided the Nation's employment needs also received due attention. For example, the latest Economic Report is addressed not only to the goal of maximum employment, production and purchasing power, but also to the goal of general price stability, to the goal of faster economic growth, to the goal of equal opportunity, and to the goal of basic balance in international payments. Clearly, this report, far from being confined to the problem of achieving full employment, is concerned with the major economic issues of our time. As much can be said, I think, of most of the earlier reports.

In view of the typically wide scope of Presidential pronouncements under the Employment Act, it may seem pointless to argue that anything is to be gained by amending the act so as to broaden its explicit objectives. Yet that is precisely what I wish to argue. My thesis is simple. The Employment Act was designed to focus national policy on the alleviation and if possible, on the prevention of unemployment. In the meantime, other goals of national policy have been articulated with a sense of urgency, especially the achievement of reasonable stability in the general price level, the achievement of a higher rate of economic growth, and the strengthening of the international foundations of our prosperity and security. These goals are interrelated. Preoccupation with one may lead to injury to the others, and thereby also militate against full realization of the first. Federal economic policy has to address itself to each of our national goals and to their mutual accommodation. The fact that one or another Economic Report has done so admirably is not a sufficient basis for expecting that this will happen with sufficient regularity in the future. Not only do Presidents have their shortcomings, but so also do their economic advisers, and the best of men sooner or later tire or retire. If certain requirements are explicitly laid down by statute, there is a better chance that they will be respected than if the matter is left to personal discretion. Not only that, but amendment of the Employment Act would enhance public awareness of both the tasks and the complexity of national economic policy.

There is some historical justification for taking this position. Since the end of World War II, whenever the forces of recession have begun to gather strength, the Federal Government has moved fairly quickly to try to curb the decline. Not only does the Employment Act call for such action, but there are always people around to remind the Executive of the Government's responsibilities. There is nothing in the law, however, that requires the Government to promote efficiency or a stable price level or a liberal commercial policy or equilibrium in the balance of payments. By and large, the pressures for corrective action in these areas have been much smaller.

For example, during the course of the recession of 1953-54, the Cabinet discussed every week, at the President's insistent request, economic developments, economic prospects, and the governmental actions that appeared to be necessary or desirable to bolster the economy. Every week the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers reported on these matters to the President and again to the Cabinet. And nearly every week some action was taken to check the recession. But when economic recovery finally got under way and signs of renewed inflation began emerging, the great sense of urgency that had previously ruled was no longer present. To be sure, inflationary developments were carefully noted and some actions were taken to contain them. To be sure, the Chairman of the Council still made his reports weekly to the President, but he did so less frequently at Cabinet meetings. Neither the President nor his advisers felt as much pressure for energetic action as before, nor did they in turn exert as much pressure on others. It would not be difficult to supply other and perhaps more striking illustrations of the tendency of governmental authorities to be more actively concerned with minimizing current unemployment than with preventing inflation or enhancing efficiency or accelerating economic growth in the future. Because of this tendency, I think that the behavior of employment itself has suffered.

I would not argue that the mere passage of an amendment broadening the objectives of the Employment Act will necessarily make much difference in the management of national prosperity. With or without such an amendment, some government officials will continue to urge new import quotas or a higher minimum wage as a cure for unemployment, some will continue to argue for higher price supports to solve the problem of agricultural surpluses, some will continue to thunder against monopoly and yet refuse to allow railroads that want to compete on a price basis from doing so, and many will remain discreetly silent about the deliberate waste in which millions of workers and their managers have acquired a vested interest. All that I claim is that amendment of the Employment Act would favor deeper and more balanced thinking on economic issues, thereby helping to create an environment in which economic policies can be better adapted to national needs.

III

I have allowed myself to speculate that if the Employment Act were being written anew, it would have a different emphasis from the law that we have. I do not mean by this that full employment would be subordinated to other goals. On the contrary, I believe that the American people are more firmly committed to the ideal of full employment than they were a generation ago. If the Employment Act were recast today, it might even be christened "The Full Employment Act," as was the original Murray bill. Experience during the post-war period has demonstrated that the monetary and fiscal policies of Government can have a powerful influence on the course of the economy without subjecting specific activities to regulation. In view of this experience, the goal of full employment has gained wide acceptance in business and financial circles as well as in other parts of our society. What we characteristically debate nowadays, therefore, is not the need for full employment, but the scale, timing, and character of economic programs for moving toward this and other generally accepted goals.

The Employment Act itself gives very little guidance on these matters. To be sure, the act stresses the importance of promoting employment and production "in a manner calculated to foster * * * free competitive enterprise," but this constraint merely reaffirms our Nation's commitment to the principle of freedom. Practically speaking, the means for dealing with recession and unemployment are left entirely to later judgment concerning the needs of the individual case. There can be no doubt that this element of flexibility has proved helpful to the Government officials charged with administering the Employment Act. Indeed, economic life is so full of surprises that the act might not have survived if the Congress had prescribed some formula, whether the one adumbrated by the Murray bill or any other, for dealing with the business cycle.

Nevertheless, not a few students of economics and politics have become dissatisfied with the way in which the Federal Government has been discharging its responsibilities under the Employment Act. There seems to be a growing feeling that antirecession policies are sometimes capricious, that they are often developed or implemented in a mood of complacency, and that speedy if not automatic procedures are therefore needed to strengthen our defenses against recession. The latest Economic Report of the President has crystallized this interest in more vigorous stabilization policy by urging a standby tax reduction authority, besides a standby public-works authority and a stronger unemployment insurance system. In the opinion of the Council of Economic Advisers, the enactment of these measures "would be the most significant step forward in policy for economic stabilization since the Employment Act itself."

The case for strengthening the stabilizing features of the unemployment insurance system seems clear. During the postwar period we have repeatedly seen how unemployment insurance aids the economy by maintaining the flow of income to individuals at the very times when income derived from production is depressed. By extending coverage to some of the millions who are still denied this protection, a larger part of the loss of income during recessions can be offset. This objective will be further served by providing for a more or less automatic extension of benefits during periods of abnormally large unemployment. True, several States have already passed legislation of this type; but the need is nationwide and the Congress has recognized this in dealing with the recession of 1957-58 and again with that of 1960-61. On each of these occasions legislation was passed to extend temporarily the duration of benefits. In each instance, however, the supplementary benefits became available only after recovery had started. The Congress will not sit idly by when the next recession brings new personal hardships. But unless the Congress moves speedily now, there is a risk that the supplementary benefits will once again come too late to serve as an effective brake on the forces of recession. The need for standby legislation that would provide for extended duration of unemployment insurance at a fairly early stage of recessions has, in my judgment, become compelling.

This, however, is not the only desirable reform of the unemployment insurance system. If we provide for a larger flow of benefit payments to the unemployed but do nothing else, some marginal workers will be tempted to join the labor force and some of the unemployed will tend to proceed more leisurely in searching for a new job, thus nullifying, at least in part, the stabilizing effects on employment of the liberalized benefits. To avoid such frustrations, liberalization should be accompanied by other reforms of the unemployment insurance system. For one thing, unemployed workers need to be given much more help than they usually receive in finding new jobs. Second, retraining programs need to be fitted into the insurance system to aid those workers who can have little hope of finding employment in their own trade. Third, the administration of benefits needs to be greatly improved, so that anyone who loses his job because of misconduct or who quits without good cause or who refuses to take a suitable job is in fact—not merely nominally as is now the case in numerous localities—excluded from insurance benefits. Reform along these lines would help to lower labor turnover and to shorten the intervals between jobs, thereby serving not only to reduce unemployment but also to increase industrial efficiency and to curb any unwholesome upward pressure on the wage level.

Of the other standby measures that have figured prominently in recent discussions of antirecession policy, I believe that the case for public works is less convincing than for tax reduction. The preparation of preliminary plans for new projects, their verification and revision, the acquisition of sites, the development of specifications, the arranging of finances, the letting of contracts and subcontracts—all these essential steps are very time consuming. Moreover, once a construction project of any magnitude gets underway, the work itself may stretch over years. In theory, these difficulties may be overcome by concentrating on projects that can be started promptly and completed within a year or less. In practice, the number of extra projects that will qualify under such a standard is likely to prove insufficient, especially when attention is paid, as will prove unavoidable in a public works program, to geographic dispersion. But once the standard for approving projects is relaxed, the bulk of the new expenditure may easily spill over to a time when the economy is already advancing of its own momentum and requires no special stimulation. In addition to this timing difficulty, an emergency public works program carries a serious risk of wasting resources, of political abuse, and—budgetary conventions being what they are—of laying the basis for a permanently higher level of governmental spending.

A temporary reduction of income taxes would be free from much of the awkwardness or embarrassment that is likely to be connected with public works. Unlike construction projects, which must be screened individually before winning administrative approval, a tax reduction works impersonally and across the Nation. Once a tax reduction has been legislated, it can become effective at once and with practically full force. Months need not elapse before the program develops momentum, as in the case of public works. If the tax reduction is also substantial, the increase in the disposable income of private citizens can be reasonably counted on to augment private spending powerfully as well as promptly. There is a great deal of general experience to support this expectation, perhaps the most directly relevant being the response of the private economy to the tax changes that became effective early in 1954.

However, a public works program is a familiar and even a somewhat popular device for dealing with recessions, while any proposal to cut taxes in order to check or avert business recession is still a novel if not a dangerous thought for many. Recent political discussions of the subject of taxes have overlooked the fact that, as yet, the Congress has never seen fit to reduce income tax rates for the purpose of mitigating a business recession, to say nothing of preventing one. Since budgetary tradition hardly favors congressional acceptance of a temporary tax cut to curb recession, the obstacles are all the greater to acceptance—or even to serious consideration—of a standby tax reduction authority under which, in order to permit speedy action, the Congress would be required to forgo some of its jealously guarded power over public revenues. It seems safe to assert that years, perhaps many years, will pass before the principle of a standby tax reduction authority can win large political support.

I happen to be a supporter of this principle. But I also feel that additional study is needed before any specific proposal along these lines is acted on. Let me mention a few of the many questions that surround the proposal that is now before the Congress. First, of all, this measure leaves the timing of any recommendation for a temporary tax reduction entirely to the President's discretion. May it not be desirable, however, in the event the unemployment rate or another suitable index reaches some specified level, to require the President to inform the Congress promptly whether or not, in his judgment, a temporary tax reduction is needed to meet the stabilization objectives of the Employment Act? Second, the measure before the Congress would call for a uniform reduction, which might be as much as 5 percentage points, throughout the schedule of the personal income tax. However, since business as well as consumer spending will ordinarily benefit from stimulation at a time of recession, would not the interests of the economy be better served by providing for a uniform percentage reduction of the income tax due from corporations as well as individuals? Third, under the proposed authority, the power of the Congress is limited to rejecting the President's recommendation within 30 days of its submission. Would it not be wise, however, to leave to the Congress not only the right to reject, but also the right to raise or lower the recommended percentage reduction, within whatever limits are specified by the enabling statute? Fourth, under the proposed authority, the tax reduction recommended by the President would automatically take effect if the Congress is not in session. Is it not reasonable to argue, however, that when the Nation's economy is deemed to be in such serious trouble as to require prompt tax reduction, the Congress should be called into special session to deal with the emergency by passing on taxes or anything else that warrants immediate action?

I believe that if the several questions I have put were answered in the affirmative, the proposal for standby tax reduction authority would come to closer grips with both economic and political life. But my main purpose in raising these questions is to indicate that the proposal is still in a rudimentary stage. Before plunging into legislation it is essential to ponder closely still other questions—such as the optimum period for a temporary tax reduction and the desirability of extending the standby authority to permit tax increases for curbing inflation. Another question to be considered is the consistency of a temporary tax reduction, or at least its termination, with the widely held theory that our tax system takes so large a fraction of the additional income generated by business expansion that the process of expansion is likely to be choked off before full employment is reached.

Furthermore, it is well to recognize that the mere existence of a standby tax authority may not make the practical problems of business-cycle policy much easier than they are at present. After all, as I have already emphasized, the pursuit of full employment has to be reconciled with other basic objectives of policy. The recent national debate on taxes illustrates the difficulty. The economists participating in this debate apparently agreed that our economy may soon be drifting into another recession. They also generally agreed that a lowering of income taxes would be advantageous at this time. However, some took the position that the critical need was to stimulate the economy over the next few months. In the interest of increasing promptly the income available for consumer spending or investing, they therefore favored a quick tax cut of the flat percentage type. Others took the position that the critical need was to stimulate the economy both this year and in the years ahead. They too were mindful of the increase in expenditure that would flow from an increase of disposable income, but they attached still greater importance to the release of money, credit, and energy that would flow from an upsurge of confidence in the future of new investments. Hence, they favored tax reform as well as tax reduction and they were willing to accept the probable cost of waiting several months for the preparation of a complicated law of this type. For the present at least, the views of the latter group have prevailed, but my point is that this might also have been the outcome if a standby tax reduction authority—the precise purpose of which is to permit speedy action—had already existed.

As we look to the future, it is altogether likely that the standards applied by the American people to the performance of the economy will become even more stringent than they already are. The tasks of economic statesmanship will therefore not become any lighter. Whatever automatic or semiautomatic devices are eventually developed for stabilizing the economy, the area for discretionary actions will remain large. It will still be necessary to balance specific goals against one another, to seek as good a reconciliation among them as can be achieved, and to strive for this fine balance in the light of tomorrow's needs as well as today's pressures. There is ample justification, therefore, for exploring new ways of mobilizing the forces of understanding and of bringing them to bear on economic policymaking.

The hope was once seriously entertained that the President's Economic Report, or at least the portion for which the Council of Economic Advisers saw fit to assume full responsibility, would provide appraisals of the state of our economy and its needs, which could command, by virtue of their scholarship and practical wisdom, general acceptance. This hope has not been fulfilled.

However excellent this or that Economic Report of the President may be, it is by its very nature a political document. Its economic analysis might be flawless and its recommendations singularly free from partisan bias. That would not stop many citizens, however, from reading partisanship into its objective utterances. In fact, and if only because the President is the head of a political party as well as the head of Government, this kind of Economic Report has never been written and probably never will be written. Much the same applies to public statements by the Council of Economic Advisers. Although the Council consists of economic experts, it is also a political body. The Council cannot discharge its primary responsibility of assisting the President and at the same time express views that diverge significantly from the President's public position. At best, the Council's pronouncements are destined to be punctuated by silence on matters that justify the eloquence of candor.

These political realities undoubtedly have their logic and even merit. Yet the question keeps recurring in both intellectual and business circles whether some method could not be devised for providing interested citizens with a thoroughly objective review of the state of the Nation's economy followed by an outline of desirable directions of national policy. One familiar suggestion for attaining this authoritative guidance is to shift the duties of the Council of Economic Advisers from serving the President to serving the general public. More specifically, the thought is to remove the Council from the Executive Office of the President and make it responsible, as is the Supreme Court, to the people at large. The idea of a "supreme court of economics" has not won, however, much support. The proposal seems obviously defective. It overlooks the fact that a need would still exist for a group of professional economists to serve as the President's advisers. Also, it naively assumes that economics has reached the status of an exact science and that economic thinking can be entirely divorced from value judgments or political thinking.

A more practical approach, which has the merit of recognizing the limitations of economic science, would be to establish, through an amendment of the Employment Act, an ad hoc Commission on the Economic Report. This Commission would be instructed to advise the Congress, within 3 or 4 weeks of the President's submission of his Economic Report, of its views concerning the findings and recommendations of the report and on such other matters as in its judgment require public attention. Once the Commission has made its report, or perhaps after its members have testified at hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee, it would pass out of existence.

The crucial question raised by this proposal is, of course, how such a Commission is to be selected and appointed. Clearly, the method of selection and appointment should be such as to establish the widest possible public confidence in the Commission's competence and objectivity. After considering various methods, I believe that perhaps the most promising method is as follows: Let the ranking member of the Democratic contingent on the Joint Economic Committee draw up a panel of 10 economists outside the Government service, each of whom is deemed to be exceptionally qualified by training and experience to evaluate the President's Economic Report. The ranking Republican member of the Joint Economic Committee would likewise draw up a list of 10 exceptionally qualified economists. Next, the ranking Democrat would designate three economists from the panel submitted by the Republican, and the ranking Republican would designate three economists from the panel submitted by the Democrat. The six thus chosen would constitute the Commission on the Economic Report. They would elect their own chairman or, if need be, cochairmen.

Such a method of selecting the Commission should help to establish public confidence in its findings and recommendations. For, not only would the membership of the Commission be selected on a bipartisan basis, but there would be public pressure on the nominating officials of both parties to include economists of proven ability and distinction on their panels. It seems probable that this pressure would increase with time, especially if the purpose of the selecting procedure were ever flouted. Moreover, the process of narrowing the list from 20 to 6 names will of itself tend to weed out economists whose views are relatively extreme or who may otherwise be controversial.

It appears to me that the Commission device, whether or not it results in unanimous reports, would tend to raise public discussion of economic issues to a higher plane. The very existence of such a reviewing body is likely to make for greater care in the preparation of the President's Economic Report. Also, since the Commission's findings and views would be available to the Joint Economic Committee before it concluded its deliberations on the President's Economic Report, its own report would benefit directly from the Commission's work. It seems reasonable to hope, therefore, that these benefits would ramify and foster sounder economic thinking on public policies across the country.

The President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy may in time also become a useful adjunct to our machinery for economic policymaking. This May a White House Conference on National Economic Issues was held on the initiative of this Labor-Management Committee. The Conference was attended by business executives, trade union leaders, other outstanding private citizens, as well as by high Government officials. Its deliberations covered a wide range of topics and the Conference was deemed by many of the participants a useful experiment in communication between public officials and leaders in private life. In the future, it might be desirable to hold conferences of this type soon after the submission of the President's Economic Report and perhaps to concentrate on wage and price behavior in the light of the President's appraisal of the state of the Nation's economy and its needs. Moreover, it remains to be seen whether the Labor-Management Committee, which has been given larger responsibilities than its name suggests, may not prove of some practical assistance to the President before as well as after his Economic Report is submitted to the Congress.

There are still other ways in which the machinery for economic policymaking may be improved. One of the formidable difficulties in shaping and articulating national economic policy is the wide diffusion of power within the Federal Establishment. Economic policy, it is well to remember, is in large part made, and in fact made continuously, through administrative decisions and the manner of their implementation. Since the policies of individual departments or agencies of our far-flung Government have ramifications that may not be recognized by their chiefs and since what is done in the domestic sphere can have repercussions on our international relations, there is a clear need for coordination of economic policies. This problem has been traditionally handled by the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, interagency committees, the Cabinet, the White House staff, and in still other ways. All these devices have proved their usefulness. The fact remains, nevertheless, that they have not infrequently failed to cope successfully with the tendency of individual units of Government to cling tenaciously to what they regard as being, or what may in law actually be, their exclusive prerogative.

In view of the vital role that economic policy has come to play in our times, it may therefore be helpful to establish an Economic Policy Board that would bring to economic matters the authority and prestige which the National Security Council brings to matters of defense. This Board might include, besides the President and the Vice President, the heads of the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as the heads of the Federal Reserve Board, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Council of Economic Advisers. These officials could serve on the Economic Policy Board without any change in their responsibilities as defined under existing law. To fulfill its promise, the Board would need to meet at regular and fairly frequent intervals, invite other officials occasionally to join in deliberations, and draw on a professional staff, the Director of which could best be the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

An Economic Policy Board thus constituted may well prove a useful experiment in government. True, the Board would impose a new demand on the President who is already overburdened. It might turn out, however, that the time spent by the President on the Board meetings is more than offset by the reduced need to discuss economic issues with department heads and other officials individually. In any event, the Economic Policy Board should provide a maximum of opportunity for balanced judgment on economic issues, thereby facilitating the development of consistent policies and the early correction of any that are found wanting.

This Board could also be helpful in the implementation of policies, which is never easy in the large establishment of government. An illustration may perhaps clarify this function. Early in 1955 it became evident that the threat of inflation was growing. By midyear, modest steps had already been taken to restrain the general expansion of credit, as well as the expansion of credit in several specific areas—housing, the stock market, and consumer installment buying. However, nothing was done about Federal spending until August 1955 when, after extensive debate at a Cabinet meeting the President decided to bring Federal expenditures about $2 billion below the projected estimate for the fiscal year. But in September the President had a heart attack and this impaired for a time his ability to keep the forces of government under close control. The decision to reduce Federal spending temporarily, which was right and important at the time, was never carried out. Instead, Federal expenditures increased and added to the inflationary pressures that were being rapidly generated by the private sector of the economy.

Of course, one cannot be entirely sure whether the decision to reduce spending would have been implemented if the President's health had been unimpaired. In view of the President's grave illness, it is also uncertain whether better governmental machinery would have made a significant difference. Nevertheless, I believe that if an Economic Policy Board, such as I have sketched, had existed at the time, the chances of implementing the President's decision would have remained good. In view of the President's disability, the chairmanship of the Board would have passed as a matter of course to the Vice President. The Board would have continued to meet on schedule. Hence, the Director of the Budget and the Chairman of the Council would have had an opportunity to report on how well the decision on spending was being carried out. As it was, the decision was forgotten amid the anxiety and confusion that followed the President's heart attack.

This illustration has implications for governmental practice that I cannot stop to pursue. My present aim is simply to emphasize the need of better machinery for economic policymaking. It is not enough to bring good men to posts of economic authority within the Government. The forces of economic understanding both within and outside the Government need also to be mobilized in an efficient manner. This practical problem of Government deserves more study than economists of political scientists have been devoting to it.

V

I shall bring these reflections on the Employment Act to a close by commenting briefly on our statistical machinery for economic policymaking. That comprehensive economic statistics are vital to the implementation of the act was clearly recognized by its authors, as my sketch of the early history of the act may already have suggested. From their very inception, the Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee have therefore worked closely with other governmental agencies, especially the Office of Statistical Standards, on the improvement of economic data. In 1954 the Joint Economic Committee gave formal recognition to the statistical side of the Employment Act by establishing a permanent Subcommittee on Economic Statistics. This congressional group has devoted considerable effort to helping other legislators understand the practical importance of better records, and it has also encouraged economists both within and outside the halls of Government to think more boldly about statistical needs. As a result of these activities and the enterprise of various private research agencies, our statistical records for economic policymaking have greatly improved in scope, in accuracy, and in promptness of publication.

Nevertheless, a serious need remains for strengthening the statistical machinery of the Employment Act. In judging the condition or prospects of the labor market, we still have to rely on a patchwork of overlapping and at times puzzling compilations. In seeking to discriminate between structural changes as one possible cause of unemployment and deficiency of aggregate demand as another, we are still frustrated by an almost complete absence of statistics on job vacancies. We still do much of our economic thinking with statistics of hourly earnings that take no account of fringe benefits, although they are a large and increasing part of labor compensation. We still put up with statistics on profits that are much too tardy. For example, as late as the middle of May 1961, when the recent recession was already over, the Department of Commerce had not yet released any estimate of corporate profits beyond the third quarter of 1960, when the recession was just about getting underway. We still do not have comparable monthly or quarterly data on prices and unit costs of production in major individual industries. We still lack systematic and comparable records for different stages of the investment process—that is, of the volume of investment initiated, the volume executed, and the volume completed. Records distinguishing between the domestic and foreign origin of the orders received by manufacturers are still scanty, and we have hardly begun to devise a system of internationally comparable price statistics. Surely, correction of deficiencies such as these is vital to the proper diagnosis of the state of our domestic economy and of our international economic relations.

There is also a need to improve estimates of the gross national product on which government and business officials nowadays rely so heavily.

A single illustration will suffice. When the President's economic report was issued in January 1955, the economy was already recovering from the recession that followed the end of the Korean war. It therefore seemed desirable to assess the lessons of that recession in the light of its scope and magnitude. According to statistics then available, the annual rate of the gross national product, when viewed from the expenditure side, had dropped $14.4 billion during the recession—that is, between the second quarter of 1953 and the third quarter of 1954. However, when viewed from the income side, the gross national product showed a drop of only $7.4 billion during this period. Some time later, revised estimates reduced the first figure to $6.6 billion and the second to $5.6 billion. When uncertainties of this magnitude can surround measurements of the past, still larger uncertainties must surround estimates of the future and there is bound to be some uneasiness about the relation that economic policies may bear to actual conditions.

Forecasting is, of course, essential to economic policy. Indeed, policymaking without forecasting is unthinkable. Some controversy has arisen, however, about, the wisdom of publishing short-term forecasts and projections such as the Council of Economic Advisers must steadily make. There is a fairly widespread belief among economists that the Employment Act requires the publication of numerical estimates of what the Nation can produce under conditions of full employment and of what the Nation will produce if existing governmental policies remain unchanged. This opinion seems to be based on a confusion between Senator Murray's "Full Employment Act" and the bill which became law.

In any event the vital question is whether estimates of this sort can be made with sufficient reliability to justify the President in cloaking them with the authority of his office. In my judgment, existing knowledge enables experts to do reasonably well in forecasting the direction of economic movements and the direction of the effects of specific policies. When it comes, however, to estimating the magnitude of changes in either potential or actual output in the future, only very rough estimates are as yet possible. When such figures are used by the President or in his name, many businessmen and wage earners may form the impression that Government officials actually know how much our economy will be able to produce and how many jobs there will be under different sets of conditions. Since that is hardly the case, statistical pronouncements of this type may generate a false sense of security among people at the cost of excessive disappointment later, thereby complicating the tasks of governmental policy.

Although Presidential endorsement of these forecasts and projections seems inadvisable to me at present, it is desirable for economists to strive energetically for the knowledge needed to justify this or other sensitive uses in the future. A significant step in this direction is represented by the statistical intelligence system that the Bureau of the Census recently inaugurated in its monthly publication on Business Cycle Developments. Earlier research had demonstrated that expansions and contractions of aggregate economic activity are cumulative processes. The new publication builds on this feature of the business cycle by presenting and analyzing the more significant indicators of activity on the principle that economic impulses take time to work out their effects. If properly used, statistics arranged in this fashion can frequently give an early warning signal of recession or recovery.

However, this tool of forecasting is still imperfect and considerable research will be needed to develop its full potential. It would be desirable, in the first place, to develop separate lists of indicators for recessions and recoveries. These lists will undoubtedly be largely the same, but they will not be identical. For example, it seems clear on theoretical grounds and is demonstrable empirically that unemployment tends to lead at downturns but to lag at upturns of the business cycle. In the second place, it would be desirable to improve on present crude methods of gaging the probable magnitude of expansions and contractions still underway. More important still, since it is often impossible even for experts to tell with confidence whether an apparent early signal of recession means precisely that or merely a temporary lull in aggregate activity, research needs to be directed to ways of refining this vital distinction. The authorities of the Bureau of the Census who have been working on business cycle developments are fully aware of these research needs.

There are many other problems that require statistical research from the viewpoint of the Employment Act. One is the measurement and forecasting of productive capacity, both in major industries and in the economy as a whole. A second involves careful review and exploratory work on formulas for triggering antirecession devices. A third involves measurement of the rate of economic growth so as to allow properly for temporary fluctuations and also for the numerous activities that are now excluded from overall measures. A fourth involves improved measurement of industrial productivity, of unemployment, of the consumer price level, and so on. These statistical investigations must go hand in hand with theoretical inquiries of economic processes and they must deal with complex psychological phenomena such as the nature of business confidence. The opportunities for useful research by economists and statisticians are therefore large and so they will remain. As we go about our inquiries, it will be useful to bear in mind that the practices of policymakers under the umbrella of the Employment Act will improve no faster than our basic knowledge of how the economy works.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 2D SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I intended to talk on the accomplishments of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, but I am not going to do it at 10 minutes to 7.

APPRAISAL OF OUR GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. James C. Davis] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, sine die adjournment of the 87th Congress of the United States will come within a few days. As we approach this milestone it is worthwhile to look at the condition of our Government, both as to our domestic and international position.

A frank appraisal reveals that:

First. The Federal Government is spending more than it can afford for domestic projects we could do without, or postpone until necessary cold war spending can be reduced.

Second. Our best hope for peace is military strength. Communism respects only military might. We must maintain defense forces and adequate military might. We must maintain defense forces and adequate military strength to repel any attack and destroy the attacker. This is our best guarantee of peace.

Third. We are fast coming under a judicial dictatorship. The judicial department of our Government must be curbed and held within its proper sphere.

Fourth. Our foreign policy must be reviewed and changed—especially as regards foreign aid, the United Nations, and the Monroe Doctrine.

Fifth. Relief must be given from the oppressive tax burden now strangling industry and individual taxpayers.

More spending is the order of the day in Washington. In 1940 the total Federal Government cost was a fraction over $9 billion. We pay more than that each year now just for interest on the national debt. The interest bill this year will be around $9½ billion. We have established a pattern of operating the Government on credit. For 26 of the last 32 years the Federal Government has spent more than its income. We overspent by $8.3 billion last year. This amount we overspent last year was nearly the total cost of Government operations in 1940. It is now admitted that this year we will overspend by $6.3 billion. By the time the fiscal year ends, the chances are good that this year's deficit will again be $8 billion. No one knows when the Federal budget will ever be balanced again. No responsible Government official will promise a balanced budget in any specific year. For the first time in history our national debt has gone above $300 billion. Government spending has reached the point where next year, if the spending projects now proposed are carried out, Government spending will be more than $100 billion. Percentagewise civilian spending projects have increased much faster than military spending. There is some room for military spending reduction, but the great opportunity for spending reduction is to cut out unnecessary and nonessential foreign and domestic spending projects.

This is a day of slogans, titles, and labels. When a bureaucrat wants to sell a useless and unnecessary spending scheme to the public now, the first step is to give it an attractive title. Billions of dollars in useless, wasteful spending have been saddled upon American taxpayers through fancy slogans and titles dreamed up by big spending Federal bureaucrats.

J. Edgar Hoover and the House Committee on Un-American Activities for years warned of the Communist menace. They have been smeared and attacked by outright Communists, Communist sympathizers, and by uninformed, well-meaning ignoramuses. Since 1917, communism has taken control of more of the earth's territory and people than any aggressor ever did in the history of the world in a like period of time. A Communist bastion exists just 90 miles from our shores in Cuba. Communism respects nothing but military might. Our chance not only for peace but for actual survival depends upon our military strength. Whatever the cost, we must keep ourselves militarily strong.

The Supreme Court has abandoned its functions as outlined in our Constitution. It is now brazenly and boldly usurping authority it does not legally possess to rewrite our Constitution and change it to conform to the personal beliefs and opinions of a majority of the nine individuals comprising the Court. This contempt for the Constitution has spread to the Attorney General's office. Both the Supreme Court and the Attorney General now are fraudulently usurping authority to transform our Government into a government of men and not a government of laws.

We continue to follow a foreign policy which has failed miserably. The Monroe Doctrine, which for generations was effective to preserve law and order and peace in the Americas, has been abandoned, and its functions transferred to an impotent, ineffectual body known as the Organization of American States. Our State Department refuses to recognize the incompetence of that organization, as it refuses to recognize the incompetence and inability of the United Nations to preserve peace, or perform any of the substantial functions it was created to perform. Our influence in the United Nations and throughout the world has steadily deteriorated. Our international standing has reached the lowest point it has ever occupied since we became a nation in 1776. We have promoted the creation of so-called independent governments and advocated their admission to the United Nations until now there are some 109 so-called independent governments in that organization. Many of them are incapable of even governing themselves, let alone participating in world government. Each of them has one vote in the United Nations, the same as our Nation with 185 million people. Some of these illiterate, half-savage nations have less than half the population of the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, which I represent, but their one vote is equal to that of the United States of America, which is funneling taxpayers' money into the governments of just about every one of those 102 nations except Communist Russia and Communist China. Many of these recipients of American bounty do not even claim to be our allies, but call themselves neutralists. Even those who claim to be our allies often do not support us.

If we are capable of learning anything, we should know by now that we cannot buy friends, and that the answer to our problems and world problems is not giving more and more money to wasteful, extravagant, often corrupt governments throughout the four corners of the earth.

We have lost the exalted position of world leadership which once was ours. If we expect to regain it and keep it, we must review and revise the foreign policies which we have been following for nearly two decades.

Wasteful spending, with its inevitable consequences of bankruptcy and ruin, has been the practice of spendthrifts from the time of the prodigal son on down to this day. Reckless and unnecessary spending has brought American taxpayers to the point today where approximately one-third of every dollar earned goes to pay taxes, Federal, State, and local. The wage earner now must work 4 months to pay his year's taxes, and is able to retain for himself only two-thirds of what he earns. This situation has reached an intolerable stage. Government spending can be decreased. It should be decreased. The American people have it within their power to correct this situation.

The minority pressure groups who clamor for this Government spending have learned the magic of organization. The great mass of sensible, right-thinking American people have not learned this, but organization is the answer to all the ills which beset us. If and when the thrifty, hard-working, right-thinking majority of Americans organize on a nationwide basis to clean up the various governments which are responsible for these wasteful spending programs, the situation can be corrected in one national election. Let us hope that the time is not far distant when that kind of action will be taken.

GERTRUDE MILLER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on September 19 the Morningside Heights community in New York lost a leading citizen; the cause of good government lost a stanch supporter; and I lost a dear and devoted friend. I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to the memory of Gertrude Miller, a most remarkable and wonderful person.

Gertrude Miller belonged to a family known as the Riverside Democrats, a unique group of concerned and dedicated Americans who already have shaped the course of political history. Today the reform Democratic movement in New York is recognized throughout the Nation as an illustration of how idealism can be translated into effective political action. Gertrude Miller's contribution to this development was vital to its success.

A writer by instinct and profession, she was engaged in the field of public relations as vocation and avocation. In 1952 she was spurred to political activity by the inspiration of Adlai Stevenson. Along with other Stevenson volunteers, she became a pioneer in the struggle to democratize and reform the New York State Democratic Party. She fought with the Stevenson Democrats of the West Side against the old-line Tammany machine and in January 1957 helped to found the Riverside Democrats in the Morningside Heights-Columbia University area. As the editor of the Riverdale Democrat during the succeeding years, Gertrude Miller devoted her unusual talent and ability to explaining to her fellow New Yorkers the hopes, aspirations and goals of reform.

Her fellow members of the Riverside Democrats held Gertrude Miller in such esteem and affection that they chose her to serve as Democratic State committeewoman from the Seventh Assembly District during 1960-62. She brought a fresh, imaginative approach to this position. The old way of doing things did not satisfy her, and her influence resulted in specific procedural changes to make the State committee more representative and responsive.

Believing that substantive issues should be debated and discussed by the citizenry at large, Gertrude Miller was responsible for organizing the highly successful Foreign Policy Conference held last February 3 at the Men's Faculty Club of Columbia University under the sponsorship of the reform Democratic Clubs of the West Side and the 20th Congressional District office. As director of the conference, she brought together prominent experts on foreign policy from government, academic, and business circles. It was not by accident, but because of the planning and preparation of Gertrude Miller's committee that over 750 West Side residents came out in a snow storm to attend this series of stimulating panel discussions. It was democracy in action; it was Gertrude Miller in action.

Mr. Speaker, Gertrude Miller was one of the most modest individuals I have been privileged to know. Never seeking or asking anything for herself, she worked for her beliefs. Her unselfishness, enthusiasm and total commitment to her ideals were contagious. Her only failing was to underestimate her own accomplishments. Her life is an answer to any who doubt the effect an individual may have upon her times and her fellow citizens. She will be deeply missed by her friends and her community.

It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to express my own sense of personal loss. I relied heavily upon the advice and sound counsel of Gertrude Miller. At times of stress and crisis during my service as Democratic leader and later as Congressman I would turn to her. Her good judgment and clear thinking were a source of strength to me. Without the Gertrude Millers of this world I would not be here now. Words cannot describe my debt to her. I shall try simply to be the kind of Congressman she wanted me to be. To her sister, Edith, and her father, Samuel Miller, I extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a moving article which appeared in the Morningsider, our local community newspaper, on September 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article follows:

RIVERSIDE DEMOCRATS' GERTRUDE MILLER DIES

Gertrude Miller died last week. She left an emptiness at the Riverside Democrats and in hundreds of men and women who had worked with her for many years.

As a writer, she would have enjoyed writing her own obituary, and she would have improved it in every respect but one—for she would have taken out the complimentary references. Honest modesty about her talents and abilities was one of her greatest virtues and perhaps her greatest fault.

She was for years editor of the Riverside Democrat newsletter, which she turned out practically singlehandedly. She was a professional writer. Yet after writing an article, she would invariably ask the advice, criticism, and suggestions of others.

Although she had her heroes, she was never saccharine sweet about people or events. She was most angered by the petty cruelties of bureaucracies and government, and she saved her sharpest criticism for the pompous and the pretenders. She knew a "crazy idea" when she heard one, and although she seldom said anything about it, she knew "an idiot" when she saw one.

In politics and as Democratic State committeewoman she never hesitated to say, quietly, what she honestly thought.

She resigned at least four times as public relations chairman of the Riverside Democrats. Although she always meant her resignation when she gave it, she would join in laughing at herself. She knew perfectly well that as deadlines approached, she would end up doing what she had insisted she could not do.

She was 38 years old. She had gone to Pennsylvania and Columbia Universities and had worked for Ruder & Finn, public relations.

After the disastrous Stevenson presidential campaign in 1952, she helped organize the Stevenson Democrats of the West Side, a group dedicated to revitalizing the Democratic Party. She became a vice president, and in 1955 she helped lead an unsuccessful primary fight to unseat a Tammany district leader who was to become a Tammany Congressman. Two years later she joined the newly organized Riverside Democrats and was elected to the board of directors. In 1960 she helped lead reform forces in the congressional primary that unseated the same old-line Tammany leader and Congressman who had defeated the Stevenson Democrats.

A few days before she died, she received Congressman WILLIAM FITZ RYAN in her hospital room at Mount Sinai. She had been a public relations adviser to RYAN for many years. As always, she was amused by his bulldog determination, particularly when it was directed at making sure the efficient hospital was doing everything possible for her. She laughed a good deal. On Wednesday she slipped into a coma. She died without pain. She is survived by her father, Samuel Miller, and a sister, Edith.

Although she was brought up in the Jewish faith, she was not formally religious. She would have been much amused at some of her friends, Irishmen in yarmulkas, hardheaded Puritans in tears and even political enemies who were personal friends paying their respects. She would have told them all to stop being idiots and to go home. God keep her.

A TAX CUT FOR THE LITTLE TAXPAYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House passed a tax revision bill. This legislation is intended to help business.

Early in this session President Kennedy announced that a tax cut may be possible next year. Since this announcement I have received a great deal of mail, both pro and con. I would like to state here and now that as long as I can remember, regardless of who occupied the White House, the little taxpayers, who contribute about two-thirds of our revenue, have received very little benefit—and I repeat very little—from any tax reform legislation.

It is my every hope that President Kennedy's proposal will deal with this subject on an equitable basis.

The main theme of the President's tax cut proposal is that the present tax system is geared to take too much money out of the economy in time of rising business activity. The economic advisers to the President express the belief that this method chokes off recoveries.

I advocate the middle-of-the-road role at this time, and I want to present my views with respect to a tax cut. While the administration has not yet presented its proposal to Congress, I understand that various plans are under study and consideration. It is expected that an overall 8-percent cut on personal income tax might be proposed, along with a decrease in the corporation tax rate from 52 percent to 49 percent.

It is my contention that the 8-percent proposal would not help the little taxpayer, and would not give our economy the boost that it needs.

The first bill I intend to introduce in the next session of Congress is one that will increase substantially the present $600 personal tax exemption. In adjusting this figure, we will not only bring our tax structure into a more realistic position but it will also give the general economy of our country a much-needed boost.

To offset the decrease in revenue that will result from increased personal exemptions, I propose a drastic change in the depletion allowance for oil. The present oil depletion allowance was initiated years ago when oil exploration was a speculative business. It is no longer that speculative that it requires a 27½ percent allowance. Other industries far more speculative in nature have no such allowances. Cutting the oil depletion allowance to 15 percent from the present 27½ percent would permit a $200 additional exemption without any loss in revenue to the Treasury.

The gross public debt at the end of the 1961 fiscal year was $288,970,938,610. The per capita debt, based on a population of 183,742,000, is $1,572.81.

In 1961, 61,267,560 persons filed income tax returns. A breakdown of these returns follows:

Tax rate:	*Returns*
20 to 30 percent	47,027,522
34 to 72 percent	14,218,735
75 to 91 percent	21,303
Total	61,267,560

On a percentage basis, 77 percent of the total returns filed were in the 20 to 30 percent bracket; 22.966 percent were in the 34 to 72 percent bracket; and .034 percent were in the 75 to 91 percent bracket.

From an IRS survey, these figures can be broken down even further:

Annual income:	*Percent*
Under $5,000	21.6
$5,000 to $10,000	19.5
$10,000 to $15,000	17.5
$15,000 to $25,000	13.5
Total	72.1
$25,000 to $50,000	13.4
$50,000 to $100,000	14.5
Total	27.9

The latest figures available on family income are:

Incomes under $3,000 were received by about 10 million families, or 21 percent of the 46.5 million families.

In the $3,000 to $5,000 income range, there were 9 million families or 20 percent.

In the $5,000 to $7,000 range, there were 10 million—about 22 percent.

Incomes above $7,000 were received by 17 million families, or 37 percent.

At this point I wish to offer some simple examples which will give a true picture of what a tax cut will mean if a straight 8 percent tax cut is granted, or if personal exemptions are increased, let us say, from the present $600 to $700. The same basic figures are used in these examples.

Example: A married taxpayer earning $6,000 per year, no dependents, and standard 10 percent deduction:

Present law	$6,000.00
10 percent	600.00
Total	5,400.00
Exemptions	1,200.00
Taxable income	4,200.00
Present tax	844.00
Tax if cut by 8 percent	776.48
Saving	67.52

Example: A married taxpayer filing jointly with net income of $15,000, no dependents:

Present law	$15,000.00
Exemptions	1,200.00
Total	13,800.00
Present tax	3,260.00
Tax if cut by 8 percent	2,999.20
Saving	260.80

Example: A married taxpayer filing jointly with net income of $75,000, no dependents:

Present law	$75,000.00
Exemptions	1,200.00
Total	73,800.00
Present tax	35,290.00
Tax if cut by 8 percent	32,466.80
Saving	2,823.20

Example: A married taxpayer filing jointly with $6,000 annual income, no dependents, and standard 10 percent deduction but with $700 exemption allowance instead of present $600:

Income	$6,000.00
10 percent	600.00
Total	5,400.00
Exemptions	1,400.00
Total	4,000.00
Tax on $4,000 ($700 exemption)	800.00
Tax if cut by 8 percent	776.48
Tax under present law	844.00

Example: A married taxpayer filing jointly with $15,000 net income, no dependents, with $700 exemption allowance:

Income	$15,000.00
Exemptions	1,400.00
Total	13,600.00
Tax on $13,600 ($700 exemption)	3,200.00
Tax if cut by 8 percent	2,999.20
Tax under present law	3,260.00

Example: A married taxpayer filing jointly with $75,000 net income, no dependents, with $700 exemption allowance:

Income	$75,000.00
Exemptions	1,400.00
Total	73,600.00
Tax on $73,600.00 ($700 exemption)	35,160.00
Tax if cut by 8 percent	32,466.80
Tax under under present law	35,290.00

Example: A married taxpayer filing jointly with $6,000 income, three dependents, and standard 10 percent deduction ($700 exemption for each):

Income	$6,000.00
10 percent	600.00
Total	5,400.00
Exemptions	3,500.00
Total	1,900.00
Tax on $1,900 ($700 exemption)	380.00
Tax if cut by 8 percent	441.66
Tax under present law	480.00

Example: A married taxpayer filing jointly with $15,000 net income, three dependents ($700 exemption for each).

Income	$15,000.00
Exemptions	3,500.00
Total	11,500.00
Tax on $11,500 ($700 exemption)	2,590.00
Tax if cut by 8 percent	2,502.40
Tax under present law	2,720.00

Example: A married taxpayer filing jointly with $75,000 net income, three dependents ($700 exemption for each).

Income	$75,000.00
Exemptions	3,500.00
Total	71,500.00
Tax on $71,500 ($700 exemption)	33,795.00
Tax if cut by 8 percent	31,391.40
Tax under present law	34,120.00

Increasing personal exemptions would be beneficial to the taxpayer in the lower income group who has several dependents. More often than not this is the man who needs it most. He has not only the responsibility of providing for his family, but he must also plan for their education.

As can be seen from my examples, an 8 percent overall tax cut would give the taxpayer in the higher income brackets a greater benefit than an increase in the personal exemption.

Therefore, I am firmly of the opinion that any reduction in our income tax should be brought about by an increase in the personal exemption allowance, and that the resulting loss in tax revenue should be made up by cutting the oil depletion allowance.

NIXON-MALAXA TIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, never, since I came to the Congress in 1949, have I taken the floor to expose and characterize any individual's personality. But there is a very heated contest on in California right now. I refer to the contest for Governor between Governor Brown and Mr. Nixon, former member of this House, former U.S. Senator and former Vice President of the United States. I have noticed from the press that Mr. Nixon has been using the old Nixon technique of smear trying to use insinuation to imply that Governor Brown and his administration are soft on communism, that there might possibly be something wrong with Governor Brown's Americanism. Such smears must not go unanswered. The doubts raised cannot remain unchallenged.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply resent such insinuations from Mr. Nixon or anyone else. I have known Gov. Pat Brown since grammar school days and I have always known him to be a loyal American in the highest tradition, a good husband and family man, a good Christian and a dedicated public servant.

Mr. Nixon has unleashed the old Dick Nixon to spread some of his noxious Nixon poison to taint the character and patriotism of Gov. Pat Brown. He does not accuse anybody, he just smears them with insinuations. I think we have the obligation, since Mr. Nixon has decided to judge the character of others, to examine his connections with a man who was a leading Nazi, later a Communist collaborator, always a scoundrel, always an enemy of Americanism. How can Nixon explain connections to the weird Nicola Malaxa? How clean are Mr. Nixon's hands? Maybe he will try to wiggle out of this one on the basis that he only dealt with Malaxa at arm's length, not personally, but just through his law firm, his friends and close associates. Or maybe Mr. Nixon will whine that since some of his top campaign managers are Jewish, how could he possibly be guilty of helping an anti-Semite like Malaxa? Mr. Nixon is too tricky for us to predict just how he will try to dodge.

Unless Mr. Nixon satisfactorily explains and repudiates his interest in the Malaxa case, I believe he will have his seventh crisis.

The case of Nicola Malaxa is becoming better known as each year new evidence accumulates to establish Malaxa as one of the most sinister figures to have made his way through the maze of both Nazi and Communist dictatorships during the Hitler and Stalin regimes. This is the story of a man who conspired with the Iron Guard in Rumania, then with the Nazis, later with the Communists; who outwitted his vicious accomplices, and finally arrived in this hemisphere with several million dollars.

I raise the subject of Malaxa today because there has come to our attention new information which not only corroborates Nazi affiliations—which he had long denied—but raises other questions pointing to strange connections between the dangerous and bloodstained Malaxa and certain Americans of great prominence and influence. This is highly disturbing. Furthermore, there are other issues which should be submitted to the Department of Justice, the State Department and the Immigration Service. First, it is necessary to review the chronology of Malaxa's ugly career.

Apparently Malaxa first acquired wealth and power as one of Rumania's leading arms and munitions magnates, thanks to the friendship of King Carol. During the war his partner was Albert Goering, brother of Field Marshal Hermann Goering; working together to supply the Hitler war machine with scarce metallurgical products. There were vast profits reaped from this, some of which Malaxa plowed back into the Rumanian Iron Guard, the fanatic storm trooper movement which was too extreme for the Rumanian Fascist dictatorship which ruled Rumania at that time, under General Antonescu.

In an American immigration proceeding—in 1951—testimony linked Malaxa to the Iron Guard's wildest activities connecting him with its January 1941 uprising, which General Antonescu finally suppressed. Witnesses told of seeing Iron Guardists enter Malaxa's home to obtain arms cached there for use in the revolt and of Malaxa's financial backing of the Iron Guard. All of this is particularly important in view of the fact that it was at that time, namely in 1940 and 1941, that the Iron Guard perpetrated its worst Jewish pogroms, killing over 7,000, looting and pillaging, and seizing Jewish owned property and businesses. That was in 1941.

We first find Malaxa entering the United States in 1946 as a member of Communist Rumania's special economic delegation. He entered with temporary status as a visitor—he never returned to Rumania. This was the period of the Stalinist terror, when Anna Pauker was the Kremlin's commissar for Rumania. Malaxa arranged with the Communists to receive $2,500,000, supposedly compensation for factories seized by the Communists. He was permitted to transfer these funds to the United States.

In 1948 Malaxa initiated steps for permanent residence in the United States, applying for admission under the Displaced Persons Act. There were hearings at which witnesses told of Malaxa's sinister past, which he vigorously denied. The Immigration Service made a finding in favor of Malaxa on September 26, 1951, but the recommendation failed to receive the required congressional approval. Malaxa's name was then added to a joint resolution initiated in the Senate which would have had the effect of adjusting Malaxa's status if passed.

There are definite reports in reputable newspapers that Richard Nixon, then Senator from California, tried to get Malaxa's name appended to legislation which would have permitted his entry. For instance, the St. Louis Post Dispatch on September 30, 1952, reports that:

Nixon introduced a bill to permit Malaxa to remain permanently in the United States.

Now I have tried to find such a piece of legislation bearing Mr. Nixon's name, and I cannot find one directly sponsored by him. What apparently occurred was that in accordance with the usual practice, the bill was introduced by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and other Senators presented names to the chairman for inclusion in an omnibus resolution. The resolution, when it reached the House, was carefully scrutinized by the able chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, and the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, and I understand that it was thanks to them that Malaxa's name was deleted, leaving him, at that time, still a displaced person.

However Malaxa had several strings to his bow. He organized and was sole owner of a company called the Western Tube Corp., purportedly to manufacture seamless tubing for oil drilling. The plan for the new company was to set up in California, the second largest oil producing State in the country, where the industry had no local source for sheet tubing. In fact, it was planned that the new company would be built in Whittier, Calif.

One must remember this was the height of the Korean war, when all industry was under wartime control. On May 17, 1951, the Western Tube Corp. filed an application for a "certificate of necessity" to give top priority for its materials and personnel.

Also, the company filed a petition seeking a "first preference quota" for Nicolae Malaxa, on the ground that he was personally indispensable in building of this essential plant, and that his presence was immediately required on the scene at Whittier where the "essential" plant was about to be erected.

The then junior Senator from California, Richard Nixon, whose hometown of Whittier was the lucky site selected for Western Tube's plant, helped promote these applications. We find the following letter, sent by Senator Nixon to the Defense Production Administration. The signature of California's other Senator was also affixed, which gave the project the appearance of being of statewide importance.

Letter follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR
AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
September 14, 1951.

Mr. MANLY FLEISCHMANN,
Administrator, Defense Production Administration, New GAO Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLEISCHMANN: We understand that Western Tube Corp. filed an application with your administration on May 17, 1951, for a certificate of necessity in connection with the plant it proposes to build in California to manufacture seamless tubing for oil wells. File No. TA 9660 was assigned to the application.

California, as you may know, is the second largest State in both oil reserves and oil production. The proven reserves are 3,825 million barrels, and its production for 1950 was 328,018,000 barrels. This represents about 17 percent of the total of reserves and production of the entire United States.

It is our understanding that at the present time there is no plant in California for the manufacture of seamless tubing for oil wells, and such tubing is now shipped about 2,500 miles from Ohio and Pennsylvania.

Be [sic] reason of these facts it is important, strategically and economically, both for California and the entire United States, that a plant for the manufacture of seamless tubing for oil wells be erected near the California oil fields. We therefore urge that every consideration that it may merit be given to the pending application.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
RICHARD NIXON.

When this letter reached DPA it was marked "urgent" and an affirmative answer was made in record time, so that Western Tube could start "operating" without delay.

The scheme worked.

Malaxa was admitted from Canada as a permanent resident under an approved first-preference petition under the general immigration law. This was September 26, 1953, during the Republican administration.

Just how close were the ties between Richard Nixon and Malaxa's phantom Western Tube Corp.? We find the following:

Western Tube's California address was 607 Bank of America Building, Whittier, Calif. It was also at 607 Bank of America Building that the firm of Bewley, Knoop & Nixon had their law office.

Thomas Bewley, of this firm, was the official "agent" for purposes of service, for Western Tube Corp. Bewley was also the secretary of Western Tube, and a director.

Herman L. Perry, the vice president of Western Tube, was an old Nixon political backer and sponsor. He was a "family friend," who, Mrs. Nixon told the Saturday Evening Post:

> Got Dick to fly home to talk to a committee of 100 citizens who, as political amateurs, were looking for someone to oppose Congressman Jerry Voorhis.

Nicola Malaxa served as treasurer of the company.

Regarding the firm of Bewley, Knoop & Nixon, Nixon reportedly severed relations with the firm sometime after he was elected to the Senate in 1950. It is believed that he was not an active member of the firm by 1952; however his name remained on the door, on the building directory as being a member of the firm.

Shortly thereafter, Western Tube became inactive. It never got beyond the paper stage and no plant was ever built in California or elsewhere. As we look back on this it is impossible to discover any reason for creating Western Tube and seeking a certificate of necessity other than to give Malaxa a springboard for entry into the United States. The company appears to have been a complete fraud. Once Malaxa obtained permanent residence in the United States the need for California to have its local supplier of tubing went a'glimmering, and we find nothing more said or written by Mr. Malaxa's sponsors about California's need for a sheet tube plant.

The misrepresentation of the Western Tube scheme caught up with Malaxa. He had gone to Argentina in 1955 "for rest and relaxation"—this was at the height of the Peron dictatorship; he stayed for almost 1 year. The Immigration Service then excluded Malaxa when he sought reentry to the United States in December of 1955. At that time, in addition to alleged fraud in the Western Tube application, Malaxa's activities in connection with the Rumanian Iron Guard, and the German Nazis prior to and during the war and his dealings with Communists after World War II were questioned.

Malaxa refused to answer questions put to him by the examining officer regarding his past affiliations, whereupon the special inquiry officer in charge of the case found against Malaxa on all points. Malaxa challenged this decision on the grounds that the special inquiry officer should have questioned him personally, and had improperly drawn adverse inferences from Malaxa's silence. There was considerable wrangling over technical procedures, as a result of which Malaxa avoided a disclosure of his true background.

The Board of Immigration Appeals, to which Malaxa had appealed, reversed the special inquiry officer in a split decision, holding that the special inquiry officer should have questioned Malaxa himself, and that he should not have drawn adverse inferences from Malaxa's refusals to answer questions. But the appeals board did not order a rehearing to obtain answers from Malaxa's unanswered question. Instead, it concluded that Malaxa was never affiliated with the Iron Guard, Nazis, or Communists. They ordered Malaxa admitted as a permanent resident.

The case was reviewed by Attorney General William Rogers, the close friend and adviser to Mr. Nixon, who was then Vice President. Attorney General Rogers found that the questions regarding affiliation with the Iron Guard, Nazis, and Communists should have been answered and that adverse inferences could properly be drawn against Malaxa from his silence. Nonetheless, Attorney General Rogers, on the basis of this admittedly faulty record, affirmed the Board of Immigration and Malaxa's residency in the United States was sustained.

That decision by Attorney General Rogers still stands, and Malaxa remains a permanent resident of the United States, reportedly living at 1158 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Malaxa has always based his case on a sweeping denial of any affiliation with the Rumanian Guardists, the Nazis, and the Communists. It has been the willingness on the part of certain officials, notably Attorney General Rogers, to accept Malaxa's own version of his political and financial dealings that has kept him in the United States. This was in the face of the testimony presented at Malaxa's 1951 immigration hearing, by Marion Novotny, Alexander Cretzinu, and Max Ausnit, and other testimony.

However, with the recent publication of official German war documents by the State Department, clear evidence is provided which dispels all doubt and takes the question of Malaxa's past out of the realm of hearsay. Here we have, for instance, the secret telegram from the German Minister to Rumania Fabricius, to the Foreign Ministry, sent from Bucharest, January 8, 1941.

(Documents on German foreign policy 1918–45. Vol. XI, "The War Years," Department of State Publication 7–83, 1940–41.)

> Secret, Bucharest, January 8, 1941—3:30 a.m.
> No. 27 of January 7, received January 8—2:30 p.m.
>
> After the Legionnaire police had made further house searches and perpetrated further acts of violence on the population, involving also well-known people such as Argetoianu and Cesianu, the (group garbled) member of the National Bank, without legal ground and without results, General Antonescu finally sent for Sima and called him very sharply to task. Sima admitted that he had known about the excesses. Because of the especially numerous excesses in Transylvania, he wanted to put the blame on the Germans, who (he said), were trying systematically to gain control of Jewish firms which the Legionnaires wanted for themselves; the economy of the country had to be taken over not by Germans, but by people of Rumanian nationality. General Antonescu, however, demanded that an immediate stop be put to all the excesses; if Germans wanted to take over in too great numbers businesses abandoned by Jews, an equitable distribution could be arrived at on a different basis. It was contrary to his policy for the Legionnaires to stir up hatred of the Germans and thus to aid England and Bolshevism. General Antonescu finally demanded that Sima obey to the full his command for tranquillity and order, which he had guaranteed.

The German Minister Fabricius further communicated:

> In this fight between the general and the Legionnaire command, a man plays a role who even earlier played a secret part in Rumanian politics: Carol's former friend and the present financial mainstay of the Legionnaires, N. Malaxa. The Legionnaires let this clever big industrialist finance them. He has in his plants the leader of the Legionnaire labor organization, Gana, and there the green flags of Sima flutter everywhere. Sima and his (group missing) have let themselves be roped in and want to come to an agreement with Malaxa on a settlement, while the general, as the exponent of order and purity, demands that Malaxa hand over all the property stolen from the state. Malaxa therefore considers the general his mortal enemy and makes common cause with the Legionnaires against him. Malaxa has even again supplied with arms the Legionnaire police, who had already been disarmed. Yesterday, while the scene betwen the general and Sima occurred in the office of the Minister President, they established themselves in the prefecture of police with machineguns.
>
> The general, whose entourage kept this information from him last evening, is now extremely angry. He would like best to send Malaxa and his family off to Germany in order to get rid of them for a while. In reply to a question from him, I told him that, if he wished it, we would be glad to oblige him by taking Malaxa in, since German industry had always been on the best of terms with him. The general considers this his only chance of getting rid of this troublesome schemer.
>
> General Antonescu described the events to me in detail. He asked me to treat the information in strict confidence.
>
> FABRICIUS,
> *German Minister in Rumania.*

How interesting to know that this man, who even the Rumanian Fascist Dictator, General Antonescu, regarded as "a troublesome schemer," found sanctuary in the United States thanks to the special favors accorded him by Mr. Nixon and Mr. Rogers. This was at a time when thousands of deserving displaced persons, victims of Mr. Malaxa's, Nazis, Iron Guardists and Communists, were unable to obtain admission. Maybe they would have done better if they had transported plunder and been friendly enough with Richard Nixon to obtain his personal intervention in their behalf. But perhaps these people were not clever enough to devise fake "essential" companies requiring their personal supervision in the United States.

The history of Malaxa is a frightful one—the history of a man who would play any game, on any side, with loyalty to nothing but his own greed, and this man operated at a time and in positions where no decent human being would have survived, let alone acquired and retained great wealth.

One is dismayed by the thought that such a person has been extended the hospitality and protection of the United States. And one is shocked by the thought that this may have come about by Malaxa's being able to find American officials in high places who were willing to pave the way for him, remove obstacles, and lend the cloak of their prestige to his manipulations and schemes.

Are we to believe that Richard Nixon was just naive, a helper of hometown industry or was he a knowing advocate of Malaxa's scheme? Can he still plead ignorance as a defense when we know that his partner, Bewley, and his original political backer, Herman Perry, were directors and officers.

Was Richard Nixon the useful dupe of the cunning Malaxa, or was he the knowing advocate of Malaxa's scheme? The pretense of setting up a fake company in Whittier, Mr. Nixon's hometown, in order to create a reason for being interested in Malaxa, is very transparent. The correspondence with the Office of Defense Production we know about. Were there phone calls also, conference? Can Mr. Nixon still plead ignorance at this stage when all the facts are known? Now, with the German war documents revealed, Malaxa's involvement with the Iron Guard and the Nazis is irrefutable. Also the fact that Mr. Nixon effectively used his position and prestige to help Malaxa is equally clear.

Equally disturbing is the role played by Mr. Nixon's close associate and political ally, William Rogers, acting in his capacity as Attorney General. As a lawyer, Mr. Rogers found that silence by Malaxa left an adverse taint; as a political ally of Mr. Nixon, he cleared Malaxa and gave him permanent residency, despite the strongest doubts about his background which are now confirmed.

There are many issues which are raised and which must be settled. I am aware that my colleagues in the House, as well as certain Members of the other body, have directed inquiries to the Attorney General regarding Nicola Malaxa's status. To these inquiries I add my own as to the possibility of reconsidering the Malaxa case in light of the incriminating evidence contained in the German war documents.

However, there are some other matters which I hope to develop; they are of direct concern to either the Department of Justice or the Department of State. These deal with:

First. The nature and extent of Malaxa's activity with the Communists in Rumania and elsewhere, after the occupation of Rumania by the Russians.

Second. Does Israel, West Germany, or any of our wartime Allies consider Malaxa indictable as a war criminal? If so, should he not be turned over to the proper authorities, or tribunal?

Third. Finally, I should like to know if Malaxa is seeking U.S. citizenship at the present time, and if the Attorney General's office is moving on Malaxa's status, on the basis that his permanent residence in the United States was first obtained by apparent fraud, and later by perjured testimony.

There are, as we know, some crimes on which the statute of limitations never expire. And there are, I regret, some people who are very prone to proclaim guilt by association who have never learned the difference between a displaced person and a Nazi war criminal.

Review Mr. Nixon's history, and his connections with this person whose background is so unsavory and whose actions so un-American. I ask you, who is Mr. Nixon to question the Americanism or the dedication of the Governor of California?

Dick Nixon should wash his hands.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI] on having seen this problem far in advance of the rest of us. I note that on April 16, 1962, the gentleman from Connecticut called attention to the fact that:

> There is presently living in the United States a Mr. Nicolae Malaxa * * * who not only was connected with the dread (Rumanian) Iron Guard during the early war years, but allegedly was an active collaborator with the Hitler government. Following the war he became actively associated with the Communist government of Rumania and was sent to the United States by that government on a trade mission.

I also want to express my amazement that anyone who has talked so much about the danger of communism in the United States as the man who is now running for Governor of California, Mr. Nixon, should have either directly or indirectly been associated with a man who came to the United States under the auspices of a Communist government and who gave two automobiles—two Cadillacs to be exact—one to the secretary-general of the Communist Party of Rumania and the other to the Rumanian Minister in Washington.

I should like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] whether he has any knowledge of political contributions that were given to the Nixon campaign fund in California from Malaxa through the Nixon law firm in Whittier, Calif., or through any other method.

I have read with interest a rather full account of Malaxa in a magazine which appeared on the newsstands recently, Saga, which goes quite fully into the background of Mr. Malaxa. This article shows that Malaxa was steeped in intrigue from his early days as an industrialist and was one of those who helped to set the German war machine on its feet by supplying it with scarce production capacity at a crucial time during the war.

I think it might be interesting for Mr. Nixon to peruse this article and search his soul, as to why he lent his influence on behalf of Mr. Malaxa both to secure a permanent residence for him in the United States and further to secure for him a certificate of tax necessity which meant a tax writeoff of a good many million dollars on a factory which did not exist and which, according to the investigation of our colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALTER, never really had any substantial reason for existence other than to promote the American citizenship of this man who had collaborated with both the Nazis and the Communists.

In this connection I want to read into the RECORD a letter sent to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Mr. Burton Y. Berry. Mr. WALTER of Pennsylvania made a very thorough search of this Rumanian's record and performed a very important service in preventing his citizenship at the time that Mr. Nixon attempted to have special legislation introduced for him, both in the House and the Senate.

I read this excerpt from the letter from the Acting Secretary of State dated March 21, 1952, which I understand has been made a part of the record at the Immigration Service in the Justice Department:

EXCERPT FROM LETTER TO FRANCIS E. WALTER, MARCH 21, 1952, FROM BURTON Y. BERRY, ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

> As U.S. representative in Rumania from November 1944 until May 1947, while that country was under an armistice regime, I had an opportunity to know something of Mr. Malaxa, who was one of the leading, if not the leading, Rumanian industrialists, although my personal acquaintance with him was quite limited. He has the reputation of being very intelligent, industrious and the possessor of considerable personal charm. His multifarious business and political activity in Rumania, however, is generally known as having been marked by extreme opportunism and lack of scruple. His political connections helped him to amass a large fortune, and his use of that fortune in turn made him an important factor in Rumanian politics. It is noteworthy that he has rendered services to and has been granted unusual favors by both extreme rightist and leftist groups when in power in that country. At one time he supported the Fascist Iron Guard. After the war, however, he succeeded in obtaining a large sum from the Communist-dominated government as compensation for a rolling mill confiscated by the Soviets. He left Rumania in 1946 in the capacity of member of the Rumanian-American Chamber of Commerce, with the consent of the Communist-dominated Rumanian Government, but did not return.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I am very happy to yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

Mr. KOWALSKI. I want to express my appreciation to the previous speaker for his kind comments, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from California for bringing this horrible case before the House for attention.

I want to again join the gentleman in expressing my own revulsion about this kind of action by the former Vice President of the United States in supporting a factious Soviet tool.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from California for bringing this horrible Malaxa case to the attention of the House, and I want to join the gentleman in expressing again my own revulsion at the actions of those holding influential positions in our country who protected and supported so vile a Fascist and confidante of the Communists as Nicola Malaxa.

Early in April of this year I received several complaints from my constituents concerning Mr. Malaxa. On April 9 I wrote a letter to the Attorney General of the United States pointing out the heinous crimes committed by Mr. Malaxa against the Jews in Rumania and asked the Attorney General for a review of this case with a view of withdrawing Mr. Malaxa's permission for permanent residence in this country. I was surprised to see the role that our former Vice

President Richard Nixon played in this sad case. I do not understand how anyone would want to be associated with anyone with the grisly background of Mr. Malaxa. The gentleman from California today has effectively presented the disgusting behavior of Malaxa and the deplorable actions of Mr. Nixon who supported this Fascist tool of the Soviet Government. Let me briefly review the crimes of Malaxa:

First. During World War II Malaxa was an active collaborator with the Hitler government and was associated in business with Albert Goering, brother of Field Marshal Herman Goering.

Second. He was the financial mainstay of the Rumanian Iron Guard, the Fascist organization which liquidated with the most horrible savagery thousands of Rumanian Jews. In one of the great pogroms against the Jews, he permitted his home to be used by the Fascist iron guard as an arsenal and headquarters for their atrocities.

Third. When the Soviet armies moved into Rumania, Malaxa very rapidly changed his colors and wormed himself into the confidence of the Communist masters of his country.

Fourth. Following the war, he came to the United States on a special trade mission as the agent of the Communist government of Rumania.

Fifth. He secured from the Communists $2½ million in compensation for factories seized by the Soviet Government, the only Rumanian citizen favored with compensation.

This is the record of Nicola Malaxa.

Despite this sorrowful record there is strong evidence that the law firm of former Vice President Richard Nixon had close connections with Western Tool Corp., a Malaxa company. It is further interesting that Mr. Nixon, who has been so free in accusing others of association with communism, should have played a part in support of legislation for the relief of Mr. Malaxa. This is not all. On September 14, 1951, Senator Nixon wrote a letter to Manly Fleischmann, of the Defense Production Administration, urging favorable action on an application by Western Tool, a Malaxa firm, for a certificate of necessity which would have given Mr. Malaxa millions of dollars in tax benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this discussion on the floor today points up several things that need to be done:

First. The Government of the United States should carefully review the Malaxa case and if it finds that the allegations made here today against Mr. Malaxa are correct, then action should be immediately instituted to deport this international Fascist-Communist.

Second. Mr. Nixon should publicly explain and renounce his previous association with Nicola Malaxa and urge his deportation.

Third. Immigration policies should be tightened up to prevent the recurrence of such cases. It is my understanding Mr. Malaxa is only one of many Fascist genocides who have bought their way into the United States.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Shelley] for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

I am particularly pleased that he has taken this opportunity to denounce the unworthy, smear attacks on Gov. Edmund (Pat) Brown, a man who has given the great State of California years of outstanding service, not only during his present administration, but as its highest law enforcement officer and as district attorney of one of its leading counties.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. Shelley] for bringing this matter to the floor. On May 31 I spoke about Malaxa. I would like to particularly commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler]. As early as 1952 the gentleman from New York, Congressman Celler, recognized the situation with respect to Malaxa. As part of my remarks I include a statement made by the gentleman from New York, Congressman Celler, in 1952 concerning Malaxa. The gentleman from New York, Congressman Celler, made the following statement in answer to a question asked on the "Youth Wants To Know" program of October 12, 1952. The statement follows:

Statement Made by Congressman Emanuel Celler, on October 12, 1952, in the "Youth Wants To Know" Program of NBC

(The question asked by Mr. Bill Martin, of Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, was: "I want to know if you and Senator Nixon have ever had any legislative differences on immigration.")

Representative Celler. Well, I hesitate a little bit to say this, but Senator Nixon offered a bill in the Senate for the relief of one Nicola Malaxa, a Rumanian arms manufacturer. When the companion bill to Senator Nixon's bill came over to the House—the Nixon bill had passed the Senate—it came to me as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. I saw something rather suspicious about the bill, and I made inquiry about Nicola Malaxa. The bill provided that despite his violation of the immigration laws and the orders that he received to depart from this country that he might remain here as a legal resident. I discovered that this man Malaxa had had very, very questionable relations with Communists. I held up the bill. The bill was not passed. Now, I think Senator Nixon is now on the defensive to tell the Nation what he knows about Nicola Malaxa and why he sponsored that bill of one who apparently is a Communist to remain in this country. Here you have the young Senator proclaiming against communism. He was a member of the Un-American Activities Committee when he was in the House. In one breath he does all that, and in the other breath he seeks to keep in this country a man whom I am sure is, and is, an avowed Communist.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. Celler on October 12, 1952.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE GREAT WHITE FLEET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, when the idea of a Great White Fleet was first conceived in 1959 by Navy Comdr. Frank Manson and widely publicized in Life magazine, there was a tremendous national response. In brief, Commander Manson envisioned a group of ships including a hospital ship, supply vessels, and a source of emergency power, all painted white to signify peace, which would travel around the world carrying aid to countries hit by natural disasters. Although the Government would give some assistance, this was to be essentially a people-to-people project.

Well, thousands upon thousands of letters poured into the Capitol urging Members of Congress to take action to institute such a fleet. Leaders from all walks of life—from Evangelist Billy Graham to David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, went on record as favoring the idea. Other letters were received from the Navy League, which offered its support, and from various shipping concerns which also volunteered their services. In fact, in a telegram to President Eisenhower, George Killion, chairman of the Committee of American Steamship Lines, stated that 14 American shipping companies were offering their know-how on a nonprofit basis to operate a White Fleet on mercy missions around the world.

Despite the overwhelming public support for such an idea, little progress in making it a reality can be seen. In 1959 more than 30 Members of the Senate rushed to lend their names and support to a resolution suggesting that the President establish a White Fleet, and in the House 45 resolutions were submitted. No action was taken by either body, however, and again in 1960 the Congress failed to pass such a bill or resolution. Finally, in June of 1961 the Senate passed Senate Resolution 154 introduced by Senator Humphrey and others which called upon the President, when he deemed it in the Nation's best interest, to authorize the establishment of a White Fleet. In the 16 months that have since elapsed no action has been taken, nor is any action being planned by the administration at this time.

It seems to me that in as much as this great Nation has readily available all the resources to make this highly worthy and humanitarian dream a reality, we should again, by means of my bill—resolution—urge the President to implement the establishment of a U.S. White Fleet.

I said that this Nation had at her disposal all the resources necessary to maintain a White Fleet. To be specific, we have three completely outfitted U.S. Navy hospital ships in mothballs in addition to numerous other vessels which could be used to transport food and additional medical supplies and provide emergency power to areas hit by hurricanes, tornadoes, or earthquakes. We have vast stores of surplus food with which to stock such a fleet, and I sincerely believe we would gain a great deal more by giving this food to people who are hungry than by continuing to fill an ever-increasing number of storage bins and warehouses. We have unsurpassed medical knowledge and skill to offer underdeveloped countries—and if the experience of Project Hope is a reliable indicator, we will have literally hundreds of applicants from the medical professions who would like to fill the berths in our White Fleet. Quite the contrary to a current notion that patriotism and humanitarianism are on the wane, the response of our people both to Hope and to the idea of a Great White Fleet indicates the vast majority are grateful for the blessings of America and would like to share them with our less fortunate neighbors around the world.

In addition to the ships, food, and medical personnel, I am sure we have experts in agriculture, public health, and sanitation, and other fields who would be eager to share their knowledge and teach their skills to men and women in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

The cost of a White Fleet to the Government would not be very great. It seems to me the country has nothing to lose by loaning ships which it is not using, especially since such ships can be recalled immediately in the event of a national emergency. Once the Government has reconditioned the ships, her financial responsibility is ended except for the contribution of surplus food. Private nonprofit organizations will then operate the ships on a true people-to-people basis. Although the Government would certainly be a partner in this effort, the real purpose of the White Fleet would be to give the people of this country a means of expressing their concern for our neighbors and demonstrating their desire for world friendship.

A White Fleet would serve a number of objectives. First of all, it would help relieve famine and distress by providing food and emergency items in times of natural disaster. The need for such assistance cannot be denied. We would all like to put from our minds the reports of terrible disasters and subsequent human suffering, but this does not alter the facts. A study prepared in 1960 revealed that in the 3-year period from 1957 to 1960 more than 750,000 people in various parts of the world were made homeless by floods, earthquakes, and other disasters, and more than 15,000 died from these causes. In that short period of time there were floods and earthquakes in Japan; floods in Mexico, Ceylon, Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. More floods in Okinawa, Thailand, Taiwan, and India. Earthquakes caused heavy damage and loss of life in Burma, Greece, Iran, Indonesia, Spain, and Peru. As you can see, every year thousands upon thousands of unfortunate people need aid, the kind of aid we could provide by means of the White Fleet.

It is true that in nearly all of these instances the U.S. Government has provided assistance of some kind—food, clothing, machinery, medical care, construction of bridges and so forth. However, it seems to me that since this aid comes from various sources within the United States and is often parceled out in bits and snatches, we would work much more effectively through a White Fleet.

It should also be pointed out that in contrast to the rather disorganized method used today, the White Fleet would be a dramatic expression of U.S. good will. We know we feel this good will, but in many cases our neighbors around the world are suspicious and distrustful of us. They have been profoundly impressed by Project Hope, however, and have responded enthusiastically to it. Direct contact with Americans who are working side by side with them to help them has convinced them of our concern which billions of dollars in foreign aid have failed to do. As long as we are helping them, let us let them know it.

In addition to providing aid in times of distress, our White Fleet will serve as a training mission to underdeveloped countries who request our help. We will be able to instruct citizens of those countries in modern methods of agriculture, public health, and sanitation. Here again the need cannot be questioned. By teaching preventive medicine in India and Indonesia, for example, where dysentery and malaria claim hundreds of thousands of lives each year, we can help break the vicious circle in which poverty leads to disease and disease leads to more poverty. By teaching we are leaving a lasting legacy rather than one which will disappear when the last dollar is spent. I firmly believe that a country is best helped which learns to help itself; through the White Fleet we could accomplish this objective.

Various foreign embassies have expressed their admiration of "this great and generous idea." The White Fleet ideas has fired many imaginations, and it is my understanding that Japan, England, West Germany, Italy, and Belgium are all considering launching such fleets. I urge you not to let the initiative be snatched from us. In the face of the complex and deeply disturbing world problems confronting us today, it is easy to become discouraged and, if not pessimistic, at least passive in the face of seemingly overwhelming odds. But let us not despair; rather, let us take positive, dramatic action. We should use to the fullest our natural advantages such as abundant food, and we should tap the vast reservoirs of medical and technological skill we have to offer to the world. In a spirit of both generosity and enlightened self-interest, let us help our fellow man. In doing so we will help ourselves by creating a climate of mutual good will and understanding.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of my bill H.R. 12286—House Conference Resolution 713—providing for the establishment of a U.S. White Fleet.

WHITE HOUSE REGIONAL CONFERENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, before this session closes I wish to report to the House on the efforts of members of the Committee on Government Operations to obtain all the facts concerning the White House regional conferences held in November of 1961 and a determination of whether the expenditures for holding those conferences were illegal. On April 11, 1962, 11 members of the Committee on Government Operations requested the Honorable Joseph Campbell to conduct an investigation of the White House regional conferences according to the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1962.

Hon. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: This letter has reference to the White House regional conferences held last November in Chicago, St. Louis, Nashville, Detroit, Cleveland, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Madison, Denver, and Seattle.

The total expenditures on these conferences must have been substantial. Costs would include travel, printing, postage (possibly use of penalty mail), telephone and telegram, use of Government space and equipment, rentals, and the time of both highly paid and run-of-the-mine public officials in preparing for, attending, and reporting on these conferences, as well as other possible items of cost.

Enclosed herewith is U.S. Government Printing Office publication, 1962 O–624327, entitled "Report to the President, White House Regional Conferences, November 1961." Also enclosed is a brochure describing the program and Federal panel participants in the White House Regional Conference for Michigan, November 14–15, 1961, Detroit, Mich.

The contents of the brochure describing the program and the contents of the report, as well as the names and positions of the panel participants, indicate that this operation was a Madison Avenue type road show designed to influence public opinion and possibly the Congress in favor of the New Frontier and its proposals to benefit various segments of our economy, the youth, unemployed, cities, senior citizens and those interested in recreational development.

Your attention is invited to section 105a, title 5, United States Code, which provides as follows:

"§ 105a. Information furnished committees of Congress on request.

"Every executive department and independent establishment of the Government shall, upon request of the Committee on Government Operations of the House, or of any seven members thereof, or upon request of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate, or any five members thereof, furnish any information requested of it relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of said committee."

Pursuant to the authority of section 105a quoted above, the undersigned members of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives request you to furnish information with respect to the White House regional conferences referred to above as follows:

1. The itemized and total cost of preparing for, conducting and reporting on such conferences.

2. Appropriations to which such costs have been charged by the respective Government departments and agencies whose personnel participated in any way in the White House regional conference program.

3. An opinion whether such expenditures violated section 1913, title 18, United States Code, which provides as follows:

"§1913. Lobbying with appropriated moneys.

"No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegrams, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Conwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment."

4. Whether any authority can be found either in authorizing or appropriating statutes for the expenditure of funds on the White House regional conference program. If you find such authority, the undersigned would appreciate your citing the appropriate statute or statutes.

5. Whether provisions contained in appropriation measures prohibiting the use of the funds appropriated for publicity or propapaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress have been violated.

6. Whether funds authorized and appropriated for the execution of specific programs designed by the Congress may be employed in a general propaganda effort designed to aid a political party or candidates thereof by influencing public opinion in their favor.

7. In the event you find expenditures on the White House regional conference program illegal and unauthorized, what remedies are available, either civil or criminal, for the recovery of the funds expended or for the punishment of officials responsible for the wrongful diversion of appropriated funds?

Respectfully submitted.

R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, GEORGE MEADER, FLORENCE P. DWYER, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, CLARENCE J. BROWN, ODIN LANGEN, JOHN B. ANDERSON, RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, F. BRADFORD MORSE.

Subsequently the Comptroller General has written to me from time to time reporting on progress or the lack of progress in obtaining information requested in our letter. Copies of those letters are as follows:

WASHINGTON, *April 16, 1962.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MEADER: We have received and assigned for immediate attention letter of April 11, 1962, signed by you and several other Members concerning the White House regional conferences held last November.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

WASHINGTON, *May 16, 1962.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MEADER: Further reference is made to letter of April 11, 1962, signed by you and several other Members of Congress concerning the White House regional conferences held last November.

We requested a report in the matter from the White House and have received a reply to our request. However, since the reply does not furnish the necessary cost data, we are now engaged in attempting to secure such data from the agencies whose employees participated in the conferences. When we complete this work we will advise you further.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

WASHINGTON, *June 21, 1962.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MEADER: Further reference is made to letter of April 11, 1962, signed by you and several other Members of Congress concerning the White House regional conferences held last November.

As indicated in our letter of May 16, 1962, to you, we have requested the agencies whose employees participated in the conferences to furnish us cost data concerning such participation. We have received this information from several agencies and are awaiting reports from others. Upon receipt of such reports we will advise you further.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

WASHINGTON, *July 26, 1962.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,

DEAR MR. MEADER: Further reference is made to letter of April 11, 1962, signed by you and several other members of the House Committee on Government Operations concerning the White House regional conferences held last November.

As indicated to you in our letter of May 16, 1962, we have requested the agencies whose employees participated in the conferences to furnish us cost data concerning such participation. We have received reports from 20 of the 30 agencies contacted. We hope to receive the other reports within a week or 10 days and, assuming we do, you may expect our reply within 2 or 3 weeks.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

WASHINGTON, *September 4, 1962.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MEADER: Further reference is made to letter of April 11, 1962, signed by you and several other members of the House Committee on Government Operations concerning the White House regional conferences held last November.

As indicated to you in our previous letters, we requested the agencies whose employees participated in the conferences to furnish us cost data concerning such participation. We have now received reports from 24 of the 30 agencies contacted. As soon as the other six reports are received, which we hope will be in the near future, we will be in a position to reply to your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

WASHINGTON, *September 12, 1962.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MEADER: Further reference is made to letter of April 11, 1962, signed by you and several other members of the House Committee on Government Operations concerning the White House regional conferences held last November.

As indicated to you in our previous letter, we requested the agencies whose employees participated in the conferences to furnish us cost data concerning such participation. We have received reports from 25 of the 30 agencies contacted. Enclosed is a schedule showing the estimated expenses incurred by those agencies in connection with the conferences. This schedule is based on the cost data furnished us by the agencies. Upon receiving the reports of the other five agencies we will supplement this interim report with a final report as to the costs incurred as well as our opinion as to the legality of such expenditures.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, as you will note, the most recent letter was September 12, 1962. This carried an attachment setting forth estimated cost as reported by agencies participating in the White House regional conferences, a copy of which I insert at this time in my remarks:

Estimated cost of White House regional conferences based on information reported by the agencies, Sept. 12, 1962

	Number of employees participating	Man-hours consumed	Total costs incurred
Major departments:			
Department of Agriculture [1]			
Department of Commerce [1]			
Department of Defense			
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	376	9,806	$86,600
Department of Interior [1]			
Department of Justice [2]	2		
Department of Labor [1]			
Post Office Department	6	100	2,300
Department of State			
Department of Treasury	7	341	5,900

See footnotes at end of table.

Estimated cost of White House regional conferences based on information reported by the agencies, Sept. 12, 1962—Continued

	Number of employees participating	Man-hours consumed	Total costs incurred
Independent agencies:			
Agency for International Development			
Atomic Energy Commission	2	11	100
Bureau of the Budget	3	28	600
Civil Service Commission			
Corps of Engineers	8	82	300
Export-Import Bank of Washington			
Federal Aviation Agency			
Government Printing Office			
General Services Administration	51	709	4,800
Housing and Home Finance Agency [1]			
Interstate Commerce Commission	3	30	100
National Aeronautics and Space Administration			
National Science Foundation			
Office of Emergency Planning [3]	2	78	1,100
Peace Corps			
Railroad Retirement Board	2	21	100
Small Business Administration	6	272	5,100
Tennessee Valley Authority			
U.S. Information Agency	1	528	2,800
Veterans' Administration	1	84	1,500
Total estimated costs based on data reported by agencies as of Sept. 12, 1962			111,300

---

[1] As of Sept. 12, 1962, these agencies have not furnished necessary data.

[2] The Deputy Attorney General advised us that the Attorney General and 1 other official of the Department attended 2 conferences without cost to the Department.

[3] We understand that OEP is to furnish us with additional information.

The above schedule reveals that 5 of the 30 agencies had not furnished the General Accounting Office with the information requested. These agencies are the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The GAO requested the information last May.

There is no way of telling, of course, the amount of expenditures these agencies incurred, but it is safe to say that the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which was actively plugging the administration's line and propagandizing at these regional conferences and otherwise for a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, must have devoted a great many man-hours and incurred sizable costs in this activity designed to influence the public and the Congress to act favorably on the administration's proposal.

One can only speculate as to the reasons for failure of these four departments and the Housing and Home Finance Agency to supply the facts requested by the General Accounting Office. It is, of course, possible that they do not want to reveal to the public or the Congress the extent of their use of appropriated funds for lobbying activities.

It is also conceivable that the activiies in the agencies were so widespread and so uncontrolled that it is difficult to identify what particular employees spent how much time and how much money on this specific propaganda activity.

In any event, we know from the statements of the agencies themselves that a minimum of $111,300 was spent on this Madison Avenue roadshow designed to brainwash the American people, to build up public opinion, and put pressure upon the Congress in favor of New Frontier proposals, and to attempt to prove that the New Frontier and all its works are a good thing for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the White House regional conferences, if they were to be held at all, should have been financed by the Democratic National Committee and that whatever may be the ruling of the Comptroller General on questions of legality raised in our letter, it is wrong for any political party to finance an election campaign out of the public treasury.

I am not completely happy about the diligence with which the Comptroller General has pursued this inquiry. Almost 6 months have elapsed since the Government Operations Committee made its request and almost a year has elapsed since our colleague, the Honorable ROBERT WILSON, of California, first made a similar request of the Comptroller General on November 7, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to do all in my power to insist that the Congress investigate thoroughly and completely, not only the White House regional conferences, but other propaganda and lobbying activities on the part of the executive branch of the Government.

I am not naive enough to suppose that a Democratically controlled Congress will be diligent in pursuing an inquiry of this type involving Democratically controlled executive agencies. This is perhaps one of the best reasons why the American people should elect a Republican House of Representatives. I can assure my colleagues that if that happy event does occur as a result of the November 6 election and I am returned to the House and continue to serve on the Committee of Government Operations, a thorough exploration will be conducted of the lobbying and publicity and propaganda activities engaged in by the bureaucracy.

On June 26, 1962, I urged that the Special Government Information Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking minority member, of the House Government Operations Committee to conduct this inquiry, but so far as I know very little progress has been made. My request for this investigation was contained in a letter to the Honorable JOHN MOSS, a copy of which is enclosed herewith:

JUNE 26, 1962.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman, Special Government Information Subcommittee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As I mentioned to you in our conversation in the Speaker's lobby recently, I believe that the Subcommittee on Government Information of the House Government Operations Committee could perform a very useful service by conducting an investigation of the publicity, publication, and propaganda activities of agencies of the Federal Government.

The cost of publicity and propaganda activities, including countless publications, of the Government must be enormous. So far as I know, it has never been ascertained or even estimated. Even more important than the cost, however, is an assessment of the importance of these activities in shaping public opinion and influencing legislative and national policies.

There is not only a question of the propriety of extensive propaganda and publicity by executive agencies, but there may be a question of legality.

Section 1913, title 18, United States Code, provides as follows:

"SEC. 1913. Lobbying with appropriated moneys.

"No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more thant $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment."

It should also be noted that many appropriation bills for many years have contained a standard, general provision in essentially the following language:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not heretofore authorized by the Congress."

My interest in urging an investigation of Federal propaganda activities was prompted in part by a recent experience of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee (the Hardy subcommittee) in hearings on the commingling of United States and Communist foreign aid. During the course of these hearings press officers, both in the Agency for International Development and in the State Department, saw fit to issue to the press certain comments and statements concerning the subject matter of testimony before the subcommittee in which positions were taken which were subsequently repudiated by responsible officials of the agencies, in the case of AID, Fowler Hamilton; and in the case of the State Department, Avery F. Peterson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Economic Affairs.

The subcommittee commented on this matter briefly in its report, "Commingling of United States and Communist Foreign Aid" (H. Rept. No. 1907, 87th Cong.). A copy of the report is attached, and I have marked page 3 (the committee's finding No. 10) and pages 8 and 9, all dealing with this point. Also attached is a copy of the hearings in which you will find this subject covered on pages 49–59, 69–71, 117–122, and 154–158.

I suggest that your subcommittee's previous investigation of the wthholding of information from Congress and the public by Federal agencies goes hand-in-hand with an investigation of the dissemination of information. It is possible by releasing a partial, distorted or slanted account to make an impact upon public and congressional opinion totally different from the impact which would result from accurate and complete information on the subject.

I hope you will agree that an exploration of the publicity and propaganda activities of executive agencies is within the scope and responsibility of the Special Government Information Subcommittee of which you are chairman and that it demands our attention. I assure you of my utmost cooperation in the event the subcommittee decides to undertake such an inquiry.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

PROPOSED UNITED NATIONS LOAN AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the truth will out. When the United Nations bond issue was being considered by the House some of us spoke up and said loaning money to the United Nations was just postponing the solution to its financial problem. We said it was stopgap legislation and would set a precedent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, acting United Nations Secretary General U Thant has said the same thing. He referred to the bond issue as only a temporary help and admits the long-term financial problem remains.

But what concerns me, and I do not like to say I told you so, is a proposal now before the General Assembly of the United Nations which would authorize the Secretary General to borrow money to make up deficits. The Foreign Minister of Ireland, Frank Aiken, suggests the United Nations increase its working capital by short-term borrowing.

In the past I pointed out the United Nations Charter gave no authority for issuance of bonds or borrowing. Now after the illegal issuance of bonds, there is discussion about authorizing such procedure as a regular means of solving deficits.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps some Members believe the recent legislation the House passed to authorize the President to buy United Nations bonds has solved a crisis. History will show it was a mistake. It just opened a way for borrowing to pay expenses rather than to assess all members under pain of losing their vote if they fail to pay up.

If member nations can refuse to pay and if the Secretary General is authorized to borrow to meet deficits, the United Nations is doomed.

PERKINS SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND, WATERTOWN, MASS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST. GERMAIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to call to the attention of the House the fact that the world-famous Perkins School for the Blind, Watertown, Mass., is in its 131st year of service.

This extraordinary institution has given new hope to countless numbers of persons afflicted with the loss of sight. It has helped them to renew their courage to face the future with confidence and faith. It has been a ray of light to those who live in a world of darkness and uncertainty.

Numerous individuals from my State have benefited from the untiring efforts of the dedicated men and women who make up the staff at Perkins. It is my great pleasure to note that one of the most distinguished graduates of Perkins School is the Honorable William E. Powers, Associate Justice of the Rhode Island Supreme Court.

Judge Powers is an outstanding example of determination and courage, and the story of his brilliant career and accomplishments is a testimonial, not only to himself, but to the early training he received at Perkins.

I would like to single out for special praise Dr. Edward J. Waterhouse, director of Perkins School since 1951. Through his efforts and inspiration, great things have been accomplished in recent years.

As a tribute to Perkins School, its outstanding personnel, and its courageous graduates who, like Judge Powers, have triumphed over darkness, I insert at this point in the RECORD, "A Brief History of Perkins School for the Blind," which was published in the 129th annual report of that institution in 1960.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF PERKINS SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND

In 1826 a Boston physician, Dr. John D. Fisher, returned home from Paris where he had been impressed by the work of the Institut Nationale des Jeunes Aveugles, the school which was to become famous in later years as the place where Louis Braille was a student and teacher and where he devised the system of reading and writing for the blind which bears his name. Dr. Fisher formed a committee which petitioned the legislature, and was granted an act of incorporation on March 2, 1829, establishing the New England Asylum for the Blind, the first school for the blind in America to receive a charter. In 1831 another Boston physician, Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, returned from participation in the Greek War of Independence, and was chosen to be the first director of the school. In August 1832 the first classes were held in the house of Dr. Howe's father, on Pleasant Street.

SOUTH BOSTON

As the pupils soon outgrew their quarters, Col. Thomas H. Perkins, a wealthy Boston merchant who had become interested in this venture, gave for its use his large house on Pearl Street. The need for still larger quarters soon became apparent, and in 1839 a great hotel, near the ocean in South Boston, was purchased. This was made possible by the assent of Colonel Perkins to the sale of his home, and because of this generosity the trustees renamed the school Perkins Institution and Massachusetts Asylum for the Blind. This name was changed in 1877, to Perkins Institution and Massachusetts School for the Blind. Our present name, Perkins School for the Blind, was adopted by the corporation on November 7, 1955.

Dr. Howe directed the growing work of Perkins for 45 years, during which the young school soon forged ahead of its European predecessors in its successful training of blind boys and girls to take their places in their own communities. During those years, too, Dr. Howe devoted much time to building up the school's endowment. But perhaps the most famous work of his career was his successful training of Laura Bridgman, the first deaf-blind person to receive an education.

In 1876, Dr. Howe was succeeded by his Greek protege and son-in-law, Michael Anagnos. Mr. Anagnos created the Howe Memorial Press for embossing books and for making appliances for the blind, and in 1887 he founded what was known as the Kindergarten in Jamaica Plain, the first school for young blind children in the world.

It was he who selected Annie Sullivan shortly after her graduation from Perkins and sent her to Alabama to teach the child Helen Keller, thus starting her on one of the most successful and celebrated careers in the history of education. He, too, was a most successful raiser of funds for the school endowment. After 30 years of leadership, Mr. Anagnos died in Rumania in 1906, while still director.

WATERTOWN

In 1907, the directorship of Perkins passed to Dr. Edward E. Allen, then head of the school for the blind in Philadelphia which he had just rebuilt. Returning to Boston where he was a native, Dr. Allen began plans for moving the two schools from South Boston and Jamaica Plain, and by 1913 the whole institution was operating in the present plant at Watertown. The present school, situated on an old estate of 34 acres on the banks of the Charles River, has teaching and living space for 300 pupils. The children live in 12 cottages and the majority of the staff are resident.

Dr. Allen established the first training courses for teachers of blind children in collaboration with Harvard University. He retired in 1931, but continued his work in the training of teachers until a few months prior to his death in 1950.

SECOND CENTURY BEGINS

In 1931 Dr. Gabriel Farrell became the fourth director. He organized the training of our deaf-blind pupils as a special department, and established an endowment fund for these doubly handicapped children. Dr. Farrell retired in 1951, and was succeeded by Dr. Edward J. Waterhouse.

In 1953 the teacher-training department was reorganized and courses were offered in association with the Boston University Department of Education. In 1956 the first graduate-level program for training teachers of deaf-blind children was organized, also in collaboration with Boston University.

THE UNREMITTING FIGHT FOR A SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has followed since the beginning of 1961 the popular action in this country for the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations will have to admit that this action has deep roots. Whether in the North or in the South, East or in the West, our people have clearly demonstrated their keen understanding of the necessity for such a committee. In this, I am afraid, they have been ahead of their own Government.

Lest anyone misinterpret this deep-rooted popular demand for a special committee, all sections of the Nation have expressed themselves. As some may mistakenly believe, this has not been a demand generated solely by so-called ethnic groups that have an adroit appreciation of the strategic importance of the captive nations to our national interest in the cold war. The demand has a still broader base than this. The continuous flow of letters received from every part of the country shows a widespread interest on the part of individual Americans in the captive nations, both within and outside the Soviet Union. Placed in the Record week after week, these letters prove that our people are intent upon learning more and more about all the captive nations and finding ways and means to bring about their eventual liberation.

THE FIGHT WILL CONTINUE

Mr. Speaker, the fight for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations is plainly an unremitting one. Come the next Congress, this popular action will again assert itself. The maneuvers employed in this past year and a half to prevent the formation of such a committee have well nigh exhausted themselves. It is now common knowledge that the quarter-spirited efforts of one of our subcommittees to deal with the captive nations have fallen far short of the objectives set forth in my original measure, House Resolution 211. A close analysis of the expected report of this subcommittee will unquestionably provide further substantiation for the stand we have taken in favor of a special committee. It will be another substantial addition to the evidence accumulated in this period.

It is most regrettable that with the Soviet Russian buildup in Cuba and Gromyko's push in the United Nations for official recognition of the territorial borders of Moscow's empire we find ourselves without a cold war offensive capable of exploiting Moscow's greatest weakness. The important byproduct of Soviet Russian action in Cuba has been a further deflection of American concentration on all of the captive nations. This works in Moscow's favor, not ours. While our eyes are sharply focused on the captive nation of Cuba, Gromyko is already set to work on gaining free world acquiescence to the permanent captivity of nations in Eastern Europe and Asia. Moscow has been striving for this for years.

Clearly, if there was ever a time for a wholesale concentration of free world concern and attention on Soviet Russian colonialism, it is now. As so often in the past, we have missed the boat again. We have failed to create an apparatus of factfinding and truthtelling that could focus worldwide attention on Moscow's imperio-colonialism. But this struggle will go on, and so will the fight for such a specialized apparatus in the form of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. To my mind this is unavoidable.

Mr. Speaker, in support of these remarks, I include the following pertinent items to be printed at this point in the Record: The September 10 issue of the Washington Report on "Soviet Russian Weaknesses and Vulnerabilities"; the resolution of the Connecticut Committee for Freedom of Captive Nations; the brief addresses of Acting Mayor Paul R. Screvane and others in New York City on the occasion of the 1962 Captive Nations Week; and an article in the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel on "Empires of Soviets, Czars Akin":

[From the Washington Report, Sept. 10, 1962]

Soviet Russian Weaknesses and Vulnerabilities

(Editor's Note.—Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky is a professor of economics at Georgetown University. He is the author of the Captive Nations Week resolution (Public Law 86–70) which was passed by Congress in 1959. This resolution provides that the third week of July be set aside each year to remind the world of the nations held in bondage by Russian imperialism. Dr. Dobriansky is also a member of the American Security Council's strategy staff.)

In analyzing Soviet Russia, it is necessary to distinguish at the outset between weakness and vulnerability. A weakness is a condition of defect and impairment which does not in itself constitute a vulnerability. For it to develop into this state, an external stimulus is required. There are many deep weaknesses in the totalitarian Soviet Russian Empire, but so long as they remain untapped they are not, by definition, vulnerabilities. Policies of patched-up containment, evolution and wishful thinking on the coming breakup of the so-called Communist bloc serve only to guarantee that Soviet weaknesses shall not become vulnerabilities. The active external agent, the catalyst, is lacking.

The prodigious irony of the current situation is the fact that beneath the surface of most Soviet Russian accomplishments and points of strength rest their most profound weaknesses.

The real decision before this Nation today is not whether to push or not to push into space, to disarm or not to disarm, to negotiate or not to negotiate, to trade or not to trade with the Red empire. Instead, the basic and real decision is whether to meet or not to meet the full cold war challenge of colonial Moscow. If we should resolve to engage the enemy in the total context of the cold war, it wouldn't and couldn't be a matter of fighting this war only on our side of the 50-yard line. The best defense is the offense, and it should be obvious that the defense of freedom is being battered from Laos to Cuba because our mere defensive and reactive posture is not the best defense.

A cold war offensive would not permit Moscow's imperialism to nibble away at us, for such an offensive necessitates the conversion of well-known weaknesses in the enemy's empire into vulnerabilities and the systematic exploitation of these vulnerabilities toward his eventual destruction.

There are five major areas for analysis: (1) the ideologicopropaganda; (2) the empire; (3) the so-called economic race; (4) the military-space field; and (5) the party apparatus.

1. We have still to appreciate the central importance of propaganda in the cold war. The Soviet Russians have developed this basic art to make a relatively backward state appear as the equal of the American giant, to make the worst empire of its kind appear as the great proponent of national liberation and independence, and to move the minds of millions throughout the world in the belief that all this is so.

However, the weaknesses of Moscow's ideologicopropaganda are deep and fundamental. After 20 years of indoctrination, millions of Ukrainians, Georgians, Russians, and others deserted colonial Moscow in World War II; after 10 years of heavy propaganda Hungarian students and workers staged the 1956 revolution. There are many similar examples to prove the utter bankruptcy of Communist ideology when it is put into practice.

Nevertheless, Moscow continues to capitalize on this massive deception, chiefly because of our failure to develop these weaknesses into critical vulnerabilities. This requires a realization of the central importance of propaganda. The Voice of America is but a pygmy compared to Moscow's media. There are many good opportunities for demolishing the image Moscow casts of its empire. For example, we could easily show the Russian perversion of theoretical Marxism, the emptiness of so-called Communist ideology, the emergence of the technocratic elite in the U.S.S.R., and the colonial exploitation of the captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union. These are only a few points to establish the Russian mythology of communism.

If we are to win the cold war, we must recognize and repeatedly stress the real threat which Soviet Russian mythology conceals. And this is the Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system of totalitarian rule.

2. The second general area of Moscow's obvious strength is its expanded empire. One of Moscow's paramount goals in the past 5 years has been to gain Western acquiescence to the permanence of its present empire, and our increasing indifference toward the captive nations has helped in this.

Those who today preach that the Soviet Russian empire is showing signs of disintegration, that the future is with us, that all that is required is a military buildup and trade with this empire, are gravely misleading the citizens of this country. There is no substantial evidence of this. In fact, all the important and basic evidence of increasing empire strength points the other way. Of course, Moscow has its problems. Who doesn't? It had even greater problems at Stalin's death and during the Hungarian revolution, but it, nonetheless, continued to build up its composite power.

Yet, beneath the surface of this imperial power and strength lies the most profound weakness of the Soviet Union and of the entire structure of Moscow's imperial rule and power. This weakness is the immense latent power of the genuine patriotic nationalism of the captive peoples both within and outside the Soviet Union. It is this patriotic nationalism which is our most formidable weapon against Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, not the superficial disagreements between puppets and the prime power.

Khrushchev's sensitivity here is shown by his fury at the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. Except for the U–2 incident, no event in the past 10 years has had as violent an impact on Moscow as this resolution. Khrushchev and his puppets know, if we do not, the disastrous effects that a methodic implementation of this resolution could have on their worldwide propaganda operations and on the nations within their empire.

3. In the economic area, it should be readily recognized that for cold war objectives the empire economy of the Soviet Union is strong, secure and increasingly threatening. Moscow has a long way to go to match our economy, but being a totalitarian and essentially a war economy, the U.S.S.R. poses an increasing threat as $12 to $20 billion of additional output becomes annually available to it for cold and hot war purposes.

Weaknesses in the economy are many, but most fundamental are the differences in status and real income between the ruling elite and the underlying population, and also the rampant economic colonialism to which the captive non-Russian peoples are subjected. This could be transformed into a vulnerability by focusing worldwide attention and opinion on these weaknesses. It would provide important political leverage to the liberal Russian and nationalist non-Russian forces within the U.S.S.R.

4. The U.S.S.R. devotes top priority allocation of resources to the military-space field. Over 20 percent of the gross product in the U.S.S.R. goes to military pursuits. Their further development poses great dangers, particularly in significant breakthroughs capable of magnifying their military power. Today, Khrushchev threatens us and the world with "global missiles." He has been so effective in propagandizing the empire's military and space feats that in addition to naive and pacifist groups doing his work for him in the free nations, even our own leaders invoke from time to time the pangs of "nuclearitis" as an excuse for the absence of a well defined and developed cold war policy.

But the innovation of present military-space technology in no way alters the persistent weaknesses in the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. The ultimate weapon is still man and his morale, loyalties and will. Moscow is well aware that in all three major wars in this century, the motley and multinational forces of the Russian empire, whether Tsarist or Soviet, disintegrated early.

Capitalization of this vital weakness into a vulnerability rests obviously on a broader program directed at the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Along with this is the necessity for a full and superior development of all our arms, nuclear and conventional. The only sure and safe way to preserve the gray peace and to move forward to cold war victory is by attaining and maintaining unquestioned superiority along the entire spectrum of military technology and weaponry.

5. The final area for analysis is the party. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the cohesive agent of totalitarian Soviet Russian strength, and the vehicle for the subverting conspiracy beyond it.

However, it has weaknesses that could be developed into fatal vulnerabilities. The perennial problem of succession, intraparty feuding, the pressures of national parties in Ukraine, Georgia, and elsewhere, and infiltration of party councils and machinery lend themselves to such a development. Here, as elsewhere, our offensive in the cold war would necessarily have to be organic, composite, and totalistic. Pursuing one weakness as against others would be both foolish and wasteful. But involved in each of these major weaknesses is the basic problem of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

It is painful to observe how, today, we continue to miss our opportunities for eventual cold war victory. However, I am positive that given an aroused citizenry, the dominant facts of international life and the predominant weaknesses of the Soviet Russian empire will lend us to the pursuit of an inescapable policy of emancipation and a cold war strategy designed for decisive victory.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Guest Editor.

CONNECTICUT COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF CAPTIVE NATIONS—RESOLUTION

"Whereas the third week of July 1962 marks the third anniversary of the Captive Nations Week resolution, recognizing the right of self-determination to Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossakia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

"Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have resulted in the creation of a vast empire, which poses a threat to the security of the United States and all the free peoples of the world; and

"Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the spirit of resistance of the captive nations should be steadfastly kept; and

"Whereas the United States follows Moscow in attacking Portugal for her colonial policy in Angola, but failing to point a finger at the greatest colonial empire—the U.S.S.R.

"*Resolved,* That we, the Connecticut Committee for Freedom of Captive Nations urge all patriotic Americans to support the resolution (H.Res. 211) calling for the establishment of a Special Committee for Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. If we grant and actively support the right of independence to the Negroid peoples, then we cannot refuse it to the non-Russian captive nations of the U.S.S.R. We must have all the captive nations on our side, if we intend to fight the Communist threat successfully."

Unanimously approved and accepted during the observance of the Captive Nations Week which was held on July 20, 1962, at the Polish National Home, Hartford, Conn.

STEPHEN BOYCHUK, *Secretary.*

REMARKS BY ACTING MAYOR OF NEW YORK CITY, PAUL R. SCREVANE, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 17, 1962

As acting mayor of the city of New York, I am honored to continue the tradition established last year by Mayor Wagner in proclaiming Captive Nations Week and holding this ceremony on the steps of city hall.

New York can rightly claim, in one sense, the proud title of being the capital city of the free world. It has earned this right, not only for its preeminence in many social, economic and cultural fields, but through the historic tradition it has established, for all the world of hospitality and sanctuary for the homeless and friendless stranger. The upraised arm of the Statue of Liberty at the gates to our city beckons and bids the newest refugee from Cuba and Hungary welcome, with the same humanity with which this city has welcomed its new arrivals for nearly three centuries. New York City has been the gateway to a new life for most of the millions who sought freedom from oppression by coming to this land of the United States. Many have remained here and, with the tender threads of memory, tradition and language, still keep a web of sympathy stretched between this, their new homeland, and the distant places whence came many of them and their forefathers.

The last 20 years has witnessed the greatest flood of refugees from tyranny in the whole history of mankind. Except for the barbed wire and watchtowers which wall in the totalitarian world, millions more would certainly have fled to the freedom they are denied. For those who escape and for those who long to escape, America remains a living beacon to their hopes.

In commemorating Captive Nations Week, we are, thus, living up to both our noblest traditions and highest ideals. It is a frightening thought that through modern technology, ill-used, modern tyranny has become far more sinister and total than any tyranny dreamed of by Nero or Caligula. There has never been a tyranny as complete as that fostered by the modern totalitarian state. But it is unlikely there has ever been a time in history in which the love of liberty, which we sometimes take for granted, has burned as clearly and fervently as it does behind the walls which enemies of freedom have built as unknowing prisons for themselves. No wall can last as long as man's love of liberty. Eventually the walls will come down and tyranny, which is contrary to the spirit of man, must crumble with them.

In celebrating this Captive Nations Week, we are not acting as New Yorkers alone, but as Americans. We are carrying out the letter and the spirit of the congressional resolution of 1959, which established Captive Nations Week, and the proclamation of President John F. Kennedy which he has issued again this year.

In his Fourth of July speech on the steps of Independence Hall in Philadelphia, President Kennedy issued a new declaration of interdependence of all free nations and eloquently reaffirmed America's dedication to the freedom of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. He said that the union of the Atlantic world "would serve as a nucleus for the eventual union of all freemen, those who are now free and those who are vowing that someday they will be free."

And the President went on to explain the great issue which differentiates us from the Communists. He said: "If there is a single issue which divides the world it is independence—the independence of Berlin, or Laos, or Vietnam; the longing for independence behind the Iron Curtain, the peaceful transition to independence in those newly emerging areas whose troubles some hope to exploit."

"This Nation," the President concluded, "conceived in a revolution, nurtured in liberty, maturing in independence, has no intention of abdicating its leadership in that worldwide movement for independence to any nation or society committed to systematic human oppression."

The spirit of these words is a legacy that has been handed down to us from the days of Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Paine. It is today the continuing spirit and principle of American foreign policy. It is today the cause to which we rededicate ourselves during this commemoration of Captive Nations Week.

ADDRESS OF VASIL GERMENJI, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE ASSEMBIY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, AT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK CEREMONIES HELD AT CITY HALL IN NEW YORK CITY ON JULY 17, 1962

The Assembly of Captive European Nations is proud to join in these Captive Nations Week ceremonies at the historic city hall of New York.

We are very grateful to Acting Mayor Screvane for issuing an official proclamation on the Captive Nations Week and accepting the chairmanship of the Greater New York committee for the observance of the week in 1962. His and Mayor Wagner's active support of the captive nations cause is in the best tradition of enlightened American political thought and action.

When people of East Europe think of the United States and of New York—the gateway into this great country—they think of equality under law, economic opportunity, and, above all, political liberty. Long years of vicious Soviet anti-American propaganda have not managed to soil that image or to destroy the abiding friendship East Europeans feel toward the United States.

The eyes of the people of East Europe are on us today. It is of great importance to them how the American people and the Government will respond to Captive Nations Week.

What do the captive people want? They want to know that they are not forgotten; that there is hope for their freedom; that the United States will actively uphold their right to self-determination. They don't want sympathy, because sympathy is too little and too easy. They see America as much greater than a mere purveyor of sympathetic gestures. We know that they are right.

With this trust in the United States as "the last and best hope of freedom on this earth," let us rededicate ourselves to the noble ideals of the Captive Nations Week.

Address of Walter Dushnyck, Representative of CACEED, at the Captive Nations Week Observance on July 17, 1962, at City Hall, New York City

Mr. Mayor, reverend clergy, representatives of nationality organizations, and friends of freedom, it is my great privilege and honor to speak at this important and memorable ceremony on behalf of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent, the common voice of some 15 million Americans whose national and cultural backgrounds originate in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, and Ukraine, countries which are now under the direct or indirect oppression and domination of the Soviet Union and Soviet Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism.

We have gathered today to commemorate the fourth annual Captive Nations Week observance in accordance with the congressional resolution which upon signature of the President of the United States became a law of the land.

Although the background of our membership stems from diverse cultural, ethnic and linguistic roots, we are Americans above all, proud of the right and privilege which this great country has offered to our fathers and their sons and daughters—the right and privilege to enjoy freedom.

But as descendants of those immigrants who came from Central and Eastern Europe, we cannot, as good and proud Americans, neglect or forget the millions of our captive brothers and sisters who are languishing in the slave empire of Moscow, deprived of all basic human rights, personal freedom, and national independence.

Therefore, we have joined with those Americans who believe in and fight for justice and freedom for all peoples and nations. We are dedicated to the cause of the captive nations, because we are convinced that by helping them we are helping the United States and its allies and partners in freedom everywhere. Consequently, in promoting and supporting the captive nations we are fighting for the basic tenets of Americanism. The captive nations resolution in 1959 spells out clearly the hope of the American people that some 22 nations enslaved by Soviet Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism will eventually be liberated. It expresses the belief in the principle of national self-determination, a fundamental creed of U.S. foreign policy for the past 40-odd years. The 1960 platforms of both our major political parties contained planks calling for support of the liberation of the captive nations. Since 1959 President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have issued special proclamations on Captive Nations Week, urging the American people to observe Captive Nations Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities devoted to "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty." Thus our solemn commemoration today is in conformity with the U.S. Congress, the President of the United States, and the wishes and feelings of the American people at large.

But we cannot disregard the fact that there is a steady and systematic campaign to play down the cause of the captive nations. The best example of this undercurrent is this year's anniversary of Captive Nations Week. Although President Kennedy signed the proclamation last Friday, July 13, 1962, there was literally no mention whatsoever of this fact in our metropolitan press, with the exception of one large daily which carried 10 lines on this event, buried among various items on the women's page. And yet the captive nations are the concern and responsibility not only of the United States, but of the United Nations as well.

While the United Nations espouses the freedom and emancipation of the colonial people of Africa and Asia, it maintains a conspicuous silence on the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe and Asia.

This tendency to neglect and abandon the captive nations of Europe also stems from the dangerous and ill-founded belief of some of our policymakers that the Soviet Union is in a process of mellowing, and that sooner or later the Soviet Russian tyrannical empire will emerge as a sort of industrial democracy ready to coexist with the Western system of government and its economic and social systems. This is a pipedream which has no foundations of fact, as we can readily see from Soviet Russian policies in Berlin, in Laos, Vietnam, the Congo, and Cuba, or in the relentless verbal threats of Khrushchev, who on each and every occasion promises to bury us or to hoist the Red flag over this great country of ours.

The traditional role of America, as we know it, is to promote the freedom and self-determination of all peoples. It is in this sense that we believe that the espousal of the cause of the captive nations can only benefit the United States and the general freedom of mankind everywhere. The support of the captive nations on our part is a strong guarantee that Khrushchev, single-minded and ruthless as he is, will not dare to attack us, because he knows the powerful strength of the captive nations under his heel. His rage at the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution 3 years ago, and his anger and vituperation at these observances each year, are well-founded and well-grounded, inasmuch as he is fully aware of the dormant strength of the captive nations and their yearnings to get rid of the despicable and hateful yoke of Communist oppression imposed upon all the captive nations by Moscow.

Therefore, we cannot only talk of new frontiers. We must demonstrate by deeds as well as by words our concern for the captive nations by supporting their claim to freedom and national independence, not only at the United Nations, but at every diplomatic conference.

We must condemn, not abet, Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism. Let us spread the facts about Soviet Russian imperialism and enslavement, and let us at each and every international gathering manifest our sympathy with and support of the captive nations, deprived of their freedom and national independence. The active commitment to the ultimate liberation of all the captive nations would strengthen our position politically, as it is in accord with the moral principles on which our beliefs and our civilization are founded.

In accusing the Soviet Union of violating its solemn promises of freedom and independence to the many captive nations which it conquered after the last war, and of denying the right to self-determination and of destroying the independence of the non-Russian nations which it enslaved immediately after 1920, we appeal to the American people during this week and at all times to manifest their awareness of the importance of our silent allies behind the Iron Curtain.

We should pledge all our moral and material efforts to the cause of the captive nations, and we firmly believe that with God's help the captive nations will rise against Soviet slavery and oppression. And we hope that the gallant struggle of the captive nations which they are waging under various guises and covers against Moscow, will ultimately win out, so that the Iron Curtain, along with the Berlin wall, will disappear forever, and all the captive nations will be then allowed to join the family of civilized nations as free and independent nations, our friends and allies in freedom and justice.

Address of Vigen K. Babayan, Representative of the American Conference for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R., at Captive Nations Week Observance, July 17, 1962, at City Hall, New York City

Deputy Mayor Screvane, honored guests, and my fellow citizens of the United States of America, today, in a free country, where the rights of its citizens are not mere words on paper but a working and practicing reality, I have the opportunity and the privilege of appearing on this platform to bring you a message on behalf of the American Conference for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U.S.S.R.

Although the name of our organization is long so is the list of the enslaved nations that go to make up its roster. Two World Wars have come and gone, over 40 years have passed and yet these enslaved nations under the yoke of communism still struggle to be heard, still raise their voices and demand justice and freedom. The U.S.S.R. has tried to digest and ingest these captive nations but they still constitute a severe stomachache to the U.S.S.R. and refuse to be assimilated into the Communist melting pot.

The United Nations believes in and has earnestly tried to bring freedom to all the peoples of the world. The various colonial empires of Britain, France, and others have slowly but surely given way to the formation of new nations and are the subject matter of history books. The U.S.S.R. has raised its voice the loudest in demanding the end of colonialism and yet she stands out as the biggest colonial power on earth and refuses to give these nations freedom and the right to live outside the U.S.S.R. The double standard which the U.S.S.R. has practiced, and which we and the United Nations have allowed her to practice, is one which nullifies the very core and foundation of the U.N. Charter. We raise our voices today, in protest, because we cannot accept the premise, "Do as I say, don't do as I do." If the United Nations and the ideas of liberty and freedom are to triumph in our shrinking world, then an end to colonialism must come, irrespectively of the nation involved. The free world has shown its good faith and belief in establishing the many nations that grace the roster of the U.N. today. Now the time is overdue to free the enslaved nations of the U.S.S.R. From tiny Armenia to the vast Ukraine, these nations, which have their proud history and heritage, demand to be free and refuse to be enslaved. With God's help one day the forces of justice and freedom will triumph and we shall welcome the whole roster of these enslaved nations of the U.S.S.R. into the family of free nations of the U.N., into the free world of people with human rights and the dignity of man.

To this task and its realization, we, the American Conference for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U.S.S.R. pledge our word and urge all Americans, all freedom-loving people in the world, to stand fast by these principles and yield no more, tolerate no more, the efforts of the U.S.S.R. to close the book on the fate of these nations. The captive nations of the U.S.S.R. have the same right to be free as any of the nations in the world. We, who have that privilege, must assure the enslaved nations that they, too, will regain that basic right. Let us give them this assurance. Let us give the world an expression of our faith and devotion to this cause. Thank you.

[From the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel, June 25, 1962]

EMPIRES OF SOVIETS, CZARS AKIN

That there is "an amazing geographic resemblance of the present Soviet Empire to the empire of the Russian czars, which at the start of World War I had within its boundaries a majority of 57 percent of non-Russian people," was dramatically portrayed over the weekend on the nationwide "Manion Forum" network radio program.

This dramatic revelation was highlighted before the vast coast-to-coast radio audience, when Dr. Clarence Manion, forum director and former dean of the law college of the University of Notre Dame, called to the microphone Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois, a particularly knowledgeable authority on the broadcast subject, who is advocating the creation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations and for assistance to legitimate groups of captive peoples of the Soviet Union now functioning throughout the free world.

Most pertinently Congressman DERWINSKI predicated the impact of his subject on the fact that "despite Communist regimentation and persecution, these people maintain their language, traditions, cultures and religious beliefs that stimulate their independent spirit and their hopes for eventual restoration as free and independent governments in keeping with the principle of self-determination of nations."

Graphically describing this nationalistic spirit as "the Achilles heel of the Communist world," DERWINSKI declared that these forces "if properly understood and evaluated by our State Department and then implemented by an imaginative program, would result in an effective policy approach leading to the restoration of freedom to the various peoples that comprise the Communist world."

Dr. Manion struck the same encouraging note when, in presenting DERWINSKI to the radio audience, he said that "in the captive nations now enslaved under Communist gangster governments, lies our best hope for destroying the Communist conquest and restoring peace to the world." And Manion related how there are 23 of these captive nations now, amazingly containing more than 1 billion people.

And Manion recounted how, for the past 3 years, pursuant to an act of Congress, passed in 1959, the President has proclaimed the last week in July as Captive Nations Week—"when Americans are asked to work and pray for the early restoration of these enslaved people to their historic and national independence."

Congressman DERWINSKI stressed the highly pertinent fact coincident to his subject, that "history does repeat itself," but that, regrettably, "this simple truism is obviously lost on the officials of our State Department, especially as it relates to our policies pertinent to international communism and the Soviet Union in particular. I do not believe that any major nation has been handicapped by as great a degree of blindness and unrealistic interpretation of the historic facts as the United States at the present time."

DERWINSKI described how "this fact is tragically demonstrated when we view the attitude and policies of our Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, on the issue of the captive nations of Eastern Europe."

The Illinois Congressman gave a graphic description of how the Soviet Union and its satellite puppets constitute a vast colonial empire, having imposed communism by force of arms on peoples who still possess their own histories, traditions of freedom and unique nationalistic origins. But he said that lamentably, Rusk, Stevenson, and their appeasement-minded subordinates "unfortunately disregard these historic facts."

DERWINSKI said that this is particularly unfortunate since "these people, despite Communist regimentation and persecution, maintain their languages, traditions, cultures and religious beliefs that stimulate their independent spirit and their hopes for eventual restoration of free and independent governments in keeping with the principle of self-determination of nations."

The Illinois Congressman most realistically climaxed his appeal to the American people to insist that their government cease helping, and sensibly resist the Communist world conspiracy by withdrawing our "foreign aid" from such Communist governments as Yugoslavia and Poland, which he said "are part of the Soviet economic sphere, channeling not only their surplus products into Soviet-controlled economic programs, but depriving their own people of the necessities of life to meet quotas imposed by the economic czars of the Red world."

REFERENCE TO A FORMER VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I find it a deplorable situation when someone would refer to the former Vice President of the United States as a Fascist Soviet tool. I do not believe, no matter what differences we might have on politics or how we would treat subversion or how we would smoke out the Reds that would destroy our institution and liberties, we should indulge in that kind of oratory. I believe it is wrong in principle, I believe it is wrong for any Member of this Congress to refer to a man who has taken an oath of office to call him a Fascist—Soviet tool. I deplore that.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York, will review the remarks to which he refers, he will find the speaker on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from Connecticut, was referring to Malaxa, and not to the former Vice President of the United States.

I hope the gentleman will review the record before he continues in what he says.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WILLIAMS for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. KNOX (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRY):

Mr. MORSE, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes, today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY, for 3 minutes, today.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $360.

Mr. BAKER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KARTH.

Mr. BRADEMUS (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI) and to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUDDLESTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KITCHIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. DENT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. MURPHY in two instances.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. POWELL in two instances.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4034. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. David V. Kyrklund;

H.R. 4670. An act to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6386. An act for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat;

H.R. 8181. An act to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia and to provide for its operation;

H.R. 8321. An act for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews;

H.R. 8662. An act for the relief of Jose Fuentes;

H.R. 9126. An act for the relief of Sgt. Ernest L. Aguilar;

H.R. 9199. An act for the relief of certain officers and enlisted personnel of the 1202d Civil Affairs Group (Reinf Tng), Fort Hamilton, Brooklyn, N.Y.;

H.R. 9804. An act for the relief of Cuyahoga County, Ohio;

H.R. 9894. An act for the relief of Loretta Shea, deceased, in full settlement of the claims of that estate;

H.R. 10415. An act for the relief of Earl T. Briley;

H.R. 11334. An act for the relief of Mary J. Papworth;

H.R. 11665. An act to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12090. An act for the relief of James Commeau;

H.R. 12701. An act for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.;

H.R. 12539. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Cox and other employees of the Federal Aviation Agency; and

H.R. 12936. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Foussé and others.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The **SPEAKER** announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 507. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe;

S. 901. An act to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes;

S. 962. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes;

S. 3177. An act for the relief of Michael (Mike) Bessler;

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Ma Chin-Ying;

S. 3279. An act for the relief of Yet Gee Moy (Tsze Woo Lai) and Mee Sen Moy (Sau Ming Lai);

S. 3338. An act to incorporate the American Symphony League; and

S.J. Res. 214. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period from November 26, 1962, through December 2, 1962, as National Cultural Center Week.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. **BURLESON**, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 4, 1962:

H.R. 1616. An act for relief of Rickert & Laan, Inc.;

H.R. 4094. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources;

H.R. 8113. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Southern Ute Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitation;

H.R. 8983. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in financing the construction of a bridge at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9747. An act to amend section 514(1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended;

H.R. 10613. An act to eliminate the requirements for certain detailed estimates in the annual budgets;

H.R. 10652. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another;

H.R. 11049. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920;

H.R. 11378. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus personal property to schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, radio and television stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission as educational radio or educational television stations, and public libraries;

H.R. 11543. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands adjacent to the Suitland Parkway in Prince Georges County, Md., to Suitland Lodge No. 1856, Loyal Order of Moose;

H.R. 11551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Maryland to the Holy Cross Lutheran Church, Greenbelt, Md., and for other purposes;

H.R. 11590. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Cherokee Nation or Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma;

H.R. 11793. An act to provide criminal penalties for trafficking phonograph records bearing forged or counterfeit labels;

H.R. 12164. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort St. Marks National Historic Site.

H.R. 12688. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying on a program of forestry research, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13044. An act to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 and the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; and

H.J. Res. 659. Joint resolution granting consent of the Congress to a compact entered into between the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia for the creation of the Potomac River compact of 1958;

On October 5, 1962:

H.R. 946. An act to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen;

H.R. 1362. An act for the relief of Calogera Virone Messina;

H.R. 1483. An act for the relief of Priscillo Jose Sisson and Evelyn Sisson;

H.R. 1598. An act for the relief of Michael Anthony Dedetsinas;

H.R. 1660. An act for the relief of Margaret MacPherson, Angus MacPherson, Ruth MacPherson, and Marilyn MacPherson;

H.R. 2836. An act for the relief of C. Edwin Alley;

H.R. 2978. An act for the relief of Rosa and Rita Quattrocchi;

H.R. 4483. An act for the relief of Simon Karasick;

H.R. 5695. An act for the relief of Forrest L. Gibson;

H.R. 6987. An act for the relief of Major William R. Cook;

H.R. 7099. An act to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas;

H.R. 7600. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the effective date provisions relating to awards, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7617. An act for the relief of John W. Schleiger;

H.R. 7876. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the joint pension plan for employees of Local Unions 645, 1507, and 1511, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 8556. An act to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to require certain additional information to be filed by an applicant for a scholarship or fellowship, and to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with respect to certain requirements for payments or loans under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8855. An act for the relief of Marie Silva Arruda;

H.R. 9342. An act to provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purpose;

H.R. 9469. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kays;

H.R. 9491. An act to provide for the removal of an encumbrance on the title of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the Board of Education of the Vallejo School District, Vallejo, Calif., by the U.S. Housing Corporation;

H.R. 9590. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward Hirsch;

H.R. 9737. An act to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that deductions shall not be made from Federal payments to a State home because of amounts collected from the estates of deceased veterans and used for recreational or other purposes not required by State laws, and to amend chapter 35 of such title in order to afford educational assistance in certain cases beyond the age limitations prescribed in such chapter;

H.R. 10316. An act for the relief of Leopoldo Rocha Canas and Teofilo Caolle Servito;

H.R. 10617. An act providing that the U.S. district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain cases involving pollution of interstate river systems, and providing for the venue thereof;

H.R. 10881. An act for the relief of Maj. Singh Sunga;

H.R. 10897. An act for the relief of Joseph Hammond;

H.R. 11018. An act to amend the act concerning gifts to minors in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11099. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Institute of Child Health and Human Development, to extend for 3 additional years the authorization for grants for the construction of facilities for research in the sciences related to health, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11552. An act for the relief of Henry E. Keiser;

H.R. 11594. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H.R. 11678. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division, holding court at Akron, Ohio;

H.R. 11732. An act to amend section 305 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

H.R. 12080. An act to permit domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors;

H.R. 12092. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Brackbill;

H.R. 12093. An act for the relief of Joseph Wolf, Jr.;

H.R. 12451. An act to authorize reimbursement to appropriations of the U.S. Secret Service of moneys expended for the purchase of counterfeits;

H.R. 12653. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act;

H.R. 12855. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 relating to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; and

H.R. 12887. An act for the relief of Benjamin Leach, Diogracias Leach, Rogelio Leach, and Maximo Leach.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 6, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2611. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the extent to which military procurement agencies and prime contractors have obtained certifications as to the accuracy and completeness of cost data used in negotiation of contract prices; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2612. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the management of selected spare parts for the Nike-Hercules guided missile airborne guidance set in the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2613. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain activities of the Public Health Service or the Food and Drug Administration heretofore authorized in annual appropriations"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2614. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Pisgah Inn, Inc., which will authorize the corporation to provide certain facilities and services on a portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway, pursuant to 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2615. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's findings of fact and opinion in the case of *H. W. Nelson Co., Inc.,* v. *The United States,* Congressional No. 13–58, pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, and pursuant to House Resolution 636, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2616. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a report for the fiscal year 1962 of gifts and bequests received and accepted by the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, pursuant to Public Law 85–477; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2617. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, requesting a change in date for filing a report from December 31, 1962, to March 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 87–256; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee of conference. S. 3389. A bill to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs (Rept. No. 2538). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 203. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 13175. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2540). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 5700. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise (Rept. No. 2541). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 8952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes (Rept. No. 2542). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 12599. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Codes of 1954 and 1939 to provide for the elimination of certain tax inequities through the permissive taxation of certain jointly owned railroad terminal and switching facility corporations as partnerships (Rept. No. 2543). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 13358. A bill relating to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 13359. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, contract, operate, and regulate a public off-street parking facility; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 13360. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that any payment or reimbursement to the United States required by such act for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees on account of private aircraft traveling between the United States and Canada or Mexico shall be on the basis of flat fees prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 13361. A bill to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on television receiving sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 13362. A bill to reduce from 10 percent to 5 percent the manufacturers excise tax on television sets, radios, and certain other entertainment equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Res. 829. Resolution to authorize an investigation into practices of Government copyrights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 13363. A bill for the relief of Miss Hermina Kuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 13364. A bill for the relief of Victoria Galante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 13365. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mankyung Ha and his wife, Kyung Ja Yoo Ha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 13366. A bill for the relief of Providence Caccioppo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 13367. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Mistica Adornetti and Sister Elena Brogno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

413. The SPEAKER represented a petition of Edward Muza, Tamal, Calif., relative to a redress of grievance and stating that his rights have been violated by being sentenced to imprisonment for the past 4½ years, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Yom Kippur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Yom Kippur, the day of atonement, is not a holiday in the usual sense. It is not an occasion for social greetings, or festivities of any kind, but a day of solemn fast and repentance. To those brought up in the Jewish tradition, the meaning of Yom Kippur is plain, and the beauty of the Yom Kippur services, centering in the chanted prayer, "Kol Nidre," is an experience to be treasured.

It is an essential part of education in American democracy, I think, that the religious meaning and the artistic beauty of liturgical observances such as those of Yom Kippur, should be described and explained to those who belong to other religious traditions. I, therefore, take this time to give a brief account of the ceremonies of Yom Kippur, and their meaning, for the benefit of any to whom these matters may be unknown, or only vaguely guessed at.

Yom Kippur is the climax of the "Ten Days of Penitence" which began with Rosh Hashanah, the Jewish New Year. In the Jewish calendar, every religious observance, including that of Yom Kippur, begins on what is commonly thought of as the evening of the day before. Thus, this year, Yom Kippur begins at sunset of October 7, and ends at sunset on October 8. For all of this day, most Jewish men and women refrain from eating and drinking, and even young children customarily fast for some part of the day. In the evening, there is a solemn service in the synagogue, at which prayers are said and hymns sung. It is at this service that the "Kol Nidre" is recited. This chant is recognized as a part of the world's great religious music, and recordings of it, as sung by singers of many faiths, are available. Some who have not heard it elsewhere will remember the dramatic use made of it in the early talking motion picture, "The Jazz Singer," with Al Jolson. In this prayer, the congregation asks God to forgive them for breaking any vows made to Him which they have not been able to fulfill. In other prayers and hymns, repentence for other misdeeds is proclaimed, and promises of atonement are made.

Some spend the whole night in prayer. For others, services begin again in the morning, with scripture readings, prayers, hymns, and a sermon by the rabbi. These services occupy the day until nightfall, when, after a memorial service for the departed, the end of the fast is announced by a blast of the shofar, the ram's horn, with which the celebration of Rosh Hashanah was inaugurated. Then this period of penitence and sorrow is brought to an end, and the worshippers return to their homes rejoicing.

May I extend to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all of our colleagues, the popular greeting at this season, "Happy New Year," and at the same time extend the traditional Hebrew—Loshono Tovo Tokosevu—may you be inscribed in the "Book of Judgment" for a good year.

Bills To Provide for the Reform of Personal and Corporate Tax Rates Over a 5-Year Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on July 20 of this year my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Florida, Representative A. S. HERLONG, JR., and I, introduced new bills for reform of personal and corporate tax rates over a 5-year period beginning January 1, 1963. At the time, administration spokesmen had created an expectation that the President would recommend quick enactment of a reduction in income tax rates. Subsequently, on August 13, the President announced that he would withhold his recommendations until the new Congress convenes in January 1963. We plan to reintroduce our bills at that time.

In a statement at the time of introduction, we set forth the details of the proposed legislation and reasons why it offers the most practical and beneficial approach to releasing the Nation's economy from growth-retarding income tax rates. Since then, we have received hundreds of new expressions of support. We have found that there is widespread appreciation of the gradual and earning concepts of our approach, made necessary by budgetary considerations. It is now well understood that more rapid growth in the economy means more rapid expansion in the tax base. Unless there is substantial budget reduction, we must rely on economic growth to earn the tax rate reductions which will permit greater growth.

The purpose of my remarks today is to provide information responsive to two related questions which we find are most often in the minds of those who have commented on our bills. The questions are: First, what is the deficiency in business capital spending and, second, to what extent would this deficiency or gap be overcome by new capital released from taxation by our bills?

In regard to the first question, there are too many variables in our economy to predict a precise rate of growth from any given level of business capital spending. All we know for certain is that more capital means more growth, and that there has been very little growth in the annual rate of business capital spending over the past decade. More specifically, there follows a table of business expenditures for new plant and equipment from 1951 through 1962, stated in terms of constant 1961 dollars. The 1962 total is estimated. This table shows a 1961 total of $34.4 billion, or only $2.3 billion more than the 1951 total of $32.1 billion. The estimated figure of $37.2 billion for 1962 represents a further increase of $2.8 billion over 1961. However, economists are freely predicting that expenditures for new plant and equipment will turn downward in the months ahead—a prediction which gives a new urgency to the need for enactment of comprehensive tax rate reform.

Business expenditures for new plant and equipment

(Billions of dollars, adjusted to 1961 price level)

Year:	*Billions of dollars*
1951	$32.1
1952	33.0
1953	34.7
1954	32.5
1955	33.9
1956	39.0
1957	38.8
1958	31.1
1959	32.5
1960	35.6
1961	34.4
1962 (est.)	37.2

To provide an estimate of the deficiency or gap in annual business capital spending, it is necessary to make an assumption of what the average annual rate of increase should be. I believe we are justified in assuming that this rate should be in the order of 4 percent. If business expenditures for plant and equipment, in constant 1961 dollars, had increased at an average annual rate of 4 percent since 1951, the total in 1962 would be $49.4 billion, or $12.2 billion more than the expected total. Some of the deficiency is attributable to causes other than capital-destroying tax rates, such as the cost-squeeze on profits and a general climate for enterprise that has restrained business expansion. However, it is evident that business and investors cannot accumulate new capital any faster than tax rates permit, and that moderation in tax rates is the key action which Government can take both to release capital for growth and to improve the business climate.

The answer to the second question, how much new capital would be released by our bills, also involves a number of variables. The total tax savings over 5 years under our bills is estimated at $19 billion, based on 1962 income levels. This total is 50 percent greater than the estimated deficiency in business capital spending. However, the tax savings would become available only gradually over the 5-year period, and a large amount of the savings inevitably would be used for consumption spending.

Of the total tax savings of $19 billion under our bills, approximately $5 billion would go to corporations and $14 billion to individuals.

It seems reasonable to believe that initially at least the larger part of the corporate tax savings would be used for new investment. Moreover, it is reasonable to expect that a substantial part of any amount paid out in increased dividends would be reinvested by stockholders. The amounts retained by the stockholders would of course be enlarged as the personal tax rates are reduced.

There is attached hereto a table showing the distribution of tax savings of individuals by taxable income brackets. This table is based on later Government data than were available at the time of preparing the similar table attached as appendix D to our statement of July 20.

The new table shows that a little over $6 billion, or 43 percent of the personal tax savings, would result from the reduction in the first rate from 20 to 15 percent in the 0–$2,000 taxable income bracket, with the remainder resulting from compression of the graduated rates. About $5.4 billion, or 38 percent of the total tax savings, would result from reducing the middle bracket rates from their current range of 22–43 percent to a new range of 16–21 percent. The remaining personal tax savings, $2.7 billion, or 19 percent of the total, would result from reducing the high bracket rates from 47–91 percent to a new range of 22–42 percent. The greater part of the tax savings in the first bracket would be used for consumption spending; a substantial if not major part of the savings in the middle brackets probably would be used for capital spending; and it is to be expected that the bulk of the savings in the higher brackets would be used for capital spending.

In considering all of these figures and factors, it is possible to make a general approximation that about half of the tax savings under our bills would be used for new capital spending and about half for consumption. In other words, the new capital released by our bills would seem to be within the general range of

the present deficiency in business capital spending, but most likely on the short side. It does seem a reasonable conclusion that a program involving a lesser total of tax savings, or one in which the distribution of tax reduction dollars is less favorable from the savings and investment standpoint, would not be adequate in meeting the needs for more capital for more growth.

Tax savings by taxable income brackets based on 1962 income levels

Taxable income brackets	Taxable income	Present rates	Tax under present rates	Rates under H.R. 12632 and H.R. 12633 end of 5 years	Tax under H.R. 12632 and H.R. 12633 rates	Tax savings	Tax saving percent of total savings
	Millions	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*
0 to $2,000	$122,889	20	$24,578	15	$18,433	$6,145	43.1
$2,000 to $4,000	35,750	22	7,867	16	5,721	2,146	15.1
$4,000 to $6,000	12,262	26	3,188	17	2,085	1,103	7.7
$6,000 to $8,000	5,976	30	1,793	18	1,076	717	5.0
$8,000 to $10,000	3,545	34	1,205	19	674	531	3.7
$10,000 to $12,000	2,549	38	969	20	510	459	3.2
$12,000 to $14,000	1,952	43	839	21	410	429	3.0
$14,000 to $16,000	1,470	47	691	22	323	368	2.6
$16,000 to $18,000	1,151	50	576	23	265	311	2.2
$18,000 to $20,000	784	53	416	24	188	228	1.6
$20,000 to $22,000	627	56	351	25	157	194	1.4
$22,000 to $26,000	935	59	552	26	243	309	2.2
$26,000 to $32,000	913	62	566	27	247	319	2.2
$32,000 to $38,000	560	65	364	28	157	207	1.5
$38,000 to $44,000	361	69	249	29	105	144	1.0
$44,000 to $50,000	255	72	184	30	76	108	.8
$50,000 to $60,000	282	75	212	31	87	125	.9
$60,000 to $70,000	164	78	128	32	52	76	.5
$70,000 to $80,000	116	81	94	33	38	56	.4
$80,000 to $90,000	79	84	66	34	27	39	.3
$90,000 to $100,000	55	87	48	36	20	28	.2
$100,000 to $150,000	152	89	135	38	58	77	.5
$150,000 to $200,000	67	90	60	40	27	33	.2
$200,000 and over	196	91	178	42	82	96	.7
Total	193,100		45,309		31,061	14,248	100.0

Tax savings by tax rate groups

Taxable income brackets	Present rates	H.R. 12632 and H.R. 12633 rates	Tax savings (millions)	Percent of total
	Percent	*Percent*		
$14,000 to $200,000 and over	47-91	22-42	$2,718	19.1
$2,000 to $14,000	22-43	16-21	5,385	37.8
0 to $2,000	20	15	6,145	43.1

Our Domestic Brass Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the prospective national tariff position which will result from the enactment of the trade bill will bring problems for many of our American industries. Several of these industries are in my district. One industry which will be substantially affected will be the brass industry. In order to slow the destructive effects which we foresee on this industry, I have been considering other possible actions which might be taken, short of an actual increase of tariffs or the imposition of other restrictive measures.

In this connection, I have come upon a method which seems to offer much hope for progress and provides a way in which the legitimate aspirations of our domestic brass mill industry can be satisfied.

Toward this end, I have written a letter to Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, and I believe that this letter clearly states the proposal which I have in mind. I append that letter after these remarks in the expectation that the proposal which I describe may require legislative implementation:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1962.

Hon. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Managers and workers in the brass industry have viewed with alarm the rising tide of competing imports in this field which are coming from Germany, England, and Japan.

Because of the great differential in labor costs and the greatly improved efficiency and competitive position of foreign industry in these countries, our producers are finding their competitive position increasingly difficult.

Since this competitive differential has sharply increased, under existing legislation, there is every reason to believe that the position of domestic producers will deteriorate even faster under the trade legislation which is currently being considered by the Congress.

Since it will apparently be more difficult than ever to obtain consideration for restriction of foreign competition in the future, it behooves us to look for other methods whereby the economic health of our industries and the employment dependent upon them may be preserved.

Since U.S. sources hold control of the major portion of the world's copper deposits, I suggest that we use this control as a lever to improve our competitive position in the foreign industries which are dependent upon this supply. This sort of resource allocation is a procedure to which the Europeans are accustomed and which they have long practiced.

It seems rather foolish to me that we should pour out our copper to these competitors in the raw form and thereby increase the number of stages of fabrication of articles such as plumbers' brass, for example, at which the disproportionately low wage rates of foreign countries can be brought to bear.

It is my proposal, therefore, that we provide a method of export control whereby certain preliminary stages of fabrication will be entered into in this country before the brass product is permitted to leave for finished fabrication in foreign mills. This has sometimes been called the Swiss method since it is practiced with steel products in that country. Thus, we would not only mine and refine the copper, but we might cast it into bars and billets and, in addition, we might well perform preliminary operations such as extruding rough wire and tubing and in rolling bars. Additional refinements of fabrication could be added if desirable.

The textile industry has received substantial benefits in the form of stepped-up depreciation schedules. The tobacco industry has been the beneficiary of large-scale financing from foreign purchases. The carpet industry has received the benefit of an increase in tariffs. Since these measures of relief have been denied to the brass industry, it seems only fair that a new method such as that which I have suggested should be investigated in order to prevent further loss of jobs and business activity in this vital and historic national industry.

In view of this critical situation, I am asking for your assistance, either in formulating executive orders, or drafting legislation which would further the objectives which I have set forth in this letter. In this way, you and the Department of Commerce could help substantially in carrying out your statutory objectives of assisting American business.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

Preservation of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a great deal of discussion over certain resolutions pertaining to official records of congressional committees, and use of said records by the parties in certain litigations.

I have listened to the disclussions here on the floor concerning the matter of conflicting congressional resolutions and their import upon the body politics of this Nation.

Without taking a position on one side or the other of any particular case either in court or in preparation for court action, one must accept the premise of the inequity of the position created by the apparent double standard created by the resolutions under discussion. These resolutions according to the RECORD were passed by the Senate.

Resolutions passed March 8, 1962, prohibited the divulgence of specific infor-

mation in one instance, while a few months later another resolution (Sept. 25, 1952) reversed this position in the earlier resolutions and permitted unrestricted divulgence.

The nature of the information, the personalities involved must be treated as a secondary consideration in this situation.

The question of the legality of the proposals or the right of the Congress to pass contradictory measures may also be removed from this discussion. We can do so because in a self-governed body, making its own rules, the question of what is right and what is wrong according to the rules, is often only a matter of majority vote. However, the question goes beyond these considerations and hits at a principle of law of a democratic Government; one that is based upon equality before the courts of the land.

In any case, this action of the congressional body could prejudice a case before a court in the favor of one of the parties in the litigation. This could and in many cases would be the determining factor in a case where the issues involved are a matter of great publicity and public interest.

To deliberately prejudice a case is against all concepts of fair trial, trial by jury, and equal justice under the law.

The records are replete with cases in point, some of which can be held to be directly related to the subject of this discussion.

The following citations show the universal disapproval of action of this nature.

When government withholds information from the accused but discloses such information to the prosecution, it violates the basic responsibility of the duty of "the government" to do justice.

The U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, 1950, in *U.S.* v. *Coplon* (185 F. 2d 629, 638), stated the purpose of this resolution more eloquently than I could possibly:

> Few weapons in the arsenal of freedom are more useful than the power to compel a government to disclose the evidence on which it seeks to forfeit the liberty of its citizens.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in *U.S.* v. *Reynolds* (345 U.S. 1, 12), eloquently states this principle:

> The rationale of the criminal cases is that, since the Government which prosecutes an accused also has the duty to see that justice is done, it is unconscionable to allow it to undertake prosecution and then invoke its governmental privileges to deprive the accused of anything which might be material to its defense.

The principle is not limited to the prosecuting arm of the Government. The courts have spoken in broad terms. In both the Reynolds cases and in *Roviarro* v. *U.S.* (335 U.S. 53, 60–61) the U.S. Supreme Court held that dismissal results if the Government withholds what the accused seeks.

It seems clear that the Government may not avoid its duty to do justice by having one of its arms prosecute while the other inhibits the defense. A powerful analogy is presented by *Delaney* v. *U.S.* (199 F. 2d 107, first circuit, 1952) in which a conviction was reversed because of the prejudicial effect of publicity resulting from congressional hearings. The Court has made it inescapably clear that, for purposes of withholding information needful to the defense no less than for purposes of spreading prejudicial publicity, the Government is indivisible.

The courts have broadly construed these constitutional inhibitions upon the State because as in the Coplon case the court recognizes that—

> All governments, democracies as well as autocracies, believe that those they seek to punish are guilty; the impediment of constitutional barriers are galling to all governments when they prevent the consummation of that just purpose. But these barriers were devised and are precious because they prevent that purpose and its pursuit from passing unchallenged by the accused, and unpurged by the alembic of public scrutiny and public criticism. A society which has come to wince at such exposure of the methods by which it seeks to impose its will upon its members has already lost the feel for freedom and is on the path toward absolutism.

The double standard implicit in these resolutions referred to above offends not only basic constitutional guarantees, but also the American's sense of fair play. This resolution is an expression of the congressional body that the information acquired through the machinery of this body may not be used in a one-sided effort.

The resolution further protects the accused by providing him with equal opportunity to secure privileged information which may have been made available to other agencies or to the courts without the express consent of the Senate.

We are reminded of the obligation of the Government in criminal cases, and it behooves the Congress in the exercise of its powers to heed the warnings of the U.S. Supreme Court, issued over a quarter of a century ago in *Berger* v. *United States, supra:*

> The U.S. attorney is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done. As such, he is in a peculiar and very definite sense the servant of the law, the twofold aim of which is that guilt shall not escape or innocence suffer. He may prosecute with earnestness and vigor—indeed, he should do so. But, while he may strike hard blows, he is not at liberty to strike foul ones. It is as much his duty to refrain from improper methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one.

The Congress of the United States has a similar obligation. Government is indivisible as it operates affecting the rights of the individual. The Senate may not and should not act in such a manner as to grant to the prosecution that assistance and cooperation which it withholds from the accused or vice versa.

Since attorneys general and all officers and Members of the Congress and the courts are only temporary in their official positions, the individuals change but the powers and rights of the officers must be the same for whomever may be holding the offices at any given moment.

When bad precedent is set, bad law follows. When bad laws become the rule instead of the exception, man's fundamental liberties and privileges under the law become trampled in the dust of man's inhumanity to man.

Let us then look to tomorrow knowing that what we have done today brightens our hopes rather than consigning them to the dark dungeon of favoritism and the abusive use of temporary authority and power.

In instances such as this the individuals do not count. The matter transcends personalities, it becomes an issue bearing upon the very foundations of our Government and our whole creed of equal justice under the law.

Record of Legislation, 87th Congress, Committee on Education and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RECORD OF LEGISLATION, 87TH CONGRESS, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, THE HONORABLE ADAM C. POWELL, CHAIRMAN

Status of legislation as of October 4, 1962, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives:

Bills reported by committee and enacted into law	18
Bills passed by House and Senate and pending conference	2
Bills reported by committee and pending before Rules Committee	18
Bills reported by committee, denied a rule	1
Bills reported by committee, defeated in House	1

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The full committee met in executive session on 65 days; the subcommittees met on a total of 317 days.

Days of hearings	221
Days of executive sessions	96

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

A. Legislation enacted

1. The Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961, Public Law 87–22 (Apr. 24, 1961); amended to include practical nurse training.

2. Establishment of teaching hospital for Howard University, Public Law 87–262 (Sept. 22, 1961). The transferal of Freedman's Hospital as a teaching hospital enhances the professional preparation possible at Howard University.

3. Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, Public Law 87–274 (Sept. 22, 1961). The first legislation of its kind to be passed. Provides Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and

to provide training of personnel for work in these fields.

4. Teachers for the deaf and speech pathologists and audiologists, Public Law 87–276 (Sept. 22, 1962).

5. Education of the blind and increased appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind, Public Law 87–294 (Sept. 22, 1961).

6. Extend National Defense Education Act of 1958; extend impacted areas (extension of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874); Public Law 87–344 (Oct. 3, 1961).

7. Amendment to title 11 of National Defense Education Act, Public Law 87–400 (Oct. 5, 1961).

8. Captioned films for the deaf, Public Law 87–715 (Sept. 28, 1962).

9. School Lunch Act amendments, important to Negroes since it removes the specific designation to race. Conference report passed House October 4, 1962, passed Senate October 2, 1962, Public Law 87——.

B. Bills passed by committee and in Rules Committee (date referred to Rules Committee)

1. University extension (May 31, 1962).
2. Special education and vocational rehabilitation (July 5, 1962).
3. Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts (July 19, 1961).
4. Adult basic education (Apr. 2, 1962); recommended by President.
5. Quality Education Act (May 31, 1962); recommended by President.
6. General aid to elementary and secondary education (June 1, 1961).
7. Overall revision of National Defense Education Act (July 6, 1961).
8. Amendment to Land Grant Colleges Act to eliminate the "separate but equitable" clause of the act (May 23, 1962).
9. Amendments to impacted areas laws to deny payments to school districts that practice racial discrimination and segregation (May 31, 1962).
10. Amendments to National Defense Education Act to raise Federal payments into student loan fund (Oct. 2, 1962).

C. Bills passed by House and Senate and pending conference

1. College Academic Facilities Act.

D. Committee prints on education

1. "Federal Aid for Education" (May 1961).
2. "The University in Latin America: Argentina and the Alliance for Progress" (September 1961).
3. "Federal Interest in Education" (September 1961).
4. "Activities and Accomplishments of the Committee on Education and Labor—Activities in the Area of Education Legislation" (December 1961).
5. "Congressional Action for Higher Education" (January 1962).
6. "Higher Education in Soviet Union" (January 1962).
7. "The New Image in Education" (February 1962).
8. "A Directory of Federally Financed Student Loans, Fellowships, and Career Training Programs in the Field of Higher Education in the United States" (April 1962).
9. "Cultural Factfinding Mission to Latin American and Caribbean Countries" (April 1962).
10. "Views on Relationships of Church and State in the Field of Education" (May 1962).
11. "Integration in Public Education Programs" (May 1962).
12. "Interim Report on Education and Citizenship in the Public School System of Puerto Rico (August 1962).

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

A. Legislation enacted

1. Minimum wage and hour amendments of 1961, Public Law 87–30 (May 5, 1961). First major overhauling and updating of this statute since date of original passed under Franklin D. Roosevelt.
2. Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act, Public Law 87–87 (July 14, 1961).
3. Federal Employees Compensation Act, Public Law 87–339 (Oct. 3, 1961).
4. Additional Assistant Secretary of Labor, Public Law 87–137 (Aug. 11, 1961).
5. Metallic and Nonmetallic Mines Safety Act, Public Law 87–300 (Sept. 26, 1961).
6. Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, Public Law 87–420 (Mar. 20, 1962).
7. Eight-hour law, Public Law 87–581 (Aug. 13, 1962).
8. Manpower Development and Training Act, Public Law 87–415 (Mar. 15, 1962). Labeled by press as probably most important piece of domestic legislation since New Deal.
9. Amendment to cover railroad workers, Public Law 87–729.

B. Bills passed by House and Senate[1] and pending conference

1. Equal pay for equal work (July 25, 1962). First successful effort to get an equal pay bill for women out of the House in the memory of man or woman.

C. Bills reported by committee and denied a rule

1. Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (reported Apr. 13, 1961), denied a rule (June 7, 1961).

D. Bills passed by committee and in Rules Committee (date referred to Rules Committee)

1. Youth Employment Opportunities Act (Mar. 29, 1962). On the President's "must" list.
2. Occupational Safety Act (July 5, 1962).
3. Equal Employment Opportunities Act (Feb. 8, 1962). First Fair Employment Opportunities Act to get out of committee since Calendar Wednesday used by Mr. Powell in February 1950.
4. Davis-Bacon amendments (Apr. 5, 1962).
5. National Council on Migratory Labor (July 5, 1962).
6. Crewleader registration (migratory labor) (Apr. 18, 1962), tabled by Rules Committee (Sept. 20, 1962).
7. Child education, migratory labor (July 5, 1962).
8. Amendment to section 302(c)(6) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (May 22, 1962).

E. Bills reported by committee, defeated in House

1. Child labor, migratory labor (Oct. 4, 1962).

F. Other legislative inquiries (ad hoc subcommittees)

1. Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation: Legislative "digging" of this committee led to findings that were later incorporated into the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.
2. Subcommittee on the Operations of the National Labor Relations Board: The exercise of its oversight function by the committee through the hearing conducted by this subcommittee led to a reevaluation of many practices and decisional policies adopted over the preceding 8 years.
3. Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment: A scouting in depth in keeping with the committee's responsibilities and jurisdiction on the general subject of employment.
4. Subcommittee on Irregularities in the Garment Industry: Investigation of racial discrimination, possible violations of existing labor-management relations statutes, and corruption based on complaints and information received by the committee over the past 18 months.

G. Committee prints on labor

1. "Worker Participation in Business Management," February 1961.
2. "Some Important Dates in the History of American Labor," February 1961.
3. "A Compilation of Economic Data on Industries Affected by H.R. 3935 and Other Bills To Amend the Fair Labor Standards Act," February 1961.
4. "Comparative Print Showing Changes Which Would Be Made in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 by H.R. 3935 as Reported by the Committee on Education and Labor," March 1961.
5. "Federal Labor Laws," March 1961.
6. "Impact of Automation on Employment," June 1961.
7. "Farm Labor Contract Registration Act of 1961," July 1961.
8. "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961," July 1961.
9. "Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board," September 1961.
10. "Applicability of Antitrust Legislation to Labor Unions: Selected Excerpts and Bibliography," September 1961.
11. "Federal Labor Laws," November 1961.
12. "Activities and Accomplishments of the Committee on Education and Labor—Activities in the Area of Labor Legislation," December 1961.
13. "The New Image in Labor," June 1962.
14. "Legislative History of Davis-Bacon Act," September 1962.

H. Investigative Task Force

The Investigative Task Force assisted the Special Subcommittee on Labor, Congressman James Roosevelt, chairman, in the preparation of public hearings concerning fair employment legislation. Many witnesses were interviewed for their appearance before the subcommittee. During the hearings, testimony was submitted indicating discriminatory practices by the Texas State Employment Commission, Dallas, Tex.; at the direction of Committee Chairman Adam C. Powell, the Investigative Task Force made an investigation, which ended such discriminatory practices.

The Investigative Task Force assisted Congressman Dominick V. Daniels, Chairman Subcommittee on Integration in Federally Assisted Education, investigating integration in federally assisted schools. Aid was also given to the Special Subcommittee on Education, Congresswoman Edith Green, chairman, in the study of Federal assistance for education purposes. In cooperation with the education section of the Committee on Education and Labor, Investigative Task Force helped prepare a committee document relating to juvenile delinquency.

Investigative Task Force conferred with labor leaders and management in Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the Yale-Towne labor strike which had been continuing for approximately 20 weeks, and which was greatly affecting the economy in that area. The Investigative Task Force also investigated alleged labor irregularities involving an independent union and the Caltex Corp. Alleged irregularities by several clothing manufacturers in Long Island, N.Y., were corrected. Several Negro workers were admitted to a local union in New Jersey as a result of sustained efforts of the staff. The Investigative Task Force also investigated complaints of discrimination in the New York Transit Authority. An investigation was made of alleged irregularities in local No. 194 of the International Hod Carriers Union, Baltimore, Md., as well as of discriminatory personnel practices by the air lines.

The Investigative Task Force instigated a full investigation of the ILGWU in New York State, the result of which was heard before the ad hoc Subcommittee on Investigation of the Garment Industry.

---

[1] Amendment to H.R. 11880, Foreign Service Building Authorization Act.

> Complaints of discrimination in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare were investigated, resulting in the promotion of a Negro secretary. Similar complaints involving discriminatory practices within other Government agencies have received preliminary investigation by this office and in most instances have been referred to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity with whom progress checks are periodically made.
>
> Our staff has investigated hundreds of complaints of discriminatory practices by labor and management and has been instrumental in bringing about satisfactory results.

"No Show" Penalty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the public was led to believe that October would be the last month of the "no show penalty program." This plan of passenger penalties was approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board on a strictly experimental basis for a 6-month period. After questioning Chairman Boyd as to the advisability of this plan on May 9, 1962, he assured me and other members of the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee that the program was "experimental" and "may prove to be wrong." He indicated that the program would not be continued until after a thorough evaluation of the results of this 6-month trial period.

In view of Chairman Boyd's assurances, I was shocked to read the following news item, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on September 25, 1962, on page 22:

> RETAIN "NO SHOW" FINE, AIRLINES TOLD
>
> The Civil Aeronautics Board yesterday told the airlines that their "no show" penalty plan should be continued.
>
> Alan Boyd, CAB Chairman, told the airlines that the plan—involving a penalty of up to $40 for passengers who fail to cancel reservations they do not use—has thus far been beneficial.
>
> A Montgomery citizens committee is protesting the death sentences. An appeal to the Supreme Court is planned.

Although mention of the Montgomery Citizens Committee was obviously a typographical error, it seems to me that citizens committees might well be forming in all parts of the United States to protest the action of Chairman Boyd. Public hearings should be scheduled by the Civil Aeronautics Board after the trial period has ended. At the very least, an objective evaluation on the merits of the "no show plan" should be forthcoming from the CAB based on the experience of the airlines and the traveling public during the 6-month period. It was Chairman Boyd himself who stated that this was a "trial and error period" and was the only way in which his agency could determine whether the approach was in the public interest. I respectfully submit that you cannot determine the outcome of an experiment until the trial period has ended and the results are studied.

Up until now, this "no show" experiment has not received the study which it merits and absolutely no information has been forwarded to the appropriate committee of the Congress. To date, the program has been of doubtful value to the airlines and has been injurious to the traveling public. A workable and equitable program of assessments would inure to the benefit of the travel industry. However, it is clear from industry reports that the program has proven to have grave disadvantages, as passenger inconvenience and high administrative costs. In some cases, the added administrative costs of carriers has exceeded the amount collected from passengers.

In addition, the cost of the ill will engendered in attempts to collect penalities and in slowing down ticket counter operations cannot be adequately assessed. No study has been made to assess the loss of revenue through loss of passengers because of bad publicity created by the program. Before the plan went into effect, 17 airlines objected to the plan based on their unwillingness to use ground personnel to administer the fines. It was felt that these ground employees would more properly be used to service overworked aircraft.

Chairman Boyd supported the no-show program as a means of solving the revenue problems caused in large part by scalpers and reservation monopolists who willfully pervert the airline reservation process to their own means. The scalpers and monopolists, both groups which are especially active in resort areas, exploit the reservation process by using fictitious names. The use of a pseudonym still provides a foolproof way of escaping detection under the no-show plan. If the plan is to be judged on its success with this problem, Mr. Boyd would certainly have to give the no-show system a failing mark.

I would suggest that Chairman Boyd provide the Congress and the traveling public with a report on how effectively and fairly fines are assessed. The Aviation Daily reported that—

> While the carriers were able to collect $283,651 from no-shows they were unable to collect $318,707 from passengers who failed to pay the airlines when billed through the mail. Of the 16,645 no-shows billed this way for a total of $335,324, only 1,619 returned payments totaling $16,617.

Is public confidence merited in a plan of assessments whereby fines are paid on an almost voluntary basis?

Even if the "no show" plan benefits outweigh the disadvantages to the airlines under continued use and experience, the Civil Aeronautics Board should consider the disadvantages to the passengers, or as Chairman Boyd appropriately phrases it, "the public interest." For example under this CAB-fostered plan the passenger has no redress for the inconvenience and financial loss he suffers as a result of unwarranted cancellations of flights on which he has booked passage. Unduly delayed flights and unpublished schedule or flight route changes which delay arrival at destinations are also responsible for incalculable inconvenience and loss to passengers. The program as it now stands essentially benefits the carriers, if anyone, and penalizes the passengers—but not the erring carriers—for nonperformance.

What is needed is a plan which will provide penalties to the travelers by the air carrier which has unduly delayed or cancelled a flight. This plan was more eloquently expressed by Chairman Boyd on May 9, 1962, when he commented on what he then thought the "no show" plan covered:

> If it is a matter over which the airline does have control, then the airline is penalized to the same extent that the passenger is penalized if he does not show up for a flight.

This is exactly what the "no show" plan should do, but does not do. The poor on-time performance of air carriers is largely attributable to such foreseeable and controlled circumstances as the overscheduling of certain craft, lack of adequate standbys, delays to repair minor equipment—such as food machines—overtaxing of equipment, and poor routing of traffic at peak hours. Chairman Boyd should evaluate the "no show penalty plan" with this situation in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that there should be no criticism of those who reserve space on a flight with no intention of using it. Other passengers are unable to obtain accommodations when space is held and not used. In addition, the public suffers from this practice as it reduces the revenues of the airlines and their ability to provide adequate service for users of air transportation.

But the time is overdue when some attention is given the airline passenger. It is high time that the Civil Aeronautics Board under the titular leadership of Chairman Boyd takes measures which will help assure dependable service and eliminate the frustration, inconvenience, and loss occasioned by unnecessary delays, cancellations, and changing of accommodations after reservations have been confirmed. Airlines must be deterred from overselling flights, one of the most serious causes of inconvenience to the air traveling public. Meaningful penalties for preventable delays and cancellations by the airlines will provide a measure of protection for the public, and hopefully, some improvements in the operation of the airlines.

Surely, Mr. Boyd's answer to this dilemma should not be blind continuation of a one-sided program of passenger penalties.

Transport of Commodities to Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, as all my colleagues are aware, I have been concerned, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Export Control, over the export of commodities to all Communist countries by our country as well as by our allies which would significantly contribute to the economic or military potential of those countries and prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States.

On September 26 in a statement to my colleagues in the House, I made reference to the deepening concern in Congress and throughout the country over the continuing Castro-Soviet economic and military buildup in Cuba, and announced that the House Select Committee on Export Control would hold hearings on October 2 and 3 to clarify U.S. policy as to certain aspects of the situation this country faces in the Caribbean.

As a predicate to my announcement of these hearings, I had particular reference, Mr. Speaker, to the persistent reports in the press and on the floor of the House and Senate, that the shipment of a significant volume of Communist-produced goods and materials, strategic and otherwise, were reaching Cuba in ships registered under flags of our NATO Allies.

Since that time there have been reports indicating that possibly American-owned ships of foreign registry have been engaged in transport of commodities to Cuba.

Appearing before the select committee at the hearings held as scheduled were several prominent witnesses from American shipowner groups flying the American flag and a representative of a similar group flying the flags of Panama, Honduras, and Liberia, commonly referred to as "flags of convenience." High-level officials of maritime unions conversant with the many facets of worldwide shipping to Cuba and the Honorable George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, gave enlightening detailed testimony.

During the 2 days devoted to Cuban trade, the select committee sought to develop:

First. The extent of free-world shipping in Cuban trade.

Second. How much shipping adversely affects our national security and welfare and assists in the spread of the Communist international conspiracy.

Third. What is being done about it?

Fourth. What has been accomplished?

The recorded detailed testimony, in my opinion, furnishes rather complete answers to all these questions. It will be printed and distributed to all of my colleagues in the House and other interested persons as soon as possible.

In the meantime, I want to call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a few pertinent personal observations concluded after hearing all the testimony:

Although the several persons representing the maritime unions and shipowner groups have some divergent interests and are involved in unsettled controversial issues, all were in complete accord that directly and indirectly, our Government should aggressively continue its efforts to induce our allies to cut off assistance in shipping strategic commodities to Cuba which would make a significant contribution to her economic or military buildup.

I was indeed pleased to note that immediately subsequent to the appearance of the several persons representing the maritime unions and shipowner groups before the select committee on October 2, 1962, the State Department confirmed publicly in a press conference on October 4, measures under consideration to control trade in the bloc-Cuban trade. The proposed measures, not yet firmed up or officially adopted, were briefly brought to the attention of the select committee in executive session in a hearing on October 3, by Hon. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State.

As a result of the information supplied to the select committee by Mr. Ball and a detailed review of a transcript of the proceedings at a State Department press conference on October 4, I directed a letter to Mr. Ball on October 5, quoted in part, as follows:

> It is my understanding that the following measures to control trade in the bloc-Cuban trade are under consideration and are being afforded further study and may be placed into effect in the near future:
>
> 1. Close all United States ports to all ships of any country if any ship under the flag of that country hereafter carries arms to Cuba.
>
> 2. No U.S. Government (including Government-financed) cargo to be carried on a foreign flagship, if any ship of the same owners is used hereafter in bloc-Cuban trade.
>
> 3. No. U.S. flagship and no U.S.-owned ship to carry goods to or from Cuba.
>
> 4. Close all U.S. ports to any ship that on the same continuous voyage was used or is being used in bloc-Cuban trade.
>
> I have reviewed the transcript of the discussion of these four proposals as recorded at the time of the State Department press conference on October 4. I am pleased with the proposals to tighten control over shipping to Cuba as far as they go—but they are not sufficiently stringent.
>
> I note in a review of the transcript of the comments at the press conference previously referred to, bloc-Cuban trade refers to bloc-originated shipments going to Cuba or Cuban-originated shipments going to the bloc, and does not apply to commodities originating in non-bloc countries such as West German, the United Kingdom, or Italy.
>
> I urge that these measures be implemented to apply to any shipments from any country to Cuba that would make a significant contribution to the economic or military buildup of Communist Cuba.
>
> In addition, as I indicated at the time of the hearing conducted by this committee on October 3, a policy should be established that no license be issued for the importation of any oil into the United States in a tanker of any country which has carried Russian oil to Cuba. Let Russia tie up her own fleet in carrying on trade with Cuba.
>
> I am fully aware that the unilateral action on the part of the United States as proposed in your measures now being considered cannot have the effect of tight multilateral control by all of the free-world countries. But I agree with your statement in your referenced letter of this date "that the measures we are taking will materially contribute to the strategy isolating Cuba," as you had previously indicated in your testimony furnished this committee on October 3.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out that Mr. Ball, the Under Secretary of State, in addition to his lucid and enlightening oral testimony in open and executive sessions of the select committee furnished in a prepared statement specific and detailed facts relative to the critical Cuban problem. As black as the situation understandably appears to many of our people, I am encouraged by the expressed determination of the administration to prevent an offensive military buildup in Cuba. I am sure that Mr. Ball's statement prepared for the select committee is of interest to my colleagues which is quoted as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE W. BALL, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 3, 1962

Mr. Chairman, in your letter requesting me to appear here this morning you indicated the continuing interest of this committee in the status of trade between the free world and the Sino-Soviet bloc. But you emphasized particularly the trade with Cuba. Since the problem of Cuba is very much on the minds of the American people today—and of real concern to this committee—I shall concentrate in my prepared statement on the present trading relations between the free world and Cuba. I shall attempt not only to describe those relations but to relate them to the larger problem which a Communist-dominated Cuba poses for the United States and the free world.

Our policy toward Cuba is based upon the assessment that it does not today constitute a military threat to the United States. Without doubt it is an economic burden for the Sino-Soviet bloc. It has value to the bloc primarily as a base for the subversive activities of international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

The policy of the U.S. Government is directed toward nullifying Cuba's usefulness as a source of infection for international communism, while at the same time rendering it more costly for the Sino-Soviet bloc to maintain it for that purpose.

In pursuit of this objective we have taken a series of measures both unilaterally and in collaboration with our friends and allies. These measures have already weakened the Castro regime and they have made it a pariah among the member nations of the American system.

President Kennedy summed up the present situation effectively when he recently said: "It is Mr. Castro and his supporters who are in trouble. In the last year, his regime has been increasingly isolated from this hemisphere. His name no longer inspires the same fear or following in other Latin American countries."

II

Mr. Castro's trouble is reflected in the state of the Cuban economy today.

Since the end of 1960, living standards in Cuba have fallen precipitously. By Government fiat the total volume of workers' salaries has been increased and rents have been reduced, but this is an illusory achievement. The volume of goods available for purchase by the population has drastically shrunk. Per capita food consumption has declined by more than 15 percent. In pre-Castro days Cuba was the third highest in Latin America; now it is the seventh. The glittering promises of new and more adequate housing have proven false. Military needs have eaten into the limited construction resources.

Cuba is a rich land with a friendly climate and a fertile soil. But as always the Communists have proven themselves poor farmers. The 1962 sugar crop will be the smallest in the last 6 years—and by a substantial margin. Meat supplies have declined sharply; they remain below the level prevailing before the Castro takeover. With domestic production at a low level and foodstuff imports greatly reduced, nationwide rationing has been inevitable.

Cuba has had the world's richest sugar economy, with only the beginnings of industrialization. In pre-Castro days Cuba lived primarily by selling sugar to the United States. In her present posture of isolation she is living badly—and then only as a dependent of the Soviet Union.

III

Cuba is isolated from the other nations of the free world economically, politically, and spiritually.

Castro contributed to that isolation in December of 1961 by making it perfectly explicit that he was a dedicated Communist. In January 1962 the Foreign Ministers of the OAS at Punta del Este declared that the present Government of Cuba was excluded from participation in the inter-American system. Since the Punta del Este Conference, the American States have carried out that decision. They have also established machinery to guard against subversive activities in this hemisphere.

The situation today can be summarized by a relatively few statistics. In 1958 United States-Cuban trade totalled more than a billion dollars. Today it is confined to minute exports of certain nonsubsidized foods and medical supplies which amounted, during the first 7 months of this year, to only $373,000—and those shipments were permitted only for humanitarian reasons.

In its Cuban trade, Canada in 1959 had total imports and exports amounting to over $27 million; for the first 6 months of this year they amounted to less than $7 million.

In 1959 the other Latin American countries did total trade with Cuba amounting to $82 million; in 1961 this had fallen to $20 million.

The nations of Western Europe have also reduced their trade with Cuba. In 1959 their exports to Cuba were approximately $122 million. By 1961 this figure had been cut to less than half.

IV

This drying up of trade has not been an accident. It has been a deliberate response by this country and its allies to the Communist efforts to establish a beachhead for subversion in this hemisphere.

The process of isolating Cuba economically first began in July 1960 when the United States prohibited the further import of Cuban sugar into this country. This cost Cuba the annual amount of $350 million in foreign exchange. Three months later we prohibited the export of United States goods to Cuba except only for the limited food and medicines mentioned above.

In February of this year, President Kennedy made the embargo on Cuban trade substantially complete, extending the embargo on sugar to all other imports, whether direct or indirect.

America's allies, both in the OAS and NATO have collaborated in limiting trade with Cuba. At Punta del Este the OAS Foreign Ministers agreed to prohibit trade with Cuba in arms and implements of war. The Council of the OAS undertook to study further trade restrictions.

Our NATO allies have prohibited the export of any military items to Cuba and they have indicated that they are not shipping any strategic items. They are also cooperating to assure that United States exports will not be diverted to Cuba through their ports.

Until early this year Japan was one of the principal free world purchasers of Cuban sugar. As a result of discussions with the Japanese Government, the Japanese are shifting their purchases of sugar to other free world sources. Castro has not only been denied the foreign exchange he desperately needs but Japanese exports to Cuba are declining as well.

V

The economic isolation of Cuba has been effected not merely by cutting off credits and goods, but also by imposing restrictions on the shipping available for sustaining Cuban trade with the bloc.

We have prohibited ships registered under the flag of the United States from transporting to Cuba commodities on the United States positive list, the United States munitions list, and items controlled by the Atomic Energy Commission. This amendment will also affect about 360 foreign flag vessels whose owners have contractually agreed not to violate the transportation order.

Moreover, bunkers are denied in U.S. ports to all vessels under charter to the Sino-Soviet bloc engaged in Cuban-bloc trade; Cuban owned or chartered vessels are also denied bunkers and ships stores in this country.

As an island, Cuba is entirely dependent upon shipping for the maintenance of its tottering economy. With the decline of the Cuban economy and with the Soviet buildup of arms and aid, ships and shipping have emerged as a special problem.

Cuba relies upon imports for most of her machinery and equipment, petroleum, steel, chemicals, wood, and paper products, cotton and, to some extent, grain. Cuba is, however, a small country. Total imports to Cuba in 1961 amounted to $641 million; exports during that year stood at $614 million. The total trade of Cuba was therefore less than one-half percent of world trade. In 1959, 2.2 percent of Cuba's exports went to the Sino-Soviet bloc; by 1961, 75.7 percent went to the bloc.

No U.S.-flag ships have called at Cuba within the last 2 years. Ships calling at Cuba are of three kinds: Soviet bloc ships, free world ships under free world operation, and free world ships chartered to the Soviet bloc. The Soviet Union has offered high rates to charter free world ships at a time when depressed conditions in the industry have produced nearly 3 million tons of unemployed laid-up shipping.

These three kinds of shipping carry different sorts of cargo to Cuba. The Soviet ships carry general cargo, petroleum and arms. No other ships carry arms. The free world ships not under charter, typically carry peacetime commodities—food, textiles, etc.; more important they do not usually participate in trade between the bloc and Cuba which, as I have noted, supplies Cuba's economic needs. That trade moves to a considerable extent on free world ships which have been chartered by the Soviet Union and which are used to transport Soviet bloc cargoes though not—to repeat—arms or ammunition. Statistics on ships calling at Cuban harbors have recently been compiled by the Maritime Administrator. These figures show that a majority of the ships stopping in Cuba are under free world flags, but, as a result of Soviet charter, more than a majority are under Soviet shipping orders and carrying Soviet cargoes.

As this situation has emerged, the U.S. Government has recognized that it should take steps to curtail or prevent the use of free world shipping in the Soviet bloc-Cuban trade. With this purpose in mind, the Department of State has during the last month approached our allies on this matter.

So far, five of our NATO allies have taken positive actions to restrict the availability of ships.

The Federal Republic of Germany has promulgated a new ordinance bringing all Federal Republic ship charters to bloc countries under license and barring Cuba as a destination for such charters. It is our understanding that Canada and France have no ships presently in the Cuba trade.

Belgium is taking steps to stop all traffic with Cuba on its flag vessels. Turkey has informed this Government that it plans to put into effect measures which will assure that, in the future, no Turkish vessel will carry cargo of any type from the Soviet Union to Cuba.

The Italian Government has assured us that no strategic goods have been transported to Cuba on Italian ships.

We are continuing to discuss this problem with our other allies, including the United Kingdom, Greece, Norway and Denmark. These are great maritime nations that depend heavily on their merchant marine for their foreign-exchange earnings—and today there is much unemployed shipping. These nations have long and deeply-felt traditions regarding "freedom of shipping." Nevertheless, they are giving careful consideration to our requests and have given informal advice to their shipowners in an effort to discourage them from allowing their ships to engage in strategic trade with Cuba.

VI

In spite of the progress that has been made so far, the executive branch of the Government is not yet satisfied that all useful measures have been taken to limit the shipping available for the maintenance of the Cuban economy. We are considering several additional measures designed to impose restrictions on the availability of shipping to Cuba.

Secretary Rusk is consulting today with the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States with regard to those measures. At the same time they are being discussed with our NATO allies. Because these matters are under consultation with foreign governments, it would not be proper for me to disclose them in public session today. I am, however, prepared to discuss them with this committee in executive session at this time. Or I should be glad to review them with this committee on another occasion, after the process of consultation has been completed.

While I cannot properly talk about all of the measures now under consideration, there is one which, I feel certain, will be adopted. This will be an order prohibiting ships of U.S. registry or ships of foreign registry owned by a U.S. citizen from participating in the Cuban trade. The exact terms of this order are now being worked out by our legal and shipping experts.

VII

As a result of the measures that have been taken by the United States and by the members of the OAS, NATO, Japan, and other countries, Cuba today is almost totally dependent upon the Soviet Union for its economic livelihood. Three-fourths of Cuba's trade is with the Communist bloc, and this percentage is increasing as other channels of trade dry up.

In the last few weeks we have read much in the newspapers of the military buildup of Cuba by the Soviet Union. Quite clearly it does not constitute a threat to the United States.

Since July, when the volume of Soviet military shipments to Cuba suddenly vaulted upward, 85 shiploads arrived in Cuban ports. Many of them carried military items, supplies and personnel. These shipments have consisted, in part, of types of weapons previously delivered to the Cuban armed forces, including more tanks, self-propelled guns, and other ground force equipment. The major tonnage in recent shipments, however, has been devoted to SA–2, surface-to-air missiles (SAMS)—together with all the related gear and equipment necessary for their installation and operation. To date, fifteen SAM sites have been established in the island. We estimate the total may eventually reach 25. These are antiaircraft missiles having a slant range of 20 to 25 miles.

In addition, three and possibly four missile sites of a different type have been identified. These sites are similar to known Soviet coastal defense missile sites that are believed to accommodate antishipping missiles with a range of 20–35 miles. Quite likely several more such sites will be installed.

Cuba is now estimated to have 60 older type Mig jet aircraft. In addition at least one advanced jet-interceptor has recently been received, and probably several more are in the process of assembly. This type of advanced jet-interceptor is usually equipped with infrared air-to-air missiles. We estimate that the total of these advanced interceptors in Cuba may eventually reach 25 to 30.

In addition, 16 "Komar" class guided missile, patrol boats which carry two short-range missiles (11–17 miles), were included in recent shipments.

About 4,500 Soviet military specialists have arrived, including construction men and technicians.

VIII

Unpleasant as may be the spectacle of a Communist-dominated island just off our shores, we should not overlook the fact that Cuba is, at the moment, a small enfeebled country with an incompetent government, a limping economy and a deteriorating standard of living. The crash efforts of the Soviet Union to provide the Castro regime with economic technicians and to build up its military defenses is a demonstration of Cuban weakness. Because of the desperate plight of the Cuban economy, Cuba's isolation from the other nations of the hemisphere and the fear which that isolation has engendered, the Cuban Government has turned itself into a dependency of Moscow.

We may take the events of the past month—regrettable as they may be in many ways—as evidence of the essential soundness of the strategy of isolation that we have pursued toward Cuba over the past 2 years. The additional measures now under consideration with respect to Cuban shipping are part and parcel of that same strategy.

We propose to continue along these lines, taking new measures as the developing situation may require. But in pursuing this policy—as in pursuing any policy—the United States must never forget that it is engaged in a worldwide struggle and that no policy can be regarded as an end in itself or as existing apart from the whole complex of relationships which give the free world its strength.

And, as the President has made clear, we shall not rely solely on the impact of political and economic isolation for our protection. If, contrary to the present evidence, it should ever appear that the Soviet Union is succeeding in making Cuba a threat to the security of this country or this hemisphere, we are prepared to take the necessary action—whatever it may be.

Alabama Delegation Urges Withdrawal of Federal Forces From Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic events of the last few days in the State of Mississippi have been a matter of grave concern for all thoughtful Americans. The use of Federal troops against U.S. citizens has been shocking and uncalled for. The activities and methods of the Justice Department and the Federal forces have raised serious constitutional questions. The Members of the Alabama delegation in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States have risen to protest this unwarranted invasion of a State. We have protested to the President asking for an immediate withdrawal of Federal forces from the State of Mississippi. I insert herewith our protest telegram sent to the President on October 2, 1962:

OCTOBER 2, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

We deplore the use of force at the University of Mississippi just as we did when President Eisenhower sent troops to integrate Central High School in Little Rock. The use of Federal force against fellow Americans can provide satisfaction only to the enemies of our common country. Therefore we urge the immediate removal of troops and Federal marshals from the State of Mississippi.

LISTER HILL, JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senators; FRANK BOYKIN, GEORGE GRANT, GEORGE ANDREWS, ALBERT RAINS, ROBERT JONES, CARL ELLIOTT, KENNETH ROBERTS, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Members of Congress.

Hon. Kathryn E. Granahan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly happy and honored to have the privilege to sit in this Chamber and work with a grand lady from the State of Pennsylvania, KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, on matters affecting the welfare of this great country of ours.

On September 28, 1962, President Kennedy nominated KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN to be Treasurer of the United States, and this appointment will bring to that post one of the most able and experienced women in American public life.

Mrs. GRANAHAN comes to this office with a most unusual background. The first Congresswoman from Philadelphia, she is now serving her fourth term. She was elected to her late husband's unfinished term in the 84th Congress, and reelected to the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses.

It has most often been said of Representative GRANAHAN that she knows her subject when she talks, and she is a careful and capable woman whenever she talks. She has earned the trust of the Members of Congress to an unprecedented degree and worked amicably and effectively with both Democrat and Republican legislators.

There have been many recognitions of her fine work. For example, in 1959 she received an honorary doctor of laws degree from St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia. She also received the Father Hogan Award, St. Joseph's College in March of 1962. She received the 1962 Gold Medal Award, Philadelphia Club of Printing House Craftsmen; the 1962 United Award given by the United Business Mens' Association of Greater Philadelphia for outstanding leadership and distinguished service to the welfare of the community, and for outstanding service to small businessmen throughout the Philadelphia metropolitan area. She was initiated as national honorary member of Theta Phi Alpha, a national sorority for Catholic women at their national convention in Cleveland, Ohio. She received the Distinguished Daughter Award from the State of Pennsylvania in 1961.

Finally, I would like to present an admission of my own. I would like to cite her as a woman of great heart, of loyalty, of dedication to the American people and to her country.

I rejoice not only because a deserved and great honor has come to a good friend, but also because her appointment holds such promise for the future.

The Use of the Farmer Committee System Is Still Valid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, ever since 1933, the farmer elected committee system has been an essential part of the administration of Federal farm programs. From corn-fed hog farm program days up to our present supply management programs, these farmer committees worked in partnership with the Government to help control overproduction of farm commodities and to carry out good conservation practices on the land. The idea that elected farmer committees should play a major role in the administration and development of action farm programs is as valid now as it was back in 1933.

The committee system has proved that it is well adapted to translating Federal farm programs passed by Congress into action at the local level. Through two major wars, farmer elected farm committees provided the stimulus to keep food production at the required level. Between these conflicts, the committees helped guide farm production to levels adjusted to peacetime requirements. Farmer elected committees have been active in a multiplicity of agricultural programs and generally have carried out their duties with distinction.

There are five features of the farmer elected committee system which make these committees uniquely adapted to administration of supply management programs at the local level. These are:

First. Committeemen have intimate knowledge of local farm conditions.

Second. The committee system permits local adaption of farm programs to fit the particular needs of different farming areas and conditions.

Third. The committee system is "democracy in action." It permits those people affected by Federal farm programs to have their say in the development and administration of those programs.

Fourth. Through the committee system local recommendations for policy and program changes can be transmitted from the grassroots to higher levels.

Fifth. Farmer elected committees provide a judgment factor in the day-to-day operation of farm programs which could not be obtained by any other method.

The Institution and the Man Who Leads It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of this historic 87th Congress now coming to a close bears witness to the truth that an institution is a reflection of the character of its leadership.

Many years ago Alexander Hamilton said:

> The amelioration of the condition of mankind and the increase of human happiness ought to be the leading objects of every political institution and the aim of every individual according to the measure of his power in the situation he occupies.

The record of this Congress is heavily weighted on the side of humanitarian action. Legislation has been enacted that—

Helps the unemployed fit themselves for new jobs.

Raises the minimum wage.

Increases old age benefits and provides special housing for our senior citizens.

Provides higher Federal grants to the States in aid of the blind, the indigent aged, and dependent children.

Lifts the scale of compensation rates for our disabled veterans.

Encourages work programs by the States that will help welfare recipients attain a status of self-support and self-respect.

These are only a few of the many accomplishments of this nature to our credit, the effects of which will be felt not only at home but by people in many countries of the world as well. However, to review that record in detail is not my purpose here.

Rather it is to stress the peculiar affinity in this instance of the institution and the man who is the head of it—our able, respected, and beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Every experience of his life, the poverty and the hardships, and of his career in the law and in politics, pointed the path of his progress to the pinnacle he has now attained. But it is not merely the practical experience in these halls which destined him for this high role of leadership.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker MCCORMACK, is a devout man, a pious man, a family man, and above all, a man with a great heart, and a spirit of kinship for his fellow man.

And the noble works of this Congress in improving the chances of world peace, in countering and opposing the evil forces of communism, in lending a hand to underdeveloped nations, and brightening the prospects of the common man everywhere bear the impress of his labors.

May the next few months of rest from this toil bring him back to us reinvigorated for the tasks of the 88th Congress.

National Lottery—"Pie in the Sky"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer is clamoring for tax reductions. Some request that Government expenditures be reduced, others seek to eliminate waste and inefficiency in necessary programs, and others desire painless methods of taxation or painless methods of raising revenue. I, for one, have recognized that we must spend money for our national defense and our national needs. At the same time, I recognize that the American taxpayer is seeking tax relief. Without security, our program would be meaningless.

I have sought to eliminate waste, and inefficiency, to reduce the cost of unnecessary expenditures. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Agriculture, I and the subcommittee members recommend a reduction of $877,690,500 from the budget requests. As a result of my activities and those of the subcommittee members, we have brought about a reduction of storage costs in our corn and wheat by 3 cents a bushel with annual savings approximating $86 million per year. The Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, of which I am a member, has recommended reductions of approximately $10 million from the budget requests this year. We have sought to cut out waste without impairing our defenses or national needs.

Some people, however, offer tax cuts through "pie in the sky" proposals. Such a proposal is the national lottery. It is cruel and it is a hoax to propose a national lottery to reduce taxes when such proposals are neither obtainable nor feasible. But it is doubly cruel when the proposal contains provisions which prevent the collection of one dime of revenue. Since 1933 national lottery bills have been proposed in Congress. These have been rejected. Lottery sponsors have introduced bills for many years. One of the sponsors has introduced a lottery bill for 10 years. Many of his speeches on lottery have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD costing the taxpayers thousands of dollars. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to speak about one bill, H.R. 2007, introduced by the gentleman from the Bronx.

H.R. 2007, to raise revenues through lottery, is so drawn that even if it were passed, it could not raise one dime. On page 3, line 9 of the bill, it provides as follows:

> No ticket or participation shall be sold in any State, or in a political subdivision of a State, where such sale is illegal.

Inasmuch as every State in the Union—50 States—including 1 State where other gambling is permitted, outlaws lottery, no funds could be collected. In a speech on May 24, 1962, I documented the statutes of every State which declared lottery to be illegal. I do not repeat them here. To my charge that no revenue could be collected because every State in the Union bars lottery and no ticket can be sold where lottery is illegal, the sponsor answers that Federal law supersedes State law. Normally where there is a conflict between a Federal statute and a State law, Federal law supersedes State law, but where a Federal statute has a savings clause, such as is contained in H.R. 2007, providing that State law shall not be set aside, the State law is valid and governs. The State law remains effective and continues to exist despite the contradiction contained in the Federal statute. H.R. 2007, which by its provisions, preserves the State laws declaring lottery to be illegal. It provides that in a State where lottery is illegal, no sale of lottery tickets can be made. In view of the fact that H.R. 2007 says no lottery ticket could be sold where lottery is illegal, no lottery ticket could, therefore, be sold. Not one dime could be raised. Not one dime in taxes would be reduced.

We in Congress see many amendments to legislation which seeks to preserve State statutes. On Thursday of this week, October 4, when I presided over the House of Representatives during the consideration of the bill to outlaw child labor by agricultural industries on farms, an amendment preserving State statutes was adopted by the membership. The House has sought to change the rule of interpretation by the courts so as to make State laws effective even where Federal laws on the same subject exist. Thus, it is obvious that State laws can stand side by side where Federal legislation so provides.

H.R. 2007, which I have been discussing, the bill allegedly purporting to raise revenue by lottery provides that State laws shall be valid, and, therefore, no sale of lottery tickets can be made where lottery is illegal.

The cruel promises to reduce taxation by lottery revenue could be excused if such promises were based on ignorance. It is unlikely that a so-called expert on lottery who has made a thorough study on the history of lottery and who has introduced lottery bills for 10 years could be that ignorant. While such ignorance is improbable, it is possible in this case. However, since May of this year, the sponsor of the lottery bill was advised by me on the floor of Congress as to the weaknesses and defects of the legislation. Yet the gentleman from the Bronx persists in his speeches and representation of tax cuts through the lottery provided for in H.R. 2007. Such continued representations spell out a willful hoax and deception upon a trusting public.

It is doubly cruel to try to hoax and hoodwink a public which needs tax relief with such "pie in the sky" proposals. H.R. 2007 cannot provide tax relief to the public nor can it increase the revenues necessary for our national needs and defense programs. It is time the public became aware of the deception, deceit, and dishonesty in the repetition of a national lottery proposal. Some people forget that Abraham Lincoln once said, "You can fool some of the people all of the time, all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

An informed public cannot be fooled, Mr. Speaker, so I take this opportunity to inform the people so they can no longer be fooled by a national lottery proposal which is only "pie in the sky."

Congressman Joseph E. Karth Reports to the People of the Fourth District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, a record of solid achievement has been made by the 87th Congress with the cooperation of the Kennedy administration. This is a fact which the people of the Fourth District—and the Nation—recognize and appreciate.

St. Paul is today at the threshold of an exciting era of rebuilding its core city. The initial stimulus came from substantial Federal projects such as the $8,317,000 St. Paul-South St. Paul floodwall which is far enough along for the Riverview Industrial Park to begin taking shape. Construction is proceeding on the $7,600,000 annex to the Post Office and Customs House. The site for the $11,700,000 new Federal Office Building and Courthouse has been agreed upon by the responsible local authorities and the General Services Administration. Detailed plans for acquiring the land are being expedited by the Federal Urban Renewal Administration.

Unprecedented progress is being made in the building of a $1,250,000 Lake States Forest Experiment Station on the University of Minnesota St. Paul campus.

In the city of White Bear Lake a badly needed addition to the post office is being constructed at a cost of $175,000 to relieve the overcrowded conditions there.

Preliminary work is being conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers to determine the feasibility of creating a great new barge harbor at St. Paul where deepwater navigation begins in the Mississippi. Funds amounting to $25,000 have been appropriated.

In the near future we can expect a new post office terminal and vehicle maintenance facility of a not-yet-determined value and a $16,400,000 Veterans' Administration Center building at Fort Snelling.

Heartened by this considerable confidence of the Federal Government in the future of the St. Paul area, private real estate interests have now begun to launch spectacular developments of their own which will ultimately wholly rejuvenate the central city.

In other economic news of interest to the Fourth District, the Department of Defense has notified me that area businesses during the last fiscal year received prime military contracts of nearly $200 million, or about 80 percent more than in the previous year. At the rate current defense contract awards are being made with area companies for classified ordnance items, electronic equipment, computers, and so forth, this will be even a better year for Twin City firms and workers.

This is heartening news because a considerable part of my efforts in Washington are devoted to exploring new ways to help area enterprises make their capabilities known to defense and space agencies and thereby to help secure new job and business opportunities for our community.

SPACE COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

As a ranking member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I was assigned by Chairman GEORGE P. MILLER to head the Subcommittee on Space Sciences. During the last session this assignment involved the responsibility of making significant investigations into projects which were encountering difficulties such as Centaur, ANNA, and Advent.

The troubles with Centaur—its initial spectacular blowup and lack of back-up capability—alarmed me because Centaur is a workhorse vehicle in many of the next generation of space exploration missions. Centaur is important because its new-type engine uses as fuel, liquid hydrogen—which boils at −422° F.—with liquid oxygen, a combination which surpasses presently known fuels in efficiency.

The investigation by my subcommittee disclosed such diffusion of management responsibility among the contractors and Government managers, lack of definition of objectives, and underfunding that the project was imperiling important parts of our space programs. The subcommittee's hearings and recommendations initiated a major reevaluation of Centaur and caused a realinement of management, clarification of goals, and establishment of a top priority in scheduling.

In addition to the investigations our subcommittee participated for weeks in holding hearings and intensively evaluating the space sciences 1963 budget for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In full committee we finally approved $3.81 billion for NASA.

ACTIONS OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

It is in the height of fashion for carping columnists to try to minimize the very substantial achievements made jointly through the efforts of the administration and liberal majorities in Congress. I certainly knew that when President Kennedy set the goals of the New Frontier he did not expect them to be accomplished immediately. As a former Congressman and Senator, he knows the Congress well—both its limitations and its strengths.

In fact the 87th Congress has done a remarkable job which has been unmatched in the last 10 years. The main problem since January 1961 has been for our Nation to catch up the 8 previous years of economic backsliding which put the United States on the brink of depression. Emphasis of the major domestic legislation enacted during the 87th Congress was on bolstering the economy with measures such as:

Temporary unemployment compensation which authorized Federal advances to permit up to 13 additional weeks of benefits for workers who have been unemployed so long that they have exhausted their regular benefits;

Temporary railroad unemployment compensation which approved additional unemployment benefits for railroad workers similar to those granted to other employees;

Aid to dependent children amendments to authorize, temporarily, aid by States to children of needy unemployed parents who are not otherwise eligible for Federal aid;

Minimum wage amendment which raises wages from $1 an hour to $1.25 and extended coverage to 3.6 million additional workers;

Manpower retraining and development programs to retrain with new skills workers who have lost jobs because of automation or dying industries and assure trainees of living expenses while learning;

Area redevelopment program established to provide a 4-year program of $300 million in loans and $94 million in grants for industrial plants and public facilities in economically distressed areas;

Public works acceleration program will make available up to $900 million in loans and grants to communities with high unemployment where community projects can quickly be initiated to employ workers;

Federal highway aid that will increase Federal share of interstate highway program from $25 billion to $37 billion;

Water pollution control program to make available an additional $270 million to help communities construct sewage treatment plants;

Housing Act of 1961 authorized up to $4.9 billion for new housing units and establishes new programs to make urban areas more desirable places in which to live;

FHA mortgage insurance loan authorization was increased by $1 billion;

VA home loans were increased by additional $1.2 billion in direct VA home loans;

Small business loans limits raised by $20 million loan;

Small business amendments increased SBA revolving fund by $105 million to a total of $1.1 billion; and

Small business investment restrictions were liberalized for small business firms.

Many of these economy-sustaining programs are financed through self-liquidating loans upon which interest is paid to the Government.

MEETING HUMAN NEEDS

Not forgotten during this Congress was the vast inventory of programs to improve human resources and the measure of social justice to those who deserve better of our community. Much more should have been done but nevertheless I am proud of these achievements:

Social security minimums were increased for old-age benefits and benefits to widows, and men were allowed to qualify at reduced benefits at age 62—disability provisions were liberalized and the fund strengthened;

Railroad retirement was improved to make benefits comparable to social security;

Disabled veterans' compensation increased by about 9.4 percent payments to veterans for service-connected disabilities;

Veterans' widows received new benefits equal to death pensions;

Juvenile delinquency grants of $10 million a year to be made available to communities with programs to combat juvenile delinquency;

Practical nurses' scholarship programs were extended;

Migratory health services made available for establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for migratory farm families;

Drug regulation law imposes stricter safeguards on use of new, untried medicines;

Education TV broadcasting given financial assistance;

Self-employed pension plans now permitted to lawyers, doctors, small businessmen, with some of the privileges enjoyed under present law by corporations;

Salaries of 1.6 million Federal workers raised to make Government employment attractive and thus hold key people who have been leaving in large numbers for private industry;

A resolution proposing that the States approve a constitutional amendment prohibiting the payment of a poll tax as a condition for voting for Federal officials; and

The Civil Rights Commission's life has been extended and programs securing the civil rights and equal employment opportunities of all citizens have been strengthened.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

In our Nation's international affairs the Congress backed this administration's forceful "no drift" foreign policy and helped with the enactment of outstanding legislation.

A new Trade Expansion Act was passed to meet the challenge of the coming revolution in foreign trade created by the European Common Market. The act will permit some U.S. tariffs to be reduced as much as 50 percent and others even more where trade is almost exclusively with the Common Market. Those U.S. industries and workers hurt by tariff reductions will be given assistance in various forms to get reestablished.

Foreign assistance was again offered to help nations facing internal and external fights with communism.

Peace Corps was established to recruit men and women with key skills and to send them as good will ambassadors to the underdeveloped areas of the world. This imaginative program has been an outstanding success.

Authority for the United States to buy up to $100 million in U.N. bonds to keep the world organization performing its peacekeeping activities.

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was established to provide weapons control information in international negotiations and prepare plans for converting defense industries to peacetime uses.

The Congress substantially backed President Kennedy's moves to counter Communist threats in Laos, Thailand, Berlin and Cuba. The Congress has now made it abundantly clear to Khrushchev and the world that a unanimous American Government is ready to face a showdown with communism and possesses the will to win if he is foolhardy enough to risk one. To back this conviction the Congress has provided the Defense Department with $48.1 billion, a record peacetime budget, to purchase primarily the military hardware and scientific know-how to insure an invincible retaliatory striking power.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Despite the important progress made on President Kennedy's legislative program, there are vital parts of the program which must be acted on in the 88th Congress. These include measures for:

Aged: Adequate hospital and nursing home care under social security as provided in the Anderson-Javits bill;

Youth: Provide unemployed young men an opportunity to work in conservation and other job-training programs;

Education: If need continues, to provide essential Federal assistance;

Labor: Establish uniform and fair minimum standards in the administration of the unemployment compensation system; and,

Tax reform: Reduce load on overburdened taxpayers and insure integrity of our tax system by closing loopholes.

Continued national progress and prosperity will require the utmost cooperation between the Kennedy administration and the 88th Congress. Working together we can insure the achievement of a program which will build a great and dynamic America.

Alabama Delegation Supports Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama congressional delegation in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States have gone on record in support of Gov. Ross Barnett, of Mississippi, in his fight to prevent the integration of the University of Mississippi. We have supported him in his efforts to preserve the rights of the States from undue and uncalled for intervention in affairs of a local and domestic concern. We support him in his fight for true interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution supports Governor Barnett in his efforts to preserve States rights and the southern ways of life.

The following telegram was sent to Governor Barnett on September 26, 1962, and I insert it herewith:

JACKSON, MISS.,
September 26, 1962.

Hon. ROSS BARNETT,
Governor, State of Mississippi:

Mississippi's fight is Alabama's fight. We support you in the principles that you are so forcefully defending and we commend you for the courageous battle you are waging for constitutional government.

LISTER HILL, JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senators; FRANK BOYKIN, GEORGE GRANT, GEORGE ANDREWS, ALBERT RAINS, ROBERT JONES, CARL ELLIOTT, KENNETH ROBERTS, ARMISTEAD SELDEN, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Members of Congress.

Big Business, Big Unions, Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I made before the student body and faculty of Fordham University, New York City, in connection with the American Age Lecture series on the subject, "Big Business, Big Unions, Big Government." The address follows:

BIG BUSINESS, BIG UNIONS, BIG GOVERNMENT

(By Hon. EMANUEL CELLER)

In this generation we often hear it said that the world is shrinking. By this we mean that as man conquers time and distance, contacts with all parts of the earth multiply.

The distant has become near and the near still nearer. Meanwhile man explores space, and we may expect that the nebulous planets of yesterday's astrologers may become the much-visited nebulae of tomorrow's space voyagers.

Paradoxically enough, at the same time as we talk of this "small world," a swelling debate takes place over the problem of "bigness." It is of bigness that I shall discourse today: "Big Business," "Big Labor" and "Big Government." I trust I shall add to the enlightenment of some of you, and to the confusion of only a few.

First, I shall address myself to the question of whether the three big B's in the United States are fact or fancy. Initially I should prefer to put quotes around each of these concepts.

It is in this wise that I ask you to view the picture of big business as I see it.

1. FACT OR FANCY OF BIG BUSINESS

It is of very big business that I speak, the very large corporations, not the moderate-size corporation. The largest supermarket in an area may be an independent unit or one unit of a chain. If it does a business of $3 million a year it is likely to be thought of as doing big business. But in my lexicon, for the purpose of this speech, and as understood by most of those who have written about the subject, big business is imaged by a corporation huge in size and power. The line between the big and the very big enterprise may not be drawn with exactitude, but in the United States there are so many which by any standard are very large that the problem is rarely one of recognition.

In this country, in 1961–62, there were at least 29 companies with over $1 billion in sales or assets or deposits. There were seven companies in the over $10 billion class.

There were 41 industrial corporations with sales of over $1 billion, and 35 with assets in excess of that amount.

Eight merchandising firms had sales of over $1 billion. The assets of these 8 companies were well over one-third of the total assets of the 50 largest.

In the transportation field, there were 10 companies with assets of over $1 billion. These 10 had about one-half of the total assets of the 50 largest transportation companies.

There were 15 public utility companies with assets of over $1 billion. These 15 companies had about two-thirds of the assets of the 50 largest public utility companies. One company, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., with over $24 billion in assets, had over one-third of the total assets of all the 50 largest public utility companies. There are 27 banks with deposits of over $1 billion each. These banks have over one-fourth of the total deposits of the almost 14,000 banks in this country.

Private power companies estimate that in the next two decades they will need a capital investment of $130 billion to meet the demands for electric service. Sizable as this amount is it is still less than the $155 billion-plus held by 300 of our 13,000-odd banks.

Three life insurance companies, in 1961, had over $200 billion of life insurance in force. One had almost 60,000 employees.

The advertising expenditures alone of each of two corporations in 1961 exceeded the sales of any industrial corporation other than the top 400.

Borrowing from one of my colleagues, Congressman PATMAN, I might note also that foundations, pension funds, and trust company management concerns are heavily involved in business enterprises. Some funds are billion dollar enterprises, and within these three categories there are many huge enterprises.

These figures convince me that the concept of big business in this country is grounded in fact. Those of you who agree with me may now remove the "quotes."

2. FACT OR FANCY OF BIG UNIONS

Can we pinpoint the fact of big unions as readily as we can big business? Strangely enough, despite the popular conception of "big unions," this concept seems to be a mixture of fancy as well as fact.

It is difficult to fix upon a satisfactory standard by which to measure the "bigness" of a union. Is it the number of its members? Is it the amount of its assets?

Labor has one major national federation to which not all unions belong. The AFL–CIO is a large organization.[1] It has 23 regional directors, 132 national and international unions. Like members of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the member unions of AFL–CIO, however, very largely are on their own in dealing with business and government.

The 11-name automobile union, sometimes known as Walter Reuther's union or the UAW for short, has over a million members as does the Steelworkers of America, and the Teamsters Union. The Carpenters and Joiners of America have about 800,000 members, and there are about 30 other unions with memberships, respectively, of over 100,000. The six largest unions represent more than one-third of all union members. More than one-half of all locals are affiliated with 17 unions, each having at least 1,000 locals.

The fancy that creeps into these facts derives from another fact. That fact is that for the most part these larger unions are composed of many smaller unions (a total of about 79,000). The amount of aid any particular local may receive from its parent will vary greatly from union to union. It may be so little that, in practice, it is the local union which must test its strength against a big company. Union strength is also dissipated by jurisdictional fights, which are not infrequent.

According to a recent survey, in metropolitan areas about four-fifths of 6,824,300 plant workers in manufacturing and three-fifths of the 3,758,300 plant workers in nonmanufacturing were in establishments operating under collective bargaining.[2]

The proportion of union members in the total labor force, however, is about one out of four, and in nonagricultural employment, about one out of three. It seems generally believed, moreover, that union membership has been on a plateau for some years. In fact, the peak appears to have been reached in 1956. The total union membership in this country is probably less than 18 million. Many unions have been hard pressed to maintain their membership and, while manufacturing output has been increasing in the past decade, a survey for the period 1953-59 showed that total manufacturing employment declined.

The increased productivity that conduces the growth of big business is often associated with decreasing employment. It has been estimated that during the next decade increased productivity might displace 200,000 workers a year.

Recently the Wall Street Journal quoted a spokesman for the Stauffer Chemical Co., of New York, as saying:

"Our plants are so highly automated that we can boost production clear up to full capacity without adding more people. It's just a matter of opening up a valve a little more."

When we turn to the size of unions in terms of assets, we find that in 1959–60, 24 national unions had receipts of over $5 million, but the total receipts of the 24 were about $353 million, with total assets of $611 million. Only one local union had receipts of over $5 million. That one had some $11 million in receipts. It had assets of about $3 million. The total assets of all the unions in the country approximates $1½ billion.[3]

The United Steel Workers of America is a union which illustrates my difficulty in arriving at a clear-cut decision as to the problem of big unions. That union does occupy an important strategic position. At the end of 1961 it had a net worth of over $21 million. It was comprised of 2,900 locals with an approximate membership of 1,200,000. But 150,000 of its members were unemployed and about 300,000 were not working a full week.

Since unions, because of the nature of the industry with which they are associated, may have the power to affect the public interest materially, it does not always follow that a union's size may be the measure of its power. This may also be true at times with respect to business corporations, although it has been my experience that in the latter case size and power go hand in hand.

To me the foregoing does not add up to a clear picture as to big unions being a fact or a fancy. You may or may not wish to remove the quotes around "big unions."

3. FACT OR FANCY: BIG GOVERNMENT

"Big Government" is a phrase often used in our times. To the political party out of power the Government is always bigger than it should be. Discussion of big Government, conveniently to me and my colleagues in Congress, usually focuses upon the executive branch of the Government, and rarely does one hear impassioned speeches about big State government or big local government.

Bigness of government, may, perhaps, be best assayed in terms of scope of activities, employment and revenue. First, a brief word about State and local governments. In 1960 the total expenditures of all State and local governments were almost $61 billion. This was less than the business done by 10 large corporations. If the States were included in any summary of bigness, none of them, in terms of revenues or expenditures, would make the big five list of business corporations. Thus the revenue of the State of California is about one-third of the amount of sales of General Motors. New York State does no better in any such listing. A.T. & T.'s construction expenditures have exceeded the expenditures of any State except one. A.T. & T., with over 700,000 employees, and General Motors, with over 500,000, have many times the number of employees of such States as California and New York, with some 146,000 and 124,000 employees, respectively.

In 1961 there were about 9 million people in the employ of Federal, State, and local municipalities, about 7 million of which were employed by State and local governments. Recent figures of the number of employees in the Federal Government indicate that, worldwide, there are about 2,528,500; in the United States, about 2,367,950. These figures do not include the Armed Forces.

It is a matter of common knowledge that there are a number of Federal regulatory agencies concerned with major segments of our economy and of our national resources. Any list of the more important of such agencies would include the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Among the departments of the Government closely concerned with our economy I need mention only the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Commerce and Labor Departments. It has been said by one who is not my favorite author—the president of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana—that there are over 60 independent agencies of the Federal Government with about 400,000 employees, and an annual budget of about $10 billion. These figures may be compared with the 700,000 employees of A.T. & T. and the latter's operating income of over $8 billion.

In a series of articles in the Indianapolis Star earlier this year, it was adduced that there were about 24 Government corporations or agencies having important business activities.

What the Federal Reserve Board does affects most of us. And if you are in the market for mortgage money, want to build a hospital, need employment insurance, and so forth, there is likely to be a Federal agency in the picture.

What buyer is bigger than our Defense Department? What lender is larger than our

---

[1] Much smaller are the Confederated Unions of America and the National Independent Union Council.

[2] Monthly Labor Review, July 1962, vol. 85, No. 7, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[3] Union Financial Statistics (1959–60), U.S. Department of Labor.

Government? What seller has more surpuls property to sell? Who receives more revenues?

I think it is fair to say that we have a big Government. I have removed my initial quotes. Most of you probably will do the same.

4. DOES THE BIGNESS OF ONE BEGET BIGNESS IN THE OTHER?

The theory of countervailing power is attributed to one who is a well-known professor of economics as well as a member of our diplomatic service—Mr. Galbraith. If not its originator he has given it popular impetus. As I understand it it means that the natural reaction to bigness of an organization is a growth of bigness on the part of those with which it deals. Thus, according to this theory, big sellers induce big buyers. Big business gives rise to big unions.

I think it is obvious that this theory is not fully borne out in practice. But I believe that there are many striking examples which support this theory. Thus the president of the Textile Workers Union of America is reported to have called for a merger of all textile unions, and to have said:

"This is no time for small, independent, and scattered efforts. Textile employers learned this lesson long ago.

"They have been steadily combining their resources and forming huge, powerful corporations. Textile workers can no longer ignore this development if they are to be able to deal effectively with these giants of industry."[4]

I am aware also that companies in certain industries, group together when engaged in collective bargaining with national unions.

An interesting sidelight in the problem of interrelationship of bigness occurred during the past year. The Federal Government held a competitive lease sale involving some three and three-quarter million acres in the Gulf of Mexico. The reason given by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior was: "The answer lies in the nature of the oil industry. The tremendous investments in equipment and material which are necessary to explore and drill in the outer shelf require that the companies hold sufficient acreage to keep such equipment working."

I am certain that the growth of big corporations with attendant increscent power and the power of some unions have been conducive to big government. Any time a government allows private sectors of its economy to become larger than it or more powerful, it is on its way out.

Size has not been outlawed under the antitrust laws. But the Supreme Court has recognized that size creates a dangerous opportunity for abuse.[5] Such bigness, because of its effect upon the Nation's economy, inevitably invites Government regulation or intervention in one form or another.

The more Government intervention, the less "free enterprise." This is illustrated by the recent steel price increase crisis, as Professor Berle noted in an article in the New York Times Magazine in April of this year.

Regulation of public utilities is so common a part of our economic scenery that we raise no question as to Government regulation in this area. Yet the reason for such regulation is the absence of competition as a regulator. The bigness of the utility and its monopoly power in the area where it operates, creates such danger of abuse that we are not willing to trust it alone to exercise such power wisely and in the public interest.

In a message to Congress in April 1938, President Roosevelt noted that "A discerning magazine of business has editorially pointed out that big business collectivism in industry compels an ultimate collectivism in government."

To those who point to the many companies of small or moderate size in this country, I ask, "Would they still be here if it were not for our antitrust laws?" Abuse of big power has been adduced on many occasions in the courts and in congressional hearings. One Government official some years ago made history by asserting that what was good for General Motors was good for the country. This equation of the interests of a big company with the interests of a big country may, rightly, give us pause for reflection. I feel certain, however, that it is our antitrust laws which have kept corporate officials from paralleling a recent statement by the head of La Société General de Belgique that, "It isn't that we are too big. It's that Belgium is too small."

I am forced to admit, however, that this country, thus far at least, does not seem to have been big enough to regulate that colossus of colossi, A.T. & T. The Federal Communications Commission, admittedly, with all of its resources, has never been able to handle the job of regulating A.T. & T.'s rates. The FCC admits it has no procedure to determine or regulate interstate long distance rates and that it can only negotiate such rates.

In June of this year, the White House Committee on Small Business, in a progress report, noted that "A large number of small independent businesses decreases the likelihood of excessive economic and political control." The part played by the cartelized economy of prewar Germany and Japan in the excessive political control there which led to World War II, attests to the truth of that observation.

5. WHETHER BIGNESS IS DESIRABLE

(a) Big business: Big business supplies us with much of our mass-produced goods. It furnishes employment to a great many of our people. It is a source of investment to many a stockholder and to a lesser number of bondholders. Often diversified, it is not so susceptible to economic ill health as small business. The taxes it pays help support Federal, State, and local governments. It is the mainspring upon which many a small company, many a small businessman depends. And its importance in this country is not infrequently matched by its importance in other countries.

But big business means big power. When a giant trips and falls, the damage he does is likely to be much greater than when one of ordinary stature suffers the same misfortune. Thus the recent bankruptcy of the 212 retail store chain of Grayson-Robinson triggered the closing of a number of their stores. In addition, it has jeopardized many of its small manufacturer creditors. And when big business misuses its big power, the resulting harm is likely to be more far reaching than when a smaller competitor is guilty of the same abuse. The small and the moderate-size businessman may compete with the big concern, but in the current business world it is a rarity to find David felling Goliath or a David acquiring Goliath as part of his entourage.

The possession of great power by great corporations is itself dangerous. The greater the power, the more likelihood of its abuses. As Lord Acton said: "Power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely."

It is common for big business enterprises to point to the many small businesses which are their subcontractors or suppliers. But this kind of emperor's largess has many disquieting factors. When all or a substantial part of the output of a small company goes to a big corporation, the former is in a very vulnerable position. To supply the needs of the latter the small company may have a heavy capital investment and acquired special equipment. A change of mind on the part of the big corporation and bankruptcy of the small company, or a forced sale to a big corporation, may be just around the corner.

The small businessman will often find it necessary to court the favor of the big corporation as to prices. Often dissatisfaction may be considered too expensive a luxury. As time goes by the urge to compete, the incentive to innovate, becomes lost. Content to be protected by big brother's umbrella, he may become big brother's most ardent defender. The Council of Economic Advisers has been troubled over the future of small businesses which "live as satellites of the corporations which dominate their industry much like feudal lords."

Tall girls are wont to be attracted to tall boys. Giant corporations are wont to commingle with other giants, ofter to the distress of the smaller businessman looking in from the outside. The huge insurance companies which lend money to shopping centers want the developers to lease to huge chain outlets rather than to a local merchant who has made good. When one bank wants to merge with another bank it is common to find advanced as a justification the need or desirability of a big bank to deal with the accounts of a big corporation. One of the largest banks in the country numbers the 100 largest corporations among its customers. The big advertising agency will often eschew the smaller advertiser to concentrate upon the big advertiser. The big advertiser, in turn, is likely to be a big corporation.

The big corporation has rarely achieved its size through natural growth. More often than not mergers with other companies have accounted for a substantial part of its size. This is true of such major generals of industry as General Motors and General Electric. It is also true of many of our largest banks.

Defenders of mammoth corporations are wont to assert that great size is a result of efficient management or that great size is necessary if an enterprise is to operate most efficiently. I am quite skeptical of such arguments.

In the first place, large size is often created through large-scale acquisitions.

Secondly, I hardly think that it is compatible with efficiency to find big corporations so often involved in price-fixing, cartel activities, and other practices, prohibited by our antitrust laws.

Thirdly, the truly big corporation is likely to spawn bureaucratic redtape and the committee system, and to grow to the point where top management does not know what is going on in their own organization. What must we think of such vaunted efficiency when the president of General Electric asserts (or confesses, according to one's taste) that he did not know of the widespread price-fixing activities of an number of high officers of that corporation. And is it a mark of efficiency that the head of Westinghouse found it necessary to make the same plea, although the company had a corps of attorneys whose primary function it was to preach antitrust gospel to officials of that company. In a "big" corporation there may be so many vice presidents that the president has to take a Dale Carnegie course to be able to remember their name.

Furthermore, a number of studies have shown that matters such as the acquisition of another company invariably are given the personal attention of the top executive of the big corporation, but that many an operating matter of comparable importance never gets that high.

Fourthly, what evidence there is points to the conclusion that efficiency does not necessarily increase with size. On the contrary, after some point the tendency may well be the other way. A study made by the Federal Trade Commission in the early 1940's found moderate-size corporations more efficient as measured by production costs and earning power. In only 1 of the 59 individual company-cost tests did the largest company have the lowest costs. And the small-size company, on the whole, did better on these tests than the large corporation. Prof. Joe S. Bain, in the March 1954 issue of American Economic Review, in an article entitled "Economics of Scale, Concentration, and Condition of Entry in 20 Manufacturing Industries," made a study of 20 manufacturing industries and concluded that economics of the scale of firm beyond the size of a single optimum plant were either negligible or totally absent.

---

[4] Washington Post, May 8, 1962.

[5] *United States* v. *Swift & Co.*, 287 U.S. 106, 116.

Big business does carry with it many dangers. One of the most important is the "don't rock the boat" philosophy which it seems to engender. One economic writer has attributed to an official of one of the large oil companies, the following philosophy: "One must submerge one's own ideas into those of the group; and one must be careful not to get twisted with redtape. Above all, one must work toward unanimity."[6]

When asked why Bethlehem Steel Co. was not using an important oxygen converter developed by the Austrians, an officer of that company is reported to have said:

"We don't want to invest in a facility unless it will return on an average, 20 percent before taxes, operating at 60 to 70 percent of capacity."[7]

The large company is likely to be a mass-production company, but mass production is generally well within the capacity of our medium-size companies.

As to big business I am constrained to say, therefore, that the size of some of them seems to have more potentiality for harm than for good.

b. Big unions. The desirability of a big or powerful union in certain industries not only may be, but has been debated.

In May of this year the President's Advisory Committee on Labor Management Policy made a report on "Free and Responsible Collective Bargaining and Industrial Peace." This committee was composed of businessmen and union leaders, as well as representatives of the academic world and the professions. That report did not note any undue size of power of unions. It made known that since 1947 the amount of working time lost because of strikes has averaged less than one-third of 1 percent.

One of its members, however, the chairman of the board of directors of the Inland Steel Co., laid the blame of national emergency disputes upon what he asserted was the monopoly power of unions. Another member, the president of the National Bureau of Research, was of the opinion that "Labor disputes which involve a nationwide industry commonly have their origin in the monopoly power of private groups." Labor leaders stated that assertions that:

"Dominant union power that constitutes a major threat to effective collective bargaining, are an example of attributing to others characteristics which are in fact one's own.

"If it is intended to assert that the existence of so-called monopoly power on the union side causes disputes which would otherwise be settled peacefully, the assertion is simply untrue. Recent experiences in the maritime and longshore industries—to which the national emergency provisions of the present law have most often been applied—surely demolish the notion that the cause of such disputes is the existence of a single union instead of several."

The report itself contains the following interesting addendum:

"ADDENDUM

"Some among the Committee members feel strongly that there is today a concentration of power in certain unions which results in the impairment of effective collective bargaining and in the substitution of power for reason in this process, and accordingly constitutes a major threat to industrial peace.

"Other Committee members have pressed with equal vigor the view that whatever danger there is from concentration of economic and financial power has developed basically on the corporate side and that protests against 'labor monopoly' are essentially distorted.

"The view of the substantial majority of the Committee is that this matter warrants special study which will permit a thoroughgoing and deliberate examination of this issue."

Many management leaders prefer to deal with one or a few large unions than with a number of small unions, often less disciplined than the larger ones. Yet domination of a large union by one with scant concern for the public interest is not only an uninviting prospect, but sometimes an actuality.

I do not think that the size and power of unions are commensurate with that of a number of our business giants. But I do not overlook the fact that some are of a size and power to affect our economy materially.

6. WHAT OUR GOVERNMENT HAS BEEN DOING WITH RESPECT TO THE PROBLEMS RAISED BY "BIG BUSINESS" AND "BIG UNIONS"

I venture to say that were it not for the antitrust laws, particularly the Sherman Act and the Celler-Kefauver antimerger statute our economy would be almost entirely constituted of dinosaur corporations. It has been the restraining influence of our antitrust laws that has kept this from coming to pass. Corporations of mammoth size do exist, but their number is still in the hundreds while that of smaller businesses are still in the thousands.

Paradoxically, some businessmen who are most vociferous in paying lipservice to our free enterprise system are the most vehement objectors to the enforcement of our antitrust laws by the Federal Government in order to preserve the competition which is the very mainspring of our free enterprise system. I would add that there is much legislation already on the books in aid of small business. The Federal Government also has a number of agencies to which the small businessman may resort to when in need of advice or money.

The Taft-Hartley Act and the Railway Labor Act are but two of a number of legislative restrictions on the power of labor unions. The National Mediation Board and the Federal Mediation an Conciliation Service help avoid undue exercise of union power. The President's Advisory Committee on Labor Management Policy recently advocated an even more active government role where labor-management disputes in major or critical industries affect national health and safety. But this recommendation evoked a dissent from Henry Ford II, one of its industry members.

7. CONCLUSION

I confess that to me a pattern of big business, big unions and big government poses a disturbing problem.

Justice Douglas, in an eloquent address before the University of Judaism expressed my own doubts in these words:

"Big business, big government, big unions—each has helped erase some of the qualities of individuality from Americans. As the individual has become more and more submerged, his voice is more indistinct."

I would want to preserve this voice, not to a whisper but loud and clear. I am loath to believe that the three B's requires its disappearance. It may well be that the three big B's are here to stay. It may be that they do more good than harm. As long as we have big business and powerful unions, and a hot-cold war, a big government may be not only desirable but necessary. But unless we are vigilant as to the danger they pose to individuality, you and I may have to pay the exorbitant price of increasing restrictions on what we can do and say.

---

[6] Baldwin, "Antitrust and the Changing Corporation" (1961) 217.

[7] The Reporter (May 1962) 22.

Another Back-Door Scheme To Put More Government in Business and in Competition With Well-Established Taxpaying Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to focus congressional attention on pending developments that will place the Federal Government in direct competition with existing private industries and drastically alter the operation of many existing industries. I refer to a "research" project being established by the Forest Service near Princeton, W. Va.

This $600,000 research project, known as the Forest Service Timber Marketing and Utilization Center, will be operational next spring. The Forest Service is already drafting plans and agreements to provide the lumber concentration, processing, and marketing program with 5 to 15 million board feet of lumber annually.

This program calls for purchase of the entire lumber output of several local mills by a yet-to-be-organized area redevelopment corporation. Lumber will be delivered to the Forest Service lumber concentration yard where it will be graded, sorted, trimmed, edged, air or kiln seasoned, planed, resorted, and sold on the open market by the Forest Service.

This project will buy lumber—at what may become subsidized rates—from various sizes of mills, process the lumber, and sell it to furniture mills, flooring mills and other area lumber users. This project, thus, will compete with existing lumber buyers who buy rough lumber for their own remanufacture and use. It will also compete in the marketplace with competent lumber manufacturers who do their own primary processing for sale to the same furniture mills, flooring mills, and other lumber users.

Proceeds of the finished lumber sales would go to this proposed corporation which would pay the Forest Service processing and marketing fee. Amazingly this fee is currently calculated as finished lumber selling prices minus the corporation costs. Thus the Forest Service will accept all net profits or support all losses in the processing and marketing operations.

Assets of the nonprofit $300,000 corporation will be used to finance similar projects at the Princeton lab. Acting as a local revolving fund the corporation permits this Forest Service project to bypass congressional Appropriations Committees.

The appropriation history of this project is amazing. It was never considered by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies which has jurisdiction on Forest Service appropriations. It was never considered by the full House Appropriations Committee nor by the whole body of the House. The project was not even a request of the Forest Service in the 1962 budget. It was added by the Senate Appropriations Committee at the insistence of Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia.

Since hearing records are not made available to the public until the appropriation bill is reported to the floor no industry members were afforded an opportunity in the House or the Senate to be heard on this far-reaching Federal intrusion into the lumber industry.

Mr. Speaker, I and several members of the House Appropriations Committee object strongly to two procedural aspects of this project: First, the original proposal was not considered by any House committee—and parenthetically, a reading of the Senate hearings would not suggest the full scope of this project—and, second, the creation of a private revolving fund to bypass the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Forest Service to hold present plans in abeyance until the House Appropriations Committee may consider the desirability of financing a Federal lumber processing project in direct competition with existing lumber industries. I consider the purpose of this project as well as its financial history highly irregular and demand that the House Appropriations Committee review the proposed program. It is my belief that the Forest Service should present to the Appropriations Committee a full and complete statement on the proposed program early next session.

Will Proposed International Coffee Agreement Prevent Excessively High as Well as Excessively Low Prices?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as one who has always tried here in the Congress to reflect the consumer point of view, I have, however, never opposed fair treatment for the farmer in assuring decent prices for the food he produces. The consumer is not benefitted in the long run if prices to the producer of food are so ruinously low as to drive the farmers off the farm.

Similarly, while I have vigorously opposed the recurring—and sometimes successful—attempts to boost prices of coffee to the American consumer on the basis of fake shortages or rumors of shortages, I would certainly not want to give the impression that I think the Latin American producers should not be helped to get fair and reasonable prices for their coffee. Far from it.

The unconscionable speculative price increases of January 1954 did not have much chance to help the individual coffee grower; the subsequent collapse of the wholesale price 6 months later, after the disclosure of the market excesses and irregularities, hurt the coffee grower very much, however. Thus, violent upswings in prices are a problem to both consumer and producer, just as depressed prices are a problem, particularly when the economy of a whole country rests heavily on just one commodity.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Secretary of State last month asking what provisions were being included in the proposed international agreement on coffee which would protect the American consumer—who forms the main market for Latin American coffee, and who is also the individual who is going to have to pay for most of the cost of any stabilization agreement—what provisions were included to protect our consumers against unconscionable price increases, in case today's surpluses should conceivably turn into tomorrow's shortages. There are circumstances under which such a thing could happen, of course.

WHAT PROTECTION FOR CONSUMER AGAINST RUNAWAY PRICES?

Mr. Speaker, I think the correspondence is self-explanatory. We all remember during price control days in this country that while it was politically possible to put a floor under farm prices, it became almost impossible politically to put any effective price ceilings over them once circumstances drove these prices from far below parity to way above parity. I had that in mind when I addressed the following letter to the Secretary of State on September 13:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1962.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Ever since I raised an alarm over runaway coffee prices in the United States in 1954, setting off a Federal Trade Commission investigation which disclosed widespread evidence of speculative price excesses and futures trading irregularities, I have been attempting to keep in touch with developments in this field which might foreshadow possible gouging once again of the consumer. Just recently, I called the attention of the House, and of the housewives of the country, to a news report from Brazil implying that some frost damage to the new crop would, or might, result in higher coffee prices in the United States. I warned that any wholesale or retail price increases based on such a scare story would be utterly unjustified, in view of the tremendous stocks of coffee on hand.

My purpose in writing to you is to do two things: first, to assure you and your aids that my concern is directed primarily at unwarranted increases in coffee prices based on false reports and speculative excesses, rather than on any opposition on my part to any reasonable international program for stabilizing coffee prices at prices which are fair to both producers and consumers; and, secondly, to ask what safeguards are being written into the proposed international agreement which would serve to protect the American consumer in case crop controls and other measures should result in inordinately high prices to the American consumer.

We have long followed a policy in this country of encouraging reductions in farm production when prices are ruinously low, so I do not subscribe to the idea that any attempt to stabilize coffee prices for Latin American producers is necessarily a disservice to the American consumer, particularly if it should mean any substantial improvement in incomes and living conditions for the people of Latin America, and thus a reduction in the amount of aid we would have to give there.

On the other hand, it has been the sad experience of the American consumer in both World War II and Korean war days that after having gladly cooperated in building a floor under farm prices, the consumer was denied any effective ceiling over those same prices once inflation became virulent. I fear that if a stabilization program should be adopted for coffee, it would require our consumers to support the idea of a floor under coffee prices, but would give them no protection over excessive increases if unexpected circumstances should precipitate sharp increases in price.

Perhaps this matter has already received departmental consideration, and the necessary safeguards have been included in the draft agreement. If so, I would be glad to know about it. If not, I certainly trust some proviso is included to permit reasonable restraints on excessive price rises as well as on excessive price declines. Since we are the biggest customer-country involved in the negotiations, and since the American consumer will largely pay for the international stabilization program in terms of higher prices for coffee in the stores, I think our consumers are entitled to the kind of consideration I have outlined.

May I have your thinking on this.

Sincerely yours,

LEONOR K. (MRS. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I have now received a reply to this letter from Assistant Secretary Frederick G. Dutton outlining the provisions of the proposed new agreement which could possibly operate to protect the American consumer in case of sudden inflation in coffee prices.

I think this information will be highly useful to us in assessing the desirability of Senate approval of the agreement. If the safeguards here outlined do not appear strong enough, perhaps we can then take whatever steps might be necessary to assure adequate protection for the American consumer.

SAFEGUARD PROVISIONS IN PROPOSED AGREEMENT

I again want to make clear, as I have tried to do in all my past discussions of coffee prices, that I favor helping the coffeegrowers, particularly those on family sized acreage, to obtain a fair price for their product. A cup of coffee would taste bitter, indeed, if it represented starvation returns for the men and women who raise and gather the beans. But excessive speculative price increases in the commodity exchanges must also be prevented, and any runaway inflation in coffee prices, no matter how improbable such a thing might seem at the moment, is something our consumers must nevertheless be protected against.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department reply to me on this issue was as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 3, 1962.
The Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I want to thank you for your letter of September 13, 1962, addressed to the Secretary, with regard to the new international coffee agreement which is now before governments for consideration. I am sorry that our reply is somewhat tardy; our workload in the closing days of this Congress has been exceptionally heavy.

At the beginning I want to say that the officials of this Department concerned with the coffee problem are sincerely appreciative of the constructive view you have taken in this matter. Accordingly they want me to assure you that they have been mindful throughout the long negotiations with foreign governments that our first duty is to protect the American consumer. The advisory committee appointed by the National Coffee Association to work with the State Department during the negotiation of the new coffee agreement has, of course, always maintained that the U.S. consumer must be protected in any coffee agreement. Toward this common objective we have managed to secure a number of provisions in the new agreement which should fully protect our interests.

Before describing these specific provisions, it is noteworthy that the tremendous stocks of coffee now held by Brazil and Colombia would seem adequate assurance that no substantial advance in green coffee prices could be sustained in the foreseeable future. Stocks are also building up in some African countries, and present productive capacity everywhere is in excess of any likely demand over the next 5 years. Thus the supply and demand situation as presently known argues against any marked increases in coffee prices.

The new international coffee agreement does not have any specific price objective in the sense that it will endeavor to maintain prices for the various kinds and qualities of coffee at certain cents-per-pound figures. It does provide that through the fixing of quotas, the members agree on the necessity of assuring that the general level of coffee prices does not decline below the general level of such prices in 1962. We consider this price objective a realistic one in view of the burdensome stocks overhanging the market. In the light of the price trend it is also a reasonably modest one, as coffee prices have been declining steadily in recent years. During the first 8 months of 1962 the price of Brazilian coffee averaged about 34.3 cents a pound, compared with 36.6 cents in 1960 and 48.4 cents in 1958. The decline set in immediately after 1954, when you will remember the severe frost damage in Brazil resulted in prices averaging 78.7 cents per pound.

Consumer protection against any unwarranted price increases is assured by a number of specific provisions in the agreement. Probably the most important are the provisions relating to the establishment and adjustment of export quotas. Export quotas are intended to control the amount of coffee that may be made available to the market by the producing countries during a given period, and thus they directly influence the price. The agreement provides that all decisions on the establishment and adjustment of export quotas shall be taken by a distributed two-thirds majority vote, i.e., a concurrent two-thirds majority of the importers and exporters voting separately. As the United States has 400 votes this in effect gives us a veto power over decisions of the Council. We would to make the veto effective need only one other importing country voting with us. The number of votes held by it would be of no consequence as we alone have more than one-third, but it was felt desirable to provide that one country alone could not exercise a veto. We cannot conceive of any situation in which the United States advocated a veto where we could not persuade at least one other importer of the merit of our position.

In addition to the voting provisions of the Agreement with regard to export quotas, two other provisions are noteworthy, in that they specifically recognize the undesirability of marked changes in coffee prices for whatever reason, and provide for corrective action under voting procedures which are easier to attain than the standard procedure of a distributed two-thirds majority. These two provisions are quoted below for your information.

"(5) All members recognize that marked price rises or falls occurring within brief periods may unduly distort underlying trends in price, cause grave concern to both producers and consumers, and jeopardize the attainment of the objectives of the agreement. Accordingly, if such movements in general price levels occur within brief periods, members may request a meeting of the Council which, by distributed simple majority vote, may revise the total level of the quarterly export quotas in effect.

"(6) If the Council finds that a sharp and unusual increase or decrease in the general level of prices is due to artificial manipulation of the coffee market through agreements among importers or exporters or both, it shall then decide by a simple majority vote on what corrective measures should be applied to readjust the total level of the quarterly export quotas in effect."

In the unlikely event that unforeseeable circumstances might arise in the administration of the agreement which would operate against the interests of our consumers or our coffee trade, the United States could always withdraw from the agreement. It is provided that any government, after September 30, 1963, may withdraw by giving written notice, such withdrawal to be effective 90 days after notification. As the agreement would collapse without our participation, this possibility is the final assurance that our views on the operation of the agreement must be respected.

If I can be of any further assistance in furnishing information please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

A Report to My Constituents on Work Accomplished for 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, my chairmanship, one, represents the results of united voting strength; two, extends to you, my constituents, your most powerful Federal influence; three, gives forceful and effective expression of minority problems to the Federal legislative process.

The power and influence of my office has been used, in addition to regular duties, to, one, express your feelings and demands concerning all Federal legislation in the vital areas of education and labor; and, two, declare your discontent with all conditions that deny you the rights of full citizenship.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD—KEY ACCOMPLISHMENTS—INVESTIGATIVE TASK FORCE, NEW YORK OFFICE

The investigative task force of my committee was instrumental in obtaining a decertification election where the employer was involved in a "sweetheart" contract with a union not selected by the workers. The employer fired 25 of his workers. These people were reinstated.

Instrumental in settling a labor dispute at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and getting the strikers back to work.

Caused the roofers union, Paterson, N.J., on May 24, 1962, for the first time in its history to admit Negroes to membership.

Two Negro employees of the Labor Department were dismissed for filing discrimination charges. We were able to get these workers reinstated.

Three Negro pickets arrested in Brooklyn for picketing Beth-El Hospital, investigation task force intervention with the police department resulted in the police dropping charges.

Conferences with the Vulcan Society, community leaders, clergy, and so forth, was instrumental in settling dispute with the New York City Fire Department relative to charges of racial discrimination within the department.

The Yardney Electrical Corp. planned to move its plant out of the city, putting some 850 IUE workers out of work. Conferences with city, company, and union officials resulted in the city making a search for a new plant site for the company.

Upon complaints of discrimination in the New York City Transit Authority, the investigation task force investigated and met with top executives of the transit authority.

Caused one Negro to be appointed in the labor relations department of the transit authority. Received assurances of other appointments.

Upon complaint of Negro members of Local No. 48, Mason Tenders & Hod Carriers, that they were not given work, caused workers to be given steady jobs.

Caused the new Americana Hotel to integrate its staff, including several Negroes in responsible positions.

Settled dispute relative to overtime and back wages involving workers of Mandalay Bar.

Settled grievance between Chinese workers and immigration authorities regarding immigration into this country.

Restored a Negro seaman, dishonorably discharged for arguing with a white southerner, to the civil service list.

Another Negro, who, while in the military, had a fight with a southern white, was dishonorably discharged and hence ineligible to join the city police department. After conferences with police commissioner, the Negro is now in the police academy.

After complaints of discrimination, caused two Negroes to get supervisory positions with General Motors.

Instrumental in getting first Negro into Local No. 15 of Operating Engineers.

Of 382 Puerto Rican complaints relative to, one, "sweetheart" contracts; two, nonunion representation; three, nonintegration of union and management; four, lack of legal protection, 208 were successfully resolved.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN FIELD OF EDUCATION DURING 1962 FOR REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS IN GOVERNMENT

Fifteen days of public hearings were conducted to ascertain the extent to which there had been compliance to the Supreme Court decision of 1954 outlawing segregation in public education. Witnesses from all parts of the United States testified. On the basis of these hearings and an intensive 3-month research investigation, the following facts were released:

First. Eight years after the Supreme Court decision, 2 million southern Negro children—over 70 percent of the total in this region—live in completely segregated school districts.

Second. Two of the sixteen land-grant colleges for Negroes are still provisionally accredited by their respective regional associations.

Third. In all of the 16 white land-grant institutions, there are accredited professional schools offering a total of 21 areas of specialization, as against 10 Negro land-grant institutions offering a total of 5 areas of specialization.

Fourth. Wherein all white land-grant institutions offer the Ph. D. or equivalent degrees, not any of the 16 institutions for Negroes offer these degrees.

Fifth. Because of the nature of the legal provisions of the Hatch Act and the Agricultural Marketing Act, none of the 16 Negro land-grant colleges received Federal funds from these sources for research in agriculture in 1960.

Based upon reports that discrimination was being shown in the engagement of teachers for dependents of military personnel, complaints were made to the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Responses from these Departments indicate that necessary investigations were made.

Upon requests from teachers allegedly unfairly fired, investigations were made, and the necessary provisions followed to assure hearings for these persons.

COMMUNITY BETTERMENT

As a result of the first legislation in the field of juvenile delinquency which was reported through the Committee on Education and Labor during 1961, central Harlem has received a sizable grant. This project will provide opportunities for the children and youth of our community to be directed into worthwhile activities and will help to eliminate the growing problems of juvenile delinquency in our area. Through the utilization of a domestic service corps, a new and entirely creative program will come to the people of Harlem. In accepting the plan, representatives of the Department of Justice hailed this project as a pioneer in an important arena of American life.

JOB TRAINING

Through the passage of the Practical Nurse Training Extension Act, many women of minority groups have been greatly benefited in seeking new job opportunities in the field of nursing.

HELPFUL STUDIES

"Directory of Federally Financed Student Loans, Fellowships, and Career Training Programs in the Field of Higher Education in the United States" was published in April 1962 as a result of my feeling that this was a necessary contribution which the Committee on Education and Labor could make to the children and youth of our country. Since that time there have been requests for 10,000 copies. This, indeed, indicates that citizens are concerned about Federal financial assistance to individuals in the field of higher education. It was the first publication of its kind to be published by a congressional committee.

Among the other 10 publications of the education staff, one would be of special significance to you, my constituents—the "Interim Report on Education and Citizenship in the Public School System of Puerto Rico." Because I am concerned about the Puerto Rican American both here on the mainland and those on the island, I was interested in studying the problems in the public schools. This report has been generously received.

LEGISLATION

Two laws have been passed in education during 1962 and 10 more are in progress. Both the School Lunch Act, which was amended, and Captioned Films for the Deaf Act, which was enacted, will be of immeasurable help to millions.

Other legislation nearing completion includes extension of the NDEA loans, development of university extension, and further development of special education and vocational rehabilitation.

KEY WORK ACCOMPLISHED IN 1962 IN FURTHERANCE OF THE INTERESTS OF MINORITY GROUPS—LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS AND RELATED SUBJECTS

Legislation: Laws enacted in 1962 coming from my committee:

Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962: Labeled by the press as probably the most important piece of domestic legislation since the New Deal. Provides training opportunities for the unemployed and a chance to upgrade the skills of the unskilled worker while receiving Government training allowances. Also amended this law to give its full benefits to railroad workers.

Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1962: Provides for the further safeguarding of the welfare plans and pension plans under which you work to insure that you will receive all the benefits to which you and your family may be entitled.

Eight-hour law of 1962: Clears up a host of conflicting laws governing overtime pay when your employer has a Government contract or subcontract in many fields.

Bills passed by my committee and awaiting action in the Rules Committee or by Congress:

Equal Pay for Equal Work Act of 1962: First successful effort to get an equal pay bill for women out of the House in the memory of man or woman.

Youth Employment Opportunities Act: Now in Rules Committee, but passed by my committee. Gives a real "break" to the unemployed out-of-school youth who needs a chance to learn work habits and a trade. Particularly important to minority groups which have the highest percentage of out-of-work and out-of-school youths.

Equal Employment Opportunities Act: First FEPC bill to get out of a House or Senate Committee since ADAM CLAYTON POWELL tried to use the Calendar Wednesday procedure in February 1950. Next session, if elected, further and intensive efforts to move this bill along are pledged.

Migratory labor legislation—may pass as of this date, health bill for migrants did pass already: For the men, women, and children who roam the land homeless to supply the labor that plants and harvests our crops. For the first time this Congress passed legislation considered and proposed by my committee to help this exploited group, which is composed mainly of minorities.

Other legislative inquiries—ad hoc subcommittees:

First. Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation: Legislative digging of this committee led to findings that were later incorporated into the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Second. Subcommittee on the Operations of the National Labor Relations Board: The exercise of its oversight function by the committee through the hearing conducted by this subcommittee led to a reevaluation of many practices and decisional policies adopted over the preceding 8 years.

Third. Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment: An inquiry in depth in keeping with the committee's responsibilities and jurisdiction on the general subject of employment.

Fourth. Subcommittee on Irregularities in the Garment Industry: Investigation of racial discrimination, possible violations of existing labor-management relations statutes, and corruption based on complaints and information received by the committee over the past 18 months.

Republicans View the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to extend my remarks, I include herewith a résumé of the 87th Congress, 2d session, prepared by the special projects subcommittee of the House Republican policy committee.

Once more a U.S. Congress is all but a matter of history. In this comprehensive analysis of its actions and inactions—of administration proposings and congressional disposings—and in the effect of what we have and have not done on American citizens and on future generations, the subcommittee on special projects of the House Republican policy committee hopes to alert every American to material on the record of the 87th Congress.

It would be quite easy to categorize this Congress as a do-little Congress. We could be more charitable and say that Congress did do quite a few things, but in so doing we would give credit for measures that were inadequate, or unwise, or watered down from high-sounding administration proposals. It was Sir James Mackintosh who referred to the House of Commons inactivity as "a wise and masterly inactivity." In its wisdom Congress despite its 3 to 2 House Democratic majority, refrained from passing much injurious legislation. No doubt it should have done so more often. The actions of the administration and the leadership in keeping both Houses in session long after wise and prudent men had suggested and urged adjournment brought, as the President said, "Lazarus back from the dead." Lazarus, arisen, will haunt the American taxpayer and our basic constitutional heritage for years into the future.

Congress, to its everlasting credit, did enact sound legislation geared to the best interest of all American citizens. But this legislation was not conceived in the White House and sponsored by a "never-failing majority" on the opposite side of the aisle. On the contrary, it was only where strong bipartisan support initiated, supported, and, in some cases, even carried the ball almost completely devoid of administration or leadership incentive that Congress reached its highwater mark in 1962. Measures relating to tariff reform; certain issues of foreign policy; the space communication satellite problems; manpower retraining; tax revision, and other similar issues would not today be law were it not for the cooperation and leadership of the loyal opposition.

Responsible Republican leadership, which led the fight for sound extension of unemployment compensation benefits in the first major legislation of the 87th Congress, 1st session, kept resolutely to the fore to the very last moment. House Republicans sought passage of a workable higher education bill for assistance to institutions in the way of "brick and mortar" accomplishments. Disagreements among Democratic conferees and the selling out of an established and clearcut House position on scholarships scuttled any chance the administration ever had for enactment of a bill which won the support of Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee as well as the House Republican policy committee. "We cannot drift to victory" stands as one of the unchallenged proverbs of our time.

The 87th Congress brought to the American people delay, drift, and disillusion. Its actions led to an increase in the national debt ceiling to $308 billion, and to an increase in our actual debt to a level of $300 billion for the first time in history. It saw jurisdictional disputes over meeting locations, filibusters, conflict of legislative priorities and just plain poor planning push Congress into its longest continuous peacetime session in a century. For the first time in the memory of Washington observers, the agonized cry of incumbents come September of "Congress go home" was matched and even exceeded by a cry from constituents saying, "Congress come home." From a fiscal standpoint, it was a cheaper alternative for those back home.

Congress rose to its greatest heights, as it did in the first session with Federal aid to education legislation hastily considered under Calendar Wednesday procedure, when it rejected—in the case of "regimentation or ruin" farm legislation; the Department of Urban Affairs and medicare. It reached its ultimate degradation in enacting partisan legislation due to pressures, purchase, and promises from the White House, as in the case of public works standby legislation. However, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, "If Congress and our Republic should last for 1,000 years, men will still say, 'Adjournment was the 87th's finest hour.' "

1. AGRICULTURE

The requests of the administration in this area during the 87th Congress included such concepts as (a) buying corn from farmers for $1.20 per bushel and selling it back for $1.05; (b) sending farmers to jail for violating production controls—a unique way to solve the surplus situation; (c) extending control areas insidiously into the realm of the dairy farmer; and (d) placing the Government in competition with private recreational enterprise in the construction and operation of ski slopes, putting greens, and merry-go-rounds on retired croplands. As was true with proposed agricultural legislation in 1961 which would have cost some $12 to $15 billion annually, American consumers and farmers were equally fortunate when these provisions were rejected in 1962.

It was only through the most drastic pressure game seen in the Capitol for some years that the House Agriculture Committee reported the administration omnibus farm bill by one vote. In one of the greatest defeats of the session for the President, the House recommitted this bill because of its "regimentation or ruin" provisions. While a final bill was enacted by the end of the session, which saddled wheat farmers with what was virtually a return to the days of the Brannan plan, the final legislative act was somewhat more palatable than prior administration proposals. A change of two votes in the House would have doomed the conference committee report. Other than the relatively noncontroversial extensions of popular existing programs, the administration did not even win the proverbial half a loaf in farm legislation during the 87th Congress.

A typical New Frontier performance was seen in the delays in hearings and consideration of the extension of the 1948 Sugar Act, which would have expired June 30. Hearings were canceled and the House Agriculture Committee became a mecca for lobbyists for domestic and foreign producers who pleaded for larger quotas. Weekend sessions and a House-Senate clash resulted from serious lack of planning insofar as this measure was concerned.

Basically, the New Frontier and the 87th Congress left the farmer and the consumer in worse shape than they had found them. The farmer has not been able to make one move toward a market economy nor toward true parity with other segments of the American populace. The consumer found that a temporary feed grains program geared to save the taxpayers and the housewife over $2 billion wound up a billion in the red. In addition, by some mysterious "phantom acre" process, the Department of Agriculture paid $150 million for the retirement of 4.5 million acres which either never existed or never were planted in corn. Perhaps Billy Sol Estes knows what happened.

The 87th Congress rejected the most obnoxious agricultural measure ever foisted on the American public. Meanwhile, the New Frontier's answer to the question "How're you goin' to keep 'em down on the farm?" was similar to its answer in many aspects of foreign and domestic policy—"Watch and wait—a miracle could happen."

2. LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT

President Kennedy's economic message of January 1962, called for an unemployment rate of 4 percent or less. It currently approximates 5.8 percent instead. It is interesting to note that under President Eisenhower, unemployment was below 5.3 percent two-thirds of the time—a rate below any ever attained by President Kennedy.

President Kennedy, as a candidate, asserted that some 16 million Americans were going to bed hungry. A pundit has guessed that at that time they were dieters, and that now they are stockholders. This month the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education stated that 30 percent or more of American families are living in substandard housing. It is ironical that decades after President Roosevelt's "one-third of a nation, ill-housed" the same condition exists, despite all the Government housing and urban renewal programs. It illustrates the contrast between the program of a Democratic Congress, which aims to spend from Washington to create jobs artificially, and that of the Republicans, who, recognizing that it takes over $20,000 to create just one permanent job, attempt to stimulate the American free enterprise system in our dynamic economy.

Little in the way of concrete legislation evolved from the 2d session of the 87th Congress, save a pension and welfare disclosure bill and the House-passed equal rights for women legislation. The administration was rebuffed by the House Ways and Means Committee in an attempt to enact still another temporary extension of unemployment compensation benefits. The so-called Youth Conservation Corps bill never got by the House. The administration claimed that its stand-by public works bill would stimulate employment and used every possible political pressure to secure passage of a bill which allowed the President to write blank checks on projects anywhere in the Nation to the tune of $900 million. Not only did a Democratic Member receive the first projects, but another Democrat Congressman talked the Department of Commerce into holding a private advance briefing for a local official five days before the rank-and-file city officials were able to hear how to get some projects. The Presidential request for $2 billion in standby public works authority to combat economic recessions was, however, rejected by the House.

The most significant measure enacted in this area during 1962 was the Manpower Retraining Act. Republican members of the House Education and Labor Committee, using materials gleaned from a 1961 positive Republican policy committee study on employment, introduced amendments to this bill which were accepted by the Democratic majority as part of the final legislation. Without these amendments, which could have pushed the bill through a year earlier if accepted at that time, the legislation might never have been passed. While the bill could have provided training for up to 1 million workers over a 3-year period, its early administration has been disappointing, indeed, to its supporters.

3. EDUCATION

Our summary of the first session of this Congress pointed out how, in contrast to Republican-enacted education legislation which provided for national defense education assistance and sought to limit aid to school construction to those areas truly in need and exercising maximum local effort, the Democrat-controlled Congress helped to defeat general aid to education in 1961 by:

First, mixing controversial across-the-board aid to schools with generally favored aid to school construction.

Second, sponsoring legislation causing public-parochial school controversies to be the determining factor in rejection of aid to education by the supposedly packed Rules Committee.

Third, abandoning the concept of need and giving aid generally to rich and poor States alike even though private and local efforts were resulting in more than enough construction each year to meet the needed classrooms for the Nation.

Fourth, bringing up a highly complex education bill with a revised formula for aid under Calendar Wednesday, causing a majority of House Members to oppose even consideration of the bill.

The Democratic Congress, which showed only extensions of the National Defense Education Act and impacted areas legislation in 1961, sunk to a new low this year in passing only an educational television measure. The House Education and Labor Committee, which hired the biggest majority staff and cut the minority staff from 4 to 2, handled more legislation with less tangible results than any similar committee in memory.

The one educational accomplishment in 1962, authorizing $32 million over a 5-year period for Federal matching grants to help develop and construct educational television facilities, was accomplished with substantial Republican backing when the House passed the bill on April 18 by voice vote. However, some Members expressed concern when the conferees opened the door for labor or management stations to benefit from the bill's provisions by killing a restrictive House amendment, and recent revelations about plans within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to control programing in the field of educational television bothered still more. At any rate, the bipartisan support given this legislation has made it possible for States to receive up to $1 million each in an area where only 273 channels have been reserved for educational broadcasting out of 2,225 possible such ventures.

It was indeed higher education where the Congress most manifestly revealed its ineptness. The House Republican policy committee and a majority of Republican House Members endorsed a college aid bill which approved loans and grants for academic facility construction for public and private colleges. The bill which passed the Senate added Federal college scholarships, which the House did not want. Despite a promise made on the floor of the House, the conferees ultimately reported a bill including scholarships after many months of conferences highlighted by disagreements among Democrat leaders over the public-private school issue. The House recommitted the conference report on September 20. It was ironical that many of the same Senate conferees who delayed a $1.15 per hour minimum wage for a year by refusing to yield on a 1960 conference report similarly managed to kill any needed aid to higher education this year. Of course, one prominent 1960 conferee, Senator John F. Kennedy, was not in the same office during the 87th Congress.

4. WELFARE LEGISLATION

The major issue once more in the field of welfare was medicare—and once more neither the House nor the Senate passed King-Anderson-type legislation. In fact, in 1962 it was that 2 to 1 Democrat-controlled Senate which voted to table the measure by a two-vote margin, with some of the leading Democratic Senators voting to oppose the administration on this issue. On the House side, the Ways and Means Committee—15 Democrats and 10 Republicans—was never able to muster up more than 11 votes for a bill which would exclude 4 million of our neediest senior citizens; takes no account of need; would jeopardize the integrity of social security and would in many ways duplicate the provisions of the as-yet-unevaluated Kerr-Mills Act.

The President and the administration sought to rally public opinion by speeches and meetings all over the Nation. However, once aroused, the American people flooded mail in to their Senators and Representatives against medicare. As of early October 1962, it looks very much as though Democrats cannot or will not make medicare much of an issue in the campaign ahead.

Otherwise, little welfare legislation passed Congress in 1962, other than some changes in the extent and standards for Federal participation in the Federal-State welfare program—with the dual goal of ending welfare abuses and rehabilitating relief recipients more constructively. Medical research and funds for the National Institutes of Health were supported to an even higher degree than the President requested in the HEW appropriation, but once more grants for construction of teaching facilities for medical schools and loans for medical students did not receive a rule for House debate.

5. TRADE, TAXES, AND THE ECONOMY

Both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee kept busy during this session of Congress by working on trade and tax revision in addition to medicare and other issues. Members were distracted for the second year in a row by a Presidential request to increase the national debt ceiling—from the temporary $298 billion ceiling of 1961 to $300 billion—on March 1—and then again by session's end for an increase to $308 billion. A Republican substitute motion would have restricted this increase to $306 billion, but this was defeated on almost a straight party-line vote. President Eisenhower had estimated in his last budget message that by June 30, 1962, the national debt would shrink to $283 billion—instead the debt actually surpassed $300 billion for the first time in our history shortly thereafter.

President Kennedy proposed a tax reform bill which drew the violent objections of every single House Republican. They felt that the 7-percent tax credit for investment was discriminatory and a single-shot windfall. They opposed withholding of dividends and interest. They favored a modified taxation of foreign subsidiaries of American firms. The "packed" House Rules Committee imposed a complete "gag rule" on any Republican substitutes, but fortunately the Senate and House-Senate conferees returned basically to the Republican position on taxation of foreign subsidiaries and withholding of dividends. The resultant tax reform measure included perhaps 20 percent of the original administration bill, and about 75 percent of the Republican-sponsored alternatives.

Near the end of the session, the administration, finally recognizing the need for encouraging the development of private enterprise, liberalized depreciation allowances as a result of a study conducted in the last years of the Eisenhower administration. Later, the President announced that he would propose tax cut legislation at the beginning of the 88th Congress. This was after a good deal of soul searching as to whether such a tax cut should be effective immediately. Pointing to proposed 1962 and 1963 deficits, House Republicans urged efforts to cut unnecessary spending and balance of the budget as higher priority items in our economy.

On the trade front, there is little doubt that the most significant measure adopted by the 87th Congress was the trade expansion bill designed to give the President increased powers in trade negotiation, especially with European Common Market nations. Republicans generally felt some action in this area was necessary, and heralded the placing of ultimate responsibility on a negotiator as eliminating overlapping and the "twilight zone of responsibility in tariff negotiations."

However, most GOP House Members thoroughly questioned what they felt to be a new philosophy in the administration. In the past, peril point clauses sought to prevent hardships to American industry and workers through imports. Now, the American people saw the administration back an adjustment-assistance program admitting that harm would take place and seeking to subsidize those victimized by free trade policies in certain areas. The result? A worker in the textile industry in Massachusetts displaced by imports might well choose between three levels of relief—unemployment insurance, retraining allowances, or adjustment assistance. A firm thrown out of the competitive textile business because of imports could go into the machine tool business against firms already engaged in this trade—subsidized by Government funds to compete against those on their own. At least, the final conferees took away most-favored-nation clauses from Poland and Yugoslavia before final passage.

Despite tax and trade legislation—despite pump priming in the areas of public works and depressed areas, America made its weakest showing of any postwar recession. Our GNP only increased 10 percent as compared to 13.3 percent in the Republican recovery of 1958–59. The consumer price index went up 1.7 percent, as compared to a decrease of 0.3 under the 1954–55 GOP recovery. Security prices went down 10.5 percent while in the two Eisenhower recoveries they rose 38.5 and 40.2 percent. Corporate profits, which increased 60 percent during the 1958–59 recovery, went up only 26.1 percent in the Democrat recovery.

The lack of confidence in the American economy on the part of Americans of every walk of life was fully justified. Instead of getting America moving again, our new administration demonstrated a sideways movement which on occasion demonstrated a propensity for almost falling over the cliff of economic disaster. Under Eisenhower, our GNP increased 3 percent per year, while under Kennedy it went up but 1.8 percent in his first annual report.

Average hourly earnings, which had increased 4.6 percent per year under President Eisenhower, rose but 2.6 percent in the first Kennedy year. While the President promised a 5-percent annual growth rate; a $50 billion GNP increase; and a 4-percent unemployment rate; he delivered a 1.8-percent growth rate; a $25 to $39 billion GNP increase; and a 6.7-percent unemployment rate for 1961.

The usual hearings were held, with executive sessions of the House Ways and Means Committee and open sessions of the Joint Economic Committee hearing mainly handpicked administration economists offering panaceas for the economy. Yet one of the Kennedy task force experts, Prof. Paul McCracken of the University of Michigan, told the Joint Economic Committee on August 9, 1962, that:

> The current cyclical expansion has been a particularly weak and sluggish one. It is the Nation's poorest performance in four decades, and probably one of the poorest in our history.

6. FISCAL POLICY

Just 1 year ago, this subcommittee concluded as a result of actions of the New Frontier and of the 87th Congress, 1st session, that "if we continue to neglect the creeping hours of time, our Nation will be faced with the alternative of runaway inflation or rigid governmental controls." We conclude now that we have come so far from the fiscal picture in 1960 that the deficits we face for fiscal years 1963 and thereafter; our national debt of over $300 billion; and our budgets now approaching and soon surpassing $100 billion per year will be mere child's play as compared to the vivid truth which will face our children in two decades unless trends are reversed.

When President Eisenhower left office, his last budget predicted a surplus of $100 million for fiscal year 1961 and a balanced budget for fiscal year 1962. He foresaw a reduction in the national debt to $283.4 billion by June 30, 1962. That date has now passed. Instead, we see a national debt of over $300 billion. We find deficits for fiscal year 1961 of over $3 billion—for fiscal year 1962 of over $6 billion—and for fiscal year 1963 of anywhere from $5 to $10 billion, depending on possible tax cut legislation and the state of our economy in 6 months' time. The reason for this is the fundamental difference in attitudes between the Republican and Democratic parties—the difference between fiscal integrity and the "spend to mend" philosophy applied to every problem or shortcoming in our Nation.

House Appropriations Committee Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, released a report showing that the House had approved appropriations for fiscal year 1963 totaling $90.8 billion. Including increases in the Senate versions of these bills along with a supplemental appropriation and some $10 billion in permanent appropriations, including mainly interest on the national debt, we find that Federal spending for fiscal year 1963, for the first time in peacetime history, has exceeded $100 billion. Yet revenues have failed to measure up.

The administration and the Democrat-controlled Congress increased the new obligational authority requested by President Eisenhower by some $14 billion per year. During the first session of the 87th Congress alone, some $20 billion in back-door spending was included. The administration helped little in their employment in the executive branch—under President Eisenhower Government employees decreased by 7.8 percent—under President Kennedy such employment increased by 158,188, or 6.7 percent, in 18 months. During the second session of the 87th Congress, revelations of waste in the Departments of Agriculture and Defense, in the National Institutes of Health, and in relief funds in the District of Columbia made even more inexcusable widespread Government deficits.

Were these increases necessary and proper defense and space funds demanded by crises in Berlin, Cuba, Vietnam, and elsewhere? Apparently not. For, while President Kennedy requested, and House Republicans supported, increases of 15 percent for national defense in fiscal year 1963, as compared to fiscal year 1960, increases in nondefense items were estimated as follows: (a) Education, 87 percent; (b) general government, 33⅓ percent; (c) agriculture, 20 percent; (d) natural resources, 35 percent; (e) health, labor, and welfare, 41 percent; and (f) commerce and transportation, 31 percent.

No matter how you sliced it, the Federal Government has been on a spending rampage during the past 2 years. Its taxes ranged higher, and its revenue much lower than predicted. Its deficits added to the burden of future generations of Americans. Congressional appropriations and authorizations, on an annual basis, added some $16 billion to the Federal expenditures of fiscal year 1960. The heritage of the New Frontier and its legacy to every American is a grand total of $650 for every man, woman, and child in the United States of America for fiscal year 1963. This does not count State and local taxes. It merely illustrates that a typical city of 50,000 population must shell into the Federal Treasury some $32.5 million each year. What the taxpayers of these cities could do with this money on a local level gives new directions to the imagination.

Despite the Democrat-controlled Congress and administration, GOP House Members sought to cut budgets, restrict appropriations, and defeat unsound authorizations. Republican Members of Congress still firmly believe that vast Federal expenditures and unbalanced budgets which undermine the value the dollar result in the destruction of freedom by fiscal irresponsibility. Fortunately, Congress in its wisdom rejected many Presidential proposals. If it had blindly placed its rubber stamp on his recommendations, our budget would have been increased by some $9 billion annually by the year 1967.

7. FOREIGN POLICY, FOREIGN AID, AND DEFENSE

While the foreign policy of the United States is traditionally promulgated in the Executive and debated in the Senate, House GOP Members generally concluded that there had been a big change from the Eisenhower administration, where we made clear the fact that we not only had appropriate weapons of retaliation but also that we would not hesitate to use them if the need arose, to the current administration, where the enemy has embarked on a carefully calculated series of adventures designed to test the extent of our will to resist while reaping whatever harvest grows out of any weakness displayed by the West. House Members, while giving bipartisan support to programs like the Peace Corps, Arms Control Agency, certain aspects of foreign aid, and final passage of the U.N. bond proposal, felt the following facts should be brought to the Nation's attention:

First. In Berlin, East German authorities have erected a wall along the border of West Germany, and Mayor Willie

Brandt, of Berlin, stated that "the West does nothing but wait for Khrushchev's moves."

Second. The President said we would support the Government and people of Laos against Communist aggression, but we did not. Secretary Rusk said we would refuse to take part in the Geneva Conference on Laos until a cease-fire had been attained, but we did not.

Third. As a candidate, President Kennedy said that "if you cannot stop a man like Castro, how in the world will you handle a man like Khrushchev." Since, our abortive move in the Bay of Pigs failed for want of air cover, and Cuba has become an armed camp for the despot's heel some 90 miles from our shore, threatening America in a military, economic, and psychological sense.

Fourth. The Communists have stepped up their attacks in South Vietnam, turning a sporadic guerrilla conflict into full-fledged war. While we have showed fortitude in this area, we have failed to recognize the relation of the Laos front to the Vietnamese front. The conclusion of the Laos Peace Treaty in July 1962, released 10,000 Viet Cong troops for action in this area.

Fifth. The firmness of the Kennedy administration toward the recognition of Communist China and its admission to the U.N. is open to doubt. Ambassador Stevenson has publicly stated that—

> It has seemed to me that it was a mistake for the United States to make such a point of trying to keep them out of the U.N. My own view is that they should be admitted, or not admitted, as the other nations of the U.N. wish.

Sixth. The administration has made a steady retreat in the field of control of nuclear weapons. We have given up demands for inspection for preparations for testing. We reduced to 19 our 21 necessary testing stations on Soviet territory. We reduced from 20 to 12 the number of annual inspections of suspicious seismic blasts needed to verify a test ban agreement. We have now yielded and agreed to a Soviet veto of the budget of the organization to police a test ban. It took only the highest degree of pressures to attain the resumption of U.S. underground and laboratory testing some 5 days after Soviet announcements that they would resume atomic tests, and after the Soviet Union violated agreements by testing while we were at the table negotiating with them.

An end to bipartisan foreign policy came on September 26, 1962, when Democrat leaders pressured their membership in the House to reject a Republican recommittal motion strengthening the hand of the President in the Cuban crisis and recognizing the breach of the Monroe Doctrine caused by Soviet infiltration of Cuba and shipments of arms and "technicians" to the Cuban Government. Republicans of course, supported the President on the passage of the resulting resolution, but the wait-and-see philosophy underlying its wording left doubts in the minds of observers here and abroad as to our intentions vis-a-vis Soviet Cuba. Republicans generally felt that we must remove any threat to our military and economic security in this hemisphere. Democrats generally—all but three of their members—accepted the status quo but vowed to somehow oppose the extension of Soviet Cuba in our hemisphere if their weapons mystically changed from defensive to offensive in character. Cuba has grown from a nuisance to a menace during the past year, as anyone within 1,700-mile IRBM range from the island could well testify.

The annual foreign aid debate was a bit sharper and even a bit more critical in 1962. House committee hearings revealed that AID had sent more than 1,000 television sets to an African village without electricity. Subscriptions of capital to international organizations were paid prematurely so we had to pay interest on the same money unnecessarily. The 600,000 individuals allegedly supported in this Nation by foreign aid turned out to be supported by checks drawn on the U.S. Treasury. Yet it was more than these isolated examples that caused Republicans and Democrats alike, including some of the strongest previous supporters of the program, to acquiesce in a cut of over $1 billion in foreign aid funds in House action.

The outflow-of-gold crisis proved that the foreign aid program is basically a one-way street, and that it is by far a drain on our Nation's resources. Representatives of the foreign aid programs took 2 months to prepare justifications for budget estimates, leading many to the conclusions that the figures were "pie-in-the-sky" sums which require more time to develop programs and projects on which to spend the money. In addition, without any appropriations whatever for fiscal year 1963 there are sufficient unexpended foreign aid funds to run the program for another 25 months at the same rate as was spent during past fiscal years. Congress also felt it had lost control of the foreign aid dollar which has been increasingly diverted into the development loan appropriation. Moreover, the contingency fund, supposedly reserved for urgent requirements arising during the year, has been used to finance certain programs limited or rejected by Congress. Foreign aid has not been used as an instrument of our foreign policy when the administration requested a $142.5 million increase to nations participating in the Belgrade Conference so critical of the United States.

For these and other reasons, the House clamped down on Presidential estimates for fiscal year 1963 foreign aid appropriations. Republicans still feel, for the most part, that foreign aid, properly administered and justified, can be a valuable weapon in the cold war. However, they feel that administration estimates in this as in other areas should be accompanied by justification and by sincere efforts to soundly administer the program rather than something which must be approved as a right.

The administration and the Democrat-controlled Congress enacted a United Nations bond issue measure only after two changes had been made in the Senate-passed resolution. One would halt the practice of using U.S. payments to the U.N. to pay the assessments of delinquent nations, and the other would make the U.S. loan 50-50 matching with other nations' pledges instead of a possible greater amount. Several Republicans sharply criticized our action in subscribing 50 percent of an issue when we had less than 1 percent of the U.N. voting power, and most GOP Members supported a Republican amendment to hold up any U.N. bond purchases until the U.N. General Assembly adopted the principle enunciated in a recent World Court decision regarding expulsion of members delinquent in their payments of special assessments as well as annual dues. However, many Republicans, including House GOP leaders, supported the proposal on final passage. Some still pointed out that during the years 1946 to 1961, we have paid over $2 billion in our total expenditures for U.N. purposes, including some 52 percent of total U.N. expenditures.

While Republicans supported increased defense expenditures for the second straight year of the New Frontier, growing concern on the part of many House Members about alleged control of defense policies on the part of "Whiz Kids" in the DOD and planning experts like Walt Whitman Rostow in the State Department; downgrading of nuclear capabilities in favor of the type of limited warfare we never want thrust upon us; confusion over programs, funding, and policies regarding the Nike-Zeus anti-missile-missile and the B-70 bomber favored by President Kennedy in the campaign but not thereafter; and similar aspects of our military policy led to more searching reviews of military and defense programs during the 87th Congress. A callup of the Reserves during the 1961 Berlin crisis was castigated by the House Armed Services subcommittee which pointed out the lack of equipment and preparation at many camps, the timelag in making the Ready Reserve ready, and the obstacles entailed in calling up Reserve forces, training them in a hurry, and then releasing them as soon as the crisis has abated. This was especially pointed up when the President requested the power to call up another 150,000 for the Cuban crisis—but stipulating new and different manpower from those called up and trained 12 months before.

Despite the most powerful forces in the world today, and despite the most liberal benefits and retirement policies anywhere, there are reports of low morale among some military men in America today. Surely "The 7 Days of May" are not upon us, but many high military officers are more and more openly critical of our policies in merely reacting to Communist actions rather than developing an overall strategy geared to victory in the cold war. Under President Eisenhower, we had a balanced force concept and spent for a long haul defense capability. Today, many Republicans feel that we have retreated to policies disdaining overall deterrent strength and stressing the deep valleys and the high peaks of spending geared only to the strategy of the enemy.

8. MISCELLANEOUS

Among the hundreds of issues considered and determined during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, some other features included:

First. A victory for the administration in final approval of a scaled down Hanford atomic reactor program, but utter defeat in all attempts to enact the long-proposed wilderness system.

Second. Considerable debate on mass transportation proposals met with no bill enacted into law, while the administration took one of its most violent knockout punches on the issue of urban affairs when the House killed a Presidential reorganization plan setting up a Department of Urban Affairs by a 264-to-150 vote on February 21, 1962. The number of Democrats, not all of them from the South, opposing the plan, along with the political blunder of injecting the race question into the issue, made it a doubtful election issue at best for the New Frontier.

Third. Considerable talk has been heard about the "stroke of the pen" which was so long promised in desegregating federally supported housing. Talk also was heard that the situation in Mississippi was handled about as adeptly as the Cuban crisis. An anti-poll-tax constitutional amendment had to be enacted under suspension of rules following inaction on the part of the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee, and a larger proportion of Republicans than Democrats supported the resolution. The administration's pattern of not jibing their words and actions in foreign policy has apparently repeated in the field of civil rights, where observers are still waiting for vigorous Democratic support of the Celler-Clark civil rights measure which President Kennedy said "would be one of the first orders of business when Congress met in January 1961."

Fourth. Measures which passed the House in 1961 with lukewarm, if any, support by the administration, included the Du Pont bill providing tax relief to individual stockholders receiving divestitures of General Motors stock and the perennial H.R. 10, which permitted self-employed persons to defer payments of income taxes on portions of their income paid into retirement funds. Both passed the Senate this year.

Fifth. The centralization and arbitrary use of power shown by the New Frontier in the private realm—the steel price situation—was accentuated in Congress by techniques called by many Republicans—and Democrats—pressures, purchase, and politics. Arm twisting on such measures as the public works bill, agriculture measure, and general support of the New Frontier program on recalcitrant Members of the House resulted in denials of patronage, new projects, and even threats of primary election defeats to Democratic Members of Congress.

9. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

First. In domestic policy, the philosophy of the New Frontier and of the 87th Congress included:

(a) A distrust of the American people's abilities to solve their own problems without excessive governmental interference.

(b) A notion that Federal money is the one and only answer to problems from agriculture to transportation.

(c) A lack of conviction that their program would be accepted by Congress of its own free will, leading to a disregard of the traditional prerogatives of the people's representatives and the feeling that the legislative branch is little more than a pawn in the great intramural game of politics played by the administration.

(d) A great outpouring of Presidential messages and programs with a very small number enacted at the end of Congress. Each week saw a changing priority list of "vital" legislation, which, together with filibusters, infighting, and Senate-House conflicts, resulted in 8 percent of the President's legislative requests passing the Senate and House by July 1962. Almost half never got out of committee. The New Frontier's program, despite a 2-to-1 Democratic Senate and a 3-to-2 Democratic House, was quite largely ignored. In fact, as of September 7, 1962, Senate committee chairmen had cast collectively 432 votes against Presidential recommendations

Second. At the close of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Republican House Members were somewhat concerned over the following aspects of foreign policy:

(a) The reluctance of the administration to expose its programs and policies to widescale debate, along with the tone and tenor of letters from constituents, led to a sharp increase in opposition to increased payments to the United Nations; unjustified and maladministered foreign aid payments; and administration actions in many portions of the world. While Republicans agree that politics should stop at the water's edge, they feel this should be the Atlantic and Pacific rather than the Choptank and the Potomac.

(b) Republicans in many cases feel that New York Times reporter was correct in his statement that "he (President Kennedy) has talked like Churchill and acted like Chamberlain." On subjects as diverse as nuclear testing, Berlin negotiations, Laos, and U.N. membership for Communist China, what we said and what we did were completely different things. Republicans hope this is not the case in Berlin and in Cuba today.

(c) We feel that the weakening of trust in the United States by its stanchest allies has been a most dangerous foreign policy development. The Dutch could not count on our support on the New Guinea issue. Lisbon (Portugal) radio classed our policy as "the art of juggling." The Philippine President felt it was "plain that the Communists are winning in Southeast Asia." President De Gaulle of France has implied strongly that the U.S. atomic protection of Europe was no longer a sure thing. The Shah of Iran fears that the Kennedy administration would try to neutralize his country. A newspaper editorial in Guatemala said, "It's time to forget about the North American idiots." And, on September 26, 1962, an editorial in the German Tribune, dismissing the value of the American alliance, commented that "to be weak, to give up fight, to resign, to accept anything the enemy demands—one does not require an alliance for that."

Third. Republicans in the House naturally feel that they should control that body in the 88th Congress. One year ago, we stated that—

> The administration has trod the primrose path of dalliance in foreign policy. At home their spend-and-lend policy has brought Americans closer to ruin than to prosperity.

Republicans in the House during the 88th and future Congresses, as they have in the past, will seek to keep the citizens of our Nation from the pit of bankruptcy at home and of defeat abroad. On the other hand, continuation of present Democrat-controlled Congresses may well jeopardize the well-being of Americans at home and in our international relations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hosea 14: 9: *The ways of the Lord are right and the just shall walk in them.*

O Thou God of all grace whose love never forgets, never forsakes, and never fails, we deeply feel the need of having our minds and hearts transformed and brought under the sway and spell of Thy will and Thy way for us.

We humbly acknowledge that life for all of us is at times so very complex in its demands but even more compelling in its persuasions and that we are frequently lacking in courage to perform our duties faithfully and in accepting the greater adventures of faith to which Thou art continually calling us.

Give us the fidelity and fortitude that dares to follow Thy leading when the path is rough and dark and we are tempted to allow our idealism to sour into cynicism.

Grant that beyond the turbulent and tragic events and happenings of our times we may see that a new day is emerging when men and nations shall disregard the claims of self-interest and live as brothers of the Prince of Peace which is our noblest obligation and highest privilege.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles; and

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 683. An act to authorize the Donna-Rio Bravo Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Donna, Tex.; and

H.R. 12546. An act to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145), approved June 19, 1934, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2953. An act relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3361) entitled "An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. KEATING to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a brief statement that the Chair will not recognize any Member for unanimous-consent requests until after the foreign assistance appropriations conference report is disposed of.

In order that Members may understand the reason why the Chair is doing this, last night our dear friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] had an accident. He was sent to the Naval Hospital. He is in his office. He is going to handle the conference report this morning.

This is one of the greatest exhibitions of dedicated service that I have ever seen. The gentleman is a warrior. The gentleman's action in being here today is far beyond the line of legislative duty. The Chair, and I know the Members, will all agree with the thoughts and the action of the Chair to have the conference report disposed of as quickly as possible so that the gentleman from Louisiana may go back to the hospital for further treatment. I simply want to emphasize that this is a powerful message to the country on the dedicated service of all Members, as represented by the action of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana in insisting upon being present today in order that he may, himself, handle the conference report, despite the fact that he is under great pain and suffering and should be in the hospital.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 284]

Adair
Alexander
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Avery
Bailey
Baring
Barrett
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Cahill
Carey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Cramer
Curtin
Daniels
Dawson
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Dooley
Dorn
Downing
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Evins
Farbstein
Fenton
Findley
Fogarty
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garland

Giaimo
Goodling
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Inouye
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kearns
Kee
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Lesinski
Loser
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McSween
McVey
Mack
Magnuson
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller,
  George P.
Milliken
Moore
Morrison
Moss
Moulder

Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Peterson
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rousselot
Ryan, Mich.
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Sullivan
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Ullman
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Yates
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 266 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2540)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for the Foreign Aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 13, 28, 34, 35, and 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 14, 15, 17, 21, 31, and 33, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$395,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$975,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$49,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,325,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,947,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, and 26.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
GALE W. MCGEE,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY)

Economic assistance

Amendment No. 1—Development grants: Appropriates $225,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $275,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—Investment guaranties: Appropriates $30,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Surveys of investment opportunities: Deletes appropriation of $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—International organizations and programs: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5—Supporting assistance: Appropriates $395,000,000 instead of $350,000,000 as proposed by the House and $400,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Contingency fund: Appropriates $250,000,000 instead of $225,000,000 as proposed by the House and $290,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Alliance for Progress, development loans: Restores the appropriation of $425,000,000 for development loans as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8—Alliance for Progress, development grants: Restores the appropriation of $100,000,000 for development grants as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9—Alliance for Progress: Deletes Senate language appropriating $575,000,000 of which not to exceed $100,000,000 is for grants and making all such funds available for loans until expended.

Amendment No. 10—Development loans: Appropriates $975,000,000 instead of $775,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,125,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Administrative expenses: Appropriates $49,500,000 instead of $46,000,000 as proposed by the House and $52,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 12 and 13—Administrative and other expenses: Insert perfecting language; and appropriate $2,700,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Military assistance

Amendment No. 14: Inserts perfecting language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Authorizes the use of not to exceed $24,500,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $24,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $1,325,000,000 instead of $1,300,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,450,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Inserts perfecting language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

General provisions

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 21: Inserts perfecting language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 25: Makes available not to exceed $6,000,000 to carry out the provisions of section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)

Peace Corps

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Appropriate $59,000,000 instead of $52,000,000 as proposed by the House and $63,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, and restore House limitation of $15,500,000 for administration and program support costs which had been deleted by the Senate.

Department of the Army—Civil functions

Ryukyu Islands, Army

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30: Appropriate $8,900,000 instead of $7,900,000 as proposed by the House and $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $1,950,000 for administrative and information expenses instead of $1,900,000 as proposed by the House and $2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Assistance to Refugees in the United States

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $70,110,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $55,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Department of State

Migration and Refugee Assistance

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $14,947,000 instead of $14,447,000 as proposed by the House and $16,677,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference agrees that not to exceed $650,000 may be used for administrative purposes.

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Loans to the International Monetary Fund

Amendment No. 33: Authorizes the appropriation of $2,000,000,000 to remain available until expended as proposed by the Senate instead of a termination date of December 31, 1966, as proposed by the House.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS AGENCIES

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriate $73,000,000 for the payment of Philippine war damage claims of which $500,000 is for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $73,560,000 of which $560,000 is for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

U.S. Information Agency

Amendment No. 36: Restores the appropriation of $1,600,000 for acquisition and construction of radio facilities as proposed by the House.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, after a discussion with the physician of the Congress, I would like to announce to my colleagues that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], now in the well of the House, unfortunately suffered an accident last night and as a result he has a fracture of the left humerus, a fracture at the shoulder joint, which is actually fractured into four pieces, I am reliably informed. The final surgery has not been performed. The gentleman is in real pain. Because of his duties here in the House he is not able to respond as yet to medication so that he can care for the injury and carry on the discussion on the floor of the House today and present the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I thought the membership of the House would like to be informed as to the nature of the gentleman's injury. He should be congratulated both for his statesmanship and his dedication to duty.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank very much the gentleman from Arkansas, Dr. ALFORD.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that my being down in the well of the House in a wheelchair might be a gag. This is not a Barnum & Bailey act. This is the U.S. House of Representatives. Permit me to assure you that even though I am in pain, I question whether I am in as much pain as about 187 million Americans who are going to have to foot the bill for the bill that I am now bringing out. So I agreed to suffer with them. I should think that when Lindbergh was flying to Paris, had he cracked up upon landing, the flight would not have been the success it turned out to be.

Mr. Speaker, having worked as long and as hard as I have worked to represent the House of Representatives and the people in trying to write reasonable legislation, with the support of a wonderful committee, to provide only the funds necessary to continue this program, I felt that it was my responsibility to report the conference bill to the House.

Mr. Speaker, of course a Member of Congress receives a little bit more attention than some other people. Had I been down on the farm I would have been plowing this morning. But, being a Member of Congress, I am receiving very special attention at the hospital. When I leave here they will fix me up in pretty good shape.

But, having worked so long and hard to bring this bill out, I thought I would like to make the final report on it.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why I am glad that this bill is soon to be disposed of, one significant reason being that the State Department bureaucrats who have been lobbying on this bill since January can return to their regular assignments. The same thing applies to the White House flunkeys. They have been out here so long, I do not know whether they will be able to find their way back to the White House or not, but I hope they will.

While you are in a sympathetic mood I should say that I am considering introducing a bill next year providing that State Department people and White House representatives sign up as lobbyists. Of course, that would be a very long list. But it may be a good idea to have them register as lobbyists and then we would know whom we are talking to. Many times, believing that I was talking to friends, I was giving away my secrets to some fellow downtown.

Mr. Speaker, referring now to title I only—the mutual security program—under the budget request sent up by the President, amounted to $4,961,300,000. We are $1,032,400,000 below the budget estimates. I do not have my notes here, but, if I remember correctly, the bill is $825,900,000 below the authorizing legislation.

I might go further and say that the bill before the House calls for an appropriation $585,700,000 below the amount we appropriated last session for these same purposes.

There has been some misunderstanding about the reductions in this bill. I think I should like to say to the House that last session we had two appropriation bills. The Alliance for Progress bill came out in May, just before we got into the fiscal year 1962 and appropriated $600 million. A little later in the session, when the regular bill reached the floor of the House, the final conference called for $3,914,600,000; so we actually appropriated last year for the same purposes, $4,514,600,000. We are consolidating the Alliance for Progress with the regular bill this year and the total for the two amounts to $3,928,900,000. It is worth repeating that the actual appropriation is $585,700,000 below that of last year.

May I say very briefly, Mr. Speaker, that it is typical for each American, each Member of this House and the other body, to express his own personal views on this situation. I think we all agree that giving away our wealth is a new concept in foreign policy. From the beginning, from the time of the adoption of our Constitution 174 years ago, we became great, free, wealthy, and respected, in that we had a firm and fair foreign policy based upon trade. It would appear to me, speaking for myself, that today our foreign policy, to a very large extent, is based upon aid, on the dissipation of our wealth and, of course, a high degree of appeasement.

If the membership would take the time to read the House report brought out by your subcommittee and take the time during your vacation, that is, during your sojourn in your district, and analyze the 3,200 pages of hearings, you will understand, maybe, for the first time why this subcommittee is rather insistent upon this bill.

If I may repeat, we spent 710 hours in hearings and research, with 9,000 pages of transcript and 3,200 pages of printed record. We believe that the foreign aid bill should as quickly as possible be cut back to our original goal of $2.5 billion. We believe you will find ample reason if you read the hearings, as to why it is desirable to reduce this bill further.

If you will be patient with me for just a couple of minutes, may I say this—something I may not have said when we brought the bill out. We still have a balance-of-payments deficit. Our gold is still disappearing. As to the myth about 80 percent of the cost of the bill being spent in America, may I say that you can just interpret that the way you want to.

Under trade agreements we ship out our goods to the four corners of the earth. We receive back goods or gold or dollars or convertible currencies from the recipient nations. But today, in this month of October, we push away from the ports $400 million worth of our goods destined for maybe 101 of the 113 nations on the face of the earth. Instead of sending those bills to the recipient nations to be paid, the bills are sent down to the Treasury and they are paid out of the till of the U.S. taxpayer.

I figure it could best be stated by saying that I am a groceryman. My favorite customer comes in and I tell him, "I like you very much. Here is a $100 check, but I want you to agree to spend $80 of it in my store."

After all is said and done, when he has cashed that check and spent $80 with me, I am out $80 worth of groceries plus $20 of my bank account.

You could talk all day and never make a better point. It is absolutely a myth, as far as I am personally concerned, calculated to make the American taxpayers believe that we are benefiting out of it.

Mr. Speaker, we had many amendments adopted during the debate on this bill. I hope that the membership will be gratified, and I would prefer it to be brought back from conference—incidentally, this may be of interest. When we went to conference the other body had put back approximately $800 million of the original $1,032,400,000 that the House, in its wisdom, saw fit to remove.

But the Senators are very brilliant people and after reading the committee report on our hearings, they yielded on $493,900,000 and the House conferees yielded only $298,500,000. That is the record and we are proud of it. Summing up the net results, it amounts to a reduction of $585 million below comparable figures for last year.

Amendment No. 20 is the Cuban amendment as we have referred to it. We tried to reach a satisfactory compromise and we believe we have.

May I state very briefly, it cuts off all military aid including supplies and materials listed under the Battle Act to all nations selling, furnishing, or shipping such aid to Cuba.

It cuts all economic assistance to all nations selling, furnishing, or shipping such aid to Cuba unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance is contrary to our national interest. In the event of such a determination, the President's decision must be published in the Federal Register with the reasons for his determination.

But I believe I can state, so far as the strategic materials and those listed under the Battle Act are concerned, the President does not have that prerogative under this legislation. We have cut it off completely. If any nation that is receiving aid should continue shipping war materials or any of the items listed under the Battle Act, then their foreign aid would be withdrawn.

This is identical with respect to Communist nations and if I may state it very briefly, it being repetitious, it cuts off all military aid including supplies listed under the Battle Act to all nations furnishing such material or aid to Communist nations.

We have brought back language that I think this House should be proud of. Had we had this in the bill a few years ago, we would not have given Tito, who is now sweethearting with Khrushchev, over $1 billion. The exact figure is classified and I will not say how much more it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that this bill comes up, as it does, at this time when our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], has sustained such injuries. I wish to extend to him my wishes and earnest prayer for his rapid and complete recovery.

Mr. Speaker as for the bill itself, as I have said, it gets bigger and bigger every year and this year it is worse. In the fiscal year ended June 30, about $106 billion was withdrawn from the Treasury. We have a bigger one in sight for the current year, and I feel certain that the debt will be even greater than it was last year. With that situation I feel obliged to vote against his bill. I think it is about time that we get to the point where we quit spending money in such a reckless fashion. The folks who appeared before us made a very poor presentation. They did not act like people who were competent to handle the job they were attempting to handle, and for that reason I feel that I must cast my vote against it.

I do want to say this, I believe that the subcommittee and the conferees brought in as much of a reduction as they possibly could under all the circumstances. The bill in conference called for a little over $6.2 billion. It is below the budget to the tune of approximately $1.1 billion. It is above the House figure by $322 million and below the Senate figure by $502.4 million. We have that satisfaction as to the way the issue was handled. I believe the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] did as good a job as anybody else could have done under all the circumstances. But we must come to realize that we cannot turn the assets our people produce over to the rest of the world scot free and expect to survive.

I am leaving the House at the end of this session; I am leaving because I have probably been here as long as I should be. I feel that the best legacy I can leave to those who will carry on the work of the House of Representatives is that we must get this bill out and get rid of the idea of doing business the way we have been doing it for the last 15 years. That statement comes from one who probably has worked more hours on the bill and the whole picture than anybody else, because I started in on it on the 1st of April 1948. The presentation of the need or the lack of need that is required makes me feel very much that we must come to realize that we have come to the end of the rope of our possibility to carry on this sort of thing.

With that I shall ask for a vote on the conference report.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great honor to serve in the Congress and on the Committee on Appropriations with this great patriotic American. We are going to miss the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on the committee. It is through his untiring efforts that research has brought about many savings that we have been able to effectuate in this bill. In my opinion, he could render many more years of useful service in this House, but he has earned retirement.

Mr. Speaker, he better have an unpublished telephone number if he does not want to continue to have a lot to do with the consideration of this bill, because I am going to be calling him, and if he does not take the calls, I am going to see him.

Mr. TABER. Good luck, Mr. Chairman. Good luck to you and I hope for your speedy recovery and that when I see you next you will be your old self.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I should be most grateful if the Members would make a couple of mental notes as to what I shall say. Incidentally, it is something I wanted to say a while ago. I have looked it over so that you will know, as the committee knows. I do not like to be really unfair, and I shall not be. I do this so you will know what the committee knows, that is, you have created an uncontrolled and uncontrollable program. The people themselves who requested the funds and who administer the funds do not know themselves what they actually need.

I received a telegram this morning from a constituent saying that we had created a two-headed monster with hooks and horns that would most surely devour us economically if we did not return to the basis of trade and a firm foreign policy and get away from aid and appeasement.

I question whether I could have made that statement had it not been that, dealing with title I only in this bill, and, Mr. Speaker, this is important, the administration came down and requested $4,961,300,000 and said time and time again if they did not get this money we would wreck the program. You get the same story every year. They do, incidentally, change the date of the letter.

What actually happened—and if you do not believe it is uncontrolled and uncontrollable and that they do not know what they need—we reduced the estimate by $1,032,400,000. Now they say they are perfectly happy and have all the money they need. I wish you would try to reconcile those two statements. In the beginning they said, "If you cut our request, you will wreck the program and ruin our foreign policy."

However, when we cut it $1 billion then they come along and say, "Everything is hunky-dory; that is all the money we need, and thank you so much for giving it to us."

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House understand why this committee lives up to its responsibilities and takes some of the fat out of this bill. Of course, we cannot get all of the fat out of the bill, but we can take some of the fat out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I disliked having to make that statement, but it is a matter of record. I do not think the American system supports the policy of "hollering wolf" in the beginning and after we cut the request, have them praise us. In all probability next year they will say "You still gave us about $1 billion more than we can spend."

Mr. Speaker, I hope to be back before the House next year, reporting this bill again, and while I am here this morning I would like to be able to point back to what I have said when we bring the bill out next year. Perhaps, again, we will get through with a bill without having any amendments to load it up.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, when this bill came on the floor for the first time I made the statement then that I believed that it had been more thoroughly studied and more carefully prepared than any bill that had previously been presented to this Congress. I reiterate that statement at the present time.

The Members of the House will recall that we did cut the bill. We thought that cuts were justified. That has been the policy since the beginning of this program. Whenever we thought cuts were justified, we recommended cuts in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the other body saw fit to restore some of those cuts. However, I want to say to the Membership of the House that the same determination that actuated the committee in framing the bill originally was exhibited in the conference with the other body. Our conferees stood firm, as is attested to by the fact that we came off with much better than a 50-50 break, which is so often customary in conferences of this kind. That was due to the fact, in large measure—almost entirely to the fact—that our chairman knew the details of this bill. I want to say to the Members of the House that I do not believe there is any man in the Congress, and I doubt if there is any in the departments who is as familiar with the details of this bill as is the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. The gentleman has no difficulty in defending the bill because he has the facts, he can fully justify the action of the committee, and he maintains his position, as all of the Members know, with great effectiveness. That was true in our conference with the other body.

Mr. Speaker, as a result we have brought back to the House a good bill, and one which I think every Member of the House can support.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I notice in the statement that amendment No. 4, international organizations and programs, is reported in disagreement.

I trust that this does not mean that there will be an attempt made to include in the law those very unsound and, may I say, ridiculous proposals for projects that are not sound in the judgment of those who know something about this.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman that is not the case. We have taken care of that situation. The disagreement is largely a technical disagreement. We have agreed to language, but because there was some change in the language, it had to be brought back in disagreement. We did not accept the Senate language. The Senate wanted to leave it wide open so that transfers could be made to those agencies. We would not agree to that, but we did finally accept, in order to reach a compromise, a reasonable limit for such transfers.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that heretofore we appropriated all the money for the international organizations, the amount this year being $148,900,000?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. We also gave them all the money they requested last year. Notwithstanding that fact, they were transferring money out of the military into the contingency fund, into the U.N., out of the contingency into the technical aid program.

So this year at least we have a limitation, and the most they may transfer is $10 million; is that correct?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. And the reason that was put in there was because the Senator from Florida suggested we might run into some difficulty in connection with the Organization of American States where it might be necessary to add some additional funds. He did not want to tie the hands of the President so that he could not use some of his contingency fund if an emergency of that kind should arise.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. What is the amount of the contingency fund provided in this measure?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, it is $250 million.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. How does that compare with the amount last year?

Mr. PASSMAN. It is $25 million under last year.

Mr. WALTER. $25 million under last year?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

Mr. GARY. It was $275 million last year.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I also commend the courage of our colleague, Mr. PASSMAN, here today.

I offered an amendment to this bill during debate in the House which was accepted and now appears in substance as section 112.

During the conference one word in my amendment was changed from "selected" to "approved," but it is quite possible that this change has improved this section and will make it possible to retain in U.S. hands control over the precontract details of foreign aid capital projects.

The purpose of this amendment is to supercede the AID directive of June 15, 1962, with its change in policy.

In order to clearly show the intent of this amendment. I insert hereafter, for the purpose of showing the AID policy which this amendment changes, the AID directive PD-5 dated June 15, 1962, and the accompanying statement of policy and summary comment:

ADMINISTRATION OF CAPITAL PROJECTS (STATEMENT OF POLICY AND SUMMARY COMMENT)

AID has adopted a policy for the administration of capital projects which will be put into effect in each region as soon as the necessary instructions can be issued. The aim of the policy is to provide a like method of implementing projects whether financed by loan or grant. A complete statement of the policy will be issued later. Meanwhile U.S. AID's are being formed of the salient features so they can consider any new relationships with the host country or internal organizational changes which may be required to carry out the purposes of the policy.

It is not contemplated that the policy will affect the method of implementing projects which are at such an advanced stage that change would disrupt orderly progress. Projects financed by AID with local currency only are exempt from the policy but will be the subject of a later policy statement.

1. "A capital project is any specific, self-contained undertaking requiring a total AID financing in excess of $100,000 which is intended to result in the construction, expansion, or alteration of a physical facility. Feasibility studies, design, procurement, construction, inspection, management, and training directed toward the realization of utilization of a capital project are considered parts of the project."

2. "AID will administer all capital projects by controlling and monitoring the use of AID funds rather than by direct involvement in the contracting, engineering, procurement, and construction, regardless of the method of financing."

Comment: Contractual arrangements will be made by the borrower/grantee with the firms it selects to do engineering and construction. AID will retain the right to approve the selection of service firms. Contracts will be approved on the basis of engineering and legal acceptability. Other controls to be exercised by AID, including appropriate audits, will be specified in the procedures. The thrust of the policy is to place as much responsibility on the recipient country as possible with prudent control exercised by AID to assure proper expenditure of its funds and proper achievement of the project.

On May 31, 1962, the executive staff discussed the paper prepared under the leadership of the Office of Engineering entitled "Administration of Capital Projects." As a result of this discussion the Administrator approved the adoption of a policy for the administration of capital projects which is outlined in its essentials in the attached circular airgram. The airgram has been sent to the field for the purpose of informing AID personnel of the salient features of the policy so that the U.S. AID can consider any new relationships with the host country or internal organizational changes which may be required to carry out the purposes of the policy. A complete statement of the policy will be issued later.

Responsibility for preparing a full statement of the policy and procedures to implement it is assigned to the Office of Engineering, which will work with designees of the four regional bureaus, the Office of General Counsel, and the Office of Management Planning.

DONALD B. EASUM,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to ask the gentleman if the amount adopted by the House placing a limitation on funds in this bill that can be utilized for paying for cargoes on vessels carrying economic or military supplies to Cuba was stricken out in conference, or does it remain?

Mr. GARY. No; we adopted language with respect to Cuba that I think will take care of the gentleman's point completely.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to know what the language is. There were two or three amendments of this type that were adopted.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is covered under amendment No. 20.

Mr. GARY. What we did was to combine all three of the amendments into one amendment, instead of having three separate amendments. If the gentleman would like me to read it, it consists of two paragraphs here.

Mr. BONNER. I think this is a matter that is very interesting to the country. The papers are full of this subject all around the country today.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, we shall reach this amendment separately. It is reported back in disagreement. If the gentleman would rather take it up at that time, it will be discussed then.

Mr. BONNER. When the amendment is called up? When is that?

Mr. GARY. After the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. PASSMAN. We have eight amendments in technical disagreement and we shall explain each one of them, if desired.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand now and shall defer until that time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply sorry about the accident to our very wonderful colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. I have followed him in all of his doings on this committee. I have the highest regard for him as a great legislator and a great American. I, however, have not found it in my heart to vote for any of this foreign aid since the shooting war stopped in Korea. But I know the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has done his very best in reducing this bill as much as possible.

I do want to say while I am here on my feet that if the fates are willing it will be my responsibility to try as best I can to step into the place made vacant on the Committee on Appropriations by our very able and esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who found it in his heart to retire after this session of Congress.

I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for 20 years. I have worked very closely with Mr. TABER. I have learned much from his fine measurements of all legislation and of appropriations. I shall miss him more than anyone in this House, I am sure, because it is rather frightening to know that I will be called upon next session, if the fates are willing that I return, to take over the great work that Mr. TABER has done so ably for 40 years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I can only ask my colleagues on the committee and my colleagues in the House to bear with me and to realize the great responsibility that rests on my shoulders and the shoulders of every Member of this Congress in that great and important job of trying as best we can to stop national bankruptcy for this beloved Nation of ours.

Again I say, Mr. PASSMAN, I hope and pray that you will soon be as good as new, and when I say as good as new, that is mighty good, because you are a great American, you have labored hard and long, and I know that you will be rewarded in the days to come for the fine job you do in this Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one in this House in my admiration and affection for the great and good Representative from New York, Mr. TABER. I have worked with Mr. TABER since first becoming a member of this committee, and it has been a labor of love. I owe him a debt of gratitude for his many courtesies and his assistance.

I also want to say that when the news came to me last night of the injury of our distinguished chairman I was terribly distressed. I am delighted that even though I know he is in great pain and is making a great sacrifice, he is on the floor of the House today handling this bill. I wish for him prompt, complete, and full recovery.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The cold arithmetic of this situation is that the State Department came to the House of Representatives with a deliberately bloated budget request for nearly $7.5 billion for this foreign giveaway program. The House reduced this figure about a billion and a half, or down to about $6 billion. The bill went to the Senate which bloated the House figure by about $800 million.

The figure we have before us today in the House, as I understand it, is $322 million above that originally approved by the House although we were told then by members of the committee that it contained plenty of fat at $6 billion. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that had it not been for the injury to our esteemed colleague, I certainly would today offer a motion to recommit this bill to conference with instructions to stay with the House figure, which I repeat was $322 million less than the figure now before us. Were it not for the unfortunate accident to my friend from Louisiana, Mr. Passman, I certainly would offer a motion to recommit, but apparently the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Passman, would not be able to function in a renewed conference so I will not offer the motion. Without his presence I feel the conference would be futile.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield; do not let the gentleman from Louisiana prevent you from doing whatever you want to do. If I had not felt that I was capable of handling this bill, I would still be at the hospital. So do not change your plans on account of the condition of the gentleman from Louisiana. But let me suggest to the gentleman from Iowa and call his attention to the section under mutual security where you will find that we did not yield except to the extent of $298,500,000. The gentleman knows we have in the bill the Philippine war claims, and we reduced that amount back to the House figure.

Do not let the gentleman's condition change the gentleman's mind. You proceed just the same as if I was getting ready to go to the golf course. I am not looking for sympathy. I am looking for good legislation, and if I cannot complete this, you have a lot of Members here who can take over. So you please proceed in the regular way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I reiterate that I would certainly want the gentleman from Louisiana on any conference and any further conference on this bill so I will not offer the motion.

Mr. PASSMAN. If I could come to this Chamber today, I can go to a conference.

Mr. GARY. I must say to our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, that our subcommittee would also want him to attend any conference on this bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in deference and out of respect to our chairman, Mr. Passman, I do not intend to speak at any length. I, like all of you, deeply regret his disability, and we certainly extend to you, Otto, our best wishes for a quick and complete recovery.

Mr. Speaker, I think most people here know my fundamental feelings concerning this kind of legislation. I have supported it since I came to the House. I have opposed in many, many instances reductions where I thought they were unjustified. I am particularly concerned as to military assistance and the supporting assistance areas.

I think with one or two exceptions, this is an excellent bill. In the case of military assistance, the funds are a little marginal. However, I have two reasons to feel that if we do run into difficulty, the President and the Congress can handle the situation.

First, I think the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana, if an emergency arose right after we reconvene in January would act promptly on additional fund requests to supplement those funds that are made available here.

Certainly $1,325 million is substantial and will be adequate for the period between now and January 1963. If anything does turn up that is really serious after Congress has reconvened I am certain the chairman would act promptly to meet this crisis.

Furthermore the President has under section 510 of the authorization act the right to draw up to $300 million in military supplies from our own U.S. stocks. If such action was necessary then in January the President could request Congress to make available funds so that the Defense Department could replenish its stock. There is therefore enough money in here for the military assistance program, when you look at the realities of the situation.

The total action by the conference committee was sound. We put the $300 million or thereabouts in about the right places. We allocated an additional $44 million in supporting assistance over the House figure. This was a big help in this account. It was absolutely essential to take such action.

As the chairman knows, I supported him in this overall figure. We were able to make some desirable revisions in various accounts that I think were sound.

The changes which we made in the conference in sections 107 and 109 are practical and I think sound. Section 107 categorically states the President must cut off aid for any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ship under its registry to carry military assistance to Cuba. In this instance there is no leeway whatsoever. None.

In the area of economic assistance, however, it states that aid shall be cut off if such country sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items to Cuba, but the President may make an exception by making a determination that such action is in the best interest of the United States.

Section 109, follows the same pattern—no leeway where military assistance is concerned and discretion on economic aid. We do permit the President leeway as far as economic assistance is concerned. This is similar to the authority given former President Eisenhower.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. There are many who will vote for legislation of the type which is before us today on the basis that it is essential and vital to the defense of the United States. There are many who feel that this type of program, despite its imperfections, has made it possible for us to ring the Soviet Union with bases and maintain those bases from year to year, and there are over 100 bases overseas.

There are some who feel that the U-2 could not have done its spectacular job a few years ago, which meant the saving of tremendous sums in our defense planning without a program somewhat comparable to this program.

We all recognize that we do not have a perfect program. The gentleman and I have worked throughout the years on defense appropriations. I would like for the gentleman to say whether or not in his opinion this type of legislation is essential and vital to the defense of the country and whether or not without this legislation we would have to increase sharply the defense budget?

Mr. FORD. In my judgment, this legislation is vital to the defense of the country. Second, if we did not make available the military assistance and the supporting assistance funds here for our allies so that they could have soldiers, sailors, and airmen, well equipped and well trained, it would cost us in our own defense program considerably more than it does at present. Furthermore it would put a far greater burden on the manhood of America. We would have to increase the active duty strength of our own Army, Navy, and Air Force if we did not have the military assistance program.

Mr. MAHON. In the event of war, do you think it is desirable to have men in the uniform of other governments to do some of the sacrificing and assume something of the burden rather than our undertaking to bear it all?

Mr. FORD. I do, and this program provides the money so that our allies can increase their own military strength and spread the burden, of defending freedom against communism.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, when two men are in business and they always agree, one is unnecessary.

I have profound respect for the gentleman from Virginia and his opinions, and this applies also to the gentleman from Texas and his opinions. But I want to say we are not talking about our regular Defense Department when we talk about this military aid under the foreign aid program. We are talking about the State Department military program, with the exception of NATO and a few other places. You take some of your new African countries and they only want bread and butter. But you get a few nations where they have a population of 3 million or more and they want guns so that they can start shooting. You have so much money in this bill for the military assistance program. I know of an instance where the Defense Department shipped out two guns per soldier, in another nation they shipped out 1½ guns per soldier. You gave the Emperor of Ethiopia a yacht with a million dollars' worth of air conditioning on it. In another nation you gave two planes for each pilot.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the military part of this is the most wasteful part of the program. But when you say "military" it brings praise and it is hard to oppose it.

I am not quarreling with the United Nations, even though many of the members thereof are better able to pick up the checks than we are.

I have handled this bill for many years and I have held hearings on it. They have so much money in this military assistance program that they are transferring it out of the military to the U.N. and from the U.N. into the Congo in the form of economic aid. These people have been insincere in their presentation and have no justification at all for their requests. There is at least a half billion dollars in phony obligations here.

If I may go one step further; I asked these people in the military assistance program, of the 65 nations if they knew what nations they were to give military aid to; if so, what, and when.

They said "It would take us 6 months to tell you to whom we have allocated these billions, for what, and for what kind of hardware."

Mr. Speaker, I am not quarreling with the distinguished gentleman from Texas. But I do not want to leave the Membership of the House under the impression that there is anything sacred about this State Department military arm other than the NATO alliance.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; I am happy to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. As the gentleman from Louisiana knows, yesterday we passed a resolution stating that we would stand firm in Berlin, and is it not true, in part, at least, that we are able to stand firm in Berlin because following World War II through foreign aid and otherwise we prevented the total and complete collapse of Western Europe to communism? We helped the nations of Western Europe get on their feet. We have helped them make themselves strong. Is it not further true as a result of our helping them become strong that they have provided us additional markets, and except for their strength, we would not be in nearly as good a position to stand firm in Berlin? I am speaking in general terms on a very big subject. I would not say for a moment that all our military aid funds have been wisely spent. I am sure that no adequate defense could be made for some of the military aid which we have upon occasion provided.

As a further sidelight on this entire problem, is it not well to remember that while there are many imperfections and wasteful practices in the program and many mistakes have been made, if we talk only of the mistakes, we may fail to see and realize that some elements of the program are vitally important to the countries involved and to the security and survival of the United States?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is your opinion. If you would give them military aid, but not give the State Department a military arm, that might be all right. Even the military people will tell you that if the State Department would keep its nose out of it they would not need all this money.

Mr. Speaker, we have such aid going to some 17 nations. Some of those people want money and not guns. I say it is the most extravagant and the most misrepresented part of the bill. I have reference, of course, to the so-called military section of the bill. They could use some money wisely, but not all for which they are asking.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman would yield further, I wish to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the magnificent job which he has done on this bill. I think the gentleman has done as good or a better job this year than in previous years. He has performed a service to the country and I support him. I am glad that the reductions were made.

Mr. PASSMAN: I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Had the reductions not been made, I do not think I could have voted for this bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman. But my time is about up. I am not fussing with reference to the bill which the gentleman from Texas handles. I am talking about this State Department military arm that they are operating all over the world. If we were able to keep the State Department downtown, we would not need but about $250 million for this particular program. They are looking for ways in which to throw money away.

When you start shipping two guns per soldier to a nation and furnishing them two airplanes per pilot, that is going a little far.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I think we all are aware of the fact that much of the money spent by the military, whether it be in this appropriation bill or in any other bill, is misdirected and wasted. No one has attempted here to defend the vital military appropriation in this bill which went for 75 tanks which were given to a country, which country did not want them and would not accept them. As a result, we had to pay the acquisition cost in order to get them to take them.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I have 30 seconds left, and if I may—I am not saying this just today, because I said it 16 years ago and I have repeated it many times since: I think that we have in our midst one of the greatest, most brilliant, patriotic, Christian Americans that it has ever been our honor to know and with whom to associate. Sixteen years ago I went to this great man, and I said "if the time should ever come when there is a vacancy in the Speakership of the House of Representatives, I want the privilege of voting for you." Last year I called this good man over long distance. I said "I am with you first, last, and always."

This man is a good man; he is a Christian man; he is a fair man. When history is written, he will go down in history as one of the greatest Speakers who ever served in this House of Representatives.

This morning, in all the 16 years I have been in the Congress, the highest honor I have ever had was paid to me when this great Christian, patriotic Amercian, having learned that I had had this little accident, dropped everything, humbled himself and came to my office to see how I was getting along. I have known for 16 years he was that kind of a man. If you do not know the type of Speaker you have, you ought to get acquainted with him. He is a Christian, he is lovable, he is able; and I hope the Supreme Architect of the universe will give him many, many years to preside over this House, which he can do in such a way that will greatly dignify this body and make it enjoyable for many of us to carry out our difficult problems.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support the foreign aid conference report.

Especially, it is pleasing to have the final version of the foreign assistance appropriations bill, after the House and Senate have composed their differences, include my amendment adding a new provision to section 107 which provides that none of the foreign aid funds go to any country which permits its vessels to transport arms or strategic materials to Cuba.

The revised language giving the President power to allow such aid if he deems it in the national interest weakens my amendment. The national interest always seems to be what the State Department regards as not antagonizing any foreign country. Under the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1951 the President can waive just such a provision to withhold aid to any nation that allows the sale of arms or strategic materials to Communist bloc nations. Never once under this act—and there have been 19 cases where nations have shipped such materials to the Communists—has a President failed to find that aid should continue. Always, it seems the proviso to cut off aid is vetoed. But the details of all these 19 examples are not available. They are classified under executive privilege.

However, I do think my amendment, though weakened, adds to the bill. I appreciate and commend the House managers and the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], for retaining it.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the conference report.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like on this occasion to go on record as stating that it is my feeling the House conferees on the foreign aid appropriations bill have yielded to the pressure of the State Department and have shirked their responsibility to the taxpayers.

By accepting an increase of over $300 million in the funds appropriated for foreign aid and by back-pedaling on the resolution to prevent aid to Communist countries and to those nations providing economic aid to Cuba, the conferees have capitulated and approved an action that they could not justify.

The State Department has in its plans for this year, economic aid to Communist governments and there is little doubt but what it will continue to dole out millions to those nations who trade with Cuba in view of the watered-down resolution accepted by the conferees. The conferees cannot possibly justify fattening up this bill by over $300 million when the chairman of the committee told the Congress that the administration could not justify any sums over the figure $3.6 billion for economic and military assistance previously adopted by the House. While this appropriation is popularly called a $3.9 billion appropriation for foreign aid—that is only half the story because this same bill calls for an additional $2.3 billion for other phases of the foreign aid program, making a total outlay of almost $6.3 billion. In addition, there is approximately $7 billion in the foreign aid stockpile that is unexpended, enough to continue the foreign aid program for 2 years without another single penny.

The most significant single factor in our gold outflow situation is this continual drain on our assets through foreign aid. This contributes more than anything else to the unfavorable balance-of-payments deficit. The taxpayers of America cannot continue to sustain the economy of 101 nations throughout the world plus the extravagant expenditures of this country.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the time has come for the Congress to take a fresh look at our foreign aid program. Failure in performance, inability to reach objectives, and waste have contributed to the feeling of disillusionment and downright opposition which is characteristic of an increasingly larger portion of the American people.

Events of the past year have demonstrated that we have come to a great divide where foreign assistance is concerned and we have started down the darker slope. Where we finish will depend upon our attitude and that of the executive which is charged with administering this program.

Technical assistance began in a modest way in areas like Latin America. Then came the massive infusions of assistance in Europe, after the war, with the Marshall plan. Later came the proliferation of programs with loans, grants, military assistance, guarantees of international lending, food for peace, and the Peace Corps.

However, even though there were areas of great success such as in Europe—in Italy and in Greece, for example—the spread of applicants for aid, the increasing cost of the program, the ill-considered use of funds and the foolishness, the inefficiency, and the illegality which were too often apparent sapped the interest and support of the American people and caused eyebrows in Congress to be raised to increasing height as time went by.

Most serious has been the feeling that in many cases we are wasting our money. Even though we might not insist on confining our aid to militarily or politically strategic areas as the Communists tend to do, nevertheless, there must be some limit to the area over which we can spread ourselves.

There must be some end to the grant of funds without promise of benefit to the United States or the donee country. There must be some termination of the lavish grants to those who promptly turn and sock us on the jaw.

As someone has asked, would it not be permissible for us to let one country somewhere in the world fall to the Communists? Perhaps a small one.

The effect on the people of that country and upon the world might be startlingly beneficial to us. Certainly experience with communism has not endeared its supposed beneficiaries to that system.

There have been significant signs of a change in thinking about foreign aid.

A prominent newspaper columnist has recently urged that we get rid of the myths of foreign aid and return to facts and in the words of President Kennedy in another connection to a difficult but essential confrontation with reality.

This same columnist pointed out that it was foolish to consider our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], as a sort of diabolical figure who singlehandedly held back the forces of light in their attempts to expand the program. There was, he stated, a deeper public opposition which manifested itself through Mr. PASSMAN but was not personal to him. In fact, until this year, appropriations have approximated authorizations.

Another harbinger of change has been the recent circulation of a memorandum by a high administration official, formerly a strong advocate of more, broader and bigger programs who now advocates broad scale reform and radical revision of policies.

There are many criticisms of our aid programs, but even supporters agree upon certain significant points of objection which must be considered before we take up authorizations and appropriations in the 88th Congress.

These reasonable grounds for criticism include the failure of our allies to share a fair burden of the load, our failure to insist upon reforms as a price of assistance, the use of aid money for wasteful political objectives rather than constructive economic ones and our frightened reluctance to let nations turn to Moscow in accordance with the threats which they make to sandbag us for aid money

Among these points is the refusal of aid agency officials to be realistic about their failures and shortcomings, to admit their mistakes, and, most important of all, to do something about them. The confidence of Congress is not increased by finding its recommendations for improvement countered with airy insouciance.

Recent hearings on the operations of REPAS, the research arm of AID, have revealed shocking examples of loose contracting, indefinite objectives, absence of legal controls and obvious waste.

It must be emphasized that the sort of calm review which is needed will not be attained if we continue to describe, as the President did, every cut in appropriations to be a threat to the free world or to characterize as irresponsible those who sought reexamination. We must abandon this type of stump language and talk specifics.

Not the least of our objectives should be the return to the Congress of a critical sense and an insistence upon its own prerogatives in the field of foreign policy. The House of Representatives is not an arm of the executive, but an independent branch. We should, of course, give every favorable presumption to our Secretary of State and support our President in every possible way in these difficult times, but we should not be led down the garden path against our better judgment only to find that we have been abandoned by those who sought to persuade us.

Now that we have passed the foreign aid appropriations bill for next year, we have a great responsibility to consider these criticisms which now are rife and to prepare our thinking for next year.

This is a great opportunity if we act wisely, but there may well be a revolution if we continue to drift.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we consider H.R. 13175, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an important statement issued by Bishop Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and William J. vanden Heuvel, president of the International Rescue Committee. This statement points out that—

> The ambivalent attitude of the West toward Yugoslavia has resulted in an ambivalent attitude toward Yugoslav refugees.

The statement presents a clear and forceful argument for aiding these refugees. After reading this statement I am sure that all would agree that Yugoslav refugees should not be subject to discrimination. The foreign aid appropriations bill does not sanction discrimination against refugees from Yugoslavia. In addition, on page 987 of the foreign aid hearings before the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations, Yugoslavia is listed as a country covered by the refugee assistance program. I hope that my colleagues will read the following statement:

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FLEEING FROM YUGOSLAVIA

(Joint statement by Bishop Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director National Catholic Welfare Conference, and William J. vanden Heuvel, president, International Rescue Committee)

Prior to the erection of the Berlin wall, East Germany was not the only refugee-producing Communist country in Europe. Mass flights occurred from other areas, such as Hungary in 1956, and year after year about 10,000 Yugoslav refugees have fled that country. Yet how many Americans know that a large segment of the Yugoslavs have not been able to obtain asylum in the West and that many have been forcibly returned to Yugoslavia?

It almost appears that it required a wall and the merciless terror of the Communist police at the wall to create concern for today's refugees and to have them accepted for what they are: victims of totalitarian oppression who flee from pervasive political, spiritual, and economic devastations which they correctly identify with the Communist system.

It is the same type of refugee who is seeking freedom, whether he comes from East Germany, Hungary, or Yugoslavia. Most are young, some are very young. Although they may not be able to articulate the reason which makes them come, it is invariably a desire to escape the police state, its totalitarian control as well as its economic deprivation. A man's yearning for freedom and human dignity is quite compatible with his hope of economic betterment.

Mass flights are always an expression of disaffection and opposition, the final protest where other protests are made impossible by political terror. Where people have no other vote, they are forced to vote with their feet. Our answer to the refugee problem is an index of the political imagination and the moral temper of the West.

The ambivalent attitude of the West toward Communist Yugoslavia has resulted in an ambivalent attitude toward Yugoslav refugees. Nothing can strengthen a totalitarian power so successfully as the feeling of resignation and apathy among its subjects. When we challenge the refugees' motivations, we appear unable to grasp why people would be fleeing and we seem to be turning our backs on them. When we acquiesce in the forcible return of escapees, we contribute to the feeling of hopelessness and thereby weaken the Democratic cause within Yugoslavia—and without.

The age and the social background of most of the Yugoslav refugees, predominantly working class with a good admixture of peasant youth, instead of being interpreted as a symptom of the failure of the Yugoslav Government to gain the allegiance of the strata in whose name it purports to rule, have been used as proof of the economic character of the refugees escape motivations. The refugees opposition to communism is being impugned because they are poor. And because, when asked what they intend to do, they express a desire to work and to earn decent wages, it is adduced that they are not victims of Communist oppression and have not suffered from the absence of personal, political, and religious freedom. It is as if the economic hardships to which they were exposed were not manmade, the result of Communist misplanning. And it is as if a desire to work and to earn a decent living were in itself improper and shameful, an attitude which calls for the label "economic refugee," that is one who does not deserve our sympathy and can be returned behind the curtain without qualms. When misgivings do arise, they are dismissed, sometimes smugly and sometimes uneasily. The kind of repression rather than the repression itself is considered, and no attention is paid to the possibility of later retribution and the certainty that people who express their dissatisfaction with the regime by trying to escape from it will remain marked as enemies of the state. It is forgotten that the very act of escape makes a man an "enemy of the state."

Everyone knows that in Communist countries, the economy is a phase of politics. In those countries where people are not free to choose their own political creed, they are not free to make their own way in the social and economic field. Freedom of initiative is either nonexistent or is permitted on a minimum scale. Savings are meaningless because sooner or later the state swallows everything. Plans for the future are better left unmade. Everyone knows what civic and family life has been reduced to. Now, with all this, when someone escapes from such distressing conditions can he really be considered an "economic" refugee?

Is physical persecution necessarily physical torture? The loss of freedom, political pressure and its inevitable consequence—economic misery—are also persecution; veiled persecution, daily persecution, persecution which these young people feel deeply, although they are often unable to give expression to their feeling, for lack of education, or difficulty in choosing the right words.

Even those few Yugoslavs who are granted asylum are frequently put in a lower category than refugees from other Communist countries by the U.S. escapee program. Thus Yugoslavs either do not qualify as refugees or they are treated as second-class refugees.

And when they come before the so-called screening commissions in the West, having crossed their Rubicon, although they have, for very valid reasons, chosen to be, as it were, "without family, without country, and without means," the only thing they find to say is "We came away to be free and to find work." Then we say, "They are young, they ran away from their parents; discipline; they are, as you can see, economic refugees."

Should we not give the matter a little more thought? There are many who are discontented with their jobs or unemployed. Do you think that they would, even with a passport, i.e., without any risk to themselves, leave Belgium, for example, leave it forever, abandoning their families, their possessions for the unknown.

A further contention is that by permitting Yugoslav refugees to stay in Western Europe or by accepting them for immigration in the Western Hemisphere we are alleviating Communist Yugoslavia's economic problems and underemployment. If this were true, Tito could have done better by negotiating labor agreements with other European countries which have manpower shortages. The 10,000 refugees from Yugoslavia annually do not alter the employment picture inside Yugoslavia to any appreciable degree. Even if it were the policy of the West to aggravate the economic difficulties of Yugoslavia, as it clearly has not been, these goals should not be pursued at the expense of the refugees, the victims of Tito's brand of communism.

The repression of freedom of religion and other fundamental human rights in Yugoslavia hardly differs even in degree from that practiced in the U.S.S.R. itself. Yet the subtle campaign of the Yugoslav authorities to popularize the term "economic" refugee has been more than successful. It has carried over into the language of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and that of certain officials of the U.S. Government. It has influenced the policy of countries which formerly granted asylum to these refugees to the point where substantial numbers of them are now being repatriated instead of welcomed. It has created a situation where Italy permits most of those fleeing to remain on its soil, but Austria, using United States equivocal policies as an excuse, forcibly returns the majority of the Yugoslav refugees. It has resulted in drastic reductions in U.S. aid to refugees from Yugoslavia. It has resulted in resentment by true democratic people from Yugoslavia who see U.S. aid helping to build a strong Communist state, but refusing to help those anti-Communist elements that escape its oppression. It has caused confusion among the Americans because policymakers fail to understand that the basic philosophy of the Communist state is the same, whether that of the Soviet Union, China, or Yugoslavia.

American policy today leaves refugees bewildered by its policy of being selective about the kind of communism and oppression from which a person must flee in order to benefit from the help of the American people.

At a time when we are granting asylum to thousands of refugees from Castro's communism, which, supported by Soviet communism, is threatening the Western Hemisphere, should the United States not take a forthright stand and give full recognition to the refugees fleeing Yugoslavia which is today linked again with the Soviet in its conspiracy to have communism dominate the world?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 108, not voting 157, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

YEAS—171

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barry
Bass, Tenn.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Brademas
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Chelf
Cohelan
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Dague
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Donohue
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Everett
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Ford
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz

Gary
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Granahan
Green, Oreg.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Healey
Hechler
Herlong
Holland
Hosmer
Huddleston
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kowalski
Kunkel
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Libonati
Lindsay
McFall
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Mathias
Matthews
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nix
Norblad

Norrell
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reece
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shelley
Sibal
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Springer
Stafford
Stratton
Stubblefield
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Wallhauser
Walter
Weaver
Wickersham
Widnall
Wilson, Calif.
Wright
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—108

Abbitt
Abernethy
Alford
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Battin
Beermann

Betts
Bow
Bray
Broyhill
Bruce
Burleson
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Church
Clancy

Collier
Colmer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Devine
Dole
Dowdy
Durno
Fisher

Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Gathings
Gavin
Goodell
Grant
Gross
Gubser
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Hemphill
Henderson
Horan
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kitchin
Kornegay
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McMillan
McVey
Martin, Nebr.
May
Minshall
Moeller
Moorehead, Ohio
Morris
Moulder
Murray
Nygaard
Pfost
Pillion
Poff
Ray
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Roush
Rutherford
St. George
Schenck
Shriver
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stephens
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Young

NOT VOTING—157

Adair
Alexander
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Avery
Baring
Barrett
Bass, N.H.
Bates
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolling
Boykin
Breeding
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Celler
Chiperfield
Clark
Coad
Cramer
Curtin
Daniels
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Dooley
Dorn
Downing
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Evins
Farbstein
Fenton
Findley
Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Garland
Giaimo
Goodling
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Inouye
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kee
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Lesinski
Loser
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McSween
Mack
Magnuson
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Meader
Michel
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Milliken
Moore
Morrison
Moss
Gray
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Peterson
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rousselot
Ryan, Mich.
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Spence
Staggers
Sullivan
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Ullman
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Williams
Yates
Zelenko

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Brown against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mrs. Riley against.

Mr. Pirnie for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Peterson for, with Mr. Shipley against.

Mr. Bates for, with Mr. McDonough against.

Mr. Giaimo for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. George P. Miller for, with Mr. Berry of South Dakota against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Harrison of Virginia against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Mack against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Reifel against.

Mr. Loser for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Mr. Milliken for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Baring against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. McSween against.

Mr. Bromwell for, with Mrs. Blitch against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Scranton for, with Mr. Hoeven against.

Mr. Daniels for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Inouye for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Van Zandt for, with Mr. Alexander against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Garland against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Schadeberg against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Haley against.

Mr. Santangelo for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Hall against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Siler against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Hiestand against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. Breeding for, with Mr. Moore against.

Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Harris against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. Ryan of Michigan for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Nelsen for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Mr. Avery for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mr. Evins for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Meader for, with Mr. Becker against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Knox against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carey with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Clem Miller with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Curtin of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Dooley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: On page 2, line 18, after "$148,900,000" strike out all down to the word "paragraph" in line 21 and insert the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation contained in this Act, except funds appropriated under this Act for the contingency fund, may be used to augment funds or programs contained in this paragraph, and no funds shall be transferred from funds appropriated under any other paragraph of title I of this Act to the contingency fund for the purpose of augmenting funds or programs contained in this paragraph."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Passman moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation contained in this Act, except funds appropriated under this Act for the contingency fund (not to exceed $10,000,000), may be used to augment funds or programs contained in this paragraph and no funds shall be transferred from funds appropriated under any other paragraph of title I of this Act to the contingency fund for the purpose of augmenting funds or programs contained in this paragraph."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: On page 4, line 20, after "appropriated" insert "and amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as having been obligated against appropriations heretofore made under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for the same general purpose as any of the subparagraphs under 'Economic Assistance', are hereby continued available for the same period as the respective appropriations in such subparagraphs for the same general purpose: *Provided*, That such purpose relates to a project previously justified to Congress."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Passman moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "and amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as having been obligated against appropriations heretofore made under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for the same general purpose as any of the subparagraphs under 'Economic Assistance', are hereby continued available for the same period as the respective appropriations in such subparagraphs for the same general purpose.

"*Provided*, That such purpose relates to a project previously justified to Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified prior to the reobligation of funds for such projects and no objection is entered by either committee within sixty days of such notification."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 5, line 16, insert "memorandum of the President dated May 15, 1962."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 7, strike out all of section 107 and insert:

"SEC. 107. (a) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for assistance to any country, the government of which sells arms, ammunition, or implements of war to the Castro regime, or permits ships under its registry to deliver arms, ammunition, implements of war, or other goods, wares and merchandise to that regime, or which furnishes, by grant or loan, any military or economic aid to that regime, or for any expenses of transportation, directly or indirectly, by merchant marine ships of any nation whose ships are used to transport any military or economic supplies to that regime.

"(b) None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for assistance to any country which permits vessels registered, enrolled, licensed, or otherwise documented under its laws to transport to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies contained on the list (known as the "positive list") maintained by the Secretary of Commerce of commodities with respect to which an export license is required under the Export Control Act of 1949.

"SEC. 107. (a) None of the funds provided in this title shall be available for assistance to any country, the government of which sells arms, ammunition, or implements of war to the Castro regime, or which furnishes, by grant or loan, any military or economic aid to that regime, or for any expenses of transportation, directly or indirectly, by merchant marine ships of any nation whose ships are used to transport any military or economic supplies to that regime, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance to such country, or the nonpayment of such expenses of transportation, would be contrary to the national interest, and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives.

"(b) None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be available for assistance to any country which permits vessels registered, enrolled, licensed, or otherwise documented under its laws to transport to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance to such country would be contrary to the national interest, and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives.

"(c) Reports made pursuant to this section shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 107.(a) No assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

"(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: On page 10, strike out all of section 109 and insert:

"SEC. 109. No assistance shall be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (except section 214(b)) to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives that: (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism. Reports made pursuant to this section shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons in detail for such findings. For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase "Communist country" shall include specifically, but not be limited to, the following countries:

"Peoples Republic of Albania,
"Peoples Republic of Bulgaria,
"Peoples Republic of China,
"Czechoslovakia Socialist Republic.
"German Democratic Republic (East Germany),
"Estonia,
"Hungarian Peoples Republic,
"Latvia,
"Lithuania,
"North Korean Peoples Republic,
"North Vietnam,
"Outer Mongolia-Mongolian Peoples Republic,
"Polish Peoples Republic,
"Rumanian Peoples Republic,
"Tibet,
"Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia,
"Cuba, and
"Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 109. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any nation, whose government is based upon that theory of government known as Communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

"(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any nation whose government is based upon that theory of government known as Communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (except section 214(b)), unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23, page 12, line 5, insert: "for procurement to which the United States is a party".

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement:

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24, page 12, line 21, strike "selected" and insert "approved".

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "approved the terms of the contracts and".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement:

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 13, line 10, insert:

"SEC. 115. Foreign currencies not to exceed $200,000, made available for loans pursuant to section 104(e) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be available during the current fiscal year for expenses incurred incident to such loans."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include tabular material relating to the conference report and the bill just adopted at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. The following table summarizes the congressional action on the foreign aid bill:

Summary of foreign aid appropriation bill, 1963 (H.R. 13175)

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—Foreign aid (mutual security):							
Development grants	$335,000,000	$225,000,000	$275,000,000	$225,000 000	−$110,000,000		−$50,000,000
American hospitals abroad	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000			
Investment guarantees	180,000,000	30,000,000	100,000,000	30,000,000	−150,000,000		−70,000,000
Surveys of investment opportunities	5,000,000		1,000,000		−5,000,000		−1,000,000
International organization	148,900,000	148,900,000	148,900,000	148,900,000			
Supporting assistance	481,500,000	350,000,000	400,000,000	395,000,000	−86,500,000	+$45,000,000	−5,000,000
Contingency fund	400,000,000	225,000,000	290,000,000	250,000,000	−150,000,000	+25,000,000	−40,000,000
Alliance for Progress	600,000,000	525,000,000	575,000,000	525,000,000	−75,000,000		−50,000,000
Development loans	1,250,000,000	775,000,000	1,125,000,000	975,000,000	−275,000,000	+200,000,000	−150,000,000
Administrative expenses (AID)	55,000,000	46,000,000	52,000,000	49,500,000	−5,500,000	+3,500,000	−2,500,000
Administrative expenses (State)	3,100,000	2,700,000	3,100,000	2,700,000	−400,000		−400,000
Subtotal, economic assistance	3,461,300,000	2,330,400,000	2,972,800,000	2,603,900,000	−857,400,000	+273,500,000	−368,900,000
Military assistance	1,500,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,450,000,000	1,325,000,000	−195,000,000	+25,000,000	−125,000,000
Total, title I	4,961,300,000	3,630,400,000	4,422,800,000	3,928,900,000	−1,032,400,000	+298,500,000	−493,900,000
Title II—Foreign aid (other):							
Peace Corps	63,750,000	52,000,000	63,750,000	59,000,000	−4,750,000	+7,000,000	−4,750,000
Ryukyu Islands	14,282,000	7,900,000	12,000,000	8,900,000	−5,382,000	+1,000,000	−3,100,000
Assistance to refugees in the United States (Cuban)	70,110,000	55,000,000	70.110,000	70,110,000		+15,110.000	
Migration and refugee assistance	21,977,000	14,447,000	16,677,000	14,947,000	−7,030,000	+500,000	−1,730,000
Investment in Inter-American Bank	60,000,000	60,000.000	60,000,000	60,000,000			
Subscription to International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000			
Total, title II	291.775,000	251,003.000	284,193,000	274,613,000	−17,162,000	+23,610,000	−9,580,000
Title III—International Monetary Fund:							
Loans to the International Monetary Fund	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000.000,000			
Title IV—Export-Import Bank:							
Limitation on operating expenses	(1,295,000,000)	(1,295,000,000)	(1,295,000,000)	(1,295,000,000)			
Limitation on administrative expenses	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)			
Total, title IV	(1,298,000,000)	(1,298,000,000)	(1,298,000,000)	(1,298,000,000)			
Title V—Miscellaneous agencies, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission:							
Payment of Philippine claims	73,000,000	73,000,000	73,000,000	73,000,000			
Salaries and expenses (U.S. Information Agency)	560,000	[1]	560,000		−560,000		−560,000
Acquisition of radio facilities (Department of State)	7,375,000	1,600,000		1,600,000	−5,775,000		+1,600,000
International conferences	1,019,000	849,000	849,000	849,000	−170,000		
Total, title V	81,954,000	75,449,000	74,409,000	75,449,000	−6,505,000		+1,040,000
Grand total, all titles	7,335,029,000	5,956,852,000	6,781,402,000	6,278,962,000	−1,056,067,000	+322,110,000	−502,440,000

[1] $500,000 included in "Payment of Philippine claims."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

G. W. TODD AND ESTATE OF LLOYD PARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2451, for the relief of G. W. Todd and the estate of Lloyd Parks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) G. W. Todd, the sum of $8,120, and (2) the estate of Lloyd Parks, the sum of $8,120. The payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of G. W. Todd and Lloyd Parks (deceased) against the United States for the loss of their exclusive right of pound-net fishing off the western shore of Cedar Point, Maryland, as a result of certain regulations issued by the Secretary of War in 1943 establishing restricted and prohibited areas for military purposes arising out of the activities of the Patuxent Naval Air Station.

(b) The total sum appropriated by this Act is the amount found by the Court of Claims, acting pursuant to Senate Resolution 309, Eighty-third Congress, second session, to be equitably due the said G. W. Todd and Lloyd Parks as a result of the action of the Secretary of War referred to in subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 25 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJOR C. TODD, JR., AND ESTATE OF IRA T. TODD, SR.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2450) for the relief of Major C. Todd, Jr., and the estate of Ira T. Todd, Sr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Major C. Todd, Junior, the sum of $11,620, and (2) the estate of Ira T. Todd, Senior, the sum of $11,620. The payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of Major C. Todd, Junior, and Ira T. Todd, Senior (deceased), against the United States for the loss of their exclusive right of pound-net fishing off the western shore of Cedar Point, Maryland, as a result of certain regulations issued by the Secretary of War in 1943 establishing restricted and prohibited areas for military purposes arising out of the activities of the Patuxent Naval Air Station.

(b) The total sum appropriated by this Act is the amount found by the Court of Claims, acting pursuant to Senate Resolution 308, Eighty-third Congress, Second Session, to be equitably due the said Major C. Todd, Junior, and Ira T. Todd, Senior, as a result of the action of the Secretary of War referred to in subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 25 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF PENSION PLAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2953) relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building & Common Laborers' Union of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is limited strictly to the subject matter; that is, there are no extraneous amendments or material in this bill?

Mr. LANE. That is correct; and it has the approval of the Treasury.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the pension plan of Local Union Numbered 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America, which was negotiated to take effect May 1, 1960, pursuant to an agreement between such union and the Building Trades Employers Association of Rochester, New York, Incorporated, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501 (a) of such Code, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under such section 501 (a), for the period beginning May 1, 1960, and ending April 20, 1961, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. WILLIAM A. CARTER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3394) for the relief of Lt. Col. William A. Carter, U.S. Air Force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William A. Carter, lieutenant colonel, United States Air Force (3019A), is relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $2,793.21, representing the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by him for the period from June 23, 1942, through August 29, 1961, while he was serving as a member of the United States Army and the United States Air Force, such overpayment having been made as a result of administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States or his designee shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, of the Army, Navy, and Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in section 1 of this Act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of those officers or agents for payments which are found to be free from fraud and collusion.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said William A. Carter, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in section 1 of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENTRY OF CERTAIN PERSONS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have an explanation of what this bill proposes?

Mr. WALTER. The amendments that were put in the Senate bill in the House provided for the naming of a person occupying the position of head of a Bureau of Consular Affairs to be designated as an Assistant Secretary of State. The Senate would not accept this proposal because they said it was in effect creating an additional Secretary of State. That is not the fact.

The second objection was the date we set in the bill for the adjustment of the status of civilians illegally in the United States. The Senate bill provided the date of December 1952, and our bill was 1940. The amendment moved it back to 1940.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the amendment with respect to the naming of an individual as an Assistant Secretary of State is out of the bill or in the bill?

Mr. WALTER. No; it is in the bill. That is the principal item on which we are going to conference.

Mr. GROSS. Why confer the title of Assistant Secretary of State upon this individual? The office has been operated in the past with an individual who has had the compensation of an Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. WALTER. May I read the language of the act creating this position, section 104(b) of the existing Walter-McCarren Act:

> There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, to be headed by an administrator (with an appropriate title to be designated by the Secretary of State), with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State.

All this amendment we proposed did was to say "to be headed by an administrator—with the title of Assistant Secretary of State—with rank and compensation" and so on. So that actually we are merely supplying the title for an officer who is now performing the duties of an Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. GROSS. Does this in any way increase the emoluments of this office?

Mr. WALTER. No, it does not increase the compensation. The only thing that the amendment does is give him a title. It does not provide for another Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. GROSS. It does not increase the compensation or other costs in any way?

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. GROSS. Will this by any chance provide him with a Cadillac, a Chrysler Imperial, or a Lincoln Continental and driver at taxpayer expense?

Mr. WALTER. No, it will not.

Mr. GROSS. There is another bill or two lurking around here to create more Assistant Secretaries of State. From what I have been able to learn, there is more than an adequate number of them now in the State Department. I can see no objection to this bill because the gentleman says it will not increase the cost or compensation, it will not change the duties, it only confers a title on him. This being true, I have no objection to it. But I do have objection to granting more of them by unanimous consent on the House floor.

I serve notice now, I intend to stop these bills. They are not going to get through under unanimous consent at this stage of the session.

Mr. WALTER. I am sure the gentleman knows I would not attempt to do any such thing.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is chairman of the Immigration and Nationality Committee, in support of S. 3361. This bill facilitates the entry into the United States of skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens.

The Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 is filled with harsh regulations with no concern that the law deals with people's lives rather than merely laws and regulations. I am personally aware of the hardships that the act has caused on a large number of naturalized American citizens in my congressional district who have found it impossible to bring into this country other members of their families. This new remedy will allow entry of approximately 25,000 persons and will aid those citizens who have relatives in Italy, Portugal, and Greece.

I will continue my efforts to bring about a more complete revision of the discriminatory provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952. Our prestige abroad could be greatly enhanced if this law were liberalized for all nations to see that America welcomes on an equitable basis people from all lands who have shown a keen desire to seek an opportunity for security and well-being in our country.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania if he can advise the House whether or not the amendment adopted by the House striking the last section of the bill is in dispute with the other body?

Mr. WALTER. It is in dispute.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WALTER, FEIGHAN, CHELF, POFF, and MOORE.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader as to what part of next week's program he can give us some information on at this time?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In answer to the gentleman's inquiry:

Monday is District Day, but there will be no business on that day, and there will be no record votes on Monday which is a Jewish holy day.

There will be no legislative business.

There will be no business on the floor, but by unanimous consent only.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, the program is, as follows:

H.R. 12580, conference report, State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill for 1963.

H.R. 12276, conference report, District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1963.

H.R. 13290, conference report, supplemental appropriation bill for 1963.

H.R. 12900, conference report, public works appropriation bill for 1963.

These conference reports may not necessarily be called in the order listed, and there may be others.

May I also state to the Members, it is imperative that all Members be here on the floor prepared to stay and vote on the remaining legislation that will be up for consideration.

This announcement is, of course, subject to the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later and that conference reports not here announced may be brought up at any time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Permit me to inquire of the majority leader as to the nature of the business on Monday. I understood him to say there would be no legislative business.

Mr. ALBERT. Except if the Speaker may recognize under unanimous consent.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What will be the nature of such business?

Mr. ALBERT. I personally am not advised of any bill that will be brought up under unanimous consent.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The reason I inquire about this is that some Members are concerned about whether certain bills are going to conference or are not going to conference and I wonder what assurances we may have with respect to items of that nature that might be brought up.

Mr. ALBERT. I am now able to advise the gentleman that there will be no unanimous-consent requests on legislative matters, either to take up bills or to send bills to conference until Tuesday.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Are there any prospects of bringing up the medical facilities bill during the coming week?

Mr. ALBERT. There is no plan to bring up the medical facilities bill at this time in this session.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, and distinguished majority leader, I think we have a few bills pending that I think affect all of us, both the majority and the minority, and I want you to know, Mr. Majority Leader, and also to notify the Speaker, that we are sitting by to object to any unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

THE SITUATION IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Mississippi—a situation involving the attempts of James Meredith to be enrolled as a student at the university in compliance with the requirements of our Constitution and the orders of our courts—has once again brought forcefully to our attention the major social problem of our society. This is the problem that many of our fellow citizens have been denied a basic American right—the right of freedom of choice and the equality of man's opportunity.

What we are witnessing today, I believe, is the last major gasp of this denial—of this segregation—in the South; the end of the War Between the States; and, the end of what, without question, is the most shameful blot on our history.

We are witnessing this end, in part at least, because of the firm and courageous action of the highest constitutional officer of our land, the President of the United States. We are witnessing this end because he has, as Walter Lippmann has so aptly put it:

> Used force without bluster, never forgetting that the inevitable wounds must be helped to heal.

As President Kennedy stated in his appeal for calmness and reason to the Nation Sunday night:

> If this country should ever reach the point where any man or group of men by force or the threat of force, should long deny the commands of our courts and our Constitution, then no law would stand free from doubt, no judge would be sure of his writ, and no citizen would be safe from his neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, with this wise but forceful action in Mississippi, we have taken a further step toward insuring that equality is not merely a right for some Americans but for all, and we must continue to push forward to the end that this right extends itself—fully and completely—into every walk of our daily life.

THE HONORABLE BRENT SPENCE

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, as the legislative sands are running out and the time is getting nearer for the retirement of the dean of our Kentucky delegation, the Honorable Brent Spence, I want to take this occasion to express our respect, admiration, and love for this outstanding leader.

Congressman Spence—"Brentie," as we Kentucky Members affectionately call him—has given 30 years of faithful service to Kentucky and to the Nation. As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee since 1932 and as chairman of that committee for all but two terms of Congress since 1943, he has been intimately involved in much exceedingly important legislation. He helped write the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, the FHA mortgage insurance law, the Federal Credit Union Act, and the public housing legislation.

He was one of the authors of the wartime and postwar rent, wage, and price control laws, and helped create the Federal slum-clearance program, the generous program of loans for college dormitories, the urban renewal program, the Area Redevelopment Administration, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. He was one of the participants in the historic Bretton Woods Conference in 1944, from which came the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. Since that time, he has been an adviser to the Secretary of the Treasury at international monetary and economic conferences. While Senator Barkley carried the workload in the Senate during World War II, Mr. Spence was the keystone and bridgehead that got the job done in the House.

His is truly a monumental record of endeavor which has affected, in a most direct and vital way, the lives of millions of Americans. He has truly let his light so shine that men could see his good works and glorify our Father in heaven.

In addition to his vast capabilities and exceptionally fine and keen mind, he has a great heart and a kindly, sincere, gentle manner which has endeared him to all who know and work for and with him.

Congressman Spence has been a tower of strength and unending inspiration to those of us in his delegation. Recently, as a small token of our appreciation, we in the Kentucky delegation presented him with a gift of his office chair with an appropriate inscription engraved in solid silver attesting to our enduring affection for him. Kentucky has given the Nation many great leaders and it is with pride that our Commonwealth ranks Congressman Brent Spence with its other native son—Henry Clay, Abraham Lincoln, and Alben W. Barkley.

He is a great Kentuckian—an outstanding American, an able legislator—a splendid chairman, a fine man—a gentle soul—a Chesterfield in manners—a God-fearing, God-loving gentleman's gentleman.

I will say to you that I remember as a youngster the first Psalm in the Book of Books:

> Blessed is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners.

It ends with this sentiment:

> May his leaf never wither and whatsoever he doeth may it prosper.

May the Lord of Hosts, the King of Kings, the Master of all lodges, nations, and men in the wide blue canopy of heaven, bless and spare this dear friend and beloved dean with good health and happiness forever and a day—till the walls of time shall crumble in ruins and moulder in dust away.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHELF. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about Brent Spence we talk about one of God's noblemen. When we talk about this great and good man we talk about one of the greatest Americans who ever lived, and one of the greatest legislators who ever served in the Halls of this Congress.

Every time I see him he is an inspiration to me, carrying on his duty in the steadfast way he does despite the many years he has devoted his great capacities in the service of our country, chairman of one of the great committees of his body, always handling his bill with complete knowledge of the provisions, meaning, and the effect of the bill as reported out of his committee, and enjoying the complete respect and confidence of all of his colleagues, particularly the late Speaker, Sam Rayburn, and myself, as the present Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Books could be written about this great man, whose noble mind is a symbol of everything that is high, noble, good, and constructive. In his humble way he ennobled those who came in contact with him.

He returns to private life in his beloved State of Kentucky not only with the highest esteem, but also the affection of his colleagues. I speak the sentiments of each and every one of my colleagues in wishing for Brent Spence many years of happiness, many years of contentment. Whenever he comes back to Washington he will always be welcomed by his colleagues who served with him.

Mr. CHELF. I thank the Speaker, and I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Natcher].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the great Members of this House, Brent Spence, of Kentucky. A kind, considerate man whose unusual life has influenced his own generation and will leave its mark on generations to come. In every position that he has held he has achieved distinction. His outstanding service as a Member of this House is recognized throughout the land.

During his long career as a legislator he has always been a true friend of the working people, the farmer, the small businessman, industry, our professions, and the veterans. His service as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee has endeared him not only to the members of this great committee but to the leadership and to the Members on both sides of the aisle.

At all times he has truly represented his district and his country. At no time has he ever been accused of placing his party ahead of his country. Upon the retirement of my friend, Brent Spence, as a Member of this body, the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the United States will give up the services of a great statesman and leader.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues from Kentucky and with all of the Members of the House in wishing the best of everything to our friend, Brent Spence, in his retirement. May he have many happy years of peace and contentment.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] who is next in line and who will inherit the toga this great and outstanding American and able Kentuckian will leave to him and to posterity.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to pay tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable Brent Spence, on the occasion of his retirement from public office after more than 30 years of service in the House of Representatives. If I should be so fortunate as to become chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee as suggested was probable by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Chelf], I shall never be able to fill the shoes of Congressman Spence, in the statesmanlike manner and in such an able, effective way that he filled them. I realize my efforts in that event would be weak and feeble in comparison to the demonstrated ability of the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman Spence.

These crowded years of crises and war, of sacrifice and victory, in which his role was so significant, have won for him in his district, in his State, in his country, and all over the world, the respect, the admiration, and the wholehearted affection of his constituents and his countrymen, his legislative colleagues, and diplomats and government leaders and officials at home and abroad.

Those of us who know him well and long and intimately feel that from the moment of his appearance in the House—as the Representative from the 6th District of his State in the 72d Congress, and afterward from the 5th District, in the 74th and succeeding Congresses—down to the present hour, he has upheld the noblest standards of legislative integrity and statesmanship.

THIS IS A LIFE THAT CASTS HONOR ON US ALL

Now in his 88th year, having piled up distinction as a lawyer, State senator, city solicitor, and more remarkably as the people's banker in the area of Federal legislation, he has above all carved a niche for himself in the roster of greatness among the patriots who have served their country in these halls.

The gentleman from Kentucky, BRENT SPENCE, ascended to the chairmanship of the Committee on Banking and Currency on December 3, 1943, an assignment of immense responsibility and meaningfulness for the Nation and the world, which he fulfilled with notable leadership, diplomatic skill, and granite honesty. Thus experience and native genius in a highly specialized field contributed to make him the wisest and the soundest incumbent for the post. This evaluation the documented record confirms by the demonstrated impartiality, the judicial eminence, and the technical mastery of his decisions.

Although his life goes well back into the previous century, he combined knowledge and respect for the past with an understanding of the profoundly changing aspects of the new century. He gave his countrymen the benefit of progressive judgments that seized upon and made the most of the new arresting and extraordinary opportunities for the betterment of mankind. No history can be written of the vast legislation of the President Franklin Delano Roosevelt era and what came after, without due regard for the brilliance, the foresight, and the courage, of the recipient of this plaque.

In the quality of his performance, on the legislative level, in the banking field, it may truly be said of him that he implemented the best thinking inherent in such agencies, laws, and institutions he helped to establish, as the Bretton Woods Agreements Act of 1945; the Housing Act of 1949; the Defense Production Act of 1950; the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951; and the Bank Holding Company Acts of 1956 and 1959.

The 16 years of his notable chairmanship can be read in the thoughtful legislation that helped in the Nation's recovery or near recovery from a complex of economic problems sometimes reaching the proportions of national disaster. His work touched a world of massive need with giant uplift through finance. It was legislation that worked its good through the social and economic fabric of the Nation. It manifested itself in legislative endeavors already broadly listed and in many others from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to Federal elimination of slums, emergency economic controls, and the correction of abuses in banking operations. There was the Export-Import Bank, U.S. participation in the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. The people at the lower rungs of the economic ladder in our country felt the fruits of the work of this committee under the Spence chairmanship.

One of the foremost banking minds in the United States, lucrative and inviting positions of financial power were open to him. But we, the undersigned, believe that love of country, a talent for politics, faith in the democratic process and an understanding of its uniqueness, kept him by his own choice at or near the helm of great events in the years of a life lived on the grand scale of services to his countrymen.

HOUSE DOCUMENT ABOUT CHAIRMAN SPENCE SOON AVAILABLE

Yesterday, the House of Representatives adopted my Resolution 819 to print as a House document with illustrations and suitable binding the transcript of the proceedings in the Committee on Banking and Currency of Thursday, September 27, 1962, incident to the presentation of a portrait of the gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, to the Committee on Banking and Currency. They should be available soon.

On the human and personal side we wish him to know that whether he remains in the Capital with his multitude of friends here, or returns to his beloved Kentucky, we shall always cherish his friendship and his counsel. We shall never forget his Chesterfieldian manners, his classic yet homespun erudition, and the charm and humor of a warm personality that bestowed so much dignity on the House of Representatives and afforded so much genuineness of character and comradeship to us all.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF], and the other Members who have spoken, in paying tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that I served as a secretary to a Member of Congress back in the days just before World War II and during the early part of that war. I can recall the very great service the gentleman from Kentucky performed in those days.

I know that Mr. SPENCE, as Mr. CHELF mentioned a moment ago, largely shepherded through this House much of the wartime economic legislation. It so happens that I served with Congressman Eliot, of Massachusetts, who was a close personal friend of Mr. SPENCE. I know they worked together on some of the most important price control and other legislation that laid the economic foundation for mobilizing our resources as successfully as we did in World War II and that helped prevent what might otherwise have been a dangerous runaway inflation.

It has been a great privilege for me in later years to have had the opportunity of serving also as a colleague of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], and so I join with my colleagues in wishing him health, happiness, and a long life in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STUBBLEFIELD].

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes have been accorded my fellow Kentuckian, Judge BRENT SPENCE. Many more well deserved words of praise will be forthcoming as Judge SPENCE voluntarily retires this year from his position as Representative from the Fifth District of Kentucky. I deem it an honor to add to this most richly deserved accolade.

BRENT SPENCE has served in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1931, which is longer consecutive service than any other Member from the State of Kentucky. During this term of service he has spent 16 years as chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency where he has been a key figure in the enactment of legislation beneficial to every segment of society.

Without listing his numerous legislative accomplishments which have been of such tremendous benefit to all Americans, suffice it to say that BRENT SPENCE has dedicated his wisdom and energy to the betterment of our society. His fine efforts on behalf of all the people have become welded into living testimony which surely must gladden the heart of this fine gentleman. He need only look about him to realize that those things for which he has fought and which he supported have become reality.

We recognize the contribution the dean of our Kentucky delegation has made in his 32 years of service in the U.S. Congress. But our recognition will pale in comparison to the heartfelt thanks of millions of Americans who have been helped in the past and who will continue to benefit from the service rendered his country by BRENT SPENCE of Kentucky.

I am grateful for the privilege and high honor of having been permitted to serve with this fine gentleman and great American.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join the other Members who have spoken in praise of the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

During the past 8 years, I have had the privilege of serving with Chairman SPENCE on the House Banking and Currency Committee. This association has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my entire life.

Chairman BRENT SPENCE has one of the keenest minds in the U.S. Congress. In his three decades of service in this assembly, he has prepared and guided legislation from proposal into law during the administrations of four Presidents.

Chairman SPENCE conducted the affairs of the Banking and Currency Committee with fairness, dispatch, and with dignity. When discussions became tense, as they sometimes did, the chairman would calm the turbulence with an old Kentucky story which pointed squarely at the point at issue. He strived for unanimous reports on legislation and usually achieved his goal.

I hope Chairman SPENCE will take advantage of the opportunity to relax awhile, and then make ready to resume the public work to which he is so devoted. I hope that he will be available for counsel and advice to either the Congress or to the administration in the difficult monetary problems which lie ahead. We need his friendly counsel much more than he needs retirement.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I rise today to say I am glad to have this opportunity, though I regret the occasion, to bid goodbye to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, my chairman, as he retires from this august body.

Mr. Spence commenced his life of public service in Congress at an age when most men contemplate a surcease from labor. He has been a most helpful and considerate committee chairman as well as an outstanding one. In the field of banking and currency, many measures are complicated and involved, but his ability to analyze the salient points and to clarify the difficult parts have been of inestimable value to the Members serving with him.

His leadership will be missed as well as his gentlemanly conduct and kindness of spirit.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the American Congress is losing a great leader and the Democratic Party is losing one of its most faithful stalwarts as our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, retires from this body.

Since I came to Congress in 1944 and took a seat on the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, has been my chairman. Over the years I have been inspired by his honest beliefs and his earnest efforts in behalf of legislation to make our citizens more secure and our Nation stronger.

The principles for which the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, has fought in the Congress are fundamental to democracy and from these principles have come statute upon statute which have given our people more economic security than any nation has ever known.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, has led some of the toughest legislative battles ever fought in Congress. He pioneered the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which wove the fabric for our other international monetary programs now in operation. He was a stalwart in the first hurdle to bring better housing to Americans, the Housing Act of 1949. In the years that I have been chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, on many occasions the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, has gone to bat for legislation to help our people obtain homeownership, to clean up our cities, and to provide a better way of life for millions of Americans.

He has been a worthy successor to the great Kentuckians who have made such contributions to our Nation as Henry Clay and Alben W. Barkley.

As the son of a colonel in the Confederate Army, the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, has also proudly borne his southern heritage and I would like my colleagues to know the deep esteem and affection that the people of the South hold for him.

We who have served long with him at the helm of our committee will sorely miss his counsel and his leadership. I join those who hope that he will visit with us often and continue to share the vast store of knowledge and ability with which he is endowed and which he has so wisely used to help make the world a better place.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, long before coming to Congress the capacity and ability of my beloved and honored colleague and friend, the Honorable Brent Spence, was well known to me. He had stamped indelibly his name in banking circles and the mark of his legislative efforts had branded with goodness folks from every walk of life.

Brent Spence is a man of principle, of courage, and of conviction, with a heart as big as the man. Benefits flowing from his graciousness, his gentlemanly qualities, his kindness, and his benevolence have been widespread amongst the folks of all Kentucky.

His parental attitude toward the newcomers to the Kentucky delegation was a source of immeasurable help. His wisdom and experience in congressional matters have been of substantial assistance to me, as I know they have been to all other Members of the delegation in breaking in.

I am filled with dual emotions. On the one hand, I feel that the Nation, Congress, and the Commonwealth will be hard pressed to adequately and effectively fill his chairmanship—knowing him as I do, I feel I can commit him as being ready to serve as a need might arise. On the other hand, the pastures are open and I know they will be green and filled with happiness. It is with affection that I bid him adieu from the Halls of Congress, but it is also with affection and sincerity that I tell him the latchstring of my office is always in his pocket.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the many that have been speaking with praise about the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee will retire from Congress at the close of this session. He first came here in 1930 and has remained without a break longer than anyone in the history of his State.

From the moment he entered the Congress right down to the present day, the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman Spence, has consistently displayed those qualities of leadership and integrity which have made him one of the most respected and influential legislators in these Halls. His counsels have been heeded with great care.

No history of the legislation of the Roosevelt and Truman eras and the years following could be written without prominent mention of this great legislator. He ascended to the chairmanship of the Banking and Currency Committee in 1943. The period of his chairmanship has been one of notable progress. His efforts have greatly effected and improved the domestic economy, and all Americans have been benefited by his work. His influence has extended to a worldwide scale by his pioneer efforts in the area of international finance.

In my years of service with him on the committee I have admired his capacity for leadership. He consistently utilized his great powers of persuasion and logic, usually with success. When an impasse was reached he would break it by a telling argument. The House will lose a great leader and the American people a great servant when the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, retires. And I personally shall miss his wise counsel in the years to come. Certainly, his character, his nobility of spirit, his superb performance and his gentle manner shall remain an inspiration to us all.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade I have had the privilege and the pleasure of working on the House Banking and Currency Committee with my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, the Honorable Brent Spence. His tenure as chairman of this committee has been long and distinguished.

My first impression of him as chairman has proven itself correct over the years. He has brought to the committee a personal warmth and good will that has enabled us to work with high ideals and goals throughout a period in our Nation's history that has been demanding in depth and scope of the problems presented for solution.

The people of his district, the fifth district of Kentucky, have been exceptionally fortunate in having a man such as Brent Spence as their Representative in Congress. No less have the citizens of his country benefited by his devoted activity in Congress. We have not always agreed in our approaches to the problems confronting the committee, but I have never failed to find him a sympathetic and understanding chairman, willing to listen to the problems and proposals of all committee members.

It is to his credit that in times of great decision the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, has put his Nation above party. His leadership and friendship will be missed by all of us, but the standard of achievement and service he has set will continue to inspire us in the years to come. I join my colleagues in wishing the gentleman from Kentucky, Brent Spence, a full and rich life in the future, and I know that, though he may retire from this body, his country will still receive the benefit of his wisdom and experience in the days to follow.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have this opportunity to express my appreciation to the Honorable Brent Spence for his years of dedicated public service. I was privileged to serve under Chairman Spence for 4 years as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. His vast knowledge of our complex financial laws was a tremendous asset to our country and an inspiration to us all. I learned to appreciate his wisdom and unfailing devotion to the highest ideals of our country.

Chairman Spence's contribution to his country, the Congress, and his constituents, will long leave its mark. He will be sorely missed. I only hope that he can be prevailed upon to lend his expert advice and assistance when we are confronted with an intricate monetary problem.

I wish him Godspeed.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I will miss the great chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, to whose committee I was appointed on my election to Congress, first term, 1960. His consistent kindnesses were appreciated by me then, and I regret that advancing age and infirmities have forced his retirement from the Congress that he has graced for so many years. I have learned a lot from him, and I hope to return to take advantage of some of the lessons.

Other members of the committee, who have served so much longer, have been more intimate over the years, but my impressions of Mr. BRENT SPENCE will be as lasting as theirs.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the adjournment of the 87th Congress we are brought to the awareness that one of our congressional stalwarts will not return for the next session. The gentleman from Kentucky, BRENT SPENCE, longtime chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has made the voluntary decision not to seek reelection, and thus he brings to a conclusion 30 years of dedicated service to his congressional district, to his State, and to his Nation.

During my tenure in Congress, I have had the opportunity of serving on the Banking and Currency Committee and thereby being exposed to the guidance and leadership of its outstanding chairman. From this point of vantage, I have observed the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] in action. I have noted his skill, tact, and insight as he steered the course of legislation that comes under the jurisdiction of his committee. I have watched as his ideas and ideals developed into the law of the land. His understanding of the needs of the people, coupled with his powers of persuasion, has enabled him to chart the direction of financial legislation for the last quarter of a century. The soundness of our financial institutions are in many respects a tribute to his vision and foresight.

Further, I have followed him from the committee room across the street to the well of this Chamber. I have observed with respect and admiration his keenness of mind and clarity of expression as he presented to this body the issue contained in proposed legislation emanating from his committee. His capacity to absorb and retain detailed facts contributed much to mark him as one of the able debaters of this era.

While I have not always agreed with the gentleman from Kentucky's [Mr. SPENCE] political philosophy, this does not dim my high regard for his qualities of statesmanship. I am not unmindful of his characteristics of charm and graciousness usually attributed to the true Kentucky gentleman, which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] possesses in great abundance. The House is losing one of its truly great figures.

As many of you may know, the committee has placed an oil portrait of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] in a place of prominence in the committee room, so that his spirit will be an inspiration to the members of the committee who continue to follow the guidelines which he laid down during his long years of public service.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying a tribute of honor and respect to the gentleman from Kentucky, Hon. BRENT SPENCE, who is soon to retire from his labors here in Congress and participate in some well-deserved rest and quietude out there in the realm of the unknown future.

BRENT SPENCE is a man of honor, dignity, character, and compassion. To know him is to love him, and certainly he has made his very lasting and most valuable contribution to all those lives he has touched both here in Washington and back in Kentucky. The Bible tells us in one verse of the Scriptures that "a good man out of the treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things." Congressman SPENCE has brought forth many good things out of the rich treasure of his kind and generous heart. It is fitting also to say that the magnitude of this man's mind matches the goodness of his heart. During these last few years we remember that his steps have been faltering at times. Yet his mind has continued right on to scintillate with erudition and those qualities of abiding culture that have characterized him in his former years. Someone said, "My mind to me a kingdom is." And if a man's mind can in reality be his kingdom, then the Spence domain has been one of rich proportions during the long years of his personal and political pilgrimage.

Both Republicans and Democrats honor this man, both northern and southern Kentuckians pay him homage, and all of us in total unison and with our spirits harmonized in complete accord wish for BRENT SPENCE the happiness and longevity that may be allotted to him by the Master of all good Congressmen, the Lord of Hosts, the God of our great Nation.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to a statesman who has served this House and our country faithfully and well for many years. I want to express my personal good wishes to the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, BRENT SPENCE, who is retiring from Congress after a truly impressive period of public service.

The gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman SPENCE, has conducted the work of the House Committee on Banking and Currency with a combination of firmness and gentlemanliness which has made our committee a most effective one in the handling of important legislation. It has been a pleasure to serve with him, and an inspiration to learn from him.

The laws of our country contain innumerable important enactments guided through Congress during periods of peace and war by the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman SPENCE, to make this a better, a stronger, and a more prosperous nation. The Defense Production Act, the many housing laws, export control legislation, banking legislation of all kinds, and other vital measures have been enacted into law largely, in many instances, because of the skill and knowledge and ability and prestige of the gentleman from Kentucky—a gentleman in every sense of the word, and a man whose friendship is to be treasured by all who are fortunate enough to enjoy it. When he retires from Congress, he takes with him our love and our respect for an outstanding career.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, for 14 of the 18 years that I have served on the Banking and Currency Committee, it has been my pleasure and privilege to serve under the chairmanship of our able and distinguished colleague, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky.

Many of them were troublesome years for our country. Much legislation, and much of it highly controversial, was enacted into law as a result of the unfailing devotion to high purpose with which Chairman SPENCE steered the legislation through the committee and the Congress. The statutes of our country are etched deep with the contributions he has made to legislation for the benefit of our people.

I am certain that the dignity and devotion with which BRENT SPENCE conducted the chairmanship of the Banking and Currency Committee will long remain as a continuing beneficial force in the operations of our committee. The imprint of this great American will remain with us even as he enjoys his well-earned retirement.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pause and pay tribute to a distinguished Member of this body who will be retiring in January after a long and outstanding record of public service. BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky, has served his district, his State, and the Nation faithfully for 32 years.

It has been a privilege for me to be associated with him in his capacity as chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. As a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, it has been most gratifying for me to serve under a chairman widely recognized for his cooperative bipartisan approach to the problems we have had to face in the committee.

As he leaves the House, I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating him for his fine record as a Member of the House of Representatives, and wishing him every future happiness.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege for me to join with my colleagues of the House of Representatives in paying tribute to a great American—a kindly man—a courageous man. I speak of my chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, BRENT SPENCE.

All of us who have served on the great Committee on Banking and Currency with this brilliant statesman know of his unequaled contribution as a legislator; of his great service to his country and to his constituents.

It was indeed a great pleasure to have had the opportunity to serve with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

I sincerely wish for him a long continued happy and good life.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join with many others in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to my friend and colleague, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE. It has been a keen source of pleasure to have served with Chairman SPENCE on the House Committee on Banking and Currency during the 87th Congress. As a freshman Member of Congress, I am only sorry that my association with him has been much too brief. However, in this short period of time, I have plainly seen a true exhibition of devotion and dedication to strong personal principles and ideals. He so richly deserves the heartfelt thanks of everyone for his untiring public service, and we will certainly miss his presence here in Congress. It is my sincerest wish that his retirement will bring many years of good health, good fortune, and happiness.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when I came as a freshman to the 81st Congress it was my good fortune to be assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency where I had the enriching experience of association with the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, the great chairman of that committee. I again served on the Banking and Currency Committee in the 83d Congress and my admiration and my affection for this legislative giant deepened with every passing day. It is difficult for me to contemplate the convening of the 88th Congress without the presence of this great American who has left an imprint upon the laws of his country that insures the inclusion of his name on any list of the alltime greats of the Congress.

From the bottom of my heart I wish for him every blessing of health and contentment and of continuing usefulness in the years of his retirement. No man has ever served his country with greater dedication. No man has more fully earned his place in the history of the Congress.

I shall forever be grateful to him for the many kindnesses that he bestowed upon me when I served on the Banking and Currency Committee. In the 81st Congress I was the lowest ranking majority member of the committee, of which the Honorable BRENT SPENCE was chairman, but the human touch, the kindliness, the innate democracy of BRENT SPENCE made me feel at home and as welcome as though I had been a member of the committee family all my life.

God bless BRENT SPENCE.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most unfortunate factors of this Congress is the impending retirement of the Honorable BRENT SPENCE. I have been fortunate to serve under him during my term of office and know that his departure will leave a great gap to be filled. We wish him well as he enters private life after an illustrious career of public service but I am sure that that service will continue even though he will no longer be a Member of the House.

BRENT SPENCE has been one of the great legislators of this Congress and one of the great men of the House. During my term of office and my service on the Banking and Currency Committee, of which he is chairman, I have often turned to him for the guidance, the advice and the consultation of an experienced and knowledgeable Member of the House.

The record of BRENT SPENCE is one that has brought credit to him and credit to the Nation. In the past few days my colleagues have spoken of the legislative record of BRENT SPENCE, and I have listened with awe, for much of the economic legislation of the past 20 years, as well as the needed wartime measures, have been the result of his work, his interests, and his responsibilities to his constituents and to the Nation.

Committees have not always had the leadership of a man with such a deft hand and an active mind. Committees have not always been chaired by men of such character and personal integrity. Seldom have we had the opportunity to pay tribute to a man of such stature as BRENT SPENCE. His native Kentucky has just cause to be proud of its son and the Nation can be proud of having men such as BRENT SPENCE serving in the Halls of Congress. We wish him the best that life can provide and that he will spend many more years as a symbol of the best in America.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to extend my personal good wishes to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, who has announced his plans for retirement. It has been my great privilege to serve on the Committee on Banking and Currency under the chairmanship of Mr. SPENCE for the past 4 years. During this time I have come to understand why he has been held in such esteem by his colleagues and his constituents.

His wisdom, fairness, and patience in meeting his responsibilities have won for him the respect and affection of those who served with him. His great legislative accomplishments, during war and peace, will long be manifested in the laws of our country.

His impressive record of public service certainly entitles him to a happy and successful retirement. I join with my colleagues in extending him every good fortune.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NO UGLY AMERICAN HERE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just read of the recent retirement of Albion Patterson from the position of Director of the Agency for International Development Mission in Argentina.

I bring this retirement to the attention of the House not only because I want to emphasize the contribution that Mr. Patterson has made as an outstanding public servant, but also because his work and his devotion to duty are characteristic of so many of our aid technicians and Foreign Service personnel.

Too often, we Members of Congress criticize the inefficient, the negligent, and the foolish performances of the executive branch, but fail to emphasize the dedicated, the efficient, and the patriotic.

Of course, we should continue to point out the failings and the defects in performance in any of our great national programs and seek to remedy them. That is our congressional and legislative duty and will contribute to the effectiveness of these programs. On the other hand, we should also direct public attention to constructive and effective performance so that our programs may be considered in proper perspective.

If we do not emphasize the good whenever possible, the public will gain a distorted picture of Government servants and programs and will make easier the creation and dissemination of mythical but damaging lore concerning American public servants such as that contained in "The Ugly American" which has no basis in fact and makes it more difficult for the U.S. public to understand our mutual security programs.

Albion Patterson first went to work for the United States in 1939 in the Government Agricultural Marketing Agency. He served thereafter the Board of Economic Warfare. In 1942, he turned his attention to Latin America and became employed by the Institute of Latin American Affairs. He served as program officer at Asunción, Director of Technical Cooperation to Paraguay and subsequently in FOA, ICA, and AID in Buenos Aires. He was named Director of the USOM in Argentina in 1958.

Mr. Patterson's work was significant for several reasons. First of all, he believed that relatively inexpensive technical assistance programs could help an underdeveloped country as much as expensive prestige projects. This he demonstrated by the Operation Beef program in Argentina which was devoted to eliminating the foot-and-mouth disease and was financed largely from Public Law 480-generated currency. This program worked in an area of inestimable benefit to Argentina, yet, cost relatively little.

Mr. Patterson also believed in phasing out our technical assistance programs when they had demonstrated their utility. In this he was not copied by some of his brethren who preferred to become empire builders within their agency.

He also believed in the concentrated use of experts for short periods of time as a means of setting highly qualified guidance and performance at less expense to the Government. Although this proposal has not fully demonstrated its usefulness, it is worthy of serious consideration.

It is a pleasure, therefore, to say "well done" to Albion Patterson, and through him to express our too-often neglected gratitude to thousands of similarly dedicated public servants in our foreign operations throughout the world.

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY CYRUS VANCE PLEDGES TO ELIMINATE ATHLETIC PROFESSIONALISM IN WEST POINT RECRUITING PROCEDURES

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the House may remember that some weeks ago I exercised my prerogative as a Member of Congress to object to immediate approval of H.R. 7913, a bill to authorize additional cadets for the U.S. Military and Air Force Academies, in the form in which it came back from the other body, and instead to send the bill to conference.

I took this action, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated at the time, because I was not at all satisfied with the response made by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army to certain evidence, which I placed in the Congressional Record and which I also made available directly to the Secretary of Defense, of improprieties in the nature of athletic professionalism involved in recruiting practices for West Point. As I said at the time, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to hold the feet of the Department to the fire by delaying a bill they were eagerly pressing to have adopted. As I said, perhaps if the bill they wanted were slowed down a bit they might pause and reconsider the evidence I had given them and might find it possible to give some serious thought to the damage that has been done and could continue to be done if the selection of cadets whose education is to be paid for by the taxpayers in the expectation of training qualified career officers of our military services is allowed to be left in the hands of athletic coaches running around the corridors of Congress.

The bill that the Army wanted, H.R. 7913, would have provided some 50 more openings per year in West Point to be filled by the Army authorities themselves, without congressional control. It is true that the other body added a number of amendments to H.R. 7913, largely as a result of the efforts of Senator Long of Louisiana, which would have placed limitations on the actions of the Army in filling these new vacancies, and to that extent might have curbed somewhat the fantastic activities which the evidence I put in the Record some time ago revealed has been going on in recruiting for West Point. But it was quite clear to me that no mere bill could ever have cleaned up these improper practices, unless and until the Army's top echelon, its top civilian leadership, was really determined to clean them up and was really determined to enforce such corrective features as the Senate had added to H.R. 7913.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to advise the House, that this action on my part has now had its effect.

Shortly after taking the action I took I had a call from the new Secretary of the Army, Mr. Cyrus Vance, and subsequently conferred with both him and with the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Barksdale Hamlett. As a result of that conference I am now satisfied that the top officials of the Army appreciate the seriousness of the problem that exists and are indeed determined to do something about it.

I had deferred making this statement, Mr. Speaker, until the bill, H.R. 71913, came back from conference. Apparently that bill is not to come out of conference after all. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to include in the Record a letter which I received from Secretary Vance confirming some of the understandings reached in our personal conference. I ask unanimous consent to include the Secretary's letter at the conclusion of my remarks and I merely want to add that I believe the Secretary deserves to be given the opportunity to demonstrate that, in the way he has outlined in this letter he can end once and for all an athletic professionalism that can have no proper place in any U.S. service academy.

The letter follows:

Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C. August 16, 1962.

Hon. Samuel S. Stratton,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Stratton: Confirming our conversation of August 16, the following actions have been taken by the Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy, to preclude the recurrence of improper counseling of candidates for admission by representatives of the Academy:

Mr. George Hunter was reprimanded for his conduct in the case of Robert L. DeLuca.

The Superintendent reaffirmed the role that athletic coaches may properly play in dealing with prospective candidates. The coaches were advised that appointments are governed by law; that candidates should seek nominations from authorized sources; that no guarantees of admission could be given. Further, coaches were advised that, in the final analysis, the Academic Board of the Academy must pass on the qualifications of all candidates and that unauthorized representation by members of the coaching staff constitutes a serious breach of conduct.

In a memorandum to the Additional Appointments Committee of the Academic Board (which recommends qualified candidates to fill otherwise unfilled vacancies), the Superintendent emphasized that their evaluations must be governed by a consideration of the candidates' total qualifications—academic performance, leadership accomplishments, physical aptitude, and extracurricular talents.

I will give the matter of appointments to the Military Academy my further personal attention and will take whatever additional action may be required.

Sincerely,

Cyrus R. Vance,
Secretary of the Army.

COOPERATION OF OUR ALLIES NEEDED TO CUT OFF TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have gained the cooperation of some of our allies to cut off trade with Cuba. But apparently others still do not want to recognize the fact that we consider any assistance to Communist Cuba as a direct affront to us.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all Americans were shocked to learn that Great Britain has today said they will not help us. This action is even more unrealistic when we realize that the British too have an interest in the security of the Caribbean area, through British Honduras, the Bahamas, and the Commonwealth nations of Jamaica and Trinidad.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we called on our friends to stand with us or call on them to let us know they will stand with us when it counts. We know where West Germany stands. They were the first to agree to cooperate and they did so with dispatch. We know where Norway stands. And there was never any doubt that Turkey would be with us, as they were in Korea. They are a brave people who live on the very edge of Russia.

The question before us today is where does England stand? Where does Greece stand? Where does France stand?

Mr. Speaker, action by the Congress of the United States puts the world on notice that we will consider as a threat to our security and our vital interests any further shipments to Cuba. Those who persist in aiding Russia in the Cuban buildup are by this very act themselves threatening our security and acting against our vital interests. We should treat them accordingly.

ARE WE GOING TO ANCHOR OR SAIL?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, not long ago the American people were asked the question "Are We Going To Anchor Down or Sail?" Today I would like to ask the man who propounded that question how we can either sail a straight course or find a safe harbor when the helmsman has abandoned the wheel and gone off on a frolic of his own?

I am sure that every Member here today had campaign plans of importance to himself and to his friends and supporters. We have canceled those plans to be at our post of duty in this House.

But the man who wanted so much to play captain is not on board today. He has jumped ship, although much urgently needed legislation might yet be moved if he would practice some of the personal leadership about which he preached.

Today might have been a good time for him to exhibit a little of that spirit of sacrifice for the country about which we have heard so much and seen so little.

ATTACK ON DICK NIXON UNFORTUNATE

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in a special order, the House was treated to the most obvious example of the double standard used by liberals which could be imagined. Several Members of this House took part in a most unfortunate attack on a great American, Dick Nixon. Did they do it directly? No. Did they produce real facts? No. Charging him with insinuation and smear, they, in my judgment fell for the very tactics that they charged against our former Vice President. It is very interesting to note that those who follow the American Civil Liberties Union brand of "ground rules" refuted them completely by using every conceivable type of guilt by association to attack Dick Nixon. Here are a few examples:

> * * * there is strong evidence that the law firm of former Vice President Richard Nixon had close connections with.
>
> Are we to believe that Richard Nixon was just naive, a helper of hometown industry or was he a knowing advocate of Malaxa's scheme? Can he still plead ignorance as a defense when we know that his partner, Bewley, and his original political backer, Herman Perry, were directors and officers?

Now it would be rather dangerous to build a case on guilt by association. If I were to use their criteria I could just as easily blame LYNDON JOHNSON for the Billie Sol Estes affair. He wrote a letter which was probably no more than what any Senator or Congressman would do for a constituent and yet our liberal friends use as a part of their attack on Dick Nixon the fact that he wrote a letter in behalf of an industry which had as its treasurer a man who may or may not be a bad one in the sense of the TV western series.

After pointing out that Mr. Nixon had written a letter in behalf of this company, it is asked:

> Were there phone calls also, conferences?

The same question could be asked of Vice President JOHNSON in regards to Estes. I do not believe that I would do that, however.

The heading placed on the special order "Nixon-Malaxa Ties," should make us a little suspect at the very start. The "ties" are indeed weak. On that point, I do not know Nicola Malaxa but he is referred to in one place as a "Fascist tool of the Soviet Government" and I do know that that takes some doing.

In another place we see the olive branch slightly extended when it is said of Mr. Nixon that—

> It is believed that he was not an active member of the firm by 1952; however, his name remained on the door, on the building directory as being a member of the firm.

On the whole, however, the epithets are there which have characterized the 10-year campaign of America's left against my good friend, Dick Nixon. Listen to a few of them:

> Was Richard Nixon the useful dupe of the cunning Malaxa or was he the knowing advocate of Malaxa's scheme?
>
> Mr. Nixon has unleashed the old Dick Nixon to spread some of his noxious Nixon poison.
>
> * * * he just smears them with insinuations.
>
> Mr. Nixon is too tricky for us to predict just how soon he will try to dodge.

It is not my purpose to question the right of these colleagues to use the floor of the House to raise doubts, cast aspersions or becloud the issue. Wide latitude is given in that area. I wonder what they and the protector of those attacked politically, the American Civil Liberties Union, would have to say if the same type of attack were unleashed against Governor Brown. I believe we all know and that should answer the matter once and for all.

RENOVATION, MODERNIZATION, AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST. GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I am introducing today has been prepared after consultations I have had with Dr. Joseph E. Cannon, director of the Rhode Island Department of Health and members of his staff.

The purpose of this bill is to give the force of law to a recent interpretation of the Hill-Burton Act which allows Rhode Island to use funds for the replacement of existing obsolete hospital beds as well as for the creation of more hospital beds. Legislation is necessary because the new interpretation—presently favorable to the needs of Rhode Island—could be changed in the future by the U.S. Public Health Service if it saw fit.

Last February, I corresponded with the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham A. Ribicoff. I pointed out that the great need of Rhode Island urban hospitals is the renovation and modernization of facilities. As of February 1, 1962, nearly one-third of the hospital beds in our State's urban areas were in obsolete and inefficient physical plants.

Now that we are benefiting from a broader interpretation of the Hill-Burton Act, we can expect this situation to significantly improve. But this interpretation and the measure I am presenting today to give it the force of law must be further extended. This bill is just the first step in a comprehensive legislative program which I shall introduce next January if I am reelected to Congress.

For the past many months, I have been doing research to establish the best possible ways to meet the problems which face Rhode Island hospitals. It is my belief that our main difficulty is a shortage of funds and that a new category must be added to the Hill-Burton Act for the renovation of obsolete hospital facilities. Legislation somewhat similar to this is now pending, but more study is needed so that the final result will be of the greatest value to Rhode Island.

While I do not expect that the bill I am introducing today can be acted upon before adjournment this year, it is my hope that this introduction will serve to stimulate interest in the problem and discussion concerning it.

The goal I am seeking is to help the people of my State by improving our hospitals so that they will be as modern and up to date as any in the Nation.

POSTAL SERVICE AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT OF 1962

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that due to prior commitments of long standing it was necessary for me to be in North Carolina on October 5 when the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 was approved by the House of Representatives.

The increase in cost of living that we have witnessed since the last Federal pay rise has placed additional financial burdens on our Government employees in the same manner it has decreased the purchasing power of all of our citizens. I would have voted for the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 had I been present on the floor of the House on October 5.

Our loyal and conscientious postal employees and other persons working in the Federal service deserve adequate compensation. I believe the heavy vote of 312 in favor of the increase with only 20 votes against it confirms my feeling that the enactment of the pay bill was justified.

INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK BILL

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that on Thursday of this week, I introduced H.R. 13340, a bill to authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to assist in the development of savings associations and building societies in countries where they do not now exist in order to accomplish improved living standards, to increase employment, and to better social and political conditions through facilities for savings and homeownership for the millions of modest but stable earning capacity.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to help alleviate serious shortages of housing in the underdeveloped areas of the world—where the free world and the rulers of communism are engaged in a titanic struggle which directly affects our American way of life. The story of unrest, revolution, poverty, and distress in Latin America and Africa is well known to all of us in this Congress. The great problem which has confronted us is the development of ways and means to alleviate human distress in the underdeveloped nations so that these millions of people will seek democratic rather than communistic solutions.

Mr. Speaker, one of the contributing factors to the political, social and economic problem of the underdeveloped areas is the tremendous shortage of decent housing in Latin America and Africa. In Latin America alone, it has been estimated that the shortage of houses exceeds 12 million dwellings while the construction of new homes throughout the continent probably does not amount to more than 200,000 homes a year. H.R. 13340 would help to alleviate this tremendous problem by authorizing the savings and loan associations in the United States to invest up to 1 percent of their assets in a proposed International Home Loan Bank which in turn would make available "seed" capital loans to new thrift organizations in the underdeveloped nations. Such funds would perform the dual role of strengthening the financial base upon which these new institutions are formed while at the same time instilling a degree of confidence in these institutions by the people in the country where they are located. The confidence factor is extremely important because it is our hope that the "seed" capital which we invest in Latin America and Africa will encourage people to invest their modest savings in these new institutions and most of these nations' private accumulation of savings is virtually unknown. Likewise, the savings capital for home mortgage loans is available only on a limited basis and on terms which would be considered nothing short of outrageous in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we will be able to hold hearings on H.R. 13340 in 1963 and that this legislation can be enacted into law. In order to stimulate study of this particular proposal, under unanimous consent, I include the following material to be printed at this point in the RECORD, including the text of H.R. 13340.

H.R. 13340

A bill to authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to assist in the development of savings associations and building societies in countries where they do not now exist in order to accomplish improved living standards, to increase employment, and to better social and political conditions through facilities for savings and home ownership for the millions of people of modest but stable earning capacity

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "International Home Loan Bank Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Bank" means the International Home Loan Bank incorporated under this Act.

(b) The term "Board" means the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

(c) The term "member", except where used with respect to a member of a Federal home loan bank, means a member of the Bank.

(d) The term "stock" means capital stock of the Bank.

INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK

SEC. 3. The Board is hereby authorized and directed to provide without regard to any other provision of law, except section 4 of the Bretton Woods Agreement Act, as amended, and provisions hereafter enacted expressly in limitation of this sentence and except as otherwise provided by the Board, for the incorporation, organization, operation, regulation, and examination of a corporation to be known as the International Home Loan Bank, which shall be under the supervision of the Board and shall be operated under the direction of a board of directors as hereinafter set forth. The Board is hereby authorized to prescribe such bylaws, rules, and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes or provisions of this Act, and any function of the Board under this Act may be exercised by regulations or otherwise. The Board shall be guided by the Department of State on those two aspects of its operations affecting foreign policy, in order that the actions taken by the International Home Loan Bank shall be consistent with the foreign policy of this Government.

SEC. 4. (a) The board of directors of the Bank shall consist of (1) twelve persons who, at the time of taking office, are citizens of the United States, and who (except for the initial directors who shall be appointed by the Board) shall be nominated and elected by the members, and (2) two ex officio directors, one to be nominated by the Secretary of the Treasury, and one to be nominated by the Secretary of State, who shall serve as advisers to the Bank concerning matters coming within the interests of the Department of the Treasury or the Department of State. Persons serving on the board of directors shall receive no compensation by reason of their service as directors. Four of the initial directors appointed to the Board shall be persons who, at the time of taking office, are presidents of Federal home loan banks. The Board shall fix the initial terms of persons appointed to the board of directors, and shall fix, and may, from time to time, alter other terms of appointive members of the board of directors, except that no such term shall be fixed for a longer unexpired period than four years. The nomination and the election of directors shall be in accordance with such provisions, including without limitation such provisions with respect to classification of members and the extent of voting rights of members and the exercise of such rights, as the Board may prescribe.

(b) The Board may provide as to (1) the eligibility and qualifications of persons for the office of director, (2) the selection and functions of a chairman of the board of directors, (3) the exercise, through meetings or otherwise, of functions of the board of directors or of any committee or body of said board or of the Bank, and (4) the nomination of directors where members fail to nominate and the appointment of directors in case of vacancies. Any function of the Board under this Act may be exercised by such person or persons as the Board may provide, and, to such extent as the Board may provide, but subject to such prohibitions, restrictions, and limitations as the Board may prescribe, any function of the Bank or of the board of directors or of the chairman thereof may be exercised by such person or persons as the Bank may provide. Any such function or any function under this Act may be exercised without regard to whether any place at which it is exercised in whole or in part is or is not within the United States or subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

CAPITAL STOCK AND MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. The Bank shall have such capital stock as the Board shall prescribe, and such stock shall be issued, and may be retired, at such times, under such circumstances, and at such price or prices as the Board may prescribe. All stock shall be without preference or priority as to dividends or assets. Stock shall be evidenced in such manner, and shall be transferable only to such extent, to such transferees, and in such manner, as the Board may prescribe.

SEC. 6. (a) Subject to such restrictions, requirements, and exceptions as the Board may prescribe, (1) stock of the Bank may be purchased or otherwise acquired and held by any Federal home loan bank or any member of a Federal home loan bank, or any State-chartered savings and loan association, or building and loan association authorized by the law of that State to be members of a Federal home loan bank, or any mutual savings bank duly chartered by any State and whose savings accounts are insured by an instrumentality of the Federal Government; and (2) while holding such stock any Federal home loan bank or any such member shall automatically be a member of the Bank.

(b) Notwithstanding and without regard to any provision of any other law, but subject to such restrictions, requirements, and exceptions as the Board may prescribe, legal authority to be a member of the Bank and to purchase or otherwise acquire and to hold stock, obligations, or other securities of the Bank is hereby conferred on any Federal home loan bank or any Federal savings and loan association, or any State chartered savings and loan association or building and loan association authorized by the law of that State to be members of a Federal home loan bank, or any mutual savings bank duly chartered by any State and whose savings accounts are insured by an instrumentality of the Federal Government, and on any other Federal home loan bank member, but nothing in this sentence shall (1) authorize any Federal home loan bank, any Federal savings and loan association or any State chartered savings and loan association, or building and loan association authorized by the law of that State to be members of a Federal home loan bank, or any mutual savings bank duly chartered by any State and whose savings accounts are insured by an instrumentality of the Federal Government, or any such Federal home loan bank member to invest any of its funds in the purchase of any such stock if, immediately after such purchase, the par value of the total amount of such stock owned by such Federal home loan bank, association, or member would exceed 1 per centum of the total capital stock, reserves, and surplus of such Federal home loan bank or 1 per centum of the assets of such association or such member; or (2) authorize any Federal savings and loan association or any such Federal home loan bank member, other than an insurance company, to invest any of its funds in the purchase of any such stock if, immediately prior to such purchase, its reserves and surplus are not at least equal to 5 per centum of its savings accounts.

OPERATIONS OF THE BANK

SEC. 7. (a) As used in this section, the term "foreign mutual thrift and home-financing institution" means an institution as to which there is outstanding a determination by the Bank that such institution (1) is a mutual institution, (2) has as primary purposes the receipt of savings and the financing of homes, and (3) does not have in the United States, or at or within any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, any office or agency, or any agent, for the receipt of savings or the making of loans, and the term "foreign home loan bank" means an institution as to which there is outstanding a determination by the Bank that such institution (1) is organized or incorporated by or under the laws of a foreign country and (2) has as a primary purpose the making of loans or advances to, or investments in, mutual institutions organized or incorporated under the laws of such country and engaged, or authorized to engage, in such country in the receipt of savings and the financing of homes.

(b) The Bank shall have (1) authority to invest in loans or advances to, or in shares, accounts, deposits, or certificates of indebtedness of, foreign mutual thrift and home financing institutions and foreign home loan banks, or in interests in any of the same; (2) all the powers and authority customary or appropriate to conduct an international banking organization to serve such institutions and banks; (3) authority to promote and assist in the establishment and development in foreign countries of mutual institutions having as primary purposes the receipt of savings and the financing of homes and the establishment and development in foreign countries of credit and financing facilities for such institutions; and (4) authority to make or procure such studies and investigations and such reports as it may deem to be necessary or appropriate to assist in the carrying out of the purposes or provisions of this Act. Funds of the Bank not invested pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection may be invested in such investments as the Board may approve.

BORROWINGS AND SECURITIES

SEC. 8. (a) The Bank is hereby authorized, upon such terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe, to borrow, to give security, to pay interest or other return, and to issue notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations, or other securities. The Bank shall not make any public offering of its obligations for sale, or sell any of its obligations otherwise than by private placement, except with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury or his designee, but the provisions of this sentence shall not be applicable to any offering or sale confined to Federal home loan banks or Federal home loan bank members or both. Any obligation or security of the Bank shall be valid and binding notwithstanding that a person or persons purporting to have executed or attested the same may have died, become under disability, or ceased to hold office or employment before the issuance thereof.

(b) Obligations of the Bank shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security, for all fiduciary, trust, and public, private, or other funds the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States, any public, private, or other corporation incorporated by or under any law of any of the foregoing, any county or municipality of any of the foregoing, any political subdivision of any of the same, any court or any corporate or other agency or instrumentality of any of the preceding, or any officer or officers, employee or employees, or agent or agents of any of the above. Nothing in the sentence next preceding shall authorize the investment of funds of any Federal Reserve bank in such obligations or securities, and nothing in said sentence shall authorize any national bank, in the exercise of any power vested in it pursuant to subsection (k) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to make any investment in contravention of any regulation of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System issued pursuant to said subsection (k).

(c) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, no provision or requirement of or under any law relating to securities, securities exchanges, investment companies, or investment advisers, or relating to indentures or agreements, or proxies or powers, with respect to securities, shall be applicable to or with respect to any stock, obligation, or other security of the Bank.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) (1) The Federal Reserve banks and the Federal home loan banks are hereby authorized to act as depositaries and fiscal or other agents of the Bank, and the Bank is hereby authorized to use them as such and to pay them compensation therefor.

(2) When designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Bank shall be a depositary of public money, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and may also be employed as fiscal or other agent of the United States, and it shall perform all such reasonable duties as such depositary or agent as may be required of it.

(b) The Bank, with the consent of and in the discretion of any department, establishment, board, commission or corporate or other instrumentality of the Government, including any field service, all of which are hereinafter referred to in this subsection as agencies, may utilize and act through any of said agencies and avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, and personnel of any of said agencies, and may pay compensation therefor, and all of said agencies are hereby authorized, at their discretion, to provide the same to the Bank as it may request. Any expenses of the Board or of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation in connection therewith, and any expenses of the Board in connection with the exercise of any function vested in or exercisable by the Board under this Act, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses. Nothing in this Act or any other provision of law shall be construed to prevent or affect the appointment, employment, or provision for compensation or benefits, as an officer, director, employee, attorney, or agent of the Bank, of any officer, director, employee, attorney, agent or member of any such agency.

(c) All notes, bonds, debentures, or other obligations of the Bank, or other securities (including stock) of the Bank, and the interest, dividends, or other income therefrom, shall be exempt from all taxation (except estate, income, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. The foregoing exemption from taxation, except as to taxation imposed by the United States, shall include exemption from taxation measured by such obligations or securities or by such interest, dividends, or other income, and from inclusion of such obligations or securities, or such interest, dividends, or other income, in the measure of any such taxation.

(d) The Bank, including its franchise, activities, capital, reserves, surplus, and income, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Bank shall be subject to State, territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed. Nothing in this subsection shall affect the applicability of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended. The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable without regard to any other law, including without limitation on the generality of the foregoing section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except laws hereafter enacted by Congress expressly in limitation of this subsection.

PENAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. (a) Except as expressly authorized by statute of the United States or by regulations of the Board, no individual or organization (except the Bank) shall use the term "International Home Loan Bank", or any combination of words including the words "International" and "Home", as a name or part thereof under which any individual or organization does any business, but this sentence shall not make unlawful the use of any name under which business is being done on the date of the enactment of this Act. No individual or organization shall use or display (1) any sign, device, or insigne prescribed or approved by the Bank for use or display by the Bank or by members of the Bank, (2) any copy, reproduction, or colorable imitation of any such sign, device, or insigne, or (3) any sign, device, or insigne reasonably calculated to convey the impression that it is a sign, device, or insigne used by the Bank or prescribed or approved by the Bank, contrary to regulations of the Bank prohibiting, or limiting or restricting, such use or display by such individual or organization. An organization violating this subsection shall for each violation be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000. An officer or member of an organization knowingly participating or knowingly acquiescing in any violation of this subsection shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. An individual violating this subsection shall for each violation be punished as set forth in the sentence next preceding this sentence.

(b) The provisions of sections 220, 658, 1011, and 1014 of title 18 of the United States Code are hereby extended to apply to and with respect to the Bank, and for the purposes of said section 658 the term "any property mortgaged or pledged" as used therein shall, without limitation on its generality, include any property subject to mortgage, pledge, or lien acquired by the Bank by assignment or otherwise. The terms "agency" and "agencies" shall be deemed to include the Bank wherever used with reference to an agency or agencies of the United States in sections 201, 202, 216, 283, 286, 287, 371, 506, 595, 602, 641, 654, 701, 872, 1001, 1002, 1016, 1017, 1361, 1505, and 2073 of said title 18. Any officer or employee of the Bank shall be deemed to be a person mentioned in section 602 of said title 18, within the meaning of section 603 of said title, and shall be deemed to be one of the officers or employees mentioned in section 602 of said title, within the meaning of section 606 of said title.

(c) The term "bank examiner or assistant examiner" as used in section 655 of said title 18 shall include any examiner or assistant examiner who is an officer or employee of the Bank and any person who makes or participates in the making of any examination of or for the Bank, and the term "bank" as used in said section 655 shall, without regard to any provision of said section with respect to membership or insurance, include the Bank and any institution examined by or for the Bank; and the last sentence of said section 655 shall not be applicable to said section 655 as extended by this sentence. The term "bank" as used in subsection (f) of section 2113 of said title 18 shall include the Bank, and any building used in whole or in part by the Bank shall be deemed to be used in whole or in part as a bank, within the meaning of said section 2113.

(d) The terms "obligation" and "security", wherever used (with or without the words "of the United States"), whether in the singular or in the plural, in sections 471 to 476, both inclusive, and section 492 of said title 18 are hereby extended to mean and to include any obligation or security of or issued by the Bank. Any reference in sections 474, 494, 495, and 642 of said title 18 to the United States, except in a territorial sense, or the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby extended to include the Bank. Section 477 of said title 18 is hereby extended to apply with respect to section 476 of said title as extended by the first sentence of this subsection (d), and for this purpose the term "United States" as used in said section 476 shall include the Bank.

(e) References in this section to sections of title 18 of the United States Code shall be deemed to be references to said sections as now or hereafter in force.

CONSTRUCTION AND SEPARABILITY

SEC. 11. Except as otherwise provided in this Act or as otherwise provided by the Board or by laws hereafter enacted by the Congress expressly in limitation of provisions of this Act, the powers and functions of the Board, the Bank, or the board of directors of the Bank shall be exercisable and the provisions of this Act shall be applicable and effective without regard to any provision of any other law. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

CONGRESSMAN MOULDER RETIRES FROM CONGRESS

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, as this session and my service in Congress draws to a close, I am filled with a mixture of emotions—happiness and regrets. Happy with the memories of the many good friends I have acquired and worked with here in Congress, but also with a feeling of genuine regret that the time has arrived when there will be a parting of the pleasant associations that have through a long period of years bound us together in true and understanding friendship.

I am voluntarily leaving at the end of this session. I decided several months ago not to seek reelection. This decision was based on redistricting and my desire to return to my private law practice in my hometown of Camdenton.

It has been a great honor and privilege to have served in the U.S. House of Representatives during the period 1948–62. The congressional district I have represented was or is referred to as a "marginal district." I succeeded a Republican Member who had served three terms, and at every general election thereafter I was the target of false attacks and vicious campaigns. Three times my margin of victory was very close when the Republican majorities ranged from 12,000 to 18,000 in the district. My success in overcoming the general political trend was due to having thousands of good and loyal personal friends who would not be deceived nor misled. I shall always be eternally grateful to those friends.

During the past 14 years of my service in Congress I have worked and voted in Congress for what I believed to be the best interests of the people. It has not been an easy job. Most certainly it has not been financially profitable. My expenses have exceeded my congressional income.

Many people erroneously assume that Members of Congress have greater power and authority than we truly have. It is regrettable that Congress has either abdicated or delegated many of its constitutional functions to the executive branch or agencies of the Federal Government. However, I am proud of the fact that my work in Congress and my services as a member of the Public Works Committee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and Committee on Un-American Activities, as the author of bills and amendments, and in hearings and investigations, has made valuable contribution to many important acts of Congress in the field of interstate commerce, especially in communications and transportation, also public works, agriculture, and legislation so essential to our national defense and security.

Continuously after my first term in Congress I have had the honor and educational experience of serving on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This committee has wide and extensive jurisdiction over legislation affecting the economic and general welfare of the people in all walks of life. Most all of the bills presented for consideration by the committee involve complex and technical subjects and problems, requiring studious concentration and understanding. In fact, each is a field of specialization and experts. OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, as chairman of the committee, surely works day and night in order to have the thorough knowledge he has of all the bills presented to the committee. Indeed we are fortunate in having OREN HARRIS as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He is one of the most brilliant and able men I have ever known. He possesses a brilliant mind and the ability to express it. He is also blessed with tact and a judicial temperament, which has enabled our committee and the House to pass more major legislation under his chairmanship in this Congress than any other committee of the Congress.

I have had the additional honor and pleasure of serving and working with another great chairman and leader of the House, FRANCIS WALTER, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. During the past 14 years we have served together on the Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee has been more responsible than any other action ever taken for alerting the people to the dangers of communism and for legislation protecting our national internal security. FRANCIS E. WALTER is a great American and a great statesman. His record of public service will always stand out as a monument far more permanent than marble. And when I recall the vicious false attacks and abuse we have been subjected to as a result of our services on the Committee on Un-American Activities, I am reminded of and agree with the great statesman, Edmund Burke, who said:

> Those who would carry on great public service must be proof against the worst fatiguing delays; the most mortifying disappointments, the most shocking insults, and, worst of all, the presumptuous judgment of the selfish interests upon their purposes.

We and our forefathers have developed a great country. We must have faith in our country and retain a strong nationalistic spirit. I deplore and resent those who scorn national pride and patriotism. It is the duty of all Americans to help preserve our American way of life. As Thomas Jefferson said:

> Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

In closing let me say again that it has been a great privilege and high honor to serve in the Congress of the United States. I express my sincere appreciation to the people of my congressional district for this great privilege. I have been honored to serve with what I consider to be the finest delegation in the Congress—the Missouri delegation. To each of them, and to all other Members of the House I express my sincere thanks for all of the courtesies which they have extended to me. I have made many fine friendships here in Congress, friendships which I shall cherish as long as I shall live.

THE 103D INFANTRY DIVISION

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago members of the 103d Army Reserve Infantry Division were advised of the official decision of the Department of the Army to "realine" the division. This decision was made at Department of Defense level. In making the decision the considered recommendations of the Department of Defense Reserve Forces Policy Board, of the General Staff—Section 5—Committee on Reserve Policy of the Department of the Army, and of the Reserve Forces Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, headed by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, [Mr. HÉBERT], were ignored. Each recommended that such "realinement" be delayed until implementation of the new ROAD division organization.

Presently located at Fort Snelling, Minn., adjoining the city of Minneapolis, are one infantry brigade headquarters; two infantry battle groups; one tank battalion and two artillery battalions.

To minimize damage to the high morale of the officers and men of the 103d, these questions should be answered promptly by the Department of Defense:

First. What is the proposed infantry, artillery, and tank troop list for the Fort Snelling area?

Second. What are the possibilities of a ROAD-type infantry brigade headquarters at Fort Snelling?

Third. What are the possibilities of an artillery group headquarters at Fort Snelling?

It makes a great deal of sense to have the aforementioned headquarters-type units at Minneapolis because of the high density population in the area and because of the excellent USAR School at Fort Snelling.

While the Department of the Army's decision means the end of the 103d Infantry Division as thousands of dedicated officers and men have known it, they will accept that decision as good soldiers. To keep their individual effectiveness at high level, the organization and location of units which will take the place of the 103d Division should be made known.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the last day of the session, when that is determined, I may have 15 minutes in which to summarize the appropriation record of the session and to include certain tables and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Would the gentleman mind reserving that request until next week when we have a definite date determined, because it is my understanding that we cannot carry on the calendar a request in the manner in which the gentleman has stated it?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at an appropriate time I have 15 minutes in which to address the House on that subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FEDERATION OF SECTION 213 COOPERATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the Federation of Section 213 Cooperatives, of which Irving Sherman of Jackson Heights, Queens, is president, is an organization dedicated to the betterment of a vital segment of American middle-income housing.

I have had the privilege of working closely with the federation and of knowing firsthand the invaluable contributions the group has made toward the betterment of all housing cooperatives. The district that I am privileged to represent in this body contains thousands of cooperative housing units, and I am proud to say the owner-occupants represent the finest example of American community life.

Because of this background I have had the unique opportunity of learning directly the problems pertaining to cooperative housing—the carrying costs, the ever-increasing maintenance needs, the continual need for capital improvements, and expanded community facilities. I have also been afforded the opportunity of knowing the important contributions these solid citizens have made to our American way of life—of the pride they take in owning their own apartments and of their collective interest in their communities.

All this adds up to a successful program and provides one of the most feasible answers to the serious and growing problem confronting urban centers. Little did the architects of the concept of cooperative living in America ever dream of the success it would enjoy. And, to think that the program is only 12 years old. Young, yes. But old enough to have a full evaluation given to its experience.

There are certain conclusions that are apparent. Outstanding among them is the superb mortgage insurance experience enjoyed by housing cooperatives. They have paid over $13 million into the housing fund and have had virtually no losses. Yet, the housing cooperators still pay one-half of 1 percent in mortgage insurance premiums, the same as 12 years ago. Ordinarily good insurance experience brings direct reductions, or under mutual programs, dividends are prorated on the experience. Housing cooperatives receive neither. Evidently even the passing of laws or the establishment of legislative intent—the will of the Congress—does not change the picture. Why? Because of fears that the housing insurance fund as now constructed cannot afford to lose the cushion it now enjoys with the 213's with which it is combined. This is a wrong concept; it is unjust, and in plain words—it is outrageous.

As one who has sponsored legislation for years to cut insurance costs, with the full backing of the federation, I am greatly disappointed that the congressional authorization to reduce mortgage premiums from one-half to one-fourth of 1 percent has not been implemented. I feel the intent of Congress has been obviously ignored here. And, as one who succeeded after repeated efforts to win acceptance of mutuality for 213's by having an amendment accepted in the 1959 and 1960 Housing Acts, only to see the entire 1959 act vetoed by the President, and the 1960 act die in the Rules Committee, I am disappointed that the present administration has not accepted the mutuality principle.

We tried to restore the mutual fund provision into the Housing Act of 1961. But, despite every conceivable effort, the move was not successful. The reasons given are inequitable, to say the least. They are refuted perceptively and completely in the federation's brief which follows my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out some effective action on the plus side—and the federation deserves much credit for this. This 1961 law does contain a provision which we have long advocated and which was adopted as an amendment to the act. I refer to the provision to provide supplemental financing. This will make possible needed repairs and capital improvements, such as plumbing, rewiring, air conditioning, and so forth. This program was slow in getting started but thanks to the federation and its leadership, it is now rapidly moving ahead, thus filling one of the large gaps in the 213 program.

But, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the sore spots—reduction in insurance premiums and mutuality—the federation has prepared a brief—a comprehensive, factual, hard-hitting presentation of its views on this issue.

I could never begin to express the picture as eloquently as is done here. I commend all my colleagues to read this brief. It hits the nail right on the head and reflects a commendable fighting spirit, a civic consciousness which is only too often lacking in this country of ours today.

With the unanimous consent of this House, I submit herewith the views of the Federation of 213 Cooperatives on the subject matter I have discussed here today:

AS SUBMITTED BY IRVING SHERMAN, PRESIDENT, FEDERATION OF SECTION 213 COOPERATIVES

The stand taken by Housing and Home Administrator Robert C. Weaver in deferral of mutuality in 213 insurance premium payments and a parallel move of deferral on the part of Commissioner Neal Hardy on the reduction of the insurance premium from one-half of 1 percent to one-fourth of 1 percent, which reduction today has the sanction of a congressional act, is defended in the first instance, that of mutuality deferment, on the ground of strengthening a general insurance fund. In the second instance, deferral of the premium reduction is on the ground of inadequate experience in judging 213 housing stability or the lack of it.

In both instances of deferrals and explanations on the part of the Housing and Home Administrator and his Commissioner, this should be substantiated by evidence at hand or by good reason of equity involvement in which event both the Administrator and the Commissioner should thereupon be supported in their positions, and appeals to them to alter their stand subside until such time as the facts change. However, if the facts or reasons adduced either by the Administrator or by the Commissioner on mutuality in the first instance and premium reduction for 213's in the second instance, do not stand up under careful scrutiny, then either one or both can continue to insist upon their deferrals only in the face of a denial of these basic facts and of the rights for the insured, the 213's. This is not to mention decent regard for congressional intent as expressed in section 213 of the National Housing Act of 1949, and in subsequent relevant amendments to this act.

Let us proceed to examine the validity of Administrator Weaver's stand in a deferral of mutuality. The first thought that comes to mind in this rejection by the Administrator is, What is being asked of him? Is this something (ultra vires) which might force his role as a custodian of insurance payments or compromise him as chief trustee for U.S. Government funds? Not at all. The 213's in their petitions merely ask that the Administrator follow the customary practices of all insurers and set up the appropriate accounting whereby insured may be rated according to loss experience from which may flow higher or lower rates, according to the experience as generally observed by insurers of all types. This is a commonplace practice and so inseparable from the insurance practice of all types that its deferral in the case of the 213's by the Administrator is an egregious omission. It is certainly outside the context of verifiable insurance practices and verges, in fact, in a type of malpractice, which is not therefore to be condoned because it is prosecuted by a high Government official in the interest of public funds safety.

It would be objectionable but yet understandable to an extent, if this deferral of mutuality was observed uniformly for all who make payment to the FHA mortgage insurance fund on whatever ground. But what can be said for a practice that is not uniformly applied by the Administrator but actually is discriminatory against the 213's? The 207's, for example, receive mutuality with provisions for rebates to payees based on an experience rating determined by the mutuality. Why does the Administrator withhold mutuality from the 213's in face of this general nature of the fund which, indeed, is known to legislators and the insured as the "mutual mortgage insurance fund."

Administrator Weaver in his stand that bars establishment of 213 premium insurance payments, under a mutual plan, offers the explanation that if this were not done it would compromise the general insurance fund. The contention is that the general fund, by itself, would prove inadequate in the event of maximum insured foreclosures and the 213 reserves are required to bolster the insurance fund in this advent. We will not, at this time, argue the validity of possible maximum calls upon the fund at any future date that might embarrass it, nor how close or how distant this future disaster might be, but where is simple justice for the 213's in a disclosure of a reason for deferral of mutuality for these insured on the part of the Administrator? Simple justice, not to mention equity, would compel the note that the 213 reserves are for the specific use for 213's which reserves are today being built up at considerable burden placed upon these 213's yet which possible benefits already have been withdrawn from them and seem indeed destined to be siphoned off to benefit other than the 213's.

The entire position taken by the Administrator on the deferral of mutuality rating for the 213's must be completely arbitrary without support in general insurance practice and an unconscionable trespass on the rights assured tenant-stockholders in 213 housing mandated by a specific act of Congress. The position is not only the equivalent of a disregard of this act and of the intent of Congress, to boot, but distortion of the principle of equity which obtains for all insurance. The stand, as indicated, calls into question whether the Administrator, by his intransigence, is not twisting the 213 payments to the mutual mortgage insurance fund out of their true context of a specific reserve for an end not only injurious to the rights of the 213's, but deleterious to the total insurance fund itself. The act complained of suggests that the fund in its totality has not been properly costed out and it is being commingled in an attempt to gloss over the gross inequities involved.

Let us next take up the matter of premium reduction for the 213's. Fortunately in this connection we may refer to a truly monumental and exhaustive study of the entire FHA mortgage insurance fund by unimpeachable researchers and authorities, Prof. Ernest M. Fisher and Chester Rapkin of the School of Architecture, Columbia University, New York. This study published in a volume in 1954 entitled, "The Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund" contains this explanatory declaration in the preface to the volume:

"The study is concerned only with the operation of the mutual mortgage insurance fund. It examines the history, both legislative and operational, of the system which was established by Congress in 1934 and has been in continuous operation since that date."

Dr. Fisher, reporting on a very favorable condition of the insurance fund at the time of the study in 1954, is quick to admit that this finding is by no means indefinitely projected. He agrees with the present FHA officials that only a period of adverse conditions can determine how adequate or inadequate the fund is or how well it can stand up under a situation of maximum foreclosures of FHA insured properties. But he also makes the following important reservations about the fund and the entire situation with respect to a reserve which should be carefully noted by all interested, and especially by FHA personnel. These points are as follows:

1. FHA's liabilities, apart from current operating costs, are limited to the payment of interest on debentures while they are outstanding and the redemption of these debentures when they mature. The debentures of the mutual mortgage insurance have a term of 20 years, or one that extends 3 years beyond the date of maturity of the mortgage on account of which they are issued. The major liabilities of the mutual mortgage insurance fund then are long term.

2. Whenever such a long-term liability is incurred by the issuance of debentures, an asset is acquired consisting of the property that was security for the mortgage. Aside from operating costs and interest on debentures, the fund will suffer a loss only when the price received for a property taken over is less than the amount for which debentures were issued (plus cash settlement) when the property was acquired and any operating deficit incurred while the property is held. And the fund does not sustain any realized loss until the property is disposed of.

Note the third point made by this very competent and indefatigable researcher and authority of the FHA reserves:

"There would not necessarily be, therefore," he concludes, "any drain upon either the cash or the total reserves of the system if a period were encountered when the number of foreclosures and properties acquired multiplied. Such a development would merely cause a change in the balance sheet of the fund. Liabilities would increase by the amount of debentures issued and assets by the amount at which the acquired properties were entered on the books, plus any reserve established against the properties."

Note the additional point made by Professor Fisher concerning the FHA fund:

"During the period for which the properties are held and the debentures kept outstanding, FHA would presumably receive income from premiums on account of those insured mortgages which are not in default, from interest on its reserves, and from operating the properties acquired. When a property is sold, it may bring a net sale price sufficient to meet all the expenses which have been incurred in taking it over, operating it, and disposing of it, including redemption of debentures issued. Or, it may be sold at a price that fails to cover all the costs. The function of the reserves of the system is to cover such losses."

In seeking to find a middle ground as between calculations of extreme losses that might be suffered by the fund during a depression and possible minimal losses of the present, Professor Fisher is careful not to commit himself too strongly one way or another. He tends to lean to the conservative in this, but he poses the following question as to an extreme which seems improbable, and which suggests a reply in the negative.

"Can it be anticipated," he asks, in holding for more reasonable approach to the fund by the FHA, "that all insured mortgages on which the outstanding balance represents more than the price which could be obtained for the property in the depths of a decline will be foreclosed? Or will foreclosures be distributed over a wide range of ratio of outstanding balance to market price?"

We now come to some very important points made by Professor Fisher which bear directly on premium payments and the conclusions reached would support rather than not a less constrained position than that taken by the FHA in connection with lower premiums for the 213's. Here are these points as made by Professor Fisher:

"Over the rate of foreclosures and property acquisition, FHA will have little or no control but administrative decisions as to when to sell acquired properties and at what price may have an important influence upon the loss rate sustained. Acting in concert with the officers of the Veterans' Administration, the FHA Commissioner could make decisions that would be important in determining local price and rental levels. It would be unrealistic to assume that the decisions, subject as they are every year to the scrutiny and direction of Congress, would for any sustained period be such as to create or aggravate a chaotic market situation.

"It is unreasonable to assume, therefore, that the loss rate actually experienced will not be higher than, if as high as, that which characterized the experience of the great depression of the 1930's, even though the mortgages insured represent higher initial low-value ratios than prevailed generally in the years preceding the depression."

Professor Fisher makes the further point of possible loss ratios at any future date:

"With these reservations in mind," he writes, "it can be pointed out that studies of the experience of insurance companies, commercial and savings banks, and savings and loan associations indicate that the foreclosure rate experienced during the thirties did not exceed 23 percent of the number of mortgages in their portfolio at the onset of the depression, and that the higher rates were encountered only in connection with mortgages which were made in the years immediately preceding the depression."

Keeping in mind that Professor Fisher's study was completed in 1954 and since that date 213 payments have enormously swelled the fund as against infinitesimal losses, the following conclusion presented by Professor Fisher in 1954 carries so much more weight today.

"On net balance," he concluded after exhaustive study and presentation of facts, figures, and ratios regarding the FHA fund, "it appears that the FHA calculations is based upon a premise that should make adequate provision for contingencies of major depression magnitude."

We may now conclude as follows: The Administrator and his Commissioner by the facts adduced herein and by observations and studies culled from an exhaustive and authoritative probe of the FHA and the mortgage insurance fund by unimpeachable authority, are both acting in a very rigid and even highly prejudicial manner. In the first instance, the Administrator refuses the 213's simple rights that inure to all insured as insurance contracts are generally constructed and understood. In the second instance, the FHA Commissioner compounds rights transgressions by abiding in a deep freeze regarding the premium insurance reductions in face of an act of Congress requesting him to act favorably and act in face of the competent and impartial authority that he has the reasons as well as the motive to move as requested of him.

It must be brought to the attention of both the Administrator and his Commissioner that the 213's, in their quest for mutuality and for premium reduction, are not seeking ends other than which the Administrator and the Commissioner also seek, namely, that of the welfare and security for the mortgage insurance fund. It is

because it is believed that this can better be achieved when 213 appeals are granted, allowing them to make payments to the fund with less strain and with realization of full mutuality for them, that the 213's persevere in their effort.

RICHARD M. NIXON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Derounian] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House was subjected to a frenzied personal attack by a group of our colleagues against former Vice President Richard M. Nixon. Obviously, this attempted smear was premeditated and planned, judging from the ready responses and detailed comments which followed the main attack by the gentleman from California [Mr. Shelley].

This is obviously a desperate attempt by the Brown forces of California to bail out the reelection candidacy of Gov. Pat Brown which is sinking so rapidly that his adherents have thrown caution to the winds.

They have dredged up an 11-year-old smear without presenting any proof or substance or new charges. This smear has been repudiated over and over again in the past. It was used in 1960 by Drew Pearson and was rejected by Senator Kennedy in that campaign, as were other groundless charges and smears now being dragged into the political arena by the Brown forces.

The attack on Mr. Nixon by our colleagues was shocking in that it dealt with innuendo, rumor, and plain perversion of the truth.

Its timing on the eve of the Jewish holidays is so patently and fraudulently political that it does not deserve the dignity of a reply. Nevertheless, we, among the many who respect and admire the fighting qualities of Mr. Nixon and who realize he has been marked by the left-wing forces of this country as an enemy of subversion, resent this last-minute, desperate, attempted character assassination. We, the undersigned, decry the use of such tactics in any political campaign.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is signed by me, Mr. Wilson of California, Mr. Lipscomb of California, Mr. Curtis of Missouri, Mr. Utt of California, Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin, Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Beermann of Nebraska, and Mr. Ashbrook of Ohio.

REPORT ON THE 87TH CONGRESS—2D SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, shortly the Members of Congress will be returning to their respective congressional districts to report to their constituents.

When I get home after adjournment I am planning an objective discussion of issues and my views on questions that faced this session of the 87th Congress.

It is my opinion that this year the most serious problems facing the American people have been in the field of foreign affairs, particularly in Cuba and Berlin. Certainly these situations have become worse during this year and have pointed up more clearly lack of planning and foresight. Especially, the Cuban situation has become increasingly more dangerous since the abortive invasion attempt of last year failed because of the withdrawal of necessary air support. The Soviet-Communist military buildup in Cuba would never have occurred had the President made it clear to the world that any such threat to the United States would bring immediate action on our part.

Therefore, today we see the Soviet Union supplying arms, ammunition, and other strategic materials to the Castro regime.

Mr. Speaker, this threat to the security of the Western World has been recognized by the United States and this session of the 87th Congress has seen fit to pass a resolution that I regret to say was a declaration of policy accepting the status quo. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this watered down resolution did not point out that the Monroe Doctrine already has been violated by the Soviet Union. When this matter was discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives I stated that I had hoped it would be possible for me and others to express more firmly and without equivocation that the Soviet Union has violated the Monroe Doctrine. I said that the Congress should pass a resolution that would urge and authorize the President to use all political, diplomatic, economic, and military means and resources at his command to end this threat to the security of the United States and this hemisphere.

But in the end I voted for the resolution, even though I felt it put a stamp of approval on a regrettable situation of which, I am sure, the American people disapprove. Surely the Members of Congress and certainly the American people are not satisfied with what has transpired in Cuba. We should let the world know by passage of an appropriate resolution that the Congress favors the President initiating effective counteraction against this Soviet military threat in Cuba.

In West Berlin American soldiers stood by while the wall dividing the city went up. They were waiting for word to come to tear it down. Unfortunately, there was indecision and this word did not come. Since that time we have acted so passively that even West Berliners are beginning to question our defense and West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt has said "the West does nothing but wait for Khrushchev's moves." Meanwhile the President has said that the United States will make no deal with Khrushchev in exchange for a hands-off policy by the Russians in Cuba. I am sure all Americans back the President in this respect and give him their full support in maintaining firmness in foreign policy.

Laos and Vietnam have added to our ever-darkening international situation along with Cuba and Berlin as major concerns of the Congress and the United States. These problems have all served as a basis for the largest peacetime budget in our history and was responsible for congressional approval of a resolution in September 1962 authorizing the President to call up 150,000 reservists and extend the terms of those now on active duty. This was on top of authority to call the National Guard and Reserves to active duty in 1961. So much in brief for foreign affairs.

On the domestic front one of the most important successes concerning the American taxpayer was the elimination of huge amounts of back-door spending. I have headed a bipartisan group of House Members who have worked hard to see that all expenditures were properly made through the regular congressional appropriations procedures. Back-door spending or financing Government programs by borrowing from the Treasury had reached tremendous proportions and obviously this financing of Federal programs by this type of borrowing from public debt receipts contributes to and is a part of the ever-increasing national debt. Therefore, I take a great deal of satisfaction in the part I played in the elimination of much of this type of uncontrolled expenditure.

Following is a quick rundown of some of the more important congressional issues during this session. In this connection I will comment as to my views and explain briefly why I voted as I did:

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

I voted to recommit this measure to the House committee in a move to kill the measure for this session of Congress. I firmly believe that the Federal Government already has become too big. There are indeed already too many bureaucrats operating in Washington telling the individual States and local governments what they can and cannot do. In my judgment this program would have only added additional centralization of power in the Capital, removing from our own local governments and citizens control and giving to this new department authority to issue specifications and regulations as to how our towns and cities should meet their problems.

FOREIGN AID

I voted against the bill to authorize the spending of foreign aid funds because there was left from money previously authorized more than $6 billion from previous years. Also the bill provided for continuation of aid to Communist countries, which I oppose. On the other hand, I supported the foreign aid appropriations bill. First, however, I voted for a motion to recommit this measure with the expressed instruction that $100 million be eliminated. I felt this cut was fully justified. On this bill I offered an amendment which was overwhelmingly adopted that would bar aid to any country which permits its vessels to transport arms and strategic materials to Cuba. This amendment will show our allies we cannot tolerate their aiding and abetting this Communist regime. The House-Senate conference kept my amendment, I am glad to say, and thus I voted for the conference report.

PEACE CORPS

When the measure creating the Peace Corps came before the House in 1961 I voted against its creation notwithstanding that the overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress voted in favor of its creation. Frankly, the Peace Corps seems to be working out successfully and therefore when the present Congress was asked to appropriate funds for its continued operation this year I voted in favor of this appropriation.

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION BILL

I voted to recommit this measure to the committee because I believed the bill was a bad piece of legislation in that there already was $8 billion of projects authorized and properly approved on a case-by-case basis by Congress. One great objection to this measure was that the Congress in it abdicated its constitutional responsibility to approve specific projects. Instead this bill delegated such authority to the President. This legislation sets up a tremendous slush fund for political use to win votes and elect friends.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT RETRAINING ACT

I do feel that it is important that a program be established under which those persons who are thrown out of work because of critical unemployment areas can be retrained. Such a program is better than straight out-and-out welfare programs and in the long run can save the American taxpayer many dollars. Therefore, I felt this was a good piece of legislation and cast my vote in favor of this program.

UNITED NATIONS

I voted against buying $100 million in United Nations bonds because I sincerely believe that it will take more than the mere purchase of bonds to solve the financial problems of the United Nations and that such action would only postpone the day when the United Nations is going to have to face up to its problem of finances. This measure only provides a temporary stopgap for today's operations. The International Court of Justice had ruled that all United Nations members are obligated to contribute their respective share of the expenses of the so-called peacekeeping operations in the Congo. I urged that the United Nations financing be done by a general assessment of all members instead of the issuing of a few bonds. Also the bill did no more than express the sense of Congress against financing future deficits in a similar fashion by borrowing. This establishes a precedent for borrowing to meet future deficits. As to the constitutional aspects of this plan, the matter of the United Nations bond purchase, in my view, presented to each individual Congressman the question of: Shall I obey my oath to support the Constitution of the United States or shall I deliberately violate it? This bill, in my opinion, was in violation of the Constitution and, therefore, as I said, I voted against this purchase of United Nations bonds.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR DISABLED VETERANS

The entire membership of the House of Representatives voted in favor of this measure because it was felt that the rates of service-connected disability compensation should be brought more in line to reflect the changes which have occurred in the cost of living since the last compensation increase in 1957, as well as to more adequately compensate seriously disabled veterans.

SENIOR CITIZENS HOUSING ACT

I voted in favor of providing additional funds under the Housing Act of 1959 to provide low and moderate cost housing, both urban and rural, for the elderly. I felt that the Housing Act had provided a way for many people to build their own homes and now it would be equally helpful for the Government to help those senior citizens who were not fortunate enough to participate in the original program. In this way, you might say, we are giving equal opportunity to our senior citizens.

SCHOOLS, COLLEGE ACADEMIC FACILITIES ACT

When the House version of this measure passed on January 30, of this year, I was among the 319 Members who voted for it. I support such Federal assistance to institutions of higher education in financing the construction and improvement of academic facilities.

The House conferees and the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor firmly committed themselves to the Committee on Rules and the House membership to uphold previous action of the House in opposition to including a Senate scholarship and grant provision in this same bill when the agreement was obtained to have the bill sent to conference. Unfortunately, the House conferees went ahead and acceded to the provisions in the Senate bill and this breach of faith by the House conferees defeated the bill along with a strong conviction by House Members that the policies involved in the student assistance program should be handled separately. In fact, the bill came back to the House almost as a new, separate, and different program than the one originally passed.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

It was my opinion that we should take a long hard look at this ever-increasing debt that now burdens the American taxpayer and should begin to find ways to cut back on some of the nonessential spending programs that have been proposed and pushed through the Congress by the administration. Therefore, I voted against increasing the public debt limit to $308 billion.

TAX BILL

I feel that our tax laws should be revised and support such a revision. However, I joined with the entire membership of the minority party in voting against this year's bill because of its many objectionable features. One reason for my vote against this bill was that it imposed a withholding tax on interest on savings accounts and dividends. I am certainly in favor of a tax cut and vigorously support a revision of our entire tax system during the next session of Congress.

AGRICULTURE BILL

With the tremendous power being sought by the Secretary of Agriculture it boiled down to, I believe, a Fascist type of proposal that would solve nothing but instead violate basic and inherent rights of citizens against compulsion and Government intervention. Under this legislation the farmer is in fact faced with ruin or rigid regimentation. I voted against it.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

My main objection to this bill was that it gave the President too much discretionary power in making decisions regarding trade with foreign countries. However, the Baker amendment, added to this bill, allows the Congress to make effective Tariff Commission decisions, if the President fails to act, and this to some extent softened my objection. Also in the House-Senate conference a Senate amendment was added to the bill relating to fish conservation. This new provision could serve to protect our fishing industry and while it does not have the force and effect of the salmon conservation legislation which I have sponsored and which was reported favorably by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries very recently this amendment to the Tariff Act did improve the overall bill. For this reason I voted to accept the bill in its final version. I did this because I strongly favor the objective of expanded worldwide trade and recognize that special circumstances exist with regard to the European Common Market.

Mr. Speaker, that covers pretty well the major pieces of legislation that were considered by this Congress and my position on them. This will show me as no rubberstamp for anyone, except I hope for my own conscience. Perhaps this summary explains why David Sentner, head of the Hearst News Service, called me "a rampaging progressive (GOP) conservative."

Perhaps appropriately now it should be stated by me that the privilege of serving in the House of Representatives, in my mind, is the greatest honor that can come to anyone. To this I only add that during this session of Congress, as previously, I tried to merit such honor by working for the national interest and the welfare of the First Congressional District without regard to partisanship, but solely on what I believed to be right.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I made mistakes in judgment but when I return to report in person to my district there is one thing for sure, and that is that I will have always acted as I thought right.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me add that if I return next year, as I hope to do, it will be a privilege to serve with the fine colleagues with whom it has been a privilege to be associated. The majority leadership of this House has my respect. They have acted fairly toward the minority and myself. For that I thank them and I hope in the years to come the House of Representatives will always deserve its reputation as the greatest deliberative body in the world.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have read with a great deal of concern, the attack on the Americans for Constitutional Action made on the floor of the other body last Thursday. This is the first time, to my knowledge, this conservative group has come under the fire of the liberals and, since it may well herald the beginning of an all-out attack, I would like to come to its defense in some small way here at the beginning of the battle.

The ACA Index is published each year for the purpose of—and this is taken from their preamble—

> Tabulating the recorded votes on those legislative votes which, in the opinion of ACA, have a significant bearing on the preservation of the spirit and principles of the Constitution, as these were defined by the Founding Fathers of our Republic.

In other words, this organization concerns itself with the relationship of votes to constitutionality.

This conservative group does not, in my opinion, attempt to take each and every vote we cast and pick it to pieces to see if there is not some flaw, however small, by which a vote could be interpreted as against the precepts of the Constitution.

They do not employ lobbyists to sell their point of view. They do not even conduct the usual "Write your Congressman" campaign as so many do. All they do is print how we vote.

If doing this is somehow subversive, then maybe the Congressional Record is, too, because that is what the Record does.

To suggest that publishing our votes is the work of "extremists" is sheer nonsense.

Perhaps I am wrong in supposing this initial attack is to lay the groundwork for others to follow. Perhaps, instead, the attackers will only be those whose ratings scale from zero to 3 or 4 percent. If that is the case, then the ACA has nothing to fear. The purpose of the attacks will be obvious.

In the initial barrage against ACA, the most the organization is accused of is being an organization of eminently respectable men who, once a year, tabulate the votes of Congressmen and Senators and show whether they are conservative, middle of the road or liberal in their political philosophies as compared to those of the framers of the Constitution.

Each Member of this body makes his own record. No one votes for us. No one else can be blamed or praised for what we do. I cast my votes, and I assume we all do, as my conscience tells me I should.

Therefore, I have no objection to any organization publishing what I have done for everyone to see.

I suggest that perhaps the reason some are opposed to the ACA publishing their rating is because they are ashamed for the public to know how little they believe in and support the principles laid down by the framers of the Constitution.

I, for one, am not ashamed of my support of the Constitution and I don't care who knows it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Baring (at the request of Mr. Friedel), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mrs. Riley (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. Williams, for today, on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Forrester, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, October 9.

Mr. Jones of Alabama, for 1 hour, on Monday, October 8, 1962.

Mr. Vanik, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, October 10, 1962, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Derounian, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Pelly (at the request of Mr. Barry), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Waggonner (at the request of Mr. Kornegay), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Feighan (at the request of Mr. Kornegay), for 15 minutes, on Monday, October 8, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Barry) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pelley.
Mr. Dole.
Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Morse.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Kornegay) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Moss.
Mr. Dent.
Mr. Zablocki.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2900. An act to provide for the representation of certain defendants in criminal cases in the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3024. An act to extend the maximum maturity of Veterans' Administration guaranteed or insured home loans from 30 to 35 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3459. An act to authorize the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 914. An act to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia, to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes;

S. 2928. An act for the relief of Seymour K. Owens;

S. 3631. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of reports filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; and

S. 3679. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to hold a World Food Congress in the United States in 1963.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Monday, October 8, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2618. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of an overobligation in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2619. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the annual report of all settlements made under the authority of section 2732, "Property Loss: Incident to Service; Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps and Civilian Employees," for the period during the fiscal year 1962, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2732(f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 13358. A bill relating to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 13368. A bill to provide vocational rehabilitation, education and training, mustering-out and loan guarantee benefits for Reserves and members of the National Guard called or ordered to active duty, or members of the Armed Forces whose enlistments are extended, after July 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 13369. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to encourage the renovation, modernization, and replacement of existing hospital facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 13370. A bill to provide for the free entry of musical handbells for use of the Zion Lutheran Church, Rockford, Ill., the Tabor Lutheran Church, Rockford, Ill, and the Emmanual Lutheran Church, Rockford, Ill.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 13371. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Benedyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 13372. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Konstantina Papanelopoulou Petreanu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Public Access to Commission Dissents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1962, and on September 20, 1962, I informed House members that the Federal Trade Commission was attempting to suppress the dissenting views of its minority members. This and a similar instance in the Federal Power Commission were uncovered by the Special Subcommittee on Government Information. As a result of subcommittee discussions with these two Commissions, both of them have now adopted new policies to make clear that from now on neither Commission will attempt to suppress the views of dissenting Commission members.

In my report to the House on September 20, 1962, I pointed out that the Federal Trade Commission's letter of September 6, 1962, did not fully clarify whether the Commission's new policy would prevent a nonconcurring Commissioner from expressing his views on any Commission action, including those that the Commission does not make public. I have now received a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission stating that the Commission's new policy applies to all Commission actions whether or not they are made public by the Commission. The subcommittee letter of September 18, 1962, and the Commission's answer of September 25, 1962, are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1962.

Mr. PAUL RAND DIXON,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DIXON: Thank you for your letter of September 6, 1962, advising that the Federal Trade Commission on September 4, 1962, unanimously adopted a resolution recognizing that any Commissioner who does not concur with any action which the Commission makes public is entitled to have his dissent and the reasons therefor shown on the document or other accompanying papers evidencing such action.

The Commission's new policy is excellent, as far as it goes; however, it does not cover actions which the Commission fails to make public. The language of the Commission's new policy, as quoted in your letter, could thus be interpreted as denying the right of a Commissioner to make known his objections to a Commission action such as a decision to drop a matter, or a decision concerning Commission procedure, or any other Commission matter, if the Commission does not make the action public.

There is no apparent basis upon which the majority of the Commission (or two Commissioners constituting a majority of a three-man quorum) may muzzle or delay the issuance of the views of dissenting Commissioners with regard to any Commission actions. Please, therefore, clarify whether the policy statement of September 4, 1962, is intended to prevent a nonconcurring Commissioner from expressing views on any Commission action which is not made public.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman, Special Government Information Subcommittee.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1962.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Chairman, Special Government Information Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In our letter to you of September 6, 1962, we advised that the Federal Trade Commission on September 4, 1962, unanimously adopted a resolution recognizing that any Commissioner who does not concur in any action which the Commission makes public is entitled to have his dissent and the reasons therefor shown on the documents or other accompanying papers evidencing such action.

You ask in your letter of September 18, 1962, whether the Commission's policy statement of September 4, 1962, is intended to prevent a nonconcurring Commissioner from expressing views on any Commission action which is not made public.

This is to advise you that it was not the Commission's intention in its statement of September 4, 1962, to prevent a nonconcurring Commissioner from expressing views on any Commission action.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL RAND DIXON,
Chairman.

The Scrapping of Fishing Trawlers by Germany Points Up the Obsolescence of Our Own Fishing Fleet and the Need for a Change in Our Laws Regulating the Construction of Fishing Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, according to the August 31 issue of the Fishing News, London, 14 German fishing trawlers are being scrapped. These vessels are termed "obsolete." They were built: One in 1953; one in 1951; seven in 1949; one in 1948; one in 1944; one reconditioned in 1941, and so forth.

Unfortunately, we in the United States do not regard vessels of this age as obsolete. Many of our trawlers are twice as old as the oldest German trawler being scrapped. Still worse is the fact that we cannot scrap our old vessels for the simple reason that we cannot build new ones at double the cost our friends in Germany, Japan, and the rest of the world can build them. This constitutes one more urgent reason for Congress to enact legislation in the next Congress, if the United States is to continue in the business of producing fish. Otherwise, we shall yield the resources of the high seas to other nations who have forced us from the second highest producing nation to the fifth in a matter of 3 years.

Reds Arms Buildup in Cuba Threatens U.S. Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, no recent event has more deeply shocked the American people than the news that Russian military hardware, accompanied by thousands of Soviet technicians, continues to pour into Castro's Red Cuba. Today, just 90 miles from the United States, antiaircraft missiles are being installed by the Soviet technicians, many of whom are suspected of being members of the Russian Armed Forces, even though not in uniform.

As more ships bearing men and munitions arrive in Cuba, it becomes increasingly apparent that the Soviet Union is establishing a base in the Western Hemisphere from which an attack might one day be mounted against the United States. Who can say that the next step will not be the installation of short- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles which could be launched against the United States in the event of war or even in the event of an effort to free Cuba from the Communist tyranny? Moreover, the very presence of thousands of Soviet technicians lessen the chance for a successful revolution to overthrow Castro from within Cuba.

While Berlin and the wall continue to dominate the headlines, it is my belief that the Russian military buildup in Cuba poses a potentially graver threat to American security. The U.S. Government and its responsible leaders have not faced up to this crisis. There have been some wavering words but an ultimatum is clearly needed now. The Red buildup in Cuba must be halted. The very least that should be done is to place a blockade upon further movements of men and military equipment into Cuba.

The Monroe Doctrine has been a continuing part of U.S. foreign policy since it was enunciated by President Monroe on December 2, 1823. The European nations were then clearly told to keep "hands off" the Western Hemisphere. The doctrine proclaimed that the United States "should consider any attempt on their (European nations) part to extend the system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Clearly Russia is extending its system to this hemisphere and just as clearly this extension is dangerous to American peace and security. Now, 139 years after it was proclaimed, is the Monroe Doctrine to be scrapped? It will go by default unless this administration displays courage, resolution, and firmness in meeting the Communist threat in Cuba. The folly of President Kennedy's April 16, 1961, decision that anti-Castro Cubans could not have the support of their own air force, coupled with his decision of April 17 prohibiting the use of U.S. planes, sealed the doom of the Cuban invasion forces.

The Record of the 87th Congress—Report to the People of the Fourth District of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as the 87th session of Congress draws to a close, I wish to take this opportunity to report to the people of the Fourth District of Wisconsin on my actions and votes as their Representative in Congress.

I have made such a report at the end of each congressional session in which I have served, because it is my belief that the people should be aware of how I have fulfilled the responsibility they have entrusted to me. In our system of representative democracy it is of the highest importance that citizens be informed on the positions and efforts of their officials on issues of significance to them and to our Nation.

I have sincerely worked for what I believe to be in the best interests of my people and our great country, the United States of America. While not everyone can be expected to be pleased with each vote, I hope that this accounting of my stewardship will meet with general approval.

I am very proud of the letter sent to me by you, Mr. Speaker, evaluating my work during the 87th Congress. I would like to include it at this point as part of my report to the people of the Fourth District:

> THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
> U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
> *Washington, D.C., October 1, 1962.*
>
> Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
> *Milwaukee, Wis.*
>
> DEAR CLEMENT: As the 87th Congress draws to a close, I want to express to you my personal thanks for the great work that you have done as a Member of Congress. You have made an outstanding record and the people of your district are justified in feeling proud of you. You reflect great credit upon them.
>
> You have performed your duties with outstanding ability, with courage, and supporting progressive legislation in the best interest of the people. You have been a bulwark of strength for legislation for greater appropriations for a strong national defense and you have supported the strong leadership that President Kennedy is giving us in the field of foreign affairs.
>
> You richly deserve reelection. I sincerely hope and I respectfully urge that the people of your district reelect you, enabling you, with your seniority, to continue the great work that you are doing in their behalf and in behalf of our great country.
>
> You are truly a people's Congressman.
>
> With kind personal regards, I am,
> Sincerely yours,
> JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
> *Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.*

THE 87TH CONGRESS: AN OVERALL VIEW

The 87th Congress has been one of the longest and most productive in history. Despite the complaints about a do-nothing Congress, the record shows that it has been both progressive and impressive in many fields.

The fact that many of its accomplishments have come slowly and laboriously is to its credit; it indicates that the Members have not been stampeded into "quickie" passage of the many measures before it. Specific legislative achievements can be found in the detailed table appended to this report.

It is important to remember that President Kennedy's legislative program was both extensive and comprehensive. After a period of relative slowdown during preceding years, the Congress was asked to take sweeping action in nearly every field of national life. The fact that it has been unable to make landmark decisions in all of the matters brought before it should not obscure the fact that programs were enacted in most of them.

The accomplishments of the 87th Congress come into sharper focus when compared with those of the previous 8 years. Before this Congress, aid to depressed areas had been stalled. A needed increase in the minimum wage was held up. We could not get the pollution program strengthened to provide clean water to cities. A comprehensive housing program was defeated by Presidential veto. We could not obtain a needed boost for educational television. But since 1960, with cooperation between the Congress and the White House, necessary legislation has been enacted in all these areas.

TRADE EXPANSION

Undoubtedly the most important piece of legislation passed by the 87th Congress was the President's Trade Expansion Act. The main provisions of this bill would empower the President to cut all tariffs on most foreign imported goods by 50 percent over 5 years, and eliminate entirely tariffs on goods in which the United States and the European Common Market account for at least 80 percent of world trade. In cutting tariffs, the President is authorized to make these concessions only in return for favorable treatment of American exports by other countries.

The bill also provides loans and tax relief for businesses hurt by the lowered tariff barriers, and payments up to 65 percent of wages to unemployed workers in these businesses while they find new work or are retrained in new skills.

Farsighted industrialists, businessmen, labor leaders, and political figures alike hailed this measure as a "stitch in time" response to the challenges of the sixties. One of this Nation's greatest needs is to create more than 5 million new jobs each year for the next several years. Three million jobs must be created just to keep even with our labor force, an additional 1.8 million for those displaced by automation and additional millions to cut into unemployment. Growth in trade through this act is expected to provide a significant number of these new jobs. With the rising wages and increased purchasing power of workers in Europe, Japan, and other countries, a great market for capital and consumer goods is opening up. We must be ready to deal with these markets or the United States may be shut out. Such an eventuality would end our favorable balance of trade, aggravate the gold outflow and leave us a financially weakened Nation.

In addition, the lowering of trade barriers will allow the United States to work in closer economic cooperation with our allies in Western Europe and around the world. Many see the Trade Expansion Act as the first step toward a giant trading bloc of free nations which would use their economic strength to frustrate and finally defeat communism.

I supported this legislation for these reasons and because I believed it would be good for Metropolitan Milwaukee. With our important capital goods industries and our fine port facilities, we stand to benefit by increased world trade.

BOLSTERING THE ECONOMY

The country was experiencing an economic slump when the 87th Congress convened in January 1960. Legislation to correct the situation was given priority. Measures included provisions for extra funds to help children whose parents were unemployed, a new Housing Act that literally means jobs for 420,000 construction workers, an increase in the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 and a temporary extension of unemployment compensation benefits to more than 2,350,000 workers who had exhausted their benefits during the recession.

As the result of these and other measures, the economy began its recovery. Both the gross national product and the number of persons employed hit alltime high levels. Yet, unemployment continued to be a problem and the Nation's growth rate was not as fast as many felt it could be. To insure continued expansion and growth of our Nation during the 1960's, Congress passed a number of farsighted bills.

The Area Redevelopment Act marked the first time that the economic weight of the Federal Government had been directed toward helping communities help themselves in reducing chronic unemployment. The act authorized $394 million in loans and grants to aid expanding enterprises in economically depressed industrial and rural areas; $10 million for payments to unemployed workers taking part in training programs for new jobs; $4.5 million for the training itself, and permanent authority for the Small Business Administration to make loans to local development corporations.

The Manpower Development and Training Act is aimed at supplying U.S. industry with the skilled manpower it will need to keep abreast of technological change. A 3-year, $435 million program, the act will create new jobs by providing on-the-job and vocational training for between 500,000 and 750,000 workers.

The Public Works Acceleration Act permits the immediate commitment of $900 million to stimulate capital investment programs in communities that are designated for area redevelopment or have had more than 6 percent unemployment for over a year. By speeding up work on construction of Federal, State, and local public works, employment will be expanded.

Also designed to stimulate economic growth and productive efficiency was a provision of the Revenue Act of 1962 designed to increase investment in American business by allowing a tax credit on the purchase of machinery and equipment. This measure and the revision of depreciation schedules will provide a $2.5 billion tax incentive encouraging American industry to modernize and expand its equipment.

There were, of course, many other measures designed in whole or part to get our country "on the move" economically, but those mentioned above were the major ones.

INCREASED NATIONAL SECURITY

In the face of increasing Soviet pressures and continuing crises in Berlin, Vietnam, Laos, Cuba, and the Congo, the Congress, at the request of the President, acted to strengthen our national defenses. Military expenditures were increased by some $9 billion over the levels maintained by the previous administration.

On two occasions when the cold war threatened to explode into a red hot conflict over Berlin, the President asked the Congress for, and received, permission to call up Reserve forces for active duty. The first callup included Wisconsin's own famed 32d Red Arrow Division. The U.S. troop buildup is generally credited with making the Russians back down on their demands over Berlin.

The Polaris submarine program, designed to give the United States a potent and relatively invulnerable nuclear striking force, was doubled by the 87th Congress. Missile development and production was sharply stepped up. Our capacity to wage conventional and guerrilla warfare was increased.

A massive, exciting space program was authorized. It included a project designed to place an American on the moon before the end of the decade. Congress has responded to the military and peaceful challenges of space.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN FOREIGN POLICY

With energy and determination, the President has conducted a bipartisan foreign policy that has reinforced the security and prestige of the United States abroad and has strengthened the forces of freedom throughout the world.

With the cooperation of Congress, the new Agency for International Development—AID—was formed from all the numerous agencies that once went their separate ways on foreign assistance. The efforts of AID were immediately coordinated with those of the great, voluntary American charitable organizations such as CARE and church missions.

In making AID's operations conform to hard American business practice, the emphasis in foreign aid has been sharply shifted away from the outright gifts to low-interest loans that must be repaid. Moreover, this aid is being tied to stipulations of self-help and social reform.

I am especially pleased to report that both the Foreign Assistance Acts of 1961 and 1962 contain a number of amendments which I offered and which were accepted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and by the entire Congress. Chief among them were amendments which placed strict conditions on foreign aid—conditions which are designed to assure that our aid will be used for the purpose for which it is given, that it will not be wasted for unnecessary projects, and that it will benefit the people of the recipient countries. I also worked for warranted cuts in foreign aid spending. The Congress, for instance, accepted my amendment to cut $600 million from the Alliance for Progress when the State Department could not produce well-defined, sound plans to justify this requested expenditure and when we lacked evidence that the Latin American countries themselves are making sufficient progress to put their house in order. I further supported new provisions to strengthen the restrictions on trade and aid with Communist and Communist-dominated countries. These are now part of the law.

Three new and dramatic programs in the foreign affairs area were enacted by the 87th Congress: Food for Peace, the Peace Corps, and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Food for Peace puts America's farm surplus to work feeding the hungry of the world. Agricultural products which otherwise would have to be stored at Government expense are sold for foreign currencies or on credit terms. The proceeds are used to finance American embassies abroad and as loans for assistance projects such as schools, hospitals, and dams.

The Peace Corps, confounding and converting original critics, has proved to be useful in underdeveloped countries, and a powerful force for spreading good will and understanding for the United States around the globe.

The Disarmament Agency was a deliberate move by the Congress to solve the problems of the threat of nuclear disaster which hangs over the earth, and of the immense amounts of money spent by nations on armaments.

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

Notable legislation was enacted in a number of domestic areas other than those already mentioned. Few Congresses after all, can boast of clearing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, as this one has. Although not counted as "major" legislation, abolishment of the poll tax in Federal elections comes as a welcome and long-awaited reform in the political affairs of this country.

Other measures passed by the 87th Congress which are of more than routine interest to the citizens of my district are:

The 5-year Water Pollution Control Act, redoubling Federal efforts in this area, important to Milwaukee and area communities because of particular water pollution problems;

Amendments to the Public Welfare Act aimed at rehabilitating relief recipients and eliminating abuses;

An amendment in the latter category was my proposal to curb abuses in the program of aid to dependent children. These abuses received national publicity which showed that money intended by Congress for needy children was being used for all types of unjustified—even illegal—purposes. By strengthening the law in this respect, I believe that we have taken a big step in the right direction. It should contribute to the welfare of dependent children, and prevent misuse of the taxpayers' dollars;

Three strong anticrime bills to combat gambling and the transmission of gambling information and equipment in interstate commerce—the first such package to be approved by Congress since 1934;

Legislation providing up to $225 million for low- and moderate-cost housing, both urban and rural, for the aged;

The first Federal program to aid in solving the problems of juvenile delinquency;

Across-the-board increases in compensation payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities;

Amendments to the Interstate Highway Act, to shift a greater portion of the cost to users and to require States to provide relocation advisory assistance to families displaced by right-of-way acquisitions;

Establishment of a commercial communications satellite system, ushering in an era of international television;

Legislation providing health care for children of migrant workers.

SOME SETBACKS

The impressive record of the 87th Congress must not blind us to the defeats suffered by the administration on some key legislative issues.

Perhaps the most crucial setback was on hospital and nursing care insurance for the aged through social security—

misnamed medicare—which was defeated in the Senate and killed in the House committee. As a cosponsor of the original legislation in this area, I believe that the health care needs of our elderly are not being adequately met and demand attention. As the facts become better known, a hospital care bill will almost certainly be passed by a subsequent Congress, perhaps the upcoming 88th.

General Federal aid to elementary and secondary education was killed in the House Rules Committee. A bill granting aid to higher education was defeated in House-Senate conference because it included assistance to private colleges and universities. It is my position that Federal aid to education should be granted strictly on the basis of proven need and without discrimination.

Other measures which met defeat were a proposal creating a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, provisions in the farm bill calling for strict marketing controls on agricultural products, and a bill preventing the use of literacy tests as requirement for voting by declaring persons with a sixth-grade education literate for voting purposes.

The Kennedy administration is expected, however, to make renewed attempts to pass legislation in these areas when the 88th Congress is convened in Washington in January 1963.

VOTING RECORD

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which lists the major legislative bills considered during the 87th Congress, showing my position and vote on each of them, and indicating their disposition:

Voting record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 87th Cong.

Stand	Issue	Status
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	Foreign Assistance Acts of 1961 and 1962, to revise and strengthen the mutual security program, place emphasis on loans rather than grants	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation authorizing purchase of U.N. bonds, but only on matching basis with other U.N. members	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation establishing and extending the Peace Corps	Became law.
Voted for	Amendments to strengthen and extend the Export Control Act, and to clarify and expand restrictions on U.S. assistance to Communist-dominated countries.	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation authorizing payment of balance outstanding on awards approved under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946	Became law.
Sponsored	Resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States is determined to defend its rights in Berlin	Adopted.
Voted for	Resolution expressing U.S. determination to use arms, if necessary, to cope with the Communist threat in Cuba	Became law.
Sponsored	Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress against seating Communist China in the United Nations	Adopted.
Voted for	The new Trade Agreements Act of 1962 to help us meet the challenge of the Common Market in Europe, assist domestic industries and workers harmed by foreign competition.	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation authorizing payment of World War II damage claims from enemy-alien vested funds	To President.
Voted for	Revision of our immigration laws, with permanent authority for the orphan visa program, assistance to escapees from Communist countries.	Became law.
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted for	$90-plus billion for national defense and security	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation authorizing the President to call up a limited number of reservists to active duty if required by world crisis	Became law.
Voted for	Expanded authority and funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs, including funds for the "Moon Shot"	Became law.
Voted for	4-year extension of President's emergency civil defense powers in the event of attack on the United States	Became law.
Voted for	Reorganization of State Department security and loyalty functions including those relating to the issuance of passports and visas	Passed House.
Voted for	Legislation to strengthen and clarify certain provisions of the Smith Act	Became law.
Sponsored	Resolution to provide for the establishment of a congressional "watchdog" committee on Central Intelligence	Pending.
Voted for	Legislation to place closer checks and restrictions on the use of mails to distribute Communist propaganda	Became law.
Voted for	Authority for Secretary of Defense to establish security program to protect classified information released to defense industries	Defeated in House.
Voted for	Amendment to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, to include organizations controlled by foreign governments or parties	Became law.
Voted for	Amendment to the Criminal Code to permit prosecution for acts of espionage committed outside U.S. jurisdiction	Became law.
Voted for	Amendment to the Hiss Act denying retirement benefits to Government employees guilty of offenses against national security, and restoring benefits to persons not intended to be affected by the act.	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation establishing the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to coordinate research and development in this field	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to authorize enlistment in the Army and the Air Force of aliens legally admitted to the United States for permanent residence	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation making hijacking of commercial airliners a crime punishable by death	Became law.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	Aid to chronically distressed areas and establishment of the Area Redevelopment Administration	Became law
Voted for	Increase in minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and extension of coverage to 3,500,000 additional workers	Became law.
Voted for	Temporary extension of unemployment compensation benefits to unemployed workers (including railroad workers) who exhausted their entitlement to benefits.	Became law.
Voted for	Temporary aid to dependent children of the unemployed	Became law.
Voted for	5-year extension of the Federal Airport Act and Federal grants under this program	Became law.
Sponsored	Amendment to the Employment Act to reaffirm the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to promote stability of consumer prices.	Pending.
Voted for	Legislation increasing lending authority of Small Business Administration for business and disaster loans	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to establish a 2-year program for the retraining of unemployed workers in new skills	Became law.
Voted for	Tax reform legislation to eliminate certain defects and inequities in Internal Revenue Code, stimulate economic growth	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation requiring equal pay for women performing the same services as men	Passed House.
Favored	Program of grants to cities and other public bodies for purchase of equipment for mass transportation systems	Pending.
Voted for	Extending for 2 years the Renegotiation Act for recovery of excessive profits on defense contracts	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation to repeal the special tax on admissions, refreshments, services, and the like	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to strengthen antitrust laws to secure equality of opportunity for small businesses and to prohibit price discrimination	Pending.
Voted for	Authority to permit foreign branches of American banks to adopt practices of country where located	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation providing for $900,000,000 in immediate loans or grants for public works projects in communities with excess unemployment	Became law.
Voted for	Appropriation of $703,049,000 for Commerce Department operations, including establishment of a Department field office in Milwaukee	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation repealing 10-percent levy on rail and bus fares, cutting air fare tax to 5 percent	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation providing salary adjustments to postal and other Government employees; increasing annuities of retired Federal workers; and increasing postal rates to reduce Post Office deficit.	Became law.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE	
Voted for	Social Security Amendments of 1961 and 1962, including Zablocki amendment to curtail abuses in the aid to dependent children program	Became law.
Voted for	The Omnibus Housing Act of 1961	Became law.
Voted for	Federal grants for training teachers of deaf children	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of National Defense Education Act, additional funds for this program, and elimination of certain provisions in the law which discriminated against students and teachers in nonpublic schools.	Became law.
Voted for	Federal assistance for construction of needed college facilities, to be provided on nondiscriminatory basis; Federal scholarships for deserving needy college and university students.	Died in conference.
Sponsored	Federal aid for construction of elementary and secondary school facilities on the basis of need and without discrimination	Pending.
Voted for	Program to aid States and cities in combating juvenile delinquency	Became law.
Voted for	Expansion of the school milk program; revision of payments for the hot lunch program to better aid children in greater need	Became law.
Voted for	Federal grants to States and communities for construction of nursing homes, training of public health personnel, and improvement of services for the aged.	Became law.
Voted for	Federal matching grants for construction of educational TV facilities by State and local bodies	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of Federal aid for construction of highways, expressways; relocation assistance to families displaced by right-of-way acquisitions.	To President.
Sponsored	Legislation to establish Youth Conservation Corps	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to establish Bureau of Older Persons in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to prevent discrimination on account of age in hiring by Government contractors	Pending.
Voted for	Raising the amount of retirement income not subject to personal income tax ($1,200 to $1,524)	To President.
Voted for	Tax deduction for noninsured property damage in storm disaster areas	Became law.
Voted for	The self-employed individual retirement tax plan	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation to provide medical care/hospital insurance for the aged under social security	Defeated in Senate.
Voted for	Legislation providing $225,000,000 for low- and moderate-cost housing for the aged in urban and rural areas	Became law.
Voted for	Increase up to $15,000 in maximum tax deduction for medical and dental expenses	To President.

Voting record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 87th Cong.—Continued

Stand	Issue	Status
	GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION	
Voted for	Creation of 73 additional Federal judgeships to meet increasing caseloads	Became law.
Voted for	Increased living expense and mileage allowance for governmental employees traveling on official business	Became law.
Voted for	Reorganization of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to prohibit and fix penalties for transportation of gambling paraphernalia	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to prohibit and fix penalties for transmission of bets by wire communication	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation to prohibit and fix penalties for interstate or foreign travel, or use of the mails, for the purpose of unlawful activity	Became law.
Voted for	2-year extension of the life of the President's Commission on Civil Rights	Became law.
Favored	8 reorganization plans, put into effect with consent of Congress, to streamline executive departments, increase efficiency and economy in Government.	Became law.
Favored	Revision of Federal election laws, raising limits on campaign spending, facilitating information on fund reports, and providing tax credit for political contributions.	Passed Senate.
Voted for	Legislation requiring that defense procurement contracts, whenever feasible, be awarded on competitive basis	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation strengthening Federal criminal law relating to bribery, graft, and conflict of interest	To President.
Voted for	Authority for FCC to require all new TV sets to be equipped to receive both UHF and VHF channels	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation making the dissemination of indecent literature illegal	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation to permit the sale of surplus U.S. property to local and State governments	Pending.
Sponsored	Resolution to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Consumer Interests	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to provide a more equitable system for the settlement of disputes, grievances, and complaints in all Federal agencies and departments. Put into effect by Executive order.	
Voted for	Amendment to the U.S. Constitution outlawing payment of poll or other tax as qualification for voting in Federal elections	Adopted.
Favored	Legislation proposing a constitutional amendment allowing noncompulsory, nondenominational prayer in all American institutions	Pending.
Sponsored	Amendment to the Constitution relating to the electoral college method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States	Pending.
Voted for	Resolution providing for establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a communications satellite system	Became law.
	NATURAL RESOURCES AND AGRICULTURE	
Voted for	Legislation to make a start toward solving our farm problem by restricting production, providing lower limits for supports, and providing disposal of surpluses.	Became law.
Voted for	The 1st comprehensive water pollution control program, with Federal assistance to communities trying to safeguard our water resources	Became law.
Voted for	Expanded program for conversion of salt water to fresh water	Became law.
Favored	Establishment of an Ice Age Park in Wisconsin	Pending.
Favored	Establishment of a national wilderness preservation policy and system	Pending.
Sponsored	National milk sanitation program to eliminate discriminating practices in the sale of milk in interstate commerce, protect consumers and enable Wisconsin producers to enter and compete in other markets.	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to end the federally subsidized drainage of wet lands valuable for water fowl refuge	Became law.
Favored	Registration of interstate contractors of domestic migratory farmworkers	Passed Senate.
Voted for	Legislation to provide basic health care to children of migratory workers	Became law.
Favored	Legislation to curtail exploitation of children by narrowing agricultural child labor exemptions	Passed Senate.
Voted for	Legislation authorizing the construction of the Fryingpan-Arkansas irrigation-power project; construction of power transmission lines in the Upper Colorado Basin; construction of San Juan-Chama water supply and Navajo Indian irrigation projects; and of other well-planned, necessary flood control, irrigation, and water supply projects.	Became law.
Voted for	Continuation of the Public Law 480 program under which some of our farm surpluses are sold for foreign currencies, or distributed to the needy at home and abroad.	Became law.
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Voted for	Direct home loan program for World War II and Korean war veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Payments of special dividends to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance	Became law.
Voted for	Restoration of rank of general (5 star) to former President Eisenhower	Became law.
Voted for	Amendment and clarification of reemployment provisions of Universal Military Training and Service Act	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in payments to veterans' widows	Became law.
Voted for	Increases averaging 9.4 percent in compensation for service-connected disabilities paid to 1.9 million veterans	Became law.
Voted for	A permanent program of vocational rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disabilities serving between World War II and the Korean war, and after.	Passed House.
Voted for	Study by VA of problems of elderly, chronically ill or handicapped veterans	Passed House.
Voted for	Increased compensation for blind veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Review by independent medical experts of disputed disability or death claims of veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation reopening for 1 year granting national life insurance policies to veterans who were eligible between Oct. 7, 1940, and Jan. 1, 1957	Died in conference.
Voted for	Legislation providing that retirement of members of Armed Forces shall be in the highest grade served satisfactorily	Passed House.
Voted for	Increases in basic allowance for living quarters for members of the Armed Forces	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation permitting members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, and grants	Became law.
Voted for	Equalization of per diem travel rates of servicemen with those of Federal employees	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in readjustment payments to members of Reserve components involuntarily released from active duty	Became law.

Rollcall record of Congressman Clement J. Zablocki, 87th Cong.

Session	Total roll and quorum calls	Roll-calls	Not voting	Quorum calls	Absent on quorum calls[1]
1st	231	116	2	115	6
2d	293	128	2	165	8

[1] Absence on quorum call does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

The Present Absenteeism in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was generous of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], to remark on the floor of the House last Friday, October 5, 1962, that he thought the American people will salute the Members of Congress who have remained in Washington, D.C., in spite of campaigns and personal difficulties and political problems to finish the business of the Congress in this session.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I have no choice other than to remain on the job in Washington, D.C., frankly, because there is still much important legislation that would be jeopardized if Members like myself go home. For example, the American merchant marine is vitally concerned as are our American shipyards with H.R. 11586 which is in conference and I am a House conferee. If the Senate-House conferees fail to work out the differences between the House and the Senate bills, the entire American ship replacement program would suffer a serious setback. And I will continue to work for an agreement and favorable action on the conference report as long as there is any hope of a settlement. There are a number of similar matters so I am staying on, even though the delay and unnecessary inaction during the past months are such as to make me highly critical of the Democrat leadership of Congress in not scheduling the program for completion in a reasonable time.

Medicare for Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in a matter of days, the 87th Congress will be history.

As the curtain falls on this session, I should like to call attention to what I deem to be a serious omission—the failure of this body to come to grips with one of the most important problems which faces us—medicare for our senior citizens, which I support. I have consistently advocated a sound, comprehensive program of medical care for our older people.

In October 1960, as a candidate for Congress, I distributed a statement to every home in my district, which said, in part:

> I firmly believe that the next Congress must enact an effective measure insuring adequate medical care for our older citizens whose increased need for such care comes at a time when their earning capacity has diminished.

Let me, here and now, reaffirm this pledge.

Let me, here and now, say to those who are making this pressing need a political football, that their oratory does nothing to relieve the anxiety of many senior citizens who live in apprehension of catastrophic illness.

Farm Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently this House voted on a series of bills affecting our farm families and in general farm economy.

In answer to many requests I have prepared the following short history of our actions on this legislation:

Many pages will be filled before we hear the last about our farm problems, farm aid, farm programs, and farm politics.

It seems to be a never-ending source of controversy, especially so in Federal election years. One solution might be to force all farm legislation up for action during the off years, rather than when Congress is running.

Our main trouble stems from the simple fact that too few of us are really informed on the problem. This gets to be a bigger problem every year because of the advanced technique of public relations.

It is no secret that volumes of pages, releases, reports, and speeches go out daily supporting the position of the party in power. This is true under both political banners. Every year we are told that the new program will save money, cut surpluses, and provide more income for the farmer—without raising prices to the consumer.

These are, of course, the sincere aims of all of us, farmers, Congressmen, administration, labor, industry, and the housewife.

The end results all too often are directly opposite.

A Member of Congress can best serve his district farmers, the Nation's farmers, and the national welfare by studying his own district, listening and learning his district's farm problems, and voting for the greatest good for the greatest number.

In this manner we would at least get legislation with both a yea and nay position being known and somewhere in between we may evolve a scheme for eventually solving this perplexing problem.

In reality, however, it becomes more complicated because the smart manipulators always seem to be smart enough to put some good features into the legislation for each group, while at the same time it would be kicking the whole farm group when the final bill is written.

This is true of most of the bills passed of late years when it comes to Pennsylvania farmers. One farmer pays the taxes while tobacco, peanut, cotton, and certain corporate-type farm holdings get the benefits.

When you realize that we have over 74,000 farms in Pennsylvania, the vast majority known as family-type farms, you realize that we are a farm State and that farm legislation plays an important role in our State economy. Many of our people tend to ignore this fact.

Of recent weeks I have repeatedly stood up for the position taken by the majority of the farmers, not alone in Westmoreland County but in our State as a whole.

Out of the 74,000 farms in Pennsylvania only 17 farms received so-called subsidy payments under the feed grain program.

In fact, we would have had to buy over 1,877,000 tons of feed grain in Pennsylvania, whereas our last growth year provided all but 412,000 tons of our needs.

This means that Pennsylvania farmers would have had to buy 1,465,000 tons of feed that they now grow on their own farms.

It seems to some of us from States with an agricultural segment that this is carrying the planned farm economy too far.

Following is a short report on the legislation:

ANALYSIS OF THE FARM BILL

This had been an eventful year in the field of agricultural legislation. And when the history of the drive to use the power of Government to control American family farmers and their farms is finally written, 1962 may have been the year of decision.

If this is so, the day of decision was June 21, the day the House of Representatives voted on a bill recommended back in January.

Mandatory acreage allotment programs for all feed grains, with marketing quotas. If farmers rejected marketing quotas in a referendum, there would be no price support programs for feed grains, and the Secretary would be authorized to dump over 350 million bushels of Commodity Credit Corporation feed grain stocks on the market for unrestricted use, a provision obviously designed to compel a favorable vote by farmers participating in the referendum.

A complicated, multiple-price certificate plan for wheat, with certificates for both domestic milling and export wheat. Marketing quotas would be continued, but if farmers voted against the quotas in a referendum, there would be no price support program. Instead, the Secretary would be authorized to dump up to 200 million bushels of CCC wheat on the market.

Controls on the production of individual dairy farmers, with bases established for each producer.

Bills incorporating the program were introduced in both the Senate and the House. Early in the spring the Senate Agriculture Committee rejected the administration's program and reported a greatly modified bill.

Fortunately, it was a different story in the House of Representatives. After extensive hearings, Agriculture Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY brought the committee together several times in an effort to get a decision. But each time it was obvious that the majority opposed the bill, so he adjourned the meeting without calling for a vote.

After 3 days of oratory and 70-odd amendments the bill came to a vote late in the evening on Thursday, June 21. Congressman FINDLEY offered a motion to kill it by sending it back to the Agriculture Committee. When the rollcall was complete, farmers had won, 215 to 205. For the time being, the bill was dead.

A courageous band of 48 Democrats joined in the victory. And for each of them it meant a greater effort than for their Republican colleagues. Your Congressman was 1 of the 48. He said to his friends, "If I voted to say that a farmer could not raise the feed on his farm to feed his livestock I would have to move, and I do not want to move."

In July the House passed a temporary bill, extending the existing emergency wheat and feed grain programs with slight modifications.

After the House acted, the Senate Agriculture Committee began work on a new bill. The committee rejected the House plan and recommended the certificate plan for wheat, together with an extension of the emergency feed grain legislation.

When the Senate's second bill reached the floor late in August, Chairman ELLENDER again led a drive to amend it. This time he secured passage of an amendment repealing the corn and feed grain price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1958 and providing that, beginning in 1964, the Secretary of Agriculture would set the price support on corn and other feed grains at from 0 to 90 percent of parity.

Because this would have left feed grain producers without any effective price support protection in 1964, it was widely interpreted as a threat to coerce farmers to accept severe controls of feed grains in the next Congress.

Thus the end product of all the legislative activity in the agricultural price support and adjustment area this year is a warning that another effort to control farms and farmers may be made in Washington in 1963.

Whether another attempt to enact a similar bill is made may depend on the congressional elections this fall.

William Kuhfuss, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, has made it clear to farmers in his State what needs to be done.

"We feel we need to support those Congressmen who paid heed to the letters and telegrams from Farm Bureau members and voted in support of the Farm Bureau position," he said.

The rollcall votes on the farm bill in the Senate and House are printed and each Member is recorded. Congressman DENT, of Pennsylvania, was one of those who supported his farmers.

Your Congressmen have voted. It is your turn to vote in November. Your vote may help determine whether this was the crucial year in the continuing fight for the American farm family's freedom.

SENATE

Monday, October 8, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, Thou hast set us in a world of wonder and beauty. Every new day we turn to Thee, seeking deliverance from low motivation which would crucify wonder and beauty on a cross of personal greed or gain.

Give us to see and to feel that our highest job in these fleeting days of mortal life is found in the loveliness of nature, in the lure of friendship, in the conquest of difficulty, and in the compensations of selfless service. In the preoccupation of this world capital, with vast issues that in their implications belt the earth, forgive us for our tendency to see too readily human failings in those close to us, and for our slowness in being aware of the virtues of those who toil by our side.

In this day of destiny, when in the fires of revolution all humanity seems molten, ready to be poured into new channels, may we be carried up into Thy great purposes for Thy human family, and find in Thee, Father of mankind, above our human contentions, the goal of all our striving and the end of all our desiring, as we pray, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done." We ask it in the name of the Holy One who taught us thus to pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 5, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 5, 1962, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 699) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2450. An act for the relief of Maj. C. Todd, Jr., and the estate of Ira T. Todd, Sr.;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of G. W. Todd and the estate of Lloyd Parks;

S. 2953. An act relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America; and

S. 3394. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William A. Carter, U.S. Air Force.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3705) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes by the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WALTER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CHELF, Mr. POFF, and Mr. MOORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 23, and 26 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8853) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 570. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin; and

H. Con. Res. 583. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 185,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 914. An act to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia, to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1288. An act to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1552. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, effectiveness, and reliability of drugs, authorize standardization of drug names, and clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority; and for other purposes;

S. 1563. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Ga.-S.C., to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes;

S. 1658. An act to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make Indian tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 2928. An act for the relief of Seymour K. Owens;

S. 3631. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of reports filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis;

S. 3679. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to hold a World Food Congress in the United States in 1963;

H.R. 7927. An act to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8853) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 570) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is and has been to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and
>
> Whereas it is the purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Germany; and
>
> Whereas in connection with the termination of hostilities in World War II of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union freely entered into binding agreements under which the four powers have the right to remain in Berlin, with the right of ingress and egress, until the conclusion of a final settlement with the Government of Germany; and
>
> Whereas no such final settlement has been concluded by the four powers and the aforementioned agreements continue in force: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress—
>
> (a) that the continued exercise of United States, British, and France rights in Berlin constitutes a fundamental political and moral determination;
>
> (b) that the United States would regard as intolerable any violation by the Soviet Union directly or through others of those rights in Berlin, including the right of ingress and egress;
>
> (c) that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 583) to provide for the printing of 185,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, one hundred and eighty-five thousand copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto, suitable for distribution as provided for by section 8 of the Act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 508; Public Law 86–650), as amended by S.J. Res. 60, to immigrants admitted for permanent residence.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2285)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is in the Chamber, as is my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

In pursuance of my statement to them on last Friday, I send to the desk at this time the report from the Senate Appropriations Committee on House bill 13290, which is the last supplemental appropriation bill for this session and the first supplemental appropriation bill for 1963. I ask that the report be filed at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (H.R. 13290) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, was placed on the calendar.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the action taken by my distinguished colleague is in complete conformity with his statement of the other day.

However, it now becomes timely for me, in pursuance of the objectives I am trying to achieve, to propound a parliamentary inquiry and then to make a statement.

Mr. President, I now desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr SMATHERS. If I were to ask that the Senate observe the rule that appropriation bills lie on the table for 3 days, such a request would now be in order, would it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, and then the bill would be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SMATHERS. And if I asked that the rule be observed and that the appropriation bill lie on the table for 3 days, when would it then be possible for the bill to be considered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On Friday.

Mr. SMATHERS. On Friday?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the leadership that I would now like to give official notice—and I should like to have the leader understand that I am doing it—that I wish to have the rule followed—namely, to have this supplemental appropriation bill lie over, in accordance with the rule, for the necessary 3 days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator will be acting within his rights if he exerts those rights to the limit. It will mean, if the supplemental appropriation bill is reported today, that the Senate will not reach it until Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand—and I hope the Chair will correct me—that if it is reported, and if the rule is carried to its full effect, it can not be considered until Friday, instead of Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in case my good friend the distinguished Senator from Florida should relent in his determination, I desire to enter an objection. Should the Senator withdraw his objection, I desire to enter an objection. After the morning hour is concluded and I can obtain recognition, I wish to discuss briefly some of the misstatements and falsehoods which have been made with respect to the position of the Senate on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of what has been said today, I think the Senate is on notice, and I hope all plans Senators have made will be canceled. As far as I am concerned, I am reconciled to remaining here for a long time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I respect the rights of my distinguished friends and colleagues in taking the position which they have taken. Inasmuch as I expect to observe the rules, I shall not attempt to call up the bill prior to the expiration of 3 days without first consulting the distinguished Senator from Georgia and my distinguished colleague from Florida. I hope events will be such that they can relent, because I had expected to attend my annual homecoming party, if I may call it that, which is set for Friday. It has been set for several months. I thought, by setting it for that day, it would be possible for us to have a 2-week vacation in the delightful mountains of North Carolina, giving us a day or two before we reached home. I hope the Senate may consider this important measure in time for me to fulfill that engagement, because, if it does not, I shall either have to turn over my responsibility to another Senator or ask that the Senate meet next Monday.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I share the hope of my colleague. I hope events will be such that the matter will not have to go over until Friday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I share that hope, but I shall be glad to support the Senator, if he does not get unanimous consent, in a motion to postpone consideration of the bill until Monday if we do not get the action desired.

Mr. HOLLAND. While that would be cruel and inhuman punishment, as described in the Constitution, for all Senators, including the three of us now discussing this question, I would be perfectly willing to accede to that suggestion if it became necessary. I do not think we can lose sight of the fact that the two Senators who have been engaged in the colloquy are engaged in trying to obtain important objectives, important to the Senate and to Members of Congress on both sides of the Capitol.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am not wholly unaware of what the rules of the Senate provide, and therefore I can understand, by the comments made a few moments ago by some of our colleagues, that this session of the Congress may continue for another week or possibly longer. There is very little anyone can do about it, except what many have already done, and that is to play some hooky.

The first Tuesday after the first Monday in November will occur 4 weeks from tomorrow when, under the Constitution, the people of the United States will be called upon to register their sentiments with respect to all the Members in the House of Representatives, and somewhat in excess of one-third of the Members of the U.S. Senate. There are some Democrats in this Chamber and some Republicans who have a very keen interest in the outcome of that election.

I view with deep regret—may I say with bitter regret—the fact that we are chained to Washington and to this Chamber in what has been the longest, and most enervating session in my 10 years' service in this body.

I speak as one who supported H.R. 10 on two or three occasions since 1953. I wish the President of the United States had seen fit, before today, to approve or reject H.R. 10 and send it back here if he rejected it, so that the Congress could then also make its decision in accordance with the constitutional process in the event the President saw fit to veto it.

I rise mainly because of the feeling of exasperation and frustration that I believe is shared by every one of my colleagues.

REPORT ENTITLED "IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARGO PREFERENCE LAWS BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2286)

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I submit a report covering activities of the committee during the current Congress for the purpose of strengthening the administration of the cargo preference statute and related laws.

Cargo preference, sometimes known as fifty-fifty, is a national policy established permanently in Public Law 664 of the 83d Congress, which provides that at least 50 percent of all Government-financed and Government-aid ocean cargoes shall be transported in commercial vessels of U.S. registry.

From the very beginning, administration of this policy by some departments and agencies has been the occasion of controversy. Although the 50 percent reservation of such cargoes was intended by Congress to be a minimum, it has apparently been considered as a maximum at times by administering departments. Also, there have been a number of occasions where purchases for Government account, particularly intended for use abroad, while clearly covered by statute, have been exempted by departmental decree from the cargo preference requirements.

During this Congress Senator MAGNUSON has taken up with various departments and agencies specific cases where cargo preference was intended to apply, and has been instrumental in securing compliance with the spirit as well as the wording of the statutes.

The report cites some of these instances, and includes also the directive issued by the President to the executive departments and agencies, setting forth the requirements for maximum use of U.S.-flag vessels for transportation of Government-generated cargoes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3798. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Barretta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3799. A bill to establish an interdepartmental committee to promote economy and efficiency in the conduct of educational and cultural exchange programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE TO PROMOTE ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN CONDUCT OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for the purpose of establishing an interdepartmental committee to promote economy and efficiency in the conduct of educational and cultural exchange programs, and ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3799) to establish an interdepartmental committee to promote economy and efficiency in the conduct of educational and cultural exchange programs, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, by way of explanation, I would like to review for the Senate the activities and proceedings surrounding one of the important information and cultural exchange programs which took place in my home State, at the South Dakota State Agriculture College, in Brooklings, S. Dak., during the past summer.

Through the cooperation of the Foreign Agriculture Training Division, the Agency for International Development, and the Cultural Exchange Division of the Department of State, arrangements were made to invite technicians, students, and Government officials to an international soil and water utilization seminar. The seminar was successfully conducted by the staff at South Dakota State College. Sixty-two nationals from thirty-one countries participated in this first seminar.

However, during the planning process and during the seminar itself, we observed that there are some deficiencies in the operation of the exchange programs, and it is for this purpose that we hope a study can be made for streamlining some of them.

The seminar which we undertook was not one which was planned well in advance. The entire operation was well under a year. It was not something for which appropriations had been specifically made. The funding was done by various agencies. It was not something specifically spelled out in law. It was achieved through the most heartwarming cooperation of dedicated public servants, working within the framework of existing laws.

We hope that this is but the first of such seminars, but we recognize that there will have to be some changes made either in law or Executive orders so the subsequent seminars can reach fruition.

The ideas surrounding the need for this legislation are not mine alone. I have spoken of "we" during these remarks because what I am saying reflects the views of many who work in the exchange-of-persons programs.

I firmly believe in the value of exchanging information and ideas, and I have supported legislation to establish them. However, when we have programs of this kind, scattered through many departments, and through agencies in the departments, we are likely to find that the programs get a little out of hand with duplication of effort and lack of coordination on programing. This has happened on some of our exchange programs. Those of us interested in these exchange efforts believe that there is a possibility that these programs can be operated in a more coordinated manner, that we can carry them out more efficiently, and that we can, thereby, promote economy.

I realize that it is late in the session to be introducing such a bill, but I do it for the reason that it will give executive agencies a little time to look at the bill and to do some thinking and planning. I fully intend to reintroduce the bill at the beginning of the next session of Congress, but we will have a short time between the end of this session and the beginning of the next when executive personnel can have an opportunity to summarize their thoughts in preparation for hearings, which I hope we can hold shortly after the first of the year.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CARL E. McGOWAN TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, October 15, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice Henry W. Edgerton, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Proclamation by the President of the United States of America for National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, 1962.

Joint statement by the associate members of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Article entitled "Jobs for the Disabled," by Howard A. Rusk, M.D., appearing in the New York Times of Sunday, October 7, 1962.

NEWS STORIES WRITTEN BY STUDENTS OF APGAR-WEST GLACIER SCHOOL, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at a time when we are being subjected to an avalanche of end-of-the-session amendments, statistics, conference reports, and other assorted heavy reading, it is refreshing to have news of the lighter side of life cross our desks.

Such was the case the other day when Mel Ruder, editor of the Hungry Horse News, of Columbia Falls, Mont., sent me a column of news stories written by boys and girls of the Apgar-West Glacier School. I found them very entertaining, and I think the youngsters should be complimented for their fine job of writing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEE DEER

Today when David Randy and I went home at noon we saw a doe and fawn. We stayed and watched. After a while we saw the doe jump a bush, then it ran away.—BOBBY SHELLEY.

My mother and I went to Great Falls to visit my father over the weekend. We drove to Belt and saw some old gold mines and a silver mine. We took pictures of the silver. I found a rock with silver in it. After that we went to see Charlie Russell's studio to add a picture of it to our school collection and when we were coming home we stopped at the Goat Lick and saw a great big goat slide down by the salt lick. When I was coming home from Sunday school last Sunday, I saw a Canada jay. Now the birds are coming back. We had stellar jays at our window.—BILLY TROTTER.

Saturday my grandmother went to let her cats in and a bear was on the porch. My grandmother put her head out and the bear slapped her. She had to go to the doctor. We live at Nyack.—PATTY SHOWEN.

Friday afternoon the Bookmobile came. We all enjoy the Bookmobile. We like the books very much. David Shaver is the librarian this time. His assistants are Judy Sloan and Donita Tyree.—CARY KING.

SMELLS BETTER NOW

There was a skunk visiting our house last Friday. He sprayed our dog, Rebel, a little. Rebel is a great big white dog with a pink nose and two brown eyes. We all like him. He is getting to smell better now.—KAREN BENGSTON.

There are two or three bears in the Nyack Valley. They come down every night and tip over garbage cans. There is one with paint on its head. The bear by our house just tips it over and doesn't scatter the garbage. We hope it isn't a grizzly bear. When they have paint on them that means that the park has caught them and have taken them away when one of these have paint on it.—TOMMY SANDS.

One day when we were eating, we heard a squeaking noise. Grandpa went out to see what was the matter. There was a chipmunk down in our empty window box and it couldn't get out. Grandpa went and got my butterfly net, and took the chipmunk out. He knocked on the window and we looked. He showed us the chipmunk and then he let him go.—RANDY COOK.

I was tying my shoe and I put my little chain bracelet in my mouth. When I raised my head I forgot about it and swallowed it.—CHELI TESMER.

TIGHT MONEY HAS SLOWED ECONOMY, CREATED UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the traditional method used for many years by our Government to stimulate the economy has been the adjustment of our money supply—to increase or to decrease interest rates. This is a method which virtually everyone, of every political party—Democrats, Republicans, and independents—approves. It is traditional. It is accepted. Unfortunately, during the past several years our monetary policy has been to keep interest rates artificially high, in my opinion.

The fact is that the money supply has been lower; that is tighter, in relationship to the gross national product, than it has been at any other time in the last 35 years, tighter than when Andrew Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury. This is one of the principal reasons why the economy has not moved ahead as rapidly as it should. This is a major reason for large and continuing unemployment.

George W. Mitchell is the only Kennedy appointee to the Federal Reserve Board. He is an eminent banker—and, incidentally, a native of Wisconsin. He has served for many years as a top official in the Federal Reserve System. In the October issue of the Mortgage Banker, he has written an article answering the question, "Could monetary policy in the last 6 months have made a greater contribution to our overall economic well-being?"

His answer is as follows—and I quote the concluding paragraph of the article:

> We come down to the basic question of the past 6 months, "Could monetary policy have made a greater contribution to our overall economic well-being?" The slower expansion thus far in 1962 suggests that a more aggressive monetary policy involving greater credit availability might have led to a fuller utilization of resources. The concern with the level of short-term rates has been a key factor in inhibiting policy. Against the possibility of more rapid economic growth we have had to balance the risk that reduced interest rates and greater liquidity might have worsened our balance of payments further.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly—and the case is overwhelming—that interest rate differentials affect only very slightly our balance of payments. The studies by Dr. Phillip Bell, of Haverford College; Robert Roosa, of the Treasury; and Robert F. Gemmill, of the Federal Reserve Board, show that this is so. I hope that before radical fiscal measures—unbalancing the budget by drastically cutting taxes at a time when revenues are already too small to permit balancing the budget—will not be used until we have a real opportunity to use monetary policy far more aggressively to move the economy ahead.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Mitchell be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COULD MONETARY POLICY IN THE PAST 6 MONTHS HAVE MADE A GREATER CONTRIBUTION TO OUR OVERALL ECONOMIC WELL-BEING?

(By George W. Mitchell)

Our current economic situation is notable for the absence so far of upward price pressures. So far as average prices are concerned, this is explained in part by the level of unutilized resources and by a number of comparatively noninflationary wage settlements.

So far as sensitive industrial prices are concerned, it may be explained more by moderate demand for basic materials relative to the domestic and worldwide capacity to provide them.

All in all, then, in the first half of 1962, spending, particularly for durable goods and inventories, slowed down. In relation to their incomes, both consumers and businesses spent less for final goods and services in the first half of 1962 than they had after a comparable period of time in the upswing following the cyclical trough of early 1958. With consumer spending not very high relative to income and with the internal flow of business funds from retained earnings and depreciation larger than capital outlays, there have not been heavy demand pressures on credit markets and the supply of funds to markets has remained fairly large.

What then can be said about the basic cause of this slowdown? Does it reflect fundamental shifts in the structure of the economy, or is it the same kind of cyclical phenomenon we have often experienced in the past?

In the past year or more, the public seems to have been quite willing to save. This could be the result of many influences, including diminished inflationary expectations. Saving is the source of funds to finance investment demand of business and consumers, but if investment demand is lagging, then the saving acts as a brake on economic growth.

It now appears that as the post-World War II experience recedes further into the past, we can count less and less on the willingness of the American consumer to go heavily into debt in order to acquire durable goods. Needs are less urgent and tastes are turning more toward services and types of expenditures less likely to be financed by borrowing.

At the same time, the Federal budget moves rapidly, sometimes too rapidly, from deficit toward surplus in economic recovery. At such times enlarged Government saving supplements private saving. This places a heavy burden on rising investment outlays by business and consumers to maintain the momentum of economic expansion. To deal with structural problems such as these, monetary policy needs to be complemented by other governmental economic action.

For several years now, foreign countries have been adding to gold and dollar holdings because they have been running a surplus in their balance of payments with the United States. Our trade balance has generally been favorable, but this has often been offset by aid and military expenditures abroad, by other current account payments for service, and by long-term capital outflows, in large part representing direct investments in overseas branches and subsidiaries. Taking all these elements together, then, we can see that what may be called our basic balance has been generally unfavorable in recent years.

In 1960 and 1961, this siutation was intensified by large short-term capital outflows from this country, partly because interest rates were high abroad and relatively low here, partly because of the demand for bank credit by certain foreign borrowers, and partly at times because of speculative activity in exchange markets. Such outflows have been less of a problem so far in 1962, however.

The balance-of-payments position has influenced credit market developments because monetary and fiscal authorities have attempted to minimize incentives for capital to flow abroad, particularly highly volatile liquid funds. It has had an influence primarily on short-term interest rates and, to some degree, on the availability of credit at commercial banks. Thus, financial market developments have been influenced not only by trends in domestic economic activity but also by balance-of-payments developments and by the reaction of policy authorities to such developments.

The continued high level of saving by consumers and business has been accompanied by a shift in the supply of funds more toward the long end of the credit market. The supply of funds channeled to this sector of the market by commercial banks and nonbank financial institutions expanded during the first 6 months of 1962. This was partly a result of shifts in the structure of institutional liabilities, especially in the first quarter of the year, when the public channeled unusually large amounts of funds into time and savings deposits at commercial banks. Consider some of these changes that occurred in supply conditions:

Bank reserve positions: Reserves available to banks provide a basis for bank credit expansion and, therefore, an important influence on the supply of funds in markets. The reserve position of banks has continued to be comparatively favorable so far in 1962, although growth in their total reserves has been slower than last year. Member bank borrowings from Federal Reserve banks have generally continued to be minimal. And free reserves of banks—that is, excess reserves less borrowings—have varied between $350 and $550 million for the past 6 months. In earlier expansionary periods, such as 1958–59, banks had already increased their borrowings markedly by this point, and they had shifted to a net borrowed reserve position. The maintenance of a free reserve position for so long a period is primarily the result of moderate bank loan demand, and the consequent willingness of the Federal Reserve to supply reserves in step with total bank deposit expansion.

Excess reserves are held mainly by country banks and in the past decade have varied within fairly narrow range. In late 1960, banks were permitted to count all their vault cash as part of required reserves. For a few months around that time, excess reserves were above normal levels, but they soon returned to around earlier levels as bankers became accustomed to the new regulation and adapted their investment policies to take it into account.

Borrowings at Federal Reserve banks are the volatile element affecting free reserves, and city banks are the most active borrowers. Their borrowings are influenced by the vigor of loan demands and the relative level of the discount rate. The discount rate is ordinarily kept in fairly close alinement with related market rates, but for the past 2 years or so it has remained unchanged at the 3 percent level to which it had been reduced in the summer of 1960 and has been consistently above market rates. At the same time private loan demand has been moderate. Thus, banks have had little incentive to borrow at Federal Reserve banks even at the present stage of the business upturn.

For most of the past 2 years, banks have been able to obtain temporary reserve funds, when needed, at rates generally below the discount rate by borrowing excess balances of other banks in what is called the Federal funds market, a market that has become increasingly more active in the past 3 years.

Money supply, bank deposits, and related assets: In the past year and a half, an unusually large proportion of funds flowing into commercial banks from the public took the form of time and savings deposits. Such deposits expanded by 13 percent in 1961, quite a high rate. In the first quarter of 1962 the annual rate of increase accelerated to 25 percent, but it has since returned to the 1961 rate.

Given the amount of reserves made available to banks by the monetary authorities, the large increases in time and savings deposits adversely influenced the growth in money supply—that is, currency and demand deposits held by the public. In the first 3 months of 1962, money supply declined slightly from its year-end level. Partly there were switches directly from demand to time accounts. And partly there were switches from market instruments and other assets to time deposits.

From the statistical evidence it does not appear that much of the rise in time and savings deposits in 1962 represented funds diverted from other savings institutions. Net inflows of funds to mutual savings banks rose in the first quarter of 1962, after allowance for seasonal variation, and remained above their 1961 pace of increase in the second quarter.

Net inflows to savings and loan associations in the first quarter were about the same as their high fourth quarter of 1961 rate, but these inflows fell off in the second quarter, paralleling reduced inflows to commercial banks. But some of the expansion in bank credit appears to have represented a diversion of savings from direct purchases of market instruments, or to a small extent from flows that might otherwise have gone to other nonbank financial institutions, and has, therefore, not represented a net increase in total credit.

Money supply in the hands of the public is about at the average level reached in December 1961. Contributing to the sluggishness of money supply was the large buildup in U.S. Government deposits until early July, when they were run down to some extent. Though, in fact, Government deposits were rising the Treasury continued security offerings, including a large amount of bills, in anticipation of a rise in Government spending relative to current tax receipts. Most of these short-term issues may well have been purchased by the nonbank public, who in some degree may have reduced idle cash holdings to do so or who may have used cash that might otherwise have financed spending. The public has in effect substituted short-term U.S. Government securities for cash, and they can hold these securities at interest rates that are attractive in periods of economic uncertainty.

Turnover of money: While the money supply has shown little increase, it has been used more intensively to finance the economy's spending, but not intensively enough to accommodate the higher level of spending hoped for. The turnover of demand deposits outside of New York—in New York turnover is more heavily influenced by financial transactions—was higher in the first half of 1962 than in the second half of 1961. A large part of the increase occurred early in the year, and was possibly related to the sharp initial movements of funds into time and savings deposits. But turnover did rise further in the second quarter, when inflows to time and savings accounts slowed down.

Turnover has generally risen throughout the postwar period from low levels reached during the 1930's depression and the war years, when the public was keeping itself in a highly liquid state—in one period voluntarily and the other involuntarily. But is has also shown cyclical variation. After adjusting for seasonal variation and for the general trend, deposit turnover has generally declined in recessions and risen in expansions. In New York, however, turnover has often risen in recession and declined in expansion. During the last recession, turnover in centers outside New York did not show as much cyclical decline as in the 1957–58 recession, possibly because of greater public preference for other assets. It is significant that short-term interest rates declined less in the last recession than in 1957–58.

Whether or not cyclically rising turnover can substitute for growth in the money supply is an important question. Many analysts have contended that turnover has a ceiling and much discussion focuses on whether or not it has been reached or approached. If it were reached, lack of money supply growth would mean lack of economic growth, for at that point the public would be unwilling to economize further on the use of cash balances in order to increase spending.

The trouble with this approach is that it looks only at the observed rate of turnover but fails to measure the strain imposed on the economy by the very act of increasing turnover. At any given time the economy can adapt to a smaller relative money supply and this will show up as increased velocity. The important question is, does the adaption involve less spending than would otherwise have occurred. One example would be that the inducement to economize cash balances is a high level of short-term interest rates, so high as to place a floor under long-term rates, which in turn inhibits borrowing to finance capital outlays.

Bank credit: With the rapid expansion of time and savings deposits total commercial bank credit outstanding has grown fairly rapidly so far in 1962, although there were slack periods in the early spring and early summer. Of total funds raised in credit markets, almost one-third were advanced by the commercial banking system in 1961 and also the first half of 1962. This was a larger proportion than in 4 preceding years, except for 1958—years when the supply of reserve funds was under more restraint.

In managing their loan and investment portfolios, banks this year invested heavily in tax-exempt State and local government issues and also became more interested in longer term loans such as mortgages. During the recession and early in the recovery, they invested heavily in U.S. Government securities, particularly short-term issues. Since mid-1961, however, U.S. Government security holdings have not increased very much.

So far in 1962, banks have put more emphasis on longer term than on short-term U.S. Government securities. They have reduced their holdings of Treasury bills, and have added to holdings of longer term Treasury issues, in part by participating in new financings. Holdings of all U.S. Government securities maturing within a year increased slightly, however, during the first half of 1962, because of the effect that passage of time has on securities remaining in bank portfolios.

These changes in bank investment behavior have several causes. Incentive to invest heavily in the longer term sectors of the market was provided by the large increase in time and savings deposits that occurred after the first of the year, when maximum permissible interest rates were raised on those deposits. At this point, banks began more actively to seek higher earning assets at some sacrifice perhaps in already high liquidity. Banks had built up their liquidity to rather high levels by mid-1961, through adding to short-term U.S. Government securities at the comparatively favorable short-term rates that prevailed for a period of recession and early recovery. Thus, they were not necessarily eager to add further to liquidity. With loan demand remaining moderate, they sought other relatively high-yielding investments.

Stock market: In supplying funds to markets, investors were influenced in part by an abatement of inflationary expectations, which increased their willingness to make funds available in fixed-value form. There was a shift away from equities as a preferred form of asset holding, particularly at prices and yields that existed earlier in the year, and this culminated in the sharp break in stock prices during spring. The decline in prices seems to have represented in part investors reassessment of stock prices in relation to earnings—in the light of diminished inflationary expectations and of a slowdown in the rate of economic expansion. The reassessment brought stock yields closer to interest rates on bonds, though still below them as they have been since mid-1959.

The total funds raised through Government and private security issues and bank and other loans after allowing for repayments reached a peak toward the end of last year, and has been lower, seasonably adjusted, in the past 6 months. But the amount of financing is still above earlier experience, except for late 1958 and 1959.

The decline has been the result mainly of lowered demands from private sectors of the economy. Federal Government financing has continued to be larger than usual for the first half of a year, with offerings in all maturity sectors. There were continued Treasury bill offerings throughout the first half of 1962, but in addition there were offerings in longer term sectors through both cash and refunding operations.

In private sectors, including State and local governments, long-term financing in the first half of 1962 has remained fairly substantial, lower than levels prevailing in the last three quarters of 1961, but above late 1958 and 1959. Demands have been sustained by continued sizable issues of corporate and State and local government securities and growth in mortgage financing. Short-term demands by private sectors have, meanwhile, fluctuated fairly widely, rising in the second half of 1961, and falling in the first half of this year, when business and other loan demands from banks, particularly loans for purchasing or carrying securities, became less active.

During the first half of 1962, short-term interest rates have been higher than in 1961, but long-term rates after receding earlier in the year rose about midyear. The movement of interest rates in the first half of the year was strongly influenced by the public's preferences for time and savings deposits, coupled with commercial banks' investment policies. In addition, short-term rates were influenced by monetary and debt management policies designed to minimize balance-of-payments strains.

Yields on longer term U.S. Government, corporate, and most spectacularly, State and local government issues, declined through midspring and then rose. They have not yet reached earlier highs, however. Mortgage yields have continued to drift downward.

The easing of conditions in long-term sectors of the market earlier in the year reflected for the most part the increased availability of funds that was sparked by the public's response to the change in regulation Q affecting time deposit interest rates; in addition, there were continued heavy inflows to savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. The early summer rise in rates was accompanied by a slowing down in the inflow of time and savings deposits to commercial banks and of funds to nonbank savings institutions. In addition, the reserve base of banks has grown more slowly in recent months.

Bank portfolio choices were not the only factors impinging on short-term rates, of course. To help the balance of payments situation, the Treasury offset downward pressures on the bill rate by increasing its offerings of short-term issues. Federal Reserve open market operations also served at times to moderate downward pressures on short-term rates. These actions served to minimize incentives for short-term capital to flow abroad. But they may also have had the effect of keeping long rates from declining more and, hence, domestic spending from rising more, mainly because short-term rates made liquidity too attractive in this period of uncertainty.

The economy's performance in the first half of the year has been below the expectation of most and the hopes of all, but we should nevertheless view it with a confidence that is commensurate with the resilience and strength shown in this period. The stock market reappraisal, the shift in fiscal operations, the inventory adjustment growing out of the steel settlement have each probably had significant dampening effects on the real economy.

The banking system appears to have responded to the actions of the Federal Reserve about as one would expect. Bank liquidity changed little in 1962. The level of excess reserves at the country banks averaged $500 million in the last half of 1961 and $440 million in the first half of 1962—about the same as in the past 5 years. The reserve city banks kept their own positions in close balance but were reluctant to go into debt at the 3-percent discount rate, given the apparent demand for loans and prevailing yields on investments. In this situation, without evident strong demand for bank loans from the economy, expansion in money supply came to a halt before the beginning of this year. In their capacity as savings institutions, banks extended credit commensurate with the increase in their time and savings deposits.

The public's response has been more enigmatic. We do know that with the rising level of GNP, the intensity with which the money supply has been used continued to rise secularly and also cyclically. High yielding liquid assets gained in appeal—the idea of earning 4 percent on funds that were as good as cash and the promotion of this idea by financial intermediaries in a competitive struggle undoubtedly was a restraint of some kind on spending.

Looking at the figures, the total of liquid assets in the hands of the nonbank public has been rising faster than gross national product in the first half of the year. In expansionary periods the ratio of liquid assets to gross national product usually declines, as it did during most of 1961. So far as credit flows are concerned, total credit flows in the first half of 1962 were lower in relation to gross national product than they were in the first half of 1959, about the same stage of the earlier cycle. Similarly, private borrowing is lower in relation to expenditures, other than those by the Federal Government, for goods and services, than was the case in the earlier period.

We come down to the basic question of the past 6 months, could monetary policy have made a greater contribution to our overall economic well-being? The slower expansion thus far in 1962 suggests that a more aggressive monetary policy involving greater credit availability might have led to a fuller utilization of resources. The concern with the level of short-term rates has been a key factor in inhibiting policy. Against the possibility of more rapid economic growth we have had to balance the risk that reduced interest rates and greater liquidity might have worsened our balance of payments further.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND WATERSHED PROTECTION PROJECTS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and in order that the Members of the Senate and House, particularly the Appropriations Committees, and other interested parties may be advised of projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and the Watershed Protection and Flood Presention Act, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this subject.

The first is a list of eight public buildings projects, six projects for new buildings, and two projects for alterations to existing buildings.

Approval of these building projects is based on prospectuses submitted to the committee by the Administrator of General Services, or reports on surveys of Federal building needs, in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 294, 86th Congress. All these projects have been discussed with representatives of the General Services Administration, who justified the need for these buildings.

The small watershed protection projects were approved under the provisions of Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BUILDINGS

Location and project	Date of approval	Estimated cost
San Diego, Calif., courthouse and Federal office building	Sept. 18, 1962	$22,584,000
Akron, Ohio, (2) courthouse and Federal office building, and post office.	Aug. 22, 1962	11,693,000
Tulsa, Okla., additional court facilities to authorized building.	do	1,609,000
Ft. Snelling, Minn	Sept. 18, 1962	16,419,000
Knoxville, Tenn., Federal office building.	do	8,252,000
Washington, D.C., office building for HHFA.	Sept. 27, 1962	32,000,000
ALTERATIONS		
Washington, D.C., South Building, Agriculture Department	Sept. 18, 1962	$600,000
Washington, D.C., Old Post Office Building	do	718,000
Total		93,965,000
WATERSHED PROJECTS		
Brandywine Creek, Del.-Pa.	Aug. 22, 1962	$2,060,978
Tobesofkee Creek, Ga. (supplement)	Oct. 2, 1962	964,358
Twin Caney Creek, Kans	Aug. 22, 1962	2,843,300
Cottonwood Creek, Okla	Oct. 2, 1962	3,837,355
Delaware Creek, Okla	do	1,117,684
Sandy Creek, Pa	Aug. 22, 1962	785,393
Salada Creek, Tex	do	3,934,298
Valley Creek, Tex	do	2,023,951
Boulder Lake, Wyo	Oct. 2, 1962	420,700
Total		18,008,017

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under the rule, was dispensed with.

BASIS LAID FOR OBTAINING BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET BY 1965

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, before this current session of Congress is adjourned, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the basis laid in the postal rate and pay bill, H.R. 7927, for obtaining a balanced postal budget by 1965. I shall ask to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement concerning this matter which should be heartening to every Member of Congress.

As Senators will see from this statement, once the postal rate bill has run its course, the revenues and expenditures of our great Post Office Department will be in balance. It is my sincere hope that we shall be able to keep it in balance for many years to come.

It seems to me that, with the proper use of modern systems, we should be able to develop the efficiency necessary to increase volume and at the same time reduce unit costs. Under a Democratic Postmaster General, we have already made significant strides in the direction of increased efficiency and elimination of frills. I believe that studies to be commenced next year on mail classification, postal costs, and mechanization will go a long way toward attaining a balanced postal budget, and will keep it so in the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement previously referred to printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET BY 1965

H.R. 7927, as amended in the Senate, provides rate increases in excess of those approved by the House committee in September 1961. The Senate version of this measure provides a firm basis for achieving a balanced postal budget by 1965. Recognizing, of course, that volume and expense will increase; nevertheless, as volume increases, so will revenues. Postal efficiency should permit volume increases at lower unit costs.

An analysis with respect to the deficit

[In millions of dollars]

H.R. 7927 will produce	[1] 600
Public services allowed	[2] 373
ICC hike in parcel post revenues	[3] 135
Total additional income	1,108
Postal deficit, fiscal year 1963	832
Additional postal pay ($363,000,000 less 25 percent, or $91,000,000)	[4] 272
Total additional cost	1,104

[1] Any further upward adjustment in postal rates would be contrary to the 1958 act (Public Law 85-426) which provides that revenue and expense should be approximately equal, after adjustment for public services.

[2] Public service estimates adjusted upward resulting from pay modifications contained in H.R. 7927.

[3] Data contained in present ICC parcel post docket.

[4] Sec. 1007 of H.R. 7927 calls for the absorption of pay costs. The total cost to the Post Office of $363,000,000 is adjusted by approximately 25 percent to allow for absorption. This absorption would be less than 2 percent of a $5,000,000,000 postal budget. Such would appear reasonable in light of the Postmaster General's record to date, and the statement by the Deputy Postmaster General in 1961 that, given time and authority, the Post Office Department could save $300,000,000 annually.

STATE DEPARTMENT REBUTTALS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, some time ago, there was discussion on the Senate floor with regard to two incidents reported in the press. The first involved an article which appeared early in September by the reporters Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott. The article charged the existence of a note from Khrushchev to President Kennedy the weekend before the 1961 ill-fated Cuban invasion, a note threatening Soviet retaliation in West Berlin if the United States used American forces against Cuba.

At the time of that discussion I stated that I had asked the Department of State for clarification of the extent to which there was a connection between Berlin and Cuba and, specifically, to respond to the inquiry whether there was such a note from Mr. Khrushchev to President Kennedy.

I said that I would place in the RECORD later the reply from the Department of State. The Department of State has replied. It has denied the existence of such a written communication prior to the Bay of Pigs invasion. I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1962.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: This letter is in further reply to the telephone inquiry from your office this past week as to whether a letter was received by the U.S. Government from Chairman Khrushchev immediately prior to the events at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, wherein Khrushchev stated, in the words of your secretary, the Berlin issue will be raised if Cuba is invaded. I am informed that no such letter was received on the eve of those events.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, nevertheless, I am assured by the newsmen concerned, who are known as well-informed and responsible observers, that in its basic essentials their original charge was true and that such a message in some form or other was conveyed to the President prior to the fateful decision to withdraw full U.S. support from the invasion.

However, in compliance with the commitment which I made, I have placed in the RECORD the letter from the Department of State.

Secondly, Mr. President, a story appeared more recently charging that the U.S. labor attaché in Rome had brought pressure to bear on the Italian Government to induce it to compel the striking crewmembers of Cuba-bound Italian ships to return to work. The State Department denied this report promptly, categorically, and in considerable detail. I rejoice that there was no truth to this report and I congratulate the State Department on its immediate effort to clarify the situation.

I ask unanimous consent that that letter may also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1962.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I understand that you are anxious to learn the circumstances behind the front-page story in the Washington Daily News of Friday, September 21, 1962, which quotes the National Maritime Union as alleging that our labor attaché in Rome had brought pressure to bear on the Italian Government to induce it to compel the striking crewmembers of two Cuba-bound Italian ships to return to work.

I am happy to be able to supply a full report. Our Embassy at Rome has denied the allegation and informed the press that it was "obviously nonsense." A senior official of the Italian Ministry of Merchant Marine has categorically denied to the Embassy that the Italian Government, for its part, had in any way attempted to induce the striking crewmembers of the two ships to continue the voyage. The Ministry official pointed out that under Italian law it was administratively impossible to force seamen to sail on a merchant ship, since hiring and firing of seamen is a matter strictly between the seamen, their unions, and the operators.

The only involvement of the labor attaché was to inquire of an official of the leading Italian free labor union, which is not a party to the dispute, what was happening in the affair of the two ships, which had been reported in the Italian press. He did not in any way attempt to persuade the Italian Government to force Italian seamen to sail the ships. On the contrary, the Embassy had occasion earlier to point out to a representative of the company which operates one of the ships that any cargoes, even nonmilitary ones such as that involved in this case, were of assistance to the Soviet-run Castro regime.

You may also be interested to hear that on September 9, the Under Secretary of the Italian Ministry of Merchant Marine issued a strong public statement that supplying strategic Soviet material to the Communist dictatorial regime in Cuba would be in contempt of the obligations of Atlantic solidarity and in violation of Italy's adherence to NATO. The statement also warned that the Italian Government would take necessary action against anyone who violated the duties of the alliance in collusion with the enemy.

I hope this information will be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary.

MONTANA DAMS AND POWER PROJECTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in regard to the proposed Knowles Dam, I wish to state that in addition to my support of a multipurpose dam, on the same basis as the Hungry Horse Dam which was built in the Flathead country, that the following have been the stipulations which my colleague, the present presiding officer of the Senate and I have laid down as basis for our support of any Federal multipurpose project in the State of Montana. As I stated on Thursday last in the debate on the proposed Knowles Dam:

First. If the Senate and the House eventually authorize a proposal, it is the intention of my distinguished colleague and myself, as well as the Representative of the Western District of Montana in which the project is located, to see to it that a preferential proportion of the power generated in western Montana is kept in western Montana for the benefit of the people of the whole State. I wish to reiterate what I said then and to emphasize my position in this respect as strongly as I know how.

Second. The project must be feasible—I think it is feasible, but authorization of Knowles will call for more detailed planning and any doubt which may exist as to its feasibility will, I am sure, be then removed.

Third. People in the area directly affected must be in favor of the proposal.

Fourth. The present level of Flathead Lake must be maintained and nothing must be done to change the position of the inlet at Flathead Lake.

Fifth. The rights of the Indians must be protected and adequate compensation given for any rights or any loss which they may incur.

Mr. President, I repeat, this has been my position and the position of my colleague [Mr. Metcalf], and our colleague in the House, Representative Olsen, on any Federal multipurpose project in my State and will continue to be our position on any proposals of this nature brought before the Senate or its committees for consideration.

TRIBUTE TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Reader's Digest contained an article entitled "We Can Be Proud of Our Foreign Service." This is a readable article which sets forth a great many facts regarding our Foreign Service and some of the conditions of living and work which our Foreign Service personnel must endure.

I have often thought that those who are perhaps among the least appreciated in the service of this country are the Foreign Service people, including the Foreign Service officers themselves, and certainly including their wives and children, who spend many years at hardship posts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WE CAN BE PROUD OF OUR FOREIGN SERVICE

(By Charles D. Lewis)

(It's not all striped-pants and cocktail parties, and service in a hardship post means exactly what it says. A businessman gives a carefully considered report.)

I was down on my farm in Virginia when one of my business friends telephoned from Florida to congratulate me: "I read in the papers that you're going to Washington to look over the State Department, Charlie. I hope you fire half of the sons-of-guns."

I laughed. "I'll do my best," I promised, and I meant it.

I'm a businessman. For the last 15 years I've been in the tobacco business, for five of those years as president of the American Sumatra Tobacco Corp., of New York. Now the State Department has invited me and five others—two businessmen, two labor leaders, and a university professor—to serve as public members on the 1961 Foreign Service selection boards.

The Foreign Service is the body which largely mans the policy offices of the State Department as well as our embassies and consulates overseas. It was going to be our job on the 1961 selection boards to study the record of every one of the 3,700 Foreign Service officers and to report what we found.

Over the years the talk among my friends and business associates has always been pretty much the same: the State Department in an ivory tower, full of dreamers, eggheads, incompetents. So I went to Washington expecting to find that a lot of bureaucratic heads should roll.

A few days later I was sitting at a stark metal table in an office of the State Department, with the other members of the board. Piled before us were 357 folders with Foreign Service performance stamped on them in big red capitals. These were the confidential personnel files on Foreign Service officers.

I eyed the files hesitantly, wondering what shocks they would contain. And they did contain some shocks, at least to my ideas of the Foreign Service. Later, I found that all the other public members had suffered a similar blow to their cherished conceptions.

When we compared notes, we found that the main ideas we had come to Washington with were these:

Idea: "Let's face it, the diplomatic life is pretty soft."

The files quickly dispelled that illusion for all of us, for good. Foreign Service officers regularly and cheerfully take their families to live for years in places where I would hate to go on a 1-day business trip. On the average, they spend at least 1 out of every 3 years of their oversea service at a hardship post, which means they live in communities with no organized sanitation, no sewers except open ditches, no pest control. It means they rub shoulders daily and hourly with dysentery, sleeping sickness, yellow fever, hepatitis, and many other diseases; often the nearest adequate hospital facilities are more than 1,000 miles away. It means they lack schools for their children, do without dentists, boil their drinking and cooking water, and wash their food with potassium permanganate.

Disease is not the only hazard. A memorial plaque in a State Department lobby is a reminder: "William P. Boteler, killed by grenade, Cyprus, 1956. Robert Lee Mikels, burned to death attempting to save lives, Korea, 1951. Douglas Mackiernan, killed by gunfire, Tibet, 1950." And so on, down a long list of Foreign Service officers who have given their lives to get the job done.

One morning last fall the newspapers headlined stories about an FSO named Louis Hoffacker, consul at Elisabethville, in the Congo. Hoffacker had plunged fearlessly into a troop of excited Katanganese commandos to rescue a U.N. official who was being beaten senseless with rifle butts. That very day one of my associates was reading the past performance report on Hoffacker. Opposite the word "courage" was written "Nothing special to report."

Idea: "How are we going to fight the cold war in any foreign country when our Foreign Service people can't even speak the language?"

I'd often heard this one, and it made sense to me. Yet all the FSO's whose files I went through spoke at least one foreign language well; some spoke more than one, and a high proportion were studying to increase their skills. In non-English-speaking countries where the other major "world" languages (French, German, Spanish) are spoken, the majority of our Foreign Service officers speak the language. And in the Soviet Union virtually all our officers speak Russian.

In what it calls the "hard languages," the Foreign Service is driving to catch up with enormously multiplied demands. At last count, we had the respectable total of 17 Iranian-speaking officers in Teheran, 12 Chinese speakers in Taipei, 10 Japanese speakers in Tokyo, 8 Indonesian linguists in Djakarta. At our relatively small mission at Phnom Penh we have three men who speak Cambodian.

The service is still far behind the need in other important hard languages such as Arabic, Hindi, Thai and Vietnamese. To meet this problem, in the past 8 years nearly 500 Foreign Service officers have been put through full-time, hard-language training, for anywhere from 6 months to 2½ years at a time.

Idea: "Don't do anything, so you don't make any mistakes—that's the way to get ahead in the State Department."

I now know how little truth there is in that idea. There is only one way to get ahead in the Foreign Service: be picked for promotion by the impartial selection boards of experienced men who make their decisions on the basis of a man's complete record of service, in voluminous and revealing detail.

Every officer is the subject of a six- to eight-page performance rating by his immediate superior at least once a year. This rating, in turn, is reviewed by the next man up the line—particularly as to whether relations between the man being rated and the man doing the rating are what they should be. In addition, a Foreign Service inspector every year or so takes an expert look at each U.S. Embassy and consulate and makes his own confidential report on every officer in the mission. When I finished reading through one of these files, covering 10 to 15 years' service, I felt I had known the man it dealt with for years.

I especially liked the sound of one man: When he learned that some American machinery had been left over, unsold, at an international fair in Tunis, he went out on his own and found a buyer for it, and drove a good bargain.

I got interested in another officer, in Korea, when I found he had chosen to live uncomfortably "on the economy," Korean style, not in the American compound. He was getting to know the people all right.

Still another FSO, in Baghdad, developed a central furniture-supply system for Foreign Service families coming and going; his initative saved U.S. taxpayers $65,000 in 14 months.

The State Department asked us not only to pick out officers for promotion but also to pick out a certain percentage to let go—the men and women who had reached their peak and stopped growing. This presented unexpected difficulty, for most of these people were competent, experienced officers. In my business, I wouldn't dream of letting employees of that caliber go. The other board members felt the same way. Our final report strongly recommended to the State Department that it find a way to make use of this valuable manpower, perhaps outside the Foreign Service.

Long before I finished my 3½ months' work, it was clear that over the years I had accepted a number of false ideas about the State Department and its personnel. I discovered that 6,000 to 8,000 young men and women apply for the Foreign Service every year. They have to pass stiff examinations, both written and oral. In the end, only about 200 of them are accepted.

The FSO's are virtually all college graduates, and more than half have done or are doing postgraduate work. The Foreign Service invests an estimated 6 percent of its manpower in full-time training of some kind every year. The other public members of the 1961 Foreign Service Selection Boards, most of whom had come to Washington with feelings very similar to mine, came to the same conclusions I did: Foreign Service work is not cocktail parties and striped-pants receptions. It's hard, down-to-earth work—like getting up in the middle of the night to try to get some Americans out of trouble somewhere; or scouring a foreign country to find new markets for U.S. goods, and working patiently and persistently to bargain down foreign tariff barriers against them.

It means giving all your waking hours to explaining and promoting the American way of thinking to opinion leaders whose attitude may be hostile or skeptical. It means working every day to keep well informed—well enough to warn Washington when trouble is building up. It means having the good judgment and initiative to know what steps can be taken to head off or deal with the trouble.

At the end of our work, the six public members of the boards went to see Secretary Rusk and handed him a letter, which was later forwarded to President Kennedy. I quote here the last paragraph:

"We are proud of these men and women of the Foreign Service. As American citizens, we want to strike a blow on their behalf against poorly informed criticism, and we feel it a privilege to convey to you our sincere praise of their abilities and accomplishments."

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FLEEING FROM YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with reference to the foreign aid bill, considerable doubt as to the situation involving refugees has arisen among individuals interested in refugees fleeing from Communist countries. In the report of the House mention is made concerning the paradox of our country giving aid, for instance, to Communist Yugoslavia, and then giving aid to refugees from Communist Yugoslavia as they flee into Austria, Germany, and Italy.

These fugitives are trying to escape persecution in Yugoslavia. They have fled into Italy, Germany, and Austria; and, in some rare instances, they have been accepted into the asylum of those countries, but, in most instances, they have been ordered back to Yugoslavia by the screening committees.

The language used in the House report would throw some doubt upon whether it was intended that the moneys appropriated for the assistance of refugees might or might not be used to help legitimate and genuine refugees out of Yugoslavia. I do not believe that the language used in the report can be construed to mean that this money is precluded from being used to help the Yugoslavian refugees.

In any event, I have a letter which was written by His Excellency Edward E. Swanstrom, titular bishop of Arba, executive director. In this letter he encloses a paper discussing "The Plight of Refugees Fleeing From Yugoslavia."

He sets forth the distressing position occupied by these refugees. He points out that in many instances they have been sent back to Yugoslavia to suffer the torments of the final penalties imposed because they fled from Communist domination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this document setting forth the problem as it exists in Yugoslavia and in the asylum countries may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FLEEING FROM YUGOSLAVIA

Prior to the erection of the Berlin wall, East Germany was not the only refugee-producing Communist country in Europe. Mass flights occurred from other areas, such as Hungary in 1956, and year after year about 10,000 Yugoslav refugees have fled that country. Yet how many Americans know what a large segment of the Yugoslavs have not been able to obtain asylum in the West and that many have been forcibly returned to Yugoslavia?

It almost appears that it required a wall and the merciless terror of the Communist police at the wall to create concern for today's refugees and to have them accepted for what they are: victims of totalitarian oppression who flee from pervasive political, spiritual, and economic devastations which they correctly identify with the Communist system.

It is the same type of refugee who is seeking freedom, whether he comes from East Germany, Hungary, or Yugoslavia. Most are young, some are very young. Although they may not be able to articulate the reason which makes them come, it is invariably a desire to escape the police state, its totalitarian control as well as its economic deprivation. A man's yearning for freedom and human dignity is quite compatible with his hope of economic betterment.

Mass flights are always an expression of disaffection and opposition, the final protest where other protests are made impossible by political terror. Where people have no other vote, they are forced to vote with their feet. Our answer to the refugee problem is an index of the political imagination and the moral temper of the West.

The ambivalent attitude of the West toward Communist Yugoslavia has resulted in an ambivalent attitude toward Yugoslav refugees. Nothing can strengthen a totalitarian power so successfully as the feeling of resignation and apathy among its subjects. When we challenge the refugees' motivations, we appear unable to grasp why people would be fleeing and we seem to be turning our backs on them. When we acquiesce in the forcible return of escapees, we contribute to the feeling of hopelessness and thereby weaken the democratic cause within Yugoslavia—and without.

The age and the social background of most of the Yugoslav refugees, predominantly working class with a good admixture of peasant youth, instead of being interpreted as a symptom of the failure of the Yugoslav Government to gain the allegiance of the strata in whose name it purports to rule, have been used as proof of the economic character of the refugees' escape motivations. The refugees' opposition to communism is being impugned because they are poor. And because, when asked what they intend to do, they express a desire to work and to earn decent wages, it is adduced that they are not victims of Communist oppression and have not suffered from the absence of personal, political and religious freedom. It is as if the economic hardships to which they were exposed were not man made, the result of Communist misplanning. And it is as if a desire to work and to earn a decent living were in itself improper and shameful, an attitude which calls for the label "economic" refugee, that is one who does not deserve our sympathy and can be returned behind the Curtain without qualms. When misgivings do arise, they are dismissed, sometimes smugly and sometimes uneasily. The kind of repression rather than the repression itself is considered, and no attention is paid to the possibility of later retribution and the certainty that people who express their dissatisfaction with the regime by trying to escape from it will remain marked as enemies of the state. It is forgotten that the very act of escape makes a man an "enemy of the state."

Everyone knows that in Communist countries, the economy is a phase of politics. In those countries where people are not free to choose their own political creed, they are not free to make their own way in the social and economic field. Freedom of initiative is either nonexistent or is permitted on a minimum scale. Savings are meaningless because sooner or later the state swallows everything. Plans for the future are better left unmade. Everyone knows what civic and family life has been reduced to. Now, with all this, when someone escapes from such distressing conditions can he really be considered an "economic" refugee?

Is physical persecution necessarily physical torture? The loss of freedom, political pressure and its inevitable consequence—economic misery—are also persecution; veiled persecution, daily persecution, persecution which these young people feel deeply, although they are often unable to give expression to their feeling, for lack of education, or difficulty in choosing the right words.

Even those few Yugoslavs who are granted asylum are frequently put in a lower category than refugees from other Communist countries by the U.S. escapee program. Thus Yugoslavs either do not qualify as refugees or they are treated as second-class refugees.

And when they come before the so-called Screening Commissions in the West, having crossed the Rubicon, although they have, for very valid reasons, chosen to be, as it were, "without family, without country and without means," the only thing they find to say is "We came away to be free and to find work." Then we say, "They are young, they ran away from their parents; discipline; they are, as you can see, economic refugees."

Should we not give the matter a little more thought? There are many who are discontented with their jobs or unemployed. Do you think that they would, even with a passport, i.e., without any risk to themselves leave Belgium, for example, leave it forever, abandoning their families, their possessions for the unknown?

A further contention is that by permitting Yugoslav refugees to stay in Western Europe or by accepting them for immigration in the Western Hemisphere, we are alleviating Communist Yugoslavia's economic problems and underemployment. If this were true, Tito could have done better by negotiating labor agreements with other European countries which have manpower shortages. The 10,000 refugees from Yugoslavia annually do not alter the employment picture inside Yugoslavia to any appreciable degree. Even if it were the policy of the West to aggravate the economic difficulties of Yugoslavia, as it clearly has not been, these goals should not be pursued at the expense of the refugees, the victims of Tito's brand of communism.

The repression of freedom of religion and other fundamental human rights in Yugoslavia hardly differs even in degree from that practiced in the U.S.S.R. itself. Yet the subtle campaign of the Yugoslav authorities to popularize the term "economic" refugee has been more than successful. It has carried over into the language of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and that of certain officials of the U.S. Government. It has influenced the policy of countries which formerly granted asylum to these refugees to the point where substantial numbers of them are now being repatriated instead of welcomed. It has created a situation where Italy permits most of those fleeing to remain on its soil, but Austria, using U.S. equivocal policies as an excuse, forcibly returns the majority of the Yugoslav refugees. It has resulted in drastic reductions in U.S. aid to refugees from Yugoslavia. It has resulted in resentment by true democratic people from Yugoslavia who see U.S. aid helping to build a strong Communist state, but refusing to help those anti-Communist elements that escape its oppression. It has caused confusion among the Americans because policymakers fail to understand that the basic philosophy of the Communist state is the same, whether that of the Soviet Union, China, or Yugoslavia.

American policy today leaves refugees bewildered by its policy of being selective about the kind of communism and oppression from which a person must flee in order to benefit from the help of the American people.

At a time when we are granting asylum to thousands of refugees from Castro's communism, which, supported by Soviet communism, is threatening the Western Hemisphere, should the United States not take a forthright stand and give full recognition to the refugees fleeing Yugoslavia which is today linked again with the Soviet in its conspiracy to have communism dominate the world?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I contemplate discussing this subject with the chairman of the conference committee and obtaining a definite understanding of what is meant by the language.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi will wait until the end of the morning hour.

SIXTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF EXECUTION OF NICOLA PETKOV, BULGARIAN PATRIOT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, September 23 marked the 16th anniversary of the execution of the great Bulgarian patriot, Nicola Petkov, by the Soviet quisling regime in Bulgaria. I think it is proper that we should observe this anniversary by retelling the story of Nicola Petkov, because, to my mind, it is one of the great personal sagas of the unending fight for human freedom.

No man believed more sincerely in the possibility of cooperating with the Soviets than did Nicola Petkov. No man paid more dearly for this belief. No man conducted himself with greater courage when once he discovered his error, nor confronted his executioners with greater dignity. No man in our time has accepted personal martyrdom with clearer foreknowledge of the consequences of his actions, both in terms of his immediate personal fate and in terms of its ultimate significance for the fate of his people. No anti-Communist leader in any country has ever led a more determined, more heroic opposition, in Parliament and out of Parliament, against apparently hopeless odds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Bravest Democrat of All," which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post for December 6, 1947. This article tells the story of Nicola Petkov in the words of Dr. G. M. Dimitrov, Petkov's chief friend and political collaborator, the recognized leader of the democratic opposition in Bulgaria until Soviet pressure compelled him to resign his post in favor of Petkov, and the recognized leader today of the Bulgarian democratic opposition in exile.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bravest Democrat of All

(By Dr. Georgi Dimitrov, as told to David Martin)

Nicola Petkov is dead. Bulgaria has lost a truly great patriot, the democratic world has lost a leader who was a moral giant. The three visiting American Congressmen who, a week after his death, placed a wreath on his unmarked grave in a Sofia cemetery, did not exaggerate when they described him as "one of the greatest democrats of all time." I think he was the bravest democrat of all.

No man believed more sincerely in the possibility of collaborating with the Soviets than did Nicola Petkov. No man paid more dearly for this belief. No man conducted himself with greater courage when once he discovered his error, nor confronted his executors with greater dignity.

His is a tragedy pregnant with significance for a democratic world that is still contemplating, Hamlet-like, the pros and cons of the very problem on which Petkov met his doom.

Petkov was deprived of his parliamentary immunity on June 5 of this year and immediately arrested. Shortly afterward he was brought to trial on a fantastic list of charges—that he had acted as an agent of foreign powers, that he had participated in a military conspiracy to overthrow the Bulgarian Government, that he had urged the peasants to sabotage the regime by destroying their crops. On August 16 he was convicted and sentenced to death.

On August 18 the State Department addressed a note to the Soviet Deputy Acting Chairman of the Allied Control Commission, urging that the Commission review the case of Petkov. The note spoke of "a gross miscarriage of justice" and indicated that the State Department considered the trial of Petkov a violation of the Yalta agreement, which ostensibly guaranteed the rights of the opposition.

The Soviets replied that intervention on behalf of Petkov would be a violation of Bulgaria's national sovereignty. In the early morning of September 23, Petkov was hanged in Sofia prison. To the last, he stubbornly refused to appeal for clemency, because he held that he had been unjustly convicted.

In striking at Petkov, the dark powers that rule Bulgaria were aiming not so much at Petkov the man as at the United States and Western democracy. "If we execute Petkov," reasoned Premier Georgi Dimitrov and the Communist hatchetmen, "this will demonstrate to the entire opposition how powerless the great democracies are to defend them, and how senselessly futile their opposition to communism has therefore become. And now that the democracies have made their empty protests on his behalf, our little demonstration will be doubled, reinforced."

Ever since January 1945 when, under Communist pressure, I handed over the secretaryship of our party to Petkov, I have been in direct or indirect touch with either Petkov or mutual colleagues. Before that, I had known him intimately since 1931. I think that I am in a better position than any other man to tell the story of Nicola Petkov and of his disastrous efforts to collaborate with the Communists.

Petkov died in the tradition of his family—he came of a family which seems to have been uniquely destined for martyrdom. His father, Dimitar Petkov, lost an arm in the war against the Turks and was decorated by Czar Alexander II of Russia for his bravery. But when he realized that the Russians planned to convert Bulgaria into a province of their own, he turned against them and led an agitation that resulted in the expulsion of Alexander's generals from the country. Several years afterward a grateful people elected him Premier. A stanch upholder of the constitution, he soon came into conflict with the autocratic King Ferdinand I. In 1907, Dimitar Petkov was shot down on Boulevard Alexander II in Sofia by agents of the monarchy.

Petkov's brother, Petko D. Petkov, assumed the leadership of the Agrarian Party after the assassination of the great Alexander Stambulisky on June 14, 1923. Undeterred by threats, Petko Petkov from his seat in Parliament mercilessly excoriated the increasingly Fascist nature of the regime of Professor Tsankov and continued to fight for Alexander Stambulisky's ideal of Balkan and European federation. On June 14, 1924, 1 year to the day after the assassination of Stambulisky, he was shot down by assassins directly in front of the palace. When the day of his funeral arrived, Sofia was inundated by a sea of peasants who flowed to the capital from all over Bulgaria to pay homage to their leader. And now the Communist reaction has taken the life of the last male member of the Petkov family.

I first met Nicola Petkov in Paris in 1930. The opposition in Bulgaria was preparing to make a bid for power, and we were anxious to have him join us. Petkov at that time was leading the life of a young aristocrat and had no profound interest in politics. But he was strongly influenced by the memory of his father and his brother, and shortly after the triumph of the opposition in the elections of June 1931, he assumed the editorship of our party organ.

My first impression of Petkov was not altogether favorable. Though his shoulders were broad and his body seemed strong, he had suffered from various maladies in consequence of which he walked with an awkwardly limp slouch and his hands frequently trembled. His manner was so diffident that his circle of friends was restricted. When he spoke, he invariably looked down to avoid the eyes of his company. This young aristocrat obviously lacked the common touch that his brother Petko had possessed, and it also seemed to me that he lacked the willpower and courage of his brother. In this estimate, as events have proved, I was completely mistaken. The limp posture, the trembling hands, the downcast eyes, concealed a spirit as courageous and uncompromising as Petko Petkov at his greatest.

The period of legality lasted for only 3 years after Petkov's return. In May 1934, the reaction staged a coup d'etat and installed a dictatorship under the premiership of Kimion Georgiev, who today holds the post of Foreign Minister in the Communist Government of Bulgaria. In 1938, however, the Government again agreed to hold elections, and Petkov was elected deputy. In Parliament he conducted himself with boldness, with the result that he was soon expelled by the reactionary majority.

Then came the war. After the defeat of Poland and France, the German pressure on the Balkans grew immeasurably stronger. Aware that this might involve us in the conflict, I approached the leaders of all the democratic and anti-German parties to suggest joint action against such an eventuality. On February 21, 1941, we forwarded to King Boris a memorandum signed by the leaders of 10 parties, in which we urged a termination of the Government's pro-German policy and adherence to strict neutrality. At 4 o'clock next morning, I was arrested by the police. When the inspector in charge turned his back to argue with my wife, I escaped out of the kitchen door and over the garden wall.

Anticipating my arrest, I had taken Petkov with me to our final meeting and had introduced him to our leaders. The understanding was that if anything happened to me, he would take over in my stead. I myself, after a period in hiding, escaped from the country via Yugoslavia. When German forces entered Bulgaria on March 1, 1941, Petkov was sent to a concentration camp. He was released some 3 months later.

Although a tyro in underground activity, Petkov now took to it with the skill of a veteran. My one difference with him was that he collaborated somewhat too closely with the Communists. He was sympathetic to Russia and he was impressed by the audacity of the Bulgarian Communists. He helped them liberally not merely with his personal funds but even with the funds of the Agrarian Party.

The original united front against the Government's pro-German policy had consisted of 10 parties ranging from the Communist Party on the left to the conservative democratic parties on the right. Now Petkov was engineered into abandoning this coalition in favor of the Fatherland Front, which included only three major parties—the Agrarians, the Communists, and the Socialists—and two minor groupings. Although the program adopted by the Fatherland Front was all that a democrat could have asked, it was obvious from the beginning that the Communists would exert far more influence than they could have exerted in a broader coalition.

Petkov was interned again in January 1944, but released in time to play a leading role in the coup d'etat of September 8, 1944. During August, the government of Premier Bagrianov had entered into negotiations for an armistice with Britain and America. For some reason never explained, the British and Americans hedged and made conditions—as though the proximity of the Red army to the Bulgarian frontier meant nothing at all. On September 6 the government of Moraviev, which had superseded that of Bagrianov on September 1, decided to declare war on Germany. The proclamation was not published because certain crypto-Communists close to the Minister of War urged postponement until September 8. On September 8 the Soviet Union, in an act as Machiavellian as its pact with Hitler, declared war on Bulgaria. The Red army poured over the frontier. That same day the Fatherland Front, with the support of the Military League, staged a coup and arrested the Government—which had already declared war on Germany. But the Red army continued its advance until it stood on Bulgaria's southern frontier, menacing Turkey.

I returned to Sofia on September 23. The moment I crossed the frontier, I was met by a delegation of party members. They said the situation was rapidly building up to catastrophe. Communist-controlled police and the Communist-organized militia had already instituted a reign of terror. Hundreds had been arrested, scores had been shot. They implored me to do something.

The narrowness of the Fatherland Front and the timing of its coup had worked in favor of the Communists. After the coup, a provisional government had been set up in which the Communists had reserved for themselves the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Justice, as well as effective control of the Ministry of War. To their posts of lesser importance; Petkov himself was given a ministry without portfolio.

Petkov was beginning to realize the importance of the concessions which, out of sheer political naivete, he had made to the Communists. His first words to me when we met were, "Thank God you've come back. I'm afraid we've made an awful mess of things."

He explained that, at the time the Government had been formed, the Communists, with Russian backing, had posed the matter in such a way that the alternatives seemed to be either a coalition on the terms of the Communists or else a government of the Communist Party. "Frankly," he said, "I didn't realize how much I was conceding, otherwise I should have refused."

On October 12, 1944, Petkov left for Moscow as a member of an armistice delegation representing all parties in the Fatherland Front. The armistice was signed on October 28. When I met Petkov on his return from Moscow, there was the look of a hunted man in his eyes. "I must speak to you in private," he said in a furtive whisper.

A few hours later we met in his apartment. Petkov, his hands trembling more than usual, began speaking—for the first time in our long friendship he looked directly into my eyes as he spoke. "The Russians want to split our party. Central Europe belongs to the Soviet sphere, they said, and our party could only hope to survive if it purged itself of Dr. Dimitrov and the other anti-Soviet elements. They urged me to assume the leadership to carry out such a program. I tried to tell them that you were a friend of the Russian people, but it wasn't of any use. Georgi Dimitrov especially is dead set against you."

"It isn't just a matter of splitting our party," I replied. "The Communists want to destroy our party because they see in the peasant movement the chief obstacle to their dictatorship."

Toward 9 o'clock the other ministers of the Agrarian Party came to the apartment. Petkov reported to us on certain personal observations he had made in Russia. The thing that appalled him more than anything else was the fantastic luxury in which the proletarian bureaucrats basked whilst their people were starving. The Bulgarian delegation had been invited to dinner by Georgi Dimitrov, one-time leader of the Bulgarian Communist Party, now a Russian citizen for more than 20 years. The dinner was oriental in its extravagance. There was course after course after course—caviar, and roast duck and other viands, and rare delicacies that Petkov had seen nowhere since before the war, and vodka served in glasses of pure crystal. In December 1944, 6 weeks after his return from Moscow, the Communists informed Petkov that I would have to resign as general secretary of the party, or else. Realizing there was no alternative at this stage, I handed over my office to Petkov, whom the Communists made clear they favored. For his part, he still believed he could effect a reconciliation with them. So, Dr. Georgi Dimitrov, the anti-Soviet fanatic, had been removed, and Nicola Petkov, lifelong friend of the Soviets had taken my place. In a speech on January 21, 1945, the day of my resignation, Communist Vice Premier Dobre Tarpeshev gushed, "If I were a woman, I can think of no one I would rather marry than Nicola Petkov."

But it was not long before the Communists came forward with new demands. They asked Petkov to dismiss the entire central committee and replace them with men they designated. Petkov, whose resistance was still in the process of hardening, compromised to the extent of accepting a few Communist stooges in subordinate positions and in the youth organization. Further than this he refused to go. For more than 3 months the Communists plied their pressures, waiting for Petkov to weaken. Instead, his attitude grew more stubborn. Finally, realizing that their plan to capture the party through Petkov had failed, they decided on a frontal attack.

Through our own agents in Communist headquarters we learned that they were preparing to arrest me and several score of our party leaders. I was to make a confession, and then disappear in the manner of Bela Kovacs. The others were to be brought to trial, and through my own confession and their confessions the Agrarian Party was to be so compromised that they would have a legal pretext for outlawing it.

On April 23, while convalescing from a serious attack of pneumonia, I was formally placed under house arrest. Before the police disconnected my telephone, my wife put through a call to Petkov. Ignoring the danger to himself, he immediately came to see me. Trembling with anger, he called the Minister of the Interior, demanding the reason for my arrest. The minister answered coldly that I had been arrested "in the interest of national security."

"In the interest of the national security," replied Petkov, "you are arresting the man who has done more to promote the national security than any other living Bulgarian. Some day you will regret your action."

The Petkov I saw at this last meeting was a completely changed man from the Petkov of 8 months previous. Gone were his illusions about cooperating with the Communists. The man with the diffident manner and the downcast eyes had become a lion. He looked both friend and foe squarely in the eyes, and when he spoke to his foes he literally roared.

On May 8, the Communists convoked a special convention of the Agrarian Party attended by several hundred picked stool pigeons. The convention voted in a new executive. The Ministry of the Interior ruled that our party headquarters, our newspaper, our treasury, and all our possessions were the rightful property of this newly elected executive of the Bulgarian Agrarian Union.

Petkov alone of the old executive was invited to join the new executive. He refused pointblank. Instead, he set up party headquarters in his own home and began to plan a campaign of resistance in open defiance of the secret police.

On May 24, I slid down a drainpipe, walked out of the alley dressed in overalls, walked past the Communist military guards surrounding the house, and took refuge in the American Embassy. My escape threw a monkey wrench into the preparations the Communists were making for their sham trial. Without my confession, the performance would have impressed no one. The trial was called off.

In July the Government announced that elections would take place within 1 month and that there would be only one ticket, the list of the Fatherland Front. Petkov immediately sent a strong letter to the Allied Control Commission, demanding that it guarantee the right of the opposition to its own electoral ticket in accordance with the terms of the Yalta agreement, and urging that the elections be supervised by an international commission. In early August, without any prior notification to Petkov, the Government announced that Petkov had resigned his ministry. In protest, all the remaining ministers of the Agrarian Party, the Socialist Party, and the Independent Intellectual Party, resigned from the Government.

At this point the British and American Governments intervened. Apparently yielding to their pressure, the Bulgarian Government agreed to postpone the elections, and to permit opposition candidates. Petkov was permitted officially to reestablish party headquarters and to publish his own newspaper.

But the improvement did not last very long. In violation of their August agreement, the Government announced that the elections would be held on November 18. Though the three opposition parties decided to boycott the elections, the campaign was so bitterly fought that the Peasant Party alone had more than a score of its followers killed. The opposition, in a statement signed by Petkov for the Agrarians, Lulchev for the Socialists, and Professor Stoyanov for the Independent Intellectuals, declared that the majority of the people had not voted and that the Government had therefore lost the election. They demanded an investigation. The Communists replied that the Fatherland Front had got more than 75 percent of the eligible vote. Their collaborators of the Zveno Group, however, put out the slightly more modest figure of 65 percent. The discrepancy made the people laugh.

At the Moscow conference of December 1945 the Russians made one of their many meaningless compromises. They agreed to advise the Bulgarian Government of the desirability of including in the Government, during the interim period, two representatives of the opposition. It was no less a person than Deputy Foreign Minister Vishinsky who went to Bulgaria to implement this arrangement. Vishinsky summoned Petkov and two other opposition leaders and said to them—as bluntly as this, "It is the order of Generalissimo Stalin that two members of your combined opposition enter the Government immediately and unconditionally."

"I do not take orders from any foreign power," replied Petkov coldly. "I take orders only from my people and my party." Lulchev and Stoyanov backed him up. The conversations with Vishinsky ended.

The Communists were worried by Petkov's recalcitrance because they knew that he accurately reflected the temper of the people. After Vishinsky's departure, the Government again approached him. This time, to the amazement of all, they accepted almost all of Petkov's conditions, including separate electoral lists and an Agrarian Minister of Justice. The agreement was concluded in the aftrenoon on March 28, 1946. That same evening, the Soviet minister to Bulgaria, Kirsanov, delivered an ultimatum protesting the agreement. The following morning a government was constituted minus the opposition—and it was announced that there would be elections to a Constituent Assembly on October 27.

Petkov now began a campaign which, for sheer heroism, is unsurpassed in the annals of any opposition. With the Red army still in the country, and with the Communist-controlled police breaking up their meetings, the opposition attacked the Government and the Communists and Soviet intervention as recklessly as though they enjoyed the protection of the American Constitution. Petkov's paper, during the preelectoral period especially, was an inspiration to read. "What our people must show," said the Banner for October 12, "is de l'audace, et encore de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace." The following day, under the capition "Where are the Agrarian Deputies?" it charged that the Agrarian Party had not been permitted to put up candidates in 25 percent of the constituencies and that of the candidates for the other constituencies, almost 50 were under arrest. "Freedom does not come on a silver platter," wrote Petkov on October 15. "Freedom is something for which you must fight."

To the Communists' protestations that they had no intention of taking the peasants' property, Petkov replied with the most devastating slogan of the electoral campaign: "As the wolf cannot watch over your flocks, as the fox cannot befriend your hens, so the Communists cannot protect private property. Electors vote without any fear against the Communist constitution, against the Communist dictatorship."

On October 20, the opposition finally was granted permission to hold an open meeting in Sofia—without loudspeakers or lights. Despite all the restrictions, more than 200,000 angry peasants swarmed into Sofia and joined the city workers and middle class in the most impressive demonstration of the entire electoral campaign. "Down with the dictatorship," they roared. "Down with Red fascism. We want Petkov."

The success of the meeting resulted in an intensification of the terror. In the 3 days before the elections, 24 members of the Agrarian Party were killed. The Communist leader, Georgi Dimitrov, who had been a resident of Russia for 13 years and who had returned to Bulgaria only 2 days before the election—it is not clear whether he resigned his Soviet citizenship—thundered against Petkov in his first declaration, "We have to remind the leader of the opposition of the fate of Drazha Mihailovich."

When the election results were announced, the opposition was credited with 101 deputies against 364 for the Fatherland Front. The Agrarian member sent a protest to the election commission in which he gave details of the terror against the opposition. "What has taken place," he said, "was not an election, but a war between the police and the people. The elections were without any question fraudulent."

When the Constituent Assembly convened on November 8, the opposition opened the session by shouting, "Long live liberty. Down with the dictatorship." In the sessions that followed, the figure of Nicola Petkov, hurling castigation and defiance at the Communist majority, completely dominated the Assembly. Georgi Dimitrov, who, as a proletarian revolutionary, had towered over his Nazi prosecutors at Leipzig, now, as a totalitarian bureaucrat, shrank to the stature of a pygmy. Without either moral or rational ground to stand on, he could do nothing but reply to Petkov with abuse—"anti-Soviet dog" was one choice term—or with crude threats.

When Georgi Dimitrov shouted that the future belonged to the Communists, Petkov intervened, "The future belongs not to you, Mr. Dimitrov, but to the people. You are not a god, Mr. Dimitrov, though you may deceive yourself on this score by taking into your party only those who accept you as their god. Your program is one word: dictatorship. Our program is also one word: liberty."

On January 30, 1947, Dimitrov made his first direct threat to Petkov. After roaring that "Koev must be hanged." (Peter Koev was one of Petkov's chief aids) he went on to say that the Government possessed documents involving the leader of the opposition. The following is a condensation of the exchange that took place.

PETKOV. Are you a satrap, that you issue such summary condemnations? After all, you are not a god—you are not even a qualified judge. As for the documents of which you speak, I challenge you to produce them.

DIMITROV. Very soon you will receive your documents. When you do, not one of you will remain in this Assembly. There is no place in this Assembly for foreign agents.

PETKOV. You speak of foreign agents. For 20 years, you, Mr. Dimitrov, were a citizen of a foreign country. You became a Bulgarian citizen only 2 days before the election. You have no right even to speak as a Bulgarian.

The battle grew in intensity. On April 3, one of the opposition deputies got up and made the accusation that under article 4 of the armistice, the Communist,Party was a Fascist organization and should accordingly be dissolved. The Communists, outnumbering the opposition almost 4 to 1, rushed across the floor and engaged them in a terribly unequal battle in which many of the opposition were injured. The opposition left the chamber en masse, by way of protest.

The next day they were back in their places to renew the struggle. An Agarian woman deputy charged that the Communist Party was squandering public funds by making all of their members eligible for the special allotments voted to active partisans. Again the Communist majority charged the opposition. Again the opposition left the chamber with their heads bloody. Again they came back the following day.

And so it went, until the final arrest of Petkov and the dissolution of his party.

The bulk of the evidence against Petkov consisted of confessions purportedly made by his fellow conspirators. The most important of these was the confession of Petar Koev, the Petkov aid who had been arrested in mid-January 1947. Koev had been arrested once before, in August 1946. While he was in prison he had been elected to Parliament and, in consequence of parliamentary immunity, he had been released. On his release he sent a letter to his leader, Petkov, which Petkov had the courage to read to the assembly.

"They reduce you to a state of utter moral and physical prostration," said Koev's letter, "in which you become indifferent to your fate and to life itself, so that you desire some solution—any solution—so long as it will put an end to the intolerable suffering. Contrary to normal juridical procedure, you are condemned first, and it is only afterwards that they begin to search for accusations and proofs. These are obtained by means of three types of torture; physiological torture—hunger, lack of sleep, thirst; physical tortures—beatings and being compelled to stand upright for days and nights on end; psychological tortures—insinuations that your family has been incarcerated, etc.

"I remained for 21 days in solitary confinement without being interrogated. During this time they subjected me to the hunger treatment—a bit of bread and water each day. The obvious purpose of this treatment is to produce physical attrition and a corresponding weakening of your will. At 8 a.m. one Saturday they took me up to the fourth floor to be interrogated. The interrogation went on for 5 days without interruption, 24 hours a day. The interrogator was changed every 3 hours, while I was compelled to remain standing, handcuffed, without sleep, unable to support myself either against the table or against the wall, without food and—what was cruelest of all during those suffocatingly hot August days and nights—without water. Every 3 hours the same questions were repeated until I became unconscious. My bare feet swelled to unimaginable proportions. The interrogators showed not the faintest pity. On the 5th day they threw me into an empty cell, where I slept like a dead man for more than 12 hours.

On the 4 succeeding nights Koev was trussed and beaten on the soles of his feet for 3 or more hours on end, with interludes during which he was questioned by Inspector Zeyev.

"During the balance of my detention," concluded the letter, "I was asked no questions, but I remained the object of a campaign of moral pressure and psychological terror. They applied refined tortures of such a kind—allusions to the fate of my family, the safety of my children, etc.—that I would honestly have preferred physical tortures."

When Koev was deprived of his parliamentary immunity on the occasion of his second arrest, he made this final declaration before leaving the Parliament, "I am innocent. I know, however, that through me you are attempting to strike at the general secretary of our party, Nicola Petkov. My final words are that only the declarations which I make before you now correspond to the truth, and that, if it should happen later that, after a period of instruction, I should make some confessions, they will have been extorted from me by means of violence."

Koev made his confessions and was sentenced to 12 years. He will never emerge alive. Petkov, though he defended himself heroically and admitted nothing, was sentenced to death.

I salute the memory of one of the great spirits of our time. To Nicola Petkov there can be no other monument than the liberation of his people from Communist tyranny.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CLARK

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post paying tribute to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and others for their efforts to defeat the mail censorship provision of the postal bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLDING UP THE MAIL

The Senate's watered-down version of the Cunningham amendment authorizing the interception of mail material from abroad which may be called Communist propaganda has now been accepted by both Chambers and sent to the White House for Presidential endorsement. Since this Senate version had administration approval as a price which had to be paid for the postal rate bill, it is, no doubt, idle and unrealistic to suggest that it ought to be vetoed by the President. It represents, nevertheless, a futile and silly adoption of a Communist technique and it constitutes a reflection on the fundamental traditions of a free America.

The adopted version, as Senator JOSEPH CLARK summarized it, provides that mail matter, except in sealed letters, prepared in a foreign country and which the Secretary of the Treasury, not the Attorney General, thinks is Communist political propaganda, shall be detained by the Postmaster General upon its arrival in the United States. Thereupon, the addressee is to be notified that such matter has been received, and he will receive it only if he requests it. This slows up mail delivery, institutes an official censorship, impedes study and understanding of Communist ideas, invites reprisals against mail from the United States sent abroad and treats Americans as though their loyalty to American institutions could not be trusted.

But because it bears a specious appearance of being anti-Communist, this essentially anti-American legislation was whooped to enactment. A few Members of the Senate stood superbly against it. They were led by Senator CLARK, despite the fact that he is now involved in a tough election campaign. In committee and on the Senate floor, he argued against this silly measure with reason and eloquence and understanding of American values. He was ably supported by Senators RANDOLPH, YARBOROUGH, and PELL. They deserve the country's respect and gratitude.

Senator CLARK said in the course of the debate that he believes that the amendment authorizes censorship prohibited by the Constitution. We hope the administration will cooperate to make possible a judicial test of the amendment's constitutionality.

BETTER JOBS FOR MORE AMERICANS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, late last month Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of St. Louis County, Mo., came out with a new book entitled "Eighty-seven Million Jobs—A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment." This book, which is a fresh and penetrating analysis of this country's unemployment problem, has been most favorably reviewed by the critics. I, myself, had an opportunity to review the book for Rollcall and found it a highly stimulating and original study of some of our major economic problems.

An article by Representative CURTIS, entitled "Better Jobs for More Americans," appears in the November 1962 issue of Advance magazine and gives an outline of the ideas more fully presented in his book. I ask unanimous consent that this article from Advance be included in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that my review of the book, as well as a number of other reviews written for leading newspapers, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETTER JOBS FOR MORE AMERICANS—A DYNAMIC PROGRAM TO END UNEMPLOYMENT

(By Representative TOM B. CURTIS)

Our dynamic economy has created a demand for so many skills of so many new and different sorts that we have, in amazing fact, developed large labor shortages. This is the crux of the so-called unemployment problem: not the lack of jobs, but the lack of skills to fill available jobs. This is the growing pain of our economy—it is not the fatal sickness of a sick economy, as those who see only the job wanted but never the help wanted columns of our papers so often say.

Most of the unfilled job requirements are known only in general terms, however.

THE NEEDS

We need many more engineers, in old as well as altogether new fields. We need more doctors, more nurses, more garage mechanics, more lab technicians, more scientists of all sorts, more teachers with more and varied training, more salesmen with genuine technical expertise about their complex products, more management technicians, more computer operators, more computer designers, more computer programers, more highly skilled production workers. More, more, and still more, as each new wave of skills breeds the machines and the services that demand ever more skills and creates ever more jobs in new fields.

Newspapers are filled with advertising for needed skills. Many employers no longer use such columns because their experience has shown that the necessary skills simply are not available. In such cases they undertake to train people to fill these jobs.

What is more, the skill requirements of our dynamic economy are snowballing. The Department of Labor recently estimated that about 5,000 new job titles will be added to its dictionary of occupational titles in the decade of the sixties. During the same period some 8 to 10 percent of current job titles will become obsolete.

Since technological growth and heads-up innovating management create a demand for more jobs than they make obsolete, our basic task as a nation is to find the ways to meet such a demand.

The cost, surprisingly in the age of so much Federal spending, is bound to be relatively low and in a sense self-liquidating. Work at higher skills obviously pays more, which enlarges the tax base, other things being equal. Also, success in this endeavor will reduce the incentive for featherbedding, which fear of technological unemployment frequently generates. The resulting greater productivity will also serve to expand the tax base. Then, billions now spent in all manner of Government programs to conceal unemployment in the fog of inflation could be saved and Federal taxes accordingly cut to the bone.

THE CONCEPT

A successful attack on unemployment even gives great promise of increasing a general understanding of the role of government in our society. Government is ancillary, a handmaiden of the private sector. Government is not a copartner of the people. It is their servant, and government jobs are created only when individuals in their private enterprise create a demand for ancillary assistance. This, and not the State concept of government as a big spender, should guide us in the era ahead.

Of all the things the Government might be tempted to do in finding answers to job problems, the most necessary first step is to satisfy requirements for relevant information about emerging skill requirements as well as about the pattern of unneeded skills. We must upgrade skills across the land, but "upgrade for what?"

1. Urgently necessary are answers based on an analytical, nationwide study of the skills of the future, emerging skills of the present, and obsolescent skills of the past. Such answers are needed, negatively, lest we retrain men, as we are unfortunately doing today in some instances, for outmoded or unneeded skills, and, affirmatively, to steer our efforts in the right direction on a time basis.

2. To this end, there should be established a national clearinghouse for the classification of these skills and their needs on a geographic basis. At present, a limited amount

of work is being done in this area by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the U.S. Employment Service. But these agencies overlap a good deal, and their operations do not synchronize well with large segments of private activity bearing on the subject.

3. The clearinghouse system should aim to present, on a timely and coordinated basis, all relevant public and private information, bearing mainly on skill requirements in relation to existing and near-term supplies of trained manpower. This information should be suitably classified as to all levels of remuneration by skill categories, length of retraining periods for typical upgrading situations, and the like. Coordination with vocational and other educational institutions would be necessary in order that the various interrelated activities be reflected in the clearinghouse's reports and analyses.

4. Such information, morever, should be systematically used by the country's Armed Forces, especially in connection with their work in vocational guidance, since these services occupy a strategic position in relation to job escalation and career planning for many young people.

5. The clearinghouse system and cooperative work by many local groups in connection with it should play a constructive role also in education. The point is worth stressing, since the country's increasing emphasis on rapid technological improvement has vast implications for educational policy.

6. Primarily, we should pay relatively less attention to old-fashioned narrow training, and place more emphasis in the schools on fundamental subjects. For it is the basic subjects which provide the future working population with a strong springboard to sound skill in youth plus improvement and occupational flexibility after they have entered the labor force. Much of this is known, of course. What a skill clearinghouse system could do in particular would be to create a framework within which citizens could more actively cooperate with school authorities in weeding our obsolete courses and programs and in helping to expedite the upgrading of teachers.

A clearinghouse system could also exert pressure on behalf of school administrators who now might lack strong local support for reforms. For instance, in a great number of vocational schools, or the vocational departments of regular schools, students needing discipline are dumped into, say, the machine shop course. This simply disrupts the course, and class effectiveness suffers badly as a result. Why should disciplinary requirements and methods curtail necessary skill development?

7. At the college level, including both the 2-year junior college and the regular undergraduate institutions, upgrading of curriculums and instruction also seems to be necessary in many cases if the Nation is to achieve a maximum pace of job escalation in technical and professional work. College officials, to be sure, are doing more than before in an effort to improve effectiveness. A functioning skill clearinghouse system could constructively enhance their work.

STRENGTHENING COLLEGES

Especially worthy of study and close attention is the tendency to lengthen college programs in many States, ostensibly to improve the student product. Educational history shows that the usual result is little more than course proliferation, with many low-quality offerings remaining in curriculums instead of being displaced by more substantial and useful ones. With a good clearinghouse system, responsible local pressure can be brought to bear in support of those educators who are fighting within their institutions for stronger courses that genuinely challenge students coming from improved high schools. This work is important and by its nature needs to be done chiefly at the local level. Today's needs for well-educated people are such that a college degree is equivalent in importance, and general need and availability, to the high school diploma of only a generation or so ago.

The significance is well illustrated in a study prepared by Prof. Almarin Phillips of the University of Virginia. He estimates that no less than 40 percent of the increase in our total national production is associated with technological change. Professor Phillips adds significantly that this change is now more rapid, but not materially different from change in previous periods. The problems developed not so much from the changes as from the failure of business, labor, and government to recognize them at their outset, when merely marginal corrections will suffice to keep skills and needs in step.

THE LOCAL IMPERATIVE

Such corrections, it should be emphasized, can be most effectively made, first of all, at the conmmunity level. The measure of their effectiveness, in fact, might well be the degree to which they prevent problems from ascending the scale of complexity to the regional, State, or Federal levels.

Where better, for instance, to spot and prepare solutions for technological changes than at the level of the community in which the changes first begin to affect individual employees and managements? Community educational institutions can be and must be more sensitive to such changes. Management, as it plans ahead, should be a partner in such community efforts—never excluded from them. The responsibility goes two ways, of course. Management must not exclude itself.

For the community that fails in its response to these challenges, preferring to pass the buck to higher, distant levels of government, there is an obvious and terrible fate: dependency, loss of local pride and initiative, and, eventually, loss of citizens and a slow decline to blight.

There are five broad areas in which action should be taken on the Federal level to remove impediments to job escalation in the private sector of the economy.

TAX REVISION

As might be expected, revision of our tax laws must play an important part in this effort. As a member of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I am acutely aware of the importance of tax policy for an effective nationwide program of job escalation. It has been said with much truth that our tax laws are now all but blind on these matters.

The five areas for action, with my specific recommendations in each area, are as follows:

1. Tax laws, for instance, provide no personal incentive for individuals contemplating retraining. Cases are covered in our newspapers constantly showing how tax laws impede the very upgrading process that our country so badly needs to encourage. Note the following press account:

"An Army captain got leave from his post as an artillery instructor to complete courses in psychology, public administration, and history. Under an Army plan to encourage higher education of its personnel, he continued to draw his regular pay, but he had to pay the added school expenses himself. The Internal Revenue Service, asked if the captain could deduct these outlays as an educational expense, said no. The law permits a deduction for costs of improving one's skills in an existing job, but not for those incurred to qualify for a new post."

Clearly, this shows that our tax laws work precisely to impede—not help—job escalation. Many individuals who want to improve their position know that they have to qualify for a different job to get a better one. The tax laws should reflect this elementary fact of life. Tax deductions or credits should be given to men and women who want to train for greater skill or competence.

2. Another way in which our tax laws hinder employment is the area of geographic labor mobility. The tax laws were written when only a relatively small percentage of our people owned their own homes, and when few persons sought work far beyond reasonable commuting distance from their normal place of residence. Today, however, it makes no sense to have our tax laws continue to regard a man's legal residence for tax purposes as the place where he works, for today nearly 70 percent of our people own their own homes and are not going to pull up family stakes just to enable the breadwinner to accept a challenging, but perhaps temporary job 200 miles away. Why should shortages of skills exist in sections of our country when men are prepared to work there temporarily if they are not penalized taxwise? The acceptance of such employment should not require that the workers relocate their entire family near the jobsite in such cases.

NEEDED: REALISM

A realistic program for job escalation, therefore, would call for more realistic tax regulations defining "place of residence" as the "tax home" of those workers temporarily engaged in an occupation in another part of the country.

Together, these two tax reforms could do much directly to stimulate the more rapid skill development and job mobility that is necessary for the smooth performance of our dynamic economy.

3. The Nation's unemployment insurance system also has a great potential as a vehicle for promoting the upgrading of our labor force. This system is paid for by private employers but administered by the States, with some participation by the Federal Government. It has achieved fairly good results in terms of providing stopgap financial assistance to men out of,work, tiding them over the cyclical downswings. But little has been made of the system with respect to the challenge of upgrading the skills of the labor force.

There is a simple key to the needed reform of our unemployment compensation system as far as job escalation is concerned. It is found by answering this question: How is an unemployed person treated at present if he enrolls in a training school to learn a new or better skill? The answer is that he is removed from the unemployment rolls, and thus becomes ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits, in 40 of the 50 States.

This is precisely the opposite of the policy that is called for. An unemployed person should be removed from the unemployment rolls if he cannot get a job in his obsolete skill and he refuses to start learning a skill that is in demand.

State legislation, therefore, should permit those engaged in training and retraining programs to continue to receive unemployment benefits up to normal amounts and limits, as is currently the case in only 18 of our 50 States and the District of Columbia.

EMPLOYER BENEFITS

Moreover, there is a potential for job escalation in the broadening of merit rating in unemployment payments. The cost of unemployment insurance to individual employers varies with the employment record of the firm. In other words, companies experiencing heavy unemployment pay more than those with a record of little unemployment.

There is no incentive stemming directly from the operation of the unemployment insurance system to provide retraining for unemployed personnel. An unemployed worker who may be undergoing company-sponsored retraining is still classified as unemployed, and the firm's merit-rating suffers accordingly. Surely this makes little sense in view of the great need for increasing retraining opportunities.

States should broaden merit rating concepts to include on-the-job retraining, to the end that the employer is not penalized for extending this opportunity to his workers. This would be another step in the direction of rapid job escalation.

4. In our rapidly growing economy, machinery becomes obsolete before it wears out. This is the reality of our technological advancement. Do our tax laws reflect this reality? Not at all. We find, on an examination of the situation, that our tax laws are geared to the old economics of wear, not of obsolescence. Such tax machinery simply does not mesh with modern industrial requirements.

In spite of the long-needed recent revision of depreciation schedules, the problem remains. We do not yet know whether these new schedules will be responsive to the needs of the economy. Depreciation schedules must be kept up-to-date continually to reflect the economic reality of useful life.

It takes more investment money to buy machinery when it becomes obsolescent long before it wears out. For the sake of progress, therefore, one would think that our tax laws would encourage such investment. Yet cutting off such investment is precisely what our tax laws do. The lag in depreciation allowances is now estimated to be some $4 to $6 billion behind replacement needs. Our economic progress is obviously slowed down when a third of our industrial plant is obsolete, as it is today.

Our tax laws must permit more realistic depreciation allowances. We need this not only for the sake of more and better jobs in the United States, but also to keep the American economy competitive internationally and to impart strength to the dollar as a world currency. Today, for example, Britain allows more than 40 percent depreciation on new machinery in the year of acquisition. Germany permits a writeoff of 25 percent the first year and about 58 percent of the cost in the first 3 years. France does even better. We do only a fraction as well.

DEPRECIATION MODERNIZATION

There are four overriding reasons why we must modernize tax legislation bearing on depreciation. First, we will experience an increase in the annual additions to our labor force in the next decade. Some 3 million new workers will be wanting productive jobs. Second, the investment cost per job—the amount required to create a new position—is rising, and is now between $20,000 and $25,000 per man. Third, there is a high investment cost in generating new products. Sensational as it is in fact, the pace of new product development is little known. Actually, about 30 percent of the goods on the market today were not there only 5 years ago. Finally, our tax legislation respecting depreciation needs modernization to assure that the American economy remains up to date as compared with rival trading nations, especially in Europe.

The needed tax legislation should be in the form of generally applicable rates, known in advance to business management so that it can make the right kind of long-range investment plans. A system lodging discretionary authority with the Government adjusting depreciation rates or tax credits in terms of untested theoretical considerations—such as President Kennedy proposed shortly after assuming office—simply will not do the job.

5. Sound employment legislation also demands a well-ordered operation in the Congress of the United States. At present, this is lacking. There is overlapping jurisdiction among congressional committees dealing with employment. Consider, for example, the way the subject of automation is handled in the House of Representatives. It is dealt with by the Education and Labor Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Joint Economic Committee. Knowledge remains uncoordinated, and one committee usually acts without knowing very much about the experience of the other committees.

In this connection, I welcome the endorsement of the House Republican policy committee, for my proposal to establish a new coordinating committee. This would be a standing Committee on Employment, composed of members from each of the four committees mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Such a standing committee could recommend positive policies in the area of employment, cooperate with State legislatures and city councils throughout the country, and analyze executive branch activities in the economic field.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

With faith in ourselves, and perseverance in job escalation without federalization, we can succeed in attaining a future of full employment. We can do so while strengthening our freedom, not through decisions which trickle down from an apex of authority in Washington but from actions originating in the broad base of the pyramid of America's economic and political strength—in the heart and soul of a strong and free people.

[From Roll Call, Oct. 3, 1962]

HORSE-AND-BUGGY ECONOMICS A DRAG ON EMPLOYMENT PROGRESS

(Representative TOM CURTIS, "Eighty-seven Million Jobs—A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment," New York; Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1962. $1.95. Reviewed by Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH, U.S. Senator from Connecticut, ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee)

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS has written a thought-provoking and penetrating book about a subject close to the hearts of all Americans—their jobs.

A Missouri Republican from St. Louis County, Congressman CURTIS is well-equipped for the task by reason of his keen and searching intelligence and his long experience as the senior House member of the Joint Economic Committee, on which we serve together, as well as a ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The book appears at a particularly appropriate time. Unemployment, which so far during 1962 has not fallen below 5.4 percent of the civilian labor force, actually rose sharply in August to 5.8 percent. Particularly disturbing is the fact that this increase occurred at or near the top of the business cycle. Since the end of World War II, each recession has left us with a higher level of unemployment. Clearly, we are a long way from solving our unemployment problem.

Congressman CURTIS offers a fresh and penetrating analysis of how to eliminate this persistent, hard-core unemployment. He rejects the widely and often uncritically held dogma that we can do it by creating jobs for the unemployed through more and more Federal Government spending. Indeed, instead of finding a solution in Federal spending and "depression economics," CURTIS believes these nostrums aggravate and prolong our unemployment problem.

The central point of Congressman CURTIS' book is that in order to eliminate unemployment we must wake up to the fact that we are living in a dynamic and changing economy in which as many jobs, both actual and potential, are going begging as there are people out of work. He sees the solution to the unemployment problem in a shift of emphasis and attention from self-defeating attempts to increase the demand for obsolete skills to the urgent and more rewarding task of filling our job vacancies.

In a dynamic economy, characterized by swift technological advances, Congressman CURTIS points out that jobs are constantly being eliminated. But while jobs are being eliminated, new jobs are opening up. He offers striking evidence of this in the shift in employment in recent years from production to service-type, professional, managerial and highly skilled jobs.

Congressman CURTIS makes clear that this trend is certain to continue in the future. If we ignore it or if we seek to correct unemployment through the application of horse-and-buggy economics, we run the grave risk of holding back our economic growth and progress. When the Government seeks to create jobs artificially at skill levels that are no longer in demand, it hampers efforts to find a genuine and lasting solution. Congressman CURTIS points out that unfilled jobs hold back our economic growth as much as unemployment.

Our inability to fill our job vacancies and to put our unemployed workers back on the job is not, Congressman CURTIS believes, because of inadequate demand in the economy. Rather, it is caused by dislocations in the labor market. Very frequently, the unemployed person either does not have the skills to fill the job vacancies or he does not live in, or is not willing to move to, an area where jobs are available.

Congressman CURTIS persuasively argues for a vast national public and private program to upgrade the skills, training, and education of our people so they can meet the job needs of our modern society. As envisioned by Congressman CURTIS, persons high up on the skill ladder move into the new and demanding jobs and thus open up positions which can be filled by persons below them on the skill ladder, and so on down the line. He also advocates measures which would encourage greater worker mobility as well as increase inducements to save and invest, which are essential if we are to accumulate the capital required to create jobs.

In recent years the search for a solution to the problem of unemployment has resembled a cat chasing its own tail—a lot of action but no real progress. Congressman CURTIS, who probably more than any other man in Congress has devoted his time and thought to this problem, is due our thanks for introducing a new and penetrating outlook to what had become a stale and unrewarding search for an answer to the serious human problem of unemployment.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Sept. 29-30, 1962]

CURTIS CALLS FOR FRESH LOOK AT UNEMPLOYMENT

(Reviewed by Patrick J. Buchanan. "Eighty-seven Million Jobs" by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS (Duell, Sloan & Pearce))

Today as thousands of coalhaulers and ditchdiggers are unemployed, newspapers advertise for operators of coal-diggers and trenchers. As millions of Americans sit idle, millions of skilled jobs go begging.

The Federal Government is using antiquated solutions bred by depression unemployed to solve the postwar problem of technological change. Taxpayers' dollars for public works are keeping drudgery and unskilled labor feasible as a way of life.

This is the Congressman's thesis and he occupies the dugout with that team of economists which argues that increased investment capital—not the hiking of aggregate demand by Federal handouts—is the key to full employment. If left alone, the dynamic American economy will create new jobs as it makes the old ones obsolete.

With tax incentives, Government should induce local business and schools to retrain workers for the skilled jobs that are opening, should reward plant modernization, and grant the newly qualified laborer easy access to areas where his talents can be employed.

Today the Government taxes every worker to provide a few with artificially created jobs, rather than encouraging the upgrading of skills to enable them to take on better jobs with a real future. Government seeks to bury the ugly visage of unemployment in a landslide of dollars that unearths the equally repulsive ogre of inflation.

To Mr. Curtis, this is our crime against the future and a hoodwinking of workers, using Federal boodle to buy their votes and keep them toiling in fruitless vineyards.

Congressman Curtis calls for a fresh look at unemployment and urges a single congressional study committee and a modern evaluation as election nears.

Chief shortcoming in the piece is his tendency to shortchange and oversimplify the arguments of a formidable economic school of thought entrenched in Swamp Poodle and Foggy Bottom.

Not a bulging text of charts and graphs, but a commonsense study by a principal actor who has stepped offstage to watch the huge cast of players, who, for all their eloquent soliloquies, seem to be moving to a curtain call that will find every American a ward of the state and an apostle of the status quo.

If today's notions prevailed years ago, he argues, men would be working on "cat whiskers" for crystal sets.

Cogent and clear, the work sides with that minority that steadfastly refuses to burn incense at the altar of John Maynard Keynes.

Opposition is anticipated from Washington deskmen and union leaders whose own future is tied to keeping telegraphers, farmers, and coal miners tapping obsolete keyboards, producing grain for Government bins, and loading 16 tons.

But these voices are familiar to Mr. Curtis.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 28, 1962]

Curtis Book Denies Economy Unwound

(By Juan Cameron)

Representative Thomas B. Curtis is a dogged baiter of Kennedy's economic thinking on the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee on which he serves as a senior Republican.

However, this influential Missourian also feels frustrated that his views—and those of other Republicans—are largely ignored by the press and public in the Democratic citadel.

The St. Louis lawyer—whose questions to administration economic policymakers have been linked to the quills of an aroused porcupine—has resorted to narrative now to present his lively if minority views on the Nation's No. 1 economic problem—unemployment.

His forum is a short, fresh little book, "87 Million Jobs—a Dynamic Program," published Friday (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 129 pages, $1.95).

VIEW REJECTED

Mr. Curtis states that with unemployment high today and with some 13,500,000 new jobs to be found in the 1970's, this problem needs a more critical analysis than it has received.

His basic analysis brings out that high employment is not, as the Democrats maintain, evidence of a rundown economy—but rather a reflection of a dynamic one causing widespread dislocations in its wake.

(Indeed he argues that the unemployment figures used by the Federal Government present a mirage, not the actual unemployment situation existing.)

His main conclusion from this analysis is that the Government must stop treating unemployment problems as a matter of economic geriatrics, with the prescribed remedy to be found in massive spending.

Since the jobless are a byproduct of growth, he argues, retraining, greater labor mobility, and more education are the ways out of this persistent problem.

WANT ADS HINT NEED

How can it be thought, Mr. Curtis asks, that unemployment reflects economic stagnation when, as the jobless rate hovers around 5.5 percent, the want ads of newspapers indicate tens of thousands of jobs are going begging?

How can the administration analysis be that an economy which in 20 years has doubled its payrolls and in 10 has doubled its productive output, requires vast infusions of Federal money to keep it moving ahead?

Part of the answer for the administration's error, Mr. Curtis argues, is that it misreads the unemployment statistics, which are confusing—a verdict that a Presidential study committee is expected to agree with in part in a report due this weekend.

INADEQUACIES NOTED

Mr. Curtis and economists like Arthur F. Burns point out some inadequacies of present unemployment totals: The figures include youths 14 years and older who are not at work; people who say they are looking for work but who, it is suspected, are not; laid-off workers who do not work because they are waiting for old jobs to reopen; people who do not seek work because of ill health or because they believe no jobs are available.

The inclusion of such categories in the monthly unemployment totals "perpetuates the confusion of the (unemployment) numbers games," Mr. Curtis contends.

The main reason there is so much long-term unemployment is that frictional unemployment—that caused by changing job demands in industry—has been left unsolved, Mr. Curtis concludes.

OVERSIMPLIFICATION?

Many feel that Mr. Curtis oversimplifies the cause and nature of unemployment and fails to give enough weight to many indicators which show that the American economy, absolutely and comparatively, is not expanding rapidly enough.

However, none disagree with his suggestions that more emphasis must be put on retraining, less on the dole.

He is correct in emphasizing, too, that while there is less need for ditchdiggers there is more for computer operators, lab technicians, garage mechanics, and natural scientists.

His criticism of unemployment statistics, too, is widely recognized, although how to correct the defects is not clear.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 28, 1962]

Lack of Skills Is Held Key to Unemployment Problem

"The crux of the so-called unemployment problem is not the lack of jobs, but the lack of skills to fill available jobs."

This is the thesis on which Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, has written "87 Million Jobs," a book published today by Duell, Sloan & Pearce.

The title alludes to the fact that by 1970 the American labor force will number 87 million. The subtitle, "A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment," serves to introduce Congressman Curtis' plan for upgrading the work force to fill the higher skilled jobs which he says are going begging today.

His multidimensional plan calls for a nationwide survey of the skills of the future and a national clearinghouse to classify these job opportunities and to disseminate information about them to schools and private employers.

On the Federal level, Representative Curtis wants the unemployment insurance system revamped to give benefits to unemployed workers who train for new skills and deny benefits to those who refuse to start learning a new skill. He also wants tax regulations relaxed to encourage persons to upgrade their skills or to move to areas where employment is available.

Rather than spend Federal money to "create jobs to fit available skills," the Government should encourage private business to expand and thereby produce more jobs by granting "more realistic" and more up-to-date depreciation allowances, the Congressman contends.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 28, 1962]

Curtis Outlines Job Plan

(By Robert Dietsch)

A leading Republican Congressman today outlined a program to upgrade unskilled and semiskilled workers to enable them to fill "the millions of jobs going begging in America today."

In a 126-page book, Representative Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, suggests new tax devices, a national clearinghouse to report on job needs, wider training in schools, better training programs by employers and changes in the Federal unemployment insurance system.

But his accent is always on upgrading workers through private channels.

"I do not rule out Government which—at all levels—has an important role to play in a well-designed program of job escalation," Representative Curtis writes in his book, "87 Million Jobs; A Dynamic Program."

"But Government spending, pump priming, does not equip a single man with the skills required to take one of the many new jobs created by our advancing technology. It can buy time, but only individual training or retraining can 'buy' any real guarantee of real work and real income."

At another point, Representative Curtis—a member of the Ways and Means and the Joint Economic Committees—said, "We hear little about the important successes in job upgrading being scored by individual business firms * * * not all of them can do as well as International Business Machines, which retrains 100,000 workers each year.

"But a number of companies are doing a fairly good job and could do much more under appropriate tax incentives and other Government policies."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 29, 1962]

People at Work—Jobs: Too Many Square Pegs?

(By Ed Townsend)

New York.—"We have a serious problem on our hands. We have jobs going begging and we have people unemployed who would like to work."

Representative Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri, senior Republican in the House and a member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee and of the House Ways and Means Committee, makes this statement in a book, "Eighty-seven Million Jobs," published this past week by Duell, Sloan & Pearce—the result of 2 years of late evening consideration of a national problem that could become a national crisis.

The book is provocative; it will be debated widely in the weeks ahead. What it outlines as "a constructive solution to unemployment" will find support in some quarters, will be scoffed at or challenged in others. Nevertheless, the book is important. It focuses new and needed attention on the basis of problems too often considered only in terms of statistics.

Unemployment persists at a level of about 5 percent of the civilian labor force. Methods of counting the jobless differ. Unions contend that the Government's figures are too conservative—that if allowances are made for those working only part time, the number idle would be about 6 million and the percentage around 7 percent. Whichever is right, there is almost universal agreement that the total is much too high.

Moreover, long-term unemployment—the kind that really hurts—has been increasing steadily in recent years. Today there are more than 500,000 men or women who have been jobless more than 26 weeks and nearly 1 million who have been off jobs for more than 15 weeks.

Conservatively, there is a large pool of nearly 4 million men and women anxious to go to work, according to Mr. Curtis, while hundreds of thousands of jobs remain unfilled because properly trained workers cannot be found.

The problem, he says, is one of imbalances. "Many employers, knowing the workers they need are not available do not even bother to advertise for them," Mr. Curtis said in a recent discussion of the problem. The openings are for skilled workers, usually for specialists. The jobseekers—the unemployed in today's labor market—are largely unskilled or semiskilled.

For instance, 900,000 more persons could be employed in the field of health services alone if they were available, according to Mr. Curtis. Many parts of the country are desperately short of teachers and other school personnel. In many cities, it is almost impossible to find competent, fully qualified secretaries.

Moreover, according to a survey by the Missouri Congressman, there is a severe shortage of automobile mechanics, tailors, sales clerks, shoe repairers, office workers, social and welfare workers, scientific and technical workers, and other classifications of white-collar and subprofessional workers—shortages that can be found even in areas with long and persistent unemployment.

However, a jobless coal miner or steelworker cannot be fitted easily into any of the shortage jobs. Usually, they lack the basic education and background necessary for retraining. Too often, they are not adaptable. And many of them are reluctant about making a new start in an entirely different field of employment.

"Too many people simply don't want to train for the jobs that are available," Mr. Curtis comments, adding, "There is no magic cure-all for all problems, but * * * we must launch a vast program to upgrade the skills of our people so that they can fill the many new jobs being created in our highly developed and increasingly service-oriented society and leave their old jobs to be filled by others, perhaps today's unemployed with their lesser skills."

This would mean training and retraining programs on a greatly expanded basis—and with attention to developing needs. There is entirely too much stress now on training and vocational programs directed toward skills little needed now or becoming obsolete, says Mr. Curtis. There is entirely too much thinking in terms of today or the past, too little in the new and challenging terms of tomorrow, he adds.

"The technique of matching idle workers with unfilled jobs is in its infancy. So, too, is our system of training and retraining Americans to fill the jobs that must be filled in the future if as a nation we are to realize our economic potential," Representative Curtis states.

The need is for a broad reshuffling, to upgrade workers "energetic and ambitious enough to try to improve skills or education." Today's big waste is the underdeveloped worker. Today's wrong technique is to try to train the untrainable—or to pass over him as untrainable. The answer, as Mr. Curtis sees it, is not to try to retrain the possessor of the lowest skill for newly emerging skilled jobs but to engage in a sweeping retraining program, upgrading workers all along the line.

It's not an easy program. It takes considerable cooperation all along the line, from workers and their unions, companies, and governments at all levels. It's only part of a solution. But it's a step that can be taken in a "free enterprise approach to our problems," according to the Congressman.

A GEOGRAPHER LOOKS AT CONNECTICUT HISTORY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on May 21, 1962, Mr. Joseph B. Hoyt presented a paper before the New Haven Colony Historical Society, which is most worthwhile. I ask unanimous consent that the paper be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Geographer Looks at Connecticut History

(A paper presented to the New Haven Colony Historical Society by Joseph B. Hoyt, May 21, 1962)

The geographer who embarks upon the task of writing history brings to that task a somewhat unique point of view. It is a point of view derived from his preoccupation with space relationships. If I may simplify things a bit to make my point: In considering the details in the tapestry of history, the historian thinks first of who and when. In contrast the geographer thinks first of where. Both are interested in explaining the why and how, but the historian tends to emphasize personal and time factors, while the geographer concentrates upon space factors.

Using Connecticut's history to illustrate these concepts, no historian would describe the settlement of our State without bringing in the names of John Oldham, Roger Ludlow, and Thomas Hooker. (Here in New Haven it might be more polite to refer to John Davenport and Theophilus Eaton.) In both cases the historian would unquestionably include the dates 1634, 1635, and 1636 in the settlement of the Connecticut Colony, and 1637–38 in the case of New Haven. Names and dates are facts of intrinsic importance for the historians. The more detailed histories of the settlement of the State also bring in the precise locations of the settlements, but as facts of secondary importance. Less detailed studies refer to them only under their present names without attempting to explain their locations.

The historical geographer describing the same events is concerned primarily with why these specific locations were settled first. To him the location is the most important fact while the names of the leaders and the dates of the settlements are of secondary importance. (The leaders' names aid him in separating one group from another should he wish to compare the several settlements. The dates are of value primarily when he wishes to relate later events to them. As the years pass, they become even less important. The debate on whether Hartford was settled in 1635 by the advance guard of Hooker's group, or in 1636 when the main body arrived, is a tempest in a teapot to the geographer.)

To the geographer the most significant facts in the first settlements of our State are (1) the selection of the alluvial meadows of the middle Connecticut River Valley, and (2) the selection of the best harbor on Long Island Sound as the locations for the earliest townsites. These two choices tell us quite a bit about these first settlers, their similarities and their differences. Both groups had to be concerned with locating good farmland since they had to support themselves from food they produced, but the New Haven Colony was settled by men who were also thinking in terms of commercial development, and, to them, the harbor was the most important asset of the New Haven area. It also had good farmland. [Today this is entirely built over by the city.]

The geographer adds a concern for the character of the land to his concern for space factors. In trying to account for the location of an event he turns first to a study of the physical characteristics of the location. Returning to our settlement illustration the geographer wants to know why the first settlements of the Connecticut Colony (I am distinguishing here between the New Haven and the Connecticut colonies) were located so far up the river. Why didn't John Oldham and the others locate in Haddam or in Lyme or part of Saybrook?

The explanation is clear to any resident of the lower Connecticut River, but it must have puzzled people back in Massachusetts if they had tried to plot the location of these first settlements. The historians pass over this puzzle or answer it somewhat cryptically by saying that the Hartford region had better land. They do not address themselves to the question of why the land was better. No geographer can content himself with such an answer. He must know why the land was better for farming in the Hartford region. It is not a natural situation. Normally as rivers approach the sea their valleys become broader, the flood plain wider and more extensive, and their value for farming settlements increases. This was obviously not true of the Connecticut River. Except for the fort at Saybrook, the early settlers avoided the lower Connecticut. And the Saybrook settlement was not chosen because of its agricultural land resources but because it guarded the entrance to the river.

To explain this rather unusual situation we need to look at the character of the land. Here we must turn to the geological history of the State. Many thousands of years back in our past a block of land crossing the State from north to south broke away and dropped down several hundreds or thousands of feet. Into this rift valley erosion poured millions of tons of sedimentary materials which the rivers stripped off the higher lands that lay on either side. The sands and clays deposited in this central strip of territory eventually hardened into rock (sandstones and shales). Both were softer than the granites and other crystalline rocks of the uplands. In a later stage of erosion the river, the predecessor to the present Connecticut, carved out a broad gentle valley, a flat bottomed valley covered with alluvial materials, excellent farmland. The lower portion of the Connecticut, from just south of the city of Middletown to the sea, crosses the old (hard rocks) upland. Here the valley is a narrow, V-shaped trough with virtually no flood plain at all. The towns are on the upland, which is a rolling, sloping surface; much of it even today remains under a forest cover.

The decision by the early settlers to bypass this rugged hilly region and to proceed upriver to the flatland around Hartford is part of what the geographer calls man-land relations. These might be considered the heart of a historical geographic study. The relationship between man and the land is a symbiotic one. Each of the two affects and is affected by the other. Man uses the resources of his land in making his living and is influenced by the relative abundance or scarcity of these resources in how he lives. In turn he changes the land as he lives on it. Some of the resources he uses up or destroys, others he improves by his actions. He cuts here and fills there. He reroutes brooks and rivers, dredges harbors, levels hills, digs tunnels beneath the surface. The manmade landscape is a vastly different thing from the natural one. Neither the land nor the population is the same after a period of long continued contact. We are somewhat different from our ancestors who first arrived in Connecticut, and it is very obvious that the State has been changed.

Recognition of the significance of the physical environment in the way man develops a region is not determinism. Like other students of man, the geographer realizes that man has some freedom of choice although this freedom is not complete. Man is limited by his own knowledge, by his possession or lack of possession of certain technical skills, those that are necessary to utilize the various resources. As an example, calling again on Connecticut's early history, both Indians and whites lived in the lower Quinnipiac River Valley, and bog iron ores were present during both occupancies. Only the whites, however, possessed the knowledge and skill needed to use them.

This case, the bog iron ores, shows the second limitation on man's freedom of choice. Obviously if the bog iron had been absent, there would have been no early iron industry in New Haven. Thus to the cultural limitation must be added a geographical limitation, the existence of the resources. These must be present before man can use them. Their presence, of course, does not insure their use.

Few parts of the world are so poor that they offer man only one resource that he can use to support himself; most land areas offer several, a variety of vegetation, animal life, soils, minerals, water, or location. Some men are sufficiently versatile that they can use these resources in a number of ways, but most men are more limited in their skills. The colonists who came to Connecticut came looking for one resource, but it was not always the same one. Some were farmers seeking potentially good farmland. This they found in the middle Connecticut River Valley. Others were lumbermen seeking merchantable trees; later on some men began looking for ores; still others were merchants seeking a harbor. The first two settlements were made by men planning on trade with the Indians; these were the Dutch trading post at Hartford and the Plymouth one at the mouth of the Farmington in Windsor. Both of these groups of men selected their sites from the point of view of a location convenient for trade. The existence of farm land nearby was a secondary consideration and not particularly important. They would have been content to have imported food if their location had turned out to be suitable for trading but not for farming.

The man-land relationship is a complex thing. It is not a mathematical relationship, rather it resembles a chemical combination of several variables which may produce any one of a number of different economies. There is an almost infinite variety of geographic regions. Each is a compound of various vegetation types, soil types, landforms types, and climate types, to say nothing of possible mineral and location factors. Blending with this geographic variety is another variable, man with his many different cultures. Whereas it might be safe to predict that a group of people accustomed to fish for a living who settled in a region with good fishing resources would continue to fish, one can never be sure. Fishing might be inhibited by some factor; a war and hostile ships offshore; fish might be declared taboo as food for some reason; or the discovery of gold in the interior might draw all the residents to the gold diggings.

The geographer is no more in the business of prophecy than is the historian. Both the historical geographer and the historian are in the business of explaining what has happened and why. I believe that the geographer adds a new dimension to the job.

The product of the historical geographer differs from the product of the historian in several ways. The historian is interested in personalities. The great man concept of history came from the historians; it could never have come from the historical geographers. He (the geographer) is concerned with the group. The fact that A led the group rather than B is of relatively minor significance. If John Davenport and Thomas Hooker had never existed I doubt that the settlement of their respective colonies would have been delayed a year. Both men left the impress of their personalities on their respective colonies and, had they not existed, the two settlements might have developed a little differently. Not very differently; both men reflected the general thinking of their times and of their associates. The historical geographer doesn't deny the significance of personalities, but he is not particularly concerned with the fact that the personality belonged to a man named Davenport rather than a man named Brown. If you wish, he writes a more impersonal kind of history.

The historical geographer looks for patterns of occupance (the way people are distributed around the region) and for changes in that pattern. In my own study of Connecticut I was fascinated by the way settlement spread throughout the State. Knowing the character of Connecticut's land and the way the early settlers thought about land, the patterns of spreading settlement were perfectly understandable. First the central Connecticut River valley and the coastline; then men moved slowly up the smaller river valleys from the coast and east and west from the Connecticut River itself. The higher uplands on the east and west were the last to be settled.

The hard rocks of these uplands had prevented the creation of broad river valleys and the first settlements there were located on the uplands. Along the Massachusetts border these uplands were quite high and somewhat cooler and less valuable for agriculture. The towns with the most rugged topography and the highest elevations were settled last and never developed into prosperous agricultural communities, Norfolk, Colebrook, Union, Washington. As you travel across these uplands you will note the tendency has been to clear the relatively flat-topped hills and to leave the slopes and many of the narrower valleys in forest. The explanation here lies back in the geologic past, also.

By the date of the first national census a pattern of occupance, based upon a subsistence agriculture for the most part, had fully developed. The Connecticut population was distributed around the State in close agreement with the ability of the land to support people by this type of economy. There was quite an even distribution with somewhat more people in the towns in the central valley, that had better agricultural resources, and along the coast where many settlers supported themselves by activities associated with the sea. The slightly denser pattern that appears in towns like New Haven, and along the coast toward New York may be partly explained by another type of agricultural operation that had begun to develop. This was a commercialized farming, raising food products that were sold in New York, or were shipped further afield. Not only were farms smaller and more productive and they supported a denser agricultural population, in addition there were those who lived by trading or craft activities in the towns. Such a map should be titled "A Map Showing the Agricultural Evaluation of the State."

A second pattern of occupance began to emerge in the first decades of the 19th century. It was the result of the mating of the industrial revolution and the Connecticut land. The industrial revolution has been variously defined. Here I would suggest that it was a cultural change producing new ways of thinking about manufacturing, particularly the idea of applying power to the several manufacturing processes of the textile industry. Waterpower had been used since the first days of the colony in grinding grain, or in sawing wood. By the middle of the eighteenth century it was being used in fulling mills. Toward the end of the century textile machinery had been set up in Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Connecticut and the whole process of spinning and weaving became mechanized using water power.

These new ideas came to Connecticut as a second wind comes to a runner. The rate of population growth in Connecticut had begun to slow down. In the decade 1780-90 we had been growing at a rate of 17 percent for the 10-year period, but from 1790 to 1800 and for each successive decade to 1840 the rate of increase ranged between 4 and 8 percent. Obviously by 1800 the State was supporting about as many people as it could on a largely subsistence agricultural basis. The surplus population was moving north and west to the open frontier lands. (The migration was made up, as they all were, of two groups: (1) The young, ambitious, energetic people who wanted more scope for their talents than they felt the old hometown offered to them. Some of these were younger children of a family that did not have enough land to support them all. Most families were large in those days and the average farm of 100 to 200 acres could only support one family. As the children grew up most of them would have to migrate. (2) The second group was made up of the failures, the ne'er-do-wells, for whom the grass is always greener beyond the horizon.)

Many of our hill towns reached their peak populations in the 1790 census and were actually declining in population in the first decades of the 19th century. Land was being abandoned and was reverting to forest. Lack of knowledge or bad judgment on the part of some farmers had resulted in clearing of hillsides that should never have been cleared. These poorer lands, scrub farms, were the first to be abandoned completely when the West opened up. Often the farms had never amounted to much, a few acres of corn and hay, a scrawny cow or two, and a tumbledown log cabin or two-room shack. They represented a sort of rural slum of the 18th century. We have our modern equivalents, the tar paper shacks on back roads.

We desperately needed new ideas in 1800. The State averaged 50 people on every square mile of our land. The quality of the land varies from town to town and is rarely all usable for agriculture. The system followed in 1800 could be called a form of shifting cultivation. Land was cleared, planted to corn for a few years, then turned over to grass cultivation and pasture for an equal length of time. Then corn or another grain was tried again. If, in the course of cultivating, the land proved poorer than had been anticipated, it was left in grass and became pasture land often growing up to bush pasture. By 1800 40 percent of the State had been cleared, but 679,000 acres or 43 percent of the cleared land was classed as bush pasture and was in the process of reverting to forest. Only the development of a new resource could make up for our limited land resources and permit further growth of the State's population.

The new resource came to light with the new ideas mentioned earlier. It was the waterpower of the State. The earlier gristmills and sawmills had often only run 1 or 2 days a week, or were turned on only when a customer appeared with his sack of grain or logs. They didn't need a large head of water or expensive storage facilities. If the stream ran low in summer, the mill suspended operation for a month or two. Few of the larger streams were used for such small-scale mill operations. The new factories created a demand for larger scale waterpower developments and focused attention on unused waterpower sites. Timothy Dwight noted the effect of these new needs when he commented on how rapidly stream-side land values rose in the Quinebaug valley around 1800.

Connecticut possessed the very desirable combination of physical features that fitted the developing manufacturing complex. These were:

1. A reliable year-round rainfall and relatively moderate winter temperatures.
2. A hilly topography that produced rapidly flowing streams, numerous falls, and thus desirable mill sites.
3. Many ponds and lakes, left as a legacy by the glacier; these could be made into storage reservoirs to even out the seasonal fluctuations in riverflow.
4. A mechanically adept population that had exhausted other State resources and was eager to try a new type of work.
5. Sufficient capital accumulated by years of thrifty Yankee saving and from profits from seafaring. This capital was seeking an opportunity for investment.

These last two are cultural elements that blended with the physical elements.

Historians have nicknamed us the "land of steady habits" and have implied we have a rather cautious approach to new ideas. The changeover did not come overnight. But, by 1850, the shift had been accomplished. We had become a manufacturing State. A new pattern of occupance emerged, one that would characterize the State almost up to the present day. The hill towns that were dependent on agriculture continued to lose population as they had been doing ever since 1790. Most of these towns had had dreams of manufacturing in the early years of the century and had begun small mills and factories. Their hopes were dashed by the small scale of the water powers in their towns. Success in the very competitive manufacturing of this period depended, among other things, upon a substantial power source. In the larger valleys, Naugatuck and Quinebaug, the newly developing mill towns absorbed the surplus rural population in addition to the immigrants who began to arrive in Connecticut in large numbers after 1840. The decade 1840–50 found Connecticut for the first time in 50 years really increasing in population, 20 percent for the 10-year period.

The shifting population pattern shows up quite clearly in a map of population changes, 1800 to 1850. In this map a simple divide has been made between towns with a larger population in 1850 than they had in 1800 and those with fewer people at the later date. Generally the towns shown in black are the smaller hill towns which lacked water power; the towns in white, and thus showing a population increase, are river towns.

Each of the main valleys from the Housatonic on the west to the Quinebaug in the east showed the pattern of increasing population in this half century. In the Housatonic the iron industry from Kent north to Salisbury and Canaan was the main factor. Along the Naugatuck were rising the manufacturing towns of Winsted, Torrington, Waterbury, Naugatuck, Seymour, Ansonia, and Derby. The Quinnipiac Valley boasted such busy little manufacturing centers as Plainville, Southington, Meriden, and Wallingford. On the Connecticut itself Windsor Locks had begun to emerge and across the river in Enfield were large carpet factories. The Hockanum supported the Rockville and Manchester industries. Further east each of the tributaries to the Thames, Hopbrook, Willimantic, and Quinebaug, rivers turned dozens of water wheels that powered an expanding textile industry.

This was the start of the urban movement in Connecticut that became more intensified in the second half of the century. In the six decades, 1840–1900, the people of the State shifted from agriculture to manufacturing as the base for their economy. To do so they had to shift their places of residence from the country to the cities. Between 1850 and 1900 was an even more widespread movement of people in the State. A number of upland and small coastal communities that had succeeded in maintaining their populations in the earlier half century now joined the list of declining towns. With hardly an exception the pattern of industrial distribution that had developed by 1900 remains unchanged today. It has become intensified. The largest cities of that date remain the largest today although their relative rank has changed.

It would be both inaccurate and unfair to suggest that this development was inevitable. The existence of potential waterpower sites in a town did not create the manufacturing plants that were located on those sites. However, given the Connecticut population of this period, the numerous men seeking locations for factories of many kinds, it might have been expected that the potentials that did exist would be found and used. The personality factor was very important. Every industry in our State, and every town, can point to specific individuals whose ability was largely responsible for that town's growth. Some of their names are familiar to us all. It was the genius of such men as Eli Whitney, the Collins brothers, Elisha Root, Samuel Colt, Eli Terry, Seth Thomas, Chauncey Jerome, Linus Yale, Charles Goodyear, Albert Pope and many others that directed our manufacturing towns into the specialties which have made many of them world famous. They gave direction and impetus to a movement that had started before most of them were born.

While we recognize the contribution of these leaders in manufacturing we should not forget the part played by thousands of other Connecticut workers, now nameless, who so capably followed these leaders. Had the population of Connecticut been uniformly stupid and incapable we could never have become a manufacturing State. And, had we lacked the physical resources that the early manufacturing industries were based upon, specifically waterpower, we would even now be a small farming State.

Today we are superimposing a third pattern of occupance upon the two previous patterns. Each pattern of occupance develops from a valuation of the State by men who have a specific frame of reference. (For example, the first pattern evolved as farmers viewed the State from the point of view of its value for farming. The regions they settled first and most completely were the best farmlands. Thus the pattern of occupance, the distribution of people, reflected the distribution of good land. The second pattern developed as the result of a valuation that focused upon an entirely different resource and one that was located in areas that had not been attractive to the farmers, water powers in narrow river valleys. It did not entirely replace the pattern of farming occupance. Indeed, during the first three quarters of the 19th century the acreage used for agriculture increased for the State as a whole. Farming was, however, concentrated increasingly upon the best land.)

The third pattern developed as a result of our population reexamining the State with new ideas in mind, in a new frame of reference. Now they began to evaluate the State from the point of view of its residential use. In the two earlier periods people selected residential sites primarily because they were near their work. In the 20th century one major invention, the automobile, freed people from the necessity of locating near their jobs. This personal transportation device made it possible for them to select a homesite on the basis of other factors, the amenities if they desired. A second invention, this one a cultural invention, the concept of vacations from work, awakened us to certain amenities, certain attractions, which the Connecticut landscape possesses and which few Connecticut residents had appreciated in the earlier years of our history. Both of these inventions were 19th century, although the full impact did not come until the end of the second decade of the 20th century.

The cultural invention preceded the mechanical one. In the latter part of the 19th century urban families had begun to come back to the hill and shore towns of New England which they or their parents had deserted to move to the cities. At first they came only for a brief visit at the old homestead or in a nearby farmhouse willing to take summer visitors. Gradually their stay lengthened until many families were spending the entire summer. They bought up abandoned farms, lake and sea front property and hillside locations. Summer months along the seashore or in our hill towns awakened an appreciation for these areas of our State that had become depopulated. Comparing the amenities of country living with the increasing disadvantages of city life, many of these people decided to stay on as permanent residents. Others returned to the city determined somehow to combine the two. This created our suburban movement.

The suburban movement may be considered a backwash from the urban migration of the 19th century. By 1920 urban growth had begun to slow down and the suburbs began to grow. This countryward movement resembled the ripples sent out by a rock dropped into a forest pool. Near the center it involved many people, further out the numbers were smaller. At first people moved into the towns closest to the cities where they worked. Very few moved more than one town away. The ideal of a home near one's work was stubbornly held. Today the migration is in full swing and the more accessible towns of Fairfield, New Haven, and Litchfield counties are filling up with people.

Every town in Fairfield County except Bridgeport, Danbury, Shelton, and Sherman increased over 100 percent in the four decades 1920–1960. The larger cities, Greenwich, Stamford, and Norwalk, increased, however, more slowly than the clearly suburban communities. Growth in these suburbs ranged from 150 percent in Bethel and Redding to 670 percent in Trumbull. New Haven County showed the same pattern. The industrial centers of the Naugatuck River grew very slowly; in reality they did not hold their natural increase. Their residents began moving to the surrounding suburbs. Four towns increased over 500 percent and the two little upland communities of Prospect and Wolcott increased 1,130 and 1,570 percent respectively. Elsewhere in the State a similar growth pattern developed. Hartford, like New Haven, was surrounded by expanding suburbs.

Litchfield, Tolland, Windham, and New London Counties shared least in this growth pattern. They were too far away from the industrial centers that employed most of the suburban residents. But even here growth was evident. Most towns in these counties were declining hill towns until 1920—now they began to reverse the trend. In the past four decades every one grew although the growth was a modest 40 to 50 percent on the average. The last decade provided most of this growth for them. Declining textile industries in the Quinebaug Valley produced a setback for such communities as Putnam, Thompson, Killingly, Plainfield, and even Norwich. New industries in the past decade have begun slowly to replace the departed textile mills and this section may recover in the next decade.

Distance still plays a role in determining the rate of growth. The more remote towns have increased the least. Commuting 20 miles each way doesn't bother many people, but few are willing to commute 40 miles. (All of us know exceptions to this general rule, and some train commuters to New York come from as far away as New Haven.)

The decentralization of industry has aided this dispersal. The invention of the steam engine and more recently the electric motor have freed industry from the necessity of locating by a river. Now a factory may be built wherever its owner wishes. In the past two decades we have seen new factories built in communities that years ago had given up hope of becoming manufacturing cities since they lacked water power. The Electric Boat Co. in Groton, and the Sikorsky plant in Stratford are examples. These two towns have displaced such well-known cities as Meriden and Norwich in the top 10 manufacturing cities of the State.

Today the urban movement has actually reversed itself in the case of the largest cities. In Connecticut, Hartford, Bridgeport and New Haven have fewer residents today than they had in 1950. This process has been going on for some time but has been concealed by the fact that we have considered any addition to the population of the previous decade in a city as evidence of growth. (We sometimes qualified it, stating it was a very small growth.) In reality a city should grow by natural increase, excess of births over deaths for the decade, say a minimum of 10 percent for the census period. If it does not it is because the residents are leaving the city. New Haven succeeded in concealing its loss of population in the 1940–50 period by counting some 8,000 Yale students for the first time. We showed a gain of 3,800 persons; in reality the city lost 20,000 people. [Computed: 160,605 in 1940, a natural increase of 10 percent would have added 16,000 plus 8,000 Yale students—24,000 or estimated total of 184,000; we had 164,443] The actual departure of people in the 1950–60 period produced a total of 152,000, an apparent loss of 12,000, but a real loss of 28,000. These are the people who have filled up our suburbs and small towns.

Each of these three patterns of population distribution as shown on the maps show man-land relations, how men with differing goals have reacted to Connecticut's varied resources at different periods of our history. Such studies are the contribution of the geographer.

Applying the same technique, the analysis of historical events in their spacial and locational aspects, the geographer contributes to an understanding of other aspects of our history. The transportation history of our State—railroads, roads, canals, navigable streams, is a natural field of study for a geographer. One can map the State's railroads by its rivers, or its rivers by its railroad lines. They coincide beautifully.

The relationship between transportation routes and the growth of towns along the route is clearly shown in the case of the Farmington Canal and the establishment and growth of such communities as Milldale, Plainville, Avon, Weatogue, and Mechanicsville. The failure of towns to develop a rail connection was partly responsible for the decline of several small towns in upland regions of the State.

The entire railroad history of Connecticut must be studied in relation to the physical geography of the State. Taking an impartial point of view in regard to the present railroad situation, one has to recognize that we overbuilt railroads in this State. The railroad offered such real advantages over canal transportation and the poor road system that this building boom is understandable. Today even newer methods of transportation are presenting the railroads with the same sort of dilemma that they presented to the canal. If Messrs. Farnham and Sheffield, who built the canal, were alive today they might regard the railroad plight as a sort of just retribution.

In closing I should simply like to say that I hope I have helped you see that there are chapters in our history to which a geographic point of view brings enlightenment. Both points of view, that of the historian with his concern for when and who and of the geographer with an emphasis upon the why and where, are essential to an understanding of our past. I myself came to geography through the anteroom of history. I hope that more historians in the future will linger in the halls of geography before they pass on into what someone has called the ivory towers in which most professors are supposed to dwell. Thank you.

AT LAST—HOLLYWOOD STRIKES BACK AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as one who has tried for long years to do his share in the war we must constantly wage against the bloodthirsty international Communist conspiracy, I wish to express appreciation for an unusual blow now being struck in that struggle, on motion picture screens throughout America.

I have reference to a film, "We'll Bury You," which traces with shocking authenticity communism's master plan for world conquest, patiently, step by step, but always with the truth that comes from history itself.

An American film company, Columbia Pictures, has given us "We'll Bury You," a picture that has nothing to do with fiction, but rather represents the painstaking selection of scene after unforgettable scene from the brutal record. Some of this material has never been shown before; much of it comes from private sources, through the archives of our own Library of Congress and the U.S. Army. The newsreel companies, and the Associated Press, have also made a valiant, inestimable contribution.

The producers went to no casting office or talent agency for their characters. They went to history, and obtained as infamous a collection of scoundrels as has ever been assembled for a film:

Khrushchev, Castro, Stalin, Trotsky, Mao Tse-tung, Lenin, Malenkov, and Mikoyan, and others of this foul stripe are among those appearing in this historic film.

Of course, their victims, millions of them innocents, also play their own tragic role in this most revolting story of our time.

"We'll Bury You" is an admirable film because it does not stop with vituperation and bombast, as too many persons and groups do. It presents facts, and shuns vague generalities. I know I speak for millions of my fellow Americans whom I urge to fortify themselves with knowledge while they share the inherent excitement of this story of our enemy, the Red terror which seeks the death of our most precious institutions, if not our life itself.

Patriotic organizations, fraternal groups, church clubs, and good Americans in general can rejoice over the fact that Columbia Pictures has produced this long-awaited counterattack against communism. It is important that the youth of America as well as adult citizens everywhere be given an opportunity to see and hear the truth about the Communist conspiracy as portrayed in "We'll Bury You." If alert citizens of every community will now take steps to be sure their favorite local theater books and shows this remarkable film the widespread favorable reaction to a portrayal of this type should stimulate other Hollywood producers and other film companies to come up with equally effective dramatic or historical portrayals evidencing the true dimensions of the Communist menace and the nature of the conspiracy whose leader proudly boasted in a rare moment of arrogant frankness, "We'll Bury You."

RICHARDSON FOUNDATION FELLOWS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, before this session is drawn to a close I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the contribution which the Richardson Foundation of Greensboro, N.C., has made to the work of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

During the past year the foundation, with the approval of the subcommittee, assigned two young lawyers to work with the subcommittee staff. These young men, George Autry and George Ragsdale were graduated in June 1961 from the law schools of Duke University and the University of North Carolina, respectively. They joined the subcommittee staff in August of 1961 and worked there through June of this year. During that time, they made a fine contribution to the subcommittee work. They assisted in the comprehensive research of the subcommittee on such subjects as "The Constitutional Rights of the American Indian," "Aministration of Criminal Justice," "The Constitutional Rights of Military Personnel," "Literacy Tests and Voter Requirements in Federal and State Elections," and contributed in innumerable ways to the subcommittee's operation.

I feel that I would be remiss if I were not to extend to the Richardson Foundation and to the Richardson Foundation fellows, Messrs. Autry and Ragsdale, the subcommittee's deep appreciation for the fine contribution these young men have made to our work during this Congress.

At the conclusion of their foundation assignment, Mr. Ragsdale returned to his home in Raleigh, N.C., where he is currently engaged in private practice. Mr. Autry has remained with the subcommittee and is a valuable member of our staff. Earlier this year, an article appeared in the Winston-Salem Journal concerning Mr. Autry and his lovely young wife who is a member of the staff of our distinguished deputy majority leader. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA MAN, WIFE AIDS TO SENATORS

WASHINGTON.—The first time George B. Autry met Bess Powell they talked. Bess talked better and won $250.

That was 8 years ago when they participated in a speech contest in Wilmington, N.C. George represented New Hanover High School and Bess spoke for Chestnut Junior High.

George finally got his hands on the money when he married Bess and now their talk is centered around politics which fills both their lives as aids to Senators.

George Autry, 24, is a staff member of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, whose chairman is Senator Sam J. Ervin Jr., Democrat of North Carolina.

Autry is serving with Ervin under a 1-year Richardson Foundation fellowship, given to three law school graduates in North Carolina every year. George won the fellowship while attending Duke University.

LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT

Bess Autry is a legislative assistant to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota. Bess, like her husband, a Duke graduate, applied for an opening in Humphrey's office and got it.

George's main task is to prepare the subcommittee for the hearings on the controversial administration proposal to outlaw literacy requirements more stringent than a sixth-grade education, as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

"We're doing legal research on both sides of the question," Autry said. "There's a real question whether the bill is constitutional or not."

"I love it," Autry said of his job. "I have always been interested in constitutional law and this is a perfect opportunity to do more research on the subject."

Mrs. Autry, 22, spends her working hours answering letters from constituents, researching on Humphrey's statements, and working with out-of-State queries.

Both spend some time helping their Senators with speeches.

NO CONFLICT

Ervin, a conservative, and Humphrey, considered a leading Senate liberal, differ on many legislative items but the Autrys don't carry the conflict home.

"We talk politics constantly," Bess said "but we see pretty much eye to eye—we feel they are both great Senators."

George agrees and said, "I think we can avoid any domestic problems."

The Autrys' social life, since their arrival in August, has centered around parties given by people in their offices. They have a one-bedroom apartment near the Capitol.

Autry said the biggest difference living in Wilmington and Washington "is the traffic."

Despite their enjoyment of Washington life, George and Bess want to return to North Carolina next year. But they haven't decided if it will be Wilmington or somewhere else in the State.

George wants to practice law and keep active in Democratic party politics, but has no plans to run for public office. Bess wants to raise a family.

LUTHER HODGES—HE LIVES THE AMERICAN DREAM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, among the distinguished progeny of North Carolina have been many men who have contributed selflessly to our Nation through service in the Federal Government. One of these highly dedicated public servants is, I am certain, destined to occupy a particularly outstanding place in the history of our country.

Born in a humble log cabin, he was a man of diligence and ambition. Not having the funds to complete his high school education, this man set out on his own to achieve not only a high school, but also a college degree. This he managed to do through hard and diligent work for the necessary financial requirements.

Later, a grassroots start in the textile industry acted as the springboard to the vice presidency of Marshall Field Co., and still later to West Germany as Chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration, managing the Industry Division. After achieving his place as a world leader in business and industry, he began a new career in the public service. Entering North Carolina politics in 1952, he ran successfully for Lieutenant Governor and in 1954 became Governor. In this capacity he became known throughout the world for the industry he brought to our State; he made North Carolina even better known for the abundance of resources she offers to anyone or any company seeking a new home.

This man, one of the most prominent in America today, is Luther Hodges, of whom it can be truly said, has lived the "American dream." President Kennedy acknowledged Hodges' contributions by appointing him Secretary of Commerce in the New Frontier. He has proved worthy of the President's confidence during the past 2 years as head of that great Department. The innovations he has made and the leadership he has given have received the almost unanimous approbation of the businessmen and economists of America.

To pay tribute to this great American and outstanding statesman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article which appeared earlier this year in the Family Weekly, "Luther Hodges—He Lives the American Dream."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Luther Hodges—He Lives the American Dream

(By Flora Rheta Schreiber)

From a log cabin on a tobacco farm, this genial extrovert has gone on to success in business, politics, government—and family life.

In 1914, the 16-year-old son of a tenant farmer began his career selling newspapers, magazines, candy, and popcorn on the mainline trains between Roanoke and Norfolk, Va.

Going east on train No. 4 as far as Suffolk, he would catch No. 3 to return to Roanoke. "I prayed," he recalls, "that just once we would miss connections with No. 3 at Suffolk so I could go on to Norfolk and see both a large city and the ocean. I had never seen either."

One day this dream was fulfilled. Arriving in Norfolk at night, he was permitted a day's layover in the city. Sleeping in a 25-cent flophouse room with a dozen other persons, he clutched the railway's money bags for fear they would be snatched from him. When day came, he wandered about the city, took a long look at the ocean, and dreamed of worlds beyond.

This boy, who today is Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, not only dreamed but acted. It would be hard to find a sharper exemplification of the American dream, of an ascent from rags to riches, from obscurity to eminence.

Secretary Hodges was born March 9, 1898, in a log cabin in the red-clay country of Virginia, the eighth of nine children.

The shack was on a tobacco farm where his parents were tenants. When he was 2, the crops failed and the family moved to the North Carolina mill town of Leaksville. His mother, a tender, gentle woman, died when he was 11. His father, living a life of hardship, was himself harsh and unbending. The boy's life was one of great stress. "We never even celebrated Christmas," Luther Hodges told me.

In the Reverend P. H. Gwynn, a Presbyterian minister, he found a friend who saw his value and give him encouragement. So intense was the boy's affinity for his mentor, a classics scholar, that the boy made straight A's in Greek and Latin. "This boy will some day be Governor of the State," the Reverend Mr. Gwynn predicted.

Luther's father, however, opposed his son's going to college. None of his brothers had—why should he? When he was 16, Luther did not have funds to complete high school, but he was determined to get a job, raise money, then continue his education. At the invitation of his sister, Mrs. S. F. Crews, wife of a railroad brakeman, he went to live with her in Roanoke, where he landed the job as a candy butcher.

Hodges worked his way through high school, then the University of North Carolina. He waited tables, fired furnaces, ran a clothes-pressing club, sold Bibles door to door, and worked in a textile plant. Despite all this, he made the basketball team, managed the baseball team, and was elected president of both the student council and the senior class. He was voted best all-around man on campus.

He also found time to go acourting. He met the lady of his dreams in the spring of 1919. Though Luther was just a senior, the Reverend Mr. Gwynn had arranged for him to deliver the commencement address at the Leaksville High School. On the platform with him was the lady—Martha Blakeney, a teacher.

"I saw a pretty brown-haired girl dressed in organdy," he recalls, "I had to have a date with her. And, I did."

"Oh, Luther Hodges is all right," Martha Blakeney told a friend, "but he's not the kind of man I'd marry." When he did ask her to marry him, her answer was: "I love you very much, but I've had a hard time, and I won't marry a man who earns under $3,000 a year."

"This came as a surprise but not a permanent setback," Hodges told me. "She had lost her mother early and had to struggle. Just the same, she cashed in everything she had for our wedding, June 24, 1922."

The Hodges have enjoyed a comfortable camaraderie. As E. L. Rankin, Jr., his press secretary for 6 years, puts it, "The Hodges are very frank with each other. He talks things over with her, she tells him what she thinks, he values her opinion—and makes up his own mind."

THE GREAT CAREER BEGINS

Hodges, who as a prospective bridegroom earned $83 a month, rose steadily in the business world. He organized the first personnel department in the textile mills owned by Marshall Field & Co., and by 1943 he was a vice president of the company.

By 1950 he was earning more than $75,000 a year, but he also was looking to new horizons. "Making money is the easiest thing men do," he told Gen. Capus Waynick, a friend.

"I told myself," he reminisces, "you're over 50. If you're going to do it, better do it now."

He resigned from Marshall Field, and the Hodges moved to West Germany, where he served as Chief of our Economic Cooperation Administration's industry division.

When a friend suggested he try politics in 1952, Hodges, a political novice, entered the fray to become a candidate for North Carolina's Lieutenant Governor, and won. Gov. William B. Umstead died 2 years later, and Hodges succeeded. He was 56.

On his first day in office, he faced a bank of pushbuttons on his desk in Raleigh.

"Partly for devilment and partly to find out what would happen. I began punching them," he recalls. "People started coming in from back offices and everywhere. I was brand new and didn't even know them. I said, 'What do you do, and why do you do it?' That was the basic approach, and it created interest—and consternation."

The main theme of Hodges' administration was increasing the industrial development of North Carolina through Operation Bootstrap. Big out-of-State industries were aggressively encouraged to set up branches in the State. Small businessmen got financial transfusions when the Governor created the Business Development Corp., with lending power of $10 million to service industries needing special help.

In 1956, Hodges entered the race for a full 4-year term as Governor and won in a landslide. He served longer as Governor than any other man elected to that job.

It was just 9 years after Luther Hodges entered politics that he was invited to Palm Beach, where President-elect Kennedy announced his appointment as Secretary of Commerce. On the plane returning from Palm Beach, the 62-year-old, silver-haired dynamo sat deep in thought. His private secretary leaned over. "Has it sunk in yet?" he asked.

Hodges raised a hand. "Don't bother me," he replied. "I've already started working."

The Hodges now live in an apartment in Washington's Woodley Place. Their children are far from home, however. Nancy, 35, the wife of John C. Finlay, an oil executive, lives in New Delhi, India. Betsy, 36, is the wife of an oil company engineer and lives in Anacortes, Wash. Luther II, 25, is doing research in business administration at the University of North Carolina. The Hodges are proud grandparents of eight youngsters.

For all his family pride, Luther Hodges is not a demonstrative father or grandfather. "In general," say E. L. Rankin, "he is quite restrained. There are no outward displays of affection. He is sentimental, but his exterior doesn't show it. He's a very complicated man."

Hodges apparently applied his own early background to the rearing of his children. "When my son was about 10," he says, "we came home after a year in Europe, where he had been getting an allowance. I told him then, 'Your allowance will be cut when you get back to America. You will have to earn your own spending money.' "

The Hodges are urbane and cosmopolitan. They enjoy good books and cherish their associations with playwright Paul Green of the Carolina Playmakers and with Carl Sandburg.

Mrs. Hodges, who is popular with the cabinet wives, sponsors her share of public events and used to entertain extensively. Yet essentially she is not a clubwoman or a joiner. Her deepest satisfactions are in reading, bridge (which she plays with tournament skill), history, and painting still life and landscapes.

The Secretary, on the other hand, is indefatigable in fishing and hunting. Says General Waynick, "When he pulls a trigger, something is likely to drop."

He is facile, too, with a quip. Asked by a reporter when the Business Ethics Advisory Council of the Commerce Department will complete the code it began last May, he said, "About January." Asked why the delay, he replied, "It's hard to write a new Ten Commandants."

A natural extrovert and optimist, Hodges has always been a joiner. Even while he was building his career, he was active in the Methodist Church and the YMCA. He organized classes for illiterate millworkers and for 10 years taught at night. Entering politics, he developed a showman's flare. When a magazine asked him to pose in his underwear, he genially complied. Martha Hodges, more reserved than he, thought that this was too great a price for the Governor of North Carolina to pay.

EARLY TO BED AND EARLY TO RISE

Secretary Hodges is buoyantly youthful. He rises at 6 a.m., retires at 10 (at the latest, 10:30), even if there are guests. He says, "I just tell them, 'Excuse me, I'm going to bed.' " He eats lightly, and his favorite foods are white beans, turnip salad, and cornbread. He has kept his weight at 190 pounds, the same as it was when he was sworn in as Governor. He doesn't smoke, and drinks very moderately.

His twin fetishes are punctuality and speed. With his associates, he is demanding. His own tempo is so fast that he wants his staff to anticipate his thoughts. He writes notes to them before leaving home in the morning and arrives at his office at 8 or 8:15 with a brief case crammed with, "Klotz: What think?—" or "Ruder: See H." By 8:30 he expects an answer. After all, it is 2 hours since he thought of it.

When he loses patience, he is likely to apologize—though in an indirect way. "I've decided," he once told a secretary who had briefly fallen from grace, "that you and I shouldn't get mad at the same time."

THE ONLY WAY IS UP

Hodges assumed the post of Secretary of Commerce without illusions. He knew that for many years, in both Democratic and Republican administrations, the power of the Commerce Department had declined, that its single towering figure had been Herbert Hoover. To his new employees, he quipped: "The only way this Department can go is up."

Up is where he is trying to take it. As cochairman of the important Advisory Committee on Labor-Management (the so-called wage-price committee), he has developed cordial relations with the Department of Labor, which had long been hostile to Commerce. Congress, at his request, has set up the U.S. Travel Service to stimulate tourism in the United States. The Department also has assumed broader powers, with responsibility for the President's depressed-area program and with its role in developing international trade.

Hodges' job also is to reassure businessmen that the President is not antibusiness. "I want the Department of Commerce to mean to the average businessman what the Department of Labor has come to mean to labor," the Secretary told me.

Luther Hodges believes firmly that the American dream that propelled him is still a great national resource, but one that citizens must not expect to have handed them as a dole.

"It is the search for security," he told me, "that keeps men from getting ahead. If they would stop thinking of punching the clock, work for the love of work, and not be afraid to make bold moves, there would be no stopping them."

Behind each word, one seems to hear the slogan Hodges has lived by: "It can be done."

THE PROBLEM OF PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, yesterday's editorial section of the Washington Post carried a splendid article on Presidential inability by Richard H. Hansen. Now a practicing lawyer in Lincoln, Nebr., Mr. Hansen directed a 19-month study of the problem of "Disabled Presidents" which was published in the June 1961 Nebraska Law Review. This fall the University of Nebraska Press is publishing his book, 'The Year We Had No President." It vividly portrays the history of the "Tyler Precedent" and the problems which can arise by relying upon informal memorandums to overcome the ambiguity in the Constitution which has perplexed lawyers from the time President Tyler took office. It is my hope that the Congress will soon tackle this problem by enacting a constitutional amendment. I am confident that when it does, its work will be greatly aided by Mr. Hansen's authoritative study. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert the Post article at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISABLED PRESIDENT PROBLEM STILL NAGS

(By Richard H. Hansen)

"The heart attack, the ileitis operation, and the stroke were terribly difficult personal crises for President Eisenhower. But even more, they were potential constitutional crises of the greatest magnitude for the Nation," wrote Richard Nixon in "Six Crises."

These constitutional crises resulted from the failure of the Constitution to provide a method for determining Presidential disability, or to give Congress clear authority to set up a procedure.

President Kennedy wisely recognized the gap in the law when he made an agreement on the subject with Vice President JOHNSON. It is identical with that made between President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon in 1958. Admittedly, it is a stopgap; the basic constitutional void still exists.

The Nebraska Law Review undertook an exhaustive study of Presidential disability in September 1960, under my direction. Our research lasted 19 months, and the results filled a book. What did the study reveal?

Three Attorneys General , (Brownell, Rogers, and Kennedy) have pointed out that the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention and the history of the pre-Federal period clearly prove that it was never intended that the Vice President become President when the Chief Executive dies or is disabled. The Vice President is referred to in the Federalist Papers as a "substitute President."

If all of this is so clear, why have we had a year without a President (for that is a conservative estimate of the period of time when a President has been disabled and no one has acted in his stead)?

When President William Henry Harrison died in 1841, records of the Constitutional Convention and the pre-Federal age were scarce. Furthermore, Vice President Tyler was confronted by the intrigues of Henry Clay, who was determined to control the President. Clay implied that "Acting President" Tyler had less powers than the regularly elected Harrison.

Tyler, determined not to become another Clay pigeon, promptly asserted that he had become President on the death of Harrison. Thus he established the "Tyler precedent," which has been followed by six Vice Presidents when a President died.

This deviation from the original intent of the Constitution would be of theoretical interest only, but for the fact that it has been used to prevent the Vice President from acting as President in cases of disability. Garfield's case exemplifies what has happened.

President Garfield was shot July 2, 1880. He lingered between life and death until September 19. Although the only Presidential function he performed during those 90 days was the signing of an extradition paper, the Cabinet did not request Vice President Chester Arthur to act as President.

The Cabinet said it was because of the Tyler precedent; the fear that Garfield upon recovery, would be barred from resuming his functions. The truth is that Arthur represented a fraction of the Republican Party hostile to Garfield's program.

Woodrow Wilson's Vice President, Thomas R. Marshall, was Wilson's second choice for the post. Wilson considered Marshall "a very small-caliber man." Consequently, when Wilson was stricken in September 1919, Marshall wasn't informed of the President's condition nor was he invited to act as President. Wilson's private secretary, Tumulty, gave the Tyler precedent as the reason.

Had Marshall become Acting President, the history of that critical period might have been different. As it is, Marshall's sole bulwark against oblivion is his comment that "what this country needs is a good 5-cent cigar."

A young Army captain, Dwight Eisenhower, watched the Wilson tragedy with alarm. When, as President, General Eisenhower was faced with the same constitutional dilemma, he entered into the memorandum agreement with Nixon setting out the conditions under which Nixon would temporarily act as President.

The agreement was never intended as a long-range solution. In fact, it was General Eisenhower who pointed out to me one of its most serious weaknesses. He emphasized the point several times in an interview at Gettysburg in June 1961.

"The whole strength of the agreement," he said, "depends upon good will between the President and Vice President." This being the case, the tenuous character of the memorandum can be seen from the Garfield and Wilson experiences.

A second weakness of the memorandum is that it does not remove the veil of secrecy which traditionally surrounds Presidential illnesses. Only a handful of people ever saw the originals of the Eisenhower-Nixon letter. The Kennedy-Johnson agreement is evidenced only by a White House news release. Executive discretion still determines whether and how much the public and Cabinet know about Presidential illnesses. It is true that Presidential physicals have now become a custom, but because a President's doctor is still selected by the Chief Executive and is usually a personal friend, the public feeling is that the physician is under the President's control.

One of the least mentioned, but most serious, defects in the memorandum rests in its assumption that a President will step aside in favor of his Vice President—even if they are close friends. The human being would be rare indeed who would voluntarily relinquish the office of President—the center of power in the free world.

What is the answer to the problem of Presidential disability? An ideal solution will be found about the same time lawyers produce the reasonable man. Nevertheless, we must set out to find the answer with the fewest legal and practical objections, and this was the purpose of the Nebraska study.

The findings to date justify the following conclusions:

A constitutional amendment is necessary to remove all doubt about the power of Congress to legislate concerning this vital matter.

The Constitution says only that "Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall" then act as President. These words have been interpreted in our succession laws to mean that Congress is empowered to provide for succession only in cases where both officers are disabled.

The amendment should be simple and in keeping with the flexibility that has made the Constitution lasting.

This means stating a few general principles and leaving implementation to Congress; with regard to disability, it means omitting from the amendment the method (the "how," "when," and "by whom") for determining when a President is disabled. This would eliminate the biggest source of disagreement.

The amendment should include a simple statement differentiating between temporary and permanent disability.

It might be wise, to avoid any political implications, to provide also that the amendment would not become effective until the term of the President who takes office next following its approval.

INADMISSIBLE CONFESSIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a very fine editorial entitled "Inadmissible Confessions," which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INADMISSIBLE CONFESSIONS

"We necessarily concern ourselves with means, not alone with ends," Judge Charles Fahy wrote in the Killough case, decided by the court of appeals on Thursday. The decision upset the conviction of a man who, by his own admission, had strangled his wife to death. It upset the conviction because a majority of the court believed the admission had been obtained as a result of unlawful conduct by the police and was unwilling to let the administration of justice be corrupted by condoning such conduct. It is precisely for this purpose that courts sit under a Government of laws.

In the Mallory case of 1957, the Supreme Court held that a confession is inadmissible in Federal courts if obtained by violation of the law requiring that an arrested person be taken before a judicial officer as quickly as possible. The police here speedily developed a technique for getting around this rule. Having obtained an inadmissible confession and brought about a suspect's detention by means of it, they sought, usually with success, to persuade him to reaffirm the confession in jail; and they then used the reaffirmed confession to convict him.

It is hard to understand how this patent evasion of the Mallory rule could have been countenanced by any court. But the fact is that panels of the court of appeals allowed convictions obtained by this legerdemain to stand in two cases. In the Killough case the problem was presented for the first time to the full court of appeals. Five members of the court agreed that the conviction could not be allowed to stand without making a mockery of the Mallory rule. Judge Fahy wrote for himself and Judges Edgerton, Bazelon, and Washington:

"The oral confession obtained in this case at the jail so soon after the illegally procured and inadmissible confessions must be held inadmissible as the fruit of the latter. To admit it would, in substance and effect, admit the earlier confessions properly held inadmissible, and thus defeat the exclusionary rule. To hold otherwise would be in reality to permit an accused to be tried without counsel, jury, or court, alone with police at their headquarters or at jail. The public trial guaranteed by the Constitution, with counsel, jury, and court, after indictment, would be hardly more than a form for validation of what had already been accomplished invalidly."

Judge Skelly Wright, who filed a separate concurring opinion, would have gone further and overruled the earlier decisions allowing the use of reaffirmed confessions. To Judge Fahy's powerful argument, he added two compelling observations: "Pragmatically, it has been shown that exclusionary rules are the only effective deterrent to police wrongdoing * * *. A fair trial means a trial based on evidence fairly obtained."

Judge Warren Burger wrote an extremely angry and consorious dissent, accusing the majority of "ignoring a reasonable balance between individual rights and protection of the public." But the simple truth is that there is no real difference between these two. The public is made up of individuals, and protection of the one is protection of the other. Judge Burger's dissent offers two suggestions, one useful in our view, the other most unfortunate.

He would "direct that the district court, in every case where evidence is suppressed because of an officer's violation of a statute or constitutional provision, send a copy of the transcript * * * to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia." Perhaps this would lead to disciplinary measures. Better still, it might produce a program of education leading to better and more lawful law enforcement.

Judge Burger's suggestion that Congress adopt legislation to diminish the protections given to individuals by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure seems to us, however, altogether unwise and injudicious. It comes close to encouraging arrests for investigation and police detention without judicial sanction. There has been quite enough talk of this sort of constitutional corner cutting of late from policemen without hearing it from appellate court judges.

Mr. MORSE. The editorial supports the decision of Judge Fahy, of the court of appeals, in regard to the admissibility of confessions obtained illegally under the Mallory doctrine.

There is a strong movement to try, through congressional action, to reverse the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in the Mallory case, which was written by the incomparable Felix Frankfurter. The editorial deals with the Mallory decision. All the Mallory decision in effect provides is that if anyone is arrested by Federal officers, he shall be taken forwith, without delay, before a committing magistrate.

What is wrong with that provision of the law? Why should the kind of police state power be given to police departments desired by, I am sad to report, the Washington, D.C., Police Department? The power to arrest for investigation violates fundamental principles of civil liberties in the United States.

I commend the editorial in this morning's Washington Post to the reading of Members of Congress, and I commend the reading of the scholarly decision of Judge Fahy to Members of Congress.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader.

On October 3, 1962, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I submitted a concurrent resolution dealing with the Berlin crisis. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a story appearing in today's press calling attention to the fact that another person from West Berlin—a young man—has been shot and the Communist refused even to let a Red Cross ambulance go to his medical assistance, to say nothing about a West Berlin military ambulance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLIES CONFER IN BERLIN ON BARRED AMBULANCE

BERLIN, October 7.—West Berlin's three allied military commands consulted throughout the day today on East Germany's refusal yesterday to admit Western ambulances on a mercy mission to East Berlin.

A British spokesman said American, British, and French headquarters were in constant consultation. East German border guards refused to let two ambulances, one a British army vehicle, come to the aid of a young West Berliner shot when caught helping East Berliners escape through a tunnel to West Berlin.

It was the first time the East German authorities have barred any allied military vehicle from entering the eastern sector.

Informed sources in West Berlin said they did not expect a protest to be filed with the Russians today.

Meanwhile, an 18-year-old East Berliner escaped to the West by jumping from the roof of an East Berlin apartment building to a West Berlin sidewalk, United Press International reported.

West Berlin police would not identify the refugee or give any details of how he had made his way into the apartment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, later today I shall move to lay aside whatever is the pending business at the time to take up the concurrent resolution relating to Berlin to which I have referred. I know of no reason why it should languish any longer in committee. The time for the Senate to act on the Berlin crisis, by way of agreeing to the proposed resolution, is now. The House acted last week. I hope that my majority leader will give consideration to the possibility of bringing up the concurrent resolution relating to Berlin before the day is over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may be recognized in my own right, I should like to say in response that I would have to object automatically to such a procedure because the Committee on Foreign Relations is charged with the responsibility and, as much as I would dislike doing so, I would have no other choice.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have made some inquiry. Perhaps with the passage of some hours that obstacle can be removed. But there is concern as to whether or not there is even a quorum of the Foreign Relations Committee available. The interests of the United States cannot wait until a quorum of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is present.

PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST SUCCESSORS TO PRESIDENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 818, H.R. 6691.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6691) to amend title 18, United States Code, secs. 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 836), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide criminal penalties against those who threaten the Vice-President-elect, or such other officer as may be next in order of succession to the Office of President, and authorizes the Secret Service to provide full-time protection for the Vice President, the Vice-President-elect, and a former President for a reasonable period of time after he leaves office.

STATEMENT

The existing law governing threats against, and protection for, the person next in line to the Presidency applies only to the President-elect and the Vice President of the United States. It does not apply to the person next in line to the Presidency when a President has died and the Vice President has become President, or when some disability has resulted in the succession of the Vice President to the Presidency. Existing law does not make any provision for the protection of the Vice-President-elect between election day and the date he assumes office. Since it is the purpose of the law to provide protection for both the President and the person next in line to succeed him, it is necessary that this obvious gap in the existing statutes should be closed.

Section 1 of the bill would, therefore, include the Vice-President-elect and such other officer as may be next to the President in the order of the succession to the Presidency among those against whom it is a crime to make certain threats.

The final section of this legislation broadens the authority of the Secret Service to provide protection to the Vice President, the Vice-President-elect, and a former President.

Section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, now provides that the Secret Service is authorized to protect the person of the President of the United States, the members of his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President. However, in the case of the Vice President, the Secret Service is authorized to provide protection only upon the request of that official. This legislation would eliminate the the requirement that the Vice President request Secret Service protection as a condition precedent to the Secret Service providing it. In addition, the bill authorizes the Secret Service to provide protection to the Vice-President-elect.

This legislation would also authorize the Secret Service to provide protection to a former President at his request for a reasonable period after he leaves office. In testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. U. E. Baughman, then Chief of the Secret Service, stated that he contemplated this would require a detail of five or six agents for a period of 6 months after the President leaves office. This Secret Service protection would be provided only upon the request of the former President.

The committee is of the view that protection of the former President under this legislation is to be limited to the protection of the person of the former President and not of his property.

The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. A. Gilmore Flues, stated in a letter to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, under date of May 15, 1961, that the cost of this legislation is limited to the expense of providing a full-time detail for the protection of the Vice President. Mr. Flues estimated that this would cost $100,864.28 each year. Testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary also indicated that the Secret Service would not seek additional funds in order to perform the duties imposed upon it under this legislation in relation to the past President and a Vice-President-elect. It was stated in that hearing that this cost would be absorbed in the normal Secret Service budget.

This legislation was recommended by the President of the United States, in identical letters to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate. The committee is in complete agreement with the President of the United States that these gaps in the present law should be closed, and accordingly, recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 6691, without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which H.R. 6691 was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ENABLING ACT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1980, Senate bill 3283.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3283) to amend the Enabling Act of the State of Arizona for the purpose of facilitating the sale or lease of certain lands granted to such State to local governments for use of public purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 9, after "1910", to strike out "(36 Stat. 557)" and insert "(36 Stat. 557, 574–575)"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "confirmed", to insert "or any natural products thereof"; in line 10, after the word "advertising", to strike out "or competitive bidding"; in line 14, after the word "made.", to insert "The term 'public purposes' as used in this paragraph shall not include industrial park sites or other commercial purposes."; and after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Consent is hereby given to the State of Arizona to adopt any amendment to the constitution of the State or to enact any laws necessary to carry out the purposes hereof.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 28 of the Act entitled "An Act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States", approved June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 574–575), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the transfer by sale or lease by the State of Arizona of any lands hereby granted or confirmed, or any natural products thereof to any agency of the State or to any county, city, or other local government or agency thereof, created by or pursuant to the laws of such State, for use for public purposes, without regard to the provisions of this section or other provisions of law requiring appraisal, advertising, or relating to the price at which such lands may be sold or leased, if such sale or lease is conditioned upon the continued use of the lands for the purpose for which the transfer is made. The term 'public purposes' as used in this paragraph shall not include industrial park sites or other commercial purposes."

Sec. 2. Consent is hereby given to the State of Arizona to adopt any amendment to the constitution of the State or to enact any laws necessary to carry out the purposes hereof.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF THE POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2233, H.R. 6836.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 6836) to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 2271), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 6836) to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, after full consideration report thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law so as to create an additional category of service-connected disability which will enable policemen and firemen to retire if an injury or disease contracted other than exclusively in the performance of duty is so aggravated by the performance of duty as to disable the member from further duty.

A member retiring under this proposed legislation will receive the same annuity as if there was no doubt of the disability having resulted exclusively in the performance of duty. Such legislation is comparable to and in keeping with industrial compensation procedures.

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of this committee held a hearing on H.R. 6836 on August 1, 1962, and received favorable testimony from representatives of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department, and the Police Department, as well as representatives of the Firemen's Association, and the Policemen's Association. At this time the subcommittee was informed that during the calendar years 1958, 1959, and 1960, the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Relief Board cleared 379 retirement cases, of which 292 were retirements for disability incurred in performance of duty, 23 were retirements for disability incurred not in the performance of duty, and 64 were optional retirements for age and service. Based on the experience over the preceding 3 years, it is anticipated that the future costs of this legislation will be minor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

1ST LT. CHARLES M. COX, U.S. ARMY (RETIRED)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2244, Senate bill 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 1961) for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That First Lieutenant Charles M. Cox, United States Army (retired), of Buxton, Oregon, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $6,800.58, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay received by him for the period from June 1, 1942, through March 13, 1960, while the said Lieutenant Charles M. Cox was serving as a member of the United States Army, such overpayments having been made as a result of his being erroneously credited, for pay purposes, with service performed in the organized militia of the State of New York.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said First Lieutenant Charles M. Cox, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for the foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 6, 1962, p. 22709, Congressional Record.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the report.

I voted against the foreign-aid authorization bill when it was before the Senate because, in my judgment, it involved the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars. I argued then that we ought to try to change the ratio of loans to grants from the ratio provided in the bill of 65 cents out of every foreign dollar being grant money or giveaway money and only 35 cents out of every foreign aid dollar repayable loan money. I pointed out that 4 years ago I started the struggle in the Foreign Relations Committee to change that ratio. At that time the grant money in the foreign-aid bill was a little more than 90 cents out of every dollar. We made some progress in 4 years, but in my judgment, not enough. I pointed out also that there was a great deal of waste, as far as the American taxpayers were concerned, in a good many of the military items in the bill. We are paying an all-out-of-proportion share of the military cost of supporting freedom around the world. We are paying most of the cost in the South Vietnam defense of freedom. For years we have paid all the cost of Laos.

We are making heavy military contributions to such Asian countries as Thailand and Formosa. I asked the rhetorical question, After all, where is England? Where are Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, France, Italy, the Lowlands, Norway, and West Germany? Where are our allies? In view of the economic recovery of most of them, greatly aided by American taxpayer dollars, how long do they expect us to continue to pay an all-out-of-proportion share of the military costs for the defense of freedom around the world?

I made some comments, as the RECORD will show, about the great contribution we have made to NATO, the heavy expenditures that the American taxpayers have made to the NATO countries.

For the most part, these countries are now in a stronger economic position than they were prior to World War II. I now ask, as I asked then, how long do we expect the American taxpayers to assume this terrific cost, this pouring out of the hundreds of millions of dollars, without the savings to which the American people are entitled?

For years now, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs, I have protested the heavy expenditures for military equipment in Latin America. In a very real sense much has been contributed to them so that they could keep up with the Joneses, so to speak, for we know that much of the military equipment that we made available to Latin-American countries will not really be of any value to us in case of conflict with Russia. To the contrary, Latin-American countries will have to look to us for their protection, because such military equipment as we have made available to them for the most part is of no value to them in a nuclear war, for if we get into a war with Russia, it will not be a conventional war, but a nuclear war.

So I have raised such questions as: What justification is there for this military aid to Latin America? Is military aid strengthening freedom in Latin America? Will it increase democracy in Latin America, or is it true, as has frequently been the case, it is used to strengthen totalitarian regimes, and playing right into the hands of Communist propaganda in Latin America? I fear that the latter is the truth.

Much of the military aid to Latin America has not strengthened democracy. It has had the inverse effect of strengthening communism in Latin America.

I see on the floor the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], nodding his head in approval. He knows of what I speak.

Much of our expenditures in Latin America for military aid in recent years not only have not strengthened democracy, but have had the inverse effect of strengthening communism.

Too frequently our military equipment has been used in Latin America to keep down freedom rather than strengthening freedom. Too frequently our military aid in Latin America has been used to build up totalitarian regimes such as Batista's in Cuba. The Senate will recall that in January 1958 my subcommittee held hearings on military aid to Batista. We brought out in those hearings that Batista could not remain in power in Cuba were it not for American military aid. That was admitted by the Assistant Secretary for Latin American Affairs of the State Department under my cross-examination. I say to the everlasting credit of the State Department that by the middle of March 1958 the State Department announced that no further military aid would go to Batista.

It is only now becoming public knowledge that aid was made available to Castro. I was one of those who hoped and believed at the beginning that Castro might bring Cuba a democratic regime. However, we soon discovered that he would not do that. I have an obligation to make clear to the American people what I believed to be the facts about Castro. I was the first, for a considerable time, in the Senate to speak out against the Castro regime. When he started with his blood baths, and when he placed under house arrest that first great President of Cuba under the Castro regime, President Urrutia, one of the great judges of Cuba, because he insisted upon the application of democratic procedures protecting the rights of Cuba, I knew we were seeing the substitution of one totalitarian for another, and that we would see the replacing of a Fascist totalitarian with a Communist totalitarian.

I shall always be proud of the fact that the RECORD shows that I was the first in the Senate to point out that in my opinion Castro was following the Commie line. In my first speech on this issue I said, "I do not know whether he is a Communist, but it does not make any difference, because the procedures he is following are Communist procedures."

We have much to answer for when the scholars, long after we have disappeared from the face of this earth, write the history of America's conduct in respect to expenditures for military arms in Latin America. So much of our expenditures in Latin America were used to play into the hands of totalitarian regimes.

So again this year I protested, as did the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who made one of the scholarly speeches of this session of Congress when he presented his speech on the floor giving an analysis of American military aid over the years to Latin America, and deplored it, as I have long deplored.

I opposed the final authorization bill for foreign aid. I opposed the appropriation bill for foreign aid. I felt that at least in the Senate we should have eliminated a good many millions of dollars of waste in the appropriation bill. That we did not do. We ought to have tackled more forthrightly than we did the problem of loans versus grants.

I did not cast a popular vote when I voted against foreign aid. If anyone thinks I did, let him come to my office and read the mail that I have received on this subject. However, I cast a vote that I believe is right. Time will prove me right, because we cannot justify the waste that we have been guilty of in the foreign-aid bill.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was very persuasive. The RECORD shows that I voted for amendment after amendment that the Senator from Louisiana offered. He brought out the millions of dollars in the pipeline with regard to military expenditures. He pointed out that we could have cut, much more drastically than the conference report cuts, the appropriations for military expenditures and still not weaken the security of the United States, but possibly teach our allies that the time has come for them to assume a greater obligation than they have thus far assumed.

There is no doubt that the conference report is a great improvement over the appropriation bill the Senate passed.

Mr. President, these savings are gratifying. However, in my judgment it is no longer a question of the dollar sign in the foreign aid bill. It is not a question of whether X money or Y money is saved. The problem about the foreign aid program is a matter of structure of the foreign aid bill, from the standpoint of the foreign policy involved in it. It has many weaknesses from the standpoint of its structures.

It has many weaknesses with respect to the question of loans versus grants. It has still many weaknesses with respect to the public policy as it affects the supply of military assistance to various totalitarian regimes throughout the world. It is an unsound public policy; and so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the question as to whether the amount shall be X dollars or Y dollars for the support of a bad public policy is immaterial. We should come to grips with the question of the public policy which is involved.

The bill still contains glaring weaknesses with respect to the whole economic aid program as it affects public policy. Are we providing economic aid in the right places; and as a result of not providing aid in the right places, are we not still wasting millions of the taxpayers' dollars? I believe we are. Although as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I favor good foreign aid programs, the bill, in my judgment, does not provide for the American people a good foreign aid program.

We must come to grips with the bad policies in the whole foreign aid program. If the bad policies in the foreign aid program are corrected, we shall have very little trouble in reaching agreement as to the amounts.

Because the bill is an appropriation bill and not a legislative bill, and deals with policy questions and continues to perpetuate an unsound foreign aid policy, I desire the RECORD to show that I also oppose the conference report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, when the foreign-aid bill was before the Senate, I made a statement setting forth my reasons for not being able to concur in what was recommended. This afternoon we have before us the appropriation bill adopted pursuant to that authorization. I do not concur in the action taken by the Senate in approving the conference report. The conference report, in a measure, improves the original bill, but not adequately to require my support of the measure. I want the record to show that I do not approve of what was done.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. METCALF in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 13175, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
October 8, 1962.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 23, and 26 to the bill (H.R. 13175) entitled "An Act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted, insert the following:

"*Provided,* That no part of any other appropriation contained in this Act, except funds appropriated under this Act for the contingency fund (not to exceed $10,000,000), may be used to augment funds or programs contained in this paragraph and no funds shall be transferred from funds appropriated under any other paragraph of title I of this Act to the contingency fund for the purpose of augmenting funds or programs contained in this paragraph."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendments, insert the following: "and amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as having been obligated against appropriations heretofore made under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for the same general purpose as any of the subparagraphs under "Economic Assistance", are hereby continued available for the same period as the respective appropriations in such subparagraphs for the same general purpose: *Provided,* That such purpose relates to a project previously justified to Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified prior to the reobligation of funds for such projects and no objection is entered by either Committee within 60 days of such notification."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 107. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

"(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 109. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any nation, whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

"(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any nation whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (except section 215(b)), unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "approved the terms of the contracts and".

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the motion of the Senator from Arizona. I wish to speak concerning another subject.

As a general rule, I have never deemed it proper for a member of a conference committee representing either body of Congress to discuss matters which are still in the hands of the conference committee for settlement. However, there has been so much persistent misrepresentation of the issues which are involved in the agricultural appropriation bill that in justice to myself, and also the Senate position, I feel I must make a brief statement to refute a consistently repeated falsehood that I have been holding up action on the agricultural appropriation bill in order to pressure—that is the word that one radio commentator used; I think another one used the word "coerce"—to pressure or coerce the other body into accepting an item which was in the bill as it was presented to Congress by the Bureau of the Budget.

I refer to the item providing for a peanut marketing research laboratory to be located in my State. I do not disavow a consuming interest in that item. I was more interested in it than I was in any other item in the appropriation bill. I regretted very much to see it convicted and hanged on the floor of the House of Representatives on the basis of false testimony that was presented to that body concerning the nature of the proposed laboratory.

Eminent Members of the House held forth at length to the effect that it was a utilization research laboratory. If this had been true it would take work away from existing laboratories in Virginia, Louisiana, and other areas. As a result of that misrepresentation, the House, by a yea-and-nay vote, killed the item.

I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture, asking him to write me a letter stating whether or not the statement that the project was to be a utilization laboratory was true. He replied, and I had that letter printed in the RECORD. In order to preserve the continuity of my statement, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence again be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1962.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you in regard to the marketing research facility proposed in the budget estimates for 1963, to be located at Dawson, Ga.

In reviewing the Department's justification for this facility in the House hearings on page 1264, it briefly describes the purpose of research investigations to be conducted at this facility as dealing with the quality control requirements of peanuts in marketing and storage channels.

When this matter was under consideration in the House on September 18, the statement was made by Members opposed to the construction of the facility that it was being established as a utilization laboratory to develop uses of peanuts rather than for peanut quality research. Heretofore, it has been my understanding that research investigations for new uses on peanuts and peanut products are conducted at the Regional Utilization Laboratory at New Orleans, La.

I will appreciate it if you will clarify this entire matter, together with the extent of present utilization research and where it is done.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1962.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: Thank you for your letter of September 20, 1962, in which you refer to statements made in the House that the program proposed for the Dawson

Laboratory would be utilization research. The Department is pleased to state that you are correct in your understanding that the type of research to be done at the Dawson Laboratory is marketing research and not utilization research.

As you stated, the broad segments of the marketing research program contemplated for the laboratory, which was developed in consultation with a peanut industry working group and presented to your subcommittee by Mr. Pace, is described and justified by the Department in the House hearings on page 1264. Briefly, a major emphasis of the program would be the protection, maintenance, and improvement of quality in peanuts during marketing, including the development of improved and more objective methods for sampling and measuring quality and facilitating inspection and grading procedures. Included would be evaluations to determine the effect on market quality of various practices followed during production, harvesting, storage, handling, and conditioning operations. This would require the use of peanuts of known production, harvesting, and handling history which would be accomplished through cooperation with production research programs of the Department and the State agricultural experiment stations. It is also contemplated that standardized facilities and skilled personnel of the laboratory would be available to the industry and other research programs of the Department and the States in making quality evaluations on small samples of peanuts which represent new varieties or experimental conditions of production, harvesting, or handling.

Also, the program would be concerned with the development of effective methods for preventing, controlling, or eradicating insects in peanuts under various conditions of storage, handling, and treatment. Finally the program would seek to improve the efficiency of peanut marketing by developing improved equipment, work, and handling methods during the drying, shelling, and storage operation. The program would necessarily be concerned with quality evaluations and the effect on quality and end products of different practices being followed in the industry. But the laboratory would not be engaged in the development of new uses for peanuts or peanut products, which is the basic mission of utilization research.

Utilization research is conducted by the Southern Regional Utilization Research and Development Laboratory of ARS at New Orleans. About three-fourths of the resources of that Laboratory are allocated to research on new uses for cotton and cottonseed. The remaining one-fourth is concerned with rice, naval stores, sugar, and other crops, including peanuts. Of the total of approximately 225 professional man-years engaged in product and process development research in that Laboratory, 3 are assigned to peanuts which represent an annual expenditure of approximately $69,000.

The Department appreciates the opportunity to help clarify some of the misconceptions which have arisen concerning the proposed laboratory.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no one knows better than do the conferees on the part of the House, as well as my four colleagues who sat with me through long hours representing the Senate on the conference, that there is no truth whatever to the statement that the peanut laboratory is now the issue. The peanut laboratory relates to the marketing service. It has nothing whatever to do with amendment No. 2, on which the Senate voted to insist by a vote of 77 to 0. One appears on page 3 under Agriculture Research and the other on page 15 under Agriculture Marketing Service. They are not even in the same item in the bill. I made it perfectly clear on occasion after occasion during the conference that, much as I regretted to see that budgeted item go down the drain, badly needed as it was to help the farmers of the whole peanut producing area, I would yield on it if the House would accept the one item in the bill, which dealt principally with research for utilization purposes and contained in amendment No. 2.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have said nothing about this subject, but to my own personal knowledge the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has made the statement relative to the laboratory in his State on three different occasions, and on one occasion while we were meeting jointly with the leadership on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from making that statement.

In our efforts to bring this problem to an honorable conclusion, I discussed the issue which places the bill in jeopardy with the Democratic leadership on the other side of the Capitol. I discussed it with the leadership on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I reiterate what the distinguished majority leader has said. I believe the distinguished Senator from Georgia made exactly that statement on at least two occasions. For the life of me, I cannot understand why people continue to talk just about peanuts.

Of course, I am not a member of the conference; but, as I understand, the Senator from Georgia is standing on a matter of principle from which he will not recede. As I recall, the Senate voted not to recede on the principle that the bill provide facilities for agricultural research. It may well be that within this category there may be some room for negotiation; but, in my judgment, the research items are among the most important in the entire bill.

As I understand the position of the Senator from Georgia, as it has been made perfectly clear to many of us, it is that, much as he regrets to do so—and I admire him for it—he is willing to yield on the so-called peanut laboratory if the principle is established that other research facilities shall be in the bill.

I commend the Senator. His principles and mine are not always in agreement; but I know that he is a man of principle and that when he takes a position, it is very difficult to budge him from it. In my judgment, his position in this instance is absolutely correct.

I have regretted the appearance in some quarters of notices to the effect that the Senator from Georgia is taking an obstructionist point of view. In my judgment, he is not taking such a position.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the issue is whether the Senate has a right to amend an appropriation bill in any and every respect. Year after year, the Senate has yielded to the fantasy that the Senate does not have the right to originate appropriation bills. We are in session today—in October—because we have accepted that fallacious construction of the Constitution, when in fact the Constitution does not contain one word which prohibits the Senate from initiating appropriation bills.

If the Senate had initiated four or five appropriation bills and had begun to hold hearings on them in January, Congress could have adjourned sine die by August 15. On the contrary, the Congress has remained in session until late in the fiscal year, waiting for the other body to send appropriation bills to us and give us a short time to consider them.

The agriculture appropriation bill, about which I am now speaking, reached the Senate on July 25, almost one month after the new fiscal year had begun. The independent offices appropriation bill reached the Senate on August 1. The military construction appropriation bill came to us on August 14. The public works appropriation bill for 1963 came to the Senate on August 16, almost 2 months after the beginning of the new fiscal year. This has been due to the fact that the Senate, in its tolerance and forbearance with the petulance of the other body has not challenged its right to initiate appropriation bills.

But in this case, Mr. President, when we reached the conference and came to these items on research, the House conferees said, "We will talk to you about the research items, but we will not discuss any item that has to do with the construction of a facility."

Mr. President, I told the conferees of the other body that I knew of no constitutional limitation on the Senate in that regard, and that I did not believe the Senate would accept one that was presented by five representatives of the other body in a conference. We were told that because the other body had not added any items for the construction of facilities, they struck out the peanut research item, although it was a budgeted item. I pointed out to them that that was not a correct statement, inasmuch as included in the House version of the bill, in this amendment No. 2, was an appropriation item by the other body for the construction of a poultry research facility at East Lansing, Mich.

So, Mr. President, the conference went on from there, with the House conferees even refusing to discuss any facility for research, because they said their committee had not included some items for research facilities that some Members of their body desired. That was a very unusual position—to oppose our constitutional right to amend the bill to provide for necessary facilities because the House had failed to do so. Even if one accepts the fallacy that the Senate does not have a right to initiate an appropriation bill, certainly either body has a right to initiate any research facility construction item.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to deal with this situation with as much forbearance as I possibly could summon, and I am perfectly willing to continue to deal with it with forbearance; but I wish to state now that the Senate has receded so much on matters relating to appropriations that the other body has about concluded that it is the only body which has a right to deal in any way whatever with appropriations. If we surrender in this case, certainly we shall not only be surrendering this power under the Constitution, but we shall also be surrendering any contention that we are an equal and coordinate legislative body.

If the Senate has an ounce of self-respect, it will stay in session until Christmas if it takes this to establish our position as a coequal body in every respect.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. HAYDEN to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of the adoption of the amendments of the conference report, a table showing the action taken on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

UNNECESSARILY LARGE NUMBER OF TROOPS STATIONED IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to obtain the floor. However, if there is to be no further debate on the question of the motion of the Senator from Arizona, I am perfectly willing to have the vote on it taken.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I object; I wish to comment on this measure.

Mr. STENNIS. Then, Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a few minutes—not for as long a time as I would otherwise do.

I wish to give a report, and then comment on it, about the number of troops remaining in and still assembled in or very near the State of Mississippi.

At 10 a.m. today, Washington time, there were 5,450 Regular U.S. Army troops in Oxford, Miss., or in the area of Oxford, and 3,000 National Guard troops in regular service and on active duty.

In addition, at Columbus, Miss., some 150 miles to the east, there were 6,700 Regular U.S. Army troops. I understand that all of them are paratroopers, and that that group includes the four or five special "crack" units out of both the 82d Paratrooper Division and the 101st Paratrooper Division.

In addition, there were 4,500 National Guardsmen scattered all over the State, some as far as Biloxi and Gulfport, Miss., some 350 miles from Oxford—4,500 National Guardsmen, still under call, and ready to report to their respective armories. There was a relaxation insofar as some of the hardship cases were concerned as to the 4,500 guardsmen—to permit them to return home, and so forth, although they are required to remain very near the area, or at least subject to call. I know that one of these units includes a medium tank battalion of National Guardsmen, who are still on duty; and I know they are, because I called some of their commanding officers this morning—a medium tank battalion on duty more than 200 miles from Oxford, Miss.

Mr. President, the figures I have given total 19,600 men, as of 10 o'clock this morning. But, in addition, at Memphis, Tenn., just over the line from Mississippi, and about 70 miles from Oxford, there were an additional 6,170 troops—for a grand total of 25,770 military men on duty this morning, with the slight exceptions as to rigid duty which I stated as to some of the 4,500 National Guardsmen for whom there have been some relaxations.

At 10 o'clock this morning there were 6,700 paratroopers at Columbus. On the other hand, Mr. President, our country has only 6,000 troops in Berlin. I venture the estimate that in view of the availability of modern air transportation and all the other means available to them, 2,000 of these paratroopers could be at any point in Mississippi within almost a matter of minutes—either from Columbus or from anywhere else in the vicinity where they are located.

At the Columbia Airbase, one of our major SAC bases, the B-52's, and all the other equipment included in that program are on the alert. I understand that the alert has not been suspended, but there are 6,700 men on the runways or surrounding them.

This morning, at 10 o'clock, 2,700 men were moved out from the Memphis area and 2,700 men were moved out from the Columbus area. But even at this moment, after subtracting for those recent movements, we find that 20,370 men remain there, on duty.

Mr. President, if this is a military decision, how can the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee take seriously the representations of the military officers or the civilian officials as to what they need in order to do a certain job? How can we seriously appropriate funds based on estimates no sounder than this.

I do not believe this is a military estimate. I do not believe military men would risk their professional reputation and standing by saying that under these conditions it is necessary to have 25,770 men on active duty there, as late as 10 o'clock this morning, Washington time. Instead, I believe it is a political decision.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to state the population of Oxford, Miss.

Mr. STENNIS. It is about 7,000 or 8,000 people.

Mr. RUSSELL. Including both the whites and the blacks?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, including all the civilians there. This is my estimate, and I am sure the population is not over 8,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. And that includes the women and the children also?

Mr. STENNIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. How many students are there at the university?

Mr. STENNIS. In all, perhaps 4,500.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does that include the coeds?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, several hundred coeds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was utterly dumfounded to hear about the extent of the concentration of armed forces in the Oxford area. Practically all of the combat-ready Regulars in this country were either there or all ready to go there. I have heard that 8 out of the 10 battle groups that constitute our 2 airborne divisions were sent to Mississippi. I was even more astonished to read where these troops were digging in and establishing foxholes and rifle pits. It seems that 25,000 troops in this small community would not have needed fortifications. I told the Secretary of Defense personally that I could see no necessity for such a vast concentration of armed forces. I venture to say that this is a greater number than General Grant had when he passed through Oxford after the capture of Vicksburg in 1863.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; and I understand that Gen. George Washington never had that many troops under his command during the Revolutionary War.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be interesting to know whether those who thought it necessary to deploy all of this military might in Oxford—and I believe I read the other day that the population of Oxford is about 6,800——

Mr. STENNIS. That is about right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of which about 40 percent are colored. That number includes the lame, the halt, the blind, the babes in arms. If the same group of people are making our plans to deal with a new eventuality in Cuba, we have an easy answer as to why there has been such timidity and hesitation about imposing a quarantine on shipment of arms to Cuba. Those who concluded that it was necessary to deploy 25,000 of our firstline troops to Oxford, Miss., would undoubtedly conclude that it would take 17 million Americans to defeat Cuba if this situation became necessary.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his timely remarks.

Mr. President, I raise the question, Is this a military decision? I do not believe it is. I do not believe the Chief of Staff would risk his reputation as a military man and certify here or anywhere else that he has any basis for the decision or that he believes the presence of these men is necessary.

Is it a logical decision? Of course it is not. It is an outrage. It is ridiculous on its face to be keeping these men there at such great cost. I will find out, in some way, how much the cost per day is. Of course, the Regular men have to be paid anyway, but I refer to the transportation costs and the cost of the additional men.

I repeat, Can we take seriously estimates that are put before us as to the military need with reference to any given situation?

I believe it is a political decision to keep these troops there, and I believe it is going to backfire. I believe there as an element which seeks to terrorize people, not only there, but elsewhere. It is un-American. It is undemocratic. It is contrary to the living spirit of the Constitution of the United States. I condemn it here on the floor of the Senate.

I stand for no violence. I stand for law and order. Most of the people in Mississippi stand for them.

NECESSITY OF OBEYING COURT DECISIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the people of the United States and the people of the whole globe are going through as difficult, as great, and as ugly a time as the world has ever seen. Like all my colleagues, I believe in law and order. I believe in peace with justice for the people of the United States and for the people of all the world.

The experiment in self-government in this country that has been in progress for the better part of two centuries is on trial. The unique and wonderful manner by which, in the 1700's, a group of colonial immigrants determined that self-government would be fashioned in America constitutes perhaps the most noble experiment in society's attempt to govern itself.

Part of the American system, with its theory of checks and balances, provides for an independent judicial branch. The basis upon which this theory of self-government must continue is on the basis of respect for law and order. When the Supreme Court, or the circuit court of appeals, or a Federal district court, or any State or local court makes a decision—object to it if you wish, Mr. President, but respect it. It is the law of the land, and it is so by virtue of the American Constitution. Respect the law of the land, Mr. President. That is the basis upon which people in this country are able to govern themselves.

I am not intimately acquainted with the manner by which the President of the United States discharged his duty in the melancholy misfortune of the State which my friend represents in this Chamber. I respect the Senator from Mississippi as a friend and as a spokesman for his State. With the greatest of respect on my part, I say that, as I see it, the President of the United States had no choice, for if a person who wears temporarily the title of chief executive of a State or of a Commonwealth repudiates a decision of the circuit court, the seeds of destruction are planted in American society. And that must not, nor cannot be.

On that subject I rise to say that in my judgment, the President of the United States had no choice. Terrorism existed in Mississippi. I hope and pray that this ugly chapter in the history of America will prove to be the last, and that we may go forward, no matter what our religion or our racial background may be, and live together, and demonstrate to all the world that we are united in a desire to establish at home a society of peace and justice and equal treatment under law, and that we continue to accept the responsibility of leadership in the cause of peace and justice for all people.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. HAYDEN to concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a moment on the conference report. Final action in connection with the conference report on mutual security is about to be taken, and the mutual security bill is nearing enactment. No great number of words will be uttered for the RECORD on this occasion, but I though Senators might pardon me for speaking for a moment on mutual security. I have the honor to be a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I remember the leadership of Dwight Eisenhower, one of the greatest American military geniuses of all time, given to mutual security before he was President, while he was President, and after he ceased to be President.

I remember when General Lemnitzer, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, spoke before the Committee on Foreign Relations earlier this year. He referred to the Draper Committee report. Senators will remember the Draper Committee report. It was an excellent report by Americans dedicated to the security of this country.

General Lemnitzer quoted from the report:

> The only alternative we can see to the interdependent allied free world, strengthened by our aid where needed, would be the Fortress America concept—taking our first stand in the last ditch.
>
> We are all convinced that the mutual security program, both in its military and in its economic aspects, is a sound concept. What is needed is the determination to continue it and the ability to administer it well.

Certainly I agree. There is waste in many offices of Government. There has been inexcusable waste in the mutual security program. War is waste at its unholy bloody utmost, Mr. President.

As I vote with the great majority of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans together, in favor of a continuation of this program, I shall vote, in my judgment, for something which adds to the security of the American people.

Only a year ago I had the honor to be a Republican delegate in a bipartisan group led by the Vice President to visit, first, the new country of Senegal, to celebrate its independence; and thereafter to go to Geneva, where we were briefed by Ambassador Arthur Dean on the almost insurmountable problem—the thus far insurmountable problem—facing the free world, of trying honorably to negotiate a first-step dependable nuclear test ban agreement.

Then we went to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization headquarters. We saw there the proceedings incident to the 10th anniversary of the NATO shield. General Norstad was in command. We sat and watched soldiers representing every one of the 15 NATO countries, in their native military uniforms, come before us and run up their flags, standing together, demonstrating that in union there is indeed, strength, and that the people of the Atlantic Alliance stand together to deter potential Communist aggression.

I believe that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization needs to be strengthened by the governments of every NATO member including the Government of the United States, and I am trying, with my vote on this occasion, to strengthen NATO, because whatever amounts of money we may spend to make that an outstanding example of collective security, we shall thereby add to the security of our own people, of our own families, when we stand together with the nations of the free world.

The other day I read an article in the newspaper, written by the distinguished American columnist Joseph Alsop. He wrote about how critically important it is for American military personnel to help aid, guide, and educate those in southeast Asia to protect their freedom—and he spoke then of Vietnam—to be able to defend their own homes and their own communities, and what a tremendous value it is to the cause of man's freedom that the Government of the United States is making available some funds by the use of which the Vietnamese are able to learn how to use the weapons of defense and thus be able to extirpate from the native villages the Communist infiltrators who continue to come into their gallant country in order to try to take it over.

Also, because I think it is something that ought to be read by those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the table on the percentage of country contributions by NATO members to NATO be inserted in the RECORD at this point. That is shown on page 425 of the hearings by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage of country contributions under international cost-sharing formulas, fiscal years 1962–64

Country	NATO infrastructure [1]	NATO military headquarter and military agencies	CEOA [2]	NMSSA [3]	SEATO [4]	Cento [5]
United States	30.85	24.20	39.00	25.70	25.00	20.00
United Kingdom	10.50	19.50	10.50	20.71	16.00	20.00
France	12.00	17.10	16.00	18.16	13.50	
Federal Republic of Germany	20.00	16.10	10.49	17.10		
Italy	5.97	5.96		6.33		
Canada	5.15	5.80	3.00			
Belgium	4.84	2.86	10.49	3.04		
Netherlands	3.83	2.85	10.49	3.03		
Denmark	2.87	1.65		1.75		
Turkey	1.10	1.65		1.75		20.00
Norway	2.37	1.15		1.22		
Portugal	.28	.65		.69		
Greece	.67	.39		.42		
Luxembourg	.17	.09	.03	.10		
Iceland		.05				
Pakistan					8.00	20.00
Thailand					8.00	
Iran						20.00
Australia					13.50	
New Zealand					8.00	
Philippines					8.00	
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

[1] North Atlantic Treaty Organization, covers latest cost-sharing agreement for 1961-64 infrastructure programs.

[2] Central European (pipeline) Operating Agency (NATO).

[3] NATO Maintenance Supply Services Agency.

[4] Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

[5] Central Treaty Organization.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before the Senate acts on the House amendments I invite attention to an article published in the New York Times this morning.

A large number of Senators including this Senator—representing a substantial minority, which may become a majority—voted for sharp cuts in the mutual security program. It has been our contention that there is unnecessary waste in foreign aid, and that it can be prevented if the program is operated more tightly.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Chester Bowles, President Kennedy's special adviser on undeveloped areas, has proposed ending foreign aid to nations that "lack the competence, organization, and will" to use it effectively.

In connection with the same statement, Mr. Bowles said that the Agency for International Development is flooded with "a wide range of pressures from worried ambassadors, visiting foreign officials, and, at an increasing rate, from foreign lobbies."

This, Mr. Bowles said, should end. He said that the Agency should be "relieved from the responsibility" of mixing cold war considerations with economic needs when it must decide on a specific request.

The United States should not hesitate, he said "to publicize our differences with those governments which persistently stick to outmoded concepts designed to protect the status quo and which refuse to take the necessary steps to reform and strengthen their own economic and social systems."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOWLES PROPOSES FOREIGN AID LIMIT—URGES END OF HELP TO AREAS UNABLE TO USE IT PROPERLY—SETS PRIORITY OF NEED

WASHINGTON, October 1.—Chester Bowles, President Kennedy's special adviser on undeveloped areas, has proposed ending foreign aid to nations that "lack the competence, organization and will" to use it effectively.

He has urged the administration to classify each nation that seeks assistance in one of four categories. He said those in the fourth should be "tactfully denied direct project assistance" but should not be ignored.

Mr. Bowles feels that by categorizing each nation and separating economic needs and cold war considerations, congressional and public uncertainty about the objectives of foreign aid will be eased.

POLITICAL TIES BLAMED

He made these suggestions in a memorandum circulated in the top echelon of the administration.

Mr. Bowles blamed what he called the "crazy quilt of political commitments which we inherited from the previous administration" for the lack of understanding about the foreign program.

Another problem, he continued, is that the Agency for International Development is flooded with "a wide range of pressures from worried ambassadors * * * visiting foreign officials and, at an increasing rate, from foreign lobbies."

This should end, he asserted, and the Agency should be "relieved from the responsibility" of mixing cold war considerations with economic needs when it must decide on a specific request.

"The United States should not hesitate" his memorandum continued, "to publicize our differences with those governments which persistently stick to outmoded concepts designed to protect the status quo and which refuse to take the necessary steps to reform and strengthen their own economic and social systems."

Sources close to Mr. Bowles reported his ideas were received with great interest by most of those who had received the memorandum, including President Kennedy. They said Fowler Hamilton, head of the Agency for International Development, agreed with the memorandum in many respects.

The document also pleased such Democratic leaders in the Senate as MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, these sources said.

In the first category, Mr. Bowles would place nations with a per capita gross national product of more than $350. Their current problems would be sufficiently acute to require aid, but their difficulties would result primarily from the "misuse and maldistribution" of their wealth.

Mr. Bowles lists in this category Greece, Venezuela, Lebanon, Cyprus, Singapore, Chile, Panama, Uruguay, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Argentina.

These nations, he feels, should be able "to put their financial houses in order." The United States, he says, should suggest corrective measures and advise them to introduce tax and land reforms and a more effective control of their foreign exchanges.

In the second category he would place nations with a gross national product of less than $350, but which are "demonstrating outstanding competence and courage in mustering their own resources."

INDIA IN SECOND GROUP

He puts in this category Pakistan, India, Taiwan, El Salvador, Colombia, Nigeria, and Tunisia.

He proposes that in aiding these countries the United States should integrate its efforts with those of international lending agencies and other capital exporting countries, cut redtape, and assign the ablest people.

We should do this, he says, because "we are badly in need of some dramatic showcase examples of what outstanding performance by a recipient nation backed by generous U.S. assistance can accomplish."

In the third category he would place nations in an in-between category—countries with inadequate gross national products that are succeeding in some fields of self-help but failing in others.

In the fourth category he would assign hopeless nations that should be satisfied to get the services of the Peace Corps, the food-for-peace program and technical and advisory services of the United Nations.

Mr. Bowles declined to identify any nations he feels should be in the third and fourth categories.

The United States, he cautioned, should realize that more than half the nations receiving assistance have an authoritarian government of one kind or another. But a military regime can be acceptable, he said, if it is striving for reforms.

Mr. PROXMIRE. While I have supported mutual security in the past and expect to do so in the future, it has been my contention that the fight to reduce the cost of the program was a most constructive action on the part of some of us in the Senate who feel strongly that the only way to get more efficiency in this program is to vote to reduce the amounts of money, and to provide some discipline in the program, so that the waste will be a minimum.

The statement of Mr. Bowles indicates that the administration, too, recognizes that we have been wasting money in the foreign aid program and is resolved to do something positive and constructive about it.

Mr. President, as one who led the fight on the floor of the Senate to cut the appropriations for foreign aid by $785 million, I welcome and applaud this attitude of the administration that we can and should serve money in the foreign aid program.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly, so that the Senate may act on the pending question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to speak about 2 minutes in regard to the conference report.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Ohio yields to the Senator from Florida to speak on the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I support the conference report on the foreign aid bill. I am glad that the amount for foreign aid, properly speaking, has been reduced to a total of about $3.9 billion. I am particularly glad that some of the additional items, which are by no means foreign aid, are approved under the conference report and were agreed upon by the conferees of both Houses.

One of those items about which I am most happy is the item for assistance to refugees in the United States, which means, of course, Cuban refugees. That problem centers largely in Miami, in the State which I represent in part. The House conferees very graciously yielded on that particular item, and the bill from the conference restores the full amount of $70,110,000, which, I wish to say for the RECORD, represents in part the payment of the costs of serving as the host area for that large number of refugees, now exceeding 100,000.

I am also happy about the inclusion of the item in the bill from the conference on the Philippine war damage claims in the total amount required to settle those claims; namely, in the amount of $73 million, of which $500,000 is to be allowed for salaries and expenses.

All Senators and other Americans will remember the difficult discussions and the troubles we had in the Far East, and particularly with the Filipinos, in connection with the early action in this session by the other body. I am glad that we have finally come to the stage not only of authorizing but also of appropriating for the settlement of the war claims of our allies, the Filipinos, in the great military effort made by them jointly with us.

I am happy also that the Peace Corps item is included in the bill, because I think that is proving to be a salutary effort in behalf of our own Nation and in behalf of the whole free world. That effort is in the field of peace, which is clearly real peace and not either in cold war or in hot war.

There are other items of that kind. I mention them merely because I think the bill is too often regarded solely because of its importance in the field of mutual assistance or foreign aid. Mentioning these three items in the RECORD will serve to bring out the fact that the bill will have important implications in other fields. I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask the Senate conferees whether there is any intention in the bill to prohibit the use of refugee money in taking care of fugitives from Communist Yugoslavia?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is categorically "No." In behalf and at the request of the chairman, I shall enlarge on that answer if the Senator from Ohio needs it. But the answer is categorically "No."

Mr. LAUSCHE. My examination of the language of the bill discloses no intention of prohibiting the use of refugee money in caring for fugitives out of Communist Yugoslavia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is 100 percent correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no intention to discriminate against them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senators.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona, which is to concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24.

The motion was agreed to.

EXHIBIT 1

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1962, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1963

TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY)

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in House bill for 1963	Amount recommended by Senate	Conference action
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
Development grants	$296,500,000	335,000,000	$225,000,000	$275,000,000	$225,000,000
Development grants, special authorization	100,000				
American hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)		[1] 2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Investment guarantees		[2] 180,000,000	30,000,000	100,000,000	30,000,000
Surveys of investment opportunities	1,500,000	5,000,000		1,000,000	
International organizations and programs	153,500,000	148,900,000	148,900,000	148,900,000	148,900,000
Supporting assistance	425,000,000	[3] 481,500,000	350,000,000	400,000,000	395,000,000
Contingency fund	275,000,000	400,000,000	225,000,000	290,000,000	250,000,000
Alliance for Progress		600,000,000	[4] 525,000,000	575,000,000	525,000,000
Development loans	1,112,500,000	1,250,000,000	775,000,000	1,125,000,000	975,000,000
Administrative expenses (AID)	47,500,000	55,000,000	46,000,000	52,000,000	49,500,000
Administrative expenses (State)	3,000,000	3,100,000	2,700,000	3,100,000	2,700,000
Subtotal, economic assistance	2,314,600,000	3,461,300,000	2,330,400,000	2,972,800,000	2,603,900,000
MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
Military assistance	1,600,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,450,000,000	1,325,000,000
Total, Title I—Foreign Aid (Mutual Security)	3,914,600,000	4,961,300,000	3,630,400,000	4,422,800,000	3,928,900,000

TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in House bill for 1963	Amount recommended by Senate	Conference action
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Peace Corps	$30,000,000	$63,750,000	$52,000,000	$63,750,000	$59,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Ryukyu Islands	7,080,000	[5] 14,282,000	7,900,000	12,000,000	8,900,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
Assistance to refugees in the United States (Cuban refugees)		[6] 70,110,000	55,000,000	70,110,000	70,110,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Migration and refugee assistance		[7] 21,977,000	14,447,000	16,677,000	14,947,000
Investment in the Inter-American Development Bank	110,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
Subscription to the International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000
Total, Title II—Mutual Security (Other)	208,745,000	201,775,000	251,003,000	284,103,000	274,613,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1962, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in House bill for 1963	Amount recommended by Senate	Conference action
TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Loans to the International Monetary Fund		[8] $2,000,000,000	$2,000,000,000	$2,000,000,000	$2,000,000,000
TITLE IV—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON					
Limitation on operating expenses	*($1,300,000,000)*	*($1,295,000,000)*	*($1,295,000,000)*	*($1,295,000,000)*	*($1,295,000,000)*
Limitation on administrative expenses	*(3,010,000)*	*(3,000,000)*	*(3,000,000)*	*(3,000,000)*	*(3,000,000)*
TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS AGENCIES					
FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION					
Payment of Philippine war damage claims		[9] $73,000,000	$73,000,000	$73,000,000	$73,000,000
Salaries and expenses		500,000	[10]	450,000	
U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY					
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities		[11] 7,375,000	1,600,000		1,600,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES					
International conferences and contingencies		[11] 1,019,000	849,000	849,000	849,000
Total, Title V—Miscellaneous Agencies		81,954,000	75,449,000	74,409,000	75,449,000
Grand total, all titles of the bill	$4,123,345,000	7,335,029,000	5,956,852,000	6,781,402,000	6,278,962,000

---

[1] Contained in H. Doc. 430.

[2] Contained in H. Docs. 430 and 503. H. Doc. 430 substituted a request for an appropriation of $100,000,000 in lieu of the request for an authorization to expend from debt receipts in the same amount, as proposed in the January budget.

[3] Reflects decrease of $18,500,000 in H. Doc. 430.

[4] Includes $425,000,000 for loans and $100,000,000 for grants.

[5] Includes $6,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 378 and $382,000 contained in H. Doc. 463.

[6] Contained in H. Doc. 514.

[7] Contained in H. Doc. 524.

[8] Contained in H. Doc. 446.

[9] Contained in H. Doc. 535.

[10] $500,000 made available in item, Payment of "Philippine war damage claims."

[11] Contained in H. Doc. 537.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

TROOPS IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I presume many Senators were as shocked as I was today upon hearing the report of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that as of this morning 25,000 troops are in Mississippi. It is true that the operation is expensive. But to me there is something more significant than that. What disturbs me is that if the President is required to send 25,000 troops to Mississippi to get a Governor of his own party to cooperate with his own President, it represents something pretty serious and a breakdown in the kind of relationships which should exist.

This is not a discussion between two political parties or two partisans. The people of Mississippi voted for the President who sent those 25,000 troops down to camp on the campus of the University of Mississippi. I am disturbed about relationships of that kind because unless we can develop more harmonious formulas for enforcing the laws of the United States, unless we can develop some better form of persuasiveness whereby the President can exercise the high prestige and power of his office to bring about the enforcement of law, one must become pessimistic about the prospects of that President conferring with Khrushchev of Moscow, who did not vote for it, who does not belong to his own party, and whose people did not support him in a great election.

How will the President of the United States persuade Khrushchev to conform with international law if he cannot compel members of his own party to cooperate in a State which has supported him faithfully and supported every President who appointed the Justices of the Supreme Court who made the initial decision to which the Mississippians object?

How is that type of relationship to be made to function? We agree, I believe, that 25,000 troops sounds like a great many. I do not know how many were required. But I wish the President and the Attorney General would devote as much time, talent, energy, and thought to developing a positive program toward Cuba as they have devoted toward developing a positive program for Mississippi. At least they got the job done in Mississippi. Everyone knows what American policy is vis-a-vis Mississippi. But I daresay that no one in America can tell what our policy is vis-a-vis Cuba, because we do not have it in hand. We do know that the Russian military buildup in Cuba is expanding. We do not know what the answer is. We would like to have guidelines. Congress has enacted legislation under which the President has been mandated to take some positive action. We have told him that we would support him. But the 25,000 troops are not being encamped, trained, and directed in connection with the Cuban problem. They are directed toward the Mississippi problem, which I join the rest of the Senate in hoping will speedily be solved.

FARM PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I take the Senate floor at this time primarily to point out that it is never pleasant for a prophet of bad news to have his prophecy vindicated. Along with other Senators, I said on the Senate floor at the time we passed the 1962 farm bill and adopted the conference report that it was a sorry day for American agriculture. I said it was bad news for the family farmer of America.

On the basis of the evidence which is now before us and which has since been publicized, I must say that this is a very bad piece of news for American agriculture in view of the generally recognized knowledge now as to the portent and content of the farm bill. I invite the attention of Senators to an Associated Press story which appeared on page 32 of the Sunday, October 7, issue of the New York Times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator knows that the Senate is still in the morning hour. Will the Senator permit the Chair to ask whether there is further morning business?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 or 3 additional minutes?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to read the article into the RECORD because I think the Senate and the country are entitled to know how the farm bill has been objectively analyzed and objectively interpreted. People might look with a jaundiced eye, I suppose, at what the Senator from South Dakota, who happens to be a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who is a Republican, and opposes the bill, may say. We may be told, "That is a partisan statement on the Senator's part because the bill is a Democratic bill."

I suppose the same people, or others like them, would look with a jaundiced eye when Secretary of Agriculture Freeman states that it is a wonderful piece of legislation and a great breakthrough for the farmer, or when any Democratic spokesman tries to support it because it is a Democratic bill.

So let us forget what the Democratic spokesmen say in praise of the bill and what the Republicans say in criticism. Let us rely, if we may, on an objective analysis by the talented farm experts and reporters of the Associated Press who have analyzed the bill and who, in yesterday's issue of the New York Times, told us exactly what will happen.

The headline states: "Kennedy Gambles on Farm Program."

The difficulty is that the President does not gamble his own money. He is not in the farming business. He is not gambling his own cattle, his own hogs, or his own cornfields. He is gambling with the farmer's future and with the farmer's products.

The subhead of the article reads: "Makes Plan Less Palatable To Gain New Controls."

Those words could be found in the speeches of the Senators who opposed the bill at the time we passed it.

I read the article:

> WASHINGTON, October 6.—The Kennedy administration has taken a calculated risk in the new farm act that may or may not pay off next year.
>
> The gamble is on the livestock feed grain program, starting in 1964, which the administration succeeded in obtaining despite the reluctance of Congress.
>
> From the standpoint of most growers this program is so much worse than the one it will replace that the administration believes the next Congress will pass a new one more to its liking.

I wish to reread that paragraph in the hope that every American farmer will find it in the RECORD, in his newspaper, hear it on the radio, or see it on the television.

The farmers should know that in 1964 they face catastrophic consequences as a result of the 1962 Farm Act with its program of flexible, falling farm supports which far out-Benson Ezra Benson.

The Associated Press analysts say:

> From the standpoint of most growers this program is so much worse than the one it will replace that the administration believes the next Congress will pass a new one more to its liking.

I continue to read from the Associated Press article:

> The administration wants authority to invoke, with the farmers' approval, controls on production of feed grains as well as of other farm products affected from time to time by surpluses.
>
> These controls, which the administration refers to as supply management, would be intended to stabilize production at levels necessary to meet all demands and maintain a safe reserve.
>
> REJECTED BY CONGRESS
>
> Congress refused to approve such controls for the feed grains this year. Many Senators and Representatives contended that the legislation enacted in 1958 under the Eisenhower administration would operate satisfactorily to stabilize feed grains if it were allowed to function.
>
> This law removed acreage allotments from corn, the major feed grain. It also set price supports at 90 percent of the average market price during the previous 3 years. This allowed a lower support rate than had prevailed under previous legislation. Advocates said it would tend to discourage overproduction and bring about a balance between supplies and requirements.
>
> But the Kennedy administration refused to go along with this program. It set up in 1961, continued this year and got Congress to extend through next year, a program that offers grain producers payments for leaving a part of their feed grain land idle and price supports on their production.

That bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a year ago. I was among those who supported it. It increased farm income to some extent; very little and inadequately, but it pointed it up a little, and it reduced surpluses, which are now being stored at such great expense to the American taxpayers.

I continue to quote:

> Failing to get the House to approve a control program, administration leaders set to work to make the old program less acceptable in the hope that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls, beginning in 1964.

Since some of the farm magazines, some of the writers on agricultural problems, and some of those who send out agricultural newsletters have failed to detect what is clearly written in the bill, let me refer to what these analysts for the Associated Press, who are free of bias and partisanship and political motivations, point out so clearly; namely, that the hope is "that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls beginning in 1964."

That means permanent controls over the American farmer starting in 1964.

I read further:

> SUPPORTS LESS PALATABLE
>
> The act of 1958 was amended to make its price supports less palatable. The amendment requires the Secretary of Agriculture to set feed grain supports at between 50 and 90 percent of parity, a formula devised to give farmers a fair market price in comparison with their costs of production. But the price level must be set so that it will not result in adding more feed grain stocks to the surplus.
>
> In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn.

In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn.

This should be of interest to the people of Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota. Here we have it factually stated, from an objective source, that the administration has devised a program, starting in 1964, setting the price of corn at 80 cents a bushel.

That is precisely what was predicted on the floor of the Senate at the time we made the valiant but losing fight to defeat the monstrosity in the form of a farm bill.

I read further:

> This compares with a minimum of $1.05 that would have prevailed if the act of 1958 had been left unchanged.

In other words, Mr. President, the farmers of America, starting in 1964, will lose a cool 25 cents a bushel in the price supports paid for corn.

I read on:

> As a consequence, when Congress takes up farm legislation next year, the administration will be in a position to say that if permanent controls are not authorized, the corn supports would have to be cut back to 80 cents.
>
> The administration is confident that Congress, faced with this choice, will finally agree, however reluctantly, to approve the administration's program of controls.

That is the end of the Associated Press article. This is almost the end of the speech by the Senator from South Dakota, except to say that this was in the debate record before the Members of the Senate or the Members of the House voted to approve the bill. It was obscure, it was in fine print, it was phased out, it was difficult to find in the long, winding sentences, but there it was, precisely as predicted and precisely as now reported by the Associated Press.

So Congress will come back next January, and the pistol will be held at the head of the farmer and he will be told, "We have you in a box. Vote for permanent controls. Vote for price supports on livestock. Vote for marketing quotas. Vote for production controls on livestock. Do all that or else you will get 80 cents for corn and 92 cents for wheat, and feed grains will be marked down in price supports because the law holds that they have to be related to the falling price supports for corn."

I predict that after the voters of America in the Farm Belt understand the bill, and after the election is held and the votes are counted, we will have a Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, which will not yield to this kind of pistol-at-the-head legislation, but which will insist on some sound economic principles being written into the law, increasing farm income, instead of decreasing it by legislative mandate, as was done in the Farm Act of 1962; and that we will write legislation which in the final analysis will free farmers to produce more at a fair price, instead of trying to starve them into submission and to create for them a survival type of economy carrying them back to the status of the peasants of Asia and Africa and Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times press story be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY GAMBLES ON FARM PROGRAM—MAKES PLAN LESS PALATABLE TO GAIN NEW CONTROLS

WASHINGTON, October 6.—The Kennedy administration has taken a calculated risk in the new farm act that may or may not pay off next year.

The gamble is on the livestock feed grain program, starting in 1964, which the administration succeeded in obtaining despite the reluctance of Congress.

From the standpoint of most growers this program is so much worse than the one it will replace that the administration believes the next Congress will pass a new one more to its liking.

The administration wants authority to invoke, with the farmers' approval, controls on production of feed grains as well as of other farm products affected from time to time by surpluses.

These controls, which the administration refers to as supply management, would be intended to stabilize production at levels necessary to meet all demands and maintain a safe reserve.

REJECTED BY CONGRESS

Congress refused to approve such controls for the feed grains this year. Many Senators and Representatives contended that the legislation enacted in 1958 under the Eisenhower administration would operate satisfactorily to stabilize feed grains if it were allowed to function.

This law removed acreage allotments from corn, the major feed grain. It also set price supports at 90 percent of the average market price during the previous 3 years. This allowed a lower support rate than had prevailed under previous legislation. Advocates said it would tend to discourage overproduction and bring about a balance between supplies and requirements.

But the Kennedy administration refused to go along with this program. It set up in 1961, continued this year, and got Congress to extend through next year a program that offers grain producers payments for leaving a part of their feed grain land idle and price supports on their production.

Failing to get the House to approve a control program, administration leaders set to work to make the old program less acceptable in the hope that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls, beginning in 1964.

SUPPORTS LESS PALATABLE

The act of 1958 was amended to make its price supports less palatable. The amendment requires the Secretary of Agriculture to set feed grain supports at between 50 and 90 percent of parity, a formula devised to give farmers a fair market price in comparison with their costs of production. But the price level must be set so that it will not result in adding more feed grain stocks to the surplus.

In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn. This compares with a minimum of $1.05 that would have prevailed if the act of 1958 had been left unchanged.

As a consequence, when Congress takes up farm legislation next year, the administration will be in a position to say that if permanent controls are not authorized, the corn supports would have to be cut back to 80 cents.

The administration is confident that Congress, faced with this choice, will finally agree, however reluctantly, to approve the administration's program of controls.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

CASTRO

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on the "Meet the Press" television program Sunday evening, Richard Nixon was critical of the Kennedy administration regarding Cuba, saying the Nation was "wanting more action than President Kennedy has been giving."

Is he an advocate of preemptive war? Is he urging that this Nation send our airpower and our Marines into Cuba or is he urging a naval blockade?

It is easy for irresponsible and thoughtless people to charge that it is high time the Kennedy administration is doing something about Cuba. When Richard Nixon makes a statement such as he did Sunday that he wants more actions toward Cuba, he can only mean one thing—some sort of military or naval action.

This candidate for Governor of a State could only mean by "action" the actual invasion of Cuba by our Armed Forces, possibly with some Cuban refugees armed and trained by us placed in the forefront of the landing force under the protection of our bomber and fighter planes and with our naval vessels cruising just offshore from this little island.

If former Vice President Nixon in advocating more action does not mean military or naval action, then the least he means is a tight naval blockade.

Let us assume the United States declares a naval blockade of Cuba. Such blockade would either bar all shipping to Cuba or would exempt only food and medicines.

An American warship hails a Russian ship carrying supplies to Cuba. The captain of this vessel refuses to halt. Then we fire a shot across its bow. The captain still refuses to halt. Do we sink the unarmed Russian ship headed for Cuba? Or if a vessel carrying the flag of some other nation follows the same course and its captain fails to halt when the shot goes across its bow, do we then sink that ship? If so, that is an act of war on our part. Following that time were we to take such aggressive action the Soviet Union would doubtless take one of two courses. The extreme course it would take would be to fire intercontinental ballistic missiles with atomic warheads at targets in this country from missile bases in Siberia and elsewhere within the Soviet Union. Instead of adopting such a course, another policy might appear opened to the Russians. The submarines and naval vessels of the Soviet Union could retaliate by firing on or sinking American ships carrying supplies to our airbases or ground forces in Iran, Turkey, and other lands allied to us that are close to the Soviet Union, as Cuba is to us.

If we take more action, as this California officeseeker, who was formerly Vice President and an advocate of watchfulness and patience regarding Cuba back in 1960, when he was defending the Eisenhower policies, suggests, and adopt the precedent of firing on Russian ships headed for Cuba, or perhaps sink one, what then would we do if and when the Soviet Union in retaliation sinks one of our unarmed supply ships or fires on one carrying merchandise toward a harbor of a country neighboring the Soviet Union allied and friendly to us and definitely not within the Soviet orbit?

Instead of listening to or heeding warmongers—even should former high-ranking public officials, even an ex-Vice President, give them aid and comfort—let us think this through. Now is the time for deliberation, calculation, and clear thinking. This Nation has an impregnable naval base within Cuba. Not only do we have the Guantanamo Naval and Air Base there, but we have naval and airbases in the nearby Canal Zone and neighboring Puerto Rico. This Nation has the capability of destroying all airbases and whatever missile bases there are in Cuba and all artillery emplacements there within hours. Were we to take such action, as some foolish people suggest we do at this time, we would risk losing the friendship of officials and peoples of Mexico and many of the people and officials of most, if not all, of the Republics of Central and South America. Such action would be regarded as some confirmation of Khrushchev's claims that we are Yankee imperialists and aggressors.

In Cincinnati last Friday evening, President Kennedy, as leader of the Democratic Party, addressed a huge rally in beautiful Fountain Square, in the heart of that city, and within a hundred yards or so of the Republican Headquarters of Hamilton County. On display in the headquarters and being carried outside and in the crowd were many placards waved in the crowd, presumably by members of that Grand Old Party of which I am not a member. They were printed signs of this sort:

> Shame, Kennedy; 100,000 GI's Fight Ole Miss. No GI's Fight Castro.
>
> Jack Kennedy, Conqueror of Ole Miss.
>
> Shame, Kennedy; Mississippi Yes, Cuba No.
>
> Kennedy Brutality in Mississippi—Nothing Cuba.

Malcolm S. Forbes, editor and publisher of Forbes magazine, one of the most authoritative financial magazines published in our country, wrote a fine lead editorial in the latest issue of his magazine. The editorial is entitled: "Cuba: Cold Logic, Not Hot Anger."

Incidentally, Malcolm S. Forbes a few years ago was the Republican candidate for Governor of New Jersey. He is a loyal, resolute, farsighted American patriot, and his statements certainly merit respect and consideration. He wrote:

> We set the precedent by sinking Russian ships bound for Cuba. How do we react when she sinks ours supplying her unfriendly neighbors? It doesn't take much imagination to foresee that overnight we would be at the brink—or over it—of global atomic annihilation.
>
> If one pauses to think, it becomes clear that Cuba, no matter how well supplied militarily, represents no real military threat to the United States. A very small number of short-range missiles would eliminate any menace in moments. Russian missiles can land anywhere in the United States from their own bases in their own land. They don't need Cuba as a launching spot.
>
> The depth of American emotions about Russian aid to Red Cuba is very real and understandable. But emotions are a poor guide in a case like this.
>
> Aside from a blockade, it is plain today that no small-scale invasion using conventional weapons would be successful. We would need a major effort by the Armed Forces, and it would come at a time when, after November 6, election day, the Berlin crisis will be unquestionably at a dangerous peak. When Khrushchev signs a "peace" treaty with East Germany as he plans to do, we cannot and will not allow East Germany to interfere or in any way control our access to West Berlin. The possibilities of a shooting war are going to be closer than ever in a few weeks over Berlin. In this situation, NATO and our allies are solidly agreed that there can be no retreat.
>
> Such is simply not the case in connection with Cuba.
>
> The dangers in Cuba come not because it is any military threat to this country, but because it forms a closer base for Red penetration in South America. We certainly can be effective in preventing the export of arms and subversives from Cuba to South American shores.
>
> Measures are being considered to isolate the Cuban virus; but those so earnestly and loudly advocating military action should realize that they are being emotional at a time when cold logic is called for.

All this was written before Mr. Nixon responded to a question on the television program, Meet the Press, on Sunday. But what Mr. Malcolm Forbes wrote in his editorial strikes the former Vice President directly in the forehead. Mr. Forbes said, and I repeat:

> Those so earnestly and loudly advocating military "action" should realize that they are being emotional at a time when cold logic is called for.

It seems the vogue for people to say we are doing nothing about Castro. The truth is this Nation is doing everything against him that can be done short of waging a shooting war. We have adopted an embargo. We are keeping Cuba under constant surveillance. No freighter from the Soviet Union or any other nation carrying and unloading armaments and men to Castro's Cuba has escaped our watchfulness.

Mr. President, whatever we do in military, naval, and air action against Castro and his forces should be done in cooperation with the Organization of American States.

Americans would do well to remember our President's statement at his recent press conference:

> If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force, or the threat of force, against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies.

Surely, Mr. President, the statement by President Kennedy which I have just quoted should satisfy anyone, other than a demagog or an officeseeker who is altogether disregarding the facts, and is appealing to the passions of people.

Our President, throughout his administration, from the inaugural and continuing through his forceful conference with Khrushchev at Vienna, to this good hour, has been firm, determined, and implacable in dealing with Communist aggression in Berlin and with Castroism, its manifestation in Cuba.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to speak personally with our new Ambassador to the Soviet Union and with another gentleman, both of whom were present with President Kennedy in Vienna, when he confronted Khrushchev, shortly after Mr. Kennedy's inauguration as President. I was proud to hear them narrate the firmness and the determination with which President Kennedy at that time stood up to Khrushchev. It was noted at that time that President Kennedy came away from the conference with a somber attitude. But certainly we can be proud of the attitude he maintained at the conference. That was not similar to the situation in 1960, following the U-2 mischance, when, unfortunately, as we read in the newspapers, Khrushchev indulged in bombast, blustering, and epithets, when face to face with the then President of the United States; and at that time the newspapers reported that President Eisenhower listened in dignified silence. But that did not happen at Vienna. I know it did not, because our new Ambassador to the Soviet Union, an Ohioan, and a career diplomat for many, many years, with a perfect command of the Russian language, was present at the conference in Vienna, along with the other gentleman, an interpreter.

Mr. President, the continuing Berlin crisis is fraught with greater danger to the peace of the world than is the Soviet buildup in Cuba. The latter may be attributed in large part to the fact that Castro is in deep trouble with his own people. Congress, in the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 230, demonstrates that the American people are solidly behind the determined no-appeasement policies of President Kennedy. He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and he has the entire support—as he should—of the American people—despite the placard carrying of some dimwits who are seeking a slogan, as they file out of some political headquarters.

In the other body, some outstanding Members spoke out in a sane, calm manner amid this mob clamor. I refer to the statement by Representative CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, who stated:

> The situation in Cuba has certainly affected emotionally a number of elected officials and editors, and has clouded their judgment. Without enlarging upon the proposals they have put forward and examining all possible consequences, they have demanded a naval blockade of Cuba, or outright invasion of Cuba. A naval blockade is, of course, an act of war. A direct invasion at the present time could be easily interpreted as first, an act of aggression which would give the Soviet Union an unprecedented propaganda issue; second, a U.S. acceptance of the principle of preventive war; third, an invitation to the Soviet Union to bomb with rockets our bases on the periphery of Russia and her satellites. I believe most firmly that such loose talk must cease * * *.

Representative BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said:

> This is no time to listen to political sorcerers, hucksters and adventurers * * * only the foolhardy and unthinking would plunge this Nation into an unneeded and unwanted war * * *.

Representative COHELAN, Democrat, of California, said:

> A great nation must have a sense of historical perspective. An invasion of Cuba at this time would utterly destroy the moral influence and authority—and much of the actual power—we now enjoy in the councils of nations. We would be relegated * * * to the footsteps left by the Soviets in smashing into Hungary.

Earl T. Smith, U.S. Ambassador to Cuba in 1959, is said to be authority for the statement that the Eisenhower administration shipped military equipment to Fidel Castro, and then helped him consolidate his control over Cuba.

Americans will remember that General Eisenhower was President when Batista fled from Cuba.

That was December 31, 1958. The facts are that the Eisenhower administration applied an arms embargo against Batista—this despite the fact that Ernesto Guevara, a top commander under Castro, had fought for the Communists in Guatemala, and our intelligence services knew that Guevara was a Communist. It is said that he was the mastermind behind Castro. This should have been known by our CIA officials at the time, and probably was known to them.

About 8 months before the time when Batista left Cuba and Castro marched into Havana, Drew Pearson in his column stated, "The Caribbean Legion—30 Percent Communist—has been fighting for Castro." Also, this nationally famed columnist reported that Castro had participated in Communist-inspired riots in Bogotá, Colombia, back in 1948. That was known, or should have been known, not only by President Eisenhower, but also by our then Vice President, who now is merely an officeseeker in California, and is snatching at this in an effort to reverse the polls, which seem to be going against him.

During the Eisenhower administration, some Cuban air force officers, now flying Soviet-made planes for Castro, were accepted for training in the United States by officials of the Eisenhower administration, and were trained in this country, at the expense of the U.S. taxpayers. However, that fact was not referred to by Mr. Nixon last Sunday.

Our people should be reminded that during the last year of the Eisenhower administration in 1960, the Soviet Union exported to Cuba 51-ton tanks. Those who served in the Armed Forces overseas know that 51-ton tanks are huge, powerful tanks. There were also received in Cuba from the Soviet Union during the year 1960 many tons of other military equipment, including heavy field artillery guns, and, in addition, Soviet military observers and advisers were landing in Cuba throughout 1960, and some of them landed there in 1959.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF CONTRACT MAIL ROUTES UP TO 100 MILES DURING CONTRACT TERM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2242, House bill 10936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10936) to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 1, after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4369 of title 39, United State Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class

"(a) Each owner of a publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4354 of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General at least once a year, and shall publish in such publication once a year, information in such form and detail and at such time as he may require respecting—

"(1) the identity of the editor, managing editor, publishers, and owners;

"(2) the identity of the corporation and stockholders thereof, if the publication is owned by a corporation;

"(3) the identity of known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders;

"(4) the extent and nature of the circulation of the publication, including, but not limited to, the number of copies distributed, the methods of distribution, and the extent to which such circulation is paid in whole or in part: *Provided, however,* That trade publications serving the arts or cultural interests need only to furnish such information to the Postmaster General; and

"(5) such other information as he may deem necessary to determine whether the publication meets the standards for second-class mail privileges. The Postmaster General shall not require the names of persons owning less than 1 per centum of the total amount of stocks, bonds, mortgages, or other securities.

"(b) Each publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4355(b) of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General information in such form and detail, and at such times, as he requires to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder. In addition, the Postmaster General may require each publication which has second-class mail privileges under section 4355(a) or 4356 of this title to furnish information, in such form and detail and at such times as he may require, to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder.

"(c) The Postmaster General shall make appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including provision for suspension or revocation of second-class mail privileges for failure to furnish the required information."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 63 of such title is amended by striking out

"4369. Affidavits relating to publications of the second class."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class."

And, on page 3, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of section 2 of the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 208; Public Law 86–513), and by paragraph 34 of the first section of the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 202; Public Law 86–507), is hereby repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I send to the desk an amendment to a committee amendment, of a corrective nature, and move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 16, in the committee amendment, to strike out "arts or cultural interests" and insert in lieu thereof "performing arts".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the remaining committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, and for other purposes."

VALIDATION OF COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES IN ARKANSAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2014, House bill 12820.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12820) to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 8, to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Section 218(p) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "Maine" after "Kansas".

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the amendment contains the substance of legislation which was approved by the House last week in H.R. 8853.

I ask unanimous consent that appropriate portions of the House report on that bill be printed in the RECORD as an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8853 is to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Your committee's bill would make applicable to the State of Maine the provision in present law which permits 17 specified States and all interstate instrumentalities to extend coverage (under their agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) to services performed by employees of any such State (or of any political subdivision thereof) in any policeman's or fireman's position covered by a retirement system of a State or local government, provided the members of the system vote in favor of coverage. The 17 States in which policemen and firemen covered by a State or local retirement system are now permitted to come under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program are: Alabama, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington.

Existing law provides adequate assurance that old-age, survivors and disability insurance coverage will be extended only to groups of policemen or firemen who want such coverage. Under the present referendum provisions of the Social Security Act, members of a State or local government retirement system group have a voice in any decision to cover them under old-age, survivors and disability insurance. In addition

existing law contains a declaration that it is the policy of the Congress that the protection afforded members of a State or local government retirement system not be impaired as a result of the extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage to members of the system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is not desired to go to a third reading of the bill yet.

REGULATION OF DISTRIBUTION OF HABIT-FORMING BARBITURATE AND AMPHETAMINE DRUGS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on May 23, 1961, I introduced a bill (S. 1939) to regulate the distribution of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs.

This bill grew out of repeated hearings of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, hearings that revealed the incredible increase of juvenile and adult addiction to what we call deadly drugs, amphetamines and barbiturates.

We found that more of these drugs were being peddled illegally than legitimately, and that inadequacies in the law were permitting this traffic to flourish.

During the past 16 months I have spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD instance after instance after instance of tragedy resulting from the illicit use of these deadly drugs. Under present conditions, the uncontrolled and virtually unrestricted use of these drugs is destroying the lives of thousands of young people who form a new class of drug addicts, and this new form of drug addiction is skyrocketing.

The solution to this problem is not easy. But a giant stride toward the solution can be made by amending the law to make possible realistic law enforcement. The sale of these drugs without a prescription is, of course, already illegal, but no effective and organized attack on these illegal sales can be made unless law enforcement officials know exactly where and in what quantities these drugs are being produced and to whom they are being shipped for resale.

S. 1939 meets this need by providing—

First, that manufacturers, compounders, and processors of barbiturates and amphetamines be required to register their names and addresses with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; second, that manufacturers and others engaged in receiving or disposing of such drugs be required to keep records of the quantities of such drugs they handle and make these records available to food and drug inspectors; and third, that adequate authority be given to drug inspectors to inspect establishments, inventory stocks, vehicles and other facilities relevant to the proper investigation of the disposal of drugs.

After this bill was introduced, our Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency held additional hearings on the drug problem. All parties concerned, including the law enforcement, the judicial and the legislative branches of both State and Federal Governments, testified in favor of such legislation. The President of the United States has three times publicly recommended that the Congress enact this measure.

As the months lengthened into a year and then into a second year, I pressed more and more urgently for action on this bill, which was resting in a pigeonhole in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions of support came in from all quarters.

The Association of Juvenile Court Judges declared for the bill.

The International Juvenile Police Officers Association urged its enactment.

The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association came out for it.

Distinguished representatives of a number of religious faiths recommended it.

Thousands of parents have written to me urging action on the bill.

Even the president of the largest producer of stimulant drugs endorsed this legislation.

Yet no committee action was scheduled on the bill. I wrote letter after letter to the chairman of the committee and to the other committee members. I sent a memorandum to the majority leader and the assistant majority leader. I buttonholed everyone who I thought could help me get action.

When told that committee consideration of the bill was being delayed pending a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I called the then Secretary, Abraham Ribicoff, and secured his complete cooperation.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported favorably on S. 1939 on July 10, 1962. In its report, the Department suggested certain refinements and improvements in the bill.

To speed the legislative process further, I had a new bill drafted incorporating all of the recommendations of the Department except one controversial provision making mere possession of these drugs a crime.

When I again pressed for committee action, I was told that the committee was still waiting for a report on my second bill, which, as I have said, was a revision of the first bill designed to meet the recommendations outlined in the favorable report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

So I again set to work. I called the new Secretary of HEW, Mr. Celebrezze, and with his wonderful cooperation my second amphetamine and barbiturate bill (S. 3673) was favorably reported on September 26, 1962.

Two weeks have passed since the submission of the second favorable report by HEW. During these 2 weeks I have again written to and spoken to committee members and have received such encouraging response that I am certain the bill would be passed if only action could be scheduled upon it. But as of this moment, it does not appear that the committee will schedule action.

I do not know what more I can do in behalf of this vital and relatively noncontroversial measure.

This statement is made not in criticism, but in puzzlement. Here is a bill which tightens acknowledged inadequacies in the law, inadequacies which are permitting a wave of narcotic addiction to go unchecked in this country. This legislation has been publicly and repeatedly supported by the President of the United States. It has been supported by the only committee that has held hearings on the subject matter, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. It has the support of every group that knows anything about this problem. It has been asked for by police officials all over the country. It has been backed by every witness who testified before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, including three drug company presidents.

It has been approved by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. It has been twice favorably reported upon by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I do not know anyone who is against it.

The bill has been killed this year by inaction just as effectively as though it had been bitterly opposed.

The result is that another year will pass without action being taken to curb an abuse which is deplored by every thinking American who reflects upon it.

I earnestly hope that we will get a fresh start on this bill early next year and obtain prompt congressional action in order that we might stop the criminal traffic in amphetamines and barbiturates which is destroying the lives of thousands of new victims every month. Surely the Congress can find time for this.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND ON CORK STOPPERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] I move that the Senate insist on its amendments to H.R. 12213 and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATIVE TO CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAXES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers' excise taxes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 10, 1962, p. 23040, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF TERMINAL RAILROAD CORPORATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 10, 1962, p. 23044, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACT CARRIERS AS CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 10, 1962, p. 23039, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

I ask that the conference report on H.R. 5700 be accepted.

When this bill went to conference with a Senate amendment added we found that the House would not yield without certain changes in the amendment.

The Senate amendment had been added by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] to grant to common carriers engaged in coastwise trade the same privilege of withdrawing from warehouse their bunker fuel and certain other supplies without payment of tax as is now granted to vessels which travel from coast to coast or touch at foreign ports.

The point on which the difference hinged was that of expanding the import quotas on oil to provide that needed for the few ships engaged only in coastwise trade.

The Senate receded on the amendment. However, there was agreement that the principle was just and a solution could be had by providing that the amendment be limited to bunker fuel and the quotas for oil not be enlarged, but that the ships in question could still take from the present quota the oil needed without payment of the tax.

In order not to delay the bill H.R. 5700, it was proposed that Senator CURTIS attach his amended proposal to another bill before the Senate, and that was done on Friday, October 5. The amendment was offered to H.R. 10117 and was accepted by the Senate.

With that explanation of why the Senate receded, I ask that the conference report on H.R. 5700 be accepted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

REAR ADM. CARL H. COTTER—AMENDMENT OF PRIVATE LAW 87-197

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2243, H.R. 9777.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9777) to amend Private Law 87-197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report on H.R. 9777.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

Private Law 87-197 relieved Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter, U.S. Navy, retired, of liability to refund retired pay received during a stated period and to authorize the payment of amounts withheld in connection with the same matter. The bill H.R. 9777 would correct the period covered by changing the closing date from July 31, 1959, to November 30, 1959, and to amend the first sentence of section 2 of the law, so as to make it clear that the amount to be paid under the law is to include the balance of retired pay otherwise due during the period in question.

STATEMENT

The facts in connection with this matter are set forth in House Report No. 2474 on H.R. 9777, and are as follows:

"In its report to the committee on H.R. 9777, the Department of the Navy has indicated that it has no objection to the purpose of the bill, that of amending Private Law 87-197 to provide full relief to Rear Admiral Cotter.

"Private Law 87-197 was enacted to extend relief in a situation where a decision by the Comptroller General imposed liability upon Rear Admiral Cotter on the ground that payment of his retired pay was barred for a certain period by section 6112(b) of title 10, United States Code, which provides that if a retired officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps is engaged for himself or others in selling, or contracting or negotiating to sell, naval supplies or war materials to the Department of the Navy, he is not entitled to any payment from the United States while he is so engaged.

"Rear Admiral Cotter retired from the Navy in 1947. Several years later he was president of a construction corporation when it entered into two contracts with the Navy in 1956 and 1957 to extend and reinforce runways and to build new taxiways and various airport development projects at the U.S. Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P.R. The contracts contained agreements to furnish all labor, equipment, and materials in connection with constructing the airfield improvements. Rear Admiral Cotter, as president of the corporation, signed one contract and the proposals for both contracts. He accepted two change orders to the contracts. He reportedly took no part in the negotiations leading to the contracts and change orders. Invitations to bid on both contracts were publicly advertised and extensively circularized among contractors. Rear Admiral Cotter's firm was the lowest bidder of eight, in one instance, and of four in the other. There have been no suggestions of improper influence or fraud regarding the contracts.

"On August 24, 1959, the Department of the Navy referred to the Comptroller General the question whether Rear Admiral Cotter was entitled to retired pay in view of his activities in connection with the contracts. At the same time the Navy suspended payments of his retired pay pending the decision of the Comptroller General.

"The Judge Advocate General of the Navy, in an opinion dated August 13, 1956, had held that the signing of contracts constituted contracting to sell under 10 U.S.C. 6112(b). The Comptroller General had held that any article of tangible personal property purchased by the Department of the Navy was within the purview of the phrase 'naval supplies or war materials' in 10 U.S.C. 6112(b) (38 Comp. Gen. 470, 1959). The issues in doubt in Rear Admiral Cotter's case, therefore, were (1) whether public works and improvements were 'naval supplies or war materials,' and (2) if so, during what period had Rear Admiral Cotter been engaged in selling or contracting to sell those supplies or materials.

"The Comptroller General ruled, in decision B-140581 dated November 9, 1959, that the officer was not entitled to retired pay during the period his firm was obligated to perform, or was engaged in performing, the Navy contracts. Rear Admiral Cotter then resigned his position with the construction company effective November 30, 1959. Private Law 87-197 relieved the officer of liability to pay the amount representing the overpayments of retired pay during the period beginning May 1, 1956, and ending July 31, 1959. His retired pay had been suspended, however, for the 4 months following July 31, 1959, pending the Comptroller General's decision, while he was still connected with the construction company. To that extent the private law, evidently through a misunderstanding, failed to provide a full measure of relief. H.R. 9777 seeks to provide full relief by amending the private law to extend the time period involved to November 30, 1959. The Comptroller General in his decision on Rear Admiral Cotter's case stated that he should not, by giving a strict and narrow interpretation to the term 'naval supplies or war materials,' foreclose the courts from considering and determining the scope of that term as used in 10 U.S.C. 6112(b). The Comptroller General recognized, however, that the activities of this officer were not clearly within the restrictions of the statute as shown by the following statement:

" 'Congress, it is true, by using the term "naval supplies or war materials," in 10 U.S.C. 6112, did not cast the statute in terms having clear literal application to the situation here involved—sales activities relating to public buildings and works (39 Comp. Gen. 366, 368).'

"It was through an expanded interpretation of the law, therefore, that Rear Admiral Cotter was required to forfeit his retired pay, for activities not clearly within the statutory restrictions.

"The Department of the Navy has interposed no objection to the relief proposed in the bill H.R. 9777. However, that Department pointed out that the bill would have to be amended in order to effectuate its purpose. In this connection, the Navy stated:

" 'The Department of the Navy interposes no objection to the purpose of H.R. 9777, to provide full relief to Rear Admiral Cotter. The bill in its present form, however, would not restore this officer to full entitlement to retired pay for the 4 months following July 31, 1959. Private Law 87-197 provided for relief from liability arising from overpayments of retired pay. Even after extension of the time period involved, the private law would not authorize payment of full retired pay to Rear Admiral Cotter for the months August through November 1959, for no overpayments were made during that period. This defect could be cured by adding to H.R. 9777 a provision to amend Private Law 87-197 further by inserting the following words after the last word in the first sentence of section 2 of the private law: "and in addition such amounts as represent the balance of retired pay otherwise due for the above period." '

"This committee agrees that this amendment is necessary and, therefore, has recommended the addition of a new section 2 to the bill embodying the language suggested by the Department.

"In view of the congressional intent expressed in the passage of the private law, the circumstances of the case, and the position of the Department of the Navy as expressed in its report, this committee recommends that the amended bill be considered favorably."

After consideration of all of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action taken by the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 9777, be considered favorably.

TYRANNY AT THE TOP—ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Statesville Record and Landmark, of Statesville, N.C., on October 2, 1962. Irrespective of the way any Senator feels about the recent unfortunate occurrences in Mississippi, I believe this editorial presents several questions which deserve the most serious consideration of each Member of the Congress and of every American citizen. I submit the editorial entitled "Tyranny at the Top" and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TYRANNY AT THE TOP

The excesses to which the Federal Government is going today in the State of Mississippi paint an impressive picture of what lies at the end of the road down which we are traveling—big government and little men.

Fifteen thousand troops—two soldiers for every civilian—sent into a community, unarmed, unorganized and untrained, to enforce judicial decrees upholding the civil rights of a single individual.

In the process, the rights of thousands of other Americans are being violated.

No martial law having been declared, Oxford, Miss., and the university campus are still under civil authority. Thus, every resident of the community is entitled to exercise the basic American rights, freedom of speech, freedom of movement, the right to assemble and petition.

Item: An ex-general of the U.S. Army is arrested 1 mile from the scene of the trouble and charged with inciting to riot. Although presumed innocent until convicted by a jury, he is slapped under $100,000 bond and spirited by plane many miles to prison in another State.

Law: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. Article 8, U.S. Constitution.

Item: Automobiles of private citizens are stopped and searched by troops placed throughout the community. One man reported being stopped and searched several times during a trip to the airport.

Law: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized. Article 4, U.S. Constitution.

Item: Citizens within a wide area surrounding Oxford have been halted, searched and their arms confiscated.

Law: * * * the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. Article 2, U.S. Constitution.

Item: Tear gas shells fired by U.S. troops and Federal marshals have driven the people of Oxford from their homes and their places of business.

Law: The right of persons to be secure in their * * * houses * * * shall not be infringed. Article 4, U.S. Constitution.

There are many other examples, particularly relating to the treatment of individuals apprehended by the troops and marshals. Many have been forced to stand against the wall, hands over heads; all have been herded into an outdoor compound, to be held there until the * * * [Federal Government] * * * decides how to proceed against them.

This is in sharp contrast with the tender care which must be extended by State and local officers to the most hardened offenders. It is also in sharp contrast to the reserved, dignified treatment extended mobs in Albany, Ga., who were being egged on by troublemakers with direct telephone lines into the Department of Justice if not the White House itself. Yet, if the State of Georgia in trying to preserve law and order had resorted to any of the techniques now being applied to the citizens of Oxford, the Federal courts would throw the cases out faster than they could be presented.

All of this raises serious questions. Why is it any worse for a Ross Barnett to encourage the violation of a Federal law with which he disagrees than for the President of the United States, through public statements, and his brother, the Attorney General, through telephoned advice, to egg on mobs bent on violating State law in Georgia?

Why is it worse for the police in Statesville, to use night sticks in apprehending individuals inciting a mob to action against private citizens than it is for Federal authorities to use the ultimate in force in Mississippi?

And, more important still, who is going to protect the rights of the innocent, the private citizen who merely wants to go about his business, in Oxford or Albany?

The Federal Government has now demonstrated again that it will go to the limit enforcing rights based on color? How far will it go enforcing rights not based on color, such as the right to work of several thousand Californians now being deprived of their jobs because they do not want to belong to a union?

Who, in the last analysis, will stand between the lowly citizen and tyranny, not at the State and local level, but at the top? No doubt the British were talking about law and order when an earlier generation of Bostonians was dumping tea.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read the first paragraph of the editorial, already printed in the Record, which is as follows:

> The excesses to which the Federal Government is going today in the State of Mississippi paint an impressive picture of what lies at the end of the road down which we are traveling—big government and little men.

The vital question stated by the North Carolina editor is in the closing paragraphs of the editorial, and is as follows:

> Who is going to protect the rights of the innocent, the private citizen who merely wants to go about his business * * *.
>
> The Federal Government has now demonstrated again that it will go to the limit enforcing rights based on color? How far will it go enforcing rights not based on color, such as the right to work of several thousand Californians now being deprived of their jobs because they do not want to belong to a union?
>
> Who, in the last analysis, will stand between the lowly citizen and tyranny, not at the State and local level, but at the top?

Mr. President, as a southern Senator who is by no means an extremist in the field of civil rights and racial matters, I feel that it is timely for all Americans to consider whether, in the zeal for enforcement of civil rights in one field, our Government has so far forgotten its obligation to sustain the civil rights of American citizens in other fields as to overrun and to violate many such rights.

Mr. President, I have noted from the editorials of many other papers that other able editorialists than the one in Statesville, N.C., are concerned with this question. Without quoting from the several available from my own State and elsewhere, I noted with interest in the lead editorial of the Sunday Star published yesterday right here in the Nation's Capital, an able discussion of one of these issues under the title "General Walker Insane?" which I ask unanimous consent to have included in full as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL WALKER INSANE?

The Department of Justice insists it has adhered faithfully to the law in confining former Major General Walker to a mental institution. Maybe so. But if this is correct, the law affords no visable protection to an individual in General Walker's situation.

He was arrested last Monday on serious charges in connection with the riot at the University of Mississippi. Taken before a U.S. Commissioner, he was advised of his legal rights. General Walker waived his right to counsel and to a preliminary hearing. He was assured that he would be tried in Mississippi on the charges against him, and bail was set at $100,000. With that, he was flown to a Federal prison hospital in Springfield, Mo., with every reason to believe that he would be eligible for release on bail when he got there.

General Walker didn't know that the Department of Justice on the following day would bring mental commitment proceedings against him in Mississippi which would result in his being denied release on bail in Missouri. In fact, it is not clear when the decision to seek commitment was made. But it must have been made not later than about noon on Tuesday. An hour earlier, according to Representative ALGER, of Texas, he was being assured by the Attorney General personally that General Walker's transfer to Springfield "had no connection with the fact that there is a mental hospital connected with that prison." He was also assured, Mr. ALGER told the House, that there would be no barrier to General Walker's release if he posted the bail fixed by the court.

Meanwhile, the wheels were turning swiftly in Washington. Someone decided that the general should be committed for mental observation at Springfield. The chief psychiatrist of the Federal Prison Bureau prepared an affidavit for submission to a Federal judge in Mississippi—not in Missouri, where General Walker was.

This affidavit is an interesting document. Its essential conclusion is that General Walker's recent behavior "may be indicative of an underlying mental disturbance." The basis for his conclusion, the psychiatrist said, was a reading of newspaper stories, unspecified "indications" in an unidentified "medical history," and "other information" of an undisclosed nature "available to me."

Armed with this flimsy weapon, the U.S. Attorney in Mississippi, doubtless on instructions from Washington, appeared before Federal Judge Claude Clayton, sitting in Oxford. The attorney told the judge that on the basis of the information from the psychiatrist, he had "reasonable cause" to believe that General Walker may be presently insane or so mentally incompetent as to be unable to understand the nature of the proceedings against him or to properly assist in his own defense. With this, the judge signed the commitment papers, and the U.S. Attorney in Springfield thereupon said that General Walker would be held for from 60 to 90 days for mental examination and that he could not be released on bail.

It is important to note, we think, that the sole question is whether the general, who certainly has offered no defense of insanity, is able to understand the nature of the proceedings against him and to assist in his own defense. Without in any way condoning his behavior, we have seen nothing which indicates that he lacks this degree of mental capacity. And we do not think that this inference is overcome by an undocumented conclusion that he "may be" suffering from "an underlying mental disturbance"—whatever that means.

This is a question, however, which must be decided in the courts. And, thanks to the availability of the writ of habeas corpus, the Department of Justice must show cause in Springfield on Tuesday why General Walker should not be released on bond. Beyond that, the Department has been ordered by a Springfield Federal court to certify the "true cause" of General Walker's detention. The full story of the Walker case should be developed in the course of these proceedings.

Meanwhile, there is ample reason, we think, to be concerned over a procedure under which an accused man can reasonably believe on one day that he will be released on bail, only to discover 24 hours later that he has been committed to a mental institution, without right of bail, on the statement of a psychiatrist who had never examined him and by a judge who had never seen him.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Star editorialist makes it very clear that he in no way condones the behavior of General Walker, but he closes with this interesting, compelling paragraph:

> Meanwhile, there is ample reason, we think, to be concerned over a procedure under which an accused man can reasonably believe on one day that he will be released on bail, only to discover 24 hours later that he has been committed to a mental institution, without right of bail, on the statement of a psychiatrist who had never examined him and by a judge who had never seen him.

RICHARD C. COLLINS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2228, H.R. 3131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3131) for the relief of Richard C. Collins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the 7th of August 1962, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs favorably reported the bill S. 103, which my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE] and I jointly authored.

In these closing days or hours of the session, with not very many Senators present, some of whom would oppose the proposed reclamation project for the State of California—parenthetically I observe that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is presiding—I am not unmindful of the difficulties in having a debate on the measure this year.

My California colleague [Mr. ENGLE] would join me completely in what I have said. Let the record show that I have tried to find him. He is busily engaged in a conference meeting at the moment.

I should like to ask the majority leader, for the record, assuming the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs repeats next year its action of this year and reports to the Senate a bill similar to S. 103, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit on the American River as part of the Central Valley project in California under Federal reclamation law, could the distinguished majority leader indicate whether or not he would look with favor upon having an early debate in the 1963 session on our most important California reclamation project?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to say to the acting minority leader that I not only would look upon the project with favor, but with approval. I shall do my very best to bring the measure to the floor of the Senate as quickly as possible in the next session. Of course, the bill would have to be reported from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the Senator from California is one of the outstanding members. I am sure that the measure could be handled in the committee. If he will do his part there, as I know he will, I shall do my part in the Policy Committee and on the floor of the Senate to be of assistance.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend. As I said a moment ago, my colleague had been detained in a conference committee. I see him now in the Chamber. As I said earlier, and repeat now, we both hope that an expeditious hearing can be given in the next session of Congress to the project, assuming, of course, that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs repeats its action approving the measure at the next session.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with the sentiment expressed in relation to the measure. I am an author of the Auburn-Folsom proposed legislation. It is a bill that involves a substantial amount of money.

Although I would like to have the precedent of Senate action on the proposed legislation at this session, I am aware that the House has not even held hearings, and the possibilities of action in the House at this time are remote to the point of being invisible. Rather than bring the measure up now, it seems to me that the more prudent course would be to let it go over, with the understanding that if we obtain favorable action again by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as I think we shall, our distinguished majority leader will help us to bring it before the Senate for debate at an early time so that the House will have sufficient time to act upon the measure at the next session of Congress. I thank my distinguished leader for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The California Senators have my utmost assurance.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

MOBILE TRADE FAIRS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3389) to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> There can no longer be any doubt but that the United States has failed in recent years to take full advantage of the foreign trade opportunities which are available around the globe. The present administration has pledged itself to stem the flow of gold from our shores, and has placed maximum emphasis on increasing our exports to achieve this aim.
>
> In this committee's study of foreign trade, we heard a great deal of support for an export expansion program from the business community. One of the methods proposed and discussed concerned the use of mobile trade fairs.
>
> I introduced this bill because I felt it would provide an important media for exhibiting our products, with the initiative being taken by private enterprise and not by the Government.
>
> The response received from business firms all over the United States has been gratifying. Their endorsement of a mobile trade fair program is obviously essential for its success.
>
> I urge the approval of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, that it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THIS YEAR'S FARM BILL PUTS OUR FEET TO FIRE ON MANDATORY CONTROLS NEXT YEAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, during consideration of the farm bill this year, and especially during consideration of the conference report, some of us argued that if the farm bill were passed, next year those of us who are very concerned about mandatory controls on feed grains would find our "feet to the fire" and would find it extremely difficult to resist mandatory controls. That was my position.

In yesterday's issue of the New York Times there appeared an Associated Press article entitled "Kennedy Gambles on Farm Program." I quote from the Associated Press article:

> Failing to get the House to approve a control program, administration leaders set to work to make the old program less acceptable in the hope that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls, beginning in 1964.

The article continues:

> In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn. This compares with a minimum of $1.05 that would have prevailed if the act of 1958 had been left unchanged.
>
> As a consequence, when Congress takes up farm legislation next year, the administration will be in a position to say that if permanent controls are not authorized, the corn supports would have to be cut back to 80 cents.
>
> The administration is confident that Congress, faced with this choice, will finally agree, however reluctantly, to approve the administration's program of controls.

Mr. President, that is a very real threat. I am concerned on two scores. First, Congress may not go along with that program, in which case we would have disastrously low prices for corn, which in turn would mean depression-low prices for hogs, beef, milk, and so forth.

Second, if a mandatory controls program were adopted by Congress, farmers will very likely vote them down at least the first year or two. The result will be real chaos and a very expensive mess to clean up. It would be tough, mighty tough, on the taxpayers as well as on the farmer. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Kennedy Gambles on Farm Program," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> KENNEDY GAMBLES ON FARM PROGRAM—MAKES PLAN LESS PALATABLE TO GAIN NEW CONTROLS
>
> WASHINGTON, October 6.—The Kennedy administration has taken a calculated risk in the new farm act that may or may not pay off next year.
>
> The gamble is on the livestock feed grain program, starting in 1964, which the administration succeeded in obtaining despite the reluctance of Congress.
>
> From the standpoint of most growers this program is so much worse than the one it will replace that the administration believes the next Congress will pass a new one more to its liking.
>
> The administration wants authority to invoke, with the farmers' approval, controls on production of feed grains as well as of other farm products affected from time to time by surpluses.
>
> These controls, which the administration refers to as supply management, would be intended to stabilize production at levels necessary to meet all demands and maintain a safe reserve.
>
> REJECTED BY CONGRESS
>
> Congress refused to approve such controls for the feed grains this year. Many Senators and Representatives contended that the legislation enacted in 1958 under the Eisenhower administration would operate satisfactorily to stabilize feed grains if it were allowed to function.
>
> This law removed acreage allotments from corn, the major feed grain. It also set price supports at 90 percent of the average market price during the previous 3 years. This allowed a lower support rate than had prevailed under previous legislation. Advocates said it would tend to discourage overproduction and bring about a balance between supplies and requirements.
>
> But the Kennedy administration refused to go along with this program. It set up in 1961, continued this year and got Congress to extend through next year, a program that offers grain producers payments for leaving a part of their feed grain land idle and price supports on their production.
>
> Failing to get the House to approve a control program, administration leaders set to work to make the old program less acceptable in the hope that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls, beginning in 1964.
>
> SUPPORTS LESS PALATABLE
>
> The act of 1958 was amended to make its price supports less palatable. The amendment requires the Secretary of Agriculture to set feed grain supports at between 50 and 90 percent of parity, a formula devised to give farmers a fair market price in comparison with their costs of production. But the price level must be set so that it will not result in adding more feed grain stocks to the surplus.
>
> In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn. This compares with a minimum of $1.05 that would have prevailed if the act of 1958 had been left unchanged.
>
> As a consequence, when Congress takes up farm legislation next year, the administration will be in a position to say that if permanent controls are not authorized, the corn supports would have to be cut back to 80 cents.

The administration is confident that Congress, faced with this choice, will finally agree, however reluctantly, to approve the administration's program of controls.

UNCONSCIONABLE WASTE IN THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been deeply concerned with the cost of the space program. I enthusiastically support the drive to be first in space, and particularly to beat the Russians to the moon. It is important that we do that. At the same time there has been great waste in the program which should be eliminated. One flagrant example of waste is in the spending on the space flight center at Houston, which originally was to cost $60 million, but for which this year we had to appropriate $91 million.

I notice in an article by William Hines in the Sunday Star that one present estimate of the ultimate cost of this center is not $60 million or $90 million or $120 million, but $200 million.

This is unconscionable. I plead with the administrators of the National Space Agency to give real consideration to cutting down this very rapidly climbing cost.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NASA RENTS LUXURY HAVEN FOR ASTRONAUTS' QUARTERS

(By William Hines, Star Science Writer)

HOUSTON, TEX., October 6.—The space agency has taken over a fancy apartment complex here as "working quarters" for the astronauts.

For at least a year, starting about November 1, the 15 fliers will temper the rigors of space flight training in carpeted, air-conditioned surroundings, which are frankly billed on a sign out front as "luxury apartments."

Other amenities include cutglass chandeliers, curving wrought-iron stairways, balconies and a landscaped courtyard complete with a 50-foot swimming pool. The layout will cost the taxpayers about $185,000 for a single year's occupancy, or slightly more than the total pay and allowances drawn by the 15 spacemen in a similar period.

REPORTER LEARNS OF SITE

This rental—based on 50,000 square feet of space at an estimated average of $3.70 a square foot—reportedly equals about one-third of the builder's $500,000 investment. It also amounts to about 1½ times what apartment dwellers will pay per square foot for living quarters in two other buildings in the same development.

The space agency's Manned Spacecraft Center did not have much to say today about the transaction beyond the fact that a contract had been entered into. In fact, in announcing the contract last week, MSC referred to the rental of office space in the "Franklin Development Center."

An alert reporter on the Houston Chronicle had never heard of the particular development center, which he thought might possibly be one of scores springing up like mushrooms in this exploding Texas metropolis of 1 million people. He asked for the address, and after some prodding was told it was located at 2510 Beatty Street, about 5 miles south of the city and within sight of the Manned Spacecraft Center headquarters.

FIFTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET

The Chronicle reporter—like out-of-towners who inspected the location today—found it to be the "Franklin Luxury Apartments," according to the sign in the front yard.

Inside, contractors and NASA technicians were working overtime to get the quarters ready for occupancy.

An employee of Joseph L. Smith and Associates, owner of the project, said the Manned Spacecraft Center would occupy 50,000 of the 67,000-square-foot total in six buildings. The two buildings reserved for private tenants consists of 26 one-bedroom apartments which will rent for $125-a-month each, utilities included, he said.

Thus, private renters will pay $39,000 a year for 17,000 square feet or about $2.30 a square foot while the Space Agency will pay about $3.70 a square foot.

OCCUPY 14 SITES

The builder's spokesman explained, however, that private renters will not be allowed to use the swimming pool in the balcony-lined, tree-shaded courtyard.

The Manned Spacecraft Center said the building will house, in addition to the astronauts and their rapidly growing staff of aids, the executive offices of the Center's spacecraft research division and a technical library.

The move constitutes a substantial improvement in astronaut working quarters over the days at Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va., when seven of them shared one medium-sized room in a crowded office building.

The Manned Spacecraft Center now occupies about 14 sites in rented buildings around Houston, ranging from old warehouses through moderate-to-fancy apartments to such luxury layouts as the paneled and patioed Farnsworth-Chambers Building, which serves as Center headquarters.

MORE LAND NEEDED

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is now building permanent facilities for the Center on a tract of land about 25 miles southeast of Houston. The land originally acquired came as a gift from Rice University, but it is now understood that more land will have to be acquired for cash on the booming real estate market.

Originally built as a $60-million construction job, the Center's appropriation through fiscal 1963 is $91 million, and estimates of the probable total cost run as high as $200 million. Occupancy is scheduled to begin in the calendar year 1964.

Most of the seven original astronauts bought houses near the new Center after a deal to get homes free fell through under newspaper pressure last May. These spacemen, whose investment funds derive principally from a $500,000 personal-story contract with Life magazine, revealed yesterday they were planning to divest themselves of interests in a plush motel near Cape Canaveral, Fla.

EXPANSION OF NASA PUBLICITY PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the same connection I must say that an expert job of public relations is being done on the part of our Space Agency. I recognize that our astronauts are to be applauded. They are real heroes, and they are showing great courage. I was interested to know how much was being spent for public relations in connection with our space program. I wrote to NASA and asked them to give me a report. Such a report has been sent to me. I note that the personnel in the Office of the Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs has increased from five in 1962 to seven in fiscal year 1963.

In the Office of Educational Programs and Services of NASA, personnel have increased from 22 in 1961 to 26 in 1962 to 73 in 1963.

In Office of Public Services and Administration of NASA, personnel have increased from 22 in 1961 to 26 in 1962 to 28 in 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

This Office was established in January 1962 to direct and coordinate all public-affairs activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The following data apply to the Office of the Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs:

	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year) 1963 (planned
Personnel	5	7
Annual personnel salary rates	$51, 230	$73, 410
Operating funds	$5, 600	$8, 500

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

This Office conducts a variety of programs aimed at improving scientific education and the scientific literacy of the Nation. These programs are carried out in cooperation with or at the request of organized entities of the education community such as the U.S. Office of Education, National Science Foundation, National Education Association, National Science Teachers Association, State departments of education, etc.

Among the programs conducted are: The spacemobile program, a traveling science demonstration principally for elementary, junior and senior high schools; space science symposiums for teachers; development of classroom instruction materials; assistance in curriculum development; educational publications; films on NASA programs and assistance to State departments of education. This Office also is responsible for a comprehensive exhibits program, the NASA historical program, and the preparation of the semiannual report to Congress. The following data apply to the Office of Educational Programs and Services:

	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963 (planned)
Personnel	27	57	73
Annual salary rates	[1] $221, 998	$520, 390	$670, 067
Operating funds	$780, 759	$3, 320, 582	$9, 271, 000
Spacemobile units	2	13	20
Space science symposiums	50	175	225
Classroom materials	0	6	33

[1] Estimated.

	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963 (planned)
Assistance in curriculum development (instances)	15	35	70
Educational publications	3	19	30
Assistance to State departments of education (instances)	10	34	75
Exhibit requests received	68	285	2, 200
Exhibits turned down	22	79	1, 213
Exhibits scheduled	46	206	887

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFORMATION

This Office coordinates public information operations throughout the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It provides services to all news media by providing information on NASA activities. The office prepares information plans on major operations, develops press kits, coordinates public affairs requirements of the NASA program offices, prepares press releases, answers media representative inquiries, provides photographic coverage of operations and provides to news media audio visual material such as color and black and white prints, slides, film clips, and tapes of voice transmissions. Other major activities include arranging interviews with key NASA officials, conducting press conferences and coordinating news media coverage of major launches at which up to 500 news media representatives are involved. The following data apply to the Office of Public Services and Information:

	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963 (planned)
Personnel	22	26	28
Annual personnel salary rates	[1]$199,343	[1]$237,565	$260,624
Operating funds	[1]$203,800	[1]$232,902	$286,000
Press releases	[1]249	319	350
Photographic requests	[1]4,584	4,709	5,500
Prints released	[1]161,640	282,238	322,000
Items cleared for release (contractor release, advertising copy, etc.)	[1]678	754	830
Interviews arranged	[1]396	1,110	1,400

[1] Estimated.

MILWAUKEE'S RALPH VOTAPEK WINS INTERNATIONAL PIANIST AWARD, ONE OF THE WORLD'S GREATEST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Saturday night a distinguished American artist was recognized in the Van Cliburn competition, at Houston, Tex. This was a worldwide competition, including some of the greatest piano artists from Russia and Japan and many other foreign countries.

I am proud to say that an American won that competition. The American who won it is from Milwaukee, Wis. He is Ralph Votapek. He gave a magnificent performance. I have talked to several critics since the contest, and I have been told that this young man, who is 23 years of age, is bound to be one of the great artists of the world. I am proud of his achievement. I ask unanimous consent that two articles, one published in the New York Times and the other in the Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

WISCONSIN PIANIST AWARDED $10,000—23-YEAR-OLD, FACING DRAFT, WINS CLIBURN CONTEST

(By Raymond Ericson)

FORT WORTH, October 7.—While 42,000 cheering football enthusiasts watched the University of Arkansas Razorbacks trounce the Texas Christian University Horned Frogs last night, a few hundred music lovers waited tensely in a hall a few blocks away for the outcome of the Van Cliburn International Piano Competition.

Early this morning it was announced that Ralph Votapek, a 23-year-old pianist from Milwaukee, had won the $10,000 first prize, probably the largest ever given a performing artist in the United States.

This was the first American contest in which Soviet pianists had taken part, and Russians placed second and third. They were Nikolai Petrov, 19, who won $5,000, and Mikhail Voskresenky, 27, who won $2,000.

Cécile Ousset, a 26-year-old Parisian, was awarded the fourth prize of $1,000, and Marilyn Neeley, a 25-year-old Californian from Glendale, the fifth prize of $750.

Prizes of $500 each went to Sergio Varrella Cid of Portugal, Arthur Fennimore of Berwyn, Pa., and Takashi Hironaka and Miss Hiroko Nakamura of Japan.

CHAMBER PRIZE SPLIT

The $600 for the best performance of chamber music during the semifinals was divided between Miss Nakamura and Mr. Votapek. Mr. Fennimore won a $500 gold watch for the best performance during the preliminaries of Lee Holby's Capriccio on Five Notes, which was commissioned from the American composer for the contest.

Ironically, Mr. Votapek may not be able to accept the many extra benefits that go with his cash prize. He received notice 3 weeks ago from his draft board to report for induction into the Army next Friday in Milwaukee.

The perquisites would include a Carnegie Hall recital on December 5, a contract with S. Hurok for an American tour, a contract for a European tour, appearances with several orchestras including the National Symphony of Mexico, and an appearance and a recording with the Paganini Quartet.

RCA Victor is taking an option on a recording contract with Mr. Votapek.

As second-place winner, Mr. Petrov has been invited to give a recital in the University of Minnesota's artist course and to appear as soloist with the Minneapolis Symphony.

The official presentation of the prizes, with medals and certificates, was made this afternoon after a recital by Mr. Votapek in the Ed Landreth Auditorium on the TCU campus, where the contest was held.

The awards were announced early this morning after the third section of the finals. As in each of the earlier sections, three contestants played concertos with the Fort Worth Symphony Orchestra. They were Mr. Cid, Mr. Hironaka and Miss Nakamura. She had been ill for 2 days and made a brave but faltering effort to appear.

Only 18, and looking delectable in a beautiful Japanese kimono, Miss Nakamara was able to finish the first movement of Beethoven's Third Concerto but was then forced to cancel her scheduled performance of the Rachmaninoff Rhapsody on a Theme by Paganini.

Neither of the other artists played as well in the finals as any of the previous contestants had.

INTERNATIONAL JURY

The winners were announced by Leopold Mannes, chairman of the jury, which comprised musicians from Europe, the Soviet Union, Japan, Central and South America and the United States. Mr. Mannes was introduced by Mrs. Grace Ward Lankford, general chairman of the competition and the driving force behind it.

Mr. Mannes said the judges' decisions were based on "capacity, talent and potential." The final tallies included the scores earned by the contestants in the preliminaries and the semifinals.

Audience approval of the judges' decisions was wildly enthusiastic, as far as the first two winners were concerned. These had largely been expected after the brilliant performances Mr. Votapek and Mr. Petrov gave in the finals. Nor was there criticism of the placement of the other finalists, although judges and spectators had personal preferences in how they should have been ranked.

VICTOR IS COMPOSED

Mr. Votapek, a good-looking, blond, spectacled youth, received the announcement with the smiling, quiet composure that is characteristic of him.

While the concertos were being played, he went to the football game—"The first I've been able to attend since college," he said. The only excitement he displayed came as soon as photographers would let him leave the stage. Then he rushed off to a booth to telephone his mother in Milwaukee.

"I hadn't really expected to win the contest when I entered it," he said afterward, "especially after I learned that some Russians would take part. My mother, who has more confidence in me than I do, hoped I might place third or second, but even she was surprised when I told her that I had won.

"I hope the draft board will give me some kind of reprieve so I can take advantage of the concert appearances they scheduled for the winner. I know that they are going to try to do something in Washington about it."

ROSINA LHEVINNE'S PUPIL

Coincidentally, Mr. Votapek has been studying for the last year with Rosina Lhevinne, who also taught Van Cliburn, in whose honor the competition was named. But Mr. Votapek had never met his famous colleague, who is only a few years his senior, until he came to Fort Worth 2 weeks ago.

Mr. Votapek's previous teachers have been Guy Mombaerts at Northwestern University and Robert Goldsand at the Manhattan School of Music. In 1959 he won the Rudolph Ganz Award in Chicago and in 1961 the Naumburg Award in New York. Also in 1961 he placed fourth in the Mitroupoulos International Competition. This year he was among the five finalists in the Leventritt Competition.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1962]

VOTAPEK PIANO VICTORY WAS NO SURPRISE

(By Paul Hume)

It was 12:07 a.m., Fort Worth time, on Sunday morning, that Ralph Votapek was named winner of the $10,000 first prize in the first Cliburn International Quadrennial Piano Competition.

The 23-year-old pianist from Milwaukee, Wis., won a clear victory, one that was predicted in the Washington Post several hours before it became official. His playing had consistently shown superb style, taste, and excitement during his three appearances during the contest. Last December, Votapek placed fourth in the Mitropoulos Competition in New York City.

The Soviet Union's two strong contenders in the finals, Nikolai Petrov and Mikhail Voskresenski, carried off the second and third prizes of $5,000 and $2,000 respectively. Both artists had been greatly admired throughout the contest.

Cecile Ousset, France's glamorous entry, who played her concertos in the finals with tinted glasses to reduce the glare of bright lights on the keyboard, won the fourth prize of $1,000. Fifth place went to Marilyn Neeley of Glendale, Calif., and sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth-place prizes of $500 each went to Sergio Varella Cid of Portugal, Arthur Fennimore of Berwyn, Pa., Takashi Hironaka and Hiroko Nakamura of Japan. Fennimore also won the special $500 gold watch for the best performance of Lee Holby's Capriccio on Five Notes, a work required of all the contestants.

The $600 prize for the best performance of chamber music, given by Van Cliburn, was divided, thanks to an absolute tie, to the fourth decimal place, between Miss Nakamura and top-winner Votapek.

Unexpected drama came in the last night of the contest when Miss Nakamura, who had been ill for 2 days, played the required Beethoven movement, colorful in a kimono of red and blue on white, with a gold obi, and then almost fainted and could not complete her part in the finals.

The judges had already placed her, with Votapek, at the top of the list in playing chamber music, and awarded her the ninth-place prize of $500 despite her inability to finish the finals.

Even before the decisions were announced, Votapek had been signed to an optional recording contract with RCA Victor. He is now in line for a worldwide tour, both as a solo artist and with orchestras. He also has been notified by his draft board to report to the U.S. Army next Friday morning. This is the time for an official pronouncement exempting him so that he can perform the service for this country for which he is most eminently qualified, that of acting as our newest, and one of our most gifted ambassadors in the arts to the whole world.

BEST ADVICE TO YOUTH: GET ALL THE EDUCATION YOU CAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have introduced a resolution in Congress to urge State governments to require that young people stay in school until they are 17.

Recently the Washington News published a very fine editorial entitled "Learning Really Pays." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Learning Really Pays

"Gosh, Pa, why do I have to finish school? Why can't I quit and go to work?"

Any parent hearing such questions from his teenage offspring would do well—after reading junior the customary riot act—to look at the latest nationwide job report.

While the unemployment rate for all workers still is fairly high (5.8 percent), it is 2½ times above the average for youths 14 to 19. Out of every 100 teenagers hunting a job last month, more than 13 couldn't find one.

The moral is clear: Finish high school. Go to college if you can. And in any case, acquire a skill; learn a craft. Then begin hunting a job.

You will have much better luck.

MIDWEST'S DEFENSE SHARE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in Wisconsin we have been deeply concerned as have most Midwestern representatives with the lack of defense contracts which we have been able to secure. Our University of Wisconsin is one of the greatest institutions in America. I do not say that as a Senator, but as objectively as I can. The University of Wisconsin grants more Ph. D.'s than any other university in the world. Our graduate school has an excellent faculty. We also have a very great industrial complex in Wisconsin. Nevertheless, we do not get our share of defense contracts, and, especially, we do not get the research and development contracts we should.

The Milwaukee Journal recently wrote an editorial entitled "Midwest Defense Share on Way Up; Future Is Cloudy." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Midwest's Defense Share on Way Up; Future Is Cloudy

A report from the Defense Department reveals that the Midwest's share of Government defense contracts isn't as small as earlier dispatches have indicated.

The Department, in an analysis of the geographical distribution of military prime contracts for fiscal year 1960 through fiscal 1962, notes that the East North Central States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin made the second largest percentage gain—33—during the period. In dollar amount, the increase was from $2.4 billion to $3.2 billion. Only the mountain region scored a greater increase. Of the five Midwestern States, the largest relative gains were by Indiana, 105 percent, and Wisconsin, 55 percent.

A previous report showed that East North Central States suffered the largest proportional loss of defense contracts from 1953 to 1960.

Gains in the last 2 years were due largely to increased buying of conventional military hardware for the Army—ranging from rifle ammunition to heavy trucks. The Midwest traditionally has provided the bulk of this equipment.

But the Midwest cannot continue to rely on this type of contract. More and more military contract money is going for complicated missile, aircraft and electronics equipment. Only those areas that make prior investments in the research and development that this new equipment requires stand much chance of winning major contracts.

The Department's largest report provides evidence that areas doing large-scale research and development collect the lion's share of procurement awards, too. The Pacific coast, which holds 46 percent of the military's research and development contracts, received nearly 28 percent of all fiscal 1962 procurement awards. By comparison, the five East North Central States share was 12.6 percent, compared with 11.5 percent in fiscal 1960.

Obviously, continued gains will require increased research and development work in the Midwest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the Senator from Wisconsin advocate a change in the procedures of the Department of Defense under which defense contracts are allocated on the basis of the lowest responsible bidder?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator may recall that I made a real fight on the floor of the Senate to provide such a change, specifically for competitive bidding on research and development contracts. That is not being provided for now. It is exception No. 11 in the procurement code. I feel that it should not be an exception. The people of the Senator's State, California, deserve great credit for the marvelous contribution they have made to defense. We in Wisconsin do not ask for favors. I am concerned about the situation, and we want to make sure that we get what is really due us and that we be given a greater opportunity to contribute to the defense of our country.

Mr. KUCHEL. When the Senator makes statements like "I want to make sure that we get what is due us," there are raised in my mind some questions, because the Senator from Wisconsin is a very able man. The Senator is a patriotic American. I am sure the Senator would agree with me wholeheartedly that the single function of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Defense is for the security of the American people. If the Secretary of Defense were to determine, in connection with a particular weapons system, that the development of that weapons system ought to go to individuals who are most qualified to develop it, I am sure the Senator would approve of the Secretary's action.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would indeed. When I said that we should get what is due us, I said that in the context of my full statement including competitive bidding. That is what I mean, we should get what we can earn. The firm that quotes the lowest price and is qualified to do the job should get it. If we in Wisconsin can do the job at a lower price, we should get it. Otherwise we should not get it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

MANITOWOC'S FRONT SPACE STORY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most interesting and, to us in Wisconsin, exciting developments of the space age has been the falling on Wisconsin soil of a part of one of the Russian sputniks. One such fragment fell on the streets in the city of Manitowoc, one of our principal cities in Wisconsin.

The officials of Manitowoc showed remarkable presence of mind and consideration for the national interest when they turned this fragment over to the Federal authorities. It was given to our delegate at the U.N., but it was rejected by the Russians. It is now being examined by some of our top scientists. It will give us some useful information on space and the effects of radiation.

This interesting incident is reported in an article published in the New York Times of yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1962]

United States Studies Bits of Spent Sputnik—Parts Found in Wisconsin Yield Radiation Data

(By Walter Sullivan)

More than a score of fragments from the first vehicle launched in the Soviet man-in-space program have been recovered in Wisconsin.

Debris from the disintegrating spaceship seems to be scattered along a 100-mile line traversing the State.

No passenger rode the 2½-ton vehicle when it was launched on May 15, 1960. It was one of two spaceships that went awry while attempting reentry early in the Soviet program. One burned up in the atmosphere. The other, because of improper aim, changed orbit when braking rockets ignited, but did not descend.

It was Sputnik IV that finally plunged into the atmosphere over Wisconsin last September 5. The recovered fragments include portions of a bronze spring that presumably scorched the grass where it landed on a golf course north of Milwaukee.

A number of metal beads rained on the roof of a church in Manitowoc. It stands on the corner where, early on September 5, the headlights of a police car disclosed a piece of metal embedded in the white centerline of the street.

A SCIENTIFIC PRIZE

This 20-pound fragment has proved to be both a scientific and political prize.

It is the first specimen known to have been recovered after a prolonged, but precisely known, period of exposure to the many forms of radiation in space close to the earth. This radiation comes from the sun, from the cosmos, and from the Van Allen belts. Its scars have demonstrated, conclusively, that the object fell from the sky.

It also enabled the U.S. representative on the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to make a dramatic offer of the specimen to the Russians on September 14. They declined to take it. But Dr. Anatoli A. Blagonravov, the Soviet space expert, was said to have looked closely at the specimen and smiled.

The search in Wisconsin may also turn up material that will disclose secret features of Soviet space technology, such as the type of material used on nose cones to dissipate heat on reentry.

Ironically, identification of the 20-pound specimen as an object from space by five American laboratories has been aided by the gift from Soviet scientists of specimens from two meteorites that fell on Soviet territory in recent years.

It is the similarity of the radioactivity found in those meteorites to that within the Wisconsin fragment that has convinced American scientists in recent days of the latter's origin. The presence of short-lived forms of radiation showed it had just fallen.

The fragment consists of a metal cylinder welded to a metal plate. Both are of steel, but one was cold rolled and the other was hot rolled. Embedded in the metal is a screw whose thread-spacing is of the European and Soviet type. The plate is 1 centimeter thick, likewise suggesting origin in a country that uses the metric system.

Although objects have been recovered from several Wisconsin communities, not all have been definitely identified as having come from space.

One fragment, found in Waupaca, proved to have been put there by a machinist as a hoax.

However, there appears to be no doubt about the many fragments found in Manitowoc. When police spotted the initial piece, at 5:30 a.m., on September 5, they thought it was a patch of cardboard. But on closer examination they found it to be a round piece of metal embedded 1 inch in the asphalt.

EMBEDDED IN ASPHALT

When they pried it out it was so hot they had difficulty carrying it to the curb, where they left it. They were unaware of the fireworks that had occurred 40 minutes earlier.

The sequence of events that culminated in those fireworks began several months ago when Spadats, the Space Detection and Tracking System at Ent Air Force Base in Colorado Springs, Colo., predicted that the capsule, Sputnik IV, would fall on or about September 6.

On August 28 the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge, Mass., asked its 750 moonwatch teams and individual observers all over the world to set a special watch. It was to be the start of a concerted effort to recover an object long exposed to radiation near the earth.

"We have chosen Sputnik IV as our first reentry observing satellite because it is the next large artificial earth satellite expected to reenter the earth's atmosphere after a long exposure to the space environment," the Observatory said.

A SCIENTIFIC TROPHY

A fragment would be a major scientific trophy, the notification said. However, in view of the vast ocean and desert areas onto which the pieces might fall, such a recovery on the first attempt seemed more than anyone could hope for.

On the night of September 4–5 the Milwaukee moonwatch team, led by Edward A. Halback, began the watch, as did numerous other teams, organized by the Observatory in Cambridge for such tasks.

One team member, Gale Highsmith, set up a homemade theodolite on a hill. The instrument consisted of 10-cent protractors and a 98-cent telescope mounted on a hoe handle.

He awaited the overhead flight of Sputnik IV, predicted for 4:58 a.m., central daylight time. At 4:49, as described by the Cambridge Observatory's SAO News, "the incredible happened." To the northwest, where the satellite was due, he saw a brilliant object that broke into six pieces as it passed to the north of him. One by one they snuffed out.

Near Green Bay, Wis., a busdriver saw the object. He and his passengers debarked hurriedly and saw a procession of 24 pieces pass directly overhead. Some observers reported hearing thunderous sounds.

SAMPLES DISTRIBUTED

When the Manitowoc police heard that Sputnik IV had plunged into the atmosphere overhead, they retrieved their 20-pound fragment and Mr. Highsmith flew with it to the Observatory in Cambridge. Six pounds of its metal was cut off and samples were sent to four other laboratories.

The Observatory dispatched Walter Munn of its meteorite-recovery network to hunt for more fragments. He found many of them.

On the lawn of the First Lutheran Church, near the corner where the original fragment fell, the son of the pastor found a cluster of metallic beads. Mr. Munn climbed onto the roof and found 15 more beads.

Presumably they came off the 20-pound fragment in flight as molten drops that hardened. From the same area Mr. Munn recovered a number of other bead clusters. Several more crusty fragments have been found.

Recovery efforts, described in SAO News and the Observatory's Sky and Telescope, are continuing. The finds are being deposited with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SPEED OF LIGHT

The radioactive substances, or isotopes, found in the initial sample had been produced by cosmic ray bombardment. These rays are atomic particles flying through space almost at the velocity of light, which is about 186,000 miles a second. Their energies often exceed those of the most powerful atom smashers.

The earth is protected from the primary rain of these particles by the shielding effect of its atmosphere and by the deflecting influence of its magnetic field.

The exposure of a meteorite to cosmic rays for millions or billions of years gives it a characteristic collection of radioactive substances. Some are long-lived and others halve their radioactivity in a few days. Capsules recovered from the Discover satellites in the U.S. military space program have displayed some of this radiation.

One of the Soviet specimens that aided in the analysis was from the Sikhote-Alin meteorite that fell on Siberia in 1947. At the Smithsonian Observatory results obtained from this object and from the Wisconsin sample were compared by Dr. Edward L. Fireman.

He found the roster of radioactive substances in the two bodies to be strikingly similar. Thus the Wisconsin fragment contained sufficient radioactive argon (argon 37) to produce five emissions a minute a kilogram. By comparison the meteorite argon produced 4.5 emissions.

EXPERT PUZZLED

At Brookhaven National Laboratory, at Upton, Long Island, Dr. Raymond Davis analyzed another specimen from the Wisconsin fragment and obtained a rate of six emissions a minute. However, he has been puzzled by the absence of tritium, a rare form of hydrogen with a nucleus containing two neutrons in addition to the single proton typical of hydrogen.

In November 1960, when both Sputnik IV and Discoverer 17 were in orbit, there was a fearsome eruption on the sun. After the Discoverer capsule had been recovered it was found that, embedded within it, were atoms of tritium and helium 3, both of them apparently shot directly from the sun into the metal.

One possible explanation for its absence in the Wisconsin specimen, Dr. Davis believes, is that the heat of reentry caused the tritium to escape.

The other Soviet specimen that proved useful was from the Aroos meteorite that fell in 1959. Its radioactive contents analyzed by the University of California at La Jolla, gave Dr. Julian P. Shedlovsky of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, in Pittsburgh, Pa., a basis for comparison.

He found the amounts of the various substances three or four times lower in the Wisconsin sample, possibly because of the shielding effects of the earth, below the vehicle, and the earth's magnetic field above it.

EXPLANATION SUGGESTED

However, one substance, manganese 54, was more abundant possibly, Dr. Shedlovsky believes, because Sputnik IV spent part of its early life exposed to the radiation of the Van Allen belt. While particle impacts on the vehicle would be far more numerous in the belt than those of cosmic rays, they would be weaker.

This should lead to a rich store of iron 55, which Dr. Shedlovsky has not yet tallied in his analysis. He and all the other investigators emphasized that their figures are preliminary. Long monitoring will be necessary to obtain precise radiation counts.

The other analysts were Dr. John T. Wasson of the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, in Bedford, Mass., and Dr. Ernest C. Anderson of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in New Mexico.

Some noted that, while the specimen certainly had fallen from the sky, there was no scientific way to link it to Sputnik IV. However, Dr. Fireman said it may ultimately be possible to tell, by the tally of radioactive materials in a specimen, the nature of its orbit.

For example the manned capsules of the United States have stayed near enough to the Equator to escape the solar protons that sometimes rain on the poles. Vehicles that orbit over the poles are exposed to those showers, as has been seen in the recovered Discoverer capsules. Meteorites, since they come from beyond the shield of the earth's magnetism, have been exposed for millenia to the full intensity of cosmic radiation.

VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY AT 60 MAKES SENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I wrote an article for the October issue of Eagle, the publication of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. This order, of course, is well known throughout the country for its devotion to the problems of the aged.

The aricle which I wrote is entitled "Social Security at 60." It is a discussion of my proposal to reduce the social security age from 62 to 60, so that persons may retire on a moderately reduced benefit at age 60.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY AT 60

(By WILLIAM PROXMIRE, U.S. Senator from Wisconsin)

On August 24 of this year, I introduced a bill in the Senate to lower the social security retirement age from 62 to 60. I did so in the belief that although our Nation is engaged in both a space race and an arms race and although it faces a multitude of other complex matters, no problems are more in need of solution than the economic and social difficulties posed by our consistently high rate of unemployment.

It is my hope that the Fraternal Order of Eagles, which has been in the forefront of the fight for social security, will join with me in this further step to improve, both socially and economically, our democratic system.

Our rate of unemployment dramatizes the fact that we are wasting our most precious resource: man and woman power. It means that the most affluent society in the history of man cannot provide millions of its citizenry with the self-respect and living standard that only a job can secure. For more than 10 years I have been visiting factory gates at dawn, in winter, and in summer. Over and over I hear that what these men and women want above all is an opportunity to retire while they still have a few years left in which to enjoy retirement.

Thus, to lower the voluntary retirement age under social security to 60 would help to reduce our unemployment rate in two ways. First it would free thousands of jobs for our younger workers if past action in this area is any guide. For example, the proportion of men 65 and older in the American labor force fell from 58 percent of men of that age in 1930 to 42 percent in 1950, thereby making jobs available to thousands of younger jobseekers.

Much the same thing happened when the age was lowered in 1961, from 65 to 62. In the first month alone over 100,000 people applied for this new program, and it is estimated that over 500,000 ultimately took advantage of this lower age during the first year. Certainly, then, the probability is that further jobs would be freed if the social security age were lowered once again.

This proposal would also affect unemployment by permitting the older worker who is unable to find a job to leave the labor market without going on relief. The impact from this exit of workers would also be quite significant because, as the July 1960 figures showed, 328,000 or well over a third of the unemployed workers aged 45 to 64 had been continuously unemployed for 15 weeks or longer, and in fact, 189,000 of them had been unemployed for more than 26 weeks. The Fraternal Order of Eagles, well versed on this problem, is doing much to help alleviate it through its jobs-after-40 program, which seeks to ban discrimination on the part of employers against hiring older workers.

The depth of this problem was well expressed by the White House Conference on the Aging in 1960: "No statistics can do justice to the effect of prolonged unemployment upon the older worker. There is no meaningful measure of discouragement and the sense of personal failure; no way to trace the consequences in terms of the medical care that the individual and his dependents do not get; the curtailed educational programs of his children; the drop in his family's day-by-day living standards; the slow attrition of skills and knowledge; the lowering of status in the community and loss of faith in a social and economic order that indefinitely denies him the opportunity to do useful work. The impact of such consequences upon young, resilient people can be serious, but it can destroy the older worker as a person, changing him, sometimes within months, from a social and economic asset to a liability."

Like the social implications, the reasons for this long-term unemployment among older workers seem reasonably clear and are well worth examination. One of the main reasons older men have difficulty securing employment stems from the policy of job discrimination so many of our Nation's employers pursue.

This policy has been vigorously opposed by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, with the support of citizens' groups, labor, many business firms, and by efforts at both the State and Federal level. In 16 States, through Eagle-sponsored legislation, this type of discrimination has been banned by law. In some areas it has been settled through voluntary cooperation. Unfortunately, however, as Margaret Gordon pointed out in the Monthly Labor Review, for November 1959, "Despite widespread efforts of both public and private agencies to break down barriers to the employment of older workers in recent years, there is little evidence that upper limits in hiring are becoming less prevalent in many areas."

But even if job discrimination can be eliminated, our older workers must still face the problem of educational obsolescene. The Department of Labor pointed out both the importance and inevitability of this problem when it stated, "Obsolescence of skills is part of the price of social progress. At any given time the aged population will reflect the patterns of education, of training, and of developed skills which were acquired a generation or more before.

"So far as the economy has progressed and has, therefore, developed or demanded new skills, so far is it likely that the aged will be less well equipped than the young to cope with the new requirements. Although attention should be given to mitigating this obsolescence, it seems at least strongly probable that it could never be overcome."

To be sure, our Nation has always faced this problem, but in the last decade it has reached critical proportions. The tremendous changes we have been experiencing have so drastically changed our job requirements that many of our efforts to combat these innovations seem doomed to failure. It hardly seems feasible, for example, to retrain machine operators or even machinists as physicists or engineers. Yet all too often just such training would be required to fulfill our employment needs.

Moreover, even if the worker should possess the necessary skills to secure work, he may find that in order to actually hold a job, he must leave his friends, his lifelong home, perhaps members of his family and give up a multitude of other things which he may greatly cherish. As the 1960 White House Conference on Aging so eloquently put it, "The hardest hit, when industry dies in a small town or city, are the older people, those whose ties are by all odds the strongest, who have inherited, bought, or built, and paid for their homes, who have firm standing in the community, and who want to die and be buried there."

All of these problems and the many more which the elderly unemployed worker must face imposes a burden on these people. Our Nation must direct its best efforts toward solving these complex problems, recognizing, however, that even our best efforts are likely to fall far short of eliminating these difficult problems. After expending our best efforts are we, as former Secretary Ribicoff put it, going to say to these people, "go on up to your welfare offices and ask for a handout," or are we going to say, "If you cannot get a job and new industries coming in won't hire you, at least you can have the option of retiring and getting social security benefits."

These are two of the most important questions our country must face and answer. To me the answer is obvious. We must provide our older citizens, who can no longer work, with the option of receiving the benefits under social security for which they have contributed and worked so hard all their lives.

THE HANDLING OF CONTRACTS UNDER THE STOCKPILE PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call the attention of the Senate to another contract which was negotiated under our stockpile program wherein it does not appear that the interests of the Government were properly protected. I suggest that this may be another contract, the handling of which, the Symington committee will want to examine.

This case involves a contract negotiated on October 4, 1951, by the General Services Administration with the National Lead Co. The Government entered into this as a firm commitment to buy for delivery over a 6½-year period, at a fixed price, certain quantities of nickel, cobalt, and copper, and the National Lead Co. under this contract entered into a similar firm commitment to deliver these quantities of metals, at the prices agreed upon.

After the contract had been signed, however, the market price of nickel, cobalt, and copper increased substantially, and 5 years later the result was, that no deliveries had been made under this contract.

By December 18, 1956, the total market price of the commodities under this contract—upon which no deliveries had been made—had advanced over $7 million above the contract price. Instead of the Government insisting upon delivery, or upon a payment in lieu, of nondelivery, the Government in 1956 negotiated a new contract—DMP-131—under which they released the National Lead Co. of all its obligations for delivery under the original contract. The Government then, under a new contract, gave the National Lead Co. "put" rights for a comparable amount of nickel, cobalt, and copper at the prevailing higher market price.

Under the second contract these "put" rights meant that the Government was obliged to take the specified quantities of metals at the prices named, but the company was not obligated to furnish.

The market prices named in the second contract were at a level which would cost the Government approximately $7 million more than the first contract, which was being canceled. There may be some explanation for this multi-million-dollar windfall, but as yet I have not found it.

Subsequently the market price of nickel advanced even further, and since under the second contract, delivery of cobalt and copper was contingent upon the company delivering comparable amounts of nickel, the National Lead Co. was again caught in a position of having to furnish nickel at a price lower than the market price or forfeit its right to deliver cobalt and copper. The price of the cobalt and copper had declined while the price of nickel was higher.

Again, the Government on October 28, 1957, further amended the contract to permit the company to sell its nickel elsewhere upon payment to the Government of the difference between the market and contract prices, and one-half of such amount above the market price as the contractor might receive for its nickel.

This now left the National Lead Co. free to make deliveries of cobalt and copper, both of which in the meantime had declined below the "put" price.

As of January 1, 1960, the contractor's right to tender cobalt had been reduced to 3,660,000 pounds, and its right to tender copper reduced to 3,600,000 pounds. Now the Government decided that it wanted to cancel the contract.

On January 6, 1960, the contract was canceled and the contractor's "put" rights as to the remaining cobalt and copper eliminated. By this time cobalt had declined from the contract price of $2.60 per pound to $1.75 per pound, while copper had declined from $0.36 to $0.34 per pound.

The total difference between the contract and market prices as to the remaining tonnage of copper and cobalt to which the Government was committed, after certain credits, was approximately $2,500,000. This amount, $2,500,000, was paid to the National Lead Co. in "electrolytic nickel" from the DPA inventory priced at market.

Thus we have this situation. In 1951 the Government signed a fixed-price, firm-delivery contract with the National Lead Co. for certain quantities of nickel, cobalt, and copper. The market advanced over $7 million, but the company made no deliveries. The Government waived its right to any of this profit and canceled this contract in 1956 and then signed a new contract at the prevailing higher market price. This time the Government was obliged to buy a fixed quantity at a fixed price, but the company was not obliged to deliver. In 1960, at which time about half of the quantities under this contract still remained to be delivered and the market having declined $0.85 per pound on cobalt and $0.02 per pound on copper, the Government wanted to cancel, and now the National Lead Co. required the Government to pay them $2½ million cancellation charge.

A more detailed history of this contract is as follows:

Contract (GS-OOP—(D)—12095) signed Oct. 4, 1951

	Nickel	Cobalt	Copper
Tonnage (pounds)	9,261,000	6,930,000	7,087,500
Prices (pound)	$0.474	$1.845	$0.214
Period of delivery (years)	6½	6½	6½
Total deliveries as of Dec. 18, 1956	0	0	0
Market price Dec. 18, 1956	$0.74	$2.35	$0.36050
Increase of market value Dec. 18, 1956, over contract price	$2,463,426	$3,499,650	$1,038,318

NOTE.—Total $7,001,394 equal market increase Dec. 18, 1956.

This was a firm purchase agreement contract, but no deliveries were made. By December 18, 1956, the market price of the undelivered material under this contract had increased $7,001,394. Notwithstanding the fact that this potential profit belonged to the Government the contract was canceled, and the company was released from its liability to furnish the metals.

This cancellation was not made on the basis that the Government did not need the materials because on the same day that this old contract was canceled, December 18, 1956, a new contract—DMP-131—was signed.

Under this contract the firm delivery requirements of the old contract were changed to "put" rights with a provision tying the right to "put" cobalt and copper to the quantity of nickel tendered.

The "put" rights under the second contract were as follows:

Contract DMP–131, Dec. 18, 1956

	Nickel	Cobalt	Copper
Quantity (pounds)	9,240,000	7,320,000	7,200,000
Prices to be paid	$0.65	[1] $2.60	$0.36
Period of delivery (years)	6	5	6

[1] This price was $0.25 per pound over the prevailing market price of that same date.

On October 28, 1957, the price of nickel was $0.74 per pound, or 9 cents per pound higher than the "put" price in the contract, so the Government again amended this contract to release the company of its requirement that the amount of cobalt and copper tendered was to be tied to the amount of nickel delivered. Accordingly—on October 28, 1957—the second contract was further changed to permit the contractor to sell its nickel elsewhere upon payment to the Government of the difference between the market and contract prices, and one-half of such amount above the market price as the contractor might receive for its nickel but still allowing the company to deliver cobalt and copper.

The company then delivered the following amounts of cobalt and copper to the Government under the "put" rights of the second contract:

	Cobalt	Copper
Amount delivered (pounds)	2,885,789	2,840,000

As of January 1, 1960, the contractor's right to tender cobalt had been reduced to 3,660,000 pounds and its right to tender copper had been reduced to 3,600,000 pounds—nickel having been eliminated from the contract in 1957 as indicated above.

By this time the price of cobalt had declined from the contract "put" price of $2.60 per pound to $1.75 per pound, representing a drop of 85 cents per pound, and copper declined from 36 cents to 34 cents per pound, or a decline of 2 cents per pound.

Thus as of January 6, 1960, the Government faced a potential loss of $3,183,000 on the undelivered portion of the contract, but now the Government decided that it did not need these metals and advised the company that it wanted to cancel the contract.

On January 6, 1960, the contract was canceled as to the contractor's "put" rights on the remaining cobalt and copper. Under the terms of this cancellation $2,500,000 was paid to the National Lead Co. as a cancellation charge. This payment was made in electrolytic nickel from the DPA inventory priced at market.

An argument was made that this $2½ million payment was in part an offset for a $3 million investment which the company had made in a plant which as a part of this cancellation agreement they were turning back to the Government. But an examination of this claim not only refutes the argument but raises more questions. For instance, this was the plant arrangement:

The National Lead Co. did convey to the Government title to certain facilities but the Government promptly leased these back to the National Lead Co. for 6 years for only a token payment.

Under the original contract the Government had advanced $7,500,000 toward the construction of the refinery. No repayment had been made either on the principal or on the interest of this $7,500,000 advance. The National Lead Co. claims that it had spent around $3 million of its own funds to complete this refinery which was being returned to the Government. But as the company turned this refinery over to the Government at the same time it obtained a lease for a period of 6 years at a rental of $600,000 per year; however, rent for the first 5 years was waived in recognition of National Lead Co.'s investment of $3 million in the Fredericktown, Mo., facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated September 6, 1962, together with a tabulation of contract information, and a letter dated September 19, 1962, both letters signed by Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, Director of General Services Administration.

There being no objection, the letters and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C. September 6, 1962.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: With further reference to your letter of August 21, we are enclosing information concerning contracts with the National Lead Co.

All of the contracts listed were purchase contracts, except for No. 12095, which was an expansion type contract. The latter contract was the only one on which a concellation was involved. The cancellation occurred simultaneously with the execution of a new contract, No. DMP–131, on December 18, 1956.

In accordance with your request for market price information, we have indicated on the attachment, appropriate prices prevailing on December 18, 1956, when No. 12095 was succeeded by No. 131; on October 28, 1957, when No. 131 was amended to eliminate the nickel "put"; and on January 6, 1960, when copper and cobalt were eliminated from the contract.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard L. Boutin,
Administrator.

Contract No.	Date	Commodity	Tonnage (short tons)	Price	Period of delivery	Delivered
SCM-TS-13908	Feb. 15, 1949	Lead, antimonial	3,800	Market month prior to shipment	February, March, April, and May, 1949.	
		Lead, common, contractor's option to furnish corroding or chemical.	7,600	do	do	
SCM-TS-14340	May 2, 1949	Lead, corroding	200	$0.151 per pound	Shipment May 15, 1949	
GS-OOP-3759 (SCM).	Oct. 30, 1952	do	1,200	Market specified month of shipment.	800 short tons November 1952 400 short tons December 1952	2,399,894 pounds.

GS–OOP(D)–12095 (succeeded by contract DMP–131) Oct. 4, 1951

	Nickel	Cobalt	Copper
Tonnage (pounds)	9,261,000	6,930,000	7,087,500
Price per pound	$0.474	$1.845	$0.214
Period of delivery (years)	6½	6½	6½
Total deliveries (pounds)	0	2,865,780	2,840,000
Contract in effect amended on Dec. 18, 1956;[1] among other things the prices to be paid were set at	$0.65	$2.60	$0.36
Undelivered portion at time of increase in price	(2)	(2)	(2)

[1] Under the amendment (actually a new contract) the contractor conveyed to the Government the title to the contract facilities, which the Government in turn leased back to National Lead Co. for 6 years. The firm delivery requirements as to metals produced were changed to "put" rights with an appropriate provision tying the right to put cobalt and copper to the quantity of nickel tendered.

On Oct. 28, 1957, the contract was further amended to permit the contractor to sell its nickel elsewhere upon payment to the Government of the difference between the market and contract prices, and ½ of such amount above the market price as the contractor might receive for its nickel.

On Jan. 6, 1960, the contract was further amended to cancel the contractor's "put" rights as to the remaining cobalt and copper, nickel having been eliminated in 1957. The difference between the contract and market prices as to the remaining tonnage to which the Government was exposed, after giving effect to counter credits growing out of the contractor's lease obligation, $2,500,000 was paid to the contractor in electrolytic nickel from the DPA inventory priced at market. The long-term lease was canceled and a firm lease for 9 months with 30-day extension privileges was signed. Subsequently, in April 1961, the lease was finally terminated and the facility was vacated by the contractor.

It should be stated that the original contract was designed to create capacity, nonexistent in the United States, to treat the intermediate residues from the contractor's own lead and zinc operation, to increase the supply of nickel, cobalt, and copper.

The original contract entailed the advance by the Government of $5,000,000, later increased by amendment to $7,500,000 to the contractor for the construction of the refinery, later as shown above, turned over to the Government after the contractor had expended some $3,000,000 of its own funds to complete.

Market prices

	Nickel	Cobalt	Copper
Dec. 18, 1956	$0.74	$2.35	[a] $0.36050
Oct. 28, 1957	.74		
Jan. 6, 1960		1.75	[a] .34

[a] Delivered.

[2] No prior delivery.

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1962.

Hon. **John J. Williams,**
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: This is to confirm the information furnished you by a member of our Defense Materials Service staff concerning contracts GS–OOP(D)–12095 and DMP–131 with National Lead Co., involving facilities at Fredericktown, Mo., in response to questions you raised upon receipt of our letter of September 6.

Contract DMP–131 provided "put" rights to National Lead Co. for 9,240,000 pounds of nickel, 7,320,000 pounds of cobalt, and 7,200,000 pounds of copper, over a period of 6 years from the effective date, which was December 1, 1956.

As of January 1, 1960, the contractor's right to tender cobalt had been reduced to 3,660,000 pounds and to tender copper had been reduced to 3,600,000 pounds. As you know, nickel had been eliminated from the contract.

The term of the lease originally provided under contract DMP–131 was 6 years with a rental of $600,000 per year. However, rent for the first 5 years was waived in recognition of National Lead Co.'s investment of more than $3 million in the Fredericktown facilities. This lease continued for 3 years and 1 month, through December 31, 1959, when by the amendment of January 6, 1960, it was converted to a firm lease for 9 months, with the right of the lessee to continue thereafter on a month-to-month basis. The contractor did continue in possession through April 30, 1961. The rental was at the rate of $190,000 per annum or 6½ percent of gross sales, whichever is greater.

There were no repayments on the $7,500,000 of advances made to construct the facilities.

The market price of nickel on January 6, 1960, was 74 cents per pound.

The first contract, GS–OOP(D)–12095, was a firm purchase agreement, while the second contract, DMP–131, was of the floor price type with "put" rights in National Lead. No deliveries were made under the first contract, as the facilities were just reaching the production stage when contract DMP–131 was executed. Thus, the deliveries shown in the tabulation accompanying our letter of September 6 were made under contract DMP–131.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard L. Boutin,
Administrator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. **Proxmire** in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. **Kathryn E. Granahan,** of Pennsylvania, to be Treasurer of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John G. Green, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination will be passed over.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE IN CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICT NO. 10

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Stramiello, Jr., of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In his capacity as a Senator from Wisconsin, the Chair suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I regret that I had not been informed that objection had been raised to all the nominations on the Executive Calendar. I knew of the objection to the consideration of one nomination; but the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin has just informed the acting majority leader that he has objection to the consideration of all three nominations unless all three may be taken up and confirmed. On that basis, I move that the action by which the nomination of Mrs. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania, to be Treasurer of the United States was confirmed be vacated.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to comment with respect to the foreign aid appropriation bill conference report which was approved today. I have noted with considerable interest that the press has called our attention to the fact that the item of foreign aid was sharply reduced from the administration's original request. Certain items in the foreign aid appropriation bill were too sharply reduced.

I recognized the problem in the conference committee. I have served on many conferences. I know that foreign aid is essentially a process of compromise. But I remind the Senate that the cuts that were made in the Development Loan Fund, that is, in the loan section of the bill, were cuts which I think were too deep.

I also feel that the process of negotiation in conference, by which these substantial cuts were agreed to, will in the months ahead cause the administration of the AID program some difficulty.

This morning the New York Times published an editorial entitled "Future of Foreign Aid." It may very well be that the editorial has already been referred to. In a sense, I believe it forewarns both Congress and the administration of the future of foreign aid.

First, it seems to me, there has been a growing lack of understanding on the part of Congress concerning what the foreign aid program has done, is doing, and can do. This results in less support for the program.

It was my privilege to be in charge of the foreign aid appropriation bill during the Senate's consideration of it. I well recognize the closeness of many votes, the sharp opposition having been registered not against the program as such, but against the amount of the program. I want the AID administration and the Department of State to have the overall responsibility for the AID program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> [From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1962]
>
> FUTURE OF FOREIGN AID
>
> The Kennedy administration is reported to be getting some satisfaction out of the conference version of the foreign aid bill, passed by the House, on the philosophic ground that the final bill might have been worse. This is no doubt true, but certainly no enthusiasm can be expected from the supporters of foreign aid.
>
> The final compromise appropriation of $3,928,900,000 reflects a cut of about 20 percent below the President's original request. Almost $300 million of this shortfall is concentrated in the appropriation for long-term development loans. The compromise does give the President discretionary authority with regard to economic aid for Poland and Yugoslavia and for non-Communist countries whose ships move goods to Cuba.
>
> With the sobering lesson of this long and bitter foreign aid battle behind it, the administration can have no illusions about the task it will face again next year in this field. The rising tide of congressional impatience with foreign aid could really result in disaster in the future if prompt action is not taken soon to find the bases of this discontent and to act against them. In seeking to change the climate of congressional opinion the administration will need very much the help of recipient countries which should be aware of their own self-interest in presenting vivid proof soon of important economic and political gains made with our help.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the editorial reads, in part, as follows:

> The final compromise appropriation of $3,928,900,000 reflects a cut of about 20 percent below the President's original request. Almost $300 million of this shortfall is concentrated in the appropriation for long-term development loans. The compromise does give the President discretionary authority with regard to economic aid for Poland and Yugoslavia and for non-Communist countries whose ships move goods to Cuba.
>
> With the sobering lesson of this long and bitter foreign aid battle behind it, the administration can have no illusions about the task it will face again next year in this field. The rising tide of congressional impatience with foreign aid could really result in disaster in the future if prompt action is not taken soon to find the bases of this discontent and to act against them.

I have said a number of times that if the AID administration is really to be able to interpret what the foreign aid program does for the people at home and for people in other parts of the world, we must learn to interpret the program as being something else besides the dollar sign.

When people hear of an appropriation of $3,900 million or $4 billion, they justifiably take a long look at it, because it represents a great sum of money. For some peculiar reason, there is a lack of communication between the aid program and the American people and, in fact, people in other parts of the world.

I wonder why we do not talk about what the aid.program does, for example, in connection with the projects which are underway and the jobs which are supplied, both at home and abroad. I wonder how many Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have ever tried to evaluate what it would mean to our economy if the aid program were dropped, in view of the fact that 78 to 80 cents out of every dollar for the aid program is spent in the United States, for goods and services from the United States. What does this program mean in district after district and in State after State? Every time we consider a public works bill, someone reminds the Congress, "This will mean great things for my district. It will mean new jobs, new employment, new business."

Yet, Mr. President, every year the foreign aid program does more for the American economy than do all the public works programs put together.

What does the aid program do overseas? It builds homes. It helps establish sound governments. It maintains friends in power. It permits countries to have programs of public help. It provides for education for millions of children. It builds schools, railroads, roads, harbors, public facilities. It provides for processing and manufacturing, and for some degree of modernization in agriculture. These are just a few of the things the aid program does.

So I suggest to the AID administration that it should begin to interpret this program in some way other than by means of an accountant's sheet or a budget document, or as if the only thing involved were a bank statement. After all, there is scarcely anything much more old, barren, and sterile than a set of figures on a ledger sheet. This program needs some good, red blood, so to speak, and some vitality. It needs interpretation on the basis of the human factors and the industrial, economic, and social developments involved. Perhaps one of these days someone will interpret the foreign aid program on the basis of what it does for people, for children, for agriculture, for land, for water, for all the natural resources.

Mr. President, the American people are doers and builders. They understand programs which result in construction and worthwhile developments. But when they are constantly told of nothing except a balance sheet or expended funds, unexpended funds, obligated funds, and unobligated funds, that is a kind of political kangaroo that few persons understand.

Instead, why do not those in charge of our AID program speak of it in terms of the number of houses that have been built, the number that are in process of construction, and the additional number on the drawing boards, instead of all the "baloney" about obligated funds, unobligated funds, expended funds, and unexpended funds. Only a few of our people are cost accountants. The American people are interested in doing things, in creating things. The trouble with the administration of our foreign aid program is that those in charge attempt to explain it in bookkeepers' terms and accountants' and bankers' terms. Instead it needs to be presented in terms of engineering projects, scientific projects, teaching projects, doctors' projects, and a host of other projects that have definite meaning to people. Of course, accounting is needed, and so are balance sheets. It is true that we need to know how much money we have, how much money we need, how much more will be needed a year from now, and so forth.

But when General Motors gets ready to sell its 1963 automobiles, it does not publish in the Saturday Evening Post its ledger statement, together with a fantastic accounting sheet punched full of holes—something that very few of our people can understand. Similarly, when an insurance company is engaging in a sales program, it does not publish its cost and expenditure statements. Instead, it uses advertisements that have definite meaning to the mass of the people—for example, an advertisement showing a mother and her child. The child is asking, "Where is daddy?" Or it publishes an advertisement with a picture of a grandfather and a grandmother who are content and comfortable because of the payments they are receiving from an annuity. Undoubtedly a definite sum of money is involved; but the advertisements concentrate on the symbols of the happy grandfather and grandmother, or the happy family with a home and a car—all made possible because of insurance. The insurance companies do not base their advertisements on statistical statements of obligated funds, unobligated funds, expenditures, balances, and all that gibberish.

The trouble with the foreign aid program is that in explaining it to the public, those in charge of it concentrate on the dollar amounts involved, instead of explaining the program in terms of the security of the United States, the security of other nations, the prosperity and welfare of our country, and the prosperity and welfare of other countries. Certainly our whole country would be better off if those who discuss our foreign aid program were to begin to talk of what is obtained for the dollars that are spent, instead of just referring to the dollar amounts involved.

Similarly, so far as the funds spent for military purposes are concerned, few people would know what our military expenditures stand for if we did not have the flyovers with the Blue Angels and the other spectaculars. Not enough of our administrators have discussed these programs in terms of the dreams for the future and what can be the promise for man.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Minnesota has been stating what these programs mean in terms of employment and employees in the United States, as a result of the foreign aid extended by us to other countries. He has stated that from 78 to 80 percent of these funds is actually spent in the United States.

However, let me point out that the other 20 to 22 percent is not spent in other highly industrialized countries. In short, the only money that is spent in other countries is spent in lesser developed countries. So such expenditures do not react against us, in connection with our balance-of-payments problem.

The Senator from Minnesota has referred to what this program means in terms of employment. I should like to mention an example in that connection; after all, if we speak only in general terms, people may not be aware of the specifics.

In June, I was informed that a plant in the Birmingham area was to be closed. It is a subsidiary of United States Steel. One of the plants there is a rail-rolling plant. We learned that that plant was about to be closed, and that more than 1,200 people would lose their jobs.

At about that time the United States made a loan to Pakistan—or had just agreed to make such a loan—for the rehabilitation of the railroads in Pakistan. Involved in that was the purchase of steel rails.

I took up with Mr. Hamilton and his associates in the aid program the problem involved in the prospective closing of the plant in the Birmingham area. I did so in an effort to ascertain whether a contract for the plant could be obtained.

I found that such a contract was obtainable, under a competitive bidding arrangement; and a $9 million contract was awarded. As a result, that plant—instead of closing on July 1, the date which had definitely been set as the closing date—continued to operate, and is operating today, and 1,200 people remain employed—whereas in the absence of that contract, they would not have employment in that community. That is but one of many examples of gains in employment as a result of this program, entirely aside from the consideration of the dollar benefits to that community; and throughout the country there are many, many other cases of that sort, which so many persons are prone to overlook.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed so; and I thank the Senator from Alabama. No man is more intimately acquainted with the operation of the foreign aid program than is the distinguished Senator from Alabama or the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright]. Others are acquainted with the foreign aid program, but these two Senators have taken the lead in managing the authorizations for what I would like to call mutual security. During the process we get reams of testimony, thousands upon thousands of pages, many thousands of words of testimony, from some of the most able officials we have in Government.

I want to conclude my remarks on the foreign aid problem by saying I know there have been mistakes. As the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], who spoke ably and brilliantly on this subject said, we do need tightening up. We cannot condone waste. We ought to exercise every possible rule of discipline and self-discipline to eliminate waste.

The AID administration has now appointed a sort of comptroller general, or an officer to watch over all of the expenditures, Mr. Mansfield, who used to be with the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Committee on Government Operations. I believe this particular office of postaudit will be very helpful.

I think, however, that we ought to keep in mind that it is the mistake, it is the error in judgment, it is the horrible example every so often that gets in the news. For example, if we have a project which goes wrong in South America—and we have had some—there is always a subcommittee of Congress that investigates, and that project makes the news. That is the headline story. But I want to say some of the good news needs to be recited as well, the good news, for example, that, because of our foreign aid and food for peace program, 42 million children in Latin America, north Africa, and the Middle East, are getting school lunches. And they know where it is coming from, because in every schoolroom in every one of those countries there is a sign, literally as big as this wall, that says, "This food is a gift from the people of the United States to the children of this country," whatever the country may be.

I have seen it. I have come home to tell the story, but I cannot get much news coverage out of it. But if I had come home and said, "Do you know what they are doing with that food? They are stealing it or blackmarketing it," they would say, "There is news, Senator Humphrey." But was it news to learn that in thousands of classrooms all over the world, which we helped build, where there are teachers we helped educate and train, there was a lunch program that we helped provide? Oh, no, that was not news. That is like loving your mother—it is not news.

There is something wrong—we are fed on news of evil, on bad news, rather than good news. The foreign aid program has much good in it. Malaria is being eradicated throughout the world. Thousands of young Americans were victims of malaria during World War II. Throughout Africa tropical diseases are being conquered as a result of the foreign aid program, the medical program of the foreign aid program, and through cooperation with the World Health Organization.

Thousands and thousands of young persons are being trained as technicians, through the foreign aid program, to help make a better country and a better world. Through foreign aid we are teaching people to help themselves build their own homes and put in some sanitation facilities. We are building farm-to-market roads. One of the real problems in Latin America is a lack of roads from producing areas in the back country to the cities. Without communication and transportation, there is no market. We are helping that situation through our foreign aid program. We have irrigated millions of acres of land through Africa, north Africa, and the Middle East.

We have brought about some good with foreign aid, and I think the program deserves a pat on the back, instead of only a kick in the pants. I think it needs a better understanding on the part of the people. That does not mean whenever there is a mistake we ought not to do something about it. In fact, I have suggested that whenever mismanagement is discovered, Members of Congress and of the foreign aid administration should be dispatched to investigate and to bring back a report. If someone is responsible, fire him; do not give him some kind of a nice chit-chat. Get somebody new. Apply some high standards and discipline. But when someone does a good job, honor him; give him some honor.

One of the troubles with the foreign aid program is that every person who works for it is under a cloud of suspicion. We have had so much criticism of the foreign aid program that everyone who works for it feels he has to constantly justify his very existence. I do not know that that is necessary. For example, I know Mr. Hamilton is doing a good job. I am not in a position to know whether the job is as good as the Government wants it to be, but he is conscientious. I know he is able. I know he is honest. I know he wants to get the most out of every dollar we spend. I think he deserves a chance. He cannot have a chance if he lives in a political environment in which every time he walks down the street someone pops out from behind a political tree and takes a whack at him. He deserves a chance, and this program deserves support. That is why this Senator has worked for it.

I also know it is not always so popular back home to be for foreign aid, but the purpose of men in public life is not to engage in popularity contests. The place to do that is in Hollywood. I think what we should engage in is a contest of dedication to the public interest. I happen to believe that the foreign aid program is necessary to our national security. I think it is as vital as our atomic energy program, our nuclear program, and our defense program. I think if we weaken it or chip away at it and discredit it, we will end up doing harm to our own security.

I do not think every dollar the administration asks for should be granted willy-nilly. Let me put that idea at rest at once. I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee conscientiously goes over every request made under this program. We look into it meticulously. I sit on the Appropriations Committee. I know that committee takes a good, hard look.

I read in the press that a Member of the other body seems to have undue influence about the final figure of appropriations for foreign aid. I hope that is fiction, and not fact. I think it is. I do not believe any deals were made. I know it makes a nice story. There was a rumor running about, but I am convinced this program needs to be judged on its merits.

One final word and I want to conclude my remarks by calling to the attention of the Senate the editorial I read from the New York Times, entitled "Financial Veto." It relates to the continued problem of United Nations finances. I am deeply concerned about what is happening in the U.N., with many new nations becoming members. The new figure is 108 member nations.

According to the most recent report, the United Nations, despite the bond issue, finds itself in serious financial difficulties. As of August 31, the United Nations owed $139.7 million against net cash resources of $33.3 million. Certain nations have not paid their assessments. Certain nations have not paid their obligations. These nations are found not alone in the Soviet bloc. France, Belgium, South Africa, and the Arab countries are in arrears or have not paid up their obligations.

Mr. Frank Aiken, the Irish Minister for External Affairs, a position equivalent to that of our Secretary of State, calls this a financial veto. As the Soviet Union has used the veto more than 100 times in the Security Council literally to incapacitate the Security Council, to deny the Security Council the authority it is supposed to have under the charter, now certain nations by their refusal to pay their obligations are exercising a financial veto, a new kind of veto, over the U.N. operations.

I am hopeful that in this session of the United Nations—and I have spoken of this before—our country will press in the General Assembly and with the appropriate committees for a resolution of these financial difficulties. We ought to insist upon an outlined program for financing the U.N. I have mentioned this in the Senate on several occasions, during the discussion of the U.N. bond issue, and within the past month.

During the summer I had one of the interns who was assigned to me from one of our universities do some research work in the field of the financing of U.N. operations. I am convinced that the United Nations needs a financial officer. Exactly as we have a Secretary of the Treasury, the United Nations needs a financial secretary. I think our own Government ought to take the lead in seeing to it that there is financial responsibility in the United Nations. Otherwise the U.N. can be paralyzed by financial weakness or can die of economic anemia. There may be the shell of the U.N. with all the trappings of the U.N.—the buildings, the delegates' lounge, the assembly hall, the Security Council Chamber, the trustee chamber, and so on—but there will be no vitality.

The United Nations is important to the world in which we live. It is important to our foreign policy. If the United Nations were to collapse, the whole structure of American foreign policy would have to be revised. The only nation which would not have to revise its foreign policy upon the collapse of the United Nations would be the Soviet Union. When will this story be driven home to the American people? The Soviet Union wants the United Nations to be weak. It does not insist that the U.N. buildings be torn down. It does not insist that the charter be scrapped. It insists only that whatever happens in the U.N. be ineffective. It insists only that the U.N. be powerless. And it is doing everything it can to make the U.N. powerless.

I believe that the Government of the United States, which has predicated its foreign policy since 1945 upon membership of the United Nations, has as much at stake in the United Nations and in its strength, its resiliency, its effectiveness, and its solvency as it has in any other single institution in our national or international life.

I believe that when the storm warnings are up we should do everything we can to prepare for the days ahead. There will be some difficult and dark hous. I am hopeful that despite the crisis in Berlin, the problems with respect to Cuba, and the host of other problems which plague us, we will not forget the United Nations itself, which should be high on the agenda of American priorities.

Think how fortunate it is, Mr. President, that the United Nations headquarters is in our own country now. The Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, has been there day after day consulting with the foreign ministers and leaders of all the 108 countries. It provides a very convenient forum for our statesmen and our leaders.

Some of the most encouraging developments of recent days are to be found in the conferences which Secretary Rusk has been conducting. I think he has been doing an admirable job. I think his record of performance should warm the heart of every American and give us new confidence. His recent meetings with the foreign ministers of the Latin-American countries was a milestone of progress between our country and our neighbors to the south, particularly as it relates to the difficult problem concerning Cuba. Also, Secretary Rusk has been pursuing relentlessly but quietly and with statesmanlike conduct our relationships with other countries, trying to find some way to resolve some of the differences which now exist between ourselves and others. In the meantime, he is building friends and allies.

Make no mistake about it, before January 1, 1963, this country will be faced with some tough decisions. The President of the United States and the Congress will be faced with the issue of the survival of this Nation. Basic principles of foreign policy will be challenged in the corridors leading to Berlin, challenged in the Caribbean, and challenged in southeast Asia.

We are in for a hard winter. We shall find, unless we are prepared to meet those challenges—and they will come from many directions—that much of what we have built and much of what we have worked for will start to fall apart.

This is why I believe Secretary Rusk's conferences are so vital. I commend him for his foresight. I commend the President for charging the Secretary with this responsibility and for trying to look to the future to see what can be done and how we can build a stronger body of free nations to stand up against the constant probing and pressuring by the Soviet Union.

I do not think we should for a moment dismiss the rumors or even the direct talk which comes to us about Berlin. It has been said in high places—and it should be spread on the public record—that between now and January, possibly in November or December, basic decisions will be made in respect to Berlin, and we will be challenged there. Our presence will be challenged there. This will be a test of American strength, of NATO, of our resolve, of our policy, of our statesmanship, and of our courage.

I commend the American press for constantly reminding us of this without trying to be jingostic or inflammatory. Some excellent articles are appearing every day about the problem. Over the past weekend a number of them were published.

Mr. Khrushchev is preparing the way for the showdown decision upon Berlin. He is trying to force our hand in Cuba. He continues, through his international

Communist apparatus, to nibble at southeast Asia.

This is why, Mr. President, I feel that every bold decision we make—on foreign aid, on military defense items, on our economy, on the United Nations, on the Alliance for Progress—is vital, and every one has to be weighed very carefully. This is why I sincerely believe we can be penny wise and pound foolish. We can look like we are doing well today, only to build for ourselves troubles tomorrow if we try to skimp, if we try to cut corners, when we ought to be preparing for the most crucial hours of our Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Financial Veto" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCIAL VETO

As everyone knows, the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council can block any decision by interposing a veto, and the Soviet representatives have frequently invoked this right.

But another type of veto, undefined in the statutes of the United Nations, is being used effectively by the Soviet bloc, by France, Belgium, South Africa, and the Arab countries. This is what Frank Aiken, Irish Minister for External Affairs, calls the financial veto, the refusal to contribute to funds that the United Nations urgently needs for its peace-keeping operations in the Congo and in the Middle East.

The annual cost of keeping the peace in the Congo and the Middle East is $140 million. Fifty-one nations have not contributed a penny to the Congo operations. Twelve are in arrears. Twenty-six have not paid anything to the Middle East fund, and 24 are in arrears. This record is deplorable and dangerous.

Despite the $200 million bond issue, and the decision of Congress authorizing the administration to match bond purchases by other countries up to a maximum of $100 million, the United Nations is in dire financial straits. As of August 21 the United Nations owed $139,700,000 against net cash resources of $33,300,000. The prospects for the next few months are hardly any brighter, as debts are expected to increase almost as rapidly as new funds come in.

With the most recent admissions there are today 108 member nations. The security of all, particularly of the new and small members, is involved in the continuation of the United Nations. Collapse of the world organization due to the "financial veto" is inadmissible; yet it looms as a dire—and real—possibility.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield the floor. [Applause.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have a staff member try to reach the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who I believe is in the cloakroom, and to whom I have agreed to yield. He has a very sad announcement to make. While waiting for the Senator from California, I shall address the Senate on another subject.

CHAPLAIN FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, 2 years ago the Chaplain of the Senate, Chaplain Harris, made an official trip to Hawaii on behalf of the Senate. At the time I not only was familiar with that trip, but also I was one who recommended that the Chaplain should make the trip to Hawaii. For some unexplained reason, that trip has been subjected to very unfair and unjust criticism of the Chaplain, giving the impression that the Chaplain took some junket. Some time ago a story appeared in the Christian Century criticizing the Chaplain's trip.

In a letter to the editor under date of September 26, 1962, the Chaplain replied to that article. I ask unanimous consent that the article and the Chaplain's letter in the Christian Century replying to the unfair and unjust attack upon him for the official Senate trip that he made to Hawaii some 2 years ago be published at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Meanwhile, a Chicago Daily News reporter sifting through the Secretary of the Senate's report for fiscal 1961 came up with evidence that the occupants of the other Capitol wing are also concerned for the aid and comfort of religion (perhaps we should have put that last word in quotes). He discovered that in October 1960 the Senate decided to make its Chaplain, Frederick Brown Harris, an "ex officio" member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. It just happened that the Chaplain and his wife were off for a 3-week trip to Hawaii, and that way the travel expenses could be paid out of committee funds. The reporter delved further. Though the subcommittee's staff director said the whole thing was news to him, Mr. Harris explained that on his return he submitted a report on "Problems Growing Out of the Mingling of the Races," and the work of "a fine group of citizens who are exposing attempts at Communist infiltration there." Juvenile Communists, we presume. At any rate, the Chaplain couldn't recall offhand the name of the group exposing their activity. Oh well, at least the Senate sessions continue to be opened with prayer.

And apparently it is appreciated. Declaring it is most unfortunate that each day's issue of the Senate's official Journal does not include "for the benefit of posterity" the Chaplain's prayer delivered on that day, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, proposed that the "beautiful, moving and inspiring prayer" delivered July 25, by Chaplain Frederick Brown Harris be inserted as an amendment to the day's official record. He made his proposal in a speech holding that the Senate prayer does not violate the first amendment.

BUT THE FACT IS

SIR: * * * My attention has been called by several preachers shocked by your editorial (August 22) referring to my mission to Hawaii almost 2 years ago. You have seen fit to give wings to an utterly false conception of my weeks in Honolulu which was by no means a junket but an officially authorized mission. Some ambitious reporter—evidently a man with a "muckrake"—who apparently was not looking for facts but for scandal, included me in a series of articles on people in the Government allegedly using taxpayers' money for personal purposes.

After having been fairly well known for many years as a minister of Methodist churches in New York and Washington, and as Chaplain of the U.S. Senate for 18 years, you printed this smear without any attempt to check up with me as to the truth or untruth of what this reporter has spread before the country as he makes his living picking up salacious bits from political gutters. The editorial * * * is in every way unworthy of the once-high journalistic standard of [your] publication. Apart from its giving credence to something entirely false it is written in a "smart aleck" sarcastic style unbecoming of any church publication. * * *

My going to Hawaii was in no way a vacation. It was a mission set up by the Senate. I had been in Hawaii twice, 6 years ago, when President Eisenhower sent me as special ambassador to Korea. With Mrs. Harris I had already seen its beauties and had become somewhat acquainted with its problems. * * * Members of the Cabinet and high military leaders in the Pentagon felt that Syngman Rhee, as a political exile in Hawaii, desperately needed my companionship and counsel. I had been his pastor and close friend for many years and he was pleading with me to come to his side. Then a number of the Senate leaders, including those from Hawaii, felt that I might render a service of good will in speaking to various groups regarding the meanings of Americanism and the menace of communism, as I had attempted to do in various parts of America. My going was to be a sort of salute to the new State.

The idea of the mission grew until my schedule in Hawaii was as strenuous as any I have ever undertaken. For the objectives of the proposed trip I was notified officially that for the period of the visit I had been made a member of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. That was done because that designation would cover human relationships of all kinds and also provide for my bare traveling expenses. On arrival in the new State our commanding general, T. D. White, asked for a conference at his headquarters. He cooperated with my mission in every way as did the splendid Senators from Hawaii. Senator OREN LONG gave me the use of his office and his secretary for the purposes of the mission.

In the weeks of my stay I spoke almost every day, sometimes twice a day, to an aggregate of several thousand including our Armed Forces at Schofield Barracks and to students in educational institutions, including 1,500 in 2 addresses in 1 day. I also addressed numbers of Hawaiian citizens at various clubs and groups—Rotary, Kiwanis, etc. I also brought messages to the Army chaplains and their wives regarding their vital work, and to representatives of the council of churches. All this in addition to preaching engagements. The press of Hawaii gave conspicuous space to my doings and statements. I spent many hours with Syngman Rhee and his wonderful wife and for what I endeavored to do in strengthening that truly great man, in that cruel crisis in his life, I received expressions of appreciation from our highest Washington officials.

One of the most influential organizations in Hawaii, of which your editorial spoke disparagingly, is headed by an outstanding physician. This alert group of real Americans keeps a constant vigil with regard to the attempts of communism to infiltrate the islands. With them I spent many hours and learned much. (Your) snide reference to "juvenile Communists" is an indication of how little you know with regard to the Red peril. * * *

During my stay in Hawaii I talked with the Governor at the statehouse. At the request of Honolulu officials I gave a day to be taken, in an official car, for glimpses of their operations in combating juvenile delinquency—and adult delinquency also. Piloted by church leaders, I made a number of visits to churches of various denominations in the city and its environs, which are ministering to different races and engaged in programs to decrease juvenile delinquency. I even attended a church conference where a known Communist had the affrontery to tell the assembled delegates what the church (in which he does not believe) ought to do to serve the present age. * * *

> All of Mrs. Harris' expenses were paid by us, including the hotel costs. All I received was traveling expenses for myself. If any mission of such proportions ever cost the Government less, I would like to hear of it. * * *
>
> From your cavalier acquiescence in slandering a servant of the church and the slighting manner in which you treat the ministry of the Senate Chaplain in these days * * * it would seem appropriate * * * to change the name "The Christian Century" to "The Un-Christian Century."
>
> FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS,
> *Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, those of us in politics are accustomed to smear attacks and unjustifiable criticisms in the American press. But it is a pretty sad thing when the press does not get its facts about a subject involving the Chaplain of the Senate prior to doing him great harm by the publication of such an untruthful story as he answered in his letter of September 26, 1962, to the Christian Century.

I have known many ministers of the Christian faith, but my association in the years that Chaplain Harris has been the Chaplain of the Senate justifies the evaluation of him that he practices the Christianity that he preaches.

REPRESENTATIVE CLEM MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like now to yield, without losing my right to the floor, to the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who has a very, very sad report to make to the Senate. When he finishes, I shall make a comment of my own on the subject that he will discuss. Then I shall discuss another subject briefly. I yield to the Senator from California without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the courtesy of my friend the senior Senator from Oregon yielding to me for the purpose of making a very sad announcement to the Senate.

Our colleague in the House, CLEM MILLER, was killed in an airplane accident which occurred yesterday at about 4:30 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon. The wreckage of the plane was found today some 15 miles east of Crescent City, where it had gone into a mountainside.

There were no survivors of the accident. The pilot, his son, and Representative MILLER were all killed.

CLEM MILLER, 46 years of age, was elected to the House of Representatives in 1958, reelected in 1960, and at this time was seeking his third term. He represented the district in California that runs from the Oregon line along the coast of California to just north of San Francisco. It is a great, beautiful, and wealthy district, primarily in lumber, livestock, agriculture, and recreation.

CLEM MILLER was a vigorous and intelligent spokesman for the people he represented. He took an intense interest in the affairs of his district. He was one of the most ardent conservationists in the House of Representatives. He was chiefly concerned, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been, about the problems of the lumber industry. He took an intense interest in the livestock, farming, and small business interests of his area. Only recently he was at the White House attending a ceremony at which the President of the United States signed the bill creating the Point Reyes National Seashore Park, of which CLEM MILLER was the author in the House of Representatives.

CLEM MILLER was born in Wilmington, Del. He served in the Army from 1940 to 1945. He is a graduate of Cornell. His presence in California was a loss to the area from which he had come and the great gains of our State. His death was a tragic loss to the Congress of the United States, the State of California, and our country, and certainly an even more tragic loss to his wife and to his five wonderful daughters. I am sad indeed that I must communicate this tragic news to the Senate at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I hardly know what to say. I join with my California colleague, all the Members of the Congress, and the people of my State in a profound and shocking sense of the loss of a distinguished Member of the legislative branch of the American Government. Over the last several years I have come to know the late Representative MILLER, not intimately, but on a very friendly basis.

Mr. President, CLEM MILLER was a member of the Democratic Party. That did not dissuade us from cooperating on many occasions. And to think that suddenly, and in the midst of life, with a lovely family, that untoward event in his home area of California would take him from this earth is a very sad thing to contemplate. On behalf of my wife and myself, I can do no more but to express the most sincere and heartfelt sentiments of condolence to Mrs. Miller and to all the family of our late colleague, who represented the First Congressional District of California. I thank my friend.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that I heard of the death of CLEM MILLER. It was 3 weeks ago this past weekend that I traveled with him from San Francisco to Washington. Representative MILLER and I had been working, along with the Senator from California and the delegations from Oregon and Washington and Idaho, on the very serious lumber crisis confronting the Western States in respect to Canadian competition. On September 26, CLEM MILLER accompanied us to the White House for the conference with the President on the lumber problems. At the White House conference we divided up the work in the presentation of the issues to the President. One of the issues was given to Congressman MILLER. His brilliant and eloquent and forthright presentation of the facts supporting our position was highly commended subsequently by all in the delegation that I talked to about it. The best evidence I can give of the persuasiveness of Representative MILLER's presentation was that the issue that he raised, dealing with the allowable-cut subject, was decided by the President then and there. When Representative MILLER finished, the President announced that it was his decision that the Forest Service should prepare, by October 15, a memorandum dealing with their record in connection with the allowable-cut problem and their proposals as to the future handling of the subject.

I agree with the two Senators from California that Congress has lost an able legislator, the State of California has lost one of its finest leaders, and the Nation has lost a good American.

PROPOSED CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I announced that before the day was over I intended to call up the concurrent resolution on the Berlin issue which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I submitted last week. The majority leader, as the RECORD will show, announced that he would have to follow a parliamentary course of action of postponing consideration of the resolution because it had been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

My reply to the majority leader was that the Senate knows its position with regard to the Berlin crisis. Referring the subject to the Foreign Relations Committee did not assure any action, because I had been advised by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee that there probably was not a quorum of the Foreign Relations Committee in Washington today. I have subsequently checked on the matter, and it is true that there is not a quorum of the Foreign Relations Committee in Washington today. I also understand that at this hour the probabilities are very great that there is not a quorum of the Senate available, either.

Since my colloquy with the majority leader earlier today, I have conferred with the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. He tells me that steps are being taken to endeavor to have a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee on the resolution, and the prospects are reasonably good that a quorum of the committee can be obtained.

I take pride in my record of seeking to cooperate on parliamentary situations with the leadership of the Senate. I have stated this afternoon that I would await committee action until Wednesday. However, if there is no committee action on the resolution, I repeat what I said earlier this afternoon, that the American people are entitled to have the Senate act, committee or no committee.

Frankly, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I believe I can tell the Senate what will happen in the Foreign Relations Committee. The concurrent resolution will be read. The chairman will ask if there is any discussion. There may be a little bit, but not much. The subject involves something on which our minds have already have been made up. There will not be a dissenting vote against the resolution in committee.

That is my prediction. The resolution is identical in its entire scope with the Cuban resolution. As the Presiding Officer knows, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I was an ardent supporter of the final draft of the Cuban resolution. I believe we must adopt the Berlin resolution, just as we adopted the Cuban resolution, because, as was pointed out by the Senator from Minnesota, the Democratic whip [Mr. HUMPHREY] in his speech a few moments ago in the Senate, there is reason to believe that some time in November or December Mr. Krushchev is likely to make a move in respect of the Berlin crisis.

It is of great importance that before we adjourn we adopt the concurrent resolution. The House has already done so. I know of no reason why there should be any delay in the Senate with respect to it. With all respect, let me say that I shall wait until Wednesday for action by the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the Foreign Relations Committee does not act on Wednesday, I hope the majority leader, when I make my motion to lay aside whatever pending business is before the Senate at the time—if it is necessary to make such a motion—to take up the Berlin concurrent resolution, he will give me his support. It is of the utmost importance that the Senate join with the House on a concurrent resolution on the Berlin crisis, and that Congress make clear to the world that we have no more intention of surrendering the precious rights of freedom with respect to Berlin than we do with respect to Cuba.

I sincerely hope that this will be the last time that the suggestion will have to be made on the floor of the Senate by any Senator that the time to act on such a resolution with respect to the Berlin crisis has arrived, and that the American people have the right to ask Congress to adopt that resolution prior to adjournment.

I say to my good friend the majority leader, who has just entered the Chamber, that I have been giving a review of my position with respect to a concurrent resolution on Berlin. I announced that I have conferred with the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has told me that steps are being taken to call up the concurrent resolution for action in the Committee on Foreign Relations on Wednesday morning, and that he has reasonable hope that a quorum will be present on Wednesday morning; that a quorum of the committee is not in Washington today. I said, good naturedly, that I am also suspicious that if an attempt were made to get a quorum of the Senate this afternoon in order to take up the concurrent resolution, probably there would be difficulty in getting a quorum if I carried forward with my announcement eariler this afternoon that I intended to bring it up.

I reported the position of the majority leader, namely, that he would be inclined to move to postpone the consideration of the concurrent resolution until the Committee on Foreign Relations had had an opportunity to act. I explained that I have tried to cooperate on parliamentary questions, but that I believed that Wednesday would be the last opportunity for the Committee on Foreign Relations to take action this year; but if the Committee on Foreign Relations did not act by Wednesday, then I thought the Senate ought to act, committee action or no committee action. The House has already acted.

The majority whip has just finished a speech in which he set forth what many of us believe, namely, that Khrushchev will probably make some move with respect to Berlin in the latter part of November or December. Some of us believe that the Javits-Morse concurrent resolution should be adopted as giving notice not only to Khrushchev but also to the world that we have no more intention of compromising freedom in relation to Berlin than we do in relation to Cuba. The Javits-Morse concurrent resolution is identical in its scope and nature with the resolution on Cuba.

The senior Senator from Oregon believes that prior to adjournment the Senate should join with the House in a statement with respect to the Berlin crisis. I shall wait until Wednesday for further action on the resolution, in the hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations will act. But in case the committee does not, I shall feel it my clear duty to seek to have action taken on the concurrent resolution on Wednesday afternoon.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 8, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 914. An act to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia, to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1288. An act to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1552. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, effectiveness, and reliability of drugs, authorize standardization of drug names, and clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority; and for other purposes;

S. 1563. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Georgia-South Carolina, to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes;

S. 1658. An act to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make Indian Tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 2928. An act for the relief of Seymour K. Owens;

S. 3631. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of reports filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis;

S. 3679. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to hold a World Food Congress in the United States in 1963; and

S.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 9, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 8, 1962:

U.S. MARSHAL

Ray H. Hemenway of Minnesota to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota for the term of 4 years, vice Harry A. Sieben, resigned.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, O18832, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 35: 5: *Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass.*

Eternal God, our Father, who art always surrounding us with Thy divine providence, make us more responsive to the overtures of Thy love and grace.

Grant that daily we may be strengthened in mind and heart as we face our duties and responsibilities, our trials and temptations, our fears and frustrations.

Inspire us to reach out and go forward with renewed confidence and hope for the triumph of the principles of truth and justice.

May we strive to elevate the moral and spiritual character and conduct of our beloved country and be partners with all who are seeking to build a nobler civilization of good will and brotherhood.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12907) entitled "An act for the relief of Dr. Mehmet Vecihi Kalaycioglu," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. KEATING to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE $280 MILLION DUKE STEAMPLANT

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I fervently hope and sincerely believe the Senate-House conferees will permit Duke Power Co. to build a little retaining wall only across the Savannah River at Middleton Shoals, thus diverting enough water to permit the construction and operation of the largest steamplant in the world. The Duke project must be authorized at this session so that they can begin construction of the necessary rail connections and make preliminary plans in the spring of 1963.

Mr. Speaker, no one that I know of is against the Duke project. It will not flood 1 acre of land privately owned in South Carolina or Georgia. Duke already owns the site and every acre necessary for the reservoir—a small reservoir which will go little beyond the banks of the riverbed and only a length of 8 miles. The Duke project will greatly benefit Georgia as well as South Carolina. Cheap electricity will be made available to the people of Georgia as well as South Carolina. It will be the heart of the industrial "golden strip" now developing between Atlanta and Charlotte. It will be nearer to Atlanta than Charlotte and by focusing the attention of the business world on northern Georgia as well as South Carolina, it will be of stupendous benefit to the great State of Georgia.

I trust and believe the conferees will retain that provision of the House bill permitting Duke to proceed immediately.

TROTTERS SHOALS DAM

Mr. Speaker, when the omnibus rivers and harbors bill passed the House, not one word was said about a Government dam at Trotters Shoals on the Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia. An amendment was added in the other body authorizing the $78 million dam at Trotters Shoals. I was not even consulted or informed about Trotters Shoals until after it had been adopted in the other body. From time immemorial, it has been common congressional protocol and courtesy to consult with the Member of Congress and at least inform the Member who lives nearest to the project. I live closer to Trotters Shoals than any Member of the House or any Member of the other body. It is literally in my backyard.

The report from the Corps of Engineers with reference to Trotters Shoals has never been forwarded from the Corps to the Department of the Army, much less to the Bureau of the Budget. The South Carolina Legislature adopted a resolution unanimously opposing Trotters Shoals. The Governor of South Carolina, the State planning board, and a vast majority of the people who have contacted me from my own congressional district, have bitterly opposed this project. The South Carolina Farm Bureau is very much opposed to Trotters Shoals as well as many other people from both South Carolina and Georgia.

All that I am asking, Mr. Speaker, is that the Congress hear all parties concerned on Trotters Shoals before a final decision is made. When the full facts are developed, the pine tree farmers of South Carolina and northern Georgia may decide that a Mead Pulp and Paper Mill above Trotters Shoals may be worth much more to the economy of South Carolina and Georgia than a Government dam at Trotters Shoals. Mead owns a 1,000-acre site at the junction of Rocky River at Savannah just above Trotters Shoals. They want and deserve to be heard as I have reliable information that they intend to build on the Rocky River-Savannah site. Then, too, Mr. Speaker, the Seaboard Airline Railroad crosses the Savannah at the Mead site. The Seaboard is a leader in industrial development in South Carolina and Georgia. Seaboard engineers also deserve to be heard by the Congress before approval of Trotters Shoals.

Mr. Speaker, there are other sites on the river where Government dams could be considered. Why at Trotters Shoals? Why, without hearings, without a report from the Corps of Engineers, without approval by the Bureau of the Budget? Why, may I ask, Mr. Speaker, is the rush on in the dying days of this session?

Mr. Speaker, all of the parties should be heard and the feasibility of Trotters Shoals firmly established before we proceed further with Trotters Shoals. But, Mr. Speaker, justice, fair play, and economics demand the approval of Duke without another moment of delay.

HON. CLEM MILLER

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that we have been receiving reports from California that one of our colleagues, the gentleman from California, CLEM MILLER, has been reported missing on a flight from Santa Rosa to Crescent City. The plane has not been sighted. A search is being made by the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and the Forest Service, but as of this hour there is no report of the missing plane with our colleague, the gentleman from California, CLEM MILLER, aboard. The gentleman from California, CLEM MILLER, together with the pilot and the pilot's son, were flying from Santa Rosa to Crescent City, a flight of about an hour. He was reported missing yesterday afternoon after the plane had radioed to the field that they were waiting for instructions to land. There was a very bad storm in the area and so far the plane has not been sighted. I know that all of us here in the House of Representatives want to express our sincere hopes and prayers that our colleague will be found safe and well before this day is over.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I know you have all been stunned by the news this morning that our colleague, CLEM MILLER of the First California District is missing. As Congressman JOHNSON has pointed out, he was on his way in a private aircraft from Santa Rosa to Crescent City where he was to attend a dinner meeting. I, too, have been involved this morning in contacts with various agencies in an effort to determine the correct and objective situation.

I am pleased to announce that the President has expressed great concern and that Air Force air rescue operations are underway. Every conceivable thing is being done to find CLEM and his companions. There is still hope, although it fades with each hour of silence.

Unfortunately the search this morning has been delayed because of bad flying conditions. Many of you who have been in northern California know that this is a coastal town and that the weather is often foggy.

Mrs. Cohelan and Mrs. Moorehead are with Mrs. Katharine Miller and the family—a family which includes five lovely girls.

I know you all join me in my prayer that CLEM may somehow be found and returned safely to his valiant wife and wonderful family.

DANGEROUS BILL

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, last week the House voted to approve a bill intended to curb the traffic in obscene literature in the District of Columbia. I felt that the bill went far beyond this stated purpose, however, and voted against it. The membership will undoubtedly be interested in knowing how the editors of the Washington Daily News viewed this legislation, and so I append an editorial on the subject:

DANGEROUS BILL

Perhaps the outstanding piece of mischief done by Congress in its rush to go home was the passing, this week, of a bill to amend the laws governing publication of indecent material in the District of Columbia.

The bill, which has now gone to the White House, would make it a crime to advertise, edit, write, publish, or exhibit any obscene, lewd, or indecent material, to sell it or give it away, or even to possess it with intent to sell it or give it away, or to offer to do so.

The penalties imposed are enough to give many District citizens cold-sweat nightmares for months to come. They include, besides fines and imprisonment, the confiscation of "all moneys, vehicles, fixtures, equipment, stock (including without limitation, furniture, and fixtures, adaptable for other uses, and equipment and stock for printing, filming, exhibiting, recording, transporting, safekeeping, or communications) or other things of value."

What this means is that if you had a copy of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales" and had planned to let your son take it to his 12th-grade English class (which was studying Chaucer), and if some District policeman decided that "Canterbury Tales" was indecent (which it sort of is), the District could proceed to seize your furniture, your car, your lawn mower, your icebox, your television set, your clothes, and everything else you possess—and padlock your house for a year.

No Washington newspaper, radio, or television station is in favor of obscenity. However, this new law would mean that they could be similarly seized and closed down overnight. The controlling factor would simply be the police standard of morality. And this standard, of course, would depend on the police interpretation of this proposed law.

As the whole history of censorship shows, there are pretty nearly as many views of morality as there are people in this world.

We trust President Kennedy will not hesitate to give this bill the veto it so richly deserves.

AEROSPACE EDUCATION

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on two earlier occasions, I have been privileged to report to my esteemed colleagues on aerospace education in New Jersey. In both instances—September 1959 and September 1961—I discussed current developments in this activity which had been so successful, particularly, in Bergen County. I closed each of these earlier reports with the sincere recommendation that this sorely needed program be duplicated throughout our Nation.

It should be even more apparent today, in light of the recent advancements of Soviet space accomplishments, that we have a critical need for a long-range, coordinated program of educating every American citizen—young and old alike—on the significance of aerospace technology and its effects on our way of life. It may well be said that the very survival of the entire free world could hinge on how soon and how well we organize and implement such a program.

This need has not been completely ignored. Many of our Government agencies and groups of forward-looking citizens have been dedicating their efforts to this task. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the U.S. Air Force—through its civilian auxiliary, the Civil Air Patrol and its Air Force Reserve—the Federal Aviation Agency and the National Aerospace Education Council are a few of the leaders in these efforts. But excellent as these efforts may be, they are not enough—because we are running out of time. The excellent programs already in existence must be multiplied a hundredfold, so that all of our people are properly educated as quickly as possible on all aspects of aerospace.

How we can meet this challenge is, I believe, best illustrated by detailing the program in the State of New Jersey with which I have been privileged to serve, since its inception in 1958. It is a program which has been conducted on a voluntary basis by a mere handful of Air Force reservists and the New Jersey wing of the Civil Air Patrol—working with professional educator associations in Bergen and several other counties in our State.

For the third year, the Bergen County Aerospace Education Workshop presented a formal course of in-service instruction to public school teachers. In addition, another workshop was presented to the teachers of Middlesex and Somerset Counties. Following the plans which have already proven successful in preceding years, these projects provided interesting and broadening aerospace experiences to about 800 teachers. These experiences included distinguished resource speakers, practical demonstrations, and coordinated field trips.

As a result of this year's efforts, we now have about 3,000 educators in New Jersey who have been familiarized with the basic concepts of space science and aeronautics. They, in turn, are better qualified to awaken the interest and guide the understanding by the students of today—who are our adult citizens of tomorrow.

The major problems in organizing and conducting such programs are threefold: The personnel to undertake the tremendously involved task—the procurement of qualified speakers and instructional material—and the recruitment of trainees or registrants, who are willing to devote the extracurriculum hours to this experience. It is with modest pride that I point to the achievements of our group in an effort to prove that the acceleration of the overall task can be done. The U.S. Air Force has assigned its own aerospace education program to the Civil Air Patrol—which is organized in every State of our Union. The Air Force also has a large pool of exceptionally skilled and experienced manpower in its Air Force Reserve units; these, too, are fairly well distributed throughout our Nation. These two groups comprise the potential manpower to implement the countrywide program that I urge.

Qualified speakers and supporting study material—as well as top quality training aids—are already available and in use from the Government agencies, private industry, related nonprofit organizations and our colleges and universities—some which I mentioned earlier in this report. The third requirement—that of recruiting the trainees—again has been demonstrated in our particular activities: Enlisting the active support of the professional teacher organizations. In every State and county—indeed, in nearly every community across our land—we have the counterpart of our Bergen County Education Association and the New Jersey Education Association, which have played such an important role in our staging the largest workshops of this type ever conducted anywhere in the free world. With the joint sponsorship of these teacher groups and support of the respective local boards of education, we found that this problem could be easily and quickly resolved. I am confident that similar results could be obtained in every other congressional district in our Nation.

Even now, in New Jersey, this program which was initiated by two dedicated officers of the Air Force Reserve only 4 years ago, is in the process of expansion on a full statewide scope. With the wholehearted support of the New Jersey Wing, Civil Air Patrol, and the education leaders throughout the State, we are confident that the figure of 3,000 "graduates" will soon be doubled, and tripled. Our pioneering air reservists and the two or three CAP squadrons will be reinforced in practically all of New Jersey's 21 counties by other volunteers from the Air Force Reserve and the full complement of the New Jersey Wing, CAP. To this impressive lineup has already been added the interest and support of the New Jersey Council of Education.

The detailed plans for this expansion will be presented to the full 48,000 membership of the New Jersey Education Association this coming November, at its annual convention in Atlantic City. Under the sponsorship of the New Jersey Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development—NJASCD—a panel of distinguished aerospace education authorities will present this program, supported by the Spacemobile demonstration lecture of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Another area that is currently being explored is that of organized service to adults of the community. Many, if not all, of our cities and towns have established adult education schools. Aviation and astronautics are interesting and important areas which could be developed in some form of package program for these schools. Our committee has been working for many months on this type of offering—with the full support of the national resource agencies. There are problems peculiar to adult education which have not been previously encountered in our inservice operations for professional educators. However, we are certain that these problems can be resolved—and we expect to present, before too long, a successful case history for adaptation by others.

This report, Mr. Speaker, would not be complete without recognition for some of the dedicated people whose untiring efforts have made all of this phenomenal progress possible. I use the term "phenomenal" deliberately not only because of the actual accomplishments—but also because it has not involved the expenditure of public moneys. All of the committee work has been on a volunteer basis, without compensation. Funds for the necessary supplies and facilities have been obtained by registration fees, paid by the individual educators or their school boards. The only costs to our Federal Government have been indirect ones—in the form of providing support by personnel from various agencies, printed literature and the like. I feel that this is indeed unusual or phenomenal in this day and age.

Among the various agencies who have given so generously of their facilities and their personnel in support of our projects—and who, I am sure, will give equal measure to similar efforts in other States—we must single out the Education Services Branch of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Under the direction of Mr. John Sims, this office supplied countless valuable reports and study literature—as well as outstanding speakers for major topic areas. They also made available their Spacemobile demonstration unit for the two workshops. In Bergen County, this unit was assigned for 1 full week, concurrent with the workshop schedule. During that week, we set up a precise timetable which permitted the viewing of the demonstration by nearly 20,000 students and educators.

This particular support drew unprecedented acclaim from parents, educators and the public press as well as from the students. Just as important as their specific contributions to individual top areas was the guidance and counsel given by Mr. Sims and his assistants. Dr. Mervin K. Strickler, Jr., aviation educationist with the Federal Aviation Agency, is another whose counsel was invaluable to our program.

Among the high spots of the instructional programs were the presentations by various major commands of the U.S. Air Force and field trips to nearby McGuire Air Force Base. The cooperation and courtesy extended on the field trips to our educator-registrants helped to make these most convincing demonstrations of aerospace power. For this wholehearted support, I would like to express my appreciation to Brig. Gen. Arthur G. Saulsbury, commander, New York sector, Air Defense Command; Col. J. B. Wallace, commander, 1611th Air Transport Wing—MATS—and to Col. Robert Sunde, commander of the 1611th Air Base Group—MATS—as well as to those members of their respective commands who actively participated in these efforts.

Earlier in this text, I cited the need for active support by the professional educator groups. Our program in New Jersey—which has brought the aerospace story to hundreds, compared to the dozens enrolled in other workshops—could never have started were it not for the foresight and interest of the Bergen County Education Association. Most particularly, I wish to cite the workshop planning committee of this group—led by Mr. Leslie D. Wilding of Ramsey and Dr. Harold T. Shafer, of Ridgewood. Others on that committee included Mr. William Dunn, of Paramus—the community which so generously provided the school auditorium for the lecture sessions; Mr. George Dykstra and Miss Mary P. Foran, both of Ramsey; Mr. Waldro Kindig, of Englewood; Dr. Gile Warren, of Westwood. Also Mr. Michael Elia, of Waldwick; Mr. Donald Duff, of Demarest, and Miss Patricia Reid, of Teaneck.

As one of the active partners in the development of this entire undertaking, the New Jersey Wing, Civil Air Patrol, furnished both skilled leadership and willing workers for the many arduous details. I feel that we should recognize the support of Col. Nanette Spears, Wing commander, and Lt. Col. Margaret Dunn, her director of training; Lt. Col. Harold Spencer, and Capt. Maureen Jordan should also be singled out for praise. In advisory capacities and also coordinating the difficult tasks of procurement of speakers and materials were Capt. Jackie L. Humphrey, USAF liaison officer, and Mr. Antone Straussner, of the Air Force-CAP regional headquarters staff.

I have reserved for the last the names of the three dedicated citizen-soldiers whose leadership and experience have provided the necessary impetus which has made these New Jersey workshops so successful. Three officers of the Air Force Reserve—Lt. Col. John S. Edwards, Jr., of Oradell; Lt. Col. John S. Gardner, of Fanwood; Maj. Harold T. Shafer, of Ridgewood, are all busy executives in their own vocational fields. But in this activity, they have furnished impressive evidence of the marvelous resource which our Nation has at its service. These Reserve officers deserve the highest praise for the manner in which they have not only represented their specific military service—but for their larger contribution to the future strength of our country.

I would also like to pay tribute once again to the hundreds of classroom teachers and school administrators who so willingly gave of their time and, in many instances, of their own funds, for their own professional betterment and toward the awakening of the American public to the challenges of aerospace.

I shall close this report, Mr. Speaker, with the same appeal which I voiced on those two earlier occasions: the future security and well-being of our Nation, and, indeed, the entire free world depends on the degree with which our young people can be taught to understand and apply themselves to the complex technology of the aerospace age. The dynamic impact of these fields of science has already affected our social, economic, political, and cultural structures. Full appreciation of these forces can be accomplished only by a major educational effort. We have the skills and the resources which are more than adequate for even such a formidable task. I urge that the example set by the Bergen County and the New Jersey aerospace education programs be mirrored throughout all of our 50 States.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, a summary of votes on legislation for the session shows me as having been paired on one occasion.

Mr. Speaker, the clerks have direction never to pair me. I am never paired on a vote on any occasion, and I wish to make this statement at this time.

THATCHER FERRY BRIDGE DEDICATION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on October 12—Columbus Day—the Thatcher Ferry Bridge across the Panama Canal, on the site of the Thatcher Ferry—which it will supersede—will be formally dedicated. An appropriate program has been arranged, to be concluded by a talk by Maurice H. Thatcher, who will thereupon cut the ribbon and permit traffic to begin. Governor Thatcher is the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, the body which had supervisory authority over the construction of the canal.

The ceremonies of dedication will be carried out in the forenoon, and Under Secretary of State George W. Ball will deliver the principal address. Doubtless, Gov. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., of the Canal Zone and president of the Panama Canal Co., will preside. The President of Panama, Hon. Roberto F. Chiari, and other prominent Panamanian and Canal Zone officials are expected to be present, together with Panamanians and U.S. citizens.

The bridge—from all accounts—is a splendid structure; and, aside from its utility, will symbolize—in the largest degree—the ideal of unity between and among the American nations.

The Thatcher Ferry, and connecting Thatcher Highway on the west side of the canal, were provided under congressional legislation enacted years ago while Governor Thatcher was a Member of the House from Kentucky. Since its establishment the ferry has carried across the canal nearly 100 million passengers and nearly 25,000 vehicles. Indeed, in the more than 30 years of its operation, toll free, it has performed for the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama indispensable services; and the name given the bridge by the Congress retains the ferry's historic designation, and, at the same time honors Governor Thatcher for his long-continued and most useful service for the canal enterprise, and its employees—U.S. citizens and noncitizens—and for all the Isthmian people. In specific legislation, in addition for that establishing the ferry and highway, was the act of 1928, which he introduced and sponsored to enactment, which authorized the establishment, in Panama City, of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, which through the years has come to be one of the outstanding institutions of the world dealing with research involving the cause and prevention of tropical disease; and since his retirement from Congress he has served as vice president and general counsel of the supervisory authority, the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, without compensation, as is true of all the officers of the institute. Governor Thatcher has also been chiefly responsible for congressional legislation granting benefits of annuity and retirement character for both U.S. citizens of the canal construction, and noncitizens, both of construction and maintenance service.

For considerations thus involved the Congress, by unanimous action of the two Appropriation Committees and the two Houses, wrote into the appropriations act for the Panama Canal for 1926 the formal designation for the bridge, thus specifically honoring Governor Thatcher; and following bridge nomenclature in the United States in carrying in bridge names, where the structures succeeded historic ferries, the names of ferries superseded—as, for instance, Harpers Ferry Bridge across the Potomac River, the Eggner's Ferry Bridge across Kentucky Lake, and many others. The Thatcher Ferry Bridge will be free of tolls; and its construction costs have been—as its maintenance and operations costs will be—borne entirely by funds provided—directly or indirectly—by or under congressional authorization.

A Thatcher Ferry Bridge stamp, symbolic in character, 500,000 4-cent, will be issued the day of dedication.

The bridge has been constructed by the Panama Canal Company—the official organization now authorized by law to maintain and operate the canal. To its officers and agents, and to the contractors, and all others who have contributed to the building of the structure, the thanks of all are due. The bridge, and its 2 miles of approaches, are wholly within the Canal Zone. It should symbolize the spirit and purposes of pan-Americanism, and the labors of all those who have participated in the construction, maintenance, operation, and defense of the great Isthmian waterway: this, in addition to the specific honor conferred and the historic utility perpetuated. All of which the Congress evidently had in mind, and the man thus honored has emphasized.

A joint Republic of Panama-United States of America Thatcher Ferry Bridge Dedication Committee has been in charge of the arrangements for the dedication, headed by Will G. Arey, chairman, and representatives of the canal organization and the Republic of Panama.

A dispatch on the subject of the dedication, prepared by the veteran correspondent, Harry W. Frantz, of the United Press International is made, by leave accorded, a part of these remarks, as well as are certain articles appearing in the October 1962 issue of the official magazine of the canal enterprise, the Panama Canal Review, as now shown, together with the formal program for the dedication, just announced by Governor Fleming.

THATCHER FERRY BRIDGE DEDICATION

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON, September 12.—Maurice H. Thatcher, now a Washington attorney, has accepted an invitation from the Governor of the Canal Zone to attend the dedication on Columbus Day, October 12, of the bridge across the Panama Canal which bears his name.

His participation will interest countless persons who have watched the progress of interoceanic transportation and inter-American relations.

Thatcher has been identified with affairs pertaining to the Panama Canal for more than a half century since he was appointed as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission by President William Howard Taft in April 1910. He is the last living member of the Commission which supervised the construction of the canal, sometimes called the "Big Ditch."

Thatcher served in the Canal Zone as head of the Department of Civil Administration, in charge of all civil activities and represented the Commission in relations with the Republic of Panama and the foreign representatives there. He therefore is commonly known as the Governor of the zone.

He served in the House of Representatives from the Louisville, Ky., district for 5 terms from 1923-33, during which period he was the author of legislation for the Thatcher Ferry and the approach road on the western side known as the Thatcher Highway; the legislation which created the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory and other important acts affecting the welfare of the Canal Zone and the people of the Republic of Panama.

Thatcher is also given credit for other national projects, such as the Mammoth Cave National Park, the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, and the permanent improvement and maintenance of the Lincoln birthplace farm in Kentucky.

The Thatcher Ferry Bridge across the Panama Canal was built by the United States, in fulfillment of a commitment made during World War II, at a cost of about $20 million. Although the bridge and approaches are entirely within the Canal Zone, its utility is chiefly to the Republic of Panama.

The bridge will supplant the Thatcher Ferry, over which an estimated 100 million persons and 20 million automobiles have passed since the service was started in September 1932.

The bridge will facilitate traffic to a part of the Republic of Panama, capable of great economic development, and expanding output of bananas, rice, cattle, citrus fruits and other agricultural commodities. The Pan American Highway section from Panama City to the Costa Rican frontier may be completed in 1963.

The bridge, without approach roads, is about 4,900 feet long in three spans without any draw. The central span has a clearance of 210 feet above mean sea level, and any vessel transiting the canal can pass under it without any interruption in passage. The top of the central arch is 284 feet above mean sea level. The approach roads have been modernized, and total 2 miles.

There is a confident feeling in Washington that the Thatcher Ferry Bridge will become symbolic of a new era of increasing cordiality and understanding between the people of the United States and the people of Panama. Unlike other public personalities whose interest wanes after leaving the scene of their early achievement, Governor Thatcher still lives in the atmosphere of the Panama Canal. He has long been vice president of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine (which supervises the work of the laboratory), one of the founders of the Panama Canal Society of Washington, of which he is still the guiding spirit, and has rendered innumerable legal services—gratis—to the workers employed on the canal in construction years, and since. The isthmian historical society was organized at his suggestion.

As recently as 1944 he was chiefly instrumental in obtaining congressional enactment of laws for payment of annuities to the canal workers, both U.S. citizens and aliens. He has an extensive correspondence with these workers, including the west Indians.

Hundreds of Congressmen, diplomats and officials have availed themselves of Thatcher's extraordinary knowledge of the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama, and both Houses of Congress last year unanimously approved the naming of the bridge in his honor. The Thatcher Ferry Bridge will become a major link in the Pan American Highway connecting North and South Americas. The name that it bears will be a reminder to many republics of his friendly identification with inter-American affairs. He was active in enactment of pioneer legislation which advances the growth of the hemispheric civil aviation network.

He was a member of the United States Commission which in 1930 attended at Caracas the presentation of a bronze statue of Henry Clay to the Venezuelan Government and people. As a Member of the House of Representatives, Clay had been one of the greatest North American champions of South American independence. Thatcher's political career has many resemblances. Thatcher's association with the bridge across the Panama Canal was not accidental. In Congress he was author of a bill for construction of the great George Rogers Clark Memorial Bridge across the Ohio River. That bill contained original provisions for financing which established a precedent that facilitated construction of many other bridges in all parts of the United States.

[From the Panama Canal Review, Oct. 5, 1962]

THE LAND REUNITED

It is doubtful if any bridge in the world surpasses the Thatcher Ferry Bridge as a uniting element between two parts of a country, two continents, two peoples, and, soon, the two parts of the world's greatest highway system.

Nothing, perhaps, could better express the historic setting for the October 12 dedication and opening of the huge new bridge linking the Americas.

The above words, from Elmer B. Stevens, bridge project resident engineer, stress the true meaning of this new major world traffic link.

The bridge also is viewed by Mr. Stevens as "a fitting and proper sequel to the slogan coined during Canal construction days, 'The Land Divided, the World United.' We can now say, 'The Land Reunited' with the secure knowledge that this fact further enhances world unity, and at a time when such unity is sorely needed."

Techniques, technology, and equipment have improved vastly since the days of canal construction. But the key roles have ever been those of the men and women of the isthmus. Magnitude of the jobs faced, and conquered, is evident in every picture and every account of the bridge project.

The date of the ceremonies is a memorable one for more than one reason. It was on an October 12 that Christopher Columbus first saw American soil.

DEDICATED TO SERVICE

The only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission will be present October 12 at the ceremonies to be held to dedicate the impressive new bridge which bears his name.

He is Maurice H. Thatcher, a man who celebrated his 92d birthday in August and whose enthusiasm and vitality won for him the unofficial title of the "First Governor of the Canal Zone." He was, in fact, the youngest member of a group of extraordinary men which included Col. W. L. Sibert, Joseph Bucklin Bishop, Adm. H. H. Rousseau, Col. Harry F. Hodges, Col. David D. Gaillard, Col. William C. Gorgas, and Col. George W. Goethals.

Mr. Thatcher served as Chief of the Department of Civil Administration which controlled Canal Zone civil affairs and included the representation of the Isthmian Canal Commission in its relations with the Republican of Panama and the foreign diplomatic missions. He held this position from May 13, 1910, until August 8, 1913.

His name has long been associated with matters relating to the Isthmus of Panama. On two occasions he has been president of the Gorgas Institute and was one of the founders of the Panama Society of Washington. In addition, he is closely connected with the Isthmian Historical Society, which was organized at his suggestion.

For five consecutive terms, from 1922 until 1933, Mr. Thatcher was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from the district of Louisville, Ky. It was during these years that he introduced legislation which created the ferry service across the Canal later known as Thatcher Ferry, made possible construction of a road connecting the west terminal of the ferry with the town of Arraijan, and established the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine.

Tireless in his efforts on behalf of the canal workers, Mr. Thatcher made every possible effort to obtain approval by the U.S. Congress of a law which was passed in 1944 giving disability retirement benefits to non-U.S. citizen employees of the Panama Canal. This legislation has benefited thousands of Panamanians as well as a number of employees of other nationalities.

The work done by Mr. Thatcher on behalf of the Isthmian community did not go unrecognized. During a meeting held July 30, 1930, the Federation for Highway Education unanimously approved a motion asking that former Gov. Harry Burgess of the Canal Zone give the name "Thatcher Highway" to the road between Balboa and Arraijan.

Perhaps it was this eloquent demonstration of public affection which inspired the U.S. Congress to pass Public Law 87-125 which gave the name of the well-known "Governor" to the magnificent bridge which unites the Americas, an action which has been termed by former Panama President Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro an "act of justice and a well-deserved tribute."

A gesture of recognition was made by the residents of the town of Arraijan who gave Mr. Thatcher a parcel of land in that area in gratitude for the part he took in the development of the town. On his part, Mr. Thatcher has set aside this lot for the construction of a children's playground which has been named in his honor.

The Government of Panama also has honored the distinguished canal pioneer by presenting him the Order of Vasco Núñez de Balboa with plaque. Ecuador has given him the Order of Merit and the Order of the Elloy Alfaro Foundation. In 1930 he received the Order of Bolívar from Venezuela when he visited Caracas as a member of a committee which presented Venezuela a statue of Henry Clay.

An enthusiastic promoter of pan-American ideals, Mr. Thatcher stated recently: "I have done whatever I could to promote good relations between Panama and the United States; I will always try to see that the Republic of Panama receives just treatment and I believe that I can depend on the good will of the Panamanian people."

In addition to the honors which Mr. Thatcher has received from Panama, Ecuador, and Venezuela, all proof of the high esteem in which he is held, he recently was presented the pen which President Kennedy used to sign the law naming the new bridge across the Panama Canal "Thatcher Ferry Bridge."

THE LAND REUNITED

(By Elmer B. Stevens, bridge project resident engineer)

On the night of September 8, 1962, Thatcher Ferry Bridge blossomed out with all its roadway lighting plus the aircraft warning lights atop the high arch. At this stage it could be compared with a fine lady primping for a party, complete except for the final touches of "putting on her face." All the graceful curves are now outlined with the proper degree of daring and discretion, essential fastenings secured, and the tout ensemble neatly poised on high heels. Just as our lady is now ready for the mirror of the public eye, which reflects sidelights and highlights that she may or may not suspect, our bridge is nearly ready for the same critical scrutiny.

The hard work now lies behind and the lighter moments of the party lie just ahead.

Just as our lady waits her escort at this stage, it should prove interesting to pause and reflect on some of the lighter moments that led to the present, as well as to confirm some of the vital statistics such as those that the dressmaker had to know, when she fashioned the alluring creation for the public to see.

Tackling the latter first and leaving the spice for last, a word may still be in order about the type of structure. Bridges are generally identified by the structural type of the main span, and classified as to size by the clear length between piers of that span.

This frequently leaves much unsaid about the balance of the structure which sometimes exceeds the scope of the main span. The three main spans of the Thatcher Ferry Bridge are properly considered as a unit and are accurately described as a cantilever, tied-arch combination. The approach spans are of the deck type (roadway on top) and are cantilever, simple-span combinations.

In technical parlance, the tied-arch of the central span is called a suspended span because of the manner by which it is attached to the adjacent centilevers, but this does not make it a "suspension" bridge, since that term refers to the type that is supported by heavy main cables, rather than trusses, draped over high towers on the main piers.

In terms of size, Thatcher Ferry Bridge is one of the largest "south of the border" but does not rank high among the large bridges of the world. It is properly compared in size only with other cantilever bridges and on that basis, its main span of 1,128 feet is less than two-thirds that of the world's largest cantilever bridge, across the St. Lawrence River at Quebec, Canada, and built many years ago.

Its total weight of structural steel, about 14,000 tons, is less than one-quarter that of the huge Quebec bridge. Its height of 201 feet above high water, however, places it among the highest in the world—for which the height was dictated by shipping requirements rather than natural terrain at the site. None is known to be higher in that artificial respect, though many bridges have greater clearances (height) that were dictated by the terrain at their sites.

Whatever the Thatcher Ferry Bridge lacks in size among the world's large bridges, however, it amply compensates as a symbol of unity. It is doubtful if any bridge in the world surpasses it as a uniting element between (1) two parts of a country, (2) two continents, (3) two peoples and, in the not-too-distant future, (4) the two parts of the world's greatest highway system.

The bridge is a fitting and proper sequel to the slogan coined during canal construction days, "The Land Divided, the World United." We can now say, "The Land Reunited" with the secure knowledge that this fact further enhances world unity, and at a time when such unity is sorely needed.

At this point a fast curve is justified by the fact that articles have already been written on the sublime and the technical features of the bridge and we will now throw the switch that illuminates some of the lighter moments of the construction period.

There was the day, for instance, when an inspection party from the heights arrived at the site of pier 4 a few minutes ahead of the scheduled start of the footing pour. The concrete plant on shore had already been cranked up and the first delivery, consisting of a large bucket of grout (sand, cement, and water without large aggregate—fortunately) was already on the way.

Told that they had only a few minutes to make their inspection, the party decided to take their chances and descended to the bottom of the cofferdam. In the meantime the grout arrived and the bucket containing it was hoisted over the receiving hopper, some 70 feet above the exposed rock within the cofferdam. At this point a workman, later professing innocence concerning the party below, opened the bucket gates and down went the grout.

Almost as if blown up by the same force that sent the grout down, the inspection party appeared topside, bringing most of the grout back up with them on their persons. Soberly assured of an error, the inspection was called off, the inspectors went home, and the pour was resumed.

It is a matter of pure coincidence, of course, that the bucket operator got a 10 cents per hour raise starting that day, and that the contractor's project manager was heard to remark that it was the first time in his life he ever had six inspectors lined up in his sights for one pull of the trigger.

There also was the time when a waterborne concrete delivery unit—an LCM with concrete buckets in this case—was being charged under the large collection hopper at dock 7. When the buckets were filled, a malfunction of the hopper gates prevented their closure and the concrete kept on coming. The LCM operator began receiving shouted and conflicting instructions in two languages.

Before he could decide which order to follow, the LCM capsized and sank.

(NOTE.—Fortunately this occurred toward the end of the pour and a "next" LCM was standing by to finish the deliveries.)

On other occasions, heavily loaded delivery units capsized en route from dock 7 to pier sites and the buckets had to be fished out from Captain Jack's harbor to prevent the possibility of their becoming a part of a ship's wheel.

Lighter moments on the superstructure seemed to center around the period when final closure was being made on the big arch, although one of those moments was not so funny for the operators of a fat pool, based on the time of closure, who had to explain the circumstances under which the pool went to a high Panama Canal official who later awarded an honor (?) to one of the engineers.

There was the ironworker, for instance, who, in the absence of flags, wanted to place one of our lady's garments on the ceremonial (closing) piece of steel.

Through the entire construction period the keen interest of the public has been an inspiration, even if at the same time its occasional skepticism has been a problem. During the trying period when cofferdam plans were being revised "in midstream," it seemed difficult to assure the public that "there will be a bridge" and that the steel parts that later went together so rapidly and well, were, even then, being rolled, fabricated, and shop assembled.

The work going on that very time, far from the site of the bridge, was the work that made the future rapid and spectacular erection possible.

Later on, as the two huge cantilevers were being erected from the main piers toward the midchannel, it was evident that the public was experiencing more agony than the erectors as to whether or not the spans would meet, being unaware of the built-in devices that guaranteed a perfect closure before the first panel was ever cantilevered out over the water.

Finally, there was the stanch belief among the devoted public that the ironworkers were predominantly Indians, this being the result of past publicity given to a group of Mohawk

Indians who are high ironworkers in the New York area.

Efforts were made to advise the public that these local "Indians" were predominantly converted cowpunchers from the plains of Texas. Some progress was being made until a photograph was published showing some ironworkers in action, including their names on the caption of the picture. All efforts at explanation were suspended when one of the names proved to be "Rainwater." Some times you have to let the public win.

(Elmer B. Stevens, resident engineer on the $20 million Thatcher Ferry Bridge project at Balboa, is retiring early in 1963 after a quarter century of service with the Canal organization. From the time he graduated from the University of Vermont with a civil engineering degree until he joined the bridge project, he has spent a good part of his time designing and building bridges. He designed the Gatun Locks swing bridge and made the cost estimate for the bridge at Balboa on which the appropriation was based.)

SAYS EX-PRESIDENT ALFAROS "WELL-DESERVED TRIBUTE"

Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro, former President of Panama (1931–32), now Justice of the International Court of Justice in The Hague, Holland, wrote the following letter to the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher commenting on an article which appeared in a leading U.S. newspaper regarding the Thatcher Ferry Bridge:

ROCKVILLE, MD., *December 6, 1961.*

The Honorable MAURICE H. THATCHER,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR THATCHER: Please find enclosed the clipping you kindly handed me day before yesterday, which I am returning to you with my thanks. I have read it with utmost interest and pleasure and I am very happy that your signal services to your country and to the cause of pan-Americanism are duly recognized by a paper of such great prestige as the Christian Science Monitor.

The parallel between yourself and your famous fellow Kentuckian Henry Clay is both just and accurate. If Clay is entitled to be remembered as the pioneer of Pan-Americanism in the United States, you have no lesser title to the recognition, the gratitude and the respect of all the peoples of our continent and particularly of the people of Panama for your magnificent work on behalf of good understanding and real friendship between the Americans of the North and the Americans of the South.

Giving your illustrious name to the colossal bridge that will reestablish continuity in the land divided by the Panama Canal is an act of justice and a well-deserved tribute. The Thatcher Bridge will be the culmination of a noble thought which had its first expression in the Thatcher Ferry. I congratulate you upon the honor you have received and my highest praise goes to the Congress and to President Kennedy for their worthy action in honoring you.

Amelia joins me in congratulating you and in expressing best wishes for your prompt and complete recovery, and with renewed assurances of my admiration and esteem, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

R. J. ALFARO.

PROGRAM, THATCHER FERRY BRIDGE DEDICATION, OCTOBER 12, 1962

Thirty-minute concert: Joint U.S. Army-Air Force Band and Panama National Guard Band.

Invocation: The Very Reverend Mainert J. Peterson, President, Isthmian Religious Workers Federation.

Introductory remarks: The Honorable Robert J. Fleming, Jr., Governor of the Canal Zone.

Address: The Honorable Max Delvalle, Minister of Public Works, Republic of Panama.

Prayer: Rabbi Nathan Witkin, director, Jewish Welfare Board, Armed Services Division, Caribbean Command.

Musical selection: 'Hymn of the Americas," Joint U.S. Army-Air Force Schools for Latin-American Glee Club.

Introduction: Governor Fleming.

Address: The Honorable George W. Ball, U.S. Under Secretary of State.

Presentation of bridge: The Honorable John F. Beasley, representing the contractors, to Col. Matthew C. Harrison, contracting officer, to Governor Fleming.

Remarks: The Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher.

The "National Anthem": United States and Republic of Panama Bands.

Benediction: Msgr. Jose Maria Carrizo V., prelado domestico de Panama.

Ribbon cutting: The Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher.

The "Thatcher Ferry Bridge March": An original persentation by the U.S. Army-Air Force Band.

PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS PROSPECTUSES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House, The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives approved prospectuses for the following public building projects:

Location	Type	Approved
Tulsa, Okla.	Amendment to include space for courts in the post office and Federal office building.	Oct. 1, 1962
Washington, D.C.	Housing and Home Finance Agency	Do.
Do.	Old Post Office Building (USIA) (alteration)	Do.

Total, three projects.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

THE HONORABLE FRANK E. SMITH

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one phase of the long and notable career of FRANK ELLIS SMITH, Representative of the old Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi, is closing. But also opening is one of equally large and challenging responsibilities that will be cast upon his capable shoulders.

FRANK SMITH soon will become a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He will follow in the footsteps of distinguished predecessors and will join a distinguished company of civil servants, but to the TVA, FRANK SMITH will bring rich experience, versatile talents, and the diligence to duty which has marked his career. We, his colleagues in the House, wish him many years of fruitful endeavor in his new tasks.

His leaving the Congress is a genuine loss to the people and State of Mississippi. In a highly literal sense, nobody knows more about his native State, its people and their problems and aspirations than FRANK SMITH. The nationally known publishers, Rinehardt & Co., who publish the American Rivers series of books, sought the outstanding authority on Mississippi history to be embodied in the book, "The Yazoo." The search was short. Leading historians and educators of Mississippi unhesitatingly recommended our colleague. His book long will be regarded as the standard history of his State, its solid facts enlivened with colorful anecdotes and wit.

After a successful career as a newspaperman, FRANK SMITH entered the U.S. Army as a private in 1942, but emerged from the service as a major of artillery and was awarded the Bronze Star for his gallantry in Europe. He was a legislative assistant to Senator JOHN STENNIS. Later he was elected a member of the Mississippi State Senate.

He came to the House in 1950, superbly equipped to represent the people who elected him. On the House Public Works Committee, he quickly became a valued member because of his intimate knowledge of the need for better water use and conservation, better highways, harbor and inland waterways development, and the critical needs of rural areas for electrical power and telephone service. He was a stanch champion of any proposal which promised better living for rural people and for industrial development in underdeveloped areas of the country at large, but particularly in his own district and State.

His background in journalism and in research for his many writings enabled FRANK SMITH to probe quickly, but deeply into complex problems and all of us on the committees on which he served were indebted to him constantly for his knowledgeable, judicial reasoning. His historical knowledge was used to good effect in the House Administration Committee and as a man of letters he left his mark in the Joint Committee on the Library.

FRANK SMITH's leaving the House is a true loss not only for Mississippi people, but to the Congress itself. But the TVA is about to gain in having a man with unbounded talents and proven dedication to the public service.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Alabama, a very close friend of my colleague from Mississippi, Frank Smith, for arranging this time so that some of us might have the opportunity to express our sincere feeling about our colleague and to wish him well in his new undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, Frank Smith is an honorable man. Frank Smith is a man of conviction. He is a man who believes in what he advocates and is willing to fight for it.

Mr. Speaker, as has been pointed out by our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones], Frank Smith is a very versatile as well as a very dedicated and capable man, author, soldier, legislator. He is both a forthright and dedicated man.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is well known here that my friend's philosophy of Government and mine are considerably different, but he has the courage of his convictions. I always admire a man who is willing to stand up and fight for what he thinks and what he believes in, and that is what our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, has done during his service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that he goes out of this body with a clean conscience and a feeling of having done what he thought was right under all circumstances, and even at times when he perhaps did not regard them as popular.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in wishing for Frank Smith, whom I regarded as my good personal friend throughout his service here, the best of luck in his new field. Mrs. Colmer joins me in extending to him, to Helen, his very charming and splendid wife, and their two sons, a long and enjoyable life in his new undertaking or in whatever pursuit he follows.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I too want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones], for taking this time and permitting us to join in paying tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Smith].

Mr. Speaker, certainly no man in this House has been more dedicated to serving his district than Frank Smith. He has worked hard and long for his people. When he arrived his task was not an easy one because he had succeeded one of the most able and most prominent men ever to serve in this body, the late Mr. Will M. Whittington. Mr. Whittington had made a tremendous reputation for himself, particularly in the field of flood control and public works which are so very essential to the lower Mississippi Valley and to the district which Mr. Smith now represents.

Mr. Speaker, Frank has followed well in the footsteps of his predecessor. He has been deeply interested in protecting the alluvial area which he represented from the dangerous waters which so frequently threaten to overflow the banks of the delta rivers. He has rendered good service to his district, his State and to the lower Mississippi Valley in espousing and promoting flood control legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Frank's district is an agricultural district, one of the best in the Union. He has exhibited active interest and effort in promoting the agricultural economy of the Mississippi Delta.

As has been said by my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer], Mr. Smith is a man of courage and conviction. He has at all times pursued that which his conscience and conviction dictated.

Mr. Speaker, Frank on leaving the House will become a member of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I cannot think of a more responsible position for one to serve in than as a member of this Board. A large part of the future and growth of the Tennessee Valley is wrapped in the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He will assume this position with our good wishes. We are confident he will give to the duties thereof the full benefit of his energy and effort. As a member of the Board we wish for him every success.

Mr. Speaker, we regret to see Frank leave the House of Representatives, and we also regret to see his fine family, his wife, his daughter and his son, depart this Capital. They will depart with our sincere good wishes, and our hope for much happiness.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones], has taken this time to pay a word of tribute to one of our finest friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Smith].

Frank Smith's years in this House have been characterized by outstanding service and devotion to duty. His grasp of problems relating to flood control and public works projects has made him one of our most knowledgeable Members in this field.

He has rendered outstanding service also to the cotton farmers of his district and of the country. He represents one of the most important cotton-producing districts in the United States. He has guarded the interests of the farmers in his district on every front. Frank Smith is a man of deep conviction, broad knowledge, and wide experience. He is dedicated and courageous. He has a big heart and a fine mind; he is a noble soul. He is going on to important service with the Tennessee Valley Authority, for which he is by inclination, training, and experience eminently qualified. We wish him every success in this new undertaking.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to join in this tribute to Frank Smith. Frank is my neighbor in two senses, in that he comes from my neighboring State of Mississippi and he is my office neighbor in the House Office Building. And I have known him as a Member of this distinguished body and as a good neighbor for many years.

I can only restate and reiterate what my colleagues already said about Frank Smith. His dedication, his humility, his devotion to duty, his understanding of the problems of legislation, his patriotism and devotion to his State, and to the United States of America are known to all of you. His knowledge of public works is superb.

One of the great losses to the House will be the fact that we will no longer have with us a man who has this intimate knowledge of the resources and the potentials of our great country.

I join with the majority leader and the others in wishing him well in his new undertaking, and in wishing happiness for him and his fine family.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Alabama in the statement he has made in recognition of the service Frank Smith has rendered in the House. It has been my privilege during the past 8 years to serve with Frank Smith on the Committee on Public Works. He has been a diligent and most conscientious member of that committee. During the last several years he has served as chairman of the Watershed Development Subcommittee of that committee.

It was my privilege last year to travel with him on a subcommittee inspection trip in Mississippi to inspect some of the flood control and conservation projects in the portion of Mississippi in which his district is located. He did everything that could conceivably be done to make that trip a pleasant one as well as an informative one for the Members of Congress who took part. I appreciated his attitude and his helpfulness to us then. He has worked very hard and very diligently for the interests of the people in his district. It was evidenced by his interest on that trip in informing the other members of that subcommittee of the problems of his area in flood control and soil conservation. I join the other Members of the House in wishing Frank Smith success in the important work which will be his as soon as this Congress adjourns.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. To know Frank Smith is to like Frank Smith. I was preceded in this body by the gentleman from Mississippi, but immediately upon taking my seat here I think he was one of the first men I got to know well. There has been no man who has served in this body during my time here that has spent more time in assisting individual Members with their problems than has Frank Smith. As a member of the outstanding Committee on Public Works, Frank took a personal interest in the problems and the projects of the individual Members of this body that came before that committee. Therefore, I know of no man who is more respected and more liked as an individual than FRANK SMITH. He is a man of outstanding conviction and great courage. I have never seen the time when FRANK SMITH was not big enough to do the job in the House of expressing his convictions on various matters of legislation. He is a big man. He is big in stature. But it takes a big body and a big frame to hold a big heart and a big mind such as FRANK SMITH possesses. Immediately upon being notified that FRANK would be retired from the House, it was my privilege to recommend to the proper appointing official that his great talents and great ability be used by this country in a position for which he is eminently qualified. The position being a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. We who are fortunate to be the recipients of the great advantages of this outstanding agency are fortunate to have a man such as FRANK SMITH as one of the Directors of that great body. This man's knowledge and ability in the field of public power, navigation, flood control, and all of the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority will certainly stand him in good stead in his service there. We in my area certainly appreciate the fact that the President of the United States saw in this man this ability and this talent.

I wish for FRANK SMITH the best that a man can have in life because he deserves it. I want to commend him for a great career here in the House and wish for him great success in his chosen field as a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to salute my distinguished friend from Alabama for taking this time to give us an opportunity to express our happiness and gratitude for the fact that we knew FRANK SMITH and have served with him.

When I think of a man in the House of Representatives or in the Senate, I think of him in terms that I can classify his service. I think of FRANK SMITH in terms such as "political honesty," "unhesitating courage," "courteous patience." On various occasions I have had projects go before his subcommittee. I have always received help. I have always received advice. I have always received efficiency. I think those three qualities are characteristic of his desire not only to serve his Nation, but to accommodate those of us who served in the Congress with him.

I am happy that I have him as a friend. I have been privileged to know him as a statesman. I have been honored to know him as a patriot. He goes now to another place where he can serve his Nation and his people and all of us. We all wish him well. I am sure the brilliance that he has exhibited here will be exhibited again. I am sure that the energy that is characteristic of any service that he undertakes will be displayed in his new position. I am sure the same dedication will be found in the TVA that we found here in the Congress. I know lots of men here that I am proud to serve with. Among them is FRANK SMITH. I just hope I will have the opportunity and the privilege of seeing him again and often, and of watching his great service to his Nation in this new and progressive position.

Recently he gave timely hearing, accurate advice, personal assistance in authorizing a worthy project in my district, known as the Thickety Creek project in Cherokee County, S.C. Hundreds will benefit directly, other thousands indirectly, because of the establishment of this new effort in conservation and flood control. In behalf of my people, benefited by his service, I thank FRANK SMITH for helping us here.

Along with others who rise today to do him honor, I wish for him the continuing satisfaction of good works and significant service. We have been privileged to have him in the Congress; we will be proud of his new service with TVA.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply grateful that the gentleman from Alabama has taken this time to say a few words about the gentleman from Mississippi [FRANK SMITH]. A great many words have been said and they have all been well said. They have covered the fact that FRANK is a man of great mental attainment and achievement, and that he has in the Congress and back home shown great leadership for waterway projects and many facets of development of his own area and of his country. One thing has not been said that I would like to say because I think it is worth saying about FRANK SMITH because to me it is one of the most appealing things about this man. That is that although his name will always be a bright star in the heaven of conservation, and all that is good for our country and for mankind, he also represents to me a man who is living in his age, a man who represents the new South. He conserves what is good of the past, but he has the vision and the courage to work for the things that are good for our future in this country and the future of his constituents.

It has been an inspiration to me to work side by side with a man who has the courage to say things which although they may not always be exactly what those about him would like to hear, nevertheless are characteristic of the way he looks at the world, as it is today rather than as it was yesterday. So I feel that the name of FRANK SMITH will always be held in the highest esteem and his friendship a thing to be treasured. The greatest glory that surrounds the name of FRANK SMITH, to me, grows out of the fact that he is a man who can see the world as it is and who can work with the things which are necessary for its preservation in the future. So I am deeply grateful that I have had the privilege of associating with this man and being inspired by his philosophy of life.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentlemen from Alabama for making it possible for us to pay tribute to FRANK SMITH. I wish to concur in everything that has been said relative to his service here in the House of Representatives.

It has been by pleasure and honor to have known FRANK SMITH for some 16 or 17 years, as we both served as administrative assistants to our respective Senators, he with Senator STENNIS and I with Senator Stewart over the other body. There I learned to know FRANK SMITH, and we had very pleasant associations. Later on he was elected to the House of Representatives, and I had the honor and privilege of being elected later. That friendship has continued since we served in this body.

FRANK SMITH has made a wonderful contribution not only to his district, to the State of Mississippi, but also to the Nation. We in the Mississippi Valley have flood-control problems. He has taken active interest in helping to solve those great problems and to make the valley a better place in which all can live and enjoy life.

We certainly are happy in Tennessee that he is soon to become a citizen of Tennessee and be on the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, itself a great governmental agency and one that has meant so much, as the gentleman from Alabama well knows, in the uplifting of living conditions and the economic conditions in our great Tennessee Valley.

The people of our congressional district wish for FRANK SMITH the best of everything in the years to come, and we are certainly happy that he will still be with us and will continue to make a great contribution to the betterment of our Nation.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with others in paying tribute to our colleague, FRANK SMITH. I have found FRANK SMITH not only a hard worker for the people of his own district and for various public works projects, but always ready to help other Members whenever possible.

FRANK SMITH has made many valuable contributions as a member of the Public Works Committee. I am sure he will be a great asset to the Tennessee Valley Authority as a member of the Board of Directors.

To FRANK, his lovely wife, Helen, and their two fine children, Cathy and Fred, I extend every good wish for the future.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] for giving members of the House an opportunity to say something on behalf of our good friend and colleague, FRANK SMITH, who makes his departure this week to accept an assignment as a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It has been my pleasure to serve with Congressman SMITH on the Committee on Public Works for the past 4 years and he has been of valuable assistance to me in the work of that committee. Frank has a vast knowledge of the legislative process and is simply steeped in the intracacies of flood control and related matters. He serves as chairman of the important Watershed Development Subcommittee, of which I am a member, and I found him to be truly an expert in the field of water resource development.

Congressman Smith is the author of an extremely interesting book, "The Yazoo," a story not only about a river in his district, but of people and places, of cities, towns, and countrysides, of local legends and national history. The Yazoo rises in the southern part of western Tennessee and joins the Mississippi in Vicksburg, an area rich in history, the very heart of the old plantation system. Mr. Smith's book abounds in folk tales of that rich triangle of land.

Because most omnibus flood control bills contain something for almost every area and every section of the country—East, West, North, South, Middle States and all, the charge has been made time and again that these measures are pure "pork barrel." Frank Smith has been one of the most ardent defenders of these programs, pointing to the economic benefits which result from remedial flood control works and navigation improvements.

He has directed his interests to the special problems of conservation and development of natural resources. It is gratifying to know that he will be continuing his interest in these fields in his new assignment as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

No better selection could have been made than that of Frank Smith to serve on the Tennessee Valley Authority. I know he will do a tremendous job. Those of us who have so much at stake in the type of development he will be administering are most appreciative of the fact that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Smith], will be there looking after the interests of the people.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, chairman of our great Subcommittee on Flood Control.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to express my deep appreciation to our colleague, Robert Jones, of Alabama, for his thoughtfulness in seeking this time in order that some of us might pay tribute to our good friend and colleague, Frank Smith, of Mississippi.

I know of no man in this House who has enjoyed, more than Bob Jones the fine tributes paid Frank Smith, because it was Bob who nicknamed Frank "Rex." How he got on to that name nobody will ever know. I am sure Bob Jones does not know, but somehow or other it seemed to fit him. The two, Jones and Smith, have been the dearest of friends.

All of these tributes today have been fine and have been sincere and have been genuine. Frank Smith is my neighbor to the south of me. Representing as I do, Memphis, sometimes known as the capital of the Midsouth and sometimes known as the second capital of Mississippi. I have become very close to Frank. I, too, recognize that he has been an author. He is an author, but to me I shall ever be indebted to Frank, as Bob Jones will ever be indebted to him, because the three of us found upon ourselves the responsibility of managing the Tennessee Valley self-financing bill. That was a long fight in the House. It was a fight, because sufficient money was not forthcoming from appropriations and it was necessary to go into the money markets of this country and sell financing bonds against that property. Of course, now all of this property is owned by all of the people of the 50 States of this Nation, and those of us in the valley who buy electricity will redeem these bonds. But it was a long, slow process, and it took a lot of hard thinking and a lot of selling to this House. But Frank Smith was right there, always intelligent in the presentation of this important bill.

So I should add one more thing that has been mentioned already. Frank Smith has extraordinary courage. On the committee he could always be expected to explode, and I use that word with reverence and certainly with affection. When a delicate situation arose, it was Frank Smith who was always able to develop the point and argue the question with success, ability, and finality.

I wish for Frank all the success in the world. I am so glad this tribute to him does not come when his star is lowered. We are paying tribute to a man today when he begins anew a real service to his country, in many respects a very much greater service to his country in this new administrative position with the TVA.

My wife joins me in wishing for Frank Smith and his family every possible success, and certainly health and happiness for a very long time to come in his service to our country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to our beloved Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a personal honor for me to join with the gentleman from Alabama and my other colleagues who are paying tribute to their friend and great colleague of ours, Frank Smith, of Mississippi.

Frank Smith has served the people of his district ably and with great distinction in this body. He is a dedicated legislator and a great American, possessing a national outlook which has been an inspiration to all others to recognize and follow.

Mr. Speaker, my dear friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] properly referred to Frank Smith's great courage. I have never met any legislator who has displayed and evidenced greater courage than has Frank Smith. He leaves the Halls of Congress with the knowledge that he has contributed during his service here greatly to the progressive and outstanding legislative history of our country. He leaves here to assume another important role as a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure years ago to support the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority and all legislation that has been enacted since to strengthen that great agency in the service to the people of a great section of our country, directly so, and indirectly to all of our country.

Mr. Speaker, Frank Smith, as one of the members of the Tennessee Valley Authority will bring to that Authority a wealth of experience, a wealth of knowledge in the historical aspects of the legislation establishing and developing the Tennessee Valley Authority, and in all aspects of the practical operation of that Authority.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in wishing Frank, Mrs. Smith, and their children every future happiness and success.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, there is not a great deal I can add to what has already been said. I do want to go on record associating myself with all the richly deserved tributes to Frank Smith, of Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, Frank comes from an area which has contributed much to the development of our country, both economically and politically. As one who has worked with Frank only a brief time, I have been impressed in a body which has such a large number of distinguished and outstanding Members, with his generosity, with his kindness, with the breadth of his statesmanship and ability.

Mr. Speaker, I would only add that the United States of America could use a lot more Frank Smiths.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute so richly deserved to our very able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, Frank Smith.

It was my privilege to meet Frank when he first came to Congress 12 years ago and to have the opportunity to speak with him on many occasions concerning vital legislation affecting the welfare of our Nation.

For many years, Frank and I had offices on the same corridor which afforded me an additional opportunity to be in frequent contact with him. He has impressed me, and I am sure all of the Members, as being a man of great knowledge, a man of courage and devotion, a man of pleasant manner and congenial spirit which made him popular and respected by all with whom he came in contact. Frank has served his district, his State, and Nation with distinction.

I am confident that when he assumes his new position with TVA, he will bring those same qualities of leadership to that body which he has brought to the House.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Trimble].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones], and others in paying tribute to Frank Smith, one of the greatest men I have known. I served with him on the House Committee on Public Works for many years. He is indeed one of God's noblest.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Alabama in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague from Mississippi, Congressman Frank Smith.

For the past 4 years it has been a distinct pleasure and a privilege to have served with Frank Smith both here in the House and also as a member of the Committee on Public Works. Frank Smith is outstanding in his great contributions in the field of conservation and natural resource development.

With his retirement from the House of Representatives, the Congress loses an outstanding leader in this field; however, the Congress always will have before it the fine example which Frank Smith has set for us.

It was with deep regret that I learned of our colleague's retirement from Congress, but I do want to wish him every success in the years ahead. I know that he will take up where he left off as an extremely valuable member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. We will miss Frank Smith here in Congress, but I know that we all want to wish him well as he continues his long and faithful service to this Nation.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my other colleagues today to pay tribute to a great American, a fighting Congressman, and I am happy to say a dear friend. It has been my pleasure to serve on the House Committee on Public Works for 8 years with Frank Smith. I have also had the pleasure of serving on the Subcommittee on Small Watersheds headed by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. Many kind things will be said here today about Frank Smith, but I believe if I were to pick out any one of his sterling qualities I would say his unequivocal stand on matters he believes to be right is an attribute few possess. Frank is a leader but knows how to follow. He is always ready, willing, and able to help a friend. His wise counsel has been of tremendous help to all of us. I know he will bring to the Tennessee Valley Authority the same wise counsel, devotion, and public service he has given to the Congress and the people of Mississippi. As he takes on his new line of endeavor, I want to join the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones] and my other colleagues and friends in wishing Frank many years of success, health, and happiness.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to number Frank Smith among my friends in the House of Representatives, and I am happy to join in this well-deserved tribute to him.

In his 12 years in this body he has established himself not only as an extremely intelligent and hard-working legislator, but also as a man of great courage and integrity, willing to stand up for his principles—alone, if need be—in the face of tremendous pressure.

It was because of this courage and integrity that Frank achieved stature as a truly national lawmaker, that is, one who is really attuned to the needs and well-being of the country as a whole. But this is not to say that he slighted the interests of the people in Mississippi whom he represented. On the contrary, as Mississippi's sole representative on the Public Works Committee he was extremely faithful and effective in promoting the welfare of his people. His diligence in attending to the interests of his constituents was well documented by Stephen Bailey and Howard Samuel in their book "Congress at Work." They chose Frank Smith, then a freshman in the House of Representatives, as the subject of a chapter describing an average day in the life of a Congressman, and the energy with which he devoted himself to his work then has not flagged in 12 years.

But his devotion to the common good, his independence of thought and action, raised Frank far above the level of one whose efforts are devoted to the service of one particular interest, and for this reason his departure from Congress will be a real loss not only to the people of Mississippi, but to the country as a whole. I know that, speaking for myself, I shall miss the warmth of his friendship deeply.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my good friend, Bob Jones, calling me about this occasion.

Mississippi this year, like a number of States, was faced with reducing its number of districts, or Congressmen from six to five. In view of that fact, I made a thorough study of the Constitution, of the Constitutional Convention, and of the past actions of the Congress.

To me, there is no question but what the Founding Fathers intended that the Membership of the House of Representatives was to be increased as the population of the Nation increased. This they did numerous times. I went before the Judiciary Committee to present my argument. Unfortunately the House, through its committees, turned down our pleas. Regretfully to me at least, my district and Frank's were consolidated.

Today friends and colleagues have expressed themselves on the results, not I hope on the outcome of our campaign, but on the failure of Congress to increase the number of Members of the House and have paid tribute to the fine job my colleague, Frank Smith, has done in numerous fields.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not here state that while Frank's philosophy differs considerably from my own, that in the heat of campaign, since our districts were put together, that, naturally, from my viewpoint, many things were said and done, which I deplore and, of course regret, I feel I should say here:

Frank Smith has done an excellent job in many fields, particularly in the field of flood control, watershed protection, flood prevention, public roads, and public works generally. His effective efforts will be missed not only by the area but by me.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an easy speech for me to make, but in all fairness, Frank Smith has done a fine job in many areas. Perhaps a new day is dawning, perhaps I do look to the past, but I give to my colleague the same sincerity of purpose, the same acknowledgement for his constructive work. Truly, I wish for him and his fine family the very best.

Sincerely, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, with what I sometimes think I see ahead, it is an open question as to who won.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that our colleague from Alabama [Mr. Jones] made it possible for us to voice our admiration and respect for the Honorable Frank Smith, from Mississippi, upon his departure from the House.

He stands out as one of the most ardent supporters of flood control, developing of natural resources, and conservation legislation. His foresight in this area of legislation has been the most valuable contribution to the economy in preserving our natural riches and controlling flood damage and navigation problems.

His appointment to the Tennessee Valley Authority by our discerning President, John Kennedy, was a masterstroke, in that his long service in the House identified him with the self-same problems that will confront him as a member of the Authority. It took courage, sincerity of purpose, and an analytical study for him to steer legislation in this field—against the opposition's far cry over the land, through the press and radio, labeling every public improvement as a "pork barrel" deal. His long fight for the Authority equips him with detailed and minute knowledge of its workings and goals.

We are sorry to lose his fine talents and professional services, both in debate on the floor and in his committee work. But we know that, in this administrative position, he will be of tremendous value to the future successes of the Authority.

To him we bid a sad adieu upon his departure—but we are proud of his Presidential appointment—and wish him and his dear wife, Helen, and lovely children, Cathy and Fred, God's blessings and the good gifts of this life.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to express my appreciation for the public service of our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Smith].

Frank Smith has had an outstanding decade of service in the U.S. House of Representatives. He came well prepared. He had behind him an outstanding record of military service in World War II when he rose from the rank of private to that of major of artillery. He had behind him a period of service as administrative assistant to Mississippi's great Senator, John Stennis. He had behind him a fine formal education. He had behind him fine professional training in the field of writing. This fine background coupled with Frank Smith's ability, his honesty, and his dedication gave him a good start in the House.

Then, FRANK SMITH had the good judgment to realize that his district had a paramount interest in flood control and public works, and he made himself a widely recognized expert in these fields. His knowledge and experience in these fields will be widely missed in the House by those of us who had come to rely heavily on his knowledge and judgment.

FRANK SMITH has great learning. He has great ability. He has extraordinary courage. He has good judgment.

All these fine qualities admirably suit our colleague for his new job as a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to which position he will soon go.

I believe and I predict that FRANK SMITH will make an outstanding member of the Board of Directors of TVA. There he will find another great field for public service, and one that directly affects the northern one-fifth of my State.

As FRANK SMITH leaves the U.S. House of Representatives he can be justly proud of his outstanding record here. He can look forward with anticipation to his service in his new capacity.

I want to publicly express to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] and his fine family my very best wishes for a long and happy and successful future.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, under general leave authorizing all Members to revise and extend their remarks regarding the gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. FRANK ELLIS SMITH, I take this opportunity to express my deep regret that the service of this distinguished friend and colleague comes to a close in this body at the end of the present session, and my deep appreciation for his ability and his friendship, and the many courtesies and favors he has so willingly granted me.

Congressman SMITH and I entered our congressional careers on the same date. He was one of the first of the freshmen Congressmen I had the privilege to meet. Doubting my ability to find my way through the twists and turns in the subway for the first time I expressed that doubt to Congressman SMITH who immediately and graciously suggested that since he had been on the Hill for some previous time as administrative aid to a Senator and was thereby familiar with the surroundings, he would take me over to the House Chamber for the opening session of the 82d Congress. I accepted his kindness, and from that day on he has been my friend.

Congressman FRANK SMITH possesses a brilliant mind and is conceded to be an outstanding authority on rivers and harbors, flood control, and other matters coming before the House Public Works Committee. I have never asked him a question on such matters that he did not courteously and correctly answer. I have been the beneficiary many times of his skill and ability and have had successes because of that assistance that otherwise might not have resulted.

Congressman SMITH will render outstanding service in the new job which he will assume at the close of this session. I wish for him and his fine family the very best of health, happiness, and success.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend and able colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, FRANK SMITH. I have never served with a Member from this body who stood more steadfastly by his convictions. Our loss here in the House is a gain for TVA. FRANK SMITH will carry to this great public organization the same devotion and dedication that he brought to this House. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for him and his lovely family the very best always; and FRANK, with privilege of the floor, you just come back to see us at any time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

RELIEF FOR RESIDENTIAL OCCUPANTS OF UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

Mrs. PFOST submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3451) providing relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. ROONEY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE OLDEST COMMUNITY NEWSPAPER IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to speak of the anniversary last week of the oldest community newspaper in the United States. This is an event of historic interest and one entitled to mention here in the Congress of the United States.

In 1907 the late Honorable William A. Rowan, then a young man of 25, became the city editor of the Chicago Daily Calumet, the publication office of which was and still is at 9120 Baltimore in the district I have the honor to represent. For 20 years Mr. Rowan remained first as city editor, then as editor of this newspaper. He later became the alderman of the 10th ward of the city of Chicago and later served with outstanding distinction as the Representative from the 2d District of Illinois in the 78th and 79th Congresses. His death not long ago weighed with grief the Members of the Illinois delegation and his former colleagues in the House from other States.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I shall say on this occasion of journalistic importance is a tribute not only to a great newspaper, but as well a tribute to the memory of a great American statesman who gave 20 years of his life to that newspaper.

Not many newspapers live to reach their 82d year. The mortality rate is very high. The Chicago Chronicle, the InterOcean, the Record, the Post, and many, many other Chicago newspapers that wielded great influence have come and gone. With the exception of the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily News, I doubt that there is any newspaper in Chicago, certainly not a daily newspaper, that was in existence in September of 1881, the natal month of the Chicago Daily Calumet.

The Chicago Daily Calumet, which has the proud distinction of being the oldest community newspaper in the United States, entered its 82d year last week. I am sure I speak the sentiment of all my colleagues in the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States in extending to this daily community newspaper that has battled and conquered the journalistic waves for 81 years, warm congratulations and wishes for another 81 years of service' and of success. In another 81 years it is within the realm of possibility that the Chicago Daily Calumet will become one of the great newspapers of the world. The possibilities for growth in the Calumet region, which the Daily Calumet serves, are beyond imagination. With the coming of the St. Lawrence Seaway and with the development of the Cal-Sag project to connect the Great Lakes with the Gulf of Mexico, the door of opportunity of undreamed of possibilities has opened for the area served by the Chicago Daily Calumet.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues I know will be interested in some of the historical data, as given by the newspaper and which follows:

> In September 1881 a newspaper company called the South Chicago Publishing Co. was organized. The first edition of its daily newspaper, the South Chicago Independent, was published the following month.
>
> Within a few years the Independent changed its name to the Daily Calumet. The corporation also changed its name to the Calumet Publishing Co.
>
> At that time the office of the newspaper was located on South Chicago Avenue immediately west of 93d Street.
>
> In February 1911 the offices and plant of the Daily Calumet were moved to 9120 Baltimore Avenue (then called Erie Street).
>
> Officers of the publishing company in those early years were H. H. Colehour, president; Ernest Hummel, vice president; D. B. Stancliff, secretary, and Jacob Bremer, treasurer.
>
> In those days there were many who predicted dire disaster for the new newspaper and the loss of the stockholders' investments.
>
> The stockholders in the year of 1884 were Jacob Bremer, holder of 28 shares; Alexander

Beck, 17 shares; Theophil Laramie, 16 shares; Fred Taeger, 15 shares, and Ernest Hummel, 6 shares.

Capitalization of the Daily Calumet during those early years was $10,000.

In August of 1885, Laramie, then the managing editor, resigned after reporting that he could not run the newspaper and do himself justice because the plant was going in the red and all the employees were 2 weeks in arrears in salary payment.

The following month, the Sunday issue of the Daily Calumet was discontinued by order of the directors.

After World War I, Robert W. Worden, former circulation manager of the Daily Calumet, and Robert Williamson, former superintendent of the job plant and estimator for the Calumet Publishing Co., purchased an interest in the company.

At a reorganization meeting held in February 1919, they were elected president and secretary-treasurer, respectively. John V. Hanberg was elected vice president.

Following Worden's death, Williamson purchased his stock, was elected president and served as such until 1951 when he retired. He disposed of his stock to Walker Butler, James P. Jamieson, and a small group of local citizens.

In the spring of 1957, Norris J. Nelson and a diversified group of representative businessmen purchased the ownership of the Daily Calumet and the Calumet Publishing Co.

That August, the board of directors changed the name of the newspaper to the Chicago Daily Calumet.

In June 1960, the Calumet Publishing Co. moved into the suburban field with the purchase of five weekly newspapers. They were the Lansing Journal, Calumet City Journal, Hammond Journal, Highland Journal, and Munster Journal.

Last fall, the Calumet Publishing Co. underwent a reorganization move. Interests of various shareholders were purchased by a new corporation headed by the firm's president and publisher, Norris J. Nelson.

Nelson was reelected president. George Arquilla was elected vice president and Elmer Johnson, secretary. Harold Holden was reelected treasurer for the fifth consecutive year.

THE CRIME PREVENTION BUREAU IN ITS OPERATION IS A VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO THE PREVENTION OF CRIME

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Crime Prevention Bureau, an organization formed by civic-minded citizens of the State of Illinois, and so forth, for disseminating informative advice among the youth of Cook County and the city of Chicago through lectures and movies depicting the end results of criminal practices and addiction to narcotics is being castigated by powerful forces seeking its dissolution.

As a youth, I recall as a member of the original Chicago Boy's Club, located between Van Buren and Jackson Boulevard on the west side of State Street, the vivid impression made upon me by a similar program. The State Street merchants sponsored the club and appointed Mr. Colby of the Colby Furniture Co. as managing director, the celebrated sociologist, Mr. Furman, was director.

Chicago's Loop was saturated with all kinds of people of all types, some of whom frequented the tenderloin that flourished on South Clark Street and Federal near Polk Street and up to Harris Street, interspersed with gambling joints and cheap bars.

We attended the Jones School at Plymouth and Harrison, and after school each boy ran to his newsstand that dotted the Loop, in time to pick up the 3:30 p.m. edition of the Daily News—the first paper delivered. My stand was at Dearborn and Harrison Streets in front of the Pontiac Building. The building is still there. Our problems were many, mostly adult ones—being subjected to the raw life experiences on Chicago's city streets. I recall drugstores selling narcotics in pill form in full view in open wooden buckets on the counter. And I saw many an addict giving himself a shot in the arm in the alley running North from Polk Street to Harrison between Clark and Federal Street. A kid could not possibly make it in these days without a two-fisted father and a watchful mother with a thick long leather strap. Our schoolteachers were wonderful disciplinarians, too—the rulers in the classroom were used more by the teacher in ruling lives by banging little palms than ruling lines on paper. So we needed a place to go for our social and cultural training. The State Street merchants had the answer—a boys' club in the Loop for the South End Loop kids—a pretty sophisticated group experienced in watching the many viceful ways of adulthood. So we had to be handled by experts, and the Colby's, the Field's, the Pirie's, the Maurice Rothchild's and Rothchild's store, the Lytton's, the Siegle's, and the Cooper's, the Hillman's—Fair Lehman's—Boston Store—Netcher's saw to it; also the newspaper publishers—Ames of the Post, McCormick of the Tribune, Thompson of the Journal, Mr. Hearst of the Examiner and American, and Strong of the Daily News.

It was the common practice to sell our unsold papers at the stands by visiting the bars or Tenderloin area in the Loop.

We were proud to hold membership in a club sponsored by the leading merchants and citizens of our city. We attended evenings through Saturday, learning to weave baskets, were trained in manual training—making footstools, shine boxes, book and tie racks and sleds—playing all sorts of games including pool and table croquet with stone hammers and balls to send under the hoops—also received instruction in freehand and watercolor drawing.

But Tuesday night was the best—movies about far-off different lands and the customs of the people, with a lecturer explaining in detail. We were entranced with interest. And also at given times, lectures on sexual diseases and narcotic addiction with slides to better depict its effects. And also movies on the development of an industry from its infancy to its complexity of organization and its contribution to the strength of the economy. And patriotic movies covering the Constitution and biographies of the lives of our American heroes and statesmen.

These pitfall lessons in our youth portrayed by real characters and events made a lasting impression upon our youthful minds. We learned secrets of life through lectures and slides by eminent physiologists of that era—something our family folks could not bring themselves around to tell.

At this period in our lives it was surely the most important contribution to our maturity within our memory. The slides showing deformities and diseases of the human family were never forgotten. The appearance first of a healthy robust youth and then a year later showing the same individual an emaciated and cadaverous looking skeleton was more than a warning to us of the terrible consequences of dope addiction.

The crime prevention bureau does just that much for the youth of today.

We have before us part of the statements that Lois L. Higgins, director of Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau sent to the Illinois Revenue Commission in defense of the Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau, as follows:

> It has been suggested that the Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau present, in a few moments, a commentary on its past activities and its justification for continued existence.
>
> It has been suggested that I, as director, account for 15 years of experience as a social worker and a woman officer of the law and for 12 years as the director—the woman director—of one of the Nation's few statewide crime prevention bureaus.
>
> This I willingly undertake—to the best of my ability, for I am deeply conscious of the responsibility that I undertook 13 years ago—to help the citizens of Illinois combat the rising tide of crime in Chicago and throughout the State.
>
> The Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau need make no apologies for its existence.
>
> It was established, in part, to combat the alarming post-World War II growth of narcotics addiction in Illinois, which had—and has—its focus in Chicago.
>
> The Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau participated in public agitation for the present stiff State and local narcotics laws and for the establishment of the Chicago Police Department Narcotics Bureau, and the municipal narcotics court, through the parent organization, Crime Prevention Council.
>
> The bureau maintained an observer for some years in the narcotics court to follow up each case.
>
> It provided information on this subject directly to the Chicago Police Department. It assisted in efforts toward establishing the Illinois Narcotics Commission and has at all times cooperated with it. As late as September 20, 1962, it was included in the group of delegates from Illinois to the White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse, scheduled for September 27–28, 1962.
>
> When the crime prevention bureau was established, the State of Illinois was the No. 2 State in the Nation, after New York, in official Federal narcotics statistics indicating the extent of addiction.
>
> Today it is the No. 3 State, after New York and California, which have had more permissive laws. Let us ask ourselves if these laws and these activities had anything to do with reducing addiction in Illinois, and the attendant petty and grand larceny and crimes against the person that every police officer and store owner knows accompany addiction. I am proud of the fact that I testified before legislative bodies in Springfield and in Washington, and supplied statistical information and suggestions—the result of crime prevention bureau research—on what might be done to curb narcotics addiction.

On April 7, 1961, at the invitation of Congressman SIDNEY YATES, of Illinois, I appeared before the Ways and Means Subcommittee of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., to urge increased penalties for peddlers and narcotics law violators prosecuted by the Federal Government.

On June 26, 1951, I testified before the special Senate committee appointed to investigate organized crime in interstate commerce.

At all possible times and on all possible occasions the bureau pressed for stronger Federal as well as State and local narcotics laws.

Evidently the work this bureau—and others—did was effective. We now have new Federal narcotics legislation with stiff mandatory sentences—without parole.

At the recent White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse in Washington on September 27–28, Lois L. Higgins, director of the crime prevention bureau, and several other delegates from Illinois were also invited.

She attended upon the invitation of the President of the United States.

She also has acted as a special adviser during the past 3 years of the U.S. Commissioner of Narcotics.

The bureau, early in its history, arranged for programs in the public and parochial high schools—and some grammar schools—explaining that the courts have no "go easy" policy on juvenile auto thieves. A final meeting was held in the city council chambers, attended by student leaders, faculty members, and school newspaper editors.

Upon repeated urging of the bureau, the first metropolitan point-to-point police radio system was set up, partly to reduce the incidence of auto theft.

The 1954 annual report of the Chicago Police Department officially notes that the bureau-sponsored assemblies and the point-to-point radio system brought about a reduction by one-third of auto thefts for the year.

Bowling lanes were sometimes congregating points for juvenile problems. The Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau cooperated with the Bowling Proprietors Association of Greater Chicago in setting up a "Family Twosome" tournament several years ago.

This tournament is still in progress. In 1962 some 3,000 young people participated in this family program.

We would like to think that we did something to establish a family atmosphere in Chicago and Illinois bowling lanes. It is our impression that this idea has been adopted in other States.

The bureau acted as cosponsor of a series of Codes of Conduct Congresses in the Chicago area public and parochial schools, again culminating in a joint meeting in the city council chambers. This program was predicated on the belief that the No. 1 crime prevention problem is the inculcation of proper standards of behavior.

In the 1950's, the Crime Prevention Bureau sponsored a meeting on sex offenses in the Chicago City Hall council chambers. The meeting was addressed by Marshall Korshak, chairman of the Illinois Commission on Sex Offenders.

Today the bureau acts as the Chicago representative—for the receipt of mail and messages—of this commission. Its name is on the office door.

The bureau is in no way ashamed of lectures delivered or the pamphlets it has published. It is in no way ashamed of any efforts that it has made to bring about a better understanding of the crime problem in Illinois and the Nation.

It is not ashamed—it is proud—of its resolute opposition to the concept of the wide open town—the town in which there exists uncontrolled or tolerated gambling, commercialized prostitution, narcotics trafficking, and violation of the liquor control laws.

It is proud of its public advocacy that bars that harbor prostitutes and criminals and violate the closing and other liquor control laws be closed permanently.

It applauds Superintendent of Police Orlando W. Wilson for his similar stand—expressed in a recent interview in the U.S. News & World Report.

It recommends Virgil Peterson, director of the Chicago Crime Commission, for the views he has expressed on legalized gambling.

The Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau strongly believes in the value of education as a crime prevention measure.

It believes that education for crime prevention and police preventive and protective measures are legitimate public functions. It believes that they are a necessary supplement to the efforts of police to deter and repress crime.

It believes that in a community where the public—and especially young people—are not informed of their responsibility to uphold the law, the tendency will be to try to place a disproportionate burden on the police.

As others have suggested, in such a community, police must rely on a show of force to prevent law violation in high crime areas. In such a community, a disproportionate number of police will be needed to force the criminal element to observe the law.

The best guarantee of obedience to the law is a citizenry that recognizes its obligations and wilingly upholds the law.

Even in the high crime areas, a majority of the population voluntarily obeys the law. But some citizens are unwilling to aid the police and courts in seeing that others obey the law.

It has been suggested that there is something scandalous in sending out 211,000 copies of bureau literature in a year.

We have to date sent out about 300,000 copies of the "Laws and Suggestions to Youth and Their Parents." We are in our fourth reprint. This publication explains the principal laws applying to juveniles in the Chicago area. It gives suggestions to parents on inculcating a responsible attitude in their children.

The 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth suggested such a publication. We were the first agency in the Chicago area to issue such a pamphlet. Others followed. We applaud them for it. If we are to be forbidden to circulate such literature, are the others to drop similar literature as an unjustified expenditure?

Here is another publication that we have distributed to schools literally in figures ranging in the hundreds of thousands. "This Is for You" booklet.

It urges schoolchildren not to accept rides with strangers. Who printed this? Convicts at the State penitentiary when Joseph E. Ragen was warden. He considered it a worthwhile expenditure. It is now out of print. We would like to print more. Will we—or anyone—be allowed, at public expense, to urge children of Illinois not to accept gifts or rides from strangers, to beware of strangers who sit down beside them in theaters, to beware of strangers who try to touch children or rearrange their clothing?

We are not ashamed of the pamphlet I hold now, "Venereal Disease: The Menace of Youth," which was issued earlier this year. May I refer you to page 74 of Time magazine, September 21, where it states:

"Only 5 to 10 percent of today's youngsters learn anything about VD from their parents, and many learn little more in school."

One hundred percent of today's youngsters in Illinois could learn about the subject if this or similar pamphlets were circulated among them.

Is this the type of literature which is felt to be a waste of the taxpayers' money?

We are not ashamed of this little booklet on "Code of Conduct" that was designed for teenage discussion. I defy anyone to find a "Dr." prefixed to my name on this leaflet. This pamphlet discusses so-called chicken games—dares to perform foolish or illegal acts because one is afraid of crowds—or mob—opinion. May I quote:

"Not being chicken is supposed to prove that a person is a man—that he is brave and ready to accept a challenge.

"There is nothing wrong about belonging to a gang or accepting a challenge, but when people accept a dare to do something that they know is wrong or silly, they are not necessarily proving their manliness. They may only be proving that they are afraid of not belonging. They may really be deathly afraid that someone will call them a name.

"It takes guts to choose our own behavior. It takes guts to do what is right when other people in our crowd would rather do something wrong. * * *

"Who is the real chicken?

"A little thinking will tell you that the real chicken is the person who is afraid to speak up when one or two members of his crowd want to do something wrong."

I am not ashamed of this leaflet. What I am ashamed of is that I—am one of those who hold similar beliefs about right and wrong—and that we were unable to get this message or a similar message into every home and classroom in Illinois.

Perhaps we might have been accused to talking in an unacceptably intellectual, highbrow tone in this publication—"Civic Leadership and Moral Crisis," in summarizing some of the remarks of Prof. David Riesman—of Chicago University:

"In the smaller families of urban life, and with the spread of permissive child care to ever wider strata of the population, there is a relaxation of older patterns of discipline. Under these newer patterns the peer group (the gang or crowd when one is speaking of juveniles) becomes much more important to the child, while the parents make him feel guilty not so much about violation of inner standards as about failure to be popular. Moreover," I am still quoting Professor Riesman, "the pressures of the school and peer-group are reinforced and continued by the mass media: movies, radio, comics, and popular culture media generally."

This publication is directed to adults. We have no apologies for the intellectual tone. We have faith in the sovereign power of reason—to quote the Chief Justice of the United States—in human affairs.

We are not ashamed of the fact that we issued "The Spirit of Liberty" by Judge Learned Hand on Law Day, 1962. May I quote from this famous speech by Judge Hand:

"The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, here 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

We are not ashamed of issuing this brief speech by Judge Hand, which was written as a prelude to the taking of "the pledge of allegiance" on I Am an American Day in New York in 1944.

I am not ashamed—I am proud—of "The Role of the State in Delinquency Control"—which was delivered at a meeting at which I shared the platform with Governor Hughes, of New Jersey.

May I quote from this publication:

"State crime prevention commissions and councils and other 'crime preventers' should take the lead in developing strong police and court efforts to suppress vice. Especially they should favor strict laws against juvenile involvement in vice situations. They should take the lead in advocating stiffer penalties for illegal vice operators. They should go and fight for their program in the State legislature and executive mansion and inform the public of the need for it."

Is this the sort of messages that should not be given the people of Illinois?

I am not ashamed of telling the people who read the comparatively few copies of our publications about the need for strong vice laws and strong enforcement efforts in control of such vice conditions as prostitution, gambling, narcotics addiction, and violations of the liquor control laws which Orlando Wilson sees as the principal support of big-city organized crime.

I am not ashamed of the fact that I testified as follows on H.R. 10226, 87th Congress, 2d session, a bill by Representatives Green and Zelenko to guarantee equal pay for equal work to both sexes.

May I quote from that—

"It is an unhappy fact that the best-paying job that some women can obtain today is that of the so-called call girl, or high priced prostitute.

"Many of the States of our Nation today are currently facing a budget crisis. The primary cause of this crisis is to be found in that section of the Social Security Act of the 1930's which established Federal fund-matching programs in aid of State-administrated unemployment compensation programs and of dependent children."

In my testimony, I spoke to the latter point:

"A contributing factor to this problem, surely, is the fact that there is a working mother—or a nonworking mother—involved in many cases of child dependency. The mother cannot make a decent living for her often abandoned children, quite often simply because she is a woman and is discriminated against."

Is this the sort of message that we cannot afford to have heard in our State today?

I am not ashamed of being a woman, of even perhaps appearing to be a hard-talking woman in her fifties who has blond white hair because it happens to run in our families. If what is meant by this remark is that I am a hard talker against crime and corruption, of dope peddlers and of filthmongers, then the statement is quite correct.

It will be noted by those who are interested in crime statistics that the arrest rate for men and women is not equal—many more men are arrested than women in the United States each year, according to official Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics. When women are arrested, it is usually not for the serious crime for which men are arrested.

I do not believe in the innate perfection of women, but I do believe that women may tend to be somewhat more law abiding. I believe that women have their proper role in our police departments and in our public life. I believe that the outraged women citizens of a community may be the means that will finally clean up the vice and corruption that unfortunately exists wherever the populace is not sufficiently vigilant or interested to oppose it continuously.

I am not unmindful of what women have done to prevent crime in nearby Lake County, Ind., and perhaps it is time for the women of the United States to start doing something about the wide-open conditions in some parts of this land—as we in this crime prevention bureau tried to do in Calumet City a few years ago. We were successful too, momentarily. This is a story which in itself would be of interest, perhaps—one which there is not time to relate here.

The Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau is not ashamed of the concept of a statewide crime prevention bureau that emphasizes education and public understanding of the tremendous problem posed today by rising crime rates.

Illinois has been in the forefront in its efforts as a State to establish such a statewide program. Is it now proposed to take a step backward and give way to more progressive States?

No one in this room can be unaware of the increased seriousness of the crime problem in our country.

No one can be unaware of the fact that the citizenry is demanding that something be done about the growing crime problem.

No one can be unaware that such eminent citizens as Robert Kennedy and Senator Kefauver have called for the establishment of a Federal Crime Commission.

Only last year President John F. Kennedy signed into law a Juvenile Delinquency Control Act that set up projects all over the country to study means of controlling juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

These projects will be carried out largely at Federal expense. The Federal Government is stepping in to perform tasks that the States are tending to ignore by default.

Economy is undoubtedly demanded by our taxpayers. Our citizens certainly deserve a full accounting for the uses that are made of their money.

At the same time, this commission might consider well where the bloody "hatchet" that has been handed to it by one who has agitated concerning this bureau in the public prints should be wielded.

In eliminating various State activities, it might be asked whether or not one might not be helping to dismantle State government in the United States.

The U.S. Constitution says that we have a Federal form of government. It says that the States and the Federal Government in Washington shall be coexisting and coordinate powers.

It does not make any difference what the Constitution says if the powers of our States and localities are being whittled away. The net result will be creeping centralized government.

If we abdicate our local responsibility for crime prevention and police and law enforcement because it costs too much money—someone will quickly say "the Federal Government can do it better."

The Federal Government will step in and do the job that you failed to do. Crime arises in local neighborhoods and local communities—it does not rise in Washington, D.C. We have to do something about it in our own States and communities if anything effective is going to be done about it. That is where young people learn to be criminals. When they break the law, they break largely State and local laws.

The Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau is not and never has been a partisan political operation. It has existed under both Democratic and Republican administrations. It deplores the fact that an attack has been made upon it for apparently political reasons—because of the longtime personal association with the bureau of Governor Kerner and Mayor Richard Daley. We might point to the fact that the bureau has enjoyed the support and good will of members of both parties. Whatever my own personal fate, for this bureau to be abolished for a purely political motive would be a crime against the people of Illinois.

Annual Report for the Year 1961—Crime Prevention Bureau of Illinois, Lois L. Higgins, Director

SUMMARY

Information supplied to the public: 35,000 requests for information were filled by mail; 8,000 telephone requests were answered; 5,000 requests made by visitors were handled.

Publications: 68,000 copies of "Laws and Suggestions for Youth and Their Parents," a new publication, were printed in 3 separate editions during the year and distributed as follows:

Schools	25,000
Police departments	12,000
American Legion post	10,000
Churches	6,000
Parent-teachers' associations	10,000
Miscellaneous (including many individual requests)	6,000

Two self-mailing leaflets, "Codes of Conduct" and "Stop the Pornography Crook" were issued for use in classroom and family discussions—2,500 copies of each were distributed.

Text of two other self-mailers was prepared on teenage venereal disease and on merchandise and services offered through the mail to young people.

Two multilithed discussions of the narcotics addiction problem entitled "Is Drug Addiction Serious Business?" and "Drugs: Dope and Death" were issued—6,500 copies of those and other bureau publications on narcotics were distributed.

Twenty-two thousand and ninety-five copies of "This Is for You," a comic book designed to warn children against would-be molestors, were distributed. The supply of these booklets was exhausted, and we are planning a new publication to replace them.

Thirty-one thousand and ninety-five copies of "Straight From the Shoulder," our Dick Tracy comic book, specially prepared for the bureau by Chester Gould, Chicago Tribune cartoonist, were distributed.

The following copies of the speeches were distributed in multilithed form:

"Legal and Social Aspects of the Alcohol Problem," Institute of Scientific Studies for the Prevention of Alcoholism, Los Angeles, July 13, 2,000 copies.

"The Role of the State in Delinquency Control," National Police Conference, Hoboken, N.J., September 12, 5,000 copies.

"The Need for an Affirmative Crime Prevention and Delinquency Control Program," Union College, Lincoln, Nebr., October 29, 500 copies.

"How Business and Employee Communications Can Help Contribute to Crime Prevention," Industrial Editors Association, November 15, 400 copies. Three hundred copies of these distributed by the association; 250 copies distributed by La Salle Extension University.

The first three of these were also published in the Police Digest, which circulates among Chicago area policemen.

One hundred and fifty copies of a letter to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, making recommendations on his bill, S. 2036 (the proposed Youth Employment Opportunities Act) with Senator Humphrey's reply, were distributed. (Comments were made at the suggestion of A. W. Motley, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.)

Two thousand five hundred copies of a multilithed speech delivered in 1959 on pornography as an organized racket were reissued as an undated bureau publication. Five hundred copies of a facsimile of a lengthy letter published by the Honolulu Advertiser in support of Chief Dan Liu's action in a pornography dispute were distributed.

One hundred and fifty copies of the new State obscenity law and 150 copies of the Chicago municipal code obscenity provisions were mimeographed and distributed.

Three thousand five hundred copies of the reprinted articles from Police and the Delphian Quarterly on the 1960 White House Conference on Youth were distributed.

Three thousand eight hundred copies of a reprinted article on the 1960 United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders were distributed.

Twenty-six thousand seven hundred copies of miscellaneous bureau publications on various bureau crime prevention programs (bowling, etc.) were distributed.

Forty-five thousand copies of various bureau publications on juvenile delinquency were distributed.

In all about 185,000 pieces of literature were distributed.

Speaking engagements: Fifty-five talks were delivered before Chicago area and Illinois PTA's, church groups, and clubs, on juvenile delinquency, crime prevention and narcotics addiction.

Several of a number of talks delivered in other States while on official leave were multilithed and distributed as bureau publications.

Addressed police recruits in Michigan City and Honolulu, among other out-of-town talks (leave status).

Radio and television talks and discussions: WGN-TV, Paul Saliner, "At Home" program February 9 and April 12. WCFL, radio station, Bob Elson Pump Room discussion, February 6. WMAQ, Sig Zakowicz program, February 1. WIMS (Michigan City, Ind.), May 15. WBKB-TV, Norman Ross, discussion of narcotics, September 1. Tape recording, Phil Lind Show, 188 West Randolph Street January 5.

Magazine articles: Prepared an article for the International Criminal Police Review, published by Interpol, Paris, France, on the Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau-Chicago Police Department stolen vehicle program in the Chicago area schools several years ago.

Police Chief magazine, published by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, published the speech delivered in Cincinnati, June 21 before the International Juvenile Officers Association.

The October 20 speech delivered in Lincoln, Nebr., was sent to the Delphian Quarterly for publication as an article.

Other publications: Cooperated with Science Research Associates, Chicago, in preparation of an occupation brief on the work performed by policewomen. Helped prepare a leaflet on the same subject for the International Association of Women Police.

Interviewed by various writers, Kitte Turmell, Christian Science Monitor newspaper, Parade magazine, Miss Leslie Artol, Associated Press, etc.

Cooperation with police and other organizations: Helped organize regional policewoman's seminar at Monticello, Ill., in cooperation with University of Illinois.

Served as member International Association of Chiefs of Police Crime Prevention Committee.

Chairman, National Police Officers Association of America, advisory board.

Appointed dean of correspondence school.

Medic alert: Appointed member of board. They maintain files of emergency medical information on diabetics, etc., who may be found unconscious in street by police, etc. American Medical Association is considering extending this program under its sponsorship—cooperated also with them.

Fellowship Club, Chicago Police Department (Alcoholics Anonymous): Participated in their annual banquet. This program will now be conducted among all city employees rather than simply among police officers.

Bowling Proprietors Association of Greater Chicago: Cosponsored the family twosome competition—2,000 families participated in this annual event, which the bureau helped originate. Helped select winners of scholarships awarded by the association.

Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police: Served as member of board, helped handle public relations, etc.

Cooperation with other government agencies:

Mayor's office: 15 requests for information were filled.

Commissioner of health: Participated in venereal disease conference, Morrison Hotel.

Municipal court: Appeared as the city's only "expert witness" in pornography trial involving 30 cases, which the city won. (Defense had seven witnesses.)

Cooperation with corporation counsel's office in pornography case involving Henry Miller's "Tropic of Cancer." Expert witness.

State of Oregon: Supplied attorney general with suggestions for organization of a State crime prevention program.

Regional White House Conference, Chicago: Participated at invitation of President John F. Kennedy.

U.S. Children's Bureau: Reviewed proposed publication entitled, "Police Contacts with Juveniles." (Wrote lengthy comments on same.)

U.S. Bureau of Narcotics: Continued to serve as a member of advisory committee.

U.S. National Committee for Children and Youth: Participated in Washington conference on unemployed—school dropouts, a followup meeting of the 1960 White House Conference on Youth, to which I was a delegate. Harvard President Emeritus Conant presided.

Personnel: It is my sad duty to report the death of James L. Doherty, the bureau's voluntary public relations counselor, which occurred on December 24. Mr. Doherty, a retired Chicago Tribune crime reporter, helped organize the bureau in 1949, and devoted much of his own time to it. At the time of his death, he was also serving as president of Crime Prevention, Inc., a citizens group which supports bureau activities.

I have been named to succeed Mr. Doherty as president of Crime Prevention, Inc.

The bureau is now and has been cooperating with the following, especially in the area of coordination and research:

U.S. Children's Bureau, "Guidelines and Perspectives for Police Contacts With Youth"—a 2-year study completed—now at Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of Narcotics—retired Hon. Harry Anslinger—now Acting Commissioner Henry Giordano. White House Conference on Narcotics—September 27-28, 1962, State Department Auditorium.

U.S. Department of Health (in VD studies and invited to the World Congress on VD, September 1962). Unable to be present.

National Committee for Children and Youth (the continuing group during the years between White House Conferences on Children and Youth—several areas of research—latest, youthful drivers).

Medic alert—of vital concern to people who are picked up unconscious, in shock, etc.—or are unable to communicate, who may be allergic to a certain drug. A file of 55,000 such persons in Turlock, Calif., is available without charge with a collect call from a doctor or other authorized person.

Science Research Associates (Chicago) provided research that developed the first brief on subject of "Policewomen," No. 107—they charge $0.25 each.

National Police Officers Association of America, Law Enforcement Institute NPOAA, auxiliary.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research Center, 44 East 23d Street, New York City (national center for research in our field.)

On Central File Index, New York City, various subjects; they pay cost of postage and other costs.

Narcotics Education, Inc. distribution to some 6,500 people in this way.

Congressional information upon request or suggestion, Youth Opportunities Act, Senate bill 2036; developed letter and did research on this.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 31, 1962]

Two Teachers Found Guilty in Smut Club Trial

A university professor and a high school teacher, members of the Adonis Male Club, were found guilty here Tuesday of conspiring to send obscene material through the mails.

They are Glenn D. Willbern, 58, associate professor of Spanish at Indiana University, and James Poulos, 40, a high school teacher in Lansing, Mich.

A sealed verdict of guilty was opened before U.S. District Court Judge Richard B. Austin. A jury of six men and six women had reached the verdict Monday night after 2 hours and 40 minutes of deliberation.

Judge Austin ordered a presentencing investigation and set February 6 for hearing of any motions.

Each man could receive a maximum sentence of 5 years in prison and a $5,000 fine.

Willbern and Poulos were among 52 persons indicated last year following Federal investigation of the Chicago-headquartered Adonis Male Club and the International Body Culture Association.

The Government charged that a "pen pal" operation was used to circulate smut through the mails.

Judge Austin also is conducting a bench trial for six other defendants in the case.

As a result of this interview the Daily News graciously printed her contentions and responses to the previous articles critical of the operations.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1962.

Mr. THOMAS COLLINS,
City Editor, Chicago Daily News,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. COLLINS: It has been a pleasant experience to meet with you. Some day it is my earnest hope that we may earn the respect of the Daily News. Meanwhile it is just nice to have met you—and to learn, once again, that newspapers really do have people behind the printing on the pages.

Thank you for your time and for the few words at least, that may be printed on behalf of crime prevention.

Women in public life need desperately the opportunity to be of service in a confused and drifting world. A "crime fighter" is indeed useless without resources and the support of a community which really ought to care more than it does—at times.

Thanks again.

LOIS L. HIGGINS.
(Mrs. Frank J.)

[From the Chicago Daily News, Sept. 24, 1962]

Crime Bureau Doing Job, Director Vows

The Crime Prevention Bureau of Illinois is doing its job well and deserves full support, says Mrs. Lois L. Higgins, its director.

In a letter to the Daily News, she deplored recent columns by John Justin Smith, saying they contained inaccuracies and distorted the picture of the bureau's values.

Smith has contended that the agency, which is tax supported, is an ineffective use of taxpayers' money, serving largely as a lecture bureau for Mrs. Higgins, and that he believes it should be disbanded.

Among the "positive contributions made by the bureau to the cause of crime prevention" cited by Mrs. Higgins, were these:

1. "Upon repeated urging by the bureau, the first metropolitan point-to-point police radio system was set up. On the first day of operation, a suspect who shot a policeman was apprehended as a direct result of this hookup."

2. "A principal reason this bureau was established was the growth of youthful narcotic addiction in parts of this area." Presenting information to investigating bodies was cited. "Evidently the work we—and others—did was effective," Mrs. Higgins said, citing new, stiff antinarcotic laws.

3. "This bureau was directly responsible for stiffer State and local narcotics laws, for the establishment of municipal narcotics courts through the parent organization's

crime prevention council. Illinois has now fallen to third place nationally in narcotics statistics. * * *"

4. The bureau has maintained an observer in narcotics court and it assisted in establishing the Illinois Narcotics Commission. Today there is no observer.

5. The bureau organized an anti-auto-theft campaign in high schools, "explaining that the courts have no go-easy policy on juvenile auto thieves," climaxed by a city hall meeting.

6. "Bowling lanes were sometimes congregating points for juvenile problems," and in cooperation with proprietors, the bureau set up family twosome tournaments that brought youths and adults together at the alleys.

7. "The bureau sponsored a series of 'codes of conduct' congresses in public and parochial schools," again capped by a city hall meeting, "on the belief that the No. 1 crime prevention problem is the inculcation of proper standards of behavior."

8. "During the last year, the bureau had a vital part in assisting the corporation counsel in successful prosecution of 30 cases of pornography."

In discussing her own qualifications, Mrs. Higgins refers Mr. Smith to an introduction in her recent book "The Policewoman's Manual," in which Chicago Police Superintendent O. W. Wilson writes:

"Lois Higgins' own stature as a social worker, teacher, and policewoman should prove an inspiration to others already working in this field and to young women who may be considering law enforcement as a career."

Mrs. Higgins also made these points in an interview:

"Mr. Smith has implied that the crime prevention bureau is nothing more than a lecture bureau. If he means that the staff has responded to more than 1,000 requests of civic, social, fraternal—or religious groups in 1 year—he is correct.

"We have a speakers' bureau. But the sad fact is that for the last 2 years, because of lack of personnel, the director (Mrs. Higgins) is the only one available to service these requests. She refers, almost daily, those she is unable to fill to personnel of youth-serving agencies.

"If the bureau is doing nothing, its reputation has held firm. This week its director will attend the White House Conference on Narcotics upon invitation of the President.

"She has been invited to attend the First Congress of American Women Leaders in early October where 35 women will be in attendance."

Mrs. Higgins also said Smith has made "misstatements of fact too numerous to recount." She made these points:

1. Smith was in error in what he said was the sign on the door of the bureau office.

2. "No one from the Chicago Police Department is assigned to the office."

3. "The quotation ascribed to Superintendent Wilson must certainly be inaccurate, since our files reflect the fact that Mr. Wilson is quite familiar with the functions and goals of this bureau. Smith had written that when Wilson was asked about the bureau, he replied, 'I'm not sure I've heard of it. What is it?'"

4. "Judge John Gutknecht was not State's attorney in 1949," as Smith had stated.

5. "The bureau's legislative appropriation is one of the smallest of any State agency. In spite of this fact, the bureau has been the recipient of countless citations and awards at the city, county, and State as well as national levels."

[From the Garfieldian]

A Comic Book Every Child Should Read

There has been considerable controversy about certain types of comic books, but there is one comic book we feel belongs in the hands of every youngster. This wholesome, color comic book, entitled "This Is for You," gives graphic demonstrations of six don'ts for children.

The don'ts are intended to warn children of dangers they may encounter from perverts in their everyday routine away from parental supervision. Now with some schools already closed for the summer and public schools about to close children will be spending more and more time outdoors—away from adult supervision a great deal of the time. The latest outrage of child molestation of the 6-year-old Detroit girl last week forcibly reminds parents that youngsters cannot be told often enough to stay away from strangers. This booklet does it with illustrations which are particularly impressionable on children.

Distributed by the Crime Prevention Bureau and the board of education the comic book advises parents to discuss and emphasize these practical rules with their children. The don'ts include:

Don't ever get into an automobile with a stranger. Don't even go near the car.

Don't allow a stranger to pick you up or touch you.

Don't take candy or money or presents from a stranger.

Don't let anyone fuss with your clothes.

Don't go away from the playground or school with any stranger.

Don't go into a stranger's home or workshop or room.

The comic book also tells parents to be on the lookout for suspicious individuals, to observe his car license number, to make a note of his description and to notify police.

Since the triple murder of the Schuessler brothers and Peterson boy in 1955 and the recent Grimes sisters' death more than 500,000 copies of this comic book have been distributed. A Crime Prevention Bureau worker said requests for copies jumped greatly after the bodies of the sisters were found.

The bureau has been distributing the booklet since 1949. They are printed at the Stateville penitentiary. Warden Joseph E. Ragen has ordered reprints and it is expected soon approximately 1 million copies will have been issued through the Crime Prevention Bureau.

PTA's who may want to see that the comic book is distributed before schools close may obtain copies at the board of education, 228 North La Salle or the Crime Prevention Bureau, 160 North La Salle. The bureau requests copies be picked up to save time and postage.

We might add we believe the printing of the comic books at Stateville is a worthy example of prison labor wisely used.

[From the Police Digest, August 1958]

State of Illinois, 1st Special Session, 70th General Assembly, House of Representatives in Commendation of Dr. Lois Lundell Higgins

(Offered by Messrs. Semrow, P. J. Miller, and W. G. Clark)

"Whereas Dr. Lois Lundell Higgins, director of the Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau, a cooperative agency fostered and encouraged by the general assembly which since 1950 has made a biennial appropriation for its maintenance, is the coauthor of a book titled 'Criminology and Crime Prevention' which has just been published; and

"Whereas Dr. Lois Higgins has been identified with the Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau since its inception in 1949 and has been its director since 1951, and has been carrying the message of crime prevention in Illinois to audiences in 125 cities of 28 States of this country, the West Indies, Europe, and most recently around the world from San Francisco to Tokyo, Hong Kong, the Philippines, India, Lebanon, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Rome, and London, and she has appeared on the platforms of some 50 universities and colleges, adding to the prestige of this State in the important field of crime prevention; and

"Whereas in her scholarly approach to the problems inherent in this field, Dr. Higgins has put the work of law enforcement and crime prevention on an extremely high professional level and has enlisted the assistance of people everywhere in the work to which her life has been dedicated; and

"Whereas the book 'Criminology and Crime Prevention,' is an authoritative work dealing with all forms of crime and stresses ways and means of helping youth escape the pitfalls that lead to ruin, and is based on the actual and practical experience of Dr. Higgins as a social worker, policewoman, instructor, and lecturer, to which has been added the collaboration of Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, president emeritus of Mount Mary College of Milwaukee, Wis.; and

"Whereas the problem of an alarming increase in juvenile delinquency confronts all of the authorities in Illinois as well as the entire country, recent reports indicating that the crime rate is increasing all over the world, and Dr. Higgins has made a global study of crime conditions and ways of combating juvenile delinquency; and

"Whereas the book 'Criminology and Crime Prevention,' gives considerable attention to juvenile delinquency, drug addiction—a subject on which Dr. Higgins has long been rated as an expert—and other phases of modern crime, including data on communism, treason, and disloyalty—matters of extreme importance at this time all over this country and throughout the free world—as well as much information useful to present and future law enforcement officers and all persons engaged in the administration of justice; and

"Whereas Dr. Higgins is known far and wide as president of the International Association of Women Police and as a member of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and as a faithful and efficient civil service worker in Chicago and the State of Illinois and has the approval and commendation of the mayor, police commissioner, members of the city council, chief justice of the municipal court, and other officials of the city of Chicago and the county of Cook: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 70th General Assembly of the State of Illinois at the 1st Special Session thereof,* That the house go on record as commending Dr. Higgins for her fine contribution to the literature of criminology and complimenting her on her accomplishments as an author and law enforcement officer, the excellence of her crime prevention activities and her service to the people of the State of Illinois; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a suitable copy of this resolution be forwarded to Dr. Higgins and that a copy of this resolution and the book, 'Criminology and Crime Prevention,' be made a permanent part of the record of the Illinois Historical Society, and such other copies of the book as may be deemed necessary be made available as part of the Illinois State Library for all to read.

"Adopted by the house, June 17, 1958.

"Warren L. Wood,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"Fred W. Ruegg,
"*Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A similar resolution was passed June 18, 1958, by the Illinois Senate. Senator Marshall Korshak (Democrat, 5th) was its sponsor along with Senator Arthur Bidwill (Republican, 7th), the president pro tempore of the senate, and Senators Daniel Dougherty (Democrat, 13th), Robert E. Cherry, (Democrat, 31st) and W. Russell Arrington (Republican, 6th) and Daniel Rostenkowski (Democrat, 27th).

Earlier Mayor Richard J. Daley and the Chicago City Council went on record as appraising the book and the crime prevention activities of coauthor Higgins.

Democrats as well as Republicans like the book, as was evidenced by the action of the general assembly in extraordinary session last June. A resolution submitted by Representatives Harry Semrow and William G. Clark, Democrats, and Representative Peter J. Miller, Republican, all of Northwest Side districts and neighbors of the Higgins family, was unanimously adopted, on June 17, and read as follows:

"RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE CITY COUNCIL BY HARRY L. SAIN, ALDERMAN, 27TH WARD

"'Whereas Dr. Lois Lundell Higgins, a policewoman of the city of Chicago for the past 21 years, and at present assigned to the Chicago municipal court as crime prevention coordinator, and serving as a director of the crime prevention bureau—a cooperative organization of State, city, county, school board, and park district employees—is the coauthor of a book titled "Criminology and Crime Prevention" which has just been published; and

"'Whereas "Criminology and Crime Prevention" is an authoritative work dealing with all forms of crime and stresses ways and means of helping American youth escape the pitfalls that lead to ruin, and is based on the actual and practical experiences of Dr. Higgins as a social worker, policewoman, instructor, and lecturer, and in which she had the collaboration of Dr. Edward A. Fitzpatrick, president emeritus of Mount Mary College of Milwaukee, Wis.; and

"'Whereas the problem of an alarming increase in junvenile delinquency confronts the authorities of Chicago as well as the entire country, and, in her recent tour of the world Dr. Higgins made a study of crime conditions and ways of combating juvenile delinquency, and for many years Dr. Higgins has been receiving great praise for her efforts and accomplishments in her chosen profession; and

"'Whereas the book "Criminology and Crime Prevention" gives considerable attention to juvenile delinquency, drug addiction—a subject on which Dr. Higgins has long rated as an expert—and other phases of modern crime, including data on communism, treason, and disloyalty—matters of extreme importance at this time all over this country and throughout the free world: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved,* That the city council of the city of Chicago go on record as commending Dr. Higgins for her fine contributions to the literature of criminology and complimenting her on her accomplishments as an author, on her recent admission to membership in the Far East Criminologist Association, and expressing our appreciation of the excellence of her service to the people of the city of Chicago, and in general for her outstanding position in the great profession of law enforcement.'

"STATE OF ILLINOIS,
"County of Cook, ss.

"I, John C. Marcin, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of that certain resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago at a regular meeting held on Wednesday, the 26th day of March, A.D. 1958.

"Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 28th day of March, A.D. 1958.

"RICHARD J. DALEY,
"Mayor.
"JOHN C. MARCIN,
"City Clerk."

RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY ALFRED J. CILELLA, ALDERMAN 36TH WARD

"Whereas the crime prevention bureau was organized in 1949 for the purpose of cooperating with the various law enforcement agencies, to prevent crime and especially to combat the narcotics evil and to curb sex offenses, automobile thefts, and other related crimes in Cook County and the Chicago metropolitan area; and

"Whereas Dr. Lois Higgins on March 3, 1955, will commence her fifth year as director of the crime prevention bureau; and

"Whereas the crime prevention bureau under the energetic and inspiring leadership of Dr. Lois Higgins, as director, has made a substantial contribution to the development and growth of Chicago by its important work in behalf of crime prevention and juvenile delinquency; and

"Whereas Dr. Lois Higgins, as a devoted mother and wife, sociologist, humanitarian, criminologist, policewoman, volunteer civic leader, and member of the Chicago Youth Commission is largely responsible for this all-important contribution; and

"Whereas public necessity in Chicago at the present time demands that all civic-minded citizens, law enforcement agencies, public officials, religious, fraternal, and labor groups, unite in a common effort to combat juvenile delinquency and teenage vandalism and crime and that persons engaged in this all-important work be encouraged to continue their efforts in its behalf: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the city council of the city of Chicago go on record as commending the fine work of the crime prevention bureau, and especially extending to Dr. Lois Higgins, our sincere thanks and appreciation for her many accomplishments as its director and also congratulating her upon the occasion of her fifth year as director of the crime prevention bureau; be it further

"*Resolved,* That this resolution be spread of record on the journal of the proceedings of the city council and that a copy of this resolution be presented to Dr. Lois Higgins.

"STATE OF ILLINOIS,
"County of Cook, ss.

"I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of that certain resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Chicago at a regular meeting held Wednesday, the 23d day of February, A.D. 1955.

"Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 28th day of February, A.D. 1955,

"LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
"City Clerk."

THE JAMES L. DOHERTY MEMORIAL

"Whereas the late James L. Doherty, ace Chicago Tribune crime reporter, was a leader in forming crime prevention programs that attracted worldwide acclaim, the National Police Officers Association of America has established the special James L. Doherty Memorial Award; and

"Whereas women police have long been established as devoted to the prevention of crime in the United States and that chief among their small group is the Honorable Lois L. Higgins, president, International Association of Women Police, director, Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau and author, lecturer, historian, and leader of the program to prevent crime worldwide; and

"Whereas the National Police Officers Association of America wishes to honor the outstanding contribution made to the prevention of crime and to alerting the public of the menace that faces this world today and thus it is fitting that the first James L. Doherty Memorial Award be presented to Dr. Lois L. Higgins, who has contributed every moment of her life to mankind and the treatment of its crime ills; and

"Whereas so many of her associates gather here in Hawaii tonight to meet in fellowship and do honor to many distinguished Americans, we have asked Chief of Police Daniel S. C. Liu, Honolulu Police Department to present this resolution and a check for $100 to be used by Dr. Higgins in any manner she sees fit and to encourage her to keep up her war against crime and evil and to continue to lead so many of us as law enforcement officers in a path of honor and humility."

Issued this 20th day of August 1962, at the Police Hall of Fame, Port Charlotte, Fla., by direction of the board, National Police Officers Association of America.

EDWARD M. RICHARD,
President.
FRANK J. SCHIRER,
Executive Director.

CHICAGO, *September 30, 1960.*

DR. LOIS HIGGINS,
Director, Crime Prevention Bureau,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR DR. HIGGINS: Thank you for the information contained in your letter of September 22, 1960, on the operations of the Crime Prevention Bureau of Illinois. I appreciate the kind words which you have for Policewoman Grace Hayes and Sgt. John J. Hartigan and for the services which they render to your bureau.

It is not my function to advise you on the operations of your bureau, but I do feel that the present arrangement by which members of the Chicago Police Department are loaned to you for extended periods of time is, at best, an awkward one. It seems to me that any governmental program of a worthwhile nature should be financed by its parent organization—which in this instance I would presume would be the State legislature. Certainly with the very impressive alinement of supporters that you cite in your letter, your bureau should have no difficulty in obtaining the necessary funds for its operation.

I recognize that arrangements of this sort cannot be worked out immediately. For this reason, I am agreeable to continuing the services of the two police officers presently assigned to the bureau through July 1, 1961, on the assumption that an effort will be made to obtain funds in the new State budget for the bureau's support.

I am sure that you can understand my desire to have police officers on the payroll of the city of Chicago work under the direct control of the police department in the provision of police service to the citizens of Chicago.

Sincerely yours,

O. W. WILSON,
Superintendent of Police.

DEAR SUPERINTENDENT WILSON: In reply to your September 16, 1960, letter, I would like to take advantage of your request that I call to your attention factors that demand the services of Policewoman Grace Hayes and Sgt. John Hartigan in this office.

As you have no doubt determined upon this general course of action because you do not desire a dispersion of your own forces, you will appreciate that we deplore a dispersion of our own personnel.

You state of the work being performed by Mrs. Hayes and Sgt. Hartigan that "it appears to us that these duties are of a nonpolice nature and would seem to be more properly performed by a regular member of your staff."

This seems to assume that there are "regular members" of a Crime Prevention Bureau staff. Actually, every person in this office is on the pay rolls of other agencies, and there is no "regular" staff.

This is a cooperative agency that has existed entirely on the good will and interest of various government officials, city, county, and State, and on the efforts of various members of the Chicago business community, who form an advisory council, to get a crime prevention program established.

This agency was started in 1949 with the interested efforts of such individuals as:

1. James Doherty, Chicago Tribune crime reporter, who now serves as our unpaid public relations counsellor;

2. John S. Boyle, subsequently State's attorney and now a candidate for judge of the superior court;

3. Donald Walsh, managing editor, Chicago American; and

4. John C. Prendergast, commissioner of police (Chicago).

The Governor, mayor, sheriff, Chicago police commissioner, superintendent of schools, superintendent of the Catholic parochial schools, have served as members of our coordinating council.

Commissioner John C. Prendergast was himself the first chairman of our coordinating council. One of the principal functions of the bureau has always been supplying information on juvenile problems to the mayor's office.

This is and always has been a completely nonpartisan operation. It received the support of Governor Adlai Stevenson, and it has had the support of Governor Stratton, through Joseph D. Bibb, director of the department of public safety.

Director Bibb has not felt that we were performing duties of a nonpolice nature. One of our regular clerical staff members is carried on his departmental payroll. Another member is carried on his appropriation through bimonthly contractual vouchers. We also receive part-time contractual services from Dr. James S. Sweet, who was at one time a civil service employee of the Los Angeles Police Department and helps prepare our informational material.

Beyond this, and an allowance for supplies and the provision of office space, we have no other State support. I myself am carried on the payroll of the municipal court. Other office assistance is carried on the Cook County payroll.

If we lose Mrs. Hayes and Sergeant Hartigan, the only nonclerical people left will be Mr. Doherty, who performs his duties gratis, myself, and Dr. Sweet.

Before we came into existence, there was no crime prevention program at all in this area. There was no mayor's youth commission, and there was no police crime prevention bureau.

We are of course flattered at the fact that others followed in our footsteps.

Following are some of our accomplishments:

1. Upon the repeated urging of this bureau, the first metropolitan point-to-point police radio system was set up. On the second day of the operation, a suspect who shot a policeman was apprehended as a direct result of this hookup.

2. A principal reason this bureau was established was the growth of youthful narcotic addiction in parts of the Chicago area. This bureau gathered statistical data on the problem which was presented to such investigating bodies as the Kefauver committee of the early 1950's. I myself appeared all over the Nation on television as a witness at these hearings. Evidently the work we and others did was effective. We now have a stiff new Federal narcotics act with mandatory sentences. Under this act, Vito Genovese and other leading participants in the Appalachin, N.Y., crime conference received long prison terms.

3. This bureau was directly responsible for stiffer State and local narcotics laws and for establishment of the municipal narcotics court. Illinois has now fallen to third place nationally in narcotics statistics issued by the U.S. Government. New York and California, with a more "gentle" approach to jailing narcotics peddlers, lead the Nation.

4. This bureau maintained an observer for some years in the narcotics court to follow up on each case, and provided information on this subject directly to the Chicago Police Department. We were planning to put Sergeant Hartigan back in this court in an observational capacity, as nobody at all is doing this now.

5. This office arranged for programs in all the public and parochial high schools, explaining that the courts have no "go easy" on juvenile automobile thieves. Following this campaign auto theft in the area fell off by one-third.

6. Bowling alleys were becoming congregating points for juvenile delinquents. We cooperated with the Bowling Proprietors' Association in setting up a family-twosome tournament, which is still going. The atmosphere in bowling alleys has considerably improved. Chicago police reportedly have received much better cooperation from bowling alley proprietors. I now serve on a committee of the bowling alley people that annually grants a college scholarship to a deserving young person.

7. This bureau sponsored a series of "Codes of Conduct" congresses in all the Chicago area public and parochial high schools, culminating in an area Congress in the city hall. This was predicated on the belief that the No. 1 crime-prevention problem is the inculcation of proper standards of behavior. Police officers on our staff were used in conducting these programs. We think it is important that students get to look upon police officers as human beings who only appear at scenes of distress and unpleasantness. We were planning to revive this program again this year. If Sergeant Hartigan, who did a good deal of contact work with schools, is taken from us, we shall be severely handicapped.

8. Sergeant Hartigan and Mrs. Hayes prepared a handbook of laws affecting juveniles for distribution in the public schools. This directly follows a recommendation of the President's White House Conference on Children and Youth. If they had not been available, there would be no handbook.

We cannot understand how this type of activity can be a nonpolice nature, unless it is believed that crime prevention is not a police function.

Police officers above all should directly participate in this work. If anything is to be accomplished, it will be done by people who have an actual day-to-day knowledge of the problems. At every step we already find people whose knowledge of this field is only theoretical who say that the worst thing that can happen in the treatment of juvenile offenders is to let the police have anything to do with them.

This attitude has undoubtedly developed because many people have never seen police officers in any other capacity than crime repression.

They do not want them doing anything but "pounding a beat," which represents their stereotype of what a police officer should do.

Chicago Police Department personnel have always been the mainstay of this office, despite its apparent State identification.

Not very much of the above would have been accomplished without them, and we shall be severely hindered in the future if Mrs. Hayes and/or Sergeant Hartigan are taken from us.

Be assured that whatever your decision we will continue to the best of our ability to cooperate in every way with you and with your department.

Sincerely,

Lois L. Higgins,
Director,
Illinois Crime Prevention Bureau.

PUBLIC POWER ADVOCATES URGE POLITICAL ACTION ON OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill still pending in the Congress, there has been increased talk and activity in recent days concerning the large public power projects included in that bill. I have just read two interesting statements which I would like to read to my colleagues here in the House of Representatives. The first one says in part:

> We have set up municipal plants * * * [another] * * * attempt which I look upon as much more hopeful than the one which seeks to set up through Government ownership * * * yardsticks by which the successfulness of private ownership under regulation may be measured * * * we cannot hope to take over the whole [electric power] industry successfully even if it were thought generally advisable to do so at the moment.

The second statement is contained in a newspaper article in the Oregon Journal, October 3, 1962, by Watford Reed. Mr. Reed said of a recent speaker:

> At the same time, he acknowledged that Federal and State ownership of utilities is not in the cards in the United States now but expressed belief that increased public ownership is possible through municipal ownership and organization of more PUD's. The only way we'll get nationwide public ownership is gradual.

These two statements may seem to have been made by the same man and perhaps at even the same meeting. But, no, Mr. Speaker, the first statement was written by H. S. Raushenbush in an aricle entitled "A Program of Gradual Socialism of Industry" for the New Leader, March 12, 1927. The second statement was made by the well-known general manager of the national electric cooperative outfit here in Washington, Clyde T. Ellis, at a recent meeting of public power advocates out in Portland, Oreg. It seems as though the advocates of nationalizing the electric industry never give up and rarely change their ideas and methods of doing business.

Watford Reed, in his article for the Oregon Journal, also reports on the speech made at the same meeting by another well-known public power advocate, Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power. Mr. Holum warns the faithful that if they want their program of accelerated water and power development they had better get active in politics, particularly on the congressional level.

Another old public power campaigner, Michael Straus, was also on hand to fan the fires of public ownership of electric utilities. Mike also called upon the faithful to put pressure on the Members of Congress here in Washington now and in the next few weeks of the congressional campaign. He urged his listeners to "look the candidates over now and make them stand up and be counted now so you will get the men in Washington who will follow the policies we advocate with no funny business in the process."

Mr. Speaker, in these remaining few hours of the 87th Congress, we, the Mem-

bers who have already been elected to represent the best interest of our constituents and the Nation, cannot and must not bow to the pressure of this kind of public power fanatic who would try to make us follow the policies they advocate with no "funny business in the process" by approving an omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill with all these unnecessary or uneconomic public power dams.

My friends, so that you too might know and recognize the nature of these individuals who advocate this needless expenditure of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, I am including Mr. Reed's article from the Oregon Journal, entitled "Public Power Advocates Urge Political Action Support for Projects at Meet":

Public Power Advocates Urge Political Action, Support for Projects at Meet

(By Watford Reed)

(Note.—Clyde Ellis and other well-known public power advocates have been having a pow-wow out in the West to bring pressure to bear on Members and candidates for Congress "to follow the policies" they advocate. They go on to say that "the only way we'll get nationwide public ownership is gradual." The many public power dams that these public power supporters are trying to pressure into the omnibus public works bill would go a long way in the direction of nationwide public ownership. Clyde Ellis must expect to be the first national Commissar of public power in his scheme of things.)

The heat will be turned up on the public power side of the public-private power vendetta if leaders follow pleas made at the Western States Water and Power Consumers' Conference at the Multnomah Hotel.

One speaker after another urged more political action and mutual support.

Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, declared Tuesday night in the last speech of the daylong meeting:

"Your programs are making progress because a handful of western congressional leaders, strongly assisted by the administration, have been able to eke out narrow margins of victory with the support of the East.

"In a very real sense, what is accomplished in 1963 and 1964 will depend upon the vigor and decisive leadership you provide.

"If you want a common carrier interconnection from the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Southwest, you have work to do. If you want the Missouri River development from Fort Benton to Fort Peck, don't leave all the work to Senators Mansfield and Metcalf and Secretary Udall.

"If you really want an accelerated program of water and power resource development, the next 5 weeks are critical. Five weeks from now the country will know the makeup of its new Congress."

Michael W. Straus of Washington, D.C., longtime U.S. Reclamation Commissioner, entitled his speech "Turn Up the Heat" and said:

"As a veteran Federal bureaucrat who has been through the Washington mill, I call on you to keep the heat on—and turn up the rheostat.

"We are in a congressional campaign, and the American way is to look the candidates over now and make them stand up and be counted now, so you will get the men in Washington who will follow the policies we advocate with no funny business in the process."

At the same time he jabbed at bureaucratic delays in these words:

"Somewhat as a squirrel in a spinning cage, there are some signs of circular inaction which we must not confuse with progress forward."

In the same vein, members of a panel called for mutual support.

Wallace Campbell, of Columbus, Ohio, director of public affairs for Nationwide Insurance, farmer-owned firm, suggested that unions invest reserves in buying electric companies.

He told his his company was begun with a $10,000 investment by farmers and has grown to a $500 million firm and how a Utah electric cooperative borrowed $800,000 from the insurance company to buy a privately owned electric company in the middle of its territory.

Campbell declared in summary:

"Our problem is to use the resources we have for our own benefit."

Pat Greathouse, of Detroit, vice president of the United Auto Workers, likewise declared:

"The only way to get results is to provide all the self-help possible."

He, too, urged more political efforts and said:

"The shift of 76,000 votes in exactly the right places would have meant the election of 29 additional liberal Congressmen in 1960. The fact that they weren't elected is not President Kennedy's fault; it our fault.

"If the coming election does not support Kennedy, the 1963 program will be smaller than the 1962 program. If it supports him the 1963 program will be bigger."

Clyde T. Ellis of Washington, D.C., general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, likewise called for "more cooperation among ourselves."

At the same time, he acknowledged that State and Federal ownership of utilities is "not in the cards in the United States now" but expressed belief that increased public ownership is possible through municipal ownership and organization of more PUD's.

"The only way we'll get nationwide public ownership is gradual," he declared, claiming at the same time that "the power companies are combining to kill off the public utilities."

Campbell also recommended help for democratic elements abroad. He declared:

"It is quite possible that $5 billion in oversea aid brings us more security than $55 billion for armaments.

"If the Communists take over abroad, we'll have to spend far more for a 'fortress America.'

"If India, the biggest democracy in the world with 440 million people, went Communist, all of southeast Asia would too, and maybe Africa and Latin America."

In a discussion period, Representative Beulah Hand, Democrat, of Milwaukee, declared that a few members of the Oregon Legislature have fought the public power fight "without even thanks" from groups that urge them on.

Norman Clapp, of Washington, D.C., Rural Electrification Administrator, told the group that "a record of $250 million is available for loan to cooperatives to build electric transmission lines and generating facilities."

He reported that 11 percent of American farms were electrified in 1935, before the REA was set up but now 97 percent have electricity. Of $4 billion lent by the REA, $1 billion had been repaid a year ago, he said.

At the same time, Clapp declared:

"If we are to avoid waste in resources development, we will need cooperation of the highest order in planning and development at all levels—Federal, State and local, between both public and private groups.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Mattila, a writer for the Portland Reporter, covered the same meeting for his newspaper. So that we may have another reporter's viewpoint of that meeting, I will also include Mr. Mattila's article "What Price Power Interties for Northwest?—Work":

What Price Power Interties for Northwest?—Work

(By Walter Mattila)

(Note.—Ken Holum, the well-known doctrinaire public power advocate, calls for several unnecessary public power dams which some people are trying to cram down the throats of the House in the omnibus public works bill. Holum implies that these dams are necessary for the first leg of the Federal power national grid which would lead to the nationalization of the electric power industry. Holum and his cronies must be rebuffed.)

"If you want a common carrier intertie from the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Southwest, you have work to do," Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of Interior, told banqueting members of the Western States Water and Power Conference here Tuesday night.

"The Northwest needs Bruces Eddy, Knowles, Asotin, and China Gardens Dams. Are you prepared for the effort that is needed to secure authorization and appropriations for these projects?" he asked the delegates from public-power groups, conservation and water districts, labor unions and other organizations.

"Yes," was the chorus answer.

Holum acknowledged some feel little progress has been made to carry out the blueprint for power development that John F. Kennedy presented while campaigning in 1960 at Billings, Mont. But he pointed out that the Bureau of Reclamation will invest $347 million in dams, irrigation works, power facilities and lines in 1962, a new record.

He said, "every organization represented at this conference and every Member of Congress from the Northwest can take pride in the Hanford victory for real conservation."

Holum also listed as fruit of the Billings speech the studies of potential interties between the Northwest and California and the Missouri Basin and the Southwestern Power Administration. He reported that studies are underway of a Bonneville-Missouri Basin intertie.

Earlier in the 1-day conference, Harry MacPhail, who represented Rural Electrification Administration units in Colorado Basin negotiations, said his people were not happy about Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall's decision to seek contracts with private utilities for wheeling Colorado River power from new Federal projects in certain areas instead of putting up all Federal lines.

MacPhail reported that Pacific Power & Light Co. in Colorado limited its noncompany wheeling to Government power, implying exclusion of power that REA's and PUD's might generate.

The conference heard Norman Clapp, REA chief, urge interties and more cheap power.

"The challenge to get adequate, low-cost power is national and plans for its ultimate achievement also must be national in scope," he said.

"Our final and overall goal is consumer benefits and to obtain this goal we must be prepared to take advantage of the amazing technological advantages which have marked the development of the power industry."

Clapp noted that the REA's had already paid back to the U.S. Treasury $50 million in interest, $1 billion in principal on their $4 billion loans.

One of the greatest trumpets for cheap power in American history, Michael Straus, Reclamation Commissioner during New Deal days claimed private utilities were opposed to interties because pumping in of cheap power would threaten their monopoly control. Although gray haired, the old New Dealer had lost none of his cutting wit and power evangelism.

Howard Morgan, Federal Power Commissioner, and formerly Oregon public utility commissioner, reviewed his Russian dam tour and summed up:

"We have been challenged by the Soviet Union to an energy race and, like it or not, we are in that race. Because, energy, electrical energy, is the heart of any industrial system, the outcome of this race may very well determine which nation will eventually command the largest and most productive industrial plant in the world.

"Whoever possesses the world's greatest industrial capacity can and will use that capacity to exert economic, political, and military leadership in the decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in another article still covering the same meeting by Harold Hughes in the Oregonian. Mr. Hughes reported that the strongest blast was fired by Clyde T. Ellis, who said of the private power firms:

Their object is to take over the Government. They are public enemy No. 1, more dangerous than Communists, because Communists are not a threat but dictatorship is a threat.

This statement by Clyde Ellis is without a doubt the most ridiculous statement that I have had the misfortune to read in my memory. This man is so vicious in his attack as to claim that the industry which collectively pays more taxes for the support of this Government than any other industry today is public enemy No. 1 and is trying to take over this Government. More than $2 billion a year is paid by the investor-owned electric utility industry in local, State, and Federal taxes to support the necessary and worthwhile activities of these governments, while at the same time these groups which he so actively represents pay absolutely no Federal taxes. The only group which I know of directly or indirectly engaged in electric energy production, transmission, or distribution which actively seeks to take over part of the Government is Clyde Ellis' own public power cronies. I suppose Clyde Ellis envisions himself as the first national commissar of a Russianized electric power industry.

In order to complete the newspaper coverage of the meeting in Portland, I am also including the article by Harold Hughes from the Oregonian.

FPC's Commissioner Tells of Russian Power Advances

(By Harold Hughes)

(Note.—Clyde Ellis accuses the industry that has powered the progress of America's greatness of now being Public Enemy No. 1. The only group actively trying to take over the direction of the Government is his own public power crowd. Like an insidious cancer, they are trying to sap the vitality of our electric power companies that pay over $2 billion a year in taxes to suport our great Nation.)

The United States is well ahead of the Russians in the electrical energy race, but the Soviet Union is gaining at an "alarming rate," Howard Morgan, a member of the Federal Power Commission declared Tuesday in Portland.

Morgan warned the 1-day meeting of the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference that the seriousness of the electrical energy race, a race that determines which nation has the most industrial capacity, is such that informed public discussion is urgently needed. He said there is a possibility the United States might eventually lose the race with the Russians.

The ex-Oregon public utility commissioner's warning preceded a pledge to the conference from Kenneth Holum, assistant secretary of the Interior Department, that the Kennedy administration is "determined that the Nation's electric facilities shall be the world's best, and that all electrical systems in the country shall have an opportunity to participate in these technological advances."

Morgan, who recently returned from Russia where he visited Soviet electrical plants in the company of a group of American, electrical experts, declared, "Today in the generation of electrical power, Russia has outstripped not only every nation in Europe by a very wide margin, but every other nation in the world as well, except for the United States."

He said the Russians are planning more efficient use of their power by linking it all together into one grid, extending to Siberia, all under automated control by regional interties.

The conference heard Norman Clapp, Rural Electrification Administrator, say that the Kennedy administration is living up to its campaign promises to restore REA to its former role of preeminence.

The conference at times developed strong political overtones as various speakers urged support of candidates who backed public power projects and organizations. At one point funds were collected by Democrats.

PRIVATE POWER CRITICIZED

Sam Moment, Portland power consultant, urged the conference to face up to the "fact private power firms have no useful future to service the people of Oregon" and need be taken over by the PUD's.

Strong attacks and blasts of verbal shot were fired at private power firms, particularly because of their opposition or silence to the Hanford project to produce electricity from wasted nuclear heat.

The strongest blast was fired by Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, of Washington, D.C., who said of the private power firms:

"Their object is to take over the Government. They are Public Enemy No. 1—more dangerous than Communists because Communists are not a threat, but dictatorship is a threat."

Earlier, Senator Wayne Morse, speaking in absentia, blasted away at private power firms. William Berg, his administrative assistant, delivered the talk for the Senator, who, along with Representative Edith Green, was unable to attend the meeting.

Morse supported a 1,000-mile-long, high-voltage intertie between the Pacific Northwest and California, saying it had "tremendous potential advantages" for the west coast and "is a lucrative proposition and the private power companies are eager to exploit it."

Morse called the private power firms "regulated monopolies" and said, "They do not pay taxes in the sense that other enterprises do; they collect them from consumers. They enjoy sheltered markets and virtually risk-free investment."

Mr. Speaker, Clyde Ellis and his wolfpack of public power enthusiasts are using every means at their disposal in an effort to pressure Congress into including the following public power projects in the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill:

The Knowles Dam in Montana which is unnecessary because the taxpaying Montana Power Co. has an alternate proposal to construct facilities in that area at no cost to the taxpayer which will utilize the resources more advantageously.

The China Gardens Dam which is also unnecessary and premature because it should be considered as an integral part of another project, the High Mountain Sheep Dam for which Pacific Northwest Power Co. presently has a license application pending before the Federal Power Commission. This taxpaying company assured the Senate Public Works Committee that if they are permitted to construct High Mountain Sheep, they will also request a license for construction of China Gardens at no cost to the Nation's taxpayers.

The Burns Creek project in Idaho which the Members of the House have already recognized as being unnecessary, uneconomic, and unworthy for inclusion in the omnibus rivers and harbors bill by their positive vote to delete Burns Creek from the House bill.

The Devils Jumps Dam on the Cumberland River in Kentucky which is so uneconomic that the TVA itself indicated that it had no interest in power from Devils Jumps because it was too expensive.

The House Public Works Committee and the House of Representatives included only one of these projects—China Gardens—in the bill which we approved last week. In my opinion, even including China Gardens was unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, in the next few hours we will be asked to go to conference with the other body on the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill. In granting permission for such a conference and appointing conferees, it is my fervent hope that the expressed will of the House in its vote last week be carried out. We cannot, we must not, allow Clyde Ellis and his public power cohorts to force their will through naked political pressure upon the honest and dedicated Members of this body.

For this reason, I call upon every Member of this body to stand firm in our resolve that Clyde Ellis will not prevail and these unnecessary public power projects will not be included in the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill.

RUSSIAN SUBMARINE MISSILE THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks we have heard much talk about the defensive nature of the Russian arms going to Cuba and Russian military installations in Cuba. This downgrading of the threat comes mainly from the Department of State. As arms continue to pour into Cuba all the State Department spokesmen still claim they are intended for defensive purposes. This ostrich head in the sand type of thinking is typical of that small, but entrenched group of reactionists in the State Department. That small group has tried to mislead the American people for too long. Now they even believe their own propaganda. This type of thinking is dangerous since it affects the security of everyone of us.

I have here a photograph which I defy even the softest of appeasers in the Department of State to describe as defensive. This is the photograph of a Russian missile firing submarine. I invite the Members to examine it closely. In the conning tower or sail as it is called in naval terminology, can clearly be seen two missile firing tubes.

Reports have recently come from the area surrounding Cuba that these submarines have been seen escorting Russian ships. In order to place this "escorting of Russian ships" phrase in proper perspective, I quote from Khrushchev's address before the 22d Congress of the Russian Communist Party on October 17, 1961:

> Construction of a submarine fleet is proceeding successfully. It is being equipped with atomic engines and armed with ballistic as well as with self-guiding (samanavodyashchiyesaya) rockets.

This statement by Khrushchev taken in light of the picture which I have here, amply demonstrates the clear and present danger to our Nation. I now quote from a report last October by an Izvestia reporter while aboard a Russian submarine:

> Our atomic submarines have an extensive array of weapons. They carry long-range missiles with nuclear warheads. They also have winged missiles for firing at various targets. They carry several types of torpedos—magnetic, self-aiming and other types—for attacks against surface ships and other submarines.
>
> Until now the submarine performed only tactical maneuvers. The new nuclear weapons and new propulsion system make it possible for a submarine to go out onto the high seas and perform operational missions. The atomic submarine and its armament can destroy a large enemy naval base, a large industrial center or an aircraft carrier formation.

With the construction of the so-called fishing port, which we all know will, in reality, be a naval base, there will be in being an additional offensive threat against the entire United States.

We know the range of our Polaris missiles and we must assume that the Russians possess the same type missiles. There have been reports emanating from Europe that large range missiles have been fired from submarines by the Russians.

If the Department of Defense possesses any information on this type submarine firings then they should release it to the American people. The people have a right to know if missile carrying submarines are prowling off our coast and if the Russians possess an underwater missile firing capability.

This photograph is enough evidence that the Russians have missile firing submarines. I believe that it will overtax the ability of the foremost appeasers in our Department of State to come up with an explanation that this submarine is a defensive type weapon.

We must serve notice on the Russians that basing of missile firing submarines in Cuba is an aggressive act and must be dealt with accordingly.

LEGISLATION AND REGULATION PERTAINING TO OCEAN SHIPPING

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, no one government, by itself, can regulate the commercial practices and, to some extent, the prices of the ocean common carriers of all flags serving its inbound and outbound foreign commerce without generating serious international problems. But problems or no, that is precisely what the United States undertook to do when, in 1916, it passed the Shipping Act. Moreover, last year's amendments of that statute[1] may be interpreted—though incorrectly, I am sure—as a recent congressional endorsement of our earlier unilateral undertakings.

In what must necessarily be a rather summary manner, I would like to discuss with you today our present unilateral attempts to regulate ocean shipping, some of the resultant problems, and a few possible solutions.

SHIPPING ACT, 1916, AS AMENDED

I assume that most of you know a fair amount about the pertinent events leading up to the enactment of the Shipping Act, 1916. If you do not and if sometime you want to delve more deeply into its historical antecedents, you might find worthwhile source material among the references cited below.[2]

But for our purposes today, I think it quite sufficient to recall merely these facts:

During the early years of this century there was a great deal of concern, here and in Great Britain, in particular, and elsewhere, too, about the activities of ocean common carriers. Especially was there alarm about their practices when operating in concert, in groups known as steamship conferences.

From 1906 to 1909 Britain studied conferences to determine whether they were detrimental to its foreign commerce and, if so, what to do about it. The conclusion was that on balance, conferences were beneficial to British foreign commerce; and, in any event, conferences were not so detrimental as to justify attempting unilaterally to outlaw or even to regulate them. Obviously, Britain's lack of effective jurisdiction—and I emphasize the word "effective"—over many of the foreign-based transactions which are an integral part of its foreign commerce, must have loomed large in its decision to refrain from asserting regulatory dominion over the British and foreign-flag lines involved. I like to think, too, that the Englishmen involved had not forgotten the principle of "freedom of the seas" for which our forefathers had so valiantly fought theirs and others approximately 100 years before.

Thus, although Britain in 1909 was generally recognized as the reigning maritime nation, it did not consider it within its power or in its own best interest to prescribe a commercial code which the rest of the shipping world would have to follow when trading to and from the United Kingdom. Instead, it entrusted the welfare of its foreign commerce to (a) the self-interest of the businessmen involved, the shippers and the carriers; (b) carrier self-regulation through conferences; and (c) the counterbalancing economic force of shipper groups authorized and, indeed, encouraged by Great Britain to bargain collectively with the conferences.

In 1912, shortly after Britain completed this landmark work, our own House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, then chairmaned by Congressman Joshua Alexander, began an extensive study of steamship conferences. As the events leading up to that study prove, our chief concern was threefold:

First, whether our foreign commerce was being controlled by foreign interests to our national detriment; there were then very few American-flag lines in relation to the large number of foreign-flag carriers serving U.S. foreign trade.

Second, whether because steamship conference activities necessarily conflicted with the antitrust law we had enacted in 1890—the Sherman Act—they should be subjected thereto or exempted therefrom.

And third, if the decision to exempt were reached, whether to exempt outright or to exempt and to regulate as we had done in the case of domestic common carriers—railroads—under the Interstate Commerce Act.

After 2 years of study—1912–14—Congress, in 1916, enacted the Shipping Act. Despite the preponderance of foreign-flag lines serving this country, we, like Britain, concluded that on balance steamship conferences were not detrimental to our foreign commerce and, therefore, should not be outlawed. But unlike Britain, which had no antitrust laws, we found it necessary to enact a statute exempting conferences from our Sherman Act.

Seemingly in consideration of thus granting conferences a statutory antitrust exemption, and without, in my opinion, giving due weight to certain critical factors, we unilaterally, undertook to proscribe and to regulate many of the commercial activities of American- and foreign-flag lines occurring and documented abroad, as well as those occurring and documented here.

The "critical factors" we ignored—and I ask you to bear them in mind as you weigh our present plight—were these:

First. There must be equal justice under law. Surely this is a cardinal principle of our jurisprudence. If a statute cannot be enforced equally against the parties it claims to cover, it is fatally defective. This becomes painfully obvious when the statute undertakes to regulate and to restrain a group of competitors some of whom it reaches easily, others of whom, for all practical purposes, remain immune.

---

[1] E.g., Public Law 87–346 (75 Stat. 762 et seq., 87th Cong. 1st sess.), 46 U.S.C. 814 et seq.

[2] Hearings before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, "Investigation of Shipping Combinations," 62d Cong., 2d sess. (1913); House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, "Report on Steamship Agreements and Affiliations in the American Foreign and Domestic Trade," H. Doc. No. 805, 63d Cong., 2d sess. (1914); Marx "International Shipping Cartels," (Princeton University Press, 1953, chap. IV, pp. 45–67); Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Steamship Conferences of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, "Steamship Conference Study," (86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959), pp. 254–257); House Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, "Report on the Ocean Freight Industry" (87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962), pp. 5–12).

Second. Statutory restraints and prohibitions incapable of being enforced according to the letter and spirit of the law should not be enacted. They breed disrespect for the law and its enforcement. In the process, they create grave confusion and uncertainty. Those who are cynical, sophisticated, or realistic enough to treat the law as empty and meaningless, gain; those who abide by it are often thereby placed at serious competitive disadvantage.

Third. Any unilateral attempt by any nation to regulate both ends of its foreign trade is selfishly nationalistic and is bound to restrain commerce, restrict economic growth, and generate retaliatory or defensive action by the other affected nations unwilling to tolerate such violations of their sovereignty. It is axiomatic that in such critical times as these, a target nation such as ours cannot have enough friends. Red China stands menacingly on the threshold of becoming a nuclear power. Russian fishing ports are springing up in hostile Cuba. Certain Latin American and African nations balance on the razor's edge between communism and freedom. Every one of our allies is beset by scores of its own debilitating national problems.

It is incomprehensible therefore, that we would long continue any program likely to alienate the respect and rust of our allies. But this, in my opinion, is precisely what we are doing when we undertake to tell the other maritime nations that if they want to do shipping business with us, they must do it our way, in their countries as well as ours, under rigid regulations laid down and enforced by us against their will, without their permission, and, in many cases, in conflict with their own time-honored customs and practices.

Surely our unilateral approach to the regulation of international shipping, begun in 1916, is a dangerous vestige of an isolationistic era, ill-suited to the primary tenet of our current foreign policy, that is, international interdependence among the free nations.

It would be impossible to measure what effect, if any, our maritime regulatory endeavors have had on the decision of certain of our maritime allies to continue "doing business as usual" with Cuba despite our obvious desires to the contrary. I have no doubt they have had some. Perhaps, too, they have been at least partially responsible for a recently reported statement by a high official of a heretofore friendly European maritime nation to the effect that his country still considers the United States an ally but no longer a friend.

You might well ask, "How is it possible that in enacting the Shipping Act, Congress ignored or underestimated the importance of such critical legal, and legislative principles?" Since I was not in Congress in 1916, I cannot answer on the basis of personal experience. But from reviewing much of the Shipping Act's legislative history, and by reading between the written lines, I would answer your question this way:

In 1912–16 it was our national habit to think in strict protectionist terms. When Congress then "discovered" steamship conferences, its first impression must have been that these were price-fixing cartels operating in conflict with our antitrust laws and made up chiefly of foreign-flag lines. As the investigation progressed, Congress discovered that most American shippers wanted and needed conference-liner service, that without conferences our foreign commerce would be seriously disrupted, and, therefore, that conferences should be legalized. But this conclusion required giving them legislative exemption from the antitrust statutes. Without bothering to analyze carefully the vast difference between their earlier decision to regulate the antitrust-exempt activities of domestic carriers and similar activities of international shipping, Congress decided to follow the pattern which it had already established in the Interstate Commerce Act.

Unquestionably, there were some Members of Congress who realized that it would be impossible for the regulatory agency to enforce effectively and equally such a detailed scheme of extraterritorial regulation. But there were not enough such men. They must have found themselves in much the same position those of us were in last year who tried to have Congress legalize a truly effective dual-rate contract system. To put it bluntly, in order to achieve the basic maritime objective—for them in 1916, legalization of conferences; for us in 1961, legalization of dual-rate contracts—statutory provisions, known to be unworkable and deficient, were accepted. Such is the so-called art of compromise; often an unhappy but nevertheless valuable aspect of our legislative process.

A few final matters of historic interest worth recalling concern certain important and troublesome provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, as it read before the steamship conference dual-rate law was enacted last year. They may be summarized as follows:

Section 1 defines "common carrier by water in foreign commerce," in such way as to extend our regulatory reach over ocean common carriers engaged in our import as well as export trade. By providing that "a cargo boat commonly called an ocean tramp shall not be deemed such 'common carrier by water in foreign commerce.'" Section 1 exempts from regulation all ocean tramps engaged in our foreign trade. Parenthetically, I assume that a number of you are aware of the fact that this broad regulatory exemption of contract carriers is, because of today's overtonnaged market, dangerously disrupting many important conferences.

Section 14 forbids certain practices by common carriers serving our foreign commerce, namely, deferred rebates, fighting ships, retaliation against shippers by refusing space because the shipper has patronized another carrier, the making of unfair or unjustly discriminatory contracts with shippers based on the volume of freight offered, or unjust discriminations as to cargo space or claims settlements. This section prescribes a fine of not more than $25,000 for any carrier violation.

Section 15 provides that every common carrier by water or other person subject to the Shipping Act, 1916, must file with the board—now the Federal Maritime Commission—a true copy of every agreement with another such carrier or other person subject to the act "fixing or regulating transportation rates or fares; giving or receiving special rates, accommodations, or other special privileges or advantages; controlling, regulating, preventing, or destroying competition; pooling or apportioning earnings, losses or traffic, allotting ports or restricting or otherwise regulating the number and character of sailings between ports; limiting or regulating in any way the volume or character of freight or passenger traffic to be carried; or in any manner providing for an exclusive, preferential, or cooperative working arrangement."

Under section 15, only those agreements requiring approval of the regulatory agency, and approved by it, are lawful. Before such approval or after disapproval, it is unlawful to carry out any such agreement.

Every agreement lawful under section 15 is excepted from the antitrust laws. A penalty of $1,000 a day for each day a violation of this section continues may be recovered by the United States in a civil action.

Section 16 provides that common carriers by water in foreign commerce, individually and in conjunction with others, are forbidden to grant undue preference or advantage to any person, locality or description of traffic, or to subject any person to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatever. They are forbidden to allow transportation at less than the established rate by false billing or other unfair device, or to influence insurance companies to discriminate among competing water carriers. A fine of not more than $5,000 for each offense is provided by this section.

Section 17 prohibits all common carriers by water in foreign commerce from charging any rate which is unjustly discriminatory between shippers or ports, or is unjustly prejudicial to U.S. exporters as compared with their foreign competitors. It requires every carrier and other person subject to the act to establish just and reasonable regulations and practices relating to the receiving, handling, storing, or delivering of property.

Section 20 prohibits common carriers or other persons subject to the act from disclosing certain information to any unauthorized person if it may be used to the detriment of the shipper, consignee or carrier.

Section 21 empowers the regulatory agency to require any common carrier by water or other person subject to the act to file with the agency "any periodical or special report, or any account, record, rate, or charge, or any memorandum of any facts and transactions appertaining to the business of such carrier or other person subject to this Act."

For each day of default, this section requires that $100 be forfeited to the United States by anyone who fails to file any documents required by this section. Anyone convicted of disclosing, mutilating or falsifying such documents is subject to a fine not more than $1,000, or imprisonment for not more than a year, or both.

Section 27 allows the regulatory agency by subpena to compel the attendance of witnesses and the "production of books, papers, documents, and other evidence from any place in the United States."

STEAMSHIP CONFERENCE/DUAL RATE LAW

In 1961, after 3 years of investigating conference activities, we further amended the Shipping Act, 1916, by enacting Public Law 87-346, often called the dual-rate law. To do so, we had to overcome the vigorous opposition of certain anticonference forces, led by persons steeped in domestic antitrust theory, many of whom unfortunately knew or cared little about the true needs of ocean common carriers and the shippers they serve.

To accomplish our basic objective of legalizing dual-rate contracts before the expiration of interim legislation which insulated existing dual-rate systems from the damaging effects of the Supreme Court's 1958 *Isbrandtsen* decision, we found it necessary to accept, for the time being at least, a number of highly questionable legislative provisions. Fortunately, before doing so, the Senate and then the House defeated vigorous antitrust forces which sought to amend the Shipping Act so as to require the regulatory agency to encourage nonconference lines, able but unwilling to join conferences, to remain nonconference.

Speaking only for myself, among the most questionable of these "highly questionable legislative provisions" was one requiring ocean common carriers of all flags serving our foreign commerce, inbound and outbound, to file with the Commission their rates and charges at least 30 days before they become initially effective or before the effective date of increases in existing rates. To me it seemed perfectly clear that such a provision would make the regulated common carriers sitting ducks for unregulated, predominantly foreign-flag tramp-type operators, many of whom know countless ways to carry substantial parcels of liner cargo.

Another "highly questionable legislative provision," in my opinion, is that requiring the FMC to disapprove rates or charges of ocean common carriers which it finds to be "so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States." It is true that the legislative history of this provision proves that its scope is extremely limited. Nevertheless, the provision constitutes such a crass, unilateral disregard for the coequal rights of all other nations at the opposite ends of our foreign-trade transactions that the best I can say for it is that I am sure we will repeal it, in our own national self-interest, once we are able to examine it carefully and objectively.

When we enacted the dual-rate law there were a number of matters which, for various reasons, we could not deal with if we were to accomplish our basic legislative objective. Since some of these matters unfortunately are of great importance, it is quite likely that before long Congress will have to face up to reviewing them. For example, because of the maritime regulatory agency's prior uniform policy of vigorously asserting its primary jurisdiction to decide, in a judicially reviewable manner, all matters involving possible violations of the Shipping Act, I certainly did not consider it necessary for Congress to spell out in the statute our endorsement of that policy. As my interrogation of Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger, in charge of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, reveals, I made it as plain as I could that I was quite unwilling to trust any matter of national shipping policy to the hostile views of his Division. At page 444 of our hearings on the dual-rate bill—it was then H.R. 4299—I said this to Mr. Loevinger:

> I just want to say for the record that I hope somebody down in the Justice Department becomes aware of the fact that we have an American merchant marine which we badly need if we are to believe our Defense Department and I would like to see somebody down there with a little sympathy toward the American merchant marine rather than taking, shall I say, an antagonistic attitude toward it.

Nor was I alone in my unwillingness to leave matters of Shipping Act policy to initial, judicially reviewable determination by the Antitrust Division. Our committee's report on the dual rate bill indicates our refusal to defer to Justice's determination of shipping policy. The Senate committee report contains even more specific rejection of Antitrust Division doctrine.

You will therefore appreciate my concern with the fact that the present Commission, ably chairmaned by my friend, Tom Stakem, seems to feel that it may, or should, refer matters of possible Shipping Act violation to the Department of Justice for initial judicial proceedings even though the Commission itself has made no judicially reviewable findings of violation. I do not say that Justice should not take whatever steps are necessary to prevent the running of the statute of limitations; in fact, it clearly should. But this, it seems to me, does not justify the Commission's voluntary abdication of the primary jurisdiction function which Congress and the courts have long expected it to perform.

Another matter we were unable to deal with satisfactorily, in my opinion, was the so-called FOB/FAS problem. I realize that some authorities consider it legislatively insoluble. Whether it is or not, I do not know. But of this I am sure; a better legislative solution can be devised than that now in the Shipping Act.

Apparently, too, we did not make it sufficiently clear that the FMC cannot and should not expect conference self-policing devices such as neutral bodies to act as conduits of documents and information which the Commission could not obtain by direct proceedings against the lines involved. If further legislative amendment is necessary to enable the Commission to create a regulatory climate favorable to reasonable self-policing mechanisms, the Commission should request it. In short, I consider it up to the Commission to make conference self-policing work even if it means asking Congress for additional legislative assistance.

I understand that the Commission is construing the new law as though Congress did something to require ocean common carriers and conferences thereof to abandon their age-old practice of including in their tariffs a "cargo n.o.s" rates; that is, a rate covering cargo not otherwise specified in the tariff. If there is any evidence in the hearing record of our committee or in that of the Senate Committee on Commerce to support such a construction, I would like to see it. But, be that as it may, if the statute or its legislative history supports such a view, prompt amendment is clearly essential. For try as they must to be specific in their tariff descriptions, carriers cannot anticipatorily describe all commodities they may be asked to carry. Then, too, without a permissible "cargo n.o.s." rate the dual-rate law requirement that new or initial rates must be filed 30 days in advance of their effective date would probably prove to be an intolerable restraint upon our foreign commerce.

There are a number of similar matters of commission and omission which we could profitably discuss today, time permitting. Unfortunately, it does not.

CONCLUSION

I submit that before long we in Congress must, for the first time, face up to the fundamental question of how much unilateral regulatory authority over international shipping our Government can exercise, effectively and equally. Then, once we know that, and within that area, we must decide to what extent it is in the national interest for us unilaterally to exercise such regulatory authority.

A year has passed since Public Law 87-346 was enacted. No one doubts that the present Commission has done a sincere and earnest job of trying to administer and enforce the law. But in the process, I fear, fundamental, avowed congressional purposes are in peril. Generally speaking, conferences today are weaker than they were this time last year. As I understand it, nonconference foreign-flag competition has increased in number of vessels and cargoes carried. At best, little progress has been made administratively to achieve the desired state whereby all conferences serving U.S. ports will have established effective self-policing devices.

Last year, the Department of State, in endorsing the Senate Commerce Committee's version of the dual-rate bill, urged Congress to continue its study of this complex international regulatory dilemma for the purpose of finding satisfactory answers to the many questions raised by the conflicting jurisdictions involved. When Congress reconvenes, I hope we will be able to do just that.

REPORT ON 2D SESSION—87TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, ever since I was first elected to Congress, I have asked my constituents for their views on some of the major issues facing our country. My means for doing this is a public opinion questionnaire. The response which has always been gratifying was especially so this year. In addition to a large number of people taking the time to reply, many added their comments and expressed appreciation for having the opportunity to state their views. I only wish I could personally thank each person who replied.

The questionnaire enables people to become active participants in the decisionmaking process of our Government. They are made acutely aware of the complexity of the decisions which the Congress and the President must make. Even though I must vote my own convictions based on the facts involved and the final responsibility for my votes in Congress rests with me, nevertheless, I believe the people I represent should have an opportunity to share their opinions with their Representative. These views are most helpful to me in recognizing my congressional responsibility to the people of my congressional district.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS AND CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

1. Question: Do you favor spending the estimated $25 billion necessary to put an American on the moon by 1970? Yes, 33.8 percent; no, 61.1 percent; undecided, 5.1 percent.

1. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Man in space: Rough estimates for the U.S. lunar project range from $20 to $25 billion for this decade. The big increase in the science and astronautics for fiscal 1962 reached $1.7 billion. The total authorized for fiscal year 1963 is $3.7 billion, about $2 billion of which was for the man in space program. A man is expected to be placed on the moon by 1970.

2. Question: Do you favor a broadening of U.S. trade policy and a general lowering of our trade barriers provided there is a truly reciprocal lowering of European trade barriers? Yes, 79.6 percent; no, 13.5 percent; undecided, 6.9 percent.

2. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Foreign trade: The Congress passed the President's trade bill in almost the exact form which he requested. The authority to lower tariffs up to 50 percent across the board by categories will allow the President the opportunity to develop a workable relationship with the European Common Market. If the basis of U.S. negotiations is "hardheaded bargaining," this new trade policy holds out the possibility of larger markets for American industry and agriculture in Europe. It could also provide an opportunity to show the rest of the world an escape from poverty and Communist tyranny.

3. Question: Do you favor the sale of farm products and nonstrategic items to Communist countries? Yes, 30.9 percent; no, 63.5 percent; undecided, 5.6 percent.

3. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Foreign aid: The Senate had included provisions in the foreign-aid bill to prevent all aid to nations known to be dominated by communism or Marxism except farm surpluses given under Public Law 480. Under the Senate plan, the President would have been denied the authority to make any exceptions.

Later in conference, both bodies accepted the House provisions which denied aid to Communist nations unless the President determined and reported to Congress that the aid was vital to U.S. security, that the nation receiving the aid was not dominated by the international Communist conspiracy, and that the aid would promote those nations' independence from international communism. Many House Members, including myself, had hoped that a tougher position would be adopted.

In approving the House plan, many Members expressed the belief that because the Constitution gives the President the authority to conduct our foreign policy, he should not be limited by congressional action as to the means of carrying out that foreign policy.

4. Question: Do you believe that the United States should test nuclear devices in the atmosphere? Yes, 53.6 percent; no, 36.8 percent; undecided, 9.6 percent.

4. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Nuclear testing: On March 2, President Kennedy, in a nationwide television-radio speech, announced that the United States would resume nuclear testing in the atmosphere in late April unless the Soviets agreed to a general test ban before that date.

There was little reaction, either in Washington or throughout the Nation, against the decision. The only complaint from any large number of Congressmen was that the renewal of testing had come too late and that the delay had endangered our national security.

5. Question: Do you favor the use of Federal funds for the construction of community fallout shelters? Yes, 23.2 percent; no, 71.4 percent; undecided, 5.4 percent.

5. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Fallout shelters: An administration proposed bill authorizing financial assistance for the construction of public facilities designed for use as fallout shelters is still pending before the House Armed Services Committee. No hearings have been scheduled. The appropriations bill authorizes $38 million to be used in the research of fallout shelters.

6. Question: Do you favor the United States purchasing $100 million of U.N. bonds in an attempt to force other countries to pay their share of U.N. peacekeeping operations? Yes, 47 percent; no, 42.6 percent; undecided, 10.4 percent.

6. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

U.N. bonds: The Senate early this year authorized the President to either purchase $100 million in U.N. bonds or lend $100 million to the U.N. The loan would have been shorter term than the bonds. Lack of information presented by the administration, criticism of the actions of the U.N. and indecision on how to assist the U.N. without supporting what many considered to be undesirable practices held up House action until late in the session. The biggest criticism stemmed from the fact that the assessments of many smaller nations, including some Communist nations like Cuba and Poland, had been reduced, which in effect meant that the United States had to pay a portion of Cuba's assessments.

The bill finally passed provided that the United States would match the bond purchases of other nations. Approximately $27 million presently have been purchased by the nations which we are matching immediately. The remainder will be purchased not as other nations pledge to purchase them but only as they make their actual purchases. The law prohibits the United States from purchasing any bonds in the event it is used to reduce the assessments of other nations.

Most of us felt that to withhold the purchase of U.N. bonds would greatly weaken that organization and strengthen the position of world communism.

7. Question: Which concept of medical care for the aged do you prefer: (a) Compulsory medical care financed by an increase in social security taxes, 23.7 percent; (b) voluntary medical care for the needy elderly financed out of the general revenue, 65.6 percent; (c) no preference indicated, 10.7 percent.

7. CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Medical care: A watered down version of the much publicized King-Anderson bill to provide limited hospital care for the elderly financed under social security was defeated in the Senate.

The Minnesota poll, published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, September 23, 1962, demonstrated a noticeable lack of support for the King-Anderson bill. The percentage favoring medical care under social security in the Minnesota poll was almost identical to that in my questionnaire—25 percent in the Tribune poll and 23.7 percent in mine.

In the last Congress the Kerr-Mills law was enacted which provides medical care for those who need it under a cooperative Federal-State arrangement. These are medically in need people who are not indigent since the indigent are cared for under old age assistance. Kerr-Mills has as its purpose to assist people who could not pay for expensive medical care unless they dip heavily into their savings and sacrificed the property which they own.

I wish it would have been possible to study this law and make any improvements which would be found necessary. However, the Ways and Means Committee felt that it should be permitted to function longer before any amendments were made and States like Minnesota have an opportunity to come under it, since Minnesota did not choose to pass its enabling legislation last session.

The King-Anderson bill, which the committee pointed out would only cover approximately 25 percent of the medical needs of older people, and seriously endanger the entire social security system, was turned down by a vote of 16 to 9 by the House Ways and Means Committee.

Question: 8. Do you favor aid to education for: (a) Elementary and secondary schools, yes, 39.1 percent; no, 45.8 percent; undecided, 15.1 percent; (b) private and parochial schools, yes, 10.3 percent; no, 69.6 percent; undecided, 20.1 percent; (c) higher education, yes, 45.6 percent; no, 38.3 percent; undecided, 16.1 percent.

8. FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Since the House rejected a program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education during the last session of Congress, a similar program has not been considered this session by either House of Congress.

Both the House and the Senate passed bills aiding higher education early in this session. The House offered loans and grants to all colleges and universities for the construction of academic facilities. The Senate provided loans with grants for constructions limited to public community colleges. The Senate also offered a $350 grant to the institution for every student enrolled under a Federal scholarship. The House included no scholarships.

After the House voted to recommit the conference report on higher education it became evident that the conferees had misjudged the degree of House opposition to scholarships.

The conferees had accepted grants for academic facilities but had limited them to libraries and science and engineering buildings. I believe the House would have accepted such a change.

However, the conference report also included a student assistance provision in the form of loans. The colleges and universities would administer the loan funds for student assistance and would be allowed to use 20 percent of the funds allocated to them as grants to exceptionally needy students of proven academic ability who would not otherwise attend any college. This provision the House would not accept.

As one of the House conferees on the college-aid bill, it has been one of my greatest disappointments this session that a bill providing aid for academic facilities could not have been passed. American higher education is much in need of such help if it is to meet the demands of the continually growing student enrollment and the need for professionally, scientifically, and technically trained people. To me the defeat of this bill was one of the biggest tragedies of this session.

9. Question: What type of a farm program do you favor: (a) Rigid controls and quotas on individual production, mandatory land retirement—a strictly regulated farm economy, 8.6 percent; (b) no controls, no supports, no protection—a completely free farm market, 33.6 percent; (c) moderate and flexible price supports, voluntary large scale land retirement—a moderate role of Government in the farm economy, 49.1 percent; (d) no preference indicated, 8.6 percent.

Farm bill: Any discussion of congressional action on farm legislation is of necessity complex. I will be as brief as possible.

It became evident very early in the session that the administration would propose a plan for strict Government regulation of agriculture.

The administration dairy proposals were ill prepared and had they been enacted would have blocked the great progress being made in the dairy industry. All future dairy production would have been based on a farmer's 1961 dairy production. This would prevent many farmers from improving their herds. If a farmer wanted to improve the production per cow, he would actually have to cut back on the size of his herd in order to comply with the quota limitation.

Remember, in 1961 the President activated Army Reserve and National Guard units for the Berlin crisis. Many of the young men involved were farmers. When they entered active duty it was necessary for them, if they were dairy farmers, to greatly reduce their milk and butterfat production. If future dairy quotas are based on 1961 production, their quotas will be correspondingly lower.

The effect would be to penalize these young farmers for serving their country in time of national need. This I could not approve.

The House Agriculture Committee is to be commended for not allowing the dairy section to remain in the bill.

Perhaps the most objectionable language in the original bill was the section providing for heavy fines and/or imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary for dairy farmers. This was removed.

I felt the voluntary feed grains program of 1961 and 1962 had worked quite well. The Secretary indicated, however, that this program had been too expensive, was self-defeating, and disrupted normal marketing channels. This was to be replaced by a mandatory feed grain program. This was turned down by the House of Representatives primarily because it would have denied a farmer the right to raise enough feed for his own livestock in many instances. Another reason why many Midwest Congressmen including myself could not support this legislation was that so-called deficit areas would have been exempted from taking acreage cuts so that the entire burden of reduction in production would have been borne by Midwest farmers.

The feed grains section would have offered two choices. The first alternative was a combination of flexible price supports and mandatory controls.

The second alternative would take effect if one-third of the feed grains farmers rejected the mandatory controls. There would be no price supports whatsoever, and the Secretary of Agriculture would be able to ruin market prices of feed grains by dumping up to 10 million tons of feed grains held in Government storage into the commercial channels.

Before the House committee reported the administration bill I offered an amendment to extend an improved version of the present Feed Grains Act, which was turned down.

To the credit of the House, it rejected the administration bill as reported by the committee.

The House later passed what at the time was a more acceptable bill. It provided for a general extension of the present farm laws and contained none of the mandatory controls asked for by the administration.

This compromise bill was based on voluntary land retirement, price supports contingent on compliance with the program, and the use of payment in kind. It extended—as my earlier amendment in committee attempted to do—the generally successful program of voluntary land retirement through 1963.

I considered it an honor to be appointed to my third conference committee dealing with farm legislation and looked forward to the opportunity of helping to develop a sound farm bill. When the conference reported the bill I was greatly disappointed.

The objectionable parts of the bill were not the sections to take effect in 1963. Most of them were good: voluntary land retirement, extension of present programs, and payment in kind.

Objections to the bill came primarily because of the 1964 provisions.

The program would lower corn price supports to 80 cents a bushel. To make matters worse, the Secretary of Agriculture would be able to dump all of the corn and feed grains in Government storage onto the market at 84 cents per bushel, plus carrying charges. Also, 75 million bushels of feed wheat would be moved into feed channels in competition with corn.

For 3 weeks the Agriculture Committee studied the CED farm report. Most witnesses were sharply critical of the fact that in 5 years 2 million farmers would leave the farm if price supports were lowered over the 5 years as much as the CED plan suggested.

Comparison shows that the conference report accepted by the House, but which I strongly opposed, does in 1 year what the CED wanted to do in 5 years. The motive behind the adopted bill seems to be to make farmers so desperate that they will accept a program of rigid control of agriculture.

I am hopeful that next year Congress will see fit to reverse its decision on farm policy.

STATUS OF ADDITIONAL IMPORTANT LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, there were naturally many important pieces of legislation not covered in the questionnaire. Any summary of the 2d session of the 87th Congress must include the action of that legislation.

Housing for the elderly: Congress enacted needed legislation with my support to increase from $125 million to $225 million the revolving fund for direct loans for urban rental for the elderly and to provide $100 million to broaden the rural housing program for the elderly.

Manpower retraining: This act provides added means for overcoming chronic unemployment. It authorizes the use of Federal funds to retrain unemployed workers for some of the increasingly complex jobs now available in our society. In signing the bill, the President stated that "it is perhaps the most significant legislation in the area of employment since the historic Employment Act of 1946." I heartily agree, it is the only legislation which will effectively get at the problem of chronic unemployment due to obsolete skills.

Drug bill: The stories of the tragic thalidomide disclosures provided the necessary impetus for the Congress to enact legislation tightening Government regulations on the manufacturing and distribution of prescription drugs. The action ended years of congressional hearings and several months of sharp debate.

Reserve callup: Congress granted the President the requested standby authority to activate up to 150,000 reservists if the international situation requires it.

Cuban resolution: Closely connected with the Reserve callup bill was a resolution on Cuba. It expressed U.S. "determination to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending by force or threat of force its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere."

Berlin resolution: This resolution carried two especially significant statements. The one is—

> Whereas it is the purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a friendly, unified, democratic Germany,

And the second is—

> That the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

Foreign aid appropriations: The Congress finally accepted foreign-aid appropriations amounting to approximately $3.9 billion. This was a substantial cut from the original request of the administration of $4.7 billion. Most of the cuts came in grant assistance and military aid. Both development loans and Alliance for Progress loans remain quite close to original requests. My feeling on foreign-aid appropriations is that we should stress hard loans. If a recipient country knows that they have a repayment schedule and must pay interest on the money which they borrow, the respect for the United States will be greatly improved.

Public works: Congress approved the administration emergency public works bill. This gave the President authority to spend an additional $900 million on public works projects throughout the country. This new authority would allow the President to bypass all normal public works procedures.

Since the Federal Government was already engaged in a massive public works program, I believe it is highly questionable whether the new program will either stimulate the economy or reduce areas of high unemployment. Our normal public works program is so huge that over $2.5 billion already appropriated by Congress for such programs had not yet been spent by the President when the emergency bill was enacted. It has been proved that countering a short and mild recession with new public works spending does not work; the effect comes after the end of the recession. This being the case, the Congress has appropriated $400 million for the above program.

Communications satellites: After a lengthy Senate filibuster, Congress approved the communications satellites bill. The issue was simply whether the new communications satellites industry was to be operated solely by the Government or by free enterprise under Government regulation. I am happy the latter prevailed.

Tax revision bill—Congress never seriously considered giving the President his requested authority to adjust taxes. We kept this responsibility for the Congress as it has been its prerogative so far in our history. The Congress rejected the objectionable 20 percent withholding of dividends and interest. This would have been especially burdensome to the many aged whose largest source of income is in this field.

The tax revision bill would include a 7-percent-a-year direct tax credit for business investments in new equipment. Although many of us feel that depreciation regulations are a better incentive for capital investment, most of the objectionable features of the tax credit plan were removed before the bill was passed. The Treasury Department, under authority already present, gave a much-needed acceleration to depreciation schedules.

An important Presidential decision was to not request a quickie tax cut. Such a hasty cut would have caused even greater Federal deficits. When the President announced this last decision, he stated that permanent tax reform and rate reduction will be proposed next year.

Postal rate increase and Federal employee salary raise: Congress passed the bill to raise by 1 cent the basic postal rates on first-class mail and raised the rates on second- and third-class mail on a graduated scale. Under the provisions of the bill, Communist propaganda would not be delivered unless addressee, after notification, advises he wants it. Libraries and certain professional institutions would be exempt from this provision.

Civil service and postal employees, under the provisions of legislation passed by both Houses, would get about a 10-percent salary increase in two stages, this was designed to make the Federal worker's pay comparable to that paid for similar work in private industry. Federal retirees would receive a 5-percent boost.

At the close of the session a large number of bills were not enacted. Among these were.

Mass transit: This bill is still pending in the House Rules Committee. It would provide $500 million in Federal assistance to State and local governments to pay part of the cost of providing improved private and public mass transportation.

Medical school construction: Also pending in the House Rules Committee is the bill to provide $750 million in Federal grants for medical and dental school construction. The bill would also provide $72.5 million in loans for medical and dental students and authorize $150 million more for the existing health research facilities construction program.

Youth corps: A third major bill still held in the Rules Committee is the youth corps bill. It would have created a 3-year Youth Conservation Corps costing $150 million and a 3-year program for an urban service corps for unemployed youth, costing $91 million.

Urban affairs plan: Early in the session the House rejected a Presidential reorganization plan to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. The vast majority of House Members, of which I was one, opposed the plan because it was unnecessary, it would not accomplish what was claimed, and it circumvents the State in its dealings with the cities. The effect of this would be to greatly weaken our Federal form of government.

Wilderness system bill: Although the Senate passed a bill creating a national wilderness system early in 1961, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee did not act on the wilderness system bill until late in this session of Congress.

The House committee bill has been ordered reported but no report has been filed. The committee attempted to bring this bill up under suspension of the rules which would have prevented full debate and adding any amendments to the measure which they reported.

It is unfortunate that no House action on this worthwhile legislation is expected this session of Congress. Evidently, we will have to wait until at least another year to see a bill enacted that would protect the last remaining wilderness areas in America.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a great privilege representing the wonderful people of the First Congressional District of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States. I am also happy to have had the responsibility of serving on the House Committees on Education and Labor, and Agriculture. A great deal of work is left to be done in both of these committees as well as the entire Congress, and I am hopeful that when the 88th Congress convenes I will again have the privilege of serving in this illustrious body.

SUMMER EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last the House of Representatives passed H.R. 5698 by an overwhelming vote of 309 to 19. This bill extended the apportionment provisions of the Civil Service Act of 1883 to summer employees of the Federal Government in such a way that those summer employees should be apportioned among the several States. I certainly want to pay tribute to my colleague from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], who introduced this bill, and also my colleague from West Virginia, the very effective and well-respected Representative JOHN SLACK, who introduced a companion bill and worked hard for its passage. Representative SLACK was also instrumental in moving this bill forward in the other body, where it is being sponsored by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

In the course of the debate on this bill, I was looking over certain material that had been placed in the RECORD by my colleague from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] and I was rather disturbed by the fact that he had a great deal of difficulty getting information from various agencies, and the names and addresses of the summer employees employed by the agencies. The thing that disturbed me the most, however, was the very great difficulty in obtaining such information from the Library of Congress which, as the Members know, is for the purpose of serving the Congress. I, therefore, wrote a letter to the Librarian of Congress, dated October 8, 1962, which letter has already been delivered to the Librarian. I would like to read the things I wrote to Mr. Mumford. I told Mr. Mumford:

> While paging through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day, I came across a copy of a letter which you had addressed to Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas, dated July 10, 1959. The letter is printed on page 21539 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 1, 1962.
>
> Although your letter to which I refer is dated over 3 years ago, apparently the policies expressed in that letter still prevail and that is what disturbs me.
>
> In response to an inquiry for the names and addresses of summer employees of the Library of Congress, you have written Representative BECKWORTH that you regret you cannot fully comply with his request because of "our longstanding policy of not providing personal information, including addresses, regarding Library employees."
>
> In checking the official U.S. Government Organization Manual, I find this statement concerning the Library:
>
> "Under the organic law, the Library is, as its name implies, the Library of Congress. As such, in all its departments and as a whole, its first responsibility is service to Congress."
>
> This statement, along with other statements of the function of the Library, has been noted as having been approved by you as the Librarian. I believe that the service provided by the Library of Congress is superior, its employees are courteous and cooperative, and on countless occasions the Library has come to my rescue in my official duties. That is why I am puzzled as I read this statement and try to square it with your reply to the gentleman from Texas, Representative BECKWORTH. It puzzles me a great deal, because it fails to square with every other aspect of the Library's work, and the cooperative, frank, and open relationship you have built up with Congress and its Members.
>
> As a political scientist, I have deep admiration for the learned scholars who grace the staff of the Library of Congress. They are giants in the political science profession, and I look up to them for the justified reputation they have earned by their writings and their teachings.
>
> They hold important positions which enhance the prestige of the Library of Congress. I would not wish to embarrass any of these learned gentlemen by singling out any specific quotations from their writings. But each of these great political scientists has written lucidly on the subject of government, the ability to obtain the necessary basic background information in order to legislate soundly and intelligently, and the occasional frustrations when executive agencies—not a "family" agency such as the Library of Congress—attempt to thwart the will of Congress or its efforts to obtain legitimate information needed in the performance of legislative duties.
>
> As I read your letter to the gentleman from Texas, Representative BECKWORTH, I have a mental picture of these political science giants marching across the horizon in splendid array and stumbling and falling flat when they reach your uncompromising sentence about your "longstanding policy."
>
> Usually, when Congress is refused information which Congress legitimately needs for the performance of its legislative duties, there is a real reason for such refusal. The reason may relate to the national security, or the danger of war which may result from passing such information. Surely that is not the case here—it is simply "our longstanding policy." I believe it is the Director of the Budget who has an expressive cartoon on his wall showing a meek-looking Budget examiner seated at the desk of a two-fisted admiral; the admiral is pounding the desk and shouting, "There's no reason for it, I tell you. It's just our policy."
>
> What is the basic raison d'être for the Library of Congress? It serves Congress, and it also serves the general public with information. When one enters its hallowed halls, one goes to seek learning, to engage in a free search for truth. It is out of keeping with the entire spirit of the Library of Congress, to give aid and comfort to censorship. Some evenings I have stood by the reference desk just to hear the nature of the fascinating inquiries which pour into the Library of Congress. Not once have I ever heard one of the Library of Congress staff say, "That's a silly question." The entire attitude is one of cheerful cooperation. I would hate to see the day come when either the public or the Congress would think of the Library of Congress as a huge clam, jealously guarding all its intellectual treasures against exposure.
>
> On the third floor of the Library of Congress are some inspiring displays of documents of freedom. One sees here also the tremendous influence of the spirit of Thomas Jefferson, whose personal library furnished such an important addition to the Library of Congress in its early years. I paused the other evening to reread the text of Jefferson's first inaugural, in which he eloquently espouses the "diffusion of information" as one of the greatest principles necessary in a free government.
>
> What would the Sage of Monticello think of your letter to Representative BECKWORTH? In a letter to James Madison, Jefferson as President wrote:
>
> "I think, on the meeting of Congress, we should lay before them everything that has passed to that day, and place them on the same ground of information we are on ourselves."
>
> Writing to Henry Lee, Jefferson once said:
>
> "There is not a truth existing which I fear, or would wish unknown to the whole world."
>
> To John Smith, Jefferson wrote:
>
> "It is essential to the public interest that I should receive all the information possible respecting either matters or persons connected with the public."
>
> Finally, since the spirit of Jefferson so well represents the spirit of the Library of Congress, there is the letter which Jefferson wrote from Monticello on July 12, 1816, to Samuel Kercheval:
>
> "I have not been in the habit of mysterious reserve on any subject, not of buttoning up my opinions within my own doublet. On the contrary, while in public service especially I thought the public was entitled to frankness, and intimately to know whom they employed."
>
> Now I realize that you state you have conferred with the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library on this matter, but the point is: Have you recommended a change in this silly policy? Just what damage do you feel it will do for Congress to know what States your summer employees come from? Will this cause any personal embarrassment to the employees? Will it enhance the prestige of the Library of Congress to keep this information secret? Is it worth the risk of a pitched battle with Congress to continue to keep this information secret? Is this in keeping with the operation of responsible government? Is this in keeping with the whole spirit of the Library of Congress?

I also told Mr. Mumford that my letter was prepared exclusively by myself, with no help from the Legislative Reference Service or any employee of the Library of Congress.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I should like to compliment the gentleman for the research he has done on this subject. As the gentleman may know, the State of Oklahoma has but 1 employee over there out of 2,400. I want to compliment both the gentleman from West Virginia and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] for the research they have done on this. It is a matter that should have the attention of Congress and should be looked into immediately.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. I understand the bill is making progress also in the other body, where it has already been reported unanimously by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. However, in view of the lateness of the session, its fate in the other body is problematical.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to my good friend from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I compliment the gentleman on the speech he has just made and its content. I would like to make an observation about the Library of Congress. I believe the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service is doing a difficult job about as well as it can be done. Some of us have the feeling that if they are not doing all that is requested of them it may be because of two things: One, they do not have an adequate staff and we do not adequately provide for them; and that is something we can correct. The second is I think a great deal of the time of the Library of Congress, is regrettably to say, occupied by what is essentially the writing of theses and essays for people who are in school or back home in some Congressman's district. It is a very regrettable thing and I think it needs to be corrected, but just how I am at a loss to know, whether it should be by a law prohibiting such practice or whether the superintendents of schools should make a regulation, or what should be done. It is a very difficult thing to distinguish between those who are really making a scholarly appeal to the Library of Congress for assistance, and those who are merely trying to obtain a thesis or an essay ready written from the Library of Congress for presentation to their own people. I think this does need correction, but I do not know just how to correct it. I do think, however, it ought to be corrected.

Mr. HECHLER. I agree with the gentleman, and I believe that the Library Legislative Reference Service has already made regulations which limit this type of activity.

I want to make it clear to the gentleman that my remarks are not directed to any criticism of the Legislative Reference Service but rather the refusal of the Library of Congress, apparently, to furnish our colleague from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] the names and addresses of summer employees. I can see no violation of national security, nothing which affects our relations with Red China, or and other facet of the Nation's safety. I am sure every employee of the Library is proud of the State he or she comes from, and would give the Librarian full permission to release such information.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I want to compliment the gentleman again and say that I understood that. I hope I have not given the wrong impression. I hope this can be corrected.

And if I may take just a short minute more, I wish to say and I am sure the gentleman will agree with it, that the Reference Service is doing a splendid job on the whole and that we should look to see whether they need additional assistance in helping them cut down on those things which may not be their real responsibility.

Mr. HECHLER. I would agree with the gentleman's observation.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the author of the excellent bill under discussion.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your kind words about me and I certainly do appreciate what the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], has done in connection with our efforts to get information from the Library of Congress, which, of all agencies, should supply to the Members of the House information we seek.

I say to this House I, too, have a very high regard for the good people and good work of the Library of Congress. The people of the Library of Congress do a fine job I feel.

It is the overall problem I am more concerned with than the difficulty I have had in getting information from the Library of Congress. More and more it is difficult and often impossible to get information from Government departments by Members of the House.

You will remember the other day, when our colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] was discussing foreign aid. He spoke frequently about how difficult it is to get information. I have had the same difficulty with reference to a number of departments including the Department of Agriculture in getting information. Mr. Freeman last March issued an order saying he wanted to cut out some of the nepotism in summer jobs.

THE FEDERAL DIARY—AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT POLICY TO DISCOURAGE NEPOTISM IS ISSUED

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Agriculture Secretary Freeman has issued a general policy that discourages nepotism in the Department.

He doesn't want close relatives to be given jobs in the same agencies where the related employees and officials are working.

In no case does he want employees to work directly under relatives who are supervisors.

Freeman informed his staff in a special letter that he had decided to take the steps, after much soul searching, to avoid public criticism particularly in the Department's handling of summer and other part-time jobs.

He explained that his 'general policy guidance' in no way restricts the employment of persons, relatives or not, who qualify for them through competitive tests.

I wish to emphasize again at this point that it is disturbing more and more to me that some agencies of our Government are slow to furnish what individual Members of Congress ask for in the way of information. The excuse that it would take too much time and cost too much and is in another form is often used. This in most instances is incorrect in my opinion. Today if one sought to ascertain how many people over 45 years of age have been hired by the U.S. Government in the last 12, 18, or 24 months, he would find it very difficult to obtain such information.

I include some communications:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
June 18, 1962.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Third District, Texas,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are writing you in regard to your letter of June 4, 1962, which requested information on various grain loans. We have been informed by our State director that the information you seek has been furnished by the State office to the Department in Washington, D.C.

Yours very truly,
ALFRED H. OLSON,
Office Manager, County ASC Office,
Wyandotte County, Kans.

Yet when I asked for the names and addresses of the people who got the jobs, I did not get them. I had to go to our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] who has helped me very much. I also have been to others who are close to the departments and they have been of help. Today I have the information. It just came in Saturday from the Department of Agriculture. I include it in the RECORD.

Mr. HECHLER. I hope the gentleman will put that in the RECORD.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I am.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1962.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am attaching a list of the summer employees here at the Department in accordance with your recent telegraphic request for these individuals and their addresses. As you know, before receiving your wire we had transmitted to you a list of these individuals together with the school or university they attended. This attached list not only indicates their university but the addresses as well.

We also have a request from you concerning figures on the number of loans made on various crops and the number of farmers by States who have loans on two or more of these crops. As you remember from the experience of last year when you requested this same information, this is a tremendously expensive and very difficult and time-consuming process but we are currently nearing completion of this material and I can assure you that it will be finally completed and in your hands by Monday, October 15.

I understand that you have raised a question as to whether we have forbidden State and county ASC committees to provide this type of information. These committees are under tremendous pressure these days to keep up with their assigned responsibilities and because of this fact and because of the fact that we have been able to work out a procedure whereby we can develop this material here in Washington from around the country, we have preferred to make the response from here to your request. This gives us better coordination of the material and assures the accuracy and internal check of the material to provide you with the broadest possible picture available nationwide in answer to your request.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH M. BIRKHEAD,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Summer employment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962

Name and residence	Sex	School	Agency	Title and grade
ALABAMA				
Copeland, Edward, III, Bessemer	Male	Harvard University	MOS	Student assistant, GS-3.
ARKANSAS				
Lentz, J. Gary, Paragold	do	Harding College	FS	Accounting technician, GS-4.
CALIFORNIA				
Cox, Wayne, Covek	do	California State Polytechnic	INF	Student assistant, GS-4.
Totten, Barbara A., Riverside	Female	University of California	AMS	Do.
CONNECTICUT				
Cook, Lucius J., North Willmington	Male	University of Connecticut	FS	Information trainee, GS-4.
Vogel, Rowen, West Port	do	Cornell University	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Vogel, Stephen, New London	do	Mitchell College	MOS	Student assistant, GS-3.

Summer employment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962—Continued

Name and residence	Sex	School	Agency	Title and grade
DELAWARE				
McLucas, Ronald M., Hoekessin	do	Delaware Valley College	ARS	Crops research helper, WB-3.
Voigt, H. Carl, New Castle	do	Pennsylvania State	SCS	Student trainee, GS-3.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
Allen, Dana D., Washington	Female	St. John's College	MOS	Typist, GS-3.
Bauserman, Carolyn M., Washington	do	George Washington University	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Borchardt, Edward K., Washington	Male	Landon School for Boys	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-2.
Black, Virginia C., Washington	Female	Immaculate Junior College	SEC	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Brice, Edward W., Jr., Washington	Male	Wooster School	FAS	Clerk, GS-2.
Carlson, Carol C., Washington	Female	George Washington University	FCIC	Stenographer, GS-4.
Brittingham, Roger K., Washington	Male	Howard University	ARS	Insect research helper, GS-3.
Chesler, Patricia, Washington	Female	George Washington University	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Coleman, LeRoy, Washington	Male	Howard University	ASCS	Messenger, GS-2.
Colley, Margaret S., Washington	Female	Radford College	ARS	Bio. aid, GS-3.
Colona, William C., Jr., Washington	Male	Georgetown University	FCIC	Student trainee (accountant), GS-3.
Couzzens, Frederick L., III, Washington	do	Calvin Coolidge High School	SEC	Mail clerk, GS-2.
Crittenden, Timothy, Washington	do	St. Francis College	LIB	Clerk, GS-2.
Davis, Carrington B., Jr., Washington	do	Howard University	FHA	Mail clerk, GS-3.
Deming, Constance D., Washington	Female	Purdue University	ARS	Home economics aid, G-4.
Fissell, Michael F., Washington	Male	Mount St. Mary's College	ARS	Farm laborer, WB-3.
Frantz, Suzan J., Washington	Female	Bridgewater College	INF	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Gardner, Catherine, Washington	do	University of North Carolina	LIB	Library assistant, GS-4.
Gardner, Tom, Washington	Male	Knox College	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Goodman, Nancy, Washington	Female	Smith College	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Guggenheim, Joan, Washington	do	University of Rochester	MOS	Economic assistant, GS-3.
Hairstone, Ronald, Washington	Male	Harvard Medical School	FS	Bio. laboratory technician, GS-4.
Hale, Oswald, Washington	do	Duke University	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Hasco, Geraldine, Washington	Female	Mount St. Agnes College	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Heller, Mary B., Washington	do	St. Mary of the Woods	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Hetrick, Dex E., Washington	Male	Kittanning Senior High	ASCS	Do.
Hildebrand, Judith, Washington	Female	University of Maryland	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Inman, Mary Jane, Washington	do	Washington and Lee High School (Gettysburg College).	ASCS	Do.
Kirkpatrick, Barry V., Washington	Male	University of Richmond	AMS	Physical science technician, GS-5.
Kirshbaum, Bernard H., Washington	do	George Washington University	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Kornfield, Ruth E., Washington	Female	Pennsylvania State University	FAS	Do.
Lindberg, Nancy, Washington	do	Swarthmore College	LIB	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Margolin, Robert P., Washington	do	Columbia University	INF	Student assistant, GS-4.
Marshall, Terrence, Washington	do	Cornell University	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Minear, Suzanne C., Washington	do	St. Anthony High School	FS	Clerk, GS-2.
Morgan, Verda E., Washington	do	Georgetown Visitation	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Mostow, Judith H., Washington	do	Oberlin College	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Mostow, Kenneth L., Washington	Male	do	MOS	Economic assistant, GS-4.
Mouser, John, Washington	do	Principia College	FS	Mail clerk, GS-2.
Murphy, Ann, Washington	Female	St. Mary of the Woods	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Murray, Alcibia, Washington	do	District schools (teacher)	MOS	Statistical clerk, GS-5.
Neustadt, Bernard R., Washington	Male	Columbia University	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Peck, Lorna, Washington	Female	Georgetown University	LIB	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Porter, Kenneth M., Washington	Male	Georgetown Visitation	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Porter, Richard D., Washington	do	University of Maryland	AMS	Bio. laboratory aid, GS-3.
Robinson, Margaret J., Washington	Female	Sidwell Friends High School (Swarthmore College).	FAS	Steno-typist, GS-3.
Sinclair, Mary Jean, Washington	do	Woodrow Wilson High School (University of North Carolina).	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Snellings, Michael, Washington	Male	Ballou High School	REA	Engineering, draftsman, GS-4.
Stafford, Mary E., Washington	Female	University of North Carolina	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Stevens, Laurence, Washington	Male	Archbishop Carroll High School	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Taylor, Richard, Washington	do	Prince Georges Junior College	ARS	Insect research helper, WB-3.
Thompson, Kenneth W., Washington	do	George Washington University	REA	Engineering draftsman, GS-4.
Thorton, Gary, Washington	do	Youngstown College	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Wagley, Charles, Washington	do	Montreat-Anderson High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Wagman, Louis P., Washington	do	George Washington University	REA	Engineering draftsman, GS-4.
Weimer, Stanley R., Washington	do	Pennsylvania State University	ARS	Insect research helper, GS-3.
Witcher, Guy E., Washington	do	Howard University	INF	Laborer, WB-3.
Woldenberg, Irving, Washington	do	Talmudical Academy High School	MOS	Economic assistant, GS-2.
Wright, Annie Mae, Washington	Female	District of Columbia Teachers College	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Wright, Douglas, Washington	Male	Howard University	ARS	Physical science helper, GS-2.
FLORIDA				
Beck, P. K., Chiefland	do	University of Florida	ASCS	Photographic laboratory clerk, GS-3.
Moody, G. M., Bunnell	do	Daytona Beach Junior College	ASCS	Do.
Young, Edwina, Belle Glade	Female	David Lipscomb College	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
GEORGIA				
Budd, Joseph D., Oxford	Male	University of Georgia	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-4.
Dorsey, S. Lynn, Athens	Female	do	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Hamilton, Kenneth, Macon	Male	do	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-4.
IDAHO				
Graves, Melvin M., Jr., Pocatello	do	Johns Hopkins University	ARS	Crops research helper, WB-3.
ILLINOIS				
Brookhart, Jerry, Macomb	do	University of Illinois	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Gehring, R. Wayne, Aurora	do	Harvard University	ARS	Budget analyst, GS-5.
Lebeck, John E., Jr., Harvey	do	University of Illinois	ARS	Student assistant, GS-4.
INDIANA				
Behling, David, Jr., Crawfordsville	do	Harvard University	MOS	Economics assistant, GS-7.
Blum, Kurt E., Bloomington	do	Indiana University	ARS	Agriculture research technician, GS-6.
Holm, Robert, Lafayette	do	Purdue University	ARS	Do.
Howell, Kathleen, New Albany	Female	do	ARS	Student trainee, GS-3.
McAuliffe, Margaret, Terre Haute	do	Indiana State University	OGC	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
IOWA				
Bolin, Sharon, Cain	do	Northwest Missouri State College	FCIC	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Sterk, Kenneth, R., Montezuma	Male	Iowa State College	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Van Houweling, Douglas, Amex	do	Iowa State University	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Zwanziger, Mary Ann, Volga	Female	do	ARS	Biological aid, GS-3.

Summer employment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962—Continued

Name and residence	Sex	School	Agency	Title and grade
KENTUCKY				
Ewbank, James, L., Warsaw	Male	University of Kentucky	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Greene, Linda, Hindman	Female	do	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Prater, Willie, Hindman	Male	Moorhead State College	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Shields, John T., Lexington	do	University of Kentucky	MOS	Student assistant, GS-5.
Woodring, Charles, Morganfield	do	do	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
LOUISIANA				
Mangham, James, Shreveport	do	Louisiana Polytechnic Institute	ARS	Clerk, GS-2.
MARYLAND				
Adams, Elvin E., Takoma Park	do	Columbia Union College	ARS	Physiological aid, GS-3.
Anastasio, James J., Forest Heights	do	Johns Hopkins University	ARS	Clerk, GS-2.
Angel, Nancy Lee, College Park	Female	University of Maryland	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Babcock, John C., Silver Spring	Male	Bullis School (University of Vermont)	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Bailey, Elizabeth C., Beltsville	Female	Harvard University	ARS	Chemist, GS-7.
Barnes, Mary Jane, Silver Spring	do	St. Lawrence University (N.Y.)	FCIC	Actuarial clerk, GS-5.
Beach, Donna, Silver Spring	do	Montgomery-Blair High School	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-2.
Beach, Roger, Hyattsville	Male	University of Maryland	ASCS	Carto. aid, GS-3.
Beall, Franklin, Glendale	do	Duvall High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Berg, Susan, Hyattsville	Female	Northwestern High School (Gettysburg College).	FCIC	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Bergeron, John A., Baltimore	Male	University of Pennsylvania	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-3.
Berlin, Elliott, Baltimore	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Chemist, GS-7.
Betz, John, Lanham	do	Duvall High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Black, Ira, Greenbelt	do	Harvard Medical School	ARS	Physical science technician, GS-5.
Blakely, Richard, Wheaton	do	Johns Hopkins University	ARS	Eng. aid, GS-3.
Bondareff, Susan, Silver Spring	Female	University of Pittsburgh	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Boswell, Cheryl, Oxon Hill	do	Oxon Hill High School	ARS	Do.
Bowman, Kimberly, Silver Spring	Male	Guilford College	ARS	Lab. Res. helper, GS-3.
Bozzella, Lawrence L., Hyattsville	do	Northwestern High School	FCIC	Student trainee (accountant), GS-3.
Brezon, Rebecca A., Silver Spring	Female	Holy Cross Academy	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Brock, Joseph, Silver Spring	Male	West Maryland College	ASCS	Carto. aid, GS-3.
Brosius, Diane M., Ellicott City	Female	Madison College	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Buchannan, David, Seabrook	Male	Duvall High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-2.
Buddington, Roland, Hyattsville	do	Duke University	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Calabrese, John F., College Park	do	St. John's High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Canada, Charles, Chevy Chase	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Biological laboratory aid, GS-2.
Carleton, Cheryl, Burtonsville	Female	Kansas State	ARS	Student trainee, GS-3.
Carney, Ellen, Takoma Park	do	Marietta College	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Cheek, Douglas W., College Park	Male	Northwestern High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Combs, John G., Silver Spring	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Do.
Consulazio, William, Bethesda	do	do	ARS	Crops research helper, WB-3.
Crum, Robert S., Silver Spring	do	do	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Cullen, Robert P., Silver Spring	do	do	ARS	Biological aid, GS-3.
Currie, Rutledge, Chevy Chase	do	Washington and Lee University	REA	Engineering technician, GS-4.
Danchik, Nolan K., Silver Spring	do	George Washington University	REA	Engineering draftsman, GS-4.
Dashiell, William H., Hyattsville	do	Northwestern High School	AMS	Engineering aid, GS-2.
Davis, Carolyn, Bladensburg	Female	Bladensburg High School	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Denit, Jeffrey, Hyattsville	Male	Clemson College	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Dimock, Roy, Silver Spring	do	Duke University	ASCS	Carto. aid, GS-3.
Distad, Donna, Mitchelville	Female	Sasser High School	FAS	Clerk-typist.
Drennan, Margaret, Bethesda	do	University of North Carolina	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Dreyer, Frederick, College Park	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Eng. aid, GS-3.
Dunaway, David J., Adelphi	do	High Point High School	ARS	Insect research helper, WB-3.
Eisenberg, Richard, Bethesda	do	Walter Johnson High School (University of Michigan).	ARS	Laboratory assistant, GS-3.
Elder, Gary, Silver Spring	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Eng. draftsman, GS-3.
Elstein, Mary, Silver Spring	Female	Northwood High School	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Elting, Virginia, Silver Spring	do	Gettysburg College	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Eyler, John M., Beltsville	Male	High Point High School	AMS	Biological laboratory aid, GS-2.
Fairfax, Nancy, College Park	Female	Duke University	AMS	Physical science aid, GS-2.
Farhood, John, Wheaton	Male	Montgomery Junior College	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-3.
Feinstein, Jay O., Silver Spring	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Fennel, John, Jr., Takoma Park	do	do	ARS	Eng. aid, GS-3.
Finael, Betsy, Silver Spring	Female	do	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Finley, Dawnell K., Beltsville	do	Maryland State Teachers College	ARS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Finnseth, David A., Greenbelt	Male	Prince Georges Junior College	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Floyd, James, III, Marrattsville	do	Glenelg High School	ARS	Do.
Fonda, Richard W., College Park	do	Duke University	AMS	Botanist (seed tech.), GS-5.
Frank, James P., Hyattsville	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Eng. aid, GS-3.
Fraser, Francis, Baltimore	do	Baltimore Dental College	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-4.
Fredlund, Carol E., Cheverly	Female	Bladensburg High School (Radcliffe College)	SEC	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Freeman, Marcia J., Silver Spring	do	Pennsylvania State University	FAS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Frye, James, Riverside	Male	University of Maryland	ASCS	Photographic laboratory clerk, GS-3.
Fugate, Harold G., Jr., Hyattsville	do	do	ARS	Bacteriologist, GS-7.
Gerzham, Patricia A., Silver Spring	Female	do	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Gordon, Robert, Edgewater	Male	Annapolis High School	ARS	Engineer aid, GS-2.
Grieb, Michael, Hyattsville	do	Mackin High School (Villanova University)	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Griffith, Samuel, College Park	do	University of Maryland	AMS	Physical science aid, GS-2.
Guidry, Claudia A., Adelphi	Female	do	ARS	Biological laboratory aid, GS-3.
Hadlock, Earl, Hyattsville	Male	do	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-2.
Haenni, Carol A., Bethesda	Female	Wake Forest College	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Hamilton, Elizabeth, Hyattsville	do	Catholic University	ARS	Biological aid, GS-4.
Hannawald, James F., Hyattsville	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Crops research helper, WB-3.
Hanson, William R., Hyattsville	do	do	SCS	Student trainee (civil engineering), GS-3.
Hart, Frederick, College Park	do	do	ARS	Chemist, GS-5.
Hartke, Barbara L., Wheaton	Female	Catholic University	ARS	Biological aid, GS-2.
Hatch, Edward, Millersville	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Do.
Haven, Robert, Silver Spring	do	University of Chicago	MOS	Digital computer programer, GS-3.
Hawkins, David, Rockville	do	Montgomery High School	ARS	Mail clerk, GS-2.
Heinze, R. Gerald, Beltsville	do	George Washington University	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-3.
Hirst, Robert C., Bethesda	do	Bethany College	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Hoenack, Stephen, Bethesda	do	George Washington University	MOS	Student assistant, GS-5.
Hofman, James W., Bethesda	do	College of Holy Cross	AMS	Biological laboratory technician, GS-4.
Holt, Martin, Hyattsville	do	Northwestern High School	ARS	Insect research helper, WB-3.
Hopkins, James E., Beltsville	do	University of Maryland	AMS	Biological laboratory technician, GS-2.
Howard, Michael, Dayton	do	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Humphrey, Barbara J., Silver Spring	Female	University of Maryland	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Hutchins, Paula, Kensington	do	Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School (Montgomery Junior College).	LIB	Do.
Ignatowski, John S., Baltimore	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Biological aid, GS-3.
Irving, Mary C., Chevy Chase	Female	do	MOS	Statistical clerk, GS-3.
Jamerson, Janet L., Ellicott City	do	Glen Elgin High School	ARS	Laboratory helper, WB-2.
Janoske, Howard, Laurel	Male	Laurel High School	ARS	Crops research helper, GS-3.
Jenkins, James P., Silver Spring	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Insurance research helper, WB-3.

Summer employment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962—Continued

Name and residence	Sex	School	Agency	Title and grade
MARYLAND—continued				
Johnson, Carole A., Bethesda	Female	Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Johnson, Daniel, Bethesda	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Jones, William C., Silver Spring	do	Silverbrook High School	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-2.
Jorgensen, Hans E., Greenbelt	do	High Point High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Kalk, Carolyn E., Chevy Chase	Female	University of Maryland	ARS	Microbiologist.
Kane, David, Bethesda	Male	Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Kane, Kathleen, Silver Spring	Female	Academy of the Holy Name (I. Loyola University.	LIB	Clerk, GS-2.
Kania, Leslie, Silver Spring	Male	University of Maryland	ASCS	Photographic laboratory clerk, GS-3.
Kelly, Louis, Jr., Silver Spring	do	do	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Key, Phillip, Silver Spring	do	Good Counsel High School (Georgetown University).	ARS	Laborer, GS-3.
King, Robert C., Capital Heights	do	Central High School	LIB	Clerk, GS-2.
Knox, David A., College Park	do	Prince Georges Community College	ARS	Insect research helper, GS-3.
Krauch, Arthur, Beltsville	do	University of Maryland	AMS	Physical Science aid, GS-2.
Krause, Mary Jane, Carrolton	Female	High Point High School	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Kunz, Lois, Silver Spring	do	Utah State University	ARS	Do.
Lehnert, Thor, Silver Spring	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Biological aid, GS-4.
Lewis, Claire L., Cheverly	Female	do	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Lippman, Mary Ellen, Silver Spring	do	Montgomery High School (Fairleigh Dickenson University).	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Loftus, Gregory T., Greenbelt	Male	Gonzaga High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Lynch, Joan, Silver Spring	Female	Dunbarton College	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Lynch, Kay, Kensington	do	St. Mary's College	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-4.
Maloof, Daniel L., Hyattsville	Male	Baltimore College of Dental Surgery	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Mannion, Robert E., Silver Spring	do	University of Maryland	SCS	Engineer aid, GS-2.
Marr, William H., Hyattsville	do	Northwestern High School	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-2.
Mason, Louis M., Takoma Park	do	University of Georgia	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-4.
Mauser, Fred, Hyattsville	do	Gonzaga High School	ARS	Insect research helper, WB-3.
McClenny, Sandra L., Waldorf	Female	Bob Jones University	FAS	Secretary (stenographer), GS-5.
McDermott, William G., Hyattsville	Male	DeMatha	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
McGinty, Linda, Brookmont	Female	Dickinson College	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Mengers, John, Catonsville	Male	University of Maryland	SCS	Engineering aid, GS-3.
Menzer, John, College Park	do	do	ARS	Engineering aid, GS-4.
Merchant, Dennis, Mount Rainier	do	Archbishop Carroll High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Miller, Linda, Kent Village	Female	Madison College	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Miller, Marilyn, Hyattsville	do	Northwestern High School	AMS	Do.
Mitchell, James, Hyattsville	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Statistical clerk, GS-3.
Modlin, Linda L., Laurel	Female	Maryland Institute—College of Art	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Mystrom, Mary, Hyattsville	do	University of Maryland	FS	Do.
Nelson, Frederick J., Bladensburg	Male	do	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Nightingale, Jane, College Park	Female	do	MOS	Secretary, GS-3.
Norman, Lois, Hyattsville	do	Muskengan College	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Oberschain, John C., Silver Spring	Male	Northwood High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
O'Brien, Carmetta M., Laurel	Female	University of Maryland	AMS	Physical science aid, GS-2.
Orenberg, Karen A., Silver Spring	do	Fairleigh Dickinson University	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Oster, Frona Faye, West Hyattsville	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Do.
Pacen, Anita, Mount Rainier	do	do	ASCS	Do.
Palmer, Dennis P., District Heights	Male	Gettysburg College	MOS	Economics assistant, GS-3.
Palmer, Marian, Kensington	Female	College of Southern Utah	AMS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Peet, John A., Silver Spring	Male	Montgomery Junior College	SCS	Physical science aid, GS-2.
Persion, Barbara A., Silver Spring	Female	Western Maryland College	ARS	Biological laboratory aid, GS-3.
Peters, Roberta, Silver Spring	do	Montgomery County High School	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Poplis, David A., Ednor	Male	Montgomery Junior College	AMS	Physical science aid, GS-2.
Powers, Van Stuart, Bowie	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Insect research helper, WB-3.
Pritchard, Judith, Silver Spring	Female	Northwood High School	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Reese, David H., College Park	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Agricultural research technician, GS-5.
Reisner, Barbara L., Silver Spring	Female	do	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Rice, Judith, Riverdale	do	do	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Ridgely, Oliver L., College Park	Male	do	ARS	Crops research helper, WB-3.
Risen, Diana June, Bethesda	Female	Penbroke College of Brown University	FCIC	Actuarial clerk, GS-3.
Rodenhisen, Brace, Bethesda	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Crops research helper, WB-3.
Rosenberger, William F., Bethesda	do	do	ARS	Do.
Rosenthal, Leo J., College Park	do	George Washington University	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Rosenthal, Norman P., Oxon Hill	do	University of Maryland	AMS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Russell, Michael, Silver Spring	do	Georgetown University	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Sanford, Patricia A., Hyattsville	Female	University of Maryland	ARS	Mathematics aid, GS-3.
Sappington, Phoebe J., Morningside	do	do	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Sarlin, Ronald A., College Park	do	do	ARS	Crops research helper, WB-3.
Sarubin, Murray F., College Park	do	do	ARS	Crops research helper, GS-3.
Saxton, George W., Silver Spring	do	George Washington University	FS	Cartographic photographers aid, GS-3.
Schiffman, Sterling, Silver Spring	do	Northwood High School	SEC	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Schindler, Rita, Takoma Park	do	University of Washington	ARS	Home economist, GS-5.
Scott, William J., Laurel	Male	Laurel High School	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-2.
Servis, Clyde, Silver Spring	do	Montgomery Junior College	ARS	Biological laboratory technician, GS-3.
Shadrick, Arnold, Beltsville	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Crops research helper, GS-3.
Shaffer, James, Jr., Lanham	do	do	ARS	Do.
Sherlin, Grover, Hyattsville	do	do	ARS	Engineering aid, GS-2.
Sherr, Mitchell, Silver Spring	do	Montgomery-Blair High School (Dickinson College).	MOS	Student assistant, GS-2.
Shields, Sara, Kensington	Female	Knox School (Bethany College)	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Sidwell, Ronald, Takoma Park	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Crops research helper, GS-3.
Siple, Donald, College Park	do	do	AMS	Physical science aid, GS-2.
Slavin, Margaret, Hyattsville	Female	do	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Smith, Eva A., Hyattsville	do	do	ARS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Smith, Leslie, Silver Spring	do	do	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Smith, William G., Silver Spring	Male	Boca Ciega High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Sobers, David, Silver Spring	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Physical science technician, GS-5.
Sooy, Richard, Edgewater	do	Edgewater High School (University of Maryland).	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Sowder, Diane R., Silver Spring	Female	University of Idaho	ARS	Home economics aid, GS-3.
Spiegel, Florence, Takoma Park	do	Earlhorn College	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Stacey, James M., Oxon Hill	Male	Pennsylvania State	ARS	Insect research helper, WB-3.
Stang, Peter C., Silver Spring	do	Gettysburg College	AMS	Biological laboratory technician, GS-4.
Starkey, Richard B., Mitchellville	do	Severn Preparatory School	AMS	Physical science aid, GS-2.
Starkey, Thomas L., Mitchellville	do	Frederick Sasscer High School	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Steel, Joel S., Silver Spring	do	Potomac State College	ARS	Crops research helper, GS-3.
Stern, Edward, Kensington	do	George Washington University	MOS	Student assistant, GS-3.
Sutphin, Esther, College Park	Female	University of Maryland	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Swanson, Richard, Kensington	Male	Montgomery Junior College	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Tatvydas, Kestutis, Lanham	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Crops research helper.
Thatcher, William, Perry Hill	do	do	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-2.
Thom, Gary, Hyattsville	do	do	SCS	Physical science aid, GS-2.
Thomas, Wilbert, Jr., Greenbelt	do	do	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-3.
Thompson, J. Leslie, Baltimore	do	do	ARS	Engineering draftsman, GS-3

Summer employment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962—Continued

Name and residence	Sex	School	Agency	Title and grade
MARYLAND—continued				
Thorton, Barbara, Beltsville	Female	Carnegie Institute of Technology	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Townsend, Richard, Takoma Park	Male	Emmanual Missionary College	ASCS	Photography laboratory clerk, GS-3.
Trattler, Henry L., Silver Spring	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Truesdell, Stribling B., College Park	do	do	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Vaccaro, Michael, Silver Spring	do	Northwood High School	ARS	Laboratory helper, WB-2.
VanDerVeer, Lynne, Silver Spring	Female	Montgomery Junior College	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Van DerVere, Pieter, Rockville	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Crops research helper, GS-3.
Van Natta, Richard C., Cheverly	do	Prince Georges Commercial College	SEC	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Volz, Gary A., Rockville	do	Texas A. & M	SCS	Engineering aid, GS-3.
Vrana, Barbara Anne, College Park	Female	University of Maryland	SCS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
Walsh, Richard, Silver Spring	Male	Our Lady of Good Counsel (University of Maryland).	ARS	Crops research helper, GS-3.
Ward, Steven, Silver Spring	do	University of Oklahoma	ASCS	Photographic laboratory clerk, GS-3.
Ware, John M., Wheaton	do	Montgomery Junior College	ARS	Insect research helper, GS-3.
Waters, Hester F., Elkridge	Female	Lycoming College	ARS	Insect research helper, GS-4.
Weaver, Claudia, Cheverly	do	Davis & Elkins College	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Wexler, Allan, Silver Spring	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Engineering draftsman, GS-4.
Whitmore, John T., Beltsville	do	do	ARS	Crops research helper, GS-3.
Wickham, Mary Ann, Silver Spring	Female	do	SCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Wilburn, Judith, Riverdale	do	University of Maryland (University of West Virginia).	ARS	Biologic aid, GS-4.
Wilson, Harry Norman, Jr., Easton	Male	University of Maryland	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Wilson, John S., Hyattsville	do	Northwestern High School (University of West Virginia).	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Woodward, Sandra J., Silver Spring	Female	University of Maryland	FAS	Do.
Zidwick, Albert, College Park	Male	do	AMS	Biology laboratory aid, GS-3.
Zimmerman, Carol, Sandy Spring	Female	Montgomery Junior College	ARS	Crops research helper, GS-2.
MASSACHUSETTS				
Berle, Peter, Cambridge	do	Harvard Law School	ASCS	Staff assistant, GS-7.
Gilgut, Patricia, Amherst	Female	University of Massachusetts	MOS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
Iden, George, Cambridge	Male	Harvard University	MOS	Economic assistant, GS-7.
Meahl, Robert K., Winchester	do	do	MOS	Student assistant, GS-7.
Pruitt, Sharon, Quincy	Female	Eastern Nazarene College	MOS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
MICHIGAN				
Koch, Stephen D., North Housbegor	Male	Swarthmore College	ARS	Agricultural research technician, GS-5.
MINNESOTA				
Love, Daryll, St. Paul	do	University of Minnesota	MOS	Student assistant, GS-3.
MISSISSIPPI				
Hendrix, Barbara, Louisville	Female	Mississippi State College for Women	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
O'Neal, James, McComb	Male	University of Mississippi	ARS	Chemist, GS-5.
MISSOURI				
Hartman, Linda L., Rock Port	Female	Northwest Missouri State College	FCIC	Actuarial clerk, GS-4.
Klump, Sylvia Sue, Rock Port	do	Nebraska Wesleyan University	FCIC	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Murphy, Edward E., St. Louis	Male	University of Pennsylvania	ARS	Family economy, GS-7.
NEBRASKA				
Elliott, Allen D., Lincoln	do	University of Nebraska	AMS	Student assistant, GS-3.
Gallamore, Robert, Fairbury	do	Weslyan University	FAS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Miller, Jerry, Davenport	do	University of Nebraska	AMS	Clerk, GS-2.
Waser, Judith M., Lincoln	Female	do	INF	Student assistant, GS-4.
NEW HAMPSHIRE				
Carrier, Stephen, Bedford	Male	Clairmont College	FS	Cartographic aid, GS-2.
NEW JERSEY				
Champion, Daniel, Pleasantville	do	University of Maryland	ARS	Physical science technician, GS-7.
Dunham, Carole S., Camden	Female	Bucknell University	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Mueller, Raymond, Marlton	Male	East Carolina College	MOS	Student assistant, GS-3.
NEW YORK				
Fausty, Patricia N., Armonk	Female	Cornell University	ARS	Home economic aid, GS-4.
Hamilton, Winthrop, Weedsport	Male	do	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Mulooly, John P., New York	do	Catholic University	ARS	Mathematical statistician, GS-7.
Tierney, John, Freeport	do	Cornell University	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-5.
Westcott, Diana Mae, Syracuse	Female	Syracuse University	SEC	Student assistant, GS-5.
Westcott, Susan, Syracuse	do	do	MOS	Student assistant, GS-3.
NORTH CAROLINA				
Ballou, Alfred, Jr., Oxford	Male	Campbell College	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-4.
Britt, Joe F., Lumberton	do	Wake Forest College	MOS	Economic assistant, GS-5.
Flake, Judith, Wadesboro	Female	East Carolina College	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Furey, Carol, Asheville	do	Women's College of the University of North Carolina.	FS	Do.
LaNier, Hilda, Burgaw	do	Carver School	AMS	Secretary (typist), GS-5.
NORTH DAKOTA				
Keel, Vernon A., Turtle Lake	Male	University of North Dakota	AMS	Student assistant, GS-4.
OHIO				
Burrill, Robert M., Athens	do	Ohio State University	MOS	Geographer, GS-9.
Mayer, Ann, Fairborn	Female	do	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-3.
Santoro, David S., Cincinnati	Male	do	ARS	Engineering aid, GS-4.
Sayre, James R., Sidney	do	do	FHA	Student assistant, GS-4.
Shurtliffe, Clinton E., Ravenna	do	West Virginia University	FS	Statistical clerk, GS-4.
Wilhelm, Bonita J., North Lima	Female	Thiel College	FS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
OKLAHOMA				
Mitchelmore, Gary E., Davis	Male	University of Oklahoma	INF	Student assistant, GS-4.

Summer employment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962—Continued

Name and residence	Sex	School	Agency	Title and grade
OREGON				
Bonebrake, Beverly R., Portland	Female	Oregon State University	SCS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Eversaul, Nancy E., Portland	do	University of Oregon	SCS	Do.
PENNSYLVANIA				
Allbeck, D. Ellen, Millville	do	Pennsylvania State University	INF	Student assistant, GS-4.
Bassett, Ronald, Williamsport	Male	University of Maryland	AMS	Biological laboratory technician, GS-2.
Cummerick, Patricia E., Greenville	Female	Thiel College	FS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Dupree, Judith A., Pittsburgh	do	Pennsylvania State University	ARS	Home Economic aid, GS-4.
Fye, Sue Ann, Sharpesville	do	do	FES	Student trainee, GS-4.
Garman, Elsie L., Ballwood	do	Bob Jones University	ASCS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Kinstlich, Judith A., Memacolin	do	Waynesburg College	FS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
Lybarger, Earl D., Mann Choice	Male	Pennsylvania State University	ARS	Engineering aid, GS-3.
Overington, Dorothy, Waynesboro	Female	Waynesboro Business College	ARS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
O'Toole, Gerald, Connellsville	Male	Salem College	ARS	Laborer, WB-3.
Plocinik, Barbara, Summit Hill	Female	Immaculate College	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-4.
Vidmar, Marie A., Central City	do	Shippensburg State College	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
SOUTH CAROLINA				
Hendrix, Mary, Rockhill	do	Winthrop College	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Jeter, William C., Winnsboro	Male	University of South Carolina	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
McMillan, John, Florence	do	do	ASCS	Do.
Plyler, George M., Clemson	do	Clemson College	MOS	Economic assistant, GS-3.
SOUTH DAKOTA				
Frericks, Delbert L., Frankfurt	do	South Dakota State College	AMS	Student assistant, GS-4.
TENNESSEE				
Bradley, Lanita C., Cottontown	Female	David Lipscomb College	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Nicholls, Kavid E., Nashville	Male	Harvard University	MOS	Economic assistant, GS-7.
TEXAS				
Barbee, Ray D., Austin	do	University of Texas	ARS	Agriculture research technician, GS-5.
Bruce, Dorothy, Waco	Female	Baylor University	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Brune Kay, Sealy	do	Wellesley College	FHA	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
Knape, Bennie W., Jr., Sherman	Male	Texas A. & M. College	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-4.
Noble, Paul, Brownsville	do	Rice University	ARS	Student trainee, GS-3.
Schuler, Margaret R., Waco	Female	Baylor University	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Summers, Frank, Longview	Male	Texas A. & M. College	SEC	Student trainee (math), GS-3.
Van Steenkiste, Richard, Austin	do	University of Texas	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
UTAH				
Allen, James, Provo	do	Brigham Young University	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Jensen, Marilyn, Salt Lake City	Female	do	FHA	Do.
Newton, Shauna, Bountiful	do	University of Utah	ASCS	Do.
Shumway, Patti, Tremonton	do	do	MOS	Do.
Speckart, Stephen, Provo	Male	Brigham Young University	ARS	Do.
Tingey, Marilyn, Brigham City	Female	Utah State University	ARS	Do.
VIRGINIA				
Abbott, Ethelyn R., Arlington	do	William and Mary College	ARS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Abbott, Frank P., Arlington	Male	University of Virginia	MOS	Clerk, GS-2.
Abbott, Russell, McLean	do	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Adkins, Diane, Oakton	Female	Radford College	ASCS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Allen, Jacquelyn, Arlington	do	Madison College	FS	Do.
Atkinson, Betty A., Arlington	do	Longwood College	SCS	Do.
Avin, Judith N., Arlington	do	American University	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Aylesworth, Nancy, Alexandria	do	Hammond High School (Michigan State University).	SEC	Do.
Bachman, Kenneth L., Annandale	Male	Ohio University	ARS	Digital computer systems analyst, GS-3.
Barber, Sharon, North Springfield	Female	Annandale High School	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Barlow, Mary L., Falls Church	do	Louisiana State University	FAS	Do.
Barrett, Nancy Burton, Alexandria	do	George Washington High School	FCIC	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Barton, Barbara J., Alexandria	do	Richmond Professional Institute	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Baylo, Arthur, Alexandria	Male	St. Stephens High School	MOS	Economic assistant, GS-2.
Blum, Joanne, Annandale	Female	Wooster College	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Brenner, Janice H., Herndon	do	Lynchburg College	ASCS	Do.
Brewston, David, Falls Church	Male	McLean High School (Bowdoin College)	FAS	Do.
Browning, Marguerite, Arlington	Female	Peabody College	INF	Do.
Bruckner, Richard, Fairfax	Male	Purdue University	MOS	Comptometer operator, GS-3.
Burch, Cordell H., Alexandria	do	J. E. B. Stuart High School (Vanderbilt University).	INF	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Burdette, Patricia M., Alexandria	Female	F. C. Hammond High School	FAS	Do.
Callaway, Robert, Arlington	Male	Brown University	ARS	Do.
Campbell, Judith A., Alexandria	Female	Groveton High School	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Cate, Meredith, Alexandria	do	Longwood College	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Coakley, Gere Lynn, Alexandria	do	Lynchburg College	MOS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Colby, Jeannette, Falls Church	do	Radford College of Virginia Polytech	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Colby, Vergie L., Falls Church	do	University of Tennessee	SCS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Colvin, Sharon A., Sterling	do	Loudon County High School	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Cook, Charlotte, Leesburg	do	Pembroke College	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Copley, Barbara J., Falls Church	do	West Hampton College	ARS	Do.
Crown, Anne V., Arlington	do	Marymount College (University of Madrid, Spain).	SCS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
Curnow, Richard, Alexandria	Male	Presbyterian College	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Curran, Barbara J., Alexandria	Female	Longwood College	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Davis, Rudy, Alexandria	Male	Howard High School	ARS	Do.
DeCamp, Russel R., Fairfax	do	University of Florida	AMS	Student assistant, GS-2.
Dewton, Elizabeth, Arlington	Female	Smith College	LIB	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Divers, Carolyn, Falls Church	do	Madison College	FS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Dowell, A. Yates, III, McLean	Male	Williams College	ASCS	Photographic laboratory clerk, GS-3.
Draper, James T., Arlington	do	George Washington University	ASCS	Clerk, GS-3.
Dudley, William E., II, Arlington	do	Dartmouth College	ARS	Medical biological technician, GS-3.
Eddicks, Thelma, Arlington	Female	Washington and Lee High School (Potomac State College).	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Flanary, Claudia L., Alexandria	do	George Washington High School	FES	Do.
Flora, Roger, Blacksburg	do	University of Virginia	MOS	Student assistant, GS-5.
Foresman, Elizabeth, McLean	do	Madison College	MOS	Clerk, GS-3.

Summer employment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962—Continued

Name and residence	Sex	School	Agency	Title and grade
VIRGINIA—continued				
Fortson, Christine, Falls Church	Female	William and Mary College	FAS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
Frankel, Karen R., Arlington	do	Miami University	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Frazier, Meredith, Arlington	do	University of North Carolina	ASCS	Do.
Furr, Joan P., Arlington	do	Utah State University	FS	Do.
Gibson, David, Oakton	Male	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	MOS	Student assistant, GS-5.
Gilmer, George, McLean	do	Emory and Henry College	LIB	Library assistant, GS-2.
Godfrey, Gloria C., Alexandria	Female	Mount Vernon High School	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Goodsell, Virginia P., Alexandria	do	Brigham Young University	ASCS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
Goold, David S., McLean	Male	do	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Grant, Phyllis A., Arlington	Female	Carson-Newman College	LIB	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Griffith, Kelley, Jr., Annandale	Male	Wake Forest College	FS	Public information specialist, GS-5.
Grimm, David M., Springwood	do	Michigan State University	ARS	Engineering draftsman, GS-3.
Hageman, Nan R., Fairfax	Female	Fairfax High School (Greensboro College)	SEC	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Hamer, John P., Alexandria	Male	University of Colorado	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Hanks, Sandra K., Falls Church	Female	Wakefield High School	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Hankes, Lewis, Falls Church	Male	Randolph-Macon College	MOS	Clerk, GS-3.
Hankison, Audrey, Arlington	Female	George Washington University	ARS	Home economics aid, GS-4.
Hansen, Gail I., Falls Church	do	J. E. B. Stuart High School	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Harris, Barry V., Vienna	Male	William and Mary College	MOS	Do.
Harrison, Pamela, Arlington	Female	Washington & Lee High School (Brigham Young University).	ARS	Do.
Healey, Kathleen, McLean	do	Marquette University	ASCS	Do.
Hein, Judith, Alexandria	do	Hammond High School	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Henriksen, Dale, Arlington	Male	Brigham Young University	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Hergt, Joseph B., Arlington	do	Arkansas University	ASCS	Do.
Hertzler, Richard A., Arlington	do	North Carolina State	FS	Engineering aid, GS-3.
Hice, Gerald E., Alexandria	do	University of Virginia	FS	Cartographic, photo aid, GS-3.
Hill, Beverly Jane, Alexandria	Female	Shenandoah College	FCIC	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Himes, Philip R., Springfield	Male	Lee High School	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Himmer, Ronald G., Falls Church	do	West Virginia University	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Hobbs, Horton H., III, Falls Church	do	University of Richmond	ARS	Biological aid, GS-2.
Hoiberg, Charles P., Alexandria	do	William and Mary College	ARS	Insect research helper, WB-3.
Holm, Patricia L., Arlington	Female	University of Maryland	AMS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Horton, Elizabeth, Arlington	do	Wakefield High School	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Howard, James O., Falls Church	Male	Wesleyan University	AMS	Student assistant, GS-3.
Hurt, Anna, Alexandria	Female	William and Mary College	ASCS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Hungerford, Franklin, Alexandria	Male	University of Virginia	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Iliff, Barbara, Arlington	Female	Ohio University	FS	Do.
Jester, Jenifer Ann, Alexandria	do	Roanoke College	ARS	Do.
Johnstone, Loretta P., Alexandria	do	George Washington High School	FAS	Do.
Kendall, Stephen A., Alexandria	Male	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	FCIC	Actuarial clerk, GS-4.
Kimball, Pamela, McLean	Female	McLean High School	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
King, Virginia Ann, Arlington	do	Radford College of Virginia Polytechnic Institute.	SEC	Clerk-typist, GS-4.
Kraus, Linda, Arlington	do	Kansas State University	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Kube, Linda Gay, Unionville	do	Richmond Professional Institute	MOS	Do.
Lane, Trina K., Big Stone Gap	do	Emory and Henry College	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-4.
Lee, James, Arlington	Male	Pearl River Junior College	ARS	Biological aid, GS-3.
Lee, Ramon, Arlington	do	North Carolina State College	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Light, Sally R., McLean	Female	Graduated Duke University, 1961 (teaches in winter).	FAS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Linton, Virginia, Alexandria	do	Madison College	INF	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Lisonbee, Mary Louise, Arlington	do	Brigham Young University	MOS	Student trainee, GS-2.
Mallard, Robert L., III, Arlington	Male	Louisburg College	INF	Photographic laboratory technician, GS-3.
Malotky, Carol L., Arlington	Female	Kent State University	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Manning, F. Dale, Alexandria	Male	American University	INF	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Marler, Janice M., Arlington	Female	University of Tennessee	AMS	Student assistant, GS-3.
Mason, William T., III, Annandale	Male	University of Virginia	FS	Cartographic photography aid, GS-4.
McGuire, Francis D., Arlington	do	Cornell University	FS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Meeks, John C., Arlington	do	Washington & Lee High School	ARS	Physical science technician, GS-2.
Meister, Jane, Arlington	Female	University of Connecticut	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Miller, Judith F., Vienna	do	Bridgewater College	FHA	Do.
Mitchell, Lynn M., Annandale	do	Smith College	MOS	Student assistant, GS-3.
Mitchell, Odessa, Alexandria	do	George Washington High School	FES	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Moe, Thomas, Arlington	Male	Capital University	MOS	Student trainee, GS-2.
Morrison, Wayne, Vienna	do	Hampton-Sydney College	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Murphey, Joyce E., Arlington	Female	William & Mary College	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Myatt, Betsy, alexandria	do	University of Wisconsin	ASCS	Do.
Neff, Nancy Joan, Sterling	do	Madison College	SCS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Neil, Janet L., Annandale	do	William & Mary College	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Nelson, Anna, Arlington	do	Mary Washington College	ASCS	Do.
Nichols, George, Arlington	Male	Haverford College	OGC	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Nikkel, Florence R., Arlington	Female	Trinity College	SCS	Do.
Noble, David F., Falls Church	Male	Annandale High School	INF	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Oldfield, Devereux A., Alexandria	do	Mary Washington College	ARS	Biological laboratory aid, GS-3.
O'Donnell, Owen, Arlington	do	Yale University	ASCS	Statistical clerk, GS-3.
O'Sullivan, Carol, Arlington	Female	Radford College	FAS	Clerk-typist.
Perry, James P., Arlington	Male	The Citadel	SEC	Budget trainee, GS-3.
Phillips, John R., Arlington	do	Brigham Young University	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Pickett, Martie Mae, Alexandria	Female	George Washington High School	FAS	Do.
Plott, Barbara L., Arlington	do	University of Delaware	ARS	Home economics aid, GS-4.
Poland, Barbara A., Hamilton	do	Longwood College	FCIC	Clerk-Typist, GS-3.
Popham, Edward L., Arlington	Male	Ohio Wesleyan College	MOS	Do.
Porter, Nancy, Falls Church	Female	Middleburg College	MOS	Do.
Predmore, Durinda, Falls Church	do	J. E. B. Stuart High School (Brigham Young University).	AMS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Quintus, John A., Arlington	Male	University of North Carolina	OGC	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Radcliffe, Mary, Arlington	Female	Furman College	SEC	Do.
Rainwater, Donna, Oakton	do	Lynchburg College	FS	Secretary, GS-4.
Rathbone, Joseph, Lexington	Male	Virginia Military Institute	REA	Engineer draftsman, GS-3.
Reese, Lynda L., Annandale	Female	Radford College	ARS	Biological aid, GS-3.
Reller, L. Barth, Alexandria	Male	Valparaiso University	SCS	Physical Science aid, GS-4.
Ricks, Richard, Falls Church	do	Brigham Young University	SCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Roberts, Thomas, McLean	do	do	FES	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Rowe, Donna, Arlington	Female	Westhampton College	FS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
Rouse, Linda, Annandale	do	Annandale High School	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Rutledge, Carol, Alexandria	do	Groveton High School	ASCS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
St. Clair, Wayne H., Springfield	Male	University of Notre Dame	AMS	Student assistant, GS-3.
Sands, Frank, Arlington	do	University of Virginia	MOS	Student assistant, GS-5.
Sapp, David G., Arlington	do	Manhattan School of Music	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Schneier, Susan, Falls Church	Female	Pennsylvania State University	ARS	Student trainee, GS-4.
Scott, John Clayton, Arlington	Male	Iowa State University	ARS	Physical Science aid, GS-3.
Scott, Patricia, Arlington	Female	Washington & Lee High School	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Scroggs, Patricia J., Alexandria	do	J. E. B. Stuart High School (Emory & Henry College).	ARS	Do.
Siedel, Mary, Falls Church	do	Roanoke College	MOS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-4.
Sigel, Maredith, Alexandria	do	Capital University	ASCS	Do.

Summer employment, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962—Continued

Name and residence	Sex	School	Agency	Title and grade
VIRGINIA—continued				
Smart, E. Jean, Herndon	Female	Lynchburg College	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Smith, Virginia, Arlington	do	Abilene Christian College	AMS	Do.
Somers, Carolyn, Arlington	do	Washington & Lee High School	AMS	Clerk, GS-2.
Somers, Thomas, Alexandria	Male	George Washington High School (University of North Carolina).	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Spauls, Louise, Arlington	Female	George Washington University	ARS	Do.
Starkweather, Roger, Vienna	Male	James Madison High School	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-2.
Stakem, Brian E., Arlington	do	Georgetown University	ARS	Physical science aid, GS-3.
Sullivan, William, Jr., McLean	do	University of Virginia	MOS	Student assistant, GS-3.
Suor, Stephen, Arlington	do	Duke University	FS	Research forester, GS-5.
Sykes, Victor, Alexandria	do	McCalle Prepatory School	ASCS	Cartographic aid, GS-3.
Taylor, Patricia, Alexandria	Female	Muhlenburg College	ARS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Thigpen, Mary D, Arlington	do	George Mason College of University of Virginia	FAS	Clerk-stenographer, GS-3.
Tompkins, Frances, Arlington	do	West Liberty State College	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-2.
Turnage, Betty Lou, Annandale	do	Annandale High School (Wake Forest College)	LIB	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Vasquez, Dolores, Arlington	do	St. Joseph College	ARS	Laboratory helper, GS-4.
Walker, Richard A., Annandale	Male	Randolph-Macon College	FCIC	Accounting clerk, GS-3.
Watson, Margot, McLean	Female	Oberlin College	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Weeks, Judith L., Arlington	do	Longfellow Intermediate School	AMS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Welch, Jo Ann, Alexandria	do	William and Mary College	FAS	Do.
White, Carol A., Arlington	do	Washington & Lee High School	AMS	Do.
Whitfield, Amanda J., Falls Church	do	Richmond Professional Institute	INF	Illustrator, GS-3.
Wiegel, Bettie M., Fairfax	do	George Mason College of University of Virginia.	SEC	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Williams, Doris N., Arlington	do	William and Mary College	AMS	Do.
Winter, Mary Ann, Arlington	do	Radford College	ARS	Do.
Wurker, Bryan K., Arlington	Male	Pratt Institute	INF	Student assistant, GS-4.
Zirkle, Lynn C., Arlington	Female	Madison College	FAS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
WASHINGTON				
Andrews, Fred L., Yakima	Male	Washington State University	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
Jones, Ronald, Tacoma	do	University of Maryland	AMS	Physical science aid, GS-4.
WEST VIRGINIA				
Bowers, Charles, Huntington	Male	Marshall University	ARS	Crops research helper, WB-3.
Coburn, James, Athens	do	Concord College	ASCS	Accounting aid, GS-3.
Sellers, Phyllis, Charleston	Female	Dickinson College	MOS	Clerk-typist, GS-3.
Widmeyer, Robert S., Parkersburg	Male	University of Maryland	ARS	Physical Science aid, GS-3.
WISCONSIN				
Swanson, Joseph, Madison	Male	University of Wisconsin	MOS	Student assistant, GS-4.
WYOMING				
Evans, Richard M., Laramie	do	University of Wyoming	SCS	Do.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Since January 20, 1961, the payroll of the Federal Government has been increased by some 160,000 employees. I wonder why we cannot get information. Certainly the manpower is available. With an increase of 160,000 in this comparatively short space of time, by an administration that said it was going to economize, it was going to cut down on Federal bureaucracy, this becomes impossible for me to understand.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HECHLER. Does the gentleman have a question he would care to ask me on this subject?

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to make that observation.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I say that the gentleman from Rhode Island, [Mr. Fogarty], has done a very wonderful job in connection with health matters in trying and in trying to help older people get work. He has worked diligently through the Labor Department, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and through the Civil Service Commission to find out the degree to which the U.S. Government today hires people over 45 years of age. But we run into too many blank walls. Even after President Eisenhower said he is for hiring older people, and President Kennedy says the same thing, and our distinguished Vice President Lyndon Johnson, the same thing, still it is almost impossible to find out how many older people our own U.S. Government is hiring. I include Representative Fogarty's letter and some other letters.

April 28, 1961.

Mr. Anthony Fantaci,
Director, Branch for Older Workers, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Fantaci: Please note the enclosure.

It seems to me the officials of the division of the Labor Department which is trying to help the aged in their efforts to obtain work should be interested in getting in touch with the Defense Department and ascertaining from the Defense Department the extent to which this Department follows its policy of hiring older people. I request you to do this. Mr Beckworth and I would like to get the actual figures.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

John E. Fogarty,
Member of Congress.

P.S.—It seems to me also you should get in touch with the other departments of our Government including the Civil Service Commission and ask for this information. We want the actual figures for each department.

Congressman John Fogarty,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Fogarty: Your letter of April 28, 1961, addressed to Mr. Anthony Fantaci of the Bureau of Employment Security, has been referred to me because of the Department and Government-wide implications of your request to look into the extent to which various Federal agencies are following a policy of nondiscrimination in employment with respect to age. In connection with previous inquiries by Congressman Lindley Beckworth, we have discussed this matter with the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Council on Aging. Virtually every agency has expressed interest in having such data but apparently do not have the staff required to obtain it on a regular or even one-time basis.

As soon as we obtain a response from the Civil Service Commission, followed by any needed discussion with its staff, I will let you know the outcome.

Sincerely yours,

W. Willard Wirtz,
Under Secretary of Labor.

U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1961.

Hon. Lindley Beckworth,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Beckworth: This refers to your letter of December 31, 1960, submitting a list you received from the Department of State, of employees over 60 years of age who were appointed to that Department during the calendar year 1960.

All of the employees listed, except Mr. Lehman P. Nickell, were appointed to positions excepted from competitive civil service examination and appointment procedures. According to information we received from the personnel office of the Department, Mr. Nickell was reinstated to the position of special assistant, grade GS-15, in that Department on January 4, 1960. None of the employees listed, therefore, was appointed through the competitive examination procedure.

Sincerely yours,

Donald R. Harvey,
Chief, Examining Division.

Mr. BECKWORTH. This Government is weakened to the extent that

Members of Congress cannot get information that Members of Congress ask for, and I say we should proceed with a vigorous policy where if a Member of Congress officially asks for information, it becomes the duty of the people in the agency to try immediately to help him obtain it. This should apply, of course, to all Members of the House and Senate and to all agencies.

I see the gentleman over there, Representative ODIN LANGEN, who has been investigating, along with others, the grain difficulty. Over and over again it was repeated in the press by authoritative officials, "I was working on something I thought more important."

Would that not be a great way for a Member of the House to answer his constituents: "The reasons I did not work on the problem was because I did not think it was important enough"?

Judgment is what a person is supposed to have when he is serving in a place of responsibility, be it in the House or the Senate or downtown, and he is supposed to be able to determine where his attention should be given today rather than tomorrow.

U.S DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., September 6, 1962.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to Mr. CANNON's letter of August 17.

Enclosed are lists showing the names and addresses of summer employees on our rolls in Washington, D.C., during the 1962 season.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE E. ROBINSON
(For Administrative Assistant Secretary).

U.S BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT SUMMER EMPLOYEES

Dorothy Angel, 8919 Brickyard Road, Bethesda, Md.

Rudy S. Apodaca, 1909 Key Boulevard, Apartment 558, Arlington, Va.

Barbara Brill, 502 Grafton Street, Alexandria, Va.

Jeffry M. Burnam, 408 Stewart Avenue, Ithaca. N.Y.

Sharon K. Burnett, 1012 Terrace Drive, Annandale, Va.

Michael Wm. Burke, 9201 Sudbury Road, Silver Spring, Md.

Joan M. Carey, 316 Lanark Way, Silver Spring, Md.

Lowell D. Castleton, 61 West 300 North, Malad City, Idaho.

Linda Anne Chavez, 2510 North George Mason Drive, Arlington, Va.

Jean A. DeBuchananne, 12313 Remington Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

DeAnne E. Dorny, 7412 Oak Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.

Christopher F. Downey, 1440 North Inglewood Street, Arlington, Va.

Kathleen M. Draper, 10004 Sutherland Road, Silver Spring, Md.

William W. Everett III, 4746 Berkeley Terrace, Washington, D.C.

Peter W. Fischbach, 3107 Grove Street, Alexandria, Va.

Perry F. Gawen, Jr., 5917 North 14th Street, Arlington 5, Va.

Donald W. Gilfillan, Jr., 3712 North 14th Street, Arlington, Va.

Christine M. Gowen, 206 Skyhill Road, Apartment 1, Alexandria, Va.

Edward L. Halpern, 2702 Navarre Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

Carell K. Heisig, 3125 North Nelson Street, Arlington, Va.

Jackie Sue Honeywell, 1914 Columbia Pike, Arlington, Va.

Susan I. Langley, 6825 Algonquin Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

Jonathan K. Lee, 7800 Maryknoll Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

Daniel J. Longen, 234 Grant Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

Lynn M. MacGowan, 18 Park Valley Road, Silver Spring, Md.

Dorothy, McDonnell, 4821 South 28th Street, Apartment B-1, Arlington, Va.

John P. McMahon, Jr., 3705 Colvend Lane, Kensington, Md.

Gerald Hammond Miller, 5804 Sargent Road, Hyattsville, Md.

Stephen D. Mitchell, 115 Croydon Court, Silver Spring, Md.

Gordon F. Nahas, State Highway No. 5, Waldorf, Md.

Sylvia Jean Nottingham, 3197 North 18th Street, Arlington, Va.

Diane A. Patterson, 4506 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Joseph Donald Peeler, 832 West Warren Street, Shelby, N.C.

Alan Kent Richards, 104 Belton Road, Silver Spring, Md.

Sue Adele Ribsby, 4405 Warner Avenue, McLean, Va.

Jonathan J. Seagle, 6505 14th Street, Washington, D.C.

Harvey H. Shapiro, 3602 Albemarle Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

Catherine A. Sherman, 9319 Sudbury Road, Silver Spring, Md.

John A. Tellier, Route 6, Box 57-A, Alexandria, Va.

William E. Thomas, Jr., 26½ East Masonic View Drive, Alexandria, Va.

Veda Ann Tudor, 1632 Nicholson Street, NW., Washhington, D.C.

Edward W. Woozley, 7709 Holliday Terrace, Bethesda, Md.

Sharon Zarkin, 6616 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

William Davies, 4816 Maddux Lane, McLean, Va.

Carl Denk, 8 Marshall Court, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Robert J. Tagg, Rural Route No. 3, Allegan, Mich.

Gilbert Pascal, 306 Croton Drive, Alexandria, Va.

Charles Spooner, 215 Cedar Avenue, McLean, Va.

Michael Berry, 410 Fenwick Drive, Falls Church, Va.

Roy Loutzenheisen, 4500 South Eighth Street, Arlington, Va.

James Dwight, 2632 North Ohio Street, Arlington, Va.

John Lanier, Box 99, Bristow, Va.

James Haley, 4365 North 26th Street, Arlington, Va.

Bruce Leopold, 5705 Springfield Drive, Bethesda, Md.

Ronald Radlinski, 56 Volney Street, Port Allegany, Pa.

Victor Rogosa, 4750 Chevy Chase Drive, Chevy Case, Md.

Patricia A. Mobley, 4000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Wayne Robertson, 9509 Hale Street, Silver Spring, Md.

Charles F. Tobin, Post Office Box 113, Clinton, Md.

Louis Cameron, 4603 Tibbs Street, Shreveport, La.

Robert Webb, 718 Grandview Drive, Alexandria, Va.

Gabrielle Eordogh, 3611 South Taylor Street, Arlington, Va.

Olivia Greenbaum, 5818 Riggs Road, Chillum, Md.

Shirley Shoemaker, 2123 Annandale Road, Falls Church, Va.

Mary Atterbury, 2225 North Early Street, Alexandria, Va.

Thomas Szabo, 1825 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Hunter P. Widener, Hill Crest Avenue, Damascus, Va.

Betty R. Goldberg, 8717 Sundale Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Margaret Jarosh, 3724 Linda Lane, Annandale, Va.

Ellyn Cottington, 8 Greenway Place, Greenbelt, Md.

Carey Ingram, 3207 North Hampton Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Laura Langbein, 4452 North 38th Street, Arlington, Va.

Katherine Chao, 1524 North Ohio Street, Arlington, Va.

Marlys E. Page, 15400 Layhill Road, Silver Spring, Md.

Tanya Suarez, 1119 Drewlaine NE., Route No. 4, Vienna, Va.

Christine Sullivan, 4405 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

Patricia Barrick, 9214 Villa Drive, Bethesda, Md.

Robert McCarthy, 10116 Brunett Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

George Manger, 3710 Woodbine Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

David A. Fleischer, 4542 Harrison Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Marlene R. Wecker, 10116 Hereford Place, Silver Spring, Md.

Sharie L. May, 1701 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, Md.

James M. Thompson, 6304 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Novell B. Sullivan, 2305 Mount View Place SE., Washington, D.C.

John Bosley, 28 Sharpless Street, Keyser, W. Va.

David Sanford, 1645 South Columbine Street, Denver, Colo.

John R. Buckley, Jr., 5483 30th Street NW., Chevy Chase, D.C.

Kathryn Collins, 9120 Sheridan Street, Seabrook, Md.

Celeste Parker, 4758 Pamponio Place, Annandale, Va.

Elaine Libman, 2206 Washington Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

Janet Russell, 10511 Proctor Street, Silver Spring, Md.

Thomas Windes, 9302 Flower Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

John Durfee, 4 Carvel Circle, Westmoreland Hills, Md.

Mary Berezoski, 4613 Eighth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Allen Hansen, 3901 Woodbine Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

Barbara J. Mann, 2534 North Jefferson Street, Arlington, Va.

Beverly Hicks, 11212 Monticello Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

Rebecca Harris, 5012 Fort Sumner Drive, Washington, D.C.

Betty Jo Wiley, 4912 North 26th Street, Arlington, Va.

Andrea Rowe, 1906 Ladd Street, Silver Spring, Md.

Ellen Garfield, 2834 North Harrison Street, Arlington, Va.

J. Reed Pumpelly, 3610 North 26th Street, Arlington, Va.

J. Graham Lewis, 19 Castle Road, Falls Church, Va.

Mark Scher, 9701 East Light Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Carl C. Shade, 5034 35th Road North, Arlington, Va.

Sally Adamson, 3101 North Nottingham, Arlington, Va.

Theodore Bahn, 2613 Key Boulevard, Arlington, Va.

Sandra Marsteller, 1619 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.

Susan Webb, 4806 Woodmoor Lane, McLean, Va.

Donald Milliken, 255 Rollins Avenue, Rockville, Md.

JoAnn Heath, 1105 North Ohio Street, Arlington, Va.

Charles Paydos, 47 West Main Street, Ware, Mass.

Robin R. Ruzek, 1709 North Stafford Street, Arlington, Va.

Benjamin Schneider, 712 Berry Street, Falls Church, Va.

Linda Sanderson, 4807 Woodmoor Lane, McLean, Va.

Linda Riggs, 2427 Executive Avenue, Falls Church, Va.

James Winkle, 2123 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Patricia Ranard, 1004 Maple Avenue, East, Vienna, Va.

Caroline Bush, 7314 Holly Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

Frankie Murphy, 214 School Street, Alexandria, Va.

SUMMER EMPLOYEES, BUREAU OF MINES

James S. Reece, 5111 Eighth Road South, Arlington, Va.

Arthur V. Fox, 3417 Southern Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

Richard G. Lamb, 7408 Wellesby Drive, College Park, Md.

Mary K. Patterson, 1607 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

James K. Dashiell, 4916 40th Place, Hyattsville, Md.

Christopher C. Stuart, 4300 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

James F. Dehn, care of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

Conrad Wexelblatt, 4713 Berwyn Road, College Park, Md.

Gerald L. Gibson, care of University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

Carlos E. Kemper, 6804 Redtop Road, Takoma Park, Md.

Paul E. Richardson, 5213 Shadyside Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Maurice B. Smith, 4608 Asbury Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

James W. Bassett, 4802 West Avenue, Suitland, Md.

James C. Francis, 7411 Foster Street, District Heights, Md.

James J. Webb, 6646 Hillandale Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

Janet L. Gardener, 4505 Gilford Road, College Park, Md.

Philip A. Sinsky, 2621 Blaine Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

Warren J. House, 5335 West Virginia, Denver, Colo.

Peter A. Lekisch, Post Office Box 852, Midland, Tex.

Patricia L. Lewis, 111 Yeonas Drive SE., Vienna, Va.

M. Virginia May, 6504 Queens Chapel Road, University Park, Md.

C. Jean Melcher, 5629 St. Johns Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

Jerry L. Phillips, 5724 Melshire, Dallas, Tex.

Suzanne Potter, 3034 Daniels, Dallas, Tex.

Thomas R. Scollon, 6319 Walhonding Road, Washington, D.C.

Kathleen Waddell, 747 South Mason Street, Harrisonburg, Va.

Patrick J. Walsh, 1908 North Harvard Street, Arlington, Va.

Diane E. Bernardon, 1330 56th Avenue, Hillside, Md.

Arlene L. Buckner, 1391 Sheridan St. NW., Washington, D.C.

Mary A. Burke, 5400 Little River Falls Road, Arlington, Va.

Kathleen A. Cadem, 4337 Yuma Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Carol L. Cady, 825 Juniper Street, Washington, D.C.

Frances S. Campbell, 4519 Holmes Run Parkway, Alexandria, Va.

Mary H. Coffman, 1401 North Illinois Street, Arlington, Va.

John Cogan, 1726 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Richard R. Cornwall, 7306 Meadow Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.

Mary S. Dalrymple, care of Col. R. W. Dalrymple, Staff and Faculty, Carlisle Barracks, Pa.

Russell A. DeCarlo, 4428 First Street South, Arlington, Va.

Frances K. Dellinger, 2515 Minnesota Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

Ruth S. Gamble, 407 North Pleasant Street, Amherst, Mass.

Barbara M. Hudson, 6002 Milo Drive, Bethesda, Md.

Virginia A. Grogan, 707 Prosperity Avenue, Fairfax, Va.

Lynn K. Hagen, 1020 Poplar Drive, Falls Church, Va.

Letitia Hickson, 600 Taylor Run Parkway, Alexandria, Va.

Robert W. Klepper, care of American University, Washington, D.C.

Barbara Dean, 4936 North 33d Road, Arlington, Va.

Mary Sue Wellens, 8216 Eastern Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

David R. Wells, 609 Hillsboro Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Sharon K. Vaughan, 9622 Woodberry Street, Seabrook, Md.

Yvonne V. Verdell, 1610 Varnum Place NE., Washington, D.C.

Phyllis C. Wampler, 2035 North Harrison, Arlington, Va.

Nancy Pruett, Route 1, Box 136, Springfield, Va.

Jan Helen Baker, 711 South Barton Street, Arlington, Va.

Betty Carlson, 5912 Lemon Road, McLean, Va.

Joyce L. Short, 4315 Gallatin Street, Hyattsville, Md.

John G. Wangler, Jr., 4326 Rowalt Drive, College Park, Md.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1962.

Memorandum of Director of Personnel, from Chief, Branch of Personnel Management; subject, summer employment data.

In reply to your memorandum of August 17, 1962 we have compiled a list of the names and addresses of persons who have been appointed to summer jobs in our Bureau:

Louis C. Adamo, 5919 23d Place, Washington, D.C.

Vicky I. Chaet, 6359 South Sacramento, Chicago, Ill.

Anita L. Kanis, 1383 Sheridan Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Thomas M. Marceron, 6507 Parkway Court, Hyattsville, Md.

Susan Simpson, 1105 Custis Parkway, Falls Church, Va.

Judith A. Stevens, 827 North Woodrow Street, Arlington, Va.

Clare J. Sturgeon, 89 Darrington Street SW., Washington, D.C.

Terry J. Taylor, 706 North Frederick Street, Arlington, Va.

Gail Ross, 3923 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Linda R. White, 101 Duvall Street, Fairfax, Va.

T. C. KRELL
(For C. Doyle Innis).

U.S. DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES,
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1962.

Memorandum to Acting Director of Personnel, from Acting Personnel Officer, Office of Territories; subject, summer employment data.

There are listed below the names and addresses of persons who were appointed to summer jobs in this office:

Mr. John A. Aguon, 1729 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. James D. English, 1304 Perry Street, NE., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Kaleb Udui, 1825 R Street NW., Washington, D.C.

M. L. KLOSKE.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington D.C., August 29, 1962.

Memorandum to Director of Personnel, Office of the Secretary, from Chief, Branch of Personnel, Bureau of Indian Affairs; subject, Summer employment data.

In accordance with your memorandum of August 17, 1962, we are listing below the names and addresses of persons who were appointed to summer positions in the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

Ian Gilbert, 4537 Grant Road NW., Washington, D.C.

Geraldine Vigil, Rout 1, Box 116, Nambe Pueblo, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Betsy D. Lindeman, 4107 Calla Drive, McLean, Va.

Janice Atwood, 235 North George Mason Drive, Arlington, Va.

Mary C. Gorham, 1110 North Illinois Street, Arlington, Va.

Anne Knodel, 1301 Shreve Road, Falls Church, Va.

Penny Zweigenhaft, 4514 Traymore Street, Bethesda, Md.

Jeanette Mucha, Wausau, Wis.

Sherry Lee Harring, 4719 Winslow Road, Oxon Hill, Md.

Ronald Ragsdale, 6021 Hanover Avenue, Springfield, Va.

Betsy Lynn Rose, 6403 Tulsa Lane, Bethesda, Md.

Phillip R. Rogers, 2400 Colston Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

C. E. LAMSON,
Chief, Branch of Personnel.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1962.

Memorandum to Director of Personnel, from Chief, Division of Personnel, Bureau of Reclamation; subject, summer employment data (memorandum dated August 17, 1962).

The following is a list of the names and addresses of persons appointed to summer jobs in the Bureau of Reclamation:

Miss Jacqueline Graber, 211 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Va.

Miss Linda C. Hoopes, 3114 44th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Miss Carole G. Knowles, 216 Monticello Drive, Odessa, Tex. (separated August 10, 1962).

Miss Marilyn P. Margetts, 7407 Wyndale Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.

Mr. John R. Pusey, Route 2, Dickerson, Md.

Mr. Franklin F. Sands, 1800 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Miss Barbara A. Sudduth, Box 367, Sanderson, Tex. (separated August 15, 1962).

D. R. HICKS.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE,
Washington, D.C.

M. Gene Barrett, 112 Peach Street, Shelby, N.C.

David Bridge, 8-A Ridge Road, Greenbelt, Md.

William S. Birkhead, 730 University Avenue, Ithaca, N.Y.

Harold J. Cross, 924 Stanton Avenue, Morganton, W. Va.

Mary S. Dorasavage, 3600 Longfellow Street, Hyattsville, Md.

Deborah S. French, 2228 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Roderick M. Hall, Jr., 5410 Hamilton Street, Hyattsville, Md.

Celima L. Hazard, 4922 Ashby Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Carolyn L. Homes, 10008 Markham Street, Silver Spring, Md.

Rosalee Johnson, 2714 Donna Circle, Annandale, Va.

William C. Jolly, R.F.D. 2, Salem, N.Y.

Charles W. Kellogg, Mountain Street, Haydenville, Mass.

Patricia Kimball, 3943 McKall Avenue, McLean, Va.

Gary D. Knipling, 2623 North Military Road, Arlington, Va.

Robert P. Murphy, 811-L Cherry Lane, East Lansing, Mich.

Nancy L. Myers, 1110 King Street, Alexandria, Va.

Susan E. Nicholas, 5906 Fifth Road North, Arlington, Va.

Thomas F. Quinn, Jr., 9137 Sligo Creek Parkway, Silver Spring, Md.

Killeen C. Pilon, 7354 Hastings Street, Springfield, Va.

Jean L. Ramey, Chantilly, Va.

Linda L. Risdon, 1805 Camp Alger Avenue, Falls Church, Va.

Barbara A. Smith, 4004 Rosemary Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

Selena D. White, 401 Quaint Acres Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Robert W. Wildman, Jr., 1022 Poplar Drive, Falls Church, Va.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C.

SUMMER EMPLOYEES AND ADDRESSES

Division of Administrative Services

Elizabeth Mae Lindsey, 6008 Chapel Drive, Edina, Minn.

Daniel L. O'Connor III, 3722 Ingomar Street, Washington, D.C.

Library

Bonnie D. Agner, 2128 North Brandywine Street, Arlington, Va.

Charlene Z. Hedgpeth, 511 46th Street, SE., Apartment 1, Washington, D.C.

David W. Kinkel, 6237 Walhonding Road, Washington, D.C.

William S. Gillam, III, 3909 Stratford Lane, Alexandria, Va.

Michael S. Lofton, 8802 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Alice M. French, 1715 Fort Hunt Road, Alexandria, Va.

William L. Goodman, 1417 South Buchanan Street, Arlington, Va.

Office of Coal Research

Nancy J. McNew, 525 Thayer Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

Mary Joyce Calnan, 511 Willow Street, Anaconda, Mont.

Office of the Under Secretary

Douglas M. Costle, 3318 North Lake Shore Drive, Apartment 1003, Chicago, Ill.

Office of the Assistant Secretary—Water and Power

Patricia H. Nucci, 6500 Ridge Drive, Brookmont, Md.

Office of the Assistant Secretary—Administrative

Kathryn Lynne Thomas, 3114 North Pollard Street, Arlington, Va.

Division of Information

Judith E. Welles, Box 350R, Route No. 1, Oakton, Va.

Office of Saline Water

Jerome S. Koehler, Jr., 4530 Avondale Street, Bethesda, Md.

Brenda Morgan, 109 East Glendale, Alexandria, Va.

Jessica Jones, 3814 North Roberts Lane, Arlington, Va.

Mary Sue Allmon, 714 Ritchie Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

Judith Lee Mesnard, 3500 Lancer Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

Office of Geography

Miss Susan Poythress, 126 North Fairmount Street, Apartment 1, State College, Pa.

William A. Collier, Jr., 2319 Ray Street, Charlotte, N.C.

James S. Fischer, Box 435, Randolph, Wis.

Miss L. Anne Braithwaite, 713 Gilbert Street, Takoma Park, Md.

Miss Mabel L. Wallis, Box 101, Delta, Colo.

Luther Max Stephens, Box 56, Morven, Ga.

Charlie James Farmer, Geography Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

Miss Cecilia Anderson, 2901 North Greencastle Street, Arlington, Va.

Gordon Ray Atkins, Route 1, Rutland, Ohio.

Miss Carol Clark, 1105 Lexington Street, Apartment 513, Waltham, Mass.

Michael J. Benson, 624 Rensselaer Avenue, Staten Island, N.Y.

Miss Cynthia F. Marlaschin, Route 8, Keene, N.H.

Miss Virginia R. Hatrick, 736 22d Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Miss Alfreda Liebermann, Route 4, Schumaker Road, Salisbury, Md.

Miss Marianna G. Koskouras, 4402 Harrison Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Janet L. Robinson, 1162 South Thomas Street, Barcroft Apartments, Apartment 22, Arlington, Va.

Office of Solicitor

Miss Gabrielle FitzGerald, 7716 Finn's Lane, Lanham, Md.

Mr. Paul I. Grady, 1007 Maryland Avenue, NE., No. 101, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Theodore A. Miles, 804 Taylor Street NW., No. 206, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Julius A. Johnson, Cook Hall, Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Jerry L. Jacobs, 102 West Maryland, Phoenix, Ariz.

Mr. Peter A. Sears, 2 Ware Street, Apartment 506, Cambridge, Mass.

National Park Service

Irwin J. Ainsfield, 2817 Mosby Place, Alexandria, Va.

James B. Artman, 307 East 8th Street, Metropolis, Ill.

Thomas K. Baber, Jr., 503 Tapawingo Road, Vienna, Va.

Frank Barnes, 1423 Clifton Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Charles E. Barrett, 9201 Shore Road, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Guy A. Bayes, 5524 Park Road, Falls Church, Va.

Mario F. Bognanno, 1904 North 15th Street, Apartment No. 6, Arlington, Va.

Earl M. Brown, Jr., 3979 Blaine Street NW., Washington 19, D.C.

John C. Burroughs, 230 East Barton Lane, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Thomas W. Buschman, 306 Doyle Drive, Alexandria, Va.

David E. Butler, 910 W Street NW., Washington, D.C.

James A. Butler, Route 1, Box 68, Accokeek, Md.

Simon G. Clarke, 45 Ivy Street SE., Washington, D.C.

Bernard A. Claveloux, Jr., Route 1, Box 83A, Centerville, Va.

Jerry C. Cobb, Route 1, Box 272, Oakton, Va.

John P. Coggeshall, 6808 Laurel Street NW., Washington 12, D.C.

William L. Cristofili, 3701 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Apartment No. 507, Washington 16, D.C.

Keith A. Cumberland, 1106 North Stuart Street, Arlington 1, Va.

George F. Danniels, Route 1, River Bend Road, Great Falls, Va.

Richard A. Davis, 1202 North Columbus Street, Arlington, Va.

Robert W. Davis, 218 Richmond Avenue, Alexandria, Va.

Scott W. Davis, Jr., 63 West Rugby Road, Manassas, Va.

Philip N. Dodd, 3509-B South Strafford Street, Arlington 6, Va.

Jennifer C. Dodds, 6623 81st Street, Bethesda 14, Md.

Marianne B. Ellis, 3309 Stephenson Place NW., Washington 19, D.C.

Alton Evans, 3101-A 24th Street SE., Washington 20, D.C.

John A. Evans, 2448 North Utah Street, Arlington 7, Va.

Dennis W. Fabella, 5429 South 4th Street, Arlington 4, Va.

Joel B. Feldman, 4430 Alton Place NW., Washington 16, D.C.

Stephen G. Frank, Jr., 13 Eastmoor Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Arthur S. Fulman, 163 Hawthorne Street, Malden, Mass.

Joseph J. Gallagher, II, 2322 Burlington Street, Arlington 7. Va.

William W. Gaston, 4917 Sheriff Road NE., Washington 19, D.C.

Lawrence P. Goodwin, 723 Jefferson Street NW., Washington 11, D.C.

Francis F. Grambo, Jr., 109 Rockdale Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Philip Graves, 119 73th Street SE., Washington 3, D.C.

Richard F. Green, 220 Cedar Lane, Fairfax, Va.

Samuel D. Harpe, Box L 147, Clinton, Md.

Robert M. Harris, 6614 Harlan Place NW., Washington, D.C.

James F. Harrison, Jr., 4812 Jefferson Street, Lanham, Md.

Jerry L. Hartman, 5901 John Adams Drive SE., Washington, D.C.

Marion W. Hazel, III, 1419 North Longfellow Street, Arlington, Va.

Clyde H. Hickerson, 713 17th Street SE., Washington, D.C.

Thomas F. Hirsch, 14 Pershing Avenue, Trenton, N.J.

Richard M. Histon, 3701 South Fifth Street, Apartment No. 301, Arlington, Va.

Michael H. Hoxie, 5025 Brookdale Road, Bethesda, Md.

Derek W. Hunt, 5712 Cromwell Drive, Washington, D.C.

Donald J. Hunter, 2438 39th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Charles J. Isbell, 504 Westminster Street, Prestonsburg, Ky.

Roland T. Jackson, 114 Ritchie Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

Alvin D. Johnson, 520 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D.C.

Leroy Jones, 61 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

Russell H. Kealen, Jr., Roseland Drive, West Palm Beach, Fla.

William E. Lacey, III, 2204 Muskogee Street, Adelphi, Md.

James W. Lawrence, 6118 Seventh Place NW., Washington, D.C.

David M. Logsdon, 739 Tuscallosa Street, West Palm Beach, Fla.

Arnaud J. Loustalot, III, 3165 North 21st Street, Arlington, Va.

William E. Marcey, 2033 North Stafford Street, Arlington, Va.

Telemachos J. Manolatos, 3413 Fessenden Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Donald P. Mason, 3592 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Thomas P. McCann, 124 Darrington Street SW., Washington, D.C.

Barbara A. McDowell, 526 Roxboro Place NW., Washington, D.C.

Earl L. McLane, 906 Telegraph Road, Alexandria, Va.

Marcia A. Montgomery, 3130 North Inglewood Street, Arlington, Va.

Donald V. Moorehead, 5915 Ipswich Road, Bethesda, Md.

Jeffrey R. Moreland, 731 Richmond Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

Robert C. Murphy, 218 Lawrence Drive, Falls Church, Va.

William Muskelley, 225 H Street NW., Apartment No. 9, Washington, D.C.

Lawrence E. Newman, Box 3760, Upper Marlboro, Md.

Terence J. O'Donnell, 4000 Tunlaw Road NW., Apartment No. 507, Washington, D.C.

George C. Offutt, 4626 Knox Road, No. 5, College Park, Md.

Alexander T. Outlaw, Route 3, Box 323, Vienna, Va.

Michael E. Petrucione Jr., 810 Mountain Avenue, Westfield, N.J.

Richard R. Pickney, 1831 Irving Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Ronald R. Pittillo, 7212 Holluck Street, District Heights, Md.

Samuel F. Polo, 614½ Glover Street, Portsmouth, Ohio.

Richard E. Pope, 5622 Baxter Drive SE., Washington, D.C.

James M. Powell, 4210 4th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert G. Prager, 716 South High Street, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

Sybil W. Prager, 716 South High Street, Yellow Springs, Ohio.

James W. Rabbitt, 70923 Burbank Drive, Bethesda, Md.

Robert A. Radivo, 6311 Field Street, Seat Pleasant, Md.

Robert L. Reid, 1408 Kearney Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Phyllis A. Rensch, 5804 Van Fleet Drive, McLean, Va.

Chris J. Richmond, 3301 17th Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Robert W. Robbins, Jr., 3210 West Clinton Circle, Tampa, Fla.

Martha J. Roberts, 9203 Topeka Street, Bethesda, Md.

Roy H. Robinson III, 4900 Sinclair Drive, McLean, Va.

Melvin M. Rotsch, 811 North Rosemary Drive, Bryan, Tex.

Frank Scaldaferri, 7400 New Hampshire Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

Henry L. Schaffer, 10109 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.

James H. Scott, 3323 23d Street SE., Apartment No. 3, Washington, D.C.

James W. Seal, 18 Danbury Street SW., Washington, D.C.

Stanley R. Spencer, Route 4, Box 638, Fairfax, Va.

James D. Sorenson, 1201 Harper Road, Silver Spring, Md.

Gail M. Sproul, 2426 North George Mason Drive, Arlington, Va.

Ralph J. Sullivan, 2431 Ontario Road NW., Washington, D.C.

Bradley A. Sweet, 4016 Hamilton Street, Hyattsville, Md.

Robert H. Swenson, 919 Gerard Street, Metropolis, Ill.

John R. Thomas, 5223 Fisher Road, Temple Hills, Md.

Raymond A. Thompson, 440 North Thomas Street, Arlington, Va.

James R. Tolson, Jr., Hughesville, Md.

James M. Upshaw, Jr., 603 Wheeler Street, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.

Ralph E. Vandervort III, 621 Midday Lane, Alexandria, Va.

Charles H. Vaughn, Jr., 2124 North Troy Street, Arlington, Va.

Elbert V. Walker, Jr., 1415 North 31st Street, Richmond, Va.

John J. Walsh, 2824 31st Street SE., Washington, D.C.

Brenda L. Watkins, 2700 North Dinwiddie Street, Arlington, Va.

Kenneth P. Weeden, 7315 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

Philip C. Wehle, Jr., Box 1491, Georgetown University, Washington, Va.

Dana R. Wellman, 6928 Alpine Drive, Annandale, Va.

Mary K. West, 1101 North Ohio Street, North Arlington, Va.

Howard S. White, 2409 Lewisdale Drive, West Hyattsville, Md.

Richard D. Widman, 4836 Kansas Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Albert Williams, 4136 Minnesota Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

Charles R. Williams, 1823 M Street, Washington, D.C.

Patricia A. Williams, 4612 Sedgwick Street NW., Washington, D.C.

William R. Williams, 4506 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Edward A. Windsor, Route 1, Box 611, Clinton, Md.

Charles H. Young III, 6933 Alpine Road, Annandale, Va.

Elizabeth H. Bahlman, 5312 Reno Road NW., Washington, D.C.

Lesley S. Barrow, 5912 Johnson Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

Anthony W. Better, 1424 Massachusetts Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

K. Maureen Brown, 8030 Jansen Drive, Springfield, Va.

Suzanne Buschman, 306 Doyle Drive, Alexandria, Va.

Mary M. Erskine, 4423 31st Street, South Arlington, Va.

Virginia K. Gilmore, 1205 Offutt Drive, Falls Church, Va.

Constance M. Grottola, 5034 41st Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Saundra Hone, 4740 Sixth Street, South Arlington, Va.

Barbara J. Robertson, 7103 Crestwood Drive, Alexandria, Va.

Nancy N. Stagner, 5712 Huntington Parkway, Bethesda, Md.

William G. Taltentino, 4809 Westway Drive, Washington, D.C.

Larry E. Thomson, 4449 20th Road North, Arlington, Va.

I include some additional data:

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., August 16, 1962.

The Honorable Lindley Beckworth,
House of Representatives.

Dear Congressman Beckworth: Thank you for your letter and enclosure of August 7, to the Secretary, requesting the names and addresses of persons who held summer or temporary jobs with the Department this summer.

I am enclosing the information which you request.

If the Department can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call on me. Your letter and enclosure are returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

Donald F. Simpson,
Chief, Employment Division.

Thomas C. Ackerman, 5501 Kirkwood Drive, Washington, D.C.

Phyllis J. Alexander, 9913 Edgehill Lane, Silver Spring, Md.

Judith A. Allen, 11 Shenandoah Road, Alexandria, Va.

Janice S. Alvey, 8815 Sundale Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Vernon Anderson, 1146 44th Place SE., Washington, D.C.

Gary Angeline, 311 Branch Circle SE., Vienna, Va.

Barbara Ann Archer, 2605 22d Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Marcia Ann Ballard, 1210 North Kenilworth, Arlington, Va.

Robert W. Banks, 905 Barrett Road, Falls Church, Va.

Robert B. Bannerman, 225 Dogwood Lane, McLean, Va.

James Barrett, 4804 Fourth Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Joyce Bassett, 12024 Remington Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Jack Baughan, Route No. 2, Box 312, Front Royal, Va.

Larry Beaber, 972 Broadway, Boulder, Colo.

Charlotta M. Beach, 8910 Brick Yard Road, Bethesda, Md.

Barbara Beahm, 4402 19th Road, North Arlington, Va.

James P. Bedingfield, 7709 Lansdale Street, District Heights, Md.

Helen M. Berezoski, 4613 Eighth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Timothy M. Biddle, 4213 Glenridge Street, Kensington, Md.

Lee S. Bigelow, 2115 Forest Park Boulevard, Fort Worth, Tex.

Elissa Blumenthal, 8714 Sundale Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

John R. Boettinger, 336 Riverside, New York, N.Y.

Patricia Bolton, 211 Wolfe Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Anne Bolton-Smith, 3007 Q Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Alice Booher, 4919 North Meridian, Indianapolis, Ind.

Martin Bresnick, 116 Everett Street, Manchester, N.H.

Mary Ann Brinker, 5605 Namakagan Road, Washington, D.C.

Kay E. Bronson, 2906 13th Road South, Arlington, Va.

Lawrence L. Brooks, 727 59th Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

Sharon E. Burdge, 46 Hilltop Terrace, Red Bank, N.J.

Frances Cantor, 129 Old River Road, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Alice S. Carney, Country Club Road, St. Clairsville, Ohio.

Richard A. Caulk, 2430 Otis Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Wayne S. Chadwick, 1311 Beech Tree Lane, Falls Church, Va.

John R. Champlin, Windham Center, Conn.

William C. Cisney, 601 Kentucky Street, Racine, Wis.

Anna J. Clark, 16 Highland Street, Cambridge, Mass.

Ann W. Clifford, 281 Concord Road, Yonkers, N.Y.

Susan T. Cline, 1005 Braddock Road, Alexandria, Va.

Wayne C. Coakley, 2207 Russell Road, Alexandria, Va.

David W. Cohen, 6618 Braeburn Parkway, Bethesda, Md.

Karen Collins, 1307 Daniel Avenue, Lockhaven, Norfolk, Va.

John Cooke, 3548 North Military Road, Arlington, Va.

Alford W. Cooley, 2309 Chain Bridge Road, Washington, D.C.

Holley L. Coulter, 2401 Fort Scott Drive, Arlington, Va.

Judith A. Cox, 7 Cheverly Circle, Cheverly, Md.

Richard A. Cox, 7 Cheverly Circle, Cheverly, Md.

Patricia A. Craven, 2217 39th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

David Culbert, 509 North Garfield Street, Arlington, Va.

Richard F. Cumberland, 3539 Texas Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

Rose Cycler, Box 310, Clarksville, Pa.

Sherry D. Dann, 8900 McGregor Drive, Chevy Chase, Md.

Timothy J. Davis, 5005 Scarsdale Road, Washington, D.C.

James Day, 8509 Cloverfield Road, Silver Spring, Md.

Carla L. Dean, 2432 South Culpepper, Arlington, Va.

Walter J. Dent, 2405 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Patsy Derby, York, Ala.

Gay G. Dickman, 8516 Milford Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

Marie E. Dondero, 5602 42d Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.

David Drabkin, 6150 Barrows Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

Janet E. Drance, 5419 North 20th Street, Arlington, Va.

Dennis Dresang, 140 South Lincoln Street, Kimberly, Wis.

Linda G. Dudley, 1114 North Illinois Street, Arlington, Va.

Clyde H. Eader, 2814 Linden Lane, Silver Spring, Md.

James W. Eighmie, 5336 Addison Road, Washington, D.C.

Rebecca Epting, 105 Fort Rutledge Road, Clemson, S.C.

Arthur Ernst, 4209 Dunnel Lane, Kensington, Md.

Suzanne Ertel, 523 Belle View Drive, Falls Church, Va.

Larry L. Fabian, 59 Victor Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Stuart Fagan, 100 Mountfort Street, Boston, Mass.

William Farrell, 296 Hudson Street, Hartford, Conn.

Yale H. Ferguson, 431 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y.

Ned Fidel, 2808 McKinley Street, Washington, D.C.

Dan Figgins, 600 42d Street, Des Moines, Iowa.

Karen M. Fite, 1230 29th Street, Washington, D.C.

Joyce Fleming, Route No. 2, Delaware, Ohio.

John H. Fonvielle, 123 California Boulevard, New Braunfels, Tex.

Terence L. Forbes, 3221 North George Mason Drive, Arlington, Va.

Gwyneth G. Foster, 3933 Livingston Street, Washington, D.C.

Winston G. Fowler, 3342 North Thomas Street, Arlington, Va.

Toni M. Francis, 5040 35th Road North, Arlington, Va.

Mary B. Freshman, 5007 Earlstan Drive, Washington, D.C.

Margaret Fulwiler, 1119 North George Mason Drive, Arlington, Va.

Susan Gabel, 3059 South Abingdon, Arlington, Va.

Philip G. Gallman, 3312 Woodley Road, Washington, D.C.

Gathy Gelbach, 1207 Lincoln Avenue, Falls Church, Va.

Nancy A. Genovese, 2611 Graham Avenue, Windler, Pa.

Roxanne George, 713 Lafayette, Mattoon, Ill.

Rosalyn Glidden, 5149 North 37th Street, Arlington, Va.

Oswald Glymph, Jr., 1524 Barnum Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Stephanie Glymph, 1524 Barnum Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Janice Goertz, 306 Cherokee Street, Hiawatha, Kans.

Judith E. Goldstein, 405 Hinsdale Lane, Silver Spring, Md.

Donald S. Goodner, Box 176, Waldron, Ark.

Charles P. Grady, 7207 Beacon Terrace, Bethesda, Md.

William R. Graham, 14 Holmes Run Road, Falls Church, Va.

Michael W. Grant, 5011 Overlook Drive, Washington, D.C.

Kenneth Grubenhoff, 8302 34th Avenue South, Seattle, Wash.

Nancy F. Hairston, 114 Blackstock Street, Spray, N.C.

Ronald F. Hale, 5911 Maxwell Courts, McLean, Va.

Janet E. Hall, 2496 Hazelwood Street, Detroit, Mich.

Patsy Hall, 1809 North Wayne Street, Arlington, Va.

M. Donald Hancock, 1305 Jasmine, McAllen, Tex.

Timothy C. Hanley, 1104 North Lexington, Arlington, Va.

John B. Hannon, Accokeek, Md.

Ann Hanowell, 4408 North 17th Street, Arlington, Va.

Donna E. Hansen, 5103 Westridge Road, Washington, D.C.

Jacqueline Harding, Holly Drive, Kennett Square, Pa.

Sally Hasselmann, 400 Washington Avenue, Glencoe, Ill.

Robert Hay, 2246 North Pollard Street, Arlington, Va.

Robert Herrick, 208 Langhorne Avenue, Bethlehem, Pa.

Alice P. Hild, 5920 Dillon Avenue, McLean, Va.

Ruth M. Hillenbrand, 3204 Park View Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

Amy Hilsbos, 1413 Pinecastle Road, Falls Church, Va.

Lavonne Hitchens, 1716 Franklin Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Sandy Holscher, 6405 Dahlonega Road, Washington, D.C.

Joseph A. Hoofnagle, 5817 24th Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

Richard O. Hope, 719 Third Street SW., Washington, D.C.

Marianna M. Howard, 3117 38th Street, Washington, D.C.

Sally E. Howard, 110 Buchanan Street, McLean, Va.

Joanne M. Howell, 4420 Volta Place NW., Washington, D.C.

Richard M. Hulton, 5806 Afton Center, Falls Church, Va.

Lucy Hummer, 1823 North Hartford Street, Arlington, Va.

Laura Hunter, 8501 Seven Locks Road, Bethesda, Md.

Frederick Jandrey, 1287 Elliott Road, Paradise, Calif.

Gerald Jensen, 4731 Kirby Road, McLean, Va.

Robert Jervis, 1155 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Mary E. John, 13301 Sherwood Forest Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Karen Johnson, 1716 Crestwood Drive, Alexandria, Va.

John A. Jones, 3833 St. Louis Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

Richard J. Jones, 404 Yorkshire Place, St. Louis, Mo.

Donald Juneau, 911 West Colorado, Hammond, La.

Anne Junek, Route 1, Box 56, Oakton, Va.

Martin B. Kass, 2602 Tunlaw Road NW., Washington, D.C.

Raymond M. Keating, 6232 North 23d Street, Arlington, Va.

Merle A. Kemp, 5922 Dillon Avenue, McLean, Va.

James Kennedy, 419 East Sixth Street, Dallas, Tex.

Kathryn Ketchum, Post Office Box 761, Bernardsville, N.J.

Sandra A. King, 4056 First Street SW., Washington, D.C.

Lawrence J. Kirsh, 143 Linden Boulevard, Brooklyn, N.Y.

John H. Kissick, 4610 Chevy Chase Boulevard, Chevy Chase, Md.

Joel Koslow, 4840 MacArthur Boulevard, Washington, D.C.

Barry K. Kowalski, 405 Regent Drive, Alexandria, Va.

William C. Kranich, 7001 Boatdock Drive, Falls Church, Va.

Kenneth P. Landon, Jr., 4711 Fulton Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Robert E. Langston, 4916 46th Street, Washington, D.C.

Nancy Lenvin, 2940 North 26th Street, Arlington, Va.

Leonard M. Levy, 9207 Summit Road, Silver Spring, Md.

Robert Lewis, 11004 Havenpark Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Joseph J. Liberati, 717 North Brodhead Road, Aliquippa, Pa.

Peter H. Linebaugh, 3405 Ashley Terrace NW., Washington, D.C.

Richard C. Linthicum, 2332 North Dickerson Street, Arlington, Va.

Janet Littell, 1221 Radnor Place, Falls Church, Va.

Philip S. Lohmeier, 19427 Irvington, Detroit, Mich.

Mary Lord, 870 North Patrick Henry Drive, Arlington, Va.

Kurt Ludwig, 744 East Fourth Street, Salem, Ohio.

Susan MacKnight, 8318 Haddon Drive, Takoma Park, Md.

Marcia J. Maleske, 5500 West Hutchinson Street, Chicago, Ill.

Joanne Maloy, 4420 Volta Place NW., Washington, D.C.

Mary Ann Manch, 4814 Loch-Raven Drive, McLean, Va.

Lisa Manfull, 1310 27th Street, Washington, D.C.

Robert A. Mang, 102 Lyndale Drive, Alexandria, Va.

Alan Markon, 527 West 110th Street, New York, N.Y.

James M. Marx, 5 Ursino Place, Elizabeth N.J.

Earle McCaskill, 1019 Calhoun Street, Madison, Ill.

Robert D. McClintock, 2228 Q Street, Washington, D.C.

Mary McGillivray, 5036 Weaver Terrace NW., Washington, D.C.

Melinda Meek, 4724 Montgomery Street, Annandale, Va.

Carolyn L. Messinger, 8202 Tahona Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Mary Miller, 4940 4th Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Laurence Mindel, 9621 Flower Avenue, Silver Spring, Md.

William Mittendorf, 426 East Nelson Avenue, Alexandria, Va.

John A. Monsma, 304 Irwin Street, Silver Spring, Md.

Elizabeth Moreland, 4524 West 40th Street, Arlington, Va.

Margaret Murphy, 729 East Mason Street, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Martha Murphy, 4704 Reservoir Road, Washington, D.C.

Karen Murrell, 5114 North 14th Street, Arlington, Va.

Daphune Muse, 2424, 2d Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Robert Mutch, 1815 Florida Drive, Fort Wayne, Ind.

John Mhles, 5217 Wissioming Road, Washington, D.C.

Jacqueline N. Neel, 406 Sleepy Hollow Road, Falls Church, Va.

Dona C. O'Bannon, 4230 North 23d Street, Arlington, Va.

Elizabeth F. O'Brien, 5020 42d Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Richard C. O'Brien, 5020 42d Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Patricia A. Oliver, 2320 Cheverly Avenue, Cheverly, Md.

Paul O'Rourke, 39 Waverly Street, Providence, R.I.

Richard Paige, 34 Laurel Avenue, Schenectady, N.Y.

Frances Page, 7515 Spring Lake Drive, Bethesda, Md.

Nancy Paulson, 3542 Valley Drive, Alexandria, Va.

Audrey Payne, 3610 South Kemper Road, Arlington, Va.

Sandra G. Perez, 230 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Phyllis A. Price, 3100 North Thomas Street, Arlington, Va.

Kay Randle, 1608 Clarendon Avenue, Bessemer, Ala.

Arthur H. Reagin, III, 4513 Colorado Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Angelica R. Remde, 1631 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Ruth Rendely, 8604 Flower Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

Penelope S. Rich, 1113 Garner Street, Nacogdoches, Tex.

Diane Ritchey, 348 West Oak Street, West Lafayette, Ind.

Suzanne D. Ritter, 5505 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Marcia E. Roberts, 4933 Sargeant Road, Washington, D.C.

Arlene V. Roberts, 5822 23d Place, Hillcrest Heights, Md.

Robert L. Rogers, 814 North West Street, Falls Church, Va.

Richard N. Rosenfeld, 41 Lee Road, Chestnut Hill, Mass.

Joan Ross, 2224 Savannah Terrace, Washington, D.C.

Gentry Rowsy, 812 Ivy Lane, San Antonio, Tex.

Philip Rudisill, 1122 State Street NW., Apartment No. 3, Atlanta, Ga.

Shirley Russell, 423 Newton Place NW., Washington, D.C.

Scott Schoenfeld, 5302 Falmouth Road, Washington, D.C.

Natalie Schwartz, 11205 Valleyview Avenue, Kensington, Md.

Richard Scully, 215 76th Street, Virginia Beach, Va.

Robert Segars, 239 Polaris Street, White Sands Missile Range, N. Mex.

Mary L. Shinkwin, 4213 North 23d Street, Arlington, Va.

Thomas G. Sinderson, 5913 Cheshire Drive, Bethesda, Md.

Ada Sligh, 4 Pine Grove Avenue, Asheville, N.C.

Valerie Smart, 6005 Hawthorne Street., Cheverly, Md.

Joann Snyder, 5314 Acacia Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

Richard A. Stewart, 209 North Emerson Street, Arlington, Va.

Jean C. Stirling, 7203 Holly Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.

Ricard L. Stokes, 2103 Second Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Janet Storm, R.D., Box 93, Ashville, Pa.

Stephen B. Strauss, 900 Linden Avenue, Burlingame, Calif.

Gertrude Streett, 414 Cleveland NW., Camden, Arkansas.

Richard Stryker, 9070 Delano Drive, Riverside, Calif.

John P. Sullivan, 1717 Riggs Place, Washington, D.C.

Richard M. Sullivan, 7719 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Rebecca L. Sutton, 106 Parshall Court, Clairsville, Ohio.

Katherine S. Taylor, 5800 Bent Branch, Washington, D.C.

Kenneth A. Taylor, 12902 Good Hill Road, Wheaton, Md.

Stuart D. Tenney, 940 25th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Mary M. Teu, 4306 South 36th Street, Arlington, Va.

Anastasia P. Thomas, 1353 K Street SE., Washington, D.C.

Gabriel Thomas, 2020 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Ruth Tobin, 7100 Wilson Lane, Bethesda, Md.

Artheur M. Tompkins, 1811 Irving Street NE., Washington, D.C.

Joan C. Topalian, 4918 44th Street, Washington, D.C.

Gary R. Transtrum, 5520 30th Place NW., Washington, D.C.

Charles P. Trumbull, 2268 Cathedral NW., Washington, D.C.

Peter A. Tscherning, 4700 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

W. Michael Vale, 3018 Arizona Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Robert A. Vale, 3018 Arizona Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Beatrice C. Visson, 5335 32d Street NW., Washington, D.C.

I include some additional information:

U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1962.
Hon. Lindley Beckworth,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Beckworth: This is in reply to your letter of September 27, 1962. In answer to your question, I do not think that it makes sense to announce an examination on July 5 with a cutoff date for the sixth. The Civil Service Commission, when announcing open competitive examinations, follows the practice of allowing ample time for filing by the general public.

Our inspections have shown that those agencies, whose promotion plans require publicity for vacancies, follow this same practice of also allowing ample time for filing. In particular, the Bureau of Weapons, Department of the Navy, provides for periods of advertising from 6 to 30 days, depending on the size of the area in which it is thought well qualified and interested candidates may be located.

A study of the file which you submitted shows that the document of July 5, issued by the Bureau of Naval Weapons, was not an announcement of examinations. It was a current vacancy list of positions for which civilians were needed. For each of the positions listed, a vacancy announcement had been previously published. In publishing these vacancy announcements the Bureau was giving effect to its promotion plan which provides for publishing vacancies. However, applications are accepted not only from those interested in promotion but from those who might possibly wish reassignment. Applicants for reinstatement or transfer from another department are also considered if any such applications are received. These vacancy announcements are concerned primarily with noncompetitive appointments.

The vacancy listings, a copy of which you sent us, is then really a ready reference file, published twice a week, as a summary of current vacancy announcements then pending.

It does not reflect the actual period during which applications were being received. For instance, NPR 75 amended, listed with a closing date of July 6, 1962, had been open from June 28, 1962, and NPR 173, listed with a closing date of July 5, 1962, had been open from June 21, 1962.

I believe that this additional information will give you a good picture of the situation. However, if I can be of further assistance to you, please let me know.

As you requested, the material forwarded with your letter is returned.

Sincerely yours,
John W. Macy, Jr.,
Chairman.

U.S. Civil Service Commission,
Bureau of Inspections,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1962.
Hon. Lindley Beckworth,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Beckworth: This is in reply to your letters of August 16, 28, and 31, 1962, and your telephone conversation with Mr. Eddinger of our Bureau of Recruiting and Examining regarding the publication "Current Vacancies for Civilians" issued by the Bureau of Weapons, Department of the Navy.

Under the Federal merit promotion program each agency is responsible for developing promotion plans, under certain guidelines issued by the Civil Service Commission. Agencies may, but are not required to, include in these promotion plans, provisions for advertising vacancies and receiving applications from those interested in promotion. Other agencies review the qualifications of employees by reference to existing files.

The publication you submitted is a list of current vacancy announcements published primarily to provide a ready reference file of positions for employees who are interested in promotion. The list is published twice a week and is posted on bulletin boards of offices in the areas where it is believed qualified and interested applicants may be found. This list consolidates in one record a compilation of individual announcements previously issued.

Without knowledge of the system used, it might appear from the review of a single listing that the publicity period for some positions is somewhat brief. However, those shown on any list as having a few days remaining in the filing period have appeared on previous listings, and have received publicity by individual announcement.

The periods of advertising vary from 6 to 30 days and are based on the size of the area in which it is thought well qualified and interested candidates may be, located. Each position is shown on all listings published during the prescribed publicity period.

These areas of consideration are established by the agency concerned and are based on what is expected to produce a reasonable number of highly qualified candidates for the particular positions. If sufficient applications are not received, it is a normal practice to then extend the area of consideration and the time within which applications should be filed.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance to you. As you requested, the items which accompanied your letters are returned.

Sincerely yours,
Seymour S. Berlin,
Director.

Department of the Navy,
Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1962.
Hon. Lindley Beckworth,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Congressman Beckworth: This is in reply to your letter of August 16, 1962, in which you inquired as to whether the U.S. Marine Corps publishes a list of vacant positions showing specific cutoff dates. We do not publish such a list; however, individual position vacancy announcements are published from time to time at the various posts and stations and these usually have cutoff dates.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated. We hope this information is sufficient for your needs.

Sincerely yours,
H. G. Dalton,
Colonel, U.S. Marine Corps, Director, Administrative Division (by Direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps).

Bureau of Naval Weapons—Current vacancies for civilians

Vacancy number	Position and location	Closing date
RRRE-30	(8) Director, Research Division (RRRE) (PL-313)	7-21-62
KT-13	(8) Supvy. Aerospace Engr., GS-861-15 (RT) (PROPOSED PL-313)	None
S-291	(8) Supvy. Electronic Engr., GS-15 (SP-23) (PROPOSED PL-313)	None
	GS-16 PROPOSED	
NPR-108 Amended	(8) Supvy. Contract Specialist, GS-15 (PROPOSED GS-16) (NPR-1)	7-15-62
	GS-15	
SP-340	(8) Electronic Engr. (Gen.) (SP-20)	None
SP-313 Amended	(8) Supvy. Electronic Engr. (SP-23)	None
RMMO-137	(8) Physicist (Mech.) GS-1310-15 or Mech. Engr. (Ordnance) GS-830-15 (RMMO) (one vacancy)	None
RMWC-173	(8) Electronic Engr. (Gen.) (GS-855-15) or Physicist (Electron GS-1310-5) (one vacancy)	None
RT-13	(8) Supvy. Aerospace Engr., GS-861-15 (RT) (PROPOSED PL-313)	None
RAAV-51	(8) Supvy. Electronic Engr. (Electro-Magnetics) (RRAV-60)	None
NPR-108 Amended	(8) Supvy. Contract Specialist, GS-15 (PROPOSED GS-16) (NPR-10)	7-16-62
SP-317	(5) Supvy. Gen. Engr. (Aero-Electronic) (SP-231)	7-1-62
SP-291	(8) Supvy. Electronic Engr. GS-15 (PROPOSED PL-313) (SP-23)	None
RR-45	(2) Gen. Engr., GS-801-15 or Physical Science Administrator, GS-1301.1-15 (RR-2)	7-1-62
	GS-14	
RRRE-27	(8) Physical Science Administrator, GS-12/13/14 (RRRE-6) (1 position to be filled)	None
RAAD-149	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Fluid & Flight Mech.) (RAAD-22)	None
SP-257	(9) Electronic Engr. (General) (SP-231)	6-7-62
RRMA-74	(6) Materials Engineer (RRMA)	None
SP-41 Amendment 3	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Fluid & Flight Mech.) (SP-2733)	7-21-62
RM-247 Amended	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Flight Systems) (RM-2)	7-15-62
CS-68	(1) Aerospace Engr. (Propulsion & Power) (CS-4)	7-6-62
RMGA-190	(1) Aerospace Engr. (Flight Systems) (RMCA-4)	7-5-62
PENS-1	(8) Personnel Officer—Duty Station: U.S. Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., Submit SF-57 to C.O., U.S. Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla.	7-11-62
SP-307	(2) Supvy. Electronic Engr. (Gen.) (SP-242)	7-10-62
CS-70	(1) Aerospace Engr. (Flight Systems) (CS-4)	7-12-62
RAAE-18	(8) Phsysical Science Administrator, GS-1301.1-14 or Physiologist, GS-413-14	8-5-62
RAAE-17	(8) Physiologist, GS-413-14, or Physical Science Administrator, GS-1301.1-14	8-5-62
	GS-13	
RRRE-28	(8) Electronic Engr. (Electro-Magnetics) (RRRE-2) GS-12/13 (1 position to be filled)	None
RRRE-27	(8) Physical Science Administrator, GS-12/13/14 (RRRE-6) (1 position to be filled)	None
RAAV-7	(8) Electronic Engr. (Electro-Magnetics) (RAAV-3311)	None
SP-170 (SP-458 Amended)	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Propulsion & Power) (RAPP-321)	None
RMGA-162 Amended	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Fluid & Flight Mech.) (RMGA-162)	None
RAAD-125A Amended	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Fluid & Flight Mech.) (RAAD-2)	None
RAAD-174	(8) Aerospace Engr (Fluid & Flight Mech.) (RAAD-34)	None
RAPP-218	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Propulsion & Power) (RAPP-234)	None
DCM-135 Amendment 2	(8) Digital Computer Systems Specialist (DCM)	None
R-2-13 Amended	(8) General Engineer (R-2)	None
RAAV-32A	(8) Electronic Engineer (Electro-Magnetics) (RAAV-41)	None
RAAV-32B	(8) Electronic Engineer (Electro-Magnetics) (RAAV-41)	None
RAAV-32C	(8) Electronic Engineer (Electro-Magnetics) (RAAV-42)	None
RAAV-32D	(8) Electronic Engineer (Electro-Magnetics) (RAAV-43)	None
RAAV-32E	(8) Electronic Engineer (Electro-Magnetics) (RAAV-43)	None
SP-243 Amended	(8) Electronic Engineer (SP-234)	7-14-62
MB-24	(7) Budget Analyst (MBC-32)	7-14-62
RAPP-202 Amended	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Propulsion & Power) (RAPP-22)	None
NAB-13	(3) Administrative Officer (Reports) (MAB-3)	7-5-62
GLT-13 & GLT-14	(5) General Engr. (Mech.-Electronics) (two positions to be filled)	7-5-62
RMGA-153	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Flight Systems) (RMGA-344)	None
MAC-13	(3) Supvy. Financial Analyst (MAC)	7-9-62
RAPP-214	(8) Aerospace Engr. (Propulsion & Power) (RAPP-321)	None
	GS-7	
NPR-144	(8) Contract Assistant-Trainee position. Several vacancies to be filled. See notice in BuWeps "Daily Log" of 6-11-62.	None
PFM-131	(5) Digital Computer Systems Analyst (PFM-4) GS-11/9/7/5	7-10-62
R-3-111	(5) Budget Analyst (R-34)	7-9-62
FW-612	(2) General Supply Assistant, GS-9/7 (FWAM-44) (1 position)	7-12-62
MB-31	(2) Fiscal Accounting Asst. GS-7 or Clerk, GS-5 (MBO-3) (1 position)	7-17-62
MSO-124	(5) Accountant, GS-9/7/5 (MSD-52) (1 position)	7-17-62
	GS-6	
SP-316	(5) Secretary (Steno) (SP-11)	7-13-62
C-14-33 Amended	(1) Secretary (Stenography) (C-1411)	7-10-62
GLT-15	(1) Clerk (Stenography) (GLT)	7-10-62
	GS-5	
NCS-69	(8) Supvy. Procurement Clerk (NCS-33)	7-15-62
NPR-173	(5) Clerk-Stenographer (NPR-54)	7-5-62
MSD-117	(5) Accounts Maintenance Clerk (MSD-23)	7-5-62
PFM-131	(5) Digital Computer Systems Analyst (PFM-4) GS-11/9/7/5 (one position)	7-10-62
MSD-105 Amended	(5) Fiscal Accounting Clerk (MSD-3)	7-12-62
NPR-139 Amended	(5) Secretary (Stenography) (NPR-23)	None
NPR-75 Amended	(1) Clerk-Stenographer (NPR-42)	7-6-62
FW-591 Amended	(8) General Supply Clerk FWAM-63)	7-28-62
MSD-124	(5) Accountant, GS-9/7/5 (MSD-52) (1 position)	7-17-62
GLT-16	(1) Secretary (Typing) (GLT)	7-10-62
FS-371	(5) Stock Control Clerk (FTMO-53)	7-17-62
FF-78	(5) Secretary (Stenography) (FFPR)	7-19-62
	GS-4	
	(1) Clerk-Stenographer (recurring vacancy)	None
NPR-84 Amended	(5) Clerk-Typist (NPR-25)	None
FF-72 Amended	(5) Clerk-Typist (FFSD) Location: Naval Weapons Plant; Hours of Work: 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.	7-9-62
PAC-281 Amended	(3) Stock Control Clerk (Typing) (PAC-33)	7-9-62
CW-39	(5) Clerk-Typist (CW)	7-12-62
DPG-21	(1) Clerk (Presentations) (DPG)	7-10-62
RM-253	(3) Clerk-Typist (RM-4)	7-19-62

Bureau of Naval Weapons—Current vacancies for civilians—Continued

Vacancy number	Position and location	Closing date
	GS-3	
	(1) Clerk-Typist (recurring vacancy)	None
DOS-417	(3) Mail Clerk (DOS-33) (Male Applicants only)	70-62
	GS-2	
DOS-372	(5) File Clerk (DOS-32)	None
DOS-402	(5) File Clerk (DOS-32)	None

Employees who wish to be considered for vacancies will submit an Application for Promotion Card (NAVEXOS-4395) and Standard Form 57 for each vacancy for which they are applying to the BuWeps Employment Reception Room 2013 Munitions Building. The required forms may be obtained in Room 2013 Munitions Building, or in Division Administrative Assistant's Offices.

Advertised in accordance with BuWeps Instruction 12340.2 of 19 November 1959.

Applications will be accepted from:

(1) BuWeps employees only.
(2) BuWeps and its field activities in the Metro D.C. Area.
(3) Navy Dept. and its field activities in the Metro D.C. area.
(4) Dept. of Defense and its field activities in the Metro D.C. Area.
(5) All sources in the Metro D.C. Area.
(6) BuWeps and its field activities.
(7) Navy Department and its field activities.
(8) All sources.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 30, 1962.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In response to your inquiry of August 16, the Office of the Secretary of Defense does not publish a list of job vacancies for civilians similar to the attached published by the Bureau of Naval Weapons, which was enclosed with your letter.

Further information regarding the vacancy list published by the Bureau of Naval Weapons may be obtained from the civilian personnel office of that agency, Washington, D.C.

Sincerely yours,
MARTHA D. SULLIVAN,
Chief, Employment Section, Personnel Branch.

Mr. Speaker, this difficulty of getting information is unpardonable and must be stopped.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his remarks. I selected this instance, because I thought it dramatized so well the need that Congress had for this information which it could not secure and could not obtain, even from the Library of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when members of the press can obtain information like this on our own payrolls, I cannot understand why we, the Members of Congress, cannot obtain information necessary for legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for further observation?

Mr. HECHLER. I am glad to yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman from Texas spoke of the Equal Jobs Opportunity Commission. Our subcommittee—and the gentleman is a new member of it, and we are glad to have him on this subcommittee—has spent weeks trying to get from this Equal Jobs Opportunity Commission its payroll, how much they are paying, and to whom the money is being paid.

In this matter of the right to know about how this Commission functions, we have exchanged a good many letters. Finally, after weeks and weeks, we obtained the information. Strange as it may seem, the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON JOHNSON, is the Chairman of that Commission.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am pleased that this whole matter is being aired. Many of my colleagues, I assure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] are interested in his bill and the good results we expect to flow therefrom. We are also very much concerned with Congress' right to know. When an agency looks up its information for reasons which appear capricious and unwarranted, it is the duty of Members of Congress to stand up and holler about it. That is just what I am doing today. Even though the Library of Congress may contend it no longer has summer employees, but only has permanent employees, I submit that the policy stated in the letter of July 10, 1959, is wrong, and this kind of thinking should be blasted out whenever an agency attempts to hide behind such a flimsy excuse.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is beginning to exercise some initiative in meeting the Cuban-Communist threat. This initiative is largely due to the Congress of the United States.

The first word which came to the American people for action to meet the Soviet buildup in Cuba came from the Congress. On September 12 I urged a seven-point plan of specific, practical steps to be taken to counter the Soviet moves into this hemisphere. My plan included:

First, Full-scale military maneuvers to be held off the coast of Cuba in international waters, with warning issued to shipping.

Second. U.S. Government action to halt allied shipping to Cuba.

Third. Precautions for the protection of the Southeastern United States to assure the same defense as is provided by the system which is across the United States-Canadian border and the area to the North.

I also urged that a full investigation into free-world shipping be conducted by the House Select Committee on Export Control, and introduced a resolution reaffirming the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, what has transpired in the past few weeks has come as reassuring news to the American people. This nation has witnessed the following developments in the Cuban crisis:

First. The Pentagon has announced military exercises to be conducted in an area surrounding Puerto Rico, and this show of U.S. force will be clearly visible to the Communists. An exhibit of U.S. might will serve as a powerful deterrent to the forces in Cuba, and will stand as a corollary to the strength clearly present at Guantanamo.

Second. Hearings were just concluded by the House Select Committee on Export Control, and the matter of free-world shipping to Cuba was given thorough exposé. As a result, public outcry for action was heightened, and action to cut this trade has been taken by several of our friends, notably West Germany, Turkey, and Norway.

Third. The executive branch has stated plans to bar the use of U.S. ports to any nation whose vessels traffic with Cuba. This step should be commended.

Fourth. The House Armed Services Committees has directed intensified military planning for the defense of the Southeastern United States.

The position taken by the Congress recently with passage of Senate Joint Resolution 230 reaffirms the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and enunciates U.S. policies to halt the spread of communism in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, from the events just summarized, it is clear that the persistence of the Congress may be credited with the alert to combat communism now underway in America, and the actions taken by this Government as well. It is in the Congress that the will of America is properly interpreted. That will exerts its pressure in the call for action, and action is beginning to occur.

THE QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the quality stabilization bill will be brought to the floor of the House for a vote before adjournment.

I know how late it is—and how anxious everyone is to return home and campaign. Let me assure you that with a statewide Senate race on my hands in Idaho, no one is more anxious than I am to finish up our work. But I feel it would be breaking faith with the small independent retailers out along the Main Street of America to adjourn this Congress before we vote on the bill which would assure a greater measure of fairplay in the marketplace.

This bill has been thoroughly aired in hearings. It is sponsored by a number of Members of both the House and the Senate and supported by many more. It was favorably reported to the House because it was obvious that quality stabilization is in the interests not only of the independent businessman, but of the manufacturer, and of the entire national economy.

Quality stabilization is in the best interests of the consumer. I am a consumer—and a shopper—myself. I come from a small community of 18,000 people—Nampa, Idaho—and I like to believe that I know and understand what goes on in the mind of the consumer, as well as in the mind of the independent retailer, when they are engaged in the buying and selling process.

The American consumer loves a bargain—as who does not—but she dislikes being fooled. She resents, for example, being lured into a shop by a retailer who advertises a deep cut in the price of a popular product—only to be told, at 9:30 in the morning that the item is all gone. She resents being enticed into the store on his pretext, and then exposed to the high pressure tactics of consumer-bait merchandise which is less familiar and on which the proprietor can make a higher profit.

The American consumer also dislikes to be outpriced by her neighbor. She feels cheated when she finds that her neighbor paid less for a particular brand item than she did.

In other words, the American consumer wants to pay a fair price for the things she buys. She does not want to be overcharged—nor does she want to be price-juggled out of the change and the greenbacks in her purse.

The quality stabilization bill goes a considerable way in eliminating from the marketplace the sharp practices that the American consumer resents. It assures that she will get value in terms of both quality and price when she shops in reputable stores in our country.

The quality stabilization bill will not add a single penny to the cost of living for the American consumer. We all know that a retailer must average out all of his prices to produce the profits he needs to stay in business. Every price in a store affects all other prices. The retailer who advertises big savings on some items prices his other goods high enough to put the customers' savings right back into his own cash register.

This practice by the giant retailer puts a few brand items at below cost, while he pads out the prices of other nonbrand items. This brings in shoppers by the hundreds, and hits hard at the small independent retailers of the country. These small stores—who line principal streets of our towns and cities and our villages, and even of our crossroad trading centers, are going out of business in shocking numbers. These are our family-owned enterprises whose proprietors do far more for the communities in which they live than just provide goods and services for the people there. They provide the community with leadership in local government, and in service to their fellow citizens. They man the fund drives, work out the details for the local rodeos, help find new business to bring to their city, serve as Scoutmasters, work in veterans' organizations, and in a million and one ways contribute to the well-being and growth and prosperity of their hometowns. It can be truthfully said that my State of Idaho is a better place to live because of her independent merchants.

My interest in passing the quality stabilization bill is to preserve, protect, and advance the independent retailer. It goes far deeper than sentiment. I know that the independent businessman is the backbone of the community in which he lives—and the backbone of America—and we must not let him and his influence die out.

The independent businessman also has another significance for the American people. He is part and parcel of the great distribution system which helps make mass production possible. Given the incentive to sell—and that incentive is both preservation and profit—he can help to move more goods off more shelves, and thus to promote increased production and more and better jobs.

Likewise, the small independent retailer provides a strong check against monopoly in the marketplace. It is a truism that to have competition—effective competition—there must be competitors—living competitors. Of the 4.7 million businesses in the United States some 2 million are retail stores. And the overwhelming percentage of such stores are owned and operated by independent retailers. Enactment of the quality stabilization bill will not guarantee their profits or success or ability to hang on in business. It will, however, make for a marketplace atmosphere that gives these smaller retailers the opportunity to make good, an opportunity which I know most of them have the will and the ability to embrace.

We in the Congress long ago expressed our concern for the welfare of small business and, on occasion, reflected that concern in constructive legislation. We have in the quality stabilization bill an opportunity to take another constructive step. And we must take it, and take it now. Small businessmen need help. They cannot continue to compete against giant retailers who are interested only in padding their sales and profits at the expense of their smaller competitors. They cannot continue to compete against deception, against pricing which makes the customer believe he is getting a bargain when, in the end, it costs him just as much.

This type of competition—this type of deception—is darkening display windows and closing store doors all along the main streets of Idaho and of the Nation. It must be stopped. Once a shop hangs up its closing-out sign, once it stops doing business, it is lost forever to the community which it once served. To put a brake on small business failures we must pass the quality stabilization bill. If it does not clear the last legislative hurdles of this congressional session, I submit it should be a top priority bill when Congress reconvenes in January.

THE HONORABLE WILBUR MILLS

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, without question one of the most admired and outstanding Members of this House is my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], who is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. Because of the tribute which was paid to him yesterday through an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks and this editorial extended in the daily RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

EVALUATION OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES AND PROCEDURES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, with the second session of the 87th Congress likely to grind to a painful sine die adjournment this week, it would certainly seem that Members of the House of Representatives—and particularly those in positions of leadership, should evaluate the legislative activities and procedures of recent sessions.

I do not believe there is a Member of this honorable body who would complain about the duration of any session if the legislative business demanded as much as a full 12 months' work.

But certainly the sporadic legislative actions which have characterized recent sessions provide reason for criticism not only within the halls of Congress but from the general public as well.

Keeping this body in session to deal with matters which have been delayed for many months is certainly not in the best interest of the public nor is it conducive to the best and most efficient process of legislating. It is a costly procedure and results in a last minute rush of bills which could easily be spread across many weeks and months of the session. If anyone is under the impression that the many bills we have handled in the past 3 or 4 weeks have all been emergency or rush legislation, they are mistaken. And the fact that we are dealing with a great deal of this legislation with a substantial number of Members not present is further indicative of a need to do something about this situation.

I want to make it imminently clear that this statement is not one of criticism or reprimand of any of my colleagues who have understandable and justified obligations late in these prolonged sessions to fulfill elsewhere.

Representatives of the people of this country, it seems to me have obligations to be back in their district to meet with our constituents in order to discuss their problems and views with them, keep them informed on our activities, and, accordingly, be in a position to properly reflect the views of the folks back home as our system of representative government was intended to do.

The prolonged sessions of Congress which were provided by the declaration of a national emergency back in the days of the Korean conflict are still not alone justified but this outmoded resolution which has not been rescinded by either of the two administrations in the last 10 years. But the technical questions involved is not as significant as the condition and pattern it has produced.

The distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, said recently on this floor of the House the American people would salute Members of Congress for staying in session into the fall months. Now, if this Congress had worked as diligently and employed some positive direction to handling priority legislation earlier in the session, I would be inclined to agree with his observations. As it is however, I do not think that the people of America have any reason to salute a Congress which has procrastinated and dillydallied as has been the situation in the past 4 years.

It would be my hope, therefore, and I know this is a hope shared by many Members of this House—that this body does not move as aimlessly in the future as it has in the recent past—particularly during the first several months of the session. There should be some agreement within each Committee on the matter of handling major legislation on a priority basis and with a reasonable time schedule.

In other words, I think we need to pursue a much better planned schedule and program, letting political chips fall where they may on certain issues.

If such a policy is adopted—and if the leadership of both parties, and the committee chairmen conscientiously moved along these lines, it will not only be in the best interest of this Congress but in the best interest of the people of this Nation.

Continued indirection and chronic indecision in dealing with major bills will only compound the problems of our legislative processes and procedures in the years ahead.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he is making, a statement calling attention to this long, drawn-out session of Congress. Can the gentleman give me any reason or has he heard of any reason why this session goes on interminably, why we did not work earlier? Does the gentleman think this is deliberately planned this way? Why is this done?

Mr. COLLIER. I have no idea whether or not it is deliberately planned, but certainly the net result is the same. I would most humbly suggest that perhaps one of the means by which we could correct the situation would be for the various committees to meet early after the turn of each year and set up some kind of planned schedule and program based on what in the judgment of the majority members of the committee should have priority, and then pursue that schedule and let the political chips fall where they may as they meet this responsibility.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think it is a little bit unreasonable if not quite a little unreasonable for the other body to cease operations as of last Saturday, the President and the majority whip of the other body taking off on a political jaunt across the country, contributing to keeping the House in session through this week, or perhaps into next week, who knows?

Mr. COLLIER. I am reluctant to criticize the other body because, as the saying goes, you cannot complain about the weeds in your neighbor's yard if perhaps your own yard is cluttered with weeds.

Mr. GROSS. Why do the weeds exist in this body then? Let us deal with this House of Representatives for a moment.

Mr. COLLIER. I think one of the reasons is the point I just tried to make, that is, we have failed on many occasions to deal with legislation of major importance on a priority basis and have not, perhaps, designed a schedule of handling legislation on a priority basis early in the session. The result has been that on many very important bills which we know have to be handled and upon which there should be prompt deliberation, the session moves into the late, hot summer months and into the fall before any decision is made with reference to them. This may to some degree be because it is sometimes politically desirable to put feelers out and to permit legislation to hang fire until public reaction is felt. Regardless of this, however, I do not think in the long run, as I have stated, that this is conducive to the best processes of legislating and I do not think it is in the best interest of the American people.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. I would like to add my commendation to the gentleman for his fine statement. But, I wonder if the basic problem is not just a bit more deep that just the problem of establishing priorities for legislation in the House of Representatives. It appears to me there is a basic fundamental lack of a national program and goals, both fiscally and in the field of international relations as well as in the economic field. It is this failure of administrative goals and policies and programs that I think has brought about this very late session that we are in now, a session that seems to lack direction and purpose and intent. I think the trouble is a little bit deeper than just a matter of establishing priorities in the House although I do agree with the gentleman that that too is lacking and needs considerable revision.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman for his observations. I would simply like to say in closing, I was never more sincere in my life, that this session should certainly point up to all of us, and we must equally share the blame and responsibility, that we ought to reevaluate the previous sessions, those in the last 4 years, and try to do something about it because continued indirection and chronic indecision in dealing with major bills will only compound the problem in the future.

Mr. PILLION. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CONGRESSMAN GONZALEZ REPORTS ON LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the closing days of this Congress. Before we hear the final tap of your gavel and the mace is set down for the last time, I ask the indulgence of the House to permit the expression of a thought which may contribute something of value to our collective thinking.

It has not been my privilege to be a "first-termer" in this Congress. I entered this body at the beginning of this session, hence am merely a "first-halftermer."

No one need remind me of my lowly status, my limited experienced, my lack of tenure. Of these I am aware. Being aware, I have endeavored to apply myself to learning my homework. Unsure at times of my own wisdom, I have listened to others expound theirs. Generally speaking, I have held my peace, except when matters of direct and urgent concern to my district were before us.

One of the times I held my peace was when the bill was before us to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948. This appeared to be a dreadfully complex and intricate subject. The hearings on it before the Committee on Agriculture were lengthy and had begun before I left San Antonio for Washington. And the people of San Antonio appear to have small interest in the involvements of the worldwide sugar industry so long as refined sugar reaches them reasonably priced and well-packaged. They are neither producers nor refiners of sugar. The Sugar Act did not, therefore, strike me as a matter on which I should seek expert knowledge.

In retrospect, I regret my lack of interest. In retrospect, I realize I let pass an opportunity to assert an idea which I believe offers something new to our approach to foreign trade problems. Perhaps I am still too inexpert to judge the merits of this idea. For that reason, if no other, I feel compelled to offer it now so that those who have more knowledge in this area can pass their judgment on it. It is timely for this thought to be advanced.

We have just completed the biannual agonizing over the foreign aid question. It is a question the answer to which varies from year to year. This year the Congress lopped a billion dollars off that amount which the administration said was needed to safeguard our national interests and carry forward our national policies. I was not happy with this action, but in truth I must acknowledge I would not have been happy either had the administration's requested sum been granted.

I am one who feels there is something yet to be desired in our whole foreign aid program, and this something is not simply a matter of arithmetic. My quarrels with the program are not told in the amounts of aid moneys but rather in the methods, the approaches to the problems that necessitate this aid. I see us missing opportunities I wish we would seize. One such opportunity is in the Sugar Act—but we missed it this year.

Those people who glibly speak their devotion to "trade, not aid," are usually hard put to spell out any criteria for determining the form of either aid or trade. And I say that if our national goals and purposes are tied up in our programs of trade or aid, as I believe they are, then it is high time we adopted some criteria for dealing with and judging both.

I do not believe that men of the world are so rational or that the processes of the marketplace are so equitable that our national interests necessarily get served by our blithely proceeding year after year without a clearer definition of the criteria by which we shall determine both our trade and our aid policies.

Along with this I think we should recognize that much of our trade is a form of aid. Nowhere is this more true than in the sugar industry. This is a rigidly controlled and subsidized industry. It is an industry beset with intrigue, sponsoring well-paid advocates constantly jockeying for favored positions.

The hearings on the Sugar Act are a revelation in many ways. The elements that appear to enter into the determination of a nation's sugar import quota would defy a logician. What we do with respect to setting our import quotas from sugar producing countries seems to be determined by delicate but ill-defined formulas in which historical habits, favored nations, arbitrary preferences, and political desires are all factors. One searches for some hard standard which would suggest what factors might really be controlling in deciding whether Brazil is permitted to send us 3 million short tons or 2½ million as its quota for participating in the U.S. sugar market.

In the absence of such hard standards, I am wondering to what extent our determinations of these quotas are being used to advance those goals for which we promote both trade and aid for these countries. I realize that when a fateful and dramatic case like Cuba confronts us our national goals are asserted and changes are made in the allocation of these quotas. But my concern is with the year to year functioning of this allocation process and not just our response to a crisis.

It is readily apparent that we have in this sugar program a vivid demonstration of one of the great economic facts of life in this world, which is that simply having access to the great American market is a thing of value. It is a positive thing of value to gain entree to the American marketplace.

This fact should suggest to us that we have a powerful factor to use in carrying out our national purposes in this world. It is one we have used arbitrarily or not at all, except in those cases where we slammed the door of this marketplace on those who have clearly shown their belligerence against our interests. I want to see us do more to use this thing of value as a reward, and not solely as a punishment. I see in it a mighty pryhole which, if properly used, can result in our bringing about some of the very things we try so expensively to do with direct foreign aid or with measures which increase the volume of world trade.

As a nation we have dedicated ourselves to efforts to raise the standards of living of people elsewhere in the world. We have tried to accelerate the development of economically undeveloped countries. We have adopted a multitude of elaborate and expensive methods to elevate the living and working standards of foreign people so as to lessen the disparity between their world and our own. Much of this we have done to counter the seductive appeal Communist urgings have for people who have never lived far removed from hunger, poverty, and hopelessness.

We hear criticism of our foreign aid program from those who question the extent to which this aid is actually reaching those who know hunger and poverty. We must live with the embarrassing examples where sometimes our aid programs have had their purposes thwarted by rich men who grew richer and calloused political leaders who became more entrenched because of our aid. We have searched for a way to compel our aid to reach those at the bottom of the economic pyramids in these countries, and when we failed our whole programs came under attack. The American people want some measurable standards to determine the effectiveness of foreign aid. They want a program in which the Communist nations cannot follow us and play their game of "oneupmanship" with us. I wish to suggest such a program, and I propose that we consider testing the program in our administration of our sugar-import program.

My proposal is that we devise a means to give increases in sugar quotas to those countries in which sugar-producing companies or combines have demonstrated a deliberate effort to increase the level of earnings of their own workers. I am not interested in giving funds for the construction of a cane mill in a Central American country unless somehow this can be shown to raise the standard of living of the cane cutters. I am not interested in arguing for an increase in import quota for the corporations in these countries unless this increase is translated into better housing, better food, better medical care, and all the other elements of a better standard of living for the least workers in those corporations.

It is time we applied this kind of test to our efforts on behalf of these countries. We can build factories, make loans, parcel out grants, send technicians and all the rest, but if the cane cutters and their kind do not realize measurable benefits from all these we have failed. And with our failure we have again failed to remove in time the conditions that create a Castro and will as surely create additional Castros. The appeal of communism is to those who do not share in the fruits of our many efforts.

I suggest that here in this sugar program we have an opportunity to make an effort that costs us nothing. We already peg a price for sugar that is above the so-called world market price. We already pay premiums for maintaining the stability of this industry. Now let us insist on paying this premium in such a way that we know it will benefit those we must help if our national purposes are to count for anything. We can use this as a pry pole to raise wages in areas where workers have been told we are only interested in exploiting their labor. We have every right to say we prefer to increase the quota of country X where a measurable increase in real wages was had instead of country Y where this was not the case. We can say there are added benefits for those countries and its sugar companies who work with us to these ends. Uncle Sam then becomes not the capitalist who builds a highway to a mill it has financed but also becomes the collective bargaining representative who secures a better living for the least workers in the same hard terms used by a labor union bargainer. It is not Communist pie-in-the-sky—it is a 10-percent increase in earnings this year. And anyone who doubts the appeal this has for workers throughout the world simply does not know what is going on within the free labor movement in the world. Politically oriented unions with all their promises have time and again lost ground to collective bargaining unions that could produce measurable gains now, today, not at some ill-defined future point.

I urge that we explore this possibility. I want to hear your thoughts on it. I know many of the objections that can be raised about the difficulties of establishing meaningful standards for measuring these wage movements, or increases in the standards of living. But anyone who says we cannot come up with objective measurements of these must be unfamiliar with what is already being done and which can be perfected, if we desire. Already the International Monetary Fund, the International Labor Organization, the Bureau of Foreign Labor Conditions of the U.S. Department of Labor, even the U.S. Department of Commerce collect some data bearing on these measurements. There are technicians who can give us reasonably objective standards for measuring these things. In any event, their standards will be more objective than one influenced by which lobbyist is hired by which country.

This has to do with our national goals and purposes, and, I submit, we should give it early attention. During this interim between Congresses we can develop our proposals.

I solicit your interest and I urge your assistance in this effort.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Toll, for Monday, October 8, 1962, on account of religious holiday.

Mr. Brown (at the request of Mr. McCulloch), and that he be excused from attending further meetings of the House during this session because of serious illness in his family.

Mr. Morgan (at the request of Mr. Boland), for Monday, October 8, Tuesday, October 9, and Wednesday, October 10, 1962, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Tollefson, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Quie (at the request of Mr. Langen), for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Hechler (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 60 minutes, tomorrow.

Mrs. Pfost, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Collier, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted:

Mr. Boland in two instances.

Mr. Beckworth, to include extraneous matter, including tables, in his remarks made during Mr. Hechler's special order today.

Mr. Alger.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Langen) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Utt.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7927. An act to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1288. An act to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1552. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, effectiveness, and reliability of drugs, authorize standardization of drug names, and clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority; and for other purposes;

S. 1563. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Georgia-South Carolina, to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes;

S. 1658. An act to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make Indian tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the housing amendments of 1955.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 9, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. PFOST: Committee of conference. S. 3451. An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2545). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY: Committee of conference. H.R. 12580. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2546). Ordered to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. ANFUSO introduced a bill (H.R. 13373) for the relief of Kiriakoula Hristoforatou, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Polish National Alliance, Group 1484, of Indian Orchard, Mass., Observes 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1962, the Polish National Alliance, Group 1484, of Indian Orchard, Mass., with its president, Bolac S. Midura, as chairman of the program, observed its 50th anniversary, beginning with a parade from Kosciuszko Hall to the Immaculate Conception Church where the members attended high mass. That evening a banquet was held in the Kosciuszko Ballroom and the members heard Mr. Charles Rozmarek, of Chicago, Ill., who serves in a dual capacity as president of the Polish National Alliance of America and president of the Polish American Congress of America.

Mr. Speaker, the Polish American Congress was founded at a convention held in Buffalo, N.Y., May 28–30, 1944. It unites 6 million Americans of Polish origin. It has 30 State districts or divisions in the following States: Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts—eastern and western; Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey—northern and southern; New York—downstate, central and western; Ohio, Pennsylvania—eastern, northeastern, lower anthracite region and western; Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Oregon, and Washington.

During the war, the Polish American Congress, which includes the Polish National Alliance as member organization, cooperated fully with our Government toward victory in the war. And all the while, it sought for Poland its freedom and independence, through every legitimate means. Every effort was made to bring Poland's cause to the consciousness of America. Everything said and done in defense of Poland and her cause was in full conviction that at the same time America's aims and cause were being defended, too.

The Polish American Congress through its president, Charles Rozmarek, presented many resolutions, memorandums, and declarations of policy to America's leaders, Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy, Secretaries of State Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes, Marshall, Acheson, Dulles, Herter, and Rusk, and to Members of the U.S. Congress.

President Rozmarek headed a delegation to the United Nations San Francisco meeting, and he and three other members of the executive board of the Polish American Congress attended the Paris conference and made a 13-week tour of Polish displaced persons camps in Western Europe. While abroad, Mr.

Rozmarek held numerous press conferences and personally conferred with leaders and diplomats of democratic countries in Paris and London.

The Polish American Congress has from the beginning opposed injustice and sacrificing of principles for passing expediency. Today, it continues its work along these same lines, but it places a priority on preserving our American way of life by counteracting subversive activities in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the aims and objectives of the Polish American Congress are:

First. To give complete support to the Government of the United States in its efforts to win a just peace in accord with the principles of the Atlantic Charter;

Second. To unify action of Americans of Polish descent within the lawful limitation of their rights and duties as citizens of this country;

Third. To inform impartially the American public of Poland's historic role, her aims and needs;

Fourth. To advocate closer and deeper cooperation of American democracy with the democracy of Poland, in the fields of civic, ideological, cultural, and social-economic life;

Fifth. To draft and apply a constructive program of activities for the welfare of Americans of Polish descent, with the view of raising their material well-being through increasing the ranks of their fraternal, professional, ideological, and other associations, and through general support of Polish industry and trade in America;

Sixth. To support—within the laws of our country—all actions to bring about independence with true democracy to the people of Poland; and

Seventh. To counteract all subversive movements aiming at destruction of our American way of life.

Wrong-Way Kennedys Romp Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of diverting headlines and general concern over the Soviet military buildup in Cuba, the Kennedy brothers conducted a military maneuver in Oxford, Miss., which should chill the bones of every American. Let it be understood that I believe any qualified person is entitled to attend a tax-supported school. I do not know the qualifications of the applicant, Meredith, in this case. I do know that he was a handpicked guinea pig for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. His service record in the Armed Forces is, of course, not available for public inspection. I do not in any way condone the arbitrary exclusion of any person from attending the tax-supported University of Mississippi, but I do know that any university, tax supported or not, excludes many people for lack of qualifications. But the burden of this report is not directed at this issue, but rather at the events following the refusal to enroll Mr. Meredith.

I would like to call your attention to the ninth amendment to the Constitution: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." It is my belief that many of the Supreme Court decisions fly in the face of this amendment, although it has not been used in arguments before the Supreme Court.

This administration and those preceding have been negotiating for a dozen years over the Berlin situation, and surely we could have negotiated for a few years on the Mississippi problem.

The public has been demanding that some action be taken to roll back the Communist thrust in the Western Hemisphere; but, instead, the Kennedy brothers jumped into Mississippi with the fierceness of a tiger going in for the kill. This is the same cabal which lacked the courage to insure the success of the Bay of Pigs invasion and withdrew military support after the Cuban patriots had been committed to a landing. This fateful decision will go down in history as one of the most shameful acts committed by the United States, and will result in untold cost of American lives and treasure, to do what we should have done without such cost.

Sixteen thousand crack troops were sent to a community of 6,000 people. The excuse for this is that Governor Barnett defied a court order because of the conflict between his State constitution and the court order.

Where was the mighty force available to the Kennedys when Gus Hall, head of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and his stooge, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, and Dorothy Healey, head of the Communist Party in California, defied a court order to register as agents of the international Communist conspiracy? Why is Bobby Kennedy so cordial to the Communists who defy a court order and so vicious with a Governor of a sovereign State? Such a double standard is intolerable. Bobby Kennedy has promoted and supported civil uprisings in the South by sponsoring the so-called "freedom riders," and threatening the transportation companies with prosecution if they refuse to transport these inciters of civil commotion.

The next step by the "Hitlerites" was the arrest of Gen. Edwin A. Walker as a political prisoner without due process of law, in contravention to the fifth amendment in our "old fashioned Constitution." This is exactly the type of treatment that one would expect under Hitler, Goering and Co.

Under the administration's program of unilateral disarmament, and the transfer of our military might to a United Nations-one world command, there would have been U.N. troops in Oxford, Miss. General Walker, and any other political prisoner, would have been taken in chains before a world court which provides for no "due process," and tried before a foreign court without a jury of his peers as provided in our Constitution, and would probably be summarily executed. Why can't the American people see the signs of danger inherent in this surrender program?

This country is falling, hook, line, and sinker, for the propaganda of the international Communist conspiracy. If we do not reverse our direction, the years are few and the days are short before we will find ourselves bound by the chains of slavery to Soviet domination. It is time for America to awake.

Resolution of Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1962

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, a false, misleading, and libelous article in a labor publication in my district would attack the integrity and courage of the Members of this august body. It states, and I quote:

> Under pressure from life insurance companies, the U.S. House has killed a proposal to reopen the GI insurance program to all veterans of World War II and Korea.

I realize that this attack would never have been made were we not in the midst of a political campaign because the officials of this union have never shown any support for this measure nor has this publication demonstrated any interest in this legislation.

It is difficult to believe that this attack on the majority of the Members of this House and pinpointed at the gentleman from Ohio was done in good faith. Certainly they must have known that national commanders and their representatives of eight major veteran organizations gathered together within the past 3 weeks and presented resolutions of appreciation to those of us who participated in this action. I enter my resolution in the RECORD:

> RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. AYRES, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS IN THE 2D SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS
>
> "Which recognized the increasing hardships inflicted on some 2 million disabled American veterans by the inflationary spiral of the cost of living; and
>
> "Which sponsored legislation to provide cost-of-living compensation increases valued at some $100 million annually for men and women disabled in wartime service to the Nation; and
>
> "Which responded with compassion at a critical moment in time to the historic joint initiative of the undersigned organizations in efforts to dissolve a procedural deadlock which threatened to continue indefinitely and unresolved; and
>
> "Which persisted in the face of procedural and political odds to achieve ultimate enactment of these equitably and overdue adjustments; and
>
> "Which has, therefore, earned the appreciation and respect of the eight undersigned national veterans leaders who dedicated themselves and their organizations in unprecedented unity to fulfillment of this Nation's just obligation to our war disabled."

Signed on this 20th day of September 1962.

William Hughes, National President, Blinded Veterans Association; Byron B. Gentry, Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of U.S.A.; John J. Farkas, National President, Paralyzed Veterans of America; Edward J. McElroy, National Commander, Catholic War Veterans; Edwin P. Fifielski, National Commander, AMVETS; Lester J. Hawkins, National Commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart of U.S.A.; Peter L. Dye, National Commander, Disabled American Veterans; Morton Loudon, National Commander, Jewish War Veterans.

As a veteran myself and as a 12-year member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I can realize the error of my election opponent in reprinting this story as part of his campaign literature seeing that he is not only not a veteran himself but he has never participated in any national veteran activity.

Had he ever done so, he would have realized that my action was in the best interest of every veteran. We who have served our country in the armed services resent any attempt by the nonveteran to mislead us. This is especially true when it is done for political purposes.

This was done when veterans were led to believe that the legislation before us would have reinstated the veterans' insurance at the same premium rates that were in force during World War II. As one who permitted his insurance to lapse at the termination of military service, I have analyzed the Senate version of the legislation and find that the premium cost under the measure would be more than twice the cost of the World War II insurance. The rate is competitive with the cost of private commercial insurance. This legislation could have but added to the bureaucracy of Washington without fulfilling the wishes of the veteran.

You will note that this attack deliberately avoids any mention of our action in granting compensation increases for 2 million disabled veterans. One has but to read the above resolution of appreciation to see the benefit that accrued by our action here.

Here are the facts of the case as the writer of this scurrilous attack must surely have known.

On August 8 the Senate passed S. 3597, a bill to authorize the purchase of national service life insurance by all veterans who served between October 8, 1940, and December 31, 1956.

The House of Representatives on August 16 passed H.R. 12333, a similar bill. After analyzing this bill and recognizing that it offered little, if any, benefit to the veteran, I offered a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to amend it so that only those veterans who, because of service-connected disabilities, were unable to purchase commercial life insurance, could purchase this insurance. This motion carried. The committee promptly reported the bill as amended and it passed the House.

The net result is that we now have a Senate version of S. 3597 authorizing the purchase of insurance for all veterans who served between 1940 and 1956 and a House version limiting the insurance to those who are unable to purchase commercial insurance by reason of their service-connected disability. The Senate has disagreed to the House amendment and has requested a conference. Conferees have been named but have not yet met.

I know that it must seem strange to Members of this body that a political foe would accuse me of "knifing the veteran." It is a well-known fact that 12 years ago, I asked for assignment to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee so that I might fight for the just rights of the veteran. During my entire service on that committee, the veteran has commended my actions on his behalf.

The most able chairman of that committee, who certainly must be commended by every veteran for his actions on their behalf, recently sent me the following letter:

U.S. House of Representatives,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1962.

Hon. William H. Ayres,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bill: As we approach the adjournment of this 87th Congress, I want to express my appreciation to you for the high degree of responsibility you have exercised as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the consideration of veterans' legislation.

Your actions during the past 12 years as a member of my committee have truly reflected a sincere regard for the best interests of the Nation and its veterans. Because you have always shown the courage to place the national welfare and the interests of veterans above political expediency, I am honored to have you on my committee.

Although you have been of immeasurable assistance in obtaining favorable action on approximately 60 veterans bills reported by our committee in this Congress, there remains much to be accomplished. I look forward to serving with you in the next Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Olin E. Teague,
Chairman.

The campaigns in my district have always been hard fought. My opponents have been honorable men who opposed me on the issues of the day. Falsehoods and insidious attacks are foreign to our method of campaigning. I am certain that the Members of this House as well as the veteran himself must be shocked at this type of political attack.

A political opponent who was himself a veteran would never have lent his name to such false literature. I certainly hope that this man, as a part-time teacher, does not use these same methods in indoctrinating our youth with principles based on dishonest statements.

Hungarian Revolution of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the last week in October of 1956 a nationwide revolutionary disturbance broke out in Hungary against the Communist regime. This significant and historic event, spontaneous and startling, at once gathered momentum and spread to all parts of the country. In the course of a few days the detested regime was overthrown, the Communists were at bay, and Red functionaries were being hounded in their government posts and party headquarters. Flushed with such an apparently easy victory over their oppressors, the Hungarians were overjoyed with their success, as were their friends and sympathizers in the whole free world. Unfortunately, however, brave and stouthearted Hungarians were in no position to stay in power in the face of threatening Soviet troops. The Hungarians had no choice but to fall back on their relatively meager resources, fight their far superior enemy with all the means at their disposal, and then gallantly die for their freedom. And they did this in tens and hundreds of thousands, sacrificing their lives in a veritable bloodbath created by the ruthless Red Army in less than 2 weeks after the outbreak of the Hungarian revolution.

Today on the sixth anniversary of that revolution Hungarians still cling to their hope for freedom, and we in the West ruefully mourn the fate of those dauntless Hungarians who lost their lives in that glorious effort, the Hungarian revolution of 1956.

President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped Now 15 Years Old—Week of October 7 Designated as National Employ the Handicapped Week—Hon. Paul A. Strachan Instrumental in Founding of Both—Dr. Howard A. Rusk Comments on Changing Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 8, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on September 17, 1962, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped celebrated 15 years of service to the Nation and the world.

It was on September 15, 1947, that the late Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach called together representatives from important organizations in our country representing labor, industry, and the information media. The Secretary was acting on the suggestion of President Harry S. Truman that leaders of interested organizations meet to coordinate the Nation's observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, placed on the statute books in 1945 by the Congress largely at the urging of President Paul A. Strachan of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped.

Paul was also behind Secretary Schwellenbach's invitation to the first meeting of what was to be known as the

President's Committee, for he prepared the lists of those to be invited and worked with the Secretary and others in preparing the agenda and in following through with the organization of the Committee.

Strachan, an old friend and valued adviser to many of today's Members of Congress, took leave of absence from AFPH and devoted several months in close coordination with Dr. Merle E. Frampton, the Committee's first executive committee chairman, in drawing up plans and policies and with Vice Adm. Ross T. McIntire—Medical Corps—U.S. Navy, retired, Committee chairman, in getting the young Committee off to a flying start. Today, if memory serves me correctly, it is the oldest President's Committee in point of service and one of the very few which has both congressional legislation and Presidential Executive order.

As a worker on the Committee, I was pleased this week to receive an attractive brochure titled, "A 15-Year Chronicle." Its foreword by Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, retired, with whom many of us served in the House of Representatives, is a classic of brevity and pays tribute rightfully to its early leaders. General Maas said:

> The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped celebrated its 15th anniversary in September 1962. The years have been eventful ones, and they have held the promise of even more eventful times to come.
>
> Let us remember, as we reminisce, that had it not been for Paul Strachan we possibly never would have had a President's Committee; and had it not been for the guiding genius of Ross McIntire, we never would have been as far along the road as we are today.

General Maas took over as chairman from the late Ross McIntire, White House physician, in 1954. Both of them deserve lasting honor for their voluntary labors.

And, sharing the credit with them is Paul Strachan, now living in retirement in Brooksville, Fla. I would like to quote from two pages of the Committee's short brochure:

> In 1945, tall, rough-hewn Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, sponsored a joint congressional resolution calling for a yearly observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as a means of promoting job equality for the handicapped. He appeared at congressional hearings, but couldn't hear a word. He is totally deaf. The Disabled American Veterans, with Millard Rice as their spokesman, also testified in favor of the resolution.
>
> Both Houses of Congress adopted the resolution on August 11, 1945. Thus NEPH Week was born.
>
> At first, coordination of NEPH Week activities was in the hands of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration under Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine, U.S. Marine Corps. A Federal interagency committee was formed, made up of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Commerce and the Federal Security Agency, Veterans' Administration, and Civil Service Commission. The Disabled American Veterans and Mr. Strachan's AFPH also were represented. In addition, a cooperating committee was created, consisting of 300 national organizations interested in and concerned with problems of the handicapped.
>
> But then RRA, having served its postwar purpose, went out of existence.
>
> What would happen to NEPH Week? Who would coordinate activities of the many organizations involved? Who would take up where RRA had left off?
>
> A short-lived private organization, the National Association for the Employment of the Handicapped, filled the breach. General Erskine was its first president; Admiral McIntire succeeded him.
>
> It was at about this time that Labor Secretary Schwellenbach received his historic Presidential mandate to rally interested organizations in a movement that was to culminate in the President's Committee.
>
> The President's Committee was born in September 1947, but it had to grow, to develop, to make itself felt and heard throughout America.
>
> Admiral McIntire was appointed first chairman, and Dr. Merle E. Frampton, principal of the New York Institute for Education of the Blind, served as first executive committee chairman. Mr. Strachan took a leave of absence from the AFPH to become special consultant to the Secretary of Labor, helping the young committee during its first few months of growth.
>
> The Committee's small staff was housed in the Labor Department. Labor also provided funds, as well as technical assistance from professionals in the Employment Service.
>
> From the start, the Committee received the full support of every segment of American life—Government, private enterprise, labor, the professions, the mass media, the complete spectrum of the Nation.
>
> And slowly but steadily the word spread and grew in intensity: "It's good business to hire the handicapped. It's good business to hire the handicapped."

Some folks have monuments, some large, some small, that are behind them on the road of life. Paul Strachan leaves two, the annual National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week observed the first full week each October, and the President's Committee. The committee has twice shortened its title with Presidential approval in keeping first with a year-round responsibility and recently to include the mentally restored and retarded.

But, National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week remains unchanged and will continue to remain unchanged. As one Federal official has said:

> It's Strachan's law, and like the law of the Medes and Persians, remains unchanged.

This is as it should be, for although well into the sunset of life and having enough medical problems to make Biblical Job feel fortunate, Paul Strachan remains the same tall and rough-hewn man, yes, and rough spoken too when anyone or anything appears to be harming the physically handicapped to whom Strachan dedicates himself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's proclamation setting aside the week of October 7, 1962, as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, the joint statement issued by associate members of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and the New York Times article of October 7, written by Dr. Howard A. Rusk be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation, joint statement and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED WEEK, 1962—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE WHITE HOUSE,
OFFICE OF THE
WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY,
Hyannis, Mass., August 25, 1962.

Whereas our handicapped workers have contributed immeasurably to the strength of our Nation through their productive capacity; and

Whereas our expanding economy demands effective and ever-enlarging utilization of our total manpower, suitably placed according to individual skills and talents; and

Whereas the physically and mentally handicapped, through increased emphasis on rehabilitation and training to prepare them for occupations commensurate with their abilities, stand ready to assume an even greater share in our social and economic progress; and

Whereas their readiness to assume this greater role can be translated into action by acquainting more employers and the public generally with the policy of giving full consideration to handicapped persons in employment, promotion, reassignment and retention; and

Whereas the Congress, by a joint resolution approved August 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 530), has designated the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week and has requested the President to issue a suitable proclamation each year: Now, therefore

I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do call upon the people of our Nation to observe the week beginning October 7, 1962, as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, and to cooperate with the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in furthering equal employment opportunity for the handicapped.

I also call upon the Governors of States, mayors of municipalities, Federal and other public officials, leaders of industry and labor, and other interested individuals and organizations to take part in this observation. I particularly urge employers to renew their efforts to give the handicapped equal consideration with others similarly qualified for employment; and I request all our people to follow the American tradition of helping others to help themselves by assisting handicapped persons to achieve economic independence and active participation in the total life of the national community.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 24th day of August in the year of our Lord 1962, and of the independence of the United States of America the 187th.

[SEAL] JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

JOINT STATEMENT, 1962, BY THE ASSOCIATE MEMBERS, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED, WASHINGTON, D.C.

During the 15 years since the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped came into being, the associate members have noted the acceleration of our Nation's economic growth, inextricably joined with the extension of equality of job opportunity.

We have seen great strides made in creating a favorable climate for the acceptance of handicapped workers, due in large measure to the observable performance of the handicapped themselves. Our free enterprise system is well suited for permitting the skills and abilities of a worker, despite his handicap, to be recognized. Moreover, there has been a growing recognition that the principle of fairplay, so basic a precept of our democracy, requires that every individual be given a fair chance for selection and advancement in employment for which he has the capacity to perform.

Our past successes should point the way for even greater use of handicapped workers. The problems and promises posed by the advent of automation have increased interest in and concern for the utilization of our total human resources. The Federal Government must lead the way in demonstrating that productive capacity is not diminished but often enhanced by selective placement of qualified handicapped workers.

We urge that all employers—Federal, State, and local governments, and private industry and business—consider the physically and mentally handicapped jobseeker in the same light as others, if he is similarly qualified to meet the requirements of the position. We ask no special favors for the handicapped. But we do believe that every man should be considered in terms of his abilities, not his disabilities.

Signed:

Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury; Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General; James E. Day, Postmaster General; Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture; Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce; Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor; Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; John Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans Affairs; John W. Macy, Chairman, Civil Service Commission; Frank B. Ellis, Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization; John L. Moore, Administrator of the General Services Administration.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1962]

JOBS FOR THE DISABLED—CHANGES IN GOALS AND ATTITUDES MARK ANNUAL EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED WEEK

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Today marks the opening of annual National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, and with it the 15th anniversary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

The committee was started at the suggestion of President Truman and has enjoyed the personal support of both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy.

Last year the word "physically" was dropped from the committee's title because of the committee's increasing activity in employment of the mentally retarded and the mentally restored.

A comparison of attitudes toward employment of the handicapped 15 years ago and today shows the committee's effectiveness.

EMPHASIS ON CIVILIANS

Fifteen years ago its primary concern was the employment of disabled veterans. It still retains that interest, but today the civilian disabled are of far greater concern.

Perhaps the most significant change in employment of the handicapped in the past decade and a half is that today we are successfully rehabilitating into employment disabled persons who were considered unemployable then.

When the committee started, for example, there were few State vocational rehabilitation agencies that would consider providing services for a person with paraplegia, paralysis of the legs and lower part of the body.

Although finding the right job for a person with a severe disability is still difficult, it is now commonplace to find paraplegics at work in all types of jobs.

Even more difficult is the rehabilitation and vocational placement of quadriplegics (persons paralyzed in the body and all four extremities). Yet, they are finding jobs.

EDUCATION A FACTOR

The majority of quadriplegic patients are teenagers and young adults who fractured their necks and backs in car accidents or in athletic accidents, especially diving, or, recently, in unsupervised use of the trampoline.

Because of their young age and the fact that young people today are far more apt to have a better basic education than prior generations had, these young people are excellent prospects for rehabilitation despite the severity of their disabilities.

A followup study of 368 such persons served in one rehabilitation center showed that over half were employed to some degree and that one-third were in competitive employment or self-emloyed on a full-time basis.

Another significant change of the last 15 years is our increasing recognition that the psychological and social adjustment of the handicapped person is frequently a far more important factor in successful job placement than the physical disability.

This has become increasingly true as machines have taken over more and more of the physical work previously done by man.

PLACEMENTS DECLINE

Due to the general business turndown last year, there was a decrease from 274,387 handicapped applicants placed in jobs in 1960 by the Nation's 1,800 local employment security offices to 255,933 in 1961.

Placement of disabled veterans, however, rose to 105,100, an increase of 5,000 over the previous year.

The Veterans' Administration has reported that as of June 30, 1962, nearly 700,000 disabled veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have had vocational training under its auspices and have been placed in employment.

The number of handicapped persons employed by the Federal Government also increased from 4,706 in 1960 to 8,648 in 1961.

A part of this increase came from the appointment of 3,500 coordinators responsible for employment of the handicapped in each Federal agency.

LEADERSHIP IMPORTANT

The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped is a perfect example of the adage that any program is the mirror of its leadership.

The long-time chairman, Melvin J. Maas, is a retired Marine Corps general who also served in Congress.

He once disarmed a maniac on the House floor and received the Carnegie Silver Medal for heroism.

Originally named vice chairman of the committee by President Truman, he was appointed chairman by President Eisenhower in 1954.

Blind since 1952, he has arthritis, diabetes, and has had three-fourths of his stomach removed.

In the 100,000 miles a year or more he frequently travels promoting employment of the disabled, he does not refer to these handicaps.

He gets a sure-fire response from an audience, however, when he states he feels qualified to speak for the handicapped because he is one of them and then adds, "I've got false teeth."

His close colleagues point out that two statements have dominated his life. One is, "There'll always be a United States of America as long as there is a U.S. Marine Corps." The second is, "It's good business to hire the handicapped." He himself is a dynamic example of both.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 8, 1962

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of October 6, 1962:

WASHINGTON REPORT—CRUCIAL ISSUES WE FACE AS CONGRESS NEARS ADJOURNMENT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The 87th Congress is coming to a close. As this newsletter is being prepared the end of the session could be but hours away. Much of what has been done by this Congress, under pressure from the White House and the Democratic leadership, has changed drastically the course of our national life and the effects will be felt by the people for many years to come. It has been a Congress dominated by unprecedented pressure from the executive branch to pass legislation increasing the power of the President to a point undreamed of by the framers of our Constitution. Some of the worst bills passed, those which have transferred power to the President which constitutionally belongs to Congress include, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, giving the President authority to rescind or eliminate thriffs, to subsidize industry he thus puts out of business and to pay workers for loss of jobs; the Revenue Act of 1962, though greatly improved from its original version is still a tax monstrosity posing a constant threat to our economy; creation of a Disarmament Agency (1st sess.) which makes it possible for the United States to disarm unilaterally and to place our sovereignty at the mercy of an international force; Unemployment Compensation (1st sess.) amendments which erode to a greater extent the responsibilities of the State and pave the way for Federal standards. There are many others, all of which have been discussed in my weekly newsletters over the past 2 years. In short, the 87th Congress was a bossed legislative body, bending its will before the onslaught of political pressure, promises and implied punishment. It is my hope we may remedy some of the mistakes of this Congress in the next session and return to the people and the Congress the rights and responsibilities given to them by the Constitution.

As the session ends, there are three burning issues which will be the issues upon which the election campaigns will turn:

First: Cuba. Our failure to stop Communist aggression in Cuba has been outlined in previous newsletters (Sept. 4, 15, 29). The most serious indictment of the State Department yet made is contained in the U.S. News & World Report of October 8, 1962. In an interview with our former Ambassador to Cuba, Earl E. T. Smith (Ambassador at the time Castro took over) the magazine exposes the fact that under State Department recommendations the United States helped bring Castro to power even though his Communist ties were known to them. In choosing to support Castro against Batista we ignored the other alternatives including important civic-minded individuals in Cuba, friendly to the United

States, who could have formed a provisional government of national unity. Such a government would have needed the support of the United States in order to maintain law and order during an interim period while general elections were being held. We refused such support or the support of any provisional government which did not include Castro on the ground that such a step would constitute intervention in the internal affairs of Cuba. We insisted on maintaining this unrealistic position while Castro seized power. We followed up this inept action by discouraging all legitimate opposition to Castro, finally culminating in the Bay of Pigs fiasco, the full responsibility of President Kennedy. Now Khrushchev has Cuba. The issue: What is going to be our policy toward the Russian Communist aggression in the Western Hemisphere? The American people must serve a mandate that we intend to protect our freedom, reinstate the Monroe Doctrine, win the cold war with a firm policy backed by effective action to rid Cuba of its Communist masters and return freedom to the people of that unhappy island.

Second: Selling our birthright for a mess of pottage. The U.S. News & World Report also relates the trend of many congressional campaigns in which politicians, in their eagerness to be elected to office, are promising bigger and bigger handouts from Washington. Of course, they fail to point out that the more we take from the Federal Government the more freedom we give in return. The issue: Have the American people reached the point where cradle-to-the-grave security means more than individual liberty upon which the strength of this great country has been built and maintained? The peoples' mandate should be that we want a return to constitutional-limited government where every man is entitled to the best possible life through the fullest expression of his individual talents, industry, and will to succeed.

Third: The General Walker case. During the past week I have taken the floor of the House to demand that Gen. Edwin Walker be given full equality under the law. At no time have I endeavored to judge the guilt or innocence of General Walker, but I have demanded that every available power of Congress and the Federal Government be brought to bear to end the ruthless violation of General Walker's constitutional rights. We dare not allow any administration or any branch of this Government to run roughshod over the legal rights of any citizen because, if we do, we will lose freedom for all of us and this Republic will die. The issue: equality under the law for every individual regardless of his station in life, his race, his political views, or his religion. This is an issue in which every American citizen, be he liberal or conservative, has a vital stake. Note: This is the final newsletter for the 87th Congress. They will be resumed when Congress reconvenes.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 14: 34: *Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.*

Almighty God, may the revelation of Thy divine wisdom and holiness daily inspire our minds to wonder and our hearts to worship.

Create within us a longing to follow faithfully and without fear the way of life which Thou hast marked out for us.

May we understand more clearly that the measure of our faith and trust in Thee will determine the measure of the abundance of our joy and blessedness.

Grant that above all the harsh and discordant notes of agitation and anxiety, of selfishness and suspicion, men and nations may hear and heed Thy voice calling them to cultivate peace and good will.

We thank Thee for the character and service of our beloved colleague who walked and worked with us and whose spirit now dwells with Thee in eternal blessedness. Bestow upon the members of his bereaved family the consolations of Thy grace.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A mesage from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3131. An act for the relief of Richard C. Collins;

H.R. 6691. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6836. An act to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act; and

H.R. 9777. An act to amend Private Law 87–197.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10936. An act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1961. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired); and

S. 3283. An act to amend the enabling act of the State of Arizona for the purpose of facilitating the sale or lease of certain lands granted to such State to local governments for use for public purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12213) entitled "An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers," disagreed to by the House; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5700) entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8952) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for the purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) entitled "An act relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13175) entitled "An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3389) entitled "An act to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, without this being considered a precedent, that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special orders heretofore entered for today be transferred to tomorrow and be placed at the top of the list of special orders for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE FOR TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a list of legislative matters that may be considered tomorrow and to advise the Members in that connection that there will be additions to this announcement. I ask unanimous consent that this announcement may appear preceding the eulogies delivered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the program is as follows:

First. Resolution relating to Senate Joint Resolution 234—Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration.

Second. The Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS] will call up a bill to correct the tax bill.

Third. H.R. 12580—conference report: State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies appropriation bill for 1963.

Any other bills that might be called up by unanimous consent.

Any further program will be announced later.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WATTS (at the request of Mr. CHELF), for the balance of the week of October 8, 1962, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1961. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3283. An act to amend the enabling act of the State of Arizona for the purpose of facilitating the sale or lease of certain lands granted to such State to local governments for use for public purposes, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 10931. An act to revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11970. An act to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13241. An act to amend section 309 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2450. An act for the relief of Major C. Todd, Jr., and the estate of Ira T. Todd, Sr.;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of G. W. Todd and the estate of Lloyd Parks;

S. 2953. An act relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building & Common Laborers' Union of America;

S. 3389. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to develop American flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs; and

S. 3394. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William A. Carter, U.S. Air Force.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 8, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4034. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. David V. Kyrklund;

H.R. 4670. An act to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 6386. An act for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat;

H.R. 7927. An act to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8181. An act to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia and to provide for its operation;

H.R. 8321. An act for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews;

H.R. 8662. An act for the relief of Jose Fuentes;

H.R. 9128. An act for the relief of Sgt. Ernest I. Aguilar;

H.R. 9199. An act for the relief of certain officers and enlisted personnel of the 1202d Civil Affairs Group (Reinf Tng), Fort Hamilton, Brooklyn, N.Y.;

H.R. 9804. An act for the relief of Cuyahoga County, Ohio;

H.R. 9894. An act for the relief of Loretta Shea, deceased, in full settlement of the claims of that estate;

H.R. 10415. An act for the relief of Earl T. Briley;

H.R. 11334. An act for the relief of Mary J. Papworth;

H.R. 11665. An act to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12090. An act for the relief of James Comeau;

H.R. 12539. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Cox and other employees of the Federal Aviation Agency;

H.R. 12701. An act for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.; and

H.R. 12936. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Foussé and others.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLEM MILLER

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, as the senior Member present of the delegation of this House from the great State of California, and following a tradition as old as this venerable and beloved body, it is my sad duty to announce the tragic and untimely death of our distinguished colleague, CLEM MILLER, Representative of the First District of California. On October 7, 1962, our beloved colleague and friend was killed in an airplane crash in California.

Mr. Speaker, in my more than 20 years service in this House, there has been no function that has been my duty to perform, that has approached this duty for sadness and distress of spirit. All who were associated with CLEM MILLER in the performance of our many duties through the years it was our privilege to know him, held him in fond esteem. He was devoted to his duty and lovely family, congenial and kindly, intelligent and pleasant to converse with as well as being impressive to look upon. He was blessed with a beautiful and loving family and is survived by his wife Katharine and five daughters—Amey, 15; Abigail, 13; Clare, 11; Marion, 10; and Katharine, 7. In addition to his wife and daughters, he is survived by his mother, Mrs. Clement W. Miller, of Wilmington, Del., his sister, Mrs. Christopher Loundes of Wilmington, Del., and an uncle, Col. Thomas W. Miller, of Reno, Nev.

How imponderable for those of us here to comprehend the will that commands such a tragedy. May the same will comfort his bereaved loved ones and assist in the sad adjustment of their lives without his living presence. It is my hope that his loved ones will keep in mind what was said many years ago, "Oh all ye that pass by the way, attend and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of a friend is always a sad occasion. The sudden and tragic death of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California, CLEM MILLER, came as a profound shock and is particularly hard to believe because he was such a vital, energetic person. With his passing the First District of California has lost a most able representative, California has lost one of her most respected citizens and we of the Congress have lost one of our most effective and loved legislators. He will be mourned by all who were privileged to know him.

CLEM MILLER was a man of Christian character, strong beliefs and great sincerity. He believed in causes and fought to the hilt for any cause he championed. Nothing was ever too much trouble for him if he believed he could be of assistance. He had great compassion for his fellow man. All of us in the California delegation are going to miss his eagerness and enthusiasm, his energy and willingness for hard work.

CLEM MILLER was a devoted husband and father, and to his widow and his children I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to believe that I am standing here with my colleagues today eulogizing the memory of CLEM MILLER, of California.

In my mind is a memory of his standing in the rear of the Chamber just a few short days ago, a healthy, vigorous, smiling man who had such wonderful ideas and hopes for the future of our country and the people of his district and, of course, for his beautiful and wonderful family.

Mr. Speaker, it makes us understand how transitory life is for all of us and how we are all subject to immediate call by our Maker.

Mr. Speaker, CLEM MILLER was a remarkably fine man, whom I was proud to know. He was a capable man and would have been an increasingly finer Congressman, because his career had just begun to blossom. All of us know of the monument to his memory in the legislation that he sponsored authorizing the Point Reyes National Seashore in California. He leaves a remarkable heritage to his five girls, of which they can be eternally proud, and the memory to his wife and girls of a wonderful husband and father, a man who truly died in the service of his country.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. McFall joins me in offering our deepest sympathy to his wife, Katie, and to his five daughters, his mother, and the rest of his family.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the friendship between CLEM MILLER's family and my family has extended over a period of 60 years. So it is with a great sense of personal loss that I heard of his death. But over and above that is the loss of a true statesman, a loyal gentleman, and a hard-working Congressman, to the First District of California, and to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, CLEM's path and mine did not cross until he came here to Congress. I had known his family for many years. While he was here, I got to know him as a fine gentleman, a devoted husband and father. This is a real loss to the Nation, a loss to me personally. Mrs. Lankford and I extend to his wife, his children, and his mother, our deepest sympathy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to our colleague whose untimely death has deprived the House of Representatives of one of its most dedicated and hardest working members. CLEM MILLER and I came to Congress together 4 years ago at the start of the 86th Congress. Our northern California congressional districts adjoined each other. In many ways, our districts were similar in nature. We had many of the same problems and the needs of our districts were much the same. It was only natural that we should work together closely, and this we did, especially in the field of natural resource conservation and development, a field in which CLEM MILLER was an outstanding leader.

The fact that CLEM MILLER became recognized as a leader in the field of conservation after a relatively brief period in the House of Representatives reflects the great strength of our late colleague—his forthright dedication to getting a job done, sparing no amount of energy to accomplish this goal. In every sense of the word CLEM MILLER was a working Congressman. He was a Congressman who did his "homework" and did it well, so that when he stood and talked about an issue, you were positive his statements were backed solidly with facts.

The Congress recently enacted legislation sponsored by Congressman MILLER to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in California. All of us, I am sure, will remember the direct and commendable manner in which he presented the case for this important project to his colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

This was typical of everything he did. He left no stone unturned in his quest for knowledge, and in his efforts to represent fully his constituents of the First Congressional District.

Another project which afforded me an opportunity to witness the thoroughness with which he worked was his effort to promote and expand the salmon and steelhead fisheries in northern California. CLEM MILLER became active in this field soon after his election to Congress. In 1959 I joined in a conference held in San Rafael at which sportsmen and fish and wildlife experts from throughout the Pacific coast regions joined to discuss the problem. This conference developed a great need for a positive program to save the salmon and steelhead fishery of northern California. Hundreds of hours of research and study by Congressman MILLER personally, combined with additional studies and surveys by the Department of Interior resulted in the development of an excellent solution to this problem. The work now being implemented can be expected to save these fisheries for this and future generations. The credit through the years properly will go to one man, our colleague, Representative CLEM MILLER, who first conceived the program.

Congressman CLEM MILLER was an able champion of the interests of the sportsmen, the lumber industry, the wine industry, and was responsible for a broad program of flood control and harbor developments serving the coastal redwood empire.

Our beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn once said about CLEM MILLER:

> I have served with many young men who have come to the House of Representatives, but none has impressed me more than CLEM MILLER.
>
> We can always count on CLEM MILLER to do a responsible job. I am sure his constituents will understand the value of having a man representing them in Congress who is experienced.

Mr. Speaker, what more can one say about this man who has in 4 short years contributed so much to the Congress of the United States, the Nation itself, our Golden State of California, and at the same time has done such a wonderful job of representing his own congressional district.

Mrs. Johnson joins with me in extending to his wife and his five lovely daughters our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, CLEM MILLER and I had adjoining districts during the 4 years he served in this Congress. And because of that fact I got to know him particularly well. We had many mutual problems. As an example, thousands of citizens from his district worked at Mare Island Naval Shipyard, where thousands of citizens of my district were likewise employed. Also, as thousands of residents of his district were interested in the Point Reyes National Seashore, which he spearheaded, many thousands of my constituents were likewise interested in the same program.

During the 4 years CLEM MILLER was here I learned to respect and admire him for the dedication with which he served his citizens and for the conscientious efforts that he used to try to resolve the many problems that developed in working out solutions to the Point Reyes National Seashore proposal, working out fair solutions that would be equitable to those already residing on the property involved. I was particularly impressed with the efforts he went to in connection with the Point Reyes National Seashore project, working out every detail so that no one would be unfairly treated, although many of the citizens had already lived in that area for many, many years. This was an evidence of the kind of conscientious effort that he applied in endeavoring to represent the people of his district faithfully and conscientiously.

Mr. Speaker, my deepest sympathy goes to his wife and his five daughters in this hour of their bereavement.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD].

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of our late colleague from California, the Honorable CLEM MILLER. Born only 46 years ago this month, his life came to an end at the close of his second term in Congress. In the short time I knew him, I came to admire him for his tenacity of purpose, his fairness of dealing, and his intellectual courage and insight. These are not hollow words. They are words that speak of qualities that we cannot do without in this House, and when one who merits them passes on, we and the country are the poorer for his passing.

Men will, in their fashion, erect a monument of granite to CLEM MILLER in due course, but the memorial—the living memorial—that will best attest the nature of the man for generations to come is the Point Reyes National Seashore. I know whereof I speak, for I know Point Reyes and I knew CLEM MILLER, not by hearsay but at first hand, as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks.

The bill that finally passed and became law bears, it is true, a Senate number, but it was CLEM MILLER's bill for all that. Without his unflinching and unwearying support for this bill and for the companion to it which he introduced, it would have gotten nowhere. It was not a popular bill with some of his constituents. But it was his firmly held conviction that Point Reyes should be saved for the Nation, that it should be preserved for all time to come. To do this, he was reluctantly willing to acquiesce in the minor concessions that had to be made for the bill to become law; he was totally unwilling to admit any of the really damaging amendments that some proposed.

Mr. Speaker, the Point Reyes Peninsula is a beautiful spot. It will, as I have said, serve the American people for hundreds of years. It will remind them that there are treasures that do not glitter, that there are things of beauty that are worth preserving, that there are men of inspiration in each generation who are farsighted enough to see this. Clem Miller was one of these. May all of us remember him for the work he did while he was with us, for the way he did it, for the example he has set for us who remain.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], the majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the House has lost one of its most effective Members in the tragic accident which claimed our friend and colleague, Clem Miller, of California.

Clem Miller was a dedicated Member of this body. He attended our sessions regularly and was most conscientious in the discharge of his duties as a Member of the House of Representatives.

It was only on Thursday of last week, as a matter of fact, that he told me that he was compelled to journey to his district for a series of meetings there, but that he would return here by today in order to be on hand for the conclusion of this session of the Congress.

He had a great intellect but, as my colleague from Texas has just pointed out, he also had intellectual courage. He was quiet but firm in his convictions. He was knowledgeable but never doctrinaire, always understanding that his position might not be entirely right. He made a magnificent and a fine contribution to his State and to his country. Mrs. Boggs joins me in expressing to his lovely wife and their fine daughters our deepest sympathy.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join my grief-stricken colleagues of the great State of California in this expression of sorrow for a very dedicated and wonderful American. It was my happy privilege to be a neighbor of Clem Miller in the Old House Office Building. Countless times we walked from that building to this Capitol arm in arm and talked over the things that kept America together and made America great.

Clem Miller was more than just a part of California. Actually he was a part of this entire Nation of ours. Born in Delaware, educated in Williams College in Williamstown, Mass., he understood America, I think, better than most Members of this great legislative body. He understood the value of conservation, and from the first day that he came to the Halls of this great Chamber he worked unstintingly to further the interests of conservation. One of his great monuments, as all of us know, is Point Reyes National Seashore Area. His was a great district. I think perhaps one of the finest districts in all of this Nation, extending from the San Francisco Bay area north some 300 miles to the Oregon border—big and complex and rugged and tough, and he was the kind of individual who represented it so well—for he loved it so much.

I know that he has left many monuments here by his work in this chamber and in the 86th and 87th Congresses in which he served.' He leaves monuments to conservation. He leaves a great monument in the Point Reyes National Seashore Area. The many, many things he did for his own district are monuments to his work and to his ability. But the most magnificent monument of all is the wonderful family he loved and has left behind and the great spirit he bequeathed to them that is now theirs. So I join with the members of the California delegation in expressing my very deep sympathy to his very lovely wife and his five wonderful children and the rest of the family.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, as secretary of the California delegation, I have been asked by the dean of our delegation, the gentleman from California [Mr. Sheppard], to read his words of condolence.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart and a sense of shock that I speak of the untimely death of my colleague from the First District of California. It was typical of this young Member of Congress that he was going about the business of being a Congressman when he met his untimely fate. Clem Miller first came to Congress in 1959. Since that time he has made his mark as an able representative of his constituency. Those of us from California were especially proud of the manner in which he handled his bill to authorize the Point Reyes National Seashore Park. This bill was enacted into law only a few short weeks ago. It is typical of the ardent conservationist views of Mr. Miller. It should stand for future generations to see as a fitting memorial to this young friend of ours. In his short years of congressional service here he has left his mark not only in this House but in his State and his district. The people he served will miss his consecrated concern for their problems. His State and his Nation will miss the devotion paid them as a member of the Army serving with gallantry in Europe, as a civil servant, and as a Member of Congress. Mrs. Sheppard joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathies to his widow and his five lovely daughters.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, further, as secretary of the California delegation, I have been asked by the members of the family to announce that memorial services will be held tomorrow in Bethlehem Chapel of the Washington National Cathedral on Massachusetts Avenue and Wisconsin here in the District of Columbia.

The family asks that in lieu of flowers contributions to acquire land for Point Reyes National Seashore Park in California may be sent to Nature Conservancy, 2039 K Street NW., Washington 6, D.C.

As many of you know, funeral services are scheduled for Saturday near Clem Miller's home in Marin County, Calif. There will be further announcements in this regard.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we have all lost an able colleague and I have lost a dear personal friend. I first met Clem in 1958 when we were both campaigning together for our respective congressional seats. Because our districts are adjoining and contiguous on many occasions we arranged joint meetings to demonstrate the interdependent character of problems in our districts. He was then, as he was up until this tragic day, relentless and unceasing in his efforts to discover how to serve best the interests of the First California District and the country. It was clear to me from our early associations that Clem was no ordinary candidate and if elected he would became an important and effective voice in the Congress.

Four freshmen Congressmen were elected to the 86th Congress from California. Three of us survived the elections of 1960 and today only two of us, Bizz Johnson and myself, are left to carry on for the class of the 86th from California. Clem's passing leaves us with an enormous gap. He set a high standard both in his personal life and in his work during his membership in this House.

Because of our many common interests we soon became close personal friends. In the course of our association over these 4 years we have shared many experiences and argued over many an issue. Like the man who came to dinner during the bobtail session of 1960 I was a guest for several weeks in his lovely home. I feel as close to the Miller family as any outsider can be.

In our many hours together over these years Clem revealed himself to me as a man of enormous intellectual capacity. His mind would invariably race far beyond the apparent surface implications of an issue. He was an incessant, avid, and rapid reader, and when he was not reading he was composing his Washington letter, or other personal letters to friends, which contained some pertinent comment on events of the day. I think Dave Broder's review in the Washington Star of the 23d of September speaks volumes about our colleague, and I am going to take the liberty of quoting it. It says:

A Member's Private View of Congress

(By David S. Broder)

("Member of the House: Letters of a Congressman," by Clem Miller. Charles Scribner's Sons, $2.)

When Clem Miller, a California Democrat, came to Congress in 1959, a few of his friends asked him to send back informal letters about life in the Capitol. He did so, and the result is this unpretentious volume which surely must rank among the best of the portraits of Congress.

Designed chiefly as a supplement to academic texts for college political science courses, "Member of the House" should delight anyone who has watched with puzzlement the workings of the legislative branch.

> These are no ordinary newsletters, aimed at building the reputation of the Congressman and flattering the prejudices of his constituents. Mr. Miller was flabbergasted by much of what he found in Washington, and he set his reactions down in the heat of the moment, between telephone buzzers and quorum bells as he puts it.
>
> The book is a mural of deftly observed congressional scenes—the contrasting moods in the Democratic cloakroom, the delicate diplomacy of a committee "markup" session, the tactics of floor debate.
>
> The Congressman has a novelist's touch when it comes to sketching the backgrounds and characterizing the actors in the legislative drama. The omission of proper names will not be much of an obstacle to any reader even slightly familiar with the Capitol scene.
>
> More important, he has a steady curiosity about what makes Congress move, the sources of influence and their use. In delineating the impact of personality on legislation he is at his best.
>
> It is a remarkable book, and a stimulating one.

Let me cite a summary paragraph on page 106 of his book which shows great insight and sensitivity as well as the gift to express it succinctly:

> The result of these sharp-honed feelings is an enlarged apperception that is used to scrutinize fellow Members. While Congressmen are quite ordinary in general outline, their practice of the political art has made them knowledgeable in assessing one another. Their instincts, sharpened by this conflict of the personal and the impersonal, enable them to characterize each other to the finest hair. Thus, each Congressman is given his own little pigeonhole, with all his strengths and weaknesses, foibles and tricks, duly noted for use on the proper occasions. Power, then, is the respect which accrues and adheres to those individuals who are best able to stand this daily etching process.

That was our colleague's impression of us. It is high praise. I commend his remarks to you.

As we all know, Clem Miller was the author of the Point Reyes bill, and it is a matter of great personal pride to me that I coauthored the bill with him.

It seems such a tragic irony that in the year of this great conservation achievement he should be struck down. What a cruel waste of a giant spirit and influence for good.

Although Clem came from a most distinguished family, he was always seeking to discover and help in the solutions of social problems. Even before the war he came out to California and worked in the migrant labor camps in order to discover for himself what these problems were all about.

Clem had the courage to be curious and the will to discover answers which might bring about needed reforms.

His war record is well known. Up from the enlisted ranks to Captain. He was proud of his war record, as he had every right to be; but he would only talk about it to recite some humorous incident. He had a puckish sense of humor, and his wit was razor sharp.

I conclude knowing that the grief of the bereaved family is shared by all members of the Cohelan family and we extend our heartfelt condolences. I know that Clem would forgive me and would understand if I read from the Book of Psalms what I believe to be a pertinent passage.

I was reminded last night by the commentary that Psalm 39 is a prayer of one who had long disciplined his impatience with the injustices and sufferings of life by restraining his anger and bridling his tongue.

> Lord, let me know mine end, and the number of my days; that I may be certified how long I have to live.
>
> Behold, Thou hast made my days as it were a span long, and mine age is even as nothing in respect of Thee; and verily every man living is altogether vanity.
>
> For man walketh in a vain shadow, and disquieteth himself in vain; he heapeth up riches, and cannot tell who shall gather them.
>
> And now, Lord, what is my hope? truly my hope is even in Thee.
>
> Deliver me from all mine offenses; and make me not a rebuke unto the foolish.
>
> When Thou with rebukes dost chasten man for sin, Thou makest his beauty to consume away, like as it were a moth fretting a garment: every man therefore is but vanity.
>
> Hear my prayer, O Lord, and with Thine ears consider my calling; hold not Thy peace at my tears;
>
> For I am a stranger with Thee, and a sojourner, as all my fathers were.
>
> O spare me a little, that I may recover my strength, before I go hence, and be no more seen.

May he rest in peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to express my grief over the sudden and tragic death of our colleague, Clem Miller, of the California First District. The news of his loss is shocking to us all, of course, but particularly so to those of us who knew him best.

Clem Miller was, beyond a doubt, a man of this century. He was consistently among the first to endorse progressive proposals looking to the betterment of living conditions and human understanding. He also was invariably among the first to employ new means in reaching the people. Tragically, it was this last factor that spelled his doom. Forsaking older methods of travel, he campaigned for office in a twin-engine private plane, which, we now are told, bore him to his death on Chaparal Mountain, in northern California.

To those of us who had the privilege of knowing him, Clem Miller will always be remembered both as one of the most pleasant and one of the most able of men to sit in this Hall.

His interests and talents were vast in scope, his enthusiasm boundless. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee he instantly acquired a reputation for great knowledge in economic matters. Yet that was but one facet of his personality. He was also a nature lover of the most pronounced sort, and the author of a bill, signed into law only last month, authorizing the 53,000-acre Point Reyes National Seashore Park north of San Francisco.

And what of his overall view of mankind? For that, consult his voting record. Or, better, yet, consult any Member in this House who, during Clem Miller's tenure of office, came forward with any kind of a bill designed for the benefit of the common man. The record will tell you, and all the authors of social reform legislation will tell you, that Clem Miller was deeply concerned in the general welfare of the American people.

Moreover, he came here with no purpose other than to work. That is to say, he appeared in no way concerned with political pettifogging, in the hope of securing higher office. Nor was he inclined to truckle to popular moods of the moment, merely for the sake of playing it safe with his constituents back home. On the contrary, he was a man of honor and determination, and in so saying I speak not merely for myself, but for all of those who knew him well. This House has, indeed, suffered grievously from his death, as have also his family, his constituents, his friends and associates—all of whom knew him as a Gibraltar of integrity in a world that can ill afford to part with such persons at such time as this.

Mr. Speaker, to Mrs. Miller and her loved ones I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in losing our colleague, Clem Miller, we Californians have lost a friend and an able member of our delegation. The First Congressional District of California, and the Nation, have lost a man with boundless energy, unquestioned effectiveness, and utmost sincerity.

We have lost a man who got things done the fair way and the honest way, and a man who never infringed upon the rights and the feelings of his colleagues, regardless of their party.

We extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Miller and her children fully realizing that at this time no words of ours can help to fill the void in their hearts; but as the years go by the spirit behind what we are all trying to say will grow in meaning.

Clem Miller is gone. But he has left a mark which will never fade, and will shine brightly through the years. He has left the mark of a gentleman, an all-American gentleman.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad moment occasioned by the tragic passing of our beloved colleague, Clem Miller. He was not only a very hardworking man, an able man, an intelligent man; he was a good man, he was a kind man.

I got to know Clem more intimately when he was appointed to serve on the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which I have the honor to chair. He brought to his work diligence and devoted attention and all that we expect of a good Congressman. He is certainly a loss to us as he is to his friends and constituents at home, and most of all to his family.

I join all of our colleagues here today in extending to his family our heartfelt condolences. May his memory be for a blessing forever.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Durno].

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 short years that I have been here I have come to know Clem very well. I have come to know him because he represents that western tier of California counties, the First District of California, and I represent the Fourth District of Oregon, the seven southwestern counties which are contiguous to his district.

Our problems have been mutual problems and that is the reason I have come to know him so well. Much has been said about his contribution here to the creation of Point Reyes. I sat on the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Interior and it was my pleasure to work with him on that problem. I attest to all that has been said about his efforts in the creation of Point Reyes. But there are two or three things that have not been mentioned here which I think should be mentioned. One was his untiring efforts, actually the leadership that he exhibited in trying to do something for the lumber industry of the Pacific coast and the Pacific Northwest. His problems in lumber were my problems.

I traveled over much the same territory that he traveled in a joint conference held in Eureka, Calif., just 2 or 3 months ago with Clem. We were trying to unravel some of the serious problems of our lumber industry.

He was one of the firmest advocates of the redwood empire. And when you talk about the redwood empire, you talk about southern Oregon and northern California; you talk about the Redwood Highway between Grants Pass and Crescent City, Calif., where Clem was bound when the untimely accident occurred. We often talked about the recreational facilities of those areas that we represented. I would point out that Clem was not only a conservationist, but he believed in recreation; he believed in lumber; he believed in the multiple uses of our national resources of the West.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my tribute to Clem because he was a good friend of mine, even though we had known each other only a short period of time. Mrs. Durno joins with me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Miller and her charming daughters.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us were stricken by the same sense of disbelief at the news of the tragic and untimely death of our wonderful colleague, Clem Miller. It is hard for the human mind to accept and to reconcile itself to the sudden and unexplained parting of a valued friend. Perhaps the numbness of spirit which all of us feel who knew Clem Miller is a measure of the deep loss which his family, this House, and the country has suffered.

It is often said that the role of the Congressman is threefold: to be a legislator, to be an arbiter between his district and the Federal Government, and to be an educator.

Clem Miller was all of these.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I serve, Clem was a diligent and imaginative member. He was respected by those who served with him and by those who appeared before the committee.

In matters relating to his constituents and to his district he was at the same time persuasive and tenacious. Nothing was too difficult and nothing was too insignificant for his concern.

As an educator Clem had few equals because he took the time to think honestly and converse with the people of his district and it is a better district today for the time and thought he put to this task.

Last week a book was published, written by Clem Miller, entitled, "Member of the House." This book reveals more eloquently than perhaps anything I can say here that Clem Miller was indeed a Member of the House in the best and highest tradition of this body. He was all that a Congressman can be, he was all that a gentleman can be, he was all that a man can be.

My deepest and most heartfelt sympathy, Mr. Speaker, goes to his family at this tragic moment.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from California and the members of the California delegation and other Members of the House of Representatives in paying tribute to a great American, a very effective Member of this body, and a warm personal friend of mine, Clem Miller.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of a friend always brings sadness. We cannot understand but neither do we question. If we should try to question what is taking place we could never understand why a man in the very prime of his life, in the beginning of what promised to be an outstanding congressional career, should be taken from us. We cannot understand these things, neither do we question them.

Clem Miller, completing his second full term as a Member of this body, endeared himself to all of us who were privileged to know him.

He proved to be an active, a diligent, and a very effective representative of a great district in his State of California which sent him to the Congress.

During the period of my service in this body there have been many occasions such as this, yet I do not remember any other occasion in which the pall of sadness and sorrow has ever pervaded this Chamber as it does today.

Mr. Speaker, if I could paraphrase the Englishman, John Donne, I would say this House, this Nation, his State and, of course, his district, and his beloved family are diminished by the tragedy which has taken Clem Miller from us. As John Donne said, "No man is an island. He is a part of the whole. As each grain of sand is washed into the sea, so the continent is diminished that much."

Mr. Speaker, we join in sorrow and in reverent tribute to our departed friend Clem Miller. Yet we would not ask for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Flynt and our children join me in extending to Mrs. Miller and their lovely daughters our condolence and our love and our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, once again a divine providence has called one of our colleagues home.

Clem Miller was dedicated to those things in which he believed. He and I disagreed on many issues, but we were close personal friends. I will miss his presence here.

To his wife and family, I extend my deepest sympathy. May God grant them the faith to say "The Lord giveth, the Lord taketh away, blessed be the name of the Lord."

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the death of any man is inevitably a loss. The death of a man in the prime of life is a tragedy to his friends, to his family, and to his loved ones. Of very few men do I think it can honestly be said that his death is a tragic loss to his country and, in fact, to the people of the world. I feel that the untimely death of Clem Miller is such a loss. I feel so because he had unique qualities of mind and spirit. The living monuments to Clem Miller, which he created himself, at Point Reyes and in his fine book that I have had the opportunity to read, combine together to show that he did have the unique qualities of which I speak. He had wit—but it was kindly. He had courage—but it was tolerant. He had wisdom—but it was not arrogant. I feel that we here in this Chamber and all of the people of the country, those who knew him, and those who never heard of him, have suffered a loss, because his potential for good was beyond that of most men with whom I have had the opportunity to speak and of most men of whom I have read.

Mrs. Bolling and I give our heartfelt sympathy to his wife, to his children, and to the other members of his family.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Pfost].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it does not seem possible that the flags should fly at half mast over our Nation's Capitol today for our good friend and colleague, Clem Miller.

Only last week he was here with us—so alert—so alive and so vigorous.

When Congressman Miller came to the Congress in 1959, his office was located on the same hall with mine, in the Old House Office Building.

I can attest to the fact that he was a vigorous and dedicated worker for the people of his district.

He was aggressive in getting through the Congress the legislation he knew was important to his district and his State.

I recall his persistence in pursuing the Point Reyes National Seashore legislation—and the assistance he rendered to our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—in bringing helpful information to us.

Looking back, it seems to me he must have had an inner drive, inner force or feeling there would not be time to get all the things done he wanted to do.

He was a leader—coordinating and cooperating with his colleagues, writing us frequently, inviting our assistance in a particular program he was interested in furthering.

He will be missed by all of us.

I join in extending sympathy to his wonderful wife and lovely daughters, his mother and the rest of his family.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, each of us who knew Clem Miller had for him a sincere affection and respect. Each of us, I suppose, knew him in a different way. In my 2 years of acquaintanceship I came to know him as a dedicated man, always willing to share with me his time and help me in the many problems that come before us for consideration. As a new Member of the House, I had much to learn. My fund of knowledge has been substantially contributed to by Clem Miller.

I found him a vigorous and successful advocate of those things in which he believed. I saw the importance for a legislator to have the persistence and intelligence to adequately prepare his case and to have a sense of fairness and integrity that make it possible for him to get the support of his colleagues.

Each of us will remember Clem Miller for many things, but I will remember him most as one who truly loved and understood the law, one who appreciated the proper place of government in our society; an honest, courageous liberal.

His loss to the district, the State, and the Nation is great. It is great to each of us who shared his friendship. My family joins in extending love and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Miller and her daughters.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I first became acquainted with Clem Miller back in 1959 when we both came to Congress. I have found him through the years to be a quiet, steady man of broad knowledge and sound convictions. Without exception, my esteem for him grew every time I met him and talked with him. We often counseled together and exchanged views, especially in the field of agriculture and conservation. He had a unique awareness of the problems of agriculture, both on the eastern and the western seaboards; and I, being from the Midwest, found it valuable to exchange views with him from time to time. In fact, the very day he left to fly back to California, we discussed for probably 20 minutes what had happened with regard to agriculture in this Congress and in the past years, and what would probably happen in the next few years.

I have been in his home. He was a personal friend, and his wife was a personal friend of my wife.

I found him to be a man who actually would combine intellect with practical experience. He was willing to analyze each individual issue upon its merits, and was never hesitant to challenge old idols. We need more like him in the Congress of the United States. He supported what he thought was right, whether he thought it was popular or not; in short, he was a leader rather than a follower.

We will never have enough citizens or Members of Congress like Clem Miller, and his loss is a loss to the entire Nation.

Mrs. Smith and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Miller and their family.

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to one of our colleagues who came to the 86th Congress together with many of us who were first elected in that year. Clem Miller, although of opposite political faith, was a friend of mine. His wife, Kay, is a very dear friend of my wife. I want to express my deep affection that we as a family have for these two marvelous people that California saw fit to send to the Congress of the United States.

It was my privilege to have been in his district on numerous occasions. Last spring I was out there, and I know something of the love and affection which the people of that area shared for Clem Miller and his wife.

We and our family hope that Kay will be often in Washington, we hope her children will grow up here, and that we shall have further opportunity to know her and to know them.

We express to all members of his family our very deepest heartfelt sympathy and we hope that there will be happiness in their lives.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Congressman Miller is a loss not only to his family, it is a loss to this entire Congress and the Nation as a whole.

Clem Miller was a trial examiner for the National Labor Relations Board before being elected to the Congress. He brought to this Chamber a background of knowledge and experience in labor-management relations that few men have been able to equal.

Last year it was my privilege to be chairman of a subcommittee investigating the National Labor Relations Board. The whole method of resolving labor-management disputes was considered. Throughout that investigation Clem Miller, even though he had tremendous responsibilities of his own, in his committee and with other legislation in which he was interested, he shared with me his very rich experience and knowledge in the very difficult field of labor-management relations. Throughout our report, which helped pave the way for a better atmosphere of labor-management relations in America, you will find the advice and counsel that was given to our committee by Clem Miller. If, indeed, we have better labor-management relations today under the reorganized board, a great deal of credit and tribute goes to the advice and suggestions which were given to our committee by Congressman Miller. I mention this aspect of Congressman Miller's background as an addendum to the many other attributes already mentioned here this morning. Clem Miller was truly an amazing man whose varied interests and knowledge reached into every corner of our social structure. His loss will be felt by the working men and women as well as all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, if there is such a thing as a shred of consolation at a moment like this to the bereaved family of Congressman Miller, I hope they will find this shred of consolation in the knowledge that they do not grieve alone; their grief is shared by each and every one of us.

Every American shares with his family the loss of a great Member of Congress and a dedicated public servant, because Clem Miller's activities affected the lives, the future, the welfare of our entire Nation.

Mrs. Pucinski and I extend our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Miller and her five daughters. We share with them their tragic loss.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us who come to this body try to identify the sources of power and we look around for ways to be more effective as Representatives in Congress. I think that Clem Miller, as was so well indicated in his book, has been able in a brilliant fashion to identify the forces at work in the House of Representatives. Yet he was not the kind of person who would simply go out of his way to cultivate sources of power; rather, he sought to identify and understand them.

Despite the fact he did not go out of his way simply to cultivate the sources of power, Clem Miller managed to pile up a remarkable legislative record on behalf of his district, the State of California, and of the Nation. Yet, I think the real measure of a man is not how well he can cultivate those in positions of power, but what is thought of him by the clerks, the page boys, the charwomen, the deliverers of mail, the secretaries in the offices, and all those others who work together to make this Congress function.

Mr. Speaker, I have been literally amazed in the last day, since the tragic news reached us, at the expressions of deep sympathy and warm human sentiment that have come from these average people, all of whom admired Clem Miller, his courage, his integrity, and his outspoken devotion to principle.

I suspect that toward much of what I am to say, and have said, if Clem Miller were here, with a characteristic gesture he would say "Let us dispense with this pretense and let us get down to business, the real business of legislating in the House of Representatives."

Mr. Speaker, CLEM MILLER was an extraordinary man, a man of great brilliance. At the same time he was a man of kindly and human sentiments, and an easy, personally unselfish, and friendly manner. I remember, for example, when I first came with him to Congress in 1959. His office was right next door to mine. Frequently he would come into the office and would talk about some of the things that puzzled him about Congress. Yet he always had a faith and an optimism which was borne out by what he was able to accomplish here. In particular, he had a very great personal interest in the passage of the area redevelopment legislation which meant so much to the State of West Virginia and to other areas of high unemployment throughout the country. This, of course, may seem unusual because in CLEM MILLER's district in California there were not any of these areas which would benefit by the legislation. Yet he went out of his way to get information to help in the passage of this bill. He lobbied the bill with individual Members, he secured and obtained support for the bill in the Banking and Currency Committee and on the floor. Everyone in West Virginia owes a debt to CLEM MILLER for what he did toward moving the area redevelopment bill to final passage; not only in West Virginia do they owe him a debt, but in the balance of the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have already mentioned the remarkable book which CLEM MILLER has written. I hope every Member of the House of Representatives will read this book. It will give him a sense of perspective in the House of Representatives and what each of us can do to improve this, the greatest legislative body in the world. I, frankly, have never read a book on the House of Representatives which is as fascinating, provocative, or as true to life as CLEM MILLER's book.

Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps one way we could pay tribute to CLEM MILLER's memory would be for us here in the House of Representatives to work toward doing away with some of the outmoded practices that exist in Congress and pay greater attention to our legislative duties.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a difficult task to adequately deliver a posthumous eulogy because it is impossible to transmute the dimensions and complexities of a great, complex, and sensitive man into a mere verbal description or a catalog of qualities. Furthermore, it all is said because the eulogy was deserved earlier.

The Honorable CLEM MILLER's immediate family can recall him as a wonderful husband, father, brother, or son as the case may be. We in Congress are privileged to recall him as a true friend because we knew him and worked closely with him long enough to learn that he was a true and wonderful friend and this description is high praise indeed.

But we in the Congress have another privilege. We can recall him as a dedicated public servant. CLEM MILLER became a Congressman—not for money or notoriety—but because he felt that public service was the career which best provided the scope for his desire and ability to help other people. In the course of choosing and pursuing that political career he made many personal sacrifices—the last and most tragic being the gift of life itself. He died in the service of his country as surely as any soldier on the battlefield and he will be long remembered in this august body and across our great land as a brave, good, and faithful public servant.

Mrs. Hagen and I join in expressing our deepest sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, CLEM MILLER: Member of the House.

After 4 years of service in the House of Representatives, these are the words he chose for himself.

CLEM MILLER: Member of the House.

CLEM MILLER loved the House of Representatives not just for what it is, but for what he hoped to help it to be.

When CLEM was elected to the House in 1958, he was an example of the best of the American political tradition. He sought election not for what he could get but for what he could give.

When he and I started to serve in the 86th Congress and sat side by side on the Banking and Currency Committee, I sometimes feared that this fierce idealist would be broken on the wheel of practical politics.

Mr. Speaker, I erred in my measure of the man. CLEM MILLER remained forever the fighting idealist, but without losing one whit of his idealism, he added a new dimension—he became an effective Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, an effective idealist is the rarest gem on the political scene.

The State of California and the Nation will suffer from the loss of a man who will fight for such things as the lumber and fishing industries of the West, the Point Reyes Park, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

But most of all I believe that this institution—the House of Representatives—will suffer. No Member who ever served in the House loved it more.

Yet, love did not blind CLEM to the faults of the House. He felt that in a changing world the evolutionary process in the House had stopped. His mission, as he saw it, was not revolutionary, but merely to start the evolutionary process working again.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that CLEM's many friends of the freshman 86th Congress and of other years share his conviction. Like CLEM MILLER we love this institution and seek only to see that it remains as it has been in the past, the greatest legislative body the world has ever seen.

CLEM MILLER: Member of the House. These are his words.

Today, I should like to add my words, "CLEM MILLER, my friend."

As we look back over our lives we remember friends who appeared in the difficult days, days of leaving home for kindergarten, going away to college or in the battles of war.

Many people share these experiences, relatively few share the experience of serving in Congress together. Even fewer start this service together and share together the wounds inflicted by the slings and arrows of the outraged oppositon in a political campaign.

CLEM and I began together and we shared together. Even more than this Katy and Lucy began together and they share together.

Our children went to school together, visited each other and they shared.

The Millers shored up the Moorheads and, I hope, the Moorheads shored up the Millers.

A person who has not been through a political campaign may not be able to understand the strong bonds that are forged by this shared experience.

For me, Mr. Speaker, these bonds are so strong that mere death cannot break them.

For me, Mr. Speaker, so long as I serve in the House of Representatives and afterward, CLEM MILLER, Member of the House, will always be at my side whispering in my ear the words of his unquenchable idealism.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL].

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I think most newcomers who come to the House of Representatives try in the early months of their service to measure up their colleagues for judgment, balance, skill, persuasion, and for the more personal characteristics and qualities as well. I think most new Members find that sooner or later they single out two or three Members of the House and say to themselves, "That is the kind of Congressman I would want to be."

I went through this process when I came here a year ago. Regretfully, I never told CLEM MILLER this, but I want to tell his wife and family today that their husband and father was one of the men I had singled out to emulate, and I hope I can continue to strive to emulate him, because CLEM MILLER was my kind of Congressman. I think those of us, his colleagues, here today can agree that in his short service he had become as so few of us become, a "Congressman's Congressman."

The Almighty in His wisdom blessed this wonderful man with a happy and unique combination of intellectual brilliance, incorruptible honesty, kindness, good humor, sound judgment, and quiet persuasiveness. These made him a pleasure to work with and an inspiration to know.

He was a practical man. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] when he said that CLEM MILLER was an "effective idealist," captured in those two words the spirit of this remarkable man.

He had, as has been said here today, a remarkably gifted pen. I think his superb, perceptive reports on the workings of the House of Representatives have never been equaled. I do not think anyone will ever again have that facility of capturing the spirit of the workings of this House.

I was privileged to be on his list to receive his periodic writings. I went to my files this morning and just plucked one newsletter at random. I should like to share with my colleagues who have not had the privilege of reading this man's work, a small part of his observations he made on the functioning of the House.

Clem Miller was talking about people who come here and are disturbed and puzzled by the way Congress operates.

Let us listen to him a moment:

> These visitors from everywhere look down on a vast Chamber, 139 feet long by 92 feet wide, which seats more than 400. Their eyes light on 30 to 50 Members, scattered about without any apparent design, and they hear voices drone back and forth. "I have an amendment at the desk." "Third reading." "A motion to reconsider is laid upon the table."
>
> "Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the desk." It may well be in another language. Yet, in its own manner, the business of our country is being conducted. This is the routine.
>
> Upon occasion the orderly routine business of the House will erupt into high excitement. It is difficult to believe that this Chamber which is so still one moment can seethe with such a ferment in the twinkling of an eye. These moments are rare, perhaps four or five times in a session. The Members jam the Chamber, listening, and jumping up for recognition in clusters, finger pointed, and the cries rise like the wind. The excitement is electric.
>
> This is a moment of drama as distinguished from mere activity and motion, say, on a rollcall. Congressmen hurry through the streets, work their way through the halls, packing into elevators, disgorging and rounding the corner into the Speaker's lobby, going full tilt, past banks of bystanders waiting to talk to Members—till they burst on the floor in a flood, then stand stock-still to catch the rhythm of the rollcall. Abbitt, Abernathy, Adair, Addabbo, Addonizio. The hubbub of the moment is disconcerting. Garmatz, Gary, Gathings, Gavin, Giaimo.
>
> As the call continues, knots of Members gather to get the word—what's the vote? Others cock an ear to catch the responses of trusted friends. Rushing in late, they may grab the committee report on the bill and wait for the second round. Young, Younger, Zablocki, Zelenko. In all the hurly-burly and noisy confusion, it is rare that a Member makes a mistake in casting his vote. If he should, he can go to the well of the House at the conclusion to change his vote. Generally, a little checking, a sharp question or two, and one is ready. May, Meader, Merrow, Michel.
>
> Very sincerely,
>
> Clem Miller.

A poet said:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

Clem Miller has left his footprints on the Senate of California and on the United States of America. California is a better place, the United States of America is a better place, and I say, Mr. Speaker, this great legislative body is a better institution because Clem Miller lived.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the untimely death of Congressman Clem Miller He was a courageous liberal—a fighter for the people's interest and a vigorous champion of his district. His district has lost an effective spokesman; the House has lost an invaluable Member, a Member who cared deeply about human values. To Clem Miller the struggle for the full achievement of human rights and the protection of civil liberties was never ending.

Mr. Speaker, I will always remember how he encouraged me when, as a new Member of the House of Representatives, I had taken a position on a controversial measure which was being considered by the House. I found Clem Miller to be a warm friend and a sympathetic and sound adviser.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our former colleague and express my profound sympathy to his wife and wonderful children.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with our colleagues in paying respects to the memory of Congressman Clem Miller of the First District of California. It was not my privilege to be closely associated with him on any of the committee work nor was I privileged to be associated with him socially. I did learn, however, of his independent judgment here on the floor and respected it.

Mrs. Younger and myself extend our deep sympathy to his family in their bereavement.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya].

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes we are prone to take our colleagues for granted. It takes a tragedy to arouse our inner powers of appraisal and evaluation of the wealth of character about us. Our departed colleague, to many of us, was not in this spectrum because, although he was only completing his second term, he had already penetrated the atmosphere of this body with his friendliness, his dedication and vibrant sense of duty.

During the last few weeks, he was sporting a smiling persuasion that penetrated the heart, that subdued the human doubt, that kindled the dormant desire of many of his colleagues—he was pleading for his district and for his people. That he was successful, that he found reception—of this there is no doubt. As he approached the beachhead of success, the light of life went out for him, but he left a monument which will rise in all its splendor to give testimony to his constituents that their Congressman performed well and fulfilled his task.

The flow of words cannot fill the vacuum nor replenish the loss that his bereaved family feels from his passing. In extending my condolences to his fine family, I trust that they will find comfort and solace in the realization that our departed colleague invigorated the working blueprints for enhancing America's destiny.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives has lost an able, sensitive, and intelligent legislator with the death of Representative Clem Miller. It was my privilege to know Mr. Miller both as a colleague and as a friend.

He espoused the causes of his district, his State of California, the Pacific Northwest, and the Nation with persistence, skill, insight, and fairness. During his two terms he devoted his legislative efforts to a commendably wide range of interests—conservation, flood control and harbors, economics, small business and the global issue of peace and war in our time.

We consulted frequently this session on the economic plight of the Northwest lumber industry. His knowledge and suggestions in the area were of marked assistance to many of us from the Northwest.

Most recently he has penned a volume of delightful letters under the title "Member of the House: Letters of a Congressman." One reviewer ranked the work "among the best portraits of Congress."

The shock of an unexpected death of a friend is for those who know him akin to the world quieting down for a moment from its hectic preoccupations. This was my feeling as I felt the stab of acknowledgment that Clem Miller is dead. I wish to express my sorrow to Mrs. Miller and the five Miller children. I hope that the true and justifiable tributes that we are paying here on the floor today will give wife and children a portrait of the esteem a husband and father is held in the workaday world.

This morning, also, I had a call from my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Oregon, Congressman Ullman. He is not able to be on the floor today. He asked me to express to Mrs. Miller and the children his sympathy and sorrow at this time.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Slack].

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of our colleague, Clem Miller, in an unpredictable airplane accident came as a great shock to me, as I know it must have to all of you in this Chamber. He first came to serve in the House at the same time I did, and many of us who first saw service in the 86th Congress found that we had much in common. His character soon revealed itself to be that of a good friend and stanch ally, and I for one will miss him greatly.

He was a hard and productive worker, and the excellence of his efforts was equaled only by his generosity in lending his talents to assist others with similar convictions. The quick turn of fate which took him from our midst has not only ended a worthy career of public service but has also called a halt to the inevitable progress of a man who was headed for outstanding status in the coming years.

The Congress and the Nation as a whole have both lost an asset in the death of CLEM MILLER, and the people of his district will search long to find his equal. Along with many of his friends, I take this occasion to extend my sincere condolences to his wife and family, and I hope they will take some small consolation from the knowledge that his personal qualities, professional abilities, and legislative attainments were recognized by all of us who served with him.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of our distinguished colleague CLEM MILLER once more calls to our attention the sudden finality of God's call to everlasting life.

In the minds of men in this instance it seems cruel and to no avail to human kind to bring to a close the career of a religious and God-fearing man in the midst of his valuable work in the service of the Republic—but the Almighty in His infinite wisdom has so decreed and we can but say—"Thy will be done."

It is with a sense of deep affection that we of the Congress venerate his name. He died at his work—giving public utterance to the principles of the Democratic Party. He believed in and supported the administration's program in the Congress. He enthusiastically went among the electorate in his district advocating the Frontier cause of the Democratic Party. He was popular and sincere in his every oratorical effort to advance his party's fortunes in the entire State. His great loss to the party will be difficult to retrieve through the political power of a replacement.

In the Congress his practical work on conservation was outstanding. In his gentle, soft-spoken way he impressed everyone with his brilliant analysis of problems at hand. He was cool and collected in presenting his studied treatment of his subject. His deep understanding of social problems contributed much to his recognition and standing among his colleagues. His progressive attitude toward practical reforms reflected his humanitarian ideals.

His life was cut off before its fullness of accomplishment—yet while he worked among us he made his mark in the legislative area of his choice—conservation, economics, and social legislation.

In times of misfortune we resort to prayer and in this tragedy we join our prayers with those of his dear wife Katharine and family. May the great heritage that he has given to his lovely wife and children give them strength in this their greatest trial and heartbreaking sadness. May the Almighty reward him with the blessings of faithful life in the service of his fellow man and his adherence to the tenets of a religious life. His death brings this poem to my mind:

THE SCATTERED LEAVES LIKE SOULS THAT DIE

He knew that life would end someday—
  All live to die in life's foray,
But never to himself did say
  That sudden death would be his way.

Yet so God wills that men shall die
  As though a message from the sky
Like leaves that fall and scattered glide
  Upon the ground to drift and die.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, at this point in these unusually lengthy but beautiful eulogies of the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. CLEM MILLER, I should like to add a brief but nonetheless sincere word. I truly feel that the Congress of the United States has lost one of the most promising, most capable, and most trustworthy legislators that I have seen in my time here in the House of Representatives. It is indeed a tragedy that suddenly takes the life of a distinguished Member who was of such importance to his district, to his State of California, and to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I join in extending sympathy to his lovely widow, their five daughters, and his mother.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House of Representatives, greater love hath no man than this, than he who is willing to lay down his life for his friends. CLEM MILLER was that type of gentleman. He truly gave up his life serving the best interests of his people and the country.

Mr. Speaker, last November I had the pleasure of visiting CLEM's district. He was a gracious host, was loved by all. He had a keen and sincere interest in the problems of those he had the honor to serve. CLEM will be missed by all of us. I would not want this occasion to pass without joining my colleages from California and, yes, every Member of this body, in saying to the family that we shall miss CLEM, his many talents, his service, his smile, and his wonderful ways.

Mr. Speaker, I realize in an hour like this, words do not ease the grief that is theirs, or really comfort them; however, I want to extend our deepest sympathy to the family in this sad time of bereavement.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, CLEM MILLER was all of the wonderful things that our colleagues and our dear friends have said. He was an extremely great and successful man. God in His infinite wisdom has called CLEM MILLER. We find it a tragedy, as does CLEM's family, but I say, as my colleagues have said, that he was a very successful man, successful in the infinite, for CLEM MILLER truly loved his fellow man. This is the highest—the very highest—achievement.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded at this sad hour of the counsel that my old-fashioned mother always gives me: "May the Lord be between thee and all harm, particularly that of sin."

Mr. Speaker, here was a great man, CLEM MILLER, who served his fellow man and served him to the very death. This is truly one of God's children whom God has called home to an everlasting life.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion pass without joining to pay my respect to CLEM MILLER.

Mr. Speaker, whatever else may have been said here today, CLEM was our friend. He was a friend of all of his colleagues.

We are here today to pay tribute to our colleague the gentleman from California and the good friend of all who knew him.

Like several of us on the House side of the Congress, CLEM came in as a Member of the 86th Congress and he was always proud to say he was a member of the 86 Club.

I have walked through the tunnel repeatedly with CLEM, and we frequently discussed problems in our home districts. From time to time our conversation would turn to the size of California's First District, which stretches from the Golden Gate nearly 300 miles north to the Oregon border. He knew the immense job it was to try to meet the constituents in a district so large and the problems of travel over such an area and even mentioned about the only way the district could be covered was by plane. It is now a matter of record that he was on his way to make a campaign appearance way up on the northern California coast when his plane was lost and later found on the slope of a mountain.

CLEM MILLER was a resourceful man. He could talk eloquently and he had a most unusual sense of humor. It is now known that his book "Member of the House: Letters of a Congressman," has recently been published. I suppose many of us will recall a writing that was circulated back during the 86th Congress which had as its general subject matter descriptions of fellow Members and their predicted attitudes concerning legislation which would be subsequently considered by the House. This was in the form of a letter sent to every Member and, although there was no signature or identification, many of our colleagues felt at the time that it was so well written, containing so much real fun expressed in such a clever manner and carrying punch lines that were most unusual, it could have been written by only one Member. Many of us at the time had strong suspicions that this came from the pen of CLEM MILLER. Now we will never know, but we do know that CLEM MILLER was a man who did his homework and undertook to study every issue very thoroughly and understood every issue that was being debated before the House.

Our friend seldom took the well, but when he did he could always command the attention of those in attendance. He was known as a hard worker on the committees to which he was assigned and highly respected by all of his colleagues.

Over on the west corridor of the ground floor of the New House Office Building hearts were heavy yesterday when the word came that the plane was lost. There are three Californians in that corridor and this one Missourian, and again and again we would go from office to office to see if any word had been received and then, with sadness, we learned in the afternoon that we had lost our friend.

Yes, that is about as good a way to put it as any. We have all lost a friend, and the loss is that not only of his colleagues but his constituents and the people of California and, for that matter, friends in the field of conservation across this country, because he was a progressive legislator strongly dedicated to his work, hard working at all times, and an able man who understood clearly what he was trying to accomplish.

Our sympathy goes to his fine family in their hour of bereavement.

They will have consolation in knowing Clem was loved and respected by all of his colleagues.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are heavy today at the untimely loss of a friend and colleague, Clem Miller. It was not my privilege to know Clem as a close friend. Somehow the swirling currents that carry us all so inexorably in Washington never paralleled my course with Clem Miller's. We were not on the same committees nor did we happen to serve together in close personal contact.

Nonetheless, I am bestirred to rise today to pay tribute to Clem Miller. He was a man you instinctively admired and trusted. There was always an element of serenity in his demeanor; a friendly smile, a playful sparkle in his eyes. He believed in his party and in his own mission as a Congressman. He was a Democrat; I a Republican. My respect for him as an indivdual and as a Congressman transcends those party lines.

As an aside, Mr. Speaker, Clem Miller and I were both graduates of Williams College in Williamstown, Mass.; he in 1940 and I in 1948. He loved his college in the "purple hills" and his life added new laurels to the glorious traditions of Williams. We honor him as a fallen brother who served his country and his conscience valiantly in war and in peace.

Would that we could convey to his widow and his five daughters the heartache and the dreadful sorrow we share with them today. Perhaps the knowledge that others feel a measure of their own grief can bring them comfort. May God sustain them in the painful months ahead.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, occasionally, very rarely, in life's stream, there is a man who can and does give friendship to thousands who know him, and who can and does provide in his friendship a special quality of understanding that makes his friends better and greater men. Such a man was Clem Miller. High in the ranks of statesmen, in the blessings of an able mind, in the attainments of character and accomplishment, his highest and best quality was his capacity for helpful and inspirational friendship. My heart and prayers go out for his beloved wife and children. Theirs is a rich heritage, though their grief is even more intense because of this. Millions of men live to old age on this earth without achieving a small fraction of what this man did; though he has left us at an early age. We in Congress can show our affection for him best by trying in our day to do our best to follow his excellent example.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Clem Miller, for whom we mourn today, was struck down in the most unfortunate circumstances, and at a time when he was in the midst of a fine and significant career of service to the people of his California district, and to his State, and Nation.

The late, great Sam Rayburn said of him:

> I have served with many young men who have come to the House of Representatives, but none has impressed me more than Clem Miller. We can always count on Clem Miller to do a responsible job. I am sure his constituents will understand the value of having a man representing them in Congress who is experienced.

The present Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], spoke of our former colleague this way:

> Clem Miller has represented the people of his district with outstanding ability and great courage. He has always supported progressive measures and legislation for more effective national defense.

I knew Clem Miller well. He was born October 28, 1916, in Wilmington, Del. He was the son of a fine civil engineer, Clement W. Miller, and his grandfather, Charles Miller, was a Republican, and a Governor of Delaware.

What was Delaware's loss was California's gain.

We worked together on many measures. He was an ardent conservationist, and one of the first bills he introduced upon coming to Congress in 1959 called for preservation of Point Reyes from urban encroachment for public recreation use as a unit of the National Park System.

He cosponsored with me legislation to establish the Peace Corps, and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Perhaps it was the common experience of our Delaware beginnings which we shared that found us voting and working for many of the same things.

Recently Charles Scribner's Sons published a compilation of Congressman Miller's monthly letters to his constituents which David S. Broder, the book reviewer for the Sunday Star, a great newspaper of the Nation's Capital, called a remarkable book, and a stimulating one.

I include here one of the newsletters which gives his enlightened view of the Congress, a letter which any one of us, I am sure, would be proud to have written.

People and the Public Interest—How Clem Miller Sees His Job

Congress is the most all-consuming job I have ever tackled. Meeting people up and down the district, talking with them, sizing up an opportunity or a problem, finding a way to solve it, then working with others in Washington to do it—this is the constant challenge.

Congress is people too—435 altogether, and all different. Congress is also a complicated piece of legislative machinery. So it can work, the committee system was built up by the Founding Fathers. There are 17 House committees which hammer legislation into shape. Mine is Banking and Currency. It was my choice because so many bills affecting the north coast—including our lumber and homebuilding industries and urban and suburban areas—are assigned to it.

Congressmen are first and foremost concerned with representing the people of their districts. For example, among those I represent are the farmers of my district; and their interests are not the same as farmers elsewhere.

I also represent city people, many of whom want to preserve our seashores and forests. I also represent people whose livelihood depends on national forest timber. Helping resolve conflicting interests so that the public interest is served, is a basic part of the job. Last session, because of the interests of my constituents, I was able to play a substantial role in determining final form of a new law spelling out improved "multiple-use" policies for our national forests.

Another basic responsibility of every Congressman is to vote on appropriation bills. Under the Constitution these bills originate in the House of Representatives. Requests for appropriations come from the President in the form of an annual budget. The Congress then works it over. (Congress has trimmed $13 billion from Presidential budgets over the last 8 years.) Most appropriations—about 80 cents out of every tax dollar—are for national defense, and almost all appropriation bills are adopted by nearly unanimous voice votes.

How to appropriate wisely for essential Government responsibilities and services is the problem.

For example, I have voted against what I consider wasteful and disruptive spending for "military hardware" for certain foreign nations, and have introduced legislation to halt excessive grain price support subsidies and surplus storage costs, and for systematic reduction of the national debt.

On the other hand, I have supported and will continue to support what I consider responsible appropriations for national defense, education, basic research, and other essential public needs. These are our national life insurance and our capital investment in America. True economy—for our country, just as for a family—includes sound investment for the future.

Representative government calls for a two-way partnership. The mail from home (including an almost overwhelming response to my questionnaire on issues before Congress) and thousands of face-to-face conversations in the hometowns of the district have helped my understanding immeasurably.

Very sincerely,

Clem Miller.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, not only California's First District lost a great Congressman but the Nation too.

In the few short years that I had the privilege of knowing Congressman Miller, I learned to respect and value his opinions.

We had many interesting conversations together and I always found him to be eager to learn the viewpoints of the older Members of Congress as to what he should do or should not do.

To his lovely wife and five daughters, Mrs. Miller's husband and the girls' daddy was quite a fellow.

We will always miss him.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing my profound sorrow at the untimely and tragic passing of our colleague, the Honorable Clem Miller, a trusted and esteemed friend.

It was a privilege for me to serve in the House with him. He was a man who served his district and country with dedication, particularly in the field of natural resources and conservation. He took an active interest in international affairs, contributing in a large measure to the creation of the disarmament agency.

The tragedy which has interrupted his career in the prime of life inflicts a heavy loss upon his family and the people of his district and State. Words cannot adequately express the feelings of sorrow aroused by the shocking news that someone so young and so capable should be suddenly taken from our midst.

My wife joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his wife, children, mother, and family. May they derive some consolation from the thought that we all share in their deep loss.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed Member, the Honorable Clem Miller, of California.

My association with Clem Miller has been quite recent and was in the interests of the depressed lumber industry in the West. It was enough, however, to give me an insight into the spirit and the attitudes that animated our late neighbor.

Clem Miller was a team player and wanted to cooperate in every way that constructive progress could be made in the direction of real help for a good purpose.

I wish to join others in extending my sympathies to his widow, Mrs. Clem Miller, and their five daughters.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are shocked and saddened by the loss of our esteemed colleague, Clem Miller, of California. I feel particularly moved because he was one of the finest gentlemen I have known, and because we were so closely associated, having come to Congress at the same time.

We have lost a devoted public servant who, having served in the European theater during World War II, had endured much personal sacrifice for love of his country.

Mrs. Stubblefield joins me in paying tribute to this able and dedicated Member of Congress and in expressing our deepest sympathy to his wife, Katharine, and their daughters.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, we all have a personal knowledge of the traditional seniority system of the Congress. We all know that a new Member of Congress must serve a long and exacting apprenticeship before his full capabilities concerning legislative affairs can be developed. The difference between new Members of this House lies in how they spend their time during this apprenticeship.

Our late friend and colleague Clem Miller was elected to the Congress in 1958. Since that time he had devoted every moment of his time to learning how to represent his people effectively and to studying the great issues before the Congress so he might make a worthwhile contribution to our Nation. His quiet determination to make every minute count for his people and our country marked Clem Miller as an exceptional colleague who would be ready and well qualified to offer further significant leadership in the Congress in the years to come.

This legislative body is going to miss the contribution that Clem Miller would have made.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sad and heavy heart that I learned yesterday of the death of our beloved friend and colleague, Clem Miller.

Warmly human in his reaction to all problems which affected his constituents, his country, and his colleagues, Clem dealt with those problems in clear, understandable terms. We will all greatly miss his delightful sense of humor. We will be deprived of his sound, liberal point of view. It is difficult to realize his vibrant personality will be with us no more.

With the deepest sense of loss I want to extend to Clem's wife and to his family, on behalf of my wife and myself, heartfelt condolences and the hope that they will know how much our thoughts are with them.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow concerning the tragic death of my beloved friend and fellow Californian, the Honorable Clem Miller.

The untimely death of this brilliant young man cuts short a political career that gave promise of greatness.

In his brief service in the House of Representatives, it was my privilege to become Clem's friend and to work closely with him on many projects and legislation which benefited our respective districts, the great State of California and our beloved Nation [illegible]

He was truly dedicated to serving the best interests of his people, his State, and the United States of America. His family, his constituents and his colleagues have suffered a great and sad loss. The Nation has lost a remarkable public servant.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is the poorer today because of the loss of Clem Miller. He was a vigorous, dedicated American, who believed in and fought for the future of our country.

His enthusiasm, his intelligence, and his genial good humor made him one of the most popular and useful members of this body. In common with most of the other members of this body, I have lost a personal friend. His tragic death will be felt for many years in the House, for Clem Miller had the mark of a man who would have been one of the real leaders of this body in the future.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying respect and tribute to Congressman Clem Miller. I did not have the privilege of knowing him as well as many of you did, but I did have occasion to visit with him in my office only a very short time ago. One did not have to visit with him very long before you were aware of his great power of perception and dedication. His persuasive abilities were such that he left a lasting memory of his sincere desire to serve the best interests of his constituency, the Nation, and the world.

His untimely passing is a great loss to this House and Congress, but his efforts have left a monument of benefits to every citizen of this country and the world. May we rededicate our efforts in his memory, to the cause of justice that he championed. I express a fond hope that his family may find some consolation in the knowledge that his lasting achievement will bear fruit and comforts to all for many years to come.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to reconcile ourselves to the fact that our beloved colleague, Clem Miller, has passed away. I had the privilege of serving on the Banking and Currency Committee with him when I first came to the Congress. He was a dedicated and devoted public servant and he represented his district well. Clem's office is on the same corridor as mine in the Old House Office Building. No matter what hour of the day or night that I passed his office the door was always open and the typewriters busy. Clem believed in giving the people of his district every possible service. This I hold as an indication of his sincere desire to do a good job in public office.

Clem Miller was loved, honored, and respected by all Members of Congress and we will miss him so very much. His loss will be felt by his district, his State, and the Nation.

I have had great affection and admiration for Clem Miller. He was a great man and a great American. To Mrs. Miller and his five children, may I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we of the California delegation are particularly grieved and saddened by the untimely death of our distinguished colleague, Clem Miller. We knew him best and had perhaps the best opportunity to admire his personal qualities and to observe first hand the outstanding record of service and legislative accomplishment he compiled during his 4 years in the House.

Clem Miller was an able legislator and a dedicated public servant in the highest tradition of this body. He was a good friend and a constant source of inspiration to his colleagues, giving freely of his time and energy to be of assistance to others. Clem possessed rare qualities of leadership and a straightforward approach in his dealings with his colleagues which added to the respect and admiration we had for him.

He was a man of highest principle and personal integrity, possessing a keen sense of responsibility for his congressional duties. While modest and unassuming in his manner, he had an intellectual brilliance which made possible meaningful contributions to the work of his committee and other activities in which he participated.

Clem Miller was also a student of Congress and a keen observer of its customs, procedures, and operations. His book, "Member of the House: Letters of a Congressman," is an interesting and enlightening collection of impressions of how the House carries on its legislative business which is already becoming an invaluable educational tool in political science classrooms.

He was motivated by deep philosophic conviction which made him a stanch supporter of legislation to protect the rights of minorities and to advance the social and economic well-being of the underprivileged. He was a vigorous advocate of the forward-looking legislative program of President Kennedy and worked tirelessly to secure its enactment.

CLEM was also an ardent conservationist. His leadership in sponsoring legislation to preserve the Point Reyes Peninsula area from urban encroachment and to assure public recreational use of this priceless resource resulted this year in the successful enactment of his bill to create the Point Reyes National Seashore as a part of our national park system. For generations to come this beautiful recreational area will be a living monument to CLEM MILLER's memory.

Mrs. Holifield joins me in extending our heartfelt condolences to his devoted wife, Katharine, their five lovely daughters, his mother, and others of his family. Their grief is fully shared by those of us who were privileged to know and to serve with this outstanding American.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I fully share the feeling of loss and sorrow occasioned by the tragic passing of our able and respected colleague, CLEM MILLER. His California colleagues, including myself, are particularly grieved because he was such an outstanding member of our delegation. It would no better serve his memory that I reiterate the fine tributes given him today than it will that I associate myself with all that has been so well said by so many others. But I do wish individually and personally to express to his bereaved family my most sincere condolences. Their sorrow is lightened only because it is shared by so many.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as are all of our colleagues, I am saddened at the untimely death of the Honorable CLEM MILLER, of California, an outstanding and distinguished Member of Congress. His service was characterized by courage, ability and sincere dedication to the public interest.

He was a well-known conservationist, whose good work has resulted in living monuments in a number of pieces of legislation, of which the Point Reyes National Seashore is but one example.

He exemplified all of the qualities which make a truly great legislator. His untiring efforts in the Congress and his vigorous and courageous liberalism endeared him to his colleagues.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as the 87th Congress draws to a close, we are all saddened and shocked by the tragic and untimely death of one of our most beloved Members, Representative CLEM W. MILLER. One of the great rewards of the 4 years I have served in the House was the warm and close friendship of CLEM MILLER. He and I were seated for the first time at the opening session of the 86th Congress. We soon found that our interests were similar and I shall long remember the frequent and friendly visits in each other's offices.

CLEM was the kind of man I like to think of as a representative of the United States. He was physically a hardened and energetic man who knew and enjoyed the outdoor life. Yet few men were as sympathetic to, or as conscientious in serving, the needs of his constituents as he. He not only had a real understanding of the problems of government, but he had the kind of vision that is needed to effectively plan for a future that would assure an ever higher standard of living for the people of this country. His dedicated work in the field of conservation will long be remembered by those who desire a full and proper development of our natural resources.

CLEM MILLER was by background and by his extensive education and experience as a government employee eminently well qualified to represent the people of California. As they shall miss his service as a Congressman, we in the Congress who came to know and respect him so well in these past 4 years shall miss him as a friend and colleague.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, there rarely has been a time in the history of the Congress when the death of one of our country's legislators has occasioned such a sense of personal loss as the passing our beloved colleague, CLEM MILLER, of California.

He was a good friend as well as a great statesman. His friendship can be truly appreciated only by those who knew him personally.

One thing I remember vividly about CLEM MILLER was his friendliness, and in one way or another, he extended his hand of helpfulness to every Member in the House. He was a rare combination of wisdom, integrity, and absolute honesty.

With the passing of this truly great legislator, his own words and deeds in his years of service to God and country are more meaningful than anything I can possibly say.

No one can more deeply feel this loss than I. My deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I feel a deep sense of personal loss. During his association with us CLEM MILLER had enwoven himself in our hearts. He was a man of dedication. He was a statesman with broad outlooks. In war he had risen by merit of accomplishment and his innate sense of leadership from private to captain of infantry. In peace he served his country in the administrative offices with such distinction that the people of his district sent him to Washington as their Representative. In his two terms in the Congress he established himself in the appraisal of his senior colleagues as one of the ablest of the newer Members and one destined for ever-broadening political heights. In the truest sense, by what his life stood for and what in an altogether too short a span of years he had contributed, CLEM MILLER was a great American.

No one ever can understand the pattern of life. We only can accept in faith, even when our finite minds cannot grasp the purpose. We who served with him to our enrichment know that CLEM MILLER left with us an imprint that will be lasting. His influence will be in every legislative decision despite his physical absence. But we shall miss him so very, very much. Our grief is heavy.

To his devoted wife and his fine daughters, I extend my warmest, heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, for each of us who knew him, it is a difficult thing to rise and pay the final tribute to our colleague, CLEM MILLER, of California. The difficulty does not lie in the tribute; CLEM MILLER was a man of rich accomplishments and even greater promise, and the citation of these things comes readily. The difficulty is instead in the heavy realization that we are here closing the book after only the first few chapters have been recorded.

CLEM MILLER was a personal friend of mine, as well as a valued colleague in this House and an effective member of the California delegation. He fought hard for the issues he believed in, both the popular and the unpopular. His positions were firm and unyielding, although he knew as a true student of our democratic process that the art of compromise is often as essential as is the strength of one's convictions.

Were it not for the nature of this occasion we could observe as happy the coincidence that just 2 weeks ago Charles Scribner's Sons published a series of CLEM MILLER's letters to his constituents, entitled "Member of the House."

The House is fortunate to have had so intelligent an observer comment on our role in the greatest deliberative body in the world. His letters are the most lucid pictures of the operations of Congress that I have ever read. With clarity and humor, with dedication and understanding, CLEM MILLER undertook the responsibility of communicating the meaning and the essence of Congress to his constituents. I could not hope to express it better than in his own words, in which CLEM MILLER explained the necessity of face-to-face contact between Congressman and constituent:

> As Representative I am constantly exposed to the represented—to our mutual education and benefit. What the recess trip home also means is that my capacity, as any Congressman's, is taxed to the limit. We are called on in this field of legislation one moment, in another the next moment, and a third shortly afterward. This is in the approved tradition of the United States. It is a kind of testing which Americans insist on. We use it as a yardstick for off years as well as election years. It's an exhilarating experience, but an exhausting one. The long hours of work in Washington, keeping oneself up to the mark on district and national and world affairs, pay off. When I return to Washington I know that I have been through the mill. I have sheaves of notes for action on new proposals: a mental health bill, an upgrading in priority of a proposed harbor project, a new outlook on the civil defense and shelter programs, the need for a new post office, and on and on. A rest of several weeks is in order, then a new session of Congress, and I'm off again.

CLEM MILLER will be missed by his colleagues and his constituents. We are fortunate to have known him; we are doubly fortunate that he has left us an articulate statement of his philosophy. This is small comfort in our loss, but it is a comfort wholly in keeping with the man whose passing we mourn here today.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great life of production and example we all knew in our association with the late and beloved CLEM MILLER, of California. To know him was a privilege, even a lesson in good works and unswerving dedication.

Many things have been said about him in the Congress in the memorial services today. Along with those who said them I heartily endorse the deserved compliments and good things the other Members have said. He was a great Congressman—a fine and outstanding citizen.

I like to think of him, however, as a great personality. He impressed me as having a cheerful and determined outlook on life. He was friendly and seemed to want to share himself with others. I think his personality was of such a nature as to persuade others that life is good, promising, and that life is a vehicle of good works and progressive and productive undertakings.

Mrs. Hemphill and I join with others in expressing to his beloved family our deepest and our continued sympathy.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, CLEM MILLER died a hero's death. Counsels of prudence were all against the plane's being where it was when it was, but CLEM MILLER had a commitment to the group waiting at the end of his flight.

CLEM MILLER was in a very real sense a man of the renaissance. As a horticulturist, he had a compendious knowledge of all living things. One of the leaders in the conservation bloc in Congress, his was the tireless energy which brought the Point Reyes National Seashore into being. A naturalistic viticulturist, his knowledge of California wines was encyclopedic. He was a specialist in labor law and administration.

In his two terms in the House, he had come to love the Congress and to look forward to it as his life work. Particularly, he was interested in making Congress an effective instrument. Just yesterday I received from him a letter pledging his support in the effort to be made in days to come to reform and streamline House procedures:

OCTOBER 4, 1962.

Hon. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: I am very interested in your resolutions regarding the organization of the House. I hope that you will include me in anything regarding these resolutions or their implementation.

Very sincerely,

CLEM.

There was a unifying theme running through all CLEM MILLER's activities. Whether the subject was conservation or foreign policy or civil liberties or the fulfillment of the American promise, CLEM MILLER's activities were distinguished by a reverence for life.

To his wife, Katharine, his daughters, Amey, Abigail, Clare, Marian, and Katharine, his mother, Mrs. Clement W. Miller, his sister, Mrs. Christopher Loundes, and his uncle, Col. Thomas W. Miller, I extend my deepest sympathy for their great loss.

But the loss is not alone theirs: it is the country's. CLEM MILLER was a conscientious and able legislator, a vigilant and imaginative representative of the people, and a fine human being. We will miss him sorely.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in "Member of the House," the very excellent book by Congressman CLEM MILLER, the author made an incisive analysis of "the vital influence of human elements in the process of developing an idea into a law." Congressman MILLER was one of the very few who fully grasped both the relationship between the people and their representatives and the dynamics existing collectively among those representatives.

It has been said that the task of a Congressman may be divided into three areas. The first is that of representing his district, acting as a spokesman, and caring for its needs. The Point Reyes National Seashore Park will be an eternal monument to CLEM MILLER's success in this sector of his congressional responsibility.

The second facet of a Congressman's responsibility is comprised of legislative and committee duties. As his colleague on the Banking and Currency Committee, I can say in all honesty that his performance as a committee member was outstanding. He did his homework. Further he was an original thinker. He presented many ideas of outstanding merit and espoused them with both courage and eloquence.

In the third area, that of educating his constituency, it may be that he was the outstanding Member of the entire Congress. In his book, "Member of the House," published only last week, he presents a collection of letters to constituents showing a remarkable insight into the entire workings of a democratic society and its representative government. Not only his constituents, but each of us may learn much by reading this volume.

The House of Representatives has lost a young Member of infinite promise and substantial achievement. The First District of California has lost an able champion and spokesman. The Nation has lost an eloquent statesman and dedicated citizen. But perhaps the most heartrending of all is the loss to his gracious and charming wife, Katharine, and their five lovely daughters. There is little enough comfort that we can offer his family, but I know that the entire House joins with me in saying that we join with them in their sorrow and mourning of CLEM MILLER's untimely and tragic death.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague and friend, Hon. CLEM MILLER, I always found to be courteous to everyone and he was consistently energetically and promptly performing all of his congressional duties.

I enjoyed frequently sitting with him on the floor of the House and listening to his expression of hopes and loyalties for the economic progress and security of our beloved Nation against aggressors or subversive programs; and he also spoke proudly of his wife and lovely family and frequently told me of his high hopes for them and how much he wished to do his full part to make our Nation even a better place than it is now for them.

I surely will miss him very much. I extend to his lovely wife and all his loved ones the sincere sympathy of myself and my wife who always speaks so cordially of CLEM's lovely wife. The Halls of this great legislative body have lost in an untimely manner this loyal, valiant, young American legislator.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, apprehension and concern swept this House yesterday morning following the announcement that the small private plane carrying Congressman CLEM MILLER had not made its scheduled landing on Sunday night. Mr. MILLER was campaigning for his third term and was traveling between Santa Rosa and Crescent City, Calif. Our fears for his safety have since hardened into the deepest sense of loss and sorrow upon learning on Monday afternoon that no survivors were found amid the wreckage discovered by a ranger after hours of searching the fogbound northern coast of California. Mr. Speaker, this shock is so severe, this hour is so sad that it is impossible to find words which will adequately express our feelings.

Our hearts go out to Mrs. Miller and her five young daughters, three of whom are in school with my children. Only Sunday afternoon my wife and I attended the school's annual dedication service at the National Cathedral where we saw Mrs. Miller shortly before she received the sad news that her husband was missing.

During the short span of 4 years CLEM MILLER made an outstanding record for himself as a highly dedicated and effective Member of the House. He lived up to the standards he set for himself, "to learn the job by doing—to be a responsible, representative, and effective Congressman." A decorated veteran of World War II, he brought the same qualities of courage, devotion and leadership to his work in the House. Without any question he was one of the young, vigorous and able men whose rise in this body was a certainty.

His passing is a tragedy. It deprives his family of a fine and loving husband and father; it deprives the House of one of its most promising and gifted Members; it deprives the Nation of a great American patriot and public servant. Mr. Speaker, I repeat that we are helpless to give full voice to the sadness which overwhelms us when we realize that this fine and able colleague will no longer move among us, sharing in our daily work. It is difficult at such a moment to take comfort; yet we can take comfort from the thought that he lived, that he had already fulfilled his great promise in large measure, that we had the opportunity to know and to love him, and that the greatness of his life and works will live on in our lives and in the lives of all who knew him. "For no work begun shall ever pause for death."

Mrs. Albert and I extend our profound sympathy to Mrs. Miller and her daughters. Our hearts go out to them and our prayers are offered for their courage and solace.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has lost one of its most beloved and valuable Members in the passing of Hon. Clem Miller, of California.

I first became acquainted with Clem in 1959 when he came to Congress. His office was located across the hall from mine. He was a good friendly neighbor. His smile made my day a lot brighter. We had many conversations regarding legislation pending before the House. He was honest and sincere in all his undertakings. His ambition was to be an exceptionally good Congressman, not only for his own district and State, but for the entire Nation. He arrived early at his office and left late. Only last Thursday before departing for California, I had a final visit with him. I was shocked when I heard the radio report that his plane was missing on Sunday, October 7.

Mrs. Kluczynski and I extend our deep sympathy to his widow and children in their great loss.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have been saddened, as have my colleagues, to hear of the tragic death of our dear friend, the Honorable Clem Miller, of California. Although he was not long with us, he made an excellent contribution and will long be remembered. Clem Miller was personable, effective and a dedicated public servant. I recall with great pleasure our many chats together as we discussed the important issues of the day. A man of high intelligence, Clem Miller never deviated from his convictions and was able to present those convictions in a most effective manner.

I want to express to his widow, the daughters and the other members of the family, my heartfelt sympathy because of this tragedy, and my earnest hope that the protection of divine guidance will be with them to sustain them.

I believe that as well as any Member that has ever served in the House of Representatives, our departed friend, Clem Miller, lived by the advice that William Cullen Bryant gave in such a noble fashion in "Thanatopsis":

> "So live, that when thy summons comes to join
> The innumerable caravan which moves
> To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
> His chamber in the silent halls of death,
> Thou go not, like the quarry-slave at night,
> Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained
> By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
> Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch
> About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I share with my colleagues the deep sense of loss that has been engendered by the departure from our midst of our good friend and competent colleague, Clem Miller, of California.

I was privileged to enjoy his friendship, and I had great respect for the ability, fairness, and sense of cooperation which he demonstrated abundantly in his work here in the House of Representatives.

Clem Miller was a high quality type of person, and this makes his absence all the more poignantly felt.

I wish to join with my colleagues in extending a deeply felt expression of sympathy to Clem Miller's wife and children.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, news of Clem Miller's death came as a stunning blow to those of us who knew and were privileged to work with him in the House. It seemed that he had just left us when the first, unbelievable report came in that his plane was missing.

Alas, it was all too true.

Clem will be sorely missed by his good wife Katharine and their five daughters—each will suffer her own deep and very personal sorrow. But the most crushing loss will be felt by the many thousands of people he represented so ably—the city housewife, the farmer, the worker, the businessman, the fisherman, the woodsman and others who knew him best for his service in their behalf.

He was proud to fight for the people's causes and they had no better champion than Clem Miller.

They, and we, will long mourn his absence from the House.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked when news reached me that our colleague, Clem Miller, died Sunday in an airplane crash in California. I am deeply touched and grieved at this sad news.

I entered Congress with Clem Miller in January of 1959. As brother freshmen Members, I came to know him and our friendship grew with each passing year. After our first meeting, I felt that this man would prove to be a great legislator, for he possessed that certain quality of righteousness one can sense in a person after only one meeting. His actions and devotion to his work affirm my beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, Clem Miller was a dedicated public servant, and it was through his devotion to duty that his untimely taking resulted. He was traveling to meet with his constituents and personally report his progress as their Representative in Congress. He always had the feeling that his constituents were entitled to meet him face to face. This was a part of his job and he was not going to shirk his duty.

We in this Chamber have suffered a great loss. Here was a man in the prime of his life, ready, willing, and able to serve his Nation and his fellow man. He had a deep sense of responsibility which was very beneficial to the American people. His work in the field of conservation alerted us to the need of protecting our natural resources. He will long be remembered for this contribution to our Nation's welfare.

May God accept him into His Kingdom and bring comfort to his loving wife, Katharine, his five lovely daughters, and his mother.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my tribute to a man we all knew well and respected, the late Clem Miller.

Clem Miller made a deep impression on all of us in his service in this body. He has left a strong memory among us, the recollection of a purposeful, dedicated man who held to the noblest ideals.

His abilities were clear to perceptive observers. Last fall and winter, a political scientist came to Washington and worked with me and others in developing monographs on the choice which the House was making of a new leadership. He talked with more than 100 Congressmen and interviewed 24. In the draft he prepared, he went out of his way to cite Clem Miller as one of the most knowledgeable and cooperative with whom he talked, and to mention Clem's newsletters as an invaluable source of material on the way the House really worked.

The world sees many men appear upon its stage, play their parts and move on. Only the best can make an impact so sharp and strong that those who have worked among them and those who follow learn from them and benefit by what they have done. Clem Miller has earned his place among the memorable.

In their grief, let me extend my deepest sympathies to Mrs. Miller and the bereaved family. Our hearts go out to them.

The tragic crash that took the life of our beloved colleague also claimed the lives of the pilot, a retired Air Force major, George Head, and his son, who were sharing the difficult obligations placed upon our Congressman. I know the House would want to extend its sympathies to their friends and family.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the sad news of Clem Miller's untimely death was a deep personal shock to me. It is hard to express the meaning of this, and harder still to let Clem's wife Katy and his family know how much sympathy we feel and how much we share their loss.

Clem was a man who had spent much of his life in the business of landscape gardening. His profound interest in conservation stemmed from his personal feeling for nature. Perhaps, equally important, Clem viewed the legislative process as one of growth; and the democratic process as one which requires cultivating. By his life and actions he showed that care, hard work, sensitivity and devotion to principle are as important in giving growth and life to plants as to democracy.

Clem's constituency and the country have lost a fine Representative. We will never know how great Clem's ultimate contribution would have been; his untimely passing did not allow the full development of his potential. However, I for one believe that his career in the Congress held great promise and that his ultimate impact, like his record to date, would have been a great one.

The House has lost a fine, sensitive, and profound thinking Congressman. I have lost a personal friend whose friendship meant very much to me.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members of the House in paying tribute to my personal friend and colleague, Clem Miller. The tasks and duties of a Member of Congress are many and varied, not the least of which is reporting to our constituents on what we have done, what we plan to do and to ask for their support or rejection of those actions. Clem Miller was in the process of that reporting when tragedy struck.

Many men have passed through this Chamber but few have brought with them the degree of intellectual honesty and personal responsibility than has Clem Miller. He came to this Chamber with eyes and ears that perceived the true consequences of our actions here. He perceived much that we tend to forget about our positions here. We would do well to follow his example and to examine his views of this great deliberative body.

In the past 2 years I had come to know Clem Miller as a good friend, as a hard-working Member of the House, as a committee member who was fully aware of what was being considered and what should be done, and as a wonderful family man. Clem Miller knew his responsibilities to his Nation, to his constituents, to his family, and to the House. He faced these responsibilities with courage and a sense of purpose. He has been a credit to the House of Representatives and to himself.

I worked closely with Clem Miller on a bill that would aid the veterans' homes in our respective States. I found him to be an active and diligent worker for legislation affecting his State and his constituents. Clem Miller was an able and fine legislator who was a source of sound advice and forthright judgment.

It is unfortunate that reflections on the careers of our colleagues are not made until those careers are no more. We can, however, pay the highest tribute to the memories of our colleagues by learning from them and following their examples. Clem Miller has left us a volume of his thoughts, his ideas, and analyses of our duties and responsibilities that gives us great cause for reflection and for learning.

I speak with a sad heart today because I have lost a good friend, a wonderful family has lost a loving father and husband, but the greatest loss is to the Nation that has lost a fine Member of Congress. The memory of Clem Miller will long remain in this Chamber and should remain as a constant reminder of our duties and our responsibilities.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as is the case with so many of us, I know, I feel quite inadequate to express in words the tremendous loss I feel at the sudden and tragic death of our colleague, Clem Miller.

Clem was not only an able, well-informed, intelligent, and forceful legislator, he was an extremely thoughtful person, with whom it was always a pleasure to work. I feel privileged to have worked closely with him on the lumber problem, as well as on other matters of mutual interest to us, as western Representatives. His contributions to the welfare of the West, and of the entire Nation, will be sorely missed here in Congress.

Mere words fail to express the measure of our loss, but to his widow and his lovely children, my deepest sympathy and affection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved to learn of the untimely and tragic death of my colleague, Clem Miller, of California. He was an able, conscientious, and industrious member of the Banking and Currency Committee. His influence had been steadily growing. His contributions were recognized by all. His life was one of leadership and service, from his days at Williams College through his exemplary performance as a soldier in World War II, to his work as a most able Member of the House of Representatives. He was a man of varied talents, being among other things a practicing landscape consultant before his entry into Congress. Most recently he had revealed himself as a sensitive observer of the Washington scene in his book, "Member of the House: Letters of a Congressman." One reviewer described it as a volume "which surely must rank among the best of the portraits of Congress."

Clem Miller's death is a severe loss to the committee, the House of Representatives, his district, his State, and the Nation. May the light of God's countenance shine upon him and give him peace.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, in the untimely passing of Representative Clem Miller, the House and the Nation have lost a hard working and dedicated Member and his district has lost a devoted public servant. Clem Miller was outstanding in his drive to achieve those goals in which he believed and even those who might differ with him on specific issues could not but feel admiration for his sincerity and his loyalty to the beliefs he held. Combined with these qualities was a boundless energy that kept him on the job early and late on behalf of the people he represented here. Those people will miss him and the service he rendered and this House also will miss Clem Miller. But the Nation's loss, however great, cannot compare to the void left in the heart of his wonderful family. I join other Members in heartfelt condolences to them and pray that God will comfort them in their loss as only He can do.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, Clem Miller was one of the finest people I have ever met.

He was able, diligent, and wise.

He always supported what he considered to be the people's interests.

He had the courage to stand for what he thought was right under all circumstances.

I feel a personal loss in his passing. I know his people do too. America has suffered a great loss in his passing.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Clem Miller has brought real grief to all of us who knew him and who were associated with him in the House of Representatives. His untimely passing has been a shock to all of his colleagues.

I was privileged to be associated with Clem Miller as fellow members of the Banking and Currency Committee. He was a man of great integrity and sincerity of purpose, a very able and hard-working Member of Congress, acutely aware of his responsibility to his constituents and his country. He will be missed on the committee and in the House.

Together with Mrs. Derwinski, I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Miller and all of the family.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, California and the Nation has suffered a deep loss in the death of Congressman Clem Miller.

Clem Miller died in the performance of his duties as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. In the process of keeping the electorate of his district advised of the work and record of the Congress he died. To those who knew him well in Congress, it comes as no surprise that in the face of inclement and hazardous weather he would risk himself in his tireless efforts to serve the people of his district. This is the measure of Clem Miller. He was an intense and devoted Member of Congress. He worked long and hard in making our governmental process the viable instrument that it is.

Clem Miller tackled his committee assignments with vigor and hard work. Clem Miller knew the truth of Woodrow Wilson's statement that the true work of the Congress is at the committee level. To his committee assignments he brought his scholarly and inquiring mind helping to frame and shape meaningful legislation for the Nation.

Clem Miller's death leaves all of us with the keenest sense of personal loss—but we shall not soon forget his strength of character, his strong sense of honor, and his warm friendship. We shall not forget him nor will the people—Point Reyes National Seashore Park will be a monument to his memory for all time.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in an expression of profound sorrow at the tragic death of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Clem Miller, of the First District of California.

During the past 4 years, I have served with Congressman Miller on the House Banking and Currency Committee. Everyone who worked with Clem was enriched by his association and stimulated by his high purpose and his devotion to the public trust. He was a rugged man—as rugged as the extensive district he so ably represented.

Clem Miller had a great mission. He was anxious, at times almost impatient with delays in the legislative program. He was a determined man of action who fought hard for the causes he believed in.

This Congress was a better place because of Clem Miller. We will miss him very much. We share the deep and profound sorrow of his devoted wife, Katharine, and his daughters.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with sad and heavy hearts that his colleagues learned of the tragic and untimely death of Clem Miller. And in the quiet void that his absence leaves us, we take stock of the man whose final measure we will never know.

I entered the 86th Congress as a freshman with Clem. In our close work together, we found a harmony of spirit and purpose that drew us to one another. Perhaps it was the battles we fought and lost more than those we won that drew us together. But always

CLEM's high sense of duty and honor set the guideposts. The little man always had him as a champion, the unpopular cause as an ally. And through all he did to promote the best interests of his Nation and the State of California, he had the prescience to leave us, his colleagues in Congress, a compilation of his thoughts and ideas concerning our own duties. CLEM's "Member of the House" will forever remain with me as the embodiment of the true representative of the people.

I join with the Members of the House and the Senate in paying this tribute to the memory of a great man. To Katharine Miller and CLEM's daughters, words are hollow things—but thank you for sharing him with us.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and California have sustained a great loss in the untimely, tragic death of our late colleague, CLEM MILLER, of the First District of California.

I know of no man who was more devoted to his duty and more sincere in his efforts to advance the cause of our country than CLEM MILLER. He gave unstintingly of himself in these efforts. His constituents can be justly proud of his unselfish dedication to their interest.

Those of us who are residents of what is known as the San Francisco Bay area will always remember Congressman CLEM MILLER for his tireless work on behalf of preserving a portion of the Pacific coastline in Marin County as the Point Reyes National Seashore. In a period when so-called urban sprawl is consuming every available open space, it is comforting to know that one part of our region has been set aside because of Congressman MILLER's efforts. There is no question but that this seashore preserve will live for the enjoyment of generations to come as a memorial to a distinguished and selfless public servant.

Additionally, Congressman CLEM MILLER had many other accomplishments to his credit. He maintained a great interest in all legislation and, particularly, those matters concerning education, public welfare, conservation, and fish and wildlife.

He is sorely missed by all and his place will not be readily filled.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, may I add just a brief word to all the tributes being paid to the memory of our tragically departed colleague CLEM MILLER.

CLEM's father and my father were close college friends more than a half century ago; his mother and father were visitors in California before their marriage where my parents were newlyweds. When CLEM came to Congress representing a district joined to mine by the Golden Gate Bridge, it brought a happy renewal of old family associations and we maintained a most pleasant social relationship from then on.

When the shocking news that his plane was missing, under circumstances which offered little hope for survival, came over the radio, it struck a personal blow to all who knew CLEM since every one of us, whether we agreed with him or not, had come to respect deeply his personal idealism and courage.

My mother, my wife, and I join in expressing to his lovely widow and five charming daughters our deep sorrow and sympathy.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I learned the sad news of the tragic death of our colleague, the Honorable CLEM MILLER, of California.

It is difficult to believe that a man so young and energetic will be with us no more. But the memory of CLEM MILLER will remain with us always in our hearts and minds.

He was a tireless worker for his district. He was a great servant of all the people. He was a man of the highest integrity and moral character. He was a dedicated champion of progressive, liberal, and humanitarian legislation.

One of the great privileges in serving as a Member of this body is to have the opportunity of being associated and serve with a man of the caliber and stature of CLEM MILLER.

To his widow and his five daughters, I express deepest sympathy on their great loss. I join with all of my colleagues in sharing their grief and sorrow.

A fitting tribute to CLEM MILLER was paid in an editorial in the Washington Post of October 11, which I include herewith:

CLEM MILLER

Representative CLEM MILLER's death in an airplane crash on Sunday seems especially shocking because it occurred so much in the midst of life, and of a life full of usefulness and promise. He was engaged, indeed, in campaigning for reelection to Congress and was flying to keep a campaign engagement when death claimed him. An exceptionally able, attractive, and progressive legislator, Mr. MILLER, after two terms as Representative for the First District of California, had already won esteem and influence among the younger Members of the House. His integrity and conscience and good sense will be missed in Congress as well as in his home State.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the death of CLEM MILLER was a terrible shock to me and I am sure to all of us. CLEM MILLER was my friend. He was a great Member of Congress. He had the vision to see the greatness of America, the ability and determination to see that greatness enhanced. No Member of Congress more ably represented his convictions and his constituents than did CLEM MILLER.

His death is a tragic loss to his family, to his district, to the Congress, and to the country.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, CLEM MILLER was one of the finest Congressmen and one of the greatest men I have ever known. He was rugged physically, alert, and able mentally. He was loyal to his constituents and devoted to this House. The last conversation I had with CLEM MILLER was about the unusual and beautiful belt buckle he was accustomed to wearing on the floor. When I mentioned the fact that my 4-year-old son would like to know where this particular belt buckle came from, CLEM became immediately interested and we talked at length because he loved children so much and was interested in people—the little things warmed the heart.

We are going to miss CLEM MILLER here and the Nation is going to miss him. He was a stalwart, typical red-blooded American. Mrs. Dorn and my children join in deepest sympathy to Mrs. Miller and his wonderful and lovely daughters.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this body recognize the importance of well-chosen words in our work here and in our districts. This is the one moment in our careers when we have no words to describe adequately the desolate grief that has invaded our hearts and minds. We all remember the oft-quoted words of the English poet, John Donne, who said, "No man is an island, entire of itself." In that same piece, Donne said what we must all feel at this terrible moment, "A man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind."

How much we are all diminished, for this was not just any man whose life was taken suddenly, tragically from him. This was our dear friend, our esteemed colleague, one of the truly great Members of this body.

> For such as he there is no death—
> His life the eternal life commands;
> Above man's aims his nature rose.
> The wisdom of a just content
> Made one small spot a continent,
> And tuned to poetry life's prose.

These words might have been written about the gentleman from California. And, to me they are especially fitting, for they were written nearly a century ago by Louisa May Alcott, to describe the passing of Henry David Thoreau, one of the very first of our Nation's conservationists, even as the gentleman from Corte Madera was perhaps the foremost of our day.

How much richer we all are for having had the inspirational privilege of his association. He has given us the legacy of courage, truth, devotion. He has given the Nation an even more tangible legacy: the assurance that the beauty of Point Reyes will endure, long after all of us are gone.

And though my words can never tell to those as yet unborn the complete integrity, the wisdom, the respect for his fellow man, the uncompromising principle of him who but a few days ago was among us, his own words shall. For his book, "Member of the House," providentially published just a few weeks ago, will soon be a text for all our citizens of this and succeeding generations to read for an understanding of what their House of Representatives is and does and means to them.

The honor, the esteem that we bear CLEM MILLER will continue as long as there is one of us, his colleagues, who survives. For his spirit lives forever and preserves his remembrance.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has just suffered a great loss and each person who had the occasion to know CLEM MILLER has just suffered a personal loss.

I know of no Member of Congress who more quickly made friends with those with whom he came in contact than CLEM MILLER.

One could tell that he had developed a sincere love for the House of Representatives, and his dedication to his job impressed all of us who saw him arrive here. Yet with all of his dedication, he had a great faculty for never taking himself too seriously and could always put things in the proper perspective.

He was a fine legislator and a real fighter for those things he believed in. I have had the occasion to know how he operated because of legislation which came before my own committee, and had it not been for CLEM MILLER, I am sure the progress of this legislation would have been slow indeed.

CLEM MILLER was the type of man for whom you went out of your way to speak to and visit with because you always felt a little better for having been with him.

I want to express my deepest sympathy to his devoted wife and beloved children, and to the people of his district which he served so well.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the tragic death of our colleague, CLEM MILLER.

CLEM came to the Congress in 1958, the year in which I was first elected, and with the other Members of the 86th group I was keenly aware of CLEM's warm and sympathetic friendship, his idealism, and his willingness to expend his energy for the benefit of his constituents. In the difficult days which lie ahead for our country we shall miss the contributions which CLEM MILLER might have made.

I deeply sympathize with Mrs. Miller and her daughters in their grievous loss, and I hope that they will find consolation in the memory of CLEM's full and constructive life.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened at the death of our beloved colleague, CLEM MILLER. Not only his district in California, but the whole State of California, as well as our great Nation, has lost one of the finest servants in the U.S. Congress.

It seems like only yesterday after we had had the Burns Creek project, which was so vital to my district, defeated on the floor that CLEM MILLER put his comforting arm around my shoulder and said, "We'll get it next year, RALPH." That is the kind of a friend that CLEM MILLER was.

I have joined with him on many projects for the benefit of the West. We have fought together for increased money for forest roads and to help the depressed timber industry. His interests extend far beyond his district; he was interested in keeping our Nation strong and prosperous throughout the whole of its boundaries.

I join with my colleagues in extending sympathy to his wife, Katharine, and their five wonderful daughters. They can take great comfort in knowing that their husband and father was not only a great Congressman but also a loyal and devoted American.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, with deepest sympathy, profound sense of loss, and heartfelt emotion I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated and selfless legislator, a great American, and a fine man—a man for whom integrity was more than a word or abstraction to which lipservice was paid, for CLEM MILLER was committed to integrity as a way of life.

His earnest pursuit of noble causes and legislation designed to preserve and prepare this democracy for the decades beyond has, in a few years time, engaged the attention and respect of all who worked with him and knew of him. The compassion breathed into all of his work, coupled with his great facility for perceiving the current of essential truth in every undertaking were the basis for his rapid rise to national stature and leadership. With his passing this Nation has suffered a great loss.

The presence of this fine man in Washington is a tribute to the people who elected him. He served them with distinction, this dear friend of mine. His absence will be long noticed—his memory long with us.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the very sudden death of our friend and colleague, the Honorable CLEM MILLER, as I know all of the Members were. When I heard of his tragic death, the thought came to me immediately that just a few days ago we had sat, side by side, discussing the necessity for the prompt adjournment of the session of Congress so that we could all go back to our districts to campaign for reelection. CLEM and I commented on how much we each had to do, how many people we felt we must meet and talk to. These were our major concerns.

And then, in the flash of a moment, all of those urgent needs and great plans and hopes were stopped forever for the conscientious Congressman from California.

The thought occurred to me again, as it has on many, many occasions when tragedy has struck down a friend working so hard at a difficult assignment: we must truly live each day as if it might be our last.

It was a pleasure to serve on the Committee on Banking and Currency with CLEM MILLER. We were both on the Housing Subcommittee and also on the subcommittee which handled the mass transit bill—an issue on which he exerted tremendous and effective effort. His penetrating questioning of witnesses reflected a thorough grasp of the problem, and he helped us to understand it better and to present it ably to our colleagues on the parent committee.

CLEM MILLER's great ability will be missed in the Congress of the United States. Because he was a fine person as well as a fine legislator, we all share some of the loneliness and the grief of his wife and his daughters.

As one who also lost a beloved husband who died suddenly while serving as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, may I say, Mr. Speaker, to Mrs. Miller and the children: "Your grief and sorrow will be deep and will be with you for a long long time—God's will be done. But you will always have locked in your heart the memory of the years with a fine man—years that God allowed you to share together."

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Representative CLEM MILLER has been a shock to all his colleagues here in the House. We share with his wife and daughters and his innumerable friends in California a sense of great loss on his passing. Although he had been a Member of the House for only a comparatively short period, while he was here he made many friends and quickly acquired an unusually keen insight into the diverse aspects of the functions and life of a Member. He applied himself to his legislative tasks with an enthusiasm and an intelligence of a high order which soon redounded to the benefit of his constituents. The occasion and the circumstances of his death were characteristic of the way he lived and pursued the fulfillment of his duties.

I want to join my colleagues in extending to his widow and daughters, as well as his many friends, my sincere sympathy.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our friend and colleague, CLEM MILLER, of California, has shocked and saddened all of us who admired and respected him.

It was my privilege to come to the House with CLEM with the 86th Congress in January 1959. His outstanding legislative ability, integrity, and courage have been an inspiration to his colleagues during the past 4 years. CLEM MILLER loved the House of Representatives. In a short time he became a keen student of its traditions, its inner workings, its moods, and the institutional characteristics which make it great. His book "Member of the House—Letters of a Congressman," captures this greatness by perceptive observations of events taking place during his service in this body.

CLEM was a true representative of his district and State. He believed strongly in the liberal tradition in the highest sense and carried with this belief an inner sense of the practical that made him an exceptionally effective legislator. Forthright and articulate, he had the courage of deep humanitarian convictions to espouse the cause of the underprivileged.

We will miss CLEM MILLER in the crucial days ahead. Yet we have all gained by having even this brief privilege of serving with him. Mrs. Giaimo and I extend to Mrs. Miller and his five daughters our deepest sympathy in their great loss.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and services of the late CLEM MILLER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution—House Resolution 830—and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable CLEM MILLER, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of 29 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Sheppard, Mr. King of California, Mr. Holifield, Mr. McDonough, Mr. George P. Miller, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Shelley, Mr. Gubser, Mr. Hagen of California, Mr. Hiestand, Mr. Hosmer, Mr. Mailliard, Mr. Moss, Mr. Utt, Mr. Wilson of California, Mr. Younger, Mr. Lipscomb, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Sisk, Mr. Teague of California, Mr. McFall, Mr. Saund, Mr. Smith of California, Mr. Cohelan, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Bell, Mr. Corman, and Mr. Rousselot.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 10, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2620. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to reporting that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Arvin-Edison Water Storage District, California, has been completed relating to the development of a contract for the sale of Friant-Kern Canal water, Central Valley project, California, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2621. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), the July 1962 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 13374. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and related items used in bagpipe bands shall be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 13375. A bill to increase the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 13376. A bill for the relief of Angelo Adragna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 13377. A bill for the relief of the shareholders of Frazar, Federal Inc., U.S.A.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 13378. A bill for the relief of Maria Vinciguerra Capobianco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13379. A bill for the relief of Annina Vinciguerra Brongo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 13380. A bill for the relief of Ruth Newton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13381. A bill for the relief of Maria Bella Filipinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 13382. A bill for the relief of Aniello Guerriero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou all-knowing and all-loving God, who in such a time as this hast called fallible men gathered here to the ministry of high service in public affairs, we pray that in all their deliberations Thou wilt deliver from undue pride of opinion, from intolerance, and from lightly ascending any throne of final judgment. Keep us from sitting in the seat of the scornful, as we remember our own lack of knowledge and our failings in past appraisals.

With a new world emerging from the churning waters which are engulfing old landmarks, help Thy servants standing within these hallowed walls to be vividly aware that Thou hast committed as a solemn trust to their hands the defense and preservation of the shining truths that make and keep all men free.

We ask it in the dear, dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 8, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting the nomination of James W. Culliton, of Indiana, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2450. An act for the relief of Maj. C. Todd, Jr., and the estate of Ira T. Todd, Sr.;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of G. W. Todd and the estate of Lloyd Parks;

S. 2953. An act relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America;

S. 3389. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to develop American flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

S. 3394. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William A. Carter, U.S. Air Force;

H.R. 10931. An act to revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11970. An act to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13241. An act to amend section 309 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Overobligation of an Appropriation

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Study of Effectiveness of Programs of Educational Exchange

A letter from the Chairman, the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, relating to a study of the effectiveness of past programs of educational exchange, and proposing a new deadline for submission of a report by that Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Review of Management of Selected Spare Parts for the Nike-Hercules Guided Missile

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the management of selected spare parts for the Nike-Hercules guided missile, airborne guidance set, in the Department of the Army, dated October 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Promotion of Economic and Social Development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Public Health Service Technical Amendments of 1962

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain activities of the Public Health Service or the Food and Drug Administration heretofore authorized in annual appropriations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

H. Con. Res. 583. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 185,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto (Rept. No. 2287).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert G. Miner, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Trinidad and Tobago;

John W. Tuthill, of Illinois, to be representative of the United States of America to the European Communities, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary;

James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Austria;

James Wine, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Ivory Coast;

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, George V. Allen, of North Carolina, Mrs. Mildred McAfee Horton, of New Hampshire, Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, and John H. Morrow, of New Jersey, to be representatives of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; and

Henry S. Commager, of Massachusetts, Herbert W. Hill, of New Hampshire, Eugene H. Jacobson, of Michigan, Robert A. Kevan, of Virginia, and Joseph B. Platt, of California, to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sixty-seven postmaster nominations.

RESOLUTION

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CLEM MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 413) relating to the death of Hon. Clem Miller, late a Representative from the State of California, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Engle, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 9045) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF CERTAIN SENATE BILLS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, two bills on the Senate Calendar were embodied in H.R. 7927, the omnibus postal rate, Federal pay, and retirement measure, now at the White House for the President's approval.

These bills are S. 2937, Order No. 1811, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for increases in annuities, eliminate the option with respect to certain survivor annuities, and provide for interchange of credits between civil service retirement system and the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act, and S. 3164, Order No. 1812, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to increase, in the case of children attending school, from 18 to 21, the maximum age for receiving benefits under such act. For this reason. I ask unanimous consent that these bills be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Javits) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 1 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill H.R. 13290) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 18 after line 11, insert the following:

"EX GRATIA PAYMENT TO CITY OF NEW YORK

"For payment to the city of New York, to be considered an ex gratia payment to assist said city to defray the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses which the city incurred in affording protection to visiting chiefs of state and heads of Government during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations, $1,500,000."

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Javits) also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 13290) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 9, 1962, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2450. An act for the relief of Major C. Todd, Jr., and the estate of Ira T. Todd, Sr.;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of G. W. Todd and the estate of Lloyd Parks;

S. 2953. An act relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building & Common Laborers' Union of America;

S. 3389. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs; and

S. 3394. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William A. Carter, U.S. Air Force.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Tribute by him to Representative Fred Marshall, of Minnesota.

By Mr. THURMOND:

American Security Council article entitled "Victory—Theory and Practice"; and newsletter prepared by him, entitled "The Frosting and the Cake."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON TO ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] is today delivering an address at the annual luncheon meeting of the Association of the U.S. Army, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, in Washington.

Those of us who have been privileged to serve with Senator Robertson are familiar with the cogency of his reasoning and the lucidity of his expression. I have observed him particularly over the past few years, since he has been cast in the role of handling the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. I have been amazed at the detailed knowledge of our Military Establishment which he has acquired over that period.

The address by Senator Robertson deals with the dangers confronting our beloved United States and the steps being taken in an effort to meet them. I consider the address of such importance that I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Senator A. Willis Robertson

At a period in our history when the tendency of young manhood is toward softness and many who are more mature, to prefer a Government handout to the eating of bread through the sweat of their brow, it is for me a great pleasure and a coveted privilege to address a group that is physically fit to answer any military emergency and which has volunteered for the privilege of doing so.

The development of the atomic bomb and the wide range of nuclear weapons capable of destroying civilization as we have known it makes many of us feel as did the English writer, Matthew Arnold, when he said that he was suspended between two worlds—the one dead, the other not yet capable of being born. As long as about one-fourth of the population of the world is dominated by men who deny God, repudiate the teachings of the Bible, and are not bound by our code of ethics, the present tensions of what we euphemistically call the cold war will continue. As my grandfather used to say "the tendency of everything is to become more so." In my opinion, the tensions created by the Soviet plan to dominate the world will increase—certainly for the months that lie immediately ahead because Khrushchev has added the pressure to us in Cuba without in any material way relaxing the pressure in West Berlin and elsewhere.

You will recall that in January of last year Khrushchev laid down a blueprint for Communist action which he boldly entitled "For New Victories of the World Communist Movement." This blueprint he has followed faithfully. We can believe him when he says Communists are opposed to global nuclear war—but only as long as we maintain the capability to make such war unprofitable to them. We can also believe him when he says that Communists are opposed to local wars—but only as long as we maintain the forces needed to thwart such limited armed aggressions. And, as events have demonstrated all too well, we can believe him when he says Communists favor covert military aggression and subversion which he calls popular revolts and wars of liberation. These are the kinds of aggressions which are giving us the most trouble today. These are the kinds of aggressions which we must learn how to forestall and defeat. And these are the kinds of aggressions which demand a modern, mobile Army of sufficient strength to meet successfully any threat to the peace of the free world.

The size and readiness of the Army—its meaning, training, and equipping—have, for many years, been matters of grave concern to those of us on the Senate Appropriations Committee who are most directly involved with the defense budget. As you well know, the Congress, at various times during the last several years, has appropriated for the Army more funds than were requested by the executive branch, not only for additional equipment but also for additional active duty personnel. And the Congress has consistently supported a drill pay strength for the Army Reserve components that was above the budget estimate.

While we always have recognized the vital importance of a powerful and ready nuclear retaliatory force, we have never felt that such a force would in any way preclude the need for a modern, well-equipped, and trained Army. There are two different purposes to be served. Nuclear war is potentially the most terrible danger we face in the world today but limited war in its various forms is the far more likely contingency. Hence, the readiness of our Army continues to be vital to our security. And I am sure that I am not unduly influenced in reaching that conclusion by reason of the fact that I served for nearly 2 years in the Army in World War I and served for some time thereafter in the Army Reserve.

In recent months we have seen the number of combat-ready Army divisions increased from 11 to 16; an increase in the size of the Army's counterinsurgency units, and a substantial increase in appropriations for the procurement of modern weapons and equipment. In keeping with a program of increased capability, the internal organization and structure of the Army is now undergoing major modernization. Army divisions are being reorganized into the new ROAD concept, with significant increases in their mobility, fire power and flexibility. The entire logistics structure is also being given its most thorough overhauling in the entire history of the U.S. Army. To insure the closest kind of coordination between the Army ground forces and their tactical air support, the new STRIKE command was formed.

While these are all impressive developments there are at least three Army areas to which I believe our military planners, and probably the Congress, will have to direct attention in the near future: first, the adequacy of the Army military personnel strength; second, our limited war capability insofar as it relates to swift and sufficient response; and, third, the modernization of material. I shall speak of each of these in turn.

ARMY MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTH

It may well be that it will become necessary for the Congress to take a hard look at the Army's manpower requirements. There are those who question the wisdom of reducing the strength of the Army to a point where it is necessary to call on the Reserve components each time a crisis develops. Such a policy disturbs the national economy, disrupts the lives of the reservists who are called, and encourages possible aggressors to foment frequent crises, with the idea of shaking the tree to see what will fall.

It has been said that the recent quick callup of the Reserves demonstrates our potential strength. It might just as well be argued that it demonstrates the need for a larger standing Army. The Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate have in the past gone on record as opposing Army strength reductions even to the point of attempting to provide mandatory language in an appropriation bill to forestall such reductions. Army strength today is greater than it was 2 years ago, but it is considerably below the augmented strength provided during a former Berlin crisis.

I hope that our military planners will not again subject the Nation to a series of hills and valleys in Army strength based on the probing by a bellicose aggressor of the allied will to resist. If it should become apparent that it is the Soviet design to exert continuing pressures of a type necessitating additional American troop strength in various parts of the world, then I believe it would be wise for us to consider methods other than repeated Reserve callups.

A similar statement may be made about our Reserve policy. For years now the Congress has successfully resisted efforts on the part of the Department of Defense to reduce the size of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard. For this present year the Department sought vigorously to reduce the strength of our Army Reserve components. Just as vigorously the Congress reacted against this plan. I personally asked the Secretary of Defense if he would maintain the Reserve components at a strength of 700,000. He promised to do so, subject to certain recruiting and operating requirements. It is my hope that the Pentagon will make no further attempts during the continuation of the cold war to reduce the strength of the Army Reserve components. It is not logical to cut our Reserves as long as they are to be used as part of our first line of defense.

LIMITED WAR CAPABILITY

In the second area, there is a growing awareness of the need for an increased limited war capability, a need emphasized by Khrushchev's announced intention to support so-called popular revolts and wars of liberation. Essential to our preparedness for limited war is a military machine possessed of both increased mobility and adequate air support.

Recent history has demonstrated the primary requirement of swift response to threats of war in any part of the free world with whatever degree of force the occasion dictates. This is the primary mission of the U.S. Strike Command and requires both a high state of mobility and a ready tactical air support. If it be found that our requirements in this area exceed the present capability of the forces assigned to the Army Strike Command, I look forward in the near future to a thorough review of the present organization to determine the best possible arrangement for providing the Army's increasing need for airlift and tactical air support.

ARMY MODERNIZATION

The third vital area for serious study is the modernization problem. Every one recognizes the need for modernization; but we seem to have trouble accomplishing the desired objectives, despite the substantial increase in funds which have been made available for that undertaking. During the course of our hearings this past spring I asked General Colglazer how long it would take to modernize the Army at the present rate. He replied, "At least 5 years." The question is whether we can afford the luxury of waiting 5 years. Certainly our experts must examine the program with the idea of utilizing available funds for the most vitally needed items in the modernization program in as short a time-span as possible. In a country which places reliance on technology rather than sheer manpower, we must make every effort to provide our fighting men with modern weapons.

NEED FOR ECONOMY

As an economy advocate, I must necessarily mention a related problem: More defense for less money through the elimination of waste generally and the establishment of efficient procurement procedures, which among other things, take advantage of the competitive features of our free enterprise system.

The recent announcement by the Secretary of Defense that he contemplates substantial savings in the near future based on improved management are encouraging. Reports of the Comptroller General and others disclosing substantial waste and inefficiency in many areas of the Department of Defense clearly indicate the need for such action.

The problems of the defense organization, of the business community, and of the Congress, are not isolated problems to be wrestled with in a vacuum. Rather they require the coordinated and sustained efforts of all of us working together if we are to succeed in our combined endeavor.

You have a right to expect that your patriotic willingness to give your bodies to the Commonwealth, as Pericles said of the young men of Athens, will be matched by a comparable spirit in industry (management and labor) to forego selfish advantages that would undermine the soundness of our economic system. And you have an equal right to expect Members of the Congress to put the preservation of our priceless principles of freedom above political expediency. In the joint undertaking of preserving American constitutional liberty, I pledge to you my fullest cooperation.

U.S. LIVING STANDARD RISES TWICE AS FAST AS IN EARLY POSTWAR ERA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, throughout this session and throughout this year's congressional campaign, there has been much talk about the importance of using Federal fiscal policy to get the economy moving—fiscal policy in terms of reducing taxes, increasing spending, and unbalancing the budget, for the purpose of stimulating economic activity, improving our standard of living, and getting a greater amount of growth in our economy. I think such talk should be put into proper perspective.

This morning, the lead article on the front page of the Wall Street Journal is entitled "Economic Growth—U.S. Living Standard Rises Twice as Fast as in Early Postwar Era."

I read from the article:

> The American standard of living has grown twice as fast in the last 8 years as in the first 8 after World War II.
>
> This fundamental fact shines through the fog of Federal statistics in an era of much fretting over "slow growth" in the Nation's economy.

It is pointed out that we have a far greater output of automobiles, that the number of television sets has very greatly increased, and that the number of washing machines, air conditioners, and so forth, has also greatly increased.

The article also states:

> The great burst of consumer goods production in recent years far outpaces the population rise. Since 1955, the U.S. population has increased 12 percent. But the number of motor vehicles in use, for example, has climbed 24 percent. Some 8 million families own more than one auto now, nearly double the 1955 total.
>
> Witness the rise of television in recent years: 9 of 10 homes have sets today, up from 7 in 10 in 1955.
>
> Or clothes dryers: Nearly a quarter of U.S. households are now equipped with them, up from 6 percent in 1955.

The article also points out:

> Rapidly rising research and development spending in recent years has laid the groundwork for further betterment in living standards. The $50 billion so spent in the U.S. in the past 4 years is nearly double the sum spent in the previous 4 years. This spending has increased yearly, through recovery and recession, since totals first were compiled in 1954.

Mr. President, the argument for increasing spending and reducing taxes has been based on the notion that our economy has grown far more slowly than have the economies overseas. But this is partly a statistical mirage. As the article points out:

> But such comparisons can be misleading. Many foreign economies were smashed by World War II. All are expanding from levels far below the U.S. postwar base.
>
> Japan's GNP, for instance, has soared over 130 percent since the mid-1950's, far steeper than the comparable rise of GNP in the United States. In absolute terms, however, the gap between the two nations has widened. U.S. GNP, at the year's start, was $491.4 billion greater than that of Japan. Eight years ago, the United States lead was only $342.6 billion. At last count U.S. GNP was more than 10 times Japan's.

So I believe we should look at the real facts, and should examine them very carefully, before we embark on policies of deficit spending and of deliberately unbalancing the budget in times of relative prosperity, since the economy has done extremely well in the last 8 years.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC GROWTH—U.S. LIVING STANDARD RISES TWICE AS FAST AS IN EARLY POSTWAR ERA—PERSONAL INCOME AFTER TAXES GAINS 16 PERCENT IN PAST 8 YEARS; 9 OF 10 HOMES HAVE TV—FLAW IN GROWTH COMPARISON

(By Alfred D. Malabre, Jr.)

The American standard of living has grown twice as fast in the last 8 years as in the first 8 after World War II.

This fundamental fact shines through the fog of Federal statistics in an era of much fretting over slow growth in the Nation's economy.

There is no index of the standard of living. Measuring it precisely is impossible. But one figure comes close to the mark. This is per capita disposable income adjusted for changes in the level of prices. The disposable means it's after all personal taxes.

Since late last year this figure has held above $2,000 for the first time. Latest tally puts it at $2,030 in terms of 1961 prices. That's an upward bounce of 16 percent in less than 8 years. In the 8 years ended with 1954 it rose less than 7 percent.

The 2,000-plus figure on the statistically average American's ultimate ability to buy the goods and services of life is now nearly double the $1,212 of prewar 1939. (The 1939 total, to make it comparable despite price changes, is in terms of 1961 dollars. In 1939 dollars it was only $537.)

EVIDENCE IN HOMES, GOLF COURSES

Evidence of how this great growth in real buying power has bettered the lot of the citizen is abundant. It's found in homes and on highways, in bowling alleys and on golf courses. It shows in book stores and concert halls. And—for the sick—in hospitals.

The 48 million new United States autos made in the last 8 years alone add up to twice as many cars as there are today on all the roads of Europe (including Russia). Once-a-week bowlers in the United States now at 36 million, double the total of 1955. The golfing army has grown 25 percent.

The leap of living standards goes beyond the enjoyment of material things. Columbia Records reports the recording of classical music is the fastest growing part of its business—up 80 percent from the year earlier period in the first half of 1962. Book sales, over $1.2 billion yearly, are twice the 1955 total. The number of persons now entering hospitals is nearly half again as large as in the mid 1950's.

Growth of consumer products has accelerated sharply in recent years.

The table below shows U.S. production of some familiar goods. The postwar years, starting with 1947, have been divided into two 8-year periods to match recent output against that in the supposedly fast growing early years. Totals for 1955-62 include full-year estimates for this year. Figures are in millions of units.

Output

	1955–62	*1947–54*
Autos	48.4	40.6
TV sets	51.9	37.7
Washing machines	30.8	29.0
Air conditioners	12.6	3.2
Clothes dryers	10.6	3.3
Dishwashers	3.9	1.6

The quantity of goods produced in the more recent 8-year span, in every case, exceeds the earlier output. In two instances—air conditioners and clothes dryers—1955-62 production is more than three times the 1947-54 total.

And the list doesn't include many items not even produced in the early years. Examples: Washer-dryer combination appliances (100,000 units sold by manufacturers last year), electric can openers (1.7 million), electric knife sharpeners (500,000) and tape recorders (500,000).

OUTSTRIPS POPULATION RISE

The great burst of consumer goods production in recent years far outpaces the population rise. Since 1955, the U.S. population has increased 12 percent. But the number of motor vehicles in use, for example, has climbed 24 percent. Some 8 million families own more than one auto now, nearly double the 1955 total.

Witness the rise of television in recent years: Nine of 10 homes have sets today, up from 7 in 10 in 1955.

Or clothes dryers: Nearly a quarter of U.S. households are now equipped with them, up from 6 percent in 1955.

Or beef consumption: Per capita, Americans ate 67 pounds of it last year, a 12-pound jump from the 1955 average.

The homebuilding surge—over 10 million new homes in less than 8 years—has reduced "doubling up" among families. In 1955, about 1.5 million married couples were without homes of their own and had to live with relatives or others. The total now is close to 900,000.

And homes are getting bigger. Floor space in a new single-family house averages about 1,500 square feet, a third more space than the average new home contained in 1955.

DEPRESSING DEMAND?

Paradoxically, the great boom in things for consumers has caused some fears that consumers now possess so many items there is little room for continuing strong demand.

Many economists, however, believe such concern is unwarranted. Norris O. Johnson, vice president and economist of First National City Bank, New York, puts it this way:

"Human wants are insatiable. If the old worries about people having everything were valid, our economy would still be in the horse-and-buggy stages."

Living-standard growth through access to more so-called services has been sweeping.

A dramatic example: U.S. hospitals last year handled a record 25.5 million admissions. That's about 40 percent above the mid-1950's level.

To supply the growing wants of Americans, U.S. industry has carried out a vast expansion in recent years. Industry's massive ability to produce has prompted some concern about "excessive" capacity. But it also has paved the way for fast growth in the years just ahead, many experts contend.

ELECTRICITY TO SPARE

Note the gigantic growth in facilities to generate laborsaving electricity. The country's generating capacity now exceeds 180 million kilowatts; that's nearly 70 million above the 1955 level.

"We have the capacity now to handle a 25-percent jump in demand," says an official of Edison Electric Institute, a trade group representing electric utility companies. In the mid-1950's, he estimates, generating capacity was only 15 to 20 percent higher than demand.

To increase and otherwise improve production, the Nation's manufacturers have pumped $101.3 billion into new plant and equipment projects since 1955. That's some $17 billion more than they spent for plant and equipment in the entire previous postwar era.

One result of such spending has been a 30-percent leap in production capacity in basic industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, textiles, lumber, and cement) in the past 8 years. These industries as a whole are now using some 80 percent of their capacity, according to Government estimates, down from about 85 percent in 1955.

Rapidly rising research and development spending in recent years has laid the groundwork for further betterment in living standards. The $50 billion so spent in the United States in the past 4 years is nearly double the sum spent in the previous 4 years. This spending has increased yearly, through recovery and recession, since totals first were compiled in 1954.

Much of the concern over "slow growth" in the United States centers in comparisons between the increase of gross national product (the market value of all goods produced and services performed) in the United States and in other lands.

GNP in the United States has risen only 2.7 percent annually since the middle of the last decade (after allowing for price increases), far below the comparable rise in some other lands.

But such comparisons can be misleading. Many foreign economies were smashed by World War II. All are expanding from levels far below the U.S. postwar base.

Japan's GNP, for instance, has soared over 130 percent since the mid-1950's, far steeper than the comparable rise of GNP in the United States. In absolute terms, however, the gap between the two nations has widened. U.S. GNP, at the year's start, was $491.4 billion greater than that of Japan. Eight years ago, the U.S. lead was only $342.6 billion. At last count U.S. GNP was more than 10 times Japan's.

"It's impossible to say for certain how fast we should expand—there's a tendency to pick a figure out of the air," asserts F. L. Simmons, vice president and economist of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York. "The statements made, moreover, often reflect the political underpinnings of the speakers."

CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most scholarly and penetrating analyses of the Cuban issue is contained in an article by Walter Lippmann which was published this morning in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON WAR OVER CUBA

(By Walter Lippmann)

On the question of going to war over Cuba (by blockade or invasion) we now have available a summary of the intelligence findings on which the administration is acting. These facts explain the President's decision to confine himself at this time to measures which are short of war. The facts were put on the record last Wednesday, October 3, before the House Select Committee on Export Control by Mr. George Ball, the Under Secretary of State.

This intelligence estimate is based on an elaborate system of surveillance by sea, by air and by land, and there is every reason to think that its accuracy is very high. For Cuba is an island easily within reach of the Navy and the Air Force, and with the modern apparatus of electronic and photographic intelligence, little of military interest can happen without our knowing it. We do not have to guess about what is being landed at the Cuban ports or about what is being constructed on Cuban territory. We know. And anyone who chooses to question the basis of our present policy must begin by proving that the intelligence estimates are wrong.

So I shall quote in full Mr. Ball's testimony on the crucial question of the Cuban military buildup. "Since July, when the volume of Soviet military shipments to Cuba suddenly vaulted upward, 85 shiploads arrived in Cuban ports. Many of them carried military items, supplies and personnel. These shipments have consisted, in part, of types of weapons previously delivered to the Cuban armed forces, including more tanks, self-propelled guns, and other ground force equipment. The major tonnage in recent shipments, however, has been devoted to SA-2, surface-to-air missiles (SAMS)—together with all the related gear and equipment necessary for their installation and operation. To date, 15 SAM sites have been established in the island. We estimate the total may eventually reach 25. These are antiaircraft missiles having a slant range of 20 to 25 miles.

"In addition, three and possibly four missile sites of a different type have been identified. These sites are similar to known Soviet coastal defense missile sites that are believed to accommodate antishipping missiles with a range of 20 to 35 miles. Quite likely several more such sites will be installed.

"Cuba is now estimated to have 60 older type Mig jet aircraft. In addition, at least one advanced jet-interceptor has recently been received, and probably several more are in the process of assembly. This type of advanced jet-interceptor is usually equipped with infrared air-to-air missiles. We estimate that the total of these advanced interceptors in Cuba may eventually reach 25 to 30.

"In addition, 16 'Komar' class guided missile patrol boats, which carry 2 short-range missiles (11 to 17 miles) were included in recent shipments.

"About 4,500 Soviet military specialists have arrived, including construction men and technicians."

The military buildup, in short, consists of weapons for the army, antiaircraft missiles, coastal defense weapons, some short-range patrol boats, a few fighter interceptors and some 4,500 Soviet specialists, technicians, and construction men. What is it all for? To attack the United States? Obviously not. The United States, using only conventional weapons, could dispose of Cuba in a few hours. Is the buildup to invade a Latin American neighbor? Conceivably, but only if Castro was prepared for the enormous punishment that would follow. It is obvious, I submit, that Castro is being armed against a rerun of the raid on the Bay of Pigs in April 1961. Tanks, coastal defenses, patrol boats, and antiaircraft equipment would be just exactly what he would need to repel another landing by Cuban exiles.

The present Cuban military buildup is not only not capable of offensive action, but also it is not capable of defensive action against the United States.

What then is Mr. Khrushchev up to in Cuba? Secondarily, perhaps he is baiting a trap for us which, if we fall into it, would throw the whole Western Alliance into confusion and disorder just at the time when a Berlin crisis is developing.

But primarily Mr. Khrushchev is in Cuba because he has talked so loudly about helping revolutions. Castro has thrown himself into Khrushchev's arms, and is blackmailing him. The Castro regime has made itself the prime and public test of whether international communism is a real force or a lot of words. Unless Castro can be made to succeed in Cuba, the revolutionary propaganda among the backward countries in the rest of the world will be greatly weakened.

So Mr. Khrushchev, despite what was undoubtedly much reluctance, is entangled in the fortunes of Fidel Castro. He must pour into Cuba oil and machinery, raw materials and food, and technicians and know-how, and money in order to demonstrate that communism can do better and faster in Cuba what the United States and the Alliance for Progress are trying slowly, but by peaceable means, to do elsewhere in Latin America.

This is the core of the Soviet-Cuban alliance. Mr. Ball described the Soviet intervention in Cuba as an effort "to establish a beachhead for subversion in this hemisphere." This would mean that Cuban facilities and Cuban connections with other countries in Latin America would be used to infiltrate agents and propaganda and small arms and money. All of this will work only if in Cuba there is a showpiece of successful communism. It will not work if the agents come from a land that is in misery and disorder.

It follows that as long as there is no direct military aggression by Cuba, as long as we are limiting ourselves to measures short of war, one of the best responses is to force the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc to carry the whole burden of Cuban reconstruction. That is the intent of the shipping measures now being formulated. They will not destroy the Castro regime now. But they will make it much more expensive and inconvenient for the Soviet Union to make Castro succeed.

Following the increasing agitation of the war party in this country, I have turned once more to a famous passage in Winston Churchill's writings in which he discusses the rights and wrongs of going to war.

"The safety of the State, the lives and freedom of their own fellow countrymen, to whom they owe their (the statesmen) position, make it right and imperative in the last resort, or when a final and definite conviction has been reached, that the use of force should not be excluded. If the circumstances are such as to warrant it, force may be used. And if this be so, it should be used under the conditions which are most favorable. There is no merit in putting off a war for a year if, when it comes, it is a far worse war or one much harder to win. These are the tormenting dilemmas upon which mankind has throughout its history been so frequently impaled. Final judgment upon them can only be recorded by history in relation to the facts of the case as known to the parties at the time, and also as subsequently proved." In the Cuban question the facts do not now compel a decision to go to war and there is no evidence whatsoever that war is inevitable and that it should therefore, be engaged in at once.

"Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclination is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will. * * * How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to read two paragraphs from the article, because in my judgment it is a very clear and, I believe, unanswerable defense of the brilliant policy which President Kennedy is following in connection with the Cuban crisis. There are those who want our country to go to war over Cuba; but they overlook the fact that if we do, we shall stand almost alone, because I think that, at the present time, world opinion is overwhelmingly against any such course of action—and rightly so.

Lippmann points it out with his keen mind in a very convincing manner. As I said before, and repeat today, the American people have every right to have confidence in President Kennedy's position in the Cuban crisis. He has no intention of allowing Cuba to take an aggressive course of action, but he has stated, in a way that is unanswerable, that even a Communist country has the sovereign right to build up its defenses.

Lippmann states:

> The military buildup, in short, consists of weapons for the army, anti-aircraft missiles, coastal defense weapons, some short-range patrol boats, a few fighter interceptors and some 4,500 Soviet specialists, technicians, and construction men. What is it all for? To attack the United States? Obviously not. The United States, using only conventional weapons, could dispose of Cuba in a few hours. Is the buildup to invade a Latin American neighbor? Conceivably, but only if Castro was prepared for the enormous punishment that would follow. It is obvious, I submit, that Castro is being armed against a rerun of the raid on the Bay of Pigs in April 1961. Tanks, coastal defenses, patrol boats and antiaircraft equipment would be just exactly what he would need to repel another landing by Cuban exiles.
>
> The present Cuban military buildup is not only not capable of offensive action, but also it is not capable of defensive action against the United States.

Let me read the final paragraph:

> It follows that as long as there is no direct military aggression by Cuba, as long as we are limiting ourselves to measures short of war, one of the best responses is to force the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc to carry the whole burden of Cuban reconstruction. That is the intent of the shipping measures now being formulated. They will not destroy the Castro regime now. But they will make it much more expensive and inconvenient for the Soviet Union to make Castro succeed.

In January of this year the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I were the two delegates from the Senate to the Punta del Este Conference. We listened to the diatribes and the Communist propaganda of the President of Cuba in a series of speeches at Punta del Este.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to continue for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. He put on a repeat performance yesterday at the United Nations, about which we read in the newspapers today. He was answered, in a prepared statement that was circulated throughout the United Nations, by our brilliant and great statesman, the American Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stevenson's statement of yesterday be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 8, 1962.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN PLENARY SESSION

Mr. President, I have asked to speak to a point of order. For 17 years we have come to expect that when a chief of state asks for the privilege of this podium, he has an obligation not to abuse it, and not to demean the United Nations and the dialog of diplomacy, but to speak here in a constructive and a statesmanlike manner.

But the President of Cuba, Mr. President, speaking as chief of state on a ceremonial occasion, has seen fit to use this rostrum to attack my country with unparalleled calumnies, slanders, and misrepresentations for 1 hour and 45 minutes.

Yet, Mr. President, I will not claim a right of reply from this platform this morning. Instead, I shall respond to his intemperate and false charges outside of this hall and at once. And, with your permission, Mr. President, I will have my response placed before the members of the General Assembly in printed form during the day.

Mr. President, the traditions of etiquette and of good taste which have been established here have built respect for this organization and, for my part, I do not want to descend even by reply to the levels of the chief of state we have just heard on this ceremonial occasion.

He is right, however, on one point. The last word will be written by history.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN REPLY TO PRESIDENT DORTICOS

Slander and invective are no substitute for facts and the weaker a case is the longer it takes to present. I think I can be very brief, indeed.

The charges just rehearsed by President Dorticos of Cuba against my Government are neither original nor true. Four times within the last 8 months, once in the Special Political Committee of the Assembly, once in the Plenary, and twice in the Security Council, the United Nations has decisively rejected accusations similar to those we have heard today.

I repeat the policy of the United States:

The Government of the United States, like the governments of the other indepehdent American Republics, will honor its commitments to the United Nations Charter and to the inter-American system. As we have stated so often, the United States will not commit aggression against Cuba. But let it be equally clear that the United States will not tolerate aggression against any part of this hemisphere. The United States will exercise the right of individual and collective self-defense—a right expressly recognized in the charter—against aggression in this hemisphere.

The charges made by Cuba against the United States are dictated by two factors. One is that the Castro regime has associated itself with the Communist bloc in its pursuit of world domination. A tactic always used in seeking this objective is to ridicule, malign and vilify anyone with the courage to oppose them.

The second factor is Cuba's self-inflicted exclusion from the American family of nations. The Castro regime has turned its back on its history, tradition, religion and culture. Cuba has turned away from its neighbors, and it is at the mercy of the political riptides that sweep through the Communist world with such frequence.

Thus the other nations of the Americas are understandably anxious and alert. But vigilance cannot and should not be equated with intervention, nor alarm with aggression.

The hemisphere—and the world—were prepared to accept the original promises of the Castro government that economic and social justice would be brought to the Cuban people. But its original pledges have now been discarded by the Cuban regime, and we condemn with all the force at our command the violations of civil justice, the drumhead executions and the suppression of political, intellectual, and religious freedom which have been inflicted on the Cuban people.

But even these excesses would not constitute a direct threat to the peace and independence of other states. However, Cuba has been opened to a flood of Soviet weapons and "technicans," and to the Soviet Union's so-called fishing fleet which is a long way from the fishing grounds off the north shore of Cuba.

The cod and the herring, gentlemen, are a long way from the new fishing fleet's headquarters. Cuba has not only armed itself to a degree never before seen in any Latin American country, but it has also welcomed penetration by the foremost exponent of a doctrine condemned in this hemisphere as "alien" and "incompatible." What we cannot accept—and will never accept—is that Cuba has become the springboard for aggressive and subversive efforts to destroy the inter-American system, to overthrow the governments of the Americas and to obstruct the peaceful, democratic evolution of this hemisphere toward social justice and economic development.

The statements of the President of the United States on this subject, and the recent joint resolution of the Congress of the United States amply attest to this concern.

Nor can these developments be ignored by the American Republics as a whole. Let there be no doubt as to the solidarity of the nations of this hemisphere on the problem of Cuba.

The foreign ministers and special representatives of the American Republics have just concluded 2 days of informal discussion on Communist intervention in Cuba. Speaking unanimously, they declared that the most urgent problem facing the hemisphere is this foreign intervention in Cuba and its threat to convert the island into an armed base for penetration and subversion of the democratic institutions of the hemisphere.

The hemisphere representatives unanimously affirmed their will to strengthen our common security against all aggression and all situations threatening peace and security in this hemisphere. Noting the special characteristics of the Inter-American regional system, they stated that a military intervention by Communist powers in Cuba cannot be justified as a situation analogous to the defensive measures adopted in other parts of the free world in order to resist Soviet imperialism.

The communique issued by the foreign ministers in Washington last week reflected the sense of increased gravity with which the American States have witnessed a succession of developments in Cuba since the Punta del Este meeting, where the Communist government of Cuba was found to be incompatible with the American system.

In the face of this threat, the foreign ministers have again unanimously reaffirmed their will to strengthen the security of the hemisphere against all aggression, from inside and outside the hemisphere, and against all developments and situations capable of threatening its peace and security.

The historic support of the members of the Organization of American States for the principles of self-determination and nonintervention are well known. These principles have been enshrined in acts of inter-American conferences, antedating by decades even the conception of the United Nations.

The United States has already begun to take effective measures concerning shipping and trade with Cuba, and the surveillance of traffic in arms and other strategic items in accordance with the discussions of the ministers of foreign affairs, the resolutions of the eighth meeting of consultation and other inter-American instruments.

The purpose of these measures is the collective defense of the hemisphere. As I have said, these measures have no offensive purpose.

There was incessant talk this morning about economic strangulation and economic blockade. Neither of these terms has any application to this case.

The current regime in Cuba has pronounced its intention to overthrow other governments in this hemisphere. Could anyone, therefore, take part in any trade, or aid trade designed to boost the Cuban economy, and to arm its military services?

To say that our self-protective actions are aggressive or a warlike gesture is absurd. It is the most normal, and indeed the least violent way, in which we can express our strong disapproval of the threats and sword rattling emanating from Cuba.

No threat to peace in this hemisphere arises out of the unanimous determination of American Republics in this regard.

The President of Cuba professes that Cuba has always been willing to hold discussions with the United States to improve relations and to reduce tensions. But what he really wishes us to do is to place the seal of approval on the existence of a Communist regime in the Western Hemisphere. The maintenance of communism in the Americas is not negotiable. Furthermore the problem of Cuba is not a simple problem of United States-Cuban relations. It is a collective problem for all the states of this hemisphere.

If the Cuban regime is sincere in its request for negotiations, and wishes to lay its grievances before the appropriate forum—the Organization of American States—I would suggest the Cuban Government might start by some action calculated to awaken the confidence of the inter-American system. The obvious place to begin would be the severing of its multiple ties to the Soviet bloc.

Let no one mistake the impact of this Soviet intervention in Cuba on the hope we all share for world peace. If the Soviet Union persists in the course it has chosen, if it continues to try to prevent the peaceful social revolution of the Americas, it will increasingly excite the deep indignation of the people of my country and of other American States. The result will be to make the resolution of issues far more difficult in every other part of the world. A consequence of this gratuitous Soviet initiative is to postpone even further the hope for world stabilization. I cannot state this point with sufficient gravity.

The tragedy of Cuba is still unfolding. How short has been the time since the two countries of the Western Hemisphere acclaimed the downfall of the Batista dictatorship and hailed what promised to be a democratic and progressive revolution. How quickly that promise was replaced by a reign of terror, confiscation, and the suppression of political, intellectual and religious freedom.

Just as fear is the first price of oppression, it would also have been the final price, if the Cuban oppressor had not been saved from the Cuban people by the Soviet Union. How many times in history has fear of the people's wrath driven tyrants to sell their nation to more powerful tyrants?

Can the Cuban electorate send the Russian forces home? Do the Cuban leaders dare face their people without these alien protectors? A country bristling with Soviet missiles and protectors is your answer.

We will constantly work to reassure the Cuban people that they have not been forgotten or abandoned, and make clear to freedom loving Cubans, both within and without that country, that they can count on the sympathy and support of the American people in their efforts to escape the grip of Soviet domination and recapture their own revolution. We did this for those who sought the overthrow of Batista. We can do no less today.

The Foreign Ministers meeting at Washington voiced the fraternal affection of all American peoples for the people of Cuba, and fervently wish to see them embraced again in the American family of nations. The United States joins wholeheartedly in this desire.

If the Cuban regime wishes to establish normal friendly relations in this hemisphere, let it return to the concepts and obligations of the inter-American system; let it cease its subservience to the Soviet Union—let it cease to be an avenue of intervention, which threatens the fundamental principles and the peace and security of all its neighbors with an alien doctrine.

The way is clear, and the choice is Cuba's.

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, the Lippmann article and the Stevenson statement make perfectly clear to the American people that we have no intention of following an aggressive course of action against Cuba, in spite of the lies spoken yesterday by the President of Cuba at the United Nations, but that we intend to stop any aggression on the part of Cuba against either the United States or any of our allies in the Western Hemisphere.

That is American policy. That is sound policy. It is within the framework of international law. I highly commend the President of the United States for his statesmanship in the field of foreign policy.

USE BY STATE AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS OF DOSSIERS FROM TRUJILLO FILES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the September 18, 1962, issue of National Review Bulletin there appeared a certain article from which I quote:

> According to reliable sources, the State and Justice Departments are making good use of dossiers taken from the files of the Trujillo regime. These dossiers show that the late Dominican dictator had a regular price list for U.S. legislators: $10,000 for a Congressman, $25,000 for a Senator or committee chairman, more for those with real political muscle. The names of those "on the take" are known, and it is charged that they reach very high in the congressional hierarchy. This information, if blasted out, could create a first-class political scandal, but so far it is being used to condition the thinking of those involved when they become obstreperous over "must" legislation.

This is a rather serious charge, and recognizing it as such I forwarded a letter to the Attorney General under date of September 20, incorporating this charge, and asking him to look into it and to comment.

I ask unanimous consent that both my letter and the Attorney General's reply thereto, as received by me on October 2, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In the September 18, 1962, issue of National Review Bulletin, there appears on page 5 the following paragraph, which is quoted in full:

"According to reliable sources, the State and Justice Departments are making good use of dossiers taken from the files of the Trujillo regime. These dossiers show that the late Dominican dictator had a regular price list for U.S. legislators: $10,000 for a Congressman, $25,000 for a Senator or committee chairman, more for those with real political muscle. The names of those "on the take" are known, and it is charged that they reach very high in the congressional hierarchy. This information, if blasted out, could create a first-class political scandal, but so far it is being used to condition the thinking of those involved when they become obstreperous over 'must' legislation."

It seems to me that this is a most serious charge to have published in a nationally circulated publication and it should not go unchallenged. I ask you, therefore, to advise me as soon as possible whether the information contained in the paragraph quoted above is or is not true.

I cannot overemphasize the seriousness which I attach to these charges and believe that if they are not true a prompt denial should be made public.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1962.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of September 20, 1962, re the paragraph in the National Review Bulletin of September 18.

I know of no list or information, such as that referred to in the article mentioned. Whether or not there is such a list is one of the matters being looked into in connection with the current investigation of the Galindez case. Up to this time, no such information has been developed.

I appreciate your interest in bringing this to my attention.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter I wrote on September 20 to Secretary of State Rusk, and the reply I received on October 10 from Assistant Secretary Frederick G. Dutton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1962.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the September 18, 1962, issue of National Review Eulletin, there appears on page five the following paragraph, which is quoted in full:

"According to reliable sources, the State and Justice Departments are making good use of dossiers taken from the files of the Trujillo regime. These dossiers show that the late Dominican dictator had a regular price list for U.S. legislators: $10,000 for a Congressman, $25,000 for a Senator or committee chairman, more for those with real political muscle. The names of those "on the take" are known, and it is charged that they reach very high in the congressional hierarchy. This information, if blasted out, could create a first-class political scandal, but so far it is being used to condition the thinking of those involved when they become obstreperous over 'must' legislation."

It seems to me that this is a most serious charge to have published in a nationally circulated publication and it should not go unchallenged. I ask you, therefore, to advise me as soon as possible whether the information contained in the paragraph quoted above is or is not true.

I cannot overemphasize the seriousness which I attach to these charges and believe that if they are not true a prompt denial should be made public.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Your letter of September 20 to the Secretary referred to a paragraph in the September 18, 1962, issue of the National Review Bulletin which quotes "reliable sources" to the effect that certain unnamed U.S. Senators and Representatives were in the pay of the late Dominican dictator Trujillo. The Department of State has no evidence to support such a charge.

Allegations of this kind have appeared from time to time, most recently in Ottawa in mid-September from Arturo E. Espaillat, the thoroughly discredited chief of the dictator's military intelligence organization. This may have been the source of the paragraph to which you refer. At that time, the Department, in answering inquiries regarding Espaillat's allegations, drew attention to Espaillat's unsavory and untrustworthy character and stated that it had no evidence to support his statements referring to the "buying" of various Congressmen and that no confirmatory evidence of the validity of such accusations had ever been produced. The charge that the Department of State is using such information to "condition the thinking" of Congressmen is therefore patently false, nor would the Department put this information to such use even if it possessed it.

Since the substance of the charges fall within the purview of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I have taken the liberty of forwarding your letter to Director J. Edgar Hoover for further reply. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

CRITICISM OF DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP IN THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this week some of us hope to bring to a close what has been one of the longest, most quarrelsome, and most frustrating peacetime sessions of the Congress.

Adjournment has been unduly delayed as the result of a series of revolts of the Democratic membership against the leadership of the Senate and their own President. It is ironical that this revolt stems, not from the opposition party but, rather, from within its own ranks.

For instance: First, appropriation bills were held up for months as the result of a picayunish dispute between the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees as to who should sit at the head of the table during the conferences. Now two subcommittee chairmen are feuding, which means more delays.

Even the secretary of the Democratic conference committee of the Senate is leading a revolt against the President and threatening to hold Congress in session indefinitely in an effort to force him to sign or veto a pet bill before adjournment. This is a bill which had been on the Senate Calendar for more than a year, and no one was even interested enough in the legislation to move for its consideration until a couple of weeks ago. In fact, less than a month ago the sponsors of this same bill voted against it when it was offered as an amendment to the regular tax bill.

Suddenly this bill assumes great importance, and one wonders whether it is the bill that is so important or whether some of the Democratic Members of the Senate are just using this as an excuse to show their resentment against some of the arrogant demands which the President has made on this Congress.

With a 2-to-1 majority in the Senate and a 3-to-2 majority in the House one would think that they could have finished the business of the Congress on schedule.

To make the situation even worse, the President, rather than staying on the job in Washington, has just been using the White House as a stopover between weekend vacationing at Hyannis Port and political junkets around the country in which he is calling for the election of more Democratic Members of Congress.

If a two-thirds majority can create the chaotic conditions, both legislative and administrative, which we are witnessing this year I shudder to think what will happen to the country if they get greater control of the Congress next year.

Perhaps if the President would stay in Washington a little more and see what a mess his party is making of running the Congress he might hesitate to ask the American people to add even more to this lopsided majority.

As one member of the minority party, I am becoming tried of and impatient with spending half of our time refereeing fights among the Democratic membership of the Senate.

I suggest that the greatest contribution that this administration could make to the American people would be to adjourn this Congress and to go home.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AQUARIUM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post there appears an editorial under the title "Wormy Bait." It deals with the aquarium proposed to be constructed on the banks of the Potomac. Some people have labeled that aquarium a "gold-plated fishbowl."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Others have called it "the fish hotel."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

In one of the early messages of the President he urged that Congress, in promoting projects, abstain from projects which, though they might be desirable, might not be essential, or might have no connection with our national defenses.

I opposed the adoption of this project. It envisions the spending of $10 million to build what will be the most expensive aquarium situated anywhere within our country. The cost of it will be far in excess of that of any other aquarium; and, when I say that, I refer to those situated in San Francisco, New York, Miami, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

In the editorial it is written:

> The slitheriest argument advanced by those who want to foist a $10 million aquarium on Washington is that somehow the project might pay for itself.

The editorial goes on to prove that the dream of the project being self-liquidating is unrealistic.

I fought the bill in committee. I fought it in the Senate. I respectfully submit that it is an affront to the intelligence of the people of our country. It involves the spending of $10 million on a project which is not needed, which is not essential, which has no relationship to national defense.

So far as I am concerned, I voice my vigorous protest against this expenditure. The most shocking aspect of it is that it is only one example of many other expenditures which are being made which are breaking the backs of the taxpayers of our country and throwing us into fiscal difficulties.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORMY BAIT

The slitheriest argument advanced by those who want to foist a $10-million aquarium on Washington is that somehow the project might pay for itself. Now that the authorization bill lies on the President's desk awaiting his signature, it is well to recall that even the Senate Public Works Committee conceded that the $10 million "would exceed the cost of any private commercial aquarium now in existence." This has prompted Senator PROXMIRE to remark, "Apparently, Washington fish will enjoy every advantage of a Fifth Avenue salon except Swedish masseurs."

Mr. PROXMIRE lists these comparative costs: San Francisco's Steinhart Aquarium (original cost: $300,000) is being entirely rebuilt for $750,000; Chicago's Shedd Aquarium cost $4 million ($3 million of which was donated); New York Aquarium, built in 1957 for an initial $1.5 million, will cost several more million when completed. Costs for commercial aquariums include $3.25 million for the Seaquarium in Miami, built in 1955, and $3.5 million for Marineland of the Pacific in Los Angeles, built in 1954.

Supporters of the aquarium blithely predict a $1 million annual income from 3 million visitors. But of the aquariums that charge admission, the top attendance is 1 million with a low of 200,000 at the New York Aquarium and 700,000 at Shedd in Chicago, cities with populations respectively 8 and 4 times that of Washington. We hope that President Kennedy reviews these figures before he swallows a 14-carat goldfish story.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer may lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives pertaining to S. 1447, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, which was, on page 1, strike out all after line 2 over through and including line 15 on page 12, and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 521, ch. 569), as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 is amended by striking everything after the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following salary schedules:

"Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9
Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$19,000								
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent	16,500								
Class 3: Assistant superintendent; president, teachers college	14,350	$14,600	$14,850	$15,100	$15,350	$15,600	$15,850	$16,100	$16,350
Class 4: Director, curriculum; dean, teachers college	12,700	12,950	13,200	13,450	13,700	13,950	14,200	14,450	14,700
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	11,000	11,250	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000
Group B, master's degree	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,700	11,950	12,200	12,450	12,700	12,950	13,200	13,450	13,700
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial and adult education.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Psychiatrist.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050	12,300	12,550	12,800	13,050
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,250	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	10,350	10,600	10,850	11,100	11,350	11,600	11,850	12,100	12,350
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050	12,300	12,550
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Director in elementary education.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850	11,100	11,350	11,600	11,850
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,050	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study and attendance).									
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Director, department of school attendance.									
Principal, Capitol page school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, veterans high school.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Principal, boy's junior-senior high school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	8,940	9,190	9,440	9,690	9,940	10,190	10,440	10,690	10,940
Group B, master's degree	9,440	9,690	9,940	10,190	10,440	10,690	10,940	11,190	11,440
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,640	9,890	10,140	10,390	10,640	10,890	11,140	11,390	11,640
Assistant director, food services.									
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	9,030	9,280	9,530	9,780	10,030	10,280	10,530	10,780	11,030
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,230	9,480	9,730	9,980	10,230	10,480	10,730	10,980	11,230
Assistant director, evening and summer schools.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Statistician.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	8,620	8,870	9,120	9,370	9,620	9,870	10,120	10,370	10,620
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,820	9,070	9,320	9,570	9,820	10,070	10,320	10,570	10,820
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Assistant director, subject fields.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	8,210	8,460	8,710	8,960	9,210	9,460	9,710	9,960	10,210
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,410	8,660	8,910	9,160	9,410	9,660	9,910	10,160	10,410
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	7,395	7,710	8,025	8,340	8,655	8,970	9,285	9,600	9,915
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,595	7,910	8,225	8,540	8,855	9,170	9,485	9,800	10,115
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Psychiatric social worker.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									

"Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7
Class 14:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$6,030	$6,285	$6,540	$6,795	$7,050	$7,305	$7,560
Group B, master's degree	6,530	6,785	7,040	7,295	7,550	7,805	8,060
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	6,730	6,985	7,240	7,495	7,750	8,005	8,260
Census supervisor.							
School psychologist.							
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.							
Instructor, teachers college.							
Instructor, laboratory school.							

"Salary class and position	Service step 8	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13
Class 14:						
Group A, bachelor's degree	$7,815	$8,070	$8,325	$8,580	$8,835	$9,090
Group B, master's degree	8,315	8,570	8,825	9,080	9,335	9,590
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,515	8,770	9,025	9,280	9,535	9,790
Census supervisor.						
School psychologist.						
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.						
Instructor, teachers college.						
Instructor, laboratory school.						

"Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8
Class 15:								
Group A, bachelor's degree	$5,000	$5,260	$5,520	$5,735	$5,950	$6,165	$6,380	$6,595
Group B, master's degree	5,500	5,760	6,020	6,235	6,450	6,665	6,880	7,095
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	5,700	5,960	6,220	6,435	6,650	6,865	7,080	7,295
Attendance officer.								
Child labor inspector.								
Counselor, replacement.								
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.								
Librarian, teachers college.								
Research assistant.								
School social worker.								
Speech correctionist.								
Coordinator of practical nursing.								
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.								

"Salary class and position	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13	Longevity step X	Longevity step Y
Class 15:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$6,810	$7,025	$7,240	$7,455	$7,670	$8,190	$8,710
Group B, master's degree	7,310	7,525	7,740	7,955	8,170	8,690	9,210
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,510	7,725	7,940	8,155	8,370	8,890	9,410
Attendance officer.							
Child labor inspector.							
Counselor, placement.							
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.							
Librarian, teachers college.							
Research assistant.							
School social worker.							
Speech correctionist.							
Coordinator of practical nursing.							
Teachers, elementary and secondary schools."							

(2) Section 2, subsection (a), is amended by striking from the third sentence "December 31, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1962"; by striking from the fourth sentence the words "counselor in the vocational high schools, counselor in the junior high schools,", and the words "school social worker,", and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the same sentence the following: ", and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was appointed on probationary or permanent status before January 1, 1963, to a position as a nonshop teacher in a vocational education program, or counselor in the vocational high schools, or counselor in the junior high schools may continue to be employed in such a position, and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was on the list of eligible candidates for any such position before January 1, 1963, may continue to be eligible for such positions until the expiration of such eligible list"; and by striking from the fifth sentence "December 31, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1962".

(3) Section 2, subsection (b), is amended by striking the figure "18" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "15".

(4) Section 4 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Each teacher, school officer, or other employee in the service of the Board on January 1, 1963, who occupies a position held by him on December 31, 1962, under the provisions of this Act, shall be placed in a salary class covered by section 1 of this Act as indicated at the end of this section. Any employee in group A, B, or C of his salary class on December 31, 1962, shall be assigned to the same letter group of the salary class to which he is transferred on January 1, 1963.

"Title and class of position on December 31, 1962

Title	Class
Superintendent	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
Assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers College	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College	4

***"Title and class of position on December 31, 1962*—Continued**

Title	Class
Chief examiner	5
Dean of students, teachers college	5
Executive assistant to the superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Director, food services	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools)	6
Director, curriculum	4
Director, elementary education (administration)	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	6
Director in elementary education	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety	6
Director, industrial and adult education	5
Director, special education	7
Principal, senior high school	6
Principal, vocational high school	6
Principal, junior high school	7
Registrar, teachers college	7

"Title and class of position on December 31, 1962—Continued

Title	Class
Principal, Americanization School	7
Principal, junior high school	7
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools	8
Supervising director, athletics	8
Supervising director, curriculum	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget and legislation)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools)	7
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance)	8
Supervising director, reading clinic	8
Supervising director, subject field	8
Director, school attendance	8
Supervising director, audiovisual instruction	9
Principal, elementary school	8
Principal, Capitol Page School	8
Principal, health school	7
Principal, laboratory school	7
Assistant principal, senior high school	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school	8
Assistant director, food services	9
Assistant principal, junior high school	9
Assistant principal, Americanization School	9
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Assistant principal, elementary school	11
Assistant principal, health school	14
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction	13
Assistant director, evening and summer schools	11
Principal, veterans high school	8
Assistant director, practical nursing	13
Assistant director, subject field	13
Statistician	11
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	16
Assistant professor, laboratory school	16
Chief attendance officer	15
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Clinical psychologist	15
Supervisor, elementary education	13
Psychiatric social worker	16
Attendance officer	18
Census supervisor	18
Child labor inspector	18
Coordinator, practical nursing	18
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools	18
Counselor, placement	18
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	18
Instructor, laboratory schools	18
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools	18
Librarian	18
Research assistant	18
School psychologist	18
School social worker	18
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College	18
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	18"

"Title and class of position on January 1, 1963

Title	Class
Superintendent	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
Assistant superintendent	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers College	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College	4
Chief examiner	5
Dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Executive assistant to the superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Director, food services	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools)	6
Director, curriculum	4
Director, elementary education (administration)	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	6
Director in elementary education	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety	6
Director, industrial and adult education	5
Director, special education	7
Principal, senior high school	6
Principal, vocational high school	6
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school	7
Registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Principal, Americanization School	7
Principal, junior high school	7
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools	8
Supervising director, athletics	8
Supervising director, curriculum	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools)	7
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance)	8
Supervising director, reading clinic	8
Supervising director, subject field	8
Director, school attendance	8
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction	9
Principal, elementary school	8
Principal, Capitol Page School	8
Principal, health school	7
Principal, laboratory school	7
Assistant principal, senior high school	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school	8
Assistant director, food services	9
Assistant principal, junior high school	9
Assistant principal, Americanization School	9
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	11
Assistant principal, elementary school	10
Assistant principal, health school	9
Assistant director, audio-visual instruction	11
Assistant director, evening and summer schools	10
Principal, veterans high school	8
Assistant director, practical nursing	11
Assistant director, subject field	11
Statistician	10
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Assistant professor, laboratory school	13
Chief attendance officer	12
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College	11
Clinical psychologist	12
Supervisor, elementary education	11
Psychiatric social worker	13
Attendance officer	15
Census supervisor	14
Child labor inspector	15
Coordinator, practical nursing	15
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools	14
Counselor, placement	15
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	14
Instructor, laboratory schools	14
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools	15
Librarian	15
Research assistant	15
School psychologist	14
School social worker	15
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College	15
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	15"

(5) Section 6, subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) On January 1, 1963, each permanent employee assigned to salary classes 2 through 15 in accordance with section 1 and section 4 of this Act shall be assigned to the same numerical service step on the schedule for his salary class, or salary class and group, under this Act as he occupied on December 31, 1962, except that employees assigned to salary class 15 on January 1, 1963, who on December 31, 1962, were on service step 13 shall be assigned to service steps for their respective groups as follows: An employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed fifteen years of creditable service but less than eighteen years shall be assigned to longevity step X, and an employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed eighteen years of creditable service shall be assigned to longevity step Y. In determining years of creditable service for placement on service steps, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the placement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned or who are brought under this Act in accordance with the provisions of section 5."

(6) Section 6, subsection (b), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ", except that each employee in salary class 15 shall advance from service step 13 to longevity step X on July 1 following the completion of fifteen years of creditable service; from longevity step X to longevity step Y on July 1 following the completion of eighteen years of creditable service: *Provided*, That beginning with the step increase normally due July 1, 1963, the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer.".

(7) Section 7, subsection (a), is amended by striking the figure "18" both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "15", by striking the figure "17" and inserting in lieu thereof "14", and by striking the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Employees newly appointed or reappointed to positions of assistant professor (salary class 13), chief librarian and associate professor (salary class 11), and professor (salary class 8) shall receive one year of placement credit for each year of satisfactory service, not in excess of five years, in a position of the same or higher rank in a college or university of recognized standing outside the District of Columbia public schools, as determined by the Board."

(8) Section 8, subsection (a), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ", except that beginning with any such step increase normally due subsequent to June 30, 1963, the Board of Education, on written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such increase in salary for the year immediately following

any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer."

(9) Section 11, (1), is amended by inserting after the word "increment" the words, "or longevity increment".

(10) Section 13, subsection (a), is amended by striking the classification and pay rates for educational employees in the summer and evening schools and inserting in lieu thereof the following classification and pay rates:

"Classification	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	Per diem		
SUMMER SCHOOL (REGULAR)			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	$19.72	$21.60	$23.66
Instructor, teachers college	21.69	23.86	26.03
Assistant professor, teachers college	22.68	24.94	27.21
Associate professor, teachers college	25.64	28.20	30.76
Assistant principal	26.62	29.28	31.94
Principal, supervising director, and professor, teachers college	28.50	31.45	34.31
	Per diem		
VETERANS' SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL CENTERS			
Teacher	$29.58	$32.54	$35.49
	Per period		
EVENING SCHOOLS			
Teacher	$5.04	$5.39	$5.79
Assistant principal	6.49	7.16	7.84
Principal	6.97	7.69	8.51"

(11) Section 13, subsection (b), is amended by striking "January 1, 1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1963".

(12) Section 14 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. Each employee assigned to salary class 15 in the schedule provided in section 1 of this Act, each assistant professor in salary class 13, each associate professor and chief librarian in salary class 11 and each professor in salary class 8 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in ten monthly installments in accordance with existing law."

(13) Section 15 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 15. On and after January 1, 1963, the Act entitled 'An Act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia', approved March 5, 1952, as amended, shall apply to employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed in salary classes 6 through 14, inclusive, under this Act, except the following: Executive assistant to deputy superintendent and the assistant to the assistant superintendent in salary class 6; assistants to the assistant superintendent in salary class 7; dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College, professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, director, school attendance, registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College, and assistants to the assistant superintendents, in salary class 8; assistant director, department of food services, in salary class 9; statistician, in salary class 10; associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, and chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 11; and assistant professor, salary class 13."

(14) Section 16 is amended by striking "January 1, 1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1963"; by striking "salary class 18" and inserting in lieu thereof "salary class 15"; by striking "chief librarian and assistant professor, salary class 14" and inserting in lieu thereof "assistant professor, salary class 13; and chief librarian, salary class 11".

Sec. 102. Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended", approved September 13, 1960 (74 Stat 913), is repealed.

Sec. 103. Sections 101 and 102 of this title shall take effect as of January 1, 1963.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill, and that the Presiding Officer be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. Morse, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Beall conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUCCESS OF THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there is no more convincing evidence of the success of the committee system of administering the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service than the record of farmer participation in the elections in which the committee members are named.

If the electorate in America turned out in anywhere near the percentage which voted in the recent county ASC elections in my State of Georgia, then we would indeed have a true expression of the voice of the people. Of an estimated 127,466 Georgia farmers eligible to vote, 85,857 cast ballots, for an overall percentage of 67.4.

I ask, Mr. President, how many primaries or local or national elections in this Nation have attracted such a tremendous percentage in the last 100 years? I am sure there have been very few.

In one Georgia county—Long County—100 percent of the eligible farmers went to the polls. And in several other Georgia counties the percentage of participation exceeded 90 percent.

Mr. President, our farmer-elected committee system of administering our national farm program embodies the highest ideals of our democratic process. It affords American farmers the opportunity to take broad Federal programs and adapt and apply them to the circumstances of local situations.

Further indication of the acceptance of the committee system, Mr. President, is found in the fact that in the nine Southeastern States 73,585 new farms have signed up to participate in the agricultural conservation program. And by new farms I mean those that have not taken advantage of this program whereby the farmer and the Federal Government share the cost of preserving soil and water resources for the past 3 years.

For the entire Southeast, Mr. President, 13,416 ASC committeemen worked voluntarily to bring about this accomplishment. This amounted to an average of 61 percent of all committeemen in the area securing one or more new ACP farms.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a table showing the breakdown by States in this regard be printed at this juncture in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State	New farms filing ACP-201	Committeemen enrolling 1 or more new farms	
		Committeemen	Portion of total
	Number	*Number*	*Percent*
Georgia	8,654	1,841	67
Alabama	7,170	1,192	55
Arkansas	10,880	1,611	54
Florida	2,883	315	99
Louisiana	4,433	1,081	77
Mississippi	5,804	812	24
North Carolina	11,408	2,440	66
South Carolina	6,432	1,129	82
Tennessee	15,921	3,040	75
Area total	73,585	13,461	61

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, these statistics make it clear that the ASC farmer committee system has done and is doing an outstanding job. To the mind of the Junior Senator from Georgia, Mr. President, it is truly one of our greatest democratic organizations.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI LAW SCHOOL STUDENTS SHOW THEIR DEVOTION TO LAW AND ORDER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this Senator has until now deliberately avoided saying anything about the crisis in Mississippi. I have done so because I have recognized, as have other Senators, what a tragedy it has been and what fine people there are in Mississippi who are doing their best under the most unfortunate and difficult circumstances.

I rise to comment on the situation today because of a development which has occurred in Mississippi which I think should be called to the attention of the Senate, and which I think reflects very great credit on the people of Mississippi who are concerned.

The Deputy Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, in an article published in the New York Times this morning, is reported to have told students at the University of Mississippi Law School "not to hope for a miracle" that would remove James H. Meredith from the campus.

Mr. Katzenbach was very blunt, when he said:

> Mr. Meredith is not going to withdraw, he's going to be right here.

He urged the students to say "Knock it off, this is becoming boring," when "loudmouths" spoke of possible violence to the university's Negro student.

When Mr. Katzenbach, who is the second ranking man in the Justice Department, finished his speech, I think one could have expected almost any kind of reaction from the audience under those circumstances, including silence and hostility. What actually happened? When he finished speaking, he received a standing ovation of nearly a minute from his audience of 200 students. Incidentally, this group included almost all the students at the University of Mississippi Law School.

I think this incident reflects very great credit on the students of the University of Mississippi, who must have been torn in their reactions to this kind of situation. Their response to the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Kennedy's second ranking man in the Justice Department shows that they feel very deeply in favor of abiding by the law, and that the Federal Government, by acting in the manner in which it has acted to support the law is in fact doing its best to prevent further rioting and further violence at the University of Mississippi.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Thomas Buckley and published in the New York Times of today, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE AID TELLS MISSISSIPPI CLASS NEGRO WILL STAY

(By Thomas Buckley)

OXFORD, MISS., October 8.—Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach told students at the University of Mississippi Law School today "not to hope for a miracle" that would remove James H. Meredith from the campus.

"Mr. Meredith is not going to withdraw, he's going to be right here," Mr. Katzenbach said. He urged the students to say, "knock it off, this is getting boring," when loudmouths spoke of possible violence to the university's Negro student.

Mr. Katzenbach, the second ranking man in the Justice Department, is in charge of the Department's operations here. He received a standing ovation of nearly a minute from his audience of 200 students when he finished speaking. The 1-hour meeting in the school's mock-court room ended with a question-and-answer period.

Then, for 30 minutes, Mr. Katzenbach, Dean Robert J. Farley, and Prof. John H. Fox, director of admissions, talked informally with 20 students who remained behind.

He also criticized the bar in Mississippi for not expressing itself during the mounting Meredith crisis.

"Above all others," he stated, "they should have been educating the people of the State to the fact that without law and obedience of the courts there is only anarchy."

Mr. Katzenbach appeared at the invitation of the faculty. Classes were canceled during the period, but attendance was not obligatory. Even so, it appeared that virtually all the law school's 223 students were present.

Later, Mr. Katzenbach spoke at a closed luncheon meeting of student leaders that was also attended by Dr. John D. Williams, the chancellor of the university.

In other developments, the Army removed the remaining checkpoints as the campus gates at 10 a.m., permitting cars to enter without being searched. However, detachments still patrolled the grounds, the city of Oxford, and the surrounding countryside for 15 miles around.

An Army spokesman said that 5,400 troops who had been standing by at military installations at Memphis and Columbus, Miss., had been ordered to start back to their bases. The force in this area stands at slightly over 10,000 men.

Mr. Meredith, who returned yesterday afternoon from a weekend away from the campus, attended classes during the morning and lunched at 1:20 at the school cafeteria. He sat with a U.S. marshal. Four others and John Doar, the Department of Justice attorney who has been with Mr. Meredith for several weeks, ate at other tables in the barn-like building at the same time. Twenty youths were gathered outside the cafeteria door when the 29-year-old student left about 30 minutes later. Several shouted the usual taunts and epithets but not so loudly as in previous days.

Mr. Meredith, in his second Monday on campus, smiled but said nothing. He was then driven to his apartment in Baxter Hall, accompanied by five marshals. The building continued to be heavily guarded by military policemen.

Mr. Katzenbach and Mr. Doar returned to Washington tonight.

Joseph F. Dolan, an Assistant Deputy Attorney General, who has been Mr. Katzenbach's chief aid, will take charge. Arvid Sather, an attorney in the civil rights division, will assist Mr. Doar.

Mr. Katzenbach, indicating that the situation was under control, said he could "find no reason for staying."

In addressing the law students, Mr. Katzenbach was on familiar ground. He taught at both the University of Chicago and the Yale University Law School before joining the Kennedy administration in January 1961.

Dean Farley evoked considerable laughter when he introduced Mr. Katzenbach to the students as an eminent lawyer "who by the merest coincidence happened to be on the campus today."

Mr. Katzenbach's remarks were heard by at least three members of the State house of representatives who are also law students. All have consistently supported Gov. Ross R. Barnett's defiance of the Federal courts in the Meredith case.

One Joseph R. Meadows, 26 years old, of Quitman, asked Mr. Katzenbach who ordered the Lyceum Building ringed with marshals late last Sunday.

Mr. Katzenbach indicated that the step was taken on the advice of Governor Barnett.

He said the Department of Justice's only mistake may have been in "waiting too long" to use tear gas on the mob that beseiged the marshals. He pointed out that the rioters had injured several marshals and had tried repeatedly to set fire to the canvas tops of Army trucks before the order to fire was given at 8 p.m.

Mr. Katzenbach again assailed the State highway patrol for its withdrawal from the campus. He said he had made repeated pleas that it continue to guard at least the entrances, thus barring outsiders from joining the battle.

The students laughed as Mr. Katzenbach said of the patrol, "they had succeeded pretty well in the past." He referred to the three times that attempts by marshals to put Mr. Meredith on the university grounds had failed.

UNNECESSARY WASTE IN DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PROCUREMENT POLICIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Comptroller General has just submitted to the Congress another of his periodic reports in which he calls our attention to some more unnecessary waste resulting from the inefficient procurement policies by the Defense Department.

In this report he outlines over $300 million in prime contracts and subcontracts involving all three military services which were awarded without first obtaining the required certificates as to the production costs of the respective items being purchased.

The result was that approximately $60 million in unnecessary expenditures were made in connection with these particular contracts.

To quote the Comptroller General:

> Prices of selected contracts were increased about $60 million either because the cost data used in negotiations were inaccurate, incomplete, or not current or because the prices were negotiated without the use of any cost data.

I ask unanimous consent that the Comptroller General's letter of October 4, 1962, in which he outlines this $60 million unnecessary expenditures, be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, October 4, 1962.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on review of the extent to which military procurement agencies and prime contractors have obtained certifications as to the accuracy and completeness of cost data used in negotiation of contract prices. This review was made as a result of the interest of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations, House Committee on Armed Services, in the effectiveness of new regulations adopted by the Department of Defense to improve the negotiation of contract prices.

The report shows that, even though procurement regulations were revised in October 1959 to require defense contractors and their subcontractors under noncompetitive procurements to furnish certifications of pricing data, many procurements entered into in 1960 and 1961 were negotiated without obtaining such certifications. Our selective review at certain military procurement agencies and contractors' plants identified Army and Navy prime contracts totaling about $253 million and subcontracts totaling about $47 million involving all three military services, which were awarded without obtaining the required certifications. We found also that the Department of Defense contract clauses used in cost-type contracts at the time of our review omitted the requirement for certifications by subcontractors. As a consequence, the Government did not receive, in many instances, the assurance intended by the revised regulation that current, complete, and correct cost and pricing data had been considered in negotiating contract prices.

Reports submitted to the Congress by this Office during recent years have shown that prices of selected contracts were increased about $60 million either because the cost data used in negotiations were inaccurate, incomplete, or not current or because the prices were negotiated without the use of any cost data. Consequently, the failure to obtain the required pricing certifications in contracts and subcontracts negotiated subsequent to the revised regulation may have resulted in payment by the Government of higher prices than were justified. Further, in the absence of the certifications, it is generally more difficult for the Government to recover excess amounts included in the contract prices and to assess penalties for making false representations of pricing data.

In connection with legislation sponsored by Congressmen Vinson and Hébert during the 86th Congress and the 87th Congress, we reviewed our findings with Congressman Hébert's Subcommittee for Special Investigations, House Committee on Armed Services, and stated our belief that administration of the regulation would be more effective if there were a statutory requirement for pricing certifications under negotiated contracts. Subsequently, we worked with both the House and the Senate Armed Services Committees concerning proposed legislation on this subject. This legislation was passed by the Congress and signed into law on September 10, 1962 (Public Law 87–653). The law amends the Armed Services Procurement Act to require with certain exceptions that, where price competition is lacking under negotiated contracts and subcontracts, cost or pricing data be submitted in procurements over $100,000 and be certified by the contractor and subcontractor as accurate, complete, and current. The law provides further that in these procurements the contract contain a clause permitting the Government to recover any significant increase in the price that resulted from the submission of inaccurate, incomplete, or noncurrent cost or pricing data. We believe that these new legal requirements will materially improve the negotiation of contract prices.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On October 5, 1962, the Comptroller General sent another report. This time he called attention to the fact that on the Nike-Hercules project the Government had more than $800,000 worth of excess subcomponent parts of a certain type and in addition to having those in excess, they also had on order another $1.9 million worth of those same parts, which would have brought the total to $2.7 million of excess material. This is a further illustration of the irresponsible purchasing practices of the Government in paying no attention to what they need at the time they buy.

I ask unanimous consent that the Comptroller General's letter of October 5 be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comptroller General of
the United States,
Washington, October 5, 1962.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Enclosed is our report on review of the management of selected spare parts for the Nike-Hercules guided missile airborne guidance set in the Department of the Army.

Our review disclosed that the Army Ordnance Missile Command procured excess quantities of three expensive repairable subcomponents of the Nike-Hercules airborne guidance set in an amount the we estimate at over $800,000 from April 1958, when production of these subcomponents began, through March 1961. In addition, the Army had in process in March 1961 proposed orders for these same subcomponents amounting to over $1.9 million, making a total of over $2.7 million worth of excess actual and proposed procurement. Further, our estimate of excesses does not measure the full extent of the actual and planned overprocurement since in our computations we accepted certain factors used by the Army in making supply predictions that overstated needs.

These excess actual and planned procurements occurred primarily because the Army lacked effective controls over supply transactions. For instance, although Army regulations require the prompt return of repairables, we found no effective method for assuring that this was done. As a result, although a substantial number of repairables were being generated, only a small fraction were being returned, thus needlessly increasing procurement needs. Similarly, users were requisitioning and maintaining in stock quantities in excess of justifiable needs which were being reported as issues made to replace unserviceable components. Such transactions both understate assets and overstate usage, each of which further inflates future procurement needs. Here again, although Army regulations prohibited this practice, we found no effective method for preventing it from occurring.

In commenting on our findings, the Army conceded in regard to the three expensive repairable subcomponents that the conditions reported by us existed at the time of our review but concluded, nevertheless, that the supply system was generally sound. The Army stated (1) that the guidance set was a relatively new item and the problems inherent in supply management of new items had not yet been resolved at the time of our review, (2) that these problems caused some excessive procurement, but not to the extent that we indicated in our report, and (3) that, furthermore, a review made by the Army in September 1961 showed that the oversupply had been steadily reduced. However, our analysis of later requirements and procurement data showed that the excess of actual and proposed procurement still totaled about $2.6 million in December 1961.

In our opinion the facts revealed in our review clearly disclose a condition in which the failure to provide for prompt return of repairable subcomponents and the unnecessary accumulation of inventories at user levels resulted in both overstating requirements and understating resources and in the consequent actual and proposed overprocurement. We are, therefore, recommending that (1) immediate action be taken to recover excess subcomponents now in the supply system, (2) controls over the supply activity of expensive repairable items be strengthened, and (3) more realistic supply data be used in requirements computations,

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I most respectfully suggest that Members of Congress as well as representatives of the agencies affected would do well to read both of those reports of the Comptroller General.

CONTRASTING CONCEPTS OF DUE PROCESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, about 10 days ago, I addressed the Senate with reference to the Meredith case. I pointed out that even though the judgment was threatened to be executed with the use of troops, there had not been a decision on the case by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the New York Times issue of October 9, 1962, the distinguished and prominent columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, published a column on the same subject. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Contrasting Concepts of Due Process

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington, October 8.—Nearly a month ago Associate Justice Black ordered the University of Mississippi to enroll a Negro, James Meredith, at the opening of the current semester, on the general ground the Justice knew as a fact the State's pending appeal to the Supreme Court for formal, final review of the issue would be dismissed without a hearing when his judicial brethren reassembled. Today his forecast was borne out by the event. The Supreme Court caught up with due process with a formal, but ex post facto, order rejecting the State's appeal to be heard in support of its petition for final review.

Meanwhile, Meredith had been enrolled over official State resistance, followed by mob resistance on the university campus that cost two lives and many injuries, and was quelled only after President Kennedy sent Federal and federalized troops to assist the U.S. marshals on whom he and his brother, the Attorney General, had first depended for enforcement of the Federal Court orders involved. And on the day the Supreme Court passed judgment on Mississippi's review appeal, in the formal way any litigant, particularly a State, deserves from the Highest Tribunal when this final step is legally to be taken, 17,000 members of the National Armed Forces were still enforcing the order Justice Black issued after taking an informal, Gallup-type poll of his summer-scattered brethren.

SOUTHERNER'S EVALUATION

Those lawyers and others, who are not at all disturbed by the casual judicial attitude toward due process in this instance and reject the view there was any relationship between it and the fury of the resistance on the university campus at Oxford, will probably not be in the least swayed by a differing evaluation, especially by a southerner in political office. But a deluge of communications to this Department from all parts of the United States indicates that many other lawyers and citizens are very disturbed over such aspects of the controversy. These at least will give respectful hearing to the following observations from Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina, a "moderate" on the racial issue from an equally moderate State, and a former associate justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court.

"If the execution of judgment in the [Meredith] case," he writes, "had been postponed from [September 10] until the Supreme Court had ruled [as it did today, October 8] upon the application of Mississippi * * * for review, it is possible that the tragic events * * * within the last few days might well have been avoided. * * * Mr. Justice Black stated in substance that he would not stay the judgment in a case the [Supreme] Court had never considered because he thought the Court would probably decide the case against the applicant. * * * Mr. Justice Black's statement might be becoming to a crusade. It certainly does not befit the occupant of a judicial office.

"The Constitution would not have been destroyed, the heavens would not have fallen, if the efforts to force the entrance of Meredith * * * had been postponed until the Supreme Court had acted on [the

State's] application * * * for review." (The postponement would have been for 28 days.)

THE MALLORY CASE

That is a concept of due process which, by total contrast, the Supreme Court has meticulously followed in cases affecting Communist and criminal defendants. For example, in 1957 it freed one Mallory, convicted of an especially brutal rape by a District of Columbia jury, whose death sentence was upheld in the Federal Court of Appeals here, because of "unnecessary delay" by the police between the interrogation of Mallory and his arraignment. Obedient to this vague formula, the same appellate court has just quashed the conviction for manslaughter of one Killough because his voluntary oral confession was preceded by a written one the court found inadmissible under the "Mallory rule." Killough strangled his wife and buried her in the city dump.

Chief Judge Miller, dissenting, said he was "shocked" by reversal of the conviction on such "tortured grounds" of due process. And, commented the Washington Evening Star today, the effect will be that the situation of unpunished violence now rampant in Washington will "get worse" until Congress specifies that confessions, otherwise valid, shall not be held inadmissible because of a delay in arraignment.

DEMONSTRATION OF NATIONAL POWER OVER STATE CONTROL OF EDUCATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have collected a number of editorials and news columns about the effect of the actions of troops in Mississippi and other events surrounding this demonstration of national power over State control of education. So that the Members of this body might have an opportunity to read these comments which are critical of the actions of the National Government in Mississippi, I ask unanimous consent that these articles, some of which have been printed in the North as well as the South, be printed in the Record.

These articles are as follows: An editorial entitled "Law and Order" from the October 4, 1962, edition of the Washington Post; an editorial entitled "National Defeat" from the October 4, 1962, edition of the Beaufort Gazette, Beaufort, S.C.; several columns by David Lawrence, "Due Process of Law Ignored," from the Evening Star, October 1, 1962, "Illegality Breeds Illegality," from U.S. News & World Report, October 8, 1962, "Brothers Kennedy Haste Questioned," from the Greenville News, October 4, 1962, and "Court Denies Mississippi Hearing" from the Columbia Record, October 4, 1962; an editorial entitled "The Birth of a Crisis" from the Journal, of West Columbia, S.C., October 4, 1962; several editorials reprinted from the Richmond News Leader, "Civil Liberties in Oxford," which appeared in the News and Courier, of Charleston, S.C., on October 5, 1962, and "Some Reflections," which appeared in the News and Courier of October 7, 1962; two columns written by Arthur Krock, "In the Nation," appearing in the New York Times on October 2 and 4, 1962; Bob Craig's column, "Thank God for Mississippi," which appeared in the October 1, 1962, edition of the Spartanburg Herald and Journal; an editorial, "Walker's Case Disturbing," from the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., on October 4, 1962; "Political Prisoner?" an editorial which appeared in the Evening Star, of Washington, D.C.; and an editorial from the Sunday Star, October 7, 1962, entitled "General Walker Insane?"

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1962]

Law and Order

Three days have passed since violence erupted in Oxford, Miss., on Sunday evening and made necessary the intervention of Federal troops. At least a sullen semblance of order has been restored. But the situation is undoubtedly still tense and ugly, with dangerous undercurrents that could produce new outbreaks of lawlessness. Perhaps it would have been wise to declare martial law in Oxford in order to enable military authorities lawfully to search for weapons and take other summary measures to maintain order. Perhaps a declaration of martial law would still be desirable. It is disquieting, in any case, to learn that, without any declaration of martial law, soldiers are in some instances acting without regard to procedures established by law.

The Army was sent into Mississippi expressly to reestablish respect for the Constitution. Its mission can only be corrupted if it behaves in unconstitutional ways. Roadblocks, searches and seizures, and other emergency measures may be necessary; if so, let the emergency be recognized and military rule be proclaimed. In this connection, it seems in order to ask if all the protections of due process are being accorded Edwin A. Walker. For all the malevolence of his part in the Oxford violence, he ought not to be denied reasonable release on bail and he ought not be committed to a mental institution even for examination without the precaution customary in the case of such a commitment.

It was to uphold the law as well as to maintain order that the Army was sent into Mississippi. Let it manifest, therefore, the most conscientious respect for the law consonant with the immensely difficult and delicate task entrusted to it.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C.]

Political Prisoner?

There is nothing in the record, as we view it, to support the contention that former Major General Walker is a "political prisoner." There is strong support, however, for the belief that his legal rights have been violated by the Government.

General Walker was arrested about noon on Monday and charged with rebellion, insurrection and seditious conspiracy in connection with the riot at the University of Mississippi. These are grave charges. If they can be proved he should be convicted and severely punished. But until found guilty by a jury, he is presumed to be innocent.

Two hours after his arrest a hearing was held before a Federal judge in Mississippi. General Walker, according to Representative Alger, of Texas, was not represented by counsel. The judge, allegedly on the basis of statements made by a psychiatrist who had not even seen, much less examined, General Walker, ordered the latter committed to a Federal mental institution in Missouri and fixed bail at $100,000.

His friends and family have raised this excessive amount. But the U.S. attorney in the Missouri district involved says General Walker will not become eligible for bail until after completion of a mental examination, which usually takes from 60 to 90 days. All of this, of course, is being done over the vigorous protests of General Walker's attorneys. But it is being done nonetheless, and if the Government can do this to General Walker it can do the same thing to any citizen.

When a riot is underway and people are being killed and wounded it doubtless may become necessary to act without too much concern for the niceties of the law. But the riot started and ended Sunday night. Four days later, however, General Walker sits in a prison hospital under circumstances which point to a denial of his constitutional rights. And certainly there is a basis for Mr. Alger's assertion that the troops in Mississippi, who are still searching cars and individuals without a declaration of martial law, are violating the fourth amendment.

When the riot started the Government was forced to act. But continued illegal action and physical abuse of arrested suspects is inexcusable.

[From the Beaufort Gazette, Oct. 4, 1962]

National Defeat

The harvest of shame and disgrace that this Nation is reaping from the tragic happenings in Mississippi has elicited a wide range of reactions from many directions, depending upon the varied approaches to this painful problem.

If a person's first knowledge of the agony had been derived from President Kennedy's address to the Nation Sunday evening, he would have been inclined to sympathize with the President in his solemn, but sorrowful, approach toward a regrettable duty. He would have felt that the President had been forced to take this stand only after all other less forceful means had been exhausted, and he would have been inclined to admire the President for his moral and political courage.

However, a listener with a little more knowledge of the steps that led to this intolerable deadlock between Federal and State power, would have had gnawing at his consciousness the fact that President Kennedy and his brother, the Attorney General, had contributed much to the national state of mind that resulted in the riots and bloodshed in Mississippi. Despite the President's profound assurance that the law must be observed, that ours is a civilization built upon laws and not upon men, he would have recalled that the Kennedy brothers had, in fact, fostered lawlessness in their very recent encouragement of the so-called freedom riders and other insurrectionists.

In the case of Mississippi, the President was only too willing to urge outsiders to stay away and let peace officers, Federal marshals, and soldiers handle the situation—all in the name of observance of the law. In the case of the freedom riders, sit-ins, and other demonstrations with explosive potentialities, the Kennedy brothers have uttered their tacit approval, in the name of what they consider desirable social reform, even at the risk of injuries and bloodshed.

Twice now Kennedy has flexed the awesome muscles of Federal power—once to crack the back of the steel industry and now to crack the back of local, self-government. He is well on his way toward developing the habit. That way lies dictatorship.

When the elected head of a nation no longer can sell his program with the persuasion of reason, the nation may have arrived at a point where they can afford to question whether the President's program is worth selling.

Resort to arms against one's own people may be interpreted not so much as a display of valor but an admission of defeat.

[From the News and Courier, Oct. 5, 1962]

Civil Liberties in Oxford

(Editor's Note.—The following editorial correspondence in the Richmond News Leader was written by James Jackson Kilpatrick, editor.)

Jackson, Miss.—In his television address to the Nation Sunday night, President Kennedy made an eloquent appeal for obedience to law. Americans may not like the requirements of a particular law or order, he said, but they must abide by the law anyhow. Any other course, he said, could lead to anarchy or tyranny.

No responsible person will take issue with the President on these entirely proper admonitions. Ours is indeed a society based upon law, and to the extent that law has been violated by Mississippians (and by some of their uninvited and unwanted guests), their actions stand condemned. Sunday night's riot at Oxford, Miss., was lawlessness incarnate. The stanchest defender of the South, gazing in sadness upon the ravished campus of the University of Mississippi, feels a sorrow too deep for words.

But it might be a most profitable exercise for the President of the United States to put the Mississippi crisis to one side for a day or so, and reflect instead upon his own record of obedience to law. We would ask him to recollect especially his own violent, lawless and tyrannical conduct only a few months ago in the matter of the steel case.

There is not the slightest question that the steel companies were acting lawfully in raising the price on their product. They were abiding by the law, but it was a state of law, in this application, that the President did not like. What example of obedience—of respect for law—did Mr. Kennedy set in April? He routed newspapermen from their beds in the middle of the night to be interrogated by FBI agents. He went far beyond his constitutional authority, in order to prevent freemen from acting freely. He cursed, abused, and threatened the steelmakers. The rabble of white trash at Oxford on Sunday threw stones and eggs; Mr. Kennedy in April threw something much heavier and of higher value: The weight of his Office.

And the President might reflect also upon the lawfulness of his own actions in Mississippi. Granted that he has a responsibility for seeing that court orders are executed, the moment James Meredith was enrolled at the University of Mississippi, that decree was carried out. The order was enforced.

By what justification are thousands of troops occupying Oxford today? The answer is that they are there to prevent domestic violence. But this is no responsibility of the President of the United States. The Constitution says in words so clear a child could understand them that Federal power may be used to protect a State against domestic violence only upon application of its Governor or legislature, and Mississippi has made no such application.

The Kennedy brothers have suspended civil liberties in Oxford in palpable violation of the constitutional rights of the people. On Monday, bayonet-bearing soldiers and helmeted U.S. marshals rounded up more than 200 persons. Most of them were teenage youngsters or immature adults. These prisoners were publicly searched and paraded before television cameramen. They were herded into interrogation rooms. Then they were publicly prodded into waiting buses, parked where the lingering tear gas was thickest, and there they were left for up to 8 hours. The youngsters had no charges placed against them; they were "temporarily detained for questioning." They had no opportunity to obtain counsel. They were denied access to telephones. They had neither food, water, nor toilet facilities.

Meanwhile, infantrymen closed off the town square of Oxford entirely. Local merchants were not permitted to open their stores. Town residents were denied the use of public sidewalks. Merchants could not even go to the post office to pick up their mail. The county courthouse was closed and all public business suspended. Women with children in their cars were compelled to stop at roadblocks, step out of their automobiles, and stand by while Negro soldiers searched the vehicles from hood to trunk. Private property has been wantonly abused and confiscated by the Federal troops. On a private lawn along Route 6, just north of Oxford, infantrymen on Monday afternoon were methodically digging deep gun emplacements. The trash and litter left by the indifferent marshals baffles description.

No one who has seen the Mississippi crisis at firsthand will doubt the gravity of this affair. It is a tense time. But when admonitions are being handed out from on high, in the name of obedience to law, a troubled country should ask the President some searching questions. Does he come into this court of equity with clean hands? Is his own record so shining that he reflects a perfect example to the Nation?

[From the New York Times, Oct. 4, 1962]

The Very Short Life of a Senate Amendment

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington, October 3.—Collectors of legislative antiques will probably never be able to display one that became a museum piece so quickly as the 1957 Senate excision from the Federal statutes of a Reconstruction Act for the enforcement of equal rights. Known as the Knowland-Humphrey amendment because its sponsors were the California Republican and the Minnesota Democrat so named, the restraint on methods of enforcing public school desegregation which its Southern supporters hoped the excision would supply lasted only from July 22 to September 24.

There were three bases on which 90 Senators, including John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, voted for the amendment, none dissenting. (1) It corrected what is known as "legislation by reference," a bad practice by which ancient statutes—in this instance the military enforcement of Reconstruction in the South—are kept in force by citing them in later measures. (2) By striking out this cross-reference, the amendment supplied the southern Senators with what they trusted would be a ban on the use of Federal troops to enforce Federal court orders for public school desegregation in the States. (3) Northern Senators agreed with Senator Clark, of Pennsylvania, that it did not, however, repeal other statutes which empowered the President to "use the military forces of the United States to execute the laws if wholesale resistance is encountered."

Two months thereafter a series of violent events demonstrated that the only ban the Knowland-Humphrey amendment had effected was the bad practice of legislating by cross-reference. Governor Faubus, of Arkansas, called out the State militia in the name of maintaining law, order, and the public safety. But this act had the consequence of preventing racial desegregation of a high school in Little Rock by Federal court order. And President Eisenhower, after removing the Governor from command of the State militia by federalizing it, sent Army paratroopers to enforce the court order and subdue civil resistance.

President Eisenhower found authority to do these things in an act of Congress of 1792; and also that this law, which had been included in the general remodification by Congress in 1956 of all Federal statutes dealing with the use of the armed forces, was not repealed by the Knowland-Humphrey amendment. A few days ago President Kennedy cited the same legal basis for sending Federal troops to quell the Oxford, Miss., riots against the enrollment, on Federal court order, of a Negro student in the university.

But, despite the short life of the 1957 repeal—as hopefully interpreted by the Southern Senators—extracts from the floor debate reveal the interesting fact that Federal military enforcement of school desegregation orders was then not even anticipated by non-Southern Senators who agreed with the very different interpretation of Senator Clark.

PATIENCE THE SOLE INTENT

"The inference," said Knowland, "was [made during the discussion of the equal rights bill of 1957 that was before the Senate at the same time] that it would be the intention of the sponsors * * * that the full might of the armed forces of the United States * * * might be brought to bear upon a school district or locality in the enforcement of certain court orders." But this, said the majority leader, was "not the intent" of the President, of the House, or of "any member of this body on either side of the aisle * * * in sponsoring this proposed [pending] civil rights legislation." However, since the cross reference in that measure to the Reconstruction Act might permit "a case to be made" of this nature, "the Senator from Minnesota and I decided to clarify the atmosphere."

The debate, said Senator Humphrey, "having been clouded by, and in fact distorted by, reference to the use of the armed forces * * * as an instrumentality of law enforcement in civil rights matters, I have felt * * * this [cross reference] was * * * unwise and psychologically unfortunate * * *. The practice of civil rights requires the mature understanding of all persons * * * it requires patience, indeed, steadfast patience." This particular reference to "the use of military power" puts "out of focus the whole purpose of the proposals * * * before the Senate."

By September 29 the cross reference and the Reconstruction Act were out, but the use of Federal military power was a fact.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 1, 1962, and the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Oct. 4, 1962]

Court Denies Mississippi Fair Hearing

(By David Lawrence)

There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States or in the laws passed by Congress which authorizes the use of Federal troops to compel any public educational institution to admit a certain student just because he demands that he be enrolled. There is nothing in the Constitution which denies the Governor of a State an opportunity to be heard by the full membership of the Supreme Court of the United States in a dispute between State and Federal authority. There is nothing in the Constitution which even mentions education as one of the subjects coming within the powers of the Federal Government.

Whatever authority the Department of Justice or the Federal courts claim today in this field is derived from a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954 which gave no legal reason but only "sociological" considerations as an argument for reversing an 1896 decision that permitted "separate but equal" facilities in dealing with segregation.

NEVER LEGAL

The 1954 decision cited the 14th amendment as the basis for its ruling, but the amendment was never legally adopted by the necessary number of States. In fact, the legislatures of some of the Southern States were compelled at the point of the bayonet by Federal troops to ratify it. Since this happened in 1868—3 years after the War Between the States was over—the Supreme Court of the United States has never been willing to rule on the validity of the process by which the 14th amendment was allegedly ratified.

Yet 1 of the 10 original amendments—known as the Bill of Rights and duly ratified in 1791—does say that no person shall be "deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

Governor Barnett nevertheless has been threatened with jail—without due process of law.

Last Saturday Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, in a telephoned address to the American Bar Association's convention at San Francisco, said that the distinguished lawyers of Mississippi had not spoken out in the battle over integration. Apparently Mr. Kennedy didn't note the speech made in the Senate just 2 days before by Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, one of the ablest lawyers in the country. He has sat on the bench. He is one of the fairest minded men in the Senate.

He told of the origin of the case of James Meredith, the Negro applicant, as a private suit against the board of trustees of Mississippi's State university and how a learned judge of the U.S. district court ruled that the Mississippi college authorities were justified in denying admission to Meredith. Mr. STENNIS described the subsequent legal battles in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. He referred to the fact that in the Circuit Court of Appeals one judge said he thought Meredith would be a troublemaker and should be denied admission.

NO HEARING

But the main point of criticism made by Senator STENNIS was that the State of Mississippi was being denied a hearing by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Constitution specifically provides that the Supreme Court must hear as a matter of "original jurisdiction all cases involving a conflict between a State and the Federal Government and that the lower courts have no right to decide such a question. But only one member of the highest court—Justice Black—ruled on it, though he claims he consulted the other judges individually, since the court was not in session. He doesn't say whether he did this by telephone or by personal visit, as the case arose recently during the time the Supreme Court members were on vacation. Certainly no opportunity was afforded the defendants for oral argument by their attorneys before the entire court.

"This," says Senator STENNIS, "is certainly not judicial consideration of the case on its merits. This is not the type of searching thought and application of legal principles which should be given such a serious case. Is it really true that a Governor might be held in contempt of court, or sent to jail, or a sovereign State might be invaded by Federal troops and its citizens terrorized at the point of bayonets, on this fragmentary attention by one judge?"

Senator STENNIS also pointed out that on three separate occasions the Senate had "soundly defeated proposals to give the Attorney General the very authority to exercize the powers which he has assumed." Mr. STENNIS referred to the substitution of the Attorney General as a plaintiff in court for a private citizen.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi—who has been for many years chairman of the all-important Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate—said to the Senate:

"If the day has come when not only a citizen of Mississippi, but also the Governor of that great State, can be dragged across a State line by Federal marshals or troops and subjected to the dictates of appellate judges appointed to their cushy jobs for life, then judicial tyranny is a reality and not a fiction."

USE OF TROOPS

There is serious doubt from a legal standpoint whether a President has the right to send troops into a State under the circumstances existing in Mississippi. This correspondent made the same criticism 5 years ago when President Eisenhower ordered Federal troops to Little Rock, Ark.

Whatever one's individual feelings may be about segregation or desegregation, it seems only fair to express agreement with Senator STENNIS that the whole case should be "heard on its merits by the Supreme Court." It seems fair also to suggest that the fraudulent method of "ratifying" the 14th amendment—on which the whole series of court rulings and new Executive orders mobilizing Federal military forces are based today—should be opened up for trial after 94 years of tragic silence by the Supreme Court of the United States.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 8, 1962]

ILLEGALITY BREEDS ILLEGALITY

(By David Lawrence)

The above headline introduced an editorial on this page on October 4, 1957, commenting on the illegal use of Federal troops at Little Rock, Ark. The Governor of a sovereign State thought he was empowered to use the State militia to prevent violence and disorder—a State function as he saw it. This was at a time when a Federal court had ordered the admission of Negroes to a public high school, previously all white, and feelings were inflamed.

But the Governor's theory was overruled, not by any court but by military force ordered by the Federal Government. Yet there's nothing in the Constitution which authorizes the Federal Government to send troops to any State under such circumstances. If the Federal court's order to open the school to Negroes did supersede the right of the Governor to take legal steps to prevent domestic violence, no opportunity was given to settle the point by legal procedures.

Today, the Governor of another sovereign State—Mississippi—feels he has the legal right to block a Federal court order requiring the State university to admit a Negro student. Any citizen has a right—at the risk of punishment—to refuse to abide by a court ruling and to have his day in court, even to the point of carrying the case to the Supreme Court of the United States for a determination of the issues involved.

The processes of the law were open in October 1957, as they are now in October 1962, to resolve the conflict of State and Federal functions. We should not be impatient, even though there is a congressional campaign in progress at present that adds political implications. We should let legal processes take their natural course.

For we pride ourselves on being a nation that abides by the law. Our difficulty, however, is in ascertaining just what is the "law of the land" in the various legal maneuvers that currently surround the integration controversy.

It is easy enough to call Gov. Ross Barnett, of Mississippi, and Attorney General Robert Kennedy political exhibitionists, but each has a duty to perform.

It is easy enough to call anyone a Negro hater who disagrees with the theory of forced integration.

It is easy enough to call the people of the South enemies of the Negro, though the facts of their relationship in the last 100 years do not bear out the accusation.

This writer was a student at an integrated high school in the North more than a half century ago and wrote often for the press about the feats of a Negro who was star quarterback on the football team and a most popular individual. But the problem that faces all of us is not just to consider our own personal feelings. Nor is it a matter simply of obedience to rulings of the courts. It goes deeper. We should not close our minds to the other side of the argument—generated as it is by the pain of an injustice that gnaws at the hearts of the people of the South.

For they have not forgotten the injustice and, indeed, the complete disregard of the United States by a radical Republican majority in Congress which despotically tore that document to shreds and imposed a series of illegal acts on the people of a defeated South.

History does not lie. The almost unanimous writings of historians and the testimony in official records tell us that the 14th amendment was never legally adopted as a part of the Constitution. Yet the whole integration-segregation controversy of today is rooted in that illegality. The Supreme Court of the United States based its decision in 1954 on the unmentioned assumption that the 14th amendment is valid.

It is a shameful truth that, ever since the 14th amendment was allegedly adopted in 1868, the Supreme Court has evaded passing on the legality of that ratifying process.

The people of the South know this. They know also that when their State legislatures— after the War Between the States was over—ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery, this was accepted as legal and the amendment was duly adopted. When, however, these same legislatures rejected the proposed 14th amendment, Congress capriciously declared them outside the Union and sent Federal troops to create new legislatures which were then coerced at the point of the bayonet into adopting the amendment.

We cannot gloss over these facts. We cannot ignore the feelings of bitterness and resentment they have created through the last 94 years.

Nor can we ignore the sociological aspects. The Supreme Court said in 1954 that times had changed, and it overruled what the Supreme Court in 1896 had decided to be the law of the land—namely, that it was legal to provide separate but equal facilities for the Negro in public transportation. This was subsequently interpreted as including public schools and colleges. No legal reason for overturning that 58-year-old decision was offered in the 1954 ruling. It was an emotional opinion that emphasized sociological considerations. Yet the Court ignored the sociological consequences feared by the people of the South.

For the South sees integration—not only in schools and buses, but in restaurants and swimming pools and recreation centers—as cumulatively hastening the day of intermarriage of the races. The State laws in the South against intermarriage have not been struck down as yet, but probably will be by the Supreme Court.

How can the defenders of the illegal method of adding an amendment to the Constitution in 1868 justify in their consciences the imposition today of a social system which many people in the North as well as the South say is an interference with the freedom of the individual? For it has always been assumed the the people of a sovereign State can by majority vote choose their own way of life and manage their own educational institutions without diminishing in any way the educational opportunities of the minority.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution, on which Governor Barnett has relied, says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It can be said positively that no legal authority has ever been granted to the executive branch of the Federal Government to manage or operate the educational institutions of the States.

Denial of admission to the University of Mississippi for the Negro student involved in the present controversy was upheld by the U.S. district court. When the case was appealed, however, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the order and, by a 2-to-1 vote of the judges, said the student should be admitted. Judge Dozier DeVane, who dissented, said in part:

"In my opinion, Judge Mize was correct in finding and holding that appellant bore all the characteristics of becoming a troublemaker if permitted to enter the University of Mississippi, and his entry therein may be nothing short of a catastrophe."

But apparently the university authorities are to be deprived of their right to pass upon the qualifications of applicants.

The argument is made, of course, that the Supreme Court of the United States, in the desegregation decision of 1954, relied on the 14th amendment, which provides that no citizen may be denied "equal protection of the laws." Even if the 14th amendment were a valid part of the Constitution, a case could be brought to court to decide whether "equal protection" means that a university must admit students on the basis of race and not on the basis of scholastic standing or individual fitness.

But the 14th amendment is not valid.

The words of a State in the North are pertinent. In October 1868—3 months after Secretary of State Seward dubiously proclaimed the 14th amendment as ratified—the Oregon Legislature, which had earlier voted to ratify, passed a rescinding resolution and declared that the ratifications by the Southern States were "usurpations, unconstitutional, revolutionary, and void," and that "until such ratification is completed, any State has a right to withdraw its assent to any proposed amendment."

Since those days, the Supreme Court has declined to decide whether an assent once given by a State can be withdrawn. It has also refused to rule on the constitutionality of a law passed by Congress declaring the Southern States out of the Union and denying them congressional representation until such time as they ratified the 14th amendment.

Amid acts of coercion and military pressure, the 14th amendment has lived on through the decades, but not until 1954 did the Supreme Court invoke it as a means of forcing the public schools of the States to bow to the Federal Government's dictation as to who must be enrolled as students.

Congress, incidentally, has never passed legislation—as stipulated in the 14th amendment—to enforce the provisions of that amendment if they relate to educational institutions. The 1954 opinion of the Supreme Court has been accepted by the Federal Government as a substitute for an act of Congress. It is still, however, the duty of the courts to pass upon the right of a President to use military force to do what Congress has never authorized him to do.

It is easy enough to grow impatient in a debate over legal questions. The processes of justice are often slow. It was at one time easy enough for southerners to say that to lynch Negroes accused of raping white women was merely to obey the impulses of natural law, and that there was no need to wait for the courts. It is easy enough also for Negro leaders of demonstrations to cry out today: "We have waited long enough—let's take the law into our own hands."

But these outbursts of passion will not solve anything. Only through the voice of reason can we find a solution, and it is important not to try to abolish overnight what generations of experience and custom—involved in the basic fear of racial intermarriage—have implanted. We must not accept the doctrine that "the end justifies the means." For when illegality breeds illegality, the result is chaos.

Brothers' Kennedy Haste Questioned

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Was it worth it? Couldn't the loss of life and the wounding of scores of persons in the rioting at the University of Mississippi have been averted if President Kennedy and his brother, the Attorney General, had permitted the State of Mississippi to exhaust its legal remedies in the normal way before any armed forces were ordered to the scene? What was the reason for haste in such a delicate situation?

Wouldn't it have been better not to have smuggled James Meredith, a Negro student, onto the campus Sunday through a back entrance?

Wouldn't it have been easier to explain to the people the true basis of Federal action if an opportunity had been afforded first to let the Supreme Court of the United States hear argument on legal questions of an unprecedented nature which were raised last Friday before the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans, La.?

It is doubtful whether the American people will ever learn the whole story of the Mississippi dispute. Lawyers with many decades of experience in the practice of law say they have never witnessed in their respective careers an exhibition such as occurred when the court of appeals was sitting as a trial court in civil contempt proceedings against Mississippi Gov. Ross Barnett.

RECORD IS CITED

The main facts as shown in the record are these: a private suit was originally entered in behalf of Meredith to obtain his admission to the University of Mississippi. The U.S. Government, represented by the Department of Justice, asked permission to enter the case as a "friend of the court." The court granted the request. The State of Mississippi asked for a similar status, and its request also was granted. Then, after the court had found that the Governor was not present at Friday's proceedings, the presiding judge indicated that the State of Mississippi would be denied its status as "amicus curiae"—or friend of the court.

The attorneys for the State of Mississippi asked for an opportunity to argue briefly why the State was entitled to be represented. The Court made no answer but took a 10-minute recess. When the recess was over, the Court, without listening to argument, declared that the State of Mississippi could not intervene as a "friend of the Court," even though the United States had been permitted to make pleadings in that manner.

The Constitution of the United States says explicitly that in all legal cases in which the Federal Government and a State are in conflict, the Supreme Court must take over. The Supreme Court then sits not as an appellate court, but as a court of "original jurisdiction."

What all this means is that Mississippi, as a sovereign State, has certain rights under the Constitution which cannot be ignored. President Kennedy told a radio and television audience Sunday night that the controversy was simply a matter of obeying laws, even though one might disagree with them. But the Court order to which he had referred was itself invalid, inasmuch as the full Supreme Court of the United States had not heard arguments either on last Friday's conflict of view or on the petition submitted in mid-August by the State of Mississippi. The latter was ruled on by only one Justice, since the Supreme Court itself was not in formal session.

Under circumstances as vague and as legally complex as the foregoing, would it have hurt anybody's cause if the President and the Attorney General had exhibited patience and had waited a while before trying to force on the University of Mississippi the registration of Meredith?

NO ARGUMENTS PERMITTED

Governor Barnett could eventually be adjudged wrong in his legal procedures, but a staff of distinguished lawyers—among them John C. Satterfield, immediate past president of the American Bar Association—were not permitted to argue for him or for the State of Mississippi in Friday's hearing in the Federal court at New Orleans.

Thus, the picture of "Free America" presented before the world today is not an inspiring one. The episodes of the weekend merely proved that unfortunately too often "might makes right," and that when one party—a sovereign State—asked for its day in court, it was rebuffed.

How much better it would have been if the legal questions had first been resolved, and then a proclamation issued by the President with ample time for the people to digest it.

As it was, Governor Barnett called for obedience by the people and deplored any violence. He said that the sovereignty of the State of Mississippi had been "trampled upon," but nevertheless he accepted the presence of Federal troops.

Military force is not a substitute for the processes of law or a means of establishing a voice of reason in the community. In the Soviet Union, they customarily use force to secure obedience to governmental edicts. In America, court orders are almost never resisted. But when any administration takes the law into its own hands, mobilizes armed forces on the scene, and attempts to decide issues that the courts should rule upon, there is bound to be friction and rioting.

It is an example of another tragic era such as America witnessed 94 years ago when Congress ordered the executive to use Federal troops to compel the legislatures of the Southern States—3 years after the War Between the States was over—to "ratify" the 14th amendment. Yet on this amendment the whole desegregation decision of the Supreme Court in 1954 was based. It is a time for a dispassionate look at the facts so that a truly constitutional remedy can be found.

[From the Journal, West Columbia, S.C., Oct. 4, 1962]

The Birth of a Crisis

The impact of the events in Mississippi has touched even the most callous person by now and is heartbreaking at the very least. There is hardly a person who does not have feelings toward one side or the other—the Federal Government's position or the position of the State of Mississippi.

On the National Broadcasting Co.'s "Today" television program Monday morning, just before the 7:30 news was presented, host Hugh Downs commented that the damage done by racists exceeded that which could be done by Communists. He meant well, and on the surface that could appear to be an all-inclusive interpretation of the events in Mississippi, but this is such a short-range interpretation of the trouble that has brewed and finally erupted. It is true that the strife has caused the Communists to gloat over the Nation's misfortune at this time. But a deeper insight is called for and there are many who honestly feel that the very beginning of the trouble was part of a Communist design and effort to foment strife and unrest and for which the Federal Government fell almost a decade ago. In short, the Supreme Court must bear most of the blame for its utter and total disregard of the 10th amendment of the Constitution of the United States. It blindly ignored the repeated findings of other Supreme Court bodies which had ruled that segregation was not unconstitutional. By disregarding the 10th amendment, the Supreme Court clearly and unconstitutionally gave birth to the present crisis in Mississippi. In this, the Supreme Court violated the Constitution which it had sworn to uphold and defend.

This is not to condone the tragedy in the Mississippi rioting, and the resulting fatalities and injuries. We pray that Almighty God will deliver our Nation from ever again experiencing a tragedy such as has occurred in our sister State of Mississippi. We don't blame the people of Mississippi for the tragedy which has resulted nearly as much as we do the black-robed nine men who on May 17, 1954, handed down an evil and unconstitutional ruling which fell right into the hands of those who would overthrow America.

If ever our Nation, including the Supreme Court, needed divine guidance it is now. We hope and pray that it is not now already too late.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1962]

THE DUE PROCESS FACTOR IN THE MEREDITH CASE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 1.—When the Supreme Court began its October term today it had already rejected, in effect and in fact, a pending appeal for review of the Meredith case by the State of Mississippi. In a most unusual, if not unparalleled, procedure, instead of dismissing the appeal as a judicial body in actual session, the members of the Supreme Court, from scattered locations during the summer recess, had given sanction to a single Justice, Hugo Black, to make the following statements in an order to the University of Mississippi to enroll James Meredith at the opening of the current semester:

"There is very little likelihood that this Court will grant certiorari to review the judgment of the Court of Appeals, which essentially involves only actual issues. * * * Although convinced that I have the power to act alone in this matter, I have submitted it to each of my brethren, and I am authorized to state that each of them agrees that the case is properly before this Court, that I have power to act, and that, under the circumstances, I should exercise that power as I have done here."

Established procedure under due process is completed only when a court of last resort has formally disposed of the final step available to litigants. Since the agreement of all the other Justices that Black announced in his order of September 12, 1962, could have been learned only by communication means other than face-to-face discussion, this raises the legitimate question whether due process was afforded the State of Mississippi. If, as Justice Black also announced, the Court was certain to reject the State's request for review, that could have been done in the established manner when the Court reassembled today, the day Meredith actually was enrolled at the university.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SPEAKS

On September 29, in a speech telephoned to a San Francisco audience, Attorney General Kennedy chided the American Bar Association as well as the lawyers in Mississippi for the "absence of any expression of support * * * for our (the Kennedy administration's) present effort to deal with the situation." It may be that the Supreme Court's highly unusual and informal manner of rejecting that State's final appeal will be attended by this same silence at the bar. But discussion of the method among lawyers would seem to be as obligatory on the profession as the support the Attorney General failed to receive from an official spokesman of the ABA.

His complaint was justified to that extent. Once the lower Federal court had imposed on the Mississippi State authorities obedience to its orders, as sustained—however irregularly—by Justice Black in the name of the Supreme Court, their execution by the Executive was mandatory if the constitutional system of the United States was to be maintained. And this absolute necessity is not lessened by the fact that, in regularly demonstrating that the Constitution is what the judges say it is, the Supreme Court has often rewritten and amended it, and also acted as a legislature, to effect shifting personal, social and economic doctrines.

THE DEPARTMENT'S ROLE

Both President Kennedy and his brother, the Attorney General, have no such claim for support for their politically based attempt to persuade the Democrats of the South that the Department of Justice's activities in the assault on racial segregation in the schools and colleges were purely responsive to Federal court orders after litigation instituted by private citizens. This attempt is plainly revealed in the stress the President and the Attorney General have given to the technical fact that "this Government had not originally been a party to" the Meredith case. But, after Federal Circuit Judge Cameron had granted four stays against the order of fellow judges that Meredith must be enrolled in September, despite the pendency of Mississippi's appeal for review to the recessed Supreme Court, the Attorney General enthusiastically entered the proceedings before Black as amicus curiae.

As Anthony Lewis, this newspaper's chief reporter in this field, wrote in our issue of September 2: "The Justice Department has become increasingly active in school cases—especially since Mr. Robert Kennedy took office. From a starting point of intervening only when violence threatened compliance with a court order, the Department has become more and more an initiator and planner of litigation."

[From the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., Oct. 7, 1962]

SOME REFLECTIONS

(An editorial from the Richmond News Leader)

Where have we been in the South? And where are we going?

What is to be said, retrospectively, of the terrible crisis that saw a military heel pressed down on Oxford? The tangled roots of race inheritance creep through dark primieval ooze. In the mind's eye, one sees the formation of a new Republic under a written Constitution; one recalls the painful incubus of slavery, long years of poverty. We have seen, in our lifetimes, the growth of judicial oligarchy far removed from the governed people. And all these figures in the Mississippi story.

Yet history, in the familiar phrase, is after all no more than the biography of men; and the immediate story is the story of fallible human beings: a President, an Attorney General, a chief marshal, a southern Governor, a Negro.

If some of these men, at one moment or another, had acted differently, had issued other orders, had responded to unheard voices, the story would not have evolved as it did. No one knows. Perhaps it never would have mattered. The fragile membrane that separates lunacy and sanity, love and hate, civility and savagery, was bound to rupture at some point. It ruptured in Mississippi at 7:58 on a Sunday evening in September. The hounds of hell came baying out of a velvet night. Ten thousand troops have whipped them back again.

A number of us who were in Oxford found ourselves musing aloud of what William Faulkner would have thought, or said, or written of it all. Here was the very town square he recreated for his legendary Yoknapatawpha County, with the clock in the courthouse tower striking the inexorable hours.

Oxford was filled with Faulknerian figures—imperious aristocrats, impassive Negroes, slackjawed countrymen, women of grace and female charm. Here were the stores of a country town: Jones' Feed Store, Shaw & Sneed Hardware, Fred's Dollar Store, the Rebel Cosmetology College, a pharmacy, a bank, a seedy hotel, and here, shockingly, were the occupying soldiers, the square blocked off, a swarthy Puerto Rican sergeant in command, the bayonets erect, symbolic, the air crackling with harsh messages by short-wave radio.

Faulkner would have wrung from this the tragedy, the humor, the sharp sardonic irony of it all. What did Governor Barnett, defending States' rights, manage to prove at Oxford? Only this: the absolute supremacy of the Federal will. But what has James Meredith proved? Only that cold steel is, at least temporarily, the master of them all. Yet the bayonets that prodded at the breast of Mississippi never touched the heart.

Barnett is a finely drawn figure in this drama. He reminds a Virginian vaguely of a watered-down Bill Tuck. Even his conversation is oratorical; his courtliness becomes almost a lampoon of courtliness. But where Mr. Tuck could be profane, decisive, colorful, Governor Barnett leaves an impression of mildness, uncertainty and pathos. He was not cast for bigotry. Last Sunday evening, when thousands of Jackson residents were rallying around the mansion, word came that the Governor would appreciate it so much if the crowd would quiet down: It was time for the grandchildren to get to bed.

On the other side, the characters are etched more sharply. The Kennedy brothers, with their flat Bostonian accents presented almost too great a contrast to Barnett's catarrhal drawl. Their very urbanity made the goad more painful. At bottom, the President was right. Of course he was right. Everyone knew in his heart the President was right. But it was like Plutarch's story of the men who grew to hate Aristides: they were simply tired of hearing him called "the just."

Early Monday, an effigy was hung from an overpass in downtown Jackson. The label did not say "Meredith." It said "Kennedy."

A part of the irony is that Mississippi never had anything to win in this affair that others might have thought worth winning. By yielding in good grace to overwhelming Federal force, the State might have salvaged something in the good opinion of mankind. Mississippi, in the final desperate hour, cared not a fig for the good opinion of mankind. That the Oxford riot would create a fruitful field for Communist propaganda, that the violence would react unfavorably around the world—none of this mattered. These considerations figured not at all in Mississippi's thinking.

It is true, of course, that Mississippi may have won a local victory of sorts. It is impossible to imagine that thousands of Negro students will fall in line to follow James Meredith's astoundingly courageous lead. The precedent Meredith set scarcely offers happy example for immediate emulation. Mississippi may also have won some points in political unity at home; misery loves company and the embittered Mississippians are knowing misery anew.

Politically, the Kennedys will have won a net advantage from their handling of this crisis—or so it seems right now. What they have lost in the South, they will gain back where it counts, in Harlem, South Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles.

The Oxford incident carries with it some terrible implications. The ordinary citizen seldom has opportunity to learn at firsthand the lessons of Federal power. Before the troops arrived in Mississippi, Sunday night, one heard childish talk of real rebellion. One youth rushed into the citizens council offices with a great idea: Get some napalm, and go bomb the army bivouac from private planes. A bystander remarked that Mississippi couldn't take on the whole United States. "We can try," he wept. "We can try, can't we?"

The military occupation of Oxford reduced these adolescent lunacies to absolute imbecility. At the Oxford Airport, Army vehicles occupied the countryside as far as the eye could see. Overhead, the helicopters puttered incessantly. Enormous Globemasters, fat as pelicans, swooped endlessly out of the sky. The troops were cold, disciplined, taciturn. They were there to kill, to capture, to compel obedience. They would ram a court order down Mississippi's throat—a court order commanding the admission of a Negro student to a State university. It was a court order applauded over most of the country. But what if it had been some other court order, some other place, extinguishing some liberty, abridging some right? Has America arrived at rule by court decree and bayonet? Is there not some better, gentler, slower method for achieving government by consent of the governed?

These are the most disturbing aspects of the Mississippi story. What happens to Meredith is incidental; he is a brave man, but in this chapter of history he is a footnote, a name in a lawsuit. Neither will it be remembered whether the Governor profited politically from his sometimes ludicrous defiance. In the long haul, the lessons to be learned from Oxford go to the power of purported law in the hands of powerful men. If the aphorism ever was doubted, it cannot be doubted now: The Constitution is what the judges say it is. And it is what the bayonet says it is, too.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., Oct. 7, 1962]

GENERAL WALKER INSANE?

The Department of Justice insists it has adhered faithfully to the law in confining former Major General Walker to a mental institution. Maybe so. But if this is correct, the law affords no visible protection to an individual in General Walker's situation.

He was arrested last Monday on serious charges in connection with the riot at the University of Mississippi. Taken before a U.S. Commissioner, he was advised of his legal rights. General Walker waived his right to counsel and to a preliminary hearing. He was assured that he would be tried in Mississippi on the charges against him, and bail was set at $100,000. With that, he was flown to a Federal prison hospital in Springfield, Mo., with every reason to believe that he would be eligible for release on bail when he got there.

General Walker didn't know that the Department of Justice on the following day would bring mental commitment proceedings against him in Mississippi which would result in his being denied release on bail in Missouri. In fact, it is not clear when the decision to seek commitment was made. But it must have been made not later than about noon on Tuesday. An hour earlier, according to Representative ALGER, of Texas, he was being assured by the Attorney General personally that General Walker's transfer to Springfield "had no connection with the fact that there is a mental hospital connected with that prison." He was also assured, Mr. ALGER told the House, that there would be no barrier to General Walker's release if he posted the bail fixed by the court.

Meanwhile, the wheels were turning swiftly in Washington. Someone decided that the general should be committed for mental observation at Springfield. The chief psychiatrist of the Federal Prison Bureau prepared an affidavit for submission to a Federal judge in Mississippi—not in Missouri, where General Walker was.

This affidavit is an interesting document. Its essential conclusion is that General Walker's recent behavior "may be indicative of an underlying mental disturbance." The basis for his conclusion, the psychiatrist said, was a reading of newspaper stories, unspecified "indications" in an unidentified "medical history," and "other information" of an undisclosed nature "available to me."

Armed with this flimsy weapon, the U.S. attorney in Mississippi, doubtless on instructions from Washington, appeared before Federal Judge Claude Clayton, sitting in Oxford. The attorney told the judge that on the basis of the information from the psychiatrist, he had "reasonable cause" to believe that General Walker may be presently insane or so mentally incompetent as to be unable to understand the nature of the proceedings against him or to properly assist in his own defense. With this, the judge signed the commitment papers, and the U.S. attorney in Springfield thereupon said that General Walker would be held for from 60 to 90 days for mental examination and that he could not be released on bail.

It is important to note, we think, that the sole question is whether the general, who certainly has offered no defense of insanity, is able to understand the nature of the proceedings against him and to assist in his own defense. Without in any way condoning his behavior, we have seen nothing which indicates that he lacks this degree of mental capacity. And we do not think that this inference is overcome by an undocumented conclusion that he "may be" suffering from "an underlying mental disturbance"—whatever that means.

This is a question, however, which must be decided in the courts. And, thanks to the availability of the writ of habeas corpus, the Department of Justice must show cause in Springfield on Tuesday why General Walker should not be released on bond. Beyond that, the Department has been ordered by a Springfield Federal court to certify the "true cause" of General Walker's detention. The full story of the Walker case should be developed in the course of these proceedings.

Meanwhile, there is ample reason, we think, to be concerned over a procedure under which an accused man can reasonably believe on 1 day that he will be released on bail, only to discover 24 hours later that he has been committed to a mental institution, without right of bail, on the statement of a psychiatrist who had never examined him and by a judge who had never seen him.

[From the Spartanburg Journal, Oct. 1, 1962]

THANK GOD FOR MISSISSIPPI

(By Bob Craig)

After 17 years of disgrace and humiliation, patriotic Americans are on the verge of seeing their Nation once more the victor.

The taste is sweet—for the last time we ate such exotic fare was in 1945 when we blasted the Japanese into submission.

Since that marvelous day of total victory Americans have had to learn how to wallow in humility.

But the time is at hand when we shall be delivered.

Shortly after World War II Americans watched helpless as their Government foundered over the war in China.

The United States, afraid to intervene directly, stood by as the Reds ruthlessly took over that vast area of Asia.

One by one, tiny little countries, longing for freedom, were swallowed by the Russians: Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia.

The United States enjoyed one brief flash of glory in 1950 when General MacArthur sailed boldly to Korea. For a while, we really thought the U.S. Army was going to fight; until the Chinese joined in. Then we found that the Government had no stomach for victory, and the greatest nation in the world was pushed back to the 38th parallel by an "emerging" nation.

A full-blooded Communist took over Cuba, insulted the United States weekly on television, confiscated U.S. property. The United States struck again boldly: It sent a half-baked army of dissident Cubans to Cuba to participate in one of the most shameful defeats in modern history.

In 1956, brave Hungarian freedom fighters rose against their Russian masters. They pleaded over Radio Budapest for U.S. aid in the struggle for freedom.

But the United States had grown used to defeat by then. It sent off a hot note to Moscow "protesting" the treatment of Hungarians.

The Russians sent fully armed tanks into Budapest as their part of the show and crushed the life out of the revolution.

But now, the hour is at hand. The U.S. Army, under its brave and resourceful commander, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, has found an enemy it is not afraid to fight: the University of Mississippi.

Perhaps the United States cannot beat Red China in open warfare. Perhaps we cannot beat powerful Cuba, or Katanga Province. Perhaps we are too weak for such victories.

But the University of Mississippi is of a size which the U.S. military can handle. At least here we can glory in a victorious army, crushing the enemy ruthlessly with sheer force of numbers.

We may have nothing to sing about when it comes to Castro or Khrushchev, but at least we can shout, "Thank God for Mississippi."

[From the Knoxville Journal, Oct. 4, 1962]

WALKER'S CASE DISTURBING

The theory upon which there has been wide support of the President's invasion of Mississippi is that the Federal courts must be supported in their interpretation of the law and the Constitution if we are to preserve the Union.

Against the backdrop of this broadest of issues, the incident which raised it—the effort of James H. Meredith to become a student at the University of Mississippi—has been relegated to secondary consideration.

Now a third issue is beginning to demand public notice in the circumstances surrounding the arrest and imprisonment of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, retired officer who was charged generally with inciting a riot during the disturbance at Oxford, Miss., last Sunday. Walker was placed under $100,000 bond (of the 11 others arraigned on identical charges, bond was set for 3 at $2,500 each and for 8 at $5,000). In the normal course of things he would have been scheduled for trial before a Federal court on the charges. Thus far in this incident no citizen has been in position to be critical of official action, though there was a question in the minds of some as to the amount of bail set by the U.S. commissioner. After all, the Texan is only an ordinary citizen of this country and there was no reason for anybody to feel that he was a privileged character above the law that rules the rest of us.

It is with official action in the Walker case, subsequent to arraignment before the U.S. commissioner, about which questions now begin to trouble the public. On the day following Walker's arrest, he was whisked away from Oxford in a military plane and locked up in the U.S. Medical Center at Springfield, Mo. This was on Monday. It was reported that this action was taken at the order of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Then yesterday afternoon, a full 24 hours after Walker was removed to Springfield, a U.S. district judge, Claude Clayton, issued an order for Walker to be given a psychiatric examination. Such an examination, according to Judge Clayton, will take from 60 to 90 days.

The evident purpose of this maneuver was that of depriving Walker of an opportunity to raise bail as set in his preliminary hearing, pending his trial of the charges before an appropriate Federal court.

All of this, for many people, will take on the color of police state methods. Modern history is full of incidents in which either the Nazis or the Communists have spirited away a critic or a politician opposed to their regime. This kind of thing must not be allowed to happen in this country, regardless of how any of us may feel about this retired Army general. If he should be proved in Federal court guilty of the four serious counts against him or guilty of any of them, then none of us could make tenable objections to the law taking its course. He must not be given special treatment or special punishment, however, because he knocked heads with the Kennedy administration during his military career.

An additional part of this incident, which will cause wonderment, is the fact that Walker was, in effect, committed to a mental institution in the absence of any legal counsel on his part and with no examination to determine even tentatively his mental condition. As almost everyone knows, before commitment to a mental institution in most of the States—all, so far as we know—there must be an examination by competent medical authorities.

Referring again to the statement made at the outset of this piece, what we are mainly concerned with is maintaining a government of laws and again rejecting a government of men. Our whole body of law avers that no man shall be held a political prisoner and if action by officials, be they Federal judges or not, takes on the color of political imprisonment then that is repugnant to the whole Nation. In preserving Walker's rights in this matter, the freedom of every one of us is directly concerned.

We hold no brief even for Walker's being in Mississippi during the battle of Oxford. He would have done much better, in our judgment, to have stayed at home where he belonged. Nevertheless, as an American citizen, he exercised the right to go to Mississippi, where his behavior, once it is established in a court of law, should determine whether or not he should be sent to jail or exonerated of the charge.

BREAKING THE LANGUAGE BARRIER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in spite of the remarkable advances made in the science of communications during this space age, man has been unable to eliminate the language barrier which continues to separate peoples of all nations and which hinders the free exchange of information and ideas. A step toward the solution of this problem was made recently with the formation of the International Committee for Breaking the Language Barrier. This group has members from 26 nations, and is under the sponsorship of the American Friends Service Committee and International House at Columbia University. It is dedicated to facilitating international travel and communication by promoting the adoption of universal pictorial signs at airports, information centers and public buildings. Eventually, the group hopes to work through the U.N. for the adoption of a universal language.

The committee will meet in New York next month to initiate a pilot project in that city. Because it is our largest port of entry for foreign visitors and new arrivals, New York is the most appropriate place to begin this campaign. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to commend this committee's work, and to welcome their efforts in my State.

WYOMING PHOSPHATE PROSPECTING PERMITS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Members of Congress quickly learn that one of their most intricate jobs is trying to untangle the Federal redtape that so often entraps us all. My colleague, Senator HICKEY, has demonstrated that he is a rapid learner in this art, to the benefit of our State and constituents.

An editorial pointing out Senator HICKEY's contribution to progress appeared in the October 2 issue of the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HICKEY WINS ANOTHER ROUND IN BATTLE FOR PHOSPHATE PERMITS

Another step on the painful path of cutting bureaucratic redtape has been taken in the efforts to secure prospecting permits for the phosphate deposit located southeast of Lander.

Carrying the biggest pair of shears in the cutting process has been Senator JOE HICKEY. Senator HICKEY has done yeoman work pursuing this project and certainly deserves nothing but credit for his work in this regard for the economic growth of Wyoming.

Senator HICKEY has found that even with the forces of the administration, the White House, and the heads of the Department of the Interior lined up in back of him—success with the U.S. Geological Survey has been anything but sensational.

Only a compromise at the last minute has made possible the promise from Assistant Interior Secretary John Carver that some prospecting permits will be issued and that other areas will be offered Susquehanna-Western under general lease.

So far this is only a promise. The U.S. Geological Survey hasn't said what it is going to do, or require, yet. In the meantime, the U.S. Geological Survey from its Salt Lake office has been carrying on a subtle campaign of subversion against the prospecting permit law passed by Congress.

The U.S. Geological Survey indicated to business columnist Bob Bernick in Salt Lake a couple of weeks ago that the prospecting permit system in the Phosphate Act had been a failure because "only a few permits had been issued."

Somebody ought to ask either Susquehanna or Senator HICKEY how difficult the U.S. Geological Survey makes it to get a permit and the perversity of the U.S. Geological Survey position would readily be seen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the President of Cuba, like a two-bit Khrushchev, has disgraced the name of Cuba in the United Nations. The similarity of his performance to the shoe-rattling act which we witnessed 2 years ago is obvious. If any evidence were ever needed that Castro's Cuba is a Soviet carbon copy, it has been presented before the world tribunal.

Cuba represents a new and menacing shift in the world balance of power. As Congress moves toward adjournment, I trust that all of us, regardless of party, are united in the hope that this Nation, through its chosen leaders and in cooperation with its allies, will progress resolutely toward the stern decisions which may be necessary to deal with the Soviet cloud now darkening our national horizon.

No course of action can be entirely without risks. The President needs the support of us all if he is to find and follow the path of strength and wisdom.

At the recently concluded meeting of Foreign Ministers of member nations of the Organization of American States, President Kennedy made a forthright and urgent appeal for concerted action to contain and isolate the Cuban cancer. I commend the President's direct approach. "Communism," he said, "can be the death of this hemisphere," and we know in our hearts that he spoke truly.

This, of course, does not hide the fact that the danger should have been pinpointed earlier. When the military buildup began, our Government should have stated publicly that the presence of Soviet troops and technicians in Cuba was viewed by the United States as a hostile act and we should have registered a formal complaint with the Soviet Union.

The Foreign Ministers of the American nations, at their informal meeting last week, uttered what should have been said months ago at the Punta del Este Conference, that Soviet intervention in Cuba poses a threat to the hemisphere. To achieve even this acknowledgment of reality taxed to the utmost the considerable abilities of Secretary of State Rusk.

The OAS Ministers geared their final communique to a common denominator based on the softest view. As one trained observer put it:

> To at least three nations of this hemisphere—Mexico, Chile and Brazil—the actuality of Soviet intervention in Cuba sometimes seems of less concern than the possibility of U.S. intervention.

The United States had hoped to achieve a recommendation for an embargo on all hemisphere trade with Cuba. It came away having committed itself to certain unilateral actions on shipping. These are forceful and commendable. It is entirely possible also that they may set an example for joint hemisphere action and exercise some persuasion on our NATO allies.

By paving the way for these possibilities, and by labeling Castro communism for the threat it is, this informal meeting of the OAS has served a useful purpose.

It is gratifying that the United States is acting to make trade with Cuba more costly and risky, not only for those shippers who trade directly, but for those who operate through chartered vessels. To launch the OAS gathering, the United States announced two steps:

Our ports no longer will be available for use by ships carrying arms and strategic goods to Communist Cuba. It is true that Cuba's arms supplies have been delivered exclusively in Soviet bottoms, which do not use U.S. ports anyway, but the new provision will ban any other Soviet bloc vessels which may deliver war goods to the island. This point, however, is largely psychological and of no practical significance.

In the case of strategic goods, non-Communist vessels, if they carry goods to Cuba, will be barred from picking up profitable return cargoes at U.S. ports. Furthermore, our foreign aid shipments will not be permitted to move out in vessels which have supplied Castro.

I have urged these steps for some time. On September 24, I urged the President to direct the Departments of State and Agriculture to clamp down immediately on shipment of U.S. foreign aid in vessels supplying Soviet goods to Cuba. These two Departments had been looking the other way while ships sold themselves first to the Soviets, then to the United States, making a fat profit by working both sides of the street.

Until the new ban goes into effect, which I understand will be in a week or two, the American taxpayer is partially subsidizing the Cuban buildup by offering profitable return cargoes to vessels unloading at Cuban ports. This situation will prevail until the Executive order goes into effect.

Mr. President, over the weekend I made six appearances in my State. When people were told that ships had been bringing strategic goods to Cuba and then moving to a U.S. port and loading up with foreign aid shipments and making a profitable journey back, they would hardly believe that such commerce has been going on. It has been going on. It is a condition to which I called attention some time ago, and it has now been conceded.

In achieving this limited ban, we owe a debt to private enterprise for exercising strong initiative.

As many of us are aware, U.S. shipowners and union leaders have been far ahead of the Government in urging a tightening up of shipping to and from Cuba. I commend the action of the union which announced that its members would not load ships with goods going to Cuba.

Further, we will cancel contracts with shipping companies carrying our foreign aid commodities abroad if they permit their vessels to engage in Cuban trade.

All of these steps are highly desirable and, in my judgment, overdue.

The United States, however, must take a strong and continuing initiative to contain the noxious weed now rooted in Cuba and rapidly spreading through the hemisphere through Castro trainees and Castro's hate broadcasts.

The time for informal talks is past. The time for leisurely meetings is past. The Council of the Organization of American States has scheduled a meeting for this afternoon. However, the Council cannot take major action. This must be done by the hemisphere Foreign Ministers.

I hope, therefore, that today's meeting will be followed promptly by a formal meeting of the OAS. Now is the time for the United States to keep up the momentum as we work to develop binding hemisphere actions.

Immediately after the formal OAS meeting, I suggest that the administration announce a reasonable deadline for a hemisphere program of action based on such affirmative suggestions as are produced.

Member nations of the OAS should be fully informed that failure to act in concert will be the signal for unilateral moves by the United States. They should, of course, be apprised in detail of what those actions will be. In other words, if OAS proves apathetic, we must spell out the precise course we intend to pursue on our own.

It is vital also that we spell out for the Soviet Union the actions to be taken—either by OAS or by the United States—giving them advance notice of the limitations we set upon infiltration, subversion, and military activity in the Western Hemisphere.

This will be far from easy. It will require that we, by taking firm and direct positions, completely reverse what seems to be a basic Soviet premise. Russian diplomats are quoted as saying in recent press dispatches, "The American people will not fight over Cuba, over Berlin, over Laos, or over almost anything else."

If this is Khrushchev's premise—and our behavior thus far may have given him such an impression—then he is assuming the United States will continue to retreat in the world's trouble spots and throughout Latin America.

Let us set one point straight before this Congress adjourns. Because we are in a political campaign, the temptation apparently has been irresistible for some to read politics into the Cuban discussions. This is a slick, easy way to write off criticism.

In the case of Cuba, the dagger is pointing at us all. Under our form of government, it is as much the duty of citizens and public officials to criticise foreign policy as any other area of public affairs.

Suggestions and critical comment on Cuba have come from all quarters, some from members of the President's own party, and surely these were not politically motivated. By and large, as attested by editorial opinion throughout the country, the criticism has been constructive. None of it can be said to have given aid and comfort to the aggressors, who bracket both Republicans and Democrats into their total hatred for the United States.

Those who would criticise us for speaking out are sowing confusion. Indeed, how can any Member of Congress fail to speak out, when we are bombarded daily with evidence of the deep concern of our people? It floods into our offices in mailbags, it dominates our television screens, and fills the news columns of our daily papers.

Several typical examples came to my attention recently. These did not originate in Florida, which is separated from Cuba by a narrow strip of water, where people understandably are worried and vociferous about the Communist buildup. They came from California, almost 4,000 miles from the new Soviet island satellite, and were reported by the respected columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop.

> It is dangerous to exaggerate, but it is impossible not to be deeply impressed—

He wrote—

> when you hear a solid, hard-working family man pointing to his neat little house and saying, "The policy I favor might mean an A-bomb right there. But I'll risk that. It's worth it to win."

Surely every Member of Congress prays to God, as I do, that this will not be the cost of a firm policy. I happen to think that it is more likely to be the cost of a weak, indecisive policy or the cost of no policy at all. And the history books support my belief as they trace the pattern of aggression by 20th century dictators. The evidence is compounded in the tragic fate of the victims who waited too long to meet the threat—keeping the peace, as the threat grew stronger and more ominous, until in the end the tyrant steamrollered across another innocent nation which loved peace, not wisely but too well.

The lesson of this story has been spelled out in one of the most profound statements of English literature:

> Cowards die many times before their deaths. The valiant never taste of death but once.

And so an obscure California householder, miles away from Washington, obviously is miles ahead of Washington in facing up to the meaning of Cuba. The American people, if not their leaders, have learned the lesson of Munich. They know the difference between "peace" and "peace with freedom." They make no attempt to kid themselves by minimizing the Cuban threat or sweeping it under the rug. They look with quiet courage into the eyes of the dictator.

Let us hope Khrushchev is aware of these quiet Americans. Let us hope he takes into account their strength and determination as he plots his aggressive ventures.

Late in August I called attention to the Russian arsenal in Cuba. At that time I set forth four proposals for handling the situation. I believed then that they were constructive. I believe now that their soundness has been underscored. I am gratified that the administration now has acted at least upon some of them. In my view they remain a sensible and sound approach for the United States.

My first suggestion, made August 31, called upon the administration to tell the American people all of the facts about the island buildup. Reliable information had reached me concerning the number of ships, types of armament, and Soviet troops arriving in Cuba. There was no doubt in my mind that I was certainly not alone in possessing the information. I could see no threat to our national security by giving the American people facts already possessed by Cubans and Russians. Indeed, it obviously would jeopardize our ability to cope with the ever-growing threat if we lulled Americans into a false sense of security.

On August 29, just 2 days earlier, the President told a reporter that he had no information that Russians were sending Nike-type missiles to Cuba, after the reporter cited a State Department source to that effect. Following my revelations on the Senate floor, on August 31, the administration first declared, through a Senator on the other side of the aisle, that Senator KEATING was "misinformed." Nevertheless, there followed from other quarters an effort to make it appear that the information I had reported had been released earlier by the State Department.

On September 4, however, the President conceded that Nike-type missiles had been delivered to Castro and confirmed in almost every detail the facts I had stated 4 days earlier. The President characterized the buildup as "defensive." This, in my view, was a tremendous error and a serious concession to the Soviets. That was their line. It should not be ours.

Since then I have suggested that the American people would welcome weekly reports from the White House on the extent of the buildup. These have not been forthcoming, although two State Department estimates have been made public. Both emphasize the continuing nature of the Soviet buildup and the increasing danger of the situation. Under Secretary of State Ball now admits that 85 ships have delivered troops and war goods to the island.

He admits that 15 missile sites have been established, and it is estimated that the total will eventually reach 25. This knowledge has been possessed for a long time by many of us. Under Secretary Ball said that the slant range of these antiaircraft missiles is 20 to 25 miles, not 15 miles. He said that four missile sites of different types have been identified. He said that these sites are similar to known Soviet defense missiles sites which are believed to contain antishipping missiles having a range of 20 to 25 miles. The significant sentence, rather buried away, is that several more such sites will be installed.

Many other facts have been stated which have been known to some of us, but which have not been publicly stated before. The statement was made that 4,500 troops are stationed in Cuba. It will be remembered that the first figure given was 3,000. I stated that there were at least 5,000. The first figure given by the President was 3,000. That was advanced to 4,200. It has now been advanced to 4,500. I stand on my statement that more than 5,000 troops are stationed in Cuba. Five thousand is a modest figure. But I commend the Under Secretary of State for revealing these additional facts.

My second recommendation called for the convening of the Organization of American States to develop a prompt hemisphere course of action. This, as we have seen, was taken up by administration officials and 2 days of informal discussions have been held. As indicated earlier, this has served a constructive purpose by producing an acknowledgment of the threat and perhaps laying a basis for something more than talk. It is obvious that it will be up to the United States to forge the OAS into an instrument for action, and no time should be lost in doing so.

My third proposal concerned our NATO allies. I urged that they recognize that Cuba is an advanced Communist base, and that the strictest limitations be imposed on shipments of strategic and economic items to Cuba. It will be necessary, of course, for the United States to exercise strong persuasion to achieve this.

Today, according to press reports, roughly half of the cargoes going into the island from the Communist bloc move in the ships of six of our allies. They are Britain, Canada, Greece, Italy, Norway, and West Germany.

For example, the U.S. Maritime Administration reports that in June, July, and August, merchant vessels flying the flags of 20 non-Communist nations made 185 trips to Cuba. Over 60 percent of this traffic moved in the ships of NATO members Greece, Britain, West Germany, and Norway. To a lesser extent Denmark, Italy, and Turkey participated in this trade.

The administration followed up my third proposal with limited success.

In an attempt to learn which allied nations are cooperating, my office called the Department of State. According to their expert, six nations have either stopped or will stop chartering ships for the Cuba trade. They are, the State Department says, Turkey, West Germany, Italy, France, Belgium, and Canada.

In checking the Canadian Embassy, however, we were surprised to learn that the State Department was inaccurate. The Canadians say they have not banned charter of their ships by the Soviets. Furthermore, an Associated Press dispatch from Ottawa dated October 4 indicates that the Canadian Government has no intention of doing so.

If such disagreement exists between information available from the State Department and the Embassy of the nation involved, it casts some reflection on the accuracy of the balance of the information given by the State Department to my office. In fact, State Department, Embassy, and press reports concerning nations which have taken actions, either governmental or private, concerning use of their ships in the Soviet trade with Cuba, seem to be in conflict.

Therefore, I urge that the State Department publish as soon as possible, an up-to-date tabulation of nations whose ships are being chartered by the Soviets, showing what action, if any, each one has taken to clamp down on the Cuba trade.

According to the Department of State, the Greek Government reports a lack of authority to interfere with shipment of nonstrategic materials, although they have appealed to their shipowners not to supply shipping for Cuba.

The Norwegian Government, again according to the State Department, has requested its shipowners not to carry military goods to Cuba, but no overall ban has been put into effect. So far as I know, Norway has never carried any military goods as such to Europe.

The situation with Great Britain apparently is under negotiation, with no substantial progress reported.

I repeat, the urgency of this matter is such that the State Department should keep the American people informed by publishing an accurate tabulation, and keeping it up to date.

To those nations which brush us off with the comment that Cuba is a U.S. problem, we must drive home the point of my opening remarks, that Cuba represents a new and menacing shift in the world balance of power. It is an ominous development in the global war which involves all men of good will, which threatens Western Europe, Britain, and other free nations.

Therefore, it is impossible for us to accept specious reasoning or shallow excuses. Every non-Communist ship going into Cuba is releasing a Soviet ship for spreading the poison elsewhere, and is thus contributing directly to the Soviet takeover of Cuba and further Soviet penetration of the free world.

This is so vital a concept that some concerned observers have suggested that we blacklist all foreign ships, allied or otherwise, and ban them from every American port if they continue this pro-Soviet activity.

We are still in the process of implementing the first three of these proposals which I outlined on September 4 and thus have not reached the point of considering the fourth, which was, failing concerted action by the OAS, the United States should give serious consideration to serving notice that we will intercept all vessels in Western Hemisphere waters which we have reason to suspect carry armed forces personnel or materiel.

I vigorously take issue with anyone who terms this proposal irresponsible. The Navy Department, which holds primary responsibility for such a blockade, has more than once endorsed bottling up Cuba in this fashion. It urged such action long ago. If it had been taken then, the risk would have been minimal. Admittedly it involves greater risks now than it did 6 months ago, when it was urged. But the risks will be infinitely greater 6 months from now.

A blockade, of course, should be considered only after other means have been exhausted. It should be put into effect not suddenly but, rather, after full and sufficient notice has been given, providing ample opportunity for the opposition to back away.

In the meantime, I fully agree that the United States should support and encourage the Cuban guerrilla fighters now harassing the Soviets on the island. Without outside help, they have no chance of victory.

Incidentally, Mr. President, it is rather ironic that some of those who denounced as warmongering, suggestions for a possible blockade, now call strongly for support of the guerrillas, although under no interpretation can that be viewed as a peaceful solution, and it presents much more risk of involvement than would a pacific or limited blockade.

In my opinion, the United States also should launch a massive propaganda campaign to counter Castro's subversive broadcasts throughout Latin America. Surely the USIA can place the transmitters and the Spanish-speaking staff in operation at appropriate southern points. I can think of no project of higher priority at this particular time. If necessary, some USIA programs of lesser priority should be curtailed in order to concentrate intensely right now on the Cuban crisis.

One would not expect it to be necessary to suggest this type of propaganda counteroffensive to our experts. Unfortunately, however, according to my information, our current policy takes the reverse position.

A tiny 1-kilowatt Armed Forces radio station is operating on 1340 kilocycles, and is broadcasting approximately 17 hours a day from our Guantanamo Base. It has a daytime transmitting coverage of 35 to 38 miles, and less at night. About 1½ hours each day are in the Spanish language, reaching roughly 15,000 to 18,000 Cubans, of the total Cuban population of about 6½ million. Their Spanish-language broadcasts are made up principally of news, Cuban recordings, and Spanish-speaking entertainment.

Certainly this is far from a powerful propaganda outlet; but, according to my information, those in charge have been instructed to devote none of their broadcasting time to anything which might be construed as anti-Castro material. In addition, I am informed that the base commander sought permission to increase the volume of the station, in order to reach a larger number of Cubans; but this was denied by the Defense Department, undoubtedly after a policy discussion with the State Department.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I point out that it would be foolish to rule out the possibility that the United States may find itself virtually a "loner" in the path of communism's ruthless penetration of this Hemisphere.

If this should come about, there is no question in my mind that we shall behave like the great Nation we are. The American people expect no less. Our neighbor nations of the Americas—behind all the if's, and's and but's—look to us for leadership. The tongues of Communist flame are licking at the edges of the free world. The longer we wait to stamp them out, the more dangerous and costly it will be to freemen everywhere.

If the President acts firmly, decisively, and promptly, we shall be with him to a man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a statement issued by the Maritime Administration, of the Commerce Department, with regard to the free world ships in the Cuban trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

In view of the current concern of the Government of the United States over the shipments of arms and other cargoes to Cuba in Soviet-bloc and free world merchant ships, this study was undertaken to determine the patterns of free world shipping in the Cuban trade, the numbers and flags of registry of the free world ships engaged in such trade, and the companies involved. The study covers the 8-month period January 1 through August 31, 1962, and includes all free world merchant ships that have arrived in Cuba from countries other than Cuba during this period. The totals of ships and the number of trips by such ships to Cuba are believed to be conservative. Insofar as ownership of individual ships is concerned, the information presented has been obtained from reliable sources and is believed to be correct. However, this administration cannot vouch for its accuracy in every instance.

II. FREE WORLD SHIPS IN THE CUBAN TRADE

During the period January 1 through August 31, 1962, a total of 432 merchant ships (including 43 tankers) flying the flags of 22 free world countries made a total of 571 trips to Cuba. Ships flying the flags of Greece, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Norway accounted for 61 percent of the total ships involved and 60 percent of the total trips to Cuba. No U.S.-flag ships called at Cuban ports (other than the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay) during the period under study. The number of free world ships in the Cuban trade and the number of trips by such ships to Cuba during the period were more than double comparable figures for Soviet-bloc shipping. The following listing shows the ranking of the various free world countries whose ships engaged in trade with Cuba during the period January 1–August 31, 1962, arranged in order of the number of ships involved and the number of trips:

Flag	Number			
	Ships		Trips	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Greece	97	22	125	22
2. United Kingdom	77	18	109	19
3. Germany (Federal Republic)	46	11	50	9
4. Norway	42	10	55	10
5. Lebanon	25	------	29	------
6. Italy	19	------	22	------
7. Japan	19	------	20	------
8. Denmark	17	------	33	------
9. Liberia	16	------	18	------
10. Sweden	15	------	19	------
11. Yugoslavia	14	------	20	------
12. Netherlands	12	------	14	------
13. Spain	9	------	30	------
14. Panama	8	------	8	------
15. France	5	------	5	------
16. Belgium	3	------	3	------
17. Finland	3	------	3	------
18. Chile	1	------	3	------
19. Morocco	1	------	2	------
20. Honduras	1	------	1	------
21. Switzerland	1	------	1	------
22. Turkey	1	------	1	------
Total	432	------	571	------

A number of ships in the Cuban trade also trade with Communist China, and a number of them are known to have carried title I, Public Law 480 cargoes.

The annex to this study provides details on the various free world ships in the Cuban trade during the period January 1–August 31, 1962. It gives the names of the ships, the flags of registry, the dates of arrivals in Cuba, and, as appropriate, the shipowners, agents, and associated companies.

III. FREE WORLD SHIPPING COMPANIES IN THE CUBAN TRADE

The great majority of the shipowners (or agents) involved in the Cuban trade operated only a few ships into Cuba during the period under study. By far the most important group of shipping companies in the Cuban trade during the first 8 months of 1962 was the group consisting of the associated companies of London & Overseas Freighters, Ltd.; Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd.; and Counties Ship Management Co., Ltd. This group accounted for 28 ships that made a total of 65 trips, or more than 10 percent of the total trips made by free world ships to Cuba. Of the 43 tankers in the Cuban trade, 16 were associated with this group of shipping companies.

The annex to this study relates, as appropriate, the free world ships in the Cuban trade with the shipowners, agents, and associated companies.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions that may be drawn with respect to the free world ships and shipping companies engaged in trade with Cuba during the period January 1–August 31, 1962, are as follows:

(1) American ships and shipping companies are not engaged in trade with Cuba to any appreciable extent.

(2) The traditional European maritime nations are providing the bulk of the free world shipping for trade with Cuba.

(3) Free world ships greatly exceed in number Soviet-bloc ships trading with Cuba.

(4) Since the world's merchant fleet numbered 17,426 ships as of January 1, 1962, and since free world ships engaged in trade with Cuba constitute only 2½ percent of this total, it is doubtful that the Cuban trade is of any great significance in solving world shipping problems.

DELIVERY OF COMMUNIST POLITICAL PROPAGANDA MAIL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the bill on postal service and Federal employees salaries (H.R. 7929) contained a large number and a wide variety of provisions. There were many who believed that some of the provisions had much better been left out of the bill, to be considered separately and on their own merits. It is fair to say that had this been done, some of them would have been rejected. But since the bill was considered in its entirety, some undesirable portions of it were approved, together with some provisions which were meritorious in their own right. Such a conglomeration always makes difficult the decision as to one's vote on the question of final passage, and in this instance that certainly was the case.

However, one section of the bill is especially noteworthy as containing substance which would have been approved had it been considered either alone or in company with any other proposed legislation. It is section 306, which has for its subject the delivery of Communist political propaganda mail.

While its approval was the final product of many persons, this Senator notes with gratification the leading role played by Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, in formulating the idea of dealing with this deadly menace of propaganda, and of sponsoring the provision through to final form. He fought with courage and tenacity to get the job done. At times the odds seemed hopelessly stacked against him, particularly when the pressures of the Post Office Department and of the administration itself were brought to bear on him and his office, in resistance to his original idea as to how this problem should be met. This resistance continued, even as to the final section as it now stands in the bill.

While Representative CUNNINGHAM did not get his original provision approved, he describes himself as 95-percent satisfied; and in the legislative world, this is a very high batting average indeed. In fact, it is almost a home run, and should, in fact, be considered as such.

THE PROBLEM

For many years, huge quantities of Communist political propaganda in printed form have been arriving in America from abroad. This propaganda is of many varieties; but each of them has a definite mission calculated to subvert, to attack our institutions, and to weaken the faith of our people in our Government, and their unity in resisting alien philosophies. The quantities run into millions of packages per year, each of the packages containing many printed items.

Delivery of this mail is now being made throughout America under the Universal Postal Union, by arrangements common throughout the world, whereby the country in which the addressee is located receives no direct compensation for such delivery service. Theoretically, such country receives in exchange the delivery of such mail as it may send to other countries, without the recipient country's receiving any direct compensation. Details of this Universal Postal Union arrangement are set out later in my remarks.

Under President Truman and under President Eisenhower, from 1948 until 1961, such printed Communist propaganda material from Iron Curtain countries arriving in mail sacks at United States ports was examined on a spot-check basis. Bags containing Communist propaganda, as defined in the Foreign Agents Registration Act, were subjected to further examination. Material addressed to Government departments, libraries, educators, and others who had shown a desire to receive material of this type was forwarded to them.

However, other addressees were notified by mail that such literature addressed to them was being held, subject to their order. If the addressee replied that he desired delivery, the mail was sent to him. If no reply was received or if the reply was "No," then the material was destroyed. A Customs Bureau official said that over 90 percent of those contacted indicated no desire to receive the material.

It should be noted here that none of this procedure applied to first-class mail, which is sealed, and which is protected by law from being opened except under very rare, well-protected circumstances. However, second- and third-class mail are both called "open mail," and under current law and postal regulations they are opened for inspection at any time. Hence, contrary to statements by some persons, there is no question of censorship or illegality in the procedures which had been used from 1948 to 1961. The methods used under President Truman and President Eisenhower protected America from a flooding of dangerous, menacing, and highly improper propaganda.

Later in these remarks it will be explained that the Universal Postal Convention was really not violated by the procedures adopted and used from 1948 to 1961. The reason is that similar mail sent under that same convention to Russia was not delivered by Russia pursuant to the terms of that treaty. Hence, if the arrangement was to be truly reciprocal and if it was to work uniformly both ways, it was not out of order for the United States to have pursued the course that was used.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY ORDERS DELIVERY OF COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA MAIL

On March 17, 1961, President John F. Kennedy ordered discontinuation of the Truman-Eisenhower procedure of intercepting Communist propaganda from abroad. Under the order, the millions of pieces of mail of such propaganda were delivered to those whose names appeared on the address side. The floodgates were opened, and for over a year and a half now millions of American homes have been bombarded with artistically printed but artfully and deceitfully phrased pamphlets and magazines calculated to weaken the fabric of faith of the American people in their Government and in their institutions. The material was of all kinds: on peace campaigns, bulletins to women, to the youth, to students, to various nationality groups. There were special mailings to penetrate into churches, consisting of antichurch material, articles boasting of the high achievements and noble objectives of the Soviet Union, depicting its high morals, low unemployment, happiness, opportunity, high farm production, new towns, and so forth.

But whatever the subject, the mission was always the same: to enable the Soviet Union to deliver its message for "peace and coexistence" to all of unsuspecting America. Peace and coexistence for the Communists mean a condition in the world which will prevail when that entire area will be dominated and controlled by the Communists.

It is difficult to understand the reason for President Kennedy's reversal of the best judgment of former President Truman and former President Eisenhower. One of the reasons assigned in his order was that the Truman-Eisenhower method was "of concern to the Secretary of State in connection with efforts to improve cultural exchanges with Communist countries." In other words, we wanted to be nice to the Communists, and yet the entire record, as these remarks show later, shows that there was no "exchange" inasmuch as the Communists did not permit the delivery within their own countries of similar mail from America.

SECTION 306 REINSTATES TRUMAN-EISENHOWER PROCEDURES

Happily, the Senate, in approving section 306, reinstated by law the policy which had governed Communist propaganda mail from the years 1948 to 1961. This is a good and a wholesome forward step.

Again, it should be emphasized that this policy does not interfere with delivery of first class mail in any way. Nor does it apply to any printed matter addressed to a Government agency, library, college, university, graduate school, or scientific or professional institution for advanced studies, or any individual connected therewith. The printed material which will not be delivered, unless desired by the addressee, is defined in the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, which was declared constitutional by a U.S. Federal Court, and which proved satisfactory for 13 years for the purpose at hand.

It was a great victory for Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska and the many efforts he put forth in the leadership of the movement to deal with this vexing and dangerous situation. He is to be highly commended for his courage and persistence.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement analyzing and commenting on Representative CUNNINGHAM's original proposal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA ON THE CUNNINGHAM AMENDMENT

Congressman CUNNINGHAM's original proposal for amending the postal rate increase bill was overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives. Only two votes were cast against it. Obviously the Members of the House felt it had a great deal of merit.

Briefly stated Mr. CUNNINGHAM's amendment did two things: (1) It denied the use of the U.S. postal system to Communist propaganda mailed abroad which is now carried, by the Post Office Department without compensation or income; and (2) it provides that Communist propaganda mailed in this country cannot be carried at rates which now require a subsidy from the American taxpayer. The basic principle involved is simply this: if Congress will raise postage rates for the American people (which it did in H.R. 7927 as passed by the Senate), there is no reason why it shouldn't charge the Russians a little more for their postage too.

Subsection 505(a) of title 39, United States Code, dealing with international postal arrangements, presently contains the following language:

"For the purpose of making better postal arrangements with other countries, or to counteract their adverse measures affecting our postal intercourse with them, the Postmaster General, by and with the advice and consent of the President, may negotiate and conclude postal treaties or conventions, and may reduce or increase the rates of postage or other charges on mail matters conveyed between the United States and other countries."

Congressman CUNNINGHAM's amendment sought to add the following wording to that subsection:

"In furtherance of this authority to counteract adverse usage of the mails and to reduce the domestic postal deficit, no international mail handling arrangement under which any postal rate, whether or not reciprocal, is established, shall permit the receipt, handling, transport, or delivery by the U.S. Post Office Department of mail matter determined by the Attorney General to be Communist political propaganda."

It should be noted that the language proposed by the Cunningham amendment specifically mentions that its purpose is "to counteract (other nations') adverse usage of the mails." It was intended to prevent the Communists from taking advantage of the benefits of the Universal Postal Union in this country, without giving similar benefits to the United States with respect to the mail it sends to the Iron Curtain countries.

In the considered judgment of many, this amendment could have played an important role in cracking the Iron Curtain. It might have brought about a wider circulation within Iron Curtain countries of the ideas and information stemming from countries of the free world and the United States. At the present time we fail in our efforts to acquaint the people in these countries with the American position on international issues. This failure is largely due to the fact that the Communist nations disregard the mailing arrangements contained in the postal convention. The Cunningham amendment might well have forced the Russians to abandon their restrictions on our material so that both sides could freely circulate printed matter in both directions.

All of us are keenly aware that America has little or nothing to fear from Communist propaganda. We are blessed with a free press and are accustomed to all of its aspects. But, there is no reason why the American taxpayer should pay for the free delivery of Communist propaganda in this country and at the same time, be denied the corresponding benefit in Communist countries.

As stated by Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

"We demand a free exchange of ideas and information between our countries. You are not allowing our ideas and information to be circulated among your people; you are therefore violating the reciprocal terms of the Universal Postal Union. As a result we take this action and will stick to it until you permit the free exchange of information between our countries, including the right of inspection to see that all parties are living up to the agreement."

Unfortunately, the Cunningham amendment was not approved by the Senate. However, the Senate did insert a provision which in substance adopts the Truman-Eisenhower procedure for dealing with Communist propaganda mail.

This provision, which was designated as section 305 of the Senate bill, reads as follows:

"'(a) Mail matter, except sealed letters, which originates or which is printed or otherwise prepared in a foreign country and which is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to rules and regulations to be promulagted by him to be "Communist political propaganda", shall be detained by the Postmaster General upon its arrival for delivery in the United States, or upon its subsequent deposit in the United States domestic mails, and the addressee shall be notified that such matter has been received and will be delivered only upon the addressee's request, except that such detention shall not be required in the case of any matter which is furnished pursuant to subscription or which is otherwise ascertained by the Postmaster General to be desired by the addressee. If no request for delivery is made by the addressee within a reasonable time, which shall not exceed sixty days, the matter detained shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General directs.

"'(b) For the purposes of this section, the term "Communist political propaganda" means political propaganda, as defined in section 1(j) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(j)), issued by or on behalf of any country with respect to which there is in effect a suspension or withdrawal of tariff concessions pursuant to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 or section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, or any country from which any type of foreign assistance is withheld pursuant to section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

"'(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable with respect to (1) matter addressed to any United States Government agency, or any library, or to any college, university, graduate school, or scientific or professional institution for advanced studies, or any individual connected therewith, or (2) material whether or not "Communist political propaganda" addressed for delivery in the United States pursuant to a reciprocal international agreement under which the United States Government mails an equal amount of material for delivery in any country described in subsection (b).'

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
"'4008. Communist political propaganda.'

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 306. Except as otherwise provided, the foregoing provisions of this part shall become effective on January 7, 1963."

Section 611(j) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, which is referred to in the bill, defines political propaganda as follows:

"The term 'political propaganda' includes any oral, visual, graphic, written, pictorial, or other communication or expression by any person (1) which is reasonably adapted to, or which the person disseminating the same believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any way influence a receipient or any section of the public within the United States with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or with reference to the foreign policies of the United States or promote in the United States racial, religious, or social dissensions, or (2) which advocates, advises, instigates, or promotes any racial, social, political, or religious disorder, civil riot, or other conflict involving the use of force or violence in any other American Republic or the overthrow of any government or political subdivision of any other American Republic by any means involving the use of force or violence. As used in this subsection, the term 'disseminating' includes transmitting or causing to be transmitted in the U.S. mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or offering or causing to be offered in the U.S. mails."

The foregoing section was declared constitutional in *United States* v. *Peace Information Center*, 97 F. Supp. 255. This is the definition which has been used by the Justice Department, Customs Bureau, and Post Office Department since 1938 when it was written as part of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

COMMUNIST NATIONS DO NOT DELIVER MAIL

Last year Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY pointed up the fact that there is no reciprocity in the delivery of mail. In an address entitled "Russian Use of the U.S. Postal Service," Senator HUMPHREY made several telling points. I quote from his remarks:

"Here is my point. There is no reciprocity in the use of the Russian postal service for the United States of America.

"With a postal deficit over $800 million, it ill behooves the Government of the United States to permit sending through the mails propaganda documents of a foreign government which threatens the life of this Nation, while at the same time we do not have the same rights within the Soviet Union. This is foolish and should be stopped.

"I believe the time has come for the U.S. Government to inform the Soviet Union that there must be a quid pro quo for the use of our postal service. In other words, it is time we said, 'All right, Mr. Khrushchev; you may use the postal service of the United States when and if you let the United States use the postal service of the Soviet Union on a 50–50 reciprocity basis; not a basis of one horse to one rabbit, which is what is happening now—with the United States getting the rabbit.'"

Mr. HUMPHREY also said:

"If we are to allow this material to flow through the U.S. mails at subsidized rates, then this U.S. Senator demands reciprocity or that we stop it."

These remarks were made on September 25, 1961. They are found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 16, page 21141.

The matter of reciprocity leads directly to the exchange of international mail.

UNIVERSAL POSTAL UNION

The Universal Postal Union Convention is an international mail-handling arrangement which has served a very useful purpose since 1874. It might be referred to as an unoffical treaty between over 110 countries. It is not a treaty in the official sense, since it does not need to be ratified by the U.S. Senate.

It facilitates the exchange of mail between countries throughout the world. In nontechnical language it works like this: If someone in the United States wishes to send a letter to Sweden, he puts the proper amount of U.S. postage on the letter. The United States retains the revenue, and the Swedish Government delivers the letter to the addressee without further charge. In exchange, if someone in Sweden wishes to send a letter to this country, he uses a Swedish postage stamp. Sweden retains the revenue from the stamps, and when the letter reaches the United States, the Post Office Department delivers it to the addressee without charge.

This arrangement has worked well, and for the most part, the participating countries have been satisfied with it. However, when the Hitler government was in power in Germany, complications developed because that government began distributing quantities of unsolicited propaganda material to persons in other nations.

Accordingly, the Postmaster General sought the advice of the Attorney General and asked whether action could be taken against it under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938. It was the opinion of the Attorney General that propaganda mailed from outside the country would be subject to the same restrictions as propaganda mailed in this country.

The Attorney General wrote the Postmaster General:

"Accordingly, if you find that the mail matter involved is of such a character that distributors of it in this country would be subject to the provisions of the act of June 8, 1938 [Foreign Agents Registration Act], as amended, and you further find that the foreign mailers of the matter have not complied with section 2 of that act by registering as foreign agents with the State Department, you will be authorized, in my opinion, under section 1 of title XII of the act of June 15, 1917, to exclude the matter from the U.S. mails" (39 Op. Attorney General).

Thus began a program of interception and inspection of foreign propaganda mail. At various times during the next 21 years, propaganda mail was detained by Customs Bureau inspection units unless it was requested by the addressees. Of course, the volume of propaganda mail from Germany greatly dwindled once this country entered World War II.

With the beginning of the cold war, this inspection program was revived to intercept

Communist propaganda. From 1948 until 1961, the program was in effect. Millions of pieces of unsolicited Communist propaganda were intercepted by the Customs Bureau inspection units. Before the program was ended by the Kennedy administration on March 17, 1961, it functioned in this way:

Material from Iron Curtain countries, which arrived in mailsacks at U.S. ports, was examined on a spot-check basis. Bags which contained Communist propaganda as defined in the Foreign Agents Registration Act were subjected to further examination. Material destined for governmental agencies, libraries, educators, and others who had indicated a desire to receive material of this type was forwarded. Other addressees were asked to indicate whether they wished to have this material forwarded.

A Customs Bureau spokesman said that over 90 percent of those contacted indicated no desire to receive the material.

At this point it might be well to call attention to a 1933 pledge by the Communist government of Russia that no propaganda activities would be carried on in this country. This statement was contained in a letter from Russian Foreign Commissar Maxim Litvinov which was part of an exchange of official correspondence which resulted in the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and Russia. In his letter, Litvinov stated it would be the "fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" to refrain from "any agitation or propaganda" aimed at the very type of revolution the Russians have been trying to encourage in this country ever since.

The actual wording of the guarantee from Litvinov was:

"To refrain, and to restrain all persons in Government service and all organizations of the Government or under its direct or indirect control, including organizations in receipt of any financial assistance from it, from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquillity, prosperity, order, or security of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions, and, in particular, from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention, or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim, the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, its territories or possessions."

Nevertheless, ever since recognition was granted to the Communist regime on November 16, 1933, that Government has used its Embassy—and through the years the embassies of those nations which are held by military force as Russian colonies—as a base for espionage and propaganda efforts in this country. Today the Russian Embassy sends out frequent mass mailings of Communist propaganda to libraries, businessmen, Government officials, the press, and other individuals and institutions.

Based on a broken agreement and carried out with a subsidy from the American taxpayer, this Russian propaganda effort has continued on a one-sided basis. Only the line is changed to keep up with the twists and turns of official Soviet policy.

The fact that propaganda is part and parcel of the Communist operations in this country may be doubted by a few. But the testimony given on March 1, 1961, by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, should remove any such doubts. While appearing before a House Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. Hoover said:

"The Communist Party, U.S.A., during the past year has stepped up its activities among the youth of our Nation. In addition to their youth work, the Communists devoted considerable effort toward infiltration of our industries and unions, in improving their agitation and propaganda machinery, in exploiting the prevailing international political climate in an effort to make Soviet policies more acceptable to American public opinion, and in rebuilding their influence among all segments of our society.

"The Soviet intelligence services have reorganized, multiplied their contacts with the American people, and have become aggressively bolder in spearheading their espionage offensive against the United States. The intelligence organizations of the satellite countries, carefully coordinated under Soviet leadership and control, have gained increasingly in experience and ability.

"The current widespread ramifications of the Soviet bloc espionage networks which today extend throughout the entire United States, have indicated a realistic need for a further tightening of our security on the homefront. While the Communists speak of peace, their intelligence setup is the most extensive in world history."

Sixteen days later, the White House issued the following press release, which ended this inspection program after 13 years:

"President John F. Kennedy, following consultation with the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, the Postmaster General, J. Edward Day, the Secretary of the Treasury, C. Douglas Dillon, and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, today ordered discontinuation immediately of the program intercepting Communist propaganda from abroad.

"A review by the four Departments has disclosed that the program serves no useful intelligence function at the present time.

"Discontinuance of the program was unanimously recommended by an ad hoc committee of the Planning Board of the National Security Council in a report of June 29, 1960. The planning board unanimously concurred in the recommendation of the committee, but the recommendation was not carried forward.

"Since 1948 varying degrees of control have been exercised by the Bureau of Customs and the Post Office Department concerning the importation of Communist political propaganda. Since 1951 the program has been extended to a spot check or censorship of all mail, except first-class mail.

"Not only has the intelligence value of the program been found to be of no usefulness, but the program also has been of concern to the Secretary of State in connection with efforts to improve cultural exchanges with Communist countries."

MATERIAL BANNED FROM THE MAIL

Although this press release ended the program carried on under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, it did not end other inspection programs which even today ban from our domestic world certain types of propaganda and other forbidden material.

Postmaster General J. Edward Day, appearing before a Senate subcommittee earlier this year, said:

"A program is currently in effect in this country for reviewing and intercepting any printed matter from foreign sources that advocates the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government or is otherwise not legally importable."

Former Deputy Postmaster General William Brawley told a House subcommitttee a few months ago that:

"Propaganda that advocates the violent overthrow of the Government is stopped and is destroyed."

U.S. laws likewise ban other material from our domestic mail. "Every letter, writing, * * * newspaper, pamphlet, book or other publication, matter or thing" which "contains any matter advocating or urging treason, insurrection, or forcible resistance to any law of the United States is nonmailable and shall not be conveyed in the mails" (18 U.S.C. 1717).

Also banned from the mails are the following (title 18):

Section 793: Defense information intended to injure the United States.

Section 954: False statements influencing foreign governments.

Section 957: Papers "used or designed or intended for use in violating any penal statute, or any of the rights or obligations of the United States under any treaty."

Section 964: Mail matter involving the delivery of an armed vessel to a belligerent nation.

Section 2388: "False reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States."

Also material covered in 10 other sections of title 18.

Under article 60 of the Universal Postal Union Convention of 1957, the mailing of certain matter is prohibited. Among these are "(d) articles whose admission or circulation is prohibited in the country of destination"; and "(h) obscene or immoral articles."

Further, article 60 reads:

"5. Moreover, the right is reserved for any country not to convey in transit in open mail over its territory articles of correspondence, other than letters and post cards, in regard to which the legal provisions regulating the conditions of their publication or circulation in that country have not been observed. Such articles must be returned to the administration of origin."

The Foreign Agents Registration Act also has language of some interest in this regard (22 U.S.C. 618(d)):

"(d) The Postmaster General may declare to be nonmailable any communication * * * reasonably adapted to or reasonably appearing to be intended for dissemination or circulation among two or more persons, which is offered or caused to be offered for transmittal in United States mails to any person or persons in any other American republic by any agent of a foreign principal if the Postmaster General is informed in writing by the Secretary of State that the duly accredited diplomatic representative of such American republic has made written representation to the Department of State that the admission or circulation of such communication * * * is prohibited by the laws thereof and has requested in writing that its transmittal thereto be stopped."

Customs Bureau witnesses have testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee that huge quantities of material are carried by this country's postal system in an "in transit" status from New York City across this country and delivered to Mexican postal authorities. It is also carried from the Mexican border to ships at New Orleans for ultimate distribution in other Latin American nations. The material from Mexico is usually printed as part of an extensive printing operation in the Russian Embassy in Mexico City.

There have been reports in the press recently of seizures by various Latin American authorities of quantities of Communist propaganda, so we can assume that it is not desired in those countries. Yet, to my knowledge, no U.S. official has ever advised officials in these Latin American countries that we are under no obligation to forward propaganda to them if they notify us they do not want it.

VOLUME OF COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

No one in this country, in or out of Government, knows how much Communist propaganda enters the United States.

Some attempt has been made to estimate known shipments of such material through the international mails. There are some 50 ports of entry in this country, plus about 100 subports where international mail is received.

Of these 150 locations, incoming Communist political propaganda is checked by the Customs Bureau in only three ports—New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco. Information received by the House Postal Operations Subcommittee clearly indicates that these three checkpoint control units do not have sufficient personnel to do a thorough inspection.

Virtually no inspection is made at the other 147 ports and subports.

In testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Customs Bureau officials have given the figures below as their estimates of the volume of Communist propaganda entering the country through the three ports where Bureau personnel are assigned to inspect incoming mail shipments: 1958, 4,897,000 packages; 1959, 6 million packages, 10 million items; 1960, 14 million packages, 21 million items.

These figures reflect only the amount received at three ports from Communist countries. Not included:

1. Material coming through the mail at the other 147 ports.

2. Material shipped into this country by freight or air freight, such as most of the propaganda from Cuba.

3. Material from Communist Party organizations and Communist-front groups in the free world. This equals the amount of material from Communist countries, according to Customs Bureau estimates.

Additional testimony from Mr. Irving Fishman, Deputy Director of Customs assigned to the port of New York, when he appeared before the Un-American Activities Committee on May 12, 1960, is pertinent. In citing figures used above he said:

"These figures do not include redefection material which is received via first-class mail. It has been estimated that * * * the port of New York alone [receives] * * * approximately 1,500,000 [pieces] a year of this latter type of material. This material is printed in Russian, Byelorussian, Georgian, Ukrainian, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, and Rumanian."

Subsequently he also made these comments:

"First-class mail is not subject to examination.

"We do not have access to diplomatic mail."

When asked if the Customs Bureau has "access to Communist propaganda which comes in bulk shipments for redistribution to dissemination points which, in turn, distribute the material outside the United States," Fishman replied:

"No; we have no control over that either."

He also said:

"Agents who are registered with the Department of Justice * * * may, of course, bring in tons of it without any control by any Government agency."

Fishman also spoke of the "issue of how to control Communist propaganda materials coming from friendly countries." He was asked:

"We have virtually no surveillance over that?"

He answered:

"No."

This is sufficient to show that even Customs Bureau figures are woefully inadequate to reflect the total amount of Communist propaganda entering this country from behind the Iron Curtain and from Communist Party organizations and Communist-front groups in the free world.

Fishman also said at these hearings:

"We have some general idea of how the material is directed. It is directed, of course, primarily and principally to people who have their heritage in the countries now under Communist domination and control. It is directed to colleges, universities, and secondary schools, to every organization associated with these schools. * * * For the most part, this material is unsolicited."

Two organizations account for most of the material sent to schools, colleges, and youth groups. These are the international union of students in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and the World Federation of Democratic Youth in Budapest, Hungary. These organizations, pure Communist propaganda outlets with no other function, publish regular magazines and booklets as well as special publications on any current Soviet propaganda line.

POUNDS OF MAIL

There have been comments about the volume of mail in terms of pounds which is sent to and received from Iron Curtain countries. The following figures for the year ending March 31, 1962, has been furnished by the Post Office Department.

Pounds of mail sent from this country, 2,553,710.

Pounds of mail received in this country, 2,683,997.

In both cases this refers to mail to and from the following countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary. Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and the U.S.S.R.

These figures reflect both letter mail (first class) and mail in the international category known as printed matter, which would generally correspond to the second and third classes in the United States.

There is also international parcel post. The latest figures for parcel post to and from the same countries are:

Pounds of parcel post sent from this country, 11,360,267.

Pounds of parcel post received in this country, 756,424.

These figures reflect the well-known fact that many persons in this country have relatives or friends behind the Iron Curtain and regularly send them packages of clothing, soap, and others items of this kind.

It is important to note that these parcel post figures do not include CARE packages. Distribution of CARE packages is handled through warehouses in the various countries in which CARE operates.

A PROFIT?

The argument has been made that because we send more pounds of mail and packages out of the country than we receive from all other nations, we make a profit on international mail exchange. In order to make a profit, we would of course have to take in more money through the sale of stamps placed on international mail which leaves the country than it costs our Post Office Department to handle all international mail.

Post Office Department costs are in three categories: First, cost of transporting our outgoing mail from all over the country to ports; second, cost of transporting this mail from our ports to its oversea destination—to a port or airport; and third, cost of delivering all mail received from foreign countries to its destination in this country.

Obviously, there are high costs involved in these three operations. That is why international mail requires higher postage than domestic mail. But it is not high enough to cover the costs. Post Office Department official figures show that during the last fiscal year this country lost $17.8 million on international mail.

Obviously, there is no profit for this country. There is a loss.

In fact, even though international mail rates were raised early in fiscal year 1962, I understand another deficit is a prospect, especially in view of anticipated higher payroll costs and transportation costs.

FREE DELIVERY?

Some question has been raised about whether or not Communist propaganda has "free delivery" in this country. Already described are the operations of the Universal Postal Union, but here is testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1957:

"Mr. Arens (Richard Arens, staff director). In other words, the postage that the man puts on in Red China to send a magazine to the United States does not completely defray the cost of transporting that magazine across the country to the recipient, isn't that correct?

"Mr. Louis J. Doyle (Associate General Counsel, Post Office Department; now General Counsel). The revenue produced in the country of mailing is entirely the revenue of that country. We get no revenue out of that mailing. We do, as you say, under the convention which is entered into by all the countries of the world, carry that mail from the point of entry into the United States to the address of delivery within the United States free of charge.

"Mr. Arens. It is true that the U.S. taxpayers are in truth and in fact defraying part, if not all, of the cost of transporting Communist propaganda throughout the United States?

"Mr. Doyle. They are defraying it to the extent that we collect nothing for delivering it from New York to Chicago, shall we say."

RECIPROCITY

The United States has little or no opportunity to present its views to the people behind the Iron Curtain. Mail is censored, U.S. publications are generally banned, Voice of America broadcasts are jammed.

AMERICAN PUBLICATIONS

The Saturday Evening Post has only 10 subscribers in Russia, most of them Americans at our Embassy. Another national magazine which is completely nonpolitical and should be innocuous to the Communists has fewer than 100 subscribers in Russia, fewer than 100 in the other Iron Curtain countries. Look magazine reports only 45 subscribers in 8 Iron Curtain countries.

There are even tight restrictions on the Russian-language magazine Amerika which the Russian Government has promised to distribute in return for our distribution of their magazine U.S.S.R.

The Washington Daily News of January 30, 1962, stated, "U.S. Information Agency officials concede American publications—except official ones covered in cultural exchange agreements—cannot be sold or distributed in the Soviet Union.

The New York Times, on February 9, 1962, reported, "Non-Communist Western publications seldom circulate in the Soviet Union, but sometimes copies of Time, Life, or Vogue are obtained from tourists."

Mr. John N. Hutchinson, Director, Press and Publications Service, U.S. Information Agency, testified before the House Appropriations Committee on April 11, 1961: "There seems to be, although we cannot be sure of it, a correlation between the number of returns (of Amerika) which the Russians turn back and the success or failure of their sales of their magazine (U.S.S.R.) in this country."

In This Week magazine, January 21, 1962, an article by Dr. Mikhail A. Klochko, recent refugee from Russia, read, "Today, however, Amerika is available only to senior Russian officials, and copies are passed from hand to hand many times."

Postmaster General J. Edward Day testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee March 8, 1962, "The indications are that the mail to Iron Curtain countries is screened and sometimes censored, that if there are items in the mail which violate their rules, particularly sending cash in, that mail will often be intercepted."

In hearings before the House Un-American Activities Committee on May 12, 1960, this exchange occurred:

"Mr. Arens (Richard Arens, staff director). Does the international Communist apparatus let down its bars and let American material,

material propagandizing other people respecting the cause of freedom, enter the Iron Curtain countries freely without restrictions, without labeling?

"Mr. Fishman (Deputy Director of Customs assigned to New York). Not to my knowledge."

VOICE OF AMERICA

Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, said earlier this year:

"The Russians spend more money jamming the Voice of America than we have to spend for the entire program of the entire Agency. They spend about $125 million a year jamming it."

It has been estimated by USIA officials that the Communists use 2,000 transmitters to jam our programs. Yet they have never been completely successful.

This tremendous program of jamming indicates, should further indication be needed, that Russia and its Communist satellites are closed to outside information to the extent that such is possible. And in a police state, much may be done to close out information.

These comments should certainly indicate that there is no reciprocity in dealing with the Communists in the field of information and ideas.

ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS

Let us turn now to comments by various persons in the administration. In order to present a somewhat complete picture of the situation, there is included pertinent material which indicates the position taken by the President, Justice Department, and Post Office Department.

President Kennedy was asked at his press conference last January:

"Mr. President, what is your view of the House amendment to the postal rate bill which would prohibit the Post Office from distributing mail labeled as Communist propaganda?"

It should be noted that the question was erroneously framed in that it goes beyond the terms of the amendment.

The President replied:

"Well, I think it does not give the Attorney General—I have just read the language here—it does not give the Attorney General very clear guidance as to what he is supposed to label Communist and political progapanda. Is he supposed to label newspapers that may be received or speeches, or whatever they may be, so that the language is somewhat vague. In addition, I think we want to realize that this is a reciprocal matter, and I think in the last 12 months ending March 31, 1961, we sent a total of 16 million pounds of mail of all types—sent to the Iron Curtain countries, and food packages and all of the rest, and we were only receiving 2.3 million pounds.

"Now, there has been a drop in the amount of mail coming in from Communist countries in the last few months, really since last spring. If there is also an effort made by the Communists to deny us ability to send mail, it is going to present serious problems for a good many Americans who have been carrying on correspondence with friends and relatives. Now, I know that is not the purpose. I think that the Senate should examine the language very clearly and make sure that it is effective and is responsive to our national needs, and determine whether the rather generalized instructions to the Attorney General fall within the necessity of legal precision.

"I think the American people are used to hearing all sides, and I don't think that they are particularly impressed by a good deal of what I have seen of propaganda. We send a good deal of mail out and I want to be sure that our rights to send our mail and our views and our correspondence to all parts of the world are not interfered with."

With the thought in mind that discussion of these comments might clear up some of the points involved, Congressman Cunningham wrote the President a few days later, offering to meet with the Attorney General or other officials from the Justice Department. His letter to the President follows:

January 31, 1962.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: While section 12 of H.R. 7927, that section denying the use of U.S. mails to Communist political propaganda was under consideration, I wrote to my Democratic colleagues in the House of Representatives as follows: "I do not consider this a partisan matter." I know that you will accept this letter to you in the same spirit. Because of my high regard for you, I have given much thought to your press conference comments of last week.

Your years in the House and Senate gave to you a broad knowledge of parliamentary procedure. You will, of course, understand that in drafting section 12 the question of germaneness had to be taken into consideration. Since 22 U.S.C.A. 711(j) defines political propaganda, and since 22 U.S.C.A. 612 and 614 designate the Attorney General as the Government officer to administer the Foreign Agents Registration Act, it was believed that a reference to Communist political propaganda in section 12, and to the Attorney General as the proper officer to make a legal decision as to what is or is not Communist political propaganda, would be both germane and sufficient.

If it is desired to spell out in greater detail the procedures to be followed by the Attorney General through the machinery of the Department of Justice, I would be most happy to meet with him or other Justice Department officers to try to work out procedures satisfactory to the Justice Department and to you. If these negotiations prove mutually satisfactory, I would then be willing to urge the adoption of an amendment to that effect in the Senate with concurrence by the House.

I also feel that these discussions with the Department of Justice should be able to resolve any question which may arise as to the security of first-class mail. It may be deemed desirable to spell out in greater detail the search warrant provisions contained in 39 U.S.C.A. 4057.

While first-class mail has been used for the dissemination of Communist political propaganda, the greatest abuses have come in second- and third-class mail, which have always been open for inspection.

It should be borne in mind that the reason this section carried the House is because Members voting almost unanimously wanted to declare that they did not feel this material should be carried at the expense of the American taxpayer when there is no such reciprocity in Russia.

If this legislation serves the purpose of helping to open up the communications systems of Russia to American newspapers and to the Voice of America broadcasts, it will have been most useful indeed. I agree entirely that it is most important for the people of Russia and its satellites to learn more and more about the United States. And if the Russian Government allows its people to read American newspapers and magazines freely, and to listen to the Voice of America, I for one would not object to reciprocity here. But this is not what is happening.

It is not possible to buy the International editions of the New York Times or of the Paris Herald Tribune in Moscow, even though many people in that country read English. What American magazine is available on any newstand in Russia? The New York Times of Sunday, January 28, under the headline "United States and Russia Will Open Cultural Exchange Talks," contains the following paragraphs:

"For instance, hundreds and sometimes thousands of copies of Amerika have been returned by Russian authorities as unsalable; despite abundance of evidence of quick sellouts and even black-market sales of the Russian-language magazine in all parts of the Soviet Union.

"The United States wants the circulation limits on Amerika and the Russians' English-language magazine U.S.S.R. raised from 50,000 to 100,000 with the additional right of free distribution of copies that are not sold."

At such time as American newspapers and magazines are freely available on Russian newsstands, at such time as the Voice of America on which we spend so many millions of dollars is unjammed in Russia, I would feel that section 12 of H.R. 7927 might be modified. Before this is done, I believe that we should insist on the reciprocal right of inspection of postal systems, so that we will know just where we stand. It may be that the conditions for such modification can be written into section 12 and I would be pleased to discuss this with the Department of Justice.

It does seem to me that the cardinal point behind section 12 of H.R. 7927 is being overlooked. It was proposed and included to prevent additional cost to the taxpayers of the United States whereas the United States does not receive reciprocal treatment for our information material in Russia. This has nothing to do with everyday correspondence between citizens of the United States and Iron Curtain countries. Certainly adequate protections are in the law or can be included in this law to protect the security of such private communications. But it is not reasonable to distribute material which may be harmful, charged to the account of our taxpayers, when simultaneously our own material is banned in Russia.

I do feel certain that you and the Congress are working toward the same end. To the extent that you believe that I, as the sponsor of section 12 of H.R. 7927, consistent with the principles set forth in this letter, can be of assistance to you, please feel free to call upon me.

Very truly yours,
Glenn Cunningham,
Member of Congress.

The reply was as follows:

The White House,
February 1, 1962.

Dear Mr. Cunningham: The President has asked me to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of January 31 regarding your willingness to meet with representatives of the Department of Justice to discuss section 12 of H.R. 7927. We are glad to notify the officials of that Department of your interest and have sent your letter to the office of the Attorney General for consideration and further reply to you.

Sincerely yours,
Lawrence F. O'Brien,
Special Assistant to the President.

Subsequently Mr. Cunningham received the following letter:

Department of Justice,
Washington, February 14, 1962.

Hon. Glenn Cunningham,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Cunningham: Lawrence F. O'Brien, Special Assistant to the President, has referred to this Department your letter of January 31, 1962, to the President, relating to section 12 of H.R. 7927.

As the President indicated in his press conference, this amendment raises several questions. These include the definition of Communist political propaganda, the possibilities of foreign retaliatory action of one kind or another, the procedures to be followed in making such a determination, the security of first-class mail, and whether or not the Attorney General is the appropriate officer to make such determinations.

I would be most happy to discuss the bill with you in detail at your convenience. However, I understand the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will hold hearings on the bill in the near future, and I assume that it will examine these as well as other problems. It occurs to me that during the course of the hearings the precise nature of the problems will come into sharper focus. It might be well to have the advantage of the testimony adduced in the hearings before discussing technical drafting changes.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel.

Congressman CUNNINGHAM again offered to meet with Justice Department officials for the purpose of finding a common ground and explaining the action of the House in adopting his amendment. He suggested that it might be possible to work out some position satisfactory to both the administration and to other House sponsors of legislation in this field.

The text of Mr. CUNNINGHAM's letter follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1962.

Mr. NICHOLAS DEB. KATZENBACH,
Assistant Attorney General,
Office of Legal Counsel,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KATZENBACH: Thank you for your letter of February 14, in answer to mine of January 31 to the President.

So that there can be no possible misunderstanding about the matter, let me make it clear that as the sponsor of section 12 of H.R. 7927, I for one am perfectly satisfied with its provisions. My letter to the President was written after his press conference comments because of my desire to be of assistance in trying to resolve any problems he believes the section may raise. Your letter advances certain questions you apparently feel the section brings up. I do believe that each of these points is satisfactorily taken care of in the amendment.

When the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee holds hearings on this legislation, I intend to ask the chairman for an opportunity to be heard, and I further intend to pursue the passage of the amendment with all vigor. I for one do not believe the House will accept any postal rate bill without this kind of provision in it.

Because there is apparently some executive misunderstanding about section 12, I offered on January 31 to discuss the matter. In this letter I repeat that suggestion. If you have changes you feel should be included, it might be advisable to discuss them in advance of the Senate hearing, so a position satisfactory to you, and to other House sponsors of the legislation in addition to myself, might be worked out. Then we would have a joint rather than separate positions before the Senate committee.

If on reflection you feel that such a bona fide conversation would be mutually helpful, I shall be most happy to talk with you in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

No answer was received in the intervening months.

TYPES OF PROPAGANDA

Propaganda of the type under discussion falls into two major categories—English-language material sent to libraries, schools, and colleges, youth groups, and other citizens and institutions; and redefection material, usually in a foreign language, aimed at recent arrivals from countries behind the Iron Curtain.

PEACE CAMPAIGN

The current theme concerns peace. As I understand, virtually every piece of material examined in recent months has had at least one article on peace; sometimes the entire magazine or pamphlet is about peace drives and organizations. In this connection I would like to quote from J. Edgar Hoover when he appeared before a House subcommittee earlier this year. He said:

"The great problem is the definition of 'peace.' We define it as we understand 'peace' in our dictionaries. The Russians and their sympathizers and satellite nations have an entirely different meaning for 'peace.' Theirs is peace on their conditions. They add the phrase 'as long as there is no opposition to communism.' Some of the people who support these movements and march as pickets are thoroughly sincere in their desire for peace, but they have been influenced by some of the Gus Hall propaganda. (Gus Hall is general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.)"

The following are samples of Communist propaganda received at the port of New York:

First there is an Information Bulletin of the Soviet Peace Committee, Moscow. This monthly publication is printed in English. The cover contains a photograph of blossoms. The inside front cover has a photograph of peace marchers before George M. Cohan's statue on Times Square in New York City. This photo is identified as follows: "A sitdown demonstration in New York. People in the United States condemn the nuclear arms race policy of the American Government." Across a globe on the title page are the words, "Peace, Coexistence, Disarmament."

Among the articles in this pamphlet are "Science—for the Sacred Cause of Peace"; "An Important Means of Strengthening Peace"; "Disarmament Is Peace"; "The Overriding Task of Our Time"; "Disarmament and the Economy"; and "Soviet Conference for General Disarmament and Peace."

Another example is an issue of the illustrated monthly magazine, Soviet Union. The title page carries these words attributed to Premier Khrushchev: "Our struggle and all that we do are subordinated to the one aim of building, creating and working to make man's life better and ever more beautiful." It is also noted that this magazine is published in 17 languages.

There are many articles in this magazine, most of them appearing to be straightforward reports on Russia's high morals, low unemployment, happiness and opportunity, high farm production and new towns, etc. Among the obvious propaganda items are articles entitled "Visiting Our Finnish Friends" (on the Communist World Youth Festival), "For Disarmament and Peace" (questions asked "civic leaders" on the eve of the World Congress for General Disarmament), and "A Commentator's Notes" (article condemning U.S. nuclear tests without mention of Russian tests).

An issue of Women of the Whole World, another well-produced monthly magazine printed in color, contains articles entitled "Italian Women for a World Without War and Without Arms" and "Accused of Desiring Peace." The back inside cover is a picture of a woman carrying a sign which reads, "Women Strike for Peace," and is identified as "Our photo: United States—Women Strike for Peace."

Before the peace movement, the main item of discussion was Berlin. One publication entitled "Berlin" contained reports on the glowing economic recovery in East Berlin, the brutality of American troops in West Berlin, angry accounts of American assistance to persons they "lured" into West Berlin, and a most interesting explanation of why the Berlin wall was erected last year. This is the explanation:

"Early on the morning of August 13, 1961, units of the National People's Army of the GDR, the People's Police, and the factory militia of the Socialist factories, took over the protection of the state frontier of the GDR in Berlin. Acting on instructions from the Government of the German Democratic Republic, and with agreement of the member states of the Warsaw Pact, these security forces established frontier controls similar to those on all state frontiers everywhere in the world. The multifold secret services in West Berlin were completely taken by surprise by these measures. The armed forces of the workers' and peasants' state acted with speed and precision. An effective barrier was erected to the danger emanating from West Berlin, in the interests of world peace."

ANTICHURCH MATERIAL

Also of interest is another theme which is used regularly in Communist propaganda—vicious attacks on religion, the Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths, and religious rites of these faiths.

These attacks are of the type that antidefamation groups in this country would fight at every opportunity. They have little or no truth in them, and, in the words of one Customs Bureau translator, "All articles are designed to indoctrinate the reader with communism's militant atheistic-materialistic tenets, to discredit, undermine, and vilify all religions, but above all the Roman Catholic Church, and to propagate the Moscow party line's policies regarding religion."

There is some doubt in my mind that such material would be mailable if posted in this country. Yet it is delivered throughout the country when mailed from oversea points.

Several summaries of recent publications were prepared by Customs Bureau translators. These are translation-summaries of publications received in this country and intended for persons whose heritage is behind the Iron Curtain. These are the Customs Bureau summaries:

"1. Light (Hungarian language) printed by the Committee for the Dissemination of Scientific Knowledge, Budapest. In this issue almost all articles sharply attack religion, the faith in God in general, and the Roman Catholic Church in particular. Advocates the liquidation of religious feelings in the masses for as long as the church has any influence on the masses through its teachings, socialism cannot win completely. To be victorious the Communist Party must break forever the church's monopoly over the man's innermost feelings.

"Accusations are made against the Vatican for having concluded concordats with Germany and Italy.

"Article stating that the bourgeois atheism is not the right kind of atheism since it is not based on Marxism-Leninism. 'Atheism and class warfare go hand in hand in Marxism' it states.

"Other articles ridicule church rites.

"(Library of Congress summary states, 'The Journal includes articles by Hungarian and foreign authors. It is directed against the church and religion in general. In this number, several articles are focused upon the Roman Catholic Church and its teachings, policy, and international contacts, past and present. But there are also items on Protestant theology, the Jewish faith, the Turinist movement, the position of women in society, and so on. Generally speaking, the Journal serves the cause of replacing religious faith by Marxist materialism.')

"2. Voice of Orthodoxy (German language), published by the Middle European Exarchy of the Moscow Patriarchate, Berlin. All articles deal with the Moscow-led All-Christian Peace Conference of Prague (a branch of Moscow's World Peace Movement), emphasizing Khrushchev's leading role in the fight for peace; greeting telegrams, sent from the Prague conference by Orthodox and Protestant leaders to Khrushchev, as well as Khrushchev's answer-telegram; the speech of Archbishop Nikodim, leader of the Soviet Russian Church delegation, held at the conference, strongly attacks Roman Catholicism and above all Pope John XXIII for his calling the Vatican Council for the reunification of Christendom, Archbishop Nikodim said that he wishes that the Pope's endeavors will remain fruitless and that the Western Christians will 'find their way to us' (to Moscow); Nikodim strongly emphasized that Orthodoxy fully supports Khrushchev's coexistence policy and condemned the West's 'colonialism, racism and war-mongering'; the speech of a Chinese Protestant bishop who extolled Red China is emphasized; the whole issue is imbued of the spirit of collaboration between the Communist Party and Orthodoxy (at least official Orthodoxy).

"3. German Review for Philosophy (German language) published by the VEB German Scientific Publishing Office, Berlin. 'Political Catholicism and Neo-Colonialism' and 'Negation of Democracy and the Clerical Theory About the State' both sharply attack Roman catholicism, above all the papacy, accusing it of striving for world dominance; another article assails a Protestant clergyman (the Reverend Thielicke) because he opposes the East German regime's subjugation of the Evangelical Church, the article calls Reverend Thielicke 'the evangelical representative of the NATO wing of EKD' (Evangelical Church of Germany). 'Thoughts on Discussions With Bourgeois Philosphers' tries to disprove and discredit contemporary Western philosphical thinking (based mainly on idealistic speculations) and to prove that Marxist-Leninist atheistic materialism is superior."

A typical English-language publication of the same type is Protestant Churches in Czecholsovakia, published by the Foreign and Information Department of the Ecumenical Council of Churches in Czechoslovakia, Prague. Virtually all of the principal articles stress the current peace campaign, revanchism in West Germany, need for a neutral atom-free zone in central Europe or other Soviet lines. The impression is given that there is free practice of religion by the people of Czechoslovakia and other Iron Curtain countries, and that the people are working through their churches for peace. Attention is given to the All-Christian Peace Assembly, the Christian Peace Conference, the German Peace Council, National Peace Committee of Catholic Clergy, and other such organizations which serve as vehicles for the current Soviet "peace" offensive.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

So there can be no misunderstandings, I want to point out the very definitive language used by Mr. CUNNINGHAM regarding domestic mailings. The phrase "propaganda financed or sponsored directly or indirectly by any Communist-controlled government" was carefully drawn to prevent any possible interference with traditional and constitutional American rights. Nothing in this provision could be construed to affect any U.S. newspaper, magazine, or other publication, except those published by the Communist Party, U.S.A., or by the Russian Government through its Embassies or the Embassies of the Communist satellite nations. No American newspaper is financed or sponsored by a Communist government. Hence no American newspaper could possibly be affected by this amendment, even if—for shock or circulation-boosting purposes—it used for 1 day or 1 week only dispatches from Pravda or Tass, which obviously would qualify as Communist propaganda. But the key point to be stressed is that the publication would not be controlled by a Communist government and so the language would not apply.

Second- and third-class mail are both called "open mail" and under current law and postal regulations, they are open for inspection at any time. Indeed, much second- and third-class mail is not even wrapped unless the sender believes it more convenient.

The amendment would not have denied Communist propaganda to those who might wish to receive it. Communist printed matter, whether 25-percent propaganda or 100-percent propaganda, could have moved under fourth-class parcel post rates. But there would be no subsidy for such rates by the American taxpayer.

No library, college, scholar, Government agency, or anyone else would have been denied the opportunity to receive and examine Communist propaganda under the amendment. Indeed, Government agencies have even another avenue open—the diplomatic pouch—which can be used to forward any material deemed appropriate from our Embassies and consulates behind the Iron Curtain.

The big difference was that under the Cunningham amendment, the American taxpayer would no longer be subsidizing the delivery of such matter.

MAIL FROM ABROAD

Under the Cunningham amendment, Communist propaganda mailed from abroad would not be delivered free by our postal service.

Such matter could have been shipped to this country by ocean freight or air freight, then deposited in domestic mails carrying the appropriate fourth-class postage. The Customs Bureau reported that in the past the Communist government in Cuba sent virtually all of its propaganda to this country via air freight, apparently because it was more convenient. This avenue would have remained open.

Such material could have been shipped to this country by freight or air freight and then distributed outside the postal system. It could have been delivered by truck to various cities and then distributed further by delivery van or messenger service.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, here are a few basic provisions in regard to the Cunningham amendment which need to be repeated and emphasized.

1. The amendment is a logical first step for this country to take to retaliate against the Communists for their unilateral abrogation of the reciprocal terms of the Universal Postal Union Convention.

2. The American people overwhelmingly support this action; indeed, they apparently support even stronger action.

3. The House of Representatives overwhelmingly supported this provision.

4. The language in the amendment was fair and precise. It allowed Communist propaganda to enter the country; it allowed it to be delivered in the mail; but it ended the subsidy which such propaganda now receives from the American taxpayers. It forced such material into a category of mail which pays its own way.

5. The provisions of the amendment did not go as far as existing law in barring certain types of propaganda and other nonmailable material.

6. The amendment had no effect on scientific journals, books or other publications unless such material also contained propaganda. In that case the matter could still be moved by way of parcel post.

7. The amendment would have given this country a position of strength to use in negotiating with the Communists. How can we expect the Communists to allow our material into their dictatorship if we have no trump cards? The amendment gave this country an opportunity to insist upon concessions from the Communist bloc nations as a condition to extending the future benefits of our postal service.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to insert into the RECORD an excellent article on the Alliance for Progress by Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso, the U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress. This article recently appeared in the Sunday magazine supplement of the Minneapolis Tribune.

There has been a great deal of criticism of the Alliance in recent weeks. There have been those who have said that no progress whatsoever has been made. This article clearly indicates that, even though the Alliance is only 1 year old—and we ought to bear that fact in mind—already considerable progress has been made. There has been land reform in Bolivia and Venezuela. There have been labor reform laws passed in El Salvador. Housing programs are flourishing in Ecuador and Colombia. Urban and rural water supply projects are underway in Brazil and Ecuador. There are nationwide primary school programs underway in Colombia, and about to be launched in Chile. And, of course, there has been a very extensive school lunch program in Peru and other Latin American countries. These are only a few of the accomplishments under the Alliance for Progress program. Therefore, in order that a better perspective may be obtained as to the achievements of the Alliance for Progress and what the Alliance means in terms of future progress, prosperity, and freedom in countries of the Western Hemisphere, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent summary of the Alliance for Progress program by Ambassador Moscoso be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW FREEDOM CAN WIN IN LATIN AMERICA—A CHALLENGE FROM THE HEAD OF THE NEW ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By Ambassador Teodoro Moscoso)

Tax reforms: In Chile, wealthy families, for whom tax evasion has been a time-honored way of life, are being warned by 120 U.S.-trained inspectors that they may receive prison terms. In 1962 collections will exceed last year's by $182 million.

Land reforms: In Bolivia, land titles have been granted to 71,000 campesinos (farmers) in the past 2 years. In Northeast Brazil, the Government has earmarked $70 million for the first year of a 5-year basic development plan.

Labor reforms: El Salvador has established minimum wage legislation and for the first time in the history of that nation, agricultural workers get a paid day of rest on Sunday.

Housing: In Ecuador, private firms are experimenting with sugarcane wastes and banana stems for producing inexpensive wallboard. In the Dominican Republic, they are using pressed wood chips sprayed with cement. Ideas like these may help to alleviate the critical housing shortage in Latin America—already over the 11-million mark and climbing higher daily.

Urban and rural water supply: In Rio de Janeiro, where even luxury hotels have had to load up from water tank trucks, an Alianza project will soon provide pure water for most of the city. In Guayaquil's slums, water has long been obtained from mud puddles under holes chiseled in surface pipelines carrying water to better neighborhoods. Our U.S. mission people obtained permission to put some surplus water tanks to work. Now the Government regularly trucks in fresh water to fill them.

Education: Thanks to increased school building and such free extras as nourishing hot lunches and decent clothes, school attendance in Latin America has risen rapidly in the past 2 years, as much as tripled in some areas. In Chile I saw how serious the need for new schools remains. I stopped at a mud and wattle schoolhouse in the country, where 4 classrooms served 250 students. A fifth had collapsed and lay in a heap. Here was an opportunity to test Alianza's speed. Before we left Chile, a new school building had been approved, and villagers had begun to dig a foundation.

Improving the lot of the people is not always that easy. If it were easy, as President Kennedy has remarked, it would have been done long ago. The job is staggering. In one decade, a society which has for centuries been composed of the few who have much and the many who have little must alter that status quo.

THE BIG JOB AHEAD

Progress often seems slight in comparison to what remains to be remedied. In Costa Rica, gastroenteritis is the greatest killer of children who've never seen pure water flow from a faucet. In Brazil, 1.6 percent of the total number of farms accounts for over half the total farmland.

In Uruguay, 75 percent of the rural population is made up of landless farm laborers. In Haiti, there are 700,000 children of primary school age, but no schools for 614,000 of them. In Paraguay, 40 percent of the budget is spent on arms, while sewerage service reaches only one-third of the capital city and nowhere else.

Because of these contrasts, many Latin nations seem always on the brink of full-scale open revolt. Though the Cubans insist that "revolutions cannot be exported," Cuba has steadily and stealthily shipped arms and even how-to-do-it handbooks on guerrilla warfare to a half dozen nations.

The arms are used. Riots and rebellions continue to harass their favorite targets—progressives like Venezuela's Betancourt. But, as demonstrated by the peasants who took up machetes to help the loyal Government troops in the recent uprising, these riots do not yet have popular support.

If the Alianza does its work, they never will. And, in several years, I am confident Castro's revolution will look to Latin Americans like a shabby mockery alongside the really great revolution which the Alianza represents.

HOMES, JOBS, AND HEALTH

Last year, in Venezuela, as I watched the pride in the faces of peasants receiving land titles, it was easy to see why Castro maligns Alianza and Khrushchev labels it "an imperialist trick." When people have land, have decent homes, have jobs and health through democracy, then they do not need to resort to terrorism and communism.

It will be some time before the anti-American slogans fade completely from Latin American walls. When I arrived in Venezuela as U.S. Ambassador, the walls were clean—the Government had repainted them. Within a few days the anti-American slogans were back. Yet in the elections the Communists received only 6 percent of the vote. I realized then that it took all the people to elect the nation's leaders, but it took only a few Communists and a dozen pots of paint to deface the nation's walls.

We are gaining an edge over Castro and Castroism, but we have to hurry. For, as Costa Rica's former President José Figueres has said so well, "It is 1 minute to midnight in Latin America."

ECONOMIC UNIONS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure our colleagues in the Senate will be interested to learn that the Latin American nations have recently entered into an economic union of rather significant proportions. At a meeting in Mexico City countries of Latin America are reported to have taken 2 giant steps toward an eventual economic union which could mean, as the article points out, the difference between poverty and prosperity for the 200 million people of the Latin American area.

The meeting at Mexico City established two common markets, the Central American Free Trade Zone and the larger but not as far advanced Latin-American Free Trade Association. This is all described in an excellent article under the byline of Mr. Bert Quint, of the New York Herald Tribune News Service.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Latin Nations Enter Into Economic Union

(By Bert Quint)

Mexico City.—Latin America has taken two giant steps recently toward an eventual economic union that could mean the difference between poverty and prosperity for its 200 million people.

The moves were made by the area's two common markets—the Central American Free Trade Zone and the larger but not-so-advanced Latin American Free Trade Association.

The first of these markets was established December 13, 1960, when the Governments of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua signed a treaty for the unification of their economies. This was to be achieved through an arrangement eliminating customs duties on products flowing from one member nation to another and by the fixing of uniform tariffs for goods entering these countries from outside the zone.

Now, a tremendous push has been given the regional association by the addition of Costa Rica, which, after El Salvador, is Central America's most industrialized country.

This free trade zone goes beyond the normal common market in that it is working toward full economic integration to overcome limitations their smallness imposes upon individual countries.

None of the nations has enough of a domestic market to encourage much in the way of industry. Yet, among them, they have a population of 11 million, and Panama, which is likely to join before long, will add another million consumers. The idea, then, is to establish industries in each country to supply the others, and although the project is still young, it looks as though it will work.

The other common market, the Latin American Free Trade Association, came into being when the Treaty of Montevideo was ratified in May 1961, and today includes Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay. It surmounted a serious challenge to its existence by rejecting in September a surprise bid for membership by Cuba.

Delegates to a recent meeting of the Association in Mexico City wrestled with the problem. Several of the member governments vowed they would withdraw if Cuba were admitted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my feeling that this country can do a great deal to promote the objectives of the Alliance for Progress by encouraging economic developments in the Latin American area. The work that has been accomplished in Central America thus far is very significant, with the establishment of the Central American Bank, which serves as an adjunct to the Inter-American Bank; and now with the Central American trade area, the Central American Free Trade Zone as a cooperating area with the Latin American Free Trade Association, it seems to me that some significant steps have been taken which can lead to better things for our Latin American neighbors.

PROPOSED WORLD FOOD YEAR—FIFTH INTERNATIONAL FOOD CONGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last month the Fifth International Food Congress took place in New York's Coliseum. This was the first time the Congress had ever been held outside Europe.

In a significant policy pronouncement, Dr. B. R. Sen, Director General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, appealed for a private food industry permanent working committee to provide liaison assistance to the FAO. Such a unit would coordinate American and European food industry efforts with FAO programs and would make available more effective technical assistance to underdeveloped nations.

In reply to Dr. Sen's proposal, Mr. William T. Brady, chairman of the board of Corn Products Co., suggested the formation of an ad hoc committee to begin setting up a liaison agency. I am hopeful, Mr. President, such an agency can become a reality. As Mr. Brady points out, there are numerous national and international food laws which must be standardized if we are to reach all men everywhere with the fruits of our know-how. Such an agency could be highly beneficial in this and other areas.

Mr. Brady also has suggested that the International Food Congress in cooperation with FAO study the feasibility of making 1965 a World Food Year. This is a splendid idea, Mr. President, and I appeal to Senators to support it.

A year ago I urged that we select a year and designate it as World Food Year, in order to bring to bear upon the problems of agricultural production and distribution all available scientific and technical know-how, calling upon the governments of all the nations of the world to emphasize at least during that 1 year the improvement of agriculture.

There is no doubt that this is one of the basic requirements of a peaceful world. With population pressures upon available food reserves and productive capacity, it is imperative that the great body of scientific knowledge which is now available to the more advanced countries in the field of agricultural production, processing, and distribution now be made available to the less advanced countries in an ever-increasing flow.

I am hopeful that we might in the coming World Food Congress, which will meet next year, hopefully in the United States, give additional emphasis to the possibility of establishing 1965 as World Food Year. We once had a World Geophysical Year, in which there was worldwide cooperation on the part of the scientists of all the nations studying some of the great problems in the field of geology and the physical formation of the earth. That led to cooperative efforts among the United States, the Soviet Union, and the countries of Asia, Africa, and elsewhere in terms of exploration of some of the vast areas of the earth which are relatively uninhabited, particularly the exploration of the Antarctic as well as the Arctic.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brady's remarks be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Closing Remarks and Proposals by William T. Brady, Chairman, Corn Products Co., in Conjunction With the Challenge Panel on World Food Problems, Sponsored by Corn Products Co., Before the Fifth International Food Congress, September 10, 1962

You no doubt share with me the deep sense of responsibility with which I close this afternoon's session. Our speakers have outlined the dimensions of the great challenge facing the food industry of the free world.

Clearly, we of the food business have an enlarging duty. It is our duty to work more effectively to help provide all men everywhere with enough food. It is our 20th-century mission to extend, wherever possible, the benefits which abundant natural resources combined with modern food processing and distribution have given to us and our people.

I have some notions as to how we can work more effectively. But, first, let us see whether the food industry of the free world is qualified to make a unique contribution.

By and large, in Europe and America, relatively little of man's time and effort must be spent to eat and eat well. This has released human energy and made it free for creative endeavor and the pursuit of happiness. It has fostered growing and vital economies strong enough to provide for the needs of their citizens, as well as to furnish help to many beyond their borders.

This is in sharp contrast to the developing countries where people must devote nearly all their energy and ideas to just feeding themselves. It also serves to point up the glaring failure of Russia and her satellites to feed their own—the shortages which have produced long food lines, high food costs, and a deadly, dull diet in some places, if not actual famine.

Through free food enterprise and technology, our homemakers spend less time in shopping, less time in the kitchen, and less of their husbands' paychecks to get a greater variety of food of higher quality than ever before.

Thanks to the introduction of hybrid seeds, high-efficiency fertilizers, and to the partnership between farming and processing and distributing which we call agribusiness, our food productivity today is several times higher per acre than ever before.

We have learned much about food—about vitamins, proteins, minerals, and fats—and their contribution to nutrition, health, and well-being. And, of course, a good deal of this has come from the scientific laboratories of the food industry.

The supermarkets of the West are the envy of the underfed, a symbol of abundance. Highly developed methods of transporting and storing food, of freezing and dehydrating and preserving it, have made it possible to enjoy fresh foods out of season and to supply desperately needed foods to geographic regions which fail to provide a balanced assortment.

So, indeed, we do have something unique to share. Something in experience and time. Something in skills. Something in technology. And, if I may say so, what we can provide is all the more valuable because it has been accumulated under the spur of competitive business conditions.

How do we export more of this knowledge and technical aid through the hunger curtain that our speakers have described today? Remember the handicaps. There are the differing food habits and traditions of various cultures that Dr. Mead has mentioned. There are the varying public health needs that Dr. Stare has discussed. There are the economic and political overtones described by Dr. Krohn.

Besides, as we of business know so well, there is the handicap of nation-by-nation and market-by-market uncertainty as represented by artificial barriers to free world trade and development. There are numerous national and international food laws which must be standardized if we are to reach all men everywhere with the fruits of our know-how. All too frequently national laws and regulations prevent the benefits of modern food technology. Here—and everywhere—the foodstuffs needed for nourishment must be allowed to cross boundaries and to reach the hungry who need them, and more importantly get inside and help them help themselves. In the ultimate, this is the real solution that free enterprise can best bring about.

It may well be that what Dr. Sen has mentioned as obstacles have been just that. To my mind, however, these have been due to unfortunate misunderstandings. The food industry—which is the largest industry in the world—is not unaccustomed to taking considered risks.

What company could be so nearsighted as to expect immediate profit from its investment in a developing country? What company could refuse to lend its technical experts in answer to requests to help build skilled manpower?

As to unstable political conditions and threats of confiscation—these, indeed, are obstacles. And here, of course, we depend greatly on the fine work of the FAO to help minimize such risks. Speed—which is badly needed—and the magnitude of the results—will depend a great deal on having the proper climate in which to operate.

We have the logical catalyst machinery in the FAO. We recognize that the FAO is continually analyzing and actively pursuing antihunger objectives in every country in the world. We have heard the Director General of the FAO openly inviting the coordinated assistance of the organized food industry. Indeed, Dr. Sen has opened the door to what amounts to a Marshall plan for the world's hungry.

Such a plan must deal with all three stages of man's hunger problem. First, the food to rescue from starvation. Second, the food to provide all the energy and vitality which men need to work out their own problems. Third, food which tastes good and helps provide the sense of fulfillment that civilized mankind hopes to achieve.

We are no doubt all of us doing something at this moment. For example, Corn Products Co.—in cooperation with the Rockefeller Foundation and a Mexican research institute—has agreed on a major research project to develop high-protein corn as it is already doing in Italy and South America. If this project is successful, it will provide a new source of sustenance to more than 200 million Latin Americans, many of whom are deprived of properly balanced diets. I'm sure many other companies have similar projects.

Yet, such individual projects are not enough. World hunger is so vast, the need is so important that Marshall-plan type of organization and industrywide collaboration is essential. Here, then are two recommendations which I propose for action by this Fifth International Food Congress:

First. That the food industry authorize the establishment of a permanent working committee to serve as the food industry's liaison with the FAO. I suggest that the duties of this committee be (a) to arrange industry services to meet needs of the FAO for technical assistance, research analysis, and other forms of aid, and (b) to coordinate and disseminate industry findings and information to the FAO for use in its work. It seems to me that the committee should be compact. Thus, I suggest one member each from distributor organizations in Europe and the United States and one member each from food manufacturing organizations in Europe and the United States—four in all. Later, Far Eastern representatives may be added. It might be wise to entrust the U.S. appointments to the organized food distributors, to the organized grocery manufacturers—and the European appointments to counterpart organizations abroad. Further, I suggest that the committee be equipped with a permanent executive director and modest staff supported by proportional contributions from all members of this Food Congress.

As for Corn Products Co.—before and beyond any industrywide committee—we freely offer its worldwide resources to the FAO for consultation and advice. We hope these resources will be just as freely asked for and utilized.

A second proposal: I suggest that this Congress, in cooperation with FAO, issue a call for a study of the feasibility of making 1965 a World Food Year. This act could stimulate action programs similar to those for the recent International Geophysical Year—as well as cooperation with the freedom-from-hunger campaign and kindred activities. Consideration of and planning for this World Food Year would make a good initial project for the new committee I have just proposed.

These proposals are modest in a revolutionary period. They should not frighten us, for the entire history of the food industry has been revolutionary. The results to be achieved may seem quite difficult but our industry's accomplishments already have been phenomenal and were not easy to accomplish.

As we have seen today, our job is not nearly finished in this rapidly changing—and sometimes even explosive—world of ours today. Our vision of a better life for more people must be our unshakable goal.

So let us begin right now. Let us take action before this Congress adjourns. History would not forgive us if we failed.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO SENATE DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I could not watch the final curtain ring down upon the 87th Congress of our Union—which I hope will be soon—without having publicly stated my warm feelings of respect and admiration for our distinguished majority leader.

The leadership was not an easy spot to fill in January of 1961 because the man who assumed that responsibility was certain to be judged in light of the Texas-sized shoes left behind by our highly esteemed former majority leader and now Vice President of the United States. I think that the Vice President himself would be the first to agree that the senior Senator from Montana has filled those shoes with distinction.

Senator MANSFIELD is living evidence that the old saying "nice guys finish last" does not always ring true. The path of his life has carried him from the deepest copper mines in Butte, Mont., to the pinnacle of leadership in the U.S. Senate and he has trod that upward path always with a profound sense of humility. He sometimes wonders aloud why he should remain in politics, but he is alone with such doubts. For all of us who know him and who have the good fortune of serving with him in the Congress are keenly aware that his is a role of unique responsibility that perhaps he alone in these trying days can so uniquely discharge. It is he who represents the Senate to the President and the President to the Senate. It is he who has accepted this eminent but in many ways unenviable position somewhat reluctantly and only after prompting by the President himself. It is he who describes himself as "just a Democrat" and has expressed a longing to be "just the Senator from Montana." And it is he who has won the admiration and respect of his colleagues by dealing with each of us on the basis of mutual respect, by the use of logic and quiet persuasiveness, and by literally applying the precept of the golden rule. This record during two sessions of the 87th Congress amply demonstrates that the efficacious luster of this guiding principle has not through the ages worn thin. He has been described as a quiet persuader, dispassionate, having the look of an ascetic, and as a truly humble gentleman with the gift of simple candor and the moral courage to use it.

Being the majority leader of the United States is in many ways the highest test of a man's character in the most highly refined democratic government in the world. Upon his shoulders is laid the responsibility for blending a hundred shades of difference into an agreeable and acceptable hue.

For any man to discharge the responsibilities of that job successfully, he must, in my judgment, have the wisdom of a Solomon, the fortitude of the Christian martyrs, and the patience of a Job. Not long ago a newsclipping said that the majority leader had won his sainthood right here on earth for the magnificent patience he has displayed during this session of Congress. With that I fully concur.

The love, admiration, respect, and esteem in which he is held by all his colleagues has been justly earned. He has been fair, temperate, and impartial; he has listened patiently to our views; and he has with a high sense of duty and independence of judgment faithfully discharged the responsibility of leadership. For the majority leader, Mr. President, I hold the warmest affection and highest admiration.

In the Holy Bible, we find the admonition: "Let him who would be greatest among you be the servant of all." The majority leader has served his colleagues, his constituents, his President, and his Nation with the noblest qualities of humanity. I salute him, Mr. President, I thank him for myself, and I hope that I may have the honor and privilege of serving under his leadership for many years to come.

Mr. President, in that connection I wish to pay tribute to the majority whip of our party, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. All Senators would agree that there is no more delightful, effervescent, charming or hardworking man than the Senator from Minnesota, our majority whip. At times I have found myself in disagreement with him. Most of the time I think he has been right. Never have I seen him when he was not willing to sit down with a Senator, exchange views, and try to reconcile differences of opinion without doing violence to his conscience or asking another to do violence to his. He has been a great spokesman for our party in the past. In the new position of leadership which he occupies he has been a great spokesman for the President over the past 2 years. I venture to say that we could not find a more eloquent spokesman for the administration anywhere.

In my judgment, the present Congress has made a great record. Much of the credit for having made that record rests on the shoulders of our majority whip, the able Senator from Minnesota. I challenge anyone to be associated with this wonderful man for any length of time and not increase greatly his admiration and affection for him. He is indeed a great man, and he has been a great leader for our Democratic Party.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Presiden, I join in what the Senator from Florida has said with regard to our majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Both have rendered excellent service.

In speaking of the majority whip, I notice that the Senator from Florida used the word "effervescent." When it comes to work, the Senator from Minnesota is boiling over at all times, ready and eager to work. I commend him for the work he has been doing in the Senate.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, as we approach adjournment sine die—I say this hopefully—I desire to compliment my colleague, the majority leader, upon the performance of his arduous duties during the past 2 years, and join with 98 of my colleagues in saying, "Well done."

As a newcomer to the Senate, I have never had a majority leader other than Senator MANSFIELD. I fervently hope that he shall continue to be my leader during the time I am in the Senate, and that it is the majority that he continues to lead. But majority or minority, all honor his high qualities and respect his patience, his tolerance, his kindliness.

MIKE MANSFIELD is dedicated to the traditions of the Senate, and has been a majority leader deserving of the historic honors of that office. He has been a strong advocate of the needs of his senatorial colleagues in conferences with President Kennedy and his staff, as a spokesman for the administration to his colleagues, and on the Senate floor his voice has been strong and clear. With MIKE MANSFIELD as a leader, no one had cause to despair.

But Senator MANSFIELD is also my senior colleague for whom I have genuine affection and esteem. No one of the 50 junior Senators has a senior colleague more understanding and more mutually helpful than I. In Montana regardless of party, we are proud of MIKE, from Albion to Yaak, from the cabbage patch to Kremlin, from the depths of the copper mines to the most remote lookout in the forest we glory that a Montana Senator has been chosen by his senatorial colleagues to lead the Senate. We are proud of his record as such a leader and Montanans will welcome MIKE home at the end of the session with open arms and acclaim.

Yet in all the national and global work that devolves upon the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD has never failed to assiduously attend to the needs of Montana. There is not a Montanan who has a problem on the Federal level who has not been aided by Senator MANSFIELD. A national leader and still as always the senior Senator from Montana he takes most pride in being just that, the senior Senator from Montana. As my leader, my colleague, my friend, I hail Senator MANSFIELD and the honor he has brought to Montana and America.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes to add to what some of my colleagues have said in regard to the leadership in the Senate. This Congress is nearing its close. We have had very able leadership. During my service as a Member of this body, I have had the privilege of serving under several majority leaders. All of them have been able men, and have given us able leadership. I measure my words when I say that the Senate has never had more able or effective leadership than it has had during the 87th Congress. As others have pointed out, Senator MANSFIELD has always been courteous and mindful of the needs of each Senator, and yet forceful in his determination to keep the Senate moving and to attain a good record of legislative accomplishments.

After all, the task of leadership is more or less a thankless one. We should be thankful at any time for having an able, considerate, and courteous Senator willing to assume that responsibility; and I pay tribute to MIKE MANSFIELD for the outstanding job he has done. I express to him my great appreciation for an excellent service.

Senator **MANSFIELD** has been ably assisted by the Democratic whip or the assistant majority leader. Senator **HUMPHREY** has always been on the job. He, too, has shown courtesy and willingness to cooperate and to be helpful; and I likewise express to him my appreciation for the leadership he has given us during this Congress.

A WAY TO STOP THE BUILDUP OF A COMMUNIST MILITARY BASE IN CUBA

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the acknowledged experts on Latin-American countries and our relationships with those countries is Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis, now retired, of Yale University. In December 1959, Professor Bemis was interviewed by a reporter of the U.S. News & World Report. At the time of the interview Mr. Bemis pointed out the very great threat that the Cuban situation presented to the United States. At that time he prepared a resolution which he thought the Congress should consider.

With some modification I submitted that resolution in January 1960. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. **SPARKMAN**] was a cosponsor of the resolution. It was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

As I have previously pointed out, the resolution was designed to reactivate the Monroe Doctrine and to dress it in modern terms. As did the original Monroe Doctrine, it would serve notice that we could not tolerate the existence of a foreign power in the Western Hemisphere, and we should be prepared to take action in the event that it was evident that actions of such a power in the hemisphere threatened the security of the United States.

No action was taken on the resolution in 1960. I resubmitted it in January 1961. Again all that year it remained in the Foreign Relations Committee. No hearings were held and no action was taken, despite my periodic inquiries of the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as to what the committee intended to do about the resolution. Nothing happened.

Last summer the situation became more serious. It was evident that the situation was growing more serious with the great increase of shipments from Russia to Cuba—not only shipments of war materials, including missiles, weapons, munitions, and so forth, but also the shipment of soldiers, Russian experts, military experts, and technicians, which were estimated a month ago to number approximately 5,000. The dozens of ships that have gone into Cuba bearing equipment and supplies for the Castro regime were ships of many nationalities.

The recognition of the increased buildup in Cuba awakened an interest finally in this country and in Congress so that when the joint resolution to authorize the President to call up 150,000 Reserves was before the Senate, I announced that I would submit my "Monroe Doctrine" resolution as an amendment to that callup joint resolution. However, after consultation with the leadership on both sides, I was persuaded not to press my resolution as an amendment to the callup joint resolution, but was assured that it would receive consideration immediately following passage of the callup joint resolution.

Following that action, the administration itself sent up a joint resolution respecting the Cuban situation, which was referred to both the Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. My resolution, in which Senator **KEATING** joined as a cosponsor, was also so referred, as were resolutions submitted by other Senators. As we all know, the administration resolution was modified and strengthened by those committees.

A report was made on a joint resolution which passed the Senate with only one dissenting vote, I believe that vote having been cast because the Senator in question felt that the joint resolution was not strong enough.

The joint resolution passed both Houses and was signed by the President.

Mr. President, the situation in Cuba continues to worsen. Yesterday I received a letter from Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis, which I wish to read:

> DEAR SENATOR BUSH: Is it not strange that, at least so far as I know, the famous Lodge resolution of the Senate of 1912, passed in regard to the project of a Japanese fishing corporation to lease an extensive tract of land on the shore of Magadelana Bay in lower California, a situation admirably located for a naval base to intercept communications between the Pacific coast of the United States and the Panama Canal, does not seem to have had any attention in the present discussion of the Soviet-Cuban "fishing" ports in Cuba?

Parenthetically, I believe Professor Bemis is correct. I have heard no reference to the Lodge resolution.

I continue to read from the letter.

> The resolution reads as follows:
>
> "When any harbor or other place in the American continents is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States, the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government, not American, as to give that government practical power of control for national purposes."
>
> I am sending a similar letter to your colleague, Senator **THOMAS DODD**.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> SAMUEL F. BEMIS.

So we see that in 1912, when the Japanese threatened to establish a foothold in lower California, a part of Mexico, the Senate immediately took cognizance of it and passed this warning resolution. I believe that it may have frustrated the plan, because we took prompt notice of it and took prompt action in connection with it, indicating, as we did, in that resolution, that the United States would look with grave concern upon the establishment of such a base; and the restrained language of the resolution certainly did not obscure the intent of the United States to stop the establishment of such a base so close to our shores, a base which would threaten our communications, particularly with respect to the Panama Canal, where we were concerned at that time.

The situation in Cuba continues to worsen. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. **KEATING**] spoke again on the subject today. I regret that I did not hear what he had to say. Speaking for myself, I believe the time has come when we must look on the Cuban situation with something more than grave concern.

I approve what the State Department has recently done with respect to penalizing ships of foreign flags which carry cargoes to Cuba for the Soviets by forbidding those ships to come to our ports to reload with cargoes that go to Europe. That was an excellent move.

Again, this is not enough. I feel that as time goes on, and we do nothing to stop this constant buildup in Cuba, the situation will grow progressively worse, so that when the time comes when we must do something to save our necks, it will be much more difficult than it is at the present time.

Many suggestions have been made as to what we should do. It is difficult for Senators to mastermind the situation. We do not have all the information. Nevertheless, I believe the time has come when we should do more. I have in mind particularly doing something along the line of our action of 2 years ago in helping the rebel force to prepare for its invasion of Cuba. I do not know how many refugees from Cuba are in our own country, but I am sure that there are many thousands of them.

We should do something to help them serve in the cause of restoring Cuba to a free government of their own people, by their own people, and for their own people. We should help Cuban nationals who are on our shores by giving them the necessary equipment and the necessary means for providing their own blockade of Cuba.

It would not require many PT boats for these Cubans to be able to stop ships. They would not have to stop more than one or two ships, and perhaps they would not have to sink more than one or two ships to convince the Russians that it would be very dangerous for them to proceed with the military buildup in Cuba.

I express the hope today that our Government will consider taking this action to assist Cuban nationals, resident in our country, and perhaps also resident in other countries of the Western Hemisphere, to establish a blockade of Cuba, in order to prevent the continued military buildup by the Soviets in Cuba.

I say again that while this may sound like a radical proposal, I do not believe it is. My feeling is that if a definite stand is taken and action is taken to intercept ships carrying military cargoes and personnel to Cuba, the buildup of a Communist military base in Cuba can be stopped, as it should be stopped.

I thank my friend Professor Bemis for calling to our attention the Lodge resolution.

I close by expressing the hope that our Government will give immediate consideration to assisting the Cuban nationals in our country and nearby in establishing their own blockade, in an effort to liberate their own country from the oppressive heel of the Communist regime in Cuba and the oppressive heel of the international Communist movement, sponsored, fostered, and led by the Soviets of Russia.

SENATE APPROVAL OF BILL ON DE ZAVALA PARKSITE IS PRAISED BY TEXAS PAPERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the recent Senate action in passing my bill to help Texas preserve a historic site as a shrine to Lorenzo de Zavala, first Vice President of the Republic of Texas, has been acclaimed in my State.

This bill would make it possible for Harris County, Tex., or the State of Texas, to acquire 142 acres, now a part of the federally owned San Jacinto Ordnance Depot in Harris County, Tex., as a De Zavala parksite.

This site is the homestead of De Zavala. He was a scholarly gentleman, who wrote a history of Mexico in 1830. He had been a member of the Cortes of Spain, and a member of the ruling group in Mexico when it became a republic. When Santa Ana overthrew the Republic in Mexico, he joined Texas and became first vice president of the Republic of Texas. His home is across the Buffalo Bayou from the San Jacinto Battlefield.

Many of the wounded from the battle of San Jacinto were brought to his home. It was his family cemetery where he is buried, where a leading Spanish general who was killed in the battle is buried, and where other heroes are buried. Texas heroes who died subsequently are buried there. It is near the San Jacinto Monument and the Battleship *Texas*, priceless in the minds of all Texans.

The Houston Chronicle and the Houston Post, commenting on the bill, have expressed hope for final favorable Congressional action.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the following editorials: "Progress Toward De Zavala Park," in the Houston Chronicle of Monday, October 1; "Save De Zavala Shrine," in the Houston Post, Saturday, October 6, 1962; and "De Zavala Park Over One Hurdle," in the Houston Chronicle of Saturday, October 6, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 1, 1962]

Progress Toward De Zavala Park

It's good news that the Senate Government Operations Committee has approved the bill to permit sale, at half of fair market price, of 142 acres of land on the Houston Ship Channel for the Lorenzo de Zavala Park. The land is part of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot property.

Senator Ralph Yarborough's bill still has a long way to go, but at least this is progress toward the goal. With only a few days remaining of the current session it is doubtful if passage of the measure by both Houses of Congress can be obtained this year.

The land in question embraces the small State-owned De Zavala Cemetery and the site of the home of the first vice president of the Republic of Texas. It should be a park for these reasons alone. But there is another reason almost if not quite as pertinent. The land is immediately across the Ship Channel from the San Jacinto Battleground Park. If it should not itself be constituted a park, not only would one of Texas' priceless historical spots be lost to the people as a whole, but in all probability some sort of industrial plant or plants would be built there. That assuredly would be no esthetic gain for the San Jacinto Shrine, and noxious odors might detract from the pleasure of visiting the battleground, the monument, and the battleship *Texas* which is moored permanently there.

The Yarborough bill should be approved; if final action cannot be had this year, then next.

[From the Houston Post, Oct. 6, 1962]

Save De Zavala Shrine

Prospects for the preservation of the old De Zavala home near the San Jacinto battleground as a park have brightened again, after a near eclipse.

The U.S. Senate has passed a bill authorizing the sale of the 142-acre site to Harris County or the State at half of its fair market value. The bill is only halfway through Congress, but Senator Ralph Yarborough, its sponsor, believes it will pass the House next year.

When the Federal Government called for bids last April on the land occupied by the old San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, the Harris County Commissioners Court petitioned Congress to reserve the De Zavala shrine and surrounding land as a county park. Historical and patriotic groups made a campaign in that behalf.

Their efforts were dashed by a Government ruling that the proposed park site would have to be sold to the highest bidder, like the rest of the San Jacinto Depot land. Then Senator Yarborough introduced his bill to permit its sale at half price.

Even if the House passes the bill, however, another barrier seems to be rising in its path. Some county commissioners say the county hasn't the money to buy the land, even at half price. They now say the State should buy it for the State parks system. This possibility looks very remote.

In the first place, it is the State parks board's long-established policy not to purchase land for State parks, but only to accept donated property.

In the second place, the parks board already is grappling with the problem of financing the improvement of three great park sites which have been given the State on condition that they be developed with reasonable dispatch.

Thirdly, the parks board is asking the incoming legislature for an unprecedented amount of money for a general overhaul of the long-starved, rundown parks system, including the development of some of them as special showplaces, and for the three unimproved parks mentioned.

Even if the parks board should deviate from its policy of buying no land for new parks, which is quite unlikely, it would have to get the money from the legislature, and the legislature might be even less likely to grant it, on top of all the other budget requests.

Zavala Point is one of the most hallowed shrines of Texas history. Lorenzo de Zavala, first Vice President of the Texas Republic, lived there. He and other early Texans were buried in the adjoining cemetery. The home was a hospital for Texans wounded in the Battle of San Jacinto.

The proposed park would be made accessible to visitors from Market Street Road on the north, and to visitors to the San Jacinto Monument across the Ship Channel on the south.

It would be a pity and a shame to let this shrine be swallowed up by Ship Channel industries. One way or another, it should by all means be preserved a park. And the best chance for its preservation seems to be by county purchase of the land.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 6, 1962]

De Zavala Park Over One Hurdle

The prospects for the proposed De Zavala Park brightened Tuesday when the Senate passed Senator Ralph Yarborough's bill authorizing the sale by the Federal Government of 142 acres out of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot property at half its fair market value.

The bill may not get through the House this week, what with the press of important business, but it should be passed next year if not during the last days of the current session.

Wisely Senator Yarborough phrased the bill to authorize sale of the property, across the ship channel from the San Jacinto Battleground Park, either to the State or to Harris County.

It is, of course, a State responsibility for preservation of the historic site of the home of the first vice president of the Republic of Texas is a matter of concern to all Texans. However, if by any chance the State fails to appropriate the necessary money—something which is almost unthinkable—it is well that Harris County will have the opportunity to buy the property at a favorable price.

One way or another, and certainly it should be by State action, this park must be established.

RICE UNIVERSITY TO OBSERVE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OCTOBER 12

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on October 12, 1962, Rice University, in Houston, Tex., will observe its golden anniversary. Dr. Pitzer will be inaugurated as its new president tomorrow. This famed institution has developed great leaders, outstanding citizens, and a remarkable faculty in its progress from a school begun in the era of the first automobile and now serving in the space age with its work in the harnessing of nuclear power and space exploration. It has always excelled in the science of engineering. It is one of the great universities of our Nation, and with the growth of Houston and the location of the space laboratories near there, Rice University is destined for a greatness beyond anything that was ever previously known.

Rice University, with its new, dynamic president, Dr. Pitzer, and its new growth and stimulus, enters its second half century on the threshold of becoming one of the great universities, not only of Texas and the Nation, but in the all-time history of the human race.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Houston Joins Academic World in Salute to Rice University," published in the Houston Post of October 7, 1962.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Houston Joins Academic World in Salute to Rice University

Rice University this week celebrates its 50th anniversary of service, not merely to the city, area, State, and Nation, but to the world of scholarship and learning, which is unrestricted by geographical or political boundaries, and to all humanity.

The university will mark this important milestone with the formal inauguration of its third president, Dr. Kenneth S. Pitzer, and a 2-day academic festival in which scholars from all parts of the country and from other nations of the free world will take part.

Presidents of 45 colleges will march in the academic procession on Wednesday, along with other representatives of some 350 institutions of higher learning and learned societies. Men of distinction in a number of fields, including the humanities as well as science and engineering, will speak during the observance. This participation by ranking scholars and scientists alone is evidence of the prestige which the institution enjoys as a center of learning and research dedicated to the extension of human knowledge.

During its 50 years, Rice has made a rich contribution to the educational, cultural, economic, and social progress of the Nation and the Southwest. But it has never aspired or endeavored to be a part of the Nation's mass educational system. It has been content to leave that function to others. Rather, it has directed its efforts and resources toward goals of excellence. The emphasis has been on quality, in the selection of the limited number of students that could be admitted, in its faculty, and in its academic programs.

Although it is best known for its activities in the fields of science and engineering, the humanities have received increased attention in recent years, and this will continue to be true.

The determinations as to the missions and functions that Rice was to undertake and the plan of development that it was to follow were made largely by its first president, Dr. Edgar Odell Lovett. It was he who made the decision that Rice was to be a university of preeminence, and because at that time there were no first-class schools of pure science and engineering in the State, he determined that these disciplines should receive primary emphasis at first, with the institution's programs to be broadened in the future as resources might permit.

The university and its officials have followed this plan closely, and although 50 years is only a short span in the lives of most of the world's great universities, Rice has already achieved in large measure the overriding goal that Dr. Lovett fixed, that it should be a university of stature.

As a young university, Rice has the advantage of not being inhibited excessively by superfluous tradition. As it begins its second 50 years, its eyes are on the future rather than the past. Indeed, its horizons embrace the challenging and uncharted frontiers of outer space. By its presence here, the university was largely responsible for the selection of Houston as a coordinating center for the Nation's vast space program, which utilizes scientific and engineering knowledge to an unprecedented degree. Rice's golden years still lie ahead.

For all the universality of its dedication, Rice remains a local and community institution, serving within the scope of its resources the educational needs of the area and the region. It is, therefore, most appropriate that all Houstonians and all Texans join in the salute to this outstanding university on the occasion of its 50th birthday. The Post joins most enthusiastically and wholeheartedly in that salute and extends its best wishes for the future.

U.S. TOURIST PROGRAM WINS FRIENDS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the encouragement of oversea visitors to the United States has great potential for good. As a member of the Committee on Commerce, I have consistently supported all our programs to increase foreign tourism in the United States. While the program was started for the purpose of trying to remedy our imbalance of trade and to stop the depletion of gold, it now appears that the flow of good will toward the United States as a result of the program for tourism might well be in the end the greatest product of the program.

This potential can be realized only with the finest cooperation between the efforts of the U.S. Government, the work of State governments, civic and business leaders, and, most important of all, private industry concerned with the attraction of visitors to the United States.

An excellent example of how the tourist trade can be developed through sound business practice was shown in an article entitled "A Taste of United States for Britons," published in the New York Times of Sunday, August 12, 1962.

Since the encouragement of visitors to the United States is good business, sound economics, and first-rate diplomacy, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1962]

A TASTE OF UNITED STATES FOR BRITONS—TOURISTS OFF "CANBERRA," WITH 72 HOURS IN COUNTRY, SPEND TEALESS BUT HAPPY DAY IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

(By Robert Dunphy)

WASHINGTON.—A trainload of veteran British travelers, accustomed to years of touring the Continent and cruising the Mediterranean, paid a whirlwind visit to the Nation's Capital before departing for New York and home aboard the liner *Canberra* last week and, with uncharacteristic British gusto, pronounced America the New Frontier in world tourism.

The Britons, part of the 1,680 tourists who arrived in New York from Southampton on the maiden transatlantic voyage of the new P. & O.-Orient Lines vessel, devoted 1 of the 3 days that they had for accelerated sightseeing in the United States to a tour of Washington, and their reaction to the New World was, without exception, enthusiastic.

THE PAST RECALLED

Evincing not a spark of resentment, they wandered through the Capitol set afire by earlier British visitors in the War of 1812. Without for a moment losing their aplomb, they gazed at paintings glorifying the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga and Cornwallis at Yorktown. And even in the National Archives, where they were confronted with the American Declaration of Independence, they did not visibly blanch.

Only when it came to the question of tea, a touchy subject between Americans and Britons since that celebrated affair in Boston Harbor back in 1773, did the English visitors lose their equanimity. After 6 solid hours of sightseeing in Washington without a single break for tea, they were practically in open rebellion against the tour directors.

And in Union Station, en route back to their New York train, when they saw soda pop and orange juice and grape juice being purveyed at the waiting-room stands, but still no tea, even the strongest among them were about to weep.

MANDATORY TEA STOP

By the end of the day, the Pennsylvania Railroad, conducting the tour, had taken the hint. It hastened to put the teakettle on as the train pulled out of the Capital, and in taking another group of British travelers to Washington the next day, it included a stop for tea as a mandatory part of the itinerary.

But being seasoned travelers, the Britons did not permit anything to dampen their enthusiasm for the United States. Typical of the comments was that of Mrs. A. A. Hardy, of Onchan, the Isle of Man, a sprightly, gray-haired veteran of many Mediterranean cruises.

"I paid $201.60 for the 14-day cruise to America on the *Canberra,* and £10 ($28) for this tour to Washington, and I am enjoying every minute of it," said Mrs. Hardy, who was traveling alone. "I always enjoy myself. I am determined to enjoy myself. I want to get my money's worth."

Another tourist, Timothy R. Richards, of Gawsworth, near Manchester, commented: "Our family has always gone on Mediterranean cruises during the holidays, but this is the first time we have had the opportunity to combine a cruise with a sightseeing visit to America. Admittedly, three days is only enough time to get the briefest glimpse into American life, but at least it's a start.

"Everyone wants to come to the United States this year. It's the fashionable thing to do. Last year, Greece was all the rage, but nowadays everybody who's anybody seems to be heading for the United States."

"This 3-day stopover is just enough time to get a quick look at this part of America," said Mr. Richards' father, Raymond Richards, a historian and chairman of the Ancient Monuments Society of England. "It's like trying to get a quart into a gill pot. We're doing just what Americans do when they try to see all of Europe in a week's time."

THE HIGH SPOTS

The aspects of America that most impressed A. F. Johnson, a farmer from Martlesham, Suffolk, during his train ride from New York to Washington were the great bridges and superhighways he saw along the way. "I went to Moscow 2 years ago, but from what I've seen on this trip, the Russians have a long way to go to catch up to the United States."

"What you Americans want to do is stop frightening people off with the idea that it's too dear to come to the States," Mr. Johnson said. "Most Englishmen have seen all of Europe, and they want to go farther afield on their holidays now—to Africa, Australia, and the United States.

"What put me off against coming by air was the price of hotels here. We decided to take the *Canberra* when we found that we would be able to use the ship as a floating hotel for the 3 days that we would be in the States."

"You don't know what New York means to us Londoners," declared S. A. Grant, a furniture manufacturer in the British capital. "I've been to Italy and France on trips in the past, but New York has always been a real dream. This is the first chance we've had to travel here at such a good price."

"CANBERRA" FIRSTS

In addition to providing many of her passengers with their first opportunity to visit America, the *Canberra* on her initial visit to New York chalked up a number of "firsts" for P. & O.-Orient Lines. The year-old luxury liner's normal run is between England, Australia, and west coast ports of the United States, but the *Canberra* was diverted from her regular service to make two special cruises to America in support of President Kennedy's "Visit U.S.A." program. She is due back on her second cruise from Southampton next Friday with 1,700 more passengers.

Among other reasons for the elaborate welcome the ship received was the fact that she carried the largest single group of foreigners to arrive in the United States since the Government's drive to spur tourism to America began a little more than a year ago. The vessel also marked a sharp departure from tradition in using New York, normally the starting point for ocean voyages, as a cruise stop solely.

In her design alone, the *Canberra* is an unusual vessel. Capable of carrying 2,238 passengers, or more than any other passenger vessel afloat, she has an aluminum superstructure and instead of the traditional big funnels amidships, two pipes aft that blow the engines' exhaust far out to sea.

The passengers, to a man, hailed the voyage as a giant step toward bringing travel to America within the means of foreigners. They bemoaned, however, the fact that they had so little time for sightseeing.

The only severe criticism they had of the trip was over the long delay they encountered in the processing of their papers by customs and immigration officials on their arrival in New York.

"We were given a blanket visa for the cruise back in England, but many of us were trapped for 2 to 4 hours in the main lounge queueing up to have our papers processed as the ship was coming into the harbor," said W. E. Cole, a filling station manager from Long Melford, Suffolk.

"The timing couldn't have been worse. Here, we saved for years to see the skyline of New York and the Statue of Liberty, and while the fireboats were outside welcoming us with a big show, we were stuck inside getting our papers stamped."

"We lost all the view coming up the river," said Miss Dorothy Leeper, of London. "It was interminable. We stood and stood. I wish you would tidy this immigration business up a bit. It was badly organized and should have been done earlier."

The British visitors had nothing but praise for Washington, which they referred to as a garden city and one of the most beautiful places that they had ever seen. They toured through Georgetown and said that they "didn't think there was anything left like that in the States." With unflagging energy, they trekked through the Smithsonian Institution, climbed the Lincoln Memorial and attended a changing-of-the-guard ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery.

"You get a wonderful sense of history here," one Briton commented. "Mind you, you don't have nearly the tradition that we have in London, but the monuments and parks are marvelous. It's a wonderful contrast to New York."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I hope that Senators and many people throughout the country will take the opportunity to read the article, because it is filled with quotations from people from Great Britain who visited America for the first time and were astonished at what they found. The response was almost uniformly favorable.

The program for tourism is building a vast reservoir of good will for the United States. Many of the visitors pointed out that they could not have come to our country before because the cost of travel was too expensive. But now, to encourage tourism, low-priced tours have been arranged, and many of them have been tours to Washington.

OUTSTANDING METHODIST LEADER LOST IN PASSING OF BISHOP A. FRANK SMITH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on October 5, 1962, Bishop A. Frank Smith, of Houston, Tex., for 30 years the presiding bishop of the Methodist Church in that area, passed away, and the Nation lost an outstanding Christian leader.

In writing of this great man's record of dedicated service, one newspaper referred to Bishop Smith as "a man to match the mountains and the seas."

Many years ago, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, the Houston Press, referred to Bishop A. Frank Smith as a man who was one of the truly great men not only of Houston but of the Nation. That statement was made by a writer who was not of the same church or faith.

Bishop Smith served half a century in Texas churches, always with honor and distinction, always close to the people, always a wise and good shepherd. Wise and kind in all his personal contacts, he was also a statesman of the church.

Elevated to the episcopacy at the age of 40, he was the youngest bishop ever to serve the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and later was a leader in the move to unite the three branches of Methodism.

Although not a member of his church, I knew Bishop Smith, admired him, and know of his influence, beyond the bounds of his own church, throughout Christian America. The entire Nation is the loser by his going.

Because of Bishop Smith's achievements and the deep affection felt for him by legions who knew him over the years, I ask unanimous consent to have the following articles and editorials printed in the RECORD:

"Bishop A Frank Smith Dies: Rites To Be Monday," from the Houston Chronicle of Saturday, October 6, 1962.

"Methodist Bishop Smith Dies," from the Houston Post of Saturday, October 6, 1962.

"Noted Texas Bishop Dies" from the San Antonio Light of Saturday, October 6, 1962.

"Bishop A. Frank Smith," from the Houston Post of Sunday, October 7, 1962.

"Bishop A. Frank Smith, Man of God," from the Houston Chronicle of Sunday, October 7, 1962.

"Mr. Methodist Is Dead; Houston and Nation Lose a Great Citizen, Bishop A. Frank Smith," from the Houston Press of Saturday, October 6, 1962.

"The Combination That Made Bishop Smith So Outstanding," from the Houston Press of Saturday, October 6, 1962.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 6, 1962]

BISHOP A. FRANK SMITH DIES—RITES TO BE MONDAY

Methodist Bishop A. Frank Smith, a servant of God and a "man to match the mountains and the seas," is dead.

Bishop Smith, presiding bishop of the Houston area for 30 years until his retirement June 1, 1960, died in his home at 1049 Kirby Drive, Friday evening. He was 72.

He had served the Methodist Church in Texas for almost 50 years, and his fellow man—no matter the creed or religion—even longer.

The bishop last year suffered a heart attack, but recovered. Last week, he was ill of influenza.

Funeral services will be held at 10 a.m. Monday at the First Methodist Church, 1320 Main Street, which he was serving as pastor when he was elected to the episcopacy in 1930.

WANTED LAW CAREER

Born in Bastrop County, Bishop Smith in his youth wanted to study law. But he followed a moral imperative to become a minister of God.

"Every person should do the thing they ought to do, not just what they want to do," he explained simply, in later years.

"A person's life should be a mission. He should have a sense of mission. In that way, he is best qualified to do his best for the welfare of his fellow man."

A graduate (1912) of Southwestern University in Georgetown, and Vanderbuilt University, where he studied theology, Bishop Smith began his ministry as a circuit-riding preacher in Cherokee County and Red River County, and he was paid in "hay, grain, maize * * * and everything we needed to eat and wear."

FIRST PASTORATE

He had married Miss Bess P. Crutchfield in June 1914, and she remained at his side from his first ministry to his death.

His first church was "a little frame church at Alto * * * a little mill town." He remained at Alto only a year, but he left his gentle mark. The new and beautiful Methodist Church in Alto, built 2 years ago, is named in his honor.

After Alto, Bishop Smith held pastorates at the Highland Park Methodist Church, Dallas, which recently succeeded the First Church here as the biggest in Methodism; the University Methodist Church in Austin, and the Laurel Heights Methodist Church in San Antonio.

During World War I, he served as a chaplain, and in 1922 came to Houston as pastor of First Church, the largest church in Southern Methodism.

"My life has been steady and uneventful," Bishop Smith once said.

YOUNGEST BISHOP

Yet, in 1930, at the age of 40, he was elected to the episcopacy, the youngest bishop ever elected in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. He presided over the Oklahoma, Missouri, and Indiana conferences from 1930 to 1931, and headed the St. Louis, Missouri, Illinois, and Indian Mission conferences in 1932 and 1933.

He became bishop of the Texas and Rio Grande conferences in 1934.

He was one of the leaders in the move to unite the three branches of Methodism (the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methdist Protestant Church), and in 1939 saw his dream realized.

One year later he became titular head of all Methodists when he was elected the first president of the Council of Bishops of the merged church.

Bishop Smith found time for many civic and intellectual pursuits. During World II, he served on the Methodist Commission on Army and Navy chaplains, and was a member of the regional War Labor Board.

BACKER OF EDUCATION

He was a member of the Houston chapter, Foreign Relations Committee, the Sons of the Republic of Texas, the Texas Academy of Science, the Academy of Political Science, National Council of Boy Scouts of America, and was a past president of the Philosophical Society of Texas.

He was particularly interested in education, feeling the church had a responsibility to offer education to all people in its worldwide parish. He was chairman of the board of Southern Methodist University, a trustee of Southwestern University, Lon Morris College, and the church's American University in Washington, D.C.

He won many tributes from State and National Government leaders and from fellow churchmen.

"He's a man to match the mountains and the seas," said Bishop Dana Dawson of Topeka, Kans.

Former Mayor Roy Hofheinz, speaking at a testimonial dinner for Bishop Smith here in 1954, described him as "the greatest living citizen of our community."

The bishop was a modest man with a deep humility.

"It is a good world and a beautiful life and I can still wonder at the goodness of God," he added only recently.

His honors were not the greatest sources of his satisfaction with life.

VALUED FRIENDSHIPS

"If I could point to any one thing that has brought my greatest satisfaction, I would say it has been the personal friendships and associations with preachers and laymen whose lives have contributed to humanity," he stated.

He had a deep faith in his country.

"I hear often that the American people have grown soft and flabby, but I think it is not so," he said earlier this year. "We must continue to sharpen our consciences, however, and we must learn to develop different attitudes as new situations arise.

"These are times for people to keep their feet on the ground and their thinking clear.

"We must be able to debate issues without lapsing into emotionalism, and without smearing the motives of those who differ with our opinions. We also must be ever alert against subversion, but he serves no good end who stirs unrest, suspicion and doubt."

He is survived by his wife; a brother, Bishop W. Angie Smith, of Oklahoma City; a daughter, Mrs. Donald G. Griffin, of Midland, Mich.; 2 sons, William Randolph Smith and A. Frank Smith, Jr., both of Houston, and 12 grandchildren.

Settegast-Kopf is handling funeral arrangements.

[From the Houston Post, Oct. 6, 1962]

METHODIST BISHOP SMITH DIES—CLERGYMAN, 72, SERVED 50 YEARS IN TEXAS CHURCHES

Bishop A. Frank Smith, who earned the title of "Mr. Methodist" during his almost 50 years of service to the Methodist Church in Texas, died quietly at his home in Houston Friday afternoon. He was 72.

A family spokesman said Bishop Smith died suddenly. He had suffered a heart attack last summer but seemed to have recovered.

The bishop, who had worked as a counselor at the Methodist Hospital since his retirement in 1960, had been at his home at 1049 Kirby Drive for the last week recovering from the flu.

Funeral services will be held at 10 a.m., Monday at the First Methodist Church, 1320 Main Street. The Settegast-Kopf Funeral Home will handle arrangements.

Bishop Paul E. Martin, Houston area bishop of the Methodist Church and Bishop Smith's successor, said Friday night: "I have known Bishop Smith since he held his first pastorate at Detroit, Tex. He has had a remarkable ministry and I sincerely believe he will be numbered among the outstanding bishops of the Methodist Church.

"He was honored by his colleagues by being elected as the first president of the council of bishops. Through the years he has gained not only the great respect but also the high affection of the leaders of our church.

"His death brings great sorrow to Mrs. Martin and me for he has been our ideal as well as our beloved friend.

"It has been a high honor for me to succeed him as bishop of the Houston area."

Bishop Smith was bishop of the Texas Conference of the Methodist Church for 26 years.

Bishop Smith was born in Elgin, November 1, 1889. He was the son of William A. Smith, whose pioneer forebearers came to Texas in 1828 as part of Stephen F. Austin's colony.

The Smith family lived in Taylor, Mart, Rosebud, and Corsicana, when the bishop attended high school.

At first, Bishop Smith thought he would become a lawyer but he later said something told him "God wanted me to be a preacher."

In 1912, Bishop Smith was graduated from Southwestern University in Georgetown with a bachelor's degree. Later he attended the Vanderbilt School of Theology in Nashville, Tenn.

As a young preacher, Bishop Smith married Bess P. Crutchfield in June of 1914, and began serving as an interim pastor of the Methodist Church of Alto, Tex.

That same year, Bishop Smith joined the north Texas conference and was assigned to Detroit circuit from 1914–15. He held pastorates at the Highland Park Methodist Church in Dallas, the University Methodist Church in Austin, and the Laurel Heights Methodist Church in San Antonio.

During World War I, the bishop served as a chaplain and in 1922 he became pastor of the largest church in Southern Methodism, the First Methodist Church of Houston. He was 32 years old at that time.

In 1930, Bishop Smith was elected to the episcopacy. At 40, he was one of the youngest bishops ever elected to the Methodist Episcopal Church of the South.

As bishop he presided over the Oklahoma, Missouri, and Indiana conferences from 1930–31. From 1932–33 Bishop Smith headed the St. Louis, southwest Missouri, Missouri, Illinois, and Indian mission conferences.

In 1934, he was named bishop of the Texas conference.

When the two main branches of the Methodist Church in the United States were united in 1939, Bishop Smith was chosen titular head of all Methodists for the first 2 years of adjustment.

From 1940 to 1941, Bishop Smith held the highest Methodist clerical post in the world. He was president of the Council of Bishops.

Bishop Smith also served as chairman of the commission on rural work, director of the bishops' crusade, president of the division of National Missions of the Methodist Church and chairman of the board of trustees of Southern Methodist University.

The Methodist leader was honored time after time by civic and religious groups.

In 1961, Bishop Smith became one of the first Protestant churchmen to be honored with a public tribute service at a Jewish congregation.

Dr. Hyman Judah Schachtel, chief rabbi of Congregation Beth Isarel, said of the bishop, "All the people of Houston have been inspired by the teaching of this great man of God, and above all, by his example."

At a dinner in Bishop Smith's honor in 1954, Roy Hofheinz, then mayor of Houston, described the bishop as "the greatest living citizen in our community."

Besides his wife, Bishop Smith is survived by a brother, Bishop William Angie Smith, of Oklahoma City; a daughter, Mrs. Donald G. Griffin of Midland, Mich.; two sons, William Randolph Smith and A. Frank Smith, Jr., both of Houston, and 12 grandchildren.

[From the San Antonio Light, Oct. 6, 1962]

NOTED TEXAS BISHOP DIES

Funeral services for Methodist Bishop A. Frank Smith, 72, who served as pastor of Laurel Heights Methodist Church from 1918–22, will be held at 10 a.m. Monday in the First Methodist Church in Houston.

Known to Texas Methodists as "Mr. Methodist" Smith died at his home in Houston Friday. He had retired in June 1960.

He left Laurel Heights to become pastor of the Houston church and in 1930 was elected bishop. In 1938 he became bishop of the Texas, Southwest Texas and Rio Grande Conferences, the latter two of which are centered in San Antonio.

Most of the southwest Texas conferences over which Smith presided from 1938–60 were held in Travis Park Methodist Church here.

Survivors include his widow, the former Bess P. Crutchfield; brother, Bishop W. Angie Smith, Oklahoma City; daughter, Mrs. Donald G. Griffin, Midland, Mich.; 2 sons, both of Houston, and 12 grandchildren.

[From the Houston Post, Oct. 7, 1962]

BISHOP A. FRANK SMITH

Methodism has lost, in the death of Bishop A. Frank Smith, of Houston, one of its ablest and most beloved leaders. The Christian faith has lost one of its most dedicated servants and truest exemplars. The city, State, and Nation have lost one of their finest citizens. The civic community in which he lived and labored during much of his life has lost one of its most respected and valuable members. And countless thousands touched by his ministry over a period of almost half a century, both within and without the Methodist Church, have lost a friend of rare compassion, tolerance, and understanding.

Bishop Smith served as bishop of the Texas Conference from 1934 until his retirement in 1960. And when the two main branches of the Methodist Church were reunited in 1939 he was chosen as president of the council of bishops, making him the titular head of Methodism in the United States. He served in this capacity during the first 2 years of critical adjustment, 1940–41.

Because of his tolerance for the views of others, his judicious temperament, his keenly analytical mind which enabled him to strip a problem to its bare essentials and his great administrative talents, he was signally qualified for this assignment.

To many he came to personify the denomination which he served with untiring devotion and great ability. He sometimes was accorded the title of "Mr. Methodist." But his work, his field of interest, and his constructive influence knew no denominational limitations. Nor was it restricted to the area of religious activity.

The esteem and affection in which he was held by members of his church was shared by clergymen and members of all denominations and faiths and by all Houstonians who knew him as a man, as a minister, and as a citizen. And all share the deep sense of loss and sadness which his death has brought.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Oct. 7, 1962]

BISHOP A. FRANK SMITH, MAN OF GOD

The long career of one of the great churchmen of our time ended Friday night with the death of Bishop A. Frank Smith.

To thousands of Houstonians Bishop Smith was their never-to-be-forgotten pastor for several years. To Southern Methodists he was an outstanding member of the episcopate, raised to that status at the early age of 40. To Methodists of the Texas Conference he was their chief shepherd for 30 years. To the largest Protestant body in the United States, formed by union of the three largest Methodist denominations in 1939, he was a leader in the unity movement and the first president of the council of bishops—the highest Methodist clerical position in the world.

"My life has been steady and uneventful," Bishop Smith was quoted once in the Chronicle as remarking. Steady, yes. A consistent record of a half century of devoted service to God and man. Uneventful, no. A career that ran the gamut from circuit rider, making his rounds on a horse he did not own but used in return for keeping the animal fed and shod, to the highest post in Methodism was eventful in the extreme.

Besides his episcopal duties, Bishop Smith found time for many other church-related activities and civic and intellectual pursuits. He was chairman of the board of Southern Methodist University and trustee of Southwestern University and the American University in Washington, D.C. He was chairman of the board of missions for years. He was chairman of the Commission on Rural Work. He was director of the Bishops' Crusade.

The well-loved churchman retired in 1960 but continued active as counselor at the Methodist Hospital.

What was the source of his never-failing strength, the wellspring of his most effective labors? Obviously it was his great faith. He said more than once, "I lie awake at night and my mind is filled with knowledge of the goodness of God and the kindness of people."

[From the Houston Press, Oct. 6, 1962]

"MR. METHODIST" IS DEAD—HOUSTON AND NATION LOSE A GREAT CITIZEN, BISHOP A. FRANK SMITH

"Having worked with him, I had an opportunity to see his greatness. His death is a great loss to his family as well as to his friends."

Bishop Paul E. Martin, Houston area bishop of the Methodist Church, was speaking of Bishop A. Frank Smith, whom he succeeded.

Bishop Smith, 72, who had come to be known as "Mr. Methodist," died at his home, 1049 Kirby Drive, Friday after a weeklong siege with the flu.

Speaking of his former superior, Bishop Martin said:

"Although he was firm in his convictions, he was a man of great kindness and tenderness, and was greatly loved everywhere.

"He was a man of remarkable insight in affairs of the church and was held with great appreciation and affection wherever he served."

Bishop Smith had suffered a heart attack last summer but seemed to have recovered, a family spokesman said.

BISHOP SINCE 1930

Bishop Smith had one of the longest tenures as bishop of an area, having held the post since 1930, Bishop Martin said.

A graduate of Southwestern University, Georgetown, and Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Bishop Smith held bachelor of arts, doctor of laws, and doctor of divinity degrees.

He served his first pastorate at Alto, Tex., where the church now bears his name, the A. Frank Smith Methodist Church.

From there he went to Detroit, Tex., and, when Southern Methodist University opened, to Dallas, where he was pastor of what is now Highlands Park Method Church, the largest church in Methodism.

TO HOUSTON IN 1922

Bishop Smith also served at University Methodist Church, Austin, and Laurel Heights Methodist Church, San Antonio, before coming to Houston in 1922.

With the election of the Reverend Sam R. Hay as bishop, the Reverend Mr. Smith became his successor as pastor of First Methodist Church here.

He remained at First Methodist until his election as bishop. He has served as bishop over Oklahoma and Missouri, and since 1934, the Houston area.

Bishop Smith retired in 1960.

OFFICIAL POSTS

Bishop Smith was longtime president of the National Division Board of Missions of the Methodist Church and president of the SMU Board of Trustees.

He also served on the commission of church union, which directed the union of Methodism's three branches in 1939. Bishop Smith held the post of first president of council of bishops in 1940.

Since his retirement, he had been serving as counselor in Methodist Hospital, one of many institutions built under his inspiration and leadership.

Also, last year Bishop Smith gave a series of lectures at St. Luke's Methodist Church and remained a much-sought-after speaker.

BORN IN 1889

Born in Elgin, Tex., November 1, 1889, Bishop Smith received his high school education at Corsicana. Prior to this, his family lived in Taylor, Mart and Rosebud.

He attended Southwestern University from 1907 to 1911, then Vanderbilt until 1914.

During World War I, the young preacher was commissioned as a major and served as chaplain.

In later years, the church leader came to be known as Mr. Methodist.

In 1954, at a dinner in his honor, Bishop Smith was described by Roy Hofheinz, then mayor of Houston, as "the greatest living citizen in our community."

Bishop Smith also became one of the first Protestant leaders to be honored with a public tribute service at a Jewish congregation. This took place in 1961.

Surviving the bishop are his wife, the former Bess Crutchfield, whom he married in 1914; sons, A. Frank, Jr., and William Randolph Smith, both attorneys here; a daughter, Mrs. Donald Griffin of Midland, Mich., and a brother, Bishop William Angie Smith of Oklahoma City.

SERVICES MONDAY

Funeral services will be held at 10 a.m., Monday, in First Methodist Church here, with Settegast-Kopf Funeral Home in charge.

[From the Houston Press, Oct. 6, 1962]

DISCARD THE EVIL, USE ONLY THE GOOD—THE COMBINATION THAT MADE BISHOP SMITH SO OUTSTANDING

(In 1960, the year in which Bishop A. Frank Smith retired, George Carmack, editor of the Houston Press named Bishop Smith as "The Man of the Year" for Houston. At the time of Bishop Smith's retirement, Editor Carmack in his "Editor's Letter to Press Readers" paid a tribute to Bishop Smith. We believe that tribute captured some of the qualities that made Bishop Smith one of the truly great men not only of Houston but of the Nation. For that reason we are now reproducing it.)

It has always interested me to try to figure out why successful men have made the success that they have.

What is the special something that these men have that has set them apart? What is the "difference" that makes them tower head and shoulders above everyone else in their field and stand exceptionally high in their community?

This week was a very significant one in Houston—in Texas and the religious life of the whole Nation, for that matter. For Bishop A. Frank Smith retired this week.

It would not be just saying the customary things to say that Bishop Smith is universally admired. For big as is the office of Bishop of the Texas Conference of the Methodist Church, Bishop Smith is a figure in the community even larger than this. Many Houstonians of other faiths feel just as close to him as the most active Methodist.

But back to my speculation on what is the "difference" that makes an outstanding man so outstanding—specifically in this case, Bishop Smith.

I have always felt that over and above many obvious qualifications that the unique quality of Bishop Smith is that, more than any man I have ever known, he combines the best qualities of country life of the great period of two or three generations ago with the best that modern life in big cities has brought to us.

And Bishop Smith was able to discard the mean, the petty, the small, the evil of both types of life—using only the good.

MUCH VISITING BETWEEN CHURCHES

While I was not reared a Methodist, the Methodist church was the largest in the small country town that was my boyhood home. And in a small town in that day, there was much "visiting" between churches—when there was no "preaching" at one church, a great many people simply went to another.

Then frequently there were joint revival meetings—usually rotated on an annual basis from one church to another. So there was nothing strange and foreign about Methodists.

I have often thought how perfectly at home Bishop Smith would be in the smallest rural church and with the humblest member of that church. He took the fine qualities of that day and incorporated them into his life—the warmth, the charity, the understanding of the problems that faced many country people then. Those people were just as fine people as this Nation ever produced—with an inborn dignity, a sense of personal responsibility, and instinctive understanding of what was right and what was wrong and a determination not to compromise with conscience no matter what the cost.

Bishop Smith has always understood that and appreciated that—and part of his great strength has always been that he never "outgrew" the fine qualities that all this represented.

MAN OF GREAT CULTURE AND POISE

But keeping all this, Bishop Smith no less incorporated into himself and into his character, the fine things that the modern big city has developed and can offer to a man.

Bishop Smith is a man of great education—of great culture—of poise that can only come from knowledge and ability to think deeply.

I have heard Bishop Smith speak on a number of occasions—several times when the speakers who preceded him had made speeches with depth of thought and power in delivery.

Yet without exception, Bishop Smith always made the "best" speech. As he talked, a listener could only say:

"What a fine thought that is. It's just what should be said on this occasion."

The modern city is a wonderful thing. It is fine to look back on the good old days of rural America. But it is wise to realize that the modern, big city life, too, has brought us many fine things.

Great scientific discoveries, great scholarship, great art and music, great production methods that have raised the standard of living of the average man to a point that could not be imagined even 25 years ago.

Bishop Smith is at home in this cosmopolitan world; with great scholars; with the men of great success in the world of business; with national leaders of government. And the best qualities of our day—of modern big city life—Bishop Smith made his own.

ALL THE GOOD—NONE OF THE BAD

This is not to fail to recognize other qualities in Bishop Smith—certainly at the base of all he has done has been his great devotion to God and to the church.

But to repeat, in every great man there is something that is uniquely his. And if I had to single out the thing that has made Bishop Smith so different and so successful, it is the fact that more than any man I have ever known, he has incorporated the good from rural, smalltown America of several decades ago and modern big city America of today, and rejected the bad of both.

You may take it from this that I consider Bishop Smith one of our truly great Houstonians, a man who stands for just what I think our city should be. I do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I knew Bishop A. Frank Smith and his brother, Angie Smith, also a bishop. I know that one of them was at one time the pastor of the First Methodist Church in Birmingham. Possibly both of them had been pastors there in the course of their ministry; I cannot be certain of that. Theirs were two of the mighty voices in Christendom.

I join with the Senator from Texas in expressing sorrow at the passing of this great churchman.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his tribute. Bishop Smith was truly a great man. He was not of my church or faith, but I knew him. He was an inspiration to everyone who knew him, regardless of the church of which he was a member.

Bishop Smith had an unusual combination of abilities. He was a statesman in his church, and he was kindly and sympathetic to every human being. Sometimes the attribute of statesmanship, whether in church or government, wears out the human kindly attribute; but not so in the case of Bishop Smith.

Many hard-bitten newspapermen were greatly moved at the passing of this great man.

The death of Bishop Smith was unexpected. He was in his early seventies and still maintained a vigorous program of activity. He was still in possession of his great oratorical powers and deep thinking powers. The State of Texas, the Nation, and Christendom have suffered a severe loss in the passing of Bishop Smith.

I knew that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] knew Bishop Smith personally, so I am especially appreciative of his word of tribute.

OPPOSITION TO RECOMMENDATION OF EXECUTIVE ORDER CONCERNING RACIAL INTEGRATION IN FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on September 14, 1959, I made a statement on the floor of the Senate against the recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission that the President issue an Executive order concerning racial integration in Federal housing programs. I pointed out at that time that if there is a prevalent national desire to kill our Federal housing programs, this would be a way to do it.

Before the closing of the current Congress, I want the RECORD to show that my views now are as strong as they were in 1959. I am concerned very deeply about the economic effects of such a Presidential order because I feel that those adverse economic effects would serve in a measure to undo a large part of the great accomplishments that have been made through the many housing measures that I have sponsored or in which I have participated on the floor of the Senate.

Moreover, Mr. President, I have misgivings as to the legal authority of the President to issue an Executive order on this subject, particularly in view of the most pronounced and adverse legislative history against incorporating these racial requirements in our housing laws.

In this connection, Mr. James E. Palmer, Jr., who is a member of the staff of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which subcommittee I have the honor to be the chairman, has recently done considerable research on this subject and has brought to bear his legal training and legal talent in a very able discussion of the question of the authority of the President to issue an Executive order concerning racial integration in Federal housing. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis written by Mr. Palmer be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO ISSUE AN EXECUTIVE ORDER CONCERNING RACIAL INTEGRATON IN FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

(By James E. Palmer, Jr.)

The Constitution sets forth the duties of the President to the extent that they may be said to be prescribed by that instrument. His activities and certain of his powers, however, are not clearly or rigidly bound by the exact letter of the Constitution. Some Presidents have taken a narrow view of their prerogative. Buchanan, in 1860, declared that the Southern States had no right to secede but that he had no power to hold them in the Union. Other Presidents have taken wide views of their functions as head of the Nation. Theodore Roosevelt held to the view that his powers were not limited to the matters expressly mentioned in the Constitution but extended in a broader sense to every question of public welfare not closed to him by the Constitution.

The President's policies and especially his directives are, apart from express or implied law, the policies and directives that must be carried out in the executive branch of the Government. The more important of these directives have by custom assumed the form of Executive orders which, in their formality and legal significance, unquestionably bind officers and employees in the executive branch.

As pointed out over 100 years ago in the case of *Kendall* v. *U.S.*, 12 Peters 524, 610 (1838), the President may not instruct employees to disregard the law. The Supreme Court stated: "To contend that the obligation imposed on the President to see that the laws are faithfully executed implies a power to forbid their execution is a novel construction of the Constitution and entirely inadmissable."

The propriety of issuing Executive orders rests first and thus foremost in the determination of the President. Also the legality of such orders occasionally rests with the President for lack of a forum in which to find a determination, or until a forum is reached and an enforceable determination is made. It is not within the norm of our constitutional law process to envision legal proceedings to enjoin the President from issuing a discretionary Executive order. If the order in question falls within the exercise of discretion, the Executive is exempt from mandamus or injunction. Likewise, the President is not subject in the performance of a "purely national" act, to interference by writ of habeas corpus. Mandamus against the Secretary of State was refused in *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cr. 137 (1803), although the fundamental basis for refusal in that case was that Congress could not enlarge the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

In *Carrick* v. *Lamar*, 116 U.S. 423 (1886), it was held directly that mandamus would not lie against the Executive for performance is a discretionary act; see also *U.S.* v. *Bashaw*, 152 U.S. 436 (1894). Mandamus will lie, however, against an officer of the United States for the performance of a purely ministerial duty, U.S. ex rel. *Dunlap* v. *Black*, 128 U.S. 40 (1888). Yet in *Mississippi* v. *Johnson*, 4 Wall. 475 (1876), it was held that the Supreme Court has no jurisdiction of a bill for injunction to enjoin the President in the performance of his official duties, although the duties were alleged to arise from an unconstitutional act of Congress.

ISSUES AND CONCLUSIONS

It is not difficult for the constitutional lawyer to contemplate the Congress approving an Executive order by acquiesence or disapproving it by contrary legislation. The Supreme Court expressly recognized this congressional prerogative in *Mid-West Oil Co.* v. *U.S.*, 236 U.S. 459 (1914) at page 471. The celebrated steel seizure case (*Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (June 1962), is still vividly in the legal mind. Here, in seizing the steel mills, the President advanced a theory not unlike the Theodore Roosevelt theory of a broad Executive residuum of power. (See also, Corwin, "The President: Office and Powers" (N.Y. Univ. Press 1950); cf. "Taft, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers," 139–40 (Col. Univ. Press 1916).)

In the steel seizure case the President seized the steel mills by Executive order, and the courts in a declaratory judgment and injunction suit, dissolved his seizure. The fact that Congress had refused to authorize governmental seizures of property to settle labor disputes had a bearing on the opinions of both the trial court and the Supreme Court. An appropriate quotation from the Supreme Court's opinion follows (p. 585):

"The President's power, if any, to issue the order must stem from an act of Congress or from the Constitution itself. There is no statute that expressly authorizes the President to take possession of property as he did here. Moreover, the use of the seizure technique to solve labor disputes was not only unauthorized by any congressional enactment; prior to this controversy, Congress had refused to adopt that method of settling labor disputes. When the Taft-Hartley Act was under consideration in 1947, Congress rejected an amendment which would have authorized such governmental seizures in cases of emergency."

Mr. Justice Jackson in this case analyzed the powers of the President and placed them in three categories; namely, maximum, "twilight zone," and minimum. When Congress authorize the President to act, his powers are at a maximum. When Congress has been silent the President is at neither maximum nor minimum as to power but is in the "twilight zone." However, when Congress has expressed a will or when there is an implied will, the President's powers are at a minimum. "Courts can sustain exclusive Presidential control in such a case only by disabling the Congress from acting on the subject," the Court stated (at 343 U.S. 637–638).

It would appear, at least on the surface, that the housing field is somewhat analogous to the steel seizure case cited above. Assuming this to be true, the President might be on questionable legal grounds in issuing an Executive order on racial integration in housing that is contrary to legislative intent. Policy is fundamentally a matter for the Congress unless it is contrary to the Constitution. There is nothing in the various housing acts directly authorizing the President to act. No mandatory requirement exists in article II of the Constitution (which deals with the powers of the President) that the President act. An implied authority for action by the President to carry out the spirit of the Constitution may well be argued in the light of recent Supreme Court decisions. A post-Civil War Act of Congress (42 USC 1982 assuring all citizens of all races the same right to purchase, lease, sell, hold or convey property) might be cited favorably. There is definitely an adverse legislative history in Congress which may well be an important legal factor in view of the emphasis placed on legislative history in the steel seizure case.

It is not prudent for the lawyer to prophesy as to future actions by the Supreme Court. Despite the recent increasing amount of civil rights decisions however, the Court could find difficulty in overruling an adverse legislative history in favor of Executive action which might be characterized by many as in substance at least in part a legislative act. The economic effect of such an order is difficult to estimate. Many builders undoubtedly would curtail their FHA and VA projects. The present trend toward conventional loans should then show a marked increase. If the order were extended to conventional mortgages through Federal financial institutions, which appears unlikely, then far more serious legal and economic problems would arise.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

A notable incident in housing legislative history wherein Congress debated and rejected racial integration as a part of the law occurred in 1949. Senator Bricker, of Ohio, offered an amendment to the pending bill (which became the Housing Act of 1949) which amendment would compel integration in public housing. There was debate on the amendment. Senator Douglas, of Illinois, aptly stated by way of summarizing the situation: "We, therefore, have the choice of voting for the Bricker amendment prohibiting segregation in public housing everywhere and thereby killing the whole program, or voting it down, enabling the act to be passed."

The amendment was voted down by the Senate (Congressional Record, vol. 95, pt. 4, p. 4861). This was a clear expression by Congress that it did not wish to prohibit segregation by law in public housing. A fortiori such an intent could be applied to programs such as the insurance program of the Federal Housing Administration, that do not involve an outlay of Federal funds, although technically the vote was taken only on public housing. On June 3, 1954, Senator Maybank, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, made a speech on the floor of the Senate dealing with the instant subject. At that time a court decision apparently had been called to his attention which concluded that segregation in public housing by a municipal ordinance is a violation of the 14th amendment. The Senator stated (Congressional Record, vol. 100, pt. 6, p. 7618): "Antisegregation amendments to housing bills have been rejected on several occasions by a majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. On April 21, 1949, an antisegregation amendment to the Housing Act of 1949 was brought to a vote in the Senate. It was recognized that such an amendment would make the public housing program inoperative and on a rollcall vote the amendment was rejected 46 to 32."

The House of Representatives has rejected proposed antidiscrimination amendments to the National Housing Act on several occasions. In 1953, Representative Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., offered an amendment that would have required written certificates in title I home improvements loans that the rental occupancy, use, lease, purchase, or sale of the property (including land) involved should in no way be limited to persons on account of race, color, or origin. The amendment was debated and was rejected by 16 yea and 49 nay votes (Congressional Record, vol. 99, pt. 1, p. 1429).

In 1954, Representative Javits, now Senator Javits, introduced an amendment that would require the FHA Commissioner to issue regulations to assure the needs of minority groups in housing without racial discrimination. This proposal amendment was defeated by 87 yea and 110 nay votes (Congressional Record, vol. 100, pt. 4, p. 4488).

Representative Adam Clayton Powell, of New York, has introduced his so-called Powell amendment requiring no racial discrimination in all housing programs on several occasions. In 1954, his amendment was debated and defeated by 74 yea and 113 nay votes (Congressional Record, vol. 100, pt. 4, p. 4488). On May 15, 1958, he introduced a bill prohibiting the use of Federal funds for loans or any other finacial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin (Congressional Record, May 15, 1958). There was no action on the bill as such and similar bills were introduced by him in 1959 (H.R. 1053 and H.R. 1054). Representative Holland of Pennsylvania introduced a similar bill also in 1959 (H.R. 1017). When the omnibus housing bill of 1959 was being debated on the floor of the House, Mr. Powell, on May 19, gave notice of a proposed amendment requiring nondiscrimination and stated: "I deliberately did not bring it before the committee because I felt that to go into any discriminatory clause, even in the case of my own Committee on Education and Labor might make it difficult to procure a rule for the consideration of the bill" (Congressional Record, vol. 105, pt. 6, p. 8533).

The following day he offered an amendment to the Herlong substitute for the main bill, S. 57, which had passed the Senate. This amendment would have required an assurance in writing from any recipient of a loan, grant, contribution, commitment, guaranty, or of any insurance, that the property involved "shall be available for sale, lease, or occupancy without regard to the race, creed, or color of the purchaser, lessee, or occupant." A division was called for and the amendment was defeated, there being 48 votes for and 138 votes against it (Congressional Record, vol. 105, pt. 7, p. 8654).

Another attempt was made the next day to place a nondiscrimination clause in the housing bill and this time it was made by Representative Baldwin of California. He attempted to insert in the public housing provisions of the bill an amendment stating that in the selection of tenants "there shall be no discrimination against any individual on account of his race, creed, or color." Mr. Baldwin stated on the floor: "I hope the amendment is approved by the House so we can express clearly the legislative intent of Congress upon this issue." (Congressional Record, vol. 105, pt. 7, p. 8833). Representative Halleck, of Indiana, called for a division and this amendment was defeated, the vote being ayes 115, noes 205 (Congressional Record, vol. 105, pt. 7, p. 8833). The bill without the amendment passed the House shortly after this vote.

The votes and the debates on the aforementioned amendments, both in the Senate and in the House, afford a rather clear legislative history to the effect that it is not the intent of Congress to impose nondiscriminatory racial provisions in the existing laws establishing and governing the various housing programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION AND OTHER GROUPS

On September 9, 1959, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights made a report to the President, which report included a recommendation that the "President issue an Executive order stating the constitutional objection of equal opportunity in housing, directing all Federal agencies to shape their policies and practices to make the maximum contribution to the achievement of this goal."

The Commission also recommended that FHA and VA strengthen their agreements with States and cities having laws against discrimination in housing by reaffirming written assurance from builders that they would abide by such laws. It was further recommended that all Federal benefits be withdrawn in cases of violations pending final action in State agencies or courts. The commission also recommended that the public housing program should avoid constructions in areas of racial concentration and that the Urban Renewal Administration assure that minority groups are in fact included among citizens in localities participating in the preparation of overall community "workable programs." Commissioners John S. Battle, Robert G. Storey, and Doyle E. Carlton filed a supplementary statement stating that on the subject of housing the Federal Government should "help but not pamper," that the expressions "freedom of choice," "open housing," and "scatteration" suggest a program of mixing the races anywhere and everywhere regardless of the wishes of either race and particular problems involved. They then stated that "The result would be dissension, strife, and even violence evident in sections where you would least expect it."

Senator John Sparkman, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing, openly and forcefully opposed the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission in a speech on the floor of the Senate in volume 105, part 15, page 19536 of the Congressional Record. He stated:

"If you want to kill housing, this is the way to do it."

The Senator also called the recommendations of the Commission "insidious" and he regretted that they dealt with the housing field, which as he stated "is very close to my heart and one to which I have dedicated a large part of my service in this body." He observed further that the recommendations of the Commission in practical operation "would result in an ever-increasing amount of Federal control and an overemphasis of racial feelings that would not exist unless the NAACP and bodies like the Civil Rights Commission stirred them up." Obviously Senator Sparkman feels that the economic results of an Executive order would be extremely bad for Federal programs and at least adverse for the whole market as well. The recent trend toward more conventional mortgage loans may well substantiate this argument.

In the course of the 1960 campaign for the Presidency, President Kennedy made reference in a speech, on August 9, to the fact that President Eisenhower had not issued an Executive order eliminating racial discrimination in housing programs when he could have done so with the "stroke of a pen." He also indicated in his campaign that if he were elected he would issue such an order. After inauguration and during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, there were no indications that such an order was imminent or forthcoming. Dr. Robert C. Weaver, a Negro, and an official of the NAACP, was appointed by President Kennedy to head the Housing Agency—HHFA—and Congress busied itself in passing the Housing Act of 1961—a very comprehensive bill and a bill with no references in it to the elimination of racial discrimination. Congress also considered, but did not bring up for final vote, the President's recommendation for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs with Cabinet rank in which all housing programs would be absorbed.

Within a few weeks after the adjournment of Congress, the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, composed of 33 civil rights, religious, and minority groups, met in Washington, D.C., and sent to the President a proposed Executive order and a memorandum of law in support thereof. This proposed order would first, prohibit discrimination by Federal, State, and local governments which operate housing in which Federal moneys are involved; second, require all Federal housing agencies to adopt regulations requiring antidiscrimination clauses in all agreements by which public assistance or credit is granted builders or developers; third, direct the Attorney General to take appropriate action regarding violations of antidiscrimination agreements; and fourth, authorize the appointment of a committee of seven members—the Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission being a member ex officio—to review the progress of the agencies in pursuing antidiscrimination policies.

In October 1961, the Civil Rights Commission made another set of recommendations to the President respecting housing. These were much stronger than the 1959 recommendations to which there was sharp congressional reaction. Under these recommendations, the President should issue an order stating the policy objective of equal opportunity in housing and then he should direct FHA, VA, FNMA, URA, and all financial agencies or institutions involved to devise effective implementing procedures. Thus, unlike the 1959 recommendations, the 1961 recommendations of the Commission made no differentiation between States having nondiscrimination laws and those not having such laws. Instead these recommendations would direct or imply written agreements containing nondiscrimination provisions or their equivalent in the entire field of Federal housing. They would require all financial institutions engaged in mortgage loans that are supervised by a Federal agency to conduct such business on a nondiscriminatory basis, and they would direct all Federal agencies to effectuate these purposes. The recommendations would also require open occupancy housing for FNMA special assistance.

Commissioner Robert S. Rankin dissented in part to the recommendations by stating "I cannot agree that the best method of achieving this result is by means of wholesale intervention."

Vice Chairman Robert G. Storey, head of Southwestern Legal Center, and former president of the American Bar Association, dissented vigorously to the suggestion of "further intervention by the Federal Government into the affairs and policies of private financial institutions." He posed the issue that the action suggested was advocating authority against freedom. He stated: "Recommendations such as this, for increasing Federal control, assume a totally powerful National Government with unending authority to intervene in all private affairs among men and to control and adjust property relationships in accordance with the judgment of Government personnel. This must lead eventually not to a greater human freedom, but to ever-diminishing freedom."

Perhaps the most general or characteristic argument given on behalf of the majority of the Commission was the statement on page 1 of the 150-page analysis or argument as follows:

"Throughout the country large groups of American citizens—mainly Negroes, but other minorities too—are denied an equal opportunity to choose where they will live. Much of the housing market is closed to them for reasons unrelated to their personal worth or ability to pay. New housing, by and large, is available only to whites. And in the restricted market that is open to them, Negroes generally must pay more for equivalent housing than do the favored majority. 'The dollar in a rake hand' does not 'have the same purchasing power as a dollar in a white hand.'

"As a consequence there is an ever-increasing concentration of nonwhites in racial ghettos, largely in the decaying centers of our cities—while a 'white noose' of new suburban housing grows up around them. This racial pattern intensifies the critical problems of our cities."

On December 1, 1961, at a luncheon in Washington, D.C., for 23 Minnesota newspaper editors and publishers, President Kennedy was asked by a publisher about his plans for an Executive order on segregation in housing. According to a UPI dispatch, the President stated that he planned to issue an Executive order on the subject but he did not indicate when he would issue it.

During the annual convention and exposition in Chicago of the National Association of Home Builders, December 3 through 7, 1961, both Representative ALBERT RAINS, chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of HHFA, were speakers. Both men were asked publicly about the expected Executive order. Mr. RAINS deplored the idea of an Executive order and stated that it would have a bad, if not disastrous effect, on the Federal housing program, of which he has been a strong sponsor through many years. Dr. Weaver differed with him as to the effect on the housing program of an Executive order. He stated that he doubted that such an order, if issued, would have anything like the adverse effect that had been predicted in some quarters.

Again in December 1961 a crucial decision was made. The White House (according to an Associated Press dispatch of December 27) decided to lay aside the proposed Executive order that would prohibit racial discrimination in any housing built with Federal help in the form of loan, loan guarantee, direct Federal funds, or mortgage insurance. It was stated that the order was merely deferred and might be expected late in the year 1962. At the same time, a decision was made to speed up action on creation of a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Mention was made by newspapers of the President considering a short cut—establishing the Department under Presidential reorganizational powers, as was done in the case of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This latter course, which eventually was taken, was at variance with the administration-sponsored bill pending for action at the close of Congress in 1961 after extensive Senate and House hearings.

The Washington, D.C., Evening Star of January 1, 1962, reported that the President, in Palm Beach, Fla., had determined officially not to issue the housing Executive order and that he had determined also to pursue the Department of Urban Affairs objective by the legislative route rather than by a reorganization plan. It was stated that while the President is committed to the housing order "eventually," nevertheless he did not wish to move too fast on new kinds of action in the field of civil rights and take the risk of doing more harm than good. It was stated also that the President wished to build, rather than tear down, southern cooperation in such activity, and that he would approve the much discussed housing order only when he thought it would be most helpful.

If the southern viewpoint remains a factor in determining when such an order will be most "helpful," there is room for considerable doubt that the time will come at a presently foreseeable date when an order touching upon something as personal to the individual as his own home and the integration of the races, would make the civil rights issue less acutely controversial.

During the early part of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, President Kennedy reversed his previously stated position on waiting for legislation on a Department of Urban Affairs and submitted to Congress a reorganization plan which would have established such a department. There was speculation in some quarters that this was related in some way to the Executive order situation regarding racial discrimination. The President stated that if the plan were approved he would appoint Dr. Weaver of the HHFA to the new Cabinet post. Many observers felt that had this occurred, the order would not be necessary politically or otherwise because a Negro would be in the Cabinet for the first time in history, and the new Department would have such powers that racial discrimination could be barred in housing programs by administrative action short of an Executive order.

The reorganization plan was defeated, however, by a vote in the Senate and the much-talked-of Department of Urban Affairs did not come into existence in 1962. Thus, the Executive order situation reverted back to its previous status.

The President was then asked at several press conferences what he intended to do about his campaign promise for such an order. He postponed further commitments on each occasion and deferred to enforcing civil rights in other categories for the time being. His position at the press conference of July 6, 1962 was stated as follows:

"Question. Mr. President, I believe you have been in office about 17 months and still haven't signed that order against racial discrimination in federally financed housing. Could you tell us when you do plan to sign that?

"Answer. I will announce it when we think it will be a useful and appropriate time.

"Question. You will sign it before the end of your term?

"Answer. I have said already I will meet any commitments of that kind that I have made.

"Question. Mr. President——

"Answer. I will point out that we have carried on a great many activities in the field of civil rights executive actions, including actions by the Department of Justice and others, and I will take action as it appears that they will accomplish the results that we want to accomplish—providing the full opportunities."

On July 9, 1962, 3 days after the aforementioned press conference, the National Association of Home Builders released a report which included a survey of homebuilders' opinion on the impact of a possible antidiscrimination order. A copy of the report was forwarded to President Kennedy. The survey was tabulated and analyzed by CEIR, a consulting firm in economic and industrial research processing. It indicated a possible loss of 112,000 units of housing from the 347,000 planned by the survey respondents. The NAHB pointed out that this would mean an impact of $3 billion on the gross national product as a minimum consequence. It was pointed out further that if these figures were projected to the anticipated production of 1,400,000 housing units in 1962, they represent a possible loss of 1 million man-years of employment and $6 billion in gross national product.

Late in the summer and in early fall of 1962, conservative or even moderate newspaper comments indicated that almost everyone except those who would benefit directly by it politically, was worried over the far-reaching effect of an order that was expected momentarily. Some observed that it would be politically and economically harmful; that it would embrace all private enterprise in the residential construction area which should be kept beyond Federal control; others expressed fears that builders and financiers may be reluctant to invest funds in open occupancy projects lest a mixture of tenants depress property value and whites may refuse to rent or buy.

A new and somewhat interesting point was raised by at least one columnist; namely, that this kind of desegregation edict would transfer the racial disturbances now troubling the South to every other region.

We turn now to what is being done in this subject in the various fields of housing and related subjects.

THE PRESENT STATUS

1. Urban renewal

Absolute open occupancy is by no means the correct description of the present Federal housing policy. Short of this, however, it may be said that the Federal agencies are administering the various housing programs very well along the lines of both congressional intent and judicial decisions affecting them. Local customs and State laws have a marked effect on any given housing program in any given State and it would be difficult for a proposed arbitrary Federal rule to change the long-term net result without State cooperation. This is particularly true if the great bulk of the housing market remains in the conventional or nongovernmental field where it now is. A severe governmental racial program would probably increase the conventional market percentagewise and decrease the approximately one-third portion of the entire housing market or total mortgage debt that is now in the Federal housing program.

Dr. Robert C. Weaver, the present Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has held high positions in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He has been a successful housing commissioner for the State of New York and has also been a prolific writer on the advancing cause of the colored race. Fundamental in his writings on the question of housing is the theme of relieving concentrations of Negroes in slum areas by affirmative, definite action. This theme was expressed and developed in detail in his book "The Negro Ghetto" published in 1948 in which he expressed an ideal goal of not only relieving racial concentrations but of attaining an abolution of a consciousness of different ethnic backgrounds.

On October 17, 1961, Dr. Weaver, an Administrator of the HHFA, reiterated part of this theme in an address in New York to the American Jewish Committee. He pointed out the need for urban renewal to be accompanied by greater freedom of choice for Negroes in housing. He concluded that unless Negroes are offered a better place to live, urban renewal projects will be unable to continue. "It will be the urban renewal of the 1960's," he stated, "that will help Negroes to escape their ghetto."

This is an indication of a rather stern forthcoming policy in the urban renewal program. This program received an additional authorization of $2 billion in the Housing Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-70) and is a rapidly developing and important housing program. Legally speaking it is fairly susceptible to directives from HHFA than is FHA which has a fairly autonomous stature and a long and separate legislative history. Moreover urban renewal grants are direct payments of Federal funds to local public bodies with no monetary repayment other than the general tax improvement expected. The ratio of Federal to local payments is 2 to 1 and sometimes 3 to 1. A rigid Federal racial policy could be enforced under this program far more easily than it could be enforced under mere insurance of loans in FHA or VA or throughout the entire Federal savings and loan association program. The Federal Government could simply refuse to pay the urban renewal grants unless racial conditions were met, including perhaps the recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission that each contract entered into between local public authorities and redevelopers contain a provision assuring access to reuse housing to all applicants regardless of race, creed, or color. This conceivably might be done by URA or HHFA directives without an Executive order of the President and in either event with considerably more legal ease than in doing the same with FHA, VA, or savings and loan programs.

URA as of May 18, 1961, regarded antidiscrimination requirements as a matter for local or State determination, as Mr. William L. Slayton, its Director told the Civil Rights Commission by letter. However, the following observations might be made. The basic statutes (63 Stat. 413, 414, 42 U.S.C. 1450) contain no antidiscrimination provisions. There is no requirement expressly prohibiting racial discrimination in the rental or sale of property built in urban renewal project areas by private developers. URA requirements, however, deal rather directly with the subject. Page 10, part II, section 504 (URA regulations) contract for planning advance for surveys and plans for urban renewal projects, contains a clause prohibiting discrimination against employees or applicants for employment in contract work for preparing plans. The plans themselves cannot contain provisions racially restrictive of use or occupancy in the area. Restrictive covenants are forbidden expressly in the loan and grant contract (sec. 106(c) URA regs. p. 11, L. & C. contract, pt. II). Clauses forbidding discrimination in employment must be inserted in all contracts down to subcontractors (sec. 107(A) (13) URA regs. pt. II, p. 14).

The Civil Rights Commission maintains that despite the above requirements, unless local law prohibits it, nothing prevents the actual disposition or use of urban renewal property in a discriminatory manner. Hence, its recommendations that all local public authorities and redevelopers must certify access to reuse housing regardless of race, creed, or color.

It might be observed that in *Tate* v. *City of Bufaula*, 165 F. Supp. 303, 306 (M.D. Ala. 1958) a complaint was filed alleging a tacit understanding between all parties that new urban renewal housing would go only to members of the white race. The court dismissed the suit as premature and based on speculation. The court observed, however, that the law is now clear "that there can be no governmentally enforced segregation solely because of race or color."

Governmentally enforced segregation as the court called it is quite different from segregation caused by voluntary preferences and economic factors.

Both urban renewal and the highway program cause problems regarding displaced persons. More public housing has been authorized to absorb a part of this burden. The expanded section 221 provision (FHA aid for displaced persons) in the Housing Act of 1961 eliminating workable program requirements other than in rental housing, will occasion more instances of dealing with displaced Negroes as well as whites. The 1961 act made no change however in existing laws or policies on racial discrimination.

2. Public housing

Inasmuch as the low-rent public housing program since its inception in 1937 (50 Stat. 888, 42 U.S.C. 1041 et seq., as amended) has proceeded on a basis of being available to members of all races, the program as such poses no great practical problems on racial discrimination other than the site selection controversy and the very heavy Negro occupancy of units in large metropolitan areas.

The legislative history of the refusal of Congress to write forced integregation or open occupancy into the housing laws has been involved largely with public housing. The public housing program is a direct expenditure program and involves billions of dollars. Contract authority is given by the act for PHA to commit the full faith and credit of the United States to local authorities to construct the projects. Local 40-year bonds are used for financing purposes and Congress appropriates annual contributions to pay deficits necessary to maintain the low-rent nature of the projects and at the same time retire the bonds.

Thus again a stern Federal policy against racial discrimination is much easier of enforcement in public housing than it would be in guarantee or insurance programs or in attempting to control the practice of all financial federally related financial institutions.

The public housing program is a very large item in the direct outlay of the Federal Government in the general housing program. At the close of 1959 there were more than 585,000 units of public housing completed, in operation or under contract. The Housing Act of 1961 authorized 100,000 more units. The program is maintained for the use of persons whose low incomes take them somewhat out of the lowest range of other housing programs. According to the Civil Rights Commission's findings nonwhites occupy 46 percent of all public housing. In large metropolitan areas this percentage is higher, however. For example, in Baltimore it is 75 percent and in Los Angeles it is 86 percent. The percentage of Negroes to the total population is approximately 12 percent. The total nonwhite percentage would not be much higher than this figure. Thus it is obvious that the public housing program has enured heavily to the benefit of the Negro population.

PHA has maintained equal opportunity standards for all races. It has authority to approve projects before the outlay of Federal funds and is in a position to enforce its standards. In 1952 PHA adopted its "racial equity formula" based on approximate volume urgency and respective need of all races. This policy applies only where public housing is provided on a segregated basis. As of March 31, 1960, PHA's publication "Trends Toward Open Occupancy" reported that 32 States operated public housing on an open occupancy basis.

The Civil Rights Commission expressed very little criticism of the public housing program. It praised the steps taken by PHA to encourage local authorities to select sites on open land outside centers of racial concentration and to encourage the construction of relatively small projects in scattered locations. Its 1961 report implied, however, that PHA should go beyond mere suggestions and encouragement in these fields and adopt mandatory requirements.

On the legal side, it would appear that the courts feel that racial segregation in public housing is unconstitutional. On May 24, 1954, the Supreme Court denied certiorari in the case of *Housing Authority of San Francisco* v. *Banks*, (120 Cal. app. 2d 1,260 p. 2d 668; cert. denied 347 U.S. 974). In effect this approved the lower court's decision that the 14th amendment prohibited the imposition of segregation in public housing by municipal ordinance. Ten days later Senator Maybank of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, criticized the decision on the floor of the Senate and pointed out that it was contrary to the intent of Congress in the legislative history of public housing. He also stated that it was not consistent with the "separate but equal" doctrine of the Supreme Court in the school case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*. Of course it was not very long after Senator Maybank made his remarks that the Supreme Court issued the celebrated Brown decision and squarely reversed itself in overruling the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* separate but equal doctrine.

The general tenor of Federal decisions is to the effect that if the Constitution prohibits States from maintaining racial segregation, then the same document could hardly justify the Federal Government in sponsoring racial segregation. Segregated public housing has been successfully challenged in several cases. See *Van* v. *Toledo Housing Authority,* (133 F. Supp. 210 ND Ohio 1953); *Detroit Housing Comm.* v. *Lewis,* (226 F. 2d 180 6th Cir. 1955) and cases cited.

3. Financial institutions

The inclusion in its 1961 report by the Civil Rights Commission of the Federal Reserve System, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, has occasioned considerable speculation as to the intended scope of proposed action on desegregation in Federal housing programs. Actually, the Commission made no recommendations that all Federal financial institutions must certify open occupancy in all of their mortgage transactions. It recommended that they be required to conduct their business on a nondiscriminatory basis. It also stated that the Home Loan Bank Board and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at least implicitly recognize that racial discrimination in mortgage lending does occur in Federal financial institutions. The range and exact nature of this discrimination is not given.

It is reasonable to assume that the average leading institution, be it a bank or a savings and loan association, lends money on the fundamental basis of credit and security. It would be rather difficult to show denial of loans based directly on color and not on economic factors. Nevertheless the Commission suggests that all four of the above-mentioned important Federal agencies require nondiscriminatory mortgage loan policies on the part of the financial institutions they supervise (p. 147, 1961 report).

The Commission points to the action of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as salutary, suggestive that all other agencies follow suit. An examination of this action by the Board, shows that it is general in nature. Unless it is supplemented by vigorous activity by examiners or by written certifications being required in Federal savings and loan transactions, it will not change existing procedures to any noticeable degree. It has been suggested in some quarters that if the President feels that he must issue an Executive order, he should follow the same relatively harmless pattern.

The Board's order No. 14,656, was issued June 1, 1961. It states:

"It is hereby resolved that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, as a matter of policy, opposes discrimination, by financial institutions over which it has supervisory authority, against borrowers solely because of race, color or creed."

It might be said in passing that further action by the Board that would impose rigid racial requirements on savings and loan associations would be very difficult of enforcement. Savings and loan associations as of September 30, 1961, account for $67 billion of the total nonfarm mortgage debt of $206 billion, and only 16 percent of this amount is involved in FHA or VA programs, as compared to 60 percent with mutual savings banks, 40 percent with life insurance companies, and 29 percent with commercial banks. The funds that are used for mortgage loans are the funds of depositors. Deposits in associations belonging to the Federal system are insured up to $10,000 by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation which, through its premium charges, is self-sustaining.

The Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) is a Federal financial institution operating in its secondary market operations on a businesslike basis of what the market justifies by way of discounts at purchase and marketability at sale. The Civil Rights Commission's only comment by way of suggestion in this field was that FNMA has no policy concerning the purchase of mortgages sold by discriminatory builders or from discriminatory lending institutions. Since FNMA buys only FHA and VA mortgages it maintains that is further removed from the operational impact of racial discrimination problems than other governmental agencies.

As to the special assistance program of FNMA which is designed to buy mortgages under special housing programs for segments of the population that are unable to obtain adequate housing under established home financing programs, the Civil Rights Commission desires that the President or Congress designate open occupancy projects as eligible for special assistance purchases. Elderly housing, Guam, urban renewal, Wherry defense projects, and a few other programs have received special assistance aid in the past. The Housing Act of 1961 increased the special assistance authorization from $750 million to $1.7 billion.

The President has authority to designate disaster areas for special assistance. Congress has specified various areas for special assistance in the past, and because of this the President might defer to congressional policy or prerogative. The Commission, however, suggests further that existing special existence authorized programs, i.e., urban renewal and elderly housing, be available on an open occupancy basis.

If this recommendation were carried out to its fullest extent under the meaning of the word "require" as used by the Commission it would encompass a vast change in our present banking and financial institutions structure throughout the Nation. Institutions could not avoid the strict controls over credit policies implied in the recommendation by simply refusing to handle Government insured loans. The recommendation applies to all real estate loans. Thus it would move into the conventional market wherein lies the bulk of mortgage credit. The element of control would be the Federal element of supervision over national banks, Federal Reserve member banks, savings and loan associations that are members of the Federal system, and banks insured by the FDIC.

In this present day of expansion of all four of the above-mentioned catagories of financial institutions, the imposition of new strict controls over lending policies on any other than broad economic soundness grounds would be a major policy question. It would involve practically all major banking interests in the United States. It is doubted that the President would attempt to go this far and it stands to reason that Congress would deliberate long and hard before going so far.

The Civil Rights Commission under the heading of findings respecting the supervision of mortgage lending institutions praised the general aims and purposes of the voluntary home mortgage credit program but used this program as an illustration that the good faith of the private lending industry would not accomplish the purposes the Commission desired. In other words the Commission is saying that the availability of credit to minority groups with Government underwriting in the private market is insufficient. Too many Negroes do not use or do not wish to use FHA or VA loans, preferring the conventional market. The Commission is, therefore, saying that VHMCP is totally inadequate because "its failures are a sober reminder of the fundamental limitations of reliance upon good faith alone" (p. 147 report). Thus the Commission prefers mandatory Government action to the VHMCP principle.

VHMCP was extended by the Housing Act of 1961 until October 1, 1965. It was started in 1954 to facilitate the flow of private funds to help minority groups and to aid remote areas and small communities. The Administrator of HHFA is chairman of a national committee supervising its operations, which committee has on it representatives from all major sectors of the mortgage credit market. All applicants for loans must certify that the type of loan requested has been refused by two reasonably accessible or local private lending institutions. Through 1960 the number of loans under this program totaled 45,343. North Carolina, with a large Negro population, had the greatest number of loans, namely 3,299. The next three highest States in order were Ohio, Texas, and Illinois.

Congressional action established this program. Presidential action could do little more than direct the Administrator of HHFA to emphasize the program should that be desired. The Civil Rights Commission report, however, when taken in its context, advocates the opposite of this approach. It seeks to establish the forced right of credit for minority groups at lending institutions in the first place, and not a program to benefit them after they have been denied credit.

4. FHA and VA

Last but by no means least in our consideration of present programs we turn to the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration. Herein we strike the bulk as well as much of the vital part of the housing programs as they affect the average homeowner. Implicit in our consideration of practical and legal values is the fact that Federal funds are not spent in these programs. They are guaranty or insurance programs. FHA has insured in excess of $68 billion in mortgages since its establishment in 1934 and has operated with a surplus rather than a loss, which surplus has been attained through a very nominal premium charge. The VA guaranty program designed fundamentally by Congress to benefit veterans per se and for no other reason, has exceeded $52 billion since its inception in 1944. The veterans direct loan program, which was started in 1950 and is applicable to rural areas and smaller urban communities, has now reached approximately $1.5 billion.

Another cardinal consideration is the fact that there is nothing in the law, nor could there be under the powers of Congress, to force private lending institutions to make loans under these programs. The experience throughout the Nation under an attempt by Congress to compel abolition of unreasonable discounts, fees or so-called points by institutions under these programs is illustrative of the practical result of compulsory or unpopular action. After Congress for the second time passed such a law (sec. 605, Housing Act of 1957, 12 U.S.C. 1709(b)) many lending institutions found the programs so far under what the market would justify in return on investments that they simply refused to make loans under the programs. Congress then repealed the law imposing the restrictions (sec. 6, Housing Act of 1958, Public Law 35–364, 85th Cong.) and the normal use of the programs was resumed, albeit that Congress did not relish accusations of recognizing and sanctioning the point system.

There is little present likelihood that Congress will impose strict racial restrictions or open occupancy requirements on these programs. If the President extends his Executive order to these programs as recommended by the Civil Rights Commission, the practical result could be similar to that experienced in the "point" restrictions made by Congress and subsequently repealed.

The legislative history of FHA shows that Congress intended to give the FHA Commissioner broad power and discretionary latitude in dealing with problems in the several States (see 12 U.S.C. 1702 and note).

Moreover the basic statute giving FHA authority states (12 U.S.C. 1703(A)):

"The Commissioner is authorized and empowered upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe to insure banks and other such financial institutions which the Commissioner finds to be qualified by experience or facilities and approves as eligible for credit insurance against losses which may sustain as a result of loans."

The essence of this statutory authority is that the FHA Commissioner has broad and flexible powers expressly given him by Congress.

The courts have recognized that Congress has not charged FHA with responsibility to enforce racial desegregation, *Johnson* v. *Levitt and Sons*, 131 F. Supp., 114, 116 (E.D. Penn. 1955); *Dorrey* v. *Stuyvesant Town Corporation*, 299 N.Y. 512, 87 N.E. 2d 641 (1949) Cert. denied 339 U.S. 981 (1950); see Note in 107 Penn. L. Rev. 515 (1959), but see Contra *Ming* v. *Hargan* 3 Race Rel. L. Rep. (Cal. Supreme Ct. 1959).

In the *Johnson* v. *Levitt* case cited above, the question was whether discrimination by a private individual receiving FHA benefits was unconstitutional. The claim of the plaintiff was that the builder's action constituted "Government action" because of the FHA loan insurance. The court denied this claim and made a clear holding that neither the 5th nor the 14th amendments prohibited discrimination in this case. A contrary holding was reached in the *Ming* v. *Horgan* case wherein the court reasoned that the Government could not constitutionally discriminate and therefore an individual acting in the FHA program could not discriminate.

The problem of determining which of the courts mentioned above is correct would seem to be a matter for the judiciary rather than for the President. Rather forceful arguments can be made that the Executive should stay out of a situation like this and that it was not the intent of the authors of the Constitution to vest such broad power in the hands of the President.

Moreover it should well be considered that Congress intended that FHA be subjected to local law and local conditions because from the start it waived governmental sovereignty and immunity and made FHA and its officers subject to local process and to suits in State courts, 12 U.S.C. 1702.

The Supreme Court has recognized this fact as a somewhat distinguishing feature of FHA. In the case of *Federal Housing Administration* v. *Burr*, 309 U.S. 242, the Court stated—"It must be presumed that when Congress launched a governmental agency into the commercial world and endowed it with authority to sue and be sued, that agency is not less amenable to judicial process than a private enterprise under like circumstances would be." Mr. Justice Douglas added (at p. 245): "Clearly the words 'sue' and 'be sued' in their normal connotation embrace all civil process incident to the commencement or continuance of legal proceedings." Thus it seems clear that Congress intended for FHA to be an insuring agency that can adjust to local business conditions and customs and that it be subject to State laws. This intent was reiterated in connection with the bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. On April 18, 1961, the President sent to the House and Senate draft legislation proposing to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and to transfer to it the functions of all of the housing agencies and the Community Facilities Administration. Appropriate bills were introduced and extensive hearings were held. On July 21, 1961, a subcommittee of the Senate amended the administration's bill to provide for a recognition of local autonomy and authority and to prohibit complete absorption of FHA in the new Department by preserving its name intact (unlike all other housing agencies) so that it could be clearly recognized in the new Department, if it were established. The bill was reported to the Senate in the 1st session of the 87th Congress but no action was taken on it.

The above action by the committee, however, shows congressional intent to preserve the long legislative history of FHA and to respect local and State laws and customs in the administration of housing policies. This congressional pattern renders an Executive order on integration in housing more difficult to enforce and less authoritative in nature as it concerns FHA and its functions in States that do not have antidiscrimination real estate laws.

If the President should by Executive order direct FHA to take appropriate steps to assure that builders and developers will not discriminate as to race and that lending institutions be forced to make an asssurance, written or otherwise, regarding nondiscrimination or open occupancy, then another part of the FHA basic laws of long standing will be drawn into the legal scene that may easily develop. FHA has a list of approved lenders. When a lending institution is removed from this list or is blacklisted so to speak, it has rights for a hearing under both FHA regulations and under existing law. This applies also to borrowers, builders and contractors.

Let us suppose that a lending institution is complying fully with State laws on discrimination. We may note in passing that only New York and New York City, New Jersey, Oregon, Washington, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Colorado, Connecticut, and the city of Pittsburgh have direct antidiscrimination laws affecting private housing. In all of these jurisdictions, FHA has entered agreements that it will not insure loans for discriminatory builders who are violating their own State laws. Suppose, however, that pursuant to a Presidential directive, FHA is forced arbitrarily to blacklist a lending institution that complies in all respects to State law because such State refuses to require open occupancy in housing developments. Faced with an arbitrary blacklisting the lender could fall back on section 512 of the Housing Act of 1934 as recodified and strengthened by Congress in 1954 (68 Stat. 610, 12 U.S.C. 1731(a)), and demand a hearing with the right to have counsel present. Furthermore, he might demand an interpretation of his rights under this law in the courts. A judicial construction of this act of Congress as compared to a Presidential directive or Executive order would present a most interesting situation.

Section 512 (12 U.S.C. 1732(a)) authorizes the Commissioner to refuse FHA benefits to persons and firms who knowingly or willfully violate the Housing Act or any "regulation issued by the Commissioner under this act," but only after due notice specifying charges with the right of a hearing afforded and a determination based thereon by the Commissioner. The act also provides that violations of State penal statutes constitute grounds for proceedings. The determinations by the Commissioner under this act are required to be "based on the preponderance of the evidence."

The paramount pleading filed in court would no doubt be that a racial discrimination regulation would not be a regulation issued "under this act" as required by the law and that the party in question complied in all respects to State law.

It is obvious that this section of the law was designed to force compliance with State laws as well as with the Housing Act and that it did not contemplate a regulation based on Presidential action. It would be difficult for a court to determine otherwise. Thus it could be argued that Congress had entered the field of how a person or firm could be denied FHA benefits and had set the standards to be followed thereby preempting the field and precluding the President from acting. A regulation issued under President directive is not a regulation issued under the act, especially when Congress intentionally kept racial discrimination language out of the Housing Act of 1954 when this section was recodified and reissued. In fact it was in this same year, 1954, that Congress specifically rejected a proposed amendment to empower the FHA Commissioner to issue racial antidiscrimination regulations. The language of the Javits amendment which was defeated 87 to 110 in the House (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 4, p. 4488) was as follows:

"The Federal Housing Commissioner shall make such rules and regulations in connection with his functions under the National Housing Act as may be necessary to cause the issuance of commitments for mortgage insurance under the titles of the act to give adequate consideration to the housing needs of minority groups without discrimination or segregation not now adequately supplied by new or sound or reconditioned existing housing."

The defeat of this amendment gives very strong backing to argument that an FHA regulation pursuant to Presidential directive regarding racial discrimination is not a regulation under the National Housing Act.

To avoid a legal impasse, should the courts desire to give the President judicial backing, this section would probably have to be declared unconstitutional insofar as it would preclude a racial discrimination regulation. Yet this would be tantamount to saying that a regulation could be based on a Presidential directive in preference to an act of Congress which authorized and gave life to the program in question. Such a holding by the courts would have far-reaching constitutional ramifications in the field of separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

With respect to the Veterans' Administration, it may be stated that the situation regarding an Executive order on housing is not unlike that in FHA. As stated before, the VA guaranty program has been in existence since 1944 and has well exceeded the $50 billion figure in coverage. The direct loan program, started in 1950, has exceeded $1.5 billion. In neither of these programs has the Veterans' Administration fostered or sponsored racial discrimination as such. The programs, due to more liberal policies, have been available to more low-income home purchasers. Thus, a higher coverage results to nonwhites. The main purpose of the veterans' laws has been, and is at present, to provide housing assistance to veterans. No reference is made to racial discrimination in the legislation establishing the programs.

VA regulations prevent the use of racial restrictive covenants on property financed under a VA guaranty. If a guaranty is issued on a loan covering such property, the lender is deprived of the valuable right of conveying the property to VA in event of default and foreclosure. As to property conveyed to VA under such circumstances, there is a considerably higher ratio that exists in FHA. In fact, the VA has in the neighborhood of $400 million worth of such property. When VA sells this type of property, it is on an open basis, irrespective of racial barriers.

VA, like FHA, enters into cooperative agreements with States that have antidiscrimination laws. VA advises the State enforcement agency of new housing developments and the State advises the builder of its antidiscrimination laws. If a State finds that a builder violates its law, VA determines whether a veteran is involved. If so, VA has the power of suspension and in such cases has caused builders to comply with State law. VA does not require certificates from builders in advance that they will abide by State law. This is on the stated assumption that they know of it and will abide by it.

While VA's large project coverage is not as extensive as that of FHA, nevertheless there are many projects of 100 or more new homes wherein builders seek and receive VA approval for guaranty coverage. As to lenders, VA encourages a rather wide roster for the convenience of the veteran. In some instances, guaranties are even made to loans by individuals.

The sharp decrease in veterans loans occasioned by the laws (which were enacted and then repealed) outlawing the use of "points" indicates that lenders cannot be coerced into making loans contrary to economic facts of life in the free market. It illustrates that economic considerations rather than racial considerations are fundamental in determining the volume of the program.

In aggravated cases of discrimination, even in States without antidiscrimination laws, it would appear that the VA has legal authority to suspend a builder and inform him that the discrimination in which he has engaged in is considered to be an unfair or prejudicial marketing practice or method under the provisions of section 504(c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. The problem herein, however, is an administrative one which must be weighed and balanced as to the groups of veterans affected, should it be considered a national uniform policy. The VA program, like FHA, was launched on a basis of adjusting to State and local laws and customs.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY EXECUTIVE ORDER

It is felt by many that the pattern of the employment opportunity executive order (Executive Order No. 10925, F.R. Doc. 61–2093, signed Mar. 6, 1961) will be followed if the President decides to issue an order in the field of housing.

Executive Order No. 10925 simply stated that discrimination, because of race, creed, color, or national origin, is contrary to the constitutional principles and policies of the United States; that it is the obligation of the United States to promote and insure equal opportunity for all qualified persons; and that it is the policy of the executive branch of the Government to encourage equal opportunity by positive measures.

The order then established a President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. The Vice President of the United States and many high ranking Government officials were placed on the Committee. The Committee was empowered to provide for procedures and policies to implement the order and to make such reports to the President as are deemed appropriate. All executive departments and agencies were directed to initiate studies in such form as the Committee may prescribe including recommendations for the elimination of any discrimination which may exist.

The order contained a mandatory clause that, except in specific exempted cases, all Government contracts must contain express antidiscrimination provisions set forth in the order.

The Committee was given the power to promulgate rules of procedure and regulations, to delegate authority, to investigate employment practices, to hold hearings, to publish the names of violators of the order or regulations, to recommend legal action for compliance or for criminal prosecution by the Department of Justice, to terminate contracts for noncompliance, to order contracting agencies to refrain from contracts with violators, and to debar a contractor from further Government contracts, and to notify the Comptroller General of the United States.

A substantially similar Executive order in the field of housing would commit the executive branch of the Government in unmistakable terms as to all programs covered therein.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on a subject which I believe to be of interest to all. Certainly it should be, because it deals with one of the trouble areas of the world.

It is a commonplace, Mr. President, that relationships between nations, like those between members of the same family, do not follow a uniformly even course. This is more dramatically apparent in the relationships between a great power, such as the United States of America, and the proud, newly independent countries of Asia and Africa.

The largest, and perhaps the most rapidly developing, of these new nations are India and Pakistan. Over the years, relationships between each of these countries and the United States have been subject to a number of dips, turns, and rises; but it seems to me that at no time has the United States lost sight of its profound interest in the orderly development of the Indian and Pakistani subcontinent. And neither India nor Pakistan has ever really lost sight of the importance to each of the U.S. role in world affairs, including the leadership of the free world.

In recent months, however, some strain has developed in U.S. relationships with both India and Pakistan. By word and gesture, the United States has managed to displease both countries, just as each of them in its turn has taken actions that we have not been able to regard favorably. Little would be gained by enumerating each and every irritant that has introduced the new strain in these relationships. None of them, I think, will prove to be of major longrun importance.

What is important is that throughout the period of their 15-year history, relations between India and Pakistan themselves have steadily deteriorated; moreover, they are moving, if anything, further apart from each other. Their rivalry is a bitter one, and inevitably has drawn in their friends, particularly the United States. Statements have been made recently by Indians and by Pakistanis, which have accomplished little, except to call attention of the people in each country to their respective difficulties with the West.

The purpose of my remarks is twofold: First, to try to place some of these statements in a wider and truer perspective; second, and perhaps more important, to discuss the root cause of the India-Pakistan dispute, which is Kashmir.

I should say, first, that most of the individuals responsible for the statements are not anti-American; nor do they lack an appreciation of what American aid has meant to their development. The fact is that most of the querulous statements issuing from Karachi and New Delhi arise from a variety of considerations, most of them rooted in domestic politics. For example, some weeks ago President Ayub told the head of an American news service that the trend in U.S. policy in the Indian subcontinent might force Pakistan "to look for protection elsewhere." And as recently as June 27, Pakistan's new Foreign Minister told the National Assembly, in effect, that Pakistan should not be considered a follower of any camp and that its defensive arrangements do not rule out friendship with Communist or neutralist countries.

Neither of these comments came as a surprise to U.S. officials experienced in dealing with affairs in this part of the world. Nor did Prime Minister Nehru's speech before the Indian Parliament, following the United Nations Security Council meeting in New York, come as any great surprise. Mr. Nehru expressed his "deep regret and sorrow" that the United States and the United Kingdom, the two great powers of the West, should "almost invariably be against us on subjects like Goa and Kashmir." Often in the past, he has made essentially the same point, just as Pakistani leaders have often asserted their freedom from U.S. influence.

It is important, I think, to bear in mind that statements by these leaders are directed less at the outside world than at their own people. To a high degree, such statements are the stuff of sovereignty recently attained and a reflection of the sensitivity which inevitably intrudes upon the relations of a former colonial dependency with one of the large powers of the advanced Western community. A newly independent people feels impelled to assert its independence, and does so through its leaders. The statements may provoke an understandably hostile reaction among Americans, whose generosity has helped to bring these countries to the point where they can realistically plan for long-term development. But in many cases, they are as politically necessary as the not entirely judicious statements that elected officials in the United States are impelled to make from time to time. Actually, there is little in the recent Indian and Pakistani statements that has not been said before, by the same people.

What I have said, however, does not apply to all of the intemperate utterances issuing from that part of the world. Some politicians, in the Indian subcontinent and elsewhere, are clearly pursuing a hostile course, presumably in an effort to build political support by fanning latent anti-American sentiment and exploiting it. In my view, no useful purpose is served by reacting to such predictably hostile behavior. Generally, the reaction merely advances the purpose of the demagog himself; he will proclaim the U.S. reaction as interference in the affairs of his country, and he will be upheld by the great Communist propaganda claque around the world.

In fulfilling its enormous leadership responsibilities, the United States has carefully defined its own interests and those of its friends and allies, a category of nations that includes both India and Pakistan. In advancing these interests, the United States has conceived a basic foreign policy that has been pursued by every administration since the end of World War II. At its heart lies the objective of peace, and the means of achieving it involve a resistance to communism at every level—political, economic, and military. It is the only realistic and logical policy. It seeks to avoid a general nuclear exchange, but clearly implies a willingness to meet Communist aggression in whatever form it arises. As such, it is the antithesis of the so-called "no win" philosophy, which some say underlies U.S. policy. Rather than dwell on this line of criticism, it is enough to say that those who are pressing it either lack the patience for the tedious and complex business of waging cold war, or do not understand the requirements of the East-West struggle.

What the United States seeks is the creation of a community of independent nations, each of them sufficiently strong politically, economically and, if necessary, militarily, to preserve its independence. It is the logic of this objective that motivates our foreign-aid programs and gives direction to our overall policy in every part of the globe. We cannot afford to undercut basic policy anywhere, merely because some prominent official makes a statement that sounds ungrateful, or even offensive. And it should matter not at all whether the source of such a remark is a normally responsible statesman, or a dangerous demagog. The statements, like the men who utter them, are perishable. The case for U.S. policy is that it seeks to create an international order that will endure. Thus, policy must be allowed to proceed on an even course, unimpeded by the excesses of fallible men.

Quite apart from the East-West struggle, a number of international disputes remain to threaten world peace. The Palestine refugee question is one. Of them all, the conflicting claims of India and Pakistan to the state of Kashmir is perhaps the most nearly insoluble.

The position of the United States on the Kashmir question corresponds to its position on other outstanding international disputes. The United States is primarily interested in a peaceful settlement of these questions, and devotes considerable effort to this objective. But the United States, like other responsible societies, is disappointed by the persistent inability, or refusal, of a number of these disputants even to discuss a settlement of their differences on a realistic basis. This is especially true in the case of India and Pakistan. These two countries are by far the largest single recipients of American aid. Their economies are—or should be—complementary. The development of the subcontinent should be a joint enterprise. Yet this most efficient use of the resources available to them is frustrated by the unwillingness of the parties to treat the Kashmir question realistically. Moreover, instead of cooperating in joint military planning for protection of their borders, each Government appears to be primarily concerned with the intentions of the other.

The Kashmir question is one of surpassing complexity and sensitivity. It goes to the heart of what India and Pakistan each regards as its basic interests in the subcontinent. A settlement would require concessions from both sides. But the risks contained in such concessions would seem by now to be outweighed by the obvious benefits to both countries that a settlement would bring.

A few months ago, the President proposed to the Governments of India and Pakistan that Mr. Eugene R. Black, President of the World Bank, use his good offices as part of an effort to help settle the dispute between the two countries over Kashmir. This initiative was rejected by Prime Minister Nehru. His Minister of Defense, Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, commented:

> There are very few countries competent to arbitrate, because they are mostly on the other side.

The Kashmir issue is clearly of primary concern to India and Pakistan. If both governments were willing to submit the issue to bilateral negotiations the question of a mediator need not arise. However, such is not the case, and Mr. Menon's comment was very wide of the mark.

The United States was one of five members of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, which was impaneled in 1948 to help settle the question. Mr. Black is, of course, an international civil servant, and played a key role in the settlement of the Indus Waters question, another longstanding dispute between India and Pakistan. The United States favors any course of action that will produce a settlement of the Kashmir problem. Whether the approach is through bilateral negotiations, or mediation, is of no consequence. The fact is, however, that only rarely has either side shown any interest in bilateral negotiations with a firm and specific agenda.

The Kashmir question, like most of the other unresolved international disputes, has two sides. For that reason alone, the United States has never favored the position of either disputant. The gravity of the problem is clearly understood in every quarter. Prime Minister Nehru has said:

> On its satisfactory solution depends the future of the Indo-Pakistan relations.

The first Prime Minister of Pakistan, Liaquat Ali Khan said:

> Divided by the suspicions which the Kashmir dispute keeps alive, it is unrealistic to talk of either Pakistan or India successfully playing their role in Asia.

Dr. Henry Grady, the first U.S. Ambassador to India, said:

> Kashmir is the one great problem that may cause the downfall of India and Pakistan.

Mr. Philip Noel-Baker, as British delegate to the Security Council in 1948, said:

> The Kashmir dispute is the greatest and gravest single issue in international affairs. It is the crossroads at which the course of future history will be decided.

Gen. A. G. L. McNaughton, as United Nations mediator, reported to the Security Council in 1950, that:

> So long as the dispute over Kashmir continues, it is a serious drain on the military, economic and, above all, on the spiritual strength of these two great countries.

Dr. Ralph Bunche, a former United Nations Palestine mediator, said in 1953:

> Kashmir is one situation you could never localize if it should flare up. It would influence the whole Muslim world. It is potentially the most dangerous in the world.

For the press, the Economist said in 1951:

> Its solution is the key to the future of the Commonwealth in Asia and to the security of the whole Indian Ocean area.

Kashmir is located at the apex of the subcontinent. It is an area of unsurpassed natural beauty and of unsurpassed strategic importance. Besides India and Pakistan the borders of the territory known as Kashmir touch China, Afghanistan, and Russia.

Prior to the partition of the subcontinent in 1947, Kashmir was one of the largest and most populous of the princely states. In size, it compares with the State of Minnesota. Its population probably numbers around 5 million, of whom nearly 80 percent are Moslems; however, in the vale, the disputed area as well as the political and economic heart of Kashmir, the percentage of Moslems is thought to run at about 90 percent. Kashmir's principal links to the outside world are three rivers—the Jhelum, Chenab, and Indus—which flow into Pakistan. Historically, these served as conduits for the timber, fabrics, fruit and vegetables and other Kashmiri commerce with the outside world.

In 1947, at the time of the British withdrawal from the subcontinent, Kashmir was ruled by a Hindu prince, although most of its people had been Moslem for 500 years. The British Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, announced that independence would mean a break in the link between the British Crown and the princely states. He urged the Princes to accede either to India or to Pakistan, and yield control of their defense, foreign affairs and communications. By independence day, August 15, all but 3 of the 584 princely states had followed Mountbatten's advice. It was obvious that the most complicated problem was posed by Kashmir, whose Maharaja would have preferred to remain independent. Mountbatten made a special visit to Kashmir to advise the Maharaja that independence or dominion status was out of the question. He urged the Maharaja to accede either to India or Pakistan, but to do so only after a plebiscite had clearly established the free will of his people. Mountbatten later wrote:

> Had he acceded to Pakistan before August 14, 1947, the future government of India

> had allowed me to give His Highness an assurance that no objection whatever would be raised by them. The only trouble that could have been raised was by nonaccession to either side, and this was unfortunately the very course followed by the Maharaja.

The Maharaja did announce his willingness to negotiate so-called standstill agreements with both India and Pakistan. On Independence Day, he signed such an agreement with Pakistan, thereby yielding operational control of Kashmir's posts and telegraphs and obligating Pakistan to provide Kashmir with food and other essentials. India never took action on the standstill agreements.

In October, Moslem tribesmen from Pakistan's northwest frontier invaded Kashmir in strength and nearly reached the gates of the capital city. The Maharaja requested Indian military aid. He was told that such aid would become available only if Kashmir acceded to India. On the following day Kashmir did accede to India. Indian troops were airlifted to Kashmir and the invading tribesmen were turned back.

Pakistan also sent troops into Kashmir, but later withdrew them. At Mountbatten's suggestion, India referred the dispute to the United Nations Security Council. There India accused Pakistan of aggression, and threatened reprisals unless Pakistan discontinued its support of the tribesmen. However, India assured the Council that a plebiscite would be held as soon as Kashmir was free of invading Moslems and the situation had been stabilized.

A United Nations Commission brought about a cease fire, which left about two-thirds of Kashmir, including the vale, in Indian control, and the balance with Pakistan.

On January 5, 1949, the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan adopted a resolution designed to settle the Kashmir dispute and acceptable to both disputants. It was the fruition of a long and valiant effort by the Commission to find a basis of joint agreement on procedure. The resolution, in brief, provided for a cessation of hostilities, conditions for a truce, and a reaffirmation by India and Pakistan of their commitment that Kashmir's future would be decided by a plebiscite.

The resolution produced a cease fire, but little more. India asserts that Pakistan has never fulfilled the conditions of a truce, a necessary precondition to a freely conducted plebiscite. Pakistan has said it is willing to withdraw its forces from Kashmir, if India follows suit. India says that would mean equating the aggressor with the legal authority of Kashmir and refuses to comply.

The core of India's argument is that Kashmir is an integral part of India as a result of the act of accession in October 1947. Pakistan argues that the accession was in violation of the Standstill Agreement with Pakistan and, in any case, is superseded by India's heavy commitment to a plebiscite.

That commitment is the most widely known aspect of the Kashmir question, and is central to Pakistan's argument. It was reaffirmed a number of times. In 1948, for example, Prime Minister Nehru said:

> Even at the moment of accession we went out of our way to make a unilateral declaration that we would abide by the will of the people of Kashmir as declared in a plebiscite or referendum. We insisted further that the Government of Kashmir must immediately become a popular government. We have adhered to that position throughout and we are prepared to have a plebiscite, with every protection for fair voting, and to abide by the decision of the people of Kashmir.

In justifying its opposition to carrying out the plebiscite, India has consistently employed the aforementioned arguments—Pakistan's alleged aggression, the legal sanctity of Kashmir's accession. However, neither India nor Pakistan has ever sought to have the legal merits of the problem tested by the International Court of Justice.

The problem is not legal. It turns instead on a great, generally unspoken issue—the vast gap between the Indian and Pakistani view of the subcontinent. India was founded as a secular state, and contains a number of minorities, including about 50 million Moslems, the third largest Moslem concentration in the world. Pakistan is a Moslem state; its creation was bitterly opposed by Gandhi and other Indian leaders. The partition of the subcontinent aroused religious passions and led to communal strife between Hindus and Moslems; an estimated 600,000 people were killed in the Punjab area alone. What India fears is the resolution of any major political question on religious grounds. And this fear accounts primarily for India's opposition to a plebiscite in Kashmir. Ten years ago, a prominent Kashmiri leader, a Moslem, said:

> India will never concede the communal principle that simply because the majority in Kashmir are Moslems, they must be presumed to be in favor of Pakistan. If she does that, her whole fabric of secularism crashes to the ground.

Thus, India and Pakistan approach the Kashmir problem from wholly different premises. India, beset through its brief history by separatist tendencies, seeks to protect the unitary and secular structure of the country, thus preventing its balkanization. Pakistan, a Moslem state, is understandably insistent upon absorbing a small, contiguous, complementary territory, whose rivers play a key role in its economy and whose people share the faith of its people. India, even at the time of partition, has always rejected the principle that Hindus and Moslems could not live together peacefully. For the Moslem leaders of Pakistan, the partition of the subcontinent amounted to a recognition of their theory that the Hindus and Moslems of the subcontinent represented two distinct religious and cultural groupings, for whom political solidarity was not possible.

As time moves on, the two viewpoints, if anything, have moved farther apart. Yet the logic of a Kashmir settlement, if anything, has grown stronger. A settlement would quicken the pace of economic development in the subcontinent. Joint military planning could be undertaken, with heavy savings to both countries as well as greater security for each. Not the least of the benefits would be the psychological lift to the spirit and pride of the people of both countries. Their preoccupation with each other could give way to an even broader role for both countries in world affairs.

The question, obviously, is whether the two viewpoints are irreconcilable. Some say they are, that a settlement will require time and a new generation less persuaded of the sanctity of the respective positions. Others—and I am one—argue that this question should not be assigned to the indefinite future. Its importance to India and Pakistan and their friends is such that any elements of a compromise that have been identified should be picked up and pressed vigorously.

Such elements do exist, at least to the extent that each side is aware of certain defects in its own case and, perhaps more important, of the realities of the situation. India is aware of its plebiscite commitment and of Pakistan's vital interest in the headwaters of those rivers that rise in Kashmir and nourish Pakistani soil. Pakistanis are aware that India is deeply committed to its secular, unitary character and cannot risk a political settlement on strictly communal grounds. President Ayub has hinted that his government is not wedded to the plebiscite principle and might accept less. For example, in an interview with the Times of India on March 1, 1960 President Ayub said:

> Pakistan is definitely not agreeable to a settlement of the Kashmir issue based on freezing the present cease-fire line, but between the alternatives of self determination and the present dividing line there is room for the negotiation of other solutions.

It is not my place to cite some of the alternate approaches to a settlement that have been discussed from time to time. However, the failure of the disputants to raise the level of discussion on Kashmir—their failure even to undertake discussions, bilateral or otherwise, on a realistic basis, is a source of concern and continuing disappointment to their friends.

The world should remember that the modern history of India and Pakistan began just 15 years ago. For both countries, concessions on Kashmir would be in deep conflict with the differing traditions and principles upon which the two societies are built. But Indians and Pakistanis must remember that the size, the capacities, and the objectives of their societies are moving them in the direction of greater growth and influence. With such growth goes responsibility. India and Pakistan have a joint responsibility to settle the Kashmir question. A failure by either country to meet this responsibility would militate against its own best interests, and thus against the best interests of the strongest supporters and friends of both countries, and, I may add, Mr. President, against the interest of world peace, because as long as a dispute remains, it retains the characteristic of being a threat to world peace.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, when the Senate amended the war claims bill, H.R. 7283, by adding certain provisions to the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the divestment of copyrights, apparently through inadvertence the sponsor of the amendment omitted items concerning the divestment of trademarks and the transfer of certain film to the Library of Congress.

These omitted items were included in the draft proposal from the Department of Justice; they were a part of the committee's reported bill, S. 495; and they were included in the House-passed bill, H.R. 9045. Since this matter has been acted upon by the subcommittee and the full Committee on the Judiciary, I ask that the Judiciary Committee of the Senate be relieved of the further consideration of the House-passed bill, H.R. 9045.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and House bill 9045 will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House bill 9045, to amend the Trading With The Enemy Act, as amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator the purpose of this amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am doing this at the request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the leadership, in order to clarify and correct an error which was made. By inadvertence, the items in regard to the divestment of trademarks and the transfer of certain film to the Library of Congress were omitted from the bill, although they should have been included. But inadvertently they were omitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is this another blooper?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No. The other day, when the war claims bill, H.R. 7283, was considered by the Senate, and was amended by adding certain provisions to the Trading With the Enemy Act, inadverently these items were omitted, although they should have been included. They concern the divestment of trademarks and the transfer of certain film to the Library of Congress. The provisions in question have been cleared with members of the committee and supposedly with all interested parties concerned, both Republican and Democrat.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I may not object, but I wonder whether this matter should not go over. Apparently this is another error or "blooper" in a recently enacted bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. It has been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am a little concerned to find that almost every day it is necessary to correct measures which were passed on a previous day. If this keeps up this Congress will be known as the "superblooper" Congress. A mistake was made in the passage of a farm bill, and it was found necessary to correct that "blooper" even before the ink on the bill was dry; and a mistake was made in passing the postal rate bill, and that mistake had to be corrected in the House when a point of order was raised.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am doing this at the request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If the Senator from Delaware wishes to object, of course he may do so. But these amendments do not involve new matter; they have previously been adopted by the Senate. My purpose is merely to have this clarification made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was told that a correction will be needed in connection with the recently enacted tax bill; in that instance a $100-million error has been made. This is some "blooper." I am afraid that if this process continues this Congress will be known as the "superblooper" Congress.

I may have no objection to the bill to which the Senator from South Carolina has referred after it has been examined, but I suggest that he just make his remarks now and then request it go over until tomorrow. Then some of us can examine this proposed bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If the Senator so desires. It involves a House bill, and a conference will be required. Time is running short and the matter must be considered shortly, else no time will be available to appoint conferees and have a conference. This is my main purpose in trying to dispose of the bill today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But there is every indication that there will be ample time for a conference, if necessary. I ask that this matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as I previously stated, no new matter is contained in these amendments. The only purpose is to correct an inadvertent omission of the provisions in regard to the divestment of trademarks and the transfer of certain film to the Library of Congress. My proposal would strike from H.R. 9045 all language except that relating to the divestment of trademarks and the release of certain films to the Library of Congress. This amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, along with the amendments which the Senate added to H.R. 7283, represents the recommendations from the Committee on the Judiciary, and will conform with the bill passed by the House in respect to the divestment of copyrights and trademarks and the transfer of film to the Library of Congress.

Therefore, I ask that the bill be considered and the amendments be agreed to at this time. This proposal has been passed on by the Senate Judiciary Committee and by the House and by the Senate, but these provisions were not included in House bill 7283, and therefore they are not a part of that law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina makes a persuasive argument, and perhaps tomorrow all of us will be in agreement that the amendments should be adopted. However, in order that we may know just what we shall be doing I still request that this matter go over until tomorrow. It may be we shall decide it necessary to set aside a special day to be called "superblooper" correction day.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I submit the amendments and ask that they be printed in the RECORD, so that the Senator from Delaware can read them. Then he can do whatever he pleases.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1246; 50 U.S.C., App., sec. 39), is amended to read as follows: "Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of section 32, 40, 41, 42, or 43 of this Act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946."

SEC. 2. The Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following sections:

"SEC. 42. (a) As used in this section, the word 'trademarks' includes trademarks, trade names, and the goodwill of the business to which a trademark or trade name is appurtenant.

"(b) Trademarks vested in the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under the provisions of this Act subsequent to December 17, 1941, which have not been returned or otherwise disposed of under this Act, except trademarks vested by vesting orders 284, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 9754, 9 Fed. Reg. 1038), 2354 (8 Fed. Reg. 14635), 5592 (11 Fed. Reg. 1675), and 18805 (17 Fed. Reg. 4364), are hereby divested as a matter of grace, effective the ninety-first day after the date of enactment of this section, and the persons entitled to such trademarks shall on that day succeed to the rights, privileges, and obligations arising therefrom, subject, however, to the rights of licensees under licenses issued by the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General in respect to such trademarks. The rights and interests remaining in the Attorney General under licenses issued by him or by the Alien Property Custodian in respect to trademarks divested hereunder are hereby transferred, effective the day of divestment, to the persons entitled to such trademarks: *Provided*, That all unpaid royalties or other income accrued in favor of the Attorney General under such licenses prior to the day of divestment shall be paid by the licensees to the Attorney General.

"(c) All rights or interests vested in the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under the provisions of this Act subsequent to December 17, 1941, arising out of prevesting contracts entered into with respect to trademarks, except—

"(1) royalties or other income received by or accrued in favor of the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under such contracts;

"(2) rights or interests which have been returned or otherwise disposed of under this Act; and

"(3) rights or interests vested by vesting orders 284, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 9754; 9 Fed. Reg. 1038), 2354 (8 Fed. Reg. 14635), 5592 (11 Fed. Reg. 1675), and 18805 (17 Fed. Reg. 4364),

are hereby divested as a matter of grace, effective the ninety-first day after the date of enactment of this section, and the persons entitled to such rights or interests shall succeed thereto, subject to the right of the

Attorney General to collect and receive all unpaid royalties or other income accrued in his favor under such prevesting contracts prior to the day of divestment.

"(d) The Attorney General shall within forty-five days after the date of enactment of this section publish in the Federal Register a list of trademarks which at the date of vesting in the Alien Property Custodian or Attorney General were owned by persons who were resident in or had their sole or primary seat in the area of Germany now in the Soviet Zone of Occupation or in the Soviet Sector of Berlin or in German territory under provisional Soviet or Polish administration. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the effective date of divestment of the trademarks so listed and published in the Federal Register shall be the date of publication in the Federal Register by the Secretary of State of a certification identifying the cases in which an equivalent trademark has been registered in the Federal Republic of Germany for a person residing or having its sole or primary seat in the Federal Republic of Germany or in the western sectors of Berlin. In those cases of an equivalent trademark certified by the Secretary of State, the person registered by the Federal Republic of Germany as owner of such equivalent trademark shall succeed to the ownership of the divested trademark in the United States.

"SEC. 42. (a) The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Library of Congress the title to all prints of motion pictures now in the custody of the Library, which prints were vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General pursuant to this Act after December 17, 1941, except prints of motion pictures which are the subject of suits or claims under section 9(a) or section 32 of this Act.

"(b) Subject to the right of selection by the Library of Congress, the authorization, direction, and exception contained in subsection (a) hereof shall apply with respect to such prints now in the custody of the Attorney General. Prints not selected by the Library of Congress may be disposed of by the Attorney General in any manner he deems appropriate.

"(c) With respect to all prints concerning which title is transferred to the Library of Congress pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) hereof, the Library shall have complete discretion to retain such prints and to reproduce copies thereof, or to dispose of them in any manner it deems appropriate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina withdraw his request for the present consideration of House bill 9045?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, if the Senator from Delaware still objects to my request for the immediate consideration of House bill 9045.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

LAND-GRANT COLLEGE—AGRICULTURE EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, last July 2, along with many others, I spoke on the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Act, or the Land-Grant College Act.

Many great acts have been adopted by the Congress through the years. The Morrill Act, and the Research and Cooperative Extension Acts that followed, have been among the historic and truly beneficial ones. They are important because of the principles on which they were based and which they have helped establish.

Today, I want to discuss and pay tribute in particular to the cooperative extension and research contributions that have resulted from the work of our land-grant colleges and the Department of Agriculture.

We in this country enjoy many freedoms. One of the most important is freedom from hunger. We take food for granted, while others throughout the world go hungry. Food is a great national problem in China. It is one of Russia's most pressing problems. But, in America, it is one of our greatest strengths.

One hundred years ago we were a young and expanding Nation. There was great clamor for developing our land, for moving westward. Congress passed the Homestead Act about the time of the adoption of the Land-Grant College Act and the act establishing the Department of Agriculture.

We had the soil, the water, the forests for a great nation. We had wide expanses of land and other natural resources. We had a brave, pioneering people.

In setting up the land-grant colleges Congress provided practical education for the sons of farmers and other laboring people, a practical education which had to do with meeting the problems of everyday life.

This program emphasized the need for research, our dependence on science, on facts, on good management and sound economics. It developed our cooperative extension system, making certain that the results of that research and good farming practices reached the people.

Here, in the story of agricultural research and extension, we have a true partnership between the Federal Government and the States. Much of this research has been done jointly between the State experiment stations and the Department of Agriculture. The purpose is to gather scientific knowledge and to apply it. And in the extension work, so necessary to disseminating the research results, control has been left in the hands of the local people. Extension's job is one of giving the facts and encouraging application of the same.

The result has been a technological revolution. When we realize how our farmers have doubled and redoubled yields and increased efficiency, how fewer farmers with greater investment and many complicated processes farm so much better, it is clear that we have had and are in the midst of a technological revolution.

Let me cite an example of Pearl River County, Miss.

When Jacob Megehee began a 4-H dairy project 10 years ago, his family had 80 acres of poor land. Its best crops were weeds. Now they have 136 acres and every bit of it, except three lakes, is in good grass, some of it knee deep. They have a prize dairy herd. A truck, a car and two tractors have replaced the two mules the family had 10 years ago. Jacob is majoring in dairy at Mississippi State University, where his two brothers have already graduated.

That is the story of what has been happening in American agriculture. It has been happening on big and small farms in Mississippi and over the Nation. Science has given us better crops, animals, and methods. We have learned to fertilize and manage the tender crops as exactingly as we feed babies. We have learned how to fight the insects and diseases that have taken so large a toll of our crops. We have had to learn how to adjust to the climate and the soil that God has given us, how to grow more efficiently what the consumer wants, and how to package and ship it and sell it more efficiently.

These are some of the things Jacob Megehee and his family and thousands like them, through knowledge, have brought about. This knowledge has been gained from research, from seeing their neighbors' progress, from their own projects and study, and from teaming up in their own community improvement efforts.

Jacob and about 100,000 other 4-H boys and girls in Mississippi alone are learning through the very practical 4-H Club livestock, crop, safety, tractor, insect, citizenship, and other projects they carry out on their own farms. Ten years of 4-H projects left Jacob with a prize dairy herd, and the determination to go to college.

Back of that fine grass and other improvements on the Megehee farm were years of research in plant breeding, soil testing, fertilizing, insect control, in field experiments and demonstrations, and the other knowledge and experience which county agents of the Cooperative Extension Service had put at the fingertips of the Megehee family. The county agents were available to assist the family and the neighbors to get higher yields, more production and better quality at less cost, and a higher standard of living.

Like the land-grant colleges, the county extension agent is uniquely American. Just as the land-grant colleges came into being as the people's college, the extension agent is clearly the people's agent. He's hired first, and in part paid by the county government. He works under the guidance of a local advisory group. He's a part of the State agricultural or land-grant college, of which he likely is a graduate, and is in part paid by the college. He is also a part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, serves as its field education arm, and is in part paid by funds from the Federal Congress.

We are proud of what this type of teamwork—Federal, State, and county, together with the people—has meant to Mississippi and of what it can mean toward helping our people meet some of their more pressing adjustments and continue progress. I know there are similar results in every State.

Great progress has been made, but much is still to be done, especially in the field of research. A large part of the research and extension that we are carrying out today is necessary just to keep up with our progress in farming. We have developed an extremely complicated, highly competitive type of agriculture. It demands the very best management, adjustment to changing markets and technological progress. Much of the progress we have made has been due to a better control of insect and disease pests which in the past have taken such a high toll of our crops and livestock. While we have developed new ways to control many of these pests, the pests have built up resistance to our controls. Our scientists must be constantly on the search for new controls, and new pest resistant plants.

Several years we have had in our rural Mississippi counties a strong rural community improvement program. Just as they have helped farmers with their individual problems, our county extension agents and home demonstration agents and those who work with the youth and 4-H Clubs have helped our rural communities organize. They've helped them get the facts to develop and carry forward their own community improvement programs. Many of these community improvement programs are now getting help from the rural area development program—in which the Federal Government and other agencies are giving added coordinated cooperation. These local citizen committees, with the advisory help and counsel from all outside sources they can muster, are dealing with some of the most pressing agricultural and economic problems of our rural communities. In this program our cooperative extension agents are able to give and are giving vital educational and organizational leadership.

Our land-grant colleges, and the cooperative research and extension system that has come with them, have done much through agricultural technology to bring us the food abundance that is ours.

The success of this program has been due in large measure to adherence to these basic factors: First, research to get the facts; second, education for practical use; and third, localized responsibility and leadership.

I know firsthand the contribution made over the years in my own State of Mississippi by the hundreds of loyal and dedicated workers in Extension and the Agriculture Research Service. Their efforts will continue to bear rich fruit for generations yet unborn. And under the capable leadership of Dr. E. T. York and Dr. Byron T. Shaw, I am confident an even greater success story will be written in the future through the vital work of those in Extension and our Agriculture Research Service.

In my State many outstanding graduates of Mississippi State University and other colleges and universities have served in an outstanding way as directors of the extension service and as directors of research centers. Mr. W. M. Bost is now serving as director of the State extension service; and Dr. H. H. Lewick is serving as director of our experiment stations. Each of these gentlemen and his excellent staff and workers are performing an outstanding service.

I have observed this extension work and the agricultural research work since the time when I was a boy during the time when I was in college, and now during my adult lifetime, much of which has been spent in public service.

The great training which American youth has had in citizenship throughout our Nation has been one of the outstanding contributions and values that have come from the investment of a relatively small amount of money and a great amount of effort by leaders in this vast program. It has brought forth a food and fiber program unequaled anywhere in the world by any civilization in any time. We are concerned today about surpluses instead of scarcities, in great and essential commodities. The program has helped to make us a strong Nation and has helped to give us fine citizens. Perhaps the greatest contribution has been the development of fine citizenship, as opportunities, inspirations, and leadership courses have been effective through the rural communities, particularly in the villages and small towns. Young minds are challenged, and great fields of opportunity are opening up to them, thus giving them leadership and direction which have led them into productive channels.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who is very much interested in this program in Congress. For many years he has given it his very fine support.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have thoroughly enjoyed the timely remarks of the Senator from Mississippi, on the occasion marking the centennial of the enactment by Congress and the signing by the President of the Morrill Act, which has meant so much to this country.

Under that act land-grant colleges sprang up in every State.

The Senator from Mississippi mentioned the land-grant college of his State. In my State we have Alabama Polytechnic, at Auburn.

Mr. STENNIS. It is one of the best.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is the alma mater of Dr. E. T. York, whom the Senator mentioned. We are proud of the fact that he is the head of the Extension Service of the whole Nation. He is an Alabama product. He was extension director for the State of Alabama, and in that position he rendered distinguished service, as he is now doing for the whole United States as National Director.

Mr. STENNIS. I have viewed Dr. York's work with greater and greater appreciation and admiration as the years have passed. He has made a profound impression upon all of us. He is rendering a great service as National Director of the Extension Service.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He is dedicated to his work and is tireless in his efforts in this great field.

While the Senator was speaking I was thinking about some farm extension work in my State. I do not know whether the Senator had this experience, but I grew up on a farm. I was a farm boy. I remember the times, when I was only a boy, when the county agent came to our farm from time to time, demonstrating better methods of farming. When I think of farming then, as contrasted with farming now, I realize what the full impact of the research and experimental and educational program has done for agriculture in this country.

Not so long ago 50 percent of the people of the United States were engaged in farming. Today, a nation of 180 million souls and a great part of the world are fed by the 10 percent of the people who produce our agricultural products. I think it is remarkable that 10 percent of the people can produce the bountiful crops which this country raises. I should not say this is the envy of the world; but certainly, as the Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, nowhere else in all the world has that record been equaled.

In contrast, I think it is interesting to observe that 50 percent of the people of Russia are required to carry on their agriculture, and we know that they have difficulty in producing enough food. I believe much of the difference between the two countries lies in what has been done by means of the worthwhile programs which have been so ably discussed by the Senator from Mississippi.

The Senator from Mississippi mentioned the 4-H Clubs. I take advantage of this opportunity to boast that I am a 4-H member. I was one of the original members, when I was a boy. In those days, the organization was not known as the 4-H Club. There were corn clubs for the boys, and tomato clubs or canning clubs for the girls. I was a corn club boy. Later, after the 4-H Clubs were started, I was initiated into a 4-H Club. I proudly display on my desk my 4-H emblem, my 4-H key. I take great pride in having been a 4-H boy. What those boys and girls are doing in agriculture is one of the finest things to behold in this country. In my State, the press has been very liberal in its publicity concerning farm programs, especially farm programs for boys and girls. I always take great delight in seeing pictures and reading articles about the various farm projects in which the boys and girls are engaged. They are building for the future and are doing remarkable work. It is a part of the united programs which the Senator from Mississippi has so well discussed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his kind remarks about the program. I join heartily with him in the point he has made.

I am glad to know that the Senator from Alabama is a former corn club member. The corn clubs originated in Holmes County, Miss., in a movement led by a gentleman who later became president of Mississippi State University. He was the president when I was a student there. Hallowed be his memory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, who is an ardent sponsor of legislation with respect to the Extension Service and the cooperative agricultural program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the most delightful parts of my public service in the Senate has been the opportunity to work with the Senator from Mississippi and other Senators who are deeply concerned about and highly effective in their sponsorship of proposed legislation relating to the welfare of farm families in agricultural areas. I served for 8 years on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Now I am privileged to serve on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

I have always found that one of the most heartening aspects of our work in Congress is to legislate, appropriate, and discuss items relating to agricultural research, Extension Service, international agricultural training, 4-H Clubs, and all the many other activities which relate to the improvement of our agricultural areas.

The Senator has very appropriately commended the Extension Service and 4-H Clubs. In Minnesota, which is predominantly an agricultural State, as are the States of Alabama and Mississippi, the 4-H Clubs are an outstanding activity. The State director of 4-H Club activity in Minnesota, Mr. Harkness, is one of our outstanding citizens. The young people who engage in the 4-H Club activities really become the reserve strength of America's agricultural life. Many of them become civic and community leaders as they mature into manhood and womanhood.

I commend the Senator from Mississippi upon his sponsorship of programs for agricultural research and reforestation. What these programs have meant to the Nation is very evident. This Nation has the finest, most modern, scientific agriculture that the world has ever known. There is nothing with which to compare it. It is, indeed, the envy of every intelligent person. When the Soviet Minister of Agriculture was in the United States only recently, he could not deny—nor did he—that our agriculture was superior to any other that he had seen.

I direct the Senator's attention for a moment to the Extension Service. It seems to me that if there is one type of program which we ought to export in terms of our overall foreign aid and technical assistance program, it is the Extension Service or county agent program. We have already done this in some areas, and we did it following the war in Western Europe. We helped to establish 4-H Club activities in Austria and Germany, and we are now doing it in Brazil and some other areas of Latin America.

But above all, I think we must act for the long pull, and that can be done by establishing the Extension Service activities on a regional or county basis or whatever the jurisdiction may be, and then to couple that with the experiment station activity. All of us are proud that throughout America agricultural experiment stations have been established, where opportunities are afforded to experiment with animals, seed, farm practices, and conservation practices, in the areas where it is necessary to apply the practices on a local or a regional basis. It seems to me that we would be performing a much needed service if we were to step up these programs.

I mention this because I have a feeling that we have been "pulled in" to a program of industrializing countries when they are not ready for industrialization. As every Senator knows, modern industry requires much capital, a large body of skilled mechanics, and a great deal of managerial know-how. But before a country can really become industrialized, it is necessary to have its agriculture in such condition that it is productive and can release manpower for the factories, and thus create capital.

I was reading an article recently in an agricultural journal. The article pointed out that every country which has been successful industrially has had to earn its capital from agriculture. In other words, agriculture had to be updated and made sufficiently efficient and productive so as to provide an accumulation of reserve capital.

So it seems to me that rather than to be constantly thinking about the large loan programs we can establish for the building of steel plants or other huge industrial operations, we would be better guided to emphasize that area of human activity called agriculture, and to modernize and improve it throughout the world as a part of the great service we seek to perform for humanity.

Also, this program fulfills the Biblical admonition to feed the hungry. There is no way in which we alone can feed them; they must be taught to feed themselves.

In the Peace Corps today the single most urgent need is for men and women who understand practical agriculture. Today men and women are wanted who can teach people in far-off places what we have already practiced and learned during many generations of agriculture. I think this story needs to be told again and again.

As the Senator from Mississippi was speaking, I saw below my desk a copy of a document relating to the Department of Agriculture Appropriation bill for 1963. This is the bill in which one item still must be reconciled. But it was a timely reminder that one reason why American agriculture is as good as it is is that we have put our resources into it. We have put back into the soil, into the farm, into the know-how, the resources which are necessary.

One of the reasons why Soviet agriculture is so backward, aside from its collective agriculture system, which I think destroys initiative, is that the Soviets have allowed their resources to be devoted to other things. As a result, Soviet agriculture has been degraded.

On the other hand, Mr. President, by means of the programs to which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] have given such outstanding leadership—programs including those for rural electrification, irrigation, reclamation, agricultural experiment stations, and the great scientific laboratories for agriculture—American agriculture has become the wonder of the world; and our only problem in connection with it is overproduction. I repeat a thousand times over that if that is the only problem our country has, we can thank Almighty God for such a glorious opportunity to live with such a small problem. Imagine our situation if, instead, our problem were one of underproduction.

So, Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Mississippi for his timely message today. Certainly if the Congress consistently supports these activities, our country will continue to have a successful agricultural economy, and the young men and young women on the farms will mature to become the finest citizens any country could possibly hope to have.

I wish to pay my tribute to the 4-H Clubs and to the Future Farmers of America. The members of these groups—some of our finest young people—are able to take advantage of the programs under the George-Dean Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and also those under the earlier Smith-Hughes Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Both of those are famous acts by which the Federal Government gives assistance to vocational training.

When I visit the county fairs—although these days I seldom have an opportunity to do so, because of the length of the sessions of Congress—certainly one of the most enjoyable experiences is to see the 4-H Club exhibits and the young farm folks with their farm animals, and to see the young ladies with the dresses they enter in the style-show competition. I do not know whether those dresses are as good as those made by Christian Dior, but certainly they are good enough; they look very fine. It is a real treat to see those young farm folks in their spotless jackets. Their contributions to agriculture and to the entire Nation are most important, and everyone who sees them is very, very proud of American agriculture.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks, and also for his continued and consistent support of these agricultural programs. He serves with me on the Appropriations Subcommittee which passes on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

Incidentally, let me refer to the relatively small amounts appropriated in those bills in support of the Agricultural Extension Service and the related programs which we have been discussing. In all the budget on which we pass each year, I do not think there is any item which brings greater returns—and few could possibly bring as many—than those brought by the few dollars of Federal funds which are spent on these far-reaching programs. Over the years they have brought very great and favorable results.

When we passed the salary increase bill, the other day, it was a matter of great regret that we could not include in it an effective provision for a fair increase in the salaries of those in the Extension Service and those who are employed in the State experiment stations, whose salaries are paid in part by the Federal Government. But the supplemental appropriation bill will provide funds for this item; and if it is not cared for in that way, certainly in January we shall make an effort to make this adjustment for a corresponding increase in the Federal share of the funds for these salaries.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution to our consideration of these subjects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Minnesota was discussing the contribution which could be made to other countries by helping them step up their production of food. Certainly that is most important. Our country's Extension Service has rendered most important service in that respect.

Soon after the point 4 program was initiated by President Truman, one of the first real efforts made under that program was the stepping up of food production and agricultural pursuits in India. Senators will remember that perhaps the outstanding job done in that connection was done by a county agent named Holmes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He had been working as a county agent in west Tennessee, as I recall. He went to India—although probably without any instructions to do so; and because of his training and his experience, he was able to help the people in the villages with the selection of seed; and he showed them how to fasten pieces of iron to the side of their wooden plows, enabling them to plow better and deeper furrows; and he taught them the utilization of fertilizer and better farming methods. I am sure Senators remember the display in Life magazine, showing him at work. He testified before the Foreign Relations Committee, as Senators will recall.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That part of our foreign-aid program should receive more attention. I am sure many Senators feel as I do. I have long felt that the finest part of the foreign-aid program was the point 4 program. We need more of it; and our Extension Service and the State experiment stations and our agricultural workers generally can, in that way, make great contributions to the world.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I agree with him.

I point out that the Future Farmers of America program is a very fine and constructive one. It receives some Federal funds, although under a different appropriation bill. It is really a different program from the ones we have been discussing today, but it supplements the 4-H Club work.

Mention has been made of the comparatively small number of Americans who now are employed in the farming business, as compared with the number heretofore employed in it. It is sad that the number of rural people and farm people has so greatly decreased, with the result that thereby they are losing, to a degree, their political impact and their other influences on the Nation as a whole.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, OF KANSAS

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, before I yield the floor, I wish to make some remarks in regard to our late colleague, Senator Andrew Schoeppel, of Kansas, who passed away in the first part of the year. I was away from the Chamber on the day when the tributes were paid to him and, therefore, I did not have an opportunity at that time to express my sentiments.

Senator Schoeppel and I came to the Senate at about the same time. Our years together here on a personal basis were very happy ones, indeed. We were thrown together on some committee work, as well as in connection with the work here on the floor of the Senate, where I learned, early, to appreciate the very fine qualities of character that always displayed themselves in his work and in his activities at all times. He had all the fine qualities of a gentleman.

Furthermore, the late Senator Andrew Schoeppel was endowed with very fine qualities of leadership. He was a great worker, and he understood human nature and human problems. He applied himself with very great energy and enthusiasm to the subject matters assigned to him, and he was very greatly concerned with the welfare of the people of his State, as a unit of the United States and, of course, with the welfare of our great Nation.

I am among those who considered him eminently qualified to serve as a Member of this body, where the strain sometimes is terrific and the problems onerous, where they pile rapidly one upon the other, and when there is no full solution to be gained from any source. Under such conditions, we must work together, giving some here, taking some there, in an effort to find a common ground among us which is sound for the Nation. Senator Schoeppel was eminently qualified in those respects, as well as in every other respect. Not only was he eminently qualified to serve in the Senate, but he did serve with the greatest distinction and with the greatest merit and accomplishment.

We continue to feel the loss of his services here, but we are confident that the fine work he did in the 12 or more years he was here contributed to the strength and the solid foundations of our Government and made the fundamental principles of our Government even stronger. That work will live on far beyond our time.

I feel confident that the God this fine character and manly person faithfully served affords his soul a lasting resting place, and that his family will in some way be enabled to understand the workings of the Spiritual Father. I join in extending them this expression of loss, and at the same time share with them great pride in the achievement and services of this very fine man.

I yield the floor.

APPROPRIATION FOR PATENT OFFICE

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, I take this opportunity to again commend the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for his usual outstanding service as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, and Related Agencies, and with particular reference to H.R. 12580, the current bill for such appropriations. This same commendation and expression of gratitude also goes to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who was chairman of the hearings dealing with appropriations in that bill for the Department of Commerce and related agencies.

As a result of the patience and thoroughness of both of these gentlemen, the appropriations for these agencies have been processed with a great deal of care and skill. They have worked hard to make certain that only those items of compelling justification would receive increases over the House allowances.

There is one item finally agreed upon in conference which is particularly disappointing to me. I refer to the appropriation for the Patent Office. A full restoration of the House reduction of $1.9 million was requested. After careful deliberation, the Senate restored $1.3 million. In conference, however, this increase was reduced to $150,000.

In view of the disturbing situation now facing the Patent Office, I regret that there has been such a drastic cut in the funds requested. Mr. David Ladd, Commissioner of Patents, in referring to the oppressive workload of his office, has sounded the warning that the patent examination system in this country has entered into a period of "crisis." At the subcommittee's hearings, he pointed out that this is due to several factors, which include, first, the steady trend toward more patent applications each year; second, the increasing complexity of disclosures in these applications; third, the increasing burden of the searchload; and fourth, an unprecedented level of personnel turnover.

These problems have also been recognized by the Senate Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights. In its report dated May 9, 1962, the subcommittee expressed its concern over "the critical situation confronting the operations of the Patent Office." The subcommittee stated that the "very survival of the patent system, as it now exists, is at stake."

The Patent Office, under its able Commissioner, Mr. Ladd, has done a remarkable job of carrying on with the resources at hand. However, if there are to be long-range improvements, Mr. Ladd must be given the necessary funds with which to work.

The budget requests which the Senate was asked to restore were intended for these long-range improvements. More specifically, these funds were requested, first, for the Patent Office's research and development program; second, a modernizing program for placing files on microfilm; and third, the establishment of an improved training program. The denial of these funds will necessarily restrict the Patent Office in its efforts to improve its procedures and reduce its backlog of cases.

Sooner or later Congress must come to grips with the problem. Otherwise, we may find our patent system collapsing under its own weight. I feel that the need for this money has been clearly demonstrated and am hopeful that this item will be given a high priority next year.

MINNESOTA HONORED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, one of the key reasons for America's economic strength is the volume of our export trade. And one of the major challenges to the Nation and its business community today is to increase the volume of our exports.

The exciting development and success of the European Common Market has underlined this challenge. As the world grows smaller in the jet age, as free nations draw closer together with modern trade agreements, as America's productive capacity increases, we are compelled to step up sale of our products to nations overseas.

We have no choice. If the United States is to fulfill its productive capacity, if our economy is to attain increased vitality and strength, if our people are to see unemployment and pockets of depression erased from America, we must intensify our efforts to find, hold, and increase oversea markets for our products.

Such steps as the new trade program advanced by the President and approved by Congress this summer will help. But ultimately, our success in expanding our export trade will stem from the individual efforts of American business and industrial firms.

As I said yesterday, Madam President, our foreign aid program is also a very helpful enterprise in terms of improving our export position, not only because between 78 and 80 cents out of each foreign aid dollar is expended in the United States for goods and services to be shipped abroad but also because the foreign aid program stimulates and expands the economies of the countries to which the foreign aid is dedicated.

I am proud that Minnesota business firms are responding to the challenge. I am pleased that their efforts are being recognized and commended.

The most recent recognition came in the form of President Kennedy's "E for Export" Awards to three Minnesota firms. The firms are Gray Co., Inc., a manufacturer of lubrication and paint spraying equipment, of Minneapolis; the Toro Manufacturing Co., a producer of power mowers, of Minneapolis; and the Owatonna Tool Co., a manufacturer of tools and hydraulic equipment, of Owatonna.

These are three modern, enterprising industrial plants, with excellent management, skilled workers, and fine patterns of labor-management relationships.

Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges presented representatives of these firms with blue and white E pennants symbolizing export excellence and honoring their achievements in sales overseas.

It was my privilege, along with Representative MacGregor, of the Third Congressional District of Minnesota, and Representative Quie, of the First Congressional District of Minnesota, to be present at those ceremonies. I was very much impressed by the attention given to the ceremonies by the Secretary of Commerce, and even more impressed by the fact that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, is today America's leading salesman, in the sense that he is promoting American export business every day and every hour of the day.

Previous E-for-Export awards were presented to three other Minnesota firms: Advance Engineering Co. and Onan Division of Studebaker-Packard Corp., both of Minneapolis, and the American Hoist Derrick Co., of St. Paul.

These are outstanding industrial and manufacturing firms, all of which have had a good record of production for the civilian economy and for our Defense Establishment.

I congratulate the management and the workers of these Minnesota firms for the E awards presented to them. And I hope that their example will encourage other firms throughout the Nation to expand their export trade efforts.

Madam President, I ask that a Department of Commerce release of October 1, announcing the E awards for these Minnesota firms, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Three Minnesota Firms Win E-For-Export Awards

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges today (9:30 a.m., Monday, October 1, 1962) presented President Kennedy's E-for-Export Award to three Minnesota industrial firms.

The winning firms, honored for their significant contribution to the national export expansion drive, are: Gray Co., Inc. (manufacturer of lubrication and paint spraying equipment), and Toro Manufacturing Co. (power mower manufacturer), both of Minneapolis; and Owatonna Tool Co. (manufacturer of tools and hydraulic equipment), Owatonna.

Blue and white E pennants symbolizing export excellence were presented to the winning companies by Secretary Hodges in his office in the U.S. Department of Commerce in Washington, D.C.

E citations, signed by the Secretary, were also presented to the Minnesota firms.

The E pennants, a revival of the E flags awarded for military production excellence during World War II, will fly above the award winners' plants and offices.

Three Minnesota firms, Advance Engineering Co., and Onan Division of Studebaker-Packard Corp., both of Minneapolis and American Hoist and Derrick Co., St. Paul, have previously been honored by an E award for export excellence.

E winners are named by Secretary Hodges following a review of the company's export programs by a Government-wide Awards Committee. Members of this Committee include representatives from the Departments of Commerce, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, the Small Business Administration, and other Federal Government agencies.

The E award is granted in two categories: Companies which manufacture products for exports; and companies, individuals, organizations, and institutions which work in support of increased exports. Special E awards are also presented to firms, individuals, or organizations that contribute significantly to the growth of travel in the United States by visitors from abroad.

Details on the newest E winners follow:

Gray Co., Inc., 60 11th Avenue NE., Minneapolis, Minn.: The company manufactures lubrication equipment, paint spraying equipment, and air-operated pumps for transfer of fluids and semifluids. It has scored substantial successes in selling these products in oversea markets. Total net sales volume in 1960 increased 40 percent over 1959 and 1961 sales were 20 percent greater than 1960. New products introduced to the international market during the past 2 years included the Graco Hydra-Spray airless system of spray painting, and the Hydra-Clean high pressure cleaning system for automotive service stations.

Owatonna Tool Co., Owatonna, Minn.: Manufacturer of precision hydraulic equipment, pumps, valves, special equipment for autos and trucks, and various tools. Owatonna Tool Co. has, since the inception of its International Division in 1954, increased its exports on a sustained basis in excess of 35 percent each year. During the past 7 years the company developed new markets abroad for its hydraulic pulling systems and hydraulic maintenance equipment. Owatonna products are now sold in 100 countries.

Toro Manufacturing Corp., 3042 Snelling Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.: Ten years ago, Toro Manufacturing Corp. had just one distributor in Europe for its power moving equipment. Since then Toro has become firmly established in oversea markets. Export sales of power moving equipment has increased at a substantial rate, and Toro overseas sales in 1961 represented better than 33 percent of the total U.S. export sales of power mowers. The company has urged its oversea distributors to take on allied lines such as seeds, fertilizers, garden tools, etc., which has resulted in such products being imported from the United States.

DRUG HEARINGS PLANNED IN DECEMBER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, before the Senate concludes its business for today, I wish to make an announcement that the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, which has specific responsibility by special resolution for inquiry and study into scientific research, will hold three hearings on the Federal administration of drug laws before the start of the new Congress in January, probably sometime during the month of December. The exact dates will be announced later.

I make this announcement because I wish to alert the appropriate agencies of Government as to these hearings.

With the new drug safety law and the new drug regulations, the Food and Drug Administration is, in effect, challenged to attain the highest standards of scientific and administrative excellence.

New burdens are being placed on the agency. I am hopeful that, in respect to the budget for the coming fiscal year, the administration will carefully review the needs of the Food and Drug Administration for adequate personnel. It is not proper to impose new obligations and new duties upon the Food and Drug Administration without providing that Administration with the manpower to properly fulfill its duties. This agency has lived on a starvation diet of professional talent and personnel, due to the inadequacy of funds, for many years. It is about time, since we have passed a new law requiring new duties, that the Food and Drug Administration be given every possible help from the Congress in order for it to fulfill its responsibilities.

The new law and regulations will thrust upon FDA the greatest volume of reports, information, and forms which have ever confronted the agency in its history. The question before the subcommittee is: Does the agency demonstrate administrative capability; for example, for using, evaluating, storing, retrieving all types of information? Once again, past evidence casts doubt as to an affirmative answer to that question, unless adequate personnel is provided.

Long before the December hearings are held, the report of the Second Citizens Advisory Committee of the Food and Drug Administration will have been received. By that time, also, I will have examined the working papers which went into this report. Secretary Celebrezze promptly and helpfully approved my request to see these working papers as soon as available.

I wish to express my thanks to Secretary Celebrezze for his splendid cooperation in respect to all the endeavors and activities of the subcommittee. He has been most helpful. It is quite obvious that he seeks to improve the professional standards of the Food and Drug Administration.

Depending upon what the working papers, as well as the report itself, reveal, the hearings will examine whichever phases appear to be most significant and useful for the public good.

However, we will want to know why the report of the First Citizens Advisory Committee, back in 1955, was virtually ignored during these past 7 years.

We will want to know why the scientific judgment expressed by a National Academy of Sciences panel to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur Flemming, in 1960, was likewise ignored.

We will want to know, too, why scientific standards apparently had sunk so low and the condition was so ignored by other scientists that it was necessary for the First and Second Citizens Committees—almost all of whom are laymen—to sound a scientific alarm.

The hearings are intended as a study not as an investigation. Investigations, as such, are the responsibility of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is the able chairman.

FDA has many dedicated, able scientific and administrative personnel. It is a source of deepest regret to me that, because of a variety of circumstances, they have not been able to make this agency what it should long since have become—a center of excellence.

Much of the responsibility for that rests upon this Congress and upon previous Congresses, because if an agency is to do its job it must have needed professional personnel. Also, part of the responsibility must rest upon those who have reviewed the budget estimates presented throughout many years of the history of this agency. We should not expect the Food and Drug Administration to fulfill its responsibilities without being provided the tools with which to do the job.

We will wish to determine why this agency has not fulfilled some of the requirements and standards expected of it.

The new drug law and regulations can help usher in a new era of pharmaceutical advances, accompanied by a greater measure of safety, provided standards within the agency are upgraded.

The new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has a golden opportunity, and one which I am confident he will welcome and utilize, because he is a man of considerable ability, a man dedicated to action. He has a golden opportunity to upgrade the Food and Drug Administration, to strengthen its professional staff, and to give this vital agency a professional standing and respect which its duties and responsibilities require.

I am very hopeful that the Food and Drug Administration will be given the same stature as the National Institutes of Health or the U.S. Public Health Service, because we have now learned that this agency has within its power literally life and death for millions of people.

That agency must ultimately give the go-ahead sign. It must turn on the green light for new drugs that go to the American people. The agency has the responsibility for evaluating the investigational processes on new drugs, and under the new drug law which Congress has now sent to the President this particular agency will have to have the closest working relationships with the pharmaceutical manufacturers, doctors, hospitals, and with many agencies of our Federal, State, and local governments.

Therefore, as a friend of the program, I speak for more effective drug law enforcement and as a friend of the Food and Drug Administration, I urge that it be given a high professional standing in the agencies of Government, including the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and that it realize that the Congress of the United States expects it to do a first-class job. It will require some rejuvenation and revitalization. It will require some reexamination of procedures. But above all, it will require alert, hard-hitting, effective administration. I shall be one Senator who will watch whether the developments come about.

REPORTS UNDER PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, in due time the Senate will reach the conference report on the public works appropriation bill of 1963, H.R. 12900.

Today I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, with a copy to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, requesting that they consider asking the Department of Commerce, which will administer the public works acceleration program, to submit monthly reports to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and to the legislative committees of the respective bodies which dealt with the authorizing legislation. The letter suggests that the Department of Commerce be requested to submit monthly reports of applications received and pending, and the applications approved, with suitable detail, including but not limited to the amounts, the nature of the projects, their location, and a brief statement of their justification.

In conversation with fellow members of the Appropriations Committee, the idea was well received. It is my hope that the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee will address such a letter to the appropriate authorities so that our objective may be achieved. Recalling the debate on the bill, there was some reluctance to approve it because the bill, granting as much authority as it does, might be subject to loose administration or perhaps favoritism.

By means of the proposed reports, we can keep a watchful eye on the administration of the program as it develops rather than in retrospect, which might be too late.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to the chairman inserted in the RECORD, at this point following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In H.R. 12900 as approved by conference committee, $400 million are appropriated for the so-called accelerated public works program.

This program was the subject of a great deal of discussion. Some of it was in praise. Some of it was quite critical. The latter, frankly, seemed to be largely on the grounds that this fund would be used to invade the provinces of regular statutes under which certain programs go forward, but might proceed without complying with the statutory requirements laid down in regular form. Other criticism was based on the probability of either loose administration or perhaps favoritism.

In order to forestall any criticism to the extent that current knowledge as to administration of this program would permit, it is my suggestion that the Department of Commerce, as administrator of this fund, be requested by you as chairman to forward monthly reports of its proceedings under this accelerated public works program to the House Public Works Legislative Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, the Senate Public Works Committee, and the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Such monthly reports should include, but not be limited to, a report on applications received and those pending as to categories and types; also applications approved and granted with suitable details such as amount granted, nature of project, its location, and a brief statement of circumstances upon which justification was based.

It is my hope that such a letter will go farward. It will be very useful as time goes on.

Before writing this letter, I did discuss this subject with Senators ELLENDER and HOLLAND. Both stated they thought kindly of the idea and felt it would be worthwhile. Copies of this letter are going forward to each of them.

Respectfully yours,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the

Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Clem Miller, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLEM MILLER, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives pertaining to the death of our colleague from California, the Honorable Clem Miller.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 830) as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Clem Miller, a Representative from the State of California.
>
> *Resolved*, That a committee of twenty-nine Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.
>
> *Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.
>
> *Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, I present a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 413) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable Clem Miller, late a Representative from the State of California.
>
> *Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.
>
> *Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints the two Senators from California [Mr. Kuchel and Mr. Engel] to join the committee appointed by the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative, Hon. Clem Miller.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, before the Senate adjourns, I wish to express my very sincere sympathy to the widow and family of the late Representative Clem Miller. He was involved in a singular tragedy. I know that family very well, and deeply regret that the tragic accident took place. We have lost a fine man and a distinguished public servant.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I do not believe there is any further business of the Senate. I move, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, October 10, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate October 9, 1962:

U.S. Tariff Commission

James W. Culliton, of Indiana, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1968.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ASCS Committeemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the most important link between the farmer and the farm programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture is the ASCS county committee. This is an attempt to explain the functions, the operations, and the importance of the county committees.

Farm programs that are enacted by the Congress of the United States are administered and carried out at the county level by a committee of farmers elected by the other farmers in the community.

Each year every farmer in the county is given an opportunity to nominate anyone he chooses to represent him as an ASCS committeeman. After all nominations are made, the ballots are prepared and every farmer in the county has an opportunity to vote for the farmers which will comprise the county committee.

These ASCS committees are composed of three county committeemen, and the local extension county agent is an ex officio member.

It is the committee's responsibility to see that the programs are carried out fairly and in full accordance with official regulations.

In each county there is a manager, who works at the pleasure of the committee and who carries out the day-to-day operation. Thus the committee could be described as a board of directors with the county office manager responsible for carrying out the committee's policies and decisions and serving as a focal point for information activities.

In addition to the county committee there is also a farmer-elected committee for each community in the county. These committeemen are commonly called community committeemen. They have the all-important responsibility of explaining the oftentimes complicated farm programs to their fellow farmers. This is where the all-important farmer-to-farmer contact is made.

In carrying out farm programs information cannot be conveyed by newspaper, radio, and television alone. There must be a person-to-person media for explaining the program and answering the questions that arise. This the community committeemen and county committeemen do.

These ASCS farmer-elected committeemen are charged with the general management of all the functions in their counties—as regarding acreage allotments and marketing quotas, the agricultural conservation program, price support loan activity, purchase agreements and incentive payments, and all the other special programs such as those for sugar, the soil bank, and wool, as well as the well-established programs in those States growing peanuts, cotton, and tobacco.

The committeemen are responsible for seeing that farmers and others are informed about the agricultural programs that are available and the requirements for eligibility to participate in these programs. These county committees made up of farmers elected by other farmers, have held the trust of their neighbors in exemplary fashion for more than a quarter of a century.

They have made nonrecourse price support loans to individual farmers in the past 15 years in the total amount of $2.4 billion. Chargeoffs of these loans due to error, fraud, or other defects in this 15-year period have amounted to only one-tenth of 1 percent—$21.5 million.

Since 1936 they have authorized cost-sharing payments of $4.9 billion to individual farmers in carrying out specified conservation practices. This averages out from $1 million to $4 million each year.

Since 1948 they have approved recourse loans to farmers for the construction of storage facilities—with 697 million bushels of capacity—and for purchase of drying equipment in the total amount of $206 million. Of the total of $72 million presently outstanding, only $132,000—or 0.0018 percent—is represented by delinquent loans.

They contracted for the retirement of 50.7 million acres of land under the acreage reserve program—1956 to 1958—and paid farmers $1.5 billion under this program. Of the total of 2.5 million contracts, fraud or other violation cases numbered only 4,600. And the amount involved in forfeitures was only $1.4 million—less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

Similarly they contracted for retirement under 306,000 term contracts of 28.7 million acres of land under the conservation reserve program—1956-1960—for payments which will aggregate $2.3 billion by the expiration of the last contracts in 1971. Total cancellations due to fraud or other violations number only 1,217—four-tenths of 1 percent of total number—to date and amount to $85 thousand.

They have operated a system of CCC owned grain storage facilities involving approximately 237,000 structures located on over 3,800 different sites, having a capacity of 980 million bushels of grain with signal success in preserving both the quantity and quality of the grain stored.

Further day-to-day supervision and direction of each program dealing with farmers is divided up among 50 State committees each responsible for direction of county offices in its State.

Through the years these community, county, and State committeemen—farmer citizens—have served in the highest tradition of civic endeavor. They have contributed much to their community and to their country. They have carried a burden of administration that would have cost a princely sum if their services had been delegated to paid full-time employees.

Tribute to Representative Fred Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the approaching adjournment of the 87th Congress will mark the retirement of Representative FRED MARSHALL from the House of Representatives, after 14 years of service to the Sixth District of Minnesota.

The sixth district is unique, in that it reflects the economic and social characteristics of the State as a whole. It contains industry and diversified farming, railroad and wholesale centers. It has natural resources which have made Minnesota famous—forests and lakes, iron and granite. FRED MARSHALL has represented this district tirelessly, competently, and honestly in every area of its particular and proper interests—agriculture, small business, labor, forestry, and conservation.

Representative MARSHALL has been one of the most respected members of the important House Appropriations Committee.

In the mind of the Founding Fathers, the House of Representatives was to be the principal legislative body for the Nation. While more publicity may be given to the President and to Senators, the House today is dominant in important legislative fields.

During his service in the House, FRED MARSHALL established a reputation for independence and a willingness to make hard decisions. He also earned a reputation for efficient and effective personal service to the people of his district in their dealingss with the Congress and the Federal Government.

His experience as a farmer and as an administrator of farm programs before his election to the House of Representatives earned for him a deserved reputation as a recognized spokesman for American agriculture. As a member of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, he was often instrumental in improving and strengthening programs of immediate concern to farm families—the so-called action programs of most direct benefit to people on farms.

Representative MARSHALL has served his district well as an able and conscientious legislator who was always aware of his responsibilities and fulfilled them faithfully. In so doing, he served the people of Minnesota and the Nation. I join his many friends in and out of Congress in offering appreciation for his record of public service and good wishes on his retirement. Anyone who knows FRED MARSHALL knows that his retirement from the House of Representatives is not a retirement from public affairs. He will continue to be a good friend and valued counselor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WWDC Performs a Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend WWDC, an independent radio broadcasting company located here in Washington, D.C., for the public service it is rendering during the preelection period.

It has scheduled over the next several weeks a series of debates, to be known as "Tell Me, Mr. Candidate," between the major candidates for office in the Washington metropolitan area.

The series will commence October 15 and conclude on October 24. During that period the station's audience will hear from the Maryland Democratic and Republican nominees for the Senate, Congressman at Large, and Congressmen from the Fifth and Sixth Districts.

Mr. Speaker, this type of public service, which, I might add, is also being rendered by many of the other broadcasting stations in the area, is to be loudly applauded. It makes available to the voter a unique opportunity to learn what each of the candidates bidding for election in November stands for. It is really only through such debates that the voter has the opportunity to measure the candidates side by side.

I am glad to participate in this sort of debate, Mr. Speaker, and I know that most of my colleagues are, because we realize that it is so important to the voter that these debates occur often during a political campaign. As the elections go by, I am glad to see that these debates are becoming more and more a part of the elective process.

Casimir Pulaski, 1748-79

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Casimir Pulaski, one of the most famous Polish patriots of his day, became a great soldier of freedom by lending his name and fame to our War of Independence and by dedicating and sacrificing his brief but brilliant life to that noble cause.

This native son of a well-to-do Polish family, born in 1748 in a little known town in Podolia—southeastern Poland—seemed from his earliest days to have had chivalric and heroic ambition. Individual and national freedom meant more to him than to most people of that period. His one purpose in life seemed to be to fight for the freedom of Poland and for the liberation of its unhappy people from foreign oppression. But at the time when he was growing up, both internal and external conditions there made it impossible for him effectively to serve his native country and the cause of his kinsmen. Even so, by the time he was 20 years old, he had already participated in numerous battles against Poland's foes. During these youthful years his military exploits, while heroic, were successful only locally. All his major efforts to carry on the warfare against overwhelming odds proved of no avail. In 1772, he barely managed to flee from capture by enemy forces, and thenceforth for several years he tried to raise and organize a force to attack Russia. He went to Paris, there to be put in touch with Benjamin Franklin, who at once perceived the talent, zeal, and quality of leadership in this young man, and advanced him the needed money for a voyage to America.

Arriving in Boston in July 1777, he met General Washington and received from him a letter to the Continental Congress, in which Washington suggested that Pulaski be given power to organize the cavalry and then be placed in charge. Pulaski was subsequently commissioned to do this and carried out this difficult task of organization with distinction, and to this day is known as the Father of our Cavalry. In September he joined Washington to participate in the battle of Brandywine, which he did with distinction. He also distinguished himself in October in the battle of Germantown. During the winter of 1777 he commanded the cavalry. He acted in unison with Gen. Anthony Wayne in scouting for supplies for the famishing troops at Valley Forge. Thenceforth he participated in many battles, and extricated himself and his comrades from many difficult situations. In every one of them he distinguished himself as a fearless fighter, and a resourceful and resolute leader. In recognition of his brilliant services Congress made him brigadier general, and then he was assigned to a new theater of action in the South.

In May 1779, he joined forces with General Lincoln and, assisted by the French fleet, was preparing to attack Savannah. On October 9, at the siege of Savannah, when he bravely but impatiently charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry, he was struck down with a fateful grapeshot in the loin. He was taken to the *Wasp*, where surgeons were unable to remove the bullet, and he died on board on the 11th. Thus ended the turbulent, meteoric, and dazzling career of this great fighter of freedom, great patriot of Poland, one of the most gallant soldiers of his day, sacrificing his life for the cause of our War of Independence. At this time of the 214th anniversary of his birth and the 183d anniversary of his death we solemnly honor the memory of this noble son of Poland, Casimir Pulaski. And we pray that the flame of liberty that burned so strong and bright in his brave heart will serve always to inspire and give hope to his countrymen of today. The spirit of Casimir Pulaski will live forever in the minds of lovers of freedom everywhere.

British Trade With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the United States has made great progress in the past few weeks in obtaining allied cooperation to suspend shipping to Cuba. This shipping was carried out in direct conflict with the interests of the United States and the free world, yet during the period June–August 1962 some 61 percent of the traffic to Cuba was carried by 20 free world nations.

West Germany, Turkey, and Norway have announced their willingness to cooperate. What of the British? They have not. This fact remains startling to the Congress and the American people.

Britain has been our most trustworthy ally in many past crises. Anglo-American ties are among the strongest in the world. We have common goals, and both nations depend heavily on foreign trade. We are among each other's best customers on the world market. Yet the British continue to allow their hulls to be used for transporting supplies for the Communists in Cuba. By so doing, the British persist in compounding the insult which occurred when the first British ship sailed into Communist Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this Government undertake the most intensified representations to obtain British cooperation, and that the United Kingdom halt its ships to Cuba.

The Honorable Marguerite Stitt Church Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, in recent years many of our distinguished colleagues have seen fit to retire to civil life. The loss of their talents has weighed heavily against the solution of many important problems, especially at the committee level.

Yet, no greater loss will be measured in the Congress than the retirement of our gentlewoman from Illinois, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH. As a State representative, I first met our gracious lady in 1931, through her beloved husband, State Representative Ralph Church, versatile member of the State Assembly, later elected State senator from the Evanston district and, still later, elected a Member of the U.S. Congress, from the 13th District, 1934–49, serving until his death in 1950, except in 1941 to 1942—unsuccessful candidacy for U.S. Senator.

Mrs. CHURCH succeeded her husband to the Congress and no one can deny that she fulfilled every expectation that her accomplished mate would have desired her to attain.

As a matter of fact, her educational background insured her success in public life. She majored in political science at Wellesley, being graduated in 1914, cum laude, with an A.B. degree. In her postgraduate work at Columbia University she received her M.A. degree in 1917. It is almost a miracle that, from her early youth, she nursed a suppressed desire to enter public life in the legislative field. Her college curriculum consisted of courses that would prepare her, basically, for her life's work. Further, her oratorical abilities were enhanced by her participation in intercollegiate debates and, also, specialized courses in economics prepared her for problems of Government.

After her graduation she became a consultant in psychology with the State Charities Aid Association in New York City—the city of her birth.

A short time later, she married Ralph Church, member of the Illinois General Assembly in his second term. It can be truly said that their mutual interest in legislative matters made an ideal partnership. She contributed much to the success that her husband enjoyed, without detracting from his abilities or talents.

In her career in the Congress, there is among her many outstanding attributes an independent sense of courage to do her own thinking and to, unswervingly, stand by her decision. One would think that her high sense of justice would have given her a cold, calculating, analytical mind, and yet, I have seen her, on the floor, search for different reasons to temper justice with mercy, especially in social and veteran legislation.

Her brilliant approach to controversial problems of government reflects the thorough research and tremendous effort to master the entire question, both as to its perplexities and resultant factors. The intricacies of the law attract her every mental faculty.

Her active work in civic affairs in Chicago dates from the early days at Hull House, under the immortal Jane Addams, as an instructor. The Family Welfare Association, the Illinois Children's Home and Aid Society, and many clubs and associations connected with college, civic and social activities, including the Girl Scouts, and so forth.

In 1960 she was awarded, by the Illinois Club for Catholic Women, their VIP Award, and in that same year the Civic Affairs Associates, Inc., awarded her their Merit Award for her outstanding work for political and economic freedom. Again, in 1962, she was signally honored by being chosen by Chicago's Loyola University for their Founders' Day Award.

The old saying that a person of dignity is to the "manor born" is true of Mrs. CHURCH. She personifies the true lady in every fiber of her being. The gentility of her forebears, of the cultured class, vibrates in her every action. Her high sense of loyalty to her friends adds to her strength of character. The honor and respect paid to her by her colleagues is indicative of their full realization that she exemplifies the high traditions of the glories of womanhood in every social stratification in our land. God bless her on her way, she has earned the sacred blessings of our national honor.

Impartial and Effective Leadership of Our Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is one of the world's great legislative assemblies, with problems of the most critical importance submitted to it. The record of the second session of this Congress is a substantial one. I have often commented on the fact that when major security interests of the United States are concerned, and when major programs in the interest of all the people are before us, we act by overwhelming margins. Many measures receive almost unanimous support in the House when they involve the best interests of all Americans.

No voice is more important in securing such action than that of the Speaker. Without effective leadership, without scrupulous respect of the rights and the opinions of all, a legislative assembly is vulnerable to factional squabbles and to embittered argument. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the Speaker, to insure fair treatment of all, to encourage constructive discussion but to see that debate moves at a proper pace to effectuate action.

The record of the 87th Congress owes much, therefore, to the impartial and effective leadership of our outstanding Speaker, the Honorable John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts.

Mr. McCormack deserves the thanks of us all and of the Nation. His courageous leadership is reflected in the progress we have made, the decisions that Congress has taken which open the way to further development of international stability and domestic advances.

We have been fortunate in having Mr. McCormack in this key position in our session now coming to a close. We have all learned a great deal from his guidance, and benefited from the experience he has acquired in the years since he first served in the Massachusetts Legislature and then in the great Congress of the United States.

Our Patent System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to a remarkable achievement of two of my young constituents. Paul L. Gomery II, who is 14 years old, and his sister, Nanette Gomery, who is 19, were issued a patent at noon today. According to the U.S. Patent Office, they are the youngest persons ever to obtain a patent.

Paul and Nanette's invention is a combination screen and storm window. They fashioned it from a tension screen and a sheet of plastic film in such a way that no holes had to be drilled and no nails were required. At the time they devised this simple but ingenious mechanism, Paul was only 10 and Nanette 15. Now, Nanette is a sophomore at Oberlin College and Paul is attending Western Junior High School in Bethesda, Md.

The patent issued to Paul and Nanette, whose home is at 5609 Ogden Road, Bethesda, is No. 3,057,401. More than 3 million others before them have been encouraged by the Constitution of the United States and the patent incentive system developed under it to come forward and disclose their inventions. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries." The patent system set up under this power of the Congress has served as a stimulus for inventions and discoveries of great benefit to the United States and the entire world.

The patent system has encouraged the research efforts of large industrial firms, but it also has been important in protecting the contribution of the individual inventor, as in the case of Paul and Nanette Gomery.

I congratulate these gifted young people. I know all America will share my pleasure that their enterprise has been recognized and will join with me in wishing them success in the future. Under our unique system their achievement is but a beginning and we wish them well.

The Government's Bleak Financial Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Government's fiscal situation is indeed bleak.

The October 15, 1962 issue of U.S. News & World Report, commenting on the country's finances, states that the U.S. Treasury outgo will run above estimates and that income will be much under estimates.

According to this magazine, for the Federal fiscal year which began last July 1 the official administration estimate had been for a surplus for the 12 months which end next June 30, amounting to $500 million.

Now, because tax revenue was overestimated, there more probably will be a deficit for this period of $7.7 billion.

The Kennedy administration has been ignoring the unpleasant reality of such a deficit. However, on September 19, 1962, Secretary Dillon, in a speech before the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund, finally conceded that "another moderate budget deficit appears likely." I do not know what the term "moderate" means in the vernacular of the New Frontier; my best guess is that any revised figure by the Bureau of the Budget and the President will be withheld until after the November election.

Meanwhile, I asked the Chamber of Commerce of the United States about the fiscal picture. A representative of its Government finance department advised me that the chamber's calculations indicate a deficit of from $5 to $6 billion at the end of this fiscal year, provided that: first, there is no recession and second, that there is no substantial tax revision.

Mr. Speaker, the real shocker is the size of the financial deficit in prospect for fiscal 1964, which is the 12-month period beginning next July 1. This outlook, according to U.S. News & World Report, is for an $11 billion deficit, even with no tax cut. With a tax cut of $5 billion on top of that, the deficit would reach $16 billion; or a tax cut of $7 billion would bring the deficit up to $18 billion. As the U.S. News article comments, that is an awfully big peacetime deficit—by far the largest ever.

An excerpt from this article is worth quoting:

> People running the Government and managing its affairs, in large measure, turn out to be professors, or rich men's sons who've never had to make a dollar in their lives.
>
> Attitudes toward money, toward debt, are shaped by a life tied up in theories or in the idea that it's easy come, easy go.
>
> Theories are those either of Harvard or the London School of Economics. It's a very loosely managed Government in Washington.
>
> A sample of the modern economics at work: Investment in surplus of farm products in year ended June 30 was reduced by $381 million. But to reduce the surplus by that much, a loss from price-support programs was increased by $726 million. About $2 was spent for each dollar of cut in surplus.
>
> In real life, that's a sure way to go broke.

The Kiplinger Washington Letter of Saturday, October 6, similarly suggests that the 1964 Federal deficit may run at high as $15 billion.

This letter points up that the Kennedy economic advisers want a boost in spending, plus a sharp cut in taxes of from $10 to $12 billion.

Between now and election the details of all this Keynesian New Frontier financial policy will be kept under wraps as much as possible. But, Mr. Speaker, if what I have indicated is exaggerated or not absolutely according to the facts, let some responsible officer of the Government or of the administration disabuse those of us who express alarm.

Until any such statement, Mr. Speaker, I charge that the Federal Government is heading straight for another increase in the debt limit, more inflation, and a financial situation which will call for Government controls and bureaucratic economic dictatorship.

Yes, the financial picture is indeed bleak.

Our Fishing Fleet Comes in Fifth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Congressional Record the following article by the U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, Benjamin A. Smith:

OUR FISHING FLEET COMES IN FIFTH—USING NEW TECHNIQUES OF CATCHING AND PROCESSING, OTHER NATIONS HAVE FAR SURPASSED US IN THIS VITAL FIELD—A SENATOR OUTLINES WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT

(By Benjamin A. Smith)

(Benjamin A. Smith, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, was formerly mayor of the commercial fishing port of Gloucester.)

In the year 1602 an English fisherman named Bartholomew Gosnold made the first commercial fishing voyage off the shores of Massachusetts. He was so impressed by what he saw that he named the land nearby Cape Cod.

If Bartholomew Gosnold had returned to the shores of Cape Cod to fish this summer, he would have found himself engulfed by a huge Russian fleet of over 150 modern fishing vessels—a fleet that may soon operate from the new port scheduled to be built in Cuba with Soviet help.

These vessels first found their fish with the most modern electronic fish-locating gear. Then their trawlers, operating with the precision of a naval armada, swept the fishing area clean. Catches were processed within hours aboard great factory ships, 250 to 300 feet in length, none over a decade old, which carried complete facilities for fileting and freezing the catch, and converting waste into industrial fish products. At the end of their day's work the Soviet fishermen retired to quarters as comfortable as any aboard a modern merchant vessel.

Had Bartholomew Gosnold looked for an American fishing vessel he might have found a trawler from the Boston fishing fleet—25 years old and dwarfed by its competitors. I say "might have," because the combined Boston and Gloucester fishing fleets—once the mightiest in America, with 500 vessels at the end of World War II—now number less than the single Soviet fleet off the cape.

The American trawler, operating by itself, could catch in a week what the larger Russian vessel could take in one haul. It carried no processing equipment aboard, but put its catch on ice to be taken ashore and processed or sold fresh. When the crew were finished their day's work they went below to crowded quarters which smelled of fish and gasoline. Their hours were long and their working conditions were both uncomfortable and dangerous.

This sorry picture is not exclusive to Massachusetts or Cape Cod. American fishermen in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are competing with old and obsolete equipment against foreign fishing fleets that are far newer and vastly superior to our own. In the North Atlantic alone, New England fishermen encounter vessels of a dozen nations that are more modern than ours. Even Ghana and the Ivory Coast have up-to-date fishing fleets.

In the Pacific Ocean a giant Soviet fleet of 150 to 200 vessels has been moving farther and farther into the Bering Sea—another traditional American fishing area. The Russians have at least 100 giant trawler factory ships and plan to have 160 more by 1965. We have none. On their design boards, the Russians have plans for fishing vessels equipped with electronic computers. With the help of underwater television, the computers will automatically adjust the depth of the trawl to that of the fish.

The Japanese fishing fleets are as good if not better than the Soviets'. They have trawlers and factory ships of equivalent size and tuna boats with a carrying capacity 60 percent larger than their American competitors. They, too, are pushing into our Pacific fishing grounds, and have gone as far afield as the South Atlantic.

Our inability to meet this competition has cost the United States its historic place as the world's second largest fishing nation. Last year, we fell to fifth place in world fishery production behind the perennial leader Japan, and Russia, Red China, and Peru.

The American fishing industry has come a long way to its present sad condition.

When James I of England asked how the Pilgrims planned to support themselves in the New World, he was told, "By fishing, sir." Fishing was the United States first commercial venture and, on occasion, all that stood between our forebears and starvation. During the Revolution, fishermen provided the crews and vessels for the infant American Navy. Sturdy Marbleheaders saved Washington's Army after the battle of Long Island and carried them across the Delaware to victory at Trenton.

Afterward the fishing industry became one of the Colonies' few successful trades and the cornerstone of New England prosperity. Yankee fishermen became Yankee whalers and traders sailing to every corner of the world. Their profits supplied the capital for early American industrial ventures.

The rise of our fisheries continued throughout the 19th and well into the 20th century. They spread down the Atlantic coast to the south and to the west with the giant salmon, tuna and sardine industries.

As late as 1948, the United States supplied nearly 13 percent of the world's fishery production. Now, however, we are down to 7.4 percent. In the decade from 1950 to 1960 the number of fishermen in the United States dropped from 161,000 to 130,000 and the number of fishing vessels decreased by 16,000. One-half as many new fishing vessels were built in 1960 as in 1950.

The decline of the American fishing industry can also be measured in imports. In 1950 we produced nearly 80 percent of the fish we consumed. Last year, we only produced 56 percent. In that interval our population rose by 28 million people, but our domestic production of fish increased only 9 percent. As a result, imports soared. They will be up again this year.

If this decline continues, it is apparent that there will soon be little left to the American fisheries. These fisheries play an important role in the economies of 23 of our States. They employ over one-half million workers and produce a product that is worth over a billion dollars at retail prices.

The collapse of this industry would do more than just add a half million more people to the rolls of the unemployed and send a billion dollars of consumer funds abroad. The loss of the American fishing industry as an effective, competitive force would mean that the American consumer would have no control over the price he paid for his product.

The loss of the fishing industry would also deprive this country of valuable food products for use in the event of a nuclear disaster. Ocean fish, protected by their blanket of water, have the lowest strontium-unit value of any food product—about one one-hundredth that of wheat. One season's catch of our fisheries could supply sufficient protein to feed the entire U.S. population during a 2-week period of national emergency. No other industry in the United States operates under such a handicap. The New England fishermen, for example, could purchase steel-hulled groundfishing trawlers for half as much in Europe as they must pay for them here. Furthermore, the foreign trawler would be of the most modern, stern-chute design. No such fishing vessel has ever been built in this country.

Nature adds to the economic problems of the fisheries. Fish are a highly perishable product, found more or less at random and often at great distances from port. The fisherman must bring his product back in good condition, then process and market it to compete effectively with other foods. The trend in fish, as in all American food, is toward "convenience" packaging. Americans like their fish frozen, packaged, canned and often precooked. Two-thirds of a fish, however, must often be discarded when it is prepared in this manner.

In order to compete successfully, then, with both domestic foodstuffs and foreign fisheries, our fishermen must have the full benefits of modern technology. They do not have this now. The march of technology which transformed agriculture and so many other industries has hardly brushed our fisheries.

How can we get the American fisheries back on their feet?

I believe the Government and industry can combine forces and bring this about. It will, however, have to be done in the form of an overall attack on the industry's problems at every level from the raw to the finished product.

The Government is already assisting the fisheries through a number of programs administered by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Interior Department.

The Bureau gives help in every phase of fishery operations. It issues marketing reports, runs voluntary quality-control programs, builds fish ladders to save salmon and develops poisons to kill lampreys (a parasitic fish that takes a heavy toll, particularly in the Great Lakes).

The Bureau has done an excellent job with the tools it has in introducing modern methods to an old-fashioned industry. It is short, however, of badly needed advanced equipment. In the whole North Atlantic, for instance, it has only one exploratory vessel of its own. It has already benefited somewhat from President Kennedy's expansion of our oceanographic programs. But more must be done.

Our first major task, then, should be to expand research into the finding, catching, and processing of fish. Much of this could be done by enlarging present research programs and by providing new equipment for the Bureau.

A strong exploratory fishing program, which could pinpoint new locations of fish, would take much of the guesswork out of present methods and would greatly improve the economics of the industry.

Congress should provide the Bureau with funds for additional new research vessels such as the new exploratory fishing vessel *Delaware* to be commissioned this fall. One or more of these vessels should be patterned after the most modern fishing trawler available and equipped with machinery for processing fish at sea. These experimental ships would give both the American fishermen and boatyards a laboratory in which to test and evaluate advanced fishing methods and equipment.

Next, the Government should set up matching grant or loan programs to help the fishing industry in key areas. The most critical need for such a program is in shipbuilding. Vessels are at the heart of our fishermen's problems. The Vessel Subsidy Act should be broadened to give the fishermen the full equivalent of the savings they could have if they were allowed to shop abroad for their vessels.

Congress should also set up a matching fund program to help the State bureaus of commercial fisheries and a loan program to help the processors. There are legislative precedents for both programs and the funds are badly needed in these areas.

The third major area for Government and industry cooperation should be in developing new products and marketing techniques. One such technique that could revolutionize fish marketing in this country is the use of atomic food irradiators. These machines destroy bacteria through low-level radiation and allow food to be kept fresh at room temperatures for long periods of time. The perfection of this equipment would open large new markets for fresh fish in areas of the country, particularly the Midwest, that are distant from the seas. Congress, I am glad to say, this year gave the Atomic Energy Commission authorization to build three such experimental irradiators, and I hope funds will be made available for them soon.

Another new product that could be of great benefit to the fishing industry is fish protein concentrate. This is an inexpensive, high-protein food additive made from whole fish. A few pennies worth of this odorless, tasteless powder added to a person's diet can supply him with his daily protein requirements. This could be of inestimable benefit to the estimated 500 million people on this planet suffering from protein malnutrition. It could be a major weapon for the United

States in its battle against hunger. As it also can be made from parts of the fish that are normally wasted, it could also be of great economic value to the fishing industry.

Congress could assist in the development of this product by providing funds to test and evaluate different manufacturing methods for it, especially shipboard methods. A fish-protein plant placed aboard a surplus freighter and sent to produce it in those areas of the world where it is needed would be a dramatic indication of this country's interest in the worldwide battle against hunger.

We have a great opportunity in the fishing field. We can begin today to rehabilitate our fishermen and regain our rightful place among the nations of the world. The benefits to our economy and our foreign policy will greatly exceed the costs. I hope that both the Government and industry will see the truth in this and make the effort necessary to save the American fishing industry.

The Frosting and the Cake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Washington Report of the American Security Council of October 8, 1962, merits the attention of the Members of the Congress. It is entitled "Victory—Theory and Practice" and contains an excellent analysis of Secretary of State Dean Rusk's recent address to the annual convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. In this address, Mr. Rusk tried to give the impression that the State Department does have a win policy in the cold war. I ask unanimous consent that the ASC's Washington Report be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with a recent newsletter which I did on this subject, entitled "The Frosting and the Cake."

There being no objection, the article and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT—VICTORY: THEORY AND PRACTICE

On August 13, 1962, Secretary of State Dean Rusk delivered an address before the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The speech has been widely hailed and labeled as an affirmation of the U.S. intention to win the cold war and as an "answer" to the "no win" criticism of the Department of State.

Actually, the speech provided an insight into the difference between the theory and practice of victory. It was a further revelation of the philosophy of abstract idealism which is slowly causing us to lose the cold war.

Once more the Secretary stated the goal of the United States: "A peaceful world community of free and independent States, free to choose their own future and their own system so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others." And he recognized and declared the simple truth that this goal and the Communist goal are incompatible. "This global struggle will continue until freedom prevails," he said. "It goes without saying that our purpose is to win. * * * Our objective is a victory for all mankind" (State Department press release 494).

So far, so good. Mr. Rusk used both the words "win" and "victory." Then he undertook to define victory: "And what is the worldwide victory we work for? Not the victory of one nation over another or of one people over another, but a worldwide victory for freedom."

He enumerated what this would mean—a world free of aggression; a world of independent nations; a world of economic and social justice for all peoples; a world ruled by law; a world of democratic governments; a world of personal freedom and dignity.

"Victory for freedom" thus represents man's eternal hope for the establishment of political utopia on earth. It is a magnificent concept which recalls the famous "four freedoms" declaration of Churchill and Roosevelt embodied in the Atlantic Charter of 1941. As a definition of cold war victory, however, it is meaningless in terms of practical policy. The specific and urgent problem which faces the United States is the defeat of the Soviet drive for world power, just as the framers of the Atlantic Charter faced the specific problem of Nazi aggression.

Internal changes or modifications within the Soviet Empire—even their economic difficulties—profit us little so long as the outward thrust of communism continues, and continues to gain victories. How exactly are we to deal with the Communist challenge, which is more and more the challenge of raw power? It is our strategy that is important. It is not noble words but results that count; otherwise the idealism is futile. That is what "win" versus "no win" is all about.

And it is precisely on this score that the Rusk speech and subsequent developments provided little in the way of reassurance.

"No one" said the Secretary, "has to convince us that 'peaceful coexistence' means to them a continuing attempt to spread their system over the earth by all means short of the great war which would be self-defeating. No one has to convince us that the contest between Communist imperialism and freedom is for keeps."

But further on, he spoke of "common or overlapping interests." One was Laos: "In June 1961, at Vienna, Mr. Khrushchev and President Kennedy agreed that both favored an independent and neutral Laos. * * * If the (Geneva) agreement is faithfully executed, all foreign troops will leave Laos and the Lao will be left alone * * * and Laos will cease to be an avenue of supply and reinforcement for Communist aggression against South Vietnam."

The remarkable thing here is not so much that Laos continues to act as a corridor for Communist troops to enter South Vietnam; that the Soviet airlift of supplies into southern Laos for the use of these troops continues; or that no more than token contingents of North Vietnamese troops have withdrawn from Laos. It was and is naive and unrealistic to think the situation would be otherwise. The remarkable thing is the contradiction between a theoretical acknowledgment that the Communist purpose is to spread their system over the earth and a practical policy which assumes that Khrushchev genuinely wants an "independent and neutral Laos." If the former is true, as it is, then the latter is completely illogical on its face. Yet this thread of unrealism runs as a constant theme through American foreign policy. The deadly flaw in this policy lies in the fact that we will not recognize the corollary of the Communist determination to rule the earth: Given such a continuing Communist objective, there cannot be a genuine area of "common interest." It does not exist, and our relentless search for "accommodation" on this basis is in vain.

Mr. Rusk professed an optimism which is particularly ironic in view of the events which have followed his speech: "I believe that a measured appraisal leads to the conclusion that the historical forces of freedom are writing fresh chapters of achievement and confidence." But just where is this true?

On the contrary, since August 13, there has been a sharp deterioration in the psychology of the cold war. "Victory for freedom" recedes before the mounting boldness of the Communist offensive. (This is particularly true in Berlin and Cuba.)

(1) In Berlin, the slow death of an East German youth in plain sight of American help which never came created a new cloud of doubt over our ultimate willingness to go to war in defense of our rights in the city. Soviet acquiescence to our demand that they cease using armored cars in West Berlin was indicative of their reaction to firmness, but was not exploited as such. The Soviet statement on Berlin and Cuba warned bluntly that the Western occupation of West Berlin "must and will be liquidated" (New York Times, Sept. 12, 1962). The specific U.S. reaction to a blockade of the city has yet to be defined. Though they have apparently postponed a crisis until after the U.S. elections, the Soviet position has, if anything, hardened since August 13. The supreme cold war crisis draws steadily nearer as the Communists sense Western weakness.

(2) Government sources labeled the Soviet warning not to attack Cuba "if this attack is made, this will be the beginning of the unleashing of war" as a propaganda bluff (which it was) but then laid down a policy which formally acquiesced to Communist control of Cuba. At his news conference on September 13, President Kennedy drove the last nail into the coffin of Cuban freedom. He solemnly pledged the United States to "do whatever must be done" if Cuba exported revolution by armed force or became an "offensive" base; but he declared that unilateral military intervention by the United States to overthrow Castro cannot be justified and attacked as "rash" those who think otherwise.

The President's declaration is historic and tragic. He reversed the judgment of his predecessor, General Eisenhower, and that of his own early administration, which led to the Bay of Pigs landing in April 1961. That judgment was that Communist control of Cuba was intolerable and required military action to eliminate it. Now, as a result of the Cuban arms buildup and the presence of Soviet forces, only some form of U.S. action can succeed in this purpose. But we have lost our nerve. We no longer have such a purpose. We reject action and accept the Communist "fait accompli." The only "quid pro quo" is a 2-months' Soviet postponement on Berlin.

Moreover, Chester Bowles, in an attack on the "realist" school of foreign policy, made it clear that Cuban freedom is being sacrificed essentially upon the altar of "world opinion": (An attack on Cuba) "would undercut our influence in world affairs, blacken our reputation in the United Nations, and forfeit our traditional claim to moral leadership." (New York Times, Sept. 7, 1962.)

Khrushchev, studying such a statement, may well wonder whether it is not the United States which is bluffing, and not only on Cuba. (If Cuba is a sovereign nation, it has a sovereign right to station any armaments on its territory, "offensive" as well as "defensive." President Kennedy's distinction between the two is legally meaningless.) So long as there is no overt act against us, the U.N. and "world opinion" is no more likely to sanction military action against a Cuba armed with ground-to-ground "offensive" missiles than at the present time. If the considerations which Mr. Bowles cites are really paramount, would we, then, really "act"?

Many will doubt it, and will continue to doubt the ultimate victory of freedom so long as the chasm between the words and deeds of its principal defender continues to widen. A theory of victory depending only on lofty ideals will not prevent the progressive loss of the freedom of more and more of the world's peoples. The hollow claim that we are defeating communism will not conceal it. A theory which relies on the "underlying forces of history" to accomplish our purposes substitutes hope for reason and the "easy" policy of inertia for the hard choice of action.

There is one interest which Communists share with us, though it is often the grounds for unwarranted optimism. That is their desire to avoid annihilation. It is the interest that always compels a Communist retreat in a showdown. It is the reason why we can still win without war. But victory has meaning only if it is defined in its cold war context. This Mr. Rusk failed to do.

THE FROSTING AND THE CAKE

(Report to the people by U.S. Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina)

After absorbing a barrage of criticism from Capitol Hill, from some portions of the press, and from a rising tide of grassroots American concern, the State Department has now officially proclaimed a "win" policy in the cold war. In an address before the stanchly patriotic Veterans of Foreign Wars Convention, on August 13, Secretary of State Rusk said: "This goal of ours * * * and the Communist goal are incompatible. This global struggle will continue until freedom prevails. It goes without saying that our purpose is to win. * * * Our objective is a victory for all mankind."

This speech by the Secretary was intended as a response to my original labeling of our foreign policy as being predicated on a "no-win" strategy. In defining "no-win," I stated that "this does not mean that it is our policy to lose. It means that we dare not try to win, for fear we may lose."

This "no-win" charge was made by me as a result of a detailed study of items, such as the words "victory" and "win" which were censored from speeches of defense leaders, together with past U.S. cold war actions of retreat and reaction, and also a study of guidelines drawn up by U.S. policy planners. For instance, I pointed out to the Senate on March 8 that our foreign policy has been based on the false assumption that the Communists would evolve into peaceful socialist states if we employed only the cold war implements of aid and information.

Under Secretary of State Ball affirmed this theory of reliance on the "evolution" or "mellowing" of the Communist societies under questioning in the censorship hearings. Following this, the Chicago Tribune carried two exclusive stories by Willard Edwards exposing the now-famous Rostow policy papers. Mr. Edwards pointed out that these proposed foreign policy guidelines rely on the "mellowing" idea as the answer to our cold war problems. Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN and others on Capitol Hill immediately pounced on the Rostow papers, expressing amazement at Mr. Rostow's ideas.

Before Mr. Ball's affirmation of the "mellowing" theory, he had sent to the censorship hearings an explantion of censored items. The forehost explanation was his definition of the term "victory" as having a "militaristic and aggressive ring less suited than the substituted phrase to describing our national objectives." He added that it left "no room for accommodation." After coming under considerable fire he later called the explanation "inartistic and fatuous."

With criticism continuing to mount, the President, the Secretary of State, and other high officials began denying that we had a "no-win" policy. They refused, however, to say that it was our intention to win the cold war. Finally, a Republican-oriented reporter, Roscoe Drummond of the banned New York Herald-Tribune, suggested a way out of their embarrassing dilemma. He said why not go ahead and speak of victory and drop the battle over semantics.

Mr. Rusk's VFW speech gave the tipoff that Mr. Drummond's advice was well taken. Courageously he faced up to using the terms "victory" and "win" with reference to the cold war. Columnist William S. White hailed the move as being "legitimate—and also overdue." He added that "never before had any top figure of the administration, outside the military, been willing to say simply and clearly that to win was our purpose and resolve."

Though the words "victory" and "win" have now been used by the Secretary, there appears to be no change in the substance of the policies which underlies the name of the policies, whether they be called win or no-win. I commend the Secretary for facing up to his error in censoring these valiant words which had always been the watchword of America in previous times of national peril. I will be the first to congratulate the Secretary when he reverses his field on coalition governments and accommodations with and concessions to the Communists. He has prepared an appealing frosting for his cake. Now he needs to bake a new cake to go with the frosting.

Domestic Peace Corps—Importing Our Own Idea: A Peace Corps at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 9, 1962

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the session is almost over, as we all know; columnists are already tallying the final box scores of a stormy session. Many of the struggles on the floor and in committees come to mind, some partisan in nature and some nonpartisan—the farm bill, the trade bill, and medical-care. Few bills come to mind, however, that elicited genuine bipartisan support and enthusiasm. Right now, however, one such piece of legislation, in particular—is foremost in my mind—the request, last spring, of the Peace Corps for an increased appropriation for its second year of operation.

True, some skeptics still existed at that time, but for reasons other than their evaluation of the corps first year of performance. They argued instead that it could become another bureaucratic monstrosity, or we couldn't afford it. These were the reasons against it. Never was there any contention the Peace Corps had failed.

On the other hand, many of the most vociferous original opponents of the plan had not only changed their position, but were, by then, offering accolades.

But, today, I should like to divert attention from the foreign corps, which has monopolized the imagination and attention of the 87th Congress quite often, to the idea of a domestic Peace Corps. Moreover, I should like to ask the House to make their final act of support and tribute for the foreign corps, their support of H.R. 12981, my bill, to set up a domestic peace corps based on many of the same principles.

Do we really need a domestic peace corps? Is not this type of volunteer social service only needed by underdeveloped nations, or younger nations? What situations at home could possibly warrant our airlifting volunteers from one city to another, or transporting people from one section of their home city or county to another one?

The answer is this: The evils and side effects of an industrial and urban society and economy. Such phenomena as the dismal hovels of the underprivileged in our large cities, the depressed areas left behind by change in some industrialized States or the superfluity of talent and manpower lying fallow in rural America, because of the shrinking agricultural sector of our economy.

But the need does not arise solely from the economic facts, but, rather from the effect these facts have had upon so many American lives. The bold fact, in fact, that many of our youth, many of our first generation immigrants, many members of minorities or backward areas cannot adjust to our complex way of life, to modern America without new awarenesses, without more education and training, without help.

Who can give them that help? A domestic peace corps of volunteers who know the basics of adjustment, have the education to communicate them, and who could afford the time and expense, if there were only Federal backing.

More specifically, I should like for one thing to see the volunteers of such a corps respond to the words of David Hackett, executive director of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, when he said:

> We must admit in all honesty that we are losing the fight against delinquency. Our control and treatment services have not been able to stem the tide.
>
> The high rates of recidivism offer abundant evidence that correctional services cannot do the job alone. Nor is it just a matter of the quality or the quantity of these services.
>
> We have been dealing with the end results, and overall, we have not been dealing with them successfully. Clearly we cannot relax our efforts to increase the effectiveness of our corrective services.
>
> But to win this fight we must prevent delinquency, not just correct it.

Too, in addition to Hackett's warning on delinquency, there are the following figures on youth in general. Twenty-six million young persons will enter the labor market in 1960. Seven and one-half million of them will do so before having finished high school and 2½ million will be grammar school dropouts. Moreover, all of this is coming about in the context of an economy depending more and more on automation and demanding even for an apprenticeship that a youth have a high school diploma.

Thus, as far as a corps of volunteers is concerned, all these youths, the delinquent, the idle, or the struggling and rejected minority group member, are in need of the training, counseling and liaison between themselves and the constructive world that the volunteers' presence among them would give.

Also, I want you to consider some other figures in conjunction with the youth statistics. These are the various estimates available on the shortage of social workers in the 1960's. In a publication of the American Public Welfare Association recently, various leaders in their fields emphasized "that only 'token service' is currently given toward protecting children and strengthening family life and this by overworked staff members." For example, one-third of the urban counties and one-half of the rural counties in the Nation have no public child welfare workers.

A broader view of the facts is that of the dean of the School of Social Work at the University of Chicago. He has been quoted as saying that America has less than half of the recreational workers she needs and less than 25 percent of the social workers in general.

Add to this, the sometimes too low level of education of many social workers—only 7 out of 10 have their B.A., and among probation officers, three-fourths of the workers lack their bachelor's degree.

This combination of many groping youths with too few counselors to guide them brings only too quickly to mind James Bryant Conant's appellation of "social dynamite." Moreover, it will, indeed, be detonated unless America brings her other kind of "social dynamite" in to work on the problem—her recently graduated and capable young people, and, also, her recently retired, and trained older population.

Too, would not such an enlistment of volunteer talent not only fit into the present American framework, but also into the American heritage? Three things make me say, unqualifiedly "yes." The first is the American tradition of volunteer help and assistance.

Americans from teen age to old age have worked all through our history and development as volunteers in hospitals, supplemented community educational efforts, supervised play and recreation, aided skilled social workers, and assisted with correctional and vocational rehabilitation.

My second reason, of course, is the success of the foreign corps, I mentioned. My third and last the existing American framework and awareness—the countless programs, urban and rural, begun in the last few years under the auspices of a private foundation like the Ford Foundation, or under the auspices of the more recent Federal legislation—the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1961.

In fact, a perfect example of exactly how a domestic corps might cooperate with these fund allocating programs is the recent two-pronged project in central Harlem, New York City.

One of the two prongs or organizations involved will be associated community teams, and its manpowers will be three groups of volunteers who will work as teaching, nursery school, child guidance personnel, hospital, orphanage and temporary custody institution aides. The three groups will consist of privileged youths from the central Harlem area, 18 years old and older; youths from other areas; and adults, again from central Harlem.

To me, this small New York project is just a microcosm of my idea for a larger corps.

In closing, I should just like to say that should a domestic peace corps fail passage this session, it is my intention to reintroduce it next year. For like its foreign predecessor, I believe it is one idea worthy of dauntless enthusiasm and unanimous bipartisan support.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, who art our light and our salvation, we would escape from the tyranny of things which so fill the horizons of each new day, as we open our hearts to Thee for this hallowed moment.

We confess the failures of our vaunted goodness and the subtle pressures that cause us to fall from high standards.

By Thy grace, develop in us the moral stamina that we may not supinely melt into our surroundings.

Make us more worthy of the gifts of heart and mind and spirit that with crimson cost have fashioned the fabric of the Republic. In these testing days so dark with dire danger, make us worthy of those who in their strength and devotion have given their all that this Nation might endure as a land of hope and glory for all the earth.

We ask it in the name of the Master who has declared, "As thy day, so shall thy strength be." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 9, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution concerning United States, British, and French rights in Berlin (Rept. No. 2288).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated September 27, 1962, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3800. A bill for the relief of Avelino Gomez Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3801. A bill for the relief of Henry Kaufusi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 3802. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands at the Southern Regional Research Laboratory with the city of New Orleans, La., for certain other lands adjacent to such laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3803. A bill to authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to assist in the development of savings associations and building societies in countries where they do not now exist in order to accomplish improved living standards to increase employment and to better social and political conditions through facilities for savings and homeownership for the millions of people of modest but stable earning capacity; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S.J. Res. 237. Joint resolution establishing a Joseph Eugene Ransdell Memorial Award and a Joseph J. Kinyoun Distinguished Research Award; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President and colleagues, since I was a young businessman in Pekin, Ill., I have been interested in the thrift and homeownership movement as practiced by our local savings and loan associations in the United States. In fact, I was then a director of our local association and, in recent years, have been a director in one of the large and outstanding local savings and loan associations in the Chicago area. I mention this to qualify myself as having some experience with these mutual and cooperative institutions and having observed the fine work they have done over the last 131 years in making it possible for American citizens of moderate incomes to acquire their own homes, and to ultimately own them free of debt.

Much of the recovery from the great depression of the thirties, prior to World War II, was due to the savings assembled by these local institutions and loaned to American families for the building and buying of homes. Since World War II savings and loan associations have been a major factor in expanding home ownership from a point where 3 out of 10 American citizens lived in and owned their own homes to where today over 6 out of every 10 American urban families live in and own their own homes. But my purpose today in asking your attention in these busy closing hours of the work of the Senate in the 2d session of the 87th Congress, is not to discuss our local or domestic problems or the great progress in the savings and loan field. My purpose is to ask your help and cooperation in extending this time-tested local cooperative principle in the accumulation of savings or "seed capital" in developing countries in Central and South America and in Africa would greatly aid these developing countries in solving their housing problem for their middle income citizens. This idea is not entirely new. Nor is it untried. A good savings and loan law, providing for a Home Loan Bank, which is now functioning, has been enacted in Peru. As a result, there are nine local mutual associations in operation. Similarly, a good law has been enacted in Chile and some 18 mutual institutions are now functioning very successfully in this country. There are new good laws in Ecuador, Venezuela, Colombia, and the Dominican Republic, and savings and loan institutions under proper supervision and prudent local management are being established and are functioning on a businesslike basis and in the public interest, just as our New England cooperative banks and embryonic savings and loan associations did in our country more than a century ago.

This program in introducing modern thrift and homeownership laws and methods to our fellow nations to the south of us is largely the work of a longtime friend of mine, and a person known to many Members of the Senate because of his work in drafting the Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners Loan Corporation Act, the Federal Insurance Corporation Act and the law and charters for local mutual Federal savings and loan associations. I refer to Mr. Morton Bodfish, of Chicago, who has not only taken the leading part in establishing these new institutions in South America, but has also prepared laws to establish similar institutions in Austria, Ethiopia, and Mexico. He is a savings and loan pioneer having been a Democratic member of the original Home Loan Bank Board. He is a practical businessman, having been the founder and chief executive officer of one of the Nation's largest savings and loan associations. In addition, he has a wide knowledge of thrift and home financing methods, and needs overseas, having served for 20 years as president of the International Union of Building Societies and Savings Associations. The International Union, founded in London, England, in 1914, has just held its ninth international congress here in Washington, D.C. Directors and officers of institutions and the appropriate public officials were present from 20 different countries. There was much discussion of the great need for establishing local mutual associations in developing countries and the principal concluding action of the ninth international congress was the unanimous adoption of a resolution which follows and which is quoted in full.

RESOLUTION BY THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF BUILDING SOCIETIES & SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS

One of the long accepted objectives of the international movement is assistance in the enactment of modern laws providing for the establishment and functioning of savings associations and building societies in countries were they do not now exist, in order to accomplish improved living standards, to increase employment and to better social and political conditions through facilities for savings and homeownership for the millions of people of modest but stable earning capacity.

An international home loan bank would be a specially chartered bank through which U.S. savings and loan associations and U.S. Federal home loan banks could lend and invest in associations in other countries. It would provide a prudently operated and supervised central bank which could accomplish a people-to-people source of credit with a minimum of governmental channels and procedures on both ends—the United States and the developing country.

The Governing Council of the International Union of Building Societies & Savings Associations, representing some 17 countries and meeting at the Ninth International Congress, commends officials of the U.S. Government; particularly the Federal Home Loan Bank Board under the leadership of Chairman Joseph P. McMurray, Joseph J. Williams, and John deLaittre; the officials of the Agency for International Development in the State Department including Osborne T. Boyd, Harold Robinson, and Richard C. Knight; the officials of the Inter-American Development Bank especially Stanley Baruch; and also U.S. Senators George Smathers, of Florida, John Sparkman, of Alabama, and Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, and Congressman Wright Patman, of Texas; for their interest and activity in the proposal to establish a U.S. International Home Loan Bank.

We further commend the U.S. savings and loan leaders who have helped to develop this proposal and who are assisting in its improvement and urging its enactment in order that it may become a functioning part of the foreign economic policy and oversea activity of the United States. We hope that the next U.S. Congress will enact the International Home Loan Bank legislative proposal and that new local thrift and home ownership institutions may be established through its leadership and its funds in many of the developing countries of the world.

We do not feel this is a proposal or program which should be confined to the United States, but respectfully suggest that a similar vehicle might be provided by the strong savings and home financing institutions in several other countries so that establishment of savings associations and building societies might be encouraged and made possible in areas outside their own country in which their nationals and their friends are interested.

This resolution shall be made available to appropriate executive agency and legislative leaders, to this council and our union members and to proper and interested press and publications.

The National League of Insured Savings Associations is firmly convinced that the establishment of a private savings and homeownership system is essential to the economic, social, political, and spiritual development of free people everywhere. To this end, the international committee of the National League resolves that U.S. foreign assistance funds for housing be conditioned on:

1. Specific provision by the Agency for International Development for technical assistance and seed capital to establish private thrift and homeownership institutions.
2. Enactment of legislation within the recipient country to establish mutual savings and loan associations.
3. Creation of a central home loan bank system within the recipient country to service and supervise the individual institutions.
4. U.S. funds allocated to housing should not be disbursed until the conditions of this resolution are met.

Mr. President, in order to facilitate the study and discussion of the International Home Loan Bank proposal on a bipartisan basis between now and the convening of the 88th Congress next January, I am introducing an International Home Loan Bank bill very similar to Senate 582 which has been under discussion and study by the present Congress. This proposed legislation, if enacted, will not require one penny from the U.S. Treasury. The bank will be managed by six Government-appointed directors—two ex officio—and eight directors elected from the savings and loan industry. All these men must serve without compensation and will be glad to do so in order to make a significant contribution to American foreign economic policy. They will strive to accomplish real people-to-people assistance under a carefully planned international bank chartered by the Congress and guided and supervised by appropriate departments of the Federal Government. Funds invested and loaned by the International Home Loan Bank will be advanced to the mutual institutions being organized under proper laws and supervision in many other countries, and funds will be available to them only after they have invested substantial amounts of their own money and have launched a savings program to attract savings from the local citizenry. After all, savings and investment money must be assembled before homes can be built and sold through proper economical financing. In the United States it takes about six savers to make possible one loan to one home buyer.

The scarcest material to build homes and improve housing standards and to make possible small home ownership, which, incidentally is the greatest bulwark against communism, is long-term credit. In practically every country, there is wood, cement blocks, bricks, and metal. There is residential land. There are local governments which can provide streets, water, and sewers. There are engineers and architects in abundance, particularly in the Latin American countries. There are construction laborers, skilled and unskilled, who would welcome and who need employment that flows from the construction of homes.

Other home construction materials are available although some 5 to 10 percent of the total materials, consisting primarily of plumbing and electrical equipment, might have to be imported. The thing that is almost totally absent is long-term economical mortgage credit through which the ordinary man can buy and pay for his home. Millions of people have the adequate 10- or 20-percent downpayment required to purchase a home, or have the lot on which to build. They cannot build for the lack of 15- and 20-year mortgage money. The International Home Loan Bank proposal, if enacted, will first help these people to help themselves in supplying this great need for credit. The money will come entirely from our home loan banks and savings associations which will send an amount equal to not more than 1 percent of their assets to assist these new institutions in getting properly and promptly into active financing of home building and home buying.

This is no new and visionary experience with us as we did it in our own country in the trying years of the 1930's. To get the financial segments of our economy, including our savings and loan institutions moving again, we invested $400 million of our Treasury and HOLC funds in new savings associations to get our homebuilding and construction part of the economy into action. Every dollar of this money was repaid. No permanent Government bureaucracy was saddled on the American public. In addition to achieving a no-loss record, the Government received nearly a 3 percent return on its $400 million investment with practically no overhead involved. This accomplishment can be duplicated again internationally in developing other countries, but on a much smaller scale and with a considerable measure of safety.

To help these other countries help themselves in terms of thrift and home ownership, I am hereby introducing a bill to establish an International Home Loan Bank, which I hope will add strength and momentum to the efforts of Senators SMATHERS and SPARKMAN and Congressman PATMAN for this program.

Mr. President, I introduce a bill to establish an International Home Loan Bank and commend it to the study of my colleagues, the appropriate Government departments, and the private financial organizations in our country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3803) to authorize the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank to assist in the development of savings associations and building societies in countries where they do not now exist in order to accomplish improved living standards, to increase employment, and to better social and political conditions through facilities for savings and home ownership for the millions of people of modest but stable earning capacity, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BURDICK submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL — ADDITIONAL CONFEREE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer appoint an additional conferee on the part of the Senate in regard to the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1963, H.R. 12276.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT OF POSITION OF SENATOR CLARK ON SUNDRY VOTES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has voted or been recorded on 225 of the 227 votes thus far in the 2d session of the 87th Congress. By inadvertence he was not recorded on two votes.

On September 18, if present and voting, Senator CLARK would have voted "nay" on the rollcall on the Bush amendments to the trade bill—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 19815.

On September 20, 1962, if present and voting, Senator CLARK would have voted "nay" on the Miller amendment to the Quincy Columbia Basin bill (H.R. 11164)—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 20066.

I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD indicate his position on these votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF COPIES OF CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND AMENDMENTS THERETO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2248, House Concurrent Resolution 583, which provides for the printing of 185,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 583) to provide for the printing of 185,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto was considered and agreed to.

FAULTY CONSTRUCTION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL IN BOSTON

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call the attention of the Senate to the faulty construction of a Veterans' Administration Hospital which was built in 1950 in Boston by McCloskey & Co.

Recently, I received a report that as a result of the faulty construction, this hospital is falling apart, and that repairs would necessitate a substantial sum, to place the building in proper condition.

I have just received a letter from Maj. Gen. J. B. Lampert, dated September 13, 1962, in which he confirms that the construction work on this VA hospital was not built according to specifications, and that the estimated cost of the necessary repairs would approximate $4 million.

If, as claimed in this report, this $4 million repair job results from faulty construction, then the contractor should be held financially responsible, and the inspectors who approved this faulty construction in 1950 should likewise be called to account.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of September 13, 1962, received from Major General Lampert, along with his report on the faulty construction and the estimated $4 million cost. I am also sending a copy of both my statement and General Lampert's report to the Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, for his examination.

There being no objection, the letter and the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., September 13, 1962.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This letter is in further reply to your recent inquiry regarding the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Boston, Mass.

I am inclosing a report on our investigation of the construction defects, including our findings and the actions we propose to take to correct the defects.

I trust that the report gives you the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. LAMPERT,
Major General, U.S. Army, Director of Military Construction.

REPORT OF CONSTRUCTION DEFICITS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, BOSTON, MASS.

BACKGROUND

The 1,000-bed general medical hospital was designed and constructed under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. Design was accomplished by contract with the architectural firm of Coolidge-Shepley-Bulfinch & Abbot, and the engineering firm of Charles T. Main, Inc., acting as joint venturers. Inspection of construction was performed by the same joint venture. A lump-sum contract for construction was awarded to McCloskey & Co., February 15, 1950, on the basis of competitive bids from the following firms:

McCloskey & Co	$10,563,000
John A. Johnson & Sons, Inc	10,917,000
Thompson & Sterrett Co	11,137,000

Gust K. Newburg Construction Co	11,157,000
Charles H. Thompkins Co. and G. L. Rugo & Sons, Inc	11,180,000
B. Perini & Sons, Inc., and C. J. Maney Co., Inc., and Peter Kewitts Sons' Co	11,183,788
Thomas O'Connor & Co., Inc	11,215,000
Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp	11,245,000
Turner Construction Co	11,252,930
George A. Fuller Co	11,432,000
Gilbane Building Co	11,444,684
John Bowen Co	11,512,000
J. Slotnik Co	12,817,000
Government estimate	12,160,000

The structure comprises 14 floors, several penthouse service levels, a basement and partial subbasement. The structure framework is reinforced concrete and the facing is brick. The hospital was completed October 1952.

HISTORY OF DAMAGE

In April 1953 the Veterans' Administration informed the Corps of Engineers that cracking, bulging and spalling of the brick surface had become evident. Beginning in June 1953 several investigations were made and corrective actions were taken to repair damages that occurred progressively.

Under authority of the Veterans' Administration the Corps of Engineers in mid-1961 through employment of consulting engineers conducted an extensive investigation of the structure and subsequently awarded a contract for removal and replacement of brickwork in distressed areas. At the same time a close examination was made of the structure in an effort to determine the cause of the continuing failures and to recommend methods of corrective action. This investigation showed that more than half of the limestone window mullions were cracked or broken; in some locations there was evidence of major cracking and the brickwork had moved away from the building frame to which it was originally fastened; in many places there were varying degrees of spalling, bulging, and cracking of the brickwork. While the face of the existing brickwork in general is true and plumb, it was found, after removal of portions of the brickwork, that there was a greater than normal space between the brick and the concrete frame; there was evidence of poor construction practice in the manner in which the block and brick backup were installed; the brick relieving and the window lintel angles were not properly installed.

In addition, all windows have at times become inoperable and have required constant repair. Investigation disclosed that the aluminum windows, which were permitted under contract specifications as an alternate to rolled steel section windows, were not of a design adequate for a facility such as this hospital where they required constant operation. The windows are of light construction with thin materials and connections that are difficult to adjust, maintain, and replace. With the varied numbers of people operating the windows and the frequency of their use, the windows are subjected to heavy duty but have only light duty capacity.

THE PRESENT CONDITION

In view of the fact that brickwork in several locations has spalled and fallen from various levels, steps have been taken to reduce accident hazards by limiting or eliminating personnel movement around the building in all but essential areas and by installing temporary protective covering over the roofs of entrances.

REMEDIAL ACTION

Because of the practical difficulties involved in proper brick or wall replacement, and because of the various irregularities of construction encountered in the examination made to date, an exterior enclosure not dependent on the present backup construction or concrete frame is considered most feasible. Therefore, a curtain wall of insulated metal panels will be installed on a stage basis to replace the present brick.

All windows will be replaced.

The Veterans' Administration has authorized the Corps of Engineers to design the corrective features noted herein and is expected to authorize the award of a construction contract after design is completed.

The estimated cost of these repairs, including design, is $4 million.

DETERMINATION OF RESPONSIBILITY

Because of the shortage of personnel at the time of original construction of the hospital, due largely to the Korean War, the architect-engineers who performed the design were retained to perform the inspection of construction. This was done by exercise of an option under the basic contract. This practice is resorted to by the Corps of Engineers only in rare instances, where its own personnel are not adequate in numbers at the time construction is to begin.

The architect-engineers and the construction contractor have been notified of the defects in the hospital, and that their responsibilities in connection with the construction are under legal review.

During reconstruction the Corps of Engineers will exercise intensive supervision through its own personnel with a view of determining, in detail, the causes for the failures and making recommendations to the Department of Justice as to whether legal action against the architect-engineers and/or construction contractor is indicated.

THE MISSISSIPPI SITUATION AND THE EROSION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there are conflicting reports as to where the blame for the tragic situation in Mississippi should be placed. The loss of life, the bloodshed, and the substantial property damage have caused thoughtful citizens throughout the Nation to extend their sympathy to the people of Mississippi and to ponder the effect which this episode will have upon the doctrine of federalism as embodied in our Constitution.

In my opinion, these regrettable circumstances result directly from a steady erosion of the principles of constitutional government in this country.

The immediate issue centers on the question of whether the Chief Executive has the constitutional authority to enforce a Federal court decree by employing troops under the conditions existing in Oxford, Miss.

However this issue may be resolved, the direct consequence of the Mississippi tragedy is another failure of the Supreme Court to interpret the 10th amendment as it was intended to be construed.

This amendment reserves to the States and to the people thereof the powers not delegated to the Federal Government.

With this in mind, it is interesting to examine two recently published newspaper articles. One of these, by Arthur Krock, appeared in the October 9 issue of the New York Times. It was inserted in the Congressional Record yesterday by my esteemed colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], one of this body's ablest constitutional lawyers.

In the article, Mr. Krock compares the somewhat casual attitude of the Supreme Court—in particular, Justice Black—toward the sovereign State of Mississippi with the Court's meticulous care in extending the principles of due process to hardened criminals. The author notes that many lawyers from all parts of the country have shown considerable concern over the lack of executive and judicial restraint exercised in the Mississippi tragedy. He quotes several comments to this effect from a letter written by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 3-minute limitation in the morning hour, the time available to the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] has served with distinction on his State's highest tribunal. In recent years, when repeated efforts, for purposes of political expediency, have been made to erode the constitutional rights of the States, he and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], have been bulwarks in defense of our cherished principle of States rights. Senator Ervin's incisive judgment on constitutional issues has been a source of enlightenment to his colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

The second article to which I refer was written by David Lawrence. It appeared in the Evening Star last night. In the article, Mr. Lawrence quotes at greater length from the letter written by the Senator from North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that the Lawrence article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ex-Judge Looks at Mississippi—Senator Ervin, Former Jurist, Says United States Acted Hastily in the Meredith Case

(By David Lawrence)

A learned judge, who served on the highest court of his State and now is a U.S. Senator, feels that President Kennedy made a mistake in failing to wait till the State of Mississippi had a chance to present its case to the entire Supreme Court of the United States before using troops to enforce a lower court order.

Senator Sam J. Ervin, Democrat, of North Carolina, sent to many of his constituents last week a letter which expresses the view that the administration bungled the Mississippi case. This, incidentally, is also the feeling of a large number of lawyers throughout the country.

It so happens that not until yesterday did the Supreme Court finally consider the application of the State of Mississippi and formally deny its request for an appeal. Only this week, therefore, can it really be said that Mississippi had exhausted all legal procedures available in attempting to deny James Meredith admission to the University of Mississippi.

Senator Ervin, formerly an associate justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court, wrote as follows:

"As a consequence of my experience in the administration of justice as a trial lawyer and judge, I am firmly of the opinion that except in the most extraordinary circumstances no judicial decision should ever be carried into execution until the losing party has been afforded the opportunity to utilize all legal procedures available to him to secure a reversal of such decision, and such decision has become final.

"There were no extraordinary circumstances in the Meredith case. If the course set out above had been pursued and the execution of the judgment in that case had been postponed until the Supreme Court had ruled upon the application of Mississippi for a certiorari to review such judgment, it is possible that the tragic events which have transpired in Mississippi within the last few days might well have been avoided. Unfortunately, however, some of the judges connected with this case forsook judicial discretion for haste.

"For example, Mr. Justice Black, of the U.S. Supreme Court, refused to stay the execution of the judgment on the ground that 'there is very little likelihood that this Court will grant certiorari to review the judgment of the court of appeals.' In other words, Mr. Justice Black stated, in substance, that he would not stay the judgment in a case which the Court had never considered because he thought the Court would probably decide the case against the applicant when it heard the case.

"With all due deference, Mr. Justice Black's statement might be becoming to a crusader. It certainly does not befit an occupant of a judicial office. This is true because it cannot be reconciled with due process of law, which Daniel Webster so well declared in the Dartmouth College case is 'law which hears before it condemns; which proceeds upon inquiry, and renders judgment only after trial.'

"The Constitution would not have been destroyed and the heavens would not have fallen in the efforts to force the entrance of Meredith into the University of Mississippi had been postponed until the Supreme Court had acted upon the application of the State of Mississippi for certiorari to review the judgment in his case.

"Since there were no extraordinary circumstances requiring the immediate acceptance of Meredith by the University of Mississippi, the Department of Justice and the President ought to have taken the position that the physical might of the Federal Government would not be employed to execute the judgment of the court of appeals until the Supreme Court of the United States made such judgment final by denying the application of Mississippi for a writ of certiorari or by deciding the case adversely to Mississippi on its merits.

"Unfortunately, the court of appeals, Mr. Justice Black, the Department of Justice, and the President did not pursue these courses of action.

"And unfortunately, Governor Barnett resorted to a species of physical force to prevent the execution of the decree in the Meredith case. I think he was mistaken in so doing for at least two reasons.

"As a practical matter, he was unwise in pitting the limited physical force of his State against the military might of the United States.

"In the second place, every party to a judicial proceeding ought to obey the decree entered in such proceeding even though he honestly believes such decree to be unwarranted or unconstitutional. In saying this, I do not imply that I approve of the decree of the court of appeals in the Meredith case. That decree was based upon the decision made by the Supreme Court of the United States on May 17, 1954, and I think it is well known that I have always maintained that the Supreme Court of the United States transgressed its constitutional authority to interpret the Constitution and undertook to amend the Constitution when it handed down that decision.

"Governor Barnett's foolish action did not justify precipitate counteraction on the part of others. On the contrary, it called for the exercise of the greatest patience on their part. As Saint Paul so well stated, 'All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient.'"

Senator ERVIN also argues that, even after the President "reached the conclusion that his duty required him to use the military might of the Nation to enforce the judgment," he should have issued a proclamation advising the people of Mississippi of the facts and setting a specified time for action so as to give Mississippi officials time to comply before troops actually were used to enforce the judgment. Mr. Kennedy, unfortunately, issued his proclamation only a few hours before sending in armed marshals, backed up by military units, to enforce the court order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE OF GEORGIA

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on October 7 my able and distinguished colleague, Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, was a guest on the television program which goes under the title "All America Wants To Know." Appearing on the program with him were Rev. James A. Pike, Episcopal bishop of California; Mr. William J. Butler, New York attorney, who argued the school prayer case before the Supreme Court; and Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican of New York.

This program well illustrates the profound knowledge of my colleague in the field of constitutional law and the Constitution of the United States. That was manifested in every word of his brilliant discussion of the momentous issue before the American people as to the proper interpretation of the constitutional provision providing for the separation of church and state.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHER. Shall we bow our heads in prayer? "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

ANNOUNCER. The U.S. Supreme Court found unconstitutional the use of this brief prayer written and recommended by the board of regents for use in New York State's public schools. Rarely has court action so rocked the Nation and divided its people. How far-reaching is the decision? What effects will it have on our public religious practices? All America wants to know: Does prayer have a place in our public schools? A monthly discussion of the great questions facing our country presented in the public interest by America's favorite magazine, the Reader's Digest, in association with Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge, and produced by Theodore Granik. This month's subject is based on the article "Has the Supreme Court Outlawed Religious Observance in the Schools," a debate by William J. Butler and Rev. James A. Pike, appearing in the October issue of the Reader's Digest. To discuss the subject, we are pleased to have as our guests the authors of the debate, Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, Protestant Episcopal bishop of California, William J. Butler, attorney who argued the case before the Supreme Court, and two distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate, Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Democrat, of Georgia, and former Governor of that State, and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, and former attorney general of that State. We will join our group in just a moment.

And now here is your moderator, Mr. Granik.

Mr. GRANIK. Gentlemen, the Reader's Digest debate poses these questions: What actually does the Supreme Court decision say and not say about prayer in the schools? What does it imply both to the schools and to religion in public life generally? Mr. Butler, as attorney for the families that brought the action, what does the ruling really mean?

Mr. BUTLER. Well, first of all, Mr. Granik, I'd like to try to put this case in its proper perspective. What actually happened was that many years ago, around 1951 to 1953, the State of New York, acting through its board of regents, decided that it was the duty and obligation of the State to inculcate into the minds of children a belief in the Almighty God. And in response to this decision, they formulated and composed their own prayer. It was really the first time in the history of the United States that a State agency had undertaken directly a religious activity. After formulating this prayer, they recommended that all the school districts of the State of New York say this prayer at the opening of the school day, hands clasped and led by either a teacher or by a student in the student body. When this prayer was initiated in Roslyn, Long Island, several parents in the local school district there took issue with it. These people were deeply religious people and they, in effect, stated that in their opinion this was the State telling their children how to pray, when to pray, and what to say.

Mr. GRANIK. May we turn to Bishop Pike. I'll come back to you.

Bishop PIKE. Yes. I'd like to challenge Mr. Butler's statement that this is the first time in history that a State agency has taken the initiative in the matter of religious activity. May I just cite a few examples quickly. At the inauguration of President Washington, a committee of the Congress planned the service, arranged for it, paid the parson, who happened to be the bishop of New York at that time. The chaplains in the Armed Forces are paid personnel of the Federal Government with regular rank as officers and they compose prayers. I preached recently at the Naval Post Graduate School down in—a very fine institution, incidentally, down at Monterey Peninsula—and I saw there the Armed Forces prayer book issued by the Government, with a prayer composed by the Government through its paid agencies opening, and in separate services, the different religions set forth. Congress pays chaplains who compose prayers. The man who prays every day in the Supreme Court—God save the United States and this honorable Court—is paid. I can't see that this is the first time that this has happened at all. There are 20 or 30 other instances.

Mr. GRANIK. Senator JAVITS, how far does the ruling go?

Senator JAVITS. I think the ruling only relates to the prescribing by a governmental body of a prayer, and no further. I believe that prayer is not ruled out of the public schools. I believe children may lean upon their desks or have a moment or a period of contemplation in prayer. I believe they may be opened with an invocation. I believe they may take their allegiance to the flag, which contains a reference to the Deity. I believe that where the government intercedes to write a prayer, the Supreme Court has said this violates the so-called establishment clause or whether there is or is not compulsion. I think that's what the decision says. I do not believe that the Supreme Court has sought to exorcise God from the schools, as the saying goes.

Mr. GRANIK. Senator TALMADGE.

Senator TALMADGE. First amendment, of course, says that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. Congress has made no such law. The New York prayer did not attempt to establish a religion. It merely said: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country." Now, I'd like to call as my witness the greatest authority on this particular matter, it was Thomas Jefferson, and he wrote a letter in January 1779 to Elbridge Gary in which he said: "I am for freedom of religion and against all maneuvers to bring about a legal ascendency of one sect over another." And Judge Cooley, the greatest authority on the Constitution, states that the purpose of it is to keep from establishing a state religion or a state denomination of religion. It has never been true in the history of our Republic that any court, any Congress, any President, any Governor, or anyone else would deny the existence of Almighty God. That's what this decision attempts to do.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Butler.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, of course, that's exactly what this decision does not attempt to do, and I have to take issue with the Senator from Georgia, I must say that the use of the word "greatest" can also be applied in my opinion, to members of the Supreme Court of the United States today, where six judges of that Court with one dissenting held that this did amount to the establishment of religion, that this was the State getting into the business of religion, that this was the State composing a prayer, and then inserting it into one of its compulsory institutions, and that this was the state of trying to tell people how to pray, what to pray and when to pray, and this, when added up in a compulsory institution, such as the public school system, will end up with the state coercive powers forcing upon children a belief in God.

Senator TALMADGE. I might interrupt at this point. Now here's what Judge Cooley says, and I think everyone in America, every member of the bar, would recognize him as the greatest constitutional authority in the history of our country. And here's what he says: "By establishment of religion is meant the setting up or recognition of a church—of a state church—or at least the conferring upon one church of special favors and advantages which are denied to others. It was never intended by the Constitution that the Government should be prohibited from recognizing religion or that religious worship should never be provided for in case where the proper recognition of divine providence and the working of government might seem to require it, and where it might be done without drawing any individious distinctions between religious beliefs, organizations or sects.

Mr. GRANIK. Senator JAVITS.

Senator JAVITS. May I have just a word here because I think it's important. I don't think my view squares with quite that of those who have been so actively debating this subject. In the first place, I think the decision is very narrow and relates to a State-prescribed prayer, and does not inhibit any prayer, as Bishop Pike so properly points out. Invocation is constant, not only in schools, but in courts and in our own Congress. The Senate of the United States opens with prayer. But I think what the people want to know of my colleagues on this debate is where do they stand. And I think that's what we ought to try to answer. Where do they stand? What can and can't be done? And I deeply feel as a lawyer that there is a distinction to be made between the establishment clause, which is the establishment, as Senator TALMADGE has just read from a very learned authority, of some type of institute—or some institution of religion—and the exercise clause, which is a freedom of worship, freedom of religion, and so on. Now I think all the Courts decided, and it went, I agree it went further that the Court has gone heretofore, it decided that a State-prescribed prayer verges so close to being an establishment of a religion that the Court has struck that down. Well, the Supreme Court is the last word on the law, and I assume that that's the law for the moment.

Mr. GRANIK. May Mr. Pike come in for a moment, Senator?

Bishop PIKE. The Supreme Court is the last word except in one thing and that is the Constitution itself, and that is why I feel in due time a constitutional amendment should be adopted which does not make exceptions to the first amendment. I'm all for the first amendment and there are so many instances of this, as you and I agree—you'd have to have an amendment this long which would make it as bad as the California constitution, which is practically an encyclopedia of everything that any State assemblyman ever said in a speech.

Senator JAVITS. Or the New York constitution.

Bishop PIKE. Is that like that too? But rather, to restate the phrase, "establishment of a religion," to say what our forefathers really meant. And I think frankly—we won't get off into that case in the tale, but in a column against the Champaign School District, I think the Court was wrong in its definition of the word "establishment." I think in this case it's wrong in its definition of the word "religion." Now, as to what "religion" meant, anyone who had had the recent English experience of my particular church being established in England knew exactly what they didn't want—the relationship between the Church of England and the state—and Madison himself made that perfectly clear in his writings. His greatest biographer, Brant, has pointed out that was his intention here, to avoid a sect prevailing. Madison himself wanted it to read: There shall be no national establishment of religion, which would have made clear what he meant except that some people didn't like the idea of mentioning the National Government.

Mr. GRANIK. Mr. Butler, in your debate in the Reader's Digest, you say you notice a growing acceptance of the decision.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. I'd like to bring that up now because I'd like to change this argument from quoting constitutional authorities out of context, and also by stating what was intended by Jefferson and Madison in the minds of lawyers. What we're really after here is religious freedom. The whole purpose of the first amendment——

Bishop PIKE. May I interrupt and ask you, did the Court or did it not in its majority opinion rest this on the religious exercise clause at all? It did not.

Mr. BUTLER. It did not.

Bishop PIKE. No, it did not. It rested it on the establishment clause.

Senator JAVITS. That's very important. Could we all agree on that? It did not involve the free exercise of religion.

Senator TALMADGE. I agree. They said "establishment." A mere address to Almighty God established a religion.

Senator JAVITS. Now that is I think the fulcrum of the discussion, in short, they have gone, I think, about as far as they could conceivably go in dealing with the establishment clause. But, so long as the exercise clause is left, the thing that concerns me, Bishop Pike, is shouldn't we allow the few other cases which erupt there—cases involving, for example, this question of an invocation, or a Christmas observance or Bible reading—shouldn't we allow those cases to be decided before we jump into what, in my opinion, could create grave religious conflict in the country. How do you write a change in the first amendment? What do you say? For example, one of my colleagues wants to allow a period for prayer. Another of my colleagues wants to allow any kind of prayer, whether or not written by a State. Now this is going to involve a very big argument. I remember a time, for example, when minorities in this country—Catholic, as well as other minorities—were very much concerned about that kind of thing.

Mr. GRANIK. I think Bishop Pike wants to get a word in. Mr. Butler, we'll come right back to you.

Bishop PIKE. Yes, I want to get a word in now because I do agree with you. That's why I said in due time I would like to see consideration of a constitutional amendment because I'm wondering myself if we hadn't better get a new opinion out of the Court on these two cases coming up now, where I'm sure after all this discussion, they will do their utmost to clarify language and point out implications more fully than the present majority opinion did, and that might throw more light on what kind of amendment, if any——

Mr. BUTLER. But I'd like to bring up this point. Nothing can be done in the United States until we put this issue in its proper framework. I'd like to convince my fellow Americans that religious freedom is better protected if we keep religion out of the public schools, that whenever the state participates in the religious exercise, promotes a religious exercise, furthers a religious exercise, it's dealing a blow to religious freedom. Religion should be left to the home and to the church. It shouldn't be in the state. It shouldn't be a function of the state to tell us how to pray and what to say, because history showed us that whenever that happened in the 3,000 years of recorded history, that that was the end of religion, the people lost their religion. They lost their right to practice their religion the way they chose. That was my plea before the Supreme Court. That's what the Court sustained. That's the proposition the Court sustained.

Mr. GRANIK. The Senator wants a word.

Senator TALMADGE. May I interrupt at that point?

Mr. BUTLER. Now if you're against that, that's the issue.

Senator TALMADGE. I sincerely believe in separation of church and state, but I just as strongly oppose secularization of our Nation. I think it's awful indeed when our courts strike down the existence of Almighty God and put Almighty God and the devil on coequal status as far as the Supreme Court of the United States is concerned.

Mr. BUTLER. But you can't believe in freedom.

Senator TALMADGE. You can indeed. Now I don't blame you for not wanting to hear constitutional authorities because none of them accept that recent decision of the Supreme Court that supports your views. Here's what Mr. Storey, a great constitutional authority said on that: He said there probably will be found few persons in this or any other Christian country who would deliberately contend that it was unreasonable or unjust to foster and encourage the Christian religion generally as a matter of sound policy as well as revealed truth. The constitutions of 49 of the 50 States in this Union mention God, including that of New York State, and I'm for it.

Senator Javits. Well, Senator, yield a minute, because I really think that we should not assume that that's what the Supreme Court did without actually being absolutely sure about it, because I do think that would be a lethal blow to the country and all its institutions. And even Mr. Butler—I was interested to hear his point—did not define his terms. For example, he couldn't—and I doubt that he would—but if he would, he couldn't against educating people about what has happened in religions historically in school. This is one of the great teachings of our history, and the minute you do, you are, if you follow the absolutely pure line, you're prohibited from teaching the history of the Reformation, the exodus of Moses or any other, or the coming of Jesus, or any other great event which is historical. And I just cannot believe that the Supreme Court decided that, and as I would like to make at least my position crystal clear, I would say this I believe this is a narrow decision. I believe it goes to the outermost limits of the decision, but I do not believe we ought to leap into a constitutional amendment without giving the Court an opportunity as the highest organ of law in our land, to clarify precisely the limits of what is meant. Then if we need a constitutional amendment, in the light of the judgment and the morality of the people, then is the time to do it, not now.

Mr. Butler. I'd like to take issue with the bishop.

Mr. Granik. We'll come right back to you—go ahead Bishop.

Bishop Pike. I'm thinking increasingly along the line, Senator, you mentioned. I have felt that the type of amendment that should emerge, if one is needed, would be simply a restatement. The establishment—the recognition as an established church of any denomination sect or other organized religious association. I'd just like to——

Senator Talmadge. That is, of course, what the framers of the first amendment intended and it was clearly demonstrated when it was debated in the House of Representatives in the colloquy between Congressman Huntington, of Connecticut, and James Madison, who was the author of the amendment. They were determined that we would not have an established church in America. We had at that time Thirteen Original States, eight of them, I believe, had established churches. At the time, the establishment referred to was the Episcopal Church—the Church of England. And Thomas Jefferson and James Madison were determined that we would not have a state religion in America that would be mandatory upon the people and tax money could be levied to support it. That's what the first amendment was intended to convey.

Mr. Granik. Mr. Butler wants a word.

Mr. Butler. Well, certainly, Senator, that was one of the things that it was intended to prevent. Of course, the ultimate aim of the first amendment has always been the religious freedom of America. No one can take that away.

Senator Talmadge. What religious freedom is denied by this practice?

Bishop Pike. Where it's voluntary.

Mr. Butler. Where it's voluntary?

Senator Talmadge. It is voluntary.

Senator Javits. You said so in your brief.

Mr. Butler. But also the establishment of religion——

Senator Talmadge. All right. What religion does it establish?

Mr. Butler. It establishes a State religion.

Senator Talmadge. Which one?

Mr. Butler. The New York State religion.

Senator Talmadge. What religion does Almighty God——

Mr. Butler. I want to finish my point. I know you'll give me the courtesy of finishing my point.

Senator Talmadge. Certainly I will.

Mr. Granik. We'll yield to the attorney from New York.

Senator Javits. We should all be saintly on a program of this kind.

Mr. Butler. Because it's pretty apparent to me that those who take issue with this decision are sanctioning in effect the State power for religious activity. I'd like to make a point that I have not made either in the article or did I make before the Supreme Court of the United States, and that is that I sense that the opposition to this decision is somehow entwined with abdication of parental and ecclesiastical responsibility. I think that the outcome of this decision is pointing out more and more each day the fact that the parents of America to a large extent are relying on the State to inculcate in the minds of their children the belief of God—a responsibility that should be theirs and should not be the State's responsibility.

Mr. Granik. Mr. Pike has a word here.

Bishop Pike. As one very much concerned for religious education—I mean administratively so—let me say this: This prayer—the under God and the pledge of allegiance and these other exercises as such—teach very little theology. We certainly cannot rely on them to set forth the framework of the Judea-Christian heritage and perspective on life. But, using these things in the 40 or 50 different ways that we do in our public life is as near neutral as anything we can get. If you leave them all out, you have secularism by default—a view of life presented of man and things without God, a time in history without eternity, simply because these things are ignored. So that's not neutrality, because secularism itself is a faith—a view of life taken on faith explaining reality. If you go to this side and you use the Book of Common Prayer, let's say of my tradition, or the Reformed Jewish Prayer Book, or something, then you are inculcating a set of ideas and doctrines and practices of a given view. These things, I regard, not so much as the teaching of religion as simple pointers, little pointers—"In God We Trust," the eye of God on the back of the dollar bill—He's not as honored as he used to be due to inflation—but these are little pointers that there may be more. It's not a conflict with what we're doing in the Sunday school or what we're doing at home, but leaves a possibility of room for God. That's all they do, and that's about as near neutral as we can get.

Mr. Granik. Bishop Pike, you've noted in the Reader's Digest debate that American public life is full of official prayers, such as the songs "God Bless America" and "America," the daily recitation of the pledge of allegiance to the flag with reference to "one nation under God" has become a public school tradition. Questions have also been raised about the use of the fourth stanza of our national anthem for the same reason. Does the Supreme Court decision affect such practices, Mr. Butler?

Mr. Butler. Well, of course not.

Senator Talmadge. Oh.

Mr. Granik. Let him answer. We'll come back to you in a moment, Senator.

Mr. Butler. And Senator Talmadge, I'm going to read to you the decision of the Court, and I hope that you won't tell me afterward that that's not what it says. But it says in so many words in footnote 1 on page 14 that this decision does not bar those kinds of activities by the State. And it went further to say that such patriotic or ceremonial occasions bear no true resemblance to the unquestioned religious exercise that the State of New York has sponsored in this instance.

Bishop Pike. That was the worst thing that they did because the Court unconsciously was blasphemous. It says when it prays every day and when these fine prayers in Congress are said that they are not religious, we don't really mean them. They are ceremonial. They're real prayers and that's a blasphemous thing unconsciously.

Mr. Butler. The objection isn't to tell Americans how to pray or what to pray. It's to instill into the hearts of the Americans a love for their country. They're patriotic utterances.

Bishop Pike. The prayers are for the love of God.

Mr. Butler. They're not prayers.

Bishop Pike. You've never read the Congressional Record?

Mr. Butler. An archaic man has done it, to tell them how to pray in Congress.

Senator Javits. Gentlemen, can't we—I think that the pragmatic operation which allows the mention of the Supreme Being, our respect for the Supreme Deity, our cognizance of the Being, satisfies all faiths in our country equally, and I have little doubt that the Supreme Court, when it sees what has happened, what it has done, will refine the decision in that way, and then we will find that as long as the implications are gone from this decision, it can be lived with. It's one of those decisions that possibly, in my opinion, can be lived with. But I think it's a great mistake to make this the occasion for internecine strife in a religious sense between the faiths.

Senator Talmadge. I think the word is whether or not they recognize the Supreme Being. That's what the framers of the Constitution intended. That's what the courts have so held, and I think that's what the true significance of the first amendment is.

Bishop Pike. I share your confidence that they will be able to help us on this next decision.

Mr. Granik. I'm sorry, gentlemen, I must interrupt. We'll return after this important announcement.

Thank you very much, Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, bishop of the diocese of California; William J. Butler, New York attorney; Senator Herman E. Talmadge, Democrat, of Georgia; and Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York.

IS THERE PRACTICAL VALUE IN SPACE EXPLORATION?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, by coincidence there came to my attention today a letter written to me by a constituent of Cleveland and the report in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of a speech delivered yesterday by Assistant Secretary of Defense John H. Rubel.

The subject with which these two documents deal involves the moneys we are spending in what is supposed to be the effort to reach the moon.

The Ohio constituent who wrote to me stated:

> I have just taken a trip through the northeastern section of the country where I have met professional and business men from many of the States, as far west as Missouri and many from the eastern seacoast and Midwest. Many of these men express concern over the magnitude of Federal spending in this program of space exploration. None of them could understand its purpose or significance. If it is merely a contest with Russia to see who can first land a man on

the moon, it seems to us to be foolish and impractical, particularly since, from all the information I have, the moon cannot support human life.

I shall omit a portion of the letter, but I continue the quotation:

If there is a logical and practical result to be attained, would it not be well for someone who is thoroughly cognizant of the purposes to be achieved to write an article to be published, for example, in the Saturday Evening Post.

The speech, delivered yesterday by Assistant Defense Secretary John H. Rubel, the Pentagon's Deputy Research Chief, was before the Aerospace Luncheon Club at the Burlington Hotel. Among other things he stated, in effect:

The Defense Department has served blunt notice on advocates of a larger military space program that it regards the current program as probably already too big.

The article further states:

Extensive research, said a high-ranking Pentagon official yesterday, has failed to demonstrate much promise for manned military spacecraft or usefulness for offensive space weapons.

The point which I desire to make is that in the enthusiasm to lead, there is always the danger of going beyond the means and beyond the ability to prudently achieve an objective. Money can be spent prudently only within certain limits. When one goes beyond those limits, lavishness and imprudence come into existence.

It seems to me that the statement by Assistant Defense Secretary John H. Rubel points out the fact that in the enthusiasm to reach an objective we have cast aside the judicious approach. We are spending money solely for the purpose of spending money, when it cannot prudently and intelligently be used. I think the time is at hand when a new look must be taken at this subject, to see if what we are doing is within the realm of prudence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PENTAGON SEES SPACE JOB TOO BIG—NOTICE IS SERVED ON ADVOCATES OF LARGER PROGRAM

(By John G. Norris)

The Defense Department has served blunt notice on advocates of a larger military space program that it regards the current program as probably already too big.

Extensive research, said a high-ranking Pentagon official yesterday, has failed to demonstrate much promise for manned military spacecraft or usefulness for offensive space weapons.

This was the substance of a speech delivered by Assistant Defense Secretary John H. Rubel, the Pentagon Deputy Research Chief, before the Aerospace Luncheon Club at the Burlington Hotel.

Defense officials made it plain that his speech was intended as a full-dress Pentagon answer to those in the Air Force, Congress, and industry who have been warning that the United States is risking danger by insufficient attention to the military aspects of space.

Rubel's comments apparently rule out any major effort to put military men into space in the foreseeable future—barring some breakthrough—although he said the Pentagon would increase its spending on space projects next year above the current $1.5 billion level.

Rubel cited communications, navigational and missile early warning satellites as examples of projects where there are clear military requirements. Despite "great technical difficulties and disappointments," he said, $100 million is being put into the missile warning program this year on top of $300 million already spent. He referred to troubles encountered with the infrared sensors on the Midas.

The "insurance" half of military space spending, he said, involves projects which are no more than "technological building blocks" for possible future space systems where the military requirement is either not clear or completely absent. The billion-dollar Titan III booster falls in this category.

The military space program, Rubel concluded, is adequate and well balanced, although "we probably err on the side of allowing too generous a margin of safety for the effects of these uncertainties."

USE OF MILITARY AIRPORTS IN TIMES OF EMERGENCY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have in my hand a bulletin issued by the Airways Traveler. This bulletin carries the statement that the Department of Defense is discouraging emergency landings at military airports. The article challenges the soundness of this judgment, which would, in effect, prohibit the use of military airports in times of emergency.

I cannot see wisdom in this judgment. It seems to me to be completely contrary to reason. When an aircraft is in the air, carrying human passengers, and an emergency develops, it seems to me that the place which is available for landing, whether it be a private airfield or a military airfield, ought to be available without conditions and restrictions.

I think the Department of Defense ought to make clear whether it really means that the military airbase, regardless of an emergency, unconditionally cannot be used to save human lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bulletin of the Airways Traveler printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MILITARY DISCOURAGES EMERGENCY LANDINGS AT MILITARY AIRPORTS

In order to discourage the use of military airports for emergency landings by civilian pilots, the Department of Defense, through its military representatives in the FAA, has issued an order which will result in (1) the airlines being billed for all rescue costs; (2) the military having the right to clear the runway of the downed aircraft by "any necessary method"; (3) freeing the Government from any legal obligation for property damage to the aircraft; (4) requiring a written report from the pilot.

Presently there is a natural tendency for a pilot, whether civilian or military, to head for the largest runway at an airport with the best emergency equipment when he encounters an emergency situation such as fire or hydraulic failure. This new edict by the military will certainly achieve its purpose in drastically cutting down the number of civil pilots who will fear (as will their companies) the potentially high out-of-pocket costs of rescue. Both airline and business pilot groups are "shocked" by the new ruling.

While the Airways Club does not think it unreasonable for the Government to be held free from any legal obligation for property damage to aircraft and surely there is nothing outrageous to expect a written report from the pilot, the fact that the airlines will be billed for crash and rescue services will act as a deterrent on pilots from using the best emergency facilities available when a dangerous situation develops in the air. We believe that, once again, the welfare and the safety of the passengers are being ignored because the actions of one powerful group are antagonizing another. It would seem the very height of foolishness to discourage pilots from utilizing the safest emergency facilities at hand when the lives of their passengers—who are all substantial taxpayers, by the way—are directly and awesomely involved. If the military is forced to expend a few thousand dollars additionally each year to protect the lives of the Nation's citizens, we say so what? What Congressman would turn down a request for additional funds necessary to save the lives of his flying constituents? We have always thought that the services of the military were traditionally available to distressed citizens during a disaster without the threat of a high price for those services. Apparently we were wrong and the imperiled lives of airline passengers aboard a burning aircraft are not as valuable as property damage during a flood.

"AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION," BY CLIFTON BROCK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the introduction to a book which has just been published here in Washington by Public Affairs Press. The book is "Americans for Democratic Action." It is a study and analysis by Clifton Brock, a young political scientist of the University of North Carolina. The introduction is written by the distinguished columnist and scholar, Max Lerner.

The ADA, of which I am a vice chairman and with which I have been associated since its founding in 1947, has once again this election year become the butt of partisan attack in many campaigns. Most of the campaign attacks on ADA are utter nonsense. Many of the allegations as to the ADA's past or present position on issues are completely false. Max Lerner's description of this book on ADA capsules the real truth about the ADA. The book itself is an objective and detailed history of it.

In his introduction, Mr. Lerner pays tribute to many of the people who have led the ADA over the years. There is one name he does not mention but which I would like to mention, that of my very good personal friend, Marvin Rosenberg. Mr. Rosenberg, an outstandingly successful New York businessman, has nevertheless found the time, the devotion, and the energy to have been one of the real leaders and guiding spirits of ADA. For many years he was its treasurer and now serves with me and with a group of very distinguished men in public life as a vice chairman of ADA. Marvin Rosenberg's activities as a good citizen have not been confined only to ADA, which is his first love, but to the Democratic Party in his own State and throughout the country. I personally am immeasurably indebted to him for the selfless help, advice, and encouragement he has given me over the years. He is a true and faithful friend and I salute him.

There being no objection, the introduction was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION BY MAX LERNER TO THE BOOK ENTITLED "AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION," BY CLIFTON BROCK

This book is more than the history of a liberal organization. It provides an angle of vision—that of an idea-in-action—from which to watch the unfolding of American liberalism in our era. It is written factually, without sentiment or adornment, which is one of its merits, for we feel in it the rough touch of authenticity: this is how it happened, these were the shaping men, and these the shaping events.

There can be no doubt that without the ADA American political thought and action would have become more extremist at both ends, left and right. The example of European nations, where communism penetrated the intellectual and professional groups after the war, is an index of what might have happened in America. With this additional note: the extreme right would have taken panic at the first signs of a strong trend toward the extreme left, and America might have witnessed not a McCarthyism which made a bid for power and failed, but one which made its bid come through. I believe that McCarthyism was defeated in the end mainly by responsible American conservatism but such a conservatism could not have functioned in a political climate where the pull was away from the center toward the extremes.

By countering the postwar Communist drive in America to capture the liberal intellectuals, the ADA kept the centrifugal pull from taking over. But it did more. It also undertook to provide some affirmative direction to creative energies in both major parties, especially the Democratic. Although it was itself, in the political spectrum, to the left of center, it helped provide a dynamic center between the totalitarian positions, to which men of diverse democratic beliefs could repair.

It was not wholly successful. Given the pluralism of American life and the inevitable fragmentation of thought, what movement could have been? But by supporting the Marshall plan at a critical moment in world history, it gave renewed strength to the drive toward a liberal internationalism which linked it with Woodrow Wilson's appeal for self-determination, Franklin D. Roosevelt's good neighbor policy, and also Roosevelt's willingness to use American power in the struggle against world chaos and world tyranny. By throwing its strength toward a welfare society and a bold program for economic growth, the ADA linked itself with the imaginative forces in American history from populism and progressivism through the New Deal. By taking a vanguard position in the civil rights struggle, and fighting it out in committee rooms and on the floor of political conventions, it committed itself to finishing the unfinished business of access. For the heart of American civilization as a dynamic world force is the idea not of a narrow egalitarianism but of equal access to equal opportunity for all. This means that, whatever the individual differences in endowment and talent, each child can have a chance to develop his potential and become a person in a society of richly diverse persons.

For those of us who took part in these battles, whether inside the ADA or (as in my own case) outside but working in the same directions, this book evokes memories of stir and excitement when (like Ulysses in Tennyson's poem) we had a chance to—

"Drink delight of battle with our peers
Far on the ringing plains of windy Troy."

For the new political generations coming up it will, I hope, serve to show that effective political action is still possible in America even for those who are not professional politicians; that the political system has not rigidified beyond the reach of reason and energy; that the belittling of the political life and career, which corroded the will of so many of my own generation, need not be part of the liberal creed; that the best form of radicalism in America is not that of the absurd and fanatic right or of the straitjacket left, but of a radical humanism which makes man's humanity the root as it makes man's welfare the goal of social action.

You will find in this book the names of the men and women who exerted themselves to keep this idea in action alive. Foremost, of course, is that of James Loeb, who fathered the ADA movement. But I think also of Joseph Rauh, of Robert Nathan, of Wilson Wyatt, of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., of James Wechsler, of Hubert Humphrey, of Samuel Beer, of John Roche, of Violet Gunther, and of many others who worked with a quiet commitment. The atmosphere they worked in had its difficulties and ironies. The ADA was not the Svengali which its enemies depicted, seducing innocent political maidens; nor was it the millstone around the neck of the practical politicians which others portrayed it. In a crisis period of history its leaders knew there was a task to be done, neither as a pressure group nor as a political party, but as a leverage group to set in motion forces stronger than itself, and to channel energies that might otherwise go unused or be used destructively. Clifton Brock has told this story admirably, straightforwardly, and with absorptive interest.

One final word. American liberals share the general American sense that size is a mark of success. Since ADA's membership never has been large, does it follow that it has not been a success in American politics? Not at all. The episode of the third-party movement in 1948 around Henry Wallace, and its tragic dissipation of good talents and generous energies, was the great turning point for the ADA and its self image. Not only did this episode show the ADA's effectiveness: it also ruled out a third-party mass movement for the ADA itself. It remained an idea-in-action, and its power remains a leverage power.

But leverage for what? Not for mass opinion in a mass culture, which is the function of the major parties themselves, but for the attitudes of the creative minorities in a creative America. For it is true in politics, as in the arts, that the mass seeks direction from the experience and judgment of the relatively few. If the liberal intellectual and professional group in America had become alienated from the mainstream of political life—as they did in the England of the 1920's and 1930's and in France and Italy in the 1950's—the American situation today would be very different from what it is. The number of ADA leaders working in the Kennedy administration is no "treason of the intellectuals" despite the charge to that effect by many who still belittle political action. It is a healthy sign that some of the best American energies are being kept in the mainstream of American life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further business in the morning hour?

ELMORE COUNTY, ALA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2157, H.R. 555.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 555) for the relief of Elmore County, Ala.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this measure has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point portions of the report having to do with the purpose of the proposed legislation and a statement about it.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay to Elmore County, Ala., $4,372.51 in full settlement of its claims against the United States for reimbursement for one-half of the cost of civil defense communications equipment purchased by the county in October of 1958 to be used in connection with civil defense programs of the county.

STATEMENT

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in its report on this proposed legislation describes the facts and circumstances and makes its recommendation as follows:

"The purchase of communications equipment which is referred to in the bill H.R. 555 was made as the result of a visit by county officials to the Office of Civil Defense in Montgomery, Ala. Early in , 1958, the county engineer, probate judge, and a number of the members of the commissioners' court met with representatives of that office and were informed that civil defense authorities were anxious for the county to obtain a communications system, since it was located in a strategic area, and such a system would be needed in the event of any emergency. The committee is advised that the strategic areas referred to included those surrounding Gunter and Maxwell Air Force Bases. After this visit by county officials, negotiations were begun by the county for the purchase of a communications system under the impression that the county was acting in accordance with civil defense regulations. In October 1958, an order was placed for the equipment and in January 1959 the communications equipment was paid for by Elmore County.

"As is noted in the report of the Department of Defense, on December 21, 1959, the county submitted a project application for a Federal contribution for one-half the expenses incurred by the county in the acquisition. This application was submitted to the State of Alabama in accordance with the procedures under the civil defense contributions program who in turn forwarded it to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization on January 11, 1960. While it is stated that the project application was withdrawn subsequently, the report of the Department of Defense makes it clear that because of the circumstances of the case the project application could not have been approved due to restrictions relating to the availability of the appropriation. The Comptroller General has ruled that project applications may not be approved where the procurement is approved prior to the availability of the appropriation. In this case, the appropriation which would have been charged with the contribution became available on July 1, 1959.

"The report of the Department of Defense refers to relief legislation (Public Law 87-390) which had the effect of ratifying contributions actually made where the procurement had occurred prior to the availability of the appropriation. However, no relief would have been available to this county under that statute, since no Federal contribution was ever paid to the county. It is relevant to note that had a payment been made to this county it apparently could have been ratified under this public law.

"The bill H.R. 555 was the subject of a subcommittee hearing on August 2, 1962. From the testimony presented at that hearing, it is apparent that the county officials acted in complete good faith in the purchase of this equipment and in fact relied upon the assumption that one-half of its cost would be assumed by the Federal Government. Since the equipment was purchased after a conference with local civil defense officials, the county officials had assumed that they had met every possible requirement for Federal participation.

"On the basis of the facts presented to it, this committee feels that this is an appropriate matter for legislative relief. Following the hearing, this committee requested that the Department of Defense further investigate the matter to determine whether the equipment purchased by the county would have met the requirements and standards which were made a prerequisite to Federal payment. The committee is advised, that after a technical review of the equipment purchased by the county in 1959 it has been determined that it did meet the specifications for communications and civil defense purposes and could have been approved had all other requirements been met. In view of this fact and the circumstances outlined above, this committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably."

This committee agrees with the conclusions and recommendations of the House Judiciary Committee and it is, therefore, recommended that H.R. 555 be favorably considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 555) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

BRUTAL SUPPRESSION OF FREEDOM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the whole world has been shocked and horrified at the confessions now being made by one Begdan N. Stashynsky, a defector from the Russian Secret Police K.G.B. who has admitted murdering Stepan Bandera and Lev Rebet, Ukrainian nationalists leaders in 1957 and 1959. At his trial which is presently taking place in Germany, Stashynsky confessed that these murders were committed with poison spray guns on German soil under the direct orders of the Soviet Government.

Mr. President, it is appalling that the Communists resort to such inhuman and sinister methods to suppress the forces of independence and self-determination, forces which today are more and more prevalent in the captive nations of the world. Mr. President, the Communist denial to these nations of the right to shape their own destinies proves that the real imperialist power today is the Soviet Union and certainly not the West, as the Russians constantly charge. These brutal crimes stand out as glaring symbols to the world of the plight of the people in the captive nations today living under the yoke of Communist tyranny where all aspirations for freedom are silenced.

Recently a resolution was adopted by the Ukrainian American Youth Association meeting in Utica, N.Y., condemning this action against freedom and further resolving that the true imperialist power today is the Soviet Union. Also, additional details of the trial of Stashynsky were reported in today's New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution and the article in the New York Times be printed in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution by Ukrainian American Youth Association, Inc.

Whereas Bogdan N. Stashynsky, agent of the Soviet Russian secret police (K.G.B.), defected to the Federal Republic of Germany and confessed to having assassinated, upon direct orders of the K.G.B. in Moscow the territory of Western Germany, the head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists Stepan Bandera; and

Whereas the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany established beyond doubt that the above-named person was murdered with poison pistols, employed by the above-named Russian agent, which constitutes an utterly immoral, inhuman, and criminal method of destroying fighters for freedom; and

Whereas the assassination was perpetrated by the Government of the U.S.S.R. against leaders of movements struggling to liberate the Ukrainian and other non-Russian nations from colonial enslavement by Soviet Russia, and fighting for self-determination, independence, national integrity, equality of all citizens before law, social justice, economic progress, and all the fundamental human rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, To ask the Court trying defendant Stashynsky to make it fully clear that the Government of the U.S.S.R. is the chief accomplice in planning and preparation of these horrible murders; and further be it

Resolved, To call upon the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to expose on the basis of these crimes the colonial policies of the Soviet Russian Government toward Ukraine and other non-Russian nations which linger under Communist-dominated regimes; and be it

Resolved, That the American people should be informed about this trial as widely as possible, inasmuch as the case exposes Soviet Russian imperialistic methods, used for achieving a world Soviet Russian empire, which methods transcend the Nazi genocide practices in their brutality as revealed at the process of Eichmann; and be it

Resolved, That the methods used in the assassination of the Ukrainian freedom fighters are basically the same as those used in Cuba and therefore require a common response; and be it finally

Resolved, To request the free nations of the world condemn Soviet Russian colonialism with its hideous methods and to demand action aiming at liquidation of the greatest, most tyrannical and criminal colonial empire of Soviet Russia.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 10, 1962]

Soviet Defector Describes Secret Gun Used in Killings

Karlsruhe, Germany, October 9.—A former Soviet agent, accused of two political murders with a secret gas spray gun, indicated today that the same weapon had been used in other Soviet-ordered killings.

Bogdan Stashinsky testified at his trial that an agent from Moscow instructed him in the use of the gun at the Soviet compound in East Berlin and told him it had been successful before. He said this was the weapon with which he killed two Ukranian nationalist leaders, Lev Rebet and Stefan Bandera, in Munich in 1957 and 1959.

The agent said the gun left no traces that would have lead investigators to suspect murder, Stashinsky said.

Stashinsky defected to the West in August 1961, after his marriage to a German girl.

REVIEWS OF BOOK ENTITLED "DEMOCRATIC THEORY," WRITTEN BY GIOVANNI SARTORI

Mr. HART. Mr. President, one of the most abused words in the English and many other languages today is the word "democracy." We all know that in parts of the world it has actually been appropriated to describe its opposite. I suspect that even in this Chamber the word is often used as a substitute for hard thought, rather than as a result of it.

Wayne State University in Detroit has recently published in English a book written by Giovanni Sartori entitled "Democratic Theory." A truer translation of its Italian title might be "Democracy and Its Definition."

Sartori, in 467 pages, apprises what political democracy logically should be and historically has been. In his preface to the American edition, Sartori says the book was written not for a convinced, but for an unconvinced audience, for he lives in a country where more than 40 percent of the electorate vote for parties which do not, in truth, want democracy.

In looking through this book, one chapter struck me as particularly apt to our own democracy. There are those among us—and we are very familiar with their point of view—who contend that power, however exercised, is by definition a threat to democracy; those whose respect for government is related inversely to the ability of that government to govern—that is, to act in positive terms on behalf of those governed.

Sartori in a brilliant chapter on "Democracy, Leadership, and Elites" points out that democracy, more than any other form of government, depends upon the quality of its leadership. The greatest threat to modern democracies is not leadership, but its absence, resulting in anarchy, mediocrity, and the rise of nondemocratic elites.

What is important to Sartori is the distinction between nondemocratic and democratic leaders which he finds to be a distinction between those who impose themselves and those who propose themselves.

Says Sartori:

> Our problem is how we are to be ruled, not to avoid being ruled. The formula for democracy, is, or should be, the following: neither to eliminate or submit passively to power, but to make it a function; to control the leaders in exercise of this function; and to put in office responsible, accountable, and capable leaders.

Mr. President, I cannot recommend this book as a soothing bedtime story. I can recommend it to those of my colleagues who want to do some hard thinking about that political system which here at home, we work to perfect, and which we seek to defend and extend throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent that reviews of this book published in the National Civil Review of July 1962 and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 18, 1962, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[National Civic Review for July 1962, by National Municipal League]

DEMOCRATIC THEORY

(Review of book by Giovanni Sartori, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1962, XVI, 479 pp., $8.50)

The English title of this book does not represent a true translation of the original Italian version, which could be more closely rendered as "Democracy and Its Definition." One of the most quoted men that ever lived, Alexis de Tocqueville, once again provides the perfect statement to describe the book—so accurately that the author himself conveniently supplies the quotation right after the title page.

It is our way of using the words "democracy" and "democratic government" that brings about the greatest confusion. Unless these words are clearly defined and their definition agreed upon, people will live in an inextricable confusion of ideas, much to the advantage of demagogs and despots.

This is a treatise in defense of the liberal-democratic concept of government. It is also an intelligent polemic against the Communists' bizarre distortion and usage of the word "democracy." More importantly—and not unrelated to the current American political scene—Professor Sartori attacks the many dilutions of Western democracy that have originated on the right and left which equate democracy with stability and security for the state and its citizens.

In his definitions and historical appraisals one can find points with which to take issue. It is, however, a provocative and valuable book. His pessimistic concluding thoughts evoke concern.

None of us is born civilized; our real birth certificate should bear the year zero. Our historical maturity of men of "our time" must always be reconquered, and each time we have to cover a longer distance. My question, and I should say my fear is, Has the line of Western tradition become too long? Do we still have the energy to travel its full length? From time to time I am struck by the suspicion that the house is more civilized than its inmates, and that civilizations crumble because they end by being more advanced than their tenants. Are we really pregnant with the future, or are we in effect unable to keep pace with our time?

WM. J. D. BOYD.

[St. Louis (Mo.) Post Dispatch, May 18, 1962]

BETWEEN BOOK ENDS—PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY

("Democratic Theory," by Giovanni Sartori, Wayne State University Press, 495 pp., $8.50)

Democracy as an ideal and democracy in practice are, of inherent necessity, two different things. What democracy means and should mean to modern man is subjected to a thorough examination by the author, a professor at the University of Florence, Italy. It is a most welcome treatise which throws now light on all the problems which beset the democracies of our time.

Sartori emphasizes that democracy means many things to many people and that where it is challenged, provisional answers will not do. He therefore deals with political democracy as opposed to economic democracy, and with its difference from social democracy. The difficulty is that as a political form democracy has to reduce the "manifold wills of millions to a single authority," which means it has to work under conditions which are but a remote approximation to the optimum conditions found in primary groups. Sartori warns that a literal democracy can never exist, as Rousseau already pointed out, because it is contrary to the nature of things for the greater number to govern and for the lesser number to be governed.

We thus get, of course, into a discussion of the elites. Nondemocratic elites impose themselves, whereas democratic elites propose themselves. Democracy should therefore not reject power but make it a function, control the leaders who exercise this function, and elect to office responsible and capable leaders. In a sense, Sartori advocates an aristocratic democracy, because the self-governing "demos" is a myth. The democratic theory of elites, he says, is the core of democratic theory itself.

Turning to the question of whether industrial societies will also be democsatic societies, the author believes that those which are already democratic can be given a favorable prognosis, whereas the newly developing societies may experience "a forced industrialization to be paid for by a radical reduction of consumption. * * * Therefore it is quite likely that throughout the world industrial dictatorships and not democracies will prevail."

The only solution lies in a rethinking of the ideas on which democracy rests.

GERHARDT NEUMANN.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business will be laid before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT INCOME

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2165, H.R. 6371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6371) to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT TO THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2247, H.R. 9045, which was discussed yesterday, and which I understand has now been cleared with Senators on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9045) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the votes by which H.R. 9045 was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in order to carry out the intention of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I send to the desk an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point, without reading.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1246; 50 U.S.C., App., sec. 39), is amended to read as follows: 'Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of section 32, 40, 41, 42, or 43 of this Act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946.'

"Sec. 2. The Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following sections:

"'Sec. 42. (a) As used in this section, the word "trademark" includes trademarks, trade names, and the goodwill of the business to which a trademark or trade name is appurtenant.

"'(b) Trademarks vested in the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under the provisions of this Act subsequent to December 17, 1941, which have not been returned or otherwise disposed of under this Act, except trademarks vested by vesting orders 284, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 9754, 9 Fed. Reg. 1038), 2354 (8 Fed. Reg. 14635), 5592 (11 Fed. Reg. 1675), and 18805 (17 Fed. Reg. 4364), are hereby divested as a matter of grace, effective the ninety-first day after the date of enactment of this section, and the persons entitled to such trademarks shall on that day succeed to the rights, privileges, and obligations arising therefrom, subject, however, to the rights of licensees under licenses issued by the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General in respect to such trademarks The rights and interests remaining in the Attorney General under licenses issued by him or by the Alien Property Custodian in respect to trademarks divested hereunder are hereby transferred, effective the day of divestment, to the persons entitled to such trademarks: *Provided*, That all unpaid royalties or other income accrued in favor of the Attorney General under such licenses prior to the day of divestment shall be paid by the licensees to the Attorney General.

"'(c) All rights or interests vested in the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under the provisions of this Act subsequent to December 17, 1941, arising out of prevesting contracts entered into with respect to trademarks, except—

"'(1) royalties or other income received by or accrued in favor of the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under such contracts;

"'(2) rights or interests which have been returned or otherwise disposed of under this Act; and

"'(3) rights or interests vested by vesting orders 284, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 9754; 9 Fed. Reg. 1038), 2354 (8 Fed. Reg. 14635), 5592 (11 Fed. Reg. 1675), and 18805 (17 Fed. Reg. 4364),

are hereby divested as a matter of grace, effective the ninety-first day after the date of enactment of this section, and the persons entitled to such rights or interests shall succeed thereto, subject to the right of the Attorney General to collect and receive all unpaid royalties or other income accrued in his favor under such prevesting contracts prior to the day of divestment.

"'(d) The Attorney General shall within forty-five days after the date of enactment of this section publish in the Federal Register a list of trademarks which at the date of vesting in the Alien Property Custodian or Attorney General were owned by persons who were resident in or had their sole or primary seat in the area of Germany now in the Soviet Zone of Occupation or in the Soviet sector of Berlin or in German territory under provisional Soviet or Polish administration. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the effective date of divestment of the trademarks so listed and published in the Federal Register shall be the date of publication in the Federal Register by the Secretary of State of a certification identifying the cases in which an equivalent trademark has been registered in the Federal Republic of Germany for a person residing or having its sole or primary seat in the Federal Republic of Germany or in the western sectors of Berlin. In those cases of an equivalent trademark certified by the Secretary of State, the person registered by the Federal Republic of Germany as owner of such equivalent trademark shall succeed to the ownership of the divested trademark in the United States.

"'Sec. 42. (a) The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Library of Congress the title to all prints of motion pictures now in the custody of the Library, which prints were vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General pursuant to this Act after December 17, 1941, except prints of motion pictures which are the subject of suits or claims under section 9(a) or section 32 of this Act.

"'(b) Subject to the right of selection by the Library of Congress, the authorization, direction, and exception contained in subsection (a) hereof shall apply with respect to such prints now in the custody of the Attorney General. Prints not selected by the Library of Congress may be disposed of by the Attorney General in any manner he deems appropriate.

"'(c) With respect to all prints concerning which title is transferred to the Library of Congress pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) hereof, the Library shall have complete discretion to retain such prints and to reproduce copies thereof, or to dispose of them in any manner it deems appropriate.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no pending business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 2165, H.R. 6371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 6371) to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of the pending bill is to have an instrument available after the Committee on Ways and Means of the House completes consideration of a proposal which is being called up in the House today. It is not contemplated that any action will be taken on the measure until the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], and also the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], are present.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is anticipated that we will not only attend to the pending business this afternoon, but may very well consider the Berlin resolution, very possibly the conference report on appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and the judiciary, and also a number of nominations about which various opinions will be expressed.

I hope that all Senators who are present will remain in the city of Washington until the business of the Senate is completed, and that those who are away and can return will do so in order that there may be enough Senators present to carry on the business of the Nation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Louisiana has been asked by some what is the essential reason for his remaining in Washington. I should like to know if business is to be transacted only by unanimous consent, for I am dubious as to whether a quorum is actually present in the city. This Senator would like to see his family in Louisiana, attend a meeting of the Baton Rouge Chamber of Commerce, and look after other matters, to which he became committed some time ago, anticipating that Congress would have finished its business by this time.

Can the Senator from Montana inform me if it is really necessary that there be enough Senators present in the city to maintain a quorum at this time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana, who has raised the question, knows that I have repeatedly urged Senators to remain in the city because of the vital and important business which must be completed before Congress adjourns.

In addition to the measures which I have mentioned, there are the public works appropriation bill, the public works authorization bill, the supplemental appropriations bill, the highway bill, and the agricultural appropriations bill. I hope that Senators will heed the request of the Senator from Montana, who serves as majority leader, and remain here. I am sure that organizations with which commitments were made at home—such as the meeting of the Baton Rouge Chamber of Commerce to which the Senator from Louisiana referred—will understand and, knowing the circumstances, would demand that the Senator remain here and attend to business.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The public works contains a number of important items affecting the State of Louisiana.

I believe an effort may be made to move to consider the bill in the event a message comes to the Senate from the President informing us of unfavorable action on the bill providing a retirement program for self-employed persons. Some Senators may then insist upon a yea-and-nay vote, and there may be the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is possible. It is one of the reasons that I should like to have Senators remain in Washington; if they cannot remain, we should be able to ask them to come back as soon as possible.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am willing to stay in Washington if it is absolutely essential. If it is not essential that we remain here, I should like to return to my State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If it is absolutely essential, I say to the Senator from Louisiana—as I would to all Senators—that if the Senator wishes me to do so, I should be glad to dispatch a telegram to any organization in Louisiana stating that intention.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe I can take care of that matter myself. I felt it should be made clear that it is necessary for this Senator and at least 50 other Members of the Senate to be present to take care of the business of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Along that same line, let me ask a question. I am not running for reelection this year, but I always like to be among my constituents during the fall months. I, too, would like to go to my home State. I realize the importance of transacting the business before us. Is it not true also that if an important matter came up and a yea-and-nay vote were requested, and no quorum were developed it would be necessary for the majority leader to ask the Sergeant at Arms to summon absent Senators and ask them to return to Washington?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would indeed be necessary.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Therefore, to leave the city would be doing something that would be absolutely futile.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. I would not like to undertake such a procedure, but I would not be adverse to it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have many commitments, including speaking engagements, which I made a long time ago, when I was absolutely confident that Congress would adjourn, even in early August. I have canceled many of them and I plan to continue to cancel commitments, although I would much prefer to fulfill them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I assure the distinguished majority leader that I shall cooperate with him. I am in the position of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in that I am not a candidate. However, my colleague is a candidate for reelection, and I am very much interested in his reelection, as I am sure the Senator from Alabama is interested in the reelection of his colleague. I have canceled speaking engagements up to last week. On the last two nights I have gone up to New York and I have come back to Washington in the middle of the night. I have speaking engagements every night this week. I will remain here, because I consider this to be my principal business. However, I feel it is necessary at this time, in the light of what is happening, to make a unanimous-consent request. I have been named a delegate to the British Parliamentary Conference in Lagos, Nigeria, from November 7 to November 13. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during that period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After hearing the Senator's disheartening remarks, I hardly know what to say. I certainly hope that the Senate will not be in session during the period the Senator has mentioned. I intend to do all I can to see to it that it will not be. I note that the Senator looks after all the angles.

Mr. KEATING. I try to take care of my personal interests and also the interest of my constituents. I am beginning to wonder whether we will be eating turkey here or somewhere else.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the majority leader, in outlining the business of the Senate for the day, made no reference to the Executive Calendar. I hope that we will be able to confirm a good many of the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is anticipated that the Executive Calendar will be brought up today. There will be some discussion of the nominations on the calendar. What the end result will be, the Senate will have to decide.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe there will be discussion of a great many of the nominees. I note at least three pages of nominations on which I do not believe there will be any discussion. I hope the majority leader will reach that business speedily, so that we may put it behind us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will.

RETIREMENT FROM THE SENATE OF SENATOR LONG OF HAWAII

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the time draws near when we must say "Aloha" to a colleague who will not be with us when we reconvene in January. I refer to my good and dear friend from Hawaii, Senator OREN E. LONG. Senator LONG, as we know, has decided not to seek reelection.

I have always looked on Senator LONG as something of a constituent of mine. As a young man, he had the wisdom and good fortune to study at Johnson Bible College at Knoxville, Tenn., and 5 years after his graduation in 1912, to marry the former Miss Geneva Rule of Knoxville. Two years ago his alma mater called him back to Knoxville to confer on him an honorary degree of doctor of law.

We in Tennessee love OREN LONG. So do the people of his adopted State, Hawaii. As a teacher, he migrated to that island paradise about the time that the public school system was extended to the children of the plantation workers. His work as an educator was quickly recognized, for he became, successively, deputy superintendent and then superintendent of public instruction for the Territory of Hawaii and served, in 1946, as chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education for Trust Territories.

But OREN LONG's interest in the total well-being of his fellow men ranged far beyond their opportunities to learn. His distinguished service as director of the department of welfare for Hawaii and secretary of the Territory well prepared him for his appointment by President Truman to be Territorial Governor from 1951 to 1953, and for his subsequent service on the Hawaii Statehood Commission and in the Senate.

The Senate, and through this body the people of the entire United States, have been the beneficiaries of the wisdom and gentle understanding of this wonderful man, qualities that have been shaped by years of devoted public service in the highest sense. We are all acquainted with the excellent work he did as a member of the Select Committee on the Aging, and for his vigorous efforts in behalf of legislation to provide medical care for the elderly and Federal aid to education.

I share Senator LONG's regret that this Congress failed to enact these measures. May I suggest that the 88th Congress can render him no finer tribute than to overcome these deficiencies.

And may I say to my colleague from Hawaii, Godspeed, good fortune, contentment, and all of the other good things of life for you and Mrs. Long in your retirement years. And don't forget to come back to Tennessee every once in a while.

THE HONORABLE STEGAR WEBB, MAYOR OF MILAN, TENN.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on the night of September 27, Tennessee lost one of its finest citizens and I lost a close personal friend, the Honorable Stegar Webb, mayor of Milan, Tenn.

Stegar Webb was a great man. His city is not a large one, nor were his actions as mayor of a kind likely to win national attention. Yet, he had those qualities of strength and goodness that are universally admired, and he employed them in the service of the people of his community, his region, and his State.

Many have spoken and written in tribute to Stegar Webb, and I ask unanimous consent that three representative examples of these tributes be printed in the RECORD. These include an editorial from the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun, and an editorial and a news article from the Milan Exchange.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun, Sept. 30, 1962]

MAYOR STEGER WEBB

In the death of Mayor Steger Webb of Milan not only does his city sustain a loss, but this entire section feels that a very valuable public servant and good citizen has been taken. His death at 44 from a heart attack accentuates the fact that a heavy toll is being taken in this country of its young men who are devoting themselves assiduously to the tasks at hand and who become unmindful of the physical and mental strain attendant thereto.

Mayor Webb was a man of vision. He was a man of determination. He was known for his honesty and integrity. He was constantly engaged in the task of making Milan a bigger and better city in which to live. He was always seeking new industry to provide for a boost in the community economy and to make jobs for his people.

Outstanding performance led the Tennessee Municipal League to name him as "Mayor of the Year" for 1962.

His most recent visit to Jackson was when he attended the dinner given by the West Tennessee Fair management which was held on Thursday night of Fair Week at the fairgrounds with 23 mayors and their wives or other womenfolk present.

His genial spirit and ready smile added to the pleasure of others on that occasion.

Mayor Webb's passing brings deep regret to many Tennesseans in official and private life.

[From the Milan (Tenn.) Exchange, Oct. 4, 1962]

TOWN SADDENED BY LOSS OF MAYOR

Milan has lost another of its greatest citizens. The tears had hardly dried from the loss of one who served his town as mayor many years ago until death struck again, taking one who had unselfishly and without restraint served the town he loved so dearly in the capacity as mayor for the past 5 years.

Mayor H. Steger Webb was loved by all who knew him, both young and old alike, especially the young with whom he spent many hours counseling and advising. Possibly his first love was for the youth of the town. He never missed a basketball or football game and most always loaded his car with young people, escorting them to and from the games. At tournament time he made it a point to carry a load of players to their destination and stayed with them until they returned home.

As juvenile judge, in which capacity he served, along with his mayorship, he prided himself in the fact that Milan's juvenile delinquency rate is almost nil. Seldom a day passed that some young person did not visit his office, bringing their needs and problems to him. He was a familiar sight at Milan High School, especially on the occasion of any special recognition of a student or the performance of any group.

As for the older, not only Milan, but all of Tennessee burst with pride when he was named Tennessee's "Typical Mayor of the Year" by the Tennessee Municipal League last June. His aggressiveness in obtaining and financing industrial buildings played a big part in his receiving the honor.

Mayor Webb had traveled many distances and "burned the midnight oil" so to speak, in seeing that his town progressed. As a result of his many hours spent above and beyond the call of duty, Milan won first place in its population class in the Mid-South Industrial Awards contest sponsored by the Memphis Commercial Appeal in 1961.

A new city hall was completed during his tenure as mayor, as was a new National Guard armory, and the indebtedness was paid in full on the new Park Avenue School.

Mayor Webb's high ideals and Christian principles accounted for the high esteem which his fellow men held for him. Those who knew and associated with him closely, loved the quick wit and dry humor for which he was noted.

Yes, Milan has lost a great leader and citizen. He is gone, but the imprint he made will linger long in the hearts and minds of his fellow men.

[From the Milan (Tenn.) Exchange, Oct. 4, 1962]

SENATOR KEFAUVER SENDS CONDOLENCES

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER in expressing his deep regrets to the people of west Tennessee, on the passing of Mayor Steger Webb said:

"Milan has lost its Mayor of the Year and all of west Tennessee mourns the death of Mayor Webb. Like few others, I know the shock and sorrow of losing a very dear and close personal friend. Mayor Webb's devotion to his people and the sincerity and integrity that he brought to public office are a monument to his memory. There are other monuments in steel and stone, on the farms and in factories, which in their activity alone are a living monument to his untiring efforts. The industrial growth, the jobs created, and the increasing prosperity he brought to the people of Milan and west Tennessee are characteristic of the inspiration and dedication of Mayor Webb.

"I recall with pride and great personal satisfaction that these efforts did not go unrecognized in his lifetime. He received a citation in 1961 for bringing to Milan industrial development that won the Mid-South Industrial Awards contest. He was elected Tennessee's Mayor of the Year in 1962 and was reelected to serve his people in 1962. While we may find others to carry on the work he has initiated, we shall all most sincerely regret the loss of his characteristic leadership and ability.

"It is my deep regret that my duties require me to be in Portland, Oreg., on Saturday when the citizens of Milan pay their last respects to Mayor Webb. He shall be remembered in my thoughts and prayers. Mr. Charles Caldwell, my administrative assistant, will attend the funeral services as my personal representative. To Mayor Webb's family and host of friends, may I say that I share your sorrow and extend heartfelt sympathy."

In a telegram sent to the Exchange Friday, Senator KEFAUVER stated:

"Mr. JOHN CALDWELL.

"EDITOR: Steger Webb was my close personal friend and I am deeply distressed that death has struck him down in the prime of his life. His monumental leadership has brought continuing progress to his community and the entire surrounding area. Milan and Tennessee have lost an able and devoted public servant and citizen.

"ESTES KEFAUVER."

DUAL LAW FOR RICH AND POOR?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on October 2, 1962, the New York Times carried a brief letter from Henry Steele Commager, one of the outstanding historians and political scientists in the country. As it is brief, I read it:

DUAL LAW FOR RICH AND POOR?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Department of Justice has announced that it proposes to reopen the case against eight alleged Communists who were cited for contempt of a House Committee for refusal to answer all questions put to them and subsequently vindicated by the Supreme Court. Meantime, the heads of the great steel corporations who openly defied a subcommittee of the United States Senate and refused to put in an appearance are not even cited for contempt.

Is it possible that there is one law for the poor and the condemned and another law for the rich and the powerful in the United States?

HENRY STEELE COMMAGER.

AMHERST, MASS., September 25, 1962.

I think the question raised by Mr. Commager is an extremely serious one and one which each Member of the Senate should consider. As Mr. Commager puts it, I hope that we in the Senate never get to the point where there is one law "for the rich and the powerful" and another "for the poor and the condemned."

TELLING OUR YOUTH ABOUT THE NAZI PERIOD

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many of us have been concerned with the evidence that large segments of our youth know little or nothing about World War II and the Nazi period. A whole generation of young people, born during the past two decades, has grown up in harmful ignorance of that most fateful era in modern history. Too often both schools and parents have shied away from the subject, wishing to shield boys and girls from revelations dreadful beyond imagining—wishing perhaps to forget the nightmare themselves.

As a member of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Committee, I had occasion to be concerned with the young people apprehended during the winter of 1959–60 in connection with the wave of swastika daubings that took place in America. During that period close to 700 houses of worship, public buildings, and other institutions were desecrated by vandals. Uniformly, the young people who were apprehended by police departments were young, in teenage. Investigators who studied these youngsters were impressed with the fact that few, if any, of them revealed any knowledge of the terrible period of Nazi domination in Germany.

A pamphlet has been brought to my attention that helps to fill the void of material needed to instruct our young people in the meaning of America's participation in World War II. It is called "Breaking the Silence: Why a Mother Tells Her Son About the Nazi Era," and was written by Kay Boyle, a prominent novelist, essayist, and expert on German affairs. "Breaking the Silence" is a simple story of a mother who searches her memory and conscience so that her son may know about the nightmare years of the Third Reich. In his foreword to this document Dr. John Slawson, the executive vice president of the American

Jewish Committee, which published the pamphlet, writes:

> As long as totalitarianism and racism continue to threaten the world, future citizens must learn what these evils are, how they arise, and where they lead. They must understand how, even in a civilized nation, hate can be turned into a political weapon—how law and human feeling can be purposely destroyed. Nothing short of such understanding will insure that it does not happen again.

One of the most hopeful signs of the day is the desire of young people to know the truth. According to a nationwide survey, teenagers followed the Eichmann trial even more intently than their elders. Fewer than half said they had learned about Nazi crimes in school, but more than four out of five felt they should have. To permit our young people to grow up unmindful and unknowing about the dangers of religious bigotry is harmful to us and to our future as a nation. It is the responsibility of our schools and youth organizations, and of all of us as adults to help secure the future of our Nation as a democracy where events such as those preceding World War II cannot happen.

USE OF BROADCAST FACILITIES BY CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Friday, October 5, I discussed in the Senate the work of the Senate Freedom of Communications Subcommittee and our availability in the current political campaigns. These remarks may be found at page 22532 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 5. Yesterday, October 9, 1962, at 3:30 in the afternoon, the Federal Communications Commission issued a public notice on the "Use of Broadcast Facilities by Candidates for Public Office." This is the latest compilation of Federal Communications Commission rules and interpretations on this subject.

On April 17, 1962, the Senate Freedom of Communications Subcommittee made certain recommendations for revision of the rules by the Federal Communications Commission with regard to political candidates in campaigns. On July 12, 1962, Chairman Minow, of the Federal Communications Commission, testified before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Committee on Commerce with regard to certain bills to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934. At that time, I expressed to Chairman Minow the hope that the subcommittee would have a communication from the Federal Communications Commission about the recommendations which have been made for revisions of the rules. Chairman Minow said that:

> Senator YARBOROUGH, we are at the moment giving serious consideration to the report of the subcommittee and are engaged already in conversations with the representatives of the broadcasters, looking toward some mutual meetings in the hope that we can clarify some of these issues.

I regret that, a very hasty perusal of this public notice of the Federal Communications Commission with regard to the use of broadcast facilities for candidates for public office, fails to reveal any substantial revision of the rules; however, it is the latest guideline from the Commission on the subject, and I would commend it to the attention of every candidate for public office.

Some of these rulings will provide little comfort to candidates as they come up against licensees of the opposite political persuasion in their quest for fair treatment. I hope that those candidates who are subjected to unfair treatment under these rules will contact the Senate Freedom of Communications Subcommittee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the public notice issued by the Federal Communications Commission be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the public notice was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Federal Communications Commission public notice B, Oct. 3, 1962]

USE OF BROADCAST FACILITIES BY CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

This public notice is a compilation of the Commission's interpretive rulings under section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and the Commission's rules implementing that section of the act and brings up to date and supersedes all prior public notices issued by the Commission entitled "Use of Broadcast Facilities by Candidates for Public Office." The Commission has carefully reviewed both its revised public notice (Oct. 1, 1958; FCC 58-936), and its supplement thereto (Sept. 8, 1960; FCC 60-1050), which contained the 1959 amendments to section 315 of the act, the amendments to the Commission's rules and additional rulings. Significant rulings made subsequent to the 1960 supplement have been added, and editorial and other revisions have been made with respect to some of the interpretations previously published. Where appropriate, cumulative rulings have been cited. Included herein are the determinations of the Commission with respect to problems which have been presented to it and which appear likely[1] to be involved in future campaigns. While the information contained herein does not purport to be a discussion of every problem that may arise in the political broadcast field, experience has shown that these documents have been of assistance to candidates and broadcasters in understanding their rights and obligations under section 315.

The purpose of this notice is to apprise licensees, candidates, and other interested persons of their respective responsibilities and rights under section 315, and the Commission's rules, when situations similar to those discussed herein are encountered. In this way, resort to the Commission may be obviated in many instances and time—which is of great importance in political campaigns—will be saved. We do not mean to preclude inquiry to the Commission when there is a genuine doubt as to licensee obligations and responsibilities to the public interest under section 315. But it is believed that the following document will, in many instances, remove the need for such inquiries, and that licensees will be able to take the necessary prompt action in accordance with the interpretations and positions set forth below.

We emphasize that this discussion relates solely to obligations of broadcast licensees under section 315 of the act. It is not intended to include the wholly separate question of the treatment by broadcast licensees, in the public interest, of political or other controversial programs or discussions not falling within the specific provisions of that section. With respect to the responsibilities of broadcast licensees for insuring fair and balanced presentation of programs not coming within section 315, but relating to important public issues of a controversial nature including political broadcasts, licensees are referred to the Commission's fairness doctrine as enunciated in its report, "Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees" (vol. 1, part 3, R.R. 91-201), and the cases cited therein. We are of the view that the 1959 amendments to the act constituted an affirmation and codification by the Congress of the Commission's fairness doctrine.[2] With regard to programs not coming within the equal opportunities provision of section 315, but relating to important public issues of a controversial nature, including political broadcasts, it is particularly important that licensees recognize that the specific obligations imposed upon them by the provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act with respect to certain types of political broadcasts do not in any way limit the applicability of general public interest concepts to political broadcasts not falling within the equal opportunities provision of section 315. On the contrary, in view of the obvious importance of such programing to our system of representative government, it is clear that these precepts as set forth in the report referred to above and, in the Commission's "Report and Statement of Policy" with respect to programing, issued July 29, 1960, are of particular applicability to such programing.

We have continued the question-and-answer format as an appropriate means of delineating the section 315 problems. Wherever possible, reference to Commission's decisions or rulings are made so that the researcher may, if he desires, review the complete text of the Commission's ruling. Copies of rulings may be found in a "Political Broadcast" folder kept in the Commission's reference room. Citations in "R.R." refer to Pike and Fischer, Radio Regulations.

I. The statute: Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, provides as follows:

"SEC. 315. (a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting stations: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate. Appearance by a legally qualified candidate on any—

---

[1] A few of the questions taken up within have been presented to the Commission informally; that is, through telephone conversations or conferences with station representatives. They are set out in this public notice because of the likelihood of their recurrence and the fact that no extended Commission discussion is necessary to dispose of them; the answer in each case is clear from the language of sec. 315.

[2] In amending sec. 315 in 1959 so as to exempt appearances by legally qualified candidates on certain news-type programs from the equal opportunities provision, it was stated in the statute that such action should not be "construed as relieving broadcasters, in connection with the presentation of newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of news events, from the obligation imposed upon them under this act to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance." (Public Law 86-274, approved Sept. 14, 1959, 73 Stat. 557.)

"(1) bona fide newscast,

"(2) bona fide news interview,

"(3) bona fide news documentary (if the appearance of the candidate is incidental to the presentation of the subject or subjects covered by the news documentary), or

"(4) on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events (including but not limited to political conventions and activities incidental thereto), shall not be deemed to be use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of this subsection. Nothing in the foregoing sentence shall be construed as relieving broadcasters, in connection with the presentation of newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of news events, from the obligation imposed upon them under this Act to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.

"(b) The charges made for the use of any broadcasting station for any of the purposes set forth in this section shall not exceed the charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes.

"(c) The Commission shall prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this section." [3]

II. The Commission's rules and regulations with respect to political broadcasts: The Commission's rules and regulations with respect to political broadcasts coming within section 315 of the Communications Act are set forth in sections 3.120 (AM), 3.290 (FM), 3.590 (noncommercial educational FM), and 3.657 (TV), respectively. These provisions are identical (except for elimination of any discussion of charges in section 3.590 relating to noncommercial educational FM stations) and read as follows:

"Broadcasts by candidates for public office—(a) Definitions: A 'legally qualified candidate' means any person who has publicly announced that he is a candidate for nomination by a convention of a political party or for nomination or election in a primary, special, or general election, municipal, county, State or national, and who meets the qualifications prescribed by the applicable laws to hold the office for which he is a candidate, so that he may be voted for by the electorate directly or by means of delegates or electors, and who:

"(1) Has qualified for a place on the ballot or

"(2) Is eligible under the applicable law to be voted for by sticker, by writing in his name on the ballot, or other method, and (i) has been duly nominated by a political party which is commonly known and regarded as such, or (ii) makes a substantial showing that he is a bona fide candidate for nomination or office, as the case may be.

"(b) General requirements: No station license is required to permit the use of its facilities by any legally qualified candidate for public office, but if any licensee shall permit any such candidate to use its facilities, it shall afford equal opportunities to all such other candidates for that office to use such facilities: *Provided,* That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast by any such candidate.

"(c) Rates and practices: (1) The rates, if any, charged all such candidates for the same office shall be uniform and shall not be rebated by any means direct or indirect. A candidate shall, in each case, be charged no more than the rate the station would charge if the candidate were a commercial advertiser whose advertising was directed to promoting its business within the same area as that encompassed by the particular office for which such person is a candidate. All discount privileges otherwise offered by a station to commercial advertisers shall be available upon equal terms to all candidates for public office.

"(2) In making time available to candidates for public office no licensee shall make any discrimination between candidates in charges, practices, regulations, facilities, or services for or in connection with the service rendered pursuant to this part, or make or give any preference to any candidate for public office or subject any such candidate to any prejudice or disadvantage; nor shall any licensee make any contract or other agreement which shall have the effect of permitting any legally qualified candidate for any public office to broadcast to the exclusion of other legally qualified candidates for the same public office.

"(d) Records; inspection: Every licensee shall keep and permit public inspection of a complete record of all requests for broadcast time made by or on behalf of candidates for public office, together with an appropriate notation showing the disposition made by the licensee of such requests, and the charges made, if any, if request is granted. Such records shall be retained for a period of two years.

"(e) Time of request: A request for equal opportunities must be submitted to the licensee within one week of the day on which the prior use occurred.

"(f) Burden of proof: A candidate requesting such equal opportunities of the licensee, or complaining of noncompliance to the Commission shall have the burden of proving that he and his opponent are legally qualified candidates for the same public office." [4]

In addition, the attention of the licensees is directed to the following provisions of sections 3.119, 3.289, and 3.654, which provide in identical language:

"(b) In the case of any political program or any program involving the discussion of public controversial issues for which any records, transcriptions, talent, scripts, or other material or services of any kind are furnished, either directly or indirectly, to a station as an inducement to the broadcasting of such program, an announcement shall be made both at the beginning and conclusion of such program on which such material or services are used that such records, transcriptions, talent, scripts, or other material or services have been furnished to such station in connection with the broadcasting of such program: *Provided, however,* That only one such announcement need be made in the case of any such program of 5 minutes' duration or less, which announcement may be made either at the beginning or the conclusion of the program.

"(c) The announcement required by this section shall fully and fairly disclose the true identity of the person or persons by whom or in whose behalf such payment is made or promised, or from whom or in whose behalf such services or other valuable consideration is received, or by whom the material or services referred to in paragraph (b) of this section are furnished. Where an agent or other person contracts or otherwise makes arrangement with a station on behalf of another, and such fact is known to the station, the announcement shall disclose the identity of the person or persons in whose behalf such agent is acting instead of the name of such agent.

"(d) In the case of any program, other than a program advertising commerical products or services, which is sponsored, paid for or furnished, either in whole or in part, or for which material or services referred to in paragraph (b) of this section are furnished, by a corporation, committee, association or other unincorporated group, the announcement required by this section shall disclose the name of such corporation, committee, association or other unincorporated group. In each such case the station shall require that a list of the chief executive officers or members of the executive committee or of the board of directors of the corporation, committee, association or other unincorporated group shall be made available for public inspection at one of the radio stations carrying the program."

III. "Uses," in general: In general, any use of broadcast facilities by a legally qualified candidate for public office imposes an obligation on licensees to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for the same office.

Section 315 of the act was amended by the Congress in 1959 to provide that appearances by legally qualified candidates on specified news-type programs are deemed not to be a use of broadcast facilities within the meaning of that section. In determining whether a particular program is within the scope of one of these specified news-type programs, the basic question is whether the program meets the standard of bona fides. To establish whether such a program is in fact a bona fide program, the following considerations, among others, may be pertinent: (1) The format, nature, and content of the programs; (2) whether the format, nature, and content of the program has changed since its inception and, if so, in what respects; (3) who initiates the programs; (4) who produces and controls the program; (5) when the program was initiated; (6) is the program regularly scheduled; and (7) if the program is regularly scheduled, specify the time and day of the week when it is broadcast. Questions have also been presented by the appearances on news-type broadcast programs of station employees who are also legally qualified candidates. In such cases, in addition to the above, the following considerations, among others, may be pertinent to a determination of the applicability of section 315: (1) What is the dominant function of the employee at the station? (2) What is the content of the program and who prepares the program? and (3) to what extent is the employee personally identified on the program? In the rulings set forth below, wherein the Commission held that the equal opportunities provision was applicable, it should be assumed that the news-type exemptions contained in the 1959 amendments were not involved.

---

[3] Sec. 315(a) was amended to read as above by Public Law 86-274, approved Sept. 14, 1959, 73 Stat. 557.

Public Law 86-677, approved Aug. 24, 1960, 74 Stat. 554, suspended the equal opportunity provision of sec. 315(a) for the period of the 1960 presidential and vice presidential campaigns with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. It provided:

"That that part of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which requires any licensee of a broadcast station who permits any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station, is suspended for the period of the 1960 presidential and vice presidential campaigns with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States. Nothing in the foregoing shall be construed as relieving broadcasters from the obligation imposed upon them under this Act to operate in the public interest.

"(2) The Federal Communications Commission shall make a report to the Congress, not later than March 1, 1961, with respect to the effect of the provisions of this joint resolution and any recommendations the Commission may have for amendments in the Communications Act of 1934 as a result of experience under the provisions of this joint resolution."

[4] On July 31, 1959, the Commission amended secs. 3.120, 3.290, 3.590, and 3.657 of its rules (FCC 59-797) by adding subsections (e) and (f).

A. Types of uses:

1. Question: "Does section 315 apply to one speaking for or on behalf of the candidate, as contrasted with the candidate himself?"

Answer: "No. The section applies only to legally qualified candidates. Candidate A has no legal right under section 315 to demand time where B, not a candidate, has spoken against A or in behalf of another candidate." (*Felix* v. *Westinghouse Radio Stations*, 186 F. 2d 1, cert. den., 341 U.S. 909.)

2. Question: "Does section 315 confer rights on a political party as such?"

Answer: "No. It applies in favor of legally qualified candidates for public office and is not concerned with the rights of political parties, as such." (Letter to National Laugh Party, May 8, 1957.)

3. Question: "Does section 315 require stations to afford equal opportunities in the use of their facilities in support of or in opposition to a public question to be voted on in an election?"

Answer: "No. Section 315 has no application to the discussion of political issues, as such, but is concerned with the use of broadcast stations by legally qualified candidates for public office. In the 1959 amendment of section 315, relating to certain news-type programs, Congress stated specifically that its action was not be be construed 'as relieving broadcasters, in connection with the presentation of newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of news events, from the obligation imposed upon them under this act to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance.' The Commission has considered this statement to be an affirmation of its fairness doctrine, as enunciated in its 'Report on Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees.' "

B. What constitutes a use of broadcast facilities entitling opposing candidates to equal opportunities?

4. Question: "If a legally qualified candidate secures air time but does not discuss matter directly related to his candidacy, is this a use of facilities under section 315?"

Answer: "Yes. Section 315 does not distinguish between the uses of broadcast time by a candidate, and the licensee is not authorized to pass on requests for time by opposing candidates on the basis of the licensee's evaluation of whether the original use was or was not in aid of a candidacy." (Letter to WMCA, Inc., May 15, 1952, 7 R.R. 1132.)

5. Question: "Must a broadcaster give equal time to a candidate whose opponent has broadcast in some other capacity than as a candidate?"

Answer: "Yes. For example, a weekly report of a Congressman to his constituents via radio or television is a broadcast by a legally qualified candidate for public office as soon as he becomes a candidate for reelection, and his opponent must be given equal opportunities for time on the air. Any use of a station by a candidate, in whatever capacity, entitles his opponent to equal opportunities." (Letter to station KNGS, May 15, 1952, 7 R.R. 1130; see question and answer 15; for a joint congressional report, see also letter to Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jan. 25, 1962; and for a judge's report, see also telegram to station KSHO–TV, Apr. 24, 1961.)

6. Question: "If a candidate appears on a variety program for a very brief bow or statement, are his opponents entitled to equal opportunities on the basis of this brief appearance?"

Answer: "Yes. All appearances of a candidate, no matter how brief or perfunctory, are a use of a station's facilities within section 315."

7. Question: "If a candidate is accorded station time for a speech in connection with a ceremonial activity or other public service, is an opposing candidate entitled to equal utilization of the station's facilities?"

Answer: "Yes. Section 315 contains no exception with respect to broadcasts by legally qualified candidates carried in the public interest or as a public service. It follows that the station's broadcasts of the candidate's speech was a use of the facilities of the station by a legally qualified candidate giving rise to an obligation by the station under section 315 to afford equal opportunities to other legally qualified candidates for the same office." (Letter to CBS (WBBM), Oct. 31, 1952; letter to KFI, Oct. 31, 1952.)

8. Question: "If a station arranges for a debate between the candidates of two parties, or presents the candidates of two parties in a press conference format or so-called forum program, is the station required to make equal time available to other candidates?"

Answer: "Yes. The appearance of candidates on the above types of programs constitutes a use of the licensee's facilities by legally qualified candidates and, therefore, other candidates for the same office are entitled to equal opportunities." (Letter to Harold Oliver, Oct. 31, 1952; letter to Julius F. Brauner, Oct. 31, 1952. However, see S.J. Res. 207 (Public Law 86–677) (suspension statute), footnote 2, supra; and III, C, infra, concerning news-type programs.)

9. Question: "Where a candidate delivers a nonpolitical lecture on a program which is part of a regularly scheduled series of lectures broadcast by an educational FM station, is that station required to grant equal time to opposing candidate?"

Answer: "Yes. Unless the candidate's appearance comes within the category of broadcasts exempt from section 315's equal opportunities provision, equal time must be granted. The use to which the candidate puts this broadcast time is immaterial. (See question and answer 4, supra.) (Telegram to station WFUV–FM, Oct. 27, 1961.)

10. Question: "Are acceptance speeches by successful candidates for nomination for the candidacy of a particular party for a given office, a use by a legally qualified candidate for election to that office?"

Answer: "Yes, where the successful candidate for nomination becomes legally qualified as a candidate for election as a result of the nomination." (Letter to Progressive Party, July 2, 1952, 7 R.R. 1300; but see sec. 315(a)(4).)

11. Question: "Does section 315 apply to broadcasts by a legally qualified candidate where such broadcasts originate and are limited to a foreign station whose signals are received in the United States?"

Answer: "No. Section 315 applies only to stations licensed by the FCC." (Letter to Gregory Pillon, July 19, 1955.)

12. Question: "A candidate for the Democratic nomination for President appeared on a network variety show. A claimant for equal opportunities showed that his name had been on the ballots in the Democratic presidential primary elections in two States; that the network had shown him in a film on a program concerned with the various 1960 presidential candidates; and that he was continuing his efforts as a candidate for the Democratic nomination. Would the claimant be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "Yes; since the appearance of the first candidate was on a program which was not exempt from the equal opportunities requirement of section 315 and the claimant had shown that he was a legally qualified candidate for the nomination for the same office." (Telegram to NBC, July 6, 1960.)

13. Question: "If a station owner, or a station advertiser, or a person regularly employed as a station announcer were to make any appearances over a station after having qualified as a candidate for public office, would section 315 apply?"

Answer: "Yes. Such appearances of a candidate are a use under section 315." (Letters to KUGN, Apr. 9, 1958; to KTTV, Jan. 23, 1957, 14 R.R. 1227; to Kenneth Spengler, Nov. 19, 1956, 14 R.R. 1226b, respectively; and letter to Jack Williams, May 18, 1962. But cf. letter to KWTX Broadcasting Co., Mar. 16, 1960; *Brigham* v. *FCC*, 276 F. 2d 828 (C.A. 5), Apr. 19, 1960 and question and answer 18.)

14. Question: "When a station, as part of a newscast, uses film clips showing a legally qualified candidate participating as one of a group in official ceremonies and the newscaster, in commenting on the ceremonies, mentions the candidate and others by name and describes their participation, has there been a use under section 315?"

Answer: "No. Since the facts clearly showed that the candidate had in no way directly or indirectly initiated either filming or presentation of the event, and that the broadcast was nothing more than a routine newscast by the station in the exercise of its judgment as to newsworthy events." (Letter to Allen Blondy, Feb. 6, 1957, 14 R.R. 1199; cf. CBS, Inc. (Lar Daly case), 26 FCC 715, 18 R.R. 701 [1959], and letter to Lar Daly, Sept. 9, 1959, 18 R.R. 750.)

C. What constitutes an appearance exempt from the equal opportunities provisions of section 315?

15. Question: "Does an appearance on a program subject to the equal opportunities provision of section 315, such as a Congressman's weekly report, attain exempt status when the weekly report is broadcast as part of a program not subject to the equal opportunities provisions, such as a bona fide newscast?"

Answer: "No. A contrary view would be inconsistent with the legislative intent and recognition of such an exemption would in effect subordinate substance to form." (Letter to Congressman CLARK W. THOMPSON, Feb. 9, 1962, 23 R.R. 178.)

16. Question: "Are appearances by an incumbent candidate in film clips, prepared and supplied by him to the stations and broadcast as part of a station's regularly scheduled newscast, uses within the meaning of section 315?"

Answer: "Yes. Broadcasts of such film clips containing appearances by a candidate constitute uses of the station's facilities. Such appearances do not attain exempt status when the film clips are broadcast as part of a program not subject to the equal opportunities provision, for the reasons set forth in question and answer 15, above." (Letter to Congressman Clem Miller, June 15, 1962.)

17. Question: "A sheriff who was a candidate for nomination for U.S. Representative in Congress conducted a daily program, regularly scheduled since 1958, on which he reported on the activities of his office. He terminated each program with a personal 'Thought for the Day.' Would his opponent be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "Yes. In light of the fact that the format and content of the program were determined by the sheriff and not by the station, the program was not of the type intended by Congress to be exempt from the equal opportunities requirement of section 315." (Letter to station WCLG, Apr. 27, 1960.)

18. Question: "A local weathercaster who was a candidate for reelection for representative in the Texas Legislature was regularly employed by an AM and TV station in Texas. His weathercasts contained no references to political matters. He was identified over the air while a candidate as the 'TX Weatherman.' Would his opponent be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "No. The Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, ruled that the weathercaster's appearance did not involve anything but a bona fide effort to present the news; that he was not identified by name but only as the 'TX Weatherman'; that his employment did not arise out of the election campaign but was a regular job; and that the facts did not reveal any favoritism on the part of the stations or any intent to discriminate among candidates." (Letter to KWTX Broadcasting Co., Mar. 16, 1960; *Brigham* v. *FCC*, 276 F. 2d 828 (C.A. 5), Apr. 19, 1960.)

19. Question: "A Philadelphia TV station had been presenting a weekly program called 'Eye on Philadelphia.' This program consisted of personalities being interviewed by a station representative. Three candidates for the office of mayor of Philadelphia, representing different political parties, appeared on the program. Would a write-in candidate for mayor be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "No; since it was ascertained that the appearances of the three mayoralty candidates were on a bona fide, regularly scheduled news interview program and that such appearances were determined by the station's news director on the basis of newsworthiness." (Telegram to Joseph A. Schafer, Nov. 2, 1959.)

20. Question: "A New York television station had been presenting a weekly program called 'Search Light.' This program consisted of persons, selected by the station on the basis of their newsworthiness, interviewed by a news reporter selected by the station, a member of the citizens union (a permanent participant initially selected by the station) and a station newsman who acted as moderator. Two candidates appeared on the program and were interviewed. Is a third opposing candidate entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "No. The format of the program was such as to constitute a bona fide news interview pursuant to section 315(a)(2), since the program was regularly scheduled, was under the control of the licensee, and the particular program had followed the usual program format." (Telegram to Ethel B. Lobman, Nov. 1, 1961.)

21. Question: "A Washington, D.C., television station had been presenting a weekly program called 'City Side.' This program consisted of persons being interviewed by a panel of reporters. The panel was selected by the station and the persons interviewed were selected by the station on the basis of newsworthiness. Three candidates for the Democratic nomination for the office of Governor of Maryland were invited to appear on the program and one of them accepted. Would a fourth candidate for the same nomination, not invited by the station to appear, be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "No. It was determined that 'City Side' was a regularly scheduled, weekly, live, news-interview program on the station for approximately 6 years; that the normal format of the program consisted of the interview of a newsworthy guest or guests by a panel of reporters; that the appearances on the program were determined by the station on the basis of newsworthiness; and that it was on this basis that the three candidates were invited to appear. Such a program constitutes a bona fide news-interview program pursuant to section 315(a)(2)." (Telegram to Charles Luthardt, Sr., May 12, 1962.)

22. Question: "A New York television station had been presenting a weekly half-hour program series for over 2 years. The program, 'New York Forum,' was presided over by a station moderator and consisted of interviews of currently newsworthy guests by a panel of three lawyers. The guests were selected by the station in the exercise of its bona fide news judgment and not for the political advantage of any candidate for public office. The local bar association suggested the lawyer-interviewers to be used on a particular program but their final selection remained subject to the station's approval. The Democratic and Republican candidates for the office of Governor of New Jersey had appeared on separate programs in the series. Would a third party candidate be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "No. Such a program is a bona fide news interview and, as such, appearances on the program are exempt pursuant to section 315(a)(2)." (Telegram to Socialist Labor Party of New Jersey, Nov. 2, 1961.)

23. Question: "Certain networks had presented over their facilities various candidates for the Democratic nomination for President on the programs 'Meet the Press,' 'Face the Nation,' and 'College News Conference.' Said programs were regularly scheduled and consisted of questions being asked of prominent individuals by newsmen and others. Would a candidate for the same nomination in a State primary be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "No. The programs were regularly scheduled, bona fide news interviews, and were of the type which Congress intended to exempt from the equal opportunities requirement of section 315." (Letter to Andrew J. Easter, Apr. 28, 1960; letters to Charles V. Falkenberg, May 12 and June 13, 1960; and letter to Congressman Frank Kowalski, July 10, 1962.)

24. Question: "A candidate for the Democratic nomination for President was interviewed on a network program known as 'Today.' It was shown that this was a daily program emphasizing news coverage, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of news events; that the determination as to the content and format of the interview and the candidate's participation therein was made by the network in the exercise of its news judgment and not for the candidate's political advantage; that the questions asked of the candidate were determined by the director of the program; and that the candidate was selected because of his newsworthiness and the network's desire to interview him concerning current problems and events. Would the candidate's opponent be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "No; since the appearance of the candidate was on a program which was exempt from the equal opportunities requirement of section 315." (Telegram to Lar Daly, July 6, 1960.)

25. Question: "Does the appearance of a candidate on any of the following programs constitute a use under the equal opportunities provisions of section 315: 'Meet the Press,' 'Youth Wants To Know,' 'Capitol Cloakroom,' 'Tonight,' and 'PM'?"

Answer: "The programs 'Meet the Press' and 'Youth Wants To Know' were specifically referred to during the Senate debates on the 1959 amendments as being regularly scheduled news interview programs of the type intended to be exempt from the equal opportunities provision of section 315. Thus, if the format of these programs is not changed in any material respect, appearances by a candidate on such programs would not constitute a use under section 315. (See also question and answer 23.) As to the 'Tonight' program, see question and answer 12." (Letter to Senator Russell B. Long, June 13, 1962.)

26. Question: "A New Jersey television station has been presenting for approximately 2½ years a weekly program called 'Between the Lines.' This program consisted of interviews by a station moderator of persons involved with current public events in New Jersey and New York. The incumbent, candidate for reelection to the State assembly, appeared on the program. Would his opponent be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "No. The Commission ruled that 'the program in question is the type of program Congress intended to be exempt from the equal time requirements of section 315.' " (Letter to George A. Katz, Esq., Nov. 2, 1960.)

27. Question: "The 'Governor's Radio Press Conference' is a weekly 15-minute program which has been broadcast approximately 2 years employing essentially the same format since its inception. In the program, the Governor-candidate is seated in his office and speaks into a microphone; each of the participating stations has selected a newsman, who, while located at his respective station, asks questions of the Governor which the newsman considers to be newsworthy. The questions are communicated to the Governor-candidate by telephone from the respective stations and the questions and the Governor's answers are communicated to the stations by the means of a broadcast line from his office to the stations. The questions and answers are taped both by his office and each of the participating stations, and no tapes are supplied by the Governor to the stations. Questions asked of the Governor and all of the material, including his answers, are not screened, or edited by anyone in his office or on his behalf. The program is unrehearsed and there is no prepared material of any kind used by the Governor or by anyone on his behalf. The newsmen are free to ask any question they wish and each program is under the control of the participating stations. Does the appearance of the Governor-candidate on said program constitute a use under the equal opportunities provision of section 315?"

Answer: "No. Since the program involves the collective participation of the stations' newsmen, is prepared by the stations, is under their sole supervision and control, has been regularly scheduled for a period of time, and was not conceived or designed to further the candidacy of the Governor, it was held to be a bona fide news interview program and, therefore, exempt from the equal opportunities provision of section 315." (Letter to Gov. Michael DiSalle, June 8, 1962.)

28. Question: "The 'Governor's Forum' program has been broadcast for approximately 8 months by several participating stations. In this program, the Governor-candidate is seated in his office and speaks into a microphone. The program consists of his answers to, and questions submitted by, the listening public. Questions asked are either telephoned or written to the stations or directly to his office. The questions which are telephoned or written to the several stations are forwarded to the principal participating station, which then selects the questions, edits the questions, and accumulates them on a tape. The questions telephoned or written to the Governor's office are likewise selected and edited by his office for taping. The tape or tapes containing the questions are played in his office, and the questions and the Governor's answers are then recorded on a master tape prepared by his office. Additional questions are asked of the Governor by the principal station's newsman, present in the Governor's office, to amplify any prior question and answer. On occasion, further editing of the tape has been made by the Governor's office or by the stations. The tape is sent to each of the participating stations by the Governor's office. There is no prepared material or rehearsal by the Governor's office. Would the appearance by the Governor-candidate on the above program constitute a use under the equal opportunities provision of section 315?"

Answer: "Yes. Such a program is not a news-interview program as contemplated by section 315(a)(2). This conclusion has been reached since the selection and compilation of the questions, as well as the production, supervision, control, and editing of the program are not functions exercised exclusively by the stations." (Letter to Gov. Michael DiSalle, June 8, 1962.)

29. Question: "CBS Television Network presented a 1-hour program entitled 'The

Fifty Faces of 1962.' The program consisted of a comprehensive news report of the current off-year elections and campaigns. It included a brief review of the history of off-year elections, individual and group interviews, on-the-spot coverage of conventions and campaigns, and flashbacks of currently newsworthy aspects of the current campaigns and elections. In addition to the appearances on the broadcast of private citizens, voters, college students, and candidates, there were approximately 25 political figures, none of whom was on camera for more than approximately 2 or 3 minutes. Some of the candidates appearing on the program mentioned their candidacy; others, including the minority leader of the House of Representatives, who appeared in that capacity and discussed the prospect of his party in the fall elections, did not discuss their candidacies. The determination as to who was to appear on the program was made solely by CBS News on the basis of its bona fide news judgment that their appearances were in aid of the coverage of the subject of the programs and not to favor or advance the candidacies of any of those who appeared, such appearances being incidental and subordinate to the subject of the documentary. Is the appearance on the program of a candidate, in his capacity as minority leader of the House of Representatives, a use within the equal opportunities provision of section 315?"

Answer: "No. Such a program is a bona fide news documentary pursuant to section 315(a)(3). The appearance of the candidate therein is incidental to the presentation of the subject covered by the documentary and the program is not designed to aid his candidacy." (Telegram to Judge John J. Murray, June 12, 1962.)

30. Question: "A television station had been presenting since 1958 a weekly 30-minute program concerning developments in the State legislature with principal Democratic and Republican Party leaders of both houses of the legislature participating. At the close of each legislative term, the station televised a 1-hour summary of the legislature's activities, using film and recordings made during its meetings. Is the appearance, in the latter program, of an officer of the State legislature, who is also a candidate, in which he and others express their views on the accomplishments of the legislative session a use under the equal opportunities provision of section 315?"

Answer: "No. For the reasons stated in question and answer 29, above."

31. Question: "A former President expressed his views with respect to a forthcoming national convention of his party. A candidate for that party's nomination for President called a press conference to comment on said views, which conference was broadcast by two networks. Would said candidate's opponent for the same nomination be entitled to equal opportunities?"

Answer: "No; since the appearance of the first candidate was on a program which constituted on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events, pursuant to section 315(a)(4)." (Telegram to Falkenberg & Falkenberg, July 7, 1960.)

IV. Who is a legally qualified candidate?

32. Question: "How can a station know which candidates are legally qualified?"

Answer: "The determination as to who is a legally qualified candidate for a particular public office within the meaning of section 315 and the Commission's rules must be determined by reference to the law of the State in which the election is being held. In general, a candidate is legally qualified if he can be voted for in the State or district in which the election is being held, and, if elected, is eligible to serve in the office in question."

33. Question: "Need a candidate be on the ballot to be legally qualified?"

Answer: "Not always. The term 'legally qualified candidate' is not restricted to persons whose names appear on the printed ballot; the term may embrace persons not listed on the ballot if such persons are making a bona fide race for the office involved and the names of such persons, or their electors can, under applicable law, be written in by voters so as to result in their valid election. The Commission recognizes, however, that the mere fact that any name may be written in does not entitle all persons who may publicly announce themselves as candidates to demand time under section 315; broadcast stations may make suitable and reasonable requirements with respect to proof of the bona fide nature of any candidacy on the part of applicants for the use of facilities under section 315." (Secs. 3.120, 3.290, 3.657, esp. subsec. (f); letters to Socialist Labor Party, Nov. 14, 1951, 7 R.R. 766; Julius F. Brauner, May 28, 1952, 7 R.R. 1189; press release of Nov. 26, 1941 (mimeo 55732).)

34. Question: "May a person be considered to be a legally qualified candidate where he has made only a public announcement of his candidacy and has not yet filed the required forms or paid the required fees for securing a place on the ballot in either the primary or general elections?"

Answer: "The answer depends on applicable State law. In some States persons may be voted for by electorate whether or not they have gone through the procedures required for getting their names placed on the ballot itself. In such a State, the announcement of a person's candidacy—if determined to be bona fide—is sufficient to bring him within the purview of section 315. In other States, however, candidates may not be legally qualified until they have fulfilled certain prescribed procedures. The applicable State laws and the particular facts surrounding the announcement of the candidacy are determinatives." (Letter to Senator Earle C. Clements, Feb. 2, 1954; and see also subsec. (f) of secs. 3.120, 3.290, 3.657.)

35. Question: "May a station deny a candidate equal opportunities because it believes that the candidate has no possibility of being elected or nominated?"

Answer: "No. Section 315 does not permit any such subjective determination by the station with respect to a candidate's chances of nomination or election." (Letter to Julius F. Brauner, May 28, 1952, 7 R.R. 1189.)

36. Question: "When is a person a legally qualified candidate for nomination as the candidate of a party for President or Vice President of the United States?"

Answer: In view of the fact that a person may be nominated for these offices by the conventions of his party without having appeared on the ballot of any State having presidential primary elections, or having any pledged votes prior to the convention, or even announcing his willingness to be a candidate, no fixed rule can be promulgated in answer to this question. Whether a person so claiming is in fact a bona fide candidate will depend on the particular facts of each situation, including consideration of what efforts, if any, he has taken to secure delegates or preferential votes in State primaries. It cannot, however, turn on the licensee's evaluation of the claimant's chances for success." (Letter to Julius F. Brauner, May 28, 1952, 7 R.R. 1189; and see also subsect. (f) of secs. 3.120, 3.290, 3.657.)

37. Question: "Has a claimant under section 315 sufficiently established his legal qualifications when the facts show that after qualifying for a place on the ballot for a particular office in the primary, he notified State officials of his withdrawal therefrom and then later claimed he had not really intended to withdraw, and where the facts further indicated that he was supporting another candidate for the same office and was seeking the nomination for an office other than the one for which he claimed to be qualified?"

Answer: "No. Where a question is raised concerning a claimant's legal qualification, it is incumbent on him to prove that he is in fact legally qualified. The facts here did not constitute an unequivocal showing of legal qualification." (Letter to Lar Daly, Apr. 11, 1956; letter to American Vegetarian Party, Nov. 6, 1956.)

38. Question: "If a candidate establishes his legal qualifications only after the date of nomination or election for the office for which he was contending, is he entitled to equal opportunities which would have been available had he timely qualified?"

Answer: "No; for once the date of nomination or election for an office has passed, it cannot be said that one who failed timely to qualify therefor is still a candidate. The holding of the primary or general election terminates the possibility of affording equal opportunities, thus mooting the question of what rights the claimant might have been entitled to under section 315 before the election." (Letter to Socialist Workers' Party, Dec. 13, 1956; letter to Lar Daly, Oct. 31, 1956 14 R.R. 713, appeal sub. nom. *Daly* v. *U.S.*, case No. 11,946 (C.A. 7th Cir.) dismissed as moot Mar. 7, 1957; cert. den., 355 U.S. 826.)

39. Question: "Under the circumstances stated in the preceding question, is any post-election remedy available to the candidate, before the Commission, under section 315?"

Answer: "None, insofar as a candidate may desire retroactive equal opportunities. But this is not to suggest that a station can avoid its statutory obligation under section 315 by waiting until an election has been held and only then disposing of demands for equal opportunities." (See citations in question and answer 38.)

40. Question: "A, a candidate for the Democratic Party nomination for President appeared on a variety program prior to the nominating convention because of the prior appearance of B, his opponent. After the closing of the convention, A claimed he was entitled to additional time in order to equalize his appearance with that afforded B. Would A be entitled to additional time?"

Answer: "No. A licensee may not be required to furnish the use of its facilities to a candidate for nomination for President after the convention has chosen its nominee." (Telegram to Lar Daly, Nov. 3, 1960.)

41. Question: "When a State attorney general or other appropriate State official having jurisdiction to decide a candidate's legal qualification has ruled that a candidate is not legally qualified under local election laws, can a licensee be required to afford such candidate equal opportunities under section 315?"

Answer. "In such instances, the ruling of the State attorney general or other official will prevail, absent a judicial determination." (Telegram to Ralph Muncy, Nov. 5, 1954; letter to Socialist Workers' Party, Nov. 23, 1956.)

V. When are candidates opposing candidates?

42. Question: "What public offices are included within the meaning of section 315?"

Answer: "Under the Commission's rules, section 315 is applicable to both primary and general elections, and public offices include all offices filled by special or general election on a municipal, county, State or national level as well as the nomination by any recognized party of a candidate for such an office."

43. Question: "May the station under section 315 make time available to all candidates for one office and refuse all candidates for another office?"

Answer: "Yes. The equal opportunities requirement of section 315 is limited to all legally qualified candidates for the same office."

44. Question: "If the station makes time available to candidates seeking the nomination of one party for a particular office, does section 315 require that it make equal time available to the candidates seeking the nomination of other parties for the same office?"

Answer: "No; the Commission has held that while both primary elections or nominating conventions and general elections are comprehended within the terms of section 315, the primary elections or conventions held by one party are to be considered separately from the primary elections or conventions of other parties, and, therefore, insofar as section 315 is concerned, equal opportunities need only be afforded legally qualified candidates for nomination for the same office at the same party's primary or nominating convention. The station's actions in this regard, however, would be governed by the public interest standards encompassed within the fairness doctrine." (Letters to KWFT, Inc., Oct. 22, 1948, 4 R.R. 885; Arnold Peterson, May 13, 1952, 11 R.R. 234; WCDL, Apr. 3, 1953; Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jan. 25 and Apr. 13, 1962; and telegram to Dr. Edward J. Leuddeke, Oct. 25, 1961.)

45. Question: "If the station makes time available to all candidates of one party for nomination for a particular office, including the successful candidate, may candidates of other parties in the general election demand an equal amount of time under section 315?"

Answer: "No. For the reason given above." (Letter to KWFT, Inc., Oct. 22, 1948, 4 R.R. 885.)

VI. What constitutes equal opportunities?

(a) In general:

46. Question: "Generally speaking, what constitutes equal opportunities?"

Answer: "Under section 315 and sections 3.120, 3.290, and 3.657 of the Commission's rules, no licensee shall make any discrimination in charges, practices, regulations, facilities, or services rendered to candidates for a particular office."

47. Question: "Is a licensee required or allowed to give time free to one candidate where it had sold time to an opposing candidate?"

Answer: "The licensee is not permitted to discriminate between the candidates in any way. With respect to any particular election it may adopt a policy of selling time, or of giving time to the candidates free of charge, or of giving them some time and selling them additional time. But whatever policy it adopts it must treat all candidates for the same office alike with respect to the time they may secure free and that for which they must pay."

48. Question: "Is it necessary for a station to advise a candidate or a political party that time has been sold to other candidates?"

Answer: "No. The law does not require that this be done. If a candidate inquires, however, the facts must be given him. It should be noted here that a station is required to keep a public record of all requests for time by or on behalf of political candidates, together with a record of the disposition and the charges made, if any, for each broadcast." (Secs. 3.120(d), 3.290(d), 3.657 (d); and telegram to Norman William Seemann, Esq., May 18, 1962.)

49. Question: "If a station desires to make its facilities available on a particular day for political broadcasts to all candidates for the same office, is one of the candidates precluded from requesting equal opportunities at a later date if he does not accept the station's initial offer?"

Answer: "This depends on all of the circumstances surrounding the station's offer of time and, particularly, whether the station has given adequate advance notice. The Commission has held that a 4-day notice by a Texas station to a Congressman while Congress is in session does not constitute adequate advance notice and the Congressman is not foreclosed from his right to request equal opportunities." (Letter to Jack Neil, station KTRM, Apr. 18, 1962.)

50. Question: "With respect to a request for time by a candidate for public office where there has been no prior use by an opposing candidate, must the station sell the candidate the specific time segment he requests?"

Answer: "No. Neither the act nor the Commission's rules contain any provisions which require a licensee to sell a specific time segment to a candidate for public office." (Letter to Mr. Bill Neil, station KTRM, Mar. 9, 1962.)

51. Question: "Is a station required to sell to a candidate time which is unlimited as to total time and as to the length of each segment?"

Answer: "Neither the act nor the Commission's rules contain provisions requiring stations to sell unlimited periods of time for political broadcasts. Section 315 of the act imposes no obligation on any licensee to allow the use of its station by any candidate. Commission's programing statement contemplates the use of stations for political broadcasting. Where the station showed that sale of limited time segments to candidates was based on its experience and the interests of viewers in programing diversification, no Commission action was required." (Telegram to J. B. Lahan, May 18, 1962; and telegrams to Grover C. Doggette, Esq., May 22 and 23, 1962. Cf., letter to station WLBT–TV, Apr. 17, 1962, and letter to station WROX, May 2, 1962, where the Commission indicated that a public interest question would be raised if the station failed to provide any broadcast time to candidates in a major election being held within the station's coverage area.)

52. Question: "If a station offers free time to opposing candidates and one candidate declines to use the time given him, are other candidates for that office foreclosed from availing themselves of the offer?"

Answer: "No. The refusal of one candidate does not foreclose other candidates wishing to use the time offered. However, whether the candidate initially declining the offer could later avail himself of equal opportunities would depend on all the facts and circumstances." (Letter to Leonard Marks, June 13, 1956, 14 R.R. 65.)

53. Question: "If one political candidate buys station facilities more heavily than another, is a station required to call a halt to such sales because of the resulting imbalance?"

Answer: "No. Section 315 requires only that all candidates be afforded equal opportunities to use the facilities of the station." (Letter to Mrs. M. R. Oliver, Oct. 23, 1952, 11 R.R. 239.)

54. Question: "Can a station contract with the committee of a political party whereby it commits itself in advance of an election to furnish substantial blocks of time to the candidates of that party?"

Answer: "Neither section 315 nor the Commission's rules prohibit a licensee from contracting with a party for reservation of time in advance of an election. However, substantial questions as to a possible violation of section 315 would arise if the effect of such prior commitment were to disable a licensee from meeting its equal opportunities obligations under section 315." (Letter to Congressman FRANK M. KARSTEN, Nov. 25, 1955.)

55. Question: "Where a television station had previously offered certain specified time segments during the last week of the campaign to candidate A, who declined the purchase, and then sold the same segments to A's opponent, was the station obligated under section 315 to accede to A's subsequent request for particular time periods immediately preceding or following the time segments previously offered to him and refused by him and subsequently sold to his opponent?"

Answer: "No. But the time offered to candidate A must be generally comparable. The principal factors considered in this situation were: (a) the total amount of time presently scheduled for each candidate; (b) the time segments presently offered to candidate A; (c) the time segments presently scheduled for candidate A's opponent and previously rejected by candidate A; (d) the time segments now scheduled for candidates for other offices, if any, and previously rejected by candidate A; and (e) the station's possible obligations to other candidates for office." (Telegram to Maj. Gen. Harry Johnson, Nov. 1, 1961.)

56. Question: "If a station has a policy of confining political broadcasts to sustaining time, but has so many requests for political time that it cannot handle them all within its sustaining schedule, may it refuse time to a candidate whose opponent has already been granted time, on the basis of its established policy of not canceling commercial programs in favor of political broadcasts?"

Answer: "No. The station cannot rely upon its policy if the latter conflicts with the equal opportunities requirement of section 315." (Stephens Broadcasting Co., 11 F.C.C. 61, 3 R.R. 1.)

57. Question: "If one candidate has been nominated by parties A, B, and C, while a second candidate for the same office is nominated only by party D, how should time be allocated as between the two candidates?"

Answer: "Section 315 has reference only to the use of facilities by persons who are candidates for public office and not to the political parties which may have nominated such candidates. Accordingly, if broadcast time is made available for the use of a candidate for public office, the provisions of section 315 require that equal opportunities be afforded each person who is a candidate for the same office, without regard to the number of nominations that any particular candidate may have." (Letter to Thomas W. Wilson, Oct. 31, 1946.)

(b) Comparability:

58. Question: "Is a station's obligation under section 315 met if it offers a candidate the amount of time an opposing candidate has received, where the time of the day or week afforded the first candidate is superior to that offered his opponent?"

Answer: "No. The station in providing equal opportunities must consider the desirability of the time segment allotted as well as its length. And while there is no requirement that a station afford candidate B exactly the same time of day on exactly the same day of the week as candidate A, the time segments offered must be comparable as to desirability."

59. Question: "If candidate A has been afforded time during early morning, noon, and evening hours, does a station comply with section 315 by offering candidate B time only during early morning and noon periods?"

Answer: "No. However, the requirements of comparable time do not require a station to make available exactly the same time periods, nor the periods requested by candidate B." (Letter to D. L. Grace, July 3, 1958.)

60. Question: "If a station broadcasts a program sponsored by a commercial advertiser which includes one or more qualified candidates as speakers or guests, what are its obligations with respect to affording equal opportunities to other candidates for the same office?"

Answer: "If candidates are permitted to appear without cost to themselves, on programs sponsored by commercial advertisers, opposing candidates are entitled to receive comparable time also at no cost." (Letter to Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Oct. 16, 1952, 11 R.R. 451; and telegram to WWIN, May 3, 1962.)

61. Question: "Where a candidate for office in a State or local election appears on a national network program, is an opposing candidate for the same office entitled to equal facilities over stations which carried the original program and serve the area in which the election campaign is occurring?"

Answer: "Yes. Under such circumstances an opposing candidate would be entitled to time on such stations." (Letter to Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Oct. 9, 1952.)

62. Question: "Where a candidate appears on a particular program—such as a regular series of forum programs—are opposing candidates entitled to demand to appear on the same program?"

Answer: "Not necessarily. The mechanics of the problem of equal opportunities must be left to resolution of the parties. And while factors such as the size of the potential audience because of the appearance of the first candidate on an established or popular program might very well be a matter for consideration by the parties, it cannot be said, in the abstract, that equal opportunities could only be provided by giving opposing parties time on the same program." (Letter to Harold Oliver, Oct. 31, 1952; letter to Julius F. Brauner, Oct. 31, 1952.)

63. Question: "Where a station asks candidates A and B (opposing candidates in a primary election) to appear on a debate-type program, the format of which is generally acceptable to the candidates, but with no restrictions as to what issues or matters might be discussed, and candidate A accepts the offer and appears on the program and candidate B declines to appear on the program, is candidate B entitled to further equal opportunities in the use of the station's facilities within the meaning of section 315 of the act? If so, is any such obligation met by offering candidate B, prior to the primary, an opportunity to appear on a program of comparable format to that on which candidate A appeared, or is the station obligated to grant candidate B time equal to that used by candidate A on the program in question unrestricted as to format?"

Answer: "Since the station's format was reasonable in structure and the station put no restrictions on what matters and issues might be discussed by candidate B and others who appeared on the program in question, it offered candidate B equal opportunities in the use of its facilities within the meaning of section 315 of the act. The station's further offer to candidate B, prior to the primary, of its facilities on a comparable format was reasonable under the facts of the case, consistent with any continuing obligation to afford candidate B 'equal opportunities' in the use of the station which he may have had." (Letter to Congressman Bob Wilson, Aug. 1, 1958.)

64. Question: "A licensee offered broadcast time to all the candidates for a particular office for a joint appearance, the details of which program were determined solely by the licensee. If candidate A rejects the offer and candidate B and/or other candidates accepts and appears, would candidate A be entitled to equal opportunities because of the appearance of candidate B and/or other candidates on the program previously offered by the licensee to all of the candidates?"

Answer: "Yes; provided the request is made by the candidate within the period specified by the rules. The Commission stated that licensees should negotiate with the affected candidates and that where the offer was mutually agreeable to such candidates, equal opportunities were being afforded to the candidates. Where the candidate rejected the proposal, however, and other candidates accepted and appeared, the Commission stated: 'Where the licensee permits one candidate to use his facilities, section 315 then—simply by virtue of that use—requires the licensee to afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station. This obligation may not be avoided by the licensee's unilateral actions in picking a program format, specifying participants other than and in addition to the candidates, setting the length of the program, the time of taping, the time of broadcast, etc., and then offering the package to the candidates on a "take it or leave it—this is my final offer" basis. For * * * section 315 provides that the station shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast. (Cf. *Port Huron Broadcasting Co.*, 4 R.R. 1.) Clearly, the "take it or leave it" basis described above would constitute such prohibited censorship, since it would, in effect, be dictating the very format of the program to the candidate—and thus, an important facet of the material broadcast. We wish to make clear that the Commission is in no way saying that one format is more in the public interest than another. On the contrary, the thrust of our ruling is that the act bestows upon the candidate the right to choose the format and other similar aspects of the material broadcast, with no right of censorship in the licensee.'" Cf. *Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, North Dakota Division* v. *WDAY, Inc.*, 360 U.S. 525. (Letter to Nicholas Zapple, Oct. 5, 1962.)

65. Question: "In affording equal opportunities, may a station limit the use of its facilities solely to the use of a microphone?"

Answer: "A station must treat opposing candidates the same with respect to the use of its facilities and if it permits one candidate to use facilities over and beyond the microphone, it must permit a similar usage by other qualified candidates." (Letter to D. L. Grace, July 3, 1958.)

VII. What limitations can be put on the use of facilities by a candidate?

66. Question: "May a station delete material in a broadcast under section 315 because it believes the material contained therein is or may be libelous?"

Answer: "No. Any such action would entail censorship which is expressly prohibited by section 315 of the Communications Act." (*Port Huron Broadcasting Co.*, 12 F.C.C. 1069, 4 R.R. 1; *WDSU Broadcasting Co.*, 7 R.R. 769.)

67. Question: "If a legally qualified candidate broadcasts libelous or slanderous remarks, is the station liable therefor?

Answer: "In *Port Huron Broadcasting Co.*, 12 F.C C. 1069, 4 R.R. 1, the Commission expressed an opinion that licensees not directly participating in the libel might be absolved from any liability they might otherwise incur under State law, because of the operation of section 315, which precludes them from preventing a candidate's utterances. In a subsequent case, the Commission's ruling in the Port Huron case was, in effect, affirmed, the Supreme Court holding that since a licensee could not censor a broadcast under section 315, Congress could not have intended to compel a station to broadcast libelous statements of a legally qualified candidate and at the same time subject itself to the risk of damage suits." (Read *Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America* v. *WDAY, Inc.*, 79 S. Ct. 1302 (October 1958) 89 N.W. 2d 102, 164 F. Supp. 928.)

68. Question: "Does the same immunity apply in a case where the chairman of a political party's campaign committee, not himself a candidate, broadcasts a speech in support of a candidate?"

Answer: "No; licensees are not entitled to assert the defense that they are not liable since the speeches could have been censored without violating section 315. Accordingly, they were at fault in permitting such speeches to be broadcast." (*Felix* v. *Westinghouse Radio Stations*, 186 F. 2d 1, cert. den., 341 U.S. 909.)

69. Question: "A candidate prepared a 15-minute video tape which contained the opinions of several private citizens with respect to an issue pertinent to the pending election. If the station broadcast such program in which the candidate did not appear, would the immunity afforded licensees by section 315 from liability for the broadcast of libelous or slanderous remarks by candidates be applicable?"

Answer: "No. The provision of section 315 prohibiting censorship by a licensee over material broadcast pursuant to section 315 applies only to broadcasts by candidates themselves. Section 315, therefore, is not a defense to an action for libel or slander arising out of broadcasts by noncandidates speaking in behalf of another's candidacy. Since section 315 does not prohibit the licensee from censoring such a broadcast, the licensee is not entitled to the protection of section 315." (Letter to Mr. William P. Webb, Apr. 24, 1962.)

70. Question: "If a candidate secures time under section 315, must he talk about a subject directly related to his candidacy?"

Answer: "No. The candidate may use the time as he deems best. To deny a person time on the ground that he was not using it in furtherance of his candidacy would be an exercise of censorship prohibited by section 315." (Letter to WMCA, Inc., May 15, 1952, 7 R.R. 1132.)

71. Question: "If a station makes time available to an officeholder who is also a legally qualified candidate for reelection and the officeholder limits his talks to nonpartisan and informative material, may other legally qualified candidates who obtain time be limited to the same subjects or the same type of broadcast?"

Answer: "No. Other qualified candidates may use the facilities as they deem best in their own interest." (Letter to Congressman Allen Oakley Hunter, May 28, 1952, 11 R.R. 234.)

72. Question: "May a station require an advance script of a candidate's speech?"

Answer: "Yes; provided that the practice is uniformly applied to all candidates for the same office using the station's facilities, and the station does not undertake to censor the candidate's talk." (Letter to H. A. Rosenberg, Louisville, Ky., July 9, 1962, 11 R.R. 236.)

73. Question: "May a station have a practice of requiring a candidate to record his proposed broadcast at his own expense?"

Answer: "Yes. Provided again that the procedures adopted are applied without discrimination as between candidates for the same office and no censorship is attempted." (Letter to H. A. Rosenberg, Louisville, Ky., July 9, 1962, 11 R.R. 236.)

VIII. What rates can be charged candidates for programs under section 315?

74. Question: "May a station charge premium rates for political broadcasts?"

Answer: "No. Section 315, as amended, provides that the charges made for the use of a station by a candidate shall not exceed the charges made for comparable use of such stations for other purposes."

75. Question: "Does the requirement that the charges to a candidate shall not exceed the charges for comparable use of a station for other purposes apply to political broadcasts by persons other than qualified candidates?"

Answer: "No. This requirement applies only to candidates for public office. Hence, a station may adopt whatever policy it desires for political broadcasts by organizations or persons who are not candidates for office, consistent with its obligation to operate in the public interest." (Letter to Congressman Charles C. Diggs, Jr., Mar. 16, 1955.)

76. Question: "May a station with both national and local rates charge a candidate for local office its national rate?"

Answer: "No. Under sections 3.120, 3.290, and 3.657 of the Commission's rules a station may not charge a candidate more than the rate the station would charge if the candidate were a commercial advertiser whose advertising was directed to promoting its business within the same area as that within which persons may vote for the particular office for which such person is a candidate."

77. Question: "Considering the limited geographical area which a member of the House of Representatives serves, must candidates for the House be charged the local, instead of the national rate?"

Answer: "This question cannot be answered categorically. To determine the maximum rates which could be charged under section 315, the Commission would have to know the criteria a station uses in classifying local versus national advertisers before it could determine what are comparable charges. In making this determination, the Commission does not prescribe rates but merely requires equality of treatment as between 315 broadcasts and commercial advertising." (Letter to Congressman Richard M. Simpson, Feb. 27, 1957.)

78. Question: "Is a political candidate entitled to receive discounts?"

Answer: "Yes. Under sections 3.120, 3.290, and 3.657 of the Commission's rules political candidates are entitled to the same discounts that would be accorded persons other than candidates for public office under the conditions specified, as well as to such special discounts for programs coming within section 315 as the station may choose to give on a nondiscriminatory basis."

79. Question: "Can a station refuse to sell time at discount rates to a group of candidates for different offices who have pooled their resources to obtain a discount, even though as a matter of commercial practice, the station permits commercial advertisers to buy a block of time at discount rates for use by various businesses owned by them?"

Answer: "Yes; section 315 imposes no obligation on a station to allow the use of its facilities by candidates, and neither that section nor the Commission's rules require a station to sell time to a group of candidates on a pooled basis, even though such may be the practice with respect to commercial advertisers." (Letter to WKBT–WKBH, Oct. 14, 1954.)

80. Question: "If candidate A purchases 10 time segments over a station which offers a discount rate for purchase of that amount of time, is candidate B entitled to the discount rate if he purchases less time than the minimum to which discounts are applicable?"

Answer: "No. A station is under such circumstances only required to make available the discount privileges to each legally qualified candidate on the same basis."

81. Question: "If a station has a spot rate of $2 per spot announcement, with a rate reduction of $1 if 100 or more such spots are purchased on a bulk time sales contract, and if one candidate arranges with an advertiser having such a bulk time contract to utilize five of these spots at the $1 rate, is the station obligated to sell the candidates of other parties for the same office time at the same $1 rate?"

Answer: "Yes. Other legally qualified candidates are entitled to take advantage of the same reduced rate." (Letter to Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Oct. 16, 1952.)

82. Question: "Where a group of candidates for different offices pool their resources to purchase a block of time at a discount, and an individual candidate opposing one of the group seeks time on the station, to what rate is he entitled?"

Answer: "He is entitled to be charged the same rate as his opponent since the provisions of section 315 run to the candidates themselves and they are entitled to be treated equally with their individual opponents." (Report and order, docket 11092, 11 R.R. 1501.) (Cf. question and answer 60; and telegram of WWIN, May 3, 1962.)

83. Question: "Is there any prohibition against the purchase by a political party of a block of time for several of its candidates for allocation among such candidates on the basis of personal need, rather than on the amount each candidate has contributed to the party's campaign fund?"

Answer: "There is no prohibition in section 315 or the Commission's rules against the above practices. It would be reasonable to assume that the group time used by a candidate is, for the purposes of section 315, time paid for by the candidate through the normal device of a recognized poltical campaign committee, even though part of the campaign funds was derived from sources other than the candidates' contributions." (Letter to Edward de Grazia, Oct. 14, 1954.)

84. Question: "When a candidate and his immediate family own all the stock in a corporate licensee and the candidate is the president and general manager, can he pay for time to the corporate licensee from which he derives his income and have the licensee make a similar charge to an opposing candidate?"

Answer: "Yes. The fact that a candidate has a financial interest in a corporate licensee does not affect the licensee's obligation under section 315. Thus, the rates which the licensee may charge to other legally qualified candidates will be governed by the rate which the stockholder candidate actually pays to the licensee. If no charge is made to the stockholder candidate, it follows that other legally qualified candidates are entitled to equal time without charge." (Letter to Charles W. Stratton, Mar. 18, 1957.)

IX. Period within which request must be made.

85. Question: "When must a candidate make a request of the station for opportunities equal to those afforded his opponent?"

Answer: "Within 1 week of the day on which the prior use occurred." (Subsec. (e) of secs. 3.120, 3.290, and 3.657 of the Commission rules; and telegram to WWIN, May 3, 1962.)

86. Question: "A U.S. Senator, unopposed candidate in his party's primary, had been broadcasting a weekly program entitled 'Your Senator Reports.' If he becomes opposed in his party's primary, would his opponent be entitled to request equal opportunities with respect to all broadcasts of 'Your Senator Reports' since the time the incumbent announced his candidacy?"

Answer: "No. A legally qualified candidate announcing his candidacy for the above nomination would be required to request equal opportunities concerning a particular broadcast of 'Your Senator Reports' not later than 1 week after the date of such broadcast. Thus, any of the incumbent's opponents for the nomination who first announced his candidacy on a particular day, would not be in a position to request equal opportunities with respect to any showing of 'Your Senator Reports' which was broadcast more than 1 week prior to the date of such announcement." (Letter to Senator Joseph S. Clark, Apr. 16, 1962.)

X. Issuance of interpretations of section 315 by the Commission.

87. Question: "Under what circumstances will the Commission consider issuing declaratory orders, interpretive rulings, or advisory opinions with respect to section 315?"

Answer: "Section 5(d) of the Administrative Procedure Act, title 5, U.S.C.A., provides that 'The agency is authorized in its sound discretion, with like effect as in the case of other orders, to issue a declaratory order to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty.' However, agencies are not required to issue such orders merely because a request is made therefor. The grant of authority to agencies to issue declaratory orders is limited, and such orders are authorized only with respect to matters which are required by statute to be determined 'on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing.' See Attorney General's Manual on the Administrative Procedure Act, pages 59, 60; also, *In re Goodman*, 12 FCC 678, 4 Pike, and Fischer R.R. 98. In general, the Commission limits its interpretive rulings or advisory opinions to situations where the critical facts are explicitly stated without the possibility that subsequent events will alter them. It prefers to issue such rulings or opinions where the specific facts of a particular case in controversy are before it for decision." (Letter to Pierson, Ball & Dowd, June 18, 1958.)

EDUCATIONAL TV BILL PUSHES EDUCATION FORWARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the approval of a bill to encourage more educational television facilities is one of the unheralded but highly important achievements of the 87th Congress.

As a cosponsor of S. 205, I was very much interested in an article recently published by School Boards, a publication of the National School Boards Association, Inc., discussing the subject of educational television.

The first paragraph of the article states:

> More than 1,000 additional television channels will be needed to satisfy the educational television requirements of the Nation in the next decade.

This statement is backed up by a nationwide survey of educational television, conducted by the National Association of Education Broadcasters.

Mr. President, S. 205, passed by the 87th Congress, will go a long way toward meeting this need for educational television.

This measure, an amendment to the Communications Act of 1934, will provide Federal matching grants up to the limit of $1 million per State to aid States in the purchase of equipment and installation of educational television facilities.

The bill authorizes appropriations of $32 million over the 5-year period beginning in fiscal 1963, for grants on a matching basis to, first, State or local educational supervisory agencies; second, State educational television agencies; and third, tax-supported colleges or universities or nonprofit organizations set up to advance educational television.

The program is to be administered by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. I am pleased to have been a cosponsor of this legislation. As a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, and of the Senate Education Subcommittee, I have worked to preserve channels for educational use, and for this TV educational bill, since I first came to the Senate.

About 5 years ago there was great danger in my State that the television channels reserved for educational use were to slip into private hands, because private interests had successfully blocked any use of most of those channels for educational purposes. Now we have real hope that the channels can be put to educational use.

Because of the interest in this measure, particularly among educators who are coming more and more to realize the great potential of this medium, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Educational Television Faces Drastic Shortage of Channels," published in the October edition of School Boards.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION FACES DRASTIC SHORTAGE OF CHANNELS

More than 1,000 additional television channels will be needed to satisfy the educational television requirements of the Nation in the next decade.

That was the conclusion of the first nationwide survey of educational television conducted by the National Association of Education Broadcasters for the Office of Education. In carrying out the survey, NAEB took into account the projected needs of colleges and universities, local school systems, and State departments of education.

A primary concern of the NAEB in basing its estimate was that educational television "must reach far beyond the formal system of schools and provide opportunities for continuing education at every stage of life."

The survey found that the school systems of the country reported a greater need for educational television than the colleges and universities. More than 95 percent of the public schools surveyed reported serious curriculum deficiencies or teaching needs. Most said these could be met, or greatly helped, by educational television.

The survey recommended that the primary educational television channel in a community should be in the very high frequency (standard broadcast) band, because most of the larger population centers are equipped for VHF reception and it also offers greater coverage at less cost. Since sufficient VHF channels are not now available, the survey concludes that the deficit must be met with ultra high frequency channels as UHF sets become available.

In arriving at its estimate of the number of channels needed, the NAEB believes that each community or educational complex using television for systematic instruction will need from 2 to 12 channels for simultaneous transmission. In most instances, they found, UHF will serve these local multichannel needs.

The projected needs are contrasted with existing facilities in one section of the survey. Since 1952, the FCC has reserved 275 channels of the existing 2,200 for the use of educational television. To date, only 62 of these channels have been placed in operation. The report points out that roughly three-quarters of all metropolitan centers, most of the smaller communities, and almost all of rural America are without educational television.

To offset its limited use, the report concluded that a minimum of 97 VHF and 825 UHF channels would have to be added to the presently reserved 88 VHF and 187 UHF channels for a grand total of 1,197 channels needed exclusively for education.

In view of these needs, the report urged the FCC to give education equal consideration with any other broadcasting service in any contest for specific unreserved channels.

OIL IMPORTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, those of us from major oil producing States have a right to and a duty to discuss the matter of proper quotas on oil imports with the President to assure ourselves that the Chief Executive understands the problems and that he is likely to take the necessary steps to assure the future of the domestic petroleum industry. As a senior member of the Finance Committee, which has legislative jurisdiction over quotas and tariffs, I have felt a particular obligation to act in this field, inasmuch as Louisiana produces more oil per square mile than any State in the Union.

Having discussed the matter with the President and other responsible persons in the executive branch of this Government on a number of occasions, I am satisfied that he is prepared to take the following necessary steps at the appropriate times.

First. Continue the oil import quota program.

Second. Bring Mexican and Canadian imports within the overall limitation on foreign imports. To do less leaves the program somewhat like a bucket with a hole in it.

Third. Tie the ratio of imports to a definite calendar year. While the domestic industry would like to roll back import quotas to the ratio of 1956 and the importers would prefer 1962, the calendar year 1961 is the most logical calendar year. After all, the figures for 1962 will not even be complete for some time to come.

Fourth. Assure domestic producers their proportionate share of the increased market. This would assure to domestic producers about 85 percent of the 2.7 percent increased use of this fuel next year.

Fifth. Recognize the relatively different situation on the west coast in allotting quotas, but do all within reason to assist in expanding the use of domestic petroleum on the west coast.

Sixth. Recognize the growing problem involved in liquified gas products such as derivatives of gas and distillates, and include this within the overall quota limitation and import formula.

Seventh. Recognize the growing problem of imports transshipped from Puerto Rico and include this within the quota arrangement.

Mr. President, some persons wonder why I did not offer amendments to the Trade Act seeking to force the President to do those things. I declined to do it because of a number of reasons.

In the first place, we had succeeded in placing all the laws we needed on the books, if we could persuade the President to do what we thought necessary. He has all the power he needs to get the job done.

In the second place, to superimpose our judgment on a matter of national security over that of the President would violate the theory of the defense amendment to the Trade Act, and it is not likely that it could be enacted with strong White House opposition in view of the fact that the House of Representatives had already rejected it.

In the third place, even if successful in the effort to vote mandates upon matters within the President's discretion, the mandates would not really bind him.

President Eisenhower, for example, refused to carry out a mandate to buy sugar from Trujillo. Whenever a President gets his back up he can refuse to obey a congressional mandate, saying, "They cannot do anything but impeach me, and I do not think they have the votes."

In the fourth place, to make the effort to vote a mandate upon the President and lose, as would surely have been the case, would have left us in an unhappy situation when we asked the Persident of the United States to do what was necessary to protect the industry. He might have told us to go to his opposition who had fought his trade bill and get our protection from them. Obviously, at that point, our fellow protectionists would be as helpless as we.

For these reasons, I arrived at the conclusion that we would do better to seek favorable and proper consideration at the Executive level than by engaging in a futile and injurious effort to tie the hands of the President. The President has been forthright and direct in discussing this matter with this Senator, as I am sure he has been with those who have had similar problems to discuss. I believe that we will not be disappointed to rely upon his good faith and good judgment in this matter.

The history of the next 5 years will prove me right or wrong. I face that verdict with confidence. In this connection let me thank my friend the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for the work that he has done paralleling what I have been doing in this field.

Let me also thank the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and, by no means least, my senior colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. They have worked with me in this endeavor and in approving this approach. I believe that it will succeed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his kind remarks about me.

As he was kind enough to say, I had discussed this matter with him while this legislation was being debated on the floor of the Senate. I am not a member of the Finance Committee. He told me of long discussions with the President and of the hopes which he and those working with him had that they could secure, by the methods outlined in the statement he has just made, a measure of protection for domestic petroleum producers that would be in harmony with, and would strengthen, our national economy.

Being a Texan, I look with some envy on his correct statement that Louisiana produces more oil per square mile than does any other State in the Union.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We do not have nearly as many square miles as Texas has.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Texas still has the largest production; but we do not boast about that any more, because the production is so small, compared with the State's capacity. This situation has been brought about by the increasing amount of foreign oil imports and the declining amount of production allowed to the domestic producers. Our production is limited to 8 days a month. As a result, farm and ranch rental income, corporate incomes, State and local tax revenues, and personal incomes, all are down. Men who have been in the oil business all their lives, and whose families have been engaged in that business for three or four generations, and whose fathers, grandfathers, or great grandfathers came to Texas from Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and other former oil producing States now find that it may be necessary for them to go into other businesses, because the domestic production of oil has declined so markedly, as a result of the increasing imports of oil.

The Senator from Louisiana has made a precise statement of seven points. I congratulate him on his leadership in this field; and I shall continue to work with him in the effort to prevent our domestic economy from being shackled by imports from areas which do not have the self-imposed restraints on oil production that our country has, and where costs are so low that it is possible to deliver the oil to our ports at approximately half the cost per barrel of production in America.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator from Texas. He knows that I would be willing to vote for a tariff on oil of $1.25 a barrel; but he knows as well as I do that even if the Senate voted that, it could not be passed through the House.

The Senator from Texas also knows that the intent of the law is that an industry which is vital to the national defense should be maintained at a level sufficient to enable it to sustain the Nation in times of emergency. If the existing law is administered in good faith, within the intent of those of us who supported it when it was enacted some years ago, and as reaffirmed in the Trade Act which was passed this year, the President will administer this act in a way which will give our oil industry the protection to which it is entitled.

I am frank to say that I do not believe it is receiving proper consideration at this moment, just as I also believe that the textile industry is not now receiving the consideration to which it is entitled. But I believe the President is considering taking steps at the executive level—and I believe they will be put into effect in the next several months—to accord these industries the consideration to which they are entitled.

Furthermore, those interested in other industries, including the lumber industry, which vitally affect other States as well as Louisiana, also have the duty to do everything in their power to have similar steps taken as to them, in order to receive the consideration to which they are entitled.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana; and certainly he has proposed a sound course to be followed in the attempt to end the existing discrimination against domestic oil production, to the advantage of foreign oil production.

Insofar as tariffs are concerned, the tariff I have suggested—82 cents a barrel—would still permit foreign oil to be imported; the purpose is not to cut off all oil imports. Instead, the purpose is to require those who produce and import foreign oil to bear some share of the cost of the protection our Government affords the oil industry in countries such as those bordering on the Persian Gulf, by means of the forces our Government maintains there. But at the present time foreign oil importers do nothing to support the protection which our Government affords them in that way, by means of the Armed Forces and the ships which our Government sends there to protect them. Instead, the oil produced in the United States pays a part of the cost to our Government, and thereby providing protection for the maintenance of those governments and those industries which produce the oil which is entering this country in such quantities as to depress our domestic industry.

For example, let us consider Aramco. It receives, on the oil it produces in Saudi Arabia, the 27½ percent depletion allowance which also is allowed in connection with oil produced in the United States. Of course, the purpose of that depletion allowance is to encourage the development of American mineral resources at home. However, Aramco is allowed the 27½ percent depletion allowance in connection with its drillings in Saudi Arabia; and Aramco has made with the Saudi Arabian Government an arrangement whereby, instead of paying royalties, it pays taxes of 50 percent. At the same time, our corporations are subject to a maximum income tax of 52 percent. So by the time the American oil companies which operate in Saudi Arabia pay the 50 percent tax to Saudi Arabia, and then receive the 27½ percent depletion allowance, we find that our Government is receiving practically no tax income from the American oil companies which operate in Saudi Arabia, even though our Government stations our Armed Forces and our Air Forces there, and our Navy nearby to protect their investments. In short, those companies are paying practically nothing for the support which our Govment provides, and without which they could not operate. That is why I say it is fair to have a tariff placed on such imports. After all, oil can be produced in those countries so cheaply that the proposed tariff would not end or lessen the imports; it would merely require that those companies pay something for the protection our Government gives them there. Our domestic producers pay taxes to local school districts, the counties, States, and to our National Government.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is very fair in the attitude he takes in regard to this matter. I am sure he realizes that if such a tariff is not imposed, the President still will have the power to impose the quota which he has already imposed. However, such a step would leave in existence the present arrangement, with its wide-open ends. For example, Canada sends to the United States almost all the oil Canada produces, and Canada purchases on the world market the oil she needs.

However, we understand that such controls are being worked out. I thank the Senator from Texas very much for his support.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Metcalf in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, transmitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Eight postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Kathryn E. Granahan, of Pennsylvania, to be Treasurer of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John G. Green, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with respect to the nomination of John G. Green to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, I am advised that when the nomination was considered by the Senate Finance Committee, a quorum was not present. I understand that the nomination was reported on a basis of polling the committee—which is not in accord with the Senate rule. Under the circumstances, and at the very specific request of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley], with whom I discussed this subject on the telephone just a moment ago, I am compelled, for him, to enter a point of order against the nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois withhold the point of order temporarily?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this seems to be an unusual procedure in certain respects, because this nomination was sent to the Senate by the President, and the nomination was before the committee for at least 5 or 6 months. The distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] has appeared before the committee, and has written to the committee, and has approached the leadership, in an attempt to obtain action from that committee.

From all I can gather, the nominee is a good man, and the appointment is a good one; and the nominee is not personally obnoxious, so far as I can ascertain, to any Senator.

Although I realize the position in which the Senator from Illinois finds himself in acting as the leader of his party on that side of the aisle, I wonder whether there is any way by which a point of order would not be considered at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I discussed the matter this morning with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] and briefly with the distinguished majority leader. For that reason I called the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] to ascertain his wishes, since he had left instructions with me before he went to Wisconsin. I had hoped that perhaps he would be content with a yea-and-nay vote on the nomination, but he made it quite plain and was quite insistent that the point of order be made. Serving as his representative, I am duty-bound to carry out the wishes of my colleague, without in any way desiring to go against the wishes of the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand the position of the minority leader, and I sympathize with it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. John Green was nominated on March 1 by the President of the United States. On March 26, 1962, I wrote the senior Senator from Wisconsin a letter asking him to return the slip, the form which the Finance Committee had sent him on the Green nomination, approving John Green. I ask unanimous consent that that letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 26, 1962.

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Alex: This letter is to express to you my hope that we will be able to get the nomination of John Green as customs collector for the port of Duluth-Superior cleared in Finance Committee and to the Senate floor for action just as expeditiously as possible.

John Green is in my judgment eminently qualified for this post, and I can think of no reason to hold up his confirmation for it.

As I'm sure you recall, Alex, during the Eisenhower administration I followed a policy of approving such nominations as quickly as possible out of deference to the President, unless of course there was serious questions of qualifications for the post.

I would appreciate it if you could let me know what your thoughts are on this matter.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on March 27, 1962, I received a reply from the senior Senator from Wisconsin in which he said he was looking into the matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
March 27, 1962.

Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bill: After talking with you yesterday, let me say I would like to be very accommodating to you because through the years you have been very friendly and accommodating with me. However, I can't forget the treatment I got in relation to some 10 post-office nominees of President Eisenhower and as this matter is not in your Madison area, I feel that a little delay won't hurt anybody.

John Green's name as customs collector was sent to the Senate floor for consideration March 1 and then referred to the Finance Committee and it is still in the committee. Considerable mail is coming in on the subject and I will file the same in due time with the committee.

Sincerely yours,

Alexander Wiley.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On March 31 I once again wrote the senior Senator from Wisconsin, pleading with him, and stating that, in view of John Green's excellent qualifications and the fact that there was no reason whatsoever to disqualify the nominee, he reconsider and permit the nominee to be approved.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 31, 1962.

Hon. Alexander Wiley,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Alex: I very much appreciate your writing me on March 27 regarding John Green.

As I'm sure you know, John Green, who is the vice president of the Superior Evening Telegram, is very well thought of in that area. I have heard from literally hundreds of people in Superior and the surrounding area who are most anxious to have his nomination go through the Senate just as quickly as possible. They have the highest confidence in the integrity and competence of John for this post, as, of course, do I.

I hope we can get this moving out of committee and on to the floor of the Senate for confirmation in the very near future.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, subsequently I pressed the chairman of the Finance Committee for weeks to hold a hearing. The chairman of the Finance Committee said that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] had asked to delay the hearing. Finally, on June 13, we had a hearing on the nominee.

I ask unanimous consent that the biography of Mr. Green which appears in the record of the hearings be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

John G. Green

Born: October 31, 1894, in St. Ignace, Mich.

Marital status: Married.

Education: Parochial and public schools in Marquette, Mich.

Employment: Marquette Mining Journal, 1910–17; Duluth Herald, Duluth, Minn., 1917; Evening Telegram, Superior, Wis., 1919. Started as linotype operator; worked in advertising and editorial departments. In 1936 was made general manager of commercial department. Now vice president of telegram company and a member of the newspaper staff.

Memberships: When engaged in printing was secretary-treasurer of the Superior Typographical Union. Served on Superior City Council for a period of 12 continuous years. Part of those years was vice mayor of the city, chairman of the finance committee, president of the board of health. Served on and was president of: TB Association, March of Dimes, Children's Welfare Board, Community Fund, Crippled Children and Adults, Inc., St. Mary's Hospital Advisory Board. President of Tri-State Fair Association. Member of Duluth-Superior Propeller Club. Member of Superior Association of Commerce. Member and one of organizers of Ace Investment Club, Superior. Member of Superior Sierra Club. Past exalted ruler Superior Lodge of Elks. Past faithful navigator, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus. Candidate for Congress in 1940 from 10th District.

Present address: 2327 Hammond Avenue, Superior, Wis.

Legal residence: Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On page 3 of the hearings, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Wiley] is shown as having testified that—

> I don't know the nominee John Green, although I did meet him in Washington a month or two ago. Everything I heard about him is good.

That was the senior Senator from Wisconsin, the only Member of the Senate opposing the nomination.

Let me repeat what he said:

> Everything I heard about him was good.

I understand that this nomination, like many nominations, has been reported to the Senate without a quorum having been present, on the basis of polling the committee. This is frequently done by all Senate committees as a matter of convenience to Senators. I suppose many nominations are in exactly the same status as the Green nomination.

It is my understanding also, and I call this to the attention of the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen], that during the time when President Eisenhower was President, after he took office, this situation occurred in reverse, so to speak. That is, President Eisenhower made nominations, and toward the end of the session in 1954, the end of the session in 1954, the first Eisenhower session, some nominations were reported, not on the basis of a quorum being present, but on the basis of having polled the committee concerned, just as in this case. It is my understanding, having talked with some Senators, that under no circumstances did any Democratic Senator object on a parliamentary ground to any of these nominations. I know some Senators may have felt strongly about some of those nominations; but they did not play the parliamentary game this way. They observed courtesy to their colleagues and permitted committees to be polled.

Therefore, I feel very badly about the situation. I have consulted the majority leader. I have consulted the Parliamentarian. I have consulted the secretary of the majority, who is an able parliamentarian. I have consulted the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], one of the ablest parliamentarians in the Senate. They all agree that the point of the Senator from Illinois is well taken and would be sustained by the Senate.

Consequently I am in a position that I cannot block the point of order.

I am going to do everything I can to try to persuade members of the Finance Committee to try to secure a quorum so there cannot be a parliamentary block. I think under these circumstances a very good man, one who is very well qualified, with no objection against him, is being barred from office. I think it is very unfortunate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the appearance of the nominee's name on the Executive Calendar is prima facie evidence that he was properly and regularly confirmed by the committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, may I say to the Chair that I consulted the Parliamentarian earlier. He told me the exact situation. He told me that the situation was that a point of order under these circumstances, since a quorum of the committee was not present, would be well taken. Then I consulted the majority leader——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not arguing about whether or not the point of order would be well taken. The Chair is not conversant at all with the facts of the situation. A further inquiry of the chairman of the committee would have been made as to whether or not there was a polling of the committee and a quorum was present. The Senator from Wisconsin has conceded that there was not a quorum present, and, of course, then the parliamentary ruling as communicated to the Senator from Wisconsin would be the ruling of the Chair, that, under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the point of order would be well taken.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say this briefly. The Chair has stated the situation correctly. The Chair has no knowledge of the facts, although he has to assume that, because the nomination is on the calendar, it was properly reported, but the Chair would make inquiry of the chairman of the Finance Committee, and the chairman would have no alternative but to state the fact, which was that a quorum was not present. Under those circumstances the ruling would have to be made that a quorum was not present and the point was well taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in all candor, it should be stated that the distinguished minority leader did state truthfully that the nomination was approved on the basis of a poll taken among the members of the Finance Committee, and not on the basis of a quorum being present to consider it. It was the understanding of the minority leader, the majority leader, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], and others that under a situation of that kind a point of order was valid and would be upheld.

Is that a correct statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, on the basis of the information given to the Chair by the minority leader, the majority leader, and the Senator from Wisconsin.

Under section 133(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which operates as a rule of the Senate, it provides that—

> No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any such committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present.

If the Committee on Finance reported the nominations in question without a majority of the members being actually present, the action of the committee in ordering them to be reported to the Senate was in contravention of the above section of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and therefore such action was without authority and void. Being "actually present" means they would have had to be present in committee, and a poll does not present a compliance with the rule.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate continue with the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE IN CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICT NO. 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Stramiello, Jr., of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADORS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for Ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations for Ambassadors be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVES AND ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES TO THE 12TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the 12th Session of the General Conference of United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of persons to be U.S. Representatives and alternate U.S. Representatives to the 12th Session of the General Conference of UNESCO be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc and are confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations placed on the Secretary's desk, for appointments in the Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations for appointment in the Navy, placed on the Secretary's desk, may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President may be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke on the subject of Cuba. At that time I did not have fully confirmed the matter to which I shall address myself now. I now have it fully confirmed. As a result, I call upon the appropriate Government officials to confirm or to deny reports of intermediate range missile bases in Cuba.

Construction has begun on at least a half dozen launching sites for intermediate range tactical missiles. Intelligence authorities must have advised the President and top Government officials of this fact, and they must now have been told that ground-to-ground missiles can be operational from the island of Cuba within 6 months.

My own sources on the Cuban situation, which have been 100 percent reliable, have substantiated this report completely.

When are the American people going to be given all of the facts about the military buildup in Cuba?

Yesterday I pointed out, for either the 19th or 20th time, that we are not getting the whole story on Cuba. I referred to the recent testimony by Under Secretary of State George Ball before the House Select Committee on Export Control. Presumably the report was supposed to be in line with the President's commitment of September 4 that, "We shall continue to make information available as fast as it is obtained and properly verified."

I stated that Mr. Ball had confirmed facts which some of us had previously reported; that he had identified three, possibly four, short-range missile sites in Cuba. I commented, however, that the significant sentence in his testimony, which was buried away, perhaps in the hope that no one would notice it, was this: "Quite likely several more such sites will be installed."

The fact of the matter is, according to my reliable sources, that six launching sites are under construction—pads which will have the power to hurl rockets into the American heartland and as far as the Panama Canal Zone.

Why would Under Secretary Ball give the committee the impression that new missile sites were a possibility rather than a fact? Even as possibilities, he indicated they would be short range rather than intermediate range missile sites. Why has such a veil been thrown around Cuba, keeping this new information from the American people? Are they still trying to perpetuate the myth that the buildup is defensive? Is it possible anyone in Government is childish enough to believe this?

According to Mr. Walter Lippmann's column of yesterday, the United States has "an elaborate system of surveillance by sea, by air, and by land and there is every reason to think that its accuracy is very high. Little of military interest can happen without our knowing it. We do not have to guess. We know."

If this is true, our Government is well aware of the fact that within a matter of months, Cuba may have the capability of launching intermediate range missiles, but the American people are being kept in the dark. The Soviets know the fact. The Cubans know this fact. But in the view of the administration our people are not entitled to know it.

Mr. President, let us have all the facts, and have them now.

U.S. WEAPONS RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would not want this session of Congress to conclude without the privilege of offering a few comments on the problem facing the United States in the one area in the world where the cold war is a very hot war. I refer to the fighting in Vietnam.

I will not at this late hour attempt to comment on the many phases of the Vietnamese situation in any detail.

It is, however, gratifying to note that, in recent months, the tide may well have turned for the forces of freedom against the Communist guerrillas of the north.

Under the leadership of President Kennedy and the active followthrough by Secretary of Defense McNamara, U.S. advisory and support forces have helped Vietnam seize the offensive in many areas.

A number of striking successes have been achieved.

The Vietnamese Army, civil guard, and self-defense corps have been greatly strengthened. They are far better led, manned, and equipped than they were a year ago.

This we can attribute to the advisory group of the U.S. military forces, and of course to the improvement in the overall training of the Vietnamese forces.

The vast program of construction of 2,300 strategic villages, with protective perimeters, has been advancing steadily.

There is strong evidence that Viet Cong forces are finding increasing difficulty in maintaining or winning the support of the peasant population in many areas.

This, I believe, is the most reassuring development of all.

LONG OVERDUE REFORMS

All is not as we might wish it, however.

The reforms which many Americans have long sought on the part of President Diem—economic, military, political, social—are still a long way from realization.

ABRIDGMENT OF REPORTERS' FREEDOM OBJECTIONABLE

Vietnamese press censorship and interference with foreign correspondents is hardly reassuring.

We Americans have learned to be skeptical of general situations when the right of American reporters to travel and report freely is seriously abridged. We are rightly skeptical of dispatches which seem to depend overly on official press-agentry, because our correspondents are not permitted to go where they want to, when they want to, to check up for themselves.

The Republic of Vietnam has the right to manage its own affairs in its own way; we are its ally, but also its guests within its borders.

The fact, however, that it is American men who are being shot at in helicopters or ambushed while on training missions does give us the right to speak frankly, as friends to the government of a courageous leader, President Diem.

And, of course, it is American taxpayers' money which is paying the big financial bill.

This is witnessed by the amount of money in the recent foreign aid appropriation for this area of the world.

COMMENDATION OF U.S. FORCES

But it is human lives that count—American boys' lives and Vietnamese lives, in defense of freedom.

I cannot express too high or warm a commendation to the Army and Marine helicopter pilots, or the American soldiers who have been training Vietnamese troops in forward areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in Tuesday's New York Times describing the fighting in Vietnam be printed at this point in my remarks. This article illustrates the massive difficulties we face in maintaining such limited war operations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM WAR A FRUSTRATING HUNT FOR ELUSIVE FOE

(By David Halberstam)

AP MY DIEN, VIETNAM, October 7.—"The enemy lives and fights like a swamp rat," said an American adviser to the Government forces here, "and there is only one way to fight him—the same way."

The war in South Vietnam is an endlessly wet and frustrating business that involves wading shoulder high in rice paddies in the Mekong Delta avoiding Communist mantraps and chasing an elusive, determined enemy over terrain that favors leeches over men, pursued over pursuer.

The conflict in South Vietnam has its particular horrors and pathos. Probably nothing is worse, so far as Americans are concerned, than the way the struggle moves back and forth across the land, taking the lives of simple peasants.

A major operation this weekend in Dinh Tuong Province involving more than 1,000 Government troops offered an insight into some of the agonies of this guerrilla war. The target was a stronghold of the Vietcong, the Communist guerrillas.

The Vietcong stronghold was in rich riceland along a canal. The attack started at daybreak, with helicopters landing Vietnamese troops in waist-high paddies on the outskirts of a cluster of huts here.

The attack started almost immediately for C Company. The men moved out by a slow, tiring crawl through the marsh toward the village. The village was reached with almost no shooting.

Inside the peasant huts there were only frightened women and children. Young men are never found. They would be suspected as Communists so they slip away to hiding places the moment the first helicopter is heard.

Later C Company learned that not all peasants had been so lucky. One company landed near three peasants in a field with water buffalo.

The three started to run. One was killed by automatic-weapons' fire and two were eventually captured. The men were taken into town for questioning.

According to the villagers, the two men were the poorest peasants in the area. One, the father of four children, was unemployed. The other was a widower, so poor he could not afford to remarry.

For C company, the next step was to spread out along the length of the canal, providing a blocking force in case the Communists were flushed out by another unit. The sound of a furious battle could be heard a few hundred yards away. Soon the Government regulars received strong air support from strafing planes armed with rockets.

Later it turned out that a company of Rangers had landed close to some hard-core Communists. Two helicopters were shot down and an American crew member was killed while helping the Vietnamese.

The man who was killed had finished his tour earlier in the week, but his time here had been extended for 30 days because of the shortage of manpower.

One company of Rangers moved toward a row of houses. They were met by Communist guerrillas who waited until the Government men were at close range before opening up with automatic weapons.

A brutal battle ensued in which 33 Government soldiers were killed or wounded. The number killed was one of the highest tolls in a Government-initiated operation. The air pounding and the Government reinforcements eventually took an even greater toll of the Communists.

Most of the Communist force started to slip away and C Company was assigned to catch them. It was almost an impossible task and the American advisers with the company were dubious from the start. They believed the attack was aimed at far too vast a region and thus gave the Vietcong ample opportunity to escape.

This terrain makes it difficult to chase a man. Company C had to follow the edge of a canal, stopping again and again to cross little inlets.

The Vietnamese soldiers, who are nimble and bear the burden of their heavy American weapons, machineguns, and mortars without complaint, slipped across the bridges easily. They laughed good-naturedly at the difficulty of the clumsier Americans, but they were unable to make as good time as the Yanks on level ground.

A particularly prosperous rice-growing area, the Mekong Delta, according to Americans, has been supplying rice to the Communists, who also levy taxes here. Their influence is shown by the Vietcong flags and anti-Ngo Dinh Diem slogans painted on trees.

One learns that the night before the Communists had given a party to exhibit Government weapons captured in a successful ambush several days earlier.

C Company was lucky because no one fell into the painful traps dug by Communists along the path. Camouflaged and lined with bamboo spears, these traps abound in this area.

The Vietnamese soldiers were not so lucky in chasing the enemy. Once a platoon of Vietcong was sighted a few hundred yards away. There was a burst of fire, but the Communists no longer wanted to fight. The enemy slipped away again.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the questions which I raise today do not, therefore, concern the heroism or skill of American forces. They have demonstrated in Vietnam, as they have on every battlefield, that when the chips are down, they fulfill the highest traditions of our flag.

Rather, my questions concern other phases.

POOR YIELD FROM ARMY WEAPONS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

I shall concentrate on one particular phase: the yield, or lack of yield, from Army weapons research and development for purposes of conduct of limited warfare, particularly counterguerrilla warfare.

In my judgment, the evidence would appear to indicate that the man who needs it most—the battle-grimed foot soldier—the man slogging through the foul jungles and rice paddies—is not getting the advanced weapons and devices he needs.

The plain fact is that this deplorable situation is not new.

Our country has a spotty history insofar as being up to the minute with the right weapons at the right time in the right quantities for the man on the firing line—the combat infantryman.

MY WARNING OF A YEAR AGO

A year ago, I commented publicly on this subject. I expressed doubts about the adequacy of limited warfare preparations, about the inadequate numbers of Special Forces troops, and inadequate weapons for antiguerrilla purposes. That comment was related, of course, to our military assistance program and the foreign aid program in Vietnam, which has continued for many years and has been a very costly matter for the American Government and the taxpayers of our country.

President Kennedy has fortunately demonstrated the deepest personal interest in this problem.

Yet, with sadness, I point out that what I said a year ago I reiterate now—and in spades, so to speak.

THE ARMY'S FINANCIAL PROBLEM

I do understand the Army's fiscal problem. It is perennially undernourished. It is not the glamour service. It has to spread its money particularly thinly.

It can never order all the new equipment and material it would like so as to be prepared for every conceivable contingency, under every possible circumstance, in every possible climate and condition.

I have voted in the Senate for additional funds for modernization of the Army's weapons. I can recall when amendments were offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and others. On several occasions it has been my privilege to vote additional funds for modernization of the Army's weapons, and particularly the small arms of the Army. But despite the limitations in its budget, the Army seems to act as if the guerrilla situation were something new.

THIRTY YEARS OF GUERRILLA WARNINGS

The Communists have actually been writing the story of guerrilla successes since the 1930's in Mainland China.

The war in Indochina is really 17 years old, dating back to the end of World War II.

The United States was putting many hundred million dollars a year into the French effort in Indochina before the French collapse at Dien Bien Phu.

How long does it take before we wake up to the fact that the Communist strategy is to explode into new proxy wars and in the most difficult, inhospitable terrain for us?

How long does it take before we come to grips with the total problem of enabling allies to win limited wars?

INADEQUATE U.S. FORCES

The overall total of a mere 5,000 U.S. special forces is still just a training and equipment target, not a reality.

The special weapons for limited warfare remain in the testing and evaluation stage. Such programs as research in night vision, new helicopter techniques and equipment, light and portable communications equipment, new lightweight weaponry have been given great publicity. But are they winning the battle in Vietnam today? The answer clearly is much more needs to be done.

The United States and Vietnamese forces still rely on hand-me-downs from World War II and Korea. These are the main weapons. The M–1 rifle is still the principal infantry weapon, even though the small Vietnamese soldier can barely lug this 10-pound burden through the dense jungles and swamps.

The agonizing 14-year development of the M–14 rifle demonstrates the waste and inefficiency that has characterized research and development of conventional infantry weapons. This country can orbit an astronaut in 5 years but it takes three times as long to redesign the basic rifle of our foot soldier. Something is badly out of line, Mr. President, somebody is not doing his job.

I think we might very well ask why that is the case. Something is badly out of joint and out of line. Someone is not doing his job, or somehow proper priorities have not been placed upon this kind of much-needed weaponry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the New York Times, describing the 14 years that it took to develop the M–14 rifle, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Army's New M–14 Rifle—Pros and Cons of Weapon Analyzed—Output Lag Is Laid to Bureaucracy

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Army's new M–14 rifle is a good case history of bureaucracy. After almost 15 years in development it is just being issued in quantity.

Even so, it represents, in the opinion of most small-arms experts, only a slight improvement over the M–1 Garand, the weapon it replaces. The M–14 has advantages. It is a lighter rifle than the Garand. The greatest advantage is that it fires the North Atlantic Treaty Organization round, the short 7.62 mm. cartridge that is now standard small-arms ammunition for the NATO Allies.

This cartridge—the T65 E3 .30 caliber, or 7.62 mm. in NATO measurements—is shorter and lighter than the M–1 ammunition. But it is not, in full sense, a lightweight cartridge, and the difference is not a significant one in the combat load of an infantryman.

Normally, the M–14 is a semiautomatic rifle, like the Garand. That is, the trigger must be squeezed for each shot, although the empty cartridge case is automatically ejected. But, unlike the Garand, a simple adapter fits the M–14 to fully automatic fire. That is, so long as the trigger is squeezed, the rifle will fire in bursts of 700 rounds a minute.

DISPLACES THREE OTHER WEAPONS

The M–14 also appears to be less inclined to jam or to malfunction than the Garand, although field experience with the new rifle is as yet too brief to permit final conclusions. But it appears to tolerate sand, dust, mud, and rain better than the M–1, which, unless well cleaned and oiled, tends to jam.

More important, the M–14 displaces three other weapons and hence promotes standardization and simplifies maintenance and supply. In the table of organization of a company, for instance 155 M–14's replace 132 M–1's, 18 Browning automatic rifles, and 5 carbines. It also displaces in some units the .45-caliber submachinegun.

This catalog of advantages, which might have been significant a decade ago, is of considerably less importance today, in view of other advances of far greater importance in battlefield firepower and mobility.

Moreover, tactical concepts have altered in the years since the development of the M–14 started. Aimed fire at 500 yards or more range was stressed in the early years of its development. Today, many experts consider that what is needed is a much lighter rifle with much lighter ammunition—perhaps 22 caliber—with killing capability and rapid rate of fire at short ranges.

STANDARDIZED ONLY IN 1957

In the opinion of most small-arms experts it has taken far too long to develop the M–14 and to get it into the hands of troops. Only a small part of this delay has been due to production difficulties by private industry.

The rifle was not formally standardized until 1957 after a decade of arguments. It took 2 years to produce the first small batch from the Springfield Armory, an Army owned and managed plant. Funds available for production were at first very small. When private industry commenced manufacture there were initially many delays and field failures.

Tolerances in the breach mechanism were erroneous in some rifles, and there were various other defects. Numerous modifications, after standardization, were made.

Even today rifles being issued in Germany have disclosed some weaknesses, including broken trigger guards. Other modifications undoubtedly will be made with experience.

There have undoubtedly been failures on the part of some manufacturers in the production of the M–14. It is uncertain how much of these failures was owing to the fact that the design for the rifles, which were virtually handmade (in the initial batches) at Springfield, was translated without change into mass production blueprints.

But the problem of "cranking in" to new weapons, the factor of "producibility" or capability of mass-producing them, has always been a major problem, particularly with small arms. The Garand went through quite a few teething troubles before it was mass produced easily. The M–14, as originally designed, was much more difficult to mass produce than some of its competitors, notably the Belgian FN rifle.

DELAY TRACED TO ARMY

The fundamental delay in producing the M–14, however, is the Army's own fault, and particularly the fault of Army Ordnance. Army Ordnance has designed some magnificent weapons, but its small arms, as compared with those of other nations, have not been outstanding since the old Springfield rifle was produced.

One of the reasons is that Army Ordnance tends to favor its own designs as against outside designs. It has become too technically ingrown. Another reason for the long delay was the failure of the Army services that use the rifle and of the top command to make up their minds as rapidly as they should have done.

In this case, there were unusual pressures. The Belgian FN rifle—issued and in the hands of troops long before the M–14 was ready—offered stern competition, particularly since the British adopted it. The pressure for standardization and competing economic interests made the choice of a new rifle doubly difficult.

Even Sir Winston Churchill, then British Prime Minister, got into the act in 1953–54 when he fired the Belgian FN rifle and defended, in the House of Commons, its adoption by the British Army instead of a new British .28-caliber rifle.

The United States is commencing to mass-produce today almost 1 million M–14 rifles to replace in part the Nation's 2 million Garands. The M–14 is at last a good and reliable rifle. But whether the slight improvement it represents is worth the cost seems questionable to many small-arms experts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The fact that the Viet Cong forces are, by and large, even more primitively equipped offers no consolation.

The Viet Minh who beat the crack French Foreign Legion troops were, by and large, not as well equipped as their foes.

THE CRUCIAL FACTOR OF MORALE

I do not wish to overstate this matter of weapons and devices.

Victory in Vietnam will come when the Vietnamese people, themselves, want victory, and are prepared to fight and die for victory. It will come from the belief in themselves and in their cause and opposition to the Communist cause.

It will be aided immeasurably by American forces improving Vietnamese systems of organization, intelligence, communication, and so forth.

The U.S. Embassy, the U.S. Operations Commission, the U.S. Information Agency, are all working, I know, very hard to assist toward victory.

Morale of the indigenous population is the crucial ingredient. Communist propaganda has destroyed more military forces than Communist bullets from Kuomintang days onward.

But the right weapons can help.

The richest nation on earth should be able to afford the best, most advanced ground weapons.

A nation which can spend $50 billion in a decade or less to get to the moon ought to be able to spend enough for the right close-range weapons to knock out enemy forces on the ground.

ONE BILLION DOLLARS FOR ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Let me point out that, in the appropriations bill for the 1963 fiscal year, the Congress has allocated no less than $1,319 million for research, development, testing, and evaluation by the Department of the Army.

It would be most welcome if some of this money would yield superior weapons usable by the man who, since the beginning of time, has carried the heaviest brunt of battle, the foot soldier, including the air-dropped foot soldier.

The battle is the payoff.

There is little apparent payoff credited in battle thus far to American inventive genius.

A variety of Army experiments in canine sentries, in chemical defoliation, in poisonous shrubs, and many other bright ideas have fizzled, according to published reports.

One does not expect infallibility in new techniques, weapons, and devices. But no business would long tolerate the waste, inefficiency, and infinitesimal payoff that has characterized the Army's research and development efforts in relation to limited war and counterguerrilla situations. In terms of the current fighting in Vietnam, the yield is practically zero. The M–113 personnel carrier has not performed to expectations; it has lodged on mudbanks, it has failed to navigate the swamps of Vietnam. New techniques in helicopter operations have been only partially successful. Light, portable hand weapons, machineguns, hand grenades designed for jungle operations have not been supplied.

Mr. President, that information is known. Officers who have returned from Vietnam have made the information available here and there. What I have attempted to do today is to bring some of the information together in a coordinated statement, because I believe that the information needs to be known by the American people and something needs to be done about it.

Senators may recall that only a short time ago an officer returning from Vietnam made the sort of statement I am making today. Subsequently an effort was made to repudiate his statement and, frankly, to see to it that that particular officer did not make any more statements. The Pentagon has no such authority over a U.S. Senator. So I make the statement.

Fortunately, many new items are now being tested under the sponsorship of the Advanced Research Projects Agency. I am indeed hopeful that some substantial payoff will be visible in the near future.

And I emphasize that I mean payoff in terms of conventional weapons, weapons for the limited, guerrilla-type conflicts that have gone on around the world for the past 25 years and the kind of conflict we will be burdened with for the next 25 years. That is where the struggle is taking place. We hope and pray that the large military operation, for which we are fully prepared, may not take place. But we shall be confronted with a nibbling harassment, the sporadic attack and guerrilla warfare from now into the foreseeable future.

We cannot help but remember the days of the French-Indian wars, in our own history, when the British forces, fighting the conventional European type of war, were harassed and cut to pieces by the Indians and the French, who understood guerrilla warfare tactics. Our country was born in this kind of experience. Somehow or other we have become overly educated, and we do not seem quite to understand this type of primitive struggle that we see going on in country after country around the world and that is going on in Cuba, and which, I am afraid, may go on in other countries in this hemisphere. Therefore, we must prepare ourselves to aid our friends to meet this kind of Communist harassment.

I read glowing reports about such glamorous weapons as the Pershing, the Mauler, Fieldata battlefield computers, Nike-Zeus, and Nike-Hercules. These weapons are designed for use in open terrain, such as found in Western Europe, or for defense against enemy aircraft or ballistic missiles.

I do not imagine the U.S. special forces in Vietnam are too worried about Viet Cong ICBM's. I do not believe a Pershing missile would turn the tide of battle in that jungle terrain.

I am talking about payoff in weapons that will help defeat the Communist guerrillas in Asia today and possibly the South American jungles tomorrow. For it may be in South America where tomorrow's proxy war will develop.

At least that is what the Communists would like to see develop. It is quite obvious that what is going on in Cuba is related to it. Indeed I trust this will not happen, but the United States must be prepared for any contingency.

We should be prepared to aid decisively; and we must be sure that we have the weapons and the trained personnel to put out these brush fires. We must be prepared to train friendly troops in other parts of the world. What I believe is really needed is a kind of special forces training program, and I am sure our Latin American neighbors are prepared to cooperate.

THE UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Why has it taken so long for our country to turn around from its fancy training of Latin American troops for a World War II-type operation to a more realistic beginning at training even a few handfuls for antiguerrilla operations?

What are the real facts as regards reports which persist that U.S. rear echelons in Vietnam outweigh forward area forces by a ratio of perhaps 5 to 1?

Why are we not bringing in special force leaders from allied nations—in Latin America and elsewhere—to see for themselves what guerrilla warfare is really like in Vietnamese jungles?

What, if anything, is happening as regards South Vietnam independently taking the battle to the enemy on his own ground—in North Vietnam—by giving the Communists a taste of their own guerrilla medicine?

It seems to me that a good deal of this could be done in Cuba through the Cuban exiles themselves, if they were properly trained, and through aiding the freedom fighters in Cuba. We are in favor of liberation. We believe in freedom. We ought to support the forces that believe in freedom. At least we ought to support the countries that are attempting to maintain their freedom, and to support them in a way which is meaningful and realistic. Those countries do not need a battleship or an aircraft carrier. They may make a request for destroyers and cruisers and aircraft carriers, but they are too costly for their limited budgets, and have no relationship whatever to their security.

What is needed is the modernized training of special forces, and the training of such troops to fight the kind of battle that those countries must fight for their survival, just as our country had to fight this kind of battle for its own survival in the Revolutionary War, and as it had to fight for years in certain areas of the world in World War II.

I believe the country deserves an answer to these, and related, questions. As a U.S. Senator I intend to follow up with this inquiry until I am satisfied that real and sustained progress is clearly evident.

Why do I take an interest in this subject? It is because I come to the Chamber as one Senator and as the majority whip and ask Senators to vote for military assistance. I ask them to vote for special funds for special training. I believe that the continuation of these programs will depend on the knowledge that we have as to results. On Monday of this week I said I thought the foreign-aid program was in trouble primarily because not enough information is given to the public as to what the foreign-aid program is doing in constructive programing and in constructive results, and what it is doing in terms of housing, health, education, agricultural production, and the improvement of industrial development. We are always talking in terms of statistics. We know that more than a billion dollars a year goes into weapon research. What we know about the results of that weapon research is rather limited.

The country and the Congress deserve answers. Since President Kennedy took a personal interest in our Nation's new defensive capabilities and in our limited war capabilities, our defense posture has experienced a fundamental reorientation. I fully support these decisions. However, I submit that much work remains in adequately equipping our foot soldiers charged with fighting limited wars. Our soldiers cannot fulfill these difficult missions with weapons inherited from the era of massive retaliation, with weapons that are hand-me-downs from World War II and from Korea. Finally we are getting a new rifle, at least new to our NATO forces. It is a much more compact and efficient rifle. It seems to me that since we have so many commitments around the world, and since we know the kind of struggle that the Communist forces wage around the world, and since we know the kind of military activity in which the Communists engage all over the world, namely, nibbling, harassment, and guerrilla type of warfare, we should be moving every force in this country in the field of military science and technology to perfect the weapons to meet this kind of situation.

I know it does not make as good a picture in the Saturday Evening Post. There is nothing that thrills one more than to see the picture of a big missile or a big B-58 bomber or a flyby of some fast new fighter planes.

Mr. President, the real weaponry that is needed is not the dramatic, but the kind of weaponry that will enable the foot soldier, who has to do his fighting in the jungles, the rice paddies, the swamps, and the mud and muck, to be able to survive and to throw back the Communist aggressor.

I am reassured by the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I believe this was an excellent appointment. It indicates to me that a genuine, high-level decision has been made and manifested by this appointment.

EXHIBITS FOR "RECORD"

I intend to ask that certain items be printed in the RECORD.

They are designed to afford some historical perspective as to U.S. lags in limited warfare—or, for that matter, other weapons.

The articles are not new. Unfortunately, all too little appears in the public or military press, critically evaluating what may really be going on.

An overwhelming mass of what is printed—especially from an area of heavy foreign censorship does not present a critical and frank evaluation of the facts. Mistakes, shortcomings, weaknesses, and misjudgments should be ventilated, not swept under the rug. I am afraid there is much we do not know concerning the development of conventional weaponry since World War II.

Professional officers who have dedicated their lives to military science are entitled to consideration and respect in their judgments. Such military leaders as Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the new Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, bears this respect and admiration. But professional orthodoxy, professional conformity, and closed professional minds cannot be tolerated. Too often such attitudes have characterized the Army's research and development efforts in the area of conventional weapons.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

I fully intend to follow up on this general question in the next session of Congress. I am sending a detailed letter to the Secretary of Defense, advising him of this fact and requesting his cooperation in accelerating the development of urgently needed conventional weapons.

I understand that the Secretary of Defense is deeply concerned about this situation. I hope my interest will fortify him and give him encouragement.

I am sending a letter to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], chairman of the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, asking their cooperation in spurring the development of arms needed to wage successful limited wars. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I intend to assume my share of personal responsibility for such action when the defense budget is considered. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, which has studied scientific research intensively and has compiled a large amount of material on this subject, I shall do likewise.

I have not been satisfied with the record which has been compiled to date. For the security of this country and the cause of freedom throughout the world, I sincerely hope that the record will be dramatically improved in the months ahead.

I wish to be fair. I think there has been a considerable improvement. I believe President Kennedy's personal interest in these problems has resulted in much improvement. I feel that Secretary McNamara has taken important steps to bring about improvement. But I desire the Secretary of Defense to know that much more needs to be done, and that he has our support.

When the appropriation bill for the Defense Establishment comes before the Senate next year, I desire the Department of Defense to be on notice that questions will be asked—and they will be intelligent questions, questions based on information which is available—as to the progress of weapon research.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure I need not tell the Senator from Minnesota that when I find myself in agreement with him, which is most of the time, it makes me happy. It makes me very unhappy when I find myself in disagreement with him.

In fairness to the Senator from Minnesota, with whose views expressed this afternoon I wish to associate myself, someone ought to call the attention of the American public to this speech of the Senator from Minnesota. It will not go unnoticed in the months ahead—I do not know how much notice will be given to it immediately, but in the months ahead it will be noticed. Next January there is no question that the speech will be reviewed in the Senate.

How easy it is to be subjected to unfair criticism. There is danger that the Senator from Minnesota may be subjected to unfair criticism as a result of this speech. Therefore, I wish to present, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota, testimony that in this body the Senator from Minnesota symbolizes disarmament. I do not know of any Member of the Senate who has made a more brilliant, constructive record of statesmanship in the field of disarmament than has the Senator from Minnesota. Yet I think he will agree with me that there are those who assume that we cannot lead from strength in leading the Nation toward disarmament.

In my judgment, the best assurance we have of winning the victory of disarmament—and unless we ultimately win that victory, there will be defeat for all the world—lies in what the Senator from Minnesota is saying to the Pentagon and to the American people, namely, that we must put ourselves in a position of strength in order to meet the threat of communism to the underdeveloped areas of the world, where the Communist approach is the approach of guerrilla warfare. Unfortunately, a good many of the soldiers of freedom have not been in a position where they could successfully combat guerrilla warfare. Therefore, we must place ourselves in a strengthened position, so that the Communist world will know that we can meet them on every front—Cuba, Berlin, southeast Asia, Africa. We must let them know that wherever they wish to attack freedom, we will stand firm and protect freedom. Then, in my judgment, we will have a better chance to carry out the vision of the Senator from Minnesota in conection with the ultimate goal that mankind must reach if mankind is to survive the ultimate goal of total disarmament. Unless the human race in our time is wise enough to follow that course of action, it is bound to destroy itself.

I desired to say this about the Senator's position on disarmament, because I can hear his critics say, "We thought Humphrey, of Minnesota, favored disarmament. Yet he made a speech in the Senate on October 10, 1962, which seemed to indicate that he stood for just exactly the opposite."

To those proponents of disarmament, I say, "Read the speech of the Senator from Minnesota, for it bears out the principle I believe we should keep in mind that we who are for disarmament, sitting here where we must vote, know that we can best further the cause of disarmament by placing the United States in a position where Russia will understand that she has everything to lose and nothing to gain by an aggressive course of acttion." True, that is also the case with us.

To the American people, I should like to say that one cannot sit as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as do the senior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Oregon, without knowing that the President of the United States understands that, too. The American people have every right to have the fullest confidence in the statesmanship of the President of the United States on the whole subject of national security, for he, too, realizes that we must be in a position to lead from strength. I have complete confidence in the strong leadership of our great President in connection with the maintenance of the military defense and security of this Republic.

But I also say to the American people, "Do not misjudge the President; for although the President stands for the strengthening of our defense, he is also dedicated to peace. He has made clear to Khrushchev, time and time again, that we are willing to negotiate peace. But we will not have the Russian point of view concerning peace dictated to us, because that point of view would, of course, subordinate freedom to communism."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I cannot find words adequate to express my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon for his remarks and his most appropriate interpretation of what I have been attempting to say in the Senate today. The Senator from Oregon served for many years on the Committee on Armed Services; he is now a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Both the Senator from Oregon and I have listened to the testimony of the best witnesses this country has to offer—yes, the best the world has to offer—in terms of the foreign policy and military strength of our country and the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, the point has often been made by those of us in the Senate who are deeply concerned with arms control and disarmament under effective international supervision and control, that that will come about only by, first, a program of disarmament and, second, and at the same time, a program of national security and national defense. These—the development of adequate military strength and the development of a disarmament program—are the opposite sides of the same coin. I want it to be quite clear that when our country makes commitments to help other peoples, it is our duty as Senators and as Members of Congress to do all we can to see to it that those who are called upon to fulfill those commitments are prepared with the best materiel, the best weaponry, and the best instruction and information which our country can possibly provide. My point is that we are committed in South Vietnam; and inasmuch as that commitment has been made, we should be sure that the men we send there are given the best we can possibly provide in terms of modern techniques to combat Communist infiltration and aggression and the best weaponry.

Mr. President, I repeat how grateful I am for the brilliant interpretation the Senator from Oregon has made of this message.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several items be included at this point in the Record:

First. Merely for historical perspective, excerpts of an article—which appeared some time ago in Look magazine—entitled "The Tragedy of the U.S. Army."

Second. Excerpts from another article, also now considerably behind the times, but, nevertheless, worth recalling, from the March 22, 1962, issue of New Republic, entitled "The War in Vietnam—We Have Not Been Told the Truth." One need not agree with this article, or, for that matter, with the preceding article, but the strong criticism in it—all too rare—should not be ignored.

Third. Excerpts from an article, in the September 1962 issue of Army, by Lt. Col. Forrest K. Kleinman.

Fourth. Excerpts from an article by Ben Price, of the Associated Press, entitled "South Vietnam War Perturbs U.S. Officers," published on July 8, 1962. The article was promptly disavowed by Army sources after publication. By the way, Mr. President, that disturbed me no end.

There being no objection, the article and the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Look magazine, Feb. 13, 1951]

THE TRAGEDY OF THE U.S. ARMY

(By Garrett Underhill and Ronald Schiller)

(Editor's Note.—Garrett Underhill has made it a personal mission to study foreign arms and armies, particularly those of Russia, for 12 years. At 35, he rates almost without question as the foremost authority in the West on Russian small arms. He has a private collection including specimens covering 100 years. This interest has led him into such related fields as the Red army's organization, tactics, clothing, and especially, tanks, on which he also ranks as a leading authority.

(Like his collaborator Ronald Schiller, Underhill has had wide writing experience. He is a former military correspondent and has contributed numerous studies for service journals. Schiller has written widely for national magazines and saw the armed services in action as an air combat intelligence officer in the Navy during World War II.

(Underhill himself left a good-paying job to enlist in the Army as a private in 1942. He wound up as an intelligence officer on the Army General Staff. His work won him a citation from Gen. George C. Marshall's deputy for having "served Army and Navy agencies as an expert consultant in technical military matters."

(Despite such accolades, Underhill takes pains to make it clear that "I don't pretend to know all; I try to speak for the men who I think deserve to be heard."

(Whether they will be heard, Underhill is now in a position to learn at firsthand. A few days after putting the finishing touches to this article, he accepted a call to return to active duty in the very Army he and Schiller courageously, but constructively, criticized in this article.)

Eager Beavers Derided

Young officers who spend too much time reading technical books and thinking about their jobs are likely to be derided by their contemporaries as "eager beavers." They risk unpopularity by setting too high a work standard. Original thinkers upsetting seniors' applecarts are liable to be classed as troublemakers, screwballs or malcontents with a negative attitude, because they won't always accept the approved solution.

The resulting atmosphere might almost be described as "anti-intellectual," fitter for the Kremlin than the Pentagon, except that in the Red army, officers can win quicker promotion by writing "think" pieces. Pavel Rotmistrov, a Red army colonel who warned in a 1940 article that Stalin's idea of how to use tanks was wrong, was a marshal by 1944 and one of the world's top tank generals.

By contrast, our Armed Forces have compiled a notorious record for punishing unorthodoxy and shunning brilliance.

The dead hand of our battleship admirals for 20 years struck down critics who saw their day was done.

Col. Philip Faymonville, our military attaché who returned from Moscow far from sure that the Russian Army would fall easy victim to the Germans, was banished to Ordnance for his heresy. Bright young officers who take too great an interest in the Russian Army have been thought to be contaminated by Red propaganda; it is safer to leave the subject alone. The examples could be repeated endlessly.

It's the same story all over again as that of Billy Mitchell, who was martyred for advocating ideas that are now standard in every army in the world.

U.S. INVENTIVENESS NEGLECTED

The military mind, too, finds it difficult to take advantage of the inventiveness that is America's peculiar genius. The submarine was American in origin, but the Germans first demonstrated how to exploit it. The first practical airplane was flown in the United States, but strategic bombing was conceived by an Italian. No country has more thoroughly mastered the internal combustion engine, but our first armored division was not organized until after the German tank blitz in 1940.

With the exception of the atom bomb—which was conceived by civilians—every major concept of war we use has been tardily borrowed from foreign originators.

The Russians quickly accepted the tank designs of the American engineering genius Walter Christie, whom our own Ordnance Department shunned. Henry Morhaupt sold the U.S. Army on the bazooka shell in 1941. Three years later, he was only a private at Aberdeen Proving Ground.

After 2 months spent with American forces in England, a highly competent British military observer remarked that he had never met soldiers so "amazingly naive and militarily uneducated. If German generals are on the undergraduate level and British generals on the schoolboy level, American generals seem to be on the kindergarten level."

It is significant that no American military leader, in the 60 years since Adm. Alfred T. Mahan, has produced a book as important as those of Liddell Hart of the British Army, Charles de Gaulle of the French Army and Heinz Guderian of the German Wehrmacht.

While our forces are masters of logistics, engineering and transportation and astound the world by their efficiency in building roads and airfields, they have neglected the principal business of soldiering—the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of the ways and means of fighting. Unlike true professionals in other fields, too many take too little interest in what their rivals are doing and thinking. They have become jobholders, not warriors.

Conceivably, junior officers and noncoms might be excused from mastering the larger aspects of enemy strategy, but what about the simple pick-and-shovel facts?

FOE'S ARMS SURPRISE UNITED STATES

It would not seem unreasonable to expect them to know as much about the enemy's standard equipment as, say, automobile dealers do about rival makes of cars.

Yet when our troops landed on Guadalcanal in 1942, they were taken by surprise by the Japanese "knee mortar," a highly unsecret weapon that had been standard equipment in all Japan's wars since 1921.

Three months later, in North Africa, U.S. tankers were taken aback by the high-velocity 88–mm. cannon that the Germans had used not only throughout the war, but as far back as the Spanish Civil War.

Again, in Korea a few months ago, our troops were unprepared to meet the Russian T–34 tank, although it had been used by the thousands against the Germans in World War II and a complete description of it has been published in Army intelligence journals.

This incredible ignorance of enemy weapons is not confined to lower echelons. At a meeting of the U.N. Security Council some months ago, our delegate, Warren Austin, brandished a "1950, Russian-made" tommygun that General MacArthur's intelligence headquarters had sent to him as proof that the Soviets were still supplying the Koreans with arms. Fortunately, the Russian delegate refused to look at it. Had he done so, he could have discovered that it was a Korean version of the Russian gun, made in a Korean factory.

A ONE-MAN INTELLIGENCE TEAM

The Army has sometimes been less than helpful in aiding its men to learn about military tools and techniques other than their own. For 3 years after the war, the job of gathering technical intelligence about every type of artillery, ammunition, rocket, and fire-control device of every nation on earth was entrusted to one captain. He was, moreover, a flak officer, ignorant of German and Russian, with no previous technical intelligence training, and had to do all his own filing, typing, and writing of reports.

[From the New Republic, Mar. 22, 1962]

The War in Vietnam—We Have Not Been Told the Whole Truth

(By "Z")

("Z" has asked that his name be withheld. ("If I were home it would be different, here it is postively dangerous.") He has for some years closely followed and written about the struggle in Vietnam.)

"After fighting with the French for 8 years from 1946 to 1954, we got Dien Bien Phu," said a Vietnamese to an American listener in Saigon recently; "and after 8 years of being nursed and trained and led by the United States, we're finally encircled in Saigon." This was said with a wry smile—unfortunately, it was no exaggeration.

For non-Communist South Vietnam had become early in 1962, what North Vietnam had become in the tragic spring of 1954: a lacework of fortified villages and Army posts completely surrounded by a population that is either deliberately hostile, or at least terrorized by an efficient network of Communist guerillas into cooperating with them. To be sure, convoys under heavy escort can, as in the spring of Dien Bien Phu, still ply the major roads during daytime; and the country's coastal railroad line (which, after an interruption of 14 years, had been reopened with great fanfare in 1959) can also be used, although it is being regularly sabotaged and then stays out of commission for 3 days at a time. But even daytime traffic on major roads is not immune from ambushes which have a twofold aim: bring about an economic blockade of Saigon, which relies for its rice, cooking charcoal, and meat on the hinterland; and drive home the point to the intercepted voyagers that the Communist Viet Cong (or VC's in American parlance) can indeed run things pretty much as they wish.

* * * * *

Vietnamese losses in this undeclared war run at about twice the rate of those suffered by the French during the Indochina war and about two-and-a-half times those suffered by the United States in Korea. How this Missouri-sized country with its 13.5 million got that way 8 years after the Geneva cease-fire theoretically restored peace to the area and after the United States spent more than $2 billion there makes a long and sordid story of much inaccurate information being wrapped into even more wishful thinking and then presented to Americans and to Congress as policy.

But in order to make America swallow the bait, the press first had to be won over—and won over it was. There has not been, with perhaps the exception of Laos, a single world crisis that has been as miserably reported upon in the United States as the state of South Vietnam since 1954. The most respected news media, conservative as well as liberal, were taken in, one by one, in one of the cleverest intoxication campaigns of the last few years.

* * * * *

THE NEW FRONTIER AND OLD SAIGON

In official circles, a similar attitude prevailed and the incoming administration, in spite of its predilection for the phrase "sense of urgency," did nothing to dispel the illusions of the Vietnam desk—or rather, it did nothing to free itself from the illusions which the Vietnam desk was dispensing in lieu of policy guidance. In brief, American official reporting on Vietnam had fallen victim to the dread disease of reverse-twist loyalty; instead of reporting to Washington what was happening in Vietnam, it reported what the Vietnamese Government said was happening It was inevitable that the emotionalism with which the issue was beclouded produced that state of affairs to a certain extent (one only has to remember diplomatic reporting from the China mainland from 1944 to 1948 for an exact simile) but in the case of South Vietnam, it often produced a kind of official blindness whose completeness amounted to self-brainwashing.

Thus, as late as April 1959—at a time when the killing rate in Vietnam had reached raound 10 per day—the then commanding general of MAAG Vietnam, Lt. Gen. S. T. Williams, testified under oath before a Senate committee that the "guerrilla threat in Vietnam has receded to a point where one single territorial regiment could handle it." He testified to that effect 10 months after his own ambassador, Elbridge Durbrow, had stated before the same committee that "because of the insecurity, the peasants of the Mekong delta can no longer till their fields properly." No one, either in Congress or in the press, sought to confront such contradictory statements and draw the necessary conclusions. No one, either among the happy businessmen of the Eisenhower administration or the eager New Frontiersmen of the Kennedy administration, was willing to ask the truly searching questions as to whether U.S. aid was really getting down to the people; whether the Vietnamese Army was not getting a bit overmotorized and overheadquartered for its modest size and tactical mission; and whether Ngo Dinh Diem, his family or his clique, had any popular following.

Instead, such questions as were asked dealt with innocuous substitutes whose reassuring answers were foregone conclusions. The legislative branch was happy when it felt that proper expenditure procedures had been adhered to and the proper vouchers filled, even if they were meaningless and, in any case, no index of the success of the program. (In one such case, a voucher attested to the "burning by fire" of about $4 million in local currency; whether this was likely or not had not even been challenged.) In the case of the military, the fact that the South Vietnamese Army had one by one adopted every item of U.S. issue and chucked everything that tied it to its own military—but "colonial"—past (an idiocy no one had, thank God, tried on the Indian, Pakistani, Israel, and other ex-British forces), was considered a great morale-builder. The French commando school, in which year after year hundreds of Vietnamese had been taught the painful art of surviving in their own jungle, was abolished to make way for a spit-and-polish NCO academy which for several years turned out fine drill sergeants instead of the badly needed small-unit combat leaders. Larger units were piled upon larger units until a Vietnamese division was just a slightly scaled-down version of its U.S. model; and senior staffs were piled upon senior staffs until that seven-division army had, in the finest traditions of Parkinson's law, three full Army corps staffs, a department of defense staff and a general staff—and plenty of recently appointed generals in all of them, who had very little idea of how to maneuver small mobile battle groups in the jungle but who had become very adept at currying favor with the presidential palace.

[From Army, September 1962]

Report From Vietnam

(Informative letters to readers of Army from its contributing editor, Lt. Col. Forrest K. Kleinman)

As all the other advisers at the working level that have met in Vietnam have said, the adviser here says that once you show them how to do something, they can do it. They like the BAR and consider it an honor to be the gunner. Despite its weight and size, they handle it with ease. Nevertheless a lighter automatic weapon would obviously be even better. (The World War II grease gun which only cost about $7 to manufacture would be an ideal weapon over here, some advisers tell me.)

For the diminutive Vietnamese the carbine is a much easier weapon to fire than the M1. Just one clip of M1 in sustained fire on the range, one officer said, and the Vietnamese has to move up about 6 inches to regain his firing position. Here again I found that the Thompson submachinegun is highly favored. Regular Army squad leaders are armed with it just as in the Civil Guard and Self Defense Corps. In jungle fighting such as in the Delta region the heavy caliber .45 bullet cuts through foliage and underbrush. Some officers I have talked to in the last couple of days have less enthusiasm for the grease gun of World War II fame than I have heard elsewhere. The ammunition problem was cited as one objection.

The importance of U.S. officers and noncommissioned officers reviewing fundamentals before they come here was stressed. I was told that some artillery officers with only missile training have been assigned as artillery advisers. All artillery here so far is, of course, tube artillery. Not only in weapons but in communications equipment, it is important that future MAAG officers and noncommissioned officers be familiar with types no longer standard issue in our own Army. Much of the equipment now being issued is World War II type, though quite serviceable and usable. U.S. advisers must be able to counsel on use and maintenance of such materiel.

[From the Washington Star, July 8, 1962]

South Vietnam War Perturbs U.S. Officers—Special Forces Used for Training, Diem Command Structure Split

(By Ben Price)

Fort Leavenworth, Kans., July 7.—The story here—and apparently elsewhere in the U.S. Army—is that the fight to save South Vietnam from the Communists is, to put it mildly, fouled up.

Both the Pentagon and the State Department have been extremely reluctant to discuss the Vietnamese operation at all.

But it can be reported that there are some extremely disturbed officers in the U.S. Army, ranging from captains through at least one major general.

It apparently is no secret throughout the Army that Maj. Gen. William B. Rosson, chief of the U.S. Special Forces—guerrillas—is downright angry over what he considers the misuse of his highly trained specialists in South Vietnam.

Further, among Army men there are reports that Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem has kept the command structure of his government so split and confused that military operations against the Communist Vietcong guerrillas border on the chaotic.

The intelligence system upon which counterguerrilla operations depend for success is reported near collapse.

And, finally, some officers hear the U.S. Military Advisory Group in South Vietnam, now numbering between 4,000 and 5,000 men, has become so topheavy and unwieldly that its efficiency has been imperiled.

For every man actually out in the field training and advising Vietnamese troops, there are reportedly at least five in rear echelon headquarters shuffling papers of one sort or another.

This ratio becomes somewhat startling when it is considered that the British carried out an extremely effective guerrilla suppression campaign in Malaya with a headquarters at the top of 9 men and assorted subheadquarters of not more than 1,000. At one time there were 250,000 troops in the Malayan theater. That's 1 at the rear to 250 men in action.

Secretary of Defense McNamara takes a less pessimistic view of the operation. Without going into specifics, he told a news conference in Washington yesterday that effectiveness of U.S. aid to the South Vietnamese Government forces has "greatly increased over the past several months."

Among other factors he mentioned were a "much more favorable ratio" of Communists killed or captured and a lesser number of guerrilla attacks.

"We cannot expect termination of a war—and it is a war—in a matter of months," Mr. McNamara said. "It will be years before it is concluded, and I believe it will be concluded successfully."

The story of the officers' reactions was pieced together in a series of interviews which began in Washington and carried through Fort Benning, Ga., and here.

Some of the officers interviewed say the Vietnamese operation at different levels and hence the experiences of one might vary considerably from another. All asked to remain anonymous for career reasons.

GREETINGS TO THE ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there is now being held in our Nation's Capital a 3-day meeting of the Association of the U.S. Army. I have been delighted to read summaries of comments which have been made before this great assembly by Army Secretary Cyrus R. Vance; by Gen. John K. Gerhart, commander in chief of the North American Air Defense Command; and by other distinguished military and civilian officials.

MY MEETING WITH GENERAL HAMLETT IN BERLIN

One of the addresses was made by a great officer whom I had the pleasure of meeting for the first time during the 1958 Berlin crisis—now Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Barksdale Hamlett.

General Hamlett told the association that the "tide has turned in Vietnam." He warned, however, of the danger of Russian threats over Berlin, as well as the problem posed in other areas.

I want to convey my sincerest personal greeting to the members and friends of the Association of the U.S. Army. Again I commend General Hamlett on his outstanding leadership.

The plain fact is that, of the three armed services, the one which has traditionally gotten "the shortest end of the stick" is the one which has been engaged in combat operations over the most extended period during our wars, and invariably has suffered the heaviest casualties. It is the U.S. infantryman, the man who takes the enemy's ground "the hard way"—inch by bloody inch—who so often has been neglected when appropriations time comes around, as well as when the Nation remembers its heroes.

The comments which I make today are in the name of that infantryman—the GI—but also are in the name of the GI of Vietnam or of any other country, fighting in defense of its freedom.

The Association of the U.S. Army will hear many statements of well-justified praise of what our Army has achieved. I certainly concur in those statements of praise and commendation.

Today, however, I am offering comments which, on the basis of evidence, raise doubts. I ask "Why we have not achieved still more." I am saying that we should equip our men better.

This is not said in slightest disrespect. Rather, it is said because I do not believe in "everybody patting everybody on the back" and saying "what great fellows we are."

There is need for independent judgment, for critical scrutiny, for finding the hard facts, which tend to get swept under the rug.

We need to look behind the press agent's glowing releases. We need to make certain the infantryman gets the weapons he needs, in the quantity he needs, and that he gets the ammunition he needs, when he needs it for the job which he is called upon to perform.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

USE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in June of this year, the Oregon Wildlife Federation at its annual convention passed resolutions on six points involving the use and management of the national forests.

The Oregon Wildlife Federation has long had a reputation of being dedicated to the wise use of natural resources. Its resolutions are not only timely, but also are explicit and succinct.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 17

(Resolution submitted by the Oregon Wildlife Federation)

Whereas as an outgrowth of difficult times in the lumber industry of the Northwest, the timber sales policy of the Forest Service has recently come under violent attack; and

Whereas such attacks have both insinuated and expressed that the established principles of multiple-use, permanent-type roads engineered to high standards to effect errosion protection and allowable cuts based upon sustained yield should be modified to accommodate economic relief to the industry; and

Whereas other criticism has been voiced that would oppose good conservation practice; and

Whereas this organization is devoted to the principles of conservation of all natural resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Wildlife Federation in convention assembled at Bend, Oreg., this 17th day of June 1962, does hereby:

1. Reaffirm our support of the policy of multiple-use management of all Federal lands.

2. Support the policy of sustained yield management based on realistic allowable cuts on all species and sizes of timber.

3. Support the policy of high standard road construction in logging operations to protect soil, watershed, stream side, recreation, and other resource values.

4. Believe that the present system of competitive bidding for national forest timber conforms to our American way of life.

5. We commend the Secretary of Agriculture for the announcement of his policy on the management of high mountain areas of the national forests of the Pacific Northwest.

6. We firmly believe that good conservation practice and forest management principles must not be compromised for the economic relief of any resource user group; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Governor of Oregon, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Oregon congressional delegation, and the Oregon division of the IWLA.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES, BRITISH, AND FRENCH RIGHTS IN BERLIN

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, during the course of the session today, I filed, from the Foreign Relations Committee, a report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 on the so-called Berlin situation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution. It is Senate Concurrent Resolution 97, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Con. Res. 97) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall not take time to make a statement on this measure.

The concurrent resolution reported from the committee was submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Several days ago the House adopted a similar concurrent resolution; in fact, the two resolutions differ only in the case of one word.

Our committee has voted to amend the Senate concurrent resolution, in order to make it conform identically with the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the acting majority leader, who also is the acting chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that I understand that the intention is to substitute the House concurrent resolution for the Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and that will be done. I believe the amendment to the Senate concurrent resolution is to be stated first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "purpose" and to insert "determination."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at this time I ask that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from the further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 570.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 570, which expresses the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 570) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 570) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and a statement by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT ENDORSING BERLIN RESOLUTION

On Friday, October 5, 1962, the House of Representatives passed by a vote of 311 to 0 a resolution which embodied a clear expression of the Congress of our national policy and determination on the Berlin question. The resolution reiterates and reemphasizes our country's unequivocal support of our rights in Berlin and of our determination to defend those rights by whatever means necessary. The other body has spoken. In my mind, I feel the Senate should proceed with all speed to speak out to the Communist leadership that the Congress of the United States fully endorses a strong policy toward Berlin, toward our rights in Berlin, and a solid front against any concessions that would undermine those rights.

It is unnecessary for me to spell out for the Senate the legality of those rights. They are well known. They are based upon the hard-won victories of World War II. They are based upon agreements with Soviet Russia, freely entered into by them during and at the termination of World War II. No question, legal or otherwise can mitigate those rights. Only a failure on our part can weaken and destroy them. The responsibility to our own security, to the free world and to the people of Berlin is embodied in those rights and any sign that we do not intend to enforce them would be a major victory for the Communists throughout the world.

We are in the last days of the Congress, and perhaps some might advocate a "wait and see" attitude. Nothing could please Khrushchev more. He already has attempted to set the ground rules for his next Berlin move. The Communist leader recently stated that he would postpone certain actions in Berlin and his proposed peace treaty with East Germany until after our November elections. The audacity of Khrushchev to offer to curtail harassments in Berlin until after our November elections. Have we become so soft in the eyes of the Communists that he would believe that the American people would buy temporary peaceful coexistence on a partisan political basis? If he has been misled by some of the fluctuations of our foreign policy, let us not hesitate to enlighten him. This intruder into the halls of freedom should be reminded that the American people through their representatives do not relinquish their rights easily, nor do they trade their freedom temporarily or permanently to the jail keeper in Moscow.

The reports throughout the world emphasize that a Western showdown with the Soviets over West Berlin is bound to come in the next few months. The continuing threat of a separate peace treaty with East Germany may be approaching a reality. Increased efforts to deny access to West Berlin can be expected and the attempt to substitute East German Communist control over our access rights is imminent. The press reported on Saturday, October 6, 1962, that the chances of Khrushchev visiting the United Nations in late November are now widely considered as "likely." The Berlin and German questions are bound to be the subject of any discussion in the U.N. if such a visit takes place. It should be made clear by the Congress that our rights in Berlin are not negotiable, that they are not to be determined by the United Nations, that they are not to be diminished by a committee of neutrals, that we endorse the position taken by Secretary of Defense McNamara—that the United States is ready to use total force in Germany if such action is necessary to protect our vital interests in Berlin. Now is the time to act—not to wait and see—and later react. Let us not mislead the Communist leaders and, yes, the people of the world that we talk hard, but act soft. Let us not be diverted by the present Cuban situation at the expense of our position in Berlin. Let us face up to the threat of communism not only on a situation-to-situation basis but rather on a free-world-versus-slavery basis and meet that threat with continuing determination no matter where it may occur. Khrushchev would relish the thought that we might be so preoccupied with Cuba that we might welcome the opportunity to buy a temporary lull in Berlin.

Can we not recall the Soviet's past history of diversion?

China is a living example, and Laos still reeks with the smell of "too little and too late."

I have never thought that the Soviets would go to war over Berlin but rather that they prefer to gradually cut off Berlin from the free world. The real danger does not reside in a military attack but a slow whittling away of the Allied position through continuing harassment and minor steps. Let us not now purchase a series of respites at the price of jeopardizing the future of our position in Berlin, in Europe, and in the free world.

If Berlin is a bone in the throat of Khrushchev, it is a flea in the beard of the East Communist leader, Ulbricht. It is a constant reminder that communism, whether Russian or German, is a failure. It is a failure economically and psychologically, and the people in the world know it. The leaders in the Kremlin know it. They also know that their system has only succeeded in the area of force. The people of the world want our way of life, but they want to be shown that we are willing to defend it.

The European Common Market poses a threat to the Soviet bloc countries. The Soviet Union and its satellites are suffering economically. Khrushchev wants to create as great a disturbance as soon as possible, because he thinks that we, in order to gain a respite, will offer concessions. He would then have time to sit back and get his own house in order.

I say, let him bang his shoe, let him yell and scream about "Western imperialism," but let us present to him on the part of the American people this resolution of determination.

The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on October 3, 1962, introduced a resolution much like the one that passed the House. They are to be congratulated, and I strongly urge that the Senate take immediate and favorable action on this vital issue.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

The concurrent resolution on Berlin which I have sponsored with the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and the Senate adopted today, helps to make it very clear that we will not permit our attention to be directed from Berlin by the situation in Cuba, and that we are determined to maintain our rights in Berlin by whatever means may be necessary. We have pledged that West Berlin would remain free and that our forces would not be pushed out of the city. I think it is time we took the initiative in Berlin and at the same time left the Soviet Union with no doubt that we mean what we say about Berlin just as we do about Cuba, and that we will not be diverted from our purpose by either situation.

We must not forget that Berlin is the prime objective of the Communists and that while they are now attempting to put the pressure on us with respect to Cuba, their major goal continues to be the absorption of Berlin. They know that as long as Berlin remains free, all the captive nations—Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, the Baltic States, and others—will continue to look upon this city as the symbol of freedom and independence.

This concurrent resolution is our notice to the world that we will live up to our commitment to the people of Berlin under the four power agreements and that we will not yield to Communist pressure.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of satisfaction that I rise in support of the resolution expressing the will of the American people to stand firm in Berlin and demands the preservation of our rights in Berlin under the Four Power Agreements. Although to many people Berlin seems to be no more than another minor controversy in a world filled with trouble spots, in reality Berlin could well be a determining factor in the future course of world history. This is true primarily because the action of the U.S. Government in meeting the repeated demands and threats of the Soviet Union over Berlin will be indicative of the forcefulness with which we will meet any future occurrences of a similar nature. If we remain firm and emerge as victors in the impending crisis, either psychologically or militarily as the situation demands, it is likely that the frequency and severity of any similarly "created" crises in the future will be reduced. We must continue to demand open and free access to Berlin, free elections for the East German people, and eventually a unified Germany. Under no circumstances should we withdraw our troops until these long-visualized goals have been achieved.

For some time now it has been apparent that a showdown over Berlin will be forthcoming this winter. If Khrushchev keeps his word, and in this instance there is every reason to believe that he will, some decision will have to be reached shortly after the November 6 elections. My newsletter of September 17 was concerned with this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LONG WINTER IN BERLIN

(Report to the people by Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina)

The American people can expect a long, cold winter of international tensions over Berlin, unless the United States moves to seize the initiative very soon in the cold war. Mr. Khrushchev has been threatening to force Western forces out of West Berlin. He has committed himself anew to this dangerous task of "removing this bone in my throat" with his recent rocket-rattling statement of September 11. In this threat over action against Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev said with regard to his position of ousting the West from Berlin that "this task must be accomplished and it will be accomplished."

Some have interpreted his statement about putting off a Berlin crisis until after the November elections as being an indication that he is backing down. Every indication, however, points to a showdown over Berlin this winter. For instance, the East Germans are strengthening fortifications along their border with West Germany and along the autobahn to West Berlin. Missiles have been installed along the air corridors to West Berlin, and electronic equipment to jam radar and other airplane controls have been reportedly set up across the wall at the end of each one of West Berlin's Templehof Airport runways. If Mr. Khrushchev can cross up air landings at Templehof, this means the United States would have to make a decision, when the Soviets sign their treaty with East Germany, whether to recognize the East German puppet regime by dealing with their officials on access rights, or whether to crash through to Berlin by use of ground forces in accordance with our present access rights.

Even Drew Pearson, who seems to be close to Mr. Khrushchev, recently stated in a news column that the man whom he says wants to be a friend to the United States, if we will give him his way, will win in Berlin in the next few months, because he has the whip hand. This prediction coming from one who is constantly reassuring the American public what nice and reasonable fellows Messrs. Khrushchev and Tito are should not be taken lightly.

Another indication of Mr. Khrushchev's cockiness over Berlin lies in his remarks to Mr. Robert Frost that the United States is too liberal to fight to protect itself. Being a shrewd analyst and strategist, Mr. Khrushchev has studied each Soviet aggressive move and each U.S. reaction, and he has found most U.S. reactions to be too late, or to constitute a complete backdown. He has ample reason to feel that since we permitted erection of his wall in Berlin, establishment of a Communist garrison state in Cuba despite our Monroe Doctrine, and made an accommodation with him in Laos, that we will do little more in a showdown this winter over Berlin.

The stakes in Berlin are very high. If we accede to Soviet demands there—and we were prepared to do so in part last year until the West Germans leaked our plans to the press—then we stand to lose West Germany. If this occurs, NATO would be disbanded, and Western Europe would be ripe for neutralization and subsequent communization.

The United States must seize the initiative in Berlin while Mr. Khrushchev has given us the moratorium to settle our election problems. We could start by making some demands of our own. First, we could demand that the people in East Germany be given free elections, as they were originally promised. Next, we could demand that the wall be removed. Next, we could demand that Korea, Vietnam, and Germany be reunited through free elections. Next, we could demand that the Soviets get out of Cuba, in accord with the Monroe Doctrine. If Mr. Khrushchev refuses, then why couldn't we rattle a few rockets in his face to force him to at least trade with us on a quid pro quo basis, rather than permitting all the trading to be against our interests. I do not advocate any deals with the Communists, because they have proved they will honor their commitments only so long as they are in their own interests. But, since our State Department insists on negotiations, we ought to have some demands of our own to make.

If we act with determination, and proceed without delay in making demands and taking actions on Cuba, we can create a crisis that will put Mr. Khrushchev on the griddle while Berlin simmers on the back burner. After all, he knows which side has superior military power. Why not convince him we have the will to use that power?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I firmly believe that this resolution expresses the opinion of the average American citizen. It has become a truism to state that the conduct of foreign policy resides in the executive branch of our Government. I know of no one who would take issue with this statement. However, upon a more careful evaluation of this constitutional responsibility, one realizes that the executive branch is charged only with the implementation and conduct of foreign policy. The power to formulate foreign policy still resides in the electorate—the people of the United States. The best way that the people of the United States have for making their will and their firm resolve known to the President and to the State Department is through their most closely responsible elected officials, those of us in the Congress. This resolution which expresses the will of the people of the United States is no more and no less than a directive from the people to the executive branch of the Government specifying the framework within which our foreign policy on Berlin must be conducted.

It must be noted that this resolution is not self-executing. Commendable as it may be, unless it is honored by our President and the State Department there is no particular virtue in the Congress giving its unanimous approval to it.

Not only do I urge its speedy approval, but I implore those officials charged with the implementation of the policy which it expresses to take heed and honor it as a solemn obligation owed to the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record the full text of the concurrent resolution and portions of the report on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The report of the Foreign Relations Committee is very brief, and it should appear in the Record. I ask unanimous consent that it also be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution and the report (No. 2288) were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 570

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is and has been to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas it is the purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Germany; and

Whereas in connection with the termination of hostilities in World War II of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union freely entered into binding agreements under which the four powers have the right to remain in Berlin, with the right of ingress and egress, until the conclusion of a final settlement with the Government of Germany; and

Whereas no such final settlement has been concluded by the four powers and the aforementioned agreements continue in force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress—

(a) that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin constitutes a fundamental political and moral determination;

(b) that the United States would regard as intolerable any violation by the Soviet Union directly or through others of those rights in Berlin, including the right of ingress and egress;

(c) that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

Senate Report No. 2288

The Committee on Foreign Relations having had under consideration Senate Concurrent Resolution 97, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin, reports the resolution favorably, with an amendment, and recommends that the resolution as amended be passed.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 was introduced on October 3, 1962, by Mr. Javits for himself and Mr. Morse. On October 5, 1962, the House of Representatives passed House Concurrent Resolution 570, which was identical to Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 with the exception of one word. The Senate resolution had expressed the sense of Congress that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin constitutes a fundamental political and moral purpose. The House substituted for the word "purpose" the word "determination".

On October 10, the Committee on Foreign Relations met in executive session and gave consideration to the two resolutions pending before it. Without objection it was agreed to amend Senate Concurrent Resolution 97 to conform to the resolution passed by the House of Representatives and to report Senate Concurrent Resolution 97, as thus amended, to the Senate.

The committee believes that the resolution clearly and succinctly states the determination of the Congress and of the American people with respect to the determination of the United States to fulfill our commitments with respect to the freedom of the people of Berlin. This commitment is expressed in paragraph (c) in these words: "That the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom."

The committee recommends early and unanimous approval of this resolution by the Senate.

THE SITUATION IN CUBA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I find both encouragement and disappointment in the announcement that the administration has decided to take unilateral steps to prevent transportation of supplies to Cuba in ships owned by nations who are our allies or profess neutrality. That we were forced to go it alone after making what I understand were strong representations to our allies is a bitter pill to swallow. That we have moved so promptly, although clearly not as far as we might have, encourages those of us who sincerely believe that stronger and more positive action was required.

We have taken a step, a good first step, but there is much yet to be done and there should be other steps, bigger ones. Surely we must have a showdown in the Caribbean and we must prepare for that day.

For one thing, Russia will be forced to increase the number of its own ships that will ply back and forth, to and from Cuba. The planned construction of a fishing port in Cuba by the Soviets shows their design to move into the Western Hemisphere for keeps. So while we have taken a good first step it can only be the start of more drastic, far-reaching action if we are successfully to thwart the Soviets in thier move into the Western Hemisphere. In recent weeks, there have been a variety of proposals to meet the threat presented by Cuba, and the intervention of the Soviets. In spite of widely divergent proposals, all informed persons recognize the potential peril in the growing military buildup in Cuba with Russian assistance.

It appears inevitable that sooner or later we will find ourselves in a position which demands action for the protection of our own national security and for the protection of our friendly neighbors. President Kennedy has made it clear that on the basis of the present conditions and circumstances we do not regard the Cuban situation as requiring an invasion. Nevertheless, Castro keeps shouting to the world that we are plotting an invasion.

So the Communist-supported Cuban military buildup grows and grows—Castro's military capability increases by leaps and bounds—and all the while Castro protests his fear of military attack and seeks to brand us as the aggressor.

The entire world knows that we are not the aggressor in this situation. We did not create this powder keg in the Caribbean area. However, the time has come when we should and must act in self-protection and in the defense of our own national security. The threat to us may be more indirect than direct, but it is nevertheless real and imminent. How far must we retreat before invoking positive measures necessary for our own defense?

The answer is clear. The longer we wait, the greater becomes Castro's military power and potential for harm; and the greater the efforts we must exert in our own defense.

These conclusions respecting the Cuban peril crystallize the serious study I have given the question for many months. Even before November 1961, when I visited our naval base at Guantanamo, the real danger was becoming apparent. And, of course, since that time our fears and suspicions have been confirmed.

It is heartening to know that we have a wonderful group of top fighting men at Guantanamo, all of them imbued with great spirit, from their chief, Rear Adm. Edward H. O'Donnell, on down.

A year ago I visited Guantanamo and spent some time with Admiral O'Donnell. I was very favorably impressed with him as a naval officer as well as with his fine concept of the real peril now involved and the future peril.

As chairman of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee, I have done a great deal of work and have gained a great deal of information on the situation that cannot be brought out into the open. I do not know more about it than others, of course, and I do not know as much as many persons do, but I mention this to show that it was a long, painstaking study, and the very opposite of a hasty conclusion. It is my deliberate conclusion, after all hope has been exhausted, that nothing short of what I propose will do the work. Also, I am convinced that if we do not take more drastic steps, we shall increase the peril and get further into the woods.

I propose, Mr. President, that we create and define a defensive area or zone around Cuba which we consider vital to our own national security. And, further, that we give notice to all the world that, within this defensive zone or area, we are fully prepared to take whatever action necessary to protect our Nation and our Latin American allies from any further buildup of military strength and striking power which might endanger our security.

At the same time, we must demonstrate to and reassure the Cuban people that it is not they, but their Communist masters, who are the object of these preparations. Our humanitarian aid in the form of necessary food and medicine could and would nevertheless go through to the Cuban people.

This would be an act of defense, not an act of aggression. It would differ little from the action we took in stationing our 7th Fleet in the Formosa Straits and in announcing to the world our intention to defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. That action could not be characterized as other than a defensive measure on behalf of an ally and in our own interest—a defensive measure which unquestionably deterred any intent to invade which the Red Chinese might have entertained.

We have taken similar defensive steps in Lebanon in 1958, in Turkey, in Greece, in Western Europe, and elsewhere around the globe.

If we were right as to Formosa, Lebanon, and elsewhere, what then should stand in the way of adopting identical steps for our own protection in the Caribbean—our own backyard? Why should we fear any loud cries of "blockade," if we are taking appropriate steps for our own protection? A blockade is not a blockade when a nation acts prudently in its own interest and in self-defense, choosing not to wait until it is too late.

Day by day the peril grows as Khrushchev and Castro take step after step to pave the way for that Russian foothold. Recently, we were advised that the Soviets were undertaking the construction of a fishing port in Cuba in order to facilitate the commercial fishing operations of the Russian fleet in the Western Hemisphere. Coupled with this was the announcement that Cuba and Russia together are building 62 trawlers for Castro's use. We would be naive indeed to accept these announcements at face value and to conclude that peaceful uses alone are considered for the fishing port and the ships.

It took a long time in the history of affairs for it to be discovered that the area at Cuba was such a valuable fishing port for these faraway interests and countries.

One of the reasons recently assigned for the conclusion that Castro's military buildup was defensive was the fact that he had no ships with which to mount an invasion. Now we are told he is getting 62 ships. Trawlers can be used for fishing. They can also transport soldiers, and they can be mounted with guns. We might refer to these ships as Castro convertibles. And the fishing port provides a convenient submarine base in the Western Hemisphere.

The history of 20th century aggression is a long line of probing steps taken by an aggressor who felt his way—going as far as he could, ready at the same time to withdraw in the face of firm resistance. So it was with Mussolini in Ethiopia in 1935, with Hitler in the demilitarized Rhineland in 1936, with the Red Chinese in Formosa in 1950 and later, and with the Soviets in Berlin in 1948 and 1961. And so it is the same, I believe, in 1962, with Khrushchev seeking a foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

When the Berlin resolution was considered, I really expected that there would be some debate on it and some explanation. I was not prepared to debate it. I certainly did not intend to oppose it. However, it seems to me, relatively speaking, that our position is already well known as to Berlin. We have had troubles in Western Germany all through the years. We have troubles in Berlin now. We have repeatedly said—and have acted to back up our statements—that they shall not pass, that we are not going to yield.

At the same time, Mr. President, it seems clear to me that with reference to Cuba, which can be a point of peril, such a short distance from our shoreline, it is absolutely necessary to take more positive steps and more firm action, somewhat along the line I have suggested. Otherwise, month after month and year after year this peril will become greater. It will grow in strength. It will grow in activity. It will become more and more difficult and burdensome for us to overcome.

My suggestion is only one suggestion. I believe every Member of the Senate who believes that some positive action is necessary should come forward and make a suggestion, after his thought has matured and a definite conclusion has been reached on the subject. This is my soul-searching conclusion, based upon at least a fair connection with and knowledge of the facts, from discussions not only with my fellow Senators, but also with many well-informed people who are in a position to know the facts, people who carry responsibility. Some of them have great military knowledge and experience.

I am speaking solely for myself on this subject.

The perimeter area around Cuba which we must defend for our own self protection and preservation is a matter for our military people to decide. Whatever this area be, we must take immediate steps to define its boundaries and announce our determination in clear and unmistakable terms.

Both our Western allies and our friends in this hemisphere will certainly understand the necessity of our action.

I am not versed in the field of diplomacy. I know nothing about diplomatic talk. However, logic, commonsense, and down-to-earth consideration of these matters, I repeat with emphasis, leads me to the conclusion that I do not see how in the world our Western allies or our friends in this hemisphere could fail to understand the absolute necessity for our action.

First, we must clearly formulate our plans to protect our shores and our interests, and then announce and declare these plans to our Western and Latin American allies sufficiently in advance for them to make the necessary and appropriate preparations and adjustments.

Our recent moves to bar aid to Cuba through a strangulation of the sea routes provide a substantial first step in the desired direction, including, first, the exclusion from U.S. ports of foreign ships transporting arms and other supplies to Cuba; second, the prohibition of any trade with Cuba for U.S. ships sailing under foreign registry, along with the similar prohibition for U.S. ships under domestic registry.

These steps gave notice to our allies that we were displeased with their failure to assist us voluntarily in freezing out the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere via Cuba. Some of them—West Germany, Greece, Italy—heard our call. But others called it our own local problem, as if Berlin were the common problem for all the Western allies while Cuba was our own private problem.

There are certain risks in following this course. But I say that the risks from inaction, from watching and waiting, are greater. Sooner or later we will be faced with an even more grave crisis in the Caribbean.

An effective plan for our own defense in the Caribbean will entail less cost and effort now than will be required when Castro has built up maximum strength with the aid of the Kremlin.

Back to Khrushchev's most recent step—the building of a port allegedly for the benefit of Russian fishing vessels. Close as Cuba is to our shore, including for example our missile testing base at Cape Canaveral, obviously any more moves of this sort holds in it the seeds of trouble for the United States.

Of course, the Panama Canal is not too far away.

That Castro's growing and cumulative military power is not immediately aided by this fishing port does not lessen the reality of his potential strength, nor does it lessen the continuing buildup serving as still another act of defiance to the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere.

Further, if we stand aside to allow Cuba's military preparations to continue without halt of substantial impediment, this will serve only as an encouragement for communistic probing and exploration at other trouble spots, Berlin or Formosa, for example.

Finally as our Latin American neighbors see Cuba in the ferment of unimpeded military preparation, they may well believe it the better part of valor to aline themselves with Cuba. An unmistakable show of determination by the United States is necessary to counter these grave possibilities.

I say again, for emphasis, that this is my thought. This is my suggestion. This is a step which I think we should take in due course, after proper notice, as I have said, which would render unnecessary later the taking of far graver or more far-reaching steps of a similar or even more burdensome kind.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who is well versed on this and kindred subjects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I desire to say a word with reference to one comment that the very able Senator from Mississippi made about there being no debate on the Berlin concurrent resolution. The resolution was reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee. It was brought before the Senate by unanimous consent. Unanimous consent was necessary, because the concurrent resolution was reported only today. One of the chief sponsors of the concurrent resolution in the Senate was the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I asked the Senator from Oregon if he cared to make a statement. He said he did not. I made a very brief statement merely explaining what our action had been. I think it was generally felt that there was no need for debate. No Senator seemed to want to debate the resolution. However, complying perhaps with the implied suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi, I wish to say——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to say that I am glad to have the Senator make his comments. His comments will be helpful for the RECORD. I was not opposing the resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that fully.

I agree with the Senator when he states that our commitments in Berlin have been stated over and over again. Some people may think that it is futile or useless to state our position again in the form in which it has now been stated. On the other hand, numerous Members of Congress of both Houses felt that it would be a good thing for the Congress to make a statement now in a concurrent resolution as to the sense of Congress.

In all frankness, I have never looked with a great deal of favor upon such resolutions. When the resolution relating to Formosa was before the Senate in 1953, I said on the floor of the Senate that the resolution was unnecessary. I stated that we had a treaty with Formosa that obligated us to do the things stated. It is within the discretion of the President to determine how such obligations are carried out.

Mr. STENNIS. I remember the argument of the Senator from Alabama on that very point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When the Near East resolution came before the Senate, I took exactly the same attitude. Back in 1947, when the Greek-Turkish problem arose, the President of the United States did not call upon Congress for a resolution. He came to Congress with a message and said, "This is the foreign policy of the United States."

So far as I am concerned, the policy that was stated at that time by President Truman in relation to the Greek-Turkish problem is still the foreign policy of the United States. I felt that President Eisenhower would certainly be well within his rights in acting under that policy and making the same pronouncement.

I have somewhat the same feeling with reference to Cuba. I realize that Cuba is closer to home and that the problem is highly emotional. However, I voted for the Formosa resolution, the Near East resolution, and the Cuban resolution.

I had the same feeling about Berlin. First, as is stated in the preamble of our resolution, we have a responsibility under the Four Power Pact signed at the end of the war. Furthermore, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and President Kennedy have all pledged to the people of Berlin that we will do whatever is necessary in order to preserve the integrity of Berlin and the freedom of the people of Berlin. Of course, we will stand by that commitment.

However, someone is always ready to say that we will not stand fast in Berlin. The Senator has heard that statement. He has seen it in newspapers and has read it in columns in different places around the country. Perhaps it would be a good thing for Congress to restate its position that we are going to stand firm.

I am as confident as I can be that the President of the United States, with or without the resolution, is determined to carry out our commitments to the people of Berlin and, furthermore, to the people in the Government of West Germany and to our allies in NATO and Western Europe.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I think it is very reassuring for the Senator to make a strong statement of that kind as to his belief. He represents the belief of all of us.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi knows that the Senator's remarks will strengthen the RECORD and the resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield, I should like to move into a discussion of the Cuban situation very briefly.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Cuban situation is naturally rather emotional because it is so close to home. Cuba is a part of our Western Hemisphere. It is a country which we liberated from a European power, and a country to which we gave much down through the years. It stings us to think of the present situation.

I have given a great deal of thought and attention to the Cuban situation. I have received a great amount of mail from my constituents and from others in different parts of the country regarding Cuba. I have tried to study the subject as best I could. I have attended conferences at the White House, and in the State Department. Secretary Rusk has appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member. Representatives of the CIA have appeared before the committee. Secretary of Defense McNamara has been before the committee. There have been conferences with other military powers.

I wish to state a very few conclusions which I have reached.

First, I desire to make clear that I believe we have reliable sources of information on Cuba.

Second, I believe that the military has made very careful calculations on the military situation, strength, type, and so forth.

Third, I believe that there is a strong probability of obtaining unanimity of action on the part of the Western Hemisphere. Goodness knows, we need it. A great many of the people in Latin America still think of the gringos of the imperial north. When they think of intervention, they think of gunboat diplomacy. I do not lose patience with our Goverment when it tries to overcome those difficulties.

I think headway is being made to overcome them. The conference held in Washington only a week ago made considerable headway. I believe there will be unanimity of action. Steps have been taken.

I noticed the Senator's careful statement that steps should be taken in due course. I am glad he used the term "in due course," because I think, as the Good Book says, there is a time for all things.

One of the great mistakes we might make would be to do what some in our country—and not the Senator from Mississippi—have advocated, which is to rush in headlong and do something rash. As long as we can close the vise on the Castro regime, we will make headway.

I could relate a great many more of my thoughts regarding Russia's connections with Cuba and what she is going to be willing, able, and ready to do. But I believe the Cuban situation can be handled. It is being handled. The President has correct information as to what the situation is there. He is on the alert as to what needs to be done. I believe that those things are being done, to use the Senator's words, in due course.

There is one other thing that some of our people seem to overlook, that is the fact that while Cuba is close to home, it must not be considered as an isolated situation. There are many such bad spots throughout the world. We know from past performance that the Kremlin is able to press the button and produce trouble in any one of many spots around the world. I believe that Khrushchev clearly planned from the beginning to use Cuba as an irritant to the United States and still intends to do so. Nothing would please him more than to have us become so involved in Cuba that we might become indifferent with respect to Berlin.

Berlin is the great danger spot in the world. That is where world war III could break out. I believe that our Government is working on this problem diligently, and at the same time is keeping in mind the global aspects of the whole troublesome mess.

I followed the Senator very closely. I am in agreement with him that we must keep a tight hold on the situation. We must not let it get out of control. I do not believe that we will let it get out of control.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his comments. They are worthy of consideration, particularly, coming from him, a well-informed member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I point out, in response to him, that I, too, have talked with the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and have heard testimony from the Secretary of State and others, and have talked with representatives of the Defense Department. I speak solely for myself. I talked with the Secretary of Defense and with many others over a period of more than a year. Something is being done. I do not say that the administration is indifferent in the slightest to this problem.

However, my point is that more drastic and more urgent and more positive steps are necessary before we can achieve needed results to stop this development. I cannot believe that, with my knowledge of our great striking power, if we were to resist it, we would touch off some trouble in Berlin. I do not believe that Khrushchev would risk war with us over Cuba or over Berlin. Certainly we cannot let one buildup follow another, in Cuba, or Berlin, or Formosa. If we do, we will be nibbled away.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not believe the Senator meant to leave that impression.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not mean to do that at all. When I started I said that it seems to me that people sometimes thought of this as an isolated incident. We must work at the whole global job, and work hard. In that connection I wonder if the Senator has read a column——

Mr. STENNIS. Before the Senator leaves that point, I believe I should say that if we take positive action to protect ourselves in the Cuban area we will be furnishing to the world conclusive proof that we will take steps to protect ourselves in other areas.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. We are taking that action. We are doing it, in the words of the Senator, "in due course." I wonder whether the Senator has read a column written by Walter Lippmann, which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. It is found on page 22872 of the RECORD. I recommend its reading. It is a very thoughtful article dealing with this subject.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I shall read it. I have read many articles along this line, pro and con, but I have not read the article to which the Senator has referred.

I conclude by saying, with emphasis, that I hope the Senator from Alabama is correct in his expression as to what he called the strong probability of unity of action. Lack of unity of action is one of the things that disturbs the Senator from Mississippi. That is what has disturbed the Senator from Mississippi, as he has watched these developments week after week, month after month, and year after year. My proposed step would bring about unity of action in Latin American countries. It would bring about unanimity of action with respect to our allies elsewhere. This step or a similar step will be proof to the world and to our allies in particular that we will move in on this situation and do what is necessary, not precipitately, but in due course and in due time; and that does not mean at some remote time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have read an article printed in a New York paper, to the effect that Mr. Donovan, who is acting as the go-between in the negotiations for the release of the Cuban prisoners, is acting as an agent of the U.S. Government in those negotiations, and that a substantial part of the ransom money is being put up by our Government. I cannot conceive of that being true. However, I notice that the story goes on to state that no official in the executive department has thus far denied it. I was wondering whether the Senator from Mississippi had any information on that subject and, if so, whether he wishes to say anything about it.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi is a member of the Appropriations Committee. Nothing like that has come before him in any hearings, and he has had no information with regard to it. I heard the subject mentioned on the radio, as a possibility. However, I have not been able to follow it up, because I have been busy with other matters, and have not had the opportunity to check on the radio report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I hope it is an erroneous report.

Mr. STENNIS. I hope so, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I trust it is an error and that our Government is not putting up a part of the ransom money. However, I feel that our Government has a responsibility to issue a denial of the statement, before it goes any further.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi agrees. I would be very impatient with any proposal for our Government to pay a part of the ransom money out of the National Treasury. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I close by emphasizing again that we hear a great deal of talk about what Russia is going to do with reference to Cuba. We know that one thing is certain, and that is that she will keep building up one thing after another so long as her hand is not called, and so long as there is no effective contest with respect to it. She will do that until some effective moves are made by us. It might not be necessary to do more than to start them. When those moves are made her efforts will be cut off and destroyed, whether it be in Berlin, Formosa, or elsewhere. In the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi it is much more likely that a great deal of the steam will be taken out of her efforts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOBBYING POWER OPERATES UNCHECKED IN WASHINGTON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most unfortunate, and neglected aspects of Government in Washington is the activity of lobbying and lobbyists. There is no question that lobbyists are very effective indeed, and there is no question that efforts looking toward their regulation are so ineffectual that they have become a farce.

An excellent series of articles is now being written by James McCartney, of the Washington bureau of the Chicago Daily News, an outstanding reporter.

Before I ask unanimous consent to have the series of articles placed in the Record, I wish to quote briefly from some of the statements made by Mr. McCartney:

The 16-year-old regulation of Lobbying Act is little or no help. Under it many lobbyists, including some of the best known, such as the National Association of Manufacturers or Americans for Democratic Action, don't even bother to register.

Others register but don't list their expenses.

There is no enforcement.

But voices of complaint are rare indeed in the Halls of Congress—a symptom of what happens when a governmental body is responsible for policing itself.

One conspicuous example of the smashing success that lobbyists have been enjoying, taken from this session of Congress, was given by Mr. McCartney, as follows:

Washington.—On March 26, in private dining room No. 4 in the Palmer House at Chicago, a group of about 25 men lit a fuse on what was to become the largest lobbying campaign of modern times.

In less than 6 weeks a program they launched reversed the fate of a major item in President Kennedy's tax program—a budget-balancing proposal for compulsory withholding of taxes on dividends and interest.

Before the campaign was over the President angrily denounced the campaign at a news conference, throwing all of the great influence of his office into an attempt to save the program.

But the President was too late. The brilliantly organized, perfectly timed lobbying campaign had already succeeded.

It had switched so many votes in the Senate that shortly thereafter administration forces surrendered abjectly.

Mr. President, this series of articles constitutes a fine study, by a top-flight reporter, of the lobbying problem in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles, written by James McCartney, and published in the Chicago Daily News, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How Huge Lobby Army Conquers—Unregulated Corps Scores Big Victories in Congress

(Note.—The deft, but often unseen, hands of lobbyists have played crucial roles in the 87th Congress, which is drawing to a close. Yet the Nation's Lobby Registration Act, on the books for 16 years, is so ineffective that lobbyists can—and do—operate in virtual secrecy. After weeks of digging into this unseen world, James McCartney, of the Chicago Daily News Washington Bureau, has completed a series of five articles on lobby pressure on this Congress. This is the first.)

(By James McCartney)

Washington.—Washington's vast "secret army," a corps of thousands of undisciplined, unregulated and uncounted lobbyists, has been riding high in the 87th Congress.

Lobbyists—who number no fewer than 6,000 and probably twice that number—have had their way with most of the major items of legislation.

At least some congressional liberals believe lobbyists and the special interest groups they represent have captured control of major parts of both the House and Senate through their friends and allies.

It's now a billion-dollar industry.

Yet the story of lobbyists' activities, even on specific bits of legislation, is largely untold and largely a matter that members of Congress—not to mention the lobbyists—like to keep to themselves.

The 16-year-old Regulation of Lobbying Act is little or no help. Under it many lobbyists, including some of the best known, such as the National Association of Manufacturers or Americans for Democratic Action, don't even bother to register.

Others register but don't list their expenses.

There is no enforcement.

But voices of complaint are rare indeed in the Halls of Congress—a symptom of what happens when a governmental body is responsible for policing itself.

AMA HEADS LIST OF BIG VICTORIES

The record of the 87th Congress tells its own story of what lobbyists have accomplished.

The American Medical Association, which reports the largest expenditures for lobbying of any group in the country, beat back hospital care for the aged.

Spokesmen for both the AMA and for a huge counterlobby from the AFL-CIO, which fought for such care under social security, give major credit for the bill's defeat to a vast, nationwide lobbying campaign.

The U.S. Savings and Loan League, in one of the largest lobby efforts in history, knocked out a proposal to withhold taxes on dividends and interest out of President Kennedy's tax bill.

The league, with help from a few other organizations, staged a month-long mail blitz that flooded the capital with hundreds of thousands of letters. Some Senate offices have not yet recovered.

The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association had a drug bill of its own making virtually in the bag after a concerted, well-financed campaign reaching into almost every community in the country.

The association was so influential in the Senate that it was able to place two of its own lawyers on an informal Senate committee that was drawing up the bill.

But in a setback rare in this Congress for a major lobbying effort, the PMA won only part of its program. The thalidomide scare, which burst forth late in the session, reversed the course of the legislation at the last minute.

These, however, are just a few of legions of examples. In others:

The American Farm Bureau Federation, the largest farm lobby, has been credited with defeating major portions of Mr. Kennedy's farm proposals.

Lobbying by agents of foreign governments reached record proportions on the sugar bill, touching off a congressional investigation.

Mr. Kennedy's tax bill was riddled by lobbying efforts. Designed originally to close tax loopholes, the result was the creation of new ones.

A near monopoly on space communications was voted for the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Nation's largest corporation, after what Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, described as "the most intense lobbying effort in the history of A.T. & T."

HOW AN 11-YEAR CAMPAIGN PAID OFF

The stories behind two particular bills illustrate drastically the current power of lobbyists.

One starts 11 years ago, when a handful of powerful lobbying groups began a campaign to permit self-employed persons to set up tax deductible private pension funds. Opponents of the proposals have called it a "giveaway" to doctors, lawyers, and other professional men.

Behind it were the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Medical Association, the Farm Bureau, and others.

For 11 years someone always found a way to keep it from coming to a vote in Congress. This year when the measure came to a vote in the Senate it passed easily. Only four Senators voted against it. Seventy-five voted for it.

Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, estimated that the bill would cost the Treasury $200 million a year to start and $2 billion to $3 billion over a period of years.

The fate of the bill is still uncertain. President Kennedy, who opposed it, could still veto it.

An even more dramatic example of lobbyist power this year is provided by passage of a bill in which lobbying expenses, for the first time in more than 40 years, were made tax deductible.

Almost every major lobbying group, particularly the Nation's big trade associations and labor unions, backed the bill.

In effect, lobbyists lobbied through a tax deduction for lobbyists—a feat they had been unable to achieve in any Congress since the previous law was enacted in 1919.

Not a single voice was raised against the proposal when it came before the House. In the Senate the vote was 51 to 13.

LOBBYING RIGHT IS GUARANTEED

Nevertheless, there is nothing intrinsically wrong with lobbying. It is a procedure honored by long practice and recognized in the law as a part of democratic government.

In all probability the right to lobby is guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution as any citizen's right to "petition" for a "redress of grievances."

But the Constitution does not bar Congress from enacting laws to make lobbyists stand up and be counted or to report what they spend so that citizens, or legislators, can know who is asking whom for what, and at what cost.

And there is nothing in the Constitution that requires that a lobbying law be an ineffective joke, as nearly every serious student of the current law has described it for many years.

The Washington telephone book lists more than 1,000 trade associations and U.S. Chamber of Commerce publications formally identify more than 2,000. Fewer than 400 registered under the lobbying act last year.

Though largely unseen and largely ignored by the press, lobbyists' influence is pervasive. Most Senators and Congressmen say they would be hard put to write laws if it were not for the help lobbyists eagerly offer.

One old hand in the Senate, a former university professor, estimates that first drafts of about half of the Nation's laws actually originate in lobbyists' offices.

Former Senate Majority Leader Scott Lucas (Democrat of Illinois) says he doubts that any major law could be passed without a large lobbying campaign. It could happen, he says, but it's "doubtful."

Everybody nowadays has a lobbyist—from diaper manufacturers to Indian tribes. The Apache, Nez Perce, Sioux and Pima-Maricopa tribes are all represented in Washington.

So are the Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, the Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, the Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee and Liberty Under Law Inc. of Salt Lake City.

So are the Pitkin County Water Protection Association of Aspen, Colo., the Nation's candy wholesalers and the Limestone Institute.

Many lobbyists, big and small, have opposition lobbyists who tend to cancel out their work. All say that they never represent a cause unless it has merit.

Most don't like to use the word "lobbyist" at all in describing themselves. One group voted to call themselves legislative counselors.

But lobbyists can be brazen. And they can wield their power with great skill. In recent weeks two executive departments—Agriculture and Interior—have had to expel lobbyists from news conferences with departmental executives. They were posing as newsmen and asking questions about their special interests.

One Senator in this session of Congress said he would not force a rollcall vote on a highway measure because he knew that highway lobbyists were seated in the Senate gallery, taking notes on whom to earmark for defeat if votes were wrong.

Big Lobby Push Born in Chicago—Decided Fate of Withholding Taxes on Dividends, Interest

(Second in series)

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—On March 26, in private dining room No. 4 in the Palmer House at Chicago, a group of about 25 men lit a fuse on what was to become the largest lobbying campaign of modern times.

In less than 6 weeks a program they launched reversed the fate of a major item in President Kennedy's tax program—a budget-balancing proposal for compulsory withholding of taxes on dividends and interest.

Before the campaign was over the President angrily denounced the campaign at a news conference, throwing all of the great influence of his office into an attempt to save the program.

But the President was too late. The brilliantly organized, perfectly timed lobbying campaign had already succeeded.

It had switched so many votes in the Senate that shortly thereafter administration forces surrendered abjectly.

When the matter came to a vote the administration could muster only 20 backers for its original position on the Senate floor—20 out of 100. The President's Senate leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, didn't even bother to put up a fight.

The story of that campaign shows how lobbyists, using the tools of modern public relations, can directly influence great decisions on the floor of Congress.

Yet their expenses go almost completely unreported under the current Lobby Control Act.

The meeting in dining room No. 4 was a gathering of the "legislative subcommittee" of a great, national trade association—the U.S. Savings & Loan League, with headquarters in Chicago's La Salle-Wacker Building.

There wasn't a political amateur in the group. Seven were past presidents of the league, once described by President Harry S. Truman as part of Washington's powerful "real estate lobby." One was a former Congressman, another a former president of a State assembly.

MEMBERS WORRIED ABOUT DEDUCTIONS

The question was simple: Should the national group give the go-ahead to member institutions to contact their savers, urging them to bombard Congress with complaints about the withholding proposal?

The league, more than 50 years old, had never tried such a campaign.

But many of the 4,800 member institutions were worried.

Under the President's proposal institutions paying interest would deduct what their savers owed in taxes and send it directly to the Government.

That, many at the meeting felt, would mean a loss in depositors and thus money. People, they felt, would resent the institution taking their money. It would be "bad public relations."

In addition, when the institution sent money to the Government it would automatically cut the amount of its deposits—money on which it could make money.

The question was whether all this could be stopped by lobbying.

Says Stephen Slipher, the "legislative director" (i.e., chief lobbyist) for the league in Washington, "at that time we didn't have the votes in the Senate to stop it."

After a 4-hour debate the letterwriting campaign was approved, to be coupled with a campaign fighting hikes in saving and loan taxes. Letterwriters could complain about either, or both.

On March 30 Norman Strunk, executive vice president of the league, mailed a letter to all 4,800 member institutions containing two "sample" letters to help them in preparing letter to their savers.

THIRTY MILLION ASKED TO WRITE LETTERS

The total number of savers in the member institutions: 30 million.

The clear-cut object of the withholding facet of the campaign: to pressure the Senate into throwing out the President's withholding proposals.

The sample letter on withholding still provides the most controversial aspect of the league's campaign.

Treasury officials blame this sample letter for misleading hundreds of thousands of people about the effects of withholding. In itself, they feel, it may have been the knife that killed the President's proposal.

"The letter was deliberately misleading and contained several major inaccuracies," says one official. "It made it sound like withholding would take the food out of your mouth. It created fear where fear was not justified."

Says Slipher of this charge: "When President Kennedy advocates a course of action he doesn't lean over backward to present opposing arguments. Neither did we."

One phrase in the sample letter read: "If you agree that this proposed withholding tax against your savings and investments is unfair, then you can do something about it * * * etc., etc."

Without actually saying so, Treasury officials point out, the phrasing "this proposed withholding tax" would seem to suggest a new tax was contemplated—not simply a new means of collecting an old tax.

Whatever the merits of the opposing arguments, the fact is that by the time the mail campaign got going, many thousands of people believed a new tax was contemplated.

And thousands of them objected heatedly about it to their Senators.

NEW TAX IDEA PLUGGED IN ADS

The results of the campaign could hardly have been foreseen by anyone. At the signal from headquarters, member institutions from coast to coast took up the battle.

For some there were no holds barred.

Although the national headquarters had not encouraged newspaper ads to drum up letters, many local associations ran them anyway.

The new tax idea crept into many of the ads. One in Oak Park, Ill., for example, mentioned, in large type, a "threatening new 20 percent tax."

It was far from the only one.

Soon the deluge began to fall on the Capitol, first in letters by the handful, then by the box, then by the cartload, then by the carload.

Before it was over Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, had received 75,000 letters. Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, got 60,000. Nobody in the Senate remembers anything quite like it.

The letters were full of inaccuracies concerning the legislation, many on the "new tax" question, but many on other questions as well. DOUGLAS reported that the "vast proportion" of those who wrote him were wrong about the meaning of the proposal.

President Kennedy said in his news conference that a "great many people have been badly misinformed."

Nevertheless, the campaign soon began to bear fruit.

KEPT CHART OF VICTORIES

Slipher kept an informal chart as the battle waxed heavy, listing the name of every Senator.

He started with 35 Republicans listed as on his side. His hope was to pick up support largely from southern Democrats. He needed 16 conversions for a majority of 51 in the Senate.

The campaign was touched off March 30.

By early May MANSFIELD was asking the President to make a public appeal to try to save withholding. It was too late.

Said MANSFIELD later, "under the pressure from home, Senators made commitments. We couldn't change them when the bill came to the floor."

Slipher says the campaign was called off 5 or 6 weeks after it started.

He says he wasn't "positive" withholding had been killed, however, until about June 1.

The big victory was the vote in the Senate Finance Committee, which had been in doubt. The league and its allies won 11 to 5.

After that, in Slipher's words, "It was no battle. The administration gave up."

The administration had, as the final 66 to 20 vote on the Senate floor proved.

To the league and its members the victory was no more than it deserved. "We happened to be in the right," says Slipher, "and our savers, far beyond our knowledge, were aware of that fact."

Treasury officials are not so sure it is that simple.

Few Doors Barred to Lobbyists—Ex-Senator Lucas Finds He's Still Club Member

(Third in series)

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—Washington lobbyists move freely, but often secretly or without fanfare, in the high councils of Government.

Their influence is so universally taken for granted that the town doesn't blink an eye when a Cabinet official or a Member of Congress shows up in the society pages at a lobbyist's dinner. At a recent posh buffet in the fashionable Mayflower Hotel staged by a lobbyist for industrial and political clients in West Germany, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON showed up, as did several Congressmen and Senators.

The lobbyist gave a speech during the evening and was accorded rapt attention. Such affairs occur every night in Washington.

An informal setting is always best for selling, but lobbyists do well in reaching seats of power within the formal framework of Government procedure.

Few lobbying campaigns could be considered more successful than that waged for the so-called Du Pont bill, which was approved early this year.

It was a high-level campaign all the way.

The bill was designed to provide tax relief for individual stockholders of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. receiving General Motors stock as a result of a Supreme Court order. It was actively sought by Du Pont, one of the world's largest chemical firms.

The campaign was masterminded by Washington Attorney John Sharon, then with the firm Cleary, Gottlieb & Steen—whose partners have included George W. Ball, now Under Secretary of State, and Fowler Hamilton, now Foreign Administrator.

After studying the lobbying problem, Sharon decided the best approach would be to bring Du Pont's president, the personable

Crawford H. Greenewalt, to Washington to lobby for the bill.

It proved to be a brilliant decision, for doors were opened to Greenewalt, as president of the giant company, that would not have been opened to others speaking for him.

For months Greenewalt shuttled back and forth by private plane between Wilmington, Del., Du Pont's home, and Washington.

Among those he visited to make his pitch were Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, and the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn.

Greenewalt didn't stop there. In the Treasury Department he visited Robert H. Knight, General Counsel, and in the Justice Department, Byron White, then Deputy Attorney General, now a Supreme Court Justice, and Lee Loevinger, in charge of the Antitrust Division.

He visited the top members of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, which were considering the bill. He called on key opponents, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee.

Douglas says the bill was approved, by and large, because of the position taken by the Treasury Department.

The Treasury never announced that Greenewalt had visited either Dillon or Knight. The Department still declines to confirm the visits, although Sharon discusses them freely.

Congressmen and Senators—like Cabinet members—rarely issue press releases announcing their meetings with lobbyists.

It doesn't take the president of a huge corporation to gain access to a Cabinet member. Lobbying regulars in Washington can open doors, too.

Former Senate Majority Leader Scott Lucas, of Illinois, now a full-time lobbyist, recently had a client with a problem in the Commerce Department.

Lucas went over to the Department and sat down with Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges to try to work it out. The result was a decision delaying enforcement of a California law that would have made things tough for Lucas' client.

And Lucas, like other lobbyists, has little trouble getting bills introduced for his clients. Representative MEL PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois, recently introduced a bill a Lucas client wanted and piloted it through the House.

Lucas, of course, because of his former high position in the Senate, has many friends that can be helpful. As he puts it:

"The Senate is a club and you're a member until you die, even if you get defeated for reelection. I can see anybody in the Senate almost any time."

Lucas is only 1 of 14 former Senators who have registered as lobbyists at one time or another in recent years. A total of 69 former Congressmen have registered.

These men have a special privilege other lobbyists do not, although it is not known how often it may be used.

Former Members of both the House and the Senate have free access to the floor of the Chamber in which they served.

Other former high Government officials have also become lobbyists. Oscar L. Chapman, President Harry S. Truman's urbane Secretary of the Interior, has represented Mexican sugar interests since 1955 and has a proven record of accomplishment.

Since he took on the job the Mexican sugar quota has jumped from 11,000 tons a year to 80,108 tons.

Chapman's fees have grown, too. When he began he was paid $20,000 a year plus expenses. Now he gets $50,000 a year plus bonuses that could carry the fee as high as $76,500 if he can increase the quota still further.

Chapman is 1 of a group of 26 lawyers and legislative experts who were paid more than half a million dollars this year to lobby for sugar-producing foreign governments on this year's sugar bill.

Lobbying techniques employed on the bill raised so many questions that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has begun an investigation. Public hearings, significantly, have been postponed until after the November elections.

A preliminary study by the committee has indicated that lobbyists for foreign governments often have managed to get unlabeled propaganda into U.S. news media and in newsreels, movies, books, and on television.

Under the Foreign Agents Registration Act propaganda from foreign governments is supposed to be labeled.

Hearings before Senate or House committees are often mere showcases for lobbyists. The Senate hearings on President Kennedy's tax bill, for example, were a succession of pleas for special privilege from lobbyists.

Of about 200 witnesses who appeared before the Senate Finance Committee almost all represented special interest groups.

Only a handful—fewer than 10—could fairly be considered as spokesmen for the "general interest."

Under the circumstances it could hardly be considered surprising that the President's bill was riddled by the committee, the lobbyists winning their way on point after point.

VFW HONORS ROBERT F. HURLEIGH, PRESIDENT, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate are aware, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States recently concluded its 63d consecutive national convention at Minneapolis, Minn. Some of the most significant and constructive features of the annual conventions of the VFW are the presentations to individuals and organizations, in recognition of outstanding contributions to the preservation and furtherance of the principles for which our Government stands.

The Mutual Broadcasting System has demonstrated—under the direction of its president, Mr. Robert F. Hurleigh—a profound understanding of the role of such a great broadcasting organization in supporting our Nation's objectives and concepts. I believe that this recognition of patriotic endeavors of a large broadcasting organization, by such an influential patriotic organization as the VFW, is highly commendable. Such recognition expresses an appreciation for the effort and expense which the Mutual Broadcasting System has made in the interest of our national well-being.

The VWF, the world's largest oversea combat veterans organization, having a membership of 1,300,000, is to be commended for its public-spirited action in so recognizing the Mutual Broadcasting System and its president, Robert F. Hurleigh.

Also, I am confident that my colleagues join me in extending to Mr. Hurleigh and the entire Mutual Broadcasting System our warmest congratulations and our deep appreciation for the patriotic, enlightened, and most helpful contributions they have made toward strengthening our Nation in these truly perilous times.

The introductory remarks of Mr. Robert E. Hansen, then National Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, set forth clearly the reason for this well-merited award to Mr. Hurleigh and the organization he heads.

Mr. Hurleigh's response to the thousands of delegates at the VFW convention is indicative of the straight, clear, and forceful thinking which has characterized the public service endeavors of the Mutual Broadcasting System. Although brief, Mr. Hurleigh's remarks contain some very pertinent and thought-provoking observations on the problems confronting our Nation today.

Because of the importance of Mr. Hurleigh's remarks, as well as the views expressed in the presentation by Commander Hansen, I ask that these two addresses be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND PRESENTATION, ROBERT F. HURLEIGH, PRESIDENT, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, 63D NATIONAL CONVENTION, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 14, 1962

Over the course of years the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has had the opportunity to work with many outstanding individuals and organizations who give of their time and facilities to aid the causes of our order. Today we take time out to honor such an organization.

This is an organization that has traditionally put America first. The cause of our flag and our Nation was the cause of this organization. Patriotism has never been a dirty word to them, but rather, the code by which they have lived. The organization I speak of is the Mutual Broadcasting System, the world's largest radio network and a great friend of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I, like my predecessors, have had the opportunity to do business with them and have learned to respect their integrity and sense of responsibility.

Their door has always been open to our organization and to all other patriotic groups. They have gone out of their way to be helpful and have been unstinting in their support.

Just as Mutual has led so often in the past, we once again find it out front as its industry adopts new patterns and new concepts. Some time ago Mr. Newton Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission called upon the broadcast industry to speak out on the important issues of the day—to call to the attention of the people of the country the challenges we face and offer a direction which to follow.

This was indeed a challenge to the broadcast industry. Most of us are aware of the continuing trend in which more and more communities are becoming one newspaper cities. This means we have the opportunity to read only one point of view and the opportunity for spirited public debate has lessened. The vacuum that this trend has created is dangerous to our form of government and all of us should be grateful that the broadcast industry is accepting the challenge and making its voice heard. Leading the way in this general area has been the Mutual Broadcasting System. It is today the only network carrying daily editorials on the issues of the day and, as perhaps many of you are aware, these editorials have continually extolled the qualities which made our Nation great. We in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and the rest of our fellow citizens can rest secure while Mutual is on the job for there shall never be any question about on which side of the fence they are standing. Simply—these people are as American as apple pie.

Accepting the award for Mutual will be its distinguished president, Mr. Robert F. Hurleigh. Many of you know this man because in the past he personally has received many awards from our organization including the commander in chief's Gold Medal Award. There is no doubt in my mind that he is a man who will go down in history as one of the outstanding spokesmen in his industry, but I think even more important to him, as one of our great patriots.

Mr. Hurleigh, will you please step forward.

Remarks of Robert F. Hurleigh, President, Mutual Broadcasting System, Veterans of Foreign Wars National Convention, August 14, 1962, Minneapolis, Minn.

I am very happy to be here in Minneapolis today—first to pay my respects to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in convention assembled, to your commander in chief, and to the distinguished members and visitors of the VFW.

I am, of course, tremendously proud—and truly grateful to the VFW for having accorded the Mutual Broadcasting System this honor. We of Mutual have consistently tried to program our service to the independent stations of America in such a way as to never leave in doubt our abiding faith in organizations such as the VFW and to support and to assist you wherever possible. We are quite proud that the major address of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, last evening, was broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System through the facilities of the Mutual affiliate for the Twin Cities, WPBC.

That you have chosen to give us this award and citation for our public service programing, and that the presentation was made here in Minneapolis is cause for genuine pleasure on our part. For it gives us an opportunity to share our acceptance this morning with our parent company—the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. of St. Paul. As a subsidiary of the 3M Co., we have been made conscious of the desire of our parent company that we constantly increase our public service programing, and maintain that open devotion to the same principles that have guided the VFW—the principles that have made our beloved country so great that it is today one of the last bulwarks in the defense of human freedoms, and the arsenal, breadbasket, and banker for so much of the world. That the parent company does take a very real interest in the public-service aspect of Mutual and today shares our pride in this award, is evidenced by the attendance at this session of your convention proceedings of a number of 3M executives, headed by two of our corporate vice presidents, Mr. Cy Pesek and Mr. C. C. March.

We are here, not alone to voice our thanks for the recognition you have given us, but to thank you for the courageous stand you have taken in matters affecting the defense of our country. The VFW has long been aware of—and in constant opposition to—the cynical swashbucklers who would bring us to our knees by force or by subversion. The VFW fearlessly and emphatically expresses principles and doctrines of national feeling concerning the philosophies and attitudes which shape the future for all of us. The collective voice of the VFW must be listened to in Washington and your fellow Americans owe you a vote of thanks for having voiced your sentiments in many areas and on certain issues which have helped in the formulation of national policy.

You have been unafraid to present your point of view. You have not been confused by obscure reasoning in the debates which swirl around us. Let me address myself at this moment to just one of these issues: The question of America supplying food to Communist China now that the planning of the Red dictatorship has failed miserably in agriculture and there is the threat of starvation facing the Communist masters.

There are those who are organizing to have this country send food to Red China, to bail out the Communist government. As in every previous instance, it is doubtful if America would be given credit, or if the food would ever reach the truly needy or, as in the past, would be used by the Reds to maintain their control. In a recent report on Communist China, the Agriculture Department reported, and I quote, "Another year of managerial bungling in agricultural production or widespread natural disasters, or some combination of these factors, could tax the current regime in the form of increased apathy and civil disobedience, perhaps to the point of political instability."

Thus, the question of whether to aid the Communist government by sending food to Red China is a question of whether we are in a cold war or not—and the VFW answers to the point and without obscuring the facts. Your national commander argues that Communist China is in trouble domestically because Mao Tse-tung and his ruthless regime place a higher priority on aggression against freedom than they do on feeding their own people. The United States should not bail Mao Tse-tung and his Red conspiracy out of the difficulty they have been responsible for creating for themselves. To do otherwise, would be like blinding ourselves to all of history's clear lessons. For history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier wars. History points to no single instance where the end has justified the means—where appeasement has led to more than a sham peace. Like blackmail, it lays the basis for new and successively greater demands, until, as in blackmail, violence becomes the only other alternative. And the VFW, composed of men who know and detest war for the scourge that it is, certainly has the respect of all peoples in standing guard over our heritage of American liberty.

One must never be confused—nor dissuaded from an honest pride in our way of life. It is personally distressing to me when I hear a spokesman for that strange group which will deride with arrogant language the warnings of the dedicated Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover. These are often the same people who speak of superpatriots, as though we should be self-conscious of our patriotism.

It is then, a great and refreshing experience to stand again amongst you—the men who know the horrors of war and who have forged your organization from the fires of combat into comradeship in peace.

If we are not to deteriorate in national purpose, if our national drive is not to vitiate, nor our enthusiasm rot, it will be due in large part to the initiative and enterprise of you—who, as a single voice may be but a cry in the wilderness, but with the volume of 1,300,000 voices you are heard throughout the world.

Again, may I express my deep appreciation, for our people of the Mutual Broadcasting System, and our parent company, the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., for this recognition by you of our public service programing and our editorial policies which proudly march in step with the patriotic principles and the philosophies of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SHOW MAGAZINE AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Show magazine upon its first anniversary. Its president, Huntington Hartford, and its publisher, Frank Gibney, have done an exceptional job.

Show magazine has been a force in bringing about a better understanding of the culture and arts of the United States and of the rest of the world. During its first year of publication it has covered such diverse and interesting subjects as Berlin, Toronto, London, Paris, Athens, and Japan; and in November it will make a presentation on South America. This will help in bringing about a better understanding among our own people of those in the rest of the world.

Obviously, we must know and appreciate each other much more—particularly in this hemisphere—if we are to survive this century. One way to achieve this understanding is through the cultural exchange of ideas, and not merely the ideas of the diplomats. As Show editorialized in April:

> The young and experimental must be given a chance. In Latin America, for example, students have a disproportionate amount of power. From the standpoint of our national interest, put in cold war terms, it is these young who must be reached, not their white-tie elders.

As I have pointed out in the recent past, the communications satellite system can be of great assistance in this program, if used properly. Show also has commented editorially upon this in its September issue:

The Time of Telstar

> The question of quality—and something more—arises also from the first appearance of Telstar. The world knows that TV programs can be instantly transmitted anywhere, from anywhere, given the proper technical equipment. There are now at least 72 nations and territories offering some form of television fare to their populations—and everyone else wants TV. Almost anyone—even, on occasion, chauvinists like the Russians and their earth-bound political satellites—would admit that local TV could stand improvement. (Indeed, a great if negative comfort for American critics of television is to visit Europe and watch some of the horrors perpetrated on the screen in the motherland of Western culture, or, worse yet, see the repeats of Revue Production's "Thrice Told Tales" from home.) And the new nations of Asia and Africa want TV badly, not only publicly as an educational medium, but frequently as a device (privately admitted) for giving their murmuring populations some fast distraction.
>
> The answer would seem to be simple; now that we have Telstar in the heavens, let's start up a worldwide TV network. The opportunities for so doing, and the need, are self-evident. The possibilities for using TV as a giant international channel of information and education are awesome. So is the urgency. Television is the great educational and entertainment medium of our time. It can influence for good or evil; and it would be criminal if the United States and the rest of the world's free nations did not set up some kind of workable international TV body, before the Russians and their friends turn one more invention to the base ends of the big lie.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMOUNT ALLOWABLE AS A DEDUCTION FOR MEDICAL AND OTHER EXPENSES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, am I correctly informed that the pending business is Calendar No. 2229, House bill 10117?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent to set aside temporarily H.R. 10117 and proceed to the consideration of House bill 10620, which is Calendar No. 2238.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, and so forth, expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, this bill relates to the limitations on deductible medical expenses. By existing law a taxpayer may deduct expenses—in excess of 3 percent, or 1 percent where applicable—up to $2,500 times the number of personal exemptions to which the taxpayer is entitled—except exemptions for blindness or old age. This is subject to a maximum limitation of, first, $5,000 if the taxpayer is single; or, second, $10,000 if the taxpayer files a joint return or is a head of household or a surviving spouse, or, third, $15,000 if the taxpayer or his spouse is age 65 and is disabled, or, fourth, $30,000 if the taxpayer and his spouse are age 65 or over and are disabled.

H.R. 10620 increases all of these limitations as follows: $2,500 would be increased to $5,000, $5,000 would be increased to $10,000, $10,000 would be increased to $20,000, $15,000 would be increased to $20,000, $30,000 would be increased to $40,000.

It was unanimously approved by the Finance Committee.

Mr. President, when H.R. 10117 was before the Senate, the following amendments were adopted:

First. Morse amendment relating to special stamp tax on liquor stores—text of H.R. 2016.

Second. Kerr amendment relating to preservation of net operating loss in cases involving income received under claim of right and later repaid.

Third. Talmadge amendment relating to search and seizure powers of criminal investigators of the Internal Revenue Service.

Fourth. Curtis amendment relating to import taxes on bunker fuel.

Fifth. Curtis amendment to permit annuity plans to include accident, health, sickness, and medical benefits.

Sixth. Miller amendment to permit mutual insurance companies to qualify as concentrated risk companies if 40 percent of their premium income is from certain risks insured in a 400-mile area.

Those amendments were adopted by the Senate.

I move that H.R. 10620 be amended by adding a new section embracing H.R. 10117 and the Senate amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Virginia a question, so that there may be full clarification? What the Senator from Virginia has done is to take the text of H.R. 10117, as it came from the Committee on Finance, without any floor amendments, and add it as an amendment to H.R. 10620.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Virginia has taken the six amendments to H.R. 10117, starting with the Morse amendment, and ending with the Miller amendment, and has added those as additional amendments to H.R. 10620. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those amendments were adopted previously to H.R. 10117. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So the text of H.R. 10117 would now be the text of the pending bill exclusive of the McCarthy unemployment amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. That still remains on the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the text of the amendment will remain as it was when we concluded business, but it would mean there would be included in the pending bill the substance of H.R. 10117 as it was reported by the committee, plus the six amendments, to which the Senator has referred, added to it as amendments to the pending bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. H.R. 10620. That is correct. I wanted a full clarification.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may we have action on the amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been agreed to.

The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, is the bill open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk; and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment may be dispensed with and that the amendment may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert: "That section 542(c)(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exception of small business investment companies from definition of personal holding company) is amended to read as follows:

" '(11) a small business investment company which is licensed by the Small Business Administration and operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and which is actively engaged in the business of providing funds to small business concerns under that Act in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Small Business Administration pursuant thereto. This paragraph shall not apply if any shareholder of the small business investment company owning, directly or indirectly (including, in the case of an individual, ownership by the members of his family as defined in section 544 (a)(2)), 10 percent or more of the outstanding stock of such small business investment company owns at any time during the taxable year, directly or indirectly (including, in the case of an individual, ownership by the members of his family as defined in section 544(a)(2)), a 10-percent or more proprietary interest in a small business concern to which funds are provided by the small business investment company or 10 percent or more in the value of the outstanding stock of such concern.'

"Sec. 2. Section 1243 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to losses of small business investment companies) is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 1243. LOSS OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY.

" '(a) General Rule.—In the case of a small business investment company operating under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, if—

" '(1) a loss is on equity securities (including stock received pursuant to an option or conversion or exchange privilege) acquired pursuant to section 304 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, and in accordance with regulations of the Small Business Administration prescribed under such section, and

" '(2) such loss would (but for this section) be a loss from the sale or exchange of a capital asset,

then such loss shall be treated as a loss from the sale or exchange of property which is not a capital asset.

" '(b) Special Rule for Determining Amount of Loss on Stock.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, for purposes of determining the amount of loss (if any) from the sale or exchange by a small business investment company of stock acquired by such company pursuant to section 304 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, and in accordance with regulations of the Small Business Administration prescribed under such section (including stock received pursuant to an option or conversion or exchange privilege), the basis of such stock shall be reduced (but not below zero) by an amount equal to the amount of any distribution received by such company with respect to such stock on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection, to the extent that any such distribution is made by the distributing corporation out of its earnings and profits accumulated prior to the date of the acquisition of such stock by such company.'

"SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the amendment has been gone over carefully, and has the approval of the Treasury Department. I move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Bureau of the Budget and a letter from the Treasury Department relating to the amendment.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1962.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of June 28, 1962, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 3481, a bill "to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies."

The Treasury Department, in a report being made to your committee on this bill, favors its enactment for the reasons stated therein.

The Bureau of the Budget concurs with the views contained in that report and is in favor of the enactment of S. 3481.

Sincerely yours,
PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 30, 1962.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the Treasury Department's views on S. 3481, entitled "A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies."

S. 3481 would amend two provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The first would amend section 542(c)(11)(C) to expand the so-called self-dealing limitation on the exclusion of a small business investment company from the definition of a personal holding company. The second would amend section 1243 to expand the types of securities eligible for ordinary loss treatment upon disposition by a small business investment company and would impose certain new restrictions to prevent tax avoidance.

Section 542(c)(11) of the code excludes a small business investment company from the definition of a personal holding company subject to certain restrictions. One of these restrictions is that no shareholder of the SBIC may own "directly or indirectly (including, in the case of an individual, ownership by the members of his family as defined in section 544(a)(2)) * * * 5 percentum or more in value of the outstanding stock of" a small business concern to which funds are provided by the investment company. Section 1 of the bill would amend this restriction in two respects. First, direct or indirect stock ownership in a small business concern by a shareholder of a SBIC would not be taken into account unless such shareholder owned directly or indirectly 10 percent or more of the outstanding stock of the SBIC. Existing law, which takes into account such stock ownership by a shareholder who owns any amount of stock in the SBIC, may be unduly burdensome and the Treasury Department has no objection to this proposed modification.

The second modification of the "self-dealing" restriction in section 542(c)(11) would be to increase from 5 percent to 10 percent the proprietary interest or stock ownership in a small business concern which would disqualify a SBIC from the exemption from the definition of a personal holding company. This liberalization in the self-dealing limitation has been prompted by the fact that the Internal Revenue Service interprets existing law as meaning that the shareholder of a SBIC "indirectly" owns stock of a small business concern which is directly owned by the SBIC. Thus, if an individual owns, for example, a 50-percent stock interest in a SBIC, he would be regarded by the Service as owning "indirectly" 60 percent of any stock held by the SBIC. In such a case, therefore, if the SBIC owned a 10-percent-or-more stock interest in a small business concern, the 50-percent owner of the SBIC would be regarded as owning 5 percent of such stock and the self-dealing restriction would be applicable. The proposed increase of the 5-percent limitation to 10 percent would, in such a case, permit the SBIC to hold up to a 20-percent stock interest in a small business concern.

The Service's interpretation of the "directly or indirectly" test of section 542(c)(11) is based upon the fact that "indirect" ownership of stock clearly requires attribution of ownership through corporations other than SBIC's, and there appears to be no basis in the statute or in the legislative history to make a distinction in the case of stock held by a SBIC.

Section 2 of the bill would amend section 1243 of the code which now provides that a loss sustained by a small business investment company "on convertible debentures (including stock received pursuant to the conversion privilege) acquired pursuant to section 304 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958" shall be treated as a loss from the sale or exchange of property which is not a capital asset. When section 1243 was first enacted, SBIC's were authorized to furnish equity capital only through the purchase of convertible debentures. However, Public Law 86–502, approved on June 11, 1960, extended the investment powers of SBIC's to include direct acquisitions of stock in accordance with regulations of the Small Business Administration. The Treasury Department believes that the proposed extension of ordinary loss treatment to all equity securities would be in accord with the policy now embodied in section 1243 of the code.

The bill would also add a new subsection (b) to section 1243 to provide that, in determining the amount of a loss from the sale or exchange by a SBIC of authorized stock, the basis of such stock shall be reduced to the extent of distributions received by the SBIC with respect to such stock, but only to the extent that such distribution is made by the distributing corporation out of its earnings and profits accumulated prior to the date of acquisition of stock by the SBIC. The purpose of this amendment is to correct a defect in existing law which, unless corrected, would be further aggravated by the proposed extension of ordinary loss treatment to all equity securities. Under existing law, a SBIC can withdraw dividends from a small business concern without paying any tax because it is entitled to a 100-percent dividends received deduction. If the SBIC later sells the stock of such small business concern at a loss, such loss may now be treated as an ordinary loss notwithstanding that the SBIC may have recovered a substantial portion of its investment through tax-free dividends. It would appear that the loss is completely an artificial loss to the extent it is attributable to the withdrawal of funds from the small business concern which were accumulated prior to the investment by the SBIC. The proposed amendment of section 1243 would correct this potential avenue of abuse.

In view of the foregoing, the Treasury Department has no objection to the enactment of S. 3481.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,
STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the amendment, as stated, is offered on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We believe it will be helpful to small business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It represents the thinking of the Select Committee on Small Business as a whole. We certainly believe it will be helpful to small business investment companies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator be willing to include in the RECORD the explanation of it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be glad to, and I ask unanimous consent to include that in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 1 deals with the personal holding company exemption presently allowed small business investment companies. Under present law a small business investment company loses its exemption if one of its shareholders own 5 percent or more of a small business concern aided by the small business investment company. Under the bill a small business investment company would lose the exemption if a shareholder owning 10 percent or more of the small business investment company also owned 10 percent or more of the small business. These are the percentages contained in the Small Business Administration regulations prohibiting self-dealing. This section merely brings the tax laws in this respect in line with the Small Business Administration regulations.

Section 2 corrects an oversight made in 1959. This section will allow small business investment companies to treat as an ordinary loss any losses on any equity securities.

Such treatment is presently afforded only to losses suffered on a convertible debenture or stock acquired under such a debenture. The Small Business Investment Act originally allowed small business investment companies to provide equity capital only through the use of a convertible debenture. When this was changed so as to allow the use of other forms of securities, the tax laws were not amended accordingly. The purpose of this section of the bill is merely to bring the tax laws in line with amendments made to the Small Business Investment Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join with the Senator in support of the amendment, because it is very much needed. I am very pleased it has been offered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 10620) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment to H.R. 10620 and ask a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Kerr, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Curtis conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 WITH RESPECT TO PLANS FOR CERTAIN MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is H.R. 10117, to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withhold my suggestion, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 WITH RESPECT TO LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT INCOME

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Finance Committee and the senior minority member of the committee a question, if I may, with respect to a House amendment to a bill which I understand will shortly be considered.

My reason for asking the question now is that the Senator from Mississippi has called a meeting of the Preparedness Subcommittee, which is a very important executive meeting, and I may have to attend soon. I think I can clear this question up now.

It is my understanding that an amendment will come to the Senate from the House on Calendar No. 2165, H.R. 6371, which concerns savings banks. It is an amendment to clear up an alleged error in the tax bill which was passed. It is my understanding that the error involves about $100 million.

There is a question in my mind in this regard, and I should like to ask if I am correctly informed that the Savings Bank League and the Federal Savings and Loan Association do not object to the amendment but believe a mistake was involved? They do not object to the passage of the amendment even though, as I understand the situation, it would cost the savings banks approximately $100 million?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I believe the Senator from Massachusetts is correct. I was informed by the Treasury Department that the error was called to the attention of the Treasury Department. The error was made. It was called to the Treasury Department's attention by the savings banks. There was an error in the writing of the bill as it passed the House. The language was not changed in the Senate. The error was made when the bill passed the House in that fashion.

I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that it is my understanding that what he has said is correct. The House amendment will come to the Senate from the House, to be added to a Senate bill later today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I speak as a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, representing a State which, with the exception of New York, has more mutual savings banks than any other State in the Union.

As I understand the amendment, it would prevent a savings bank from paying a dividend which it would ordinarily pay on December 31 of this year, with an allowance to put it over into calendar year 1963. If that were done, they could save taxes this year, because they would be taxed this year under the old system, and next year they would save taxes because they would pay five dividends instead of four in calendar year 1963.

I wish to make sure that the savings bank people do not object to the procedure suggested.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think it has been recognized for some days that an error was made. No protest has come to me as chairman of the Finance Committee with respect to the correction of the error which was made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator gives me that assurance, I shall not object to the passage of the amendment. I merely wish to make sure that the savings banks are protected.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. So far as I know, the Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me I should like to join the chairman of the committee in stating that as we understand it, this is to be the correction of an error which has just been discovered in the recently enacted tax bill, the purpose of which amendment is to carry out the intent of the original bill. I am reasonably certain that the savings banks would prefer that the error not be corrected, because in that event their taxes would be $100 million less next year than they will be if we correct the error in the bill.

As the chairman of the committee pointed out, there was an error in the bill passed by the House. It was passed by the House since the language was insisted upon by the administration. I referred to it yesterday as another "blooper" which we are now asked to correct as a result of hasty consideration of major legislation in closing days of the session.

I noticed in the newspapers last night that a Treasury Department official was referring to this action as the closing of a $100 million loophole. This will not be the closing of a loophole. The loophole will not exist until the President signs the new tax bill, which is as yet not signed. Let us be frank. We have been asked to correct an error, or a "blooper." I think we should do it; I am in favor of a correction. But let us admit that it is an error and that we are not closing some loophole. Let us not make great heroes of those downtown for correcting what in reality was a stupid mistake.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the two Senators who serve on the Finance Committee that it was my original understanding that the savings bank people, although they did not like the new tax bill because it would increase their taxes, believed as a whole it was not a bill they should oppose, and they did not oppose it. Now a question arises as to the $100 million error, or whatever it may be called, and it is my understanding they still do not oppose the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding; the amendment would merely carry out what they thought was being done in the first place.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Delaware. I thank the senior Senator from Virginia. I thank the acting majority leader for permitting me to ask these questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAIRPLAY FOR UNION CONTRACTORS—A RECOMMENDATION OF 81ST CONGRESS BECOMES LAW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on August 13 of this year, President Kennedy signed into law the Work Hours Standards Act of 1962, which provides for the payment of overtime at time and a half after 40 hours, on federally assisted construction projects.

President Kennedy, at the signing of the Work Hours Standards Act of 1962, pointed out that the new act coordinates the conflicting provision of the former statutes and established a 40-hour workweek standard long prevalent in private industry. Workers, employees, and Government officials will benefit greatly from this equitable and modern law providing a straight-time 8-hour day and 40-hour week to Federal contract and federally assisted work. It represents progress long overdue. I am gratified that the Congress has acted, and that this action will result in greater efficiency in work for the Government and in greater security for the workers involved.

The President indicated those sentiments in his message about the bill when he signed it.

Mr. President, I would like the record to show that the groundwork for the enactment of this legislation was undertaken by the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor Management of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 81st Congress, of which I was chairman, and that the complete case history as related to the enactment of this law was set forth in a report entitled "Labor-Management Relations in Federal Projects Involving the Davis-Bacon Act."

This report has been vindicated. On page 90, recommendation No. 12 states:

> Congress should give consideration to the enactment of a 5-day, 40-hour week, Monday through Friday, inclusive, where Federal construction is involved. This should constitute the workweek. At present, there is no legislation on number of days in week an individual may work on Federal projects just so long as he does not work over 8 hours in any one day. If he works over 8 hours he receives time and one-half.

I want the record to show that since 1952 on the strength of that recommendation I have introduced a bill to achieve this objective in every session of the Senate.

I am pleased and happy that Congress and the Executive have enacted this needed legislation into law after 10 years of persistent effort to attain this objective.

This is set forth, Mr. President, because many times with the enactment of a piece of legislation the struggle and the work that has gone into the making of this legislation is completely lost sight of.

Sometimes I think it is well for the public to know that it takes many years to process needed legislation. There is a good deal of public education that is required and a good deal of hard legislative work in the respective Houses of Congress.

I want to commend Mr. Ray R. Murdock who was counsel of the subcommittee under whose guidance these case histories were undertaken and compiled which showed the factual need for this legislation. I want to say a few words in recognition of the outstanding contribution which was rendered by Mr. Alexander K. Christie, economist and consultant to the subcommittee, who undertook these on-the-spot investigations setting forth the evaluation and recommendation as embodied in the report.

This report has rendered an outstanding contribution in this difficult field of labor-management relations involving the Federal Government.

I hope that in the next session of Congress the chairmen of the respective committees may be so guided, and that these recommendations may be introduced in the form of bills, and that appropriate committee action and final congressional action may be taken to carry out the recommendations that have been before us for almost 10 years.

I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the magazine of the AFL-CIO, entitled "Fairplay for Union Contractors," may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> FAIRPLAY FOR UNION CONTRACTORS
>
> Payment of overtime at a minimum of time and a half after 40 hours—in addition to after 8 hours in any day—on new Federal contract and federally assisted construction projects will be obligatory for all contractors starting the middle of October.
>
> President Kennedy signed the new Work Hours Standards Act of 1962 into law on August 13 in the presence of Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg; C. J. Haggerty, president of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL-CIO; and Frank Bonadio, secretary-treasurer of the Building and Construction Trades Department.
>
> Passage of this legislation plugs the gaps in both the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage law and in a series of so-called 8-hour laws which date back to 1892.
>
> Under these laws, Government contractors were able to work employees 7 days a week, up to 56 hours, at straight-time rates, as long as they didn't work over 8 hours a day. This gave nonunion contractors a significant advantage over union contractors paying standard overtime rates.
>
> The importance of the new law also lies in the fact that it broadens the coverage of the older laws by applying it to all federally assisted construction projects in addition to the usual direct Government construction.
>
> According to a statement by President Kennedy at the time of the signing of the Work Hours Standards Act of 1962, "The new act coordinates the conflicting provision of the former statutes and establishes a 40-hour workweek standard—long prevalent in private industry. The coverage of the former statutes has been extended * * * to include federally assisted construction activity.
>
> "Workers, employers, and Government officials will benefit greatly from this equitable and modern law providing a straight-time 8-hour day and 40-hour week to Federal contract and federally assisted work. It represents progress long overdue.
>
> "I am gratified that the Congress has acted, and that this action will result in greater efficiency in work for the Government, and in greater security for the workers involved."

FARM OPPOSITION TO MANDATORY CONTROLS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it was with great reluctance that I opposed the administration's farm proposals, which I did in committee and on the floor of the Senate. I only did this because I am sure that it is a great mistake for Congress to force mandatory controls on the feed grain farmers, particularly the dairy farmers, who feed all the feed grain they grow to their cows.

Mr. Samuel Lubell is one of the country's outstanding pollsters, and is certainly recognized as one of the most distinguished men in the field. His article on this subject, which appears in the Washington Daily News of today, is entitled "Farm Discontent Is Starting to Swing Against the Dems." I quote from the article:

> On several occasions President Kennedy has complained about Congress not giving him what he wants.
>
> But at least as far as farm legislation is concerned, Mr. Kennedy has been politically lucky in not getting what he asked for.
>
> Early this year the President sent Congress an omnibus farm bill which would have imposed compulsory quotas on all dairy producers and acreage cuts on all farmers raising corn and other feed grains.
>
> If Mr. Kennedy had been given what he wanted, my interviews in seven farm States indicate, the Farm Belt today would be in violent political revolt.

The article emphasizes what I have maintained, namely that any feed grain program including a referendum on controls for dairy farmers is heading for trouble. Farmers who feed everything they grow on the farms are very much opposed to voting in favor of mandatory controls. Of course the way the referendum must be set up, if farmers vote "no"—and I am convinced that more than one-third would be likely to vote "no"—the result: no limitations, unlimited productions, depression farm prices, immense dairy surpluses, in a word: chaos.

I quote another paragraph from the article:

> In Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota the most bitter opposition to Government controls comes from farmers who say, "I feed every kernel of corn that I raise to my own livestock. We don't need a program."

Mr. President, this is the way many farmers would vote. The result would be farm disaster. It would be a mess, which would take years to clean up, at great cost.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMER DISCONTENT IS STARTING TO SWING AGAINST THE DEMOCRATS

(By Samuel Lubell)

On several occasions President Kennedy has complained about Congress not giving him what he wants.

But at least as far as farm legislation is concerned, Mr. Kennedy has been politically lucky in not getting what he asked for.

Early this year the President sent Congress an omnibus farm bill which would have imposed compulsory quotas on all dairy producers and acreage cuts on all farmers raising corn and other feed grains.

If Mr. Kennedy had been given what he wanted, my interviews in seven farm States indicate, the Farm Belt today would be in violent political revolt.

However, the farm legislation which Congress finally approved in September has pacified many farmers with a generous boost in next year's subsidy payments. Still, in 15 or 17 farm counties that I visited, I found farmers turning toward the Republicans in protest that "a man ought to keep his freedom."

"Ezra Benson made a Democrat out of me," recalled one 52-year-old farmer in Buena Vista County, Iowa, "but Kennedy is turning me back into a Republican. I'm against compulsory controls."

In Minnesota's new Sixth Congressional District even farmers' union members—ordinarily ardent Democrats—talked of voting Republican—for Congress. Their common lament ran, "Small farmers like us have to use every bit of land we have. We can't leave anything idle."

TELLS STORY

This resistance to compulsory controls also tells much of the story of the recent holdback "strike" put on by the National Farmers Organization. In five counties I drove into every farmyard where I saw an NFO placard. These NFO farmers turned out to be neither predominantly Democratic nor Republican; neither big farmers nor small ones.

The one bond they shared was the fear voiced by a southern Illinois farmer, "If we don't find a way of managing our own production, the Government will come in and tell us all what to plant and what we can't plant."

The Farm Belt swing toward the Republicans does not seem big enough to rout the Democrats. Actually neither party can be said to hold a clear dominance.

Many farmers contend, "the only way to control production is to make everyone cut his acreage." Actually, with prevailing hog prices and price supports, only farmers who suffered poor crops are not better off than a year ago. One Iowa farmer, pointing to cornstalks 7 feet high in his field, grumbled, "the crops are too good. It will just add to the surplus."

MUCH AT STAKE

As I talked to these farmers I came to feel that much more than an ordinary election is at stake in this year's voting.

The election could mean that, as some farmers say, "no one can solve the farm problem" and whichever party holds the office of Secretary of Agriculture loses farm votes. After Dwight D. Eisenhower became President, a steady Republican erosion set in which cost the GOP 15 congressional seats before it was halted in 1960.

This election may show that the pendulum of farmer discontent has begun to swing against the Democrats.

But it is also possible that the November balloting will go down in history as part of "a last stand" fight against virtually complete Government management of agriculture. At present the corn program is voluntary—farmers can cut their acreage in return for higher price supports or stay out of the program as they wish.

But the Kennedy administration is on notice that it will ask the next Congress for corn controls, similar to the quotas now in force for cotton, wheat, and tobacco.

THE THINKING

This question of whether to accept controls dominates the current thinking of farmers. I asked each farmer I talked with this question: "What if it came to this showdown choice: on one side you could pick no controls and no price supports, on the other side you would get price supports but would have to take compulsory controls. Which would you pick?"

Those who favored the Democrats were 15 to 1 in favor of controls.

Republican-inclined farmers stood 8 to 1 against controls.

The farmers who were undecided how to vote in November divided 3 to 1 against controls.

SHARP CONFLICT

Through Minnesota and the southern counties of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio I found the sharpest conflict among the smaller farmers. "We need price supports to survive," they would argue. "But cutting our acreage will drive us out. The big fellow can rent more land. We can't."

In Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota the most bitter opposition to Government controls comes from farmers who say, "I feed every kernel of corn that I raise to my own livestock. We don't need a program."

To weaken this resistance among livestock growers, next year's program will offer a brandnew subsidy payment of 18 cents a bushel for corn that is fed to livestock.

Whether this new gift from the Magi will halt the shift to the Republicans in November is still not clear.

SALARY INCREASES FOR TEACHERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these days, when we become accustomed to bad news with regard to the legislative process in Congress, particularly with regard to working out conference reports with the House, I am pleased to give the Senate a little good news.

One conference which has just been completed has kept faith with the conference procedure. Before I announce the results of the conference, let me say that the conference procedure was based upon a conscionable compromise. It was not based upon adamancy on the part of either House. It certainly was never contemplated historically that the conference procedure, involving many subjects, for example, was one that would justify a demand on the part of the House to turn the Senate into a House of Lords, with our voice being an advisory voice. Probably there will be more discussion of this basic legislative principle later in the week.

I point out that the conference which was held by members of the Senate District of Columbia Committee and members of the House District of Columbia Committee with respect to the teachers' pay adjustment bill, raising salaries for the teachers in the District of Columbia, carried out, in my judgment, and I am sure in the judgment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] also, the historic purpose and function of the conference procedure. I am happy to report that in the past 15 minutes the House conferees and the Senate conferees agreed on a conference report on the teachers' pay-bill.

There was a difference in the two bills with respect to the pay increase. The Senate bill called for a 14-percent increase, and the House bill called for a 10-percent increase. The Senate conferees receded and agreed to the 10-percent increase as provided in the House bill.

That does not mean that we felt that the teachers should not have a raise of 14 percent. It does mean that the Senate conferees carried out the obligation that rests upon all conferees of both Houses; namely, to seek a conscionable compromise. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will agree that this was a conscionable compromise when I point out that the second great difference between the House and the Senate bills was with regard to the classification of principals and assistant principals.

We have been following a policy of differences in the salaries of principals in the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Superintendent Hanson, the District School Board and other educators, in their testimony before the Senate District of Columbia Committee, convinced each member of the committee that there should be what is called a single classification for principals and assistant principals. We presented that point of view of the Senate to the House conferees. We pointed out that it would cost more money, but that it would result in a much sounder educational policy for the District of Columbia.

As I said good naturedly in conference, with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] sitting at my right, and Representative BROYHILL, of Virginia, sitting on my left, I wanted to help Superintendent Hansen, because without this educational procedural reform, for which he had asked, he would be placed at a great disadvantage in competing for principals and teachers with the States of Maryland and Virginia.

The result of our discussion was that the House receded on the classification matter involving principals and assistant principals. As a result there will be a single pay salary procedure for principals and assistant principals.

There was a dispute over an increase in the salary for the Superintendent of Schools. The House figure was $19,000, and the Senate figure was $25,000. The $25,000 figure would still leave Washington, D.C., below any salary scale for school superintendents, in comparison with many cities of comparable size in this country. The Senator from Maryland and I took the position—and I spoke also for the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] whose proxy I held—that we did not think the salary bill should be lost in conference over any dispute with regard to the superintendent's salary.

Although $19,000 is certainly not enough, we were satisfied that Dr. Hansen, who in my opinion is one of the most able and competent superintendents in the United States, would not want us to sacrifice the long overdue salary increase for teachers in the District because of any dispute involving an increase in his own salary.

Furthermore, the conferees were confronted with a proposal of the chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee, Representative McMILLAN, who could not be with us. Representative McMILLAN offered his proposal in the form of a bill, H.R. 13375.

On a motion, agreed to by the Senator from Maryland, we moved that Representative DOWDY be chairman of the conference.

He did a very able job in conference.

Representative DOWDY, chairman of the conference, pointed out to us that Representative McMILLAN has introduced a bill, H.R. 13375, which would raise the salary of the Superintendent of Schools, and also the salaries of the District Commissioners. He explained that there was a feeling in the House that the salary of the Superintendent of Schools should not be higher than the salaries of the Commissioners. That was one of the realities which confronted us. Representative DOWDY said he did not know whether that bill could be passed before Congress adjourned because it would require unanimous consent. But he said that if it was not passed before Congress adjourned, Representative McMILLAN had made clear that it would be introduced next January.

I suggested that if it were introduced in January, we should endeavor to make the increase retroactive both for the Commissioners, the Superintendent of Schools, and the Assistant Superintendent of Schools to the effective date of the salary increase bill for teachers. So the Senate conferees receded on the question of the salary of the School Superintendent and Assistant School Superintendent.

One major difference remained, and that was with respect to the so-called class 15 and class 14 salary differentials. The Senate conferees had taken the position that certain counselors and others who had been moved into class 14 under the House bill violated the single salary principle which must be maintained to encourage teachers to remain in the instructional field. I am happy to report that the Senate conferees were successful in maintaining the Senate position on the matter. The House proposed to drop those persons to class 14. We prevailed as to leaving them in class 15, although that leaves no one at the present time who is drawing a salary in class 14; but it is left to the school administrators to have class 14 available to them in the future, in case it is decided that there are some persons who ought to be promoted to class 14.

That resolved our differences. The staffs of the two committees are at work in making the necessary technical corrections. The conference papers have been signed. The House report should be available for consideration tomorrow morning.

I commend Representative DOWDY for the leadership he gave to the conference.

I commend my colleague of long standing on the Committee of the District of Columbia, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. I suppose we are the two veterans on that committee. He was of great assistance to me in arriving at the compromise.

To give some idea of the friendly spirit which existed, one of the House conferees said he was a little surprised that I made my motion for a compromise quite so soon. I told him that was the finest compliment that had been paid me in connection with conferences in 18 years. But I thought it was a relatively fair compromise, and following a discussion the compromise was adopted, after the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] made what I thought was a most able argument in support of the proposal which I made in order to reach agreement on the teachers' pay bill.

I have made the explanation of the conference report today, because I understand time is available now, while tomorrow time may be at a premium. I wanted to explain the report and have my statement about it appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today.

I am very happy to report that now there will be a teachers' pay bill at this session, subject, of course, always to the possibility of a slip between cup and lip. But the House conferees assured me that they had every reason to believe the conference report would be adopted by the House tomorrow without any problem.

As soon as the House acts tomorrow on the teachers' pay bill, I shall move the acceptance of the House amendments to the firemen's and policemen's pay bill. After consultation with the leaders, I shall wait to handle both pay matters one after the other tomorrow.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I congratulate and thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his cooperative spirit and the effective way in which he helped the conferees arrive at a compromise. A conference means just what the word implies—a meeting of the minds, in which differences in two pieces of proposed legislation are compromised.

The Senator from Oregon and I were agreed that we were correct in asking for a 14-percent increase in teachers' pay. But we also felt that it was most important to maintain the provision of the Senate bill (S. 1447) which provides for a single salary scale for all principals and assistant principals in the District of Columbia school system. I believe that this was the reason why the Senator from Oregon suggested that we yield to the House on the percentage of the pay increase.

We were confronted with an unusual problem with respect to the pay of the District of Columbia Superintendent of Schools. We believe that he is underpaid, when his salary is compared with salaries paid superintendents of schools in other cities. However, we know that legislation has been introduced in the House to provide for an increase in the salaries of the District Commissioners and the Superintendent of Schools. Of course, this bill in all probability will not be enacted in the closing days of this Congress, but the chairman of the House committee assures us that it will be introduced in the next session of Congress. We, therefore, felt justified in yielding to the House conferees on the question of the Superintendent's salary.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I not still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I have yielded to the Senator from Maryland. When the Senator from Maryland has finished his remarks, I shall yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, we believe that the provision which retains a single salary scale for all teachers and certain counselors and psychologists is of great importance. We were quite fortunate in keeping it in the bill. I think the Senator from Oregon has rendered a fine service.

While we did not get everything we sought, we have a bill which should be acceptable to almost everyone. But, as is true of all legislation, everyone will not like it.

I again thank the Senator from Oregon for his fine cooperation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Maryland upon the excellent adjustment in promotions made in the conference report on this important piece of proposed legislation for the District of Columbia.

I am familiar with its details, and I think it is an excellent solution of a most difficult problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Minnesota.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOWDY, Mr. WHITENER, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. BROYHILL, and Mr. HARSHA were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 831) as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Joint Resolution 234, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year 1963, in the opinion of the House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution and is an infringement of the privileges of this House, and that the said joint resolution be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Jones of Alabama, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Cramer, and Mr. Baldwin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30, 44, 46, and 48, to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 20, 27, and 33, to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8355) to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 7283. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses;

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles;

H.R. 10650. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1963

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. What disposition is usually made of documents such as the remarkable one which the Senate has just received from the other body?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The custom is to leave such documents at the desk of the Presiding Officer; and the Senate can take whatever action it may see fit to take.

Mr. RUSSELL. It will lie on the desk of the Presiding Officer?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well, Mr. President. I suppose that is about as good a disposition as could be made of it at this time. I can think of a somewhat better depository than the desk of the Presiding Officer, but I shall not mention that at this time.

But later—perhaps by the first of next week—I probably will have a resolution to submit with respect to that document.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator from Georgia to say the first of next week, or the first of next month?

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope to start this constitutional debate by the first of next week, but I think it will require some time to conclude it. At the least, it will have to last until we can prevail upon our colleagues in the other body to read the clear language of the Constitution of the United States. When and if we can induce them to read the language of the Constitution, I think we might be able to solve the issue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Georgia was in the Chamber when I referred to the problem involved in this case—namely, the effort of the House to turn the Senate into an American House of Lords. I want the Senator from Georgia to know that I stand shoulder to shoulder with him in his endeavor to maintain the constitutional rights of the Senate. Although I am eager to go home, for obvious reasons, there is no greater service I could render my constituents than to remain here—although we might take a holiday on election day—until Christmas, if necessary, in order to protect the constitutional rights of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Let me say that in connection with this matter, the Senate has carried good nature to an extreme, in the desire of Senators to return to their respective homes; and the other body has not hesitated from time to time, to play upon that desire, and to take advantage of the very natural desire on the part of the Members of the Senate, as well as our willingness to placate the other body and to tolerate their whims and fancies and fantastic interpretations of the Constitution of the United States. But I think the time has about come when the Senate should—if it expects to be a coequal body—make up its mind to stay here until this question can be settled.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that once, when I was dean of the University of Oregon Law School, the legal education committee of the State bar recommended that our law school include in the curriculum an advanced course on constitutional law. It was called the course on legislation. I taught it for many years.

In that course, I taught a straight constitutional lesson in regard to the format of our system of government, with its three coordinate, equal branches. That course was taught on the basis of a group of cases known to all law students who have taken the standard course on legislation as the group of cases which involves the matter of the rights and duties of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. It covered the great difference between the House of Commons and the House of Lords, under the British parliamentary system, and the great superiority of the system of checks and balances of our constitutional form of government, by reason of having two coequal and coordinate branches of the Government in our legislative branch.

I want my friend the Senator from Georgia to know that I never knowingly have walked out on any of my teachings, and at this time I do not intend to walk out on this great constitutional issue.

All I can wish for the Senator from Georgia is stamina, which he possesses in abundance, and determination—and I have never known his determination to weaken. I do not need to wish him well in regard to the presentation of his arguments, because the brilliance of his mind will take care of that.

I am a private in his ranks; he is my constitutional general, and he can call upon me to fire whatever ammunition he puts in my possession.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will permit, insofar as it is within my power, I shall be glad to make the distinguished Senator from Oregon a five-star general in this contest, because he has the advantage of having taught the course in constitutional law over so long a period of years. It is unfortunate that some persons—whom I shall not name—did not have an opportunity to sit at the feet of the Senator from Oregon, because if they had, they might have learned what the Constitution is, and they might have some idea of what it contains.

The only thing I ask of the Senator from Oregon is that he refresh himself from his notes in connection with his lectures, and be prepared to enter in the records of Congress his views on this subject, in order that future generations may not be as misguided as some of the present generation appear to be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the willingness of the Senator from Georgia to seek to supply me with students. But our institution had very

strict qualifications for admission to the law school.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then I shall have to modify my statement.

THE O. & C. LANDS—THEIR HISTORY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on August 28, ex-Governor Sprague, of Oregon, who has long been chairman of the O. & C. Advisory Board, made a major speech at a banquet commemorating the 25th anniversary of the passage of this legislation, which created sustained yield management for these Federal forest lands.

Ex-Governor Sprague made an excellent speech. He went back into the history and set forth the attitude and thoughts of people in the early days following the revestment of these lands from the railroad; and then he brought these thoughts forward, and expertly noted the shifts in public attitude. For example, at one stage of events, the call was to place these lands in agricultural use. Only a few persons pointed out that these lands were not suited to agriculture. Others expressed strong opposition to any further increase in the national forests. Times changed, and events which caused a substantial revision of thinking took place.

It was particularly appropriate therefore, at this juncture in time, for Governor Sprague to make the speech he did. The issues are now somewhat different in setting and dimension, but the problems confronting Oregon on the use of private and public timber lands remain large and challenging.

Governor Sprague has done more than discuss the history of O. & C. lands. He has discussed the framework within which conservation policy is made. Therefore, I commend his speech, not only to the lumber industry and to conservationists, but also to all within the State, and specifically to those in high schools and colleges.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Sprague's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY GOVERNOR SPRAGUE AT THE O. & C. ADVISORY BOARD BANQUET ON AUGUST 28, 1962, SALEM, OREG.

Thank you, Mr. Toastmaster, and distinguished guests here at the head table, members of the O. & C. staff, Bureau of Land Management, and representatives from the county courts and county commissions, and guests.

Well, this is certainly an auspicious occasion, that on this 25th anniversary we can assemble and meet in such amity and accord in considering a field which has been fraught with controversy and debate over a long period of time. This happy occasion is not an accident by any means. It's the fruit of labors of many, many people—labors that began, 'way, 'way back, and they have been continued through the years. You have had a very thorough course in the history of the O. & C. lands and their revestment in the address which Dave Mason gave today. It's a very comprehensive, compact statement of the history and, as he said, there is a great deal more than he was able to get in in one afternoon's paper.

I do think that on this occasion it would be a good thing for us to mention the names of some of those who have been conspicuous in this work. As we lok back at 1937, Senator McNary and Congressman Mott were very active in obtaining the passage of this act, which is the basic act at the present time; and Guy Cordon as the attorney for the Association of O. & C. Counties spent a great deal of time in Washington trying to get through this progressive legislation. Also, back at that time were County Judge Earl Day of Jackson County and Victor Moses who had been county judge of Benton County.

As you go back to 1926 when the Stanfield Act was passed, which was an effort to shake loose some money from the Treasury after the funds had dried up under the Chamberlain-Ferris Act, Stanfield was the U.S. Senator and the act bears his name. Willis C. Hawley was the Congressman from the First District and he was active in the House in that matter. But all through the years there has been a continuing contribution by the county courts—I can't begin to list all of the county judges and commissioners who have had a hand in prodding the Government for action, making trips to Washington and all of that; and they now have some very tangible rewards.

The present county courts and commissions owe a great deal to their predecessors in office. Then, as has been mentioned, we have been fortunate in the leadership of the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon, or its predecessor before it was the Bureau. Mention was made this afternoon of that very able and fine person, Walter Horning, who devoted so much of his life to this great undertaking, both in the field here and later when he was transferred to Washington. It is a matter of very great regret to those of us who knew him that his retirement was cut short by death before he had the chance really to complete the wrap-up of the history of this great cause. Then we had Dan Goldy, who was described by Mr. Landstrom today as something of an innovator. Indeed he was, he rattled the dry bones, no doubt about it. And while some said he was not so much of an executive, he certainly was bristling with ideas. And I think we must give Dan Goldy and Netzorg, his solicitor, the credit for driving through the reciprocal road agreement regulations which have unlocked these checkerboarded areas for open competitive bidding. That work also had considerable help from the advisory board and we had a committee of which Frank Sever was the chairman, and it worked very, very hard with the staff to develop these road regulations. It is a matter, I think, of pride to those of us who have been on the advisory board that this was worked out with the cooperation of the board and worked out so that it has been very successful.

Now I want to run down—it will be partly repetitive of what Dave said today but there are others here who were not here this afternoon. I will mention some of the achievements under BLM management. There is the access roads, first by appropriation and we had to fight to get appropriations from Congress, and later by the counties' willingness to divert the 25 percent to which they had become entitled in this road work. Later, of course, they added to that reforestation, and now recreation, so that that 25 percent is proving a very, very valuable fund as it is expended, under authority of Congress, by BLM.

Another thing I think that we perhaps had a hand in is the improvement in legislation for fire protection that followed the 1951 fires. There was quite a controversy in the advisory board over operation, particularly on the Vincent Creek fire down on the coast, and while those who were responsible had vigorous defense, nevertheless the next legislature strengthened greatly the fire prevention legislation and it has been very effective and very valuable for the protection of not only BLM land but other lands which are under the State forest department and the fire patrol associations.

Then there is another matter that has been accomplished—the settlement of the controverted lands issue. That inheritance from the past where some of the lands to which the railroad had claim were locked into the Federal forests and managed by the Forest Service, but that was finally settled by legislation with a hand by Lafferty and the courts. And then there followed the exchange between the BLM and the Forest Service of some of those marginal lands.

We had, particularly under Roscoe Bell, aggressive action on salvage sales after the big blowdown of 1951. Those of you who were connected with us back in 1948 will recall the great hearing in Eugene over the sustained unit proposals for the Fischer Bros. at Marcola. That was a battle royal between those who favored that system of cooperative sustained units and those who condemned the chosen instrument policy. The funny thing was that Girard Davidson, who was then the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, sustained the policy of the cooperative sustained yield. What he said as far as the Fischer Bros.' project was concerned, they would have to work the agreement over. They didn't agree on the agreement and Fischer Bros. later sold out. There has never been a proposal for a cooperative sustained yield unit since. Whether that is good or bad would still be a subject, I suppose, of controversy. Dave Mason referred to it some in his paper today.

Then there was something else that was accomplished just a few years ago which I believe loosened up the marketing of O. & C. timber, and that was the dropping of the master unit. You may recall that the sale for primary processing was limited to the master unit. That served to nail down the trees to the area in which they were grown. Well, more enlightened policy, I believe, prevailed and after a period of hearings and consideration, that policy was dropped and now timber goes to the best market.

I can mention also the improvement in inventory which has been accomplished, part of the fruits of which we had reported to us today, with the increase in allowable annual cut, although it was not attributed to any revision of inventory but rather to fresh studies.

I would mention also the great improvement in organization and in management policies. As I look back at the staff which they had in 1948, the meager staff facing this scattered area of over 2 million acres, all across Oregon, and how they were trying to get organized, with the people clamoring for timber and all of that, and then note the improvement that has followed through the years; the development of the staff—the growing experience of the staff members—the greater confidence that they had in administering the law—and the greater confidence that buyers of timber and the public had in the staff—I think that that is one of the reasons why the authorities in Washington praised the administration of O. & C. lands.

I think we should mention some of those. I mentioned Horning; and there were Dan Goldy and Roscoe Bell, who, by the way, is now land commissioner up in Alaska where he has millions more acres to administer than he ever had here in Oregon; and Jim Doyle who has been transferred back to Washington, and now Russ Getty, and of course Travis Tyrrell who has been a stalwart through the years, especially in the fields of forestry and range management. Then we have had some good members of the advisory board, believe it or not. Frank Sever is here, he was long a representative of the counties. Dave Mason has been a member since the beginning of time as far as the board is concerned; Roy Morse from over at Longview, representing the Long-Bell people; the late Stuart Moir, a fine, fine forester; the late Floyd Hart of Medford; Loran Stewart from Cottage Grove; and we have had also representation from State agencies like the State forester and the mining director, and others. I don't pretend that this list by any means covers those who deserve credit for the considerable achievement under this administration.

Now, don't be alarmed, but I want to show you this. [A bound-volume edition.] This is not my speech, so you can compose your worries. I am going to take you back into ancient history. This is a very remarkable document from the State library. I don't know whether there is another like it anywhere, but there may be in the Portland public library. It reports a conference that I had never heard about before. These are the official proceedings of the O. & C. railroad land-grant conference which was held in Salem in September of 1915. You may recall that the Supreme Court issued in its decision in this case, it was not too sharp a decision as far as the public was to know what to do, or the railroad or other officials. It sort of kicked it back to Congress to do something, and it gave Congress, I think, about 6 months. That decision came down in June. The conference was held in September. Now this was a blue ribbon conference. I have gone over the list of names, and I doubt if ever in the history of Oregon, perhaps since the original constitutional convention in 1857, there was as distinguished a group of leaders who assembled to consider a public question. It was called by Governor Withycombe at the request or suggestion of C. C. Colt, then president of the Portland Chamber of Commerce. Those who were invited included all the congressional delegation, all the members of the legislative assembly, Federal officials in Washington dealing with public resources, all the elected State officials, 5 from each of the O. & C. counties and 1 from the non-O. & C. counties, 10 from organized labor and 10 from the Grange, 10 from the Farmers Union, 3 from the Oregon Development League, Bankers Association, the State press, and 3 from several other organizations. The list of names really is formidable. Maybe I could mention some of them which I know would be familiar to you. Congressman Hawley and Pat McArthur were here, and Congressman Johnson came over from the State of Washington. Sam Garland, of Lebanon; A. M. La Follette, senator from this county; Cusick, of Albany; I. N. Day, State senator from Portland; Robert S. Farrell, of Portland; Dan Kellaher, of Portland; Gus Moser, State senator—those were in the State senate—and William Strayer, of Baker—Strayer wasn't here, he was invited but didn't attend—and a great many others. As I have looked over the list of those invited the only two whom I identify as still living are A. W. Lafferty who attended and William G. Hare, of Hillsboro, who did not. There may be others, but those are the only two whom I recognize.

As I said, the call was issued by Governor Withycombe and he made the initial speech. It was short, and this is what he said:

"We want farmers to be producing prosperity for themselves and for the State on these lands. We want them to be opened up to settlers, development and taxation."

Now that really struck the keynote of this convention. In here I find also a quotation from an Oregonian editorial of the time. "The main interest to the State is the settlement and development of the land." One of the first speakers was Senator Louis Bean from Lane County, and I will just read a condensation of what he had to say: "Our purpose and object is, and our belief is, that the right thing to do is to put them—that's the lands—on the market and to put them into private ownership and let them be settled. We want no more forest reserve at all. We have enough."

Then there were others that I might read from that I think would be of some interest. This is from Os West, who was ex-Governor at that time. He gave quite a long speech and he followed P. F. Dunn, the attorney for the Southern Pacific—Dunn, by the way, was all for harmonizing the thing. He said: "Let us meet like two gentlemen who are both interested in the welfare of this State and let's see if we cannot arrive at some adjustment which the railroad company and the State will consent, and upon which the equity and welfare of all parties may be consulted and conserved." Well, Os West followed him and Os didn't treat his comments with very great consideration. But I will summarize or quote now from what Os West had to say:

"As I view it, any suggested policy should provide for the early classification of the lands, for the opening to entry of every acre of land suitable for settlement, for the early opening to development of all mineral resources, for the sale of all merchantable timber in appropriate sized tracts to the highest bidder, giving a reasonable time for removal, thus adding to the taxable property on our rolls, for the payment of the claims of the several land-grant counties for taxes due and unpaid, and for turning over to our State school fund all unexpended revenues derived from timber sales that we may have ample funds to develop our irrigation projects (that was one of his hobbies) and assist our small farmers and struggling settlers throughout the State with needed loans at low rates of interest. I deem it good business and for our best interest that the State offer to take over the grants and reimburse the railroad companies."

He felt that cutover tracts suitable for farming should be open to settlement and other timberland should be held for reforestation.

Perhaps one of the most realistic speeches made at this time was by State Treasurer Tom Kay. I'll read from the minutes of the proceedings: "If we permit a man to settle on timberland on which he cannot expect to make a living from an agricultural standpoint, it means that the man fortunate enough to file on a piece of timberland in advance of his neighbor has made a small fortune to the detriment of the State. Every man here who has gone into the mountains in the State knows that there are tens of thousands of acres fit for nothing in the world excepting for the timber on it. Every fall I have gone into the mountains of Douglas County on the South Umpqua and on the North Fork, and for miles there is hardly enough land on the Umpqua River to warrant a man settling there. For one mile back the land is so steep and so rocky that no one could expect to make a living on it. Its value is, therefore, entirely in timber, and timber will not be accessible to the market for years and years to come. It requires a great expenditure of money for sawmills and railroads to cut and market this timber, and there are enough railroads and sawmills to supply the demand now. Therefore, how do you expect these settlers to go back 30 miles from the railroad and settle there and make a living on this homestead land until the timber becomes available for market? You gentlemen know, who have had experience in these lands, that under such circumstances if a man were not permitted to sell his claim after securing it that that man would starve to death before reaping any benefit from the timberland. Then there is the further fact that the timber on these lands is an asset of the State, and the fact that the State should receive the benefit from that. No man should be permitted to go there under the pretense of homesteading tillable land, take the most valuable sections in the State and the State not get any benefit therefrom. Now I will state to you the solution for this trouble, if there is any trouble. If the excess over $2.50 per acre were turned into the school fund, the entire State would profit by it. The income from the school fund would go to the various school districts of the State and the more that we have in that fund the less taxes there would be for school purposes."

The only note that was sounded with reference to retaining this in public ownership came from a source that you might expect—it was a letter from Henry S. Graves, the Chief of the Forest Service. He was not able to be there but sent this letter and I'll read a few sentences: "Land which is of such a character that it can best be developed and utilized under private ownership, I believe should pass into private ownership in a prompt and orderly manner. Land which must ultimately be protected and developed at public expense, should remain public property and not be transferred to private control for a brief period of speculative exploitation to revert to the public in a state of ruin."

Well, now, what did this conference, composed, as I said, of the best brains in the State in the year 1915, what action did they take? The chairman of the resolutions committee, and I think there were 27 on the resolutions committee, was Judge H. H. Hewitt, of Albany. And the operative part of their resolutions, after numerous "whereases," called on Congress "to take action defining and settling who shall be considered an actual settler"—that term was taken from the original act—"under the terms of the act, and what shall be considered actual settlement and requiring the grantees under said act to perform the conditions of said act and sell and dispose of said lands according to the true intent and purpose of said act to such actual settlers. We are unalterably opposed to any further increase in forest reserve in the State of Oregon. We urge upon Congress the enactment of legislation which shall provide for the immediate sale of said grant lands in quantities of not greater than 160 acres to any one person, and to actual settlers at a price not in excess of $2.50 per acre, and to provide against all fraud in the settlement and disposition of said lands."

Also, in response to the suggestion of Attorney Dunn, they appointed a committee to confer with the Southern Pacific Railroad, the committee consisting of the Governor, the Secretary of State Ben Olcott, Treasurer Tom Kay, W. I. Vauwter, who I think was judge of Jackson County at that time and chairman of this convention, and Senator Louis Bean and Senator Sam Garland from Lebanon, and C. E. Spence of the State grange. This very fine document is typescript, well bound; and I suppose we can give credit for that to the late C. C. Chapman, who was the secretary of this conference.

Well, that seems an echo from another era, doesn't it? But it opens a window on the thinking of the people of 1915 and before. When I first came to the Northwest in 1910 I was a guest in a private home. Also there was the president of one of the great land-grant colleges of the Northwest. He just couldn't get through berating the Forest Service. He condemned it up one side and down the other—full of graft and I don't know what. In 1911 I was working as a reporter out on Grays Harbor—that was the summer that Richard Ballinger had been retired as Secretary of the Interior after the famous feud with Gifford Pinchot. Well, Grays Harbor was all for timber and all for

Ballinger, and they had a great banquet welcoming Ballinger back to the State of Washington. Now the words of Governor Withycombe reveal the philosophy of the time—settlement, development, and taxation.

The idea had been for many years to get the land settled—get the land settled—get it developed. Of course the latter sociologists use a different word from development—they say "exploitation," and those early comers, both on the range and in the forest, do not fare very well in the hands of the social historians. But, nevertheless, the watchword of the time was "development."

You read in this book, all through this was the prod of the counties for the taxes that they had lost when these lands were taken over by the Government from the railroads; and that was the primary idea—get these lands on the tax rolls, let's get the taxes, and so that was the animus back of much of this attitude. In other words, they already saw they had a large percentage locked up, as they said, in the forest reserves in the national forests, and they didn't want to add to that this 2¼-2½ million more acres of the O. & C. lands. They overlooked the fact that relatively few of these lands were subject to agricultural development, and they failed to realize the impracticability of selling those lands to individuals on a quarter section lot, whether at $2.50 an acre or not, because that simply would be on the way to monopoly. By the way, one man, C. P. Strain from Umatilla County, had this to say—it is much more practical than what most of them said who lived right over here under the eaves of these lands and mountains. He said, "Lands chiefly valuable for timber, experience shows that distribution of timberlands to entrymen results inevitably in monopoly, lands lie in high foothills and mountains inaccessible save when used in large tracts," which of course we found out to be true. All right, now contrast that philosophy in 1915 and 1916, because the Chamberlain-Ferris Act really carried out the philosophy of this conference. It called for the early liquidation of this vast area, opening up to settlement all the agricultural lands and selling off the timber as fast as the market could absorb it.

But, you see some 20 years later you find a very, very different philosophy. Dave Mason in his paper today was altogether too modest in reporting. He drew from his diaries, but he didn't give credit to himself or to the prominent part that he had played in the revision not only of the philosophy but of the law, because Mason—you'll find this in the report of the hearing where Mason appeared, hearings on this 1937 bill—Mason identified himself as the Chairman of the Forestry Committee of the Pacific Northwest Planning Commission, which was related to the National Planning Commission or Resources Commission. Gov. Charles Martin had been active in promoting this planning here in Oregon. For instance, the Willamette Valley project is one of the fruits of the efforts that he made for planning in the Willamette Valley. Mason, in his testimony, recommended that the bill provide (a) for sustained yield forest management, including authorization to participate in cooperative sustained unit, and (b) for homestead settlement only on lands described primarily for agricultural use. There you see you have a recognition of the distinction between the timberland and the agricultural land—all right to sell the agricultural land; the timberland should be held and kept in sustained use. Now, he wasn't the only one—I don't mean to quote only from him to reflect the change in philosophy. W. B. Greeley, who at that time had been chief forester, manager of the West Coast Lumberman's Association, testified at a committee hearing on this 1937 bill—remember he is a spokesman for the lumbermen—and I quote, "Now the viewpoint of the great majority of the lumbermen I represent, the lumbermen of Oregon, living in there, many of them using Oregon and California timber, is that the time has come when the Government should change its whole attitude toward this tremendous forest problem, and instead of disposing, or liquidating, or getting rid of the resources as rapidly as markets will permit, we ask the Federal Government to adopt a policy of conserving a trust and to put it in the simplest, everyday terms. We would like to have the Federal Government regard itself as trustee for a very valuable property, under restrictions from the owners, the people, to conserve the productiveness of this property as a perpetual resource of the country in the State of Oregon, to utilize its income, to distribute its income under title II in whatever is an equitable and fair way."

Why it was ever done it was hard to tell, but of course, when they began with these railroad grants back in the Middle West, why the idea was to alternate the sections so that private settlers could come in and fill the interstices, and the railroads would then get some freight to haul, and then the railroads could dispose of their land to other settlers, and so it was. But they continued that on through the West into the mountainous country and into the forested country.

In my reading of history, I think there is only about one man who had the vision of proper land policy, and he did not deal with the disposition of timber land so much. That was John Wesley Powell, whose report on the arid lands, put out in 1878, was really a landmark in land planning. Well, for instance, he advised that west of the 100th meridian, where the humid area left off, do away with all of this civil township surveying system and when you get out into this rough country, survey by the topography. Pick your points on the contour. And also, he would have you dispose of the land somewhat in that fashion. For example, he would provide that for irrigated farms, and he knew irrigation because of the extensive work on the Colorado plateau and his acquaintance with the Mormons and their development there, he would provide 80 acres of irrigated land for a settler and then he would provide for range land, 2,560 acres of range land—11 sections, including 20 acres of irrigated pasture and a prominent water right. Now, of course, water wasn't that abundant in all of the great West, but at least he had the vision, you see, that it wouldn't do just to parcel it out in 160-acre tracts or even 320 under the Desert Land Act. And so the authorities now rate the Desert Land Act that we did pass, and the Timber and Stone Act which opened up the timber for private appropriation, as a great blunder. And now we see, in the checkerboarding of these timbered areas, another error that we have had to live with through the years.

Now, if we look ahead, one hesitates to make prophecy. After I read the prophecies of those best brains of 1915, you can understand that I am very loathe to say what we should do in the future. But fools rush in where angels fear to tread, and so I am going to suggest this—that instead of living with this checkerboard forever, might we not block these lands off by exchange with private owners, to their benefit and to the benefit of the management of these lands, and I throw that out as one thing to work on. You know, both the county courts, the county commissions, and the Bureau and the congressional delegation from Oregon haven't had very much to do in the way of important modification of policy on the O. & C. land management, so this would give them something to chew on, and I throw it out anyway.

My own thinking is that marketing problems are going to persist in spite of the population increase. Silviculture is in its infancy and when we read that they produce a Gaines wheat that yields 149 bushels to the acre on irrigated lands, and Howard Belton says that he grew 80 bushels per acre of wheat on his farm this year, why, what possible hope does Mr. Freeman have of ever digging out from under the production in agriculture? I don't see but what that same prospect faces us in the field of timber, if we are going to keep it on sustained yield and keep on increasing the yield, because as I said, silviculture is in its infancy and the processes of utilization and the elimination of waste still have a long way to go. We are going to have the marketing problem, but I think we can see also a wider utilization through upgrading of the raw materials as is already taking place very generally.

Looking to the future, I think our land pattern in forestry is becoming fixed. We have the national forests. No one proposes that they be sold off, at least here in Oregon. We have the O. & C. lands. We have the Indian reservation forests, and I don't believe the Government is going to repeat the termination of a tribe as was done with Klamath, at least in the early future. And we have State forests, and the State forests occupy a considerable acreage. They came in consequence of a condition that prevailed through the twenties and thirties—lands where the timber was cut off were allowed to go back for taxes, they lay there—cutover lands—they were just economic deserts, and then the State forests were established, and under the able management of the State forest department, they are becoming productive and yielding good revenues also to the counties.

And then, of course, we have the great corporate holdings, and they are quite firmly established now. Some may say that Oregon in that respect is but an economic colony. To a certain extent that is true. These great corporations, you know them, I know them, have their headquarters elsewhere, but you will also notice this, that these big corporations are able to come in with the capital and provide the plants for the higher utilization of the timber. Just now, or last week, down at Gardiner, International Paper turned the shovel—the Governor helped—for a new pulp and paper mill. Now, that's just an example of where a large corporation, with the capital and with the expertness of its employees, can come in and make added investments which will greatly increase the value of the finished product. Then, also, the large corporations operating these tree farms are doing an expert job in the growing of trees. I had a visit not long ago to the Lewis and Clark, the Clatsop Tree Farm, of Crown Zellerbach, and it really is a revelation to see what they are doing in the management of that great resource. And that is the goal of the BLM and I am sure it's the goal of the Forest Service—to bring these acres under the best management.

Then, I think we will see, as we have seen, a decline in the individual proprietorship. But there still will be room for considerable individual proprietorship. The growing cycle is not going to be so long that you have to wait for two or three generations to realize on it, and it is quite possible that families can develop areas where they will have a continuous income as their lands are worked into a sustained yield program. Then, of course, we will continue to have a great deal of production on what we call the farm woodlot, or the marginal lands which are well adapted in some portions of them for the growing of timber. And so, as I see it, we have that pattern of ownership pretty well fixed now and the problem is to articulate the management of all of these varieties of ownership into long lines which will yield the greatest return for the owners and for the people and for the economy of the State.

Now in closing, I merely want to say this. One trouble with the people who assembled here in 1915 was that they looked on this primarily as a local and State problem, the counties were eager to get their tax money which was delinquent, the people of the State were eager to get hold of that for settlement and development. But these lands were not then, and are not now, either State or local. They are national lands and managed by the National Government, and I think we must all keep that in mind. We of the advisory board, are only advisory—we can't make any decisions. The county commissions and the county courts have a great stake in the fine management, and their cooperation certainly is very important for the able development of the resource, but the decision doesn't rest with them—the decision rests with the Bureau of Land Management and with the Department of the Interior and with the Congress. And, so we must respect the fact that these are a national resource and not just a local resource. And to that end it is important that we continue to cooperate with the Federal agencies. We are grateful to the Federal Government for the part it has played in protecting this resource and bringing it to a time when the people here would appreciate it as a trust. And we appreciate also the able way in which this trust has been administered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have other matters to submit; but I understand that at this time the leadership is ready to have the Senate take up the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

"THE RIGHT ROAD AHEAD"—ADDRESS BY JOSEPH P. McMURRAY, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I invite attention to an address entitled "The Right Road Ahead," by the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., at the 53d annual convention of the South Carolina Savings and Loan League.

Mr. President, I think this is an excellent address by Mr. McMurray. I especially bring to the attention of the Senate the high praise and most honorable reference to our late colleague, Burnet R. Maybank, the former senior Senator from South Carolina. I could think of no greater tribute that any person could make to his former employer and to a former friend than what Mr. McMurray has said in this address about the late Burnet R. Maybank, who gave such distinguished service to his State and Nation as chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee until his untimely passing in 1954. I ask that this address be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHT ROAD AHEAD

(By Joseph P. McMurray)

As you know, it is possible for the Chairman and members of the Board to accept but a small fraction of the invitations they receive to participate in such conventions as this; even though we always learn a great deal about the particular problems with which you are confronted in your own State and area. Certainly, it is very helpful and educational for us to get the grassroot feel of things. Also, we hope we are able, by our participation, to give you a better understanding of how we at the Board look at things and how we size up the problems with which you are confronted. Also, of course, it is a chance to get better acquainted, which is important, since regulations and laws go only so far. To do our job best, what you in the industry and we at the Board need most of all is cooperation, and this is made easier when we know you and you know us.

What I and other Board members do is "split up" the State meetings, and within our 4-year term we try to participate in at least one of each State's league convention.

The reason I was happy that I could accept your invitation—although my stay is unfortunately too short since on yesterday I had to swear in our newest Board member, John deLaittre—is that South Carolina is a State very dear to my heart and a State with which I have a fair familiarity. It was my great privilege and honor to work very closely with one of the most beloved and distinguished statesmen of South Carolina, whose name and that of his ancestors are identified with your State's glorious history—the late Burnet R. Maybank, who served your State so ably up to the time of his untimely death in 1954.

I served under him as staff director when he was chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. I only wish time permitted me to tell you about him and what great things he did for your State and your Nation. I can only say now that I never met a more human being—a man with so much charity in his heart and knowledge of the needs of his fellow human beings, and who was able to translate these qualities into good laws and good government for his State and his Nation. Without him as my teacher and generous friend for so many years while I served under him, I am sure I would never have been able to achieve my present high office or the other honors that have come to me. So I come to you in the spirit of Burnet Maybank, and I only hope that what I say and what I shall do as Board Chairman will bring credit to his name.

You are now a $777 million industry with 68 associations. In 15 years you have grown 1,100 percent. Your growth compares favorably with the growth of the industry nationally, for in 15 years its assets have increased from $8 billion to $85 billion.

You have done a phenomenal job in promoting thrift and economical home financing in your State and have contributed to our national effort to promote home ownership and better living for all our people.

In the past year, we on the Board, I hope you will agree, have made a little progress. My colleague, Joe Williams, and my old friend and colleague, Ira Dixon who, having completed two terms on the Board, has graciously agreed to serve us in an advisory capacity, have brought me a long way along the road to understanding. To them and to our staff, I owe a particular vote of thanks.

Yesterday I had the privilege, as I indicated, of swearing in our newest member, John deLaittre. He brings to the Board a tremendous understanding and intimate knowledge of the whole thrift industry and its operations. More than that, he brings integrity of character and a most attractive personality. He will add new breadth, perception, and know-how to our Board and I am sure it and the industry will greatly benefit.

Today, I would like to give you some of my reflections on a few problems with which I have been concerned during my past 16 months in office, and look briefly into the future.

It isn't easy for a new Chairman or even for Board members with long experience to achieve all that one would wish in a short period of time. The history of an institution is such that it casts a long shadow over the events with which we have to deal each day.

More and more, I have become convinced that the injunction on the pedestals outside the Archives Building in Washington are not mere empty platitudes. One reads, "What is past is prologue," the other reads, "Study the Past." These bits of advice have more meaning than we sometimes realize. Today, without delving into the remote past, I would like to discuss with you the recent past which is enough to give you some of the flavor of the situation which confronts the Board both for the present and for the near future.

Occasionally, we read about some fortunate soul who inherits a large sum of money from his father, then his mother, then his grandmother, then a rich uncle who is, after all, the boy's best friend under certain conditions and so on. In a sense, the Board, too, is a continuous heir. It is an heir to the problems of the industry, of the Government, of the public, of the Congress, with reference to the area in which the Board has jurisdiction and responsibility. One of our newer staff members remarked to me one day that the problems that confront people in Washington are so complex, have so many facets, reach so deep into the fabric of our very existence, and must be decided in such a short period of time that it is a wonder that we do so well under such pressures.

He was referring not just to the Board but to the entire Government process. This position, I think, has so much merit that I would like you to bear it in mind in the course of the remarks that I am about to make.

The issues which confront the Board are so varied that an attempt to classify them must be regarded as an exercise in heroics. Nevertheless, let me present a brief classification. The first would be, from your point of view, the lending and investing powers of associations. Second are the supervisory problems confronting the Board since they directly affect your welfare. Third are a whole host of credit and financial problems involving the Board's judgment which influence not only the associations but your share account holders, the public, and the general economic fabric of our society. Finally, there are repeated suggestions which influence either directly or indirectly the framework in which all financial institutions can operate.

In the past year, the Board has been the recipient of more suggestions than anyone outside of our organization can imagine. Many of these suggestions have considerable merit. However, they have two characteristics that I think would be of interest to you. In the main, the suggestions reflect a very narrow point of view, usually only the point of view of the individual or the group making the suggestions.

When we examine these suggestions, when we test them against what other groups or individuals among the associations think we find a concatenation of voices and opinions that is distressing. If it seems, therefore, that the Board sometimes acts slowly or that the Board does not adopt a good many points of view presented to them, you should realize that the test to which these views are subjected fails to reveal sufficient uniformity and agreement to permit judicious and appropriate Board action.

With more than 4,000 member associations, the Board faces a problem of attempting to recognize what is general and of help to the entire fabric which we regulate and that which is specific or special and appropriate only in a very limited number of cases.

Another characteristic of these many suggestions, particularly those coming from the industry, is that they seek greater freedoms in lending, investing, dividend powers, and so on. The Commission on Money and Credit has recommended a broadening of lending and investing powers and you may, therefore, think that such suggestions to the Board are quite appropriate, but I regret to say that many of these suggestions, again, are predicated on a very narrow view of the issues involved. While the Board is currently engaged in working with the President's Committee on Financial Institutions which will probably deal with the question of broadening investing and lending powers for all financial institutions, the Board and other regulatory bodies are still under an obligation to maintain an environment of prudence, soundness, and appropriateness for even the broadest type of lending authority. Consequently, the Board is confronted by a set of aims and goals, but in the resolution of these aims and goals, you should recognize that the Board must consider the public welfare and not just the welfare of a given institution or group of institutions.

This may be an appropriate point at which to discuss the variation in investing and lending powers between State and Federal associations. We have had some views expressed that the Board is interested only in Federal associations. Let me point out that the dual banking system and, in fact, a dual financial system has a long record in the United States. One of the principles underlying the dual system is that the chartering authorities, either Federal or State, retain certain prerogatives in both banks and savings and loan associations; the chartering parties spell out the detailed lending powers of the several financial institutions. Consequently, with reference to State associations the Board has much more limited power than with reference to Federal associations.

The Board through its powers as the insurer over State-chartered associations is responsible for granting insurance under the charters and for seeing that the associations maintain safe and sound lending practices.

There are other detailed points on which the Board has roughly similar powers over both State and Federal associations. As the supervisory agency, the Board sets the standards on which all member associations may borrow from the Federal home loan banks. Consequently, there are areas in which there is a complete community of interest for both Federal and State associations with which the Board is concerned.

In those areas, we treat all parties alike. We do not attempt to have one set of standards for Federal associations and another set of standards for State associations. It is our belief that in those areas there is really no basis for conflict between what may be the interest of Federal and State associations, and we adhere to the broad public welfare which recognizes no distinction based on the type of charter.

One obvious area of conflict arises in lending powers where we have very direct control over Federal associations. May I say that there is a great variety of State legislation on lending powers in most cases providing more liberal and more flexible authority than that which Congress has seen fit to accord the Federal associations. Nevertheless, the States vary among themselves. One group of State associations will have a breadth of power in one area, and another in another area. We face conflict when we attempt to modernize the lending power of Federal associations.

Inevitably, we step on the toes of an association from one State but may not even approach the limit of the powers of associations in another State. The easiest way to resolve this conflict would be for the Board to stand absolutely still and do nothing.

I think those of you who have State charters would recognize rather quickly that the Federal associations would then be in a box from which they could never extricate themselves. Here again we have to deal with realities, with a changing world, with a history of legislation revealing congressional intent, as well as with the general questions of soundness and safety. Having made a determination that some actions are necessary with reference to Federal associations does not mean that the Board has deliberately ignored or attempted to abridge the purposes and rights of State associations.

In fact, if you compare the actions the Board has taken with reference to Federal associations you will find that in most instances the Federal associations still have less room for maneuver than the State associations in a good many other jurisdictions. Just as your State supervisor must look at the problems confronting him with reference to the associations for which he is responsible, so we must follow the same procedure for Federal associations. To jump to the conclusion that the Board, therefore, is interested only in Federal institutions is a negation of the facts of life. We cannot, by history and by tradition, inject ourselves into a State situation except to the extent that Congress has authorized us to do so.

There is also a great deal of discussion in some States about charters and branches. The Board has the authority to insure savings and loan associations and must decide conflicting claims on all the information available to it. In the case of branches, we attempt to be as circumspect as is possible in respecting filings by State associations when considering those of Federals. While we have no authority over State branches, we do not wish to preempt the field for Federals, and we work constantly with State supervisors to assure each group a fair opportunity. Again, we cannot abdicate our responsibility or delegate our authority to others.

The second category of problems which I would like to mention is that dealing with supervision. There has been a great deal of discussion within and without the industry about supervision of savings and loan associations. I would like to point out, that supervision is not a precise science—it is an art—and the regulator must be allowed some latitude for judgment. On previous occasions, I have taken the trouble to point out that the history of financial institutions is such that it is indicated that the regulator must have the authority to determine what is safe and sound. A great many questions have been raised about these terms, from time to time, and we have been busily engaged in trying to compress the area of uncertainty. But no matter how we work, no matter how many regulations we issue, there is still an area of judgment involved and that, historically, according to the courts, and the legislature, belongs to the regulator. Each of the Board members has made it clear that what the Board believes in is regulation not strangulation.

The thought I would like to leave with you for the moment is that the Board is charged with the responsibility for making determinations under an act of Congress and it cannot abdicate its position. We have streamlined our procedures and we are in the process of studying them further to improve them for the future.

One of the things that I believe I have learned in the past year is that institutions tend to create their own image. When I joined the Board I was told by many in the industry: "We hope you will do something to improve the stature of the savings and loan industry." Our Board by hard work, concentrated study and accelerated action, hopes we have improved its status. More than this, however, in our meetings and informal discussions, we have explored this issue with each other, and I, for one, have reached the conclusion that I would like to pass on to you. There is an area of institutional discipline which cannot be defined or regulated, or endowed by some outside force. Each set of financial institutions ultimately designs and carves its own picture before the public.

It appears to me that what is needed in any set of financial institutions is a degree of discipline which testifies to the probity of the industry. We all know that no matter how well disciplined the overwhelming majority may be, there will always be mavericks. A maverick need not necessarily be undesirable if he is an innovator who can stay within bounds of prudence. The mavericks who concern us, I think, are those who depart from the standards of safety and soundness and place the rate of return on their assets above everything else. The executives of associations are the ones, I suppose, that regulations are really created for. It is they, with whom we have to deal from time to time. The disturbing element, however, insofar as the majority of the industry is concerned, is that voices are rarely raised in favor of developing procedures which would permit a better control over such operations. It is in this sense that I have talked about industry discipline.

I should like to invite your attention to industry discipline in lending practices. As I indicated earlier, there is a strong probability that all financial institutions may have broader lending and investing powers than they have today. The Board has already proposed that Congress broaden the authority for Federal associations to make loans on multifamily houses and the House Banking and Currency Committee reported it favorably to the House on last Friday. With record-breaking speed, I am pleased to report that on yesterday the House, under suspension of rules requiring a two-thirds vote of its membership, approved the legislation. My comments, therefore, do not refer to the general types of activities in which institutions may engage. What is of concern is the way that any specific lending power, no matter how narrow or broad, is utilized.

Financial institutions have a long history in regulation. As early as 1911 the Supreme Court, in a decision, stated very definitely that the regulator must be obeyed, or else the public could be deceived. In line with this procedure, the bank regulatory authorities have as a matter of course required specific reserves against certain assets which were questionable. Similarly, where there is a doubt about the valuation of an asset the judgment of the regulator has tended to rule in the banking field. The wording of various acts under which we operate as such, the same powers are implied, if not specifically stated, for the Board and the Insurance Corporation.

Despite many complaints that the Board has exceeded its authority in this area, it seems as if the Board has not used the tools available to it to the fullest extent. Consequently, the reviews that we now have under way of supervision of regulation may indicate a much firmer approach to some issues of supervision than has been the case in the past. We hope that the associations will recognize that this is not an attempt to substitute the judgment of the supervisor or the regulator for that of management. It seems fitting to discuss this point here because the practices of your associations have been of such high quality that it seems appropriate to enlist your support for this view of things.

Institutional discipline also involves financial practices. By financial practices in this particular instance I mean more than the lending and investing policies to be followed. Financial practices, imply, also, the degree of liquidity which institutions maintain.

It is not that I feel that liquidity is generally inadequate. I think it is adequate, but the time comes in the history of every set of institutions when it must reexamine itself and adopt procedures that will help it to meet the needs of a new period. As events are evolving I think it would be advisable for the industry to look at its liquidity position, to study it, and to take steps to adopt a posture which would lend honor to its name with the public.

Still a third area of institutional discipline involves record and operating practices. An institution may have an impeccable set of policies, which it follows quite diligently. These, however, may be of little avail in avoiding disputes or questions simply because its recordkeeping and operating procedures are muddy. It is my opinion that there would be less strife between financial institutions and those who supervise them if records were maintained that clearly showed what had developed and the basis on which the association or some other institution made its decision. The Board is looking at this matter with the greatest of care and there is a possibility that it may be reduced to a regulation. However, it would be helpful if you, as members of the industry, would recognize the need for concise, clear records which will support the position which you have taken.

With reference to institutional discipline, I should like to point out that there are always proposals for financial institutions generally which seem to be of merit, at first glance. After analysis, however, the proposals could involve all financial institutions in questionable or futile pursuits. While always being guided by the past, I have not been afraid to think along new frontiers or to innovate where I thought there was a need. I should like to encourage you to do the same, but again there is a difference between originality and merely adopting gimmicks. Too many of the proposals that are made for financial institutions are back-door entries into an area that is open to serious doubt. There are even attempts to harness the resources of the Federal Government for purely private gain. I should like to suggest to you that those who argue that the Government ought to stay out of business ought not to argue that the Government should support their pet ventures.

Finally, I should like to look at the future a bit more specifically. Twenty-five years from now, this Nation will probably have a population that staggers the imagination, perhaps about 300 million or even more. Gross national product will be above the 1 trillion mark even in today's prices. The savings industry, and I include the mutual savings banks who may then all be members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, will probably have assets of $300 billion or thereabouts. These are the targets toward which we are being drawn. To arrive at these targets, however, we must earn our status.

I should like to leave the thought with you that in each of the areas which I have discussed, you, as individuals, and as members of a State association, can take steps to improve the image of the industry no matter how good it may already be. It is in this way that you can build for your industry, for yourselves, and for the public, a position of strength and an image which will command respect from all.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senate that all conferees of both Houses agreed to the conference report and signed it.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] served as chairman of the subcommittee which handled this matter. The Senator from Florida handled only that portion which related to the Commerce Department and certain related agencies, which had been considered in a separate bill for years prior to this year. Because of the necessary absence on official business of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] I have been asked by him and by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] to handle the report.

Mr. President, the conference bill is under the budget estimates by $97,352,300. The conference bill is over the House version of the bill by $124,680,000. The conference bill is under the Senate version of the bill by $10,913,000.

The conference amount for all portions of the bill comes to $2,025,895,700.

I shall be happy to reply to any questions relating to any part of the bill. I think perhaps it might be well to state for the Record the contents of the five different titles of the conference report.

That relating to the Department of State shows a conference agreement of $396,185,000, with figures for the budget estimates, the House bill, and the Senate bill which I shall later send to the desk.

That part which relates to the Department of Justice shows a conference amount of $306,677,000. I shall later send to the desk the appropriate figures covering the budget estimates, the House bill, and the Senate bill.

The final amount for the Department of Commerce is $793,670,000. I shall later send to the desk the figures for the budget estimates, the House bill, and the Senate bill, to appear in connection with this amount.

The final amount for the judiciary is $61,570,700. I shall later send to the desk the appropriate similar figures for the budget estimates, the House bill, and the Senate bill.

For the related agencies, the final conference amount is $467,793,000, and I shall later send to the desk the appropriate similar figures for the budget estimates, the House bill, and the Senate bill.

As I have already stated, the final amount of the conference bill covering all five titles is $2,025,895,700.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I commend the Senator from Florida for what he did in the conference. I invite his attention to the fact that whereas the amount of increase is $124 million over the House figure, $100 million of that is for the bond issue for the United Nations, which was not before the House, and another $11 million is for the maintenance of embassies abroad, which was stricken out on a point of order. So of the $124 million, $111 million was not considered by the House at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. The facts as stated by him are exactly correct.

I should have added, Mr. President, that in addition to the five titles of the bill to which I have referred, the bill also contains the approved appropriation from the highway trust fund for Federal aid highway activities for 1963 in the amount of $3,251,200,000, which is a separate item from the five items for the five separate titles which I have already read into the Record.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield for any questions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. First I wish to express my compliments to the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] for another sterling performance in conference. We are all indebted to him and his coconferees. I commend the committee for bringing to the Senate today this important appropriation measure for final action. I know that each member of the conference committee worked long and hard to achieve this end.

However, I have a question which I shall raise shortly for legislative history because, as I have been heard to say before, what the Senator from Florida, who is in charge of the bill in the Senate, says about the bill at this point will mean a great deal as to the subsequent interpretation of its intent and the purpose of the Congress at the time of the adoption of the report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. I think I should say, in pursuance of part of the comment he has made, that I have never served on a more pleasant conference. The attitude of the chairman of the House conferees, Mr. Rooney, and his associates was most agreeable and most pleasant.

The conference completed its duties without anything other than the ordinary differences of opinion and without any bitterness, animosity, or exchange of personalities whatsoever, which, in view of some of the things now happening in the Congress, I think is a notable performance. I am happy to so report.

Mr. MORSE. That is the second such good report received this afternoon. I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber or not, but I reported a similar experience with the House conferees on the teachers' pay bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I heard that report.

Mr. MORSE. I did not know whether the Senator had.

Mr. HOLLAND. I rejoiced at the performance of the conference. I commend the Senator from Oregon for his important part in those activities.

Mr. MORSE. My only point in making this comment is that I think with the passage of time reason may prevail in this Congress.

Going back to the point I was seeking to raise, in connection with the funds provided for the Weather Bureau, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator handling the bill whether the measure provides adequate funds in the amount of $200,000 for the continuation of the improved fire-weather service which was begun last year.

As pointed out to me by Mr. Phipps, State forester of Oregon:

> A knowledge of impending fire-weather is a key factor in forest management. The forest administrator needs the best possible weather advice for making decisions regarding the regulation of the logging industry during periods of high fire danger. This becomes extremely important in Oregon where our economy is primarily dependent on the timber industry. Also, the firefighting strategy necessary to effect the quickest, safest and most efficient control of a going forest fire is based almost wholly on the fire-weather forecast.
>
> The restoration of this $200,000 to the Weather Bureau's appropriation would help insure the best possible fire-weather services, so vitally important to Oregon's forest industry.

The question I wish to ask the Senator from Florida is as follows:

Does the Senator believe that, under the conference allowance of salaries and expenses, sufficient money is provided to maintain this vitally important program to the lumbermen and loggers of the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in reply I wish to say that last year Congress appropriated $200,000 for that activity. This year it was represented to us that the activity must be enlarged to give the degree of protection which is required. The number of destructive fires during the past year indicated that fact.

The Senate added a second $200,000, making $400,000 in all. There was no direct reduction of the second $200,000 in the conference. But the reduction in the complete Senate amount for salaries and expenses was such that, as apportioned to that particular objective, it reduced the objective, as we are told by the Weather Bureau which has jurisdiction over it, from an additional $200,000 to an additional $150,000, which will make available $350,000 for 1963, which I think is a material improvement of the situation.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, that statement not only brings a sigh of relief to my lips, but I am sure it will bring many sighs of relief in Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the letter I received from our State Forester, Mr. D. L. Phipps, on this question and a letter I received from Mr. H. R. Glascock, Jr., of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association, dealing with the same problem, including a memorandum entitled "Fire Weather Service—The Underdeveloped Conservation Tool."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF STATE FORESTER,
Salem, Oreg., October 3, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have learned that the House of Representatives, in acting on appropriations for the U.S. Weather Bureau, failed to approve the $200,000 required to continue the highly important program for improved fire-weather service begun last year. This causes us great concern.

A knowledge of impending fire weather is a key factor in forest management. The forest administrator needs the best possible weather advice for making decisions regarding the regulation of the logging industry during periods of high fire danger. This becomes extremely important in Oregon where our economy is primarily dependent on the timber industry. Also, the firefighting strategy necessary to effect the quickest, safest, and most efficient control of a going forest fire is based almost wholly on the fire-weather forecast.

The restoration of this $200,000 to the Weather Bureau's appropriation would help insure the best possible fire-weather services, so vitally important to Oregon's forest industry.

We urge your cooperation.

Respectfully yours,
D. L. PHIPPS,
State Forester.

WESTERN FORESTRY &
CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., September 19, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are greatly disturbed to learn that the House of Representatives late last week, in approving appropriations for the U.S. Weather Bureau, knocked out $200,000 required to implement the badly needed 7-year plan for improved fire-weather service begun last year. If this reduction obtains, fire-weather service will once again languish in inadequacy. It will become of increasingly smaller importance in the Weather Bureau's total program and remain a weak link in forest resources protection.

Western Forestry and Conservation Association has been much concerned with the development of strengthened fire danger forecasting to assist in the prevention and control of devastating forest and range fires. To date the expenditure of effort and funds in this field has been meager and this great potential for forest resources protection goes largely unrealized. The penny wise and pound foolish nature of our present effort in fire-danger forecasting and the case for a stepped up program are stated in the enclosed paper "Fire-Weather Service—The Underdeveloped Conservation Tool" which we presented to the Conference of Western Fire Weather Meteorologists in Portland, Oreg. last year.

The program for improved fire-weather service, cooperatively developed by the U.S. Weather Bureau and the U.S. Forest Service, was started last year with an initial appropriation by Congress of $200,000. It was understood that the goal of $1,500,000 would be reached over a 7-year period in successive increases of $200,000 each year.

Keeping this long overdue program to protect resources on schedule is crucial to the West. It has already started to add important new fire-weather service offices in Western areas not properly covered.

May we count on you to help restore this conservation program to its scheduled level and to inform us of any developments?

Respectfully yours,
H. R. GLASCOCK, Jr.,
Forest Counsel.

FIRE WEATHER SERVICE—THE UNDERDEVELOPED CONSERVATION TOOL

(Presented at 1961 conference of Western Fire Weather Meteorologists, Portland, Oreg., March 28, 1961, by H. R. Glascock, Jr.)

One hundred million dollars a year on forest fire control and less than one-half of 1 percent of that amount on fire weather service. These rough estimates of total national effort illustrate the inconspicuous relative position to which fire weather endeavor in the United States is relegated. If the hard-to-estimate but huge value of forest fire losses nationwide were added to fire control costs and compared to these fire weather expenditures, the latter would then indeed appear insignificant.

From this the layman might conclude that weather and man's knowledge of it have but a small part to play in forest fire control. But, of course, the opposite is true. Weather teams up with fuel and topography to determine the origin and behavior of any wildfire. Knowledge of fire weather is the key tool in both forest fire prevention and control.

Why then this disparity of attention? Is it that somehow adequate fire weather research and service come cheap? Unfortunately not. It is rather that fire weather service lags well behind its potential, is indeed an underdeveloped conservation tool.

Is this good economics? What would improved fire weather service, properly used, have done in the recent bad fire years in the west to reduce fire losses, including losses of forest resources and human life? What would it have done to cut firefighting costs and production and wage losses from woods closures? No one can say, but neither can anyone deny a considerable probable effect. This state of affairs obviously is poor economics, a case of being pennywise and pound foolish.

How do we explain this deficiency, continuing as it has long after various attempts to remedy it have been tried and have failed? I think we must first state what is not the cause of the problem. We must affirm the fact that the relatively few personnel now engaged in or associated with fire weather research and forecasting are as competent and dedicated a group of professional men as can be found anywhere. In fact, it may become a considerable problem to find men of equal training and ability with whom to strengthen the fire weather program.

Instead, the basic reason for insufficient emphasis on fire-weather service of recent years to protect the fast-growing multiple use values of the forest would seem to be the faster-growing values of commercial aviation and overwhelming competition from that and other sources for Weather Bureau services. It doesn't take many plane crashes with their attendant losses of life in this day of heavy air travel to create strong public and governmental interest in strengthened programs to improve air safety programs which involve weather service among other things.

How much value in forest resources, one might ask, would have to be destroyed by fire with how much attendant loss of life and cost of control efforts to create as much or even proportional amounts of public and governmental interest in remedial action? Would the great fire losses in California in 1960 do it, where the firefighting costs alone on two of the largest fires were over $1½ million apiece[1] and where nine men's lives were lost on firefighting duty? While the U.S. Weather Bureau's service to aviation has justifiably increased tremendously in the last few years, the "same old problem" of fire weather has become proportionally an even smaller part of the total Bureau effort with inadequate funds available for all programs.

Of course, there are other factors contributing to the underdevelopment of fire-weather service as a tool. The aircraft industry has no doubt worked harder for improved forecasts than have forest land managers. And foresters surely have needed to make better use of fire-weather forecasts on all fires. The very nature of the fire-weather problem calls for the closest cooperation and communication among many people busy with many other things: governmental weather agencies, forest protection organizations, and private and public land managers.

There is room for improvement in these areas. Nor can it be said that interest or progress has been lacking on the part of governmental weather agencies in improving the fire-weather service. There are several areas of improvement in the last few years which offer encouragement: the establishment of successful cooperative forecasting units in the State forestry headquarters in Oregon and Washington; the planning and installation of the first mountaintop weather radar unit on a peak in Montana to detect and track lightning storms; the maintenance of the position of western fire-weather coordinator; the invited participation of forestry representatives in the annual western fire-weather conferences; significant progress in some phases of fire-weather research and equipment development.

But the needs are great and greater every year for a strengthened program of fire-weather service. As Mr. Loren A. Tucker, supervisor, division of forest fire control, Washington State Department of Natural Resources, told the Western Forest Fire Research Committee meeting last December: "The land manager is called upon to make decisions, based on weather information, involving thousands of dollars of his employer's money and millions of acres of public and private forests * * * forecasters still admit that it is very risky burning ahead of a forecasted rain" and the American Meteorological Society still "holds that issuance of detailed day-by-day weather forecasts for more than 2 or 3 days in advance is misleading and not justified by present meteorological knowledge."

Mr. Tucker concluded: "Then, if this is the situation, meteorology, as applied to fire weather, is not advancing fast enough to keep pace with the need in land management. Forest land managers should see to it that the fire-weather forecasting service is getting its share of the research pie, so our forecasters can have more knowledge at their disposal. We can then have forecasts in detail good for 5 days or more. Were this accomplished the benefits in increased profits, because of reduced operating costs to all agencies depending on weather would compensate manifold the added cost of research necessary to accomplish this."

In addition it must be recalled that 61 percent of all commercial forest land in the West is federally owned or managed, a major area of Federal responsibility is forest resource protection. And there is much feeling that basic research in conservation matters is also a prime responsibility of the Government since its values accrue to the whole Nation.

Realizing these facts, the last two Western Forestry Conferences, representing both the public and private forestry agencies of the western United States and Canada, have resolved "to support and promote a strengthened fire-weather program" which "should be developed in cooperation with governmental weather agencies, forest protection organizations and private landowners. Mentioned was formulation of a detailed program that includes:

(a) Improved and more detailed local fire-weather forecasts.

(b) Better long-range forecasting facilities on a regional basis.

(c) Expanded research in fire-weather forecasting.

It is pleasant to relate that a committee of the U.S. Weather Bureau and U.S. Forest Service in Washington have recently developed a new national plan for fire-weather service. This plan, as finally revised after comment of many local agencies affected, would add fire-weather service at 33 additional offices around the Nation and strengthen services at the existing 15 offices. This, plus supporting area forecast centers would extend fire-weather forecasting to those portions of the country which do not now have such service and where protecting forests, range and other watershed land from fire is an important activity. The plan would also provide for intensification of existing services with emphasis on close contact between fire-weather personnel and user. Goal: a vigorous, first-class forecasting service, adequately staffed by competent meteorologists with special training in fire weather and fire control matters supported by an aggressive research program.

This ambitious step forward in fire-weather forecasting in the United States has much indeed to recommend it. It would establish many new fire-weather service offices in the West where they are needed, such as Riverside, Fresno, Sacramento, and Eureka, Calif.; Medford and Pendleton, Oreg.; Spokane, Wash.; Billings, Mont.; Casper or Cheyenne, Wyo.; Rapid City, S. Dak.; Denver, Colo.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Reno, Nev.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Juneau and Fairbanks, Alaska.

One big omission, however, would seem to be that the plan, while providing for training of fire-weather meteorologists, does not provide for training of fire control personnel to insure that optimum use is made of forecasts and weather information provided. Neither is there provision for training of the temporary fire-weather observers, the seasonal lookouts, fire guards and others who take and report fire-weather observations.

There may be other deficiencies and possibly some excessive development devoted to areas not in sufficient need of it. However, on balance, this is a most constructive and solid plan for progress and achievement in fire-weather service. If it is budgeted for and approved as part of the administration's budget, and I trust it will be, it should be amply supported in the Appropriations Committees of House and Senate by those who realize this great opportunity. An opportunity, that is, for real breakthrough in fire-weather service, the underdeveloped forest conservation tool.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Florida very much. The legislative history which he and I have made will, I am sure, be very satisfactory to the people of interest in my State.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Madam President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is unable to be present at this moment. He had prepared a statement concerning the Census Bureau and the conference report, which changed the Senate report with relation to the Census Bureau doing certain work which the Senator from Pennsylvania believes is in direct competition with one or more taxpaying private firms. I ask unanimous consent that the statement prepared by the Senator from Pennsylvania be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT REGARDING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

While the Senate is considering the conference report on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, I wish to comment on one of the items originally in disagreement between the Senate and the House. This relates to the administration's request to permit the Census Bureau to expand its activities with respect to surveys of consumer buying intentions. When the Senate Appropriations Committee reported out H.R. 12580, the committee report contained the following language:

"The committee recommends the exclusion of increases requested within the original budget request of $13 million for the initiation of the following activities: weekly indicators of industrial production; initiation of national address registers; survey of consumer buying intentions; emergency planning activities; and the administrative costs related to the foregoing; this reduction totals $1,002,000."

During the course of the appropriation hearings in both the House and the Senate, strong representations were made to the committee that approval of the amount requested for survey of consumer buying intentions would permit the Census Bureau to enter into direct competition with at least one private firm currently performing this type of survey. The Senate committee was obviously impressed by these presentations and consequently, approved the prohibition I have just quoted.

However, this prohibition apparently was overruled in conference and this body is now faced with the proposition of endorsing direct competition by the Census Bureau with one or more tax paying private firms.

I do not know that we can remedy this situation in the short time remaining in this session. But, I feel that I would be remiss if I did not call the attention of the Senate to the consequence implicit in approval of the conference report. We have all heard a great deal about the need to increase the Nation's economic growth rate. I suggest one of the more constructive measures that the Government might take is to avoid expanding its activities when they compete directly with the private sector of the economy.

---

[1] Donner Ridge and Forest Hill fires.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], it is indeed correct that the conference report added to the objectives to be handled by the Census Bureau one item which had previously been financed by the Federal Reserve Board. However, the House conferees did yield to the Senate conferees on other activities which were suggested for enlargement of the work of the Census Bureau. I think the decision of the conferees in that whole field was sound.

Madam President, unless there are further questions, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 20, 27, and 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12580, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30, 44, 46, and 48 to the bill (H.R. 12580) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the "$1,000,000" named in said amendment, insert "$10,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$3,350,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105 (f) and all of 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-256) shall apply in carrying out the activities concerned with exhibits and missions".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Immediately following the amount contained in said amendment, insert the following: ", of which not less than $4,300,000 shall be available for the reconversion of combination vessels".

Mr. HOLLAND. I move that the Senate now concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 20, 27, and 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, for the information of Senators and others who may be interested in the several matters covered by the bill, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks and made a part of the RECORD, a table showing the essential facts with reference to the conference amounts, the budget estimates, and the House and Senate action on the various items covered by the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of bill

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Item	1962 appropriations [1]	1963 revised budget estimates	1963 House bill	1963 Senate bill	Conference action
ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS					
Salaries and expenses	$137,700,000	$144,210,000	$140,710,000	$141,910,000	$141,210,000
Representation allowances	925,000	1,100,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad	10,000,000	27,795,000		11,000,000	10,000,000
Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency fund)	4,650,000	2,205,000	2,000,000	2,205,000	2,205,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Total, administration of foreign affairs	154,775,000	176,810,000	145,160,000	157,565,000	155,865,000
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES					
Contributions to international organizations	87,192,000	68,609,000	68,392,000	68,392,000	68,392,000
Missions to international organizations	2,115,000	2,370,000	2,250,000	2,290,000	2,250,000
International conferences and contingencies	1,943,000	[2] 2,270,000	1,943,000	1,943,000	1,943,000
Loan to United Nations		[3] 100,000,000		100,000,000	100,000,000
International tariff negotiations	171,000				
U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO	[4] 150,000				
Total, international organizations and conferences	91,571,000	173,249,000	72,585,000	172,625,000	172,585,000
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses	604,000	670,000	620,000	670,000	670,000
Operation and maintenance	1,950,000	2,010,000	1,950,000	1,950,000	1,950,000
Construction	13,173,000	12,355,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Total, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico	15,727,000	15,035,000	13,570,000	13,620,000	13,620,000
American sections, international commissions	415,000	455,000	415,000	415,000	415,000
International fisheries commissions	1,910,000	2,165,000	1,910,000	2,082,000	1,910,000
Total, international commissions	18,052,000	17,655,000	15,895,000	16,117,000	15,945,000
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE					
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities	(37,006,600)	56,657,000	40,000,000	43,900,000	41,950,000
International educational exchange activities	27,000,000	(5)			
International educational exchange activities (special foreign currency program)	7,400,000	(5)			
Center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West	3,300,000	8,343,000	8,340,000	8,340,000	8,340,000
Preservation of ancient Nubian monuments (special foreign currency program)	4,000,000				
Total, educational exchange	41,700,000	65,000,000	48,340,000	52,240,000	50,290,000
OTHER					
Rama Road, Nicaragua	1,000,000	2,350,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Pan American Health Organization building site	217,150				
Total, other	1,217,150	2,350,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Total, title I, Department of State	307,315,150	435,064,000	283,480,000	400,047,000	396,185,000

See footnotes at end of table.

***Summary of bill*—Continued**

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Item	1962 appropriations [1]	1963 revised budget estimates	1963 House bill	1963 Senate bill	Conference action
LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses, general administration	$4,165,000	$4,311,000	$4,295,000	$4,295,000	$4,295,000
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	15,785,000	16,760,000	16,500,000	16,500,000	16,500,000
Alien property activities, limitation on general administrative expenses	*(690,000)*	*(690,000)*	*(690,000)*	*(690,000)*	*(690,000)*
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	5,875,000	5,988,000	5,988,000	5,988,000	5,988,000
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals	25,185,400	27,712,000	27,085,000	27,085,000	27,085,000
Fees and expenses of witnesses	2,235,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
Salaries and expenses, Administrative Conference of the United States	150,000	129,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Total, legal activities and general administration	53,395,400	56,800,000	55,868,000	55,868,000	55,868,000
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION					
Salaries and expenses	127,216,000	130,700,000	130,700,000	130,700,000	130,700,000
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	63,500,000	64,600,000	64,050,000	64,050,000	64,050,000
FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	46,789,500	49,455,000	48,814,000	48,814,000	48,814,000
Buildings and facilities	2,350,000	3,945,000	2,595,000	3,545,000	3,545,000
Support of U.S. prisoners	4,000,000	3,800,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
Total, Federal prison system	53,139,500	57,200,000	55,109,000	56,059,000	56,059,000
Total, title II, Department of Justice	297,250,900	309,300,000	305,727,000	306,677,000	306,677,000

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Item	1962 appropriations [1]	1963 revised budget estimates	1963 House bill	1963 Senate bill	Conference action
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	$3,620,000	[6] $4,635,000	$3,700,000	$3,900,000	$3,800,000
Participation in Century 21 Exposition	900,000				
Participation in New York World's Fair	17,000,000				
Total, general administration	21,520,000	4,635,000	3,700,000	3,900,000	3,800,000
AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION					
Operations	8,250,000	13,500,000	12,250,000	12,250,000	12,250,000
Grants for public facilities	40,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
Area redevelopment fund appropriation	122,500,000		115,480,000	115,050,000	115,050,000
Borrowing authority replaced in bill by appropriation		*(115,480,000)*			
Total, Area Redevelopment Administration	170,750,000	48,500.000	162,730,000	162,300,000	162,300,000
BUSINESS ACTIVITIES					
Salaries and expenses		[6] 26,450,000			
Export control	3,480,000	[6] 3,735,000	3,480,000	3,735,000	3,695,000
OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES					
Salaries and expenses	3,163,000	([7])	3,400,000	3,430,000	3,350,000
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	4,211,800	([8])	4,600,000	4,940,000	4,940,000
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
Salaries and expenses	[9] 4,900,000	([10])	6,500,000	8,300,000	7,025,000
U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	2,500,000	([11])	3,350,000	3,950,000	3,350,000
OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS					
Salaries and expenses	1,600,000	1,860,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS					
Salaries and expenses	10,779,000	[6] 13,600,000	12,250,000	12,598,000	12,450,000
1962 Census of Governments	1,096,000	1,400,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
1963 Censuses of Business, Transportation, Manufactures, and Mineral Industries	1,000,000	3,244,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
1964 Census of Agriculture		700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Modernization of computing equipment		4,100,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Eighteenth Decennial Census	3,630,000	[6] (Language)		(Language)	
Total, Bureau of the Census	16,505,000	23,044,000	21,000,000	21,348,000	21,200,000
COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY					
Salaries and expenses	18,925,000	[6] 23,500,000	21,500,000	22,750,000	22,750,000
Construction of surveying ships	14,185,000	14,500,000	14,400,000	14,400,000	14,400,000
Total, Coast and Geodetic Survey	33,110,000	38,000,000	35,900,000	37,150,000	37,150,000
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION					
Ship construction	98,000,000	[12] 64,200,000	50,000,000	64,200,000	64,200,000
Operating differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization)	202,000,000	225,000,000	225,000,000	220,400,000	220,400,000
Research and development	6,500,000	5,500,000	3,550,000	5,500,000	3,550,000
Salaries and expenses	15,600,000	15,125,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000
Maritime training	3,218,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
State marine schools	1,270,000	1,270,000	1,375,000	1,375,000	1,375,000
Payment of War Shipping Administration claims	18,136				
Total, Maritime Administration	326,606,136	314,395,000	298,175,000	309,725,000	307,775,000
PATENT OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	24,860,000	[13] 27,800,000	25,860,000	27,103,000	26,010,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary of bill—Continued

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued

Item	1962 appropriations [1]	1963 revised budget estimates	1963 House bill	1963 Senate bill	Conference action
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS					
Limitation on general administrative expenses	*($35,400,000)*	*($37,600,000)*	*($36,800,000)*	*($36,800,000)*	*($36,800,000)*
Federal-aid highways (trust fund)	*(2,990,600,000)*	*(3,250,000,000)*	*(3,249,200,000)*	*(3,249,200,000)*	*(3,249,200,000)*
Improvement of the Pentagon road network (trust fund)		*(2,500,000)*	*(2,000,000)*	*(2,000,000)*	(2,000,000)
Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	27,400,000	35,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization)	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Control of outdoor advertising		4,600,000	4,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total, Bureau of Public Roads	30,400,000	42,600,000	38,500,000	36,500,000	36,500,000
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS					
Research and technical services	23,500,000	30,000,000	27,500,000	27,500,000	27,500,000
Research and technical services (special foreign currency program)	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	500,000	500,000
Plant and facilities	10,000,000	2,100,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Construction of facilities	35,000,000	35,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Total, National Bureau of Standards	69,500,000	68,100,000	60,500,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
WEATHER BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses	56,250,000	[6] 60,060,000	58,250,000	60,076,000	59,500,000
Research and development	9,000,000	11,500,000	10,000,000	11,500,000	11,000,000
Establishment of meteorological facilities	5,250,000	[6] 4,940,000	4,000,000	4,650,000	4,325,000
Meteorological satellite operations	48,000,000	45,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
Total, Weather Bureau	118,500,000	121,500,000	112,250,000	116,226,000	114,825,000
Total, title III, Department of Commerce	831,605,936	720,619,000	781,695,000	800,447,000	793,670,000
Adjustment for borrowing authority replaced in bill by appropriations		115,480,000			
Total, title III, Department of Commerce, including above adjustment for comparability	831,605,936	836,099,000	781,695,000	800,447,000	793,670,000

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Item	1962 appropriations [1]	1963 revised budget estimates	1963 House bill	1963 Senate bill	Conference action
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES					
Salaries	$1,479,000	$1,494,000	$1,494,000	$1,494,000	$1,494,000
Printing and binding Supreme Court reports	105,000	108,000	108,000	108,000	108,000
Miscellaneous expenses	82,800	96,200	79,000	79,000	79,000
Care of the building and grounds	284,400	327,000	323,400	323,400	323,400
Automobile for the Chief Justice	6,700	6,800	6,800	6,800	6,800
Books for the Supreme Court	38,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Total, Supreme Court	1,995,900	2,067,000	2,046,200	2,046,200	2,046,200
COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS					
Salaries and expenses	359,000	361,000	361,000	361,000	361,000
CUSTOMS COURT					
Salaries and expenses	895,000	919,000	919,000	919,000	919,000
COURT OF CLAIMS					
Salaries and expenses	955,000	1,044,500	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000
Repairs and improvements	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500	9,500
Total, Court of Claims	964,500	1,054,000	1,034,500	1,034,500	1,034,500
COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES					
Salaries of judges	10,100,000	10,860,000	10,860,000	10,860,000	10,860,000
Salaries of supporting personnel	25,645,000	27,125,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	4,800,000	[14] 6,000,000	4,500,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses	5,437,500	4,700,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
Administrative Office, salaries and expenses	1,441,750	1,609,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Referees, special account:					
Salaries of referees	*(2,370,000)*	*(2,750,000)*	*(2,600,000)*	*(2,600,000)*	*(2,600,000)*
Expenses of referees	*(4,310,000)*	*(5,290,000)*	*(4,850,000)*	*(4,850,000)*	*(4,850,000)*
Total, other courts and services	47,424,250	50,294,000	48,460,000	49,760,000	49,760,000
Total, title IV, the judiciary, excluding annual indefinites	51,638,650	54,695,000	52,820,700	54,120,700	54,120,700
Total, title IV, the judiciary, including annual indefinites	58,318,650	62,735,000	60,270,700	61,570,700	61,570,700

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Item	1962 appropriations [1]	1963 revised budget estimates	1963 House bill	1963 Senate bill	Conference action
AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$1,360,000	$1,550,000	$1,523,000	$1,523,000	$1,523,000
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS					
Salaries and expenses	888,000	995,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	[11] 40,000	2,900,000	2,100,000	2,700,000	2,300,000
FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation	625,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Transfer from War Claims fund	*(40,000)*	*(30,000)*	*(30,000)*	*(30,000)*	*(30,000)*

See footnotes at end of table.

Summary of bill—Continued

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued

Item	1962 appropriations [1]	1963 revised budget estimates	1963 House bill	1963 Senate bill	Conference action
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation	$7,113,500	$6,000,000	$5,750,000	$5,750,000	$5,750,000
Transfer from revolving fund	*(18,447,000)*	*(27,500,000)*	*(27,000,000)*	*(27,000,000)*	*(27,000,000)*
Transfer from RFC liquidation fund	*(397,000)*				
Revolving fund	220,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000
Total, Small Business Administration	227,113,500	306,000,000	305,750,000	305,750,000	305,750,000
SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	395,000	395,000	395,000	395,000	395,000
TARIFF COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	2,770,000	2,950,000	2,900,000	2,950,000	2,950,000
U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY					
Arms control and disarmament activities	[16] 1,000,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY					
Salaries and expenses	111,500,000	[17] 125,500,000	120,500,000	120,500,000	120,500,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	9,300,000	9,000,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
Special international exhibitions	8,000,000	7,600,000	7,600,000	7,474,000	7,600,000
Special international exhibitions (special foreign currency program)	250,000	400,000	375,000	375,000	375,000
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities	10,750,000	11,260,000	10,750,000	8,750,000	8,750,000
Informational media guarantee fund	1,500,000	4,300,000	1,500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Total, U.S. Information Agency	141,300,000	158,060,000	149,225,000	146,599,000	146,725,000
Total, title V, related agencies	375,491,500	480,050,000	470,043,000	468,067,000	467,793,000
Total, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies excluding special accounts	1,863,302,136	1,999,728,000	1,893,765,700	2,029,358,700	2,018,445,700
Total, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies including special accounts	1,869,982,136	2,007,768,000	1,901,215,700	2,036,808,700	2,025,895,700
Adjustment for borrowing authority replaced in bill by appropriation		115,480,000			
Grand total, including above adjustment for comparability	1,869,982,136	2,123,248,000	1,901,215,700	2,036,808,700	2,025,895,700

---

[1] Includes $107,615,000 in 2d supplemental appropriation, Public Law 87-545.

[2] Excludes $1,019,000 contained in H. Doc. 537, dated Sept. 6, 1962.

[3] Supplemental amount requested in S. Doc. 133, Sept. 21, 1962.

[4] In addition, not to exceed $100,000 reappropriation.

[5] Included in "Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities."

[6] As amended in S. Doc. 110, July 23, 1962.

[7] $3,550,000 contained in estimate for "Business activities, salaries and expenses."

[8] $7,240,000 contained in estimate for "Business activities, salaries and expenses."

[9] Appropriated under heading of "Bureau of Foreign Commerce."

[10] $11,460,000 contained in estimate for "Business activities, salaries and expenses."

[11] $4,200,000 contained in estimate for "Business activities, salaries and expenses."

[12] And $2,800,000 by transfer from "Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy," as amended by S. Doc. 110.

[13] Includes $800,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 335.

[14] Includes budget amendment of $1,500,000, S. Doc. 111, dated July 23, 1962.

[15] Plus $1,266,000 derived by transfer from "Salaries and expenses, maritime activities."

[16] Plus $840,000 derived by transfer from "Salaries and expenses, Department of State" and $177,000 by comparative transfer.

[17] Excludes $1,815,000 requested in H. Doc. 514, dated Aug. 13, 1962.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I am grateful for the attendance of the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who have been exceedingly diligent and helpful. I am certain that if the Senator from Arkansas were present, he would wish me to express the gratitude and approval of Senators on this side of the aisle to them and other Senators on the other side of the aisle for the handling of the measure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, it is easy to be diligent with a distinguished chairman who does a great deal of the work himself and who has a very full understanding of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, one would think, from the language used by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, that he had been born a good deal farther South. I have enjoyed very much his statement, and I appreciate it greatly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his handling of the conference report. It was very considerate of him, and was done very expeditiously. I commend him.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate temporarily set aside the bill (H.R. 10117), which I understand is the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT INCOME

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 2165, House bill 6371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6371) to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, the bill would amend the retirement credit income provision of the Internal Revenue Code. It conforms with limitations on the retirement income credit to amendments made in the Social Security Acts of 1960 and 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the measure be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 6371—LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

This bill amends the retirement income credit provision of the Internal Revenue Code. It conforms the limitations on the retirement income credit to amendments made in the Social Security Acts of 1960 and 1961.

The retirement income credit was enacted by Congress in 1954 to reduce the differences between tax-exempt pensions such as social security and railroad retirement and taxable pensions and annuities and other forms of taxable retirement income.

Under existing law, a retirement income credit of 20 percent of retirement income up to $1,200 is provided. Thus, the maximum credit would be $240. Retirement income for this purpose includes dividends, interest, pensions and annuities, and rental income. Because of the retirement income credit, a single taxpayer age 65 and who has interest income of $2,667 would owe no Federal income tax. If there were no retirement income credit, this taxpayer would owe $240.

Under the provision in the law, retirement income eligible for the credit must be reduced by social security benefits and other nontaxable income, and also by earned income in excess of $1,200 if the taxpayer is between age 65 and 72, or if he is less than age 65, his retirement income must be reduced by earned income in excess of $900. These earned income limitations are consistent with the earned income limitations which were in the Social Security Act prior to the 1960 and 1961 amendments.

Under the 1960 and 1961 amendments to the Social Security Act the primary social security benefit was increased to $127 per month, or $1,524 per year. The earned income limitations also were modified so that there would be no reduction for the first $1,200 of earned income, and a reduction of only 50 cents for each dollar of earned income between $1,200 and $1,700; thereafter, there would be a dollar-for-dollar reduction.

H.R. 6371 conforms the limitations in the retirement income credit to the limitations in the Social Security Act, as amended. The bill makes three principal amendments.

First, the maximum amount of retirement income permitted to qualify for the credit is increased from $1,200 to $1,524.

Second, the reduction for earned income is modified so that there will be no reduction for the first $1,200, a reduction of 50 cents for each $1 of earned income between $1,200 and $1,700 and a dollar-for-dollar reduction for earned income of more than $1,700.

Third, individuals, age 62–65, will qualify for this same earned income reduction procedure; but those below age 62 must continue to reduce their retirement income eligible for the credit by earned income in excess of $900.

The maximum credit under H.R. 6371 would be $304.80. Under this bill, a single taxpayer age 65 who has interest income of $3,027 would not have to pay any Federal income tax. Under existing law, he would be required to pay a tax of $64.80.

H.R. 6371 would apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment and is estimated to result in a revenue loss of about $30 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Sec. 3. (a) Section 461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to general rule for taxable year of deduction) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Dividends or Interest Paid on Certain Deposits or Withdrawable Accounts.—Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, amounts paid to, or credited to the accounts of, depositors or holders of accounts as dividends or interest on their deposits or withdrawable accounts (if such amounts paid or credited are withdrawable on demand subject only to customary notice to withdraw) by a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, or a cooperative bank shall not be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year to the extent such amounts are paid or credited for periods representing more than 12 months. Any such amount not allowed as a deduction as a result of the application of the preceding sentence shall be allowed as a deduction for such other taxable year as the Secretary or his delegate determines to be consistent with the preceding sentence."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1962.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, the amendment in general provides that mutual savings bank and loan associations and cooperative banks will not be allowed in any one year income tax reductions for interest payments to depositors or for dividend payments to shareholders which would be attributable to more than a 12-month period. That applies to the taxable years ended after December 31, 1962.

This is intended principally to be applicable to these institutions in 1963 and subsequent years. It was thought that there was a possibility of a $100 million loss unless the amendment were adopted.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the amendment may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The following example illustrates the problem corrected by this amendment:

Assume that for 1962 X domestic building and loan association has income of $200 and that its only deductions are for dividends paid semiannually to depositors and for additions to bad debt reserves. Assume X pays out in dividends $100 of its earnings. The other $100 it credits to a bad debt reserve which does not exceed 12 percent of deposits. Under existing law, X would owe no tax since its deductions equal its income.

Assume that for 1963 X also has income of $200, $100 of which it pays out in dividends. Assume that under section 6 of the Revenue Act of 1962 X computes its bad debt reserve under the 60-percent method. Taxable income of this association computed without regard to the bad debt deduction is $100 and the deduction for additions to bad debt reserves is 60 percent of this amount, or $60. For 1962 X would have taxable income of $40.

If X postponed its dividend payment for the last half of 1962 until after January 1, 1963, it would still owe no tax for 1962 because of the bad debt deduction allowed for that year under existing law. For 1963, however, X could reduce its taxable income substantially because of the "bunched" dividend deduction for 1963 made up of $100 attributable to 1963 and $50 deferred from 1962. Taxable income of this association for 1963 computed without regard to the bad debt deduction is $50. After a bad debt deduction of $30 (60 percent of $50), taxable income is only $20. Thus by deferring dividend payments from 1962 to 1963 the taxpayer can reduce, or in some cases eliminate entirely, its taxable income in the first year to which the new tax formula applies.

SUMMARY AMENDMENT

This amendment provides in general that mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, and cooperative banks will not be allowed in any one year income tax deductions for interest payments to depositors (or for dividend payments to shareholders) which are attributable to more than a 12-month period. This applies for taxable years ending after December 31, 1962. This is intended to prevent the possible avoidance of the new tax provisions applicable to these institutions for 1963 and subsequent years by "bunching" in 1963, or a subsequent year, interest (or dividend) payment deductions attributable to more than a 12-month period.

The Treasury Department has urged the enactment of this provision.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for as long as I have been in Congress, I have been vitally interested in legislation to help senior citizens enjoy their retirement years free from constant worry and hardship. H.R. 6371 will go a long way toward alleviating the fears of men and women over 65 who are not Social Security beneficiaries, but are retired under Government or private pension programs.

During the last month alone, I have received over 1,000 letters on this bill, particularly from retired teachers, appealing for my support of H.R. 6371. These men and women have contributed their services to the welfare of our Nation. Some have devoted 40 and 50 years of service to teaching our children to be good citizens—a worthy task and well-performed when we view the great strides our education system has made over the years. Many of these men and women are now experiencing a hand-to-mouth existence as each year reduces their physical capacities. They are unable to seek employment, even on a part-time basis. The struggle to maintain self-respect and personal independence becomes increasingly difficult because their pensions remain fixed while costs of living rise.

Mr. President, I feel that is is only just that this legislation be enacted to provide equal tax treatment for all of our retired senior citizens. I am proud to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income, and with respect to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, for his active participation today in taking care of many tax items. We have cleared quite a bit of legislation in his field. I am most grateful.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I have been informed that the conferees have completed their work in conference on the highway bill. The Senator from Michigan is in the Chamber. Am I correctly informed in that regard?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correctly informed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the House will act on the conference report tomorrow.

Mr. McNAMARA. Or possibly tonight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That means that tomorrow the Senate will take up the conference report on the highway bill. I am delighted to receive that good news. This is one of the better days in the Senate.

Mr. McNAMARA. I point out to the acting majority leader that the House has authority to file its report up to midnight tonight. Therefore, it will probably complete action on the conference report tonight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There will be scheduled for tomorrow's business of the Senate the District of Columbia teachers' salary bill, on which the conferees have agreed. It was alluded to by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] a short time ago.

I believe that the public works authorization bill is now in conference.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burdick in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10936) to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders.

THE DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT PROVISION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with Senate consideration of H.R. 8556, which is at the White House awaiting the President's signature, careful consideration was given to many aspects of the problem involved.

Among other communications given study by the committee as it considered the legislation was a brief prepared by Wiggin & Dana, counselors at law in New Haven, Conn. In my judgment, this brief will be of interest to students of this subject.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the legal brief to which I have alluded be printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Haven, Conn.,
September 13, 1962.

Mr. David B. H. Martin,
Special Assistant for Governmental Relations in the Office of the Provost, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Dear Mr. Martin: You have asked our opinion concerning the constitutionality of the so-called disclaimer affidavit provision (disclaimer) of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). See section 1001(f).

For our information you have furnished to us a copy of the opinion dated January 11, 1962, of Messrs. Thompson, Raymond, Mayer & Jenner, of Chicago, addressed to Mr. Julian Levi, of the University of Chicago, and signed by Mr. Albert E. Jenner, Jr. That opinion finds the disclaimer to be too vague to meet the definiteness requirement of the fifth amendment. We concur in this view.

In accordance with your request we have also considered the validity of the disclaimer under the first amendment, a question which Messrs. Thompson, Raymond, Mayer & Jenner were not requested to consider. It is our view that the disclaimer fails in this respect also. The basis for this view is briefly expressed below.

Finally, we comment at the end of this letter upon the status of the disclaimer as a bill of attainder.

Although the freedoms of speech, assembly, and belief protected by the first amendment are the subject of many opinions of the Supreme Court, one recent opinion involves both these freedoms and disclaimer provision very much like that in the NDEA. This is *American Communication Association, CIO* v. *Douds*, 339 U.S. 382 (1950). Although Douds was decided by only six Justices, including several not now on the Court, and although these six were equally divided on the fifth amendment definiteness test, five were substantially united in the expressions concerning the first amendment referred to below as relevant in testing the disclaimer under that amendment. A short statement of this aspect of Douds is necessary at this point.

Section 9(h) of the Taft-Hartley Act required union officers to make the disclaimers on pain of loss of NLRB facilities by their unions if they failed. The Court readily found that the Douds disclaimer had the necessary effect of restraining first amendment freedoms (Douds, 389–390, 393, 399, 411–412). Thus the first amendment question was whether the disclaimers infringed the classic test: First amendment freedoms may not be restrained unless there is a "clear and present danger." The Court proceeded to clarify the test for use in the context of Douds and to apply it.

The Court observed that society need not be "imperiled"; it is enough if some evil will result if the statute under test be not enforced. But the evil must be "serious and substantial" (pp. 396–399). In this regard the legislature's purpose is to be ascertained and some deference is to be accorded to its determination of the need (pp. 400–401). Examination of the legislative history, and Congress findings and declaration of policy in the statute, in Douds disclosed to the Court a purpose to prevent the so-called political strike, i.e., a strike called by union officers who intend to obstruct commerce in support of the policies of a foreign government rather than merely to achieve proper union objectives (pp. 387–388). Armed with this guide, the Court said that the classic test as previously formulated, being premised upon the probability that the proscribed advocacy will arouse forceful actions before advocacy in reply can have effect, was not adequate for Douds, where Congress sought to protect commerce from evils not resulting from advocacy but from the action of persons in position to control events without it (pp. 395–396). The Court formulated the test as follows:

"In essence, the problem is one of weighing the probable effects of the statute upon the free exercise of the right of speech and assembly against the congressional determination that political strikes are evils of conduct which cause substantial harm to interstate commerce and that Communists and other identified by section 9(h) pose continuing threats to that public interest when in positions of union leadership" (p. 400).

In applying the test the Court referred to the "great mass of material" before Congress concerning Communist infiltration of unions (pp. 387–389). It said:

"Congress has concluded that substantial harm, in the form of direct, positive action, may be expected from that combination. In this legislation, Congress did not restrain the activities of the Communist Party as a political organization; nor did it attempt to stifle beliefs. * * * Section 9(h) touches only a relative handful of persons, leaving the great majority of persons of the identified affiliations and beliefs completely free from restraint. And it leaves those few who are affected free to maintain their affiliations and beliefs subject only to possible loss of positions which Congress has concluded are being abused to the injury of the public by members of the described groups" (pp. 403–404; see pp. 415–419–435).

In all this, and in other language of the Court omitted here for the sake of brevity, the fundamental importance of the facts before Congress as disclosed in its record, the findings made by Congress, and its determination of policy, is apparent.

Judged against the test and methods of analysis employed in Douds, the NDEA disclaimer, we think, cannot stand under the first amendment. As regards the disclaimer, no facts were presented to Congress, no findings were made, and no policy proclaimed. Nothing concerning the disclaimer appears in the published committee hearings and reports of Congress (see "Hearings on Bills Relating to Federal Scholarship and Loan Program," House Subcommittee of Committee on Education and Labor, 85th Cong.. 1st and 2d sess., pts. 1–3 (1958); "Hearings on Science and Education for National Defense," Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958); H. Rept. No. 2157, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958); S. Rept. No. 2242, 85th Cong. 2d sess. (1958); Joint Conference Rept. No. 2688, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958)). In debate on the floor the only reference to the disclaimer was made by Senator MUNDT, as follows. "The Senate is assured that students qualifying for the scholarship shall be good Americans and not be people involved in Communist or any other subversive organizations" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 13, p. 17320; see pp. 16576–16594, 16682–16747, 16854–16855, 17230–17240, 17245–17253, 17259–17260, 17264–17272, 17275–17305, 17307–17331, vol. 104, pt. 15, pp. 19078–19088, 19595–19619).

Rather, the attention of Congress, as disclosed by its record, was focused upon the external threat posed by the inference, drawn from the Russian Sputnik I, that U.S. education must be improved in certain respects by means of Federal aid. Indeed, Congress has itself in effect precluded any ascertainment of its intent as regards the disclaimer by means of indications, in the subsequent legislative history of proposals to repeal the disclaimer, that it gave no real consideration to the reasons for inserting the disclaimer. (See S. Rept. No. 454, 86th Cong., 1st sess. 2 (1959); CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 11, pp. 13989, 14076; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 10, p. 12646.)

What then is the "clear and present danger" which the NDEA disclaimer seeks to prevent? Congress provides no answer. Douds teaches that an answer must be provided or the first amendment freedoms may not be impaired. Could the answer be satisfactorily provided by evidence offered in court? We think evidence sufficient for such a purpose does not exist.

There is nothing in the legislative record to show, as in Douds, that Congress was concerned with actions of improperly motivated students, rather than with the advocacy by speech. Thus the classic test should be used and the disclaimer ruled invalid unless it is found that substantial, serious, forceful action will follow (before rebuttal can be heard and have effect) from the words of students who decline to make the disclaimer. We do not believe it can be shown that there was substantial foreign-inspired turmoil on American campuses sufficient to call for control by test oath when the NDEA was adopted, nor that there is now. On the contrary, we have in the United States a tradition of academic freedom, of belief that the best education requires both the freest expression of views and a highly developed capacity for prompt academic rejoinder, and of belief that what is bad is to be analyzed, exposed, and rejected, rather than concealed from view.

If such a clear and present danger existed why single out for control only the students who receive Federal assistance and whose education Congress desires to improve in the defense-vital subjects of science, mathematics, languages, etc.? If the danger exists, it exists more broadly, and the disclaimer, applicable only to a minority of students who receive Federal assistance, is not a reasonable way to deal with it. It seems reasonable to conclude that Congress could not, in requiring the disclaimer, have sought to avoid such a danger, but that the real purpose was to deny assistance to students whose views it did not like. But this impairs the freedoms of the first amendment and is precisely what Congress may not do.

In short, if the danger exists, the disclaimer could not fairly be found to be intended to deal with it, and if it does not exist the disclaimer may not lawfully be required.

And even if the disclaimer were deemed to be aimed at action rather than inflammatory advocacy, which seems unlikely, and the test formulated in Douds applied, we believe the disclaimer would fail, and for similar reasons.

We conclude therefore that the Douds reasoning invalidates the disclaimer under the first amendment. The only question remaining is whether Douds can be distinguished. We think not. Supporters of the disclaimer may perhaps base an attempt to distinguish it on an allegation that assistance under the NDEA is a mere "privilege gratuitously granted by the Government" (Douds, p. 390). But it is by no means clear that, if the Court in Douds had so regarded the NLRB benefits, it would have on that ground held the first amendment inapplicable. Even if it would have so held, the fact is, in the case of the NDEA assistance as in the case of the NLRB benefits in Douds, that more than "gratuitous privilege" is involved. In Douds it was found that the disclaimer made it "difficult for unions to remain effective" even though it did not prevent nonsigners from being union officers. So here, the disclaimer makes it difficult for many students who do not sign to be as effective as those who do. Thus the NDEA disclaimer, as was true of the Douds disclaimer, exerts pressures upon students "identified by particular beliefs and political affiliations" (Douds, p. 390), to alter, abandon, or refrain from expressing them, and this, in the realm of education, where freedom to hold and express beliefs is the cornerstone of progress.

We furnish below some comments concerning the status of the disclaimer under article I, section 9, clause 3, which forbids Congress to enact bills of attainder. The subject has been considerably discussed in print (see, for example, Comment, 63 Yale L. J. 844 (1954)).

A bill of attainder has been defined as a "legislative act which inflicts punishment without judicial trial" (*Cummings* v. *Missouri*, 4 Wall. 277, 323 (1867)). Courts have said that a statute is not such a bill unless it (1) applies to specific individuals or an easily ascertainable group, (2) imposes punishment, (3) without judicial trial. That items (1) and (3) are fulfilled by an expurgatory oath requirement imposed before a privilege can be enjoyed seems to be fairly well settled (*Cummings* v. *Missouri;* Ex parte Garland, 4 Wall. 333 (1867); Comment, 63 Yale L. J. 844, 846, 857–859 (1954) and cases cited). But that such a statute would be held to impose punishment cannot be stated with confidence in view of *American Communication Association, CIO* v. *Douds,* 339 U.S. 382 (1950). Although punishment may exist even though the oath statute merely withholds a privilege, *U.S.* v. *Lovett,* 328 U.S. 303 (1946), it is necessary that there be found a legislative intent to enact a penal law rather than accomplish some other proper aim. This requirement can probably be met as regards the disclaimer; but in Douds it was held (pp. 413–414) that the disability resulting from failure to sign the disclaimer was not imposed by the statute, because the statute was only prospective in operation. However this does not seem to have been the position of the Court in *Cummings* v. *Missouri,* where the Court said a bill of attainder "may inflict punishment absolutely, or may inflict it conditionally" (p. 324), and the distinction drawn in Douds seems hard to square with the reality that inability to make the disclaimer deprives one of important benefits. A question exists whether upon reconsideration of the matter in a case involving the NDEA the Court would follow Douds. Its view in Douds has been persuasively criticized (Comment, 63 Yale L. J. 844, 852 at n. 58 (1954)).

We have tried to condense our views in this letter. We have, however, available for your consideration at any time, more detailed discussion of each of the points made here.

Yours very truly,

WIGGIN & DANA.

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM UNDER THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last month there appeared in the Wall Street Journal an article concerning student loan programs under the National Defense Education Act. The article could raise, in the minds of some, questions regarding the title II program.

In order that the program can be seen in proper perspective, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the operation of the national defense student loan program, prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and a letter from Dr. Wilbur J. Cohen, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE,
September 13, 1962.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education, Labor, and Public Welfare Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Wall Street Journal of September 12 contained an article by Kenneth G. Slocum on the subject of student loan programs. The article reported some difficulties in the collection of student loans.

The attached report prepared by Student Loan Section of the Office of Education gives the pertinent facts about the operation of the student financial assistance program under title II of the National Defense Education Act. It indicates the steps the Office of Education has taken to assure efficient operation of the program and the repayment of the loans.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Assistant Secretary.

STATEMENT ON THE OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

At the time each of the 1,502 colleges, now participating in the national defense student loan program, made initial applications for Federal capital, and agreement setting forth responsibilities of both the Office of Education and the college was executed. Among the provisions in this agreement is one which stipulates that the institution will use reasonable diligence in effecting the collection of the principal and interest of the loans from the fund. Further, reasonable diligence has been defined as the same degree of diligence the institution employs in collecting any other debt owed to it.

The principle of reasonable diligence recognizes the fact that the experience of colleges in collecting long-term student loans prior to enactment of the National Defense Education Act has been of the highest order. When queried on this point last year, the following institutions reported the collection rates shown in their own student loan programs. The rates are averaged over the past 15 years. MIT, 99-plus percent; Ohio State University, 98.7 percent; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 99-plus percent; University of Michigan, 95 percent; University of Illinois, 95 percent; Harvard University, 99-plus percent.

Information from the Office of Education derived from account reports of 1,452 colleges in the program last year shows the following:

Total accounts on which payments or cancellation for teaching had been made, 25,482. Total repayments of principal and interest, $2.8 million. In 1,100 colleges, all required repayments were made on time, and in 352 institutions a total of 1,989 payments due as of November 30, 1961, were late. No institution reported an account as uncollectible, and as the figures above show, the 8 percent late payments were concentrated in less than 25 percent of the participating colleges.

To provide first-hand assistance to the colleges, two vital activities of the Office bear on the collection problem. The first of these is an internal unit conducted by staff members of the Office of Education Fiscal Advisory and Audit Section. These audits, once completed are discussed with the institution concerned, so that immediate or anticipated problems may be identified and resolved. Secondly, Regional Representatives for the Division of College and University Assistance are in constant contact with participating institutions throughout the Nation, to provide needed help and guidance whenever and wherever necessary.

Just recently, the Student Financial Aid Branch conducted a series of technical conferences in Boston, Chicago, Atlanta, and Pittsburgh on loan collections, involving collegiate, banking and legal representatives. This same subject will be a primary topic for consideration in additional conferences this fall.

During the 1962–63 college year, all participating colleges will be asked to define the policies and procedures each has developed for collection of NDEA loans. Once submitted and reviewed, this statement will become part of the binding agreement between the commissioner and the college as further support of the institutional due diligence responsibility.

IMPORTANCE OF FULL DISCLOSURE OF THE PUBLIC'S BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during all the years when I taught government and law, and long before entering politics, I had—and I continue to have—the firm conviction that in a democracy there is no substitute for full disclosure of the public's business. It has always been my position that that doctrine, which is essential to preservation of the liberties of the American people, should be the prevailing rule to be followed by all servants of the people who hold administrative positions in connection with the Government, from the President of the United States down to the most lowly public official entrusted with discretion and the rendering of judgment in the administration of government.

But it is also true that even this basic rule is subject to another rule or axiom or maxim; namely, that, after all, there are exceptions to all rules.

But, Mr. President, an exception to the rule that in a democracy there is no substitute for full disclosure of the public's business can justifiably arise only when the common good and the security of the Nation require that such an exception a strict and literal following of that rule be made. Of course this exception has been recognized in American law since the time of George Washington. The exception takes the form of executive privilege on the part of the Presidency.

There are other fact situations in which such exceptions to this rule apply—among them, the so-called doctrine of privilege in connection with pastor-parishioner relationships, lawyer-client relationships, husband-wife relationships, and doctor-patient relationships. Such exceptions bear upon the matter of full disclosure of the public's business, because although these fiduciary and confidential relationships involve information which can be considered part of the public's business, very often they also involve information which is recognized in the law as so sacrosanct and confidential and privileged that it is in the greater public interest to prevent public dissemination of information such as that which a doctor can make available about a patient, or a lawyer about a client, or a husband or a wife about each other, or that involved in any of the other confidential or fiduciary relationships.

But it is very easy to make the mistaken judgment that the exceptions are more powerful than the rule, that the exceptions should be allowed to destroy respect for and adherence to the rule in fact situations in which, as a matter of fact, the public interest really is paramount and the public interest should prevail.

I have made these statements because they are specially befitting the subject matter I want to discuss very briefly; namely, a book entitled "Washington Cover-Up," by Clark R. Mollenhoff, one of the most able correspondents and news analysts of our time. This book by Mr. Mollenhoff discusses the subject matter of privilege in connection with the administration of our Government. He pointedly and persuasively and with documented evidence throughout the book argues for the proposition—and I think irrefutably—that the doctrine of privilege has come to be abused in the administration of government, particularly on the Federal level, for time and time again congressional committees are denied access to information in the files of various agencies of the Federal Government on the ground of privilege.

One of the difficulties that confronts us in the administration of government in respect to this problem is the difficulty of getting a judicial determination of a case involving the issue. Mr. Mollenhoff points out, as I shall in a moment by taking a citation from his book, that from the very early history of our country the courts have said that such information must be made accessible to the public. But the difficulty is to enforce any ruling against a President of the United States, under the Constitution, if, for example, he exercises the judgment that the public interest calls for withholding of the information. And so from the time of Washington on down through the administrations of the Presidents, the issue of privilege has been raised.

Presidents have met it in various ways. I think it is accurate to say it has been recognized that, for the most part, the matter falls within the wise discretion of a President. That is a pretty broad generality. It can be pointed out that there are cases which shows exceptions to that generality, but, by and large, it has been pretty much recognized as judicial determination that if a President of the United States, in the exercise of his wise discretion, believes certain information should be withheld from the public for reasons of national security, or for reasons of what he considers to be the predominant national interest, he has the legal authority to do so in most fact situations.

But, by and large, Presidents of the United States have acknowledged that its denial is not automatic; that it is a matter of their judgment and discretion.

Mr. Mollenhoff has documented, at lease to my satisfaction, and I think to the satisfaction of most jurors in any jury box who might be called upon to render a jury decision on this issue, that there have been many instances of abuse of discretion in the applying of the doctrine of privilege.

It is a thesis of Mr. Mollenhoff in this book that particularly in recent times Presidents have been inclined to apply the doctrine in many fact situations in which the public interest did not really justify the application of the doctrine.

It is well that such a very able documentation of the problem has been put between the covers of an interesting and readable book under the title "Washington Cover-Up."

I think one of the able reviews of the book appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune for September 27, 1962, entitled "Reporter Sees Truth Hidden by Privilege," by Wilbur Elston. It is such an exceedingly able review of the book that I wish to associate myself with it after reading the book with great care. In my judgment, Mr. Elston's review really presents such a favorable evaluation of the book that it leaves little that can be said by any other reviewer, including the present speaker.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Elston's review be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORTER SEES TRUTH HIDDEN BY PRIVILEGE

(By Wilbur Elston)

Clark Mollenhoff is a big, bearlike man who has earned a reputation as one of the most thorough investigative reporters in Washington and as one of the Capital's strongest crusaders on behalf of the people's right to know.

In his new book ("Washington Cover-Up," Doubleday, $4.50, 209 pages), Mollenhoff emphasizes that access to news about governmental affairs is not just a problem for newspapers and journalists. Instead it is a problem that should be of concern to every citizen.

"The citizen in a democracy must know what is doing," Mollenhoff writes, "or he will lack the soundest basis for judging the candidates and the platforms of our political parties."

When Mollenhoff rears up to his full height of 6 feet 4 inches, and shoots a penetrating question at a public official in a private interview or a press conference, it is a rare man who does not quail and begin to tell Clark what he wants to know.

Yet even Mollenhoff has been halted in his pursuit of the truth about governmental affairs. What has halted him and his congressional informants, more often than not, has been the application of the theory of executive privilege.

This refers to the practice by Presidents and their deputies in the executive branch of the Federal Government of withholding information from Congress and the public whenever it seems likely that exposure would hurt some political favorite or damage the administration in power.

Mollenhoff concedes that some governmental secrecy is necessary, in order to protect military security, to protect our Government during negotiations with foreign governments, to protect individuals who might be hurt by information in the unevaluated files of the FBI, and so on.

But he insists that the tendency of Presidents to withhold information has grown, especially since World War II, and he finds fault with ex-Presidents Truman and Eisenhower as well as President Kennedy for using executive privilege to bottle up information.

From his more than 20 years as an investigative reporter—the last 12 as a Washington correspondent for the Minneapolis Star and Tribune—Mollenhoff has developed a deep suspicion of Government secrecy. His suspicion is based on the belief that secrecy breeds corruption.

Thus he contends that secrecy has been used "to hide incompetence, laxity, bungling and outright frauds in the Defense Department, in the foreign aid program, and in dozens of other areas." Secrecy prevents Members of Congress, the public and the press from getting the information they need to judge specific actions by executive agencies and their officials.

After taking a look at Government secrecy under earlier Presidents, Mollenhoff gives the Kennedy administration credit for tackling the problem of secrecy with noble thoughts and brave deeds in its first year.

But he thinks President Kennedy has made only "an uncertain start" and he sees the President's personal sensitivity to criticism and his inclination to punish his critics as portents of more trouble ahead.

What Mollenhoff proposes to counter "executive privilege" is a specific law under which all officials except the President would be required to report to Congress and the General Accounting Office—unless specific laws permitted them to withhold information.

He also wants Congress to enact special laws covering the areas in which withholding of records is deemed necessary to the public good; provide stiff criminal penalties against Government officials who withhold information, and set up a systematic review of papers carrying national security classifications.

Only through the establishment of such checks on executive secrecy will the public be assured that the laws are administered in the way that Congress intended them to be, Mollenhoff believes.

This is an admirable book, one which should be of interest to the private citizen as well as the newspaperman concerned about access to public information. The one area that he might have added to his review of Government secrecy is that of congressional secrecy, which also is a problem in Washington.

Today many committees of Congress meet behind closed doors, not at the request of the executive branch but because chairmen and members find it easier to work that way. Lobbyists for various points of view testify behind closed doors and even when the transcripts are published later, testimony is censored and the people's "right to know" is violated.

Yet Mollenhoff's book is concerned mainly with the broad principle that Government secrecy is basically undemocratic. Thus all of us can agree with his conclusion that "when the old secrecy practices are cast aside and freedom of information guaranteed, then will our democracy flourish as the Founding Fathers intended it should."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated at this point in my remarks the paragraphs written by our colleagues in the Senate: Senator Jackson, of Washington; Senator Smith, of Maine; Senator Anderson, of New Mexico; Senator Goldwater of Arizona; and also by Mr. Dabney, editor of the Richmond Times Dispatch.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statements on Book Entitled "Washington Cover-Up," by Clark R. Mollenhoff

Henry M. Jackson, U.S. Senator, Democrat of Washington: "an absorbing and provocative defense of the public's 'right to know' by a distinguished newspaperman and longtime fighter against arbitrary Government secrecy. Clark Mollenhoff tells most of his story from official records of congressional committees. He proves the need for Congress to investigate even when the Executive assures the public that 'all is well.'"

Margaret Chase Smith, U.S. Senator, Republican of Maine: "Clark Mollenhoff knows and writes his subject well. This book adds to his stature as a respected reporter. I have long experienced the frustrations of 'executive privilege' in both Democratic and Republican administrations—but the Kennedy administration is by far the worst."

Clinton P. Anderson, U.S. Senator, Democrat of New Mexico: "Clark Mollenhoff's work should alert thoughtful Americans to the clear and and present threat posed by unwarranted Government secrecy to their right to know what's happening to the public's business. He is a great reporter who does more than cover the news. He helps develop what ought to see the light of day and does it with both courtesy and courage."

Barry M. Goldwater, U.S. Senator, Republican of Arizona: "Mollenhoff's new book, 'Washington Cover-Up,' can do more to reestablish confidence in our Government than anything I can think of at the present time. Wrongdoings such as the Teapot Dome, the tax scandals, and the Billie Estes matter in Texas cannot happen without official connivance.

"The pressure this book can create can help bring an end to the secrecy which now covers up for these wrongdoers."

Virginius Dabney, editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch: "'Washington Cover-Up' is a much needed and devastating analysis, by one of the ablest living correspondents, of the pernicious doctrine known as 'executive privilege,' by which Washington bureaucrats prevent the public from finding out what is going on. It should make such coverup much more difficult hereafter."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have marked a series of passages in this book which I think substantiate the author's thesis beyond any question of doubt in respect to his claim that the doctrine of executive privilege has been overused and in some instances misused in the past quarter century or so, although there have been examples of its misuse, I think, from time to time throughout our history. I ask unanimous consent that those passages in the book which I have marked, bearing upon the observation I have made, may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From "Washington Cover-Up"

There is a sharp cruelty in secrecy that results in such injury to an individual, and there is great damage to our Government—and to people's faith in it—when secrecy is used to cover up mismanagement and corruption. I am gravely concerned over any obstructions put in the way of congressional committees' investigating the abuses of secrecy. Where would we be if Congress had not looked into such nefarious schemes as the Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding administration or the tax "fixes" in the Truman administration?

Have we, a self-governing people, learned anything from these black marks on our history? I am afraid that we have not learned enough yet. I am afraid that the people as a whole, and many persons in the press and Congress, tend to disregard the danger signs and accept the self-serving declarations of virtue from their Presidents or other high officials. A few newspapers, a few diligent investigators for congressional committees, a few Senators and a few Congressmen have had to take the whole responsibility for breaking through unjustified secrecy and uncovering the truth.

* * * * *

The corruption of the Grant administration is considered by many to be the worst blot on the Nation's escutcheon. Republican political figures organized a construction firm, the Crédit Mobilier of America, which was used to divert lavish profits from the building of the Union Pacific Railway. An American diplomatic figure lent his name to a huge mine swindle, Navy contracts were for sale, and there were wholesale frauds in the custom houses.

The widespread scandals of the Grant administration presented no basic problems for Congress in obtaining Government records because the key evidence in these cases could be obtained from sources outside the executive branch.

However, a problem did develop in 1876 when the Democratic House sought to obtain testimony and records of financial transactions of Jay Cooke & Co. Jay Cooke & Co. was one of the largest financial institutions of the time, and Jay Cooke was close to the Grant administration and Republican Party politics. When the House of Representatives discovered that the Secretary of the Treasury had deposited large sums of money with a London branch of Jay Cooke & Co., it sought to determine whether there was some impropriety involved in the decision to make the deposit.

In the course of its investigation, the House issued a subpena for Hallet Kilbourn, who managed some real estate operations for Jay Cooke & Co. Kilbourn refused to produce the documents sought and argued that the House had no right to investigate private affairs. The House ordered him arrested for contempt.

Kilbourn was imprisoned by House Sergeant at Arms John Thompson. Kilbourn immediately obtained a court order for his release and then sued Thompson for false imprisonment. The U.S. Supreme Court held that Thompson was liable for damages, and in the decision threw a doubt over the right of Congress to punish witnesses for refusing to answer questions or produce records.

The decision upset the longstanding view that the power of Congress to investigate was as broad as the almost limitless power of inquiry of the British Parliament. The U.S. Supreme Court stated:

"We are sure no person can be punished for contumacy as a witness of either House, unless his testimony is required in a matter into which that House has jurisdiction to inquire, and we feel equally sure that neither of these bodies possess the general power of making inquiry into private affairs of the citizen."

It was not until 1927, when the U.S. Supreme Court decided the case of *McGrain v. Daugherty*, that the right of Congress to compel testimony was firmly reaffirmed. In the intervening 35 years two Presidents successfully resisted the Congress.

President Grover Cleveland, a Democrat, faced a Republican Senate, and Theodore Roosevelt, an independent-minded Republican, took delight in testing his strength even against a Republican Congress.

President Cleveland in 1886 backed his Attorney General refusing to deliver to the

Senate some reports dealing with the administration of the U.S. District Attorney's office in the District of Columbia. The man who had held the office had been suspended, and Cleveland argued that the report on the reasons was the business of the executive branch. Because the Kilbourn case had weakened the position of Congress, Cleveland was not challenged.

President Theodore Roosevelt refused to allow his Attorney General to deliver papers to the Senate dealing with the status of investigations involving the United States Steel Corp. The papers included an Attorney General's opinion on the United States Steel Corp. case.

Although the papers sought involved a pending case, the Senate insisted on pursuing the matter. Herbert K. Smith, head of the Bureau of Corporations, was summoned and was threatened with contempt and imprisonment if he failed to produce the documents. President Roosevelt asked Smith for the papers and, after taking them into his possession, informed the Senate the only way they could get the papers would be by impeaching him. The Senate then dropped the matter.

The infamous scandals of the Harding administration renewed the will of the Congress, and proved for all time the need for Congress to investigate even when a President assures the public that "all is well."

* * * * *

CHAPTER III. TEAPOT DOME TO THE TAX SCANDALS

* * * * *

It was in May 1921, within a year of President Harding's election, that Secretary of Interior Fall persuaded the President and Navy Secretary Denby to transfer certain naval oil reserves from the Navy to the Interior Department. Once he got them within his domain, Fall then transferred the oil reserves—at Teapot Dome, Wyo., and Elk Hills, Calif.—to two private oil producers, Harry Sinclair and E. L. Doheny. The leases were signed secretly, without competitive bidding, and Secretary of Interior Fall conveniently tossed them into a drawer away from public view. He then proceeded to collect $100,000 from Doheny for the Elk Hills transfer, and $300,000 from Sinclair for the Teapot Dome transfer.

* * * * *

Nevertheless, the Senate investigating committee persisted. Both Secretary of Interior Fall and Secretary of Navy Denby were called to testify. It was essential to question these two high-level Government officials to lay the groundwork for the investigation. It was essential to explore the conversations between them, as well as the personal financial transactions between Fall and the Doheny and Sinclair interests. It was also necessary to explore the opinions and recommendations of subordinate officials.

Without all of this information, Congress could not have proved the dishonest use of a Government position by Albert Fall. It would have been naive to expect that the Justice Department under Harry Daugherty would have conducted an investigation that was fair and objective, for Daugherty was already mired in his own corruption.

The Harding scandals should have demonstrated for all time that the public cannot rely on any administration to police itself. Nor can it rely on the self-serving declarations of a President, however well meaning he may be.

* * * * *

President Coolidge was faced with a request for a list of the companies in which his Secretary of Treasury, Andrew Mellon, had an interest. A special Senate investigating committee was studying the Bureau of Internal Revenue and wanted to investigate the tax returns of firms with which Mellon was associated.

President Coolidge said it would be "detrimental to the public service" to reveal the list of Mellon's business interests and the tax returns of those firms. With that, the investigation ended.

Another request for information was similarly nipped by Hoover. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee had requested that Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson produce the contents of telegrams and letters leading up to the London Conference and the London Treaty. The committee contended it had a special right to such papers because of the constitutional prerogative of the Senate in the treaty-making process. Stimson disagreed and President Hoover backed him, arguing that in order to maintain friendly relations with other nations, it would be unwise to give the Senate all of the information on statements leading up to the treaty.

* * * * *

Though President Roosevelt had directed the Secretaries of War and Navy not to deliver some documents which the FCC investigators had requested, his stated reason was simply that it would "not be in the public interest." No broad claims of a constitutional right to withhold information were ever invoked. There was no need for them because the coverup was that ruthless and that effective. Had the Nation not been at war, such a coverup would likely have caused a major uproar.

The end of World War II and the election of a Republican Congress in 1946, however, brought the Democrats to heel. From the time the Republican Congress took control of the committees, the Truman administration was in almost constant combat with Congress. The first disputes involved the efforts of Republican committees of Congress to obtain access to FBI records and loyalty files. Later disputes centered on efforts to gain access to records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Justice Department.

In 1947, the Republicans were intent on demonstrating that the Truman administration was "coddling Communists." Investigators sought access to personnel records and letters dealing with the retention and promotion of persons who were alleged to be security risks or of questionable loyalty.

President Truman issued an Executive order barring Congress from access to any of the loyalty or security information in the personnel files of the Government. He said it was to protect the Government employees from abuse by committees of Congress. The unrestrained activities of some congressional investigators did indeed make the order seem justifiable to many. However, the Republicans viewed it as a coverup.

Representative Richard M. Nixon, later the Vice President, Representative CHARLES HALLECK, later the Republican leader, and a dozen other prominent Republicans kept a continuous barrage of criticism firing at President Truman.

* * * * *

If Cabinet officers and subordinate officials had refused to testify about the Teapot Dome affair on grounds of "confidential executive communications," it could have stifled the entire investigation by Senator Thomas Walsh, the Montana Democrat. Under the "executive privilege" theory, Secretary of Navy Edwin Denby and Secretary of Interior Albert B. Fall could have refused to give testimony or produce records of events leading up to the leasing of the Teapot Dome oil reserves. Fall's crimes might never have been uncovered, and he would have avoided the exposure and conviction.

* * * * *

I talked to several members of the Army-McCarthy committee, and with several of my newspaper colleagues, Democratic and Republican Senators alike were disturbed at this seemingly limitless claim for "executive privilege." They hoped that the Eisenhower administration had written the letter for just this one hearing and had used the broad language merely to avoid an impression that Senator McCarthy was being singled out for special treatment. Among the newspaper reporters the attitude was that Joe McCarthy was getting about what he had coming to him; there was little concern over what use might be made of the precedent in other investigations.

Many of the reporters had been misled by a memorandum that accompanied the Eisenhower letter. It said, in effect, that President Eisenhower was doing no more than George Washington and many other Presidents had done. By invoking such names as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, the memorandum made it possible to pass off the Eisenhower letter as a mere "clarification" of an old and settled principle. A close reading of "the precedents" disclosed in fact that President Washington actually opposed withholding information from Congress. (See ch. I.) He once refused to deliver treaty papers to the House but only because the Senate, not the House, had jurisdiction to ratify treaties.

* * * * *

CHAPTER VI. SECRECY FIX ON DIXON AND YATES

Not until the summer of 1955 did it become apparent that the May 17, 1954, Eisenhower letter would be used on matter unrelated to Senator Joseph R. McCarthy. Throughout the fall and winter of 1954, I spoke and wrote about the potential danger of "executive privilege" as it had been applied in the Army-McCarthy hearings and in the McCarthy censure hearings. A few persons saw it my way. But the general tendency to believe that the letter was written solely to deal with Senator McCarthy held fast, and a general faith prevailed that the Eisenhower administration would not use it to cover up mistakes, corruption, or improprieties.

Then suddenly, in June 1955, the White House reinvoked the letter as justification for refusing to make records available to a Senate committee investigating the Dixon-Yates contract.

First, Budget Director Rowland R. Hughes used "executive privilege" to conceal testimony and documents requested by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, the Tennessee Democrat in charge of the investigation.

Then J. Sinclair Armstrong, the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, used "executive privilege" to justify his refusal to disclose conversations with Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams relative to postponing a hearing on Dixon-Yates financing.

Also, Sherman Adams claimed the "privilege" not to be required to testify about his talks with Armstrong or about other activity in the Dixon-Yates contract development.

At least a few of the Democrats who had been only too glad to see "executive privilege" invoked against Senator McCarthy opened their eyes. The realization of the danger dawned too late, however, for it would take more than a few weeks to upset a precedent that only a year earlier had been generally viewed as praiseworthy.

* * * * *

Lewis L. Strauss, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), and Joseph Dodge, then Director of the Budget, were active in pushing this contract. Chairman Strauss pushed it despite the fact that a majority of the Atomic Energy Commissioners were opposed to such a contract on grounds there was no Atomic Energy Commission installation near West Memphis, Ark., and the power was to be used in Memphis, Tenn.

The Eisenhower administration had opposed the Tennessee Valley Authority proposal to build a steamplant at Fulton, Tenn., with a capacity of 500,000 kilowatts to provide for the power needs of Memphis, plus a surplus for industrial expansion. Budget Director Dodge opposed the Fulton steamplant and axed the $90 million requested from the budget in 1953. Gordon Clapp, at the time Chairman of the TVA, then asked that to offset the loss of the Fulton steamplant the AEC consumption of TVA power be cut sharply. It was at this point that Budget Director Dodge turned to the AEC in an effort to get that agency to find ways to obtain power from a private company.

The Dixon-Yates contract idea developed over a period of months in 1953 and early 1954. Dozens of conferences were held in which one of the important figures was Adolphe Wenzell, a vice president and director of the First Boston Corp. Wenzell was an engineer and an expert in the cost of construction of public utility plants. From May 20, 1953, to September 3, 1953, he made studies and issued reports on TVA powerplant costs. In January 1954, Rowland R. Hughes, then Deputy Director of the Budget, asked Wenzell to assist the Budget Bureau on the Dixon-Yates contract. Wenzell agreed and, until April 10, 1954, continued to participate in the Dixon-Yates negotiations.

Wenzell continued to draw his salary from First Boston Corp., and received travel costs and a per diem allowance from the Government for his services for the Budget Bureau. Since First Boston Corp. was slated to be underwriter of the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., a question was raised by his associates about the propriety of Wenzell's services to the Budget Bureau and to First Boston—a firm that had a pecuniary interest in the Dixon-Yates contract agreement.

As the Dixon-Yates contract moved toward completion, a lawyer for the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell told Wenzell that before First Boston should take part in the financing for Dixon-Yates, Wenzell should make clear that he had severed his entire relations with the Bureau of the Budget.

In the summer of 1954, a few complaints were raised about the Dixon-Yates contract. There was also opposition to the Dixon-Yates contract within the Tennessee Valley Authority as well as by a majority of the Atomic Energy Commissioners. But on June 16, 1954, Rowland Hughes, by then promoted to Director of the Budget, wrote to the Atomic Energy Commission:

"The President has asked me to instruct the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with negotiations with the sponsors of the proposal made by Messrs. Dixon and Yates with a view of signing a definite contract."

The contract was signed, and in the following weeks the number of Democratic complaints mounted. The complaints hit a number of points. The Democrats contended that the Dixon-Yates contract could cost the Government from $107 to $120 million over a period of 25 years, but that in the end the Government wouldn't own the plant. This was compared to the $90 million cost for the Fulton steamplant which the TVA wanted to construct.

* * * * *

Senator KEFAUVER took the Senate floor to lash out at the concealment of records and testimony in the Dixon-Yates investigation. At the Presidential press conference on June 30, 1955, Frank Van De Linden, of the Nashville Banner, forced the issue with President Eisenhower:

"Senator KEFAUVER charged on the Senate floor yesterday that the Budget Bureau was trying to conceal what he called a scandal in the Dixon-Yates contract negotiation regarding the employment of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, of the First Boston Corp.," Van De Linden said. "Senator Knowland says there is no corruption in it, and that he thinks you were just trying to help the Tennessee Valley get some power. I wonder if Mr. Hughes, of the Budget Bureau, had cleared with you his refusal to give Mr. KEFAUVER the information he was asking down there?"

President Eisenhower answered: "Mr. Hughes came to see me, went over the situation, and I repeated the general instructions—I think that I expressed some in front of this body—that every single pertinent paper in the Yates-Dixon contract, from its inception until the final writing of the contract, would be made available, I think I said, at that time to the press, much less to any committee."

After seeming to approve an open record, he then qualified it: "Now, I do stand on this: Nobody has a right to go in and just * * * wrecking the processes of Government by taking every single file—and some of you have seen our file rooms and know their size—and wrecking the entire filing system and paralyzing the processes of government while they are going through them."

The President rambled on: "There are—these files are filled with every kind of personal note—I guess my own files are filled with personal notes from my own staff all through; they are honeycombed with them. Well, now, to drag those things out where a man says to me, 'I think so-and-so is a bad person to appoint, to so-and-so, and you shouldn't have him,' all he had was his own opinion. You can't drag those things out and put them before the public with justice to anybody, and we are not going to do it."

President Eisenhower has engaged in a lot of conversation unrelated to the information sought. Now he indicated that he personally believed that officials of his administration had already put out all pertinent documents:

"At the time that I gave those instructions, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Strauss, whoever else was involved, got together every single document that was pertinent to this thing and put it out."

The President concluded with a complete approval of the Wenzell role: "Now, as far as the Wenzell report, Mr. Wenzell was never called in or asked a single thing about the Yates-Dixon contract. He was brought into—as a technical adviser in the very early days when none of us here knew about the bookkeeping methods of the TVA or anything else. He was brought in as a technical adviser and nothing else and before this contract was ever even proposed."

President Eisenhower seemed to have no information about Wenzell's role after January 1954. His comments seemed completely contrary to the testimony already taken before the Kefauver Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. I followed up the Van De Linden question.

"Mr. President," I said, "A little while ago you stated that Mr. Wenzell was never called in about the Yates-Dixon contract, and there seemed to be some testimony before the SEC and before a committee that he served as a consultant. I wonder if you were——"

The President cut in to answer that "He (Wenzell) did serve as a consultant at one time."

"Of Dixon-Yates?" I asked it fast.

"No; I think—now, I will check this up," the President started. "My understanding is that quickly as the Dixon-Yates thing came up he resigned, and we got as our consultant a man named Adams from the Power Commission here itself to come over and be consultant so as to have him because he (Wenzell) was connected with a great Boston financial company."

"Mr. President," I asked, "Had you been informed that he had no connection at all with the Dixon-Yates——?"

"My understanding of it, and it may have been—that part of it there may have been—an overlap of a week or two, there I am not sure of," President Eisenhower answered. It was difficult to understand he had so little information on the key issue at this late date.

"Would there be any change in your position on that if there was material that he (Wenzell) had served as a consultant on that (Dixon-Yates)?" I asked.

"If he had served as a consultant on that (Dixon-Yates) and brought in a definite recommendation to us I would be very delighted to make that public," President Eisenhower answered. "But I just don't believe there is a thing in it about it. However, I will have it checked again."

Noting the press conference statement, Senator KEFAUVER fired off a quick letter to President Eisenhower:

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have just been informed that in answer to questions of the press today you are recorded as saying that Mr. Adolphe H. Wenzell was never called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract, and that as quickly as the Dixon-Yates matter came up Mr. Wenzell resigned. However, you say you will have it checked again."

Then Senator KEFAUVER followed up with a careful chronological study of the testimony of Wenzell and other key officials in the Eisenhower administration which showed that Wenzell had been a consultant on the Dixon-Yates contract. It also showed that high Eisenhower administration officials knew, or should have known, the precise role that Wenzell had filled.

At his next press conference, on July 6, 1955, President Eisenhower said Wenzell's role was perfectly "proper" in Dixon-Yates, but indicated there was a chance the contract might be canceled.

Senator KEFAUVER sought an explanation of the Sherman Adams calls to the SEC that had postponed hearings on the financial arrangements for Dixon-Yates at the crucial point before the House took up the appropriation measure.

On July 21, Adams refused to testify before the Kefauver investigating subcommittee. In a letter to Senator KEFAUVER he stated that he could not give testimony because of his confidential relationship to the President, and also because "every fact as to which I might give testimony either has been or could be testified to fully by other responsible Government officials."

The same day Kenneth Fields, general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, wrote to KEFAUVER declining to furnish documents on ground they were "privileged communications within the executive branch." Earlier, SEC Chairman Armstrong had made his first refusal to testify on his conversations with Sherman Adams.

Senator KEFAUVER replied to Adams that there had been consistent claims of "executive privilege" that barred the investigators from obtaining the truth.

"No official of the Government," the Senator wrote, "no matter how high his position can properly claim privilege when a committee of Congress is seeking the facts in respect to corruption."

Senator KEFAUVER stated: "In these circumstances a claim of privilege is tantamount to suppression of evidence of possible crime and corruption. Not even the privilege of attorney-client can be used for such a nefarious purpose."

Sherman Adams hid out behind the protective walls of the White House, unavailable for questioning by Congress and unavailable for questioning by the press. "Executive privilege," as smoothly practiced by the Eisenhower administration, made it appear that Adams was invulnerable to attack, or even questioning, on any of his activities. Perhaps he was the cold and clean New Hampshire granite of the legend of Sherman Adams. Perhaps he was the dispassionate, efficient barrier against the corrupting influences of personal and political favoritism. But, even if Sherman Adams were the puritanic guardian of good government as pictured, the idea of surrounding any man's activities with such arbitrary secrecy was a bad principle. It was an open invitation to misuse of power and influence that few could withstand.

* * * * *

In asking Attorney General Herbert Brownell to present the matter to a Federal grand jury, Kefauver commented:

"Indictments and convictions have been obtained under section 371 of title 18 of the United States Code in cases involving similar circumstances. The offense under this section of the Criminal Code is that of conspiring to defraud the U.S. Government. The essential ingredient of the offense under this section of the Criminal Code is the failure of a governmental official to discharge conscientiously the duties of his office and administer Federal law in an unbiased manner."

Kefauver continued: "In this case there exists substantial evidence indicating that Mr. Adams, Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Strauss deliberately attempted to conceal the conflict of interest growing out of Mr. Wenzell's dual role in the Dixon-Yates deal—a conflict which the President's own Attorney General now labels so contrary to public policy as to render the agreement null and void."

Senator O'Mahoney characterized the Dixon-Yates matter as violating "every concept of decent government and fair and impartial administration of applicable law."

The stentorian-toned Wyoming Senator gave a "partial listing of the wreckage left strewn in the path" of Dixon-Yates.

1. "The independent character of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was brought into serious question.

2. "Officials of the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission were placed in the position of having been persuaded to take legal positions which ran counter to precedent of many years standing.

3. "The administration of the law by SEC was brought into disrepute because of SEC's flagrant departures from accepted interpretations of the Public Utility Holding Company Act and its succumbing to pressures from 'higher authority' emanating from the White House.

4. "AEC was forced to execute and sponsor a contract which the Department of Justice has since asserted violated the Holding Company Act, the Atomic Energy Act, and the conflict of interest statutes."

O'Mahoney said that there "is no way that we can ascertain the full facts" because "the subcommittee has been completely blocked from getting to the bottom of the Dixon-Yates contract by the very men in the White House who were involved in these negotiations."

After this debacle, it surprised me more than ever to discover that few people saw the full evil of the broad principle of "executive privilege" as set out in the May 17, 1954, letter.

There was still a general lack of awareness of the possible dictatorial power lurking behind the secrecy curtain.

* * * * *

In December 1954 and January 1955, I had written a series of articles describing the Agriculture Department's unjustified ruling on Wolf Ladejinsky. Ladejinsky, an agricultural attaché in Tokyo, was called a "security risk" by Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson without the slightest evidence that Ladejinsky's loyalty was questionable. The State Department had previously cleared Ladejinsky following an exhaustive investigation under the new and tighter security standards established by the Eisenhower administration.

I had been able to verify that the Agriculture Department made its adverse ruling on the same evidence that had been examined by the State Department when it cleared Ladejinsky. Harold Stassen, then head of the Foreign Operations Administration, moved in quickly to clear Ladejinsky. His report on Ladejinsky's file stated that there was no evidence that Ladejinsky had ever been sympathetic to any Communist causes in the 19 years he had been employed as an economist by the Government.

Even with FOA and State on record clearing Ladejinsky, it took more than 6 months of congressional investigation to force Agriculture Secretary Benson to withdraw his finding that Ladejinsky was a "security risk." Throughout the entire period of time, the investigating subcommittee was obstructed by the refusal of various agencies to submit reports and give testimony.

Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, refused to comply with a subpena duces tecum, for production of records. He cited the May 17, 1954, letter on "executive privilege" and commented:

"The President's letter points out that it is essential to efficient and effective administration that employees of the executive branch be in a position to be completely candid in advising each other on official matters, and that it is not in the public interest that any of our conversations or communications or any documents or reproductions concerning such advice be disclosed."

R. W. Scott McLeod, who then headed the State Department personnel security program, refused to tell the investigating subcommittee of his conversations with Milan D. Smith, executive assistant to Agriculture Secretary Benson. He claimed that to tell what he told Smith on the Ladejinsky case would reveal advice within the executive branch of the Government, and would violate President Eisenhower's instructions on "executive privilege."

The report of the subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee released on July 22, 1956, devoted an entire section to the problem of obtaining information from the executive branch in the face of the arbitrary secrecy policies being used under a claim of "executive privilege."

* * * * *

The report cited the classic legal treatise, "Wigmore on Evidence." In this work Professor Wigmore denies that the Chief Executive or any other officer has a testimonial privilege not to be a witness in court.

"The public (in the words of Lord Hardwicke) has a right to every man's evidence," Professor Wigmore wrote. "Is there any reason why this right should suffer an exemption when the desired knowledge is in the possession of a person occupying at the moment the office of the Chief Executive of a State?

"There is no reason at all. His temporary duties as an official cannot override his permanent and fundamental duty as a citizen and as a debtor to justice. The general principle * * * of testimonial duty to disclose knowledge needed in judicial investigations is of universal force. It does not suffer an exception which would be irrespective of the nature of the person's knowledge and would rest wholly in the nature of the person's occupation * * *.

"Let it be understood then, that there is no exemption for officials as such, or for the Executive as such, from the universal testimonial duty to give evidence in judicial investigations. The exemptions that exist are defined by other principles."

* * * * *

According to the best authorities it seemed clear that Congress had the power to compel testimony when searching for facts within its jurisdiction. The Supreme Court had held that private persons could be compelled to testify, and it seemed equally clear that Government officials could be compelled to give evidence. There was no way for Congress to force the President personally to give testimony or produce records except by impeaching him. Yet he was obligated, along with all other Government officials, to give testimony or produce records for a proper congressional committee as long as the national security was not endangered.

Certainly the revelation of testimony of conversations between a State Department personnel officer and an Agriculture Department personnel officer on the Wolf Ladejinsky case would not endanger the national security of the United States. It is significant that the Department of Agriculture departed from precedent in previous security cases in making information on Ladejinsky available, but this was information derogatory to Ladejinsky. The Department used secrecy to hide its own faulty administration. The claim of executive privilege was simply being used to cover up, and everyone familiar with the record knew it.

* * * * *

CHAPTER XI.—KEEPING THE PROFESSOR IN THE DARK

The Justice Department, Commerce Department, Agriculture Department, Defense Department, and State Department had all used the arbitrary secrecy of "executive privilege" without causing a public uproar. Not only had they succeeded in avoiding major press criticism, but they had secured statements from President Eisenhower to give a noble and patriotic coloring to their deceptions.

With such encouragement at the top it was inevitable that the policy of secrecy would spread. In August 1957, the newly created House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee hired Bernard Schwartz, the young law professor from New York (see Chapter VIII), as counsel for an investigation of the various regulatory agencies. The committee, headed by Representative Morgan Moulder, Missouri Democrat, had been established "to go into the administration of the laws (creating the regulatory agencies) and see whether or not the laws * * * were being carried out or whether they were being repealed or revamped by those who administer them."

The young professor had barely started his work in September 1957, when he began bumping into secrecy trouble. In all, there were six of the so-called independent regulatory agencies in the scope of the House Legislative Oversight Subcommittee. The "big six" to be probed were the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB), the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), the Federal Power Commission (FPC), the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).

The Congress had created these regulatory agencies to perform a wide range of functions including control of radio and television licenses, control of gas and electric powerlines, control of commercial land transportation by train, truck, or bus, the investment market, and air transportation. Rights worth billions of dollars were involved in the decisions of these agencies, and it had been the stated intention of Congress to remove these decisions from the direct pressure of politics. To do this, the regulatory agencies were headed by bipartisan commissions or boards, the members of which were nominated by the President, subject to approval by the Senate and limited to a fixed term of office.

In theory, at least, these boards or commissions were specialized courts in their fields. They had rulemaking and administrative functions, but they also rendered judicial decisions on the basis of public records and public hearings. Once appointed, these members of the regulatory agencies were to be insulated from the pressure politics of the White House and the Congress. Prior to Dr. Schwartz' arrival in Washington, there had been widespread reports, and some evidence, that members of some of the regulatory commissions were engaging in conversations with political personnel at the White House and elsewhere on cases under study. To Dr. Schwartz, an outstanding authority in the field of administrative law, it was elementary that such conversations were improper while a case was being decided.

"It is as bad as having one of the parties in a lawsuit sneak into the chambers of the judge to try to influence his decision in the middle of a trial," Dr. Schwartz told me.

* * * * *

On September 19, Dr. Schwartz requested that the CAB allow members of the House subcommittee staff "to receive and examine any records, documents, or information directly, or indirectly, pertaining to your agency, function or business within the jurisdiction of this subcommittee."

A few days later, on September 23, he pressed CAB Chairman James R. Durfee for full access to CAB records. Durfee insisted that CAB would screen all files containing documents or communications from other agencies or departments of Government. It was now apparent that Durfee was going to refuse access to internal governmental communications on grounds of executive privilege. Dr. Schwartz was irate. He termed Chairman Durfee's position "completely ridiculous" and suggested that Durfee obtain competent legal counsel.

By this time the pressure of the investigation was being felt by a number of the regulatory agencies. The chairmen of six regulatory agencies met at a luncheon at the University Club in Washington the next week to determine how to handle the inquisitive Dr. Schwartz. Because of the success some Government departments had been having with executive privilege some of the chairmen decided that this was to be the answer for their agencies, but there was no general agreement.

* * * * *

Dr. Schwartz was allowed to examine the public files, but his efforts to obtain files of correspondence with the White House and with other agencies ran into the claim of executive privilege. In the first months, he nevertheless became aware that Sherman Adams and others on the White House staff had been extremely active in reaching various regulatory agencies.

In an exhaustive 82-page "Memorandum of Law," filed on October 17, Dr. Schwartz exposed the true nature of the executive privilege arguments. They all sprang from the idea that the king can do no wrong.

"In the pretension of those who espouse executive privilege," he said, "the infallibility recognized in the king in the days when he was personally sovereign of England has been attributed to the President in our system. The reasoning which supports the doctrine should shock the intelligence, as well as the sense of justice, of those who truly believe in the essentials of representative democracy."

He reported that the CAB claimed "the authority to screen files and records before they are made available to the subcommittee, with a right to the Board in its discretion to remove any and all documents" that could be considered personal files of Board members or communications within CAB or with the White House.

* * * * *

"The Civil Aeronautics Board cannot claim privilege with regard to communications between the Board, on the one hand, and the President or other departments and agencies, on the other. Such an assertion of privilege cannot defeat the right of this subcommittee to investigate the relationship between the independent regulatory agencies and the executive branch."

Schwartz continued: "'Executive privilege' is not available to an independent agency like the Civil Aeronautics Board as a possible basis for the withholding of information from the Congress. The Civil Aeronautics Board, as the Supreme Court has recognized, is an independent agency whose members are not subject to the removal power of the President. Such a body cannot in any proper sense be characterized as an arm or an eye of the Executive. It is instead an arm of the Congress, wholly responsible to that body.

"The doctrine of absolute 'executive privilege' itself is not supported in law. The cases cited by its proponents are not truly relevant on the power of the Executive to withhold information from the Congress. On the other hand, there are many decisions squarely rejecting the doctrine, even in courtroom cases. In addition, Dean Wigmore (the leading authority on the subject in this country) flatly repudiates the doctrine."

* * * * *

Tempers flared in the days following the leak of the Schwartz memorandum, and finally on February 10, 1958, the House subcommittee voted to fire Dr. Schwartz. I called Dr. Schwartz in the early evening of February 10 to inform him of the subcommittee's decision and also to tell him that a subpena was to be issued for him to testify the next morning.

He told me he had copies of every important document from the committee files in a trunk and two cardboard boxes. "Someone should have knowledge of what is in these records," he said, "so it will be possible to force the subcommittee to continue hearings." If something dramatic wasn't done, he was convinced the investigation would never get off the ground.

Dr. Schwartz asked if I wanted the copies of documents to take to Members of Congress who had shown an interest in the problems of the regulatory agencies. I said I should not take possession of documents which might be considered the property of the House subcommittee. But since the documents were legally in his custody, I suggested that he could take them to the apartment of Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the Delaware Republican, and I would be happy to accompany him.

I had talked with Senator WILLIAMS of improper pressure on the regulatory agencies and thought he would take the records. He had fought against tax scandals in the Truman administration, but I regarded him as an objective crusader who would call the strikes the same way if the Eisenhower administration were involved in wrongdoing. I had hoped that Senator WILLIAMS might be able to give the investigation of regulatory agencies the same prodding that he had given to the House tax scandals investigations in 1951 and 1952.

Dr. Schwartz said he would be willing to turn the papers over to Senator WILLIAMS and explain them to him in detail.

I headed at once for his apartment. When I arrived, Dr. Schwartz had the trunk and two boxes of documents ready to go. Mrs. Schwartz was nervous about her husband's going, however. I assured her that for practical political reasons it was unlikely that the House would take action against Dr. Schwartz for delivering the documents to a U.S. Senator. As quickly as possible we carried the heavy trunk and boxes to my car. At the Mayflower Hotel, we hired a porter to wheel them on a baggage cart to the apartment of Senator WILLIAMS. While we were at the Williams apartment, Dr. Schwartz received an urgent telephone call from his wife. He took it in private in another room. Mrs. Schwartz said she had been called by a reporter who told her that since Senator WILLIAMS was a Republican, he would probably turn the documents over to Sherman Adams at the White House. The fear was groundless, but Mrs. Schwartz was frantic and made her husband promise to leave the Williams apartment and take the documents with him.

Dr. Schwartz returned to the room and told the Senator it had been suggested that the documents might be taken to Senator WAYNE MORSE, the Oregon Democrat. We excused ourselves to go telephone Senator MORSE and left Senator WILLIAMS alone with the documents. I made the call. As I was certain he would—for I had previously talked with him about the regulatory agency scandals—MORSE assured me he was interested in reviewing any documents Schwartz had available.

When we arrived at his apartment, Senator MORSE greeted us calmly and assured us that he wanted the documents because of his official interest in the regulatory agencies, and we left them with him. Now we felt certain we had created a situation in which it would be virtually impossible for the House to avoid going forward with the investigation. The word would move fast that the files had been examined by a leading Democratic Senator and a leading Republican Senator. It would create a good many complex problems for any House Members inclined to ignore or hide the evidence and leads that Schwartz had accumulated.

Before the Schwartz files were returned to the House subcommittee, Senator MORSE read them. It was reported to me that most, if not all, of the documents were photographed before they were sent on to Representative OREN HARRIS, the Arkansas Democrat who was chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Until now it appeared Sherman Adams had erected a total shield from investigations by Congress. He had used "executive privilege" to avoid testimony in the Dixon-Yates case. He had been able to make his contacts at the Securities and Exchange Commission without undergoing questioning by the investigating subcommittee which was examining why the SEC had postponed a hearing on Dixon-Yates at a crucial point.

It was Sherman Adams who scribbled his initials on papers to indicate he had approved them for President Eisenhower's signature. Sherman Adams was on the telephone daily to U.S. Senators and Congressmen on knotty legislative and patronage matters. Sherman Adams ironed out the problems between Cabinet officers, and he dipped his hand into virtually every department from the first months of the Eisenhower administration. Always it was understood that Sherman Adams was speaking for President Eisenhower, or was acting for President Eisenhower. Even when he didn't say, "This is what the President wants," it was understood he was speaking for President Eisenhower.

* * * * *

CHAPTER XIV. HIDING THE LAOS MESS

By the summer of 1959, Representative PORTER HARDY was fed up with arbitrary executive secrecy. The lanky Virginia Democrat was getting a double dose of "executive privilege" and had nearly reached the end of his patience. He was a member of the Armed Services Subcommittee headed by Chairman EDWARD HÉBERT, and therefore had firsthand knowledge of how the Defense Department was hampering investigations of military waste.

Representative HARDY was also chairman of his own Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee. This subcommittee (of the House Government Operations Committee) was responsible for investigating the handling of more than $60 billion in foreign aid by the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration (ICA).

The Hardy subcommittee had a small staff of a half dozen headed by John T. Reddan, the chief counsel. Under the best circumstances, HARDY knew that they would be able to look into only a few reports of mismanagement or fraud. But a little scrutiny should soon tell whether the internal investigations of ICA were being conducted in such a manner that the Congress could rely on ICA to police itself.

To find out how well ICA was performing, it was necessary to examine the files of complaints of fraud or mismanagement and to determine how these complaints were being followed up by ICA investigators. But the ICA barred HARDY's committee or staff members from examing the investigation files as well as the evaluation reports ICA was making on its own operations. Such files, Chairman HARDY was told, would contain "advice, recommendations and conclusions," and, according to President Eisenhower's May 17, 1954, letter, therefore, could not be released.

* * * * *

The requests for ICA files on Laos foreign-aid spending were rejected by ICA Director James W. Riddleberger. The ICA also barred Chairman HARDY from files on India, Bolivia, Brazil, and Guatemala.

A few months later, the ICA refused to let the GAO auditors see the files on Laos.

Chairman HARDY was irked with the frustration, but downright furious at what he considered to be a disregard of the law. Certainly the ICA reports on Laos should be made available to the GAO, for the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921 provided explicitly that all records of all departments must be made available to the GAO auditors.

Furthermore, when the foreign-aid program had been established in 1948, the debates had included discussion of the accounting on foreign aid and the necessity for availability of information to Congress.

At that time Senator Arthur Vandenberg, the Michigan Republican, commented:

"There are several points in the bill where it is provided that Congress is to be advised. In addition, we are creating * * * the 'watchdog' committee (Joint Committee on Economic Cooperation) * * * which will be entitled to all information of every character at all times."

Despite the law and the intention of the lawmakers, the ICA had clamped the secrecy lid on, and kept it on. ICA also rejected GAO requests for information on foreign-aid spending in Formosa, India, Vietnam, Pakistan, France, Turkey, and others.

In its investigation of but one of the foreign-aid programs—the one in Laos—the Hardy subcommittee unearthed enough evidence of incompetence, laxity, mismanagement, and fraud to fill scores of pages of an official report.

* * * * *

CHAPTER XVI. KENNEDY MAKES A WOBBLY START

* * * * *

During the 1960 campaign, President Kennedy made a most forthright declaration on the responsibility of the President to keep the citizens fully informed so that democracy would flourish.

"An informed citizenry is the basis of representative government," he said. "Democracy—as we know it—cannot exist unless the American people are equipped with the information which is necessary if they are to make the informed political choices on which the proper functioning of the democracy depends. An informed people—able to examine, and when necessary, to criticize, its government—is the only guarantee of responsible democracy."

As a candidate, Kennedy also declared that the President had much more than a negative duty.

"The President—who himself bears much of the responsibility for the preservation of American democracy—has the affirmative duty to see that the American people are kept fully informed. It is true that in today's world of peril some Government information must be kept secret—information whose publication would endanger the security of national security—the people of the United States are entitled to the fullest possible information about their Government—and the President must see that they receive it."

Senator Kennedy said that the "executive privilege" should be reserved for the exclusive use of the President. He added that when information is not restricted by specific statute, security needs, or the Constitution, "there is no justification for using the doctrine of 'executive privilege' to withhold that information from Congress and the public."

* * * * *

Democrats took great party pride in the speeches President Kennedy made to assure the public of his concern for freedom of information.

"The essence of free communication must be that our failures as well as our successes will be broadcast around the world," President Kennedy said at the convention of the National Association of Broadcasters. "And therefore we take double pride in our successes.

"The great inner resource of freedom, the resource which has kept the world's oldest democracy continuously young and vital, the resource which has always brought us our greatest exploits in time of our greatest need, is the very fact of the open society.

"Thus, if we are once again to preserve our civilization, it will be because of our freedom, and not in spite of it. For the flow of ideas, the capacity to make informed choices, the ability to criticize, all the assumptions upon which political democracy rests, depends largely upon communication."

By the time the House Government Operations Committee was ready to file a second report on Government information policies, the Democrats were aglow with admiration for President Kennedy. The September 21, 1961, report stated: "For the first time since the subcommittee entered the fight against excessive Government secrecy six years ago, there is a powerful new weapon—the support of a President who is clearly on record in favor of the greatest flow of Government information."

Representative MEADER thought the Democrats were too willing to praise a Democratic administration. In his dissent, he wrote:

"I cannot subscribe to the majority report because in my judgment it has political overtones and accepts the self-serving declarations of officials in the new administration rather than actual performance as indicating an improvement in the attitude of the executive branch toward providing information to the Congress and the public.

"The majority condemns the Eisenhower administration record on secrecy in Government while praising that of the Kennedy administration. Such a distinction in my opinion, is not justified."

MEADER well remembered the fine words spoken in 1952 and 1953 on the same subject by officials of the Eisenhower administration. He knew that the true test of the Kennedy administration lay not with words but with the administration's continued willingness to support the power of inquiry of the Congress.

A few days after the release of the House report and MEADER's dissent, Attorney General Kennedy upheld the importance of investigations by Congress.

* * * * *

CHAPTER XVIII. A SOLUTION

History establishes that any administration may be afflicted with laxity, incompetence, and even outright fraud. History has also taught that any administration can harbor men who want to hide mistakes and corruption.

It is true that no President has been directly involved in fraudulent activity, and it seems unlikely that any ever will be. Holding such a high office would inspire almost any man to rise above the desire for personal enrichment, particularly if the cost might be damaging to his place in history. But any President might be tempted to hide records on a claim of executive privilege if he felt he could save some trusted subordinate from the slings of the opposition political party.

In varying degrees, our Presidents have been dependent upon a palace guard. The nature of the position, with all its vast responsibilities, makes a circle of close advisers inevitable. Thus Presidents of the past have sought information about alleged improprieties or corruptions from the very men who have been accused of perpetrating them. Instead of facts and a clear analysis of the problem—whether it was Teapot Dome, tax scandals, or Dixon-Yates—the Presidents have received misinformation and excuses. The accusations have been explained away to our Presidents as partisan complaints from politicians maliciously bent on destroying the administration's programs. Such explanations from palace guards unfortunately have been all too effective and have obscured the facts that would have alerted our Presidents to conflicts of interest, favoritism, and fraud.

President Kennedy and future Presidents will face the same kind of pitfalls. Regardless of their own integrity, they cannot be expected to conduct personal investigations of each of their subordinates. The Presidents and the people must therefore depend upon investigations from outside the executive branch—by the Congress and the General Accounting Office—for an aggressive search for the facts.

Investigations by Congress have demonstrated the failure of the military departments to police themselves effectively from the inside. In every recent year, the Congress and the GAO have pinpointed the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars on inefficient, incompetent, or corrupt handling of defense contract arrangements.

Examination of testimony on the foreign-aid programs in Laos and Peru shows that the State Department is little better than the Defense Department in rooting out mismanagement and corruption. There are dozens of other areas within the bureaucracy where the record is just as bad.

It is doubtful that we will ever eliminate corruption in the Federal Government, but it must be kept under closer control or it can spread with devastating impact. Nothing speeds the growth of corruption more than policies that foster arbitrary secrecy. Secrecy allows little scandals to become major scandals, costly to the tapayers, devastating to our foreign-aid program, to our position of defense readiness, and to our national morale.

* * * * *

In these pages, I have not attempted to examine every agency of Government. I have examined enough, however, to show how severe the infection of secrecy has become, what dire symptoms it produces, and how seriously it threatens the health of our democracy.

It can be wiped out. As treatment for a permanent cure, I suggest the following steps:

1. All officials except the President should be obligated to explain all their actions to Congress and the General Accounting Office, unless specific laws are passed for withholding information. This does not mean that the public or Congress should have access to all papers when a decision is pending, but at a later date Congress should have access to all records and testimony concerning events leading up to the executive decisions.

* * * * *

2. Congress should enact special laws to cover the specific areas in which withholding of records is deemed necessary to the public good. There are now laws that provide for withholding of Federal income tax information from the public, and from all committees of Congress except certain ones with supervisory jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Service. Laws have been enacted providing for withholding of defense

> information that involves national security. Other areas—FBI reports, patent secrets, business reports, or personnel files—could be covered by special legislation of a similar nature, but modified to meet the requirements of the area in which the withholding is needed.
>
> 3. Congress should provide stiff criminal penalties for use against Government officials who withhold information from properly authorized committees of Congress or the GAO. This legislation should also provide the mechanism for prosecution to be initiated by the Congress or the GAO. Such a mechanism is necessary to avoid the situation wherein an Attorney General, advocate for the President and appointed by the President, simply refuses to enforce the law or gives patently false legal opinions to avoid enforcement.
>
> 4. The Congress should establish an effective means for systematic review of papers carrying national security classifications of "confidential," "secret," or "top secret." Or the President could establish a small committee to spot check, review, and challenge questionable use of national security classifications. However the review group is set up, its members should be selected from outside the military field, and they should be persons with a strong and responsible interest in open government. They should have authority to challenge arbitrary or questionable security classifications and authority to obtain explanations from all persons with a role in questionable classifications.
>
> This review group should not have the power to change classifications, only the power to recommend changes. It should have the authority, however, to file reports with Congress, with department heads, and with the President that could be made public. Such reports should identify individuals engaged in arbitrary or questionable overclassification, as well as those responsible for failing to take steps to declassify.

* * * *

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to read two or three of them with brief comments.

On page 16 Mr. Mollenhoff says:

> There is a sharp cruelty in secrecy that results in such injury to an individual, and there is great damage to our Government—and to people's faith in it—when secrecy is used to cover up mismanagement and corruption.

The author had just given a dramatic case of a woman in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who had been discharged but who was unable to find out the reasons for her discharge, unable to find out the sources of the allegations against her, unable to find out what claimed facts were presented which justified her discharge. Mr. Mollenhoff pointed out that this resulted in a cruel injustice to this woman.

As one reads the facts of the case, the exercise of the doctrine of privilege, the refusal to give the woman the facts, all take on the coloring of a police state technique. Of course, that is the danger always present when executive privilege is exercised, or when there is a denial of public information as a part of the public's business on the grounds of privilege.

Mr. Mollenhoff recognizes that, for example, the raw data of the FBI we would not expect to be publicized, for, as we have stated many times in recent years in the Senate, the raw data of the FBI contain all sorts of rumors, accusations, and hearsay. It is recognized that much of the information is unreliable and comes from unreliable sources, yet it is material which the FBI must sift and must consider in connection with leads for its detection work.

We know there have been times when cases involving even the raw files of the FBI have led to such serious accusations in the Halls of Congress that arrangements have been made, under various Presidents, to have bipartisan subcommittees of committees go to the Department of Justice to check into such files and to report their conclusions to their committees later. I well remember that some years ago such a serious problem arose in connection with files in the State Department, and two members of the Committee on Foreign Relations were appointed to confer with the Secretary of State. They were allowed to see the supposedly top secret files that involved charges of injustice in connection with the State Department.

It will be recalled by the presiding officer that from time to time in recent years similar disputes have arisen as between committees of the Congress or Members of the Congress and the State Department over passports. The senior Senator from Oregon, in representing constituent claims on various occasions, has found himself in serious disagreement with the Department over the denial of passports and charges which were made that the particular constituent was being denied a passport on the grounds of security reasons. All the information the senior Senator from Oregon had about the constituent led him to believe that there was no basis in fact for a justifiable denial of a passport.

To the credit of the State Department, in several of those instances I was taken into the confidence of the State Department—and I ask Senators to mark my language—and was given the so-called secret information that was used as a justification for the denial of the passport. In a couple of instances, Mr. President, the information was completely inaccurate. Again I say, to the credit of the State Department, after the correct information was supplied passports were issued.

But those constituents had someone to fight for them. So I raised at that time, and I raise tonight, the question: What about other Americans denied passports who did not have a Senator to fight for them? Who did not take it up with a Senator? Who were beaten down by the State Department?

Those are the injustices which exist, Mr. President, and which are bound to arise when one substitutes secrecy for full public disclosure of the public's business.

One can only wonder how many American citizens have been subjected to great wrong by various agencies of the Government which have followed what amount to police state methods by an abusive exercise of discretion in the name of privilege, whose cases would have been differently handled if the elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States had known of the individual cases and had "gone to bat" for them, so to speak.

One might say, "After all, this is a part of our check and balance system. If a person believing he has been wronged does not make use of the congressional check, he has only himself to blame."

That is fine theory. But it has very little relationship to practicality. Very often wrongs are done to uninformed people, ignorant people, frightened people, and many people who by temperament tend to surrender quickly and easily.

We cannot justifiably put the burden upon the victim. The burden of the problem so ably discussed by Mr. Mollenhoff in the book rests on the executive branch of the Government whenever it abuses its power, and rests upon the legislative branch of the Government when it fails to take the necessary steps to check the abuse. The burden lies in those two places.

I believe it is good that Mr. Mollenhoff has given us factual information between the covers of this very readable and relatively short book of only 239 pages, including its appendixes.

The purpose of my discussion of the book tonight is not only to recommend and commend the book and its author, but to raise the issue once more before the Congress of the United States, What does the Congress propose to do about it?

If reelected on November 6—and I fully expect to be, as evidenced by the fact that I am ready to go to vote tomorrow—I intend to do something about it in January, because the book has inspired me to make a study of this problem from the standpoint of legislative or constitutional amendment remedy.

Certain legislative remedies or checks could be imposed. If my research satisfies me that I am correct, I shall offer them early in January 1963. However, if that legal research leads to the conclusion that a constitutional amendment would be required, I shall propose a constitutional amendment. As government becomes more and more complex, it becomes more and more important that we put into the laws the procedural checks that will protect individuals, for our Government exists only for the purpose of promoting the general welfare of the people of our country. It does not exist to empower Presidents to exercise unwise discretion.

It does not exist for the purpose of subjecting the American people, or any one of them, to procedural abuses that take on the coloring of police state techniques.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. BURDICK) knows very well the position of the senior Senator from Oregon in regard to the unchecked power of CIA. Not one out of a hundred American citizens is fully aware of the arbitrary, uncontrollable, unchecked power of CIA.

I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Not a single member of that committee can get any information out of CIA that CIA does not want to give us. The Congress cannot get information out of CIA if CIA does not want to give it to us.

That is a frightening and frightful power. Whenever any agency of Government is given such unchecked power, democracy in the United States is not safe.

I have said before, and repeat tonight, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, that the unchecked power of CIA is dangerous to the American people in respect to the potentially explosive situation in Latin America, for it violates the precious principle of checks and balances between the executive and the legislative branch of Government.

Mr. President, on page 16 of this book, bearing on the question of secrecy in Government, Mr. Mollenhoff states:

> There is a sharp cruelty in secrecy that results in such injury to an individual, and there is great damage to our Government—and to people's faith in it—when secrecy is used to cover up mismanagement and corruption. I am gravely concerned over any obstructions put in the way of congressional committees investigating the abuses of secrecy. Where would we be if Congress had not looked into such nefarious schemes as the Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding administration, or the tax "fixes" in the Truman administration?
>
> Have we, a self-governing people, learned anything from these black marks on our history? I am afraid that we have not learned enough yet. I am afraid that the people as a whole, and many persons in the press and Congress, tend to disregard the danger signs and accept the self-serving declarations of virtue from their Presidents or other high officials. A few newspapers, a few diligent investigators for congressional committees, a few Senators and a few Congressmen have had to take the whole responsibility for breaking through unjustified secrecy and uncovering the truth.

On page 23 Mr. Mollenhoff states—and this is fascinating American history and a completely accurate interpretation of the case of Marbury against Madison:

> A Supreme Court case in the administration of President Thomas Jefferson raised the question of whether it was possible for the courts to force the Cabinet to perform certain acts required by law. In the last hours of the administration of President John Adams a midnight appointment was made of a justice of the peace for the District of Columbia named William Marbury, a minor Federalist political figure. James Madison, who became the new Secretary of State in the Jefferson administration, refused to deliver the commission to Marbury to complete the appointment process.
>
> Marbury asked the Supreme Court to issue a writ of mandamus under the Judiciary Act of 1789 to force Madison to deliver the commission. In February 1803, Chief Justice John Marshall delivered the opinion of the Court. First he dealt with the question of whether Madison had a right to refuse to deliver the commission to a properly appointed official. The decision was a rebuke to Secretary of State Madison and stated: "Is it to be contended that the heads of departments are not amenable to the laws of their country?"
>
> However, the opinion went on to conclude that the Constitution provided no methed for the Supreme Court to issue writs to force the Executive action requested. Chief Justice Marshall stated that the Judiciary Act providing for a writ was inconsistent with the Constitution, and that "a law repugnant to the Constitution is void."

Our legal scholars and court after court since then have pointed out that the great Virginian handed down a decision holding that, after all, the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land.

Even though it meant that in this particular instance there was no enforcibility, it nevertheless did not change the legal principle that Marshall had enunciated.

Mr. Mollenhoff says:

> Although Madison was wrong in withholding the commission from Marbury, the Court held that under the Constitution there was no way to force action. The case did not mean that Madison had a legal right, but only that Marbury had no remedy. The Marbury appointment was in essence a political matter and could only have been countered indirectly by the impeachment of the President.
>
> The specific question of congressional access to executive papers was raised in one case in the Jefferson administration. In 1807, President Jefferson was requested to furnish the House "any information in the possession of the Executive" on the allegation of a conspiracy by Aaron Burr. However, the request specifically exempted papers "such as he (Jefferson) may deem the public welfare to require not to be disclosed."
>
> President Jefferson displayed an awareness of the dangers of arbitrary withholding of information by carefully explaining the nature of the papers he did not deliver. He stated that these papers included matters "chiefly in the form of letters, often containing such a mixture of rumors, conjectures, and suspicions as to render it difficult to sift out the real facts and unadvisable to hazard more than general outlines, strengthened by concurrent information or the particular creditability of the relator."
>
> Later, when Aaron Burr was actually tried for treason in Richmond, Chief Justice Marshall issued a subpena for papers in Jefferson's custody, including a private letter from General James Wilkinson to Jefferson. While Jefferson continued to assert a right to determine which papers he would produce, he did in fact send all the documents requested in the subpena.

(At this point, Mrs. NEUBERGER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. In fact, that has often been the position of Presidents. They have said, "We deny your right to demand these papers from us, but we will voluntarily supply the papers." Throughout most of the history of the Nation, Presidents, when they have been requested to furnish some papers, have supplied them, even as they restated their constitutional right, which Marshall made clear was theirs, namely, the right to deny information on the ground of privilege, if they felt that the public welfare called upon them to make such a denial.

So in this instance, as the author points out, Jefferson clearly stated his presidential right, but he supplied the papers. I continue to read:

> Also, General Wilkinson appeared at the trial and testified fully about his communications with President Jefferson. Chief Justice Marshall's decision conceded that the President could not be summoned to make a personal appearance before a judicial body because of the nature of his position and the dignity of his office. Since Jefferson produced all the documents under subpena there was no need for adjudicating the issue of what types of papers might be withheld. (The trial eventually resulted in a jury acquittal for Burr.)
>
> Until President Jackson's term there were no significant controversies over requests for information. Jackson was involved in a number of disputes. Although he consistently asserted a right to withhold information from Congress, he usually sent the requested documents along with his angry criticism of Congress for making the requests.
>
> A Senate investigation of land frauds in the Jackson administration resulted in demands for papers dealing with land transactions conducted by a Jackson appointee. President Jackson refused to deliver the papers to Congress, but the resulting coverup of land frauds could hardly be called a precedent worthy to be followed.

Then Mr. Mollenhoff goes on to discuss the experiences with other Presidents in history, on down through the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, and then he proceeds to discuss the issue of secrecy, as it was raised in connection with the Teapot Dome scandals. A mere reading of the chapter headings of the book tells a story.

I have already obtained unanimous consent to insert certain excerpts in the RECORD dealing with Mr. Mollenhoff's discussion of this problem of secrecy, and these excerpts will cover each of the chapters, a list of whose headings are as follows:

> Chapter I. Secrecy Solves No Problems.
>
> Chapter II. The First Century.
>
> Chapter III. Teapot Dome to the Tax Scandals.
>
> Chapter IV. Army-McCarthy—A Claim of Secrecy Unlimited.
>
> Chapter V. Another Blow at Senator Joe.
>
> Chapter VI. Secrecy Fix on Dixon and Yates.

Madam President, with reference to chapter VI, every Senator will recall the courageous fight made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I shall always be proud of the fact that I stood with him in that secrecy contest over Dixon-Yates. As the Presiding Officer of the Senate knows, it did not take very long to prove we were right in our objections to the attempt of the Eisenhower administration to cover up the scandals of Dixon-Yates.

The list continues:

> Chapter VII. Congress Becomes Concerned.
>
> Chapter VIII. Secrecy Hides the Security Bunglers.
>
> Chapter IX. Secrecy Curtain on Iron Curtain Deals.
>
> Chapter X. Pressing a Point With Ike.
>
> Chapter XI. Keeping the Professor in the Dark.

What memories that brings back. The Presiding Officer knows that some of these documents were delivered to my home after midnight one night for safekeeping, because there was an attempt on the part of the Government to cover up the secrecy which these wandering documents portrayed.

The author of the book was one of the deliverers of these documents to my home on that very interesting occasion.

The list concludes, as follows:

> Chapter XII. Ike's Lawyer and the Law.
>
> Chapter XIII. Muzzling the Public's Watchdog.
>
> Chapter XIV. Hiding the Laos Mess.
>
> Chapter XV. Defiance to the End, Above the Law.
>
> Chapter XVI. Kennedy Makes a Wobbly Start.
>
> Chapter XVII. A Pending Problem for J.F.K.
>
> Chapter XVIII. A Solution.

Appendix A. Letter from President Eisenhower to the Secretary of Defense.

Appendix B. Letters Regarding the Presidential Letter of May 17, 1954.

Appendix C. Correspondence on the Right of Access to Information by the General Accounting Office.

Appendix D. Letter From President Kennedy to the Secretary of Defense.

Appendix E. Executive Privilege Correspondence Between President Kennedy and Congressman JOHN E. MOSS.

The book shows that the problem of secrecy is still with us. The book shows that we still have a long way to go in the administration of government and of this democracy to give full meaning and effect to that tenet that I announced when I began my speech—namely, that in a democracy there is no substitute for full disclosure of the public's business.

I highly commend Mr. Mollenhoff for the contribution he has made to the crying need for greater protection of the people's rights against a growing enveloping secrecy by government, a secrecy which if not stopped will take on the color of police state techniques.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A BETTER DAY FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the agricultural economy of this Nation is in a decided upswing, and the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the 87th Congress can be proud of this accomplishment.

This upswing is being felt all across the Nation. It is benefiting the farmer, labor, businessmen, and consumers.

It has reversed an 8-year downtrend that saw farm income drop year after year while surpluses increased at great cost to the taxpayers.

This upswing is a direct result of legislation proposed by the Kennedy administration, enacted by this Congress and implemented by Secretary Freeman and the Department of Agriculture.

HIGHER FARM INCOME

Farm income is higher, food prices are stabilized, farm assets are higher, and agricultural exports are at a new high. We are sharing more of our abundance at home and abroad. Surplus grain stocks have been reduced. Crop production is more in line with our needs. Our soil, water, and forests are better protected, and a revitalized rural renewal program is attacking the problem of rural poverty.

The increase in net farm income in 1961 was $1.1 billion over 1960, and this important gain is due in large part to the enactment of two bills last year—the Emergency Feed Grain Act and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Net farm income in 1961 was $12.8 billion—$1.1 billion higher than in 1960 and the highest net income since 1953. It is expected to continue at this high level in 1962.

Gross farm income increased from $38 to $40 billion—almost $2 billion more in spending power—from 1960 to 1961. Net income per farm rose from about $2,960 in 1960 to $3,360 in 1961—up 13½ percent. Hourly returns rose from 83 to 99 cents an hour for all farm labor and management.

Meanwhile, food prices have remained relatively stable, despite the increase in farm income. Food-at-home prices rose less than 2 percent from 1960 to mid-1962. All food prices rose 2.4 percent, the same as entire Consumer Price Index. We spend less of our take-home pay for food than ever before—about 20 percent in 1962, compared with 26 percent 15 years ago.

REDUCING FARM SURPLUSES

Approval by this Congress of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 means the Kennedy-Freeman administration will be able to continue its reduction of the huge farm surpluses that were piled up during the 8 years of Eisenhower and Benson.

Government costs for storage of surpluses have been significantly reduced. Total Commodity Credit Corporation inventory has been reduced $1.5 billion below the fiscal yearend peak of 1960.

For the first time since 1952 production of feed grains was reduced below the level of consumption.

At the end of 20 years of farm programs prior to Benson, the Federal Government on December 31, 1952, had CCC investments of $1,064,617,225.

But by the beginning of 1961 the CCC had over $9 billion in loans and inventories. Carrying costs were exceeding $1 billion a year.

During this unhappy period of 8 years the Department of Agriculture appropriations or expenditures were greater than the total of all the 90 previous years of the Department's history.

Surpluses of wheat and feed grains especially mounted during the ill-fated Benson regime. The cost of carrying corn and grain sorghum inventories alone rose to nearly $500 million a year.

For 9 consecutive years the feed grain carryover rose from 20 million tons in 1952 to nearly 85 million tons in 1961.

Using bushelage measurement, during the Benson years the surpluses of wheat and feed grains increased from less than 1¼ billion bushels in 1952 to 4¼ billion bushels in 1960.

In wheat alone the carryover increased from 256 million bushels in 1952 to 1.4 billion bushels in 1961.

The surpluses piled up at an accelerated rate after the Benson Act of 1958 became law with its disastrous results to the taxpayer and the farm economy.

From October 1, 1958, to October 1, 1960, the feed grain carryover, including CCC inventories and commercial and farm stocks, climbed from 59 million tons to 84.7 million tons.

The corn carryover rose from 1.4 billion bushels to 2 billion bushels, the grain sorghum carryover from 308 million bushels to 701 million bushels, and the wheat carryover from 881 million bushels to 1.4 billion bushels.

This Congress, acting at the request of President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman, went to work in 1961 to reduce these surpluses with the Emergency Feed Grain Act and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

We have seen the results of this legislation this very year. The 1962 carryover figures for feed grains and wheat showed a decline for the first time in 10 years.

On October 1, 1962, the feed grain carryover had dropped to 72.9 million tons from the record high of 84.7 million tons a year earlier.

The corn carryover on October 1, 1962, was 1.65 billion bushels—down from the high of 2 billion bushels the year before. Grain sorghum carryover was 690 million bushels—down from the record 701.9 million bushels of last year.

The wheat carryover on July 1 of this year was 1.304 billion bushels—down from the high of 1.411 billion bushels last year.

Armed with the legislation provided by this Congress, the Kennedy-Freeman administration, through its feed grain and wheat programs, has reduced CCC surpluses by an estimated 800 million bushels of corn and 150 million bushels of wheat.

Adoption by this Congress of the farm bill on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 will enable the Kennedy-Freeman administration to continue this trend of reducing surpluses.

SAVINGS TO THE TAXPAYER

The payment-in-kind provisions of 18 cents a bushel on both wheat and feed grains for the 1963 crops, as provided by the conference report, will bring about in 1963 reductions in acquisition, carrying and interest costs of nearly $250 million for wheat and nearly $1½ billion for feed grains.

Although land diversion and support payments may offset much of this saving in 1963, the fact that little or no wheat and feed grains will be taken under storage will mean the ultimate savings on carrying and interest costs may amount to as much as $1 billion a year.

Savings will continue under the 1964 wheat certificate plan provided by the new farm legislation. It is estimated that Government costs under the certificate plan will be at least $300 million a year below pre-1961 wheat programs, and $100 million below the 1962 wheat program. Carryover will be down at least 150 million bushels a year as long as such reductions are needed to keep adequate supplies of wheat for foreign and domestic use in balance with production.

These may sound like dry statistics, but they tell a story—a success story—of how American agriculture is heading away from the gloom and despair of the Benson years and up toward the plateau of prosperity. And this is being accomplished at lower costs to the taxpayers.

As farm income has increased, so has the value of farm assets. Total agricultural assets were about $200 billion in the years of 1959, 1960, and 1961, with a big jump this year to $207 billion for 1962.

As we reduced agricultural production through legislation enacted by this Congress, we saw the Nation actually begin to use up its stored surpluses. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 should accelerate this trend.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS INCREASE

We also have increased farm exports to new records. Agricultural exports hit a new high of $5.1 billion in fiscal 1962, compared with $4.9 billion in 1961, $4.5 billion in 1960, and $3.7 billion in 1959.

These exports bolstered the income of American farmers, helped reduce the accumulated surpluses, and were a powerful weapon in our struggle with communism. And these gains were achieved through legislation passed by the 87th Congress.

Amendments to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, extensions of this and other legislation, including the International Wheat Agreement Act, plus enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, made this rise in farm exports possible.

During the last 18 months the food-for-peace program, under Public Law 480, showed a marked increase—rising from $1.1 billion in 1959–60 to $1.4 billion in 1960–61, and to $1.6 billion in 1961–62.

More wheat and flour, more corn, poultry, and dry milk were shipped to our friends abroad. Fourteen countries started programs using U.S. food grants for their economic and social development.

U.S. voluntary agencies greatly expanded their role, distributing four billion pounds of food to some 70 million people, 34 percent more than in the preceding 18 months.

Food grants to Latin America increased 100 percent since early 1961. Thirty-five million foreign children received food for peace last year, 10 million more than the preceding year. We are also offering $40 million in food and $10 million in cash and transportation as our part in the United Nations world food program.

AGRICULTURAL ABUNDANCE USED AT HOME

Meanwhile, more of our agricultural abundance is being used at home. President Kennedy's first Executive order directed the Secretary of Agriculture to expand and improve the program of food distribution to needy persons. A pilot food stamp plan, making available a wide variety of food at low prices to families in need, was the second step taken to make full use of agricultural products to relieve distress.

The 87th Congress passed a number of laws to make our abundant food supplies more readily available to Americans in need and to insure better diets for our children. These included extensions of the special milk program for children.

In 1962 a total of 65,000 schools and 14.2 million children participated in the school lunch program, compared with 62,000 schools and 12.8 million children in 1960. The special milk program, to encourage schoolchildren to drink more milk, was expanded to 88,000 schools and other institutions in 1962, compared with 84,000 in 1960.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues legislation that I introduced this year calling for an annual National School Lunch Week. President Kennedy, I am pleased to announce, has just signed this Senate joint resolution and the first of these annual observances will begin next Sunday. I ask unanimous consent to print the text of the resolution at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution (S.J. Res. 211) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the seven-day period beginning on the second Sunday of October in each year is hereby designated as National School Lunch Week, and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The program to improve the diets of needy families reached 7.4 million people in 1962. In addition, some 4 million pounds of food were available to victims of floods and other natural disasters in 16 States and Puerto Rico.

EMERGENCY ACTIONS

Congress also moved during the 87th session to alleviate the hardships of farmers themselves who are victims of drought, flood, and other natural disasters. The Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to permit the harvesting of hay on land in the soil bank where necessary to alleviate these hardships. This was done in laws approved June 29, 1961, and July 3, 1962.

Authority to make emergency livestock loans was granted by other legislation enacted this session and a previous law permitting the sale of Commodity Credit Corporation feed in disaster areas was modified to permit more expeditious relief.

FARM CREDIT

Congress and the Department of Agriculture also have recognized that technological changes in farming have resulted not only in abundant production but also in a much greater need for credit. In a law approved March 29, 1961, Congress permitted up to 25 percent, instead of 10 percent, of the money appropriated for operating loans to be made where the total operating loan would exceed $10,000.

The Department loaned farmers and other rural people a record $637 million in fiscal 1962. This is 61 percent more than in 1961, and 106 percent more than in 1960. About 205,000 farm families are using USDA credit this year, 12 percent more than the year before. About 8,200 new rural and farm homes were financed in 1962.

The Housing Act of 1961, approved June 30, 1961, facilitated housing loans for farmers and authorized the Department to conduct research on farm housing problems. The program was broadened to include nonfarm families living in rural areas.

The Agricultural Act of 1961 made sweeping changes in the supervised credit programs of the Department and made possible the $637 million loans in fiscal 1962. Under this authorization loans have been made available for rural water systems, long needed.

The Congress also approved this year legislation that I introduced amending the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of insured loans from $150 to $200 million.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT, REA, RESEARCH

When this Congress enacted the Rural Area Development Act of May 1, 1961, a broad base was provided whereby the Department of Agriculture could cooperate with the Department of Commerce in attacking the problems of rural poverty on an area basis.

Work is underway on this rural areas development program of the USDA in 1,600 counties and in all States of the Union. Nearly 50,000 rural and small town community people are working on rural development. With 2,700 projects planned and 900 already underway, new employment has been created for 12,000 rural people, adding millions of dollars of rural purchasing power. When the other 1,800 projects are developed, an estimated 25,000 more new jobs will be created.

To meet the rising need for rural electric power throughout the Nation, the Department of Agriculture in fiscal 1962 approved 242 electric loans totaling $261 million. More than 240,000 rural people will get their first USDA-financed electric or dial telephone service as a result of these 1962 loans. The five millionth electric consumer was hooked up in 1962 and the billionth dollar in principal repaid.

Federal crop insurance was expanded this year as USDA added three new crops—peanuts, potatoes, and peas—and 100 new counties—the maximum allowed—to its books this year. This brought Federal crop insurance to nearly 1,000 counties and 17 crops. Total insurance coverage in 1962 is estimated at $370 million, compared with $271 million in 1961 and $266 million in 1960.

Some 365,000 separate farmers' crops are now covered by FCIC insurance. In 1963 three more crops and 100 more counties will be added.

This Congress has recognized the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture for protecting our great natural resources for the benefit of the Nation. Research on forest, soil, and water conservation has been sharply increased through congressional appropriations.

Forest research funds nearly doubled from 1960 to 1962, from $14 million to more than $26 million. Sixteen new forestry research buildings are planned or being built.

Research is being carried out in forest genetics, forest management and replanting, learning how to protect forest soils and water, how to get more dependable water supplies for cities and farms.

Laws approved in 1961 and 1962 provide for the addition of certain lands to the national forests, and Congress has increased appropriations for forest protection and utilization, forest land management and other purposes vital to our forest land.

FORESTRY—CONSERVATION—SUGAR

More forest roads and trails are being built, with construction funds rising from $43 million in 1960 to almost $50 million in 1962. The importance of our forests as a major recreational resource can be seen from the increase in the number of visitors from 92 million in 1960 to an estimated 112 million to our national forests in 1962.

Soil conservation districts, now numbering more than 2,900, blanket 96 percent of U.S. farms. Almost 23 million acres were added to districts in 1962, compared with 21 million in 1961 and 17 million in 1960.

On 1,204,000 farms and ranches, agricultural conservation program shared the cost of conservation measures for soil, water, grass, woods, and wildlife.

In the small watersheds program, 1,700 applications had been received by September 1, 1962, from local organizations in 48 States, covering 123 million acres. Of these, 403 projects were operating and 388 had been approved for planning aid.

In 1962 construction was started on 65 small watershed projects, compared with 58 in 1961. Funds available have been increased 75 percent since 1960, from $32 million to $56 million.

The Great Plains conservation program, tailored to meet the needs of low-rainfall, high-winds areas of the Plains States, gained in 1962. Conservation plans and contracts total over 9,100 on about 23 million acres.

For a hundred years Congress has recognized the importance of both an abundant and a wholesome supply of food. Under its direction, the Department of Agriculture in 1962 inspected record amounts of meat and poultry for wholesomeness, and carried out grading programs for meat, poultry, dairy products, fruits and vegetables for the benefit of consumers.

USDA inspected 40.5 billion pounds—liveweight—of meat in fiscal 1962, compared with 39.4 billion pounds in 1961. Inspected poultry increased from 7.5 billion pounds—liveweight—in fiscal 1961 to 8.1 billion pounds in 1962.

This Congress also enacted a law in 1961 directing the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate a national hog cholera eradication program in cooperation with the States. Again this year Congress authorized the Secretary to take such steps as necessary to guard against the introduction or dissemination of communicable disease of livestock or poultry. These laws strengthened USDA in its continuing fight to protect the sources of our food from danger.

While the Congress was approving the Agricultural Act of 1961 it authorized marketing orders for peanuts, turkeys, cherries and cranberries for canning and freezing, and apples in certain areas. It also extended the National Wool Act, under which direct payments are made to wool producers, for a period of 4 years.

Congress also passed a number of acts which made needed adjustments in special aspects of price support legislation. These reforms have been carried out by the Department of Agriculture.

The problem of sugar became important early in the administration as Congress and the President recognized the fact that the Cuban Government was falling victim to the communistic ideology. Congress first took action on the sugar problem by a law approved March 31, 1961. This extended the Sugar Act of 1948 for 15 months and gave the President authority to reallot the quota formerly assigned to Cuba.

The Sugar Act Amendments of 1962, approved July 13, extended the act to December 31, 1966, with respect to domestic areas and the Philippines, and to December 31, 1964, with respect to quotas for other foreign countries. Domestic sugar quotas were increased by about 650,000 tons. This new sugar legislation is expected to add to farm income.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, approved September 27, will strengthen the Department of Agriculture in carrying out many of its responsibilities. It will be particularly helpful in maintaining farm income, in securing better use of our land, in further developing our world trade and aiding friendly nations, in controlling agricultural surpluses, in fighting rural poverty and opening up our countryside for recreational use.

Madam President, this 87th Congress and President Kennedy and the Secretary of Agriculture have worked together to help the American farmer continue to make America the best-fed nation in the world, to protect our great natural resources, and to take an active part in the worldwide struggle against communism.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a press release issued through the facilities of the Department of Agriculture. The release contains a statement made by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission commending Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman on the new farm program.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMISSION COMMENDS FREEMAN ON NEW FARM PROGRAM

Members of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, meeting here October 2–3, commended Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman for his effective leadership in securing enactment of a legislative program "that will result in great gains for American agriculture."

President Kennedy signed the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 into law September 27.

"As a result of this legislation farm income prospects have improved, production can be geared more effectively to amounts that can be used, and a vigorous program to strengthen rural America is well under way," the commission said.

"The commodity programs enacted this year will enable us to continue the progress already made in 1961 and 1962 toward reducing surplus stocks and improving farm income.

"Extension of the voluntary feed-grain program for 1963 will provide a foundation upon which we can build a more adequate long-range program for the years ahead.

"Enactment of a new permanent wheat program to begin in 1964 constitutes the adoption of a long-term program—developed in consultation with major farm organizations in wheat-producing areas over many years—that will prevent the pileup of surpluses and strengthen farm income.

"Provisions in the 1962 legislation to strengthen rural America provide new hope for farmers and small towns throughout the Nation.

"Development of wildlife and recreation resources, in addition to the best use of our resources of soil and water, will not only augment farm income but will help to provide, for all the people of this country, services now in scarce supply."

At the same time the commission said it is "imperative" that in the next Congress efforts be made to develop acceptable and workable programs to deal with feed grain, dairy, and cotton problems. The current voluntary feed-grain program was extended for just 1 year by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and the act included no new dairy or cotton provisions.

In regard to these problems, the commission declared that failure to develop effective measures will result in a serious loss in farm income with damaging effects on business associated with agriculture, and in fact on the general economy of the Nation. If no action is taken on the dairy problem, there will be a further buildup of butter stocks in Government storage, at great expense to the taxpayer.

The commission noted that mandatory supply-adjustment programs are the most effective means for achieving a desirable supply-demand balance, and increase farm income at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer. However, the commission said, an important question is whether farmers and Congress are ready to accept additional mandatory programs. Consequently alternative methods should be further explored for dealing with these problems.

The commission said it is not prepared to make specific recommendations until economic studies now underway have been completed so that various proposals can be analyzed.

In discussing the cotton situation, the National Agricultural Advisory Commission noted that the Advisory Committee on Cotton will meet October 8–9 in Washington, D.C. The commission observed that the income of growers is being squeezed by rising costs so that reductions in producer prices without offsetting benefits will further depress the already low incomes of this large segment of U.S. agriculture.

During their fourth quarterly meeting of 1962 the commission received progress reports on family farm studies and from the group studying the farmer committee system and the administration of ASCS programs. It also discussed the foreign trade expansion program.

Chairman Harry B. Caldwell, of Greensboro, N.C., presided at the meeting. All 25 members of the Commission were in attendance with the exception of Cornelius D. Dosker, Sr., of Louisville, Ky.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 11, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 10, 1962:

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Charles W. Latimer, Pleasant Valley, Conn., in place of E. M. Norton, retired.

GEORGIA

Hazel W. Lawson, Avondale Estates, Ga., in place of G. J. McGovern, removed.

LOUISIANA

Edward W. Cruse, Alexandria, La., in place of J. W. Lewis, Jr., resigned.

MINNESOTA

Earl W. Dressen, Green Isle, Minn., in place of J. C. Myers, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Felix L. Sweatt, Shaw, Miss., in place of L. M. Ferriss, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph W. McCauley, Millburn, N.J., in place of H. F. Jacobus, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Carolyn F. Singley, Cashtown, Pa., in place of I. G. Ridinger, retired.

Edward P. O'Connell, Eagleville, Pa., in place of M. E. Honsberger, retired.

TEXAS

Milton H. Elliott, Shallowater, Tex., in place of A. J. Evans, transferred.

WISCONSIN

Fredrick W. Pagel, Watertown, Wis., in place of R. W. Lueck, Jr., resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 10, 1962:

TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. Kathryn E. Granahan, of Pennsylvania, to be Treasurer of the United States.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Michael Stramiello, Jr., of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS

John W. Tuthill, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America to the European Communities, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

James W. Riddleberger, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria.

Robert G. Miner, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Trinidad and Tobago.

James Wine, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ivory Coast.

UNITED NATIONS

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida, to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Mrs. Mildred McAfee Horton, of New Hampshire, to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

John H. Morrow, of New Jersey, to be representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

ALTERNATE U.S. REPRESENTATIVES TO THE 12TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE OF UNESCO

Henry S. Commager, of Massachusetts, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Herbert W. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Eugene H. Jacobson, of Michigan, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Robert A. Kevan, of Virginia, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Joseph B. Platt, of California, to be alternate representative of the United States of America to the 12th session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

A. Cecil Oliver, Rose Bud.
Guyla D. Moore, Vilonia.

CALIFORNIA

Helen M. Lowey, Downieville.

FLORIDA

William L. Townsend, Palatka.
Rodney G. Rushing, Riverview.

GEORGIA

Joseph M. Rush, Kingsland.

ILLINOIS

Eugene E. Boeckman, Bartelso.
Elizabeth M. Schweizer, Elwood.
Fred C. Lindstrom, Evanston.
Lane Stewardson, Shelbyville.
Edward F. Swan, Wheeling.

INDIANA

Alberta C. Brandt, Arcola.
Urban H. Blank, Batesville.
Louis W. Ogden, Lawrenceburg.
Wayne E. Davis, Norman.
Robert D. White, Patoka.
Francis M. Rogers, Straughn.
Virgil E. Utterback, Trafalgar.

KENTUCKY

Chester B. Owens, Broadhead.

LOUISIANA

Toby Medlin, Marion.

MAINE

Hector A. Lerette, Hallowell.

MASSACHUSETTS

Daniel G. Barrett, Rowley.
James P. McBride, South Acton.

MINNESOTA

Durward C. Peterson, Clearbrook.
Edward F. Zalusky, Mahnomen.

MISSOURI

Kestner E. Story, Matthews.

MONTANA

William B. Deffinbaugh, Ryegate.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Bernard S. Murphy, Alton Bay.
Walter M. Plummer, Bristol.
Walter W. Fortier, Chocorua.
Harry E. Moses, Haverhill.
Harry D. Perkins, Smithtown.

NEW JERSEY

Edward A. Struble, Butler.
Francis M. McKenna, Closter.
Kathryn E. Legg, Dorchester.
Dorothy E. Barth, Landisville.
Isabel B. Lowden, Leesburg.
Paul J. Rudinsky, Wharton.

NEW MEXICO

Francis G. Shaw, Fort Stanton.

NEW YORK

Eleanor J. Carmichael, Canandaigua.
Robert S. Lovell, Chemung.
Carol A. Lane, Chichester.
Robert L. Steere, Falconer.
Edith L. Walker, Farnham.
Arthur J. Walsh, Fishers Island.
Edward C. Lavery, Geneseo.
Thomas J. Taylor, Golden's Bridge.
Steven M. Douglass, Hammondsport.
Ruth M. Whitney, Henderson.
Samuel M. Horwitt, Hillsdale.
Stanley W. Cermak, Holcomb.
Ronald J. Donovan, Mount Morris.
Helen S. Hobart, Bushville.
Merle C. Leonard, Savona.
John M. Hull, Unadilla.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edith C. Swann, Olivia.

OHIO

Carl J. Richards, Mesopotamia.
Max R. Westfall, North Lewisburg.
William C. Bolenbaugh, Ohio City.
Frank J. Carpenter, Swanton.

VIRGINIA

Frances W. Lugar, Eagle Rock.
Charles A. Ashe, Gloucester Point.
John R. Chandler, Onancock.
W. Morris Milliner, Onley.
Lancelot C. Lockridge, Raphine.

WASHINGTON

Theodore F. Holtzheimer, Blaine.

WISCONSIN

Byron T. Adams, Wisconsin Rapids.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning William L. Adams to be captain, and ending Curtis J. Zane to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 26, 1962.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ecclesiastes 3: 11: *God hath made everything beautiful in His time.*

Most merciful and gracious God, in whom our loftiest aspirations and noblest impulses find their source and their satisfaction, may these moments of prayer beget in us a richer experience and a deeper appreciation of the tenderness and tenacity of Thy divine love.

Grant that in these autumn days with their beauty and loveliness, their ripeness and richness, when the harvest brings forth the treasures of its glorious season, we may long to bring to fulfillment and fruition those ideals which will make human life as beautiful and lovely as the world of nature which Thou hast created and in which we are privileged to live.

May the thoughts and activities, the plans and proposals of this new day give clear and commanding witness that we are endeavoring to live and labor faithfully, ever following Thy divine guidance as Thou dost seek to lead us from the low valley of fear toward the heights of vision and power.

Hear us in our Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. Res. 413

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Honorable Clem Miller, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1447) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Morse, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. Beall to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had, pursuant to Public Law 689, 84th Congress, appointed the following members on the part of the Senate to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentarian's Conference, to be held in Paris, France, beginning November 12, 1962: Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Cannon, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Javits, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Hickenlooper.

The message also announced that the Vice President had, pursuant to Public Law 85–474, appointed the following members on the part of the Senate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference to be held in Brasila, Brazil, beginning October 24, 1962; Mr. Robertson, chairman; Mr. Long of Hawaii; Mr. Smith of Massachusetts; Mr. Thurmond; Mr. Stennis; Mr. Metcalf; Mr. Talmadge; Mr. Yarborough; Mr. Murphy; and Mr. Ferguson, ex officio.

CELEBRATION OF 150TH ANNIVERSARY, BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 208) to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to commend the Committee on the Judiciary for bringing this resolution forward. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Forrester, the chairman of the Subcommittee No. 4, House Judiciary Committee; the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. McCulloch, the ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee; and Mr. Foley of the Judiciary Committee staff for the consideration they have given this resolution and for the many courtesies they have extended to me personally during my endeavors to have this matter brought to the House floor for consideration today.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie. Commodore Oliver Perry's victory over the British naval forces took place on September 10, 1813, near Put-in-Bay, Ohio. Commodore Perry's victory marked the only time in the history of the world that an entire British squadron surrendered to an enemy. This victory, which led to an early conclusion of the War of 1812, was not only a tremendous naval victory, but one for lasting peace between the United States and Canada. As this resolution so aptly states:

> The enduring results of this conflict have cemented more strongly the cultural and economic ties which exist between Canada and the United States as a demonstration of peace and good will in a world today fraught with unrest and fear.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand there is no money provided in this joint resolution?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, there are no funds authorized. There were some funds provided in the resolution, when it came over from the other body, but there is a House amendment striking out that provision.

Mr. GROSS. I compliment the gentleman on accomplishing the difficult feat of saving the taxpayers a little money.

Mr. FORRESTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the renowned naval Battle of Lake Erie near Put-in-Bay, Ohio, will occur in September 1963;

Whereas the decisive victory of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry on September 10, 1813, over the British naval forces in Lake Erie had profound results on the conclusion of the War of 1812 and the future of the United States as a nation;

Whereas this victory of the small squadron commanded by Commodore Perry marked the only time in the history of the world that an entire British squadron surrendered to an enemy;

Whereas Commodore Perry's report following this engagement, "We have met the enemy, and they are ours . . . two ships, two brigs, one schooner and one sloop", electrified the young Nation at that time and will ever be remembered in the annals of American history;

Whereas the War of 1812 on the land and sea areas of the United States and Canada introduced these two great English-speaking nations to a period of one hundred and fifty years of permanent peace and mutual respect along an unfortified three-thousand-mile common boundary;

Whereas this struggle resulted in memorializing the principle of international peace by arbitration and disarmament and lasting peace among nations;

Whereas the enduring results of this conflict have cemented more strongly the cultural and economic ties which exist between Canada and the United States as a demonstration of peace and good will in a world today fraught with unrest and fear: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby established a commission to be known as the "Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of thirteen members as follows:

(1) Four members who shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate (two of whom shall be from the State of Ohio);

(2) Four members who shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives (two of whom shall be from the State of Ohio);

(3) One representative of the Department of the Interior who shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior and who shall serve as executive officer of the Commission; and

(4) Four members to be appointed by the President of the United States.

(b) The President shall, at the time of appointment, designate one of the members appointed by him to serve as Chairman. The members of the Commission shall receive no salary.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 2. The functions of the Commission shall be to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration, in 1963, of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie.

Sec. 3. The Commission may employ, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, such employees as may be necessary in carrying out its functions.

Sec. 4. (a) The Commission is authorized to accept donations of money, property, or personal services; to cooperate with agencies of State and local governments, with patriotic and historical societies and with institutions of learning; and to call upon other Federal departments or agencies for their advice and assistance in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution. The Commission, to such extent as it finds to be necessary, may, without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies, procure supplies, services, and property and make contracts, and may exercise those powers that are necessary to enable it to carry out efficiently and in the public interest the purposes of this joint resolution.

(b) Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid by the executive officer of the Commission, who shall keep complete records of such expenditures and who shall account for all funds received by the Commission. A report of the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of funds received and expended, shall be furnished by the Commission to the Congress within one year following the termination of the celebration as prescribed by this joint resolution. The Commission shall terminate upon submission of its report to the Congress.

(c) Any property acquired by the Commission remaining upon termination of the celebration may be used by the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the national park system or may be disposed of as surplus property. The net revenues, after payment of Commission expenses, derived from Commission activities, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, but in no event shall the sums hereby authorized to be appropriated exceed a total of $25,000.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: On page 4, line 2, strike the period after "functions" and insert: "*Provided, however,* That no employee whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if said Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. Such rates of compensation may be adopted by the Commission as may be authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as of the same date such rates are authorized for positions subject to said Act. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee."

Amendment No. 2: On page 4, lines 10 and 11, strike the following: ", without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies,".

Amendment No. 3: On page 4, line 15, strike the period after the word "resolution" and insert: "*Provided, however,* That all expenditures of the Commission shall be made from donated funds only."

Amendment No. 4: On page 5 at the end of Sec. 4, add the following new subsection:

"(d) Mail matter sent by the Commission as penalty mail or franked mail shall be accepted for mail subject to section 4156 of title 39, United States Code, as amended."

Amendment No. 5: On page 5 strike the language on lines 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions during the years 1959 and 1960, I took the floor to point out the way in which the State of West Virginia was being shortchanged in defense installations, military contracts, and other projects of the Federal Government. With the largest percentage of its population enlisted in the Korean conflict, and also the largest number of killed and wounded in proportion to population of any State in the Union, it could properly be stated that West Virginia was first in war, first in peace, and last in the hearts of the Pentagon.

West Virginia, which ranked 46th in the Nation—near the bottom of the heap—in per capita amount of military prime contracts in the last year of the Eisenhower administration, now ranks 30th in the Nation under President Kennedy. For the fiscal year 1960, the total amount of prime military contracts awarded by the Department of Defense amounted to $36,098,000, while the figures for the fiscal year 1962 showed $133,782,000 for West Virginia. I have asked the Legislative Reference Service to prepare a ranking of the States on the per capita amount of military prime contracts. When these figures are related to population of each State, comparisons are more meaningful.

The Legislative Reference Service reports that $19.51 per person was spent in West Virginia in the fiscal year 1960 in prime military contracts awarded by the Department of Defense. For the fiscal year 1962, this figure has rocketed to $72.31—an increase of 370 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dramatic illustration of the fact that West Virginia is no longer being shortchanged and that President Kennedy is fulfilling his campaign pledges to West Virginia.

AQUARIUM AND RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's Record you who voted for the aquarium and research center here in Washington will find an article that will be of much value to you when you go home. It is an article written by the smartest man in the country on fish, U.S. Senator Benjamin Smith, of Massachusetts. He tells you how low we have fallen in research. We are fifth in the world in the matter of knowledge about fish. Peru is ahead of us with more boats and more knowledge. Red China, Japan, and Russia are ahead of us. We are fifth.

This article was published in the New York Times last Sunday. Those who voted for the aquarium and research provision will find there the answer to most of the questions that can be asked on the subject. Take it home with you and you will know how low we have dropped in an industry that once brought us many millions of dollars. Now we are only fifth.

My advice to you before you leave here is to take a copy of today's Record with you. Then you can tell the people what a good job you have done for them.

CUBA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I read in the press that supersecret negotiations are going on in Havana, Cuba, to my amazement and shock between a Mr. Donovan, who happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate, and Fidel Castro for the release of Cuban prisoners to result in turning $60 million to Castro largely in foodstuffs—thus permitting Castro to overcome his food mistakes and the New Frontier to try to apologize for its Bay of Pigs mistakes.

I have sent a wire to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Comptroller General of the United States, asking the following questions:

1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?
2. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?
3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?
4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so, let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Does not his visit to Cuba require Government approval?
5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the $60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?
6. Why has not a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?

I add this following question:

According to the Department of State's reply to me by Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary, March 10, 1962, when I asked for the recognition of a free non-Communist government-in-exile be made, he said:

> There are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison.

Why are not actions being taken to get American citizens out of prison in Cuba?

I include the entire letter of March 10 as a masterpiece of doubletalk, wishy-washy "accommodation" policies on Cuba following my wire yesterday to the President, Secretary of State, and the Comptroller General, protesting this effort to strengthen Castro and Cuba:

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1962.

Hon. William C. Cramer,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Cramer: The Department has been requested to reply to your telegram of February 3, 1962 to the President in which you expressed your concern over the plight of the Tampa cigar industry resulting from the embargo on trade with Cuba and in which you urged that additional steps be undertaken designed to effect the downfall of the Castro regime.

You may be assured that in recommending that an embargo be imposed upon trade with Cuba, the Department carefully considered the impact this measure might have upon the domestic tobacco industry. In the light of the decisions taken at the recent meeting of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este with respect to the Communist Castro threat to the hemisphere and considering that the Communist Cuban Government was continuing to earn dollars through sales of its products in the United States, it was determined that such an embargo would be both timely and in the overall national interest. The Department is confident that the patriotic citizens of the Tampa area comprehend the desirability of depriving the Communist regime of Cuba of badly needed dollar income.

The Department appreciates receiving suggestions which may advance our policy with respect to Cuba. Your recommendations have been particularly welcome and the courses of action you advocate have received and will continue to receive most careful consideration based upon our national interests, including our international obligations and commitments.

The Deparment is pleased to take this opportunity to comment on the various proposals you have made.

RECOGNITION AND SUPPORT OF A CUBAN GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

The recognition of a Government of Cuba in exile at this time is not in the national interest of the United States because neither the Government of Switzerland nor any other government could then represent U.S. interests before the Castro regime. Were a government-in-exile formed, and should the United States recognize such a government, the United States would have to look to that government and not the Castro government for the fulfillment of Cuban obligations. In addition, there are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison and who can only be reached through the efforts of the Swiss Embassy in Havana.

PREVENTION OF THE SHIPMENT OF WAR MATERIEL BY THE SINO-SOVIET BLOC TO CUBA

Underlying an announcement, such as you suggest, that the United States will not permit the shipment of war materiel to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet bloc is, of course, the intention to insure that the terms of the announcement are fulfilled. Effective prevention of these shipments may entail interference with shipping on the high seas, expose the United States and its allies to reciprocal treatment, and thus exacerbate the already tense international situation. You may be assured, however, that close attention is being paid to the military buildup in Cuba, with special reference to the growing Cuban potential for intervention and subversion in Latin America.

PAYROLL AT GUANTÁNAMO BASE

The Department of the Navy has informed the Department of State that the Cuban nationals employed at the base are for the most part skilled workers who have given long and faithful service to the United States. Most of them have U.S. civil service status and represent families who have worked for the naval base for several generations. Like other employees of the base, they are paid in U.S. currency.

When consideration was given to paying these employees in Cuban pesos in order to avoid supplying the Communist Cuban Government with foreign exchange, it was determined that this plan would not benefit the United States. The peso introduced by the Castro regime in August 1961 has been rejected by free world traders as a medium of international exchange, and Cuban pesos are unobtainable outside Cuba. Therefore, in order to obtain pesos to pay the Cuban employees of the base, Guantánamo officials would have to purchase pesos from the National Bank of Cuba for the whole amount of the base payroll for Cuban nationals at the official exchange rate set by the Cuban Government at 1 peso for 1 dollar. Since approximately 1,100 of the 3,150 Cuban nationals employed at the base now reside on the base, only a small portion of the dollar wages presently paid that group returns to the Cuban economy. Thus, fewer dollars are supplied the Castro regime under the present payment procedure than would be the case under the alternative of payment in Cuban currency.

AID TO LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES UNDER THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM

As you know, the Alliance for Progress is a 10-year program of mutual cooperation among the American Republics, from which Cuba has been excluded. The contribution of effort and resources which the Latin American Republics are expected to make will outweigh by far the contribution of capital which they will receive from the United States and other sources. A number of the Latin American countries are confronted with serious domestic political problems which stem in part from the inroads made by Castro-Communists and other extremist elements. To contain and overcome such threats to their stability, the governments of these nations require our aid to improve the political, economic, and social climate in their respective countries so that orderly progress may be made within a democratic framework. To withhold our assistance would in many instances further weaken the very nations that for the above-mentioned reasons find that it is politically unfeasible at this time to undertake steps, such as sanctions, against the Communist Cuban Government.

AID TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

The United States extends assistance to two Communist countries, Poland and Yugoslavia. However, this aid is in no way channeled to Cuba or to any third country. The recent press report that one of the Yugoslav freighters carrying jet aircraft purchased in the United States stopped at Havana for 5 days "under a complete blackout" is unfounded. Reliable and verified information available to this Government indicates conclusively that none of the Yugoslav ships carrying these planes touched Cuba. In this connection I am enclosing for convenient reference a copy of Secretary Rusk's statement before the Select Committee on Export Control of the House of Representatives.

The Department sympathizes with the plight of the cigar industry employees at Tampa. At the Department's request, the Department of Labor has provided the following information with respect to the impact of the embargo in that area and the steps that have been taken to date by that Department:

Immediately upon announcement of the ban on Cuban imports the Secretary of Labor dispatched a representative of the U.S. Employment Service to Tampa to investigate the effects on employment of the embargo on Cuban tobacco. The area's labor force amounts to about 290,000 with about 3,800 engaged in the tobacco industry in Tampa. Local estimates indicate the supply of tobacco on hand is adequate for another 6 to 12 months of normal operations. This has been substantiated by Mr. James Corral, president of the Cigar Manufacturers Association.

As you may know, there is a special provision in the Florida Unemployment Insurance law which provides for a uniform benefit year beginning in May for cigarworkers in Hillsborough County (Tampa). This preserves and makes usable workers' wage credits prior to their layoff for a longer period of time.

Only three plants in the area use 100 percent Habana tobacco. The Secretary of Labor is keeping currently informed on the developments in this area and has taken steps to gather pertinent information to determine the magnitude of the problem and to accelerate the activity of the local public employment office in developing job opportunities for those individuals who may be affected by this action. Public employment officials in the Tampa area are also working with State and local government officials to develop plans to maintain employment stability in the industry and to provide job opportunities for unemployed workers.

Please call on us if we can be of any further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.:

Regarding $60 million foodstuffs and medicine exchange as ransom for Cuban prisoners, which by all news reports is to include U.S.-owned, taxpayer-paid-for foodstuffs to make up the difference between volunteered funds and the $62 million demanded, I strongly protest this or any expenditure of taxpayers' money through U.S.-owned foodstuffs for the ransom of Cuban prisoners as being contrary to the basic statement of policy by Congress calling for and authorizing specific action to rid this hemisphere of Castro and communism. In view of the strong public protest against the tractors-for-prisoners proposal, and in view of the downgrading of our prestige as the leading nation of the free nations of the world by thus admitting our participation in and backing of the Bay of Pigs invasion and our conciliatory attitude toward Castro and having introduced resolutions opposing both the tractors deal and the $62 million ransom deal, I feel I must express my deep concern and shock over the secret negotiations that are even yet not fully revealed between the United States through a private citizen and Castro. In view of the restrictive language written into the mutual security bill instructing the withholding of aid to countries that do business (trade) with Castro and the House Cuban resolution calling for strong and affirmative action to get rid of Castro and the Communists, I am specifically requesting information as to what possible authority exists for the spending of any portion of the $60 million by the Government of the United States in payment of ransom to the enemy Communist Fidel Castro and, further, even if such legal authority exists, which is unknown to me, how can the United States be put in the position of strengthening Castro and communism on the one hand by delivering shipments to Cuba of $60 million worth of American substance, when calling on the other hand for all other countries to stop all other types of shipments to Cuba. How two-faced can our foreign policy objectives be? How inconsistent can our actions be? How confused the entire free world must be? Historically, the United States has never paid ransom or indemnity and this precedent will come to haunt the United States and the free world in the future. I am asking that this supersecret negotiation be called to a halt before irreparable damage to U.S. prestige is done. It is further inconceivable to me that, and I question the legality of, a private citizen, namely Mr. Donovan, would be allowed to negotiate with an enemy government on behalf of the United States—with the Castro government—declared to be an enemy government by the Congress in its resolution and by the President in invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act to prevent the inshipment of Havana tobacco of recent date. Such negotiations are considered a violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Logan Act and it has been the general policy of Congress to oppose any trade with the enemy as set forth in the Trading With the Enemy Act. These basic policies for freedom and against communism are all being violated in my opinion in this abortive deal—and I strongly protest making Castro stronger, our anti-Communist efforts a laughing stock throughout the world, and the establishment of a policy of paying taxpayer money to Castro for indemnity and ransom inherent in this supersecret deal, kept secret purposely and negotiated by a private citizen. I specifically ask these questions:

1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?

2. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?

3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?

4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?

5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the $60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?

6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?

William C. Cramer,
Member of Congress.

THE $10 MILLION FISH BOWL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the attempt to justify the $10 million glorified fish bowl in Washington, D.C., as a research center intrigues me and I might add it would be humorous if $10 million was not involved.

Mr. Speaker, I shudder to think of the millions upon millions of dollars that are already being spent for research with respect to fish. As a matter of fact, the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Bonner], recently obtained from the Department of the Interior a statement showing that some 79 projects are now being conducted in research on salmon alone. There are scores of others dealing with other species.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the New Frontier now is; Ask not what the fish can do for you, but rather what you can do for the fish.

ASSOCIATION OF GREEK SHIPOWNERS HONORS RECOMMENDATION TO HALT SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, word has just come that the Association of Greek Shipowners has decided to honor the recommendations of the Greek Government and halt shipping to Cuba. This decision stands as a signal victory in the current Cuban crisis.

In a firm and decisive statement, the Greek shipping association recommended "emphatically to its members that they abstain from all types of charter contracts for the transportation of goods to and from Cuba despite the repercussions this will have on Greek shipping in these difficult times."

Thus Greece joins the ranks of our most cooperative allies. Those other nations honoring U.S. requests for boycotting Cuba are West Germany, Turkey, and the Norwegian shippers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective and immediate means of combatting communism in this hemisphere is to halt free world shipping to the island of Cuba. This would force the entire burden on the already strained Communist fleet, crimp the Cuban Communist pipeline, and make communism in this hemisphere untenable and impractical to support.

We salute our West German, Turkish, Norwegian, and Greek friends. But what of our friends the British?

CHARITABLE SOLICITATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the matter about which I shall speak has nothing to do with foreign affairs. However, a few days ago there was an article which appeared in the local press relating to the fact that under the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act permission had been granted to a society of homosexuals to solicit charitable contributions in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the Superintendent of Licenses and Permits said that his office had no authority to deny a solicitation permit under the law to these people.

Mr. Speaker, the acts of these people are banned under the laws of God, the laws of nature, and they are against the laws of man. I think a situation which requires them to be permitted a license to solicit charitable funds for the promotion of their deviations is a bad law.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to correct this situation. I trust that by the beginning of next year we will have sufficient reports from the various departments to effectively prevent this sort of action.

THE HONORABLE BRENT SPENCE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the State of Kentucky has been proud of many of its Representatives in Washington, including some of the country's greatest. Today we are facing the loss of our senior Congressman by voluntary retirement, to a rest which he has well earned by 32 years of service—including almost 16 years as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

During that period of service, Brent Spence has been the guiding hand in the development of legislation for housing programs that will remain a monument to his memory long after all of us have passed from this scene.

The gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman Spence, had become an institution in Kentucky. The only campaign he had to make was to file an application to have his name placed on the ballot and his reelection was assured. The people of Kentucky and especially northern Kentucky both loved and respected Brent Spence.

Entering Congress 2 years before the beginning of the Roosevelt administration at an age when many of us are considering retirement, he became a stanch supporter of the fiscal and financial reforms sponsored by our great depression President and advanced to the chairmanship of the Banking and Currency Committee before the end of that long administration.

While his law practice began in the 19th century, he was one of those gifted individuals who was always able to look to the future, to lay the groundwork for the proper development of the America that few of us will see in the 21st century. Now, as the oldest Member of Congress, he can step aside for a well deserved rest without regrets because we are all sure that his job was well done.

His record here stamps him as one of the greatest of Kentucky's Congressmen, which includes such illustrious names as Henry Clay, Alben Barkley, Fred Vinson, and others too numerous to mention.

His splendid example remains as an inspiration to all of us.

GRANTING EASEMENTS ON REAL PROPERTY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8355) to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 2 on page 4 and insert:

"(d) The term 'real property of the United States' excludes the public lands (including minerals, vegetative, and other resources) in the United States, including lands reserved or dedicated for national forest purposes, lands administered or supervised by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, Indian-owned trust and restricted lands, and lands acquired by the United States primarily for fish and wildlife conservation purposes and administered by the Secretary of the Interior, lands withdrawn from the public domain primarily under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, and lands acquired for national forest purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was voted out of our committee unanimously. The Senate amendment is acceptable to the minority. It also takes out of the bill what little controversy there was concerning it. I ask the gentleman, is that not correct?

Mr. McFALL. That is correct; the gentleman has stated the fact. The bill would grant authority to the heads of the executive agencies having control over real property of the United States to grant easements for rights-of-way purposes. I believe it was passed on the Consent Calendar in the House. A public lands amendment was taken from the bill as it passed the House. The Senate has included the amendment which excludes public lands, the way the bill was originally introduced. I know of no opposition to or criticism of the bill as it stands now.

MORE ON $60 MILLION TO CASTRO FOR PRISONERS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object—and I intend not to object—because of the limitation of the 1-minute rule earlier, I did not have the opportunity to comment on the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers]. I will say that it appears to me that if we are asking other nations to cut off trade with Cuba, we should set the example first and not negotiate directly or indirectly or permit negotiations by a private citizen to send $60 million worth of foodstuffs to Cuba at the same time. I strongly oppose such action, I cannot understand this double-standard, this conciliatory attitude towards Cuba and I intend to discuss the matter in detail on my special order later today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11880) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he can advise the House whether the amendments of the Senate to the Foreign Service Buildings Act are germane to the legislation as it passed the House.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. They are not. As the gentleman knows, the Senate has added two bills as amendments; the equal pay bill and the bill providing for an additional Secretary of State.

Mr. BOW. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, my objection was made with some regrets for I favor the bill as it applies to Foreign Service buildings. Furthermore, I favor the equal pay bill that was added as a Senate amendment, and I voted for that bill when it was considered as a separate measure in the House. While I am opposed to the additional Assistant Secretary of State that would be added by another Senate amendment, that is not the reason for my objection to considering this bill as it was returned from the other body.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House prohibit the consideration of amendments that are not germane to the measure being acted upon except by unanimous consent or, under certain circumstances, by a majority of two-thirds of the Members voting; and with one other important exception, that, under our rules, no point of order can be made against a Senate amendment regardless of how flagrantly it violates the rule of germaneness, nor is it necessary to have more than a simple majority to adopt such an amendment. This rule must be based on an overly generous application of the so-called rule of comity for it certainly is not in keeping with the other rules concerning germaneness.

The two Senate amendments to this Foreign Service buildings bill are not germane by any stretch of the imagination. I do not question the motivation behind these amendments, but regardless of the motivation I am strongly of the opinion that this is not the way this House should legislate. This measure is now a conglomerate of three bills no one of which is germane to either of the other two. I would have absolutely no objection to the consideration of each of them individually, and I would vote in favor of the passage of two as I have already indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House rules, with regard to the consideration of Senate amendments that are not germane, are not logical or reasonable. At the beginning of the 88th Congress I intend to offer an amendment to the rules which will require that consideration of ungermane Senate amendments be only by unanimous consent or by a two-thirds majority vote as is required if such amendments originate in our own House. In the meantime I feel constrained to use such parliamentary means as are available to prevent amendments, such as those to H.R. 11880, coming before the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 286]

Adair
Alexander
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Barry, N.Y.
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Charberlain
Chiperfield
Coad
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Denton, Ind.
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Doyle
Durno
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Fenton
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fogarty
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Gavin
Glenn
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Haley
Hall
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hull
Inouye
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karth, Minn.
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kyl
Laird
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McSween
McVey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mack
Magnuson
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Michel
Miller, George P.
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder, Mo.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Osmers
Passman
Peterson
Philbin
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Rousselot
Santangelo
Saund
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas

Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Ullman
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 248 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 831) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That Senate Joint Resolution 234, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year 1963, in the opinion of the House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution and is an infringement of the privileges of this House, and that the said joint resolution be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 1962, the other body messaged to the House Senate Joint Resolution 234, now on the Speaker's table. This joint resolution is an infringement on the privileges of the House, as stated in section 7 of article I of the Constitution, under which the House of Representatives has always maintained the right to originate the appropriation bills.

The priority of the House in the initiation of appropriation bills is buttressed by the strongest and most impelling of all rules, the rule of immemorial usage. As Mr. Asher Hinds relates in section 1500 of volume II of "Hinds' Precedents" at page 973—while the issue has been raised a number of times—"there has been no deviation from the practice."

Many precedents could be cited, but the most recent instance, as many of those present will recall, is reported in the Congressional Record, volume 99, part 2, page 1897, where the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber], at that time chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, offered a resolution identical with the pending resolution—and under circumstances corresponding to the situation with which we are confronted today—respectfully returning an appropriation bill originated by the other body.

Mr. Taber's resolution was unanimously agreed to, and there have been no further proceedings on the subject from that time to this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the precedent of March 12, 1953, to which the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, has just referred, was, like the one which we have under consideration at this time, a clear attempt to violate that provision of the Constitution which, by uniform construction and practice, has been maintained as an exclusive privilege of the House throughout all the years since the Constitution was adopted.

In "The Federalist," the collection of papers explaining the new Constitution in 1787 and 1788, there are some significant and I believe wholly conclusive words by Madison and Hamilton on this question. They were members of the Constitutional Convention and had a big hand in drawing it up.

I am going to read one passage because I believe it ought to be in the Record. This is found in volume 57, at page 405:

> Notwithstanding the equal authority which will subsist between the two Houses on all legislative subjects, except the originating of money bills, it cannot be doubted, that the House, composed of the greater number of Members, when supported by the more powerful States, and speaking the known and determined sense of a majority of the people, will have no small advantage in a question depending on the comparative firmness of the two Houses.
>
> This advantage must be increased by the consciousness, felt by the same side, of being supported in its demands by right, by reason, and by the Constitution; and the consciousness, on the opposite side, of contending against the force of all these solemn considerations.

Note the use of the words "except the originating of money bills." Those are the words I want to stress.

I will also insert in the Record two more quotations from "The Federalist," because they are significant, considering again that Hamilton and Madison are credited with their authorship:

From pages 406 to 407:

> The House of Representatives cannot only refuse, but they alone can propose the supplies requisite for the support of Government. They, in a word, hold the purse; that powerful instrument by which we behold, in the history of the British Constitution, an infant and humble representation of the people gradually enlarging the sphere of its activity and importance, and finally reducing, as far as it seems to have wished, all the overgrown prerogatives of the other branches of the Government. This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon, with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure.

From page 463:

> But independent of this most active and operative principle, to secure the equilibrium of the National House of Representatives, the plan of the Convention has provided in its favor several important counterpoises to the additional authorities to be conferred upon the Senate. The exclusive privilege of originating money bills will belong to the House of Representatives. The same House will possess the sole right of instituting impeachments: is not this a complete counterbalance to that of determining them? The same House will be the umpire in all elections of the President, which do not unite the suffrages of a majority of the whole number of electors; a case which it cannot be doubted will sometimes, if not frequently, happen. The constant possibility of the thing must be a fruitful source of influence to that body. The more it is contemplated, the more important will appear this ultimate, though contingent power, of deciding the competitions of the most illustrious citizens of the Union, for the first office in it. It would not perhaps be rash to predict, that as a mean of influence it will be found to outweigh all the peculiar attributes of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, each of these quotes contains language unmistakably and conclusively showing that the House, under the Constitution, was given the sole right to initiate the appropriation of money bills.

I also call attention to a statement I made in the House on March 12, 1953, which is to be found in the Congressional Record, volume 99, part 2, page 1897.

In that statement I went into a complete review of the matter then pending before the House of Representatives and called attention to an article by John Sharp Williams, a Senator from the State of Mississippi. He had made a very strong and thorough study of the rights of the two Houses and supported the position of the House completely. I have always understood that exhaustive study to be regarded as a classic on the question and a frequent reference source.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, so that the Record will be more complete, I will insert some of the key passages from the study of the then Senator Williams. The complete document is identified as Senate Document No. 872, 62d Congress, 2d session, July 15, 1912. It traces the particulars of the point from the beginning to the end:

> Mr. President, if the Senate can constitutionally originate general appropriation bills when money is in the Treasury, then it can do the same thing when there is no money in the Treasury; and thus this body, representing the States and not the people—representing chiefly the smaller States—could force either Federal insolvency—not to be thought of—or else could force the House to levy new or additional taxes; thus force the House to originate tax bills. The two things hang together. If this Senate could originate general supply bills, then it could commit the Government to a course of expenditure that would coerce the House not only into originating but into passing tax bills.
>
> As Seward well says, speaking of the long practice under which the House always insisted upon and the Senate always conceded—the right of the House to originate general appropriation bills:
>
> "This [practice] could not have been accidental; it was therefore designed. The design and purpose were those of the contemporaries of the Constitution itself. It evinces their understanding of the subject, which was that bills of a general nature for appropriating the public money or for laying of taxes or burdens on the people, direct or indirect in their operation, belonged to the province of the House of Representatives." (See Congressional Record, vol. 16, pt. 2, p. 959.)
>
> He added:
>
> "If this power be confined to the one and not to the other—that is, to the levying of taxes to get money, but not to its expenditure—then the right is useless, because we change revenue laws so seldom."
>
> This criticism of Seward's is correct, although it was made in view of what occurred later and not of what was in the minds of the framers of the Constitution. I believe it is not too much to say that, in the minds of the framers of the Constitution, a bill to raise revenue was a budget; that is, a bill levying taxes and at the same time appropriating the proceeds of the levy, because such was the contemporaneous practice.

Mr. Sumner, of Massachusetts, said that he regarded the Senate origination of general appropriation bills as "a departure from the spirit of the Constitution." (Ibid.)

Mr. Hinds, in his incomparable work, in a note at the bottom of page 973, volume 2, concerning the question of the right of the House to originate general appropriation or supply bills, says: "But while there has been a dispute as to the theory, there has been no deviation from the practice that the general appropriation bills originate in the House of Representatives." He expressly uses this phrase as contradistinguished from special bills appropriating for single, specific purposes.

It is well to remember in this connection the Hurd resolution of January 13, 1885, which was laid on the table in the House. The fact that it was laid upon the table has been quoted very frequently, but the resolution was directed at Senate bill 398 (the Blair educational bill). It was not a supply bill, but a bill of specific appropriation; not a bill for carrying on the Government any more than a bill making appropriation for a public building would be a bill for carrying on the Government.

Our present Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], made a statement at that time in the Congressional Record, volume 99, part 2, page 1898, when the matter was under consideration. I quote what he said:

> Mr. Speaker, I am sure when my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber], and my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], agree, that the House of Representatives must indeed have a sound case; but will the gentleman for the Record state what part of the resolution which has come from the other body violates the longstanding custom, and usage, and practice of the Congress?
>
> Mr. Taber. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, in its entirety violates the practice. There is no part of it which could be considered as covering anything else or any other part of the subject matter.
>
> Mr. McCormack. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's statement satisfies me.

Today, in Senate Joint Resolution 234, we have a complete appropriation bill covering the whole Department of Agriculture. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon] has indicated that he will move the adoption of his resolution which is offered to protect the privileges of the House. I hope it will be adopted unanimously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Would a yea vote be a vote to send Senate Joint Resolution 234 back to the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 245, nays 1, not voting 188, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

YEAS—245

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Alford
Alger
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Broyhill
Bruce
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Chelf
Chenoweth
Church
Clancy
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Collier
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Green, Pa.
Gross
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Ichord, Mo.
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kunkel
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Ray
Reece
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Saylor
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Waggonner
Walter
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Winstead
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—1

Rogers, Fla.

NOT VOTING—188

Adair
Alexander
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chiperfield
Colmer
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Doyle
Durno
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Fascell
Fenton
Findley
Fino
Flynt
Fogarty
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hull
Inouye
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kyl
Laird
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Mack
Magnuson
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Michel
Miller, George P.
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Osmers
Passman
Peterson
Philbin
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Rousselot
Santangelo
Saund
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Ullman
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Hays with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Arends.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Mack with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Durno.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Fino.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Peterson with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Inouye with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Brown.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Michel.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr McDowell with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. James C. Davis with Mr. Springer.
Mr Philbin with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Breeding with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Brewster with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Short.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Rousselot.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Dominick.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Baring with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Teague of California.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Williams with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Andrews with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Scranton.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Garland.

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. John W. Davis with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Mason.

Mrs. Riley with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. McVey.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, is this an automatic rollcall or is the vote being taken by the yeas and nays?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The yeas and nays.

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot qualify, Mr. Speaker. If I had been present I would have voted "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the privileged resolution (H. Res. 832, Rept. No. 2547) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution just reported (H. Res. 832) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, disagreed to and that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes to the two Houses be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is, Will the House consider the resolution (H. Res. 832)?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the House agreed to consider the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution which we are about to consider is to send to conference between the House and Senate the public works omnibus bill. There has been, and perhaps will continue to be considerable controversy about the measure, and I think it is necessary to make a brief statement about it.

You will recall that when the House had before it the so-called $900 million public works acceleration authorization bill, it was pretty generally understood that if that bill was passed, there would be no general omnibus bill this year. After that bill was passed, something happened—I do not know what—but the Committee on Public Works began consideration of an omnibus bill. They held hearings. They went through the usual course and performed their function, which was entirely legitimate and proper that they should do. The bill was presented to the House, and after thorough consideration, it was adopted by the House and sent to the other body for concurrence by that body. It remained there for a short time and was then passed with amendments.

The bill, as it left the House, carried something like $2¼ billion of authorizations. The other body adopted some 50 additional projects that had not been considered by the House and were not in the House bill. When I say that the additional projects were not considered by the House, there is one exception to that because in the House bill was what is known as the very controversial Burns Creek item. The House by a rollcall vote and a substantial majority rejected that item and struck it from the bill. The other body reinserted it in the bill by amendment. As I said, there were something like 50 new projects adopted in the other body. The bill came back here and there was an objection raised to sending the bill to conference.

There were something like 50 additional projects inserted in the bill without any consideration on the part of the House involving authorizations of something like—there is a difference in the figures, because I took them all and added them up on an adding machine in my office, and my adding machine was not big enough to carry these figures, so I had to send out and have it done elsewhere—my estimate came to $1,700 million of authorized expenditures that the House had not considered; many of them the Budget had not even considered; many of them had not been approved by the Corps of Engineers. Over that arose this controversy, which has been pretty hot.

I would like to digress for a moment on a parliamentary question of the rules of the House. We have some rules in the House, and some of them are pretty specific and they are written in pretty plain, clear English that he who runs may read. We have a rule known as rule XX which provides that any amendment of the Senate placed on a House bill, if it should have been considered under the rules of the House in the Committee of the Whole, that involve appropriations or tax, if it had not arisen in the House and was required under the rules of the House to be considered in the Committee of the Whole House, that it shall be subject to a point of order when it comes back to the House.

This is a perfect illustration of that rule. There were some differences over it. Anyway when they asked for this conference there was objection, and it went to the Rules Committee, and many Members of the House appeared before the Rules Committee pro and con on the bill.

While it may not be considered by some as the function of the Rules Committee to consider the merits of legislation, that is a matter, of course, of great controversy and difference of opinion around here. It has been said that the Rules Committee is merely a traffic cop, and I was criticized for considering it as something else. My reply was that I was not elected to Congress by my people to be a traffic cop; and as long as I have anything to do with it I expect to exercise my functions as a Member of this Congress. But under the peculiar circumstances the committee did hold extended hearings. They lasted from 10:30 yesterday morning until 4 something yesterday afternoon, in which any number of Members of Congress came before the committee to testify in this matter of having forced upon them projects that concerned them not only without consideration in the Committee of the Whole House but also without any consideration at all by anybody else in the House.

Some of us thought that was not the way to run this Congress. Some of us think that we have certain obligations to be somewhat cautious, and to exercise some responsibility about the authorizations and appropriations we make around here. So that led to this controversy, and we had, as I stated, any number of Members of Congress who came and protested against some of these amendments made in the other body.

The evidence was so clear that some of these projects should not be in this bill at the present time without consideration by the House that we had some discussion with the House conferees and the House leadership. I think, and I have reason to hope and expect, when this bill goes back to conference the House conferees are going to stand upon these matters that should not have been in this bill and that everybody knows they should not be in the bill. That is about all I can say on the matter.

All the information we have upon which to consider these Senate amendments—is a conference print, and that, with the amendments put on by the other body comes to 90 pages. I knew this matter was coming up, so I had an opportunity to go to the country over the weekend and spend a couple of days trying to find out what it was all about. I think I know a little bit about the matter. But no one can comprehend all of these projects and their merits in the short time and on the small amount of information we have.

I will conclude my statement by saying that I devoutly and sincerely hope and expect that the conferees are going to stand by the House bill and not indulge in this type of irresponsible legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to commend the chairman of the Rules Committee, first for having the meeting yesterday and considering this bill. I was the one who objected to the bill going to conference because of the fact that these projects which have been referred to by the chairman of the Rules Committee were included by the other body, and unless we had an opportunity to go before the Rules Committee there would have been no opportunity for the Members of this House to voice their objection. With the understanding that has been agreed to, I am in favor of this bill going to conference.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman did appear before the committee and disclosed to the committee that certain items placed in this bill had not been considered in the House but had been taken from the committee which has jurisdiction, which is his Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that were taken over by the Committee on Public Works of the other body.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need to long belabor the debate on this resolution. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has pointed out the principal issues that made House action necessary to send this bill to conference.

I have some comment to make in addition to the point brought out by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

In the first place, I would like to ask a question and of course this question cannot be answered. If anybody wants to answer it, I will be glad to have it for the RECORD. I wonder why we are considering a public works authorization here not in the closing weeks, or not in the closing days, but in the closing hours of a session of Congress that has been going on for 2 years. I do not believe hearings were held on this so-called omnibus public works bill for 1963 until sometime in September. And here we are trying to compress an orderly procedure, possibly authorizing the expenditure of over $3 billion, into a few days of legislative procedure, when a substantial number of Members are not able to be present.

I consider that to be very poor management on the part of the majority, and I do not think it can be defended. If there is any defense for such procedure, I would welcome any Member of the majority stating their justification for this unwarranted delay.

Mr. Speaker, in respect to the additions that were placed in this bill by the other body, as the gentleman from Virginia told us—and I think it may be repeated later—there ostensibly has been an addition of about $1.5 billion in projects added by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, the minority reported in the Rules Committee yesterday that this was not a realistic figure; that actually there was half a billion dollars in addition to that amount, although it is not spelled out in this bill. There are commitments in this bill that will have to—the end result of an addition by the other body of almost $2 billion rather than $1.5 billion set out in the Senate amendment. So, after all, we are talking about or we may be talking about a $4 billion commitment. Yet here we are debating it in the floor of the House with 248 Members answering to a quorum call and about 240 of those Members would like to be home.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is responsible procedure. But, of course, this is a bill in which nearly half of the Members of the House have very deep and sincere interests. Of course, it also has political repercussions.

Mr. Speaker, it has been frequently referred to by our friends in the press as a pork-barrel bill. That may be right. However, be that right or be it wrong is beside the point.

This is a bill that authorizes public works that are of vital concern to the economy of every State in the Union and many cities are directly or indirectly affected by projects contained in this bill. So, from a realistic standpoint, it is necessarily going to attract a considerable amount of attention from all the States in the Union and congressional action can be anticipated and expected.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one final point: I would like to break these Senate amendments down into four categories. If the conference report comes back to the House, I would hope at least that these categories will be established by the conferees and that the projects which remain in the conference report will fall into only one of the categories and final judgment will be placed on this basis:

First, there are projects in this bill that have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and which are not controversial. The informal judgment of the Rules Committee seemed to be yesterday that there would not be substantial objection to this category of projects that was added by the other body. May I repeat that: Projects that have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and which are not controversial—and I shall not attempt to suggest what number of projects may be in that particular context.

The second category involves projects that have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and are controversial. There are some of these projects which are controversial even as between House Members from the same State. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] told us just a moment ago, these Members resent, if you please—and I think that is the right word—that they were not afforded an opportunity even to be heard on these projects that are in the bill which are located in their districts and to which they are opposed.

Of course, the third category involves projects that are not approved by the Bureau of the Budget and are controversial.

Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding in the Rules Committee that the House conferees would reject all the projects that have not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and which are controversial, particularly those opposed by House Members.

Then there is the fourth separate category, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] that includes projects clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works, and contained in this bill.

I should hope, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees will object to those projects as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time mainly for the purpose of trying to put in focus a few things that I think the membership of the House are entitled to know. No. 1: I intend to vote to send this bill to conference. I expect to be the ranking Republican conferee. I have full confidence that we will be able to bring back a clean and a good bill. I have high hopes of that. I will say that it has been my consistent position and it has been the consistent position of the minority that when a bill of this magnitude on public works authorizations, for the first time since I have had the pleasure of being a member of that committee, in 8 years, comes before this body at this late hour and is considered by our committee under specific ground rules that do not permit even Members of the House to be heard, let alone interested citizens of this country, in the proper democratic fashion to present their views on matters, many of which are extremely controversial, that we should live by specific ground rules in order to preserve the integrity not only of our committee but of this House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States, to preserve the integrity of our committee and to assure the taxpayers that we are protecting their interests in this public works bill. So my views in the conference will be the same as they have been on the floor of this House consistently since I have been a Member, and in particular the manner in which this bill has been handled in the last days of the session, to make certain that controversial projects on which people have asked to be heard, in the true democratic tradition of America, that they be given the opportunity to be heard. I, in good conscience, could not vote for projects on which American citizens have asked to be heard, who have been denied that opportunity; and on which even my own colleagues, representing their districts, have been denied an opportunity to be heard.

In good conscience and in protecting the taxpayers of the country I could not possibly vote to return them to this House as part of the conference report.

Likewise, these projects having not been heard, I could not vote to bring projects in that have not been properly cleared by the proper departments and without hearings.

I hope we can bring back a clean bill and that in so doing we shall help to speed the adjournment of this House.

Mr. Speaker, there are many good and sound projects in this bill.

It is most unfortunate that the good ones, which are in the vast majority in the bill, are jeopardized by the action of the other body in putting in $1.4 billion in excess of the House bill, and that does not include the additional $400 million, if you take into consideration the true cost of the Columbia Basin projects and other multiple-purpose projects, rather than the amounts referred to in the bill that were put in without hearings.

Let me give you an example of what the other body did. On page 37 of the bill there is a certain project in Oklahoma, the Arkansas River project, between the Arkansas River and Muskogee, Okla., where they authorize a study of the project. And in the same bill—and this illustrates the irresponsibility of the manner in which this bill was handled, and why I feel it is essential, if we go to conference that we bring responsibility back to the bill—they say, "There is hereby authorized"—we do not even know what the cost is, what the project is—are hereby authorized and determined to be feasible and justified by the Chief of Engineers on approval of the President, unless within the period of the first 60 calendar days of the meeting of the 1st session of the 88th Congress such report is disapproved by the Congress.

This is a "gimmick" that the House Committee on Public Works refused to accept on other projects, which would not only provide for a survey but automatic authorization, not even knowing what the survey results are.

The other body passed a bill of $3.7 billion, the House $2.3 billion. I intend to stand by the House position in striking out the Burns Creek project because hearings are justified and should be had. The Knowles Dam was added at a cost of $258 million; the Bruces Eddy Dam at a cost of $186 million; Burns Creek at a cost of $52 million; and Trotters Shoals, $78 million. This is just to give you four examples.

Most of those are in the Columbia River Basin, and add some $326 million to this bill.

I have confidence that these projects will be sound and we will have a good bill when we bring it back.

One other thought, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas: Why is this bill here so late? For 6 months the Committee on Public Works spent the time of that committee trying to justify the $900 million boondoggle public works so-called acceleration program, on which we are going to have some discussion later. Four hundred million dollars is already in the appropriation bill which we are going to be considering on this program, which permits the President to pinpoint projects without proper consideration by the Congress on specific projects. I am going to bring out that it does not indicate what projects are involved, and they are asking for a $400 million blank check.

Instead of voting for a proper bill, our committee spent most of the time trying to work on the $900 million bill and the $2 billion standby authority requested to be financed out of any unexpended balance. That is why we have this bill here at the last minute of the Congress. That is why it is jeopardized, and it should not be. It is unfortunate that these good projects and most of them were handled through the proper authorizations of the Congress, are being jeopardized at this late date for a lot of much less justified projects.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the House Committee on Public Works and those Members that may serve on the committee of conference on this bill have an obligation to the Members of this House in case of the controversial projects that may have been added by the other body to make sure that those projects are deferred until there is an opportunity for the Members of the House interested in those projects to be heard and to make sure also that any constituents of those Members who desire to be heard are given that opportunity. It seems to me we have to take this position to protect the integrity of the House. This bill is of substantial magnitude. It involves projects in almost all the States of the Union. When there are Members in whose districts projects may be built who have not been given an opportunity to be heard by the committee of the House handling the bill, it seems to me it is most essential that we defer those projects until the Members have an opportunity to be heard, which is the position I am going to take in the committee of conference. I think it is the only proper position we can take to protect the integrity of the House and the right of the individual Members of the House to have a hearing and have their constituents have the opportunity to be heard before a decision is made on such projects.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia, Judge Smith, for his forthright, straightforward, and honest stand here today, as always, for the taxpayers of the United States and for justice and fairness. I want it clearly understood that I advocate this rule permitting the omnibus rivers and harbors bill to go to conference. I appeared before the Rules Committee yesterday asking for this rule; however, I want to make it crystal clear that I am in complete agreement with the gentleman from Virginia, Judge Smith, that every single project which has not cleared the Bureau of the Budget and which has not been heard by the Congress should be postponed until all parties can be heard.

It is incredible that projects authorizing more than a billion dollars have been added to this bill, Mr. Speaker, in many cases without consultation—without even notice to the Members of the House most affected. I can say without contradiction that the only time that I have had the opportunity to mention Trotters Shoals before a congressional committee was when the gentleman from Virginia, Judge Smith, gave me permission to appear yesterday before his great Rules Committee. Judge Smith, I am grateful to you, sir, for your unquestioned integrity, for your fairness, and your willingness to speak for our people.

I know the Speaker will appoint stalwart conferees who will stand by the traditions and principles of this House. This House is not the lower body. It is the body closest to the American people and foremost in the eyes of the American people. This House is taking the lead in protecting the American people from ruthless pressure groups and unbridled bureaucracy. With the budget unbalanced, with the national debt $300.8 billion, it is unbelievable that literally billions are added to this bill without hearings, consultation, and without adequate reports on their feasibility.

Mr. Speaker, when I say I am for free enterprise and that I detest socialism, I can truthfully say that I practice what I preach. I do not want to advocate on one hand a balanced budget, reduction of the national debt, a sound dollar and then on the other hand run to Washington with my hat in my hand begging for the taxpayers' money for my own district. I want Trotters Shoals to be heard by all parties concerned. If it can be proven feasible and beneficial, I will be for it. I do not want it railroaded through and my people "sandbagged" without Mead, the Seaboard Railroad, Bigelow-Sanford, and countless others being heard.

I believe the conferees will do the fair thing and postpone Trotters Shoals until early next year. I believe, too, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished and able leaders of the South and the Nation in the other body will in the end be fair and just to my people and to me personally. I truly believe they will postpone Trotters Shoals till all can be heard.

I plead with them to permit Duke to go ahead now as they must have authorization this session. Duke is beyond controversy. No one has opposed Duke—not openly. There is no argument against Duke. Duke must begin the preliminary stages of its project early next year. We passed the Duke bill in the House without controversy. On its merit it should receive the same consideration elsewhere.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Members here are statesmen, not politicians, but in case they are interested in elections, here is how to run a railroad. This is a dispatch from North Korea:

> North Korea's Communist regime today claimed a perfect record in the election of members of the new National Assembly.
>
> The Korean central news agency said in a dispatch from Pyongyang that 100 percent of the voters registered in the 383 constituencies voted Monday and "100 percent of the elec-

tors cast their votes for the candidate deputies."

The Korean Communist Party had named one slate of candidates, and there were no contested races.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, inadvertently a committee clerk yesterday evidently informed the Evening Star there was one project, in conference, the Waurika project, that did not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget or the U.S. Corps of Engineers. This is not the case. This project was included in the Senate bill. It was given a hearing and favorably reported in the other body by the Senate Committee on Public Works. It does have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget as well as the approval of the U.S. Engineers, and it was heard by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Previously, it was heard by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and reported favorably by said committee and by the other body.

I have conferred with the House conferees about this bill, urging favorable consideration, I do hope and trust that this project, known as the "Waurika project," will be left in this bill. It is most important to 400 members of Waurika families who have been run out of that area three times in recent months by heavy floods. It is a very worthwhile project. Furthermore, it is essential to several cities as a source of needy water supplies.

I hope the conferees will agree to allow this worthy project to remain in the omnibus public works bill.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the statements of the members of the Committee on Public Works on this side of the aisle who will be conferees on this matter. But, we have not heard from anyone from the other side, from the conferees on the other side. I wonder if their opinion is the same as that expressed here; and as other Members have expressed the importance of abiding by this procedure. Can anyone enlighten me? Will someone from the Committee on Public Works make a statement from the majority side of the aisle?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The conferees on the majority side are in substantial agreement with the statements made by the two gentlemen on your side.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee very much and appreciate it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1960, in my home State of Montana, the now President John F. Kennedy was speaking of the Knowles project which is the subject of my remarks today. President Kennedy said:

> We will not stand by and permit our resources to be wasted or taken for partial development for the benefit of special interests. We will not stand by, for example, and permit another Hells Canyon blunder in the Clark Fork Basin. I think the next President of the United States must support early authorization of the multipurpose project in the Paradise Knowles area.

The Senate held extensive hearings on the Knowles Dam project, in Montana over a period of years on several occasions, and finally this year in the Public Works Committee of the Senate. Everyone who had any interest in the project was heard. Thus the Senate included Knowles in that body's public works program. When news reached Montana of the inclusion of this project in the proposed public works bill of 1963, telegrams commenced to arrive at my office. In the last 4 days, I have received over 200 in favor of the project and none against.

As Senator MANSFIELD said a few days ago, and as I have been quoted, as well as Senator METCALF earlier this year, we support Federal investment in Knowles Dam with three specifications:

First. A reservation of power for Montana.

Second. Substantial compensation to the Indians—it could be a block of power.

Third. Continue the guarantee of present elevation of Flathead Lake.

For many years, I have supported the policy of Montana water for Montana people and the development of Montana resources first for the benefit of Montana people; and, of course, for the benefit of everyone in the Nation.

Water is committed to running downhill. Therefore, to benefit Montana people, the water must be developed before it gets out of the State. Since time began, excess runoff of water from Montana has been going to the seas undeveloped. The run of the river dams developed by private power companies have permitted a great waste of water by failure to corral the floodwaters. The people of Montana and the Nation are entitled to full development of the river—electric power, irrigation and reclamation, flood control, and recreation. Private power companies are organized for the profit of their stockholders—in the case of Montana, about 80 percent of the stock is held outside the State. Private power companies are not organized for and do not control floodwaters, develop recreation, or irrigation and reclamation, or any of the other benefits of a great river such as the Clarks Fork of the Columbia River or the Flathead River. We must commit ourselves to the development of the whole river, complete development, in cooperation with the whole basin of the river. For instance, Hungry Horse Dam as an isolated operation would produce only 90,000 kilowatts of power.

However, the at-site power of Hungry Horse under a coordinated operation with other Federal dams on the Columbia River produces 221,000 kilowatts, plus downstream generation of 862,000 kilowatts from the reuse of Hungry Horse storage; that is a grand total of more than 1 million kilowatts. Knowles Dam; under coordinated operation, will develop 267,000 kilowatts at-site plus an additional 686,000 kilowatts downstream from reuse of Knowles storage; or a total of almost 1 million kilowatts. This should be compared with the rated possible production at Buffalo Rapids of 148,000 kilowatts, by the Flathead Indian Tribe or the Montana Power Co. because it would be only a run of the river dam and has no storage capabilities whatsoever. Knowles is the wiser choice of these possible developments at this reach of the river. These facts and conclusions are those made after 11 years of study by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army; and these conclusions have been approved and the recommendation of the Corps of Engineers has been concurred in by the Board of Rivers and Harbors, the Secretaries of the Army and Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President. The Knowles project would pay for itself in 50 years on a cost-benefit ratio of 1.2 to 1. The benefits of more than $200 per acre from the 50,000 surface acres of the stored water are compared with the benefits from each of the 8,600 acres of tillable inundated lands with a gross acre revenue of less than $44. Knowles will irrigate more than 21,000 acres. Additionally, Knowles would be beneficial to Montana:

First. Cheap power inviting job-making industry to Montana at Bonneville Postage Stamp—rate of 2.4 mills instead of private power rate of 6 mills per kilowatt.

Second. Montana obtains its rightful share of National Government investment in natural resource development.

Third. Increase in broadened tax base of local government with new industry, new families, and new homes.

Fourth. Greatly enhance fish and wildlife resources.

Fifth. Boost Montana recreation and tourist industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the conferees to accept the Senate amendment, the Knowles project, in the public works bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the more than 200 telegrams which I hold in my hand and submit for the RECORD:

HELENA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization strongly urges you to carry on fight for Knowles Dam. Our organization of 20,000 members on record by convention action in full support of Knowles Dam.

JAMES S. UMBER,
President, Montana State AFL–CIO.

HAMILTON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Trust you won't be influenced by Montana Power Co. opposition to Knowles Dam.

Brandy,
G. M. BRANDBORG.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

From information I have gathered I earnestly feel that the majority of western Montana citizens favor the construction of Knowles Dam.

Gehres D. Weed,
Architect, Paddock Building.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge inclusion of Knowles Dam project in omnibus public works bill.

J. R. Riley,
County Attorney Office.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam bill passage.

William L. Close.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to support Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. R. M. Houghton.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I expect you to give Knowles Dam your fullest support.

Anne R. Rinke.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge inclusion of Knowles Dam; cannot afford underdevelopment by private power against Russian competition.

Edna Mann.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The people of western Montana are positively not opposed to Knowles. They overwhelmingly favor it. The economic dislocation is trifling compared to the economic gains to be derived. It is projects such as this which make prosperous areas out of existing rock reefs and sagebrush.

Donald A. Paddock,
Attorney at Law.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge passage of Knowles Dam.

Arlen and Jaquetta Thompson.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Hon. Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge that Knowles authorization be added to House bill before adjournment.

Leon and Esther Hurtt.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Use your most persuasive arguments to secure Knowles for Montana.

La Verne Taylor.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge committee to retain Knowles Dam in public works bill.

Elton and Bernice Brechbill.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully support the Knowles Dam. Pay no attention to the threat of the American Crystal Sugar Co. We have more beet land available on our ranch than the whole Moise Valley. At $10.8788 per ton no return anyhow. We're a hundred percent behind you on this bill.

Elmer and Mary Flynn.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I favor Knowles Dam.

Lorene Loran.

Butte, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Hon. Arnold Olson,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Arnold fight for Knowles Dam.

Geo. Blair,
Secretary, Boilermakers Union No. 30.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support Knowles Dam bill this session of Congress.

Dale Warren.
Swan Lake, Mont.

St. Ignatius, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

Dennis R. Plouffe.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam during this session of Congress.

Gus Pieniak.
St. Ignatius.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We sincerely hope Knowles Dam will be included in bill this session.

Margaret and Herbert Carson.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. Fred Miles.
St. Ignatius, Mont.

St. Ignatius, Mont.
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. L. E. Dunn.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam this session.

Mr. and Mrs. Dan McCollum.
St. Ignatus, Mont.

St. Ignatius, Mont., *October 7, 1962.*

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam authorized soon.

Harold Mitchell, Jr.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

L. H. Krogstad.
Ronan, Mont.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam bill passage.

Melvin Shuffields.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because I feel it will benefit the entire Northwest.

Mrs. George Wells.
Hot Springs.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Believe Knowles Dam project in best interest of Montana business. Urge your support.

K. G. Distributors.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Believe Knowles project in best interest of Montana, Northwest and Nation. Strongly urge authorization.

Eugene Pike.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Brown.
St. Ignatius, Mont.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES R. CORDIER.
POLSON, MONT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of its many benefits for all this area.

Mr. GEORGE WELLS.
HOT SPRINGS.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

ROSALIE P. MATT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

WALTER RUDD.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. CLIFFORD A. MATT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana needs industry. We need cheap power from Knowles to attract it. Urge authorization.

GEORGE W. EVINS,
AGNES E. EVINS.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam for western Montana progress.

RICHARD V. ORR.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support Knowles Dam this session. Montana needs this project.

Mr. and Mrs. ARCHIE W. OLSEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

People strong for Knowles Dam this session.

Mr. and Mrs. VALENTINE M. SCHELER.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana needs Knowles Dam. Hope it is authorized this session.

Mr. and Mrs. MICHEL ASHLEY.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge support of Knowles Dam for western Montana.

Mr. and Mrs. RAY ORR.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

People want Knowles Dam this session.

Mr. and Mrs. PARLEY A. KENT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Community wants Knowles Dam authorized for western Montana.

JOHN C. BROCK.

BUTTE, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Concensus heavily in favor of your staying in Washington to vote on public works appropriations and other vital legislation. Recognize you have tough campaign. Offer any assistance possible.

MARY and SARAH MCNELIS.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate support of Knowles Dam for western Montana.

JAMES S. MORAN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request your support of Knowles Dam.

MARY HOPPE.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Everyone here strong for Knowles. Try to keep it on bill.

JIM MCCOLLUM.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Want Knowles Dam authorized before adjournment.

S. SMESRUD.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Community urges your support of Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. LOYAL LESTER.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request all possible support by you for Knowles Dam. Montana needs this project.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES HUNTER.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hope for Knowles Dam authorization soon.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN A. MICHEL.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I believe Knowles Dam would be a great asset to northwestern Montana.

TOM JACKQUES.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I think Knowles Dam is essential to the economy of the entire Northwest.

ALMA CARNEY.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD H. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because I think it is good for the future of Montana.

Mrs. EDGAR STEVENS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

ART WARREN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please vote "Yes" on bill for Knowles Dam.

CECIL G. CRUSCH.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for the Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. D. D. WERNER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for the passage of the Knowles Dam this week.

Mrs. VERNE HARRIS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam a must. Do all you can. November 6 will take care of itself.

Mr. and Mrs. DON WALDRON.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam. We're for it.

BEN and BESSIE DORMAIER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote "yes" for the Knowles Dam bill.

Mr. and Mrs. CLARENCE JENSEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

H. R. RESNER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for the Knowles Dam bill.

Mr. and Mrs. MELVIN LUND.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles Dam. Please vote "Yes."

Mr. and Mrs. LAWRENCE CHRISTENSEN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support the Knowles Dam bill.

EMANUEL BELLON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. LEO ROUILLIER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. DERALD DELLWO.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We're for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. TED COMPTON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support the Knowles Dam bill. Please vote "yes."

HAROLD G. TEIGEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam this session of Congress.

JESS ROGERS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Opposed to Knowles Dam along with majority voters Lakes County.

Mr. and Mrs. W. D. MCDANIEL.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam bill. Montana needs additional power for existing and new industry to help stabilize economy. New water facilities to boost tourism. Added flood control a must for Columbia Basin.

GERОGIA WALTER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge inclusion of Knowles Dam project in omnibus public works bill.

JACK PINSONAULT,
County Attorney.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your help in retaining the Knowles project on the public works bill.

ELMER BASTROM.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel what you are doing for the Knowles project is great. Knowles must stay on the PWB.

BOB WILZ.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles project must stay on the PWB. Anything you can do is appreciated.

ORVILLE RIYZMAN.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your efforts in keeping the Knowles project on the public works bill are more than appreciated. We stand behind you.

JOE CROSSWHITE.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Kalispell Central Trades & Labor Council has unanimously supported the Knowles project. Please do all that is possible to retain it on the public works bill.

JOE CROSSWHITE.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your help in retaining the Knowles project on the public works bill.

HAROLD SIDELRUD.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

By unanimous action at our regular meeting last night we are on record urging you to do your best to retain Knowles project on the public works bill.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING
ENGINEERS, LOCAL 371.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your efforts at keeping the Knowles project on the PWB are appreciated. Montana needs this dam.

WM. STERNER.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Just to let you know your efforts in keeping the Knowles project on the PWB are greatly appreciated.

MARGARET PRINCE.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to do everything possible to keep Knowles on the PWB.

JOE SZIVI.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

If we build Knowles it will help our economy.

VIRGINIA LOVSAUG.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our area will prosper if we build the Knowles Dam.

LEONARD NOVSAUG.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

A Knowles Dam supporter, let's build it.

BILL BRUCE.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We like what you are doing to keep the Knowles project on the PWB. Keep up the good work.

VILA B. STERNER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam to encourage industry for the benefit of Montana.

ANDREW N. JOHNSON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Favor passage of bill to construct Knowles Dam project.

JOHN A. NEWELL.

Kalispell, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your help in keeping the Knowles project on the public works bill.

Bob Johnson.

Kalispell, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We stand behind you in your effort to retain the Knowles project in the public works bill.

Julius Skaar.

Kalispell, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Knowles Dam project must remain on the public works bill. Your help is appreciated.

James H. Choate.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana cannot afford delay on Knowles. Thank you.

Williard and Carol Carter.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need industry and jobs to keep young people in Montana. Please authorize Knowles.

Ann and Margaret Roberts.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are praying Knowles will be authorized before adjournment.

Clay and Hulda Carter.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Break Montana power monopoly. Continue your support of Knowles Dam.

Jim Seery.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Full development of the Columbia is vital to the West. Do A-OK Knowles Dam.

Herbert and Adeline Bartron.

Charlo, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

People who think for themselves want Knowles for flood control, heat, power, and jobs.

Francis Logan.

Pablo, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please work hard for passage of Knowles.

Mr. and Mrs. James Fleming.

Ronan, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Do your utmost for the passage of Knowles.

Mr. and Mrs. Joe Charvat.

Ronan, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Favorable vote for Knowles important for Montana's economy.

Mr. and Mrs. William Sell.

Ronan, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

A favorable vote for Knowles important for Montana's economy.

Mr. and Mrs. John Hughes.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel Knowles project wanted and needed in Montana. Please give all possible support.

Mr. and Mrs. William Ballard.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Hon. Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge restoration of the Knowles Dam authorization to the House bill. We need Knowles Dam now; it must not be sidetracked.

Edwinn and Leona Marvin.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We favor Knowles Dam.

Bill and Angeline McCoy.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I recommend that Knowles Dam be passed at this session.

Mrs. Frances Waylett.

Paradise, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Hon. Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a businessman, Knowles Dam is what we need. Eighty percent of my customers are for it.

Carl H. Dahl.

Kalispell, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge all efforts keep Knowles in appropriations bill.

N. M. Gies,
Secretary, Kalispell, Mont., Building
& Construction Trade Council.

Charlo, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want you to support Knowles.

Mr. and Mrs. Gene Medved.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles Dam for Montana's increased industrial growth.

Mrs. Leo Hansen.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please pass the Knowles Dam in the session. We need Knowles Dam.

Miss Marlen Waylett.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have supported multipurpose dam in Paradise-Knowles area since 1953. We still do.

Missoula Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge authorization of Knowles Dam. Believe it is for the good of Montana.

Donald E. Woolridge.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

Ben F. Cortner.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, and economic development.

Amy A. Fallee.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, and economic development.

Steven S. Saller.

Polson, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your support of legislation for Knowles Dam necessary for comprehensive river development.

Lee and Elizabeth Larson.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of water storage, progressive development, and wildlife preservation.

Mrs. Ivon Pineger.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, water storage, and economic development.

Avon Pinegar.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, and economic development.

Charles W. McMenus.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of Knowles Dam project.

Virginia L. Meltzer.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your support of Knowles Dam legislation. We need development of western Montana.

S. Bruce DeLong.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Build the Knowls Dam; it will help our economy.

Leland E. Breiner.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam. We need development of our resources.

Edna M. Mooney.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam will help. Please build it.

D. J. Brockway.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles for development of Montana.

Bert L. Vancampen.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of construction of Knowles Dam in Sanders County. Please continue support.

Kathryn DeLong.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

My support is for Knowles Dam.

M. C. Sutherland.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Need Knowles dam for complete river development and to alleviate chronic unemployment.

Stephen D. Babcock.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam is needed to boost the economy and stimulate industrial growth in Western Montana.

Martin Neilsen.

Charlo, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our State needs more employment so we need Knowles.

Mr. and Mrs. Ren Olson.

Charlo, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I would like industry in our State. Support Knowles.

Mr. and Mrs. Orla Hensen.

Plains, Mont,
October 5, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Favor passage of Knowles Dam. Sanders County needs this project.

John F. Harwood,
Sanders County Commissioner.

Charlo, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are for Knowles.

Mr. and Mrs. Lester Olson.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles Dam for the future industrial growth of Montana.

Lorene M. Templeton.

Polson, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge passage of bill for Knowles Dam. Need for power and flood control paramount.

C. E. and Esther Livingston.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue supporting Knowles Dam. We feel its in the best interests of Montana.

Margaret and Roy Busditt.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Work program needed badly. The allover picture a good one. We need Knowles Dam.

Betty Livingston.

Charlo, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need to have Knowles built.

Mr. and Mrs. Bert Olson.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge the passage of the Knowles Dam bill. Will we need it here.

Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Palmer.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles Dam for the progress of Montana.

J. H. Johnston.

Missoula, Mont.
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am wholeheartedly in favor of Knowles. Please continue supporting it.

William L. Close.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana must have Knowles Dam. Please put full force of your office behind the project.

Tom Danietson.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

Lillian Cortner.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Western Montana needs Knowles Dam with low-cost power to boost industrial growth.

Marcia Neilsen.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

Mina Albert.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

Allen Barns.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

Mrs. Beulah Snyder.

Charlo, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

We need power and storage. Build Knowles now.

Ann Driscoll.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in favor of Knowles Dam. Western Montana needs low cost power for economic growth.

Thomas Neilsen.

ARLEE, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We favor Federal Knowles for flood control, power, recreation, economic, and democratic reasons.

Mr. and Mrs. RAY D. CARY.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles Dam for Montana's increased industrial growth.

LEO HANSEN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic developments.

R. E. SNYDER.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Imperative build Knowles Dam.

C. C. COFFEY.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Public works legislation must provide for Knowles Dam now. Majority here support it.

HOWARD M. ROSLYN.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge inclusion of Knowles Dam in appropriation for public works. This is a must.

JOHN R. GARDEN.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam must be provided for in public works legislation. Majority here demand it.

W. L. VACURA.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Only Knowles Dam can accomplish intelligent handling and complete development of our water.

DUKE SALLEE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

MARET BLIXT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Western Montana desperately needs Knowles Dam now.

FREDERICK R. MATT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Businessmen and surrounding communities want Knowles authorized this session.

J. J. CHIPMAN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Company has paid staff to round up telegrams. Supporters of Knowles write and send their own.

CHARLES MILLER.

GREAT FALLS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge every effort to include Knowles Dam in House conference report.

Regards,

LEONARD KENFIELD,
President, Montana Farmers Union.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Big Horn area farmers now know power dams cause summer shortage—winter flooding. Knowles unjustified.

HARLAN THOMPSON.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana and Lake Counties desperately need Knowles Dam now.

THOMAS HOOYENGA.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your splendid support of Knowles Dam and defiance of company.

MRS. ROXANNA GOULD.

PARADISE, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD H. OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam a very worthwhile project. Vote "yes."

W. E. BARTHOLOMEW.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly favor Knowles. Montana needs it.

DON POSIVIO.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly favor Knowles. Don't give in to Montana Power.

CLETE and RUTH FEARON.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana needs Knowles for water storage. Western Montana needs a boost.

FRANCIS MOORE.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight for Knowles. Western Montana needs it.

CHARLES WHALEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 7, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Do everything you can for Knowles. Montana needs it very much.

Mr. and Mrs. ARCHIE MCDONALD.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am very strong for Knowles. Try your best to keep it on bill.

THOMAS D. GOULD.

COLUMBIA FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam passed this session.

Mr. and Mrs. SAM ROBILLIEU.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your magnificent fight for Knowles and Montana success.

FRED AHRENS.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

All my neighbors hope for approval of Knowles before adjournment.

H. DEWAYNE E. OLSEN.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Most of the people strong for Knowles authorization.

G. A. ROSENBAUM.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope for Knowles authorization now.

R. L. WOLCOTT.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana Power is main source against Knowles. Most of us are for it.

ARTHUR JONASEN.

St. Ignatius, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I request your support of Knowles Dam.

Sheldon Gould.

St. Ignatius, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In favor of Knowles Dam. Pass this session.

Mr. and Mrs. Charles V. Cordier.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote two "yesses" for Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M. Tuffman.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I would like to see Knowles Dam built.

Martha B. Timlin.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Build Knowles Dam, we need it.

Earl Wollaston.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I am for the Knowles Dam.

Helen Brown Snider.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam. We need development in this area.

Franklin Sorensen.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam.

James L. Heim.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue to vigorously support Knowles Dam.

Ruth Martman.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

This area needs Knowles Dam.

Jim Dean.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I am for the Knowles Dam.

Beatrice Jonas.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I am for the Knowles Dam.

D. A. McChesnie.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam will help the entire West.

John H. Pyatt.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because it would help Montana's economy by increased industries and jobs.

Mrs. W. V. Ehlert.

Plains, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam for future industries.

Rowanna Bros.

Eureka, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The entire Northwest needs your support on Knowles Dam project.

K. W. Vincent.

Plains, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam for future progress.

Willie Bros.

Eureka, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We request you do everything possible to assure passage of Knowles Dam legislation.

Lincoln Electric Cooperative.

Great Falls, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fight to put Knowles in the House conference report.

May Walters Hotel and Restaurant
Employees Union.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge approval of Knowles Dam.

Jean Pinsoneault.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam.

Gilbert Jonas.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam; we need development of our resources.

Felix G. Carter.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Sanders County and Montana need Knowles Dam now.

Elinor Thurman.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I am for the Knowles Dam.

Pat Dean.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

As a citizen of western Montana I urge you to support the Knowles Dam program for Montana.

Wayne R. Johnson.

Kalispell, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

U.S. Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I am one out of many who urge you to do your best in retaining the Knowles project on the public works bill.

Ken Sterner.

Thompson Falls, Mont.
October 6, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Build Knowles Dam. We need the employment in this county.

Roy A. McKenzie.

Paradise, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Hon. Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am definitely for Knowles Dam.

Mildred O. Dahl.

Thompson Falls, Mont.
October 6, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Western Montana must have the Knowles Dam.

Pearl E. McKenzie.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I favor Knowles Dam because of water storage power output and industry.

Cecilia K. Johnson.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 8, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam to bring in industry and for other favorable reasons.

Mrs. Lillian E. Crary.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam.

Bonnie Liggst.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Backing you for the Knowles Dam.

Art Crabtree.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in favor of Knowles Dam. Let's build Montana with power.

Mr. and Mrs. D. M. Mullen.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam; we need development of our resources.

N. ADRIAN PRESTON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam.

DON BROWN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD M. OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam means increased business, more jobs, better water use for Montana. I'm for it.

MRS. ANNA LAUERMAN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our support Knowles Dam for the progressive development of Sanbers County in Montana.

MRS. EMIL MARSH.

MISSOULA, MONT.
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I expect you to give Knowles Dam your fullest support.

BURLEY C. RINKE.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1692.
ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Highly recommend approval of Knowles Dam.

HENRY LOZEAU.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to support authorization of Knowles Dam project. Montana needs it.

HOWARD R. GAVIN.

HAMILTON, MONT.,
October 5, 1692.
Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

MPCO statement cost taxpayers untrue. Urge build Knowles Dam. Self-liquidating in 50 years.

FOREST COOPER.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your Knowles Dam stand; Montana and Northwest greatest need.

SAM K. SMITH.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to keep Knowles in the Senate bill.

Sincerely,
CHARLES HARBALL and SALLY HARBALL.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in favor of construction of Knowles Dam to further the economy of county.

CARL CLARK.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because: Flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

EDNA REIFSCHNEIDER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Favor passage of Knowles Dam legislation to further advancement of economy of western Montana.

EUGENE P. MAHONEY.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request your continued support of Knowles Dam legislation. Only intelligent way to develop our rivers.

RICHARD T. THIEGS.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Work program needed badly. The all over picture a good one. We need Knowles Dam.

MAUDE K. SAGE.

DIXON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am for Knowles Dam. One of businessmen Dixon, Mont. Would like see improvement Flathead River.

ALBERT C. PAUL.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Build Knowles Dam. Our great State will no longer be the last frontier.

MARIE ROMSA.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Fight for Knowles Dam vital for the economy of western Montana.

J. C. ROMSA.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam for jobs that are needed badly in western Montana.

JOE ROMSA.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Do not let power companies stifle the progress of western Montana. We want Knowles.

MRS. J. K. ROMSA, Jr.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge authorization of Knowles before adjournment and construction at earliest possible date.

Respectfully,
T. W. and LEILA ROBERTS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Passage of Knowles Dam absolute necessity if all the people in Montana are to participate.

MAURICE J. MCDONOUGH.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge the addition of Knowles Dam to the House water resources bill.

MRS. RICHARD E. RABER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam for needed water storage and recreation and for benefit of wildlife.

ANTONE A. GRELL.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in support of Knowles Dam and believe it will help the economy.

RAY J.'NOVAK.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Recommend approval of Knowles Dam at this session of Congress.

LILIS WAYLET.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam, it will help this community and Montana.

MRS. ROGER D. NYGREN.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support the Knowles project. We need Knowles to help develop our area.

PAUL K. SAYLOR.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam is essential to welfare of county.

CLINTON O. SPINDLER.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Public works legislation must provide for Knowles Dam now; majority here support it.

H. C. SCOTT.

Plains, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Public works legislation must provide for Knowles Dam now; majority here support it.

John J. Gagnon.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The opinions I derive from talking to clients indicates Knowles is overwhelmingly favored.

Raymond W. Brault.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam. It is necessary to control floods.

Walt Gould.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam. Our depressed area needs this development.

Dewey L. Duffel.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington D.C.:

I support Knowles for development of Montana.

Jesse C. Nelson.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

We want the Knowles Dam. It will help our county.

Ester Breiner.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. Boyd L. Davis.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I am for the Knowles Dam.

Ruth Graham.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Let's push the Knowles Dam issue through now.

Lloyd R. Johnson.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I favor Knowles Dam.

George D. Hartman.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam.

H. L. Maplethorpe.

Charlo, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I would like to see Knowles Dam built as we need it.

Mrs. Lila Evans.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please continue your fight in favor of Knowles Dam.

E. E. Solum.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam.

Marie Goode.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

The Honorable Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your support for Knowles Dam.

Tony Cochiarella.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam is vital to the economy of our Nation and State. We must look to the future of our young people who now must leave Montana for employment opportunities after we have invested heavily in their education.

Earl J. Barlow.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for the Knowles Dam.

Mrs. Art Crabtree.

Hot Springs, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of its importance in water conservation for our Western States.

Bill Ehlert.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge your support of Knowles Dam legislation.

Mrs. W. L. Gannett.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold M. Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam sorely needed for economic development of Montana. I strongly urge House authorization.

Arnold Bolle.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Congress failure to authorize Knowles Dam will be bitter disappointment to forward looking Montana citizens.

Edmund Freeman.

Ronan, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles needed in Montana regardless of opposition.

Mr. and Mrs. William Hocker.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Would appreciate your support for Knowles Dam.

Robert H. Newman.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge your continued support of the Knowles Dam.

Stella Jean Hansen.

Ronan, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Water power and employment makes a better Montana. Knowles beneficial.

Dorothy Lundvall.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulate your support Knowles Dam, Lake County property owners.

Mr. and Mrs. Pete Aune.

Ronan, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please work hard for passage of Knowles.

Mr. and Mrs. Everett Krudde.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam needed for power and flood control. Strongly urge passing of this bill.

Ronald and Eva Tollefson.

Missoula, Mont.,
October 6, 1962.

Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope you will be successful in your support of the Knowles Dam project.

Dorothy Barr.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam.

Annie L. Gill.

Thompson Falls, Mont.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Our economy depends on passage of the Knowles Dam bill.

Henry L. Gill.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Let us build the Knowles Dam.

G. V. TAYLOR.

PARADISE, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Give us Knowles Dam.

ROBERT E. DRAYTON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you pass Knowles Dam at this session of Congress.

JOE L. WAYLETT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge the passage of the Knowles Dam bill.

STRANGER and FLORENCE TABISH.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam a must for our future generations.

ROBERT GILL.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

NIKKI BARNS.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Imperative build Knowles Dam.

SOPHIA CECILIA ADAMS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I recommend Knowles be passed at this session.

NANCY JO WAYLETT.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I recommend that Knowles Dam be passed at this session.

MRS. ERMA LOZEAU.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We must have Knowles Dam now. Number me among its many supporters.

JOSEPH INESGARDEN.

PARADISE, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam badly.

NONA EVANSON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue your support of Knowles project for the benefit of western Montana and Sanders County.

LEVINA M. CLARK.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of needed flood control, progressive development, and recreational purposes.

MRS. BILLY SCHAFFER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need industry. Why educate children here and they have to go to other States to get jobs.

GORDON MARLENE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

BUD HOSEA CECIL.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge passage of Knowles Dam Bill.

BOB SHAFER.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Imperative build Knowles Dam.

HERB FISHER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

ALPHA O. HEDIN.

MISSOULA, MONT.
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.:

Let's not pet Knowles approval vet bogged down in the House. Montana needs Knowles.

PAULA KNAPP.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam. We need more power to develop industry.

ARTHUR HARLOW.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of water storage power output and economic developments.

TED SCHAFFER.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge support Knowles Dam.

DONNIE AND CLINTON DEVOE.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

This area needs authorization of Knowles Dam if possible.

JOHN AND MONICA COLTER.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Our council composed of four local unions in northwest Montana urge that you insist Knowles Dam be retained in the public works bill.

CARPENTERS DISTRICT COUNCIL OF NORTHWESTERN MONTANA,
P. PETERSEN, *Secretary.*

MISSOULA, MONT.
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The overwhelming majority of people I talked to tell me they want Knowles Dam.

ROBERT WATT.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Insist on Knowles Dam being retained in public works bill. Our 17 locals in western Montana, 9 in vicinity of Knowles, have repeatedly testified in favor of Knowles-Paradise project at all hearings held in this area.

ROBERT C. WELLER,
Secretary, Montana District Council Lumber and Sawmill Workers.

HAMILTON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge your continued support on Knowles Dam measure. Will stimulate permanent employment in area.

GILBERT L. JELINEK.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need industry. Why educate children here and they have to go to other States to get jobs.

ANN MARLENEE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

JOE BLIXT.

HAMILTON, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Without Knowles comprehensive development Columbia River impossible. All opposition by Montana Power.

MILES ROMNEY.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support Knowles Dam. Sanders County in the Northwest needs this project badly.

ROY R. MILLS.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Al and I support the Knowles Dam proposal. Good luck.

MARGARET STONE.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife recreation, and economic development.

MILDRED O. MCMENUS.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support the Knowles Dam project because of need of flood control and progressing developments.

Mrs. THESPA A. GRELL.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Hundreds of Lake County people support your stand for Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. LEON TERRY.
Mrs. MARY MEYER.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We need the Knowles project now.

W. BRITTON.

POLSON, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your progress on Knowles Dam. Continue effort on our behalf.

Mr. and Mrs. CARRL A. HALGREEN,
Mr. and Mrs. PAUL HAVOLICH,
Mrs. DORA BRUCE.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of Knowles being built immediately.

A. A. HERTZ.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Western Montana needs Knowles Dam desperately. Urge prompt support.

DAN SEERY.

ST. IGNATIUS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge all possible support for Knowles Dam. Western Montana needs this project.

J. E. TAPLIN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because of progressive development, economic development and recreational development.

C. E. LATHAM.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge authorization of Knowles Dam this session.

GRACE T. KERR.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Majority of western Montanans favor Knowles. You've done fine job. We support you strongly.

BERTHA PADDOCK.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

At least 50 percent of this area strongly supports Knowles Dam.

S. R. LOGAN.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building Washington, D.C.:

Residents of the area involved favor Knowles as I do.

Mrs. ROSIE GRAY.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building Washington, D.C.:

From conversations with clients it is my opinion Knowles is overwhelmingly favored.

RAYMOND P. TIPP.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam.

ART THURMAN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage wildlife, recreation, and economic development.

MABEL COON.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Favor Knowles Dam. Sanders County needs this project.

Mrs. JACK HARWOOD.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam. It will help this community and Montana.

ROGER D. NYGREN.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is essential to pass Knowles Dam bill. We need it.

RICHARD HARWOOD.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of Knowles Dam.

Mrs. MINNIE HARMOND.
PARADISE, MONT.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

HARRY CECIL.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Certainly need the power of Knowles Dam. Hope you can get it for us this session.

NICK HERIN.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Fight for Knowles, we represent most of Perma.

Mr. and Mrs. EDWARD MULICK.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam a must for good of Sanders County, Mont.; United States.

JAMES L. TAYLOR.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to pass Knowles Dam bill. We do need the boost to our economy.

Mrs. RICHARD HARWOOD.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam. Good for State.

A. F. DAYLOR,
SIG DAYLOR.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Authorized to pass bill providing for Knowles Dam. Badly needed this area.

DOROTHY VACURA.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam. Good for Montana.

MRS. A. F. DAYTON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of Knowles Dam project.

GEORGE C. MELTZER.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of Knowles Dam project.

DAVID M. MINNES.

DIXON, MONT.,
October 6, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Vote for Knowles Dam.

ED CANTRELL.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam is essential to county.

HAROLD E. FARRINGTON.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam. Knowles will help recreation and wildlife.

BARBARA GOULD.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Lots of people here strong for Knowles Dam.

JOHN YEARER.

HOT SPRINGS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I support Knowles Dam because flood control, power output, water storage, wildlife, recreation, economic development.

BUD COON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

I favor Knowles Dam.

DONALD F. EGELAND.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We and our friends are in strong support of the Knowles Dam.

BEATRICE K. and EUGENE H. WEIGEL.

THOMPSON FALLS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you act affirmatively on Knowles Dam legislation. Sanders County and the West need power.

GERTRUDE J. MAHONEY.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

For the common good of Montana, very important that Knowles Dam be authorized.

L. J. CARTER.

PLAINS, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I vote for Knowles Dam.

DEAN D. STAPLETON.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I recommend the approval of Knowles Dam.

NELBA H. LOZEAU.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 5, 1962.
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge the passage of the Knowles Dam bill.

HELEN MURRAY.

FEDERAL PAY BILL

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, during debate on Monday and Friday of last week on the Federal pay-postal rate-retirement pay bill, I repeatedly warned that adoption of the pay provisions of this bill would trigger enormous pressures in the next Congress for very substantial pay increases at the top of the classified pay system, in the Executive Pay Act, and in the salaries of the Federal judiciary and Members of Congress.

The administration evidently has lost no time in providing confirmation of that warning.

The able staff writer on Federal employee affairs of the Washington Evening Star, Mr. Joseph Young, in his column "The Federal Spotlight," yesterday reports that administration officials already are at work on proposals to be submitted to the new 88th Congress in January.

In this same article, Mr. Young calls attention to another aspect of the chain reaction started by the ill-considered and ill-advised legislative action last week.

He points out that enactment of the supergrade, Executive Act, and congressional pay increases next year will inevitably result in new pressures for still further pay increases in the lower levels.

I quote Mr. Young's exact words:

> All this has significance, too, for Federal employees in the upper-middle class and even those below these grades. For once the Executive Act and supergrade pay ceilings are raised, this will give more latitude to increasing eventually Federal pay down the line, which until now has been held down because of restrictions on the salary paid to the top grades.

If events bear out this prophecy—and I have no doubt they will unless the Congress miraculously discovers the courage to resist periodic pressure campaigns for pay increases—it will prove that the administration's proposed policy of salary comparability is a complete fraud upon the American taxpayer.

It will prove equally fraudulent the claims of sponsors of this year's pay legislation that its adoption will forestall these periodic pressure drives.

During consideration of this year's pay legislation in the executive sessions of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I offered an amendment to provide a straight 7-percent across-the-board pay raise. It was voted down. Yet this approach to the problem would have provided many justifiable pay increases—and some not so justifiable—but at the same time it would have avoided the kind of lid-raising operation that was finally carried out and which obviously is going to be pursued further when Congress returns next January.

These remarks are intended to put the next Congress on notice as to what they will face. It is also intended to put the American taxpayers on notice as to what they face.

One final comment: Mr. Clarence B. Randall, who has served as a businessman "yes-man" under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and who was Chairman of President Kennedy's Federal Salary Policy Panel, in a statement early this year published by the National Civil Service League made this incredible and totally unsubstantiated statement:

> I am firmly convinced that higher Federal salaries would attract a level of competence that would so improve Government operations that there would be no out-of-pocket cost at all.

In view of the very substantial increase in payroll costs of Federal employee salary increases—of which this year's billion-dollar boost is obviously only the first installment—I wonder when the American taxpayers will begin to get a "refund" in line with Mr. Randall's preposterous prediction.

I advise the American taxpayers not to hold their breath waiting for it.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the full text of Mr.

Young's column dealing with this subject:

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT—WORK BEGINS ON INCREASING EXECUTIVE ACT SALARIES

(By Joseph Young)

Administration officials already are at work on proposals to be submitted to the new 88th Congress in January for raising Executive Act salaries, Government supergrade careerists' pay as well as the salaries of Members of Congress.

Present administration thinking is to propose a $35,000 salary for Cabinet officers and substantial increases as well for agency heads, commissioners, assistant secretaries, etc., who come under the Executive Pay Act. The top pay for supergrade career jobs, set in the new pay raise legislation enacted by Congress at $20,000, would be raised to $24,500 as a result of the administration's pending proposal. Other supergrade salaries also would be adjusted upward accordingly.

President Kennedy also is expected to suggest—rather than formally recommend, since this is the prerogative of Congress—that Congress raise the present $22,500 salary of the members to $30,000 a year.

Discussions already are being held by administration officials with key members of Congress and the leaders and staff members of the Congressional committees which would handle such legislation. Such discussions are expected to continue during the adjournment of Congress.

The administration wants to have the features of the proposal straightened out to everyone's satisfaction so that the official proposals will get prompt action from Congress next year.

As a matter of fact in its report accompanying the Federal classified and postal employee pay raise bill which was enacted last week by Congress, the Senate Civil Service Committee "urged" President Kennedy to submit proposals next year for raising Executive Act and supergrade pay. It did not mention congressional salaries, but it is the understanding that any Executive Act and supergrade salary raise would have to be accompanied by a congressional pay raise.

All this has significance, too, for Federal employees in the upper-middle grades and even those below these grades. For once that Executive Act and supergrade pay ceilings are raised, this will give more latitude to increasing eventually Federal pay down the line, which until now has been held down because of restrictions on the salary paid to the top grades.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his statement. Of course it was made implicit in the pay increase bill that there would be legislation in the next session of Congress to increase the pay of the executive branch of the Government as well as Members of Congress. Already there is a bill lurking around here somewhere that would increase the pay of certain District of Columbia officials because it seems that the employees of the District, whose pay was increased, will be drawing higher salaries than their chiefs; and this comes about as a result of the pay increase bill which was passed through the House with practically no explanation. I hope Members of the House are at last aware that the so-called pay increase bill also increased congressional retirement and that those who voted for it voted to increase congressional retirement.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman is correct. I thank him for his comments, and I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding me this time.

PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Chair appoints the following confereees: Messrs. DAVIS of Tennessee, JONES of Alabama, BLATNIK, CRAMER, and BALDWIN.

There was no objection.

TEACHERS' SALARY INCREASE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, with House amendments thereto and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if this bill is taken to conference as the gentleman is asking be done, I assume there will be no effort made to attach a pay increase for certain District officials who now find themselves on the lower end of the totem pole as compared with the pay increase that was voted the other day for some of the "Indians," otherwise employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to state those officials you referred to will be considered in another bill.

Mr. GROSS. So the gentleman will resist any attempt to increase the pay of any officials of the District government through the medium of this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. I would like to say to the gentleman that I agree thoroughly with him that we should never have increased the salaries of clerks in the District higher than that of the District Commissioners.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, would the gentleman briefly explain what the bill is and the House amendment? The two are compatible? The amendment is germane?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes. The Senate passed a salary increase bill with the amount of 14 percent. The House figure was 10.1 percent. The House left out some of the principals and the Superintendent.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, it is a matter germane to the bill the House passed.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOWDY, WHITENER, HUDDLESTON, BROYHILL, and HARSHA.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the gentleman proposes to take ample time to explain this conference report?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2546)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 7, 8, 14, 19, 22, 23, 24, 28, 35, 51, 52, 53, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16, 18, 21, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 47, 50, 55, and 56, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$141,210,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,832,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,695,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$26,010,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 20, 27, 30, 33, 44, 46, and 48.

John J. Rooney,
Robert L. F. Sikes,
Clarence Cannon,
Frank T. Bow,
John Taber,
Managers on the Part of the House.

John L. McClellan,
Allen J. Ellender,
Spessard L. Holland,
Carl Hayden,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Karl E. Mundt,
Roman L. Hruska,
Mike Mansfield,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12580) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $141,210,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $140,710,000 as proposed by the House and $141,910,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the additional amount, $300,000 is to be used for security equipment and for no other purpose.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $2,205,000 for acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

International organizations and conferences

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $2,250,000 for missions to international organizations as proposed by the House instead of $2,290,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $100,000,000 for loans to the United Nations as proposed by the Senate.

International commissions

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $670,000 for salaries and expenses, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, as proposed by the Senate instead of $620,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $1,910,000 for international fisheries commissions as proposed by the House instead of $2,082,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Educational exchange

Amendment No. 8: Provides a limitation of $1,000 for official entertainment as proposed by the House instead of $2,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $41,950,000 for mutual educational and cultural exchange activities instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $43,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Provides that not less than $14,515,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,515,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Provides a limitation of $1,832,000 for administrative expenses instead of $1,732,000 as proposed by the House and $1,932,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Federal prison system

Amendment No. 12: Inserts language relative to a new psychiatric institution as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $3,545,000 for buildings and facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,595,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General administration

Amendment No. 14: Provides a limitation of $1,500 for official entertainment as proposed by the House instead of $2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $3,800,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $3,700,000 as proposed by the House and $3,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Area Redevelopment Administration

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $115,050,000 for the area redevelopment fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $115,480,000 as proposed by the House.

Export control

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $3,695,000 instead of $3,480,00 as proposed by the House and $3,735,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Provides that $1,337,000 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,237,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that not to exceed $80,400 may be advanced to salaries and expenses under general administration as proposed by the House instead of $120,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Field Services

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Business and Defense Services Administration

Amendment No. 21: Appropriate $4,940,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

International activities

Amendment No. 23: Deletes "trade missions" which was inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Provides a limitation of $10,000 for official representation as proposed by the House instead of $20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $7,025,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $6,500,000 as proposed by the House and $8,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Provides that $1,600,000 shall remain available for trade and industrial exhibits until June 30, 1964, instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

United States Travel Service

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $3,350,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $3,950,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee has not restored the reclama because the Congress will meet again in January. In the meantime the committee is investigating this service. If more funds can be justified in the next session the committee will look upon them with careful consideration.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $12,450,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $12,250,000 as proposed by the House and $12,598,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum of $200,000 is included for statistical support for the international textile agreement and $148,000 for the survey of consumer buying intentions. No funds are included for the initiation of a national address register.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $22,750,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $21,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

Maritime Administration

Amendment No. 33: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $220,400,000 for operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the Senate instead of $225,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $3,550,000 for research and development as proposed by the House instead of $5,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Patent Office

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $26,010,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $25,860,000 as proposed by the House and $27,193,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional $150,000 is for intensified specialized training of patent examiner recruits.

Bureau of Public Roads

Amendment No. 37: Inserts "reconstruction" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Provides that the funds for improvement of the Pentagon road network are to remain available until expended as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $2,000,000 for control of outdoor advertising as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $500,000 for research and technical services (special foreign currency program) as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $59,500,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $58,250,000 as proposed by the House and $60,076,000 as proposed by the Senate. All of the items as set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 on page 20 of Senate Report No. 2226 are approved.

Amendment No. 42: Inserts "purchase of two aircraft" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $11,000,000 for research and development instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House and $11,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $4,325,000 for establishment of meteorological facilities instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions—Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 46: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $5,800,000 for fees of jurors and commissioners as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Federal Maritime Commission

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $2,300,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $2,100,000 as proposed by the House and $2,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tariff Commission

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $2,950,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,900,000 as proposed by the House.

U.S. Information Agency

Amendment No. 51: Provides a limitation of $500 for entertainment as proposed by the House instead of $2,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $7,600,000 for special international exhibitions as proposed by the House instead of $7,474,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Provides a limitation of $10,550 for representation as proposed by the House instead of $15,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Inserts "and trade" as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $8,750,000 for acquisition and construction of radio facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates $1,000,000 for informational media guarantee fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
R. L. F. SIKES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the bill as now before the House for consideration contains a total of $2,025,895,700 in direct appropriations. It is $124,680,000 higher, including $100 million to enable the President to provide a loan to the United Nations, than the amount as it was passed by the House. However, I should explain that in addition to this $100 million, a total of $19,070,000 in additional budget estimates were also considered by the other body. It is now $10,913,000 below the amount of the bill as passed by the other body.

It should be noted that the bill as passed by the House on July 20, 1962, was $102,962,300 below the total amount of the budget estimates presented to the House Committee on Appropriations. As it passed the other body it was $86,439,300 below the total amount of the budget estimates.

It is presently and as now before this body for approval $97,352,300 below the total budget estimates for the fiscal year 1963.

The conferees feel that there is sufficient money included in this bill even with this cut of $97,352,300 for the agencies and departments concerned to carry on in proper and ample fashion during the present fiscal year.

I should add that the pending bill also includes a total of $3,251,200,000 for the Bureau of Public Roads to be derived from the highway trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may at this point in the RECORD insert a table indicating the action of the conferees with regard to the various items carried in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Department of State	$435,064,000	$283,480,000	$400,047,000	$396,185,000	−$38,879,000	+$112,705,000	−$3,862,000
Department of Justice	309,300,000	305,727,000	306,677,000	306,677,000	−2,623,000	+950,000	
Department of Commerce	[1] 836,099,000	781,695,000	800,447,000	793,670,000	−42,429,000	+11,975,000	−6,777,000
Bureau of Public Roads (highway trust fund)	(3,250,500,000)	(3,251,200,000)	(3,251,200,000)	(3,251,000,000)	(−1,300,000)		
The judiciary	62,735,000	60,270,700	61,570,700	61,570,700	−1,164,300	+1,300,000	
American Battle Monuments Commission	1,550,000	1,523,000	1,523,000	1,523,000	−27,000		
Commission on Civil Rights	995,000	950,000	950,000	950,000	−45,000		
Federal Maritime Commission	2,900,000	2,100,000	2,700,000	2,300,000	−600,000	+200,000	−400,000
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000			
Small Business Administration	306,000,000	305,750,000	305,750,000	305,750,000	−250,000		
Subversive Activities Control Board	395,000	395,000	395,000	395,000			
Tariff Commission	2,950,000	2,900,000	2,950,000	2,950,000		+50,000	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000			
U.S. Information Agency	158,060,000	149,225,000	146,599,000	146,725,000	−11,335,000	−2,500,000	+126,000
Total	[1] 2,123,248,000	1,901,215,700	2,036,808,700	2,025,895,700	−97,352,300	+124,680,000	−10,913,000

[1] Includes $115,480,000 adjustment for borrowing authority replaced in bill by appropriations.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I see in the bill amendment 12 concerning some language relating to a new prison psychiatric institution as proposed by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter addressed to the Honorable Robert Kennedy, Attorney General.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Texas has yet learned what General Walker was doing a week ago Sunday night on the campus of Ole Miss?

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman thinks he knows and reminds the gentleman from New York, as he did last week, when the same question was asked, this is for the court to decide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions last week I took the floor of the House to point out the dangers to the civil rights of all our people in the procedures which were being followed in denying equality under the law to Gen. Edwin Walker. We are all happy, I am sure, that the mistakes that were being made in the General Walker case have been somewhat corrected by the reduction of the bond asked for his release, although $50,000 is still an unreasonable and unjustified figure, and in allowing General Walker to make the bond and be released pending a trial.

Unfortunately, we cannot allow the matter to end here. There are several questions involved in the arrest and subsequent events in the General Walker case which demand answers. It is vital that Congress and the American people have a complete explanation from the Attorney General as to the part played in this tragic affair by a Government psychiatrist, Dr. Charles Smith. According to the news media, Dr. Smith made a professional decision that General Walker should undergo a mental test on the basis of press reports and an examination of General Walker's medical record. If this is true, it is astounding that such a procedure could take place in the United States or that it could be condoned by the Justice Department. I think Congress has a right to know the identity of Dr. Charles Smith, his role in our Government, his professional background and ability, and upon what grounds, moral or legal, he could make the decision he did, upon the evidence reported. I think the Congress must know what medical record he consulted and how he obtained access to it.

In this connection I have asked the Attorney General for a full report and an investigation of the methods employed by Dr. Charles Smith. Also, by what right legally, James Bennett, prison head, transferred Gen. Walker to the Missouri Mental Hospital. If the Department of Justice is unable to undertake such an investigation and to furnish Congress with a proper report, I shall ask that the invesigation be made by a duly constituted congressional committee. I include my letter to the Attorney General herewith:

October 10, 1962.

The Honorable Robert Kennedy,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Attorney General: Although Gen. Edwin Walker has now been released on bond and the case has been redirected to proper legal procedures, there are several questions involved in his arrest that demand an answer. As I explained to you on the telephone last week and, as I repeated on the floor of the House, during my discussion of General Walker's arrest, I am concerned only with the protection of every American citizen against illegal arrest or prosecution. If we are to remain a free nation there must be equality under the law for all our citizens, those with whom we disagree as well as those whose cause we support.

There are some grave questions which have come up with the arrest and subsequent events in the case of General Walker. I think Congress has a right to know and I think the American people have a right to know your position on two matters in this connection.

First, under what legal procedures and by what authority did the Director of Federal Prisons, James Bennett, order the removal of General Walker from Mississippi to the Federal Prison at Springfield, Mo.?

Second, under what legal authority did the Government psychiatrist, Dr. Charles Smith, order General Walker held for examination? From the newspaper accounts we are informed that Dr. Smith made this decision based upon press reports and an examination of General Walker's medical record. This action upon the part of Dr. Smith is the most frightening aspect of this whole sorry procedure. How can any reputable man of medicine or any responsible Government official make a judgment of such a nature on such evidence? If this can be done with the approval of the Department of Justice, no person in this Nation is safe from the violation of his civil rights.

Mr. Attorney General, I believe that a full report on Dr. Smith's unwarranted action must be given to Congress and I propose that a full and complete investigation of the methods employed by this man be instituted at once. If the Department of Justice feels it is unable to undertake such an investigation, it will be my purpose to ask that it be done by the Congress.

I hope you will agree to the necessity of a prompt reply.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce Alger.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask whether the gentleman could give me the amount of money for development grants and development loans applicable to Africa.

Mr. ROONEY. This is the State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill.

Mrs. BOLTON. It has nothing to do with these grants and loans?

Mr. ROONEY. No. They are included in the foreign aid appropriation bill which was finally passed by the House last Saturday afternoon upon adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This bill as it comes back from conference is $97 million below the budget request?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct; $97,352,300.

Mr. GROSS. That is, it is that amount below the administration's asking price. How much is it below the expenditures for the same general purposes for last year?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, it would necessarily be substantially above the amounts appropriated last year because of the inclusion of the one item of $100 million for U.N. bonds. The amount for 1962 was $1,869,982,136.

Mr. GROSS. So, it is somewhere around $200 million fatter than it was a year ago for the same general purposes, minus the $100 million for the U.N. bonds.

Mr. ROONEY. This is a mathematical matter, and I am sure the gentleman and I can sit down a little later and figure it out to the penny. Seventy-eight million six hundred and thirty-six thousand five hundred dollars was added in 1963 fiscal year for the Small Business Administration over the amount provided in 1962.

Mr. GROSS. You did not increase the food and drink bill?

Mr. ROONEY. Not one iota, if you can drink an iota.

Mr. GROSS. But there is still, when it is all added up, about $1¼ million in this bill for food and liquor?

Mr. ROONEY. The representation allowances are in the same amount as they were when they were approved some months ago in this particular bill. I might say in this regard that it has not been easy to bring these items back so pleasing to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] if the gentleman will examine the reports of the other body, the gentleman will find in most instances those were increased. However, we brought the bill back in the same way in which the House passed it. We were able to prevail upon the other body to keep the House figures on those items and they are the same as they were when we passed the bill in the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Once again I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], for their tenacity in holding this spending down, as compared with the request of the other body. I say again that we can be thankful for small favors.

Permit me to ask the gentleman this further question——

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to say that $97,352,300 is not a small favor.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the representation allowances.

Mr. ROONEY. Those are peanuts; those are peanuts and Scotch and soda.

Mr. GROSS. One and one-quarter million dollars worth of it is not exactly peanuts. Permit me to ask the gentleman this question: Under "Miscellaneous expenses," for the Chief Justice, to be found on page 43 of the bill, would that permit the Court to buy a parking lot or to start planning for a parking lot under the eaves of the Supreme Court? I understand the Chief Justice says that women employees are not safe upon leaving their work in the late afternoon.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman referring to the item on page 44 of the bill entitled "Automobile for the Chief Justice"?

Mr. GROSS. No; I am referring to "Miscellaneous expenses," to be found on page 43, I believe; "Miscellaneous expenses" to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve, $79,000.

Mr. ROONEY. That would not include a parking lot.

Mr. GROSS. Or even planning for a parking lot?

Mr. ROONEY. No, it would not.

Mr. GROSS. I am intrigued by the fact that even the women employees of the U.S. Supreme Court are not safe on the streets near the Supreme Court Building in the late afternoon when they leave work.

Mr. ROONEY. This amount, I should point out to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, is less than it was last fiscal year, 1962. The amount was not in disagreement between this body and the other body because the other body took this body's figures.

Mr. GROSS. How much money is in this bill, if any, for the Equal Job Opportunities Commission?

Mr. ROONEY. I am not familiar at the moment with how much is for the Equal Job Opportunities Commission.

Mr. GROSS. It is chairmaned by Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON. May I ask the gentleman this question? Is there any appropriation made to the departments covered in this bill so that they may in turn contribute to the support of the Equal Job Opportunities Commission which spends in the neighborhood, as I remember it, of some $500,000 or $600,000 a year? Precisely where they get their money from these various departments I have been unable to discover.

Mr. ROONEY. I suspect that there are amounts also included in a number of other bills for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Is the Civil Rights Commission appropriation in this bill?

Mr. ROONEY. It is.

Mr. GROSS. The same as it was last year?

Mr. ROONEY. It is in the amount as it passed the House last July 20. There was no disagreement between this body and the other body with regard to the money for the Civil Rights Commission. The Civil Rights Commission asked for $995,000. This body allowed them $950,000. They were allowed $950,000 in the other body. The item was not in disagreement, at all.

Mr. GROSS. Where will the Justice Department get the money for the invasion of Mississippi? Will that come later? That is not in this bill?

Mr. ROONEY. No one ever accused me of being a swami, and I do not have a crystal ball. I do not know when it is coming or in what amount. But I do expect that the U.S. marshals will have to be paid for their services in Mississippi and for their overtime and travel.

Mr. GROSS. That will come in some later bill?

Mr. ROONEY. I expect so.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the $6.5 million appropriation to the Disarmament Agency, is there any accomplishment of note since this new and plush agency was created?

Mr. ROONEY. I must say to my distinguished friend that when this item, with regard to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was before this body in July, this body approved the amount $6.5 million. This same amount, $6.5 million, was then approved by the other body. So the item was not in disagreement.

Mr. GROSS. What are we getting for this money? Can the gentleman give me any accomplishments we have had for the $6.5 million?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman knows as well as I since it was discussed when this bill was before the House for consideration some months ago, that this is an agency which is studying means of achieving peace, insofar as arms control is concerned. I have always maintained that it is worth $6½ million to study this subject. If it can be safely done I am for it, provided the plan is approved by the military.

Mr. GROSS. Prior to jumping to $6.5 million we were spending $1 million a year on it, and I think accomplishing just about as much.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know that we accomplished anything for that $1 million. I am anxious to see what we will accomplish for the $6.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. So am I. I am going to be very interested to see what is accomplished for the $6.5 million.

You had a substantially increased appropriation for this purpose last year, now $6.5 million. The new thing in the bill is the $100 million for the phony United Nations bond issue.

Mr. ROONEY. That is the way the gentleman characterizes this item, but I do not characterize it that way. This is a good investment for peace and security insofar as this country is concerned. It is included in the bill with the overwhelming consent of both bodies. The gentleman knows this, so when he calls it phony, that is only the gentleman's personal characterization.

Mr. GROSS. I stated it as my personal view, my personal opinion, that it is strictly phony.

Did the gentleman notice the other day where two or three or four countries made token payments on the many thousands of dollars they owed the United Nations, so that they would not be in arrears and could retain their membership in the United Nations? In the light of the International Court decision and the light of the history of this thing when it was on the House floor, I do not think it is a bit good that they make a token payment of a thousand dollars of $1,500 on a $100,000 arrearage to the United Nations. I do not think this is good, and I do not think the gentleman thinks it is good, and I do not think he thinks that the $100 million is ever going to be repaid.

Mr. ROONEY. Let me say I am hopeful.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. On page 4 of the report in the statement of the managers, in title I, amendment No. 3, "appropriates $2,205,000 for acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad—special foreign currency program—as proposed by the Senate instead of $2 million, as proposed by the House." May I ask, do they think they can take care of all the buildings abroad under this appropriation?

Mr. ROONEY. I should say to the distinguished gentlewoman that this is the full amount and should be acceptable to the Department of State. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amount. This is a special foreign currency program. Of course, it is not going to carry the whole buildings program for 1963 fiscal year.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is it going to carry any of the buildings that are required for these new countries?

Mr. ROONEY. The answer is probably "No." We do not yet have an authorization in law from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. This committee and the Congress has no authority in law to appropriate. There is now included in this bill, and there will subsequently be a motion, which is now at the Clerk's desk, to add $10 million in addition for the purpose of maintenance, operation and repair of our buildings abroad, which together with the amount to which the gentlewoman has referred will make a total of $12,205,000 available for this purpose.

Mrs. BOLTON. To carry on something that has been in effect?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am prompted to ask this question by reason of a news report I heard this morning having to do with the possibility of the need for increasing the gasoline taxes, and so forth, that go into the Highway Trust Fund.

Mr. ROONEY. There is nothing in this bill in connection with that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I realize it is not pertinent to the conference report, but I notice that in this bill there is an appropriation from the Highway Trust Fund to the Bureau of Public Roads, is there not?

Mr. ROONEY. There is money appropriated herein out of the Highway Trust Fund to the Bureau of Public Roads. I might say to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin that the function of this subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations insofar as this particular item is concerned, is primarily a checkwriting function. We sign a check for whatever has already been obligated under the authority given the Federal Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The only purpose of my asking the question was to find out what the estimated receipts going into this fund are as compared to the estimate of the cost of the program, to see whether they are getting this so far out of balance that we now have to start thinking of additional taxes.

Mr. ROONEY. The report today was the opinion of one gentleman, a former colleague of ours, who should have waited until tomorrow before making such a statement, incidentally. We have had over 100 telephone calls on the head of it. But let me say that when the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Public Roads were before this subcommittee many months ago, there was presented to the committee a statement in regard to revenues from excises and obligations. That will be found in the printed committee hearings.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank my colleague.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for the usual excellent job he does on this particular piece of legislation. I want to make a comment on the very question raised by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio. The amendment No. 3 to which reference was made is just for maintenance of buildings already in existence. I am very unhappy to report that the Federal Building Act which we worked on so long and so hard during this past year was passed by the House of Representatives but I am sorry to report that when the other body acted it attached the equal pay for equal work for women bill. As to what is going to happen to that particular bill, I do not know at this moment because the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs certainly does not extend to that subject. My colleague from Wisconsin today requested that these bills go to conference but objection was raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. Therefore, both bills were killed for this session.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, the gentlewoman must realize that the authorization for the foreign buildings program was held up in her own committee for an unusual length of time, and that the delay in bringing it to the floor of the House was probably more responsible for the present predicament than anything else.

Mrs. KELLY. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am almost sorry that I complimented my colleague from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I know the gentlewoman would want me to be accurate.

Mrs. KELLY. I wish to be accurate, too, because we spent an unusual length of time going over every section of the bills requested for the different buildings abroad.

As my colleague knows, I am a member of that subcommittee and I attended every meeting and I would like to tell him that along with the gentlewoman from Ohio, and Mr. HAYS, who is chairman of that subcommittee, the committee deserves a great deal of credit for insisting that the entire bill and the buildings be considered item by item. The Foreign Buildings Act to which we refer was in the committee for this session and we of the policy committee took the same length of time the Appropriations Committee did and we do equally as careful a job in scrutinizing every item.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This particular appropriation bill, as I remember, passed the House way back in July or about the middle of July; is that not about right?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, it was on the 20th of July.

Mr. GROSS. And the other body has been sitting on it since then; is that about correct?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, it was passed in the other body about a week ago.

Mr. GROSS. One final question, if I may, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I most certainly shall; I am delighted to yield to my friend.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing in this bill to fund the pay increase that the House voted the other day; is there?

Mr. ROONEY. There is not.

Mr. GROSS. And that will have to come up later in a deficiency appropriation bill or something of that kind?

Mr. ROONEY. I expect so.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his kindness and patience in yielding to me. I also would like to say to him that although I cannot support the bill, I know from reading the hearings that the gentleman from New York has worked hard in an effort to hold down spending under this measure.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 76, not voting 185, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—172

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Coad
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Ford
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Granahan
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Healey
Hechler
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Md.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mathias
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rodino
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Taylor
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Walter
Weaver
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—76

Abbitt
Abernethy
Alford
Alger
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Becker
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Bray
Bruce
Burleson
Casey
Church
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Everett
Flynt
Forrester
Gathings
Goodell
Goodling
Grant
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Hemphill
Herlong
Huddleston
Ichord, Mo.
Johansen
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Latta
Lennon
McMillan
Matthews
May
Milliken
Mills
Moore
Pelly
Pillion
Poff
Ray
Reece
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.
Rutherford
St. George
Saylor
Selden
Smith, Va.
Taber
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten

NOT VOTING—185

Adair
Alexander
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bailey
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolling
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brown
Broyhill
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chiperfield
Cohelan
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Doyle
Durno
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Fenton
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Gavin
Glenn
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hull
Inouye
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kyl
Laird
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Mack
Magnuson
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Michel
Miller, George P.
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Osmers
Passman
Peterson
Philbin
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Rousselot
Santangelo
Saund
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schwengel

Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Ullman
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Springer for, with Mr. Schadeburg against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.

Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mr. Schriver for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Hiestand.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Kearns.

Mr. Inouye with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. James C. Davis with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Durno.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Brown.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Wallhauser.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Findley.

Mr. John W. Davis with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Wright with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Haley with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Brewster with Mr. Curtin.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Elliott with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Michel.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Loser with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Mack with Mr. Short.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Garland.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Nelsen.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Scranton.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. McVey.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Broyhill.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. COLLIER, and Mr. ROBERTS of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TAYLOR changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: On page 4, line 7, insert the following:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

"For necessary expenses of maintenance, operation, repair, and payment of leaseholds of properties acquired pursuant to the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 292–300), including personal services in the United States and abroad; salaries, expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801–1158); and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $11,000,000, of which not less than $7,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,323,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the "$11,000,000" named in said amendment, insert "$10,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 25, line 9, strike out "$3,400,000" and insert "$3,430,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$3,350,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: On page 26, line 10, insert: ": *Provided*, That the provisions of section 105(f) and 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–256) shall apply in carrying out the activities concerned with exhibits and missions."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105 (f) and all of 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–256) shall apply in carrying out the activities concerned with exhibits and missions".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

"EIGHTEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

"The time limitation under this head in the General Government Matters, Department of Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act 1962 is changed from 'December 31, 1962' to 'June 30, 1963'."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: On page 30, line 12, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$64,200,000:".

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rooney moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Immediately following the amount contained in said amendment, insert the following: ", of which not less than $4,300,000 shall be available for the reconversion of combination vessels".

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the amount of $4,300,000 which is made available by the House-Senate conferees under this amendment No. 33 is to pay the construction differential subsidy on the reconversion of the combination vessels *President Cleveland* and *President Wilson* of the American President Lines, and the *Argentina* and *Brasil*, of Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: On page 41, line 1, insert:": *Provided*, That appropriations granted under this head, in the fiscal year 1962, shall be merged with this appropriation."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: On page 42, line 17, insert: "SEC. 304. The Bureau of the Budget shall provide the Congress, in connection with the budget presentation for fiscal year 1964 and each succeeding year thereafter, a horizontal budget showing (a) the totality of the programs for meteorology, (b) the specific aspects of the program and funding assigned to each agency, and (c) the estimated goals and financial requirements."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: On page 47, line 8, insert: ": *Provided*, That $300,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriation for similar purposes for the preceding fiscal year."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report and on the amendments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 12135.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman indicate what the bill is?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. It is the so-called highway bill. It has nothing to do with the omnibus flood control bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I am a conferee and do not object to the filing of the report to speed up adjournment.

FURTHER ON PRISONER RANSOM FROM CUBA

Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I read a wire service report, but before I do, let me say that I previously had expressed my concern over the fact that the administration is negotiating for a Cuban settlement for the release of prisoners.

I read from the press item, UPI wire service, a report as follows:

The Kennedy administration was prepared to help finance part of the ransom. But State Department and White House officials decline comment on any aspect of the private negotiations.

Administration officials were understood today to be hoping that the ransom payments for Cuban invasion prisoners would be made in food and medical supplies rather than cash. They do not want this country to contribute much foreign exchange which Premier Castro could use to purchase key industrial items or further his military buildup.

Everyone knows that one of the great problems facing Castro is lack of foodstuffs. He needs to bail his Communist government out of its agriculture troubles. Apparently the administration is hoping to complete negotiations for transfer through Mr. Donovan before the people get wise to the deal in progress. I think it is time the administration told the American people what this deal is before it becomes a fait accompli. The American people should have a right to express themselves as they did in opposition to the previous ransom attempt. The use of American taxpayer-supported foodstuffs is inexcusable and should be exposed.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise, and ask unanimous consent that the statement on the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I want to be certain the gentleman explains the conference report, and I would like an opportunity to ask a few questions.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman will have that opportunity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2541)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments to the text and to the title of the bill.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
ROBERT S. KERR,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Subsection (a) of section 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930 provides that articles of foreign or domestic origin may be withdrawn from customs custody free of duty and internal revenue tax for supplies of certain vessels described in such subsection. The Senate amendment added a new subsection (e) to section 309 providing that the provisions for free withdrawals made by subsection (a) were, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, to apply to articles withdrawn for use as fuel on vessels of the United States employed as common carriers on the high seas or the Great Lakes pursuant to certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Senate recedes.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that the bill H.R. 5700 was passed by the House by unanimous consent some weeks ago. It was a bill introduced by our distinguished colleague, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from the State of Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. While the bill was in the other body an amendment was added. During the course of the conference the Senate receded from the amendment, so that the bill that comes from conference is identical with the bill that previously passed the House by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5700 as passed by the House would permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise. The amendment added by the other body would have authorized the withdrawal from customs custody, free of any duties or taxes, of fuel for use on vessels of the United States employed as common carriers in coastwise service pursuant to certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission. As I stated, the Senate receded from this amendment.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the conferees for deleting the Senate amendment from this bill.

As passed by the House, H.R. 5700 amended the Tariff Act to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise.

The Senate added an amendment which would have authorized the withdrawal free of any duty or taxes of fuel for use on vessels employed as common carriers in coastwise service pursuant to certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Senate amendment established a bad precedent.

The extension of the privilege of withdrawing fuel from customs custody free of duty would have had a twofold effect: The user not only will save the duty and taxes; the user will also be able to purchase oil outside of the import quota at a price considerably below the price of oil which has either been produced in the United States or imported duty-paid under quota.

While the number of vessels involved may be small—and not a matter of serious concern—it would be a basis for other carriers seeking to avoid the import quota. At present, vessels of the United States operating in international waters are permitted to withdraw fuel free of duty only because of recognition of the fact that those vessels put in at foreign ports and would otherwise take on fuel at such ports. If we grant the same privilege to certified carriers in coastwise service, there is nothing to prevent the bargelines, or other vessels in such service not certified by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and any other competitive carriers, from seeking the same privilege.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTIVE SALE PRICE, EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers' excise taxes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2542)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 11 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 4 to 23, inclusive.

Page 12 of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out lines 1 to 16, inclusive, and insert the following:

"(d) NEW COMPANIES QUALIFYING FOR 8-YEAR LOSS CARRYOVER.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 812(e)(2)(B) of such Code (relating to nonqualified corporation) is amended by adding immediately after the words 'with any other corporation' in the first sentence, the following: (except a corporation taxable under part II or part III of this subchapter)'.

"(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1954, except that in the case of a nonqualified corporation, as defined in section 812(e)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect prior to the amendment made by paragraph (1), a loss from operations for a taxable year beginning in 1955 shall not be an operations loss carryover to the year 1961, and there shall be no reduction in the portion of such loss from operations which may be carried to 1962 or 1963 by reason of an offset with respect to the year 1961.

Page 12, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(f)" and insert the following: "(e) CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS OF STOCK OF SUBSIDIARIES.—".

Page 13, line 3, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The" and insert the following: "(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (d)(2), the".

And the Senate agreed to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
ROBERT S. KERR,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SECTION 1. CONSTRUCTIVE SALES PRICE FOR PURPOSES OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS EXCISE TAXES

Section 4216(b)(2) of the code now provides that, in determining the base for the computation of manufacturers excise taxes, a constructive sales price may be used where sales are made to retailers or to consumers if sales are also made at the wholesale level. However, this provision applies only if the normal method of sales within the industry is not to sell articles at retail, to retailers, or both. The bill as passed by the House provided that this latter restriction was not to apply in the case of the manufacturers excise taxes on refrigerators and related items, on electric, gas and oil appliances, and on radios and television sets and related items. Under the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and under the conference agreement, this latter restriction is not to apply in the case of any of the manufacturers excise taxes except those relating to automobiles, trucks, and buses, business machines, and matches.

Under the bill as passed by the House, this provision would have applied to sales after December 31, 1961. Under the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and under the conference agreement, this provision will apply to articles sold on or after October 1, 1962.

SECTION 2. CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOUNDATIONS FOR CERTAIN STATE COLLEGES

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill amends section 170(b)(1)(A) of the 1954 code (relating to limitation on the amount of the deduction for charitable contributions by individuals) to add a new clause (iv). Existing section 170 (b)(1)(A) provides for an additional allowance (not to exceed 10 percent of an individual's adjusted gross income) above the general 20 percent limitation for charitable contributions. Under existing law this additional 10 percent limitation is applicable in the case of contributions to churches and conventions or associations of churches, and to certain schools, hospitals, and medical research organizations. The effect of the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and of the conference agreement, is to make the additional 10 percent provision applicable also in the case of contributions to an organization referred to in section 503(b)(3) of the code which is organized and operated exclusively to receive, hold, invest, and administer property and to make expenditures to or for the benefit of a college or university which is an organization referred to in clause (ii) of section 170(b)(1)(A) and which is an agency or instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or which is owned or operated by a State or political subdivision thereof or by an agency or instrumentality of one or more States or political subdivisions.

SECTION 3. LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

(a) Variable annuities and other segregated asset accounts: The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, amend section 801(g) of the 1954 code, relating to variable annuity contracts—

(1) to remove the termination provisions contained in existing paragraph (6) of subsection (g) of section 801 (which provides that such subsection (g) is not to apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962);

(2) to provide for separate accounting by life insurance companies with respect to contracts with reserves based on segregated asset accounts, and to define such a contract as one—

(A) which provides for the allocation of all or part of the amounts received under the contract to an account which, pursuant to State law or regulation, is segregated from the general asset accounts of the company;

(B) which provides for the payment of annuities; and

(C) under which the amounts paid in, or the amounts paid as annuities, reflect the investment return and the market value of the segregated asset account;

(3) to provide, in effect, that income allocated to the contracts described in paragraph (2) is not to be taxed to the life insurance company; and

(4) to provide, in effect, that, in the case of qualified pension contracts for which segregated asset accounts are maintained, capital gains allocated to such contracts are not to be taxed to the life insurance company.

(b) Tax in case of capital gains: Under existing law, a life insurance company is taxed separately on its capital gains. The excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital losses is taxed at a 25-percent rate, without the alternative provided other corporations to include capital gains in the regular tax base.

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, provide that a life insurance company is to determine its tax as the lesser of the taxes computed under two methods—a regular method and an alternative method. The regular method requires that the excess of the net long-term capital gain over the net short-term capital loss be included, in effect, in life insurance company taxable income. Under this method, such excess is not taken into account in determining investment yield. The alternative method requires that the tax be determined by adding 25 percent of such excess to the partial tax computed on the life insurance company taxable income determined without such excess. The alternative method is the one required under present law. This provision applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

(c) Limitation on certain deductions: Section 809(f)(1) of existing law limits the aggregate amount of deductions allowed to life insurance companies under paragraphs (3), (5), and (6) of section 809(d). Section 809(f)(2) imposes a priority for the application of this limitation to the three deductions. The deductions under such paragraphs (5) and (6), to the extent allowed after the application of this limitation, are added to the policyholders surplus account under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 815(c)(2).

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, amend section 809(f)(2) to provide that the limitation of section 809(f)(1) is to apply first to the deduction for dividends to policyholders, then to the special deduction relating to group life insurance contracts and to accident and health insurance contracts, and finally to the special deduction relating to nonparticipating contracts. In a case where the limitation would permit the first of these deductions but not the latter two, then the latter two would not have to be added to the policyholders surplus account. This provision applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

(d) Reduction of policyholders surplus account: Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 815(c)(2) of existing law require the addition to the policyholders surplus account of the amount equal to the amounts which have been allowed as deductions under paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 809(d). Under certain circumstances distributions to stockholders by a life insurance company, when it has amounts in the policyholders surplus account, may result in tax to the company.

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill provided that, to the extent that the deductions added to the policyholders surplus account under the indicated subparagraphs, merely increased a loss from operations which did not result in a reduction in tax for any taxable year to which the loss could be carried, then such additions may be removed from the policyholders surplus account without incurring tax liability.

The conference agreement does not include this provision.

(e) New companies qualifying for 8-year loss carryover: Under existing law certain new insurance companies, which are not controlled by another corporation, or which do not control another corporation, may carry over operations losses for 8 years.

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, provide that the disqualification from the 8-year operations loss carryover will not apply where the new life insurance company is connected through stock ownership only with a corporation taxable as an insurance company other than as a life insurance company.

This provision applies to all losses to which the Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1959 would have applied, if it had originally contained this provision, except that a loss arising in 1955 shall not by reason of this amendment be an operations loss carryover to 1961 and there shall be no reduction in the amount of such a loss which may be carried to 1962 or 1963 by reason of an offset for 1961.

(f) Certain distributions of stock of subsidiaries: Under section 815(a) of existing law a life insurance company is, under certain circumstances, subject to tax at the time of distributions of property to stockholders.

The Senate amendment to the text of the bill, and the conference agreement, provide that after December 31, 1961, and before January 1, 1964, section 815(a) will not apply to a distribution of stock of a controlled corporation, if (1) the distribution meets the requirements for a tax-free distribution under section 355, (2) the controlled corporation is an insurance company subject to tax under section 831 (relating to tax on certain insurance companies other than life and certain mutuals), and (3) control was acquired before January 1, 1963, in a stock-for-stock transaction qualifying as a reorganization under section 368(a)(1)(B).

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 8952 was introduced by our colleague from Massachusetts, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. BURKE]. It passed the House some weeks ago by unanimous consent. While the bill was in the other body, certain amendments were added to it.

Mr. Speaker, as passed by the House, the bill H.R. 8952 dealt with the application of the restrictions imposed by present law upon the use of a constructive sales price as the base to which the manufacturer's excise tax applies. One of these restrictions precludes the use of this constructive sales price unless the normal method of sales within an industry is other than at retail, to retailers, or both. Under the House bill, this restriction was made inapplicable in the case of manufacturer's excise taxes on refrigerators, electric, oil, and gas appliances, and radio and television sets. As amended by the other body, this restriction would not apply in the case of any manufacturer's excise taxes except those relating to automobiles, trucks, and buses, business machines, and matches.

The other body also amended the House bill by changing the effective date of this provision from January 1, 1962, to October 1, 1962. The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objection to these amendments made to the basic bill.

There were certain other amendments which were added to the bill in the other body unrelated to the subject matter of the bill as it passed the House. One of these amendments, Mr. Speaker, added a provision which would make the 30-percent limitation on allowable deductions for gifts to churches, schools, hospitals, and certain medical research organizations, also applicable to gifts of foundations which are organized and operated exclusively for the benefit of State colleges and universities, including land-grant colleges. Under present law, gifts to these organizations are subject to the generally applicable 20-percent limitation. This amendment would be effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

Your conferees accepted this amendment. This is not a new matter in the sense it has not been previously considered. I am not certain, but it seems to me not more than 2 years ago we thought we had resolved this situation by an amendment increasing this limitation on allowance, but in the process of doing so we restricted its application to contributions directly to churches, schools, hospitals, and medical research organizations. It developed that some of our State universities cannot receive moneys directly for their purposes without having to transfer those moneys immediately into the State treasury.

What we are doing here is getting around that handicap by permitting the money to be given in the form of gifts for the purposes of these universities to foundations and not directly to the universities. This is a very desirable change, and I am satisfied the House Members would have done what the conferees did with respect to it, unanimously.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Arkansas for working out this very technical matter. It is highly important to my State of Kansas, and I understand there are seven or eight other States similarly situated.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, including the State of Arkansas.

Mr. AVERY. And including the State of Arkansas, I may say. This amendment to the code will make possible for these gifts to go beyond the 30-percent limitation which now prevails.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure the gentleman means up to the 30-percent limit.

Mr. AVERY. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to express to the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means my thanks for his work and the work of the committee in bringing this matter before us. As the gentleman knows, my own State of Florida and my own institution, the University of Florida, is very much interested in this. I believe I introduced legislation in an effort to get this problem solved. This incorporates my legislation along with other kindred legislation of this kind.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the gentleman taking time to call attention to that fact. I had intended to say that I hoped this amendment would in some way at least, in part, be known as the Matthews amendment.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. I say that since the matter was before the Committee on Ways and Means in the form of a bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, there are some other amendments that were adopted by the Senate to this bill, also not dealing with the subject matter initially contained in the bill. They have to do with the treatment of life insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, the first of these life insurance company amendments would continue in effect for future years tax treatment of variable annuities that were provided in the Life Insurance Act of 1959. Under present law this special treatment is scheduled to be terminated on December 31, 1962. This amendment would also exempt from tax the actual investment earnings realized on assets which are maintained in segregated asset accounts and entirely apart from the other assets of these companies—as reserves for life insurance contracts which are issued under qualified employee pension plans. Under present law the earnings on assets held by qualified trusteed plans are entirely exempt from tax. This amendment would provide equal treatment for nontrusteed plans which are funded through life insurance contracts, thereby eliminating the competitive inequity in favor of trusteed plans under existing law.

On the whole, Mr. Speaker, it can be said that what we are doing here in this amendment is continuing beyond the termination date, December 31, 1962, a provision which was enacted by the Congress and developed in the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the Life Insurance Tax Act of 1959.

Mr. Speaker, another amendment dealing with life insurance companies would treat life insurance companies like any other corporations by providing the alternative method of taxing their long-term capital gains. Under present law, life insurance companies do not have the alternative of treating capital gains as ordinary income but are required to pay a flat 25-percent tax on any long-term gains they realize even though they may be operating at a loss.

Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this amendment was considered by the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the Insurance Tax Act of 1959. Your conferees accepted this amendment because they thought, unanimously again, that these companies should be treated like any other corporations, particularly when this amendment would benefit those companies that are operating at a loss.

Mr. Speaker, another amendment made by the other body would change the priorities specified for taking certain deductions by stock life insurance companies. Under the present law the aggregate of these deductions and the deduction for policyholder dividends cannot offset taxable investment deductions by more than $250,000. However, present law specifies that these special deductions—which must be restored to income when distributions are made to stockholders—must be taken before the policyholder dividend deduction, which is not later restored to income. This priority is specified even though there may be sufficient policyholder dividends to offset completely this $250,000 limitation and which, if taken before the special deductions, would not be restored to income in the future. Under this amendment, the policyholder dividend deduction would be taken before the deduction for the special items is allowed.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment also was accepted by the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the other body also added an amendment which changes present law by precluding the taxation of stock life insurance companies on the distribution of amounts added to special reserves at a time when no tax benefit was received from the deduction of the reserve addition.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment was deleted by the conference committee. It developed that it could have no application to any companies perhaps for several years and it was not, in the opinion of the conference committee, as pressing as some of the other provisions.

Another amendment made by the other body would permit a life insurance company to divest itself of stock in a fire or casualty insurance company subsidiary which was acquired in a stock-for-stock reorganization, without the imposition of the phase 3 tax on distribution to stockholders. This will permit a life insurance company to return to the tax position it was in prior to the acquisition of such a subsidiary.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the part of the House accepted that amendment.

The final amendment made by the other body would permit a new life insurance company to have the 8-year loss carryover provision generally accorded such new companies under present law despite the fact that the new company owns control in, or is controlled by, a fire or casualty insurance company. Under present law, this carryover is denied new life companies that control, or are controlled by, other corporations, but it does not apply to all life companies that are not so owned or controlled.

Under the conference agreement all of the amendments made by the other body were retained, with the exception of the one that I earlier discussed and called attention to as being deleted in conference.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret to register a discordant note, but I am sure the Constitution is quite clear that tax measures must originate in the House of Representatives.

These Senate amendments are not germane to this bill. The Ways and Means Committee of which I am a member has not considered any one of these measures. There was ample time in this session of Congress for these bills to be presented in orderly fashion. I know that my people on my side rely on the members of the Ways and Means Committee to advise them in these highly complicated areas, just as on the majority side they rely, not just on the chairman and the ranking minority members, but on the entire committee.

This is a complete bypass of the Ways and Means Committee. It is in violation of the Constitution. It is bad procedure because it does not provide the orderly process.

I am willing to accommodate our friends and colleagues from the other body if they have matters where they think the tax laws need amending. I am sure any 1 of the 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee and the committee itself would be happy to have bills introduced, and consider them in an orderly fashion.

Frankly, I am shocked that we have this situation where a person like myself has to register this objection in behalf not just of the House of Representatives but in behalf of the Constitution. They are real reasons in my judgment why the Constitution provides that revenue measures may only originate in the House. I can see where there can be nongermane amendments inserted in the other body that have special reasons. None of these has. I think we shall get to another conference report where I can point out where nongermane amendments do not violate these specific principles which I think are so important.

I am forced to adhere to this position, just as I have before in the past on conference reports where nongermane matters were put in by the other body, to vote against the bill. I think that under the circumstances I am going to try to get a rollcall vote on this if I can.

Mr. MILLS. Would my friend from Missouri listen to me for a few seconds?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am always happy to listen to my friend.

Mr. MILLS. I have listened to my friend's admonition about the action taken by the conferees in connection with this. Your conferees on the part of the House were five in number, and it happens that there are five Members of the House conferees who signed this conference report. I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there were five conferees on the part of the Senate who also signed the report.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Does that make it right?

Mr. MILLS. Just a minute until I complete my statement, then I will yield to the gentleman.

To continue, the gentleman is proceeding to set himself up here as a critic, apparently, of any action by the Senate with respect to any amendment to any of these bills.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, the gentleman misinterprets my position.

Mr. MILLS. I will yield to the gentleman but I do not want him breaking in until I do.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me state my position.

Mr. MILLS. I said I would yield in due course. I am not yielding now. I have been listening to this for some days. I want to make a statement, if the gentleman will just listen to me for a minute.

There is not an amendment that was accepted by your conferees to this bill, for the gentleman's information, that would not have been germane to this bill under the rules of the House, let alone the rules of the Senate. The bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. These amendments amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The gentleman is referring to the next conference report I want to call up here when we dispose of this one. He tries to say that this conference report we are now considering involves matters which are not germane to the subject matter of the bill, but that the next conference report he can support because none of those matters are not germane.

I want to discuss that when we come to the next conference report because what we have done is call up a situation that the conferees on the part of the House ever since I have been serving as a conferee, have found themselves in with respect to amendments adopted by the Finance Committee and the other body. We cannot foreclose that body from adopting amendments. We can, when we get to conference, reason with them on the basis of the amendments, whether or not we will accept them. There is nothing in this procedure that violates the Constitution. It is entirely in accord with the Constitution and court holdings on the subject, and has been the practice for years and years. The important point is that the basic bill must originate in the House. The Senate has not forwarded to us on this occasion a Senate-numbered bill involving the revenues of this Nation. These amendments, I think, are completely germane, not in the sense perhaps that my friend from Missouri is using the word, germane to the subject matter of the specific bill, but that is also true of the next conference report that we will call up. The amendments are germane under the rules of the Senate. They are germane under the rules of the House.

In addition, we have not agreed to anything in this conference report that has not been the subject matter of a bill before the Committee on Ways and Means and with respect to which reports have been obtained by the Committee on Ways and Means from the interested departments. The gentleman from Missouri is entitled to know that those departments have all reported favorably on these amendments we are talking about here involving the insurance industry.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman is talking off the point. I know there have been reports but the Committee on Ways and Means did not consider these matters.

Mr. MILLS. The committee did not.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The committee did not, is the point.

This is a clear violation of House rule 20 which has been the subject of discussion on the floor of the House earlier today. This Record will be available for anyone to read and for people to think about. It is very true that part of our differences and the difference that I have with the chairman of the committee revolves around the definition of the term "germane." But I do not think there is any question about the meaning of both the Constitution and, certainly, of rule 20. Yes, I am critical but I am not critical as an individual. I am not setting myself up, as the gentleman so unkindly put it, as an authority. I am expressing a viewpoint as a Member of the House of Representatives that I feel very deeply about. If I am in error, the gentleman from Arkansas can contest it and so can anyone else.

I trust the Record will be here for many people to read and I feel certain in the long run the point of view I am trying to get across here is going to prevail because it is essential that it do prevail, if the integrity of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Ways and Means and of the Constitution is to be preserved.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was just one member of this conference group that is making this report to the House. The gentleman from California [Mr. King], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] have signed the conference report. We did the best we could in conference. These matters are entirely appropriate for enactment, I can assure the membership. I am not in a position to bring back to the House on every occasion, Mr. Speaker, a matter just as it passed the House. I wish I could, but we cannot under the rules, as I understand them, refuse at least to entertain the consideration of amendments made by the other body. Of course, I have just as much feeling as the gentleman from Missouri about carrying out the Constitution and preventing anybody from violating the Constitution. We had a situation today earlier where a resolution was adopted returning a matter to the other body. Any time a bill is sent over by the other body with a Senate number on it, which bill has for its purpose the raising of revenues for the Government, you can expect me as long as I am here to offer to the House a resolution returning the bill to the other body such as was adopted by the House earlier. But I cannot guarantee to the House that matters which originate in the House cannot be amended by the other body. That is all that was done in this instance. These amendments deal with taxation and the bill as it went to the other body dealt with taxation.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to the conference report on H.R. 8952 for a very simple but important reason, bad procedure which can result in bad legislation. Are the Senate provisions replacing the House bill meritorious? We do not know.

The House Ways and Means Committee has held no hearings or executive meetings on the substitute measures substituted by the other body. The House bill, which related to the sales base of the excise tax, is replaced by tax measures which include section 1, the excise tax, section 2, changes in the tax law of the contributions to foundations for certain State colleges and universities, and section 3, life insurance companies.

The merits and/or demerits of the new language is unknown to me, since the Ways and Means Committee has not studied these measures. The conferees of House and Senate may know these provisions, but the House Members can hardly be expected to know.

I believe it is wrong for tax changes to be made in this way—in haste—in the closing days of Congress, without Ways and Means Committee work, rammed through by the other body in conference. These are bad procedures, improper procedures, and can result in very bad legislation. Even if proper legislative changes are made, this is a bad precedent. It is possible that these are excellent tax revisions. Since I have been foreclosed from learning the facts, I do not know if they are good changes or not and therefore cannot support such changes in ignorance.

It is my hope that U.S. industry and business groups will not endeavor in the future to change tax law legislation railroading tax changes through the other body.

No matter how meritorious such tax changes may seem to be at the moment, the door is open for bad legislation which at other times, by the same procedure, will do harm. Good procedures protect majority and minority groups alike, and should be observed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 6, not voting 181, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—247

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Alford
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Broyhill
Bruce
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Casey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Church
Clancy
Clark
Coad
Collier
Colmer
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Ichord, Mo.
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Keith
Kelly
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Merrow
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Morris
Morse
Mosher
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Ray
Reece
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Germain
Saylor
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stephens
Stubblefield
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall, Morris K.
Utt
Vanik
Waggonner
Walter
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Winstead
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—6

Alger
Ashbrook
Bray
Curtis, Mo.
Gross
Hagen, Calif.

NOT VOTING—181

Adair
Alexander
Andersen, Minn.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chiperfield
Cohelan
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Doyle
Durno
Edmondson
Elliott
Evins
Fenton
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Gavin
Glenn
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Haley
Hall
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hull
Inouye
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kowalski
Kyl
Laird
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Mack
Magnuson
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Michel
Miller, George P.
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Osmers
Passman
Peterson
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Roudebush
Rousselot
Santangelo
Saund
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Ullman
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Michel.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Wallhauser.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Inouye with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. John W. Davis with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Brown.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Henderson with Mr. Wilson of California.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Durno.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Mack with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Peterson with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.
Mr. Denton with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Short.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.
Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Andrews with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Baring with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Scranton.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. James C. Davis with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Weis.
Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Garland.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. McVey.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF TERMINAL RAILROAD CORPORATIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. MILLS. That is my purpose, yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2543)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

Wilbur D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
Noah M. Mason,
John W. Byrnes,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Harry Flood Byrd,
Robert S. Kerr,
Russell B. Long,
John J. Williams,
Carl T. Curtis,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Sections 1 and 2. Terminal railroad corporations.

The bill as passed by the House provided rules for the computation of the taxable income of certain railroad terminal corporations and their shareholders. The new treatment under the bill was applicable to all years to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies.

Senate amendment No. 3, and the conference agreement, provide additional rules relating to the application of the bill in the case of taxable years ending before the date of the enactment of the bill. The House recedes.

Senate amendments Nos. 1 and 2, and the conference agreement, also make technical changes to permit the application of section 281 to certain corporations which are common parent corporations and to certain corporations having short taxable years. The House recedes.

Section 3. Statistical studies, etc.

Senate amendment No. 5, and the conference agreement, amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to make special statistical studies and compilations involving data taken from tax returns, declarations, etc., to engage in special studies and compilations jointly with parties making such a request, and to furnish transcripts of these special studies and compilations to the parties making the request where they pay the cost of the work performed.

Amendment No. 5, and the conference agreement, also authorize the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to admit employees and officials of States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, possessions of the United States, local governments of any of the above, the District of Columbia, or of foreign governments to training courses conducted by the Internal Revenue Service and to supply them with texts and other training aids. In this case the Secretary of the Treasury may require the payment of a reasonable fee not to exceed the cost of the training and training aids.

Amendment No. 5, and the conference agreement, also provide that payments for work or services performed—

(1) pursuant to the new section 7515 (special statistical studies and compilations);

(2) pursuant to the new section 7516 (supplying of training and training aids); and

(3) for a State or a department or agency of the Federal Government in supplying certain copies and data,

are to be deposited in a separate account. This separate account may be used to reimburse appropriations which bore all or part of the costs of such work or services, or to refund excess sums when necessary.

The House recedes on Senate amendment No. 5.

Section 4. Allowance of certain refunds.

Senate amendment No. 6, and the conference agreement, make a technical amendment to section 6512(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limit on amount of credit or refund of overpayment determined by the Tax Court). The House recedes.

Section 5. Cooperative banks.

Senate amendment No. 7, and the conference agreement, in effect provide that for cooperative banks to qualify for the special bad debt reserve provisions of section 593 of the Code (as amended by section 6 of the Revenue Act of 1962) they must meet essentially the same requirements as to the character of their investments as are provided for domestic building and loan associations. The House recedes.

Wilbur D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
Noah M. Mason,
John W. Byrnes,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 12599 passed the House some days ago by unanimous consent, having been introduced by our colleague from Illinois [Mr. Libonati] and having been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means unanimously.

While this bill was in the Senate the Senate adopted some amendments to it. The other body added an amendment to the text of the bill that passed the House. I will come back to that in just a minute.

The first amendment, not related to the subject matter of the bill itself, which dealt with certain terminal railroad corporations and tax treatment of the earnings of those corporations, had to do with authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to make special statistical studies and supply certain training and training aids and to be reimbursed for the cost of such studies and training by the persons benefiting without adversely affecting the appropriation of the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department. The Treasury Department favors the adoption of this amendment. It would permit reimbursement to the Service rather than its going into the general funds of the Treasury. There are those on the outside that also favor it, including State and local governments.

This amendment was agreed to by the conferees and is, I think, identical with the language of the bill H.R. 12030, which passed the House by unanimous consent. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] and I introduced companion bills on this subject matter.

The other body added an amendment to the bill which, in effect, would subject cooperative banks to the same investment restrictions that are imposed on domestic savings and loan associations under the Revenue Act of 1962 by including them in the definition. The conference report on the Revenue Act, you will recall, was approved by this body on Tuesday of last week. In the absence of this amendment, which could not be taken in conference on the Revenue Act of 1962, cooperative banks would not be subject to any of the investment restrictions placed upon domestic savings and loan associations by the Revenue Act of 1962. It was known by the conferees on the part of the House and Senate that this matter would have to be legislated upon subsequently. The Senate has taken the initiative in doing so by adding this particular proviso to the bill H.R. 12599.

Another amendment adopted by the other body corrects a technical defect in present law relating to the allowance of refunds where the Tax Court has acquired jurisdiction of a refund suit, by making it clear that refunds can be paid where they are clearly due. This amendment restores the treatment afforded under the 1939 code and eliminates an apparent oversight in the drafting of the comparable section of the 1954 Revenue Code.

The problem arises under a very literal reading of the present statute in the case where there is multiple jurisdiction relating to a particular tax case. The amendment is retained, Mr. Speaker, under the conference report.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In regard to this bill, I want to point out, as the gentleman from Arkansas intimated in the previous colloquy, in this instance I believe the three remaining amendments are not in violation of these principles I expressed. The purpose of getting this out in the open is so that possibly we can move forward and develop some good procedures in this area as to what is germane and what is not.

You will notice the first amendment was a bill that actually was passed out unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and was passed by the House. So it was a matter that had been considered by not only the House of Representatives, but by the Committee on Ways and Means itself. Technically, I think perhaps the bill could have been passed by the Senate and sent back and just enacted in that fashion. Why it was tacked on here, I do not know—but I see no harm done.

I want to commend the committee in this area. The second is a technical amendment that came in regard to a matter that had been considered at some length by both the Committee on Ways and Means, the Senate Finance Committee and the House of Representatives. There was a technical error in the bill here in defining what a cooperative bank was once we had amended the laws in regard to the Mutual Savings and Loan Act. This amendment, too, is what is sometimes done, I might say improperly but without any real violation in conference where there is no verbiage in either the House version or the Senate version, but it is obviously a mistake or a slipup. Sometimes this is corrected in conference. I was very pleased to find the committee not doing that but coming back. So this is entirely a technical amendment and has to do with simply clarifying the terminology.

As to the third item, I must confess I have a little more difficulty when it comes to conforming to what I think are proper rules of germaneness. But it does relate to a procedural question involving two different statutes of limitations. It is not in that strictly technical sense a revenue-raising measure, but is a procedural thing.

As to the third, I certainly think it would be better procedure if it had been initiated in the House.

As to the other bill, I would like to call attention to the fact that there were very complicated amendments involving the taxation of life insurance companies. I feel it is more technical. I saw no reason and I see no reason now why this matter could not have been initiated in the House of Representatives as it should be and why it should not have been carried through in the proper fashion.

But for these reasons, and also to try to make a record, which is all I am trying to do here, I will not object and I will vote for this conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri can make the distinction between the amendments here involved and the amendments that were involved in the previous conference report. For the life of me, I cannot. They are matters that with the exception of the one amendment, as I started to point out earlier, are not related to the text of the matter that was in the House bill.

There is one amendment that I overlooked discussing which has to do with a retroactive application of the House-passed bill. That was suggested by our staff people and the Treasury people as a perfecting of the House bill. The conferees took that suggestion. But these basic amendments, in my opinion, involved in this conference report are not within the subject matter of the bill that passed the House any more than the others were. But I am pleased that my friend from Missouri can distinguish between them to his own satisfaction and I appreciate the right that he has to do that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I am glad the gentleman realizes the basic principle involved.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the approval of the conference report covering H.R. 12599 gives to terminal railroad corporations equitable income-tax treatment. The greatest expense of operating a railroad is terminal cost. To isolate this phase of the transportation business and ascribe to it profit, belies economic reality. H.R. 12599 represents the legislative solution to this problem in that terminal facilities are not profitable to transportation companies. This legislation has saved three lines from going into bankruptcy. I congratulate the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, and the members of the committee, for making possible the passage of this important legislation. Our Illinois dean, THOMAS O'BRIEN, was active in its support. The gentleman from California [Mr KING], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], together with Chairman MILLS guided the legislation in its passage, through the House as well as managers in the conference with the Senate.

The friendly attitude of the Senate indicated that they accepted the critical problem facing the railroads to the end that the very existence of these companies were threatened as a public service—under conditions of financial stability. Their approval was forthcoming in that H.R. 12599 authorized the permissive taxation of jointly owned railroad switching and terminal companies as partnerships. It was in good judgment that the managers on the part of the Senate, Senators BYRD, KERR, LONG, WILLIAMS, and CURTIS approved of this needed relief. Senator DOUGLAS and the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. KARSTEN] also were in sympathy with the purposes of the legislation. We are proud of the House and Senate action in this matter. It instills confidence and stability of purpose in the business world to know that the Congress of the United States resolved the equities of the transportation companies and granted them the relief needed to keep them in private hands.

TAXABLE YEAR FOR CERTAIN SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 13358) relating to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means without amendment on Friday of last week.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only that we may have some time on this particular bill, because I think it does require some explanation in order that Members and the taxpayers involved may know what the committee proposed to do and what the bill proposes to do.

I yield to my friend the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I thank my friend for taking this time and giving me the opportunity to explain the bill in order that the Members may understand what is in it.

We had before the Ways and Means Commitee, and the Senate Finance Committee had before it, the Revenue Act of 1962 that we agreed to on last Tuesday finally in the House. Our attention was directed to the fact, or possibility, that some building and loan associations might change their practice of paying the so-called dividend, or interest, from December of this year to January of 1963, and continue to pay the four quarterly payments that will be developed from earnings within the year 1963, making altogether five payments that could be deducted from gross income by the savings and loan association for interest paid, for purposes of determining the net income of the institution.

There are about 2,500 of these associations in the United States that would have had the privilege under the 1962 Revenue Act of changing their payment from say December 31 to January 1 or 2, and would have so affected their gross income and their net income for tax as to substantially reduce their 1963 taxes.

We on the committee are presumed to be smart enough always to anticipate these things, but we did not, and I must admit that the very fine, outstanding staff that works for the Ways and Means Committee and for the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation did not discover it. It was brought to our attention by people in the savings and loan business after it was said by the Treasury that they knew about it but they also overlooked calling it to our attention in the morass of work. I do not know whether the Treasury is entitled to credit or the savings and loan institutions themselves are entitled to the credit for first bringing this situation to our attention. They both contacted us.

But in view of the fact this simple change in the payment of interest in 1962 by some 2,500 institutions from December 31, 1962, into the taxable year January 1, 1963, could reduce revenues that we estimated would be received in 1963 from these mutual savings banks and building and loan companies from $200 million to $100 million, I would say there is room in all of these developments for both the Treasury and the people in the industry itself to claim some credit.

There is $100 million, we understand, involved in this. If it does not pass, the net effect is that we would reduce the revenue-raising side of the Tax Revenue Act of 1962 by $100 million and create more of a deficit between the cost of the bill and the revenue to be developed under that last bill.

This I discussed this morning with a representative of the industry, and he assured me that the industry is satisfied with this bill; that they will not object to it; and, that they think the bill is required. We suggesed that perhaps some alternative ways of doing it could be formulated, but they had not had an opportunity to consider those alternative ways. They said they have had an opportunity through their accountants and through their lawyers to consider this particular bill, and I was assured it was entirely agreeable to them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to thank the chairman for a very clear explanation, and also point out that the savings and loan companies came in and called attention to this. I make that statement because I read some press reports which I thought were quite unfair, suggesting that the way this was found out was because some of the savings and loan institutions were sort of boasting and joking about this loophole. That is in error. They came forward forthrightly and called this matter to the committee's attention. I would say, and I think the gentleman from Arkansas will agree, if we do not do this it would create a situation where some would abide by the spirit of the law, and many of them would, but there are those who would not, and it would create a difficult situation.

Mr. MILLS. Permit me to agree with the statement of the gentleman from Missouri. It would, if we did not pass this bill, bring about some degree of discrimination.

The gentleman will recall I said about half of the 5,000 institutions could move forward from December 31. Those organizations which are federally chartered under the home owners loan organization cannot change their final disbursement from December 31 to January. They would have to pay more tax than those institutions who could move the date forward 1 or 2 days.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I still think we would have discrimination to an extent, and I think some action will probably have to be taken to permit the federally regulated institutions to shift their dividend payment from December to January. Good business practice on the part of these institutions will dictate that they shift from a December payment date to a January payment date in order to carry forward deductions that really accrued in 1962, but can be used in 1963. On a long-range basis I think we can say this will not have any great impact, but it would have an effect in the future upon the liquidation of some institutions. They would then be taking both the deductions they were eligible to take for 1962, which we permit under this bill if payment is made in January, plus whatever payments would have been made in the year of liquidation.

It is my opinion that good business practice is probably going to require that they shift from a December payment date to a January payment date, which is going to cause some inconvenience to quite a large number of institutions and is going to require a change of the regulations of the Home Loan Bank Board to permit this shift.

This might have been avoided if instead of the amendment before the House we had provided a simple cutoff date of December 31, 1962, beyond which the deduction for interest or dividends could not be carried forward by the savings and loan associations. Such an approach would have placed all savings and loan associations on an equal basis, and would have obviated the necessity for any determinations in the future by the Secretary of the Treasury. Unfortunately, time did not permit adequate consideration of this alternate approach by the institutions affected.

Mr. MILLS. I want to join my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes], in that suggestion. The point is this: that whenever one of these institutions should be liquidated in the future, if the institution is required to continue on the fixed disbursement date of December 31 and other institutions are permitted to change from December 31 to January 1, there will be some significant difference in the treatment of the two.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And in their tax liability.

Mr. MILLS. That is right. The regulations of the Home Loan Bank Board could be changed so as to permit these Federal institutions to change the payment from December 31 to January 1, 1963. At the same time this legislation would require the December 31, 1963, payment then to be changed over to January 1, 1964. Therefore, there would only be four payments in that year and not five as may be permitted under the provisions of existing law.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right, and I certainly agree with the gentleman that something should be done to correct this oversight, because if we really accomplish what the committee and the Congress thought we were accomplishing when we passed the Tax Revision Act of 1963, this will have to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out, while I have the opportunity, that we will probably have to hold ourselves in readiness to take care of other oversights. I would call attention to the fact that today we have already corrected two oversights—or we corrected one and we are now in the process of correcting another oversight—in a bill which we just finished and sent to the President less than a week ago. I think we will find that there will be other matters that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Congress must hold themselves in readiness to correct, as they become known to us.

But I certainly agree that this should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I would make one further observation, and that is this: I am not positive that this is the most logical way to make the correction or it may not be the most appropriate way. But it is a way which accomplishes the objective, at least, that we seek to accomplish.

No. 2, it does have the general approval, at least, of the people who will be bearing the burden of the tax.

One thing which I do not like, Mr. Speaker, is the authority that it gives the Secretary of the Treasury in the future to control in a sense what these institutions can do by way of when they declare and pay their dividends. I think, if it were possible, I would like to see a situation where we could have avoided this additional delegation of authority to the Secretary of the Treasury. But under this procedure that has been developed under the bill as it has been reported, we cannot avoid that situation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to general rule for taxable year of deduction) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Dividends or Interest Paid on Certain Deposits or Withdrawable Accounts.—Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, amounts paid to, or credited to the accounts of, depositors or holders of accounts as dividends or interest on their deposits or withdrawable accounts (if such amounts paid or credited are withdrawable on demand subject only to customary notice to withdraw) by a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, or a cooperative bank shall not be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year to the extent such amounts are paid or credited for periods representing more than 12 months. Any such amount not allowed as a deduction as the result of the application of the preceding sentence shall be allowed as a deduction for such other taxable year as the Secretary or his delegate determines to be consistent with the preceding sentence."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1962.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to further extend my remarks on the bill just passed and that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] may also be permitted to further extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 13358, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means concerns the taxable year for which mutual savings banks, domestic building and loan associations, and cooperative banks will be permitted to claim a deduction for interest paid to depositors in these institutions. The enactment of this bill has been urged by the Treasury Department.

The Members of the House will recall that the Revenue Act of 1962 contains provisions which are designed to increase the share of the tax burden that is to be borne by savings institutions commencing in 1963. However, the Treasury Department has advised your committee that these institutions may substantially limit their 1963 tax liability or the tax liability of some future year, by "bunching" their interest deductions in such year. This could be accomplished by the simple expedient of, for example, postponing a scheduled December 1962 interest payment date to January of 1963 or, conversely by accelerating a normal January 1964 interest payment date to December of 1963, thereby bunching the payment of and the deduction of interest attributable to more than a 12-month period into 1 taxable year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to preclude such manipulations for tax purposes by providing, in effect, that the allowable deduction for interest payments made by these institutions in any one taxable year cannot exceed the interest attributable to a 12-month period. The bill provides regulatory authority to the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the deduction for longer periods where it is established that this does not involve tax avoidance.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has estimated that well over one-half of the increase in estimated revenues under the provisions of the Revenue Act of 1962 relating to savings institutions may be lost if this bill is not enacted. The Treasury Department estimates that in a full year of operation the provisions relating to savings institutions will produce $200 million; the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, $170 million. Without enactment of this legislation this would mean the revenue loss would run in the area of $85 to $100 million or larger.

Information obtained from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board indicates that there are little or no supervisory restrictions which would prevent the shifting of year-end dividends in the manner indicated. The revenue consequences of a shift are large because a single quarterly dividend is likely to be about as large as the income of the institution.

I strongly urge the favorable consideration of this legislation by my colleagues in the House.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CORKBOARD INSULATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill—H.R. 12213—to provide for the temporary suspension of the duties on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill contain any amendments added by the Senate to the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. MILLS. There are eight amendments that were added to this bill—seven to the text and one to the title. The gentleman will recall that this is a bill that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Schneebeli] introduced, which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House unanimously, dealing with a temporary suspension of the duty on cork board insulation. In any event, there was no objection to that bill. There were some amendments added by the Senate. I think what the gentleman has in mind is whether or not these amendments may include matters that have not been studied by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. Amendments that have not been before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLS. I would certainly have to admit that some of the amendments adopted fall into that category.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, then I must object.

EXTENSION OF CONTRACT MAIL ROUTES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10936) to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

After line 6, insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class

"'(a) Each owner of a publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4354 of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General at least once a year, and shall publish in such publication once a year, information in such form and detail and at such time as he may require respecting—

"'(1) the identity of the editor, managing editor, publishers, and owners;

"'(2) the identity of the corporation and stockholders thereof, if the publication is owned by a corporation;

"'(3) the identity of known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders;

"'(4) the extent and nature of the circulation of the publication, including, but not limited to, the number of copies distributed, the methods of distribution, and the extent to which such circulation is paid in whole or in part: *Provided, however*, That trade publications serving the performing arts need only to furnish such information to the Postmaster General; and

"'(5) such other information as he may deem necessary to determine whether the publication meets the standards for second-class mail privileges.

The Postmaster General shall not require the names of persons owning less than 1 per centum of the total amount of stocks, bonds, mortgages, or other securities.

"'(b) Each publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4355(b) of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General information in such form and detail, and at such times, as he requires to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder. In addition, the Postmaster General may require each publication which has second-class mail privileges under section 4355(a) or 4356 of this title to furnish information, in such form and detail, and at such times as he may require, to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder.

"'(c) The Postmaster General shall make appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including provision for suspension or revocation of second-class mail privileges for failure to furnish the required information.'

"(b) The table of contents of chapter 63 of such title is amended by striking out

"'4369. Affidavits relating to publications of the second class.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class.'"

After line 6, insert:

"Sec. 3. The second paragraph of section 2 of the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 208; Public Law 86–513), and by paragraph 34 of the first section of the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 202; Public Law 86–507), is hereby repealed."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to one hundred miles during the contract term, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; as I understand it, this is a bill that provides for an increase from 50 to 100 miles in contract routes; and also provides for certain filing on the part of publications with the Post Office Department; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

The first section of this bill, as amended in the other body, consists of the language of the bill, H.R. 10936, as passed on the Consent Calendar by the House on September 4, 1962. The second section consists of the language of H.R. 10696, passed on the Consent Calendar by the House on October 1, 1962, to which the Senate added a three-line proviso.

Both H.R. 10936 and H.R. 10696 were unanimously approved by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and both are based on official recommendations of the Post Office Department.

The first section of the Senate-passed bill authorizes the Postmaster General to increase the one-way length of a route under a mail transportation contract in an aggregate amount of not more than 100 miles during the contract term, in place of the present limitation of not more than 50 miles.

The second section, as added by the Senate amendment, clarifies and modernizes provisions of law, first enacted in 1912, which require second-class publications to file certain information with the Post Office Department showing their entitlement to second-class entry and to publish it each year. The 1912 law is popularly known as the Newspaper Publicity Act.

The other body merely combined these two House-approved bills and added a three-line proviso. The proviso provides for continuance of the existing practice under which trade publications serving the performing arts submit required information to the Post Office Department but do not publish it. The Post Office Department has no objection to the proviso.

Mr. GROSS. And there was a Senate amendment inserted in the bill that excepts two publications from the required filing. This would be my criticism; however, I am not going to object to the passage of the bill. My criticism is to the fact that it excepts two publications from the requirement that all other publications in the country must meet.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I served on the subcommittee which processed this feature of the bill to which the gentleman refers. I want to say that I share his misgivings about the provisions that the Senate inserted. I felt that the House bill really tightened up the Newspaper Publicity Act and made it much stronger. I was a little bit unhappy that the Senate saw fit to except from the provisions that we had written, the two publications to which the gentleman refers. I think, however, that the bill as it comes back to us from the Senate is such a good bill and accomplishes so many worthwhile things that I would not want to see the whole measure shot down in flames because of this one unsatisfactory provision.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman, and thank him for the sentiments he has expressed. However, I would like assurance, if I may have it from the chairman and perhaps other members of the committee, that next year the committee will hold hearings to obtain information as to why these publications were excepted.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. Speaking for myself, I certainly would want the hearings, and I would be glad to cosponsor with the gentleman a bill to eliminate these two publications now excepted and get some information as to why this was done and what justification there is for their exclusion.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman from Iowa is fortunate enough to be reelected, he will join the gentleman from Arizona. We will do exactly that if I am reelected.

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL. I do not think there is much doubt about that.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. What are the publications that are excepted; will the gentleman state what they are?

Mr. GROSS. The bill specifies trade publications serving the performing arts, which, as I understand it, may mean Billboard and Variety. Why these two should be excepted, I do not know.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree with the statement that has been made by the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Arizona. I hope the committee will look into this further next year. However, on behalf of the minority members of the committee, may I say that we will not object to the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the legislative history on this particular bill to be perfectly clear. In the hearings it was developed that annual publication of ownership and circulation information served a very useful purpose, and that publication of this data is in the public interest. Publications are required to print the information annually at the present time. In the past nonprofit publications have not been required even to file information.

In the bill now before us, nonprofit publications will supply the information, but are not required to publish it, nor are profitmaking publications serving the performing arts.

Even though this information in these cases does not have to be printed in the publication, certainly it must be the intent of Congress that this data be available to the general public. After all, we are dealing with what is called the second-class privilege. Newspapers and magazines are carried at lower rates, and properly so, because of the public interest nature of publications which qualify for that rate. Now merely because this bill says that a few publications, whether in section 4369(a) or section 4369(b), title 39 of the code, after this bill is enacted, need only furnish ownership and circulation information to the Postmaster General, I would like to be certain that this information will be generally available and that no wall of secrecy will be created by the Post Office Department about it.

I support the bill but feel that the legislative history should show that we are not making any of this information classified. Since these publications use second-class mail for which Congress has historically made special provision, we in Congress and the general public have a right to have this information available whether or not it is published in any particular magazine.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to subscribe to the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. I also agree that we do not want the exclusion of these magazines which serve the performing arts to include any more publications than just the two that have been mentioned. Like the gentleman from Iowa, I do think there should be some hearings to determine just why these two magazines have been excepted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3451) to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

Mr. SAYLOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman explain the bill, and yield me some time to speak on this matter?

Mrs. PFOST. I will be very glad to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2545)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3451) to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior may convey to any occupant of an unpatented mining claim which is determined by the Secretary to be invalid an interest, up and including a fee simple, in and to an area within the claim of not more than (a) five acres or (b) the acreage actually occupied by him, whichever is less. The Secretary may make a like conveyance to any occupant of an unpatented mining claim who, after notice from a qualified officer of the United States that the claim is believed to be invalid, relinquishes to the United States all right in and to such claim which he may have under the mining laws. Any conveyance authorized by this section, however, shall be made only to a qualified applicant, as that term is defined in section 2 of this Act, who applies therefor within five years from the date of this Act and upon payment of an amount established in accordance with section 5 of this Act.

"As used in this section, the term 'qualified officer of the United States' means the Secretary of the Interior or an employee of the Department of the Interior so designated by him: *Provided*, That the Secretary may delegate his authority to designate qualified officers to the head of any other department or agency of the United States with respect to lands within the administrative jurisdiction of that department or agency.

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act a qualified applicant is a residential occupant-owner, as of the date of enactment of this Act, of valuable improvements in an unpatented mining claim which constitute for him a principal place of residence and which he and his predecessors in interest were in possession of for not less than seven years prior to July 23, 1962.

"Sec. 3. Where the lands for which application is made under section 1 of this Act have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, or of a State, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary of the Interior may convey an interest therein only with the consent of the head of the governmental unit concerned and under such terms and conditions as said head may deem necessary.

"Sec. 4. (a) If the Secretary of the Interior determines that conveyance of an interest under section 1 of this Act is otherwise justified but the consent required by section 3 of this Act is not given, he may, in accordance with such procedural rules and regulations as he may prescribe, grant the applicant a right to purchase, for residential use, an interest in another tract of land, five acres or less in area, from tracts made available by him for sale under this Act (1) from the unappropriated and unreserved lands of the United States, or (2) from lands subject to classification under section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act (48 Stat. 1272), as amended (43 U.S.C. 315f). Said right shall not be granted until arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary have been made for termination of the applicant's occupancy of his unpatented mining claim and for settlement of any liability for the unauthorized use thereof which may have been incurred and shall expire five years from the date on which it was granted unless sooner exercised. The amount to be paid for the interest shall be determined in accordance with section 5 of this Act.

"(b) Any conveyance of less than a fee made under this Act shall include provision for removal from the tract of any improvements or other property of the applicant at the close of the period for which the conveyance is made, or if it be an interest terminating on the death of the applicant, within one year thereafter.

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior, prior to any conveyance under this Act, shall determine the fair market value of the interest to be conveyed, exclusive of the value of any improvements placed on the lands involved by the applicant or his predecessors in interest. Said value shall be determined as of the date of appraisal. In establishing the purchase price to be paid by the applicant for the interest, the Secretary shall take into consideration any equities of the applicant and his predecessors in interest, including conditions of prior use and occupancy. In any event, the purchase price for any interest conveyed shall not exceed its fair market value nor be less than $5 per acre. The Secretary may, in his discretion, allow payment to be made in installments.

"Sec. 6. (a) The execution of a conveyance as authorized by section 1 of this Act shall not relieve any occupant of the land conveyed of any liability, existing on the date of said conveyance, to the United States for unauthorized use of the land in and to which an interest is conveyed.

"(b) Except where a mining claim embracing land applied for under this Act by a qualified applicant was located at a time when the land included therein was withdrawn or otherwise not subject to such location, no trespass charges shall be sought or collected by the United States from any qualified applicant who has filed an application for land in the mining claim pursuant to this Act, based upon occupancy of such claim, whether residential or otherwise, for any period preceding the final administrative determination of the invalidity of the mining claim by the Secretary of the Interior or the voluntary relinquishment of the mining claim, whichever occurs earlier. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as creating any liability for trespass to the United States which would not exist in the absence of this Act. Relief under this section shall be limited to persons who file applications for conveyances pursuant to section 1 of this Act within five years from the date of its enactment.

"Sec. 7. In any conveyance under this Act the mineral interests of the United States in the lands conveyed are hereby reserved for the term of the estate conveyed. Minerals locatable under the mining laws or disposable under the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended (30 U.S.C. 601–604), are hereby withdrawn from all forms of entry and appropriation for the term of the estate. The underlying oil, gas, and other leasable minerals of the United States are hereby reserved for exploration and development purposes, but without the right of surface ingress and egress, and may be leased by the Secretary under the mineral leasing laws.

"Sec. 8. Rights and privileges to qualify as an applicant under this Act shall not be assignable, but may pass through devise or descent.

"Sec. 9. Payments of filing fees and survey costs, and the payments of the purchase price for patents in fee shall be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior as are such fees, costs, and purchase prices in the disposition of public lands. All payments and fees for occupancy in conveyances of less than the fee, or for permits for life or shorter periods, shall be disposed of by the administering department or agency as are other receipts for the use of the lands involved."

And the House agree to the same.

Gracie Pfost,
Walter S. Baring,
Harold T. Johnson,
Glenn Cunningham,
Managers on the Part of the House.
Alan Bible,
Frank Church,
Henry M. Jackson,
Thomas H. Kuchel,
Gordon Allott,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3451) to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendment to the text of the bill:

The amendment to S. 3451 which was adopted in the House differed from the bill as it came from the Senate in many respects. The principal differences between the two versions and the disposition of these differences recommended in the substitute which the conference committee proposes are as follows:

1. The House version would have permitted any "seasonal or year-round residential occupant-owner, as of January 10, 1962" of improved land in an unpatented mining claim which is found to be invalid or is relinquished or which, within 2 years preceding the date of the act, was found to be invalid or was relinquished, to apply for relief under the act. The Senate version used July 23, 1962, as the critical date, required the applicant to be a citizen or declarant, and provided that the improvements should be "a principal place of residence" for him and that he or his predecessor in interest should have been in possession of the claim for at least 7 years. The conference committee recommends, in substance, adoption of the Senate "principal place of residence," 7-year possession, and July 23, 1962, tests, and omits the citizenship provision as unnecessary and the retrospective 2-year provision as inconsistent with certain other provisions of the conference amendment.

(The conference committee notes that the amendment it proposes does not require the mining claim to be the principal place of residence of an applicant. It requires, rather, that it be a principal place of residence. This is intended to avoid problems in cases in which weather and topography make the site, though suitable for continuous occupancy for several months each year, impossible for the remainder of the time. It also eliminates, on the other hand, the occasional weekender who cannot, in good faith, be said to use the site as a principal place of residence. It is also noted that the expression "occupant-owner" is not intended to ratify claims of ownership in the usual sense of the word; it is used to describe persons who have constructed improvements, regardless of whether title might ultimately be found to be in them or in the Government.)

2. The House version did not explicitly provide for conveyance of anything less than a fee simple. The Senate version, however, provided for conveyance of a life estate or lesser interest in appropriate cases. The conference committee version follows, in effect, the Senate provisions in this respect.

3. The House version would have allowed applications to be filed at any time during the next 3 years and required a lieu-selection right to be exercised within 2 years from the date it is granted. The Senate version provided 5 years in each of these cases. The conference committee recommends adoption of the Senate provisions on these points.

4. The House version provided that if an applicant is not permitted to acquire a homesite on his mining claim because such acquisition is inconsistent with the public interest or because the necessary consent is not given by an agency in aid of whose functions the land is withdrawn, the Secretary of the Interior "will" grant a "preference" right to purchase certain other lands. The Senate version made the granting of such a right a matter of secretarial discretion and omitted the "preference" phraseology. The conference committee version adopts these features of the Senate bill. It provides, however, that an in-lieu right may be granted only if the Secretary finds that conveyance of an interest in the original mining claim lands would be "justified" but cannot be granted because necessary consents cannot be had.

5. The House and Senate versions limited the lands that could be used for lieu selections to certain unappropriated and unreserved lands of the United States and certain lands which are subject to classification under section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act. To this the Senate version added provision for conveyances of life interests in withdrawn lands, such conveyances to be made by the head of the department for whose benefit the lands are withdrawn. The conference committee version deletes the provision covering withdrawn lands since it is in large measure fully covered by other provisions of the bill, and in the form in which it appeared in the Senate version, would have scattered authority to make conveyances and would have allowed an agency administering land under temporary withdrawal to grant life interests outrunning the period for which the withdrawal is effective.

6. The House version provided for payment of fair market value of the lands conveyed, this value to be determined as of the date of the act. The Senate version provided for payment of not less than $5 per acre nor more than fair market value, determined as of the date of appraisal, in

the case of fee transfers of lands held more than 20 years; $5 or fair market value, whichever is greater, in the case of other fee transfers; and not less than $5 per acre nor more than 50 percent of fair market value for transfers of a life estate or lesser interest. It also provided that in making an appraisal "the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to the equities" of the applicant and that, in the case of transfers of a life or lesser interest, he might provide for payments "on an annual payment schedule." The conference committee version provides that fair market value shall be found as of the date of appraisal, fixes a minimum sale price of $5 per acre and a maximum price of fair market value, requires the Secretary to take equities into account when determining the purchase price, and allows him to accept installment payments.

7. Both the House and the Senate versions reserved all minerals to the United States, withdrew the locatable minerals, and provided for the leasing of leasable minerals. The House version included, but the Senate version omitted, provisions permitting grantees to allow exploration for locatable minerals and to purchase them from the United States at any time. The Senate version included, and the House version omitted, provision that lessees of the leasable minerals should not have rights of ingress or egress to the surface of lands conveyed under the act. The conference committee version adopts, in substance, the Senate version with respect to minerals. The committee notes that, although surface ingress and egress is not reserved, many minerals (particularly oil and gas) can frequently be extracted by such means as slant drilling and that the reservation from a conveyance of the leasable minerals for exploration and development includes exploration and development by all means which do not involve an invasion of the surface during the term of the estate or interest conveyed.

8. The Senate version included a requirement that the conveying agency, before making a conveyance, should consult with local authorities "to determine the effect of a proposed conveyance upon the services of Government which might be then required." The House version contained no such provision. The conference committee version follows the House in this respect.

9. The Senate version included provisions with respect to the disposition of moneys received under the act. The House version included no comparable provision. The conference committee version adopts the Senate language which substantially reaffirms the law that would apply in any event.

10. The Senate version provided that the execution of a conveyance should not relieve the occupant of an unpatented mining claim of liability for unauthorized use of the lands conveyed to him that had theretofore accrued "except to the extent that the Secretary of the Interior deems equitable in the circumstances." The House version omitted the quoted language. So, too, does the conference committee version.

In addition to the points noted above, the conference committee version of the bill contains many minor clarifying language changes from the text of the Senate or House versions of the bill.

GRACIE PFOST,
WALTER S. BARING,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it is with real pleasure and a sense of achievement that I bring before the House for approval today the report of the committee of conference on S. 3451, an act that will provide essential relief to residential occupants who have placed valuable improvements on lands held on mining claims and who now, for the most part, through no fault of their own, are unable to proceed to obtain title to the land under the mining laws.

This is a bill that will save the homes of small families. It will save the homes of hard working American families that have been occupying public lands in good faith in anticipation of obtaining title.

I shall not dwell further on the purpose and background of the bill except to remind the House that on September 17 last this body suspended the rules and passed S. 3451 with an amendment that substituted the language of the House bill (H.R. 12761) by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The bill we passed was a good one; but I earnestly recommend to the House the bill that has come out of conference as an even better one, and I will hit the high spots of what we have accomplished in conference.

As recommended by the conference committee, an applicant to qualify will be required to have been a residential occupant owner as of July 23, 1955, on a mining claim which for him constitutes a principal place of residence. In the bill passed by the House last month, the critical date of occupancy was January 10, 1962. The House conferees, in recommending that the House recede from its position, recognized that July 23, 1955, represents a logical date from which to base occupancy because that is the date on which a statute became effective making it clear for the first time that mining claims were not to be used and occupied for nonmining purposes. The effect of using this date is to eliminate from possible consideration to receive the benefits of the legislation now before the House any persons who might have sought to subvert the mining laws.

The varying versions passed by the House and the Senate both contemplated that there might be conveyances to occupants of an interest less than fee title. However, the Senate bill made this explicit and the House conferees recommend this provision so that the administrators will have no doubt about their authority to grant, for example, a life estate in an area where the Government itself has a long-range requirement for the property.

The final major item in disagreement relates to the formula to be used in determining the monetary consideration to be paid by a residential occupant for the purchase of his property. The committee of conference recommends the procedure we have agreed upon, which requires the Secretary of the Interior to determine the fair market value of the interest to be conveyed; thereafter the Secretary would take into consideration any equities of the applicant and his predecessors in interest and establish a purchase price that would be no more than the appraised market value but not less than $5 per acre which, I should point out, is the amount that, generally speaking, would have to be paid if title to the property were being acquired under the mining laws. This price formula is a compromise between the provisions that were contained in the House and Senate bills. We think it is fair to the occupant while protecting the interest of the United States.

There were, of course, other differences between the bills; but they were not of such significance, Mr. Speaker, as to require detailed analysis. Each and every difference and the recommended solution is set forth in great detail in the statement of the managers on the part of the House which I hope each Member has at his desk.

This legislation is needed and it is needed now. Unless we act promptly, some of these families may face eviction from their long-established homes. It would be tragic to have any family evicted and then have the same land put up for sale on the open market merely because there is no provision in general law whereby the present occupant can obtain a preference or priority right.

I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary for me to take exception to the conference report which has been filed in this case. This bill was brought up under suspension and at the time I asked the House to vote in favor of suspension of the rules. I did so because the action of the other body in handling this bill led me to believe the Senate was cognizant of the evils which had arisen as a result of certain uses of mining claims and were conscientiously attempting to remedy a bad situation. I say they were conscientiously trying to remedy a bad situation because the original author of the bill in the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], called the attention of our committee to certain cases where there had been real hardships.

For example, he pointed out one or two towns and he gave us the maps together with the overlay showing that the people had originally gone into an area that had been actively used for mining, filed mining claims and had built homes. Those homes have been there not for just 7 years, as provided in this bill, but they have been there for three and four generations in some cases. They have been handed down from father to son. They have been sold. Unless something is done to give these people relief, a real hardship will take place.

However, there is another group of people who have filed mining claims who never intended to prospect for any minerals whatsoever. What they were looking for was a nice place in a national forest or some beautiful spot in our public domain for the purpose of building a nice weekend cottage; and they have it. This has become almost a national scandal. The late Bernard DeVoto was responsible for writing a series of articles calling this to the attention of the American people and calling attention to this use of mining claims for summer cottages, other illegal uses, and they have been stopped.

The Comptroller General of the United States in May of this year published a report and I quote from a portion of that report:

> The use of unpatented mining claims for purposes not related to mining is not in accord with the intent of the mining laws. Judicial decisions dating back to the 19th century state that possession of an unpatented mining claim does not confer the right to take timber or otherwise make use of the surface of the claim except as may be necessary for mining. * * *
>
> Mining claims, many of which are located in areas where there are vast quantities of merchantable timber, are hindering the effective administration of national forest lands by preventing Forest Service access to Federal timber and other resources. In some cases we reviewed, planned sales of many millions of board feet of timber, some of which was overmature, diseased, and insect-infested, had been postponed for long periods because of lack of rights-of-way across mining claims. * * *
>
> Mining claims, many of which are located in areas where there are vast quantities of merchantable timber, are hindering the effective administration of national forest lands by preventing Forest Service access to Federal timber and other resources.
>
> * * * * *
>
> However, the more than 1,100,000 unpatented claims in the national forests may in the future constitute an even greater hinderance to management of the forests because, as patents are obtained on claims, the Government usually loses all rights to the use of the claims, including rights-of-way across them.
>
> Numerous unpatented mining claims in national forests are apparently being used for purposes not related to mining. Permanent residences, summer homes, townsites, orchards, commercial enterprises, farming, and a house of ill repute are examples of uses made of some unpatented claim sites.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Forest Service officials stated that the primary objective of increasing numbers of people who have mining claims is simply a desire to have a place in the mountains to go to and enjoy and ultimately to own, without regard to requirements of the mining laws.

This conference report goes even further than the House bill. The House bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced said that anyone who did not have a claim on the 10th day of January 1962, when he filed this bill, would have no right whatsoever. The conference report updated that to the 23d day of July 1962, and put a provision in here that it should be not the principal place of residence, but it should be a principal place of residence. Further that the only requirement should be that the present occupant or his predecessor in interest should have been in possession for at least 7 years.

The Forest Service is opposed to this type of legislation.

It is for these reasons that I feel that this conference report should be rejected. The situation which the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] originally intended to take care of in his bill is one of real hardship, and I could say to him that I would be happy to cooperate, if reelected to the 88th Congress, to see to it that these people are taken care of. But I am opposed to bills of this type which will allow the actual rape of the national forests and our public lands. This is the challenge that we have before us and I hope that we will measure up to that challenge.

I realize that opposing a conference report is rather difficult, but I intend to ask for a vote on final passage, and I sincerely hope that the House will reject this conference report.

The date that should be adopted is January 1, 1920. On this date you can take care of all of the people who went into the mining areas during World War I and before that time and did a job and have since considered that their home. But if we adopt the date of July 23, 1962, all we will do is enrich a number of people who have performed in the first instance an illegal act.

I hope that the conference report is turned down.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the article or the investigation referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no application to this report whatsoever. There is no change in the mining laws. The Secretary of Agriculture through the Forest Service or the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management has a right today to move in on any mining claim as to the validity of the mining claim. Therefore, we have not changed that in this particular piece of legislation.

When we met in conference, we went into this matter, and as far as the Forest Service is concerned and the Department of Agriculture, they are not in opposition to the conference report. I might say all conferees, both on the Senate side and the House side, with the exception of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] agreed to this conference report.

As far as the Bureau of Land Management is concerned, the only time this will come into effect is when the Bureau of Land Management is wanting to dispose of some land as they are throughout the West at the present time.

This would give the present occupant of an unpatented mining claim, who has his place of residence there, a preference, or a privilege to ask for the right to purchase that piece of property at fair market value, with all of the mineral rights being retained by the U.S. Government. This is certainly no giveaway. This land in the West is being disposed of each and every day of the year.

In this conference report we give a right to the agency of the Government to grant a life estate or lesser estate or to grant up to and including a fee title. I am certain that the Bureau of Land Management wants to grant a fee in the land that they dispose of, because at the present time in these areas they are disposing of many tracts of land under the Small Tracts Act. In these cases the individual will only have the right to purchase up to 5 acres. It has been my experience in California in the areas where this is being done at the present time under the Small Tract Act that those lands were less than 5 acres, and they were sold at fair market value. Fair market value was as high as $1,100 an acre.

I am sure no Member in this Congress would want to deprive an American citizen of a place to live in this country. These people have filed these claims. They were legitimate claims and many of them are just as legitimate today as in the days when they were filed upon. These people are very hard pressed. In my country, in many of the counties, 85 percent of the land is owned by the Federal Government. We have very little private land left. These people are living in their homes that were built there, and they are only asking for a preference if and when this land is going to be put up for sale they may go in and negotiate with the agency of Government and pay the fair market value at the time the lands will be acquired or sold.

Since coming to the Congress I have watched all sorts of redevelopment measures. We have furnished housing throughout the United States for many people. We have furnished housing throughout the world for many of the people in undeveloped countries. We are only asking for a right or a preference to go in there and purchase this land from the U.S. Government at fair market value. This is no raid upon the Federal land reserves. These are only lands that the Government wishes to dispose of, and in the instance of the lands within the National Forest reserves there will be no land sold.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman from California speaks of land that is being put up for public sale. This is land that is presently under the control of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management; is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In some specific cases it is also land that is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SAYLOR. The ones in the national forests are not being put up for sale?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct. Most of the lands are mining claims that are being considered by the Forest Service. If the applicant is willing to waive the surface rights, then the applicant is left to remain there and live there.

Mr. SAYLOR. In other words, he is given a license or a permit to live there for a period of years?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He is not given a permit. He merely remains there and so far has not been disturbed.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would allow the Forest Service to give him a life estate or lease.

Mr. Speaker, since this bill has been before the Congress for a considerable length of time—the House passed a version under suspension of the rules and the Senate passed a version under a unanimous vote—the bill has been thoroughly considered in conference. All the conferees with the exception of one, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, have agreed to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there is nothing in this bill that would harm or raid the Federal land reserves. We are merely trying to take care of Americans so that they might have a place to live.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that in these mountain counties about which I speak and which are found elsewhere in the West, this is about the only place we have on which to build a home. Most of them are straight up and down. Many of these claims are on level areas where people have placed their homes and have lived there for a long time. In many of the communities which it is my pleasure to represent practically the entire town is located on mining claims.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Congress certainly wants to take care of that type of American citizen who is willing to take care of himself and is willing to pay a fair market value for the small parcel of land which he is going to use for his home.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I think three points made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania need to be answered.

First is the reference to the presence of a house of ill repute on an unpatented mining claim which, I say, is an attempt to get headlines on this legislation. It has no bearing, because in the report of the Comptroller General, although made in 1962, it is pointed out that a court injunction enjoining and restraining the illegal operation had been obtained in December 1957.

The Federal Government, through that action and the commendable diligence of the Forest Service, regained possession of the property in July 1960. This shows that our administrators are enforcing the law. In addition, these people in any event would not be qualified under this legislation because it applies to residencies and such illegal use would not be embraced.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. PFOST. Yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my good colleague, the gentlewoman from Idaho, if I were seeking to get headlines, I would have referred to that part of the report which says there was a nudist colony conducted on one of these areas. Also, had I been given an opportunity to read further, I would have advised further that the house of ill repute for 7 years was closed, the nuisance was abated, and the mining claim was declared null and void.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Pennsylvania has brought up the question of the nudist colony, I want to point out that it was located on patented land and has no relationship to the legislation now under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, there are two other points which I should like to bring up.

The proposal to go back to January 1920 as the date of occupancy for qualification under the legislation has no basis in logic. It is intended to destroy the effectiveness of the bill that is before the House today.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the date of July 23, 1955, as the base time from which an occupant or his predecessor in interest must have been occupying an unpatented mining claim is a reasonable, logical, compromise solution of a difficult problem. Like all compromises it is not perfect.

The House bill approached the problem on the theory that this is relief legislation and that therefore the relief should be available to all occupants as of the approximate date on which the proposed introduction of legislation was announced. This date was January 10, 1962; and the House bill would have permitted residential owner-occupants of unpatented mining claims of that date to qualify for the purchase of their homesites. We thought this made good sense in keeping with the general principle behind relief legislation: wipe the slate clean as of the date on which you decide to provide relief.

The Senate version referred to 7 years occupancy prior to July 23, 1962, thereby establishing the July 23, 1955 date. There is considerable merit to this approach both from the standpoint of the fact that, against anyone but the Government, a person could in many States in 7 years obtain title through adverse possession; likewise, the date coincided with the enactment of the Multiple Use Act of 1955 which limited surface use of mining claim areas to mining activities. From that date forward, persons staking mining claims did so under a law that specifically limited their rights of occupancy.

When we went to conference, the dispute on this point was January 10, 1962, versus July 23, 1955. We have adopted the more restrictive Senate approach; we have recommended that the House recede from its position; and we think we have a date that has been justified both in fairness to the occupants and in protecting the national interest.

I would also like to restate this point: If we are going to grant relief to these people, we could not go back any earlier than 1955 without destroying the very basis and concept of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember that this act is discretionary and will not give benefits to those who do not act in good faith. It is permissive and discretionary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in further support of the conference report on S. 3451, I want to set the record straight as it relates to certain statements that were made on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] at the time this measure was originally passed by the House.

First. The statement that 1.1 million people have mining claims that would result in 2.2 million acres of the public domain being disposed of under the bill is an erroneous conclusion.

The report of the Comptroller General of the United States submitted to the Congress in May 1962 indicates that there are approximately 1.1 million unpatented mining claims within the national forests. I think that everyone knows that the great majority of such claims are not occupied. The bill would apply only to lands used for residential purposes and upon which valuable improvements have been constructed. I am advised that the gentleman from Michigan was told that there were probably about 10,000 such unpatented mining claims in the national forests which, based on his arithmetic of 2 acres per claim, would result in a maximum of 20,000 acres being eligible for transfer under this legislation.

Actually, nobody knows exactly how many of these claims exist, nor how many people have them. The estimate that we have was furnished to the Subcommittee on Public Lands on May 1, 1962, in the testimony of Arthur W. Greeley, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, who stated:

> Our guess, and I would have to call it that, although we believe it is an educated guess, is that there are probably about 10,000 claims within the national forest upon which this type of improvement has been constructed and upon which some kind of action under this legislation would be called for.

So we see that the threat of a million acres of forest land being disposed of is reduced by 98 percent.

Second. It is inaccurate to think that all claims that are eligible will be turned into disposals. First of all the legislation is stricty discretionary. There is no "right" to purchase as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan and,, in fact, there are provisions requiring the Secretaries of the executive departments to withhold from sale property that is needed for some public purpose. Second, it is not only possible but probable that, particularly in the national forests, many of the occupancies will be converted into life estates rather than fee transfers.

So even the 20,000 acres that might be eligible for consideration under the bill will be reduced further.

Third. It is inaccurate to state that the type of occupancies involved in S. 3451 are instrumental in blocking access to timber sale areas. As a matter of fact the very cases pointed to by the gentleman from Michigan, based on the Comptroller General's report, are cases that would not qualify under the legislation now before the House.

Furthermore in at least three of the forests mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan there appear to be no residences on any unpatented mining claims, and the Comptroller General's report itself specifically stated that access in these forests was blocked by owners of patented mining claims.

Fourth. Other misleading statements were the references to the presence of a house of ill repute, gambling casinos, and a nudist camp in these areas. However, these activities do not constitute residential occupancies, and therefore would not be involved in this legislation.

As I pointed out to the House in response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when the Comptroller General's report was released in May, the house of ill repute had long since ceased to operate and the nudist camp was on patented lands. Finally, with reference to having read in the paper about the gambling casinos, responsibility requires at least a reference to the source, but none was given.

These are the major points and now the record is straight. I do, however, want to add one further word of explanation. There is a difference between unpatented and patented mining claims. Once the land has been patented it is improper to refer to it as a claim; a patent under the mining laws transfers full fee title with all of the rights of private ownership. The Comptroller General has suggested that Congress consider the possibility of changing the mining laws. But I submit to my colleagues that we should not try to do so in connection with a piece of discretionary relief legislation such as S. 3451 and, secondly, we should not use such arguments as a smokescreen in an attempt to change basic law through indirection.

In view of the facts and that discretion will be vested in the Secretaries, I urge the adoption of the conference report on this relief legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the Chair that I intend to ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman advises the Chair that if the question on agreeing to the conference is put he will object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, further consideration of the conference report will be postponed until tomorrow.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls 288 and 289 I am recorded as absent. My absence was due to my attendance at memorial services for our late colleague, Clem Miller. I should like the RECORD to show that had I been present I would have voted "yea" on both rollcalls.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I asked for recognition to inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us the program for tomorrow and any subsequent days.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Of course, I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I can only announce now that the unfinished business is agreeing to the conference report on S. 3451, unpatented mining claims, following that, the following conference reports are ready and it is expected they will be taken up tomorrow in the following order:

H.R. 12276—conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

H.R. 12135—conference report on the Federal Highway Act of 1962.

It is also expected that S. 1447—conference report on the District of Columbia teachers salaries will be ready tomorrow.

Any further program we shall announce tomorrow.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman if a public works conference report is filed tonight whether that will come up tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. On the appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No; the general public works bill that was sent to conference.

Mr. ALBERT. We shall be happy to program that just as soon as it is ready, I advise the gentleman. We shall announce any other matters that may be ready as soon as we are aware that they are ready.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. May I inquire with reference to the public works appropriation bill which I understand on the Senate side is more comprehensive than it was on our side, when that will come back to the House?

Mr. ALBERT. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has advised me that he is not ready to call that report up but will advise us as soon as he is in a position to do so.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill S. 1447 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON THE 87TH CONGRESS

MR. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time during the 87th Congress I have issued reports to my constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. These reports form a chronological summary of the activities of the Sixth District's Congressman. I am appending herewith excerpts of these reports hoping they will prove of interest to my colleagues in the House and my constituents in Maryland.

AGRICULTURE, 1962

Farm bill: Living as I do in the midst of one of the most fertile farming regions in America I was appalled by the proposals contained in the original 1962 farm bill. The Secretary of Agriculture once again urged increased controls and restrictions on the production of crops. The experience of the past 30 years has proven this approach to be no answer to the farm problem. Portions of the farm bill affecting milk and dairy products, particularly important to Maryland's Sixth District, are in direct conflict with the administration's 1961 higher price supports for milk to stimulate production. Relying on that new policy, farmers enlarged their herds and expanded their facilities. Less than 1 year later, they were ordered to cut milk production. This was confusing to the farmer, confusing to the Congress and confusing to the Nation.

Congressional reaction to such contradictory proposals in the original farm bill was recorded last June when, following a dramatic several days of debate, the House voted 215 to 205 in a bipartisan action to recommit the farm bill to committee, killing the administration's proposal.

Secretary Freeman's recommendations proved too dictatorial for the Agriculture Committee and harsh penalties proposed by the administration, including criminal penalties, were deleted from the bill as being totally foreign to American thinking and to American agricultural practices. Nevertheless, the spirit of regimentation remained in the bill.

The House action came after a record number of amendments were offered to the proposed bill in an attempt to make it acceptable. A bipartisan group of Members sent the bill back to committee so that a program might evolve which would be helpful to American agriculture.

Congress bipartisan opposition to the bill was reflected in these remarks of Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, after the Senate OK'd the controversial bill. He stated:

> The No. 1 victim of the administration farm bill just passed by the Senate is the dairy farmer. If you are a dairy farmer, your feed grain production will be reduced or limited, and you alone among the Nation's farmers cannot look forward to a penny's increase in income. The real injustice in this administration bill is that although you suffer this serious production limitation, you won't get 1 cent more for your milk.

I voted to recommit the bill, joining with my colleagues who felt the administration's program did not meet the needs of agriculture in America.

Feed grains: The 1961 measure and the 1962 clause in the feed grain bill, in my judgment, were little more than an economic gun placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. If he can sell surplus grains at less than the support price, he can force compliance with farm programs that are advertised as voluntary. I strongly opposed these measures.

By authorizing the Secretary to set price support for feed grains at not less than 65 percent of parity and establishing a conservation and land retirement program subject to terms and conditions set by the Secretary, we moved closer to a system whereby the Government sets the farmer's prices, controls his production, markets his produce, and thereby impairs a competitive market system. The cost burden is passed on to the housewife, the retailers, and farmers who are livestock, dairy, and poultry producers.

U.S.-INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Foreign affairs: Ominous events in various parts of the world, especially the Berlin crisis, provided a somber background for the consideration of the foreign aid program.

Foreign aid, 1961: The administration sought a moderate shift in emphasis last year from military to economic aid. In his 1961 message to Congress the President adhered largely to the foreign aid budget proposed by former President Eisenhower. President Kennedy requested a $2.4 billion economic aid program. The administration's additional request for a 5-year authorization for development loans, to be borrowed from the Treasury rather than through annual appropriated funds, faced prolonged debate. This request was compromised by authorizing long-term development programs to be financed by annual appropriations.

There is no disagreement with the program's large expenditures for purposes which are vital to the security of the United States and the entire free world. Responsible government requires, however, that Congress annually examine the effectiveness of any program, seeking ways to root out waste and inefficiency in its administration.

Foreign aid, 1962: A significant action preliminary to approval of the 1962 foreign aid program was the limitation placed on the assistance to Communist countries.

This resulted from amendments, the first offered by the gentleman from Texas, Representative BOB CASEY, Democrat, and the second a modifying amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. The language finally approved by the House by a vote of 277 to 4 provides as follows:

> No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, as amended, to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to the Congress that (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international Communism.

This language was reported by Chairman MORGAN to be agreeable to the President. Recent Senate action on the foreign aid bill ratifies this policy in substantial degree.

It should also be noted that a compromise foreign aid bill gradually emerged from Congress in reference to monetary allotment provision. The Senate restored a portion of the funds previously reduced by the House. The resultant Senate version is still considerably below the original administration requests, but has been accepted by the President.

I believe that this bipartisan program is a necessary burden of the cold war and I think a drastic reduction in aid at this time is unwise. At the same time I share the concern of many throughout the Nation that the program be administered both wisely and well.

Trade bill: The most important and far-reaching international measure passed by the 87th Congress is the trade expansion program. The bill approved by the House altered considerably the legislation originally proposed by the President. The alterations include addition of strong and definite guidelines with respect to the exercise of authority granted by the bill. There is now a basis in the legislation for providing protection for segments of American industry where such protection is shown to be vital.

I voted in favor of the trade expansion program because I believe we must expand our foreign trade on the basis of the free trade principle by reducing artificial barriers to international commerce. We must encourage trade and we must participate in it. It will stimulate the exchange of goods and the growth of our economy, provided we are able to compete. In order to compete we must improve our domestic ground rules.

At the time the trade bill was being debated on the floor of the House, I warned that in order for American business and labor to compete in world markets we must shore up our domestic economy by providing: First, a comprehensive reform of our tax structure; second, a realistic depreciation allowance; third, elimination of inflationary trends and Federal deficits; and, fourth, encouragement of private investment in expanding markets of the world.

U.N. bonds: There were valid arguments on both sides of the question of whether the United States should purchase $100 million in United Nations bonds. The U.N. certainly has not lived up to all the hopes of mankind, but it has an important role to play as an instrument for the conduct of international relations and as a force, in many areas, for the improvement of human welfare.

Failure to approve the bond issue might have been fatal to the United Nations, and to kill the United Nations would be an irremedial act. To lend it a limited amount of money on stated conditions is an act that can be reversed if it is in error.

THE POTOMAC RIVER VALLEY

Antietam, 1961: Because the National Park Service had considerable funds remaining from appropriations, there is today a large sum available for the acquisition of Civil War battlefield sites. For the coming fiscal year 1963, the National Park Service will allocate $260,800 for the purchase of additional lands at Antietam Battlefield making a total of approximately $1 million appropriated for Antietam by the 87th Congress.

The C. & O. Canal: A $150,000 grant for stabilizing the banks of the C. & O. Canal in 1963 was approved by a congressional conference committee. This is a small but important step in preserving the national monument and I look forward to the day when this work will be incorporated into the canal property as part of a National Historical Park.

The National Park Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives recommended to the full committee that the C. & O. Canal be established as a National Park. The C. & O. Canal is near large centers of population and is easily accessible to many people for recreational facilities. There is a continuing national interest in the history of the valley of the Potomac.

It is to be hoped that the confusion incident to the end of a session and conflict on other park and conservation legislation will not deny the Nation this urgently needed national park before the 87th Congress adjourns sine die.

Potomac River Basin: The Congress recently appropriated $75,000 for the collection and dissemination of information regarding a pending Army Corps of Engineers report proposing future development of the Potomac River watershed. Public hearings will be needed before Congress makes any decisions on basin development. The residents of the area must be fully advised of the facts and the proposals before they come to those hearings and express their opinions. I was glad to support this item because I believe the people of the Potomac Valley have a right to be heard and to review all the information available on this matter. It is important to people along the upper tributaries that some development take place there and that it come soon. There can be no industrial expansion in western Maryland until there is better utilization of our water.

Water pollution: A 1961 congressional authorization extended Federal grants to assist community programs of water pollution control from the present levels of $50 to $100 million by 1964. I preferred State matching fund provisions for grants in excess of $50 million and supported such a motion. Upon its failure, I voted for the bill rather than have this important program interrupted.

TRANSPORTATION AND METROPOLITAN LEGISLATION

Highway construction: The current program has been extended until 1971 with a continuation of pay-as-you-go financing, established during the Eisenhower administration. I supported the final conference bill which retained the billboard regulations provisions. Maryland was one of the first States to take advantage of those incentive provisions, thereby insuring the preservation of scenic beauty along our interstate roads.

Various sections of our Sixth District will figure prominently in specific congressional appropriations for highway construction.

Defense: The problem of balancing the budget is immediately related to the immense size of the appropriations for our Defense Establishment. During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, I supported the defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1962 amounting to $42 billion. Earlier this year, I joined a majority of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in passing a record defense appropriation bill of some $47 billion, more than half the Government's entire income. This is a staggering amount of money and it is hard to comprehend its size, but in my opinion it is an important and necessary burden to maintain our security.

In January of 1962, the vast cost of maintaining our defense preparedness was brought home to me in a graphic and personal way. At that time, as a lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, I flew to an aircraft carrier in mid-Atlantic operating on actual antisubmarine patrol. During my Reserve assignment, it was encouraging to observe great progress in modern methods of detecting and destroying submarines. In contrast with my World War II naval experience, I was impressed with the added complexity of electronic equipment that is necessary in modern defense weapon systems. The expense of maintaining this modern Defense Establishment rises with its complexity and its efficiency, but my observation led me to the conclusion that we have no choice, however staggering the cost may be.

Urban affairs: In Maryland's Sixth Congressional District there are 46 municipalities, representing a majority of our people, which must cope with established Federal agencies. They came to me seeking help in providing easier ways to deal with the various departments, agencies, and bureaus. From my experience as a former city attorney, I could readily understand the reasons advanced for urging greater efficiency in coordinating existing Federal programs dealing with municipal problems.

The administration's original legislative proposal to create a new Cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs never came to the floor of the House for a vote. It was tabled by the Rules Committee on January 24, 1962. On January 30, 1962, the President undertook to reform the Housing and Home Finance Agency by Executive order. Under the law such a reorganization plan is subject to congressional veto. As limited by the Reorganization Act the plan could not have added any new functions to the Agency, although it changed the Agency name and gave Cabinet status to its chief officer. It was designed to pull together and coordinate existing functions under one roof in order to achieve efficient, consistent policies in urban affairs. The House rejected the plan, but I voted for it in the interest of meeting the critical problems of the Sixth District's municipalities and the metropolitan communities of the Nation.

THE GOVERNMENT AND FISCAL POLICY

The budget: The President made a record peacetime request for a $92.5 billion budget for fiscal year 1963, which began on June 30, 1962. When the budget message was delivered to Congress the administration predicted that revenues of $93 billion in 1963 would permit a half billion dollar reduction of the national debt. Present projections of Federal revenues and expenditures, however, indicate an approaching fiscal 1963 deficit of some $7 billion. This is cause for serious concern. I have pledged my support in helping to achieve a budget that is balanced in fact as well as in theory. I am convinced that national defense needs, improved foreign trade, a stable economy and a satisfactory growth rate all depend on squarely fulfilling this fiscal necessity.

Government economy to balance increased spending: In an effort to meet our vastly increased military budget requirements, and to eliminate waste and duplication in Federal spending and increases in deficit financing, I have written the President on several occasions urging him to implement present laws which would effect economies. It is my belief that much needed economies in Government can be obtained if we will but carry out certain recommendations of the Hoover Commission. As an example, I urged the President specifically to establish a common purchasing system for all the armed services. I am glad to report that the new Defense Supply Agency has been established and will result in substantial savings to the American taxpayers.

Economic growth and tax reform: In recent months there has been growing concern over the state of our economy. The discussion that has accompanied this concern has not yet provided any meaningful interpretation of the many economic indicators which report on the health of our economy.

I am sure we can all agree, however, that the American economic structure must not only remain sound, it must be increasingly vigorous to challenge new times, new concepts, and new expectations.

Unfortunately, it is increasingly apparent that there is an unsatisfactory rate of economic growth in the Nation. The American economy is not experiencing the strong, rapid expansion that had been anticipated by most people. In the place of conviction, we find uncertainty, and in place of advancement, we find hesitancy and a wait-and-see attitude.

The 1962 tax bill: The administration promised the Nation a complete tax overhaul which is still purported to be inchoate on the Secretary of the Treasury's desk awaiting a future unveiling. The plan for such tax reform as was actually submitted to the Congress this past year proved to be unresponsive to the wishes of the American people. An example was the proposal for the withholding of taxes on interest and dividends. Consequently, the tax bill was in large measure rejected by the Congress, and the Nation is still without much-needed tax reform. New proposals to revise our tax laws are now promised for next January. I hope the bill will be responsive to the desires of Americans and will be a sensible, reasoned proposal capable of invigorating growth in our economy.

I have long advocated a general revision of the Internal Revenue Code with emphasis on such overdue reforms as a new schedule of realistic depreciation rates. The 1962 tax bill was written behind closed committee doors after a year of study and debate. It was presented to the House of Representatives on March 29, but no amendments were permitted during the final debate. Individual Members of Congress like myself had no chance to improve the bill by changes based on their experience or special skill and knowledge of tax law. I, therefore, voted against that bill because its effect was to discriminate against every taxpayer in the United States. Instead of closing some alleged tax loopholes it would have created certain special tax privileges.

The 1962 tax legislation that finally emerged from Congress was a watered down version of the original proposals. In my opinion neither the original nor final version of the bill adequately met the new demands occasioned by our contemporary economic structure.

Depreciation allowances: The administration in 1962 took executive action to liberalize depreciation allowances. I have long advocated the tax reform, but feel that the responsibility for establishing meaningful rules in this vital area belongs to the Congress. It should not be left to the whims of executive edict as in the past. I personally favor much more liberal depreciation allowances than those granted by the administration. The Congress must also approve other programs of reform. It must be prepared to make up for the deficiencies of the Executive in the area of economic policy.

Increase in national debt: On June 14, 1962, the House approved an increase in the amount of bonded indebtedness to $308 billion, a new record for this country. I voted against raising the debt limit to this figure. On two previous occasions in the 87th Congress I voted to raise the temporary debt limit, first from $293 to $298 billion, and later to $300 billion. I had voted for additional military items that were required by the Berlin crisis as well as for other military expenditures. For these reasons I felt the increases to be justified and that the only responsible thing to do was to vote to authorize the sale of bonds to pay the bill.

In voting on the latest increase, I felt differently. When the President came back for an additional $8 billion authority I felt that we were reaching a danger point at which the brakes must be applied. We are reaching a saturation point as far as the bonded indebtedness is concerned. Unless the people of this country are alert to the danger inherent in the rapid growth of the national debt, we are in for serious fiscal troubles. For these reasons I voted to limit the increase to $306 billion and when that motion failed, I voted against the increase to $308 billion.

ECONOMIC LAG AND COUNTERACTION

Unemployment: In my circuit riding trips through the Sixth District I have been saddened by talking with families which have separated because of the harsh necessity of the husband and father having to look elsewhere for work. Some families are buying groceries only through the industry and courage of wives who have turned the living room into a home workshop.

Unemployment figures in the Sixth District during the past three winters compared to the national average are as follows:

[In percent]

	February 1962	March 1961	March 1960
Hagerstown labor market area	13.1	13.6	13.2
Cumberland labor market area	10.5	10.5	10.4
National average	6.46	6.7	5.56

I have repeatedly called on the Area Redevelopment Administration and the Small Business Administration for help. I have continued to work with the administration to secure defense contracts for Maryland industry. I have personally solicited support for a Western Maryland Economic Council to help coordinate all these efforts. I have supported the Area Redevelopment Act, popularly known as the depressed area bill, with its concomitant promise of assistance to our economically depressed areas of western Maryland. Most recently I supported the administration's Public Works Acceleration and Coordination Act which will provide substantial assistance to areas with chronic unemployment and depressed economic conditions. It is good to be able to report that these efforts are achieving positive and substantial results. The latest unemployment figures show that the rate for the Cumberland labor market area has fallen to 6.3 percent, and the rate in Hagerstown area is now at 5 percent, its lowest figure for many years. Incidentally the Hagerstown rate is now below the national average of 5.8 percent.

Area redevelopment: For 30 years the western counties of the Sixth District have suffered from fluctuations in employment and industry. A purposeful effort is being made to find both short- and long-range solutions to this problem. I organized an economic conference for western Maryland and I support plans for a permanent economic council to coordinate redevelopment throughout the district.

New and expanded industry is essential to relieve our plight. The possibility of tourism as a new source of jobs should be emphasized. The Sixth District has the setting for it: Mountain scenery, wild woodlands, rivers, and lakes; and proximity to the metropolitan areas of the East.

I voted for the area development, or depressed areas, bill which provides $394 million to communities classified as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. Hagerstown and Cumberland should benefit under this act.

Public works bill: Both Houses of Congress approved the $900 million Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act. As long as thousands of people in western Maryland are unemployed and underemployed, no valid opportunity to create jobs should be denied them. For this reason, it seemed essential to me to join with the other Appalachian area Congressmen of both parties in supporting this bill. The Presidential power to turn the program off and on at will was deleted and, the funds must be expended in depressed areas.

It is a matter of regret that in our own Sixth Congressional District we have had three such areas. It is my intention to work with the agencies involved to see that some of the funds provided under this public works bill will be expended in our district where help is desperately needed. Unemployment there has been a persistent problem for a number of years and has been acute during the past several winters.

EDUCATION

Education bill, 1961: Congressional consideration of the 1961 education bill was frought with discussion over Government assistance to private schools and administration parliamentary maneuvering. Events in the House saw the President's education bill abandoned in the Rules Committee and hurriedly superseded by another sponsored by the gentleman from New York, Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. Copies of this compromise bill were only made available to Members of the House late on a Tuesday afternoon with action called for in the House the next day under a parliamentary procedure known as Calendar Wednesday. In other words, less than 24 hours was provided to read and study the proposed alternate education bill of 1961, and to seek necessary answers to pertinent questions concerning this bill.

I voted against granting the request of Chairman POWELL for bobtailed debate and abbreviated consideration on Calendar Wednesday. It was with the hope of more responsible committee behavior than this that I voted last year to enlarge the House Rules Committee. The intention of that action was to promote a full, constructive flow of ideas and proposals from the committee to the entire House.

Impacted area assistance: I have always supported the view that some assistance for local education by the Federal Government is both appropriate and necessary. One of the first bills I introduced in Congress provides for continuation of the time tested and equitable impacted area program by which the Federal Government has assisted local school boards in meeting increased educational expenditures which arise as a direct result of Federal activities within the country. This legislation was enacted in 1961.

Aid to teachers of the deaf: I cosponsored legislation to establish a Federal program for the training of teachers for the deaf. The bill establishes a 10-year program for providing funds to train teachers and to provide additional persons to train the teachers in institutions of higher learning. This bill is now law.

College tuition income-tax deduction: In order to alleviate the economic burden on those currently paying the rising cost of higher education, I introduced legislation to allow an individual an itemized deduction for the amount of tuition paid to a college, university, or other institution of higher learning. The maximum deduction would be $500, subject to a limitation of educational benefits paid by the Federal Government under present laws. I believe that it is proper and necessary to extend deductions to those individuals paying tuition to institutions as well as to continue currently authorized deductions for contributions to the same academic institutions. Unfortunately consideration of this and similar measures was postponed until next year.

Higher education bill 1962: The failure to enact an education bill for the college and university level in the 87th Congress borders on national tragedy. Due in great measure to a lack of forceful leadership, much needed Federal assistance for higher education was either abandoned or disapproved. I voted for this Federal assistance to higher education, but the measure was defeated. Defeat of the college aid bill reflects a tragic disregard of the evident needs of our American system of higher education. Inaction of Congress deprives American youth of necessary new college facilities and tuition assistance. Although while America's youth may be the first to suffer because of congressional failure, the Nation is the ultimate loser.

General aid to education: No bill to provide general Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools came to a vote in the House of Representatives during the entire 87th Congress.

JUDGESHIPS

We think of a day in court as a right which every American can demand when he needs it. This right has been virtually denied as a result of political delays in creating new Federal judgeships to carry the workload in the courts. I voted to authorize the appointment of 73 new judges. It is to be hoped that ability and integrity, not politics, will be the major criteria in the selection of new judges.

MINIMUM WAGE

The central question in minimum wage legislation was not money, since both sides agreed in debate on identical wage increase proposals. The difference lay in the legal approach: whether or not to adhere to the constitutional principles governing interstate commerce. I felt that we should do so, and was therefore unable to vote for the bill approved by the majority.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

The 1961 bill provided for increases in minimum retirement benefits for retired workers and widows of covered workers; optional retirement for men at age 62 as well as women, at proportionately reduced benefits; and a slight increase in the $1,200 outside earning limitation. I voted for this legislation and for similar extension of railroad retirement benefits.

HOUSING

I voted against the administration's $4.9 billion housing bill in the first session. I was disturbed by such items as the increase in the President's request for a facilities program which was raised from $50 to $500 million only a matter of days after the President had come personally to the Congress to seek a curtailment in and to specifically ask Congress not to enact bills that increased his spending requests. In rural housing, as an example of what happened, the President had requested an extension of an unexpended balance of $207 million. This figure was doubled by the House committee to $407 million. Exaggeration of this sort was out of line with the needs of the country. We must assess the urgent needs in housing in the light of our heavy but necessary defense expenditures. I voted for extension of the current housing program for a year at a cost of $1.1 billion.

OTHER LEGISLATION

I have introduced legislation in various fields including bills to: permit withholding of State income tax from Federal payrolls as a convenience to Government employees; exempt Government employees from the prohibition of the Hatch Act in municipal and county elections; extend the benefits of the Library Services Act to areas either lacking public libraries or with inadequate library facilities; provide an increase in the salaries of teachers for the District of Columbia; and improve firefighting services in the Washington metropolitan area.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, now that the omnibus public works bill is being taken to conference, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the importance of standing fast against Senate attempts to create voluminous alterations in our version of the bill. Perhaps I am being unfair in presupposing the attitude of our friends on the other side of the Capitol with respect to H.R. 13273, yet failure of that body to recall the bill for adoption over the past several days would indicate a measure of controversy for the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the importance of our getting away from Washington as quickly as possible. While personal appearances in our constituencies cannot take precedence over emergency work that needs to be done here in the Capitol, voters rightfully expect us to make every attempt to get back as quickly as possible so that we may report to them on a personal basis and answer any last minute questions that may arise. I regret that we have been held here into the month of October. I think many unnecessary delays took place almost from the time that the second session convened last January. Now we have less than 1 month until election day, yet we cannot afford to be less conscientious in our sworn duties than if the session were just beginning.

I have extreme confidence in the distinguished gentlemen serving on the conference on the omnibus public works bill. If, however, the Senate remains adamant in its proposal to keep its many unwise and unnecessary projects that it added to H.R. 13273 last week, then we must pledge ourselves to see this battle through regardless of how much longer we must remain on duty. I was deeply gratified at the impressive House vote to delete the proposed Burns Creek Reservoir and power project from the bill. The attempt to sneak this Snake River project through Congress in this manner after it had been rejected by a standing committee was an affront to recognized congressional procedure. This action by the 87th Congress will serve as a rallying force on the side of good government if and when similar tactics are attempted in the years to come. For us to have voted otherwise would have set a dangerous precedent from which legislative confusion and chaos would emerge and spawn at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to reiterate the many bad features of the Burns Creek project. I have studied every facet of it and I have reported time and again that Congress would be grossly derelict in its responsibilities if it were to endorse this wasteful, undesirable, and unnecessary proposal. Our Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has had 5 long years to study Burns Creek, and we have had a parade of witnesses from both sides. We have found no excuse whatsoever for accepting the plan to spend $48 million on a project which has nothing to do with reclamation but is primarily a power project—and a most uneconomic and highly unfeasible one at that.

Burns Creek is probably the most outstanding example—save for the Hanford reactor project—of the designs and aspirations of the public power crowd. Here was a deliberate attempt to inflict upon the taxpayers a costly and extravagant proposal that admittedly has no value other than in the production of electric power. As such, its principal effect would be to create unemployment and extend economic distress. Oh, by putting $48 million—and you can be sure that the cost would skyrocket before the project was completed—into this sort of thing, you can get a lot of people into temporary jobs. If half of the estimated investment were to be spent for wages and it took 3 years to build Burns Creek, 2,000 men could realize an income of $4,000 each for that period. Then, after the last hopper of cement dried and the generators were ready to begin whirring, the men who make their living without Federal subsidy would begin to feel the pinch.

The Burns Creek project was designed with a capacity of 90,000 kilowatts and would dilute the amount of coal consumed in the area by 250,000 tons per year, thus creating a loss of $275 million in mine payroll and a $100,000 annual reduction in payment to the United Mine Workers of America welfare fund. Burns Creek has been strongly opposed by both the United Mine Workers of America and the coal industry, as have the myriad of public power projects that are coming before us all the time.

Burns Creek would be another link in the national power network that has been on the drawing board of the public power group for many years.

Incidentally, the Senate version of the public works omnibus bill contains projects totaling more than 2,800,000 kilowatts of installed capacity—enough to displace almost 9 million tons of coal annually. The total cost of these projects is $1,350,700,000.

Fortunately, Congress took the steps necessary to remove from consideration the project that would have been a key to all-out realization of the public power program. By insisting that the atomic energy authorization bill be amended to preclude the Federal Government from assuming any liability in the construction or operation of the atomic generating plant at Hanford, Wash., the 87th Congress established a precedent which we hope succeeding Congresses will retain and apply to other public power proposals. Parenthetically I remind my colleagues that the Hanford project was referred to by the United Mine Workers Journal as "a new scheme to defraud the taxpayers." Since, however, it was agreed to permit the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Washington Public Power Supply System to enter into the negotiations for so-called private construction of a generating plant at Hanford, Congress must watch closely to see that its will is not circumvented through loans from such agencies as the Housing and Home Finance Corporation, the Rural Electrification Administration, and/or other Federal offices.

Hanford would have had an 800,000 kilowatt capacity. Add these and the scores of other public power projects already in existence and in the dream stage, and there would be enough electricity available to close half the coal mines in the United States. I am not exaggerating. Down at the Department of Interior you will find a map on which existing and projected transmission lines encircle this land from Washington to California to Florida and Maine and back again, with interties crossing every single region of the country. With the sharp increase in the efficiency of long-distance transmission lines, it would be possible to bring electricity from hydroelectric plants and atomic energy generating stations right into the very heart of the coalfields. Yesterday, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Holum included this statement in an address before a cooperative association in South Dakota:

> A five-man task force has completed its study and report on the proposed Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie. The technical significance of the report itself has been extremely noteworthy because it establishes that d.c. transmission makes possible

and economic the transmission of energy between points 1,000 and 2,000 miles apart. The electric load in Chicago is within practical transmission distance of the cheap lignite fuels in the Dakotas.

To complete this analysis, Mr. Holum could have pointed out that every coal-consuming center in the United States is within deliverable distance of electric energy from hydro projects. Every city and community in Pennsylvania is within a thousand miles of the hydroelectric plants on the Niagara River, in the Tennessee Valley, and within the periphery of the Southeast Power Administration. If Mr. Holum is correct in stating that economic transmission of energy is now possible over distances up to 2,000 miles, then Philadelphia public utility coal markets could expect to be offered subsidized service from water-powered generating stations in the Missouri River Basin and in the Fryingpan-Arkansas project approved by this Congress this year.

He, incidentally, mentioned, in the course of his remarks, some of the super plans which his Department has in store in the way of creating unemployment in the coalfields through hydroelectric projects. The Bureau of Reclamation alone undertook construction of hydroelectric plants in 1962 that will have a total capacity of 1,857,900 kilowatts. As a consequence, the coal industry will lose about 6 million tons of business, with a wage loss of $12 million to miners. For the United Mine Workers welfare fund, this tonnage would amount to $2,400,000. These losses, I remind you, are a result of Bureau of Reclamation activities exclusively. They do not include Army Engineers projects or the Government-sponsored atomic energy power projects, all of which serve to enhance the labor losses brought about by these subsidized miner-displacement programs. If the network of public powerlines were ever to become a reality, today's conditions in surplus labor areas of mining States would seem ultra prosperous by comparison. A growing number of coal miners would join the queues at unemployment compensation counters, with thousands of railroaders now working on coal-carrying roads standing beside them. The depressing economic force would affect railroad shops, local business houses, and every community in central and western Pennsylvania as well as in all other coal-producing States.

I am confident that we are not going to permit Burns Creek to be restored to the omnibus public works bill. I am certain that the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who rejected this proposed monument to waste will not change their position merely because the public power gang is trying to catch us in a vote-for-anything mood as the curtain is lowered on the 87th Congress. Members of Congress from both parties who recognize the danger that Burns Creek and associated projects hold for the American economic and social order, will have no more of Burns Creek or anything else that resembles it.

TRIBUTE TO HON. BURR P. HARRISON

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, as this, the 87th Congress, draws to a close and as we pause to reflect on the events of the days just passed, I cannot fail to take this means of expressing my deep regret that one of our most respected, admired, and beloved colleagues in the House of Representatives is retiring after completion of this session.

The gentleman from Virginia, BURR POWELL HARRISON, is one of those rare individuals about whom one can truly say that "this place is better for his having passed this way" in his journey through life. In him are combined those qualities of greatness which are given to so few but which benefit so many. He is possessed of a big heart, a gentle and modest manner, a kind and generous disposition, a humility and respect for his fellow man, as well as those attributes of sharpness of mind, tenacity of purpose, and soundness of judgment found only in the greatest of our public servants. He is at once a historian and a scholar, a lawyer and a judge, a legislator and a statesman. He has been my friend and will continue to be, I hope, for many years.

BURR HARRISON's public record in this House will stand the test of time and events. All of us who have had the privilege and honor of working with him know that his positions on legislative issues were never lightly taken nor easily assailed. In his service here, BURR HARRISON has contributed much that is great, much that is lasting, and much that is in the public interest of his State and Nation. The keenness of his political instincts is well known.

Because BURR occupied the seat next to me in the Committee on Ways and Means for more than a decade, I speak with some experience. I know the force of intellect, the background of history, and the soundness of judgment which he has brought to bear on the great issues of the day, particularly those which have fallen within the realm of the Committee on Ways and Means, such as our internal revenue laws, our Federal social security laws, unemployment compensation, tariffs, reciprocal trade, highway financing and all the other great fiscal measures handled by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Our good friend, BURR, has never hesitated to measure swords or enter the lists against those forces or causes which he thought to be wrong in principle or result and he has been both steadfast in support and eloquent in his oratory in expressing himself in behalf of those things he believed to be right.

He is one who fills with honor, dignity and high intelligence the seat which was filled years before him by his father. His is the second generation of service in this body representing the same district of the great Commonwealth of Virginia, and one can truly say that BURR HARRISON is wise in his generation and is a public servant deserving of emulation by those who follow him.

He has a keen good humor and an invariable sparkle in his eye. As one who has on occasion felt the razor edge of his wit and his lightning mind, I say that this quality is one which we shall all remember well and which we shall miss from day to day after he leaves this House for other endeavors.

I know I speak the sentiments of every member of the Committee on Ways and Means on both sides of the aisle when I say to him that we will always welcome him and we hope that we will often have the benefit of his advice and counsel during the months and years to come. As he returns to the practice of law which he entered in 1926, and from which he became State's attorney, State senator, circuit court judge and then Representative of the Seventh District of Virginia, we all express to him our regret that he has concluded voluntarily and for personal reasons, his service in the House, but we extend to him sincere best wishes in all of his future endeavors.

PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL HARANGUES WON'T SOLVE NATION'S PROBLEMS

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend President Kennedy was campaigning in Michigan and Minnesota for the election of a Democratic Congress.

I was amazed and disturbed by a newspaper report on the theme which the President is adopting in his political speeches. According to the Wall Street Journal of October 8—

> Current economic problems either are laid at the door of the Eisenhower administration or blamed on obstruction by Republican Congressmen. Unemployment may be high but it's down from the fall of 1960; the rate of economic growth is bad now, but has been too low "for the past 5 years;" and the economy is operating far below potential because Congress won't enact "the kind of program which will make it possible for this very rich country of ours to fulfill its promise."

There are two things in particular about this report which I find disturbing. In the first place, the President's assertion that unemployment is down from the fall of 1960 is misleading, to say the least. In September 1962, the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment was 5.8 percent. In September of 1960, the rate was 5.7 percent. If we look at the actual unadjusted number of unemployed persons, we find that this September there were over 3.5 million jobless men and women, while in September of 1960 there were somewhat less than 3.4 million. In other words, there are about 125,000 more people unemployed today than in September of 1960. In effect, the unemployment situation is virtually unchanged.

But there is one big difference between September 1960 and September 1962. Today—or at least so the President has repeatedly said—we are riding the crest of a prosperity wave. By contrast, we were on the way down the business cycle in September 1960, and actually hit bottom in February 1961.

In other words, we have about as many unemployed during this so-called Kennedy prosperity as we did approaching the bottom of the 1960–61 recession. The big question now is what kind of an unemployment rate are we going to have in the next recession, which some economists now say is only months away?

Notwithstanding the President's assurances of the progress we have made, I am deeply disturbed at the prospect of an unemployment rate more severe than any we have seen since the early 1940's. Clearly, the President has failed to deliver on his campaign promise made on October 15, 1960, in Sharon, Pa., to "move at once to put our people back to work."

The Wall Street Journal also reported that President Kennedy now blames his economic failures on Congress, which, he says, will not enact "the kind of program which will make it possible for this very rich country of ours to fulfill its promise."

The President has certainly puzzled me and, I am sure, many other Americans by his sudden about-face on whether this has been a productive or an unproductive Congress. As recently as August 13, in his television address to the Nation, he said:

> This Congress has done more in the last 18 months to combat the recession and strengthen the economy than any Congress since the end of the Second World War.

Which is it, Mr. President? Is your overwhelmingly Democratic Congress a good one, which persumably does not need more Democrats to carry out your programs? Or, is your overwhelmingly Democratic Congress a bad Congress, in which case it could use some more Republicans? I think the country deserves a clear and straightforward answer.

Instead of spending his time belaboring the Republican minority for the failures of his Democratic Congress, the President could better serve the country by discussing and encouraging debate on his program to get this country moving again.

In the area of employment and unemployment, I think this country is sadly behind the times in its thinking. We are living in a dynamic and technologically advancing economy in which millions of jobs are becoming obsolete while millions of new jobs are opening up. There are about as many jobs going begging today as there are unemployed men and women.

This unemployment is not caused by inadequate demand—as the President and his advisers maintain. Their prescription of more Government spending to spur demand does not solve the unemployment problem, but it does hamper the search for a genuine solution and results in retarding our economic growth.

Our task is to upgrade the skills of our people through a vast national public-private program of education and training. In addition, we must improve our economic statistics and try to identify job vacancies and skill needs. Along with this we should set up a national clearinghouse which will make this information readily available to the jobseeker. We should also make certain changes in our tax laws and in our unemployment insurance system which will encourage training and retraining and greater voluntary mobility of the labor force.

With so many subjects of deep importance to our people to discuss, it is a pity that the President has chosen to launch out on this political vendetta. Political harangues, after all, are not going to put the unemployed back to work or speed up this country's economic growth.

DEBT MANAGEMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, both the Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Economic Committee held hearings in July on the question of whether or not we should have a quickie tax cut in order to stimulate our economy.

I asked most of the witnesses with some monotony how they figured that a tax cut in face of a budget already out of balance would stimulate our economy in light of the fact that any tax cut would immediately create added problems in the field of debt management.

I was shocked to find not one witness, even Dr. Heller, the chairman of the President's Council for Economic Advisers, had given serious consideration in their prepared statements to the problems of debt management. The response of the witnesses to my question of what debt management problems would be presented and the economic impact of solving these debt management problems might be, was clearly a matter of momentary improvising and not the result of considered thinking and judgment.

Perhaps it is only the members of the Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury Department who have to think of how we are to market our Federal bonds when we spend more money than we collect in taxes. Maybe that is why so many people are willing to go along with the President in treating deficit financing and further Federal debt as a matter of little consequence, a shibboleth, a piece of outmoded thinking.

Perhaps the real reason for passing the matter of debt management off so lightly is that very few people know much about it. President Kennedy is most fortunate in having a man in his administration, Under Secretary Treasurer for Monetary Affairs Robert V. Roosa, who knows a great deal about it. On October 2, 1962, Mr. Roosa addressed the annual convention of Mortgage Bankers Association of America at Chicago, Ill. His subject was debt management and the capital markets. This is an excellent discussion of the realities of debt management. I was pleased that Under Secretary Roosa looks upon the past record so rosily, when he says:

> The relatively sparing use which we have made of the commercial banking system in financing the deficit of the past 20 months testifies, I would suggest, both to our intent and our ability to finance any future deficits in a manner which does not generate an inflationary potential.

I hope he is correct. However, I would like to explore in some depth how he would have handled an additional deficit of some $5 to $10 billion or whatever was to be the amount of the quickie tax cut without generating an inflationary potential. Furthermore, I trust he has some plans in mind to handle the oncoming deficits of fiscal 1963 and 1964 which seem to be rather definitely in the cards and together will total close to $20 billion.

Here is the speech, an excellent one:

DEBT MANAGEMENT AND THE CAPITAL MARKETS

(Remarks of the Honorable Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, at the annual convention of the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, at Chicago, Ill., Tuesday, October 2, 1962, 10 a.m.)

A meeting of the Mortgage Bankers Association is a particularly appropriate forum for a discussion of debt management—the problems, the policies, and the results. For mortgage bankers and the managers of the Federal debt have a vital interest in common: a continuing concern with the state of the capital markets, with the forces of supply and demand at work in them, and with the behavior of interest rates that results from these forces.

The mortgage market is by far the largest single component of our long-term capital markets in this country. The net increase of mortgages outstanding in a single year consistently exceeds the entire outstanding total of all Federal debt in the 20-year-and-over maturity range. For example, after allowing for all repayments and refundings, your industry placed last year a volume of long-term debt that was larger than the total of long-term Federal debt now in existence as the combined and cumulative result of everything that all of the managers of the Federal debt have been able to accomplish in that area of the market since World War II. So I approach you very humbly, seeking both the sympathy and the suggestions of the successful.

I would like to review with you the range of varied objectives that we have to try to fulfill, and to reconcile, in managing a Federal debt that is distributed through all maturity sectors of the money and capital markets. And, in the light of that review, I will then trace through some of the results we have had in working toward those objectives during the past 20 months.

I

The process of decisionmaking in debt management is complicated by the sheer number and diversity of objectives which we must pursue simultaneously. Some are the cost and efficiency considerations appropriate to any borrowing operation; some are peculiar to the inescapable fact that our operations must almost always be large; and some relate to the special responsibilities and opportunities inherent in any exercise of public policy. This means that anyone engaged in Federal debt management must, among other things, keep in mind the impact of any given Treasury debt operation on the liquidity needs of the domestic economy, on the long-term capital markets, on our balance of payments position, and on the interest cost of carrying the debt as a whole. Moreover, against the inexorable pressure of the passage of time, the debt manager must continually strive to turn over to his successor a suitably balanced debt structure.

Very broadly, these objectives of debt management may be divided between those that are more largely of a housekeeping character and those that are more closely related to the Government's economic policy.

One of the first on either list is the aim of minimizing interest costs and the burden of the debt on the taxpayer, to the fullest extent consistent with other compelling objectives. Another housekeeping aim is that of promoting and maintaining an active and broadly based market for Government securities, not only in the interest of the Treasury and of investors in Government securities, but also in the interest of the Federal Reserve, which must operate through this market in adjusting, on a day to day basis, the reserve position of the banking system.

Our further housekeeping objectives must be to establish and maintain a maturity structure for the debt which will assure a reasonable range of flexibility for the Treasury debt managers in the future, a structure which will also facilitate rather than inhibit the execution of appropriate monetary policies, and one which will provide appropriate quantities of securities in the various maturity areas to meet the needs of the investing public.

Very often we are asked why the Treasury does not finance solely through short-term securities. Such borrowing seems always to be more easily carried out. And, since short-term rates are usually lower than long-term rates, would not such a policy also save the taxpayers money? Not many of those who ask this sort of question would carry it to its ultimate extreme and argue that the Treasury ought to finance its operations solely through greenbacks—demand obligations which carry a zero interest cost. The hazards of greenback financing are well known. Unfortunately, the hazards of an excessive concentration of short-term financing are less well known.

Perhaps our housekeeping objectives can best be understood by pointing up some of these hazards. First and most important, if we were to concentrate our financing entirely in short-term securities, we would be courting the danger of excess liquidity and the inflationary potential which excess liquidity creates. Short-term Government securities are a close substitute for money; they can be turned into money very quickly and with little risk of loss. To be sure, an advanced economy, such as ours, has need for a large stock of liquid instruments that are free of credit risk; such a stock is needed for the ready reserves of our financial institutions and other organizations. And, as our economy grows, the size of the appropriate stock of liquid instruments will also grow. But this does not mean that all of the debt can be in short form. For the stock of liquid instruments can exceed the needs of the economy at going prices and practicable rates of output. And, to the extent that such an excess occurs, a threatening inflationary potential will have been created in the economy—even an economy that is not, throughout its many sectors, fully employed.

Furthermore, it does not follow that, if the Treasury were to concentrate its financing solely in the short-term area, the interest cost on the Federal debt would be reduced. The level of interest rates for any given maturity area reflects not only the state of expectations, but also the quantity of securities supplied to the market in that maturity area. If the Treasury were to add to the supply of short-term securities well beyond the needs of the economy for this kind of instrument, short-term rates on Treasury securities would inevitably rise relative to long-term rates.

This sort of situation is illustrated by the actual experience of 1959 and early 1960, when the Treasury was forced to concentrate an excessive amount of its financing in the 1 to 5 year maturity area. As a result, a "humped" yield curve was produced, with yields in the 1 to 5 year area being substantially higher than yields on the longest-term Government securities. And partly as a result, total budgetary interest costs for the fiscal year ending June 1960, were larger than those for either of the two following fiscal years, even though the total outstanding debt was actually increasing over those later years and, at the same time, a considerable lengthening of the average maturity of the debt was being accomplished.

Another major hazard of an excessive concentration of short-term Government securities is that it may severely inhibit the execution of monetary policy. It can do so in several ways. To the extent that more of the Federal debt is concentrated in short maturities, other than Treasury bills, there will inevitably be a need for more frequent, large refunding operations by the Treasury.

The reason that the turnover of our short debt is now accomplished with relatively little disturbance to the money market, and without serious impact on the flexibility of the Federal Reserve, is that the volume of short-term securities is still well within the absorptive capacity of the economy. However, if the Treasury, because of an excessive concentration of short debt, was forced to engage in very frequent and very large refunding operations of the sort which might be disruptive to the money markets, the Federal Reserve would find itself with only very short intervals of time within which it could freely and independently work out gradations of change, or shifts, in monetary policy without risking an undue disruption not only of the markets but also of the Treasury financing operations themselves.

Since February 1961, the Federal Reserve has extended open market operations throughout the entire maturity range of Government securities, instead of concentrating its efforts solely in the short-term sector. This is a change in procedure which the Treasury has welcomed. However, if the Federal Reserve is to be able to release or absorb reserves through transactions in any part of the maturity range that is appropriate for its policy objectives, the quantity of outstanding securities in the various maturity areas must be adequate to provide an active and broadly based market in which such transactions can actually be conducted.

It is particularly important, so far as the implementation of monetary policy is concerned, that the maturity composition of the Federal debt include a significant volume of long-term debt. For at times when monetary controls should be reaching through to the longer maturity areas—influencing the supply of funds that may or may not be released to flow into mortgages, for example—significant changes may be brought about in market expectations by relatively small changes in the daily flows of funds into or out of Government securities, and the related small changes in interest rates. If there were not an adequate supply of tradable Government securities, the effects of any needed monetary policy would have to be expected to work their way out toward the longer area by means of tentative and possibly erratic efforts at private arbitrage. The alternative for monetary policy, if there were no tradable volume of longer term Government securities, would be a great lengthening of the time needed for monetary controls to take hold and a great intensification of the severity of the other actions that would actually have to be taken by the Federal Reserve to accomplish a given result. It can indeed be argued that a tradable quantity of outstanding Government debt in all maturity sectors is a precondition for any broadly effective monetary policy in the United States today. And that case is strong whether or not the Federal Reserve itself chooses to operate directly in all maturity sectors.

For very short periods, the objective of maintaining a balanced maturity structure for the debt may be subordinated to shorter-run economic policy considerations. But this is very much like deferred maintenance on a railroad or an industrial plant. If the practice is continued long enough, the basic structure may deteriorate to such an extent that it may be very difficult to restore a sound basic structure again. It is often said that there is never a time when the Treasury can freely place securities in the longer-term area of the capital market—when business is slack, no diversion from private investment can be risked, and when business is booming, interest costs are too high. The debt manager must, nonetheless, place long-term debt into the market without being hung from either of the horns of this dilemma, and, if possible, while furthering all of the other housekeeping objectives we have just reviewed, and while also fulfilling the economic policy aims which I will now briefly describe.

II

Debt management cannot escape involvement in economic policy. The present size of the debt alone virtually compels a continuous interrelationship between what is done to refund the steady stream of maturities and what the Federal Reserve is doing to influence the supply of money and credit. We now have a debt of more than $300 billion, almost $90 billion of which will mature and have to be refunded during the year ahead. Apart from that, in recent years, the ordinary seasonal swings in the Treasury's cash borrowing requirements have been running around $10 billion.

Thus, with about $100 billion of indicated borrowing requirements, whether or not there are further budget deficits, the very magnitude and frequency of Treasury borrowing operations is necessarily such that Treasury operations can scarcely avoid having some impact on all of the other markets for fixed income securities—the corporate bond market and the market for State and local Government securities, as well as the mortgage market. The challenge to debt management planning is, therefore, so to channel the influence of Treasury debt operations upon these various other markets and activities that it will, wherever possible, help to further the objective of Government economic policy—domestically and with respect to the balance of payments.

Much has been said in other countries about a presumed necessity for combining monetary control and debt management into a single policy instrument. And, in some countries, both are administered by a single agency. But in accordance with the principle of checks and balances, and the diffusion of power, which characterizes our political institutions generally, these functions have most appropriately been divided in the United States between the Federal Reserve and the Treasury. Two separate centers of responsibility appraise the needs of two interrelated spheres of action. And the results for each, given a full flow of intercommunications and a genuine desire for harmonious cooperation, are greater than any conceivable result of an enforced consolidation. Certainly there is no country in the world today in which the independence of these two functions is more clearly respected; yet I doubt if there is any in which the integration between monetary policy and debt management is more effective.

There are three areas of economic policy in which monetary policy and debt management come together. First, there is that of maintaining an appropriate level of liquidity—not only for the routine needs of the domestic economy, but also to sustain a strong rate of economic growth—without creating a potential inflationary hazard. The Treasury's decisions on the volume of short-term Government securities to be issued play a part in determining the volume of "near money" liquidity in the economy The influence exerted is necessarily similar to, although, of course, much less potent than that of the Federal Reserve in regulating the volume of bank reserves and thereby the quantity of money itself.

A second general policy area that is common to debt management and monetary management is that of helping to create conditions in the credit and capital markets which will be conducive to the most appropriate flow of funds into long-term private investment. I need not tell this group that not only the amount, but also the manner and the timing, of Treasury borrowing efforts in the longer-term market can have important effects on the flow of private investment funds. And as to the influence of Federal Reserve action—even the significance of expectations as to what that action might be—surely no elaboration is necessary.

A third important area of economic policy concerns the impact of debt management and monetary policy on our balance-of-payments position. Over the past 2 years and more, this has meant that both debt operations and monetary actions have had to be directed, in part, toward keeping our short-term rate structure in reasonable competitive equilibrium with rates abroad. The purpose has not been to put a floor under rates at any particular level. Our concern is not the with absolute rate levels, but with relative levels. The aim is to keep our short-term rates, if possible, in line with foreign short-term rates, after adjusting for the cost of covering the forward exchange risk. The result thus far, as many of you know, is that very little money has flowed out of this country for interest arbitrage over most of the past 2 years.

In addition, we have begun to use debt management itself as an active instrument of balance-of-payments control. In recent months, we have borrowed from official agencies at short term in two foreign currencies—the Swiss franc and Italian lira. We have converted the proceeds into dollars at an overall cost that compared favorably with the costs of borrowing here. The incidental result has also been a net absorption of excess dollars abroad that might otherwise have ultimately been used to purchase gold here. Though what we have done is still tentative and exploratory, we are increasingly impressed with this new dimension of debt management—an approach originally foreseen by Russell Leffingwell, then Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, when we asked Congress for the necessary legislative authority before the close of World War I. To be sure, however, this is not an approach that would be relevant to a very sizable part of our total debt management program.

Every time a judgment is taken in debt management, however, some aspects of all three of these areas of economic policy, as well as our various "housekeeping" goals, must be weighed in the light of all known conditions, at that particular moment in time. Quite obviously, no single answer can produce the optimum result every time for each of these diverse objectives. The objectives themselves may even occasionally be in conflict. The best we can hope for, probably, is reasonably well-balanced progress toward meeting all of these objectives, over a period of time.

III

Having thus briefly paraded the problems of debt management, I trust it is now safe for me to review what we have been trying to do in debt management during the past 20 months. Perhaps the best starting point is to examine the economic environment within which policies were initially formulated.

In January, 1961, we faced a conjuncture of a number of serious problems; a recession which had been underway for the past half year; an inadequate rate of growth which had been slackening for a number of years; and, as if these two problems were not enough, we were faced with a critical balance-of-payments problem, with world confidence in the dollar deteriorating.

In developing a policy framework which would embrace all of these problems, we placed the central focus of our policies on encouraging and raising the level of private investment. Increased private investment would help pull us out of the recession. At the same time, more investment could be the key to quickening our growth rate and reducing the continuing high rate of unemployment. And, in a longer range sense, through increasing the productivity of American industry, more investment would also make the most fundamental and long-lasting contribution toward strengthening our national competitive position in the world and thereby righting our balance of payments.

All of our policies, then—fiscal policy, tax policy, and debt management, as well as monetary policy in its coordinate role—were oriented toward this common goal. The joint evolution of monetary policy and debt management, which had been underway since the summer of 1960, had two major aspects: to help create conditions in the capital markets which would promote a large flow of long-term capital into productive investment while, at the same time, averting any changes in the short-term interest rate structure which would set off significant outflows of short-term capital seeking interest rate advantages abroad. To achieve both of these objectives simultaneously required new operating techniques and new kinds of emphasis in the decision-making processes of both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury.

In monetary policy, this new policy orientation was reflected in the decision by the Federal Open Market Committee to conduct open market operations wherever necessary over the full maturity range of Government securities. In debt management, the new emphasis was initially reflected in the development of the following key elements of policy:

That the Treasury would conduct the great bulk of its cash borrowing operations in short-term securities, thereby exerting a maximum of pressure to sustain an appropriate international relationship for interest rates on Treasury bills and the constellation of surrounding money market instruments; that, in ordinary refunding operations, the Treasury would largely concentrate on short-term and intermediate-term securities in a maturity range out to around 10 years; and, that to offset the deterioration in the maturity structure of the debt which would otherwise have occurred, the Treasury would seek, through the technique of advance refunding, to extend further out into the long-term area substantial quantities of long-term debt already in the hands of the public, but which the passage of time was moving steadily closer to the intermediate and short maturity range.

In concentrating its cash financing largely in the short-term area, the Treasury had, of course, several objectives. By placing upward pressure on short-term yields from the supply side of the market, debt management helped enable the Federal Reserve to expand the monetary base without sacrificing our balance-of-payments objectives. Moreover, from the standpoint of the liquidity position of the domestic economy, there was a positive need for an expansion in the quantity of liquid assets to support a further increase in economic activity. In statistical terms, the economy had apparently grown up to the excess liquidity created during World War II, and the relationship between the money supply and the gross national product had returned to the level which had generally prevailed during the first 30 years of this century. In practical terms, a number of financial and business firms were actively seeking more short-term investments.

And at the same time, by concentrating its own cash borrowings in the short-term area, the Treasury in effect was reserving the flow of new long-term savings for the use of private investment in housing, industrial and commercial plant and equipment, and for State and local public facilities.

Of course, no matter what we think we are trying to do, for housekeeping purposes or in the interest of broad economic policy, we also have the bedrock problem of designing issues that will sell, will hold their place in the market, and will make participation in the distribution of Government securities a reasonably rewarding as well as a patriotic undertaking. The fine art of tailoring our issues to the prevailing market has no formulas. Each actual offering is always a combined product of the advice we receive in many ways from the market itself (notably our splendid advisory committees), the technical expertise of our career staffs, the lessons of recent experience, and a pinch or two of hunch and intuition.

IV

In appraising the results of our efforts during the past 20 months, I should start with a word on savings bonds. They account now for almost one-sixth of the entire outstanding debt. They provide, without exposure to market risk, a convenient opportunity for every individual to have some part in the debt financing of Government. And they pay rates of interest that are, year in and year out, better than any alternative savings instrument that has other investment attributes of even rough comparability. Since the continued success of this program is a vital part of the whole debt management effort, and since it depends so heavily on the support of a volunteer program, it is gratifying that savings bonds have kept their place in our debt structure during these recent months when the competitive pressure from higher rates on bank deposits and savings and loan shares, in particular, has been of unusual intensity.

In turning to the marketable debt, perhaps I can best sketch the outlines of most of the significant developments if I focus on three visible indicators: the behavior of interest rates, the change in the maturity structure of the Federal debt, and the change in the ownership of the debt.

For a period that has consisted mainly of sustained economic expansion, the interest rate behavior of the past 20 months has been must unusual. Since January 1961 short-term interest rates have been moving within an upward-rising range, while long-term rates have remained stable or moved lower. The yield on 3-month Treasury bills, for example, has gone up from 2¼ percent to the recent range of 2¾ percent to 3 percent. Yet corporate bond yields are now at about the same level as in January 1961, when we were close to the bottom of the recession, and rates on municipal bonds and mortgages are actually lower than they were then. Just how much of this unusual behavior of interest rates should be attributed to the influence of monetary and debt management policies and how much would have occurred in any event, I would not venture to say. However, one thing is clear: This is precisely the sort of interest rate behavior that should have been expected to occur if the economic policy aspects of the monetary and debt management programs of the past 20 months were to be fulfilled.

The favorable climate in the capital markets during the past 20 months has been reflected, as you know, in a record combined flow of long-term capital into corporate securities, State and local government bonds, and mortgages. The corporate sector alone has not set new records, so far as market borrowing is concerned, but both of the others have expanded remarkably. New record highs have been reached in the first half of 1962, with $5 billion flowing into State and local government bonds and more than $10 billion flowing into mortgages.

Meanwhile, the total outstanding public debt has grown by $10 billion over the full course of the 20 months from the end of January 1961 through September 1962. Of this, $9 billion has been in marketable issues and $1 billion in nonmarketables, such as savings bonds. What has happened in the maturity composition of these marketable issues? The total outstanding in the under-1-year category has risen by almost $9 billion, the debt in the 1- to 5-year maturity area has declined by almost $13 billion, and the debt maturing beyond 5 years has risen by almost $13 billion. But note that, while the rise in very short debt has been about equal to the rise in total debt, the increase in the over-5-year debt has been 40 percent greater than the $9 billion total increase in the marketable debt during this period.

The decline of roughly $13 billion in the 1- to 5-year debt is very significant from the standpoint of the maturity structure of the debt. The under-1-year debt can increase in two ways: it can be increased by deliberate action, as we have done in order to maintain upward pressures on the bill rate, or it can increase automatically as, with the passage of time, more debt falls within the 1-year area. The substantial reduction in the quantity of debt maturing in 1 to 5 years means that the short-term debt is under better control, since the potential for automatic increases in the very short debt has been substantially reduced.

We are convinced that the shifting of $13 billion of debt from the 1- to 5-year area out beyond 5 years has produced a significant improvement in the overall maturity structure of the debt. Statistically, this has been reflected in an increase of 6 months in the average maturity of the debt, from 4 years and 6 months in January 1961 to 5 years at the present time, the highest level in 4 years.

The developments in ownership of the Government debt have been equally interesting. While the total debt has gone up by $10 billion, and the marketable part by $9 billion, commercial bank holdings have risen by only $1½ billion. The Federal Reserve has, to be sure, added about $3½ billion to its holdings of Government securities. This means that $5 billion, or one-half of the total increase in the debt, has been financed outside the banking system.

The subject of financing deficits through the banking system has been much discussed in recent weeks. That is as it should be. But some of the public discussion has seemed to me to proceed in oversimplified terms. The issue is not simply whether the Treasury sells securities to the banking system or not, but whether the amount of securities that remains in the banking system becomes so excessively large that the credit base is expanded well beyond the needs of the economy and an inflationary potential is, thereby, created. This, I can assure you, is a situation which both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve are able and determined to prevent. The relatively sparing use which we have made of the commercial banking system in financing the deficit of the past 20 months testifies, I would suggest, both to our intent and our ability to finance any future deficits in a manner which does not generate an inflationary potential.

It is important to remember, too, that the distinction between financing a deficit through the banking system and financing it through savings is not a sufficiently clear-cut basis for evaluation. For, in addition to their demand deposit function, the commercial banks are one of the most important financial intermediaries engaged in attracting and investing the savings of the public. Since January 1961 time and savings deposits at commercial banks have grown by about $21 billion. The $1.5 billion increase in commercial bank holdings of Government securities represents only about 7 percent of this increase in time and savings deposits.

And so far as Federal Reserve acquisitions of Government securities are concerned, these have all been an incidental byproduct of providing an adequate, but noninflationary, reserve base for the commercial banking system. I would indeed suggest that there is no evidence—in terms of the expanding money supply, the overall growth of bank credit, or in the broader context of price behavior in the economy—that Federal Reserve credit has grown too much.

V

To sum up the record of the past 20 months, though there is obviously much more we would like to have done, we believe that we have had some success in working toward both our economic policy and "housekeeping" objectives. Throughout the period, we have managed to avoid the sort of persistent, sizable gaps between short-term interest rates in the United States and rates abroad which would have encouraged substantial outflows of short-term capital. At the same time, the availability of funds and long-term interest rates have remained at levels consistent with the promotion of a large domestic flow of investment capital.

While the rate of increase in corporate investment has not been up to our hopes and expectations this year, it does not appear that the flow of corporate investment is being constrained by the level of money rates or the availability of long-term funds. So far as Government is concerned, it is probably in the area of tax policy that we must look for further means to stimulate corporate investment.

In pursuing the various economic policy objectives, the Treasury has not sacrificed its longer-term interest in a balanced maturity structure. The maturity structure of the debt is, in fact, despite a rise of $10 billion in the outstanding debt, in better balance than it was 20 months ago—a result largely attributable to carrying forward the creative innovations in debt management introduced by the preceding Treasury administration.

Looking to the future, the only generalization that can be made with absolute certainty is that debt management policy, like monetary policy, must adapt to changing circumstances. It must continually evolve in response to changes in the liquidity needs and the investment requirements of our domestic economy, changes in our balance-of-payments position, and modifications in the overall policy mix through which the governmental part of the solutions to our economic problems may be sought.

From time to time, new debt management procedures may be needed to meet both our economic policy objectives and our housekeeping objectives. In recent months, we have tentatively introduced borrowing arrangements with governmental bodies abroad. We have already announced our intention to test another new procedure in the capital market here—the sale of long-term bonds on the basis of competitive bidding. And as our experience grows, as conditions alter, and experts such as those gathered here supply us with further suggestions, there will be further changes in the techniques and the policies that guide debt management and its relationship to the money and capital markets in the United States.

AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 there was enacted the Legislative Reorganization Act, one section of which—section 132—declared that the Congress should adjourn sine die not later than the last day of July except in times of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President. In 1950, following the outbreak of the Korean war, such an emergency was proclaimed and we have found this emergency, nearly 10 years after the last shot was fired in that war, used as the reason to keep the Congress in session long after the day set for its adjournment under the Legislative Reorganization Act.

I believe it would be well for us to adhere to the policy which was established by the Legislative Reorganization Act. I believe we can and should gear our legislative calendars to finish the business of the Congress in the 7 months which the act provides. In the second session of this Congress—a session which bids fair to last until mid-October—we could have done our work in the time allotted by the act. The second session of any Congress is but a continuation of the first; the work that was done in the first should blend smoothly into the second session and the Congress should buckle down to work from the first day it returns. This session what happened? From our first meeting in January until the end of March the House was in session 44 times for a total of 138 hours 21 minutes, an average of just over 3 hours per meeting. The atmosphere was relaxed; 27 public laws were signed between the start of the second session and the end of March and during the same time 43 private laws were signed. This was a leisurely pace, and a more ambitious pace would have allowed us to finish our work earlier and avoid the unfortunate tactics that seem to crop up at the end of every Congress when procedures are pushed aside and haste rather than wisdom dictates the course of our deliberations.

Aside from stirring the Congress into earlier action, abiding by the July 31 adjournment date would, in my opinion, strengthen the process of representative government. A Congressman comes to Washington to work for his constituents. He must know them and their thoughts and upon this knowledge he must apply himself to the task of studying in depth the issues which others in his community can, because of the pressure of time, look into only in a limited way. He must use his best ability conscientiously to come to an understanding of issues and evaluate them in the light of the national interest and the interest of his community as he understands it. And he must, once the decisions have been made on the issues, stand ready to return to his constituency and report to them on what has taken place in Washington, what he has learned in his study of the issues and why he has voted the way he has on those matters which touch upon the interests of those he serves. These interminable sessions which we have experienced of late severely restrict the Congressman in doing his duty. He is taken away from his home and his community, he loses the touch which he must have with the thoughts and feeling of his constituency if he is to really represent them. He loses the opportunity to report to them and to give them his feelings, fully explained, about the issues. The help which he has in his task—the mass media—are often little help; indeed, they often tend to obscure the real issue. I do not say this in scorn of the mass media, for many in the professions associated with them are conscious of this failing and working hard to try to correct it. I only point out that, as an instrument of reporting to the people, they have been inadequate.

In sum, I believe we should well turn to the limit set by the Legislative Reorganization Act and not continue to subvert its purpose by the flimsy ruse of a national emergency proclaimed for a war whose guns have long been silent. For this reason I have today introduced a bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act. It provides, in substance, that insofar as it affects the date of adjournment of the Congress, the national emergency proclaimed in 1950 shall be considered as terminated. This does not say that future wars or national emergencies cannot be effective in extending the length of the congressional session; nor does it eliminate the provision which also appears in the act that the Congress may, if it desires, extend the session. It does reaffirm the policy which was wisely laid down in 1946 that Congress should terminate its session by the end of the month of July. Let me urge my colleagues to give close attention to this idea, for I believe that in enacting this bill we will take a step in the direction of improving our National Legislature.

TAX INCENTIVE TO SPUR MODERNIZATION OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Mr. **LANE.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **LANE.** Mr. Speaker, travelers returning from Europe bring reports of the ultramodern factories whose efficiency is a real competitive threat to the older plants and equipment in the United States.

Under the Trade Expansion Act which is necessary for reasons that I shall not detail at this point, foreign competition will endanger some American industries unless we offer them incentives to invest in modernization programs.

The new tax bill, granting business a tax credit for this purpose is a step in the right direction. Although it will result in a loss of tax revenue to the Government, this will be temporary.

In the long run, the encouragement given to our industries should help to bring many of them up to date and thus strengthen our ability to compete in world trade. This will result in profits for industry and a larger revenue income for the Government. This provision of the new tax bill was one of the most constructive achievements of the 87th Congress.

I bring to you an assessment of this legislation in an editorial titled "Measure of the Tax Bill" that was published in the October 8, 1962, issue of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune:

MEASURE OF THE TAX BILL

The new tax bill, we think, will be measured by the effect of the section that grants business a tax credit for investment in new machinery and equipment.

Purpose of the section is to stimulate modernization of the American industrial plant. Modernization is needed to enable American industry to compete more effectively with foreign industry. European and Japanese manufacturers in general enjoy more modern plants than American manufacturers.

Foreign plants in numerous instances were destroyed by war. When peace came Europeans and Japanese started from scratch and built new plants. American plants, unharmed by war, remained serviceable, but, compared with new foreign plants, were inefficient.

If the investment credit section is taken advantage of by industry, the Government will lose tax revenue.

With this fact in mind, the President called for a withholding tax on savings and dividends. Public protest of this plan, however, rightly was vigorous and persuaded Congress to reject the plan. So the President got only half of the principal items in his tax program. The failure means that the Government will lose revenue.

Despite such praiseworthy provisions as those to prevent individuals and some businesses to avoid American taxes by establishing themselves abroad, net loss to the Government in tax revenue by the new bill is estimated by the Treasury at $200 million a year and by Congress at $545 million.

If, however, industry seizes the tax credit opportunity and thereby increases its profitable activity, the long range effect of the new bill can be good for the Government in terms of tax revenue and for everybody else too.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

Mr. **WALTER.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WALTER.** Mr. Speaker, teachers, men of learning, true intellectuals, have always been admired, respected, and honored by civilized societies. I am glad to say that this condition prevails in the United States today. The American people recognize the great contribution many intellectuals have made—and are now making—to our Nation. This applies not only in the field of defense, where we are dependent on them to such a great degree for our very survival, but in other fields such as the arts, humanities, and political theory.

Despite this, it must be said that there is in the minds of a considerable number of Americans a certain suspicion of intellectuals. This unhappy fact has not been brought about by the majority of intellectuals, nor is it due basically to a failing of the American people. Contrary to what some so-called intellectuals would have us believe, the people of this country are not ignorant, primitive-minded clods who are fundamentally anti-intellectual and, therefore, distrustful of education and mental ability, and development as such. Rather, this distrust of intellectuals is caused by the fact that a minority, but very vocal and aggressive, element in the intellectual community—an element composed, for the most part, of those who have achieved no real eminence in it and which has been exalted far beyond its worth in the liberal press—has, by its words and actions, given the American public a false image of what the intellectuals of this country are really like. They have created a picture of a group of eggheads, educated beyond their mental capacities, living in a completely unreal world, uninformed about the basic issues related to national survival and incapable of thinking about them intelligently.

A good example of how this misleading picture has been created was provided within the last few days by the American Association of University Professors—an organization which has done the same kind of thing on more than one occasion in the past.

What did the AAUP do this time?

It denounced and censured George Washington University here in Washington, accusing it of "gross irregularities."

Why?

Because George Washington University got rid of a professor who had refused to tell the university officials, as well as a congressional committee, whether he was presently a member of the Communist Party.

Now, the AAUP is not truly representative of the intellectuals of this country. It is not even truly representative of the professors of this country. It is very definitely a professional minority group. It claims membership equal to about one-fifth of the total number of professors in this land. However, because the way the Washington Post and some other newspapers play up the organization, many people have been led to believe that it speaks for the majority of our college and university professors. Its inanities thus tend to discredit many intellectuals who deserve to be held in much higher esteem by the American people.

What are the facts in the George Washington University case?

On May 1, 1959, the university signed a 2-year contract with Prof. Richard W. Reichard to teach four history courses beginning September 1 of that year.

On July 22, 1959, Professor Reichard, in response to a subpena, testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he had joined the Communist Party while at Harvard during the years 1946–49, if he had been leader and branch organizer of the student Communist Party unit at Harvard, if he had been a member of the Communist Party while teaching at Washington College in Chestertown, Md., during 1956–58, and if he was presently a member of the Communist Party.

Dr. Reichard was suspended by George Washington University after his appearance before the committee. Three of the courses he was scheduled to teach were withdrawn, and the fourth was given to another professor. In December 1959, George Washington University announced that it had withdrawn Professor Reichard's appointment on the ground that he had been found "unsuitable and unqualified to join the faculty."

I want to stress the fact that this was not a hasty action on the part of the university taken without consideration of Professor Reichard's rights and without giving him a chance to state his case or clear himself. As soon as Professor Reichard received his subpena from the Committee on Un-American Activities, there were informal discussion between administrative officers of the university and Professor Reichard concerning his case. This was followed by an interview with a special faculty committee made up of five members of the university's history department and two deans. Dr. Reichard's advisor was with him at this interview. The special faculty committee recommended withdrawal of his appointment.

This interview was followed, in turn, by a hearing before a special committee of university trustees. Professor Reichard was represented by counsel at this hearing. This special committee of university trustees agreed with the finding of the faculty committee and recommended that his appointment be withdrawn.

Professor Reichard was paid all the time his case was under consideration by the university, and he has now been paid $12,400—the salary he would have earned under his contract if he had taught four courses at the university for a period of 2 years. He has, to put it simply, received 2 years' pay for doing nothing. He never taught a day at George Washington University.

Yet, the American Association of University Professors now brazenly accuses George Washington University of "gross irregularities" in handling his case. It denounces the university on the fantastic charge that it made "no provision for a final clearing up of the charges against him. Officials of the university, of course, have rejected the charge, and Professor Roderic H. Davison, chairman of the university's history department, has sent a letter to the AAUP, in behalf of the entire department, expressing complete disagreement with the AAUP accusation.

It is more than evident that there are "gross irregularities" in the operations of the AAUP, rather than George Washington University. It may appear startling that an organization of university professors should be so irresponsible in its actions. An analysis of the AAUP's past record, however, indicates that this is just what we should expect of the organization. Here are some of the things it has done:

It has censured the University of Washington for the "dismissal of the two faculty members whose sole offense was membership in the Communist Party."

It has censured the University of California because, by adopting a policy of not employing members of the Communist Party at the university—the AAUP said—it failed "to maintain conditions of freedom and tenure."

It has censured Temple University, among other reasons, on the ground that that university "seems to place on a faculty member who refuses to cooperate with a legislative committee a duty of demonstrating that he should be permitted to continue in the discharge of his teaching responsibilities."

It has censured Ohio State University because, by adopting a policy of excluding from the faculty not only Communists but persons suspected of communism, it had adopted "measures inimical to academic freedom."

It has censured the University of Michigan because it dismissed a professor who was an identified member of the Communist Party "on the theory that present membership necessarily involves acceptance of illegal and immoral principles and methods of action."

It has censured New York University because it adopted a policy which "regarded membership in the Communist Party as disqualifying a teacher from employment" at the university.

I could go on, but I think that this brief recitation of past AAUP actions should be sufficient to discredit the organization in the mind of any thinking person.

How does the AAUP rate in the eyes of those members of the intellectual community in this country it claims to speak for?

In 1956 the AAUP produced a report on academic freedom and national security. The following are some of the reactions to that report from the intellectual community:

Twenty professors at North Dakota Agricultural College resigned from the organization, stating that they were doing so as a protest against the type of AAUP leadership that "condoned a biased and distorted report."

Prof. William Flemming, chairman of the department of political science at Ripon College, stated:

> On July 11, 1949, an investigation committee of the AAUP stated that teachers had a right to belong to the Communist Party. According to the committee, only proved disloyalty constituted ground for dismissal. * * * Unfortunately, once more the AAUP has chosen to minimize the danger of possible subversion and fifth columnists in the field of education.

John L. Childs, professor emeritus at Columbia University, asked:

> What moral influence will an action carry which is premised on the notion that an instructor should be defended in his position even though he deliberately subjects himself to the discipline of a party ideology that is shaped and reshaped to meet the demands of the Kremlin?

Frederic Heimberger, vice president of Ohio State University, said:

> There is only one really new and crucial issue in the recommended statement of policy. It is the proposal to deny flatly the right of any institution to dismiss a faculty member for the sole reason that he is an avowed Communist.

He then went on to point out a glaring inconsistency in the AAUP statement. He asked:

> By what strange logic is it proper to refuse to employ a Communist but, at the same time, praiseworthy to allow one to continue to teach once he has been appointed, unwittingly or otherwise?

Raymond Moley, the well-known Newsweek columnist, wrote:

> The American Association of University Professors resolved this month in annual convention to nail its pink flag to the mast and go down fighting. * * * For its so-called principles not only damage the dignity but reproach the intelligence of the profession which the association professes to represent.

Mr. Moley pointed out that he had been a member of the AAUP, but that its actions of recent years had impelled him to make an investigation of it. As a result, he said:

> I dropped my membership with but one regret—that I had not done so years before.

Perhaps the most stinging indictment of the AAUP and its report on academic freedom and national security came from Prof. Sidney Hook, of New York University, well-known liberal and former member of the AAUP's council. In an article in the New Leader magazine, Professor Hook raised the question of whether the report actually represented the views of the organization's membership. He also pointed out that of the 18 institutions covered in the report, only 2 had been actually visited by an AAUP investigating committee.

> The committee—

Professor Hook said—

> conducted itself like a kangaroo court, and based its findings on "facts of public knowl-

edge" even though these admittedly did not represent all the facts.

He stated, without qualification, that the principles in the AAUP report "will be gravely damaging to the AAUP and, more important, to the cause of academic freedom."

The report of the special committee—

Professor Hook stated—

reflects its ignorance of the Communist Party and its ways.

He then went on to say that "this is not the first time that a committee of the AAUP has portrayed either ignorance of, or indifference to, the nature of communism and the Communist Party." He pointed out:

> It was the business of the special committee to assess these charges against members of the Communist Party thoroughly and honestly in the light of the ideals of professional ethics which the AAUP always stressed. They did nothing of the sort. They made no study of Communist Party activities in the colleges. They made no study of Communist Party directives to its members to abuse their professional trust. They cited no literature on the question. They met none of the arguments showing why supervision and observation of the behavior of Communist Party teachers in the classroom was morally undesirable and pedagogically impractical. They contented themselves with the pious statement that the academic community has a duty "to defend itself from subversion of the educational process."

Professor Hook made two more points which I think are most important to bring to the attention of this House and to the American public. He stated that—

> 1. The AAUP committee "goes on to advocate a policy which seemingly suggests that a college is actually failing in its educational duty unless members of the Communist Party are teaching on the campus."
>
> 2. The odd thing about the position of the AAUP on this question [of the Communist professors] is that it has never permitted its membership to discuss the issue fairly in the pages of its bulletin or to hear it debated by competent representatives of both sides before a national meeting. It has loaded the pages of the bulletin with only one position. It has refused point-blank to invite any speaker known to differ with the official position.

This then is the record of the American Association of University Professors. This is what professors of eminence and educational leaders think of the organization. These are facts which go far toward explaining why, when certain segments of the press play up the AAUP as an organization truly representative of the intellectuals of this country, many Americans—with justification—begin to wonder about our intellectuals. The AAUP is an organization of so-called intellectuals that has brought, and continues to bring, discredit on the true intellectuals of this country.

In view of the record of the AAUP, I believe that every Member of this House should be pleased that a university in our Capital has won the censure of the organization. Had it won praise from the American Association of University Professors, there would be cause to be concerned about George Washington University. I, for one, wish to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the unversity for the action it took in the case of Professor Reichard and to assure it that its censure by the AAUP will in no way discredit it in the eyes of thinking Americans.

OIL IMPORTS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, as we draw to the close of this session of Congress, America's domestic oil industry still stands in Washington, hat in hand so to speak, pleading for an administration oil policy that will give this industry some hope for survival, and with its survival, the survival of the Nation.

Strong boasts are heard of the great legislative record we have compiled. We have touched on almost every field of American economic life, yet the one indispensable industry finds itself growing weaker day by day because of the unchecked flow of foreign, tax-free oil that is allowed to come into this country because of an inadequate import control policy.

Many Members of this Congress were assured by White House spokesmen that if they would go along with the Trade Agreements Act without insisting on amendments to the national security clause, where the oil industry was led to believe it could obtain relief, that the President would soon bring forth this relief in the form of an effective Executive order.

Knowing the seriousness of the situation, those of us who have made this problem our chief concern can only renew our plea that the President act and act quickly. We can only hope that the apparent influence of the huge, greedy oil importing companies will no longer block or forestall this desperately needed relief. They have had their way far too long for America's safety.

It was a matter of grave concern to these domestic oil producers, who have waited long and expectantly for help, to review the comment made on Wednesday last by the President at his press conference.

The President was asked this question:

> Mr. President, several weeks ago the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning presented to you a study on crude oil import control program. Have you anything to say at this point particularly as to when there might be a decision, or what direction the decision might take?

The answer:

> The report was not wholly accepted by me, so that I don't expect any announcement will be made about the matter at the present time.

After a year and 8 months, with study after study having been made, America's oil producers are asking: Why cannot this administration come up with some dependable policy regarding its oil industry?

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments before the end of this session to make a personal statement. I shall keep it short; otherwise, I might not be able to complete it without an unseemly show of emotion.

My husband loved this House. He was a conscientious legislator of strong convictions, but he made friendships here on both sides of the aisle which he treasured. In the past 6 years, I have come to understand how he felt about this House. I shall always cherish these past years of service here.

To the Speaker, and to the leadership, I say thank you deeply for your gallantry and your wonderful encouragement and help. To my colleagues generally, I say, thank you for your friendship and your graciousness. My constituents have honored me by permitting me to serve them in the Congress of the United States. My colleagues here have made that service a source of immeasurable pleasure. I am deeply grateful to the Democratic leadership in Philadelphia, and particularly to our chairman, for the original opportunity to run for Congress.

The President has designated me for a new assignment, which I shall certainly try to perform to the best of my abilities. I am profoundly impressed by the confidence he has placed in me. It is my prayer that I shall never let him down—and my determination to serve him as ably as I can.

But in whatever work I shall be doing, I shall never lose my love for this House and my gratitude for the friendships I have made here. May God bless this House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. First of all, I want to advise the House that the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has been appointed Treasurer of the United States, and her appointment has been confirmed by the Senate. For that we all sincerely congratulate her.

Second, I want to say that there is no one, to my knowledge, who has served in this House since I have been a Member who is more loved and respected and admired by all Members, and certainly by me, than the distinguished gentlewoman from Philadelphia. She is a soldier, she is a gentlewoman indeed, and she is a Representative of the highest caliber. I hope at some future time the situation will be such that she will desire and will be able to return to us as a Member. We will miss you

KATHRYN. We wish you every success and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I personally extend to Mrs. GRANAHAN my sincere thanks for the loyalty she has given me. Her friendship is one of the finest treasures of my life. There is no Member of the House who is more respected or more entitled to respect than our distinguished and charming colleague, KATHRYN GRANAHAN.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join in everything that my distinguished friend, the majority leader, has said. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] has made her mark in this legislative body. Her late husband was a distinguished Member of the National House of Representatives and the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania succeeded him. But in her own right, she has made an outstanding name for herself as a Member of this great body.

She has been one of the most loyal supporters that the late Sam Rayburn had and that I have had as Speaker, and the Democratic leadership has had. Her record as a legislator in all respects is outstanding. She has been a stalwart supporter of a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy. In the domestic field, the gentlewoman has supported progressive legislation in the best interests of our people.

As majority leader and as Speaker in this session of the Congress, I never had any doubt as to where Mrs. GRANAHAN would be—I knew she would be supporting the leadership in the passage of progressive and forward-looking legislation, and that she would be supporting President Kennedy and the leadership in the House of Representatives in bipartisan action in connection with a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy properly recognized her great services as a legislator and her great capacity for service to our country in the future by appointing the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania as Treasurer of the United States, a position of great importance and of great trust.

With the distinguished gentlewoman on the assumption of her new position in this new field of activity in public life go the sentiments and best wishes of all of her colleagues without regard to party. We all know that she will make an outstanding success and will make one of the greatest Treasurers of the United States in the entire history of our country.

You will always be a Member of the House of Representatives in the hearts of those who have served with you in this great body.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want very much to express my own regret that the gentlewoman from Philadelphia is not returning here as a member of the "Dove Party" in the House of Representatives. We have very much appreciated her gentleness, her firmness, and her charm. We women do not take sides; we just do our work, but it has been a particular pleasure to me to have little contacts with Mrs. GRANAHAN, and I am happy to have this opportunity to wish her well and to say that we shall miss her while she is away and hope, as the distinguished majority leader said, that she will be back someday as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MAY. We certainly shall miss you, KATHRYN GRANAHAN—those of us who represent what we might say is perhaps a special minority in this body of Congress. But I would like to say that the women of this body, representing all the women in America, are always particularly gratified when one of us receives an appointment and the high honor that goes with it because of her outstanding qualifications and her ability. There is not one of us who has served with you, KATHRYN, who does not believe that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has been given this appointment on the basis of ability, competence, and effectiveness as demonstrated by her record of public service and public life. So it becomes a matter of gratification on the part of all of us, because it is an honor we share with you.

I personally have enjoyed the privilege of being a colleague and friend of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, and I am happy personally and proud of the honor that has been conferred upon her which she so richly deserves.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my colleagues, the distinguished Speaker [Mr. McCORMACK], the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], and our other colleagues who have paid such wonderful and well-deserved tribute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania this afternoon.

All of us on both sides of the aisle will miss the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania. She has performed a tremendous service particularly in a public relations way with those of us who have worked closely with her. She has grown right into the hearts of all of us. When the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, KATHRYN GRANAHAN, had some project she was particularly interested in, we all knew it very shortly, and she had such practical wisdom she sponsored and furthered the type of legislation that we could generally support. I particularly wish to congratulate her upon the excellent work she did on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee as a most able and dedicated subcommittee chairman.

And while we are relinquishing her to the administrative branch downtown, we will look forward to seeing much of her in the future. I know she will serve in her capacity as Treasurer of the United States in a dignified, efficient, and able manner.

Had the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania chosen to run for reelection in her district, I am confident she would have been overwhelmingly elected. We are very proud to have been associated with the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania and give her our best wishes in her new assignment.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, in addition to congratulating the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania on her recent appointment as Treasurer of the United States, I think it would also be appropriate to congratulate the President of the United States on the good judgment which he showed in selecting the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for this very high position in Government.

It was a pleasure to the gentleman from Georgia upon first being elected to Congress to have served on the same committee with the gentlewoman's husband, the Honorable William T. Granahan, the late Representative from the State of Pennsylvania. During the period of our service together we were very warm personal friends. With the election of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania to the seat of her distinguished husband it has been my pleasure during the period of our service together to consider the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania my very warm personal friend.

A few days ago, the gentlewoman may recall, I had the pleasure of introducing a group of my constituents to her, and I want to join in one of the comments one of my constituents made to the next Treasurer of the United States when he said we would all like to make a substantial collection of her autographs.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. As a representative of the deep South, South Carolina, and having been in Congress for 22 years, having known the gentlewoman's distinguished husband, I was glad to see you succeed him. Because I knew of the closeness of your family ties and the principles you stood for, I felt you would serve the highest traditions of the City of Brotherly Love. This you have done. Your engaging conversation, your intriguing personality and your fine friendliness to all of us, North, East, South and West, have made all of us love you and respect you for what you are. When your name graces the currency of the United States the hearts of those who know the gentlewoman so well will swell with pride, because we know this currency will have an indefatigable defender for the most sacred thing a nation possesses, the sanctity of its currency and the guardian of its economy. We know that you will do just exactly this and that you will represent our President and our people in the greatest tradition of those who have held this great position before you.

We wish you every success in your new undertaking.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I feel your selection is one of the wisest selections the President has made since women's suffrage. I know our colleague has the same motto as Will Rogers.

I know each and every one of us have met the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania not only like and respect her but love her. It was my great privilege to serve with her husband. Both are wonderful people. I feel that the value of the dollar will be strengthened hereafter.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the Second District of Illinois the name of KATHRYN GRANAHAN is better known than the name of BARRATT O'HARA. I have received thousands of letters from the young men and young women of my district who look upon you as a saint of purity. Your work has made your name one of love, of respect, and inspiration in my district.

For myself, the Granahans have given my congressional service a deep graciousness. When I came here as a freshman your late beloved husband's office was across from my office. He was my mentor. He instructed me and inspired me. When he went to his reward, you came here, and during these years whenever I met you and encountered your smile and heard your words of optimism and encouragement I have said, "This is a grand world, and it is a great thing to be in the Congress with Congressman Granahan, and then with Congresswoman GRANAHAN."

Whenever I take a greenback from my pocket in the future and I see the signature of KATHRYN GRANAHAN, before I spend the bill I will kiss the signature.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania. I had the great pleasure and privilege of also serving in this House with her late husband, and I had a great admiration and respect for him.

It has been a real privilege to serve in this body with the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania. She has rendered outstanding service to the Nation.

I want to take this opportunity to commend her upon the effective work she has done in an effort to stamp out obscene and pornographic literature in this country. She deserves the gratitude of every American citizen for what she has accomplished in this field, as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I sincerely feel that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has rendered a most valuable service to the youth of our Nation. I was greatly pleased when I learned of her appointment to this high office. I wish her success and much happiness as she assumes the duties of Treasurer of the United States.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor to join my colleagues in extending congratulations and best wishes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania as she prepares to accept her new post as Treasurer of the United States. We will miss her. We will miss her smile, her warm heart. We will miss the great service she has rendered not only to her district in Pennsylvania but to the entire country. I wish it were possible when she affixes her signature to the money bills that she could put the picture of her smiling face on the bills.

I think we could put more money into circulation. We also would appreciate the opportunity of being reminded of the great friendships and service the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania will leave here.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are a number of our colleagues who would like to join our great Speaker, the majority leader, and others who have spoken, in wishing for the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania the best of success in her new post.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to associate myself with my colleagues relative to honoring the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN], on this day. I know that the fortunes of politics sometimes place one in probably the deepest depressing circumstances which one can experience as a human being and which one can withstand.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentlewoman loves the House of Representatives, its work and its membership. Her honest sense of direction on legislation created for her many, many admirers throughout the Nation, especially in the fact that the subject matter of the bills which she fostered and sponsored were such that every mother and father realized the importance of the legislation and its effect upon the lives of the young.

Mr. Speaker, to place her now in a position of importance within the administration reflects the honor and credit that is due her from those in authority to grant her one of the most important positions in our Government, one of trust, one that will reflect upon her and the honesty of purpose that she has always adhered to in all of her work and her consideration of others.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania leaves us with a heavy heart. I know what her suppressed desires really are. I appreciate the fact that in the enjoyment of this moment with her colleagues giving her the encomiums that she deserves, she leaves here with a better attitude and understanding of what she truly means to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, in the kindness of this moment may I say God bless you in the future and that we will welcome you back at any time you are desirous to return to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in the gentlewoman's retirement there were thousands of people in the State of Pennsylvania who were critical of the party that she so truly represented and who are having to be forced in some way to make a decision which in one respect the gentlewoman accepts. The courage of your choice is such to contribute to the party, to the strength of the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania, that you acceded to this request and campaigned for your colleagues, who in some measure took your place. That reflects fine character which brings out the true sentiments of a loyal Democrat to the party and to the purposes which that party espouses.

May God bless you in your future endearment to your party, to the administration and in your service.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I thank my colleagues for these many, many kind words. I want all of you to know it is very difficult for me to leave the House of Representatives.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, Mrs. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, who in 1956 succeeded her late husband as Representative of the Second District of the great Commonwealth, will depart for another distinguished post as Treasurer of the United States. She has served her constituency well while dedicating her energies at all times to the best interests of our Nation. Although we regret her departure; and we shall miss her infectious personality and her reassuring presence, we heartily congratulate her, confident that the country shall continue to benefit from her knowledge and perseverance and integrity.

On behalf of the people of her entire district, and all of the people of the city of Philadelphia and the citizens of the United States as well, I wish her continued success and good health to perform those duties which the President has assigned her.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Philadelphia is proud indeed of her distinguished daughter, KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN. We are particularly proud of the latest honor to come her way—her appointment by the President to the high office of Treasurer of the United States.

It was my privilege to have known Mrs. GRANAHAN's late husband, the Honorable William T. Granahan, who represented the Fourth District of Pennsylvania in the House of Representatives. Bill Granahan, a man of warm "diplomatic" personality, was a gentle and effective representative of the people. His successor, the gracious gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, has exhibited the same wonderful qualities. She has continued her husband's industrious and devoted attention to duty in her service in the Congress. On numerous occasions when talking with people from her district, as well as other Philadelphians, they have praised her service to them personally and to the community.

Among KATHRYN GRANAHAN's contributions in the legislative field, has been her strong program to rid our country of obscene and pornographic material, which is so detrimental to the youth of our Nation. I had occasion to work with her on proposals to strengthen the procedure in the Post Office Department to weed out pornographic mailings.

I am proud to have served with KATHRYN GRANAHAN in the House of Representatives. As she moves on to assume her new important post as Treasurer of the United States, she takes with her the respect and fond wishes of her colleagues in the Congress—and her thousands of constituents and friends in a grateful city.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation for the valuable services of Hon. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN who is leaving us after years of fruitful efforts in the Congress. The members of the Committee on Government Operations and of our Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization on which she served have profited immensely from our association with her. Congresswoman GRANAHAN's unfailingly pleasant disposition and keen attentiveness to her duties have made her one of the most respected and beloved of our colleagues. We are particularly proud of her authorship of amendments to the Travel Expense Act which have proved so helpful to Government employees.

We congratulate her on her appointment to the high office of Treasurer of the United States and wish for her much success in carrying out the important responsibilities in that position.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join with many others in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to my friend and colleague, the Honorable KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, who has been honored by the President in her appointment as Treasurer of the United States.

KATHRYN has been a conscientious and effective Member of the House of Representatives, as was her late husband who was also my good friend. When she leaves these Halls she will leave her mark, a lasting impression of charm, good looks, graciousness and efficiency. I am certain she will add the same distinction to the Treasury Department upon her installation there. Needless to say, she will take with her my wholehearted wish for continued success and happiness. We will most assuredly miss her presence here in Congress.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased and happy to hear of KATHRYN GRANAHAN's confirmation as the Treasurer of the United States. I know our President selected the finest candidate for this very important post; and I further know that Mrs. GRANAHAN will do a splendid job.

I do, however, regret the fact that she will no longer be a Member of this House, where she has done an exceptional job for her country and her constituents.

I have known KATHRYN GRANAHAN for many years. She is a brilliant lady who has been blessed with compassion and understanding for her fellow man. We have worked together on many projects of concern to our City of Brotherly Love and her wisdom and understanding is remarkable.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I will represent a major portion of Mrs. GRANAHAN's district in the 88th Congress and have had an opportunity to meet many of her people. They have the highest regard for her and I only hope I can in a small measure fill her footsteps.

To you, KATHRYN, I wish you every success in your new assignment and will pray for your continued good health and happiness.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all delighted with the nomination and confirmation of our colleague, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] as Treasurer of the United States. She will fill this position with grace and with distinction.

On the other hand, there is no Member of the House who does not regret her departure from our midst and we shall all be sorry that her charm and her warmth will no longer help to ease the burdens of the long sessions which we necessarily experience.

I was privileged to serve with Mrs. GRANAHAN on the House Committee on Government Operations and I am keenly aware of the contribution that she made to that committee as well as her outstanding work on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee where she did so much to bring before the country the difficulty and the importance of the problem of distributing pornographic literature.

Mrs. GRANAHAN has been a responsible and constructive Member of this body and on leaving it she will have the great satisfaction of knowing that a lasting contribution will remain behind.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it affords me a great deal of pleasure to pay tribute to my former neighbor and longtime friend, KATHRYN O'HAY GRANAHAN, the distinguished Member of the Pennsylvania delegation.

I had the pleasure of serving in this body with her late husband, who also was a conscientious Representative of his constituents. I certainly was pleased when KATHRYN succeeded him as a Member of the congressional delegation from Pennsylvania.

KATHRYN's family were neighbors of mine in our native Easton, Pa.

As chairman of a House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee, Mrs. GRANAHAN has distinguished herself for her devotion to duty. She has won worldwide recognition from all decent Americans for her fight against obscene literature.

I am positive that as she goes forth into her new position, that of Treasurer of the United States, she goes with the best wishes of every Member of this House. I am as equally positive that KATHRYN O'HAY GRANAHAN, my longtime friend, will serve in her new position with distinction just as she has done here in this great body.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] upon her appointment as Treasurer of the United States.

In my short tenure of office as Congressman from the State of Michigan, I have become acquainted with her quite well and have found her to possess the qualities of leadership, friendliness and, above all, graciousness. I wish to be numbered among those who are sorry to see her leave this distinguished body, but I know that she will assume her new position in a new field of public activity with competence and effectiveness based on her ability shown in this House of Representatives.

It is with deep regret that this honorable body loses a valued Member; however, the President of the United States has full confidence in her abilities and has selected her to become our next custodian of public funds as Treasurer of the United States.

The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has performed a tremendous service to the Nation as a Member of this House during the past 6 years. I know that she will cherish these memories as a Member of this honorable body. She has been a most loyal supporter of the Democratic Party and backed the party in its position for a strong national defense and firm foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy properly recognized her great services as a legislator and her great capacity to further serve our country in the position of great importance and great trust. Again, I wish to congratulate her on the attainment of this high honor and humbly pray that God continues to bless her in her new tasks.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my regret that our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, is terminating her service in the House of Representatives at the close of the present Congress.

During her term of service she has made a place for herself as a respected and influential Member of the House. It is gratifying to all of us that she will continue to serve the Nation as Treasurer of the United States.

I am sure that I express the consensus of the House of Representatives when I state that it has been a privilege to be associated with her and that all of us have benefited from her presence among us.

She has represented the people of her district in an outstanding manner while giving the fullest consideration and highest priority at all times to the national interest and the well-being of her fellow Americans throughout the Nation.

I want to congratulate Mrs. GRANAHAN on her new appointment and to assure her of the continued friendship of the House. We hope she will be a frequent visitor to the House Chamber where she will always find a warm welcome.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, with each session of the Congress that passes into history we must endure the departure from amongst us of some of our most beloved and respected colleagues. Sometimes, such departures are occasions of grief, for we shall no longer ever see some of those colleagues on this earth. At other times, they are occasions of sadness, that the political tide we must all breast has for the moment overcome them. Then, there are those times when while we regret the loss to this great body, we are gratified and proud that our former colleague will continue to serve our Nation and her citizens with the same dedicated, effective effort, though in a new capacity.

So it is today.

Since her arrival in the House, I have been privileged to know the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania. Even before her arrival as our colleague, I was privileged, for in the 7½ years of my service before KATHRYN joined us, I knew her as the lovely, gracious lady of the distinguished late gentleman from Pennsylvania, William T. Granahan. Bill Granahan was one of the truly great young veterans who helped me when I first came to the House. He was a dear friend, a valued, respected counselor. And to have known him and served with him could not but generate a predisposition to respect KATHRYN when she was elected to take his place.

Immediately, however, KATHRYN won our admiration and respect on her own merits alone. On domestic legislation, or that on foreign policy, she has firmly, unflinchingly supported bills that will maintain our Nation as the leader of the free world, while giving to all our citizens the rights that are properly theirs. On the floor, or in her committees, KATHRYN has been one of our most courageous, effective leaders.

Now she leaves us. But thankfully, she will not be far away. On some recommendations and actions by the President and his Secretary of the Treasury there has not always been unanimous approbation from both sides of the aisle. In selecting KATHRYN GRANAHAN to be Treasurer of the United States, I know, however, that the President and the Secretary have the genuine congratulations of all our colleagues.

We shall miss you, KATHRYN. We look forward to seeing you soon, as soon as you have the time to break away from downtown. We shall not forget the work you have done here. We shall not forget you.

May God bless you always with good health and the strength to continue to serve as you have always served.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, on her appointment by President Kennedy and upon her confirmation as Treasurer of the United States. I am happy to have been among those who urged her appointment.

It has been my privilege to serve with the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] since her election to the 84th Congress. She has served her district and the Nation with great distinction. The entire country is grateful for her vigorous and fruitful efforts to remove smut from the mails. The people of my district in Cleveland, Ohio, were very well aware of Mrs. GRANAHAN's work and instructed me to support her program, which I did.

My best wishes go to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] on her new responsibilities. She is eminently qualified to be the best Treasurer in history. I know she will make the effort.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in expressing my congratulations to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] upon her selection and appointment to be Treasurer of the United States.

A brief review of Mrs. Granahan's career indicates to anyone her devotion to human beings and compassionate causes. Interested and experienced in welfare problems, she has taken part in many programs relating to better medical care for our people, and holds an honorary degree from St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia.

I have watched her with admiration since joining her in the Congress and want to pay tribute to her indefatigable efforts. The Nation can be grateful for the special work she has done in combating the flow of indecent materials in the country.

The Congress will miss her, but the Nation will gain a fine public servant in her new role. The President should be congratulated for his outstanding choice of a new Treasurer.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Representative from the Second District of Pennsylvania, KATHRYN GRANAHAN.

I knew Mrs. GRANAHAN very well while serving in the Congress with her late husband and was greatly pleased with her election as his successor. She has upheld his ideals and principles and has been an outstanding Member of the House. Having served with her on the Committee on Government Operations, I was able to observe firsthand her fine work, devotion to duty, her ability, and her dedication. We will miss her very much in the House and regret that circumstances make it necessary for her to resign.

However, our loss will be another Government agency's gain, and as Treasurer of the United States, she will have the opportunity to continue the splendid record of service which has characterized her entire adult life. In both civic and political life she has set an excellent example for all of us, one worthy of emulation.

My heartiest congratulations to Mrs. GRANAHAN on her new appointment and my best wishes and prayers go with her in her new duties.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congresswoman KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, has undertaken the duties and responsibilities of administering the office of the Treasurer of the United States. Since the 84th Congress Mrs. GRANAHAN has served the needs of the people of Pennsylvania; she has the distinction of being the first woman elected to Congress from the city of Philadelphia. Her work as a legislator has earned her commendable citation. Her dedicated service, industry and energy have, I am sure, prompted the President to appoint her to this highly responsible post.

KATHRYN GRANAHAN succeeded her husband, the late Congressman William T. Granahan, who had until the time of his death served the people of Pennsylvania. The Granahan family has, therefore, made its distinguishing mark in Congress during an important decade in American history.

In her new role, Mrs. GRANAHAN, will assume the responsibility for the receipt, custody and disbursement of public moneys, and for maintaining the records in connection with the source, location, and disposition of U.S. funds. This is a staggering responsibility when one considers the universal recognition accorded the integrity of the U.S. dollar, and its use as a benchmark of value by all nations. She will, among other duties, maintain close liaison with the Federal Reserve Board, commercial banks, and our postal savings system through her many office divisions. Her alertness and energy will go far in maintaining confidence in our monetary and fiscal systems.

KATHRYN GRANAHAN will, we know, perform this difficult job with the same closeness of attention to detail and versatility with which she addressed herself to her congressional duties, during which time she has earned and merited the friendship and confidence of the memberships of both sides of the aisle. In joining the executive branch she will bring to that portion of our Government a talent and ability which will assure good government, trust, and the faithful discharge of the duties and responsibilities of her new office.

While we regret with a deep sense of loss her departure from Capitol Hill, it is reassuring to know that her services will continue for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, now that Congresswoman KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania, has been nominated by President Kennedy and confirmed by the U.S. Senate for the position of Treasurer of the United States, I want to express my heartfelt congratulations to KATHRYN, knowing that she will fill this important position with honor and great ability. We will certainly miss her here as one of the outstanding Members of the House, however.

My husband served with KATHRYN's husband, Bill, on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During the first 3 years of my service here, Congressman Granahan was a gracious and helpful colleague, and since 1956, I have been privileged to enjoy KATHRYN's friendship as a colleague. She has distinguished herself as a leader against the misuse and abuse of the mails for transmitting filth and pornography, and I am sure her efforts and the legislation she sponsored will continue to have a great effect in combating the flood of obscene materials aimed primarily at children.

Mrs. GRANAHAN has also been an outstanding friend of Government employees and particularly of the postal workers, as a ranking member and a subcommittee chairman in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. And her devotion to the well-being of her constituents is well known to all of us here. She has, therefore, built a substantial and admirable congressional record of achievement.

The redistricting of the Pennsylvania congressional districts cannot help but result in an injustice to the people whom KATHRYN represented so ably, and it is most unfortunate that her district was divided and eliminated. However, she accepted this great disappointment in her usual manner, and will now put her very effective talents into a new assignment where her charm, intelligence, and devotion to duty will make her a truly outstanding official of the Government of the United States, as Treasurer of the United States.

My very, very warm wishes go with you, KATHRYN, as you prepare to start on the important responsibilities you are undertaking in the administration of President John F. Kennedy.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I join in extending my heartiest congratulations and best wishes to our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] as she leaves the House of Representatives after a distinguished 6-year record of service to become Treasurer of the United States.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service and Government Operations Committees, Mrs. GRANAHAN became an outstanding expert in the intricacies of the Postal Establishment. By her diligent work on the Post Office Committee she led the fight against pornographic literature in the mails, a fight which won for her the praise of parents, churches, and civic groups throughout the country.

It has been a pleasure to serve with such an outstanding legislator and conscientious public servant. We wish Mrs. GRANAHAN every happiness on her challenging new assignment in the executive branch.

H.R. 10508 WOULD CURB TESTING ABUSE IN SCHOOLS

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 10508 which would curb abuses in many of the testing programs which are being conducted in our schools throughout the United States. Its purpose is to assure that parents be apprised of tests of a nonacademic nature which are to be administered to their children. It is based on the positive belief that parents are primarily responsible for the upbringing of their children and that schools are partners in that sphere, along with the church and home, and not preeminent. All too many educators are taking the view that education is the exclusive province of the schools. I believe there is an urgent need for this legislation so that proper guidance and counseling will not be confused with brainpicking and interference.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its booklet No. OE-25003 (1962) notes that—

> Tests are classified in terms of the purpose for which they are designed, for example: mental ability, intelligence, or scholastic aptitude tests; achievement tests; interest inventories; and personality inventories.

The latter two areas render themselves subject to wide abuse if not properly administered and constitute, in many cases, an outright invasion of the privacy of the home and family life.

On page 10, this booklet, entitled "Understanding Testing," states:

> A personality inventory is designed to measure personal adjustment, to describe a person in terms of his personality traits, or to discover the nature of his problems. Such tests differ in purpose, types of items, and the traits they purport to measure.

It can be seen at the outset that all children are deemed to have problems. A well-adjusted, successful pupil is tested right along with the rest. In all of the testing which I have researched, the tests are uniformly administered to all students and not merely those who have problems.

On the same page, booklet OE-25003 honestly admits the dangers inherent in this shotgun approach of testing by this cautious injunction:

> Much care should be exercised in the use and interpretation of results, for much damage can be done when inadequately trained people interpret inventory scores.

HEW sees no danger, however, in the overall invasion of privacy that comes when children are asked questions such as these:

> My father is a tyrant.
>
> I feel there's a barrier between me and my parents.
>
> My parents play favorites.
>
> I'm ashamed of my father's job.
>
> I'm ashamed of my parents' dress and manners.
>
> My parents avoid discussing sex with me.
>
> I wonder if I am normal in my sexual development.
>
> I want to know about venereal disease.
>
> I need an acceptable vocabulary to discuss sex.
>
> I think about sex a good deal of the time.
>
> How far should high school students go in love relations?
>
> I'm confused in my religious beliefs.
>
> I'm bothered by thoughts of heaven and hell.
>
> Is there a conflict between the Bible and my school subjects?
>
> I'm losing faith in religion.
>
> Is it wrong to deny the existence of God?

These are but a few of the 298 questions which are contained in the SRA Youth Inventory, published by the Science Research Associates, one of numerous testing services available to our high schools. It is my contention that nonacademic tests of this type should be given only with parental consent. At the present time they can be given without any prior notice to the parents. A school would be in serious trouble if it would undress young students for examination or inoculate them with some serum without parental permission. Yet, virtually the same thing is being done all of the time through these brainpicking tests which literally undress young people and interfere in private areas which would better be left alone by schools.

Many tests call for difficult or impossible answers—in some cases pitting loyalties of religion, home, and parents against each other. Take the following excerpts from one moral value inventory exam, for example:

> Which is worse: (1) spitting on the Bible; (2) spitting on the American flag?
>
> Which is more important: (1) taking the oath of allegiance to the United States; (2) joining a church?
>
> Which is worse: (1) denying the existence of God; (2) laughing while the Star-Spangled Banner is being played?
>
> Which of the following men contributed more to the progress of mankind: (1) St. Paul (in the Bible); (2) Abraham Lincoln?

Guidance and counseling received a big boost through the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Section V carries the high sounding name "Guidance, Counseling, and Testing: Identification and Encouragement of Able Students." The purpose of the title V was set out as follows:

> To provide financial assistance to the States to establish and maintain (1) a testing program in secondary schools to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and abilities, and (2) a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools to encourage students to complete their secondary school education in preparation for their entrance into institutions of

higher education and to enter such institutions.

Nothing here would seem to foster or encompass the nonacademic, psychological testing aforementioned. The 1961 amendment restated the same purpose and expanded the program to include the seventh and eighth grades.

One point should be made clear. Testing of this type could be done without the NDEA. It has been through the NDEA that guidance and counseling has become vogue. Most of this testing would seem to be legitimate when directed toward the principle of encouraging students in developing their abilities and goals. Office of Education Commissioner McMurrin testified that during the 2 years of operation of title V, a 50-percent increase occurred in the number of qualified full-time counselors employed by secondary schools. The counselor-pupil ratio, he stated, had improved throughout the Nation during this period from 1 to 750 to 1 to 610, a substantial step toward the ratio of 1 to 300 acknowledged by leaders in the field to be the acceptable proportion. The NDEA has been a vehicle to enhance testing at the high school level.

On the face of it, HEW has maintained that there is no authorization in the National Defense Education Act for testing projects of the type referred to in my legislation. Counselors in high schools who are supported by HEW funds, however, are currently conducting such tests. Laws on the State level are obviously needed to further block the loopholes for these nonacademic invasions of privacy.

Here is the test which is currently being given to secondary school students in my State of Ohio and elsewhere throughout the Nation:

SRA YOUTH INVENTORY

(Form A, prepared by H. H. Remmers, Purdue University and Benjamin Shimberg, director of Educational Testing Service guidance inquiry)

MY SCHOOL

1. I have difficulty keeping my mind on my studies.

2. I wish I knew how to study better.

3. I wish I knew more about using the library.

4. I have difficulty taking notes.

5. I don't know how to prepare for tests.

6. I wish I could be more calm when I recite in class.

7. I spend too much time studying.

8. I would like to take courses that are not offered in my school.

9. I dislike my courses.

10. I have too much homework.

11. I hate school.

12. I feel sleepy in class even when I've had enough sleep at night.

13. I wish I could quit school now.

14. I doubt the value of things I study.

15. I am too restless to stay in school.

16. I have difficulty keeping my mind on what goes on in class.

17. My courses are too far removed from everyday life.

18. I must select a vocation that doesn't require college.

19. I would like to get some practical work experience.

20. I have difficulty expressing myself in writing.

21. I need some individual help with my courses.

22. My teachers give me no encouragement.

23. My teachers make fun of me.

24. My teachers don't make assignments clear.

25. My teachers aren't interested in me.

26. My teachers are too strict.

27. My teachers are too impersonal.

28. My teachers play favorites.

29. My teachers don't understand me.

30. Class periods are not well organized.

31. My teachers aren't interested in the things that interest me.

32. My teachers don't like me.

33. I have difficulty expressing myself in words.

AFTER HIGH SCHOOL?

34. What are my real interests?

35. What shall I do after high school?

36. For what work am I best suited?

37. How much ability do I actually have?

38. I would like to know more definitely how I am doing in my school work.

39. I need advice in choosing courses.

40. I want to know more about what people do in college.

41. Should I go to college?

42. What are the requirements for college?

43. How shall I select a college?

44. Can I get into the college of my choice?

45. I wish I could afford college.

46. Should I borrow money for college?

47. What are some ways of financing a college education?

48. How do you fill out application blanks for college?

49. Do I have the ability to do college work?

50. I would like to have more vocational courses.

51. How can I get apprenticeship training?

52. What are some careers for girls?

53. I want to learn a trade.

54. What courses will be most valuable to me later on?

55. What fields are overcrowded?

56. What career shall I pursue?

57. What training do different vocations require?

58. How will the draft affect me?

59. What are the opportunities in different fields?

60. What jobs are open to high school graduates?

61. How do I got about finding a job?

62. Where can I go for help in finding a job?

63. I wish I could write good letters of application.

64. How can I prepare for a job interview?

65. For what kind of job should I apply?

66. How should I act during an interview?

67. I have no work experience.

68. What's expected of me on a job?

69. What is proper office etiquette?

70. Am I likely to succeed in the work I do when I finish school?

ABOUT MYSELF

71. I'm easily excited.

72. I have trouble keeping my temper.

73. I worry about little things.

74. I'm nervous.

75. I can't sleep at night.

76. I can't help daydreaming.

77. I have thoughts of suicide.

78. I feel guilty about things I've done.

79. I'm not popular with (boys) (girls).

80. I often feel lonesome.

81. I feel "low" much of the time.

82. My feelings are easily hurt.

83. I need to learn not to let people push me around.

84. I don't see much future for myself.

85. I often do things I later regret.

86. People dislike my race or nationality.

87. I lack the drive others have.

88. People stare at me.

89. I feel that I'm not wanted.

90. I have a "crush" on an older person.

91. I'm not ready for any job when I graduate.

92. I hesitate to take responsibility.

93. I feel that I'm not as smart as other people.

94. I must always be "on the go."

95. I prefer to be alone.

96. I must learn to "keep my head" when things go wrong.

97. I would like to discuss my personal problems with someone.

98. I wonder if I am normal in the way my mind works.

99. I worry about tests.

100. I'm unsure of myself.

101. I feel that I'm different from the other kids.

102. I'm trying to get rid of an undesirable habit.

103. I'm afraid of failure or humiliation.

104. My nose is ugly.

105. I bite my nails.

106. I can't help feeling bad when I can't get my own way.

107. I don't know why people get angry with me.

108. I don't know what is expected of me.

109. I wish I could overcome being careless.

110. I'm always thinking up alibis.

111. I'm afraid of making mistakes.

112. I'm afraid to speak up in class.

113. I can't do anything right.

114. I don't want to leave home for a job or college.

GETTING ALONG WITH OTHERS

115. I want people to like me better.

116. I don't know how to introduce people properly.

117. I wish I could carry on a pleasant conversation.

118. I don't know how to treat people whom I don't like.

119. I wish I were more popular.

120. I want to make new friends.

121. I need to develop self-confidence.

122. I need to be more tactful.

123. I wish I knew how to drop a person I no longer want for a friend.

124. I don't know how to act on formal occasions.

125. I'm ill at ease at social affairs.

126. I want to learn to dance.

127. I want to feel important to society or to my own group.

128. I wish I had things to talk about in a group.

129. I can't live up to the ideals set by groups to which I belong.

130. I need to learn how to keep from being too aggressive.

131. How much initiative should I take in getting invited to parties or dances?

132. I need to learn to be a good listener.

133. I need to learn to be more tolerant of other people's opinions.

134. I need to learn how to plan a party.

135. There aren't enough places for wholesome recreation where I live.

136. I don't know what clothes to wear on different occasions.

137. I get stage fright when I speak before a group.

138. I'd like to learn proper table manners.

139. I need to learn how to get along with people my own age.

140. I need to learn to be a "good sport" in games.

141. I'm often left out of things other kids do.

142. I need to learn how to select the right clothes for my figure.

143. I wish I knew how to use cosmetics properly.

144. I don't know how much of my inner feelings to reveal to my friends.

145. I need to learn to be on time for appointments.

146. I need to learn how to order food in a restaurant.

147. I need to learn how to work for the good of the group.

148. I'd like to know how to become a leader in my group.

149. I have difficulty deciding between my own standards and those of the crowd.

150. I can't find a part-time job to earn spending money.

151. I need money for social affairs.

152. I don't have a (girl) (boy) friend.

153. I am not attractive to the other sex.

154. I can't seem to live up to the ideals I have set for myself.

MY HOME AND FAMILY

155. I have no quiet place at home where I can study.

156. I can't get along with my brothers and sisters.

157. There is constant bickering and quarreling in my home.

158. I feel that I'm a burden on my parents.

159. I have to do too many chores around the house.

160. My allowance is too small.

161. I feel there's a barrier between me and my parents.

162. I can't discuss personal things with my parents.

163. My father is a tyrant.

164. I don't like to invite people to my home.

165. I don't feel that I belong in the family.

166. I am seldom consulted in family decisions.

167. I want to be accepted as a responsible person by my parents.

168. My parents play favorites.

169. My parents interfere with the spending of the money I earn.

170. My parents are trying to decide my vocation for me.

171. My parents are too strict about letting me use the family car.

172. My parents are too strict about dating.

173. My parents won't let me make my own decisions.

174. I get no encouragement at home.

175. My parents don't usually respect my opinions.

176. My parents don't trust me.

177. My parents expect too much of me.

178. My parents are too strict about my going out at night.

179. I am criticized for dating someone older than I am.

180. I am criticized for dating a person of whom others do not approve.

181. I have too many dates.

182. I wish I could get my parents to treat me like a grownup.

183. I wish I had my own room.

184. I am ashamed of my father's job.

185. I am ashamed of my parents' dress and manners.

186. I wish I could gain the confidence of my parents.

187. I want to get married soon.

188. I feel like leaving home.

189. My family tries to hold me down.

190. I am afraid to tell my parents when I have done something wrong.

191. I must turn over my earnings to the family.

192. I feel disloyal because I do not share the views of my parents.

193. My parents are too strict about permitting me to date on schoolnights.

194. My family is always worried about money.

195. My parents often pry into my private affairs.

196. My parents object to my following fads.

197. My parents continually nag about studying.

198. My parents neglect me.

199. My parents interfere in my choice of friends.

200. My parents disapprove of my social activities.

201. My parents won't let me do my own shopping.

202. My parents hate to admit that I'm sometimes right.

203. My parents are cold toward my friends.

204. My parents aren't interested in what I accomplish.

205. My parents criticize me too much.

206. My parents don't let me decide in which activities I can take part.

207. My parents avoid discussing sex with me.

BOY MEETS GIRL

208. I seldom have dates.

209. I don't know how to ask for a date.

210. There is no place to dance in the town where I live.

211. I'm bashful about asking girls for dates.

212. I don't know how to keep (boys) (girls) interested in me.

213. I don't know what to do on a date.

214. What are good manners on a date?

215. How do I refuse a date politely?

216. I'm bothered by dirty stories or vulgar talk.

217. I wonder if I am normal in my sexual development?

218. I don't know how to break up with a person I have been dating without causing bad feelings.

219. Is there anything wrong with going places "stag"?

220. Is it all right to accept "blind dates"?

221. Is drinking harmful?

222. I am dating a person of a different religion than mine.

223. How can I keep (boys) (girls) from taking me for granted?

224. Should I go steady?

225. Should I kiss my date the first time we go out together?

226. Must I neck to be popular?

227. I'm embarrassed in any discussion of sex.

228. I wonder if high school students should pet and make love.

229. I need an acceptable vocabulary to discuss sex.

230. I think about sex a good deal of the time

231. How far should high school students go in love relations?

232. I need more correct information about sex.

233. I don't understand how children are born.

234. I have conflicting information about sexual matters.

235. I want to know about venereal disease.

236. What things should one consider in selecting a mate?

237. How long should people know each other before getting married?

238. How can I prepare myself for marriage and family life?

239. What things cause trouble in marriage?

HEALTH

240. I want to gain (or lose) weight.

241. I want to learn how to select foods that will do me the most good.

242. I smoke too much.

243. I am crippled (or have some other handicap).

244. I am bothered by menstrual disorders.

245. I'm concerned about improving my figure.

246. I want to improve my posture and body build.

247. My stomach is upset easily.

248. What can I do about bad breath?

249. Is smoking harmful?

250. What can I do about body odor?

251. I worry about my health.

252. I don't get enough exercise.

253. I get tired easily.

254. I don't get enough sleep.

255. I have no pep.

256. My teeth need attention.

257. I have frequent headaches.

258. I have frequent colds.

259. I don't hear very well.

260. My muscles are poorly developed.

261. I have no appetite.

262. I want to get rid of pimples.

263. I sometimes feel faint.

264. I wonder if I am normal in my energy and endurance.

THINGS IN GENERAL

265. I'm concerned with what life is all about.

266. I'm confused in my religious beliefs.

267. I'm bothered by thoughts of Heaven and Hell.

268. Is there a conflict between the Bible and my school subjects?

269. I feel that I'm not living up to my religion.

270. I'm searching for something to believe in.

271. How does one set standards of "right" and "wrong"?

272. I'm concerned about cheating.

273. I'm having difficulty deciding what's important in life.

274. I'm confused on some moral questions.

275. Can I believe the newspapers and radio?

276. How can I help get rid of intolerance?

277. How can I help to make the world a better place in which to live?

278. What can I do about the injustice all around us?

279. I'm mixed up about world affairs.

280. I'm worried about the next war.

281. Is there something I can do about race prejudice?

282. Is there any way of eliminating slums?

283. What can I do to help get better government?

284. How can I learn to use my leisure time wisely?

285. I have difficulty budgeting my time.

286. How can I learn to get the most for my money?

287. Does one have to take advantage of people to be successful?

288. What can I contribute to civilization?

289. I'm losing faith in religion.

290. I need to develop a satisfactory philosophy of life.

291. I can't decide whether or not money is the major thing to work for in life.

292. How can we get honest government?

293. Can I believe advertising?

294. What is eternity?

295. Does it really pay to be honest?

296. I wonder about the after-life.

297. Is it wrong to deny the existence of God?

298. What makes people selfish or unkind?

A typical type test which deals with wishes, desires and impulses is the Wishing Well, published by the Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, given to youth in grades 4 through 7. Here are a few of the eight score wishes which the child is supposed to answer:

I wish I did not feel so different from my parents.

I wish I could talk over important things with my parents more often.

I wish I felt like a real member of the family.

I wish my parents did things that would make me feel more love toward them.

I wish I could be sure my father would always have a steady job.

I wish our family could afford to give each other better presents at Christmas and on birthdays.

I wish I knew how you can believe that God is always right and at the same time believe that you should think for yourself.

> I wish I knew how you can make lots of money and still be a very good citizen.
>
> I wish someone would help me to see the place of religion in my life.
>
> I wish I liked Negro children as well as white children.
>
> I wish I knew how you can like your own country best and at the same time like people in other countries too.
>
> I wish I knew why factories sometime shut down when people need the things factories make.
>
> I wish I knew why people say that everyone is equal when some people have more money than others.

A parent could well ask what all of this has to do with the educational process. Suggestions often plant seeds of doubt. Children who are normal may begin to think they are not normal. To read all of the 160 questions tends to give anyone an inferiority complex.

It can be seen that tests of this type go far beyond any superficial goal of testing academic prowess or even the proper role of assisting a student to select his vocational pursuit. These tests are based on the premise of so-called life adjustment by which the student is psychoanalyzed and then fitted into the group by adjustment. Miss Emily Cuyler Hammond conducted an intensive study of the surge toward togetherness in the Germany of the thirties and refers to these testers as a dedicated cult of hidden persuaders "using the Freudian art of motivation research to reach and manipulate young minds." She added:

> These are not the Madison Avenue hucksters of bubble gum, station wagons or other materialistic accouterments of belongingness. These are the modern educationists and guidance counselors, selling not only packaged, sugar-coated, easy-to-take lessons but the necessity of adjustment to togetherness, or belongingness, itself.

In a free society, education should be directed toward teaching the child to think. Not to think what I might think or the testers might think but to think for himself and make his own decisions. The home, the church, the overall sense of morality which we imbue into our children implant the sense of right and wrong which make the ability to think meaningful. To develop patterns referred to in UNESCO booklets as "right attitudes" is indeed a dangerous one in a free society and can well lead our youth down the path to collectivism and internationalism whereby they gradually lose their loyalty to home and nation.

There is ample room for doubt of the validity of these so-called personal inventory exams. Pitirim A. Sorokin, onetime head of the Department of Sociology at Harvard, in his book, "Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology and Related Sciences," observes that—

> At the present time in Western countries almost every individual is tested from the cradle to the grave, before and after the important events in his life. He is given a battery of various tests after his birth, in his nursery school and kindergarten, in his elementary school, high school, and college, before and after his draft into the Armed Forces, before and during his marriage, before and after his gainful employment, and so on, up to the tests preceding and following his death. His life-career is largely determined by these tests. Beginning with intelligence tests and ending with the tests of loyalty and subversiveness, various testers have replaced the old-fashioned angel-guardians that supposedly guided the life-course of each person. We are living in an age of testocracy. By their tests of our intelligence, emotional stability, character, aptitude, unconscious drives, and other characteristics of our personality, the testocrats largely decide our vocation and occupation. They play an important role in our promotions or demotions, and in our successes and failures in social position, reputation, and influence. They determine our normality or abnormality, our superior intelligence or hopeless stupidity, our loyalty or subversiveness. By all this they are largely responsible for our happiness or despair, and, finally, for our long life or premature death.
>
> The enormous influence of tests is primarily due to the supposedly scientific and infallible character of these tests. The testocrats have succeeded in selling their tests as strictly scientific, precise, operational and unerring. As such they are rarely challenged and hardly ever questioned.

In this testomania, Sorokin observes that the defectiveness of the tests is notably increased by the conditions under which they are administered. They are for the most part not continuous but sporadic ad hoc tests, given only once or a few times. Results tend to be somewhat accidental and may be entirely unrepresentative of the knowledge or the traits of the testee.

The most notable complaint that can be lodged against these personal inventory examinations is that the results are autocratically decided by the testers. Many questions in the above SRA examinations ask for wishes, desires, aspirations, preferences, tastes and other subjective evaluations by the testee. It is entirely possible that the testers are not right, especially when it comes to sociological problems. In many cases it can be shown that the right answers are wrong. Sorokin points out that when these tests deal with psychosocial phenomena:

> For instance, when they probe the psychological, psychiatric, sociological, anthropological, economic, political, historical, philosophical, ethical, juridical or aesthetic values of the tested person—the unreliability of the tests is still more increased for the following reason. In these fields there are few generally accepted concepts, definitions, theories, methods, uniformities and values. In these disciplines we have, instead, different theories, approaches, generalizations and values. Insofar as the testers are all too human, they are inclined to regard their own denominational creed. In this way new elements of subjectivity are introduced into the tests.

Although they would never admit it, I am sure it is hitting close to home.

THE GENESIS OF BRAINPICKING

The trend toward testing programs of this type has its genesis in the Freudian concept of psychiatry. Supposedly, these people are specially anointed to solve all of the ills of the world by ridding man of his delusions, repressions, frustrations, and problems up to and including wars. When their theory is reduced to practice we have life adjustment curriculum in schools whereby the student "adjusts" to his various neuroses. These neuroses are spotted by the eye of the tests given not to check academic achievement but rather through subjective brainpicking tests which probe into the deepest recesses of the mind and deal with opinions, attitudes, and ideas—many of which have always been private through good taste and modesty.

Dr. G. B. Chisholm, renowned psychiatrist, solemnly told a group of his compatriots:

> With the other human sciences, psychiatry must now decide what is to be the immediate future of the human race. No one else can. And this is the prime responsibility of psychiatry.

He was giving the William Alanson White Memorial Lectures on "The Psychiatry of Enduring Peace and Social Progress" and this address was printed in the February 1946 issue of "Psychiatry—Journal of the Biology and the Pathology of Interpersonal Relations."

What stands in the way of attaining the goals that Dr. Chisholm wanted? He states:

> For many generations we have bowed our necks to the yoke of the conviction of sin. We have swallowed all manner of poisonous certainties fed us by our parents, our Sunday and day school teachers, our politicians, our priests, our newspapers, and others with a vested interest in controlling us.

He makes it about as clear as one can. Morality is the culprit—our burdensome sense of right and wrong. Pierce this iron veil of stultifying restraint and you will have progress. Impeding progress are the forces of the home and church—they must go.

> If the race is to be freed from its crippling burden of good and evil it must be psychiatrists who take the original responsibility.

How will all of this be done? He has an easy answer—the upbringing of the child. He states:

> The most important thing in the world today is the bringing up of children. It is not a job for economic or emotional misfits, for frightened, inferiority-ridden men and women seeking a safe, respectable and quickly attainable social and emotional status. * * * It is therefore necessary that, for so long as it may take to change the bringing up of children in enough of the world, our close watch on each other and everyone in the world should not be relaxed for a moment.

By proper training children will not grow up as their elders did with a "warped" sense of guilt emanating from the antiquated sense of sin. In fact, sin is the arch-enemy of progress and has caused all of our troubles. According to Dr. Chisholm—

> The only psychological force capable of producing these perversions (note: preventing the rational use of intelligence) is morality, the concept of right and wrong, the poison long ago described and warned against as "the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." We have been very slow to rediscover this truth and to recognize the unnecessary and artificially imposed inferiority, guilt and fear, commonly known as sin, under which we have almost all labored and which produces so much of the social maladjustment and unhappiness in the world.

Freedom from moralities, says Dr. Chisholm, means freedom to think and behave sensibly. By a program of reeducation a new world can be molded and children be prepared for world citizenship.

Who is this man? A crackpot? He has influenced your life more than you would care to admit. My study of this area has extended over several years and many related subjects. Brainpicking tests and life adjustment education are part and parcel of this field. Dr. Chisholm cannot be dismissed lightly—if for no other reason than the positions he has held. He was Director-General of the World Health Organization in its formative years and president of the World Federation for Mental Health, 1957–58—how about those for qualifications. It is not surprising to also learn that he is honorary president of the World Federalists of Canada.

Cut out of the same cloth are the recommendations of another United Nations agency, UNESCO, which would redesign the upbringing of our youth if it had its way. In their "Toward World Understanding," we see the same line of reasoning:

> The kindergarten or infant school has a significant part to play in the child's education. * * * Not only can it correct the errors of home training, but it can also prepare the child for membership * * * in the world society [page 9]. It is sufficient to note that it is most frequently in the family that the children are infected with nationalism by hearing what is national extolled and what is foreign disparaged. * * * The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes. * * * As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results [pp. 54–58].

UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, has set out in the nine volumes of "Toward World Understanding" the means of instructing young people toward the day when their first loyalty will be to world government and not to country. The above excerpts were taken from volume V, "In the Classroom With Children Under 13 Years of Age." The same target is present in all of these schemes—the upbringing of the child.

All of these—Freudian psychiatry, UNESCO and brainpicking tests—point toward the same goal—detect and then indoctrinate. Kept to their proper use as a tool of education which will help develop the intellect and the ability to think for one's self, testing programs would not meet with objections from the parents. It is the effort to play God and to indoctrinate which meets our strenuous opposition.

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

It is significant to note that these theories are coming into more prominence in the U.S. Office of Education. In an early publication of the Federal Security Agency, Office of Education—Bulletin 1951, No. 3—entitled "Vitalizing Secondary Education—Education for Life Adjustment," it is solemnly proclaimed:

> In summary, educational research has found that youth learn chiefly what they experience * * * [and] the impact of democratic experiences upon individual personality is more significant than the mastering of figures and facts and the learning of rules and regulations (p. 10).

This John Dewey or Mann approach to education is closely tied to educational testing through increased development and use of educational statistics, testing techniques, and community surveys which has pointed out the need for democratizing the processes of learning as well as the operation of the high schools. The booklet emphasizes the importance of bringing real life into the curriculum and practicing democracy—whatever that means—and in "orienting" the thinking of the secondary student. On page 101, under the heading "Functions Schools Should Serve," the report states:

> School programs should provide the understandings and experiences necessary to meet the demands for democratic world citizenship. * * * Schools should help youth understand the patterns of the new social structure and the changed social relationships which advancing technology brings. In short the modern school should induct youth by stages into full membership in the dynamic local, State, national, and world communities in which they live.

This is almost exactly the way that the UNESCO Commission also puts it. This 104-page booklet outlines many good goals and changes but throughout is the overall theory of indoctrination and orientation which are a far cry from the educational goals of teaching young people to think for themselves and to make decisions for themselves in a free society. UNESCO calls this developing right attitudes.

This is exactly what the progressive educators, the Chisholms, the UNESCO crowd, the personal inventory-type testers and the Office of Education all have in common. The testing program is an integral part of developing the attitudes cited. The new social order referred to is socialistic and the world communities is very clearly the one-world of the internationalists in which American sovereignty becomes subservient to the United Nations.

In the foreword to "Vitalizing Secondary Education," eight staff members of the Office of Education were credited with writing the report, one of whom was John R. Ludington.

In a 1961 HEW-Office of Education document "Guidance Counseling and Testing Program Evaluation," No. OE–25020, the foreword contains the names of the same John R. Ludington, Director, Aid to State and Local Schools Branch, and E. Glenn Featherston, Assistant Commissioner, Division of State and Local School Systems. It is my understanding that Mr. Ludington will move up even further and become chairman of the Office of Education Civil Service Review Board.

Mr. Speaker, last year I read into the RECORD the HEW publication, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future," which presented the Office of Education blueprint for making American education Federal rather than local in nature. Many of the recommendations made in that bureaucratic design have already been implemented. It is especially interesting to note that in recent reorganizations within the Office of Education, staff and contributing members of the group or so-called mission which drew up the document are now in the driver's seat. I pointed out these changes in my July 26, 1962, speech to the House. Here are some of the promotions which have moved those officials up the ladder:

Mr. Arthur Harris, a member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting Associate Commissioner and Director of the new Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs.

Mr. Ralph C. M. Flynt, an ex officio member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting Associate Commissioner and Director of the new Bureau of Educational Research and Development.

Mr. John F. Hughes, another ex officio member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting executive officer and Director of the Office of Administration in the new Office of the Commissioner.

Mr. Charles P. Dennison, a member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting executive officer under Mr. Flynt in the Office of Educational Research and Development.

Mr. Thomas E. Cotner, a member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting Deputy Associate Commissioner in the Bureau of International Education.

Mrs. Sonia O. Ashworth, a staff member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting budget assistant under Mr. Flynt in the Bureau of Educational Research and Development.

Mr. Edward Cunningham, a staff member of the Committee on Mission and Organization, became acting personnel assistant under Mr. Harris in the Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs.

Mr. E. Glenn Featherston, author of a confidential report to the Office of Education Committee on a Federal Education Agency for the Future, became Deputy Associate Commissioner under Mr. Flynt in the new Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this instance we are not buying that famous pig in a poke—because these various authors of the discredited pamphlet, who have, as it were, written their own job-promotion tickets, have some pretty telltale quotations to their credit or discredit. For example:

Mr. Featherston, in his advisory memorandum to the committee, observed:

> Without question the Office of Education has and will continue to exert leadership through the collection of information, through research, through consultation and through the administration of programs. However, it is to a broader type of leadership I am referring here and that is the deliberate and planned effort to influence on an extensive, nationwide scale, thinking in American education * * * What changes should be made in elementary and secondary school curriculums? This would open up a tremendous area of activity and through the proper role the Office could bring about a great change without dictating.

If American education is directed and controlled by those bureaucrats it is certain, in my opinion, that they will move us in the direction of indoctrination rather than education. Control education and you write the future. If we allow these people to "teach" according to their social, economic, political, and international proclivities we will truly be a different America.

Another indication of the type of leadership that is being installed in the Office of Education is indicated by a memorandum of May 9, 1962, which notes this promotion:

> Eric R. Baber, presently regional representative, Office of Education, Chicago, Ill., to Director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Bureau of Educational Research and Development, effective May 14, 1962.

Now just who is Eric R. Baber, you might ask, and what is significant about this appointment. William H. Whyte, Jr., in his 1956 best seller, "The Organization Man," told us quite a bit about Mr. Baber. On page 428 of his book, Mr. White gave considerable attention to Mr. Baber, then superintendent of Park Forest, Illinois, High School. He noted that:

> What makes Park Forest's high school unique is that, where in traditional communities what has been called the life adjustment curriculum has been introduced a bit at a time, at Park Forest it has been the foundation.

He goes on to tell of Baber in these terms:

> Five years ago, when the school was still in the planning stage, Baber told parents that the trouble with U.S. education is that it is concentrated far too much on the intellectual aspect of education.

Mr. Whyte quotes a letter from Dr. Baber in which he said:

> If I were to attempt to define the bases of our educational program, I believe it would be in terms of three fundamental concepts: (1) the philosophy of experimentalism, compromised somewhat by the pressures of tradition, (2) an organismic (or Gestalt) psychology, and (3) democratic educational leadership.

Now you begin to see why Dr. Baber is so significant. Like Dr. Chisholm, he would make a slight concession by having his experimentalism compromised by the pressures of tradition but life adjustment education is to be the cornerstone. When coupled with testing programs you can see just what this means. Dr. Baber proudly proclaimed that all aspects of family group life are open to study. On page 432, Mr. Whyte gives one of the keys we see in all of these progressive educational programs when he says:

> The testing program is extensive. In addition to a battery of achievement tests, such as the Iowa tests, and intelligence tests, the school has given students the Kuder vocational preference record, the Bell adjustment inventory, and the California personal adjustment test.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare scrupulously denies that any testing of this type is carried out under the National Defense Education Act. In a letter from Mr. Featherston, he stated:

> Under title V-A of the act, Federal allotments are made to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining programs of guidance, counseling, and testing in the secondary schools. States desiring payments under their allotments have submitted a State plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for approval. State plans set forth the programs for which the funds will be spent. Payment under the Federal allotment is made in an amount equal to one-half of the State and/or local funds expended for the programs.
>
> In connection with testing under title V-A, the act provides that, if a State is not authorized by law to make payments to cover the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools in the State, the Commissioner will arrange for the testing of such students and shall pay one-half the cost thereof out of the State's allotment.
>
> Under regulations which we have issued pursuant to title V-A, "testing" means "the use of tests which measure abilities from which aptitudes for the individual's educational development validly may be inferred." We have advised the chief State school officers, in the enclosed bulletin, that there can be no Federal financial participation in expenditures for "tests, scales, inventories, or other devices for the collection of information relative to the student's social, moral, spiritual, or family values, relationships, or adjustments."

This may be the Department's position but it is done anyway. This is why I feel we need legislative action rather than an administrative regulation. Guidance counselors who are receiving Federal funds as part of their salaries have been conducting these brain-picking tests in many schools. In some cases, bureaucrats get the same thing accomplished if by a roundabout method. The heading of one test of the so-called inventory-type carried the following heading: "Kansas Junior High School Student Survey—Conducted by the University of Kansas, Bureau of Child Research, Lawrence, Kans.—Supported by Grants From the U.S. Public Health Service and the University of Kansas."

I have included this particular test in the appendix following these remarks. Note that this test was supported by grants from the U.S. Public Health Service.

CONCLUSION

One of the pronounced tendencies of these tests is to stress the materialistic side of life and place little emphasis on the moral or spiritual. As Archbishop O'Hara so aptly put it on April 8, 1958, when addressing the National Catholic Education Association:

> I am afraid that sometimes some of our teachers overlook the fact that the philosophy of secularist counseling is based on the exclusion of God and the soul from the educational process. I mention this because counseling is the subject of a piece of legislation now before the Congress. A bill presented at this session proposes Federal subsidies for enlarged counseling services available to students in both public and nonpublic schools.

The archbishop was referring of course to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which opened the door on counseling of this type.

My bill, H.R. 10508, would not, as some educators charge, prohibit such tests. It would merely bring these tests out into the open. It would not be the whole answer but it would be a start. It specifically requires that reasonable notice be given to parents of students to whom such examinations are to be given, that the parent be given the opportunity to view the test. If they so desire, the parent could then refuse permission to the school officials to administer the test to their child. My bill reads as follows:

> H.R. 10508
>
> A bill to limit the purposes for which funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may be used
>
> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be expended, granted, or otherwise used for the purpose of giving an examination to any student in an elementary or secondary school, or to pay or supplement the salary of an individual administering an examination taken by any such student, if any information is to be requested or obtained by means of such examination which relates to such student's personality, environment, home life, parental or family relationships, economic status, religious beliefs, patriotism, sexual behavior or attitudes, or sociological or psychological problems, unless (1) reasonable notice is given to parents of students to whom such examination is administered of the giving of such examination and of the right of any such parent (A) to see or hear each question that will be given or asked during such examination, and (B) to refuse to permit the giving of such examination to his child; and (2) the rights described in subclasses (A) and (B) of clause (1) are accorded to each such parent.
>
> SEC. 2. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that there is failure to comply substantially with the provisions of the first section of this Act in carrying out any program in whole or in part with funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that no more of such funds are expended to carry out such program until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply.

Martin L. Gross, writing in Life magazine, recently stated:

> Some State education laws, which prevent a licensed physician from giving a child an aspirin without parental permission, allow school testers to diagnose "maladjustment" or "potential schizophrenia" and have it entered on the child's record without informing the parents.

Mr. Speaker, this article is included in the appendix to these remarks because I believe it is timely indeed. I do not believe we want George Orwell's "1984" with Big Brother watching over all of us. In the first place I do not believe these people are that smart. Most educators do not invade the privacy of the home or fashion themselves as junior psychiatrists. Most educators are interested in academic development and reject these questionable tests. It is obvious that we need State laws to plug these loopholes in addition to my bill which would prevent the use of Federal funds for these purposes. Let the words of Dr. Chisholm ring in your ears:

> Let us be our own authority. We know far more than any of our ancestors. Scientists of this generation have no obligation to admit superiority of knowledge or of wisdom in any body of traditional belief or authority.

There is no room for authoritarian dogma in the field of human relations.

* * * * *

Let us discard the bromides which have kept us drugged, obedient to the old people, and afraid of their displeasure. Let us accept our own responsibility to remodel the world in bolder, clearer, more honest lines. Let us stop prostituting man's noblest and highest development, his intellect, to the service of guilt and fear and shame.

By alerting American fathers and mothers to the dangers inherent in these nonacademic brainpicking tests we can encourage them to be ever vigilant lest their children be guinea pigs in some classroom. My bill H.R. 10508 would help plug this gap but in the final analysis it is going to be an alert and vigilant citizenry which will rectify this erroneous usurpation of the privileges and responsibilities of the home and church.

Mr. Speaker, appendixes 1 and 2, to which I have referred, follow:

APPENDIX 1

THE NEW TESTS IN OUR SCHOOLS—THE THREE R'S AND A P (FOR PSYCHE)

(By Martin L. Gross)

(Life Magazine, September 1, 1962)

In the first few weeks of the new school year several million pupils from the first grade through senior high will open examination booklets that pose some surprisingly personal questions.

"Are you too nervous?"

"Have you often felt that you would rather not live at home?"

"Do many of the people you know seem to dislike you?"

Grade-school children will be required to answer these questions with a simple "Yes" or "No." Or they will be asked to mark "problem check lists" which state such childhood concerns as "I wish my father had a higher level job."

These nonacademic interrogations are standard procedure in schools throughout the country where an effort is being made to find out why Johnny can't read—or won't read—by probing deeply into his psyche. While parents and PTA's have been debating the merits and shortcomings of IQ and aptitude ratings, a far more controversial program of personality testing has been gathering momentum in public school systems. Few students in the United States will graduate from high schools without having come under this careful psychological watch.

Most parents are amazed to learn that their child's "personality" is all recorded in black and white in the locked files outside the principal's office. These personality probes are often conducted in a confidential atmosphere by guidance counselors. And pupils are not inclined to talk about the exams. The child who may return home and sadly admit he didn't know the answer to the question "Who fought in the War of 1812?" is unlikely to admit he wrote "Yes" next to the question, "Do you sometimes feel lonely at home?"

But the discovery of these tests can bring sharp reaction. Last spring in Hicksville, Long Island a candidate ran—and won—a place on the school board through his campaign pledge to eliminate the "Blacky" test, a psychoanalytic-based device that, with a series of dog cartoons, attempts to evaluate a fifth grader's "castration anxiety" and "oral eroticism," among many other traits.

The most common school personality probers are "inventories" and "check lists," including the California Test of Personality-Primary, the Mooney Problem Check List, the Science Research Associates Junior Inventory, the Minnesota Counseling Inventory. Each of the tests views children's psyches in somewhat different terms (calmness or nervous symptoms—freedom from or conventionality). But the quizzes cover considerable psychological grounds; a child's worries and fears, nightmares, sex problems, insights into mom and dad, sister and brother, and, among teenagers, menstruation. The scores, which often become part of a child's permanent school record, are marked on graphs provided by test publishers and connected into "personality profiles." With the help of national "norms" teachers and guidance counselors may attempt to compare the child's psyche with those of his classmates and decide whether or not the youngster is "emotionally well- or mal-adjusted." Unfortunately, few guidance counselors or teachers have had enough psychological training to make such decisions.

Because school personality probes stress intimate family details, mother's attempts to keep family business private are becoming distressingly futile. The popular California test of personality, used in 1,370 schools last year, asks 12-year-olds these questions about their home life:

Have you often felt as though you would rather not live at home?

Do you prefer to keep your friends away from your home because it is not attractive?

Another popular test, the SRA junior inventory (844,000 schoolchildren have taken this and other SRA inventories since 1956), tries to tap a student's adjustment with a list of 168 weighty problems which fourth through eighth graders must finish in 45 minutes. Some of the problems are casual: "I wish I could take music lessons." But others can have strong psychological impact: "I am too nervous," "I am not very happy," "I wish I could be a girl." The SRA youth inventory for 7th to 12th graders, probes further: "My parents play favorites," "I want to know about venereal disease," "I'm losing faith in religion," "My family is always worried about money."

The teacher or counselor doubling as amateur psychologist has some bizarre tools to experiment with, including the clinical Minnesota Counseling Inventory, which was derived from an adult test that compared hospitalized psychotics with those of a normal sample. Some statements on the MCI check list are:

> "Most of the time I wish I were dead."
> "I hear strange things when I am alone."
> "I am afraid of losing my mind."

Although the teacher is often pressed into service as a personality tester, most of the work is handled by guidance counselors who have become essential members of school staffs. The guidance counselor keeps a close watch over the confidential results of personality tests. High scorers, supposedly more maladjusted, are singled out for further testing, counseling, or referral to the school psychologist. The results, say counselors, provide hints on areas to discuss with parents during conferences and even emotional background information for some college entrance blanks.

"We find that inventories and checklists are wonderful timesavers," says one counselor who administers a checklist to a seventh-grade class. "Through it, we can often find children in need of help whom we might not have found otherwise. Even if a child leaves his test blank free of problems, it doesn't mean that he is worry free. This itself might be an indication of a greater underlying problem."

Most tests give the students a chance to indicate whether or not they wish to discuss their problems further. "We may call them in anyway if we feel they are troubled enough," says one counselor.

Some professional psychologists, however, not only question the usefulness of personality testing but consider it more harmful than helpful. In Denver, Colo., school psychologists and other guidance personnel in the school system protested the wide use of a personality quiz for individual evaluations. ("Do you sometimes suffer from a trembling feeling in your muscles?" the test asked.) The test has been dropped by the Denver schools this year because, as a Denver guidance official admits, "Some teachers used the results to play God."

Efforts by unorganized groups of parents to halt similar tests have had mixed success. In Whitehall, Ohio, parents complained that the SRA Youth Inventory was a threat to "parental authority and privacy." But the test has been retained as acceptable to the Ohio Education Department. In the suburb of Island Trees, Long Island, complaints from several parents that their 12-year-olds were being quizzed on sex and dating habits in written examinations did stop the use of the youth inventory exam in the seventh grade.

"I take a dim view of current personality tests and I think the general public is being much too frequently taken in by the mumbo-jumbo that goes with them," says Dr. Henry S. Dyer of the nonprofit Educational Testing Service in Princeton, N.J. "The inventories, the projective tests—all of them—are scarcely beyond the tealeaf reading stage."

Gilbert M. Trachtman, past chairman of the School Psychologists' Division of the New York State Psychological Association, describes personality quizzes as rough group instruments that are not accurate enough for individual evaluations. "There is too much overbuying and overselling of them by naive people," he says.

Why, then, are they so commonly used by reputable school administrators? Guidance Expert John W. M. Rothney, of the University of Wisconsin, suggests that it is the result of "amazing psychometric innocence" on the part of teachers, administrators and guidance people, "round-the-clock hucksterism" by test publishers, and the desire to impress with an "array of scores seemingly supported by pedantic jargon."

The popular interest tests—the Kuder Preference Record, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, the California Occupational Interest Inventory—have met with the same skepticism. This year some 2 million schoolchildren will bring home their "Kuder graphs" as vocational guidance evidence. The results may indicate the child is suited for a career in engineering because he checked, among other things, that he would like to "visit a factory in which typewriters are made." Most studies indicate that children's interests change rapidly and radically. Children usually do not enter occupations indicated by interest tests taken in junior or senior high.

A parent may be amused or even impressed by marks on the Kuder graphs, but he would likely be confused by the results of the personality tests. Even if given the opportunity, few parents are equipped to evaluate the findings of these tests. The knowledge that they are being given in local schools often produces dismay or resentment. But the individual parent can do little about it. Some State education laws, which prevent a licensed physician from giving a child an aspirin without parental permission, allow school testers to diagnose maladjustment or potential schizophrenia and have it entered on the child's record without informing the parents.

Despite the public's growing awareness of and opposition to personality tests, there is no letup in their use in schools. The standard college entrance examination and the National Merit Scholarship Corp. are preparing ways to spot personality traits in student applicants. The national testing program, Project Talent, given under direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1960 to 440,000 high school pupils, plans to check up for the next 20 years on the personality scores of those who took the exams—and may discover that a test paper is no place to probe a student's psyche.

APPENDIX 2

KANSAS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT SURVEY—CONDUCTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, BUREAU OF CHILD RESEARCH, LAWRENCE, KANS.—SUPPORTED BY GRANTS FROM THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AND THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

FACTS ABOUT YOURSELF

Please answer all questions completely.

5. How old are you? (Check only one answer.)
(1)------11 years or younger.
(2)------12 years old.
(3)------13 years old.
(4)------14 years old.
(5)------15 years old.
(6)------16 years old or older.

6. Sex:
(1)------Boy.
(2)------Girl.

7. What grade in school are you now in?
(7)------Seventh grade.
(8)------Eighth grade.
(9)------Ninth grade.

8. Are you (check only one answer)—
(1)------An only child?
(2)------The youngest child in your family?
(3)------The oldest child in your family?
(4)------Neither the youngest nor the oldest child?

9. How many living brothers and sisters do you have?
(0)------None.
(1)------One.
(2)------Two.
(3)------Three.
(4)------Four.
(5)------Five or more.

10. What was the highest grade your father finished in school?
(1) ------ Eighth grade or less.
(2) ------ Some high school.
(3) ------ Finished high school.

PART I. RULES WE ALL BREAK

The questions in part I are about more personal things concerning you and your friends. Do not put your name or address on this questionnaire. We want to assure you that your answers will be kept completely secret and confidential. No one will ever know how you answered any of the following questions. We encourage you to be completely honest with your answers.

For the purpose of this study, we are interested in the things you have done during the last 2 years only.

11. Damage or disfigure furniture in schools, such as chairs, tables, and desks:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

12. Steal goods from warehouses or storage-houses:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

13. Damage cemetery property:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

14. Damage or destroy public signs or road markers:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

15. Steal automobile parts such a hubcaps, mirrors, ornaments, etc.
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

16. Kicked, bit or scratched a student of about your own age:
(3) ------ Three or more times.
(2) ------ Twice.
(1) ------ Once.
(0) ------ Never.

17. Get out of going to school by writing a fake excuse for yourself:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

18. Steal or siphon gasoline from cars, trucks, or other kinds of vehicle equipment:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

19. Damage or destroy mailboxes:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

20. Steal more than $2 (money) from your parents:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

21. Puncture or cut automobile tires, bike tires:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

22. Steal materials or equipment from buildings that are being constructed:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

23. Kicked, scratched or bit an adult relative (mother, father, guardian, or uncle, for example):
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Once.
(2) ------ Twice.
(3) ------ Three or more times.

24. Damage or destroy toys or games that belonged to persons your own age:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

25. Steal from buildings that are being torn down:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

26. Tied a person up with rope, string, or wire to a tree or similar object and then left them that way:
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Alone.
(2) ------ With one or more others.
(3) ------ Both alone and with others.

27. Steal things from your parents that were worth more than $2:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

28. Teased severely, hurt, or killed a cat or dog.
(1) ------ Alone.
(2) ------ With one or more others.
(0) ------ Never.
(3) ------ Both alone and with others.

29. Scratch the paint on someone's car on purpose:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

30. Steal more than $2 (money) from your brothers or sisters:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

31. Skip school with one or more friends or classmates:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

32. Steal articles of clothing worth more than $5 from clothing or department stores.
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

33. Become so mad or angry that you threw things at or hit a teacher or principal or other school official:
(3) ------ Both alone and with others.
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Alone.
(2) ------ With one or more others.

34. Steal a bicycle from anyplace other than a place that sells bicycles (like from neighborhoods, schoolgrounds, or public places where bikes may be parked):
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

35. Remove spark plugs or wires from cars:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

36. Steal a car for joyride without the owner's knowledge or permission:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

37. Break or crack windows in automobiles:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

38. Skip school with three or more friends or classmates:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

39. Steal articles of clothing worth less than $5 from clothing store or department store:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

40. Damage flowerbeds or gardens on purpose:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

41. Steal gasoline from gas stations, farms, or other private places:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

42. Taken part in fights where knives or switchblades were used:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

43. Steal a bicycle from a store that sells or repairs bikes:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

44. Skip out of certain class periods, but not the whole day, without permission (like gym class or student assemblies):
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

45. Fought physically and bodily with an adult relative such as mother, father, or aunt (that is, fought in anger or fear, not in sheer fun):
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Alone.
(3) ------ Both alone and with others.
(2) ------ With one or more others.

46. Steal things (not money) from your brothers or sisters that were worth more than $2:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

47. Get out of school early by pretending to your teacher that you were sick or not feeling well:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

48. Steal anything because an adult asked you to steal it:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

49. Beat up a person much older than yourself in a fight?
(0) ------ Never.
(2) ------ With one or more others.
(1) ------ Alone.
(3) ------ Both alone and with others.

50. Steal more than $2 (money) from your friends or classmates:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

51. Damage parking meters on purpose (break glass, jam slot):
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

52. Steal jewelry worth more than $2 from jewelry, department, dime or drugstores:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

53. Skipped school or stayed out of school without a genuine excuse for more than 1 day:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

54. Damage or break coin machines of any kind on purpose:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

55. Damage or ruin personal clothing of classmates or other schoolchildren:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

56. Get out of going to school by pretending to your parents that you were sick:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

57. Steal more than $2 (money) from candy, coke, or cigarette machines:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

58. Leave home with intention of going to school, but just never making it to school (without a good reason):
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

59. Injured or hurt someone not in your family, but arranged matters so that someone else got the blame:
(1) ------ Alone.
(2) ------ With one or more others.
(3) ------ Both alone and with others.
(0) ------ Never.

60. Steal more than $2 from school:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

61. Leave school early without permission:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

62. Try to "get by" without paying the bill in restaurants, cafes, soda fountains:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

63. Skip school by yourself without good excuse from parents:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

64. Taken part in a gang fight against another gang or against one or two other persons:
(1) ------ Once.
(2) ------ Twice.
(3) ------ Three or more times.
(0) ------ Never.

65. Steal things from inside of parked cars:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

66. Break windows on purpose in vacant homes, garages, or other buildings:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

67. Damage or destroy anything because someone "dared" you to do it:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

68. Steal things worth more than $2 from foodstores:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

69. Damage school property other than chairs, tables, and desks:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

70. Curse or use obscene language in speaking to a teacher or other school official:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

71. Steal anything and then sell it to an older teenager or adult:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

72. Damage or destroy anything that belonged to another person, in order to "get even" with that person:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

73. Steal money from public telephones or parking meters:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

74. Hit or strike a teacher, coach, or other school official:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

75. Take part in fights where BB guns, air-pellet guns, or slingshots were used:
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

76. Tease or embarrass someone by stripping or taking his or her clothes off?
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

77. Damage or destroy anything "just for the heck of it":
(1) ------ No.
(2) ------ Yes.

78. Steal less than $2 (money) from candy, coke, or cigarette machines:
(2) ------ Yes.
(1) ------ No.

PART II. ALONE OR WITH OTHERS

Instructions: We are interested in how certain rules are broken. Some people break rules only when they are with others, some break rules only when they are alone, and others break rules both when alone and when with other persons. For each item, check the box that applies to you. If it does not apply to you, leave that item blank.

In the last 2 years, did you:

	(1) Only when alone	(2) Only when with other persons	(3) Both alone and with other persons
11. Steal hubcaps, mirrors, etc., from cars			
12. Puncture or cut tires, convertible tops, scratch the paint on cars			
13. Tie a person up with rope or string and left them that way			
14. Tease, hurt, kill harmless animals			
15. Steal clothing worth less than $5			
16. Steal a car for a joyride			
17. Beat up a person much older than you			
18. Damage or break coin machines			
19. "Get by" without paying the bill in cafes, soda shops, movies, other events			
20. Damage school property on purpose			
21. Steal things in order to sell them			
22. Damage or destroy road markers, signs, mailboxes, street lights			
23. Steal anything worth more than $5 but less than $50			
24. Beat up an adult for his money			
25. Steal anything worth $50 or more			
26. Break into and enter a locked store, gas station, or other buildings			

PART III. YOUR SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

Instructions: In this section are statements about what some boys and girls do most of the time in their time after school and on weekends. Read each statement and decide whether it fits you or does not fit you as you are right now or during this year. If the statement is true of you, that is, if you would say "Yes" to the statement, put a No. 1 next to it. If the statement is not true of you, that is, if you would say "No" to the statement, put a No. 2 next to it.

Be sure to read and to answer each statement with a 1 or a 2. If it fits you fairly well but not exactly, put a 1.

Answers: Put 1 for a "Yes." Put 2 for a "No."

------27. I spend a lot of time with one special friend who is not a member of my family.
------28. I stick pretty much to myself.
------29. I never disobey my parents.
------30. I spend a lot of time with one friend at a time, although I have several close friends.
------31. I spend a lot of time with two or three friends. The group of us play together.
------32. I do some talking about or listening to talk about sexual matters when I am with my friends.
------33. I play with a large group of four or more children in or near my home neighborhood.
------34. I mostly play alone or with my brothers or sisters.
------35. I belong to a group that is often chased after by some adults such as storekeepers, police, or homeowners.
------36. I never catch cold in the winter or spring.
------37. I play with friends my parents do not like.
------38. I never tell lies.
------39. I often share secrets and ideas or hopes with my friends.
------40. I have taken part in kissing and necking while on a date or while alone with a person of the opposite sex.
------41. Most of my friends are my own age or between 11 and 14.
------42. I have never spent a night in a detention home or jail.
------43. Most of my friends are 2 or 3 years older than I am.
------44. I have petted with a person of the opposite sex while on dates or when we were alone.
------45. Most other boys and girls like me.
------46. I try to get other boys and girls to like me.
------47. I have gone further than petting with a person of the opposite sex.
------48. I care a great deal about what other boys (or girls) think of me.
------49. I want to be different somehow from others in my own age group.
------50. I have answered ads in comic books or other magazines which advertised pictures, photographs, or stories about sexual matters.
------51. I like most of all to spend my free time alone.
------52. Some of my friends do not like the way I act.

PART IV. LEISURE ACTIVITY AND FAMILY LIFE

Instructions: The statements in this section are like those in the section you just completed. But these have to do with how you spend your spare time and how you are treated by your parents.

Read each statement. If it applies to you as you are right now or have been during this year, mark the statement with a 1 for a "Yes." If it does not apply to you, mark it with a 2 for a "No."

The statements: Write 1 for a "Yes," and 2 for a "No."

------53. Do you spend more of your free time with your friends than with your family?
------54. Do you go to dances more than once a month?
------55. Do you go out with your mother or father more than once a month? (Movies, dining, social events, etc.)
------56. Is your father fairer about punishment than your mother?
------57. Do you study school work at home less than five times a week?
------58. Is your mother fairer about punishment than your father?
------59. Do you work at a part-time job job once or more a week?
------60. When you do something extra good, do your parents reward you with praise or special privileges or without money?
------61. Do you help around the house doing chores almost every day?
------62. When you have done something wrong or "bad" do your parents try to reason with you?
------63. Do you usually attend at least one movie a week?

------64. Are some children in your family punished more severely than others?

------65. Do you spend time after supper at a local hangout (drugstore, soda shop, bowling alley, etc.) at least two times a month?

------66. Do your parents get all the facts before they punish you?

------67. Do you usually have one or two dates a month or more?

------68. Are the children in your family punished more severely than in other families?

------69. Do you think that your friends have better ideas than your parents do about what a young person should do in his spare time?

------70. Do you usually spend three or more evenings a week away from home?

------71. Are the children in your family ever punished when they do not need it?

------72. Does your father punish you when your mother does not think you should be punished?

------73. Would you like to spend more of free time with your friends than your parents now allow?

------74. Does your mother punish you when your father does not think you should be punished?

------75. Do you feel your mother punishes you fairly?

------76. Do you feel your father punishes you fairly?

77. Below is a line that stands for your grades or marks in school this year, thinking of them lumped together. Make only one check where you best fit.

100	"A" or best possible	90	"B" or high	80	"C" or average	70	"D" or below average	60	"F" or failing

PART V. GUESSING CAUSES

Instructions: Reprinted below is a news story that appeared not long ago in the Kansas City Star. After you read the story carefully, pretend that you are talking the story over with some school friends. None of you knew the boy in the story directly or indirectly, but you are all guessing about why he did what the police claim he did. Then answer the questions that follow the story, indicating what your guesses would probably be. (Names and places in the story have been added or changed.)

The story

"The Kansas City police last night arrested Walter Stevens, age 13, who was caught by Police Sergeant Daniels. Daniels charged the boy with stealing coins from the coin machine and the washing machines in the Whirlaway Laundromat. The policeman said he saw Stevens pry open the coin slots on the machines and remove quarters and dimes. He had $15 in coins in his pocket when arrested.

"The boy's mother, Mrs. William Stevens, said she thought her son was at work at his part-time job in the nearby Roll 'Em bowling alley. He had worked there 2 nights a week for 2 months, she said, and had been earning about 60 cents an hour. The boy's father, William Stevens, 48, is a clerk in the central post office. He works the night shift and was away at the time of the arrest.

"Walter Stevens is a seventh grade student at Wiltmore Junior High School. The Wiltmore principal, Mr. John Savage, reported that young Stevens had been doing very poorly in school for several months, and said that he had been expelled once for breaking school property and had often skipped school.

"When interviewed, young Stevens told this reporter that his father had to work such long hours that he was very seldom home and that his mother was often ill and had to remain in bed. He claimed, 'Nobody at school understands me or tries to help me.'"

Instructions: Now check the statements below that you think provide the best possible explanation for why Walter Stevens did what he did. Remember that these are guesses and that all of them may be true or all may be false.

Put a 1 if you agree, and a 2 if you disagree.

------11. Walter wanted to get more money than he could earn at his job in order to help his poor parents.

------12. Walter was lonely and unhappy at school, where no one understood him.

------13. Walter was raised by bad standards and had not been taught properly what was right and wrong.

------14. Walter had everything against him. He was bound to get into trouble when everything at school and at home went wrong.

------15. Walter was fired from his job at the bowling alley but didn't want to worry his mother, who needed the money he had been giving her.

------16. A gang of young boys managed by a professional thief had organized stealing from laundromats and other service stores, and Walter had fallen in with this gang through his acquaintances at the bowling alley.

------17. Walter liked to steal and had probably been stealing one thing and another for several years before he was caught.

------18. Walter was sick, mentally or physically, but no one at school or at home understood this and helped him.

------19. Other children at school had been selfish and unkind in the past and had kept Walter from building any friendships. His loneliness led him to steal.

------20. Older boys in a gang really broke the coin machines and did the stealing, but they left Walter, who thought they were his friends, when they heard the police car and dumped the coins into his pocket.

------21. Walter's parents had never taken him to Sunday school, where he could have learned what is right and wrong.

------22. Walter wanted to find a way to get decent clothes and money for an allowance. His parents could not give him these things, but he needed them to try to make friends at school.

PART VI. WISHES

Below are listed some wishes that have been expressed by boys and girls in other junior high schools. Read each wish carefully. Then check the wish with an X if you feel it is a wish that you have made or thought about any time during this year. If the wish does not fit you, leave it blank. Check (X) here

------23. I wish I could buy my lunch in the cafeteria more often.

------24. I wish I could afford to go to the movies as often as many of the others in my school.

------25. I wish my family could take me on vacation trips like those that many of the persons in my school have enjoyed.

------26. I wish I were able to dress as well as most or many of the persons in my school.

------27. Many of the students in my class will get to go to college some day, but I probably won't get the chance.

------28. I wish I were physically better built or more attractive.

------29. I wish I were as attractive to the opposite sex as many of my schoolmates.

------30. I wish I could join the Boy or Girl Scouts like many of my classmates.

------31. I wish my parents were more understanding, like the mothers and fathers of many of my classmates.

------32. I wish my family had nearly as much money as the families of many of my classmates.

------33. I might like to be an engineer or a scientist when I grow up, but I probably will not get the chance.

------34. I won't have as good opportunities when I grow up as many of my classmates.

------35. I wish my parents were not so strict with me, and more like the parents of many of my classmates in this way.

------36. I wish my parents were a little more strict with me, like the parents of many of my classmates.

------37. I wish my father and mother were better educated, like the parents of many of my classmates.

------38. I wish my father had as good a job as many of my classmates' fathers.

------39. I wish I could go on dates the way many of my classmates do.

Now write down one wish that you have felt strongly about this past year.

____

____

____

PART VII. SOCIAL VALUES AND FEELINGS

Please answer each question by making a check in the space next to agree or disagree. There are no right or wrong answers. Just report your opinion.

40. Watching television programs such as "Sugarfoot" and the "Donna Reed Show" and "Dobie Gillis" is boring or dull and a waste of time:

(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

41. Having a coke in a drugstore with other boys and girls after school or on a weekend is dull and a waste of time:

(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

42. Watching school athletic contests is boring and a waste of time:

(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

43. Watching school basketball or football games is fun:

(1) ------ Agree.
(0) ------ Disagree.

44. Television programs such as "Cheyenne" and "National Velvet" and "Lassie" are fun to watch:

(1) ------ Agree.
(2) ------ Disagree.

45. The people who get the best jobs when they grow up are usually the people who have friends who do favors for them, rather

than the people who are best trained or educated:
(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

46. Teachers give their praise and recognition to the students who find a way to become their special favorites, whether these students are good workers in school or not:
(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

47. Most teachers do not really like to help students:
(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

48. Teachers give their praise and recognition to the students who work the hardest and learn the most:
(1) ------ Agree.
(0) ------ Disagree.

49. The popular children in any school are the ones who have earned the respect and admiration of other students:
(1) ------ Agree.
(0) ------ Disagree.

50. Teachers have such different ideas about what you are supposed to learn in school that it is impossible to get a clear idea of what is best:
(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

51. People have such different ideas about what is right and wrong that you can't ever get clear ideas on this question:
(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

52. Once some teachers decide that a certain boy or girl is "bad" or a "troublemaker," there is nothing you can do to change their minds:
(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

53. Teachers can usually tell quite well who is learning a lesson and who is not:
(1) ------ Agree.
(0) ------ Disagree.

54. Most parents have very clear ideas about how their children should act on dates and about matters like kissing:
(1) ------ Agree.
(0) ------ Disagree.

55. People in any town have a lot to say about how their town government is run:
(1) ------ Agree.
(0) ------Disagree.

56. The children and adults in any town can help the police do a good job of enforcing the law:
(1) ------ Agree.
(0) ------ Disagree.

57. Students in junior high schools never have any say or influence in what they are taught in their classes.
(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

58. So many other people voted in the national election last fall that it didn't matter to me whether my parents voted or not.
(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

59. If a group of children decide they do not like you, there is nothing much you can do to change their minds.
(0) ------ Agree.
(1) ------ Disagree.

PART VIII. WAYS OF DISCIPLINING YOUNG PEOPLE

Below are various ways by which many parents discipline children and young people. Please answer each question by checking the choice which best tells how your parents have disciplined you during the last 2 years. Answer each question for your mother and your father separately.

Do your parents take away your allowance?

61. Father:
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Very seldom.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(3) ------ Frequently.

62. Mother:
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Very seldom.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(3) ------ Frequently.

Do your parents refuse to speak to you?

63. Mother:
(1) ------ Very seldom.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(0) ------ Never.

64. Father:
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(0) ------ Never.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(1) ------ Very seldom.

Have your parents slapped you or given you spankings?

65. Mother:
(3) ------ Frequently.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Very seldom.

66. Father:
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(1) ------ Very seldom.
(0) ------ Never.

Do your parents forbid you to do something that you were especially planning on doing?

67. Father:
(3) ------ Frequently.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Very seldom.

68. Mother:
(3) ------ Frequently.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(0) ------ Never.
(1) Very seldom.

Do your parents tell you to leave home, or to find a new home if you can't be better?

69. Mother:
(1) ------ Very seldom.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(0) ------ Never.
(3) ------ Frequently.

70. Father:
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(0) ------ Never.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(1) ------ Very seldom.

Do your parents spank you with a stick, belt, hairbrush, or things other than their hands?

71. Mother:
(1) ------ Very seldom.
(0) ------Never.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(2) ------ Sometimes.

72. Father:
(0) ------ Never.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(1) ------ Very seldom.

Do your parents take away some special privileges?

73. Mother:
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Very seldom.

74. Father:
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Very seldom.

Do your parents say they don't love you or warn you that they will stop loving you?

75. Father:
(3) ------ Frequently.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(0) ------ Never.
(1) ------ Very seldom.

76. Mother:
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(1) ------ Very seldom.
(0) ------ Never.

Have your parents beat you up (using their fists, etc.)?

77. Father:
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(0) ------ Never.
(3) ------ Frequently.
(1) ------ Very seldom.

78. Mother:
(3) ------ Frequently.
(2) ------ Sometimes.
(1) ------ Very seldom.
(0) ------ Never.

HON. JAMES CURRAN DAVIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Landrum). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, when this session adjourns it will mark the end of the magnificent service of our friend and colleague, Hon. James Curran Davis, in the Congress of the United States.

The services of this great patriot and legislator have seldom been equalled, and that is conceded by everyone familiar with his record.

Congressman Davis was born in Heard County, Ga. He was a country boy of honest, courageous, and Christian parents. They had little money to speak of, but it was the lack of character rather than the lack of money which was, and is, frowned upon in that little community. Courage, character, and fortitude were his birthright.

There is no such thing as a self-made man, but he personally contributed greatly to his development and, as always, he used good material in the making. He never had any patience with anyone complaining that they were "second class citizens," for he thought anyone whomsoever was exceedingly lucky to live in the United States. He thought the right to pursue happiness and good fortune was all that anyone was entitled to, and that the one who deserved higher status could, with that right, obtain it.

James C. Davis read law in the office of Bryan and Middlebrooks, Atlanta. No scholarship was given him. With the help of his family and friends, he climbed the ladder of success by hard work and devotion to duty. He served in the General Assembly of Georgia from 1924 to 1928; as juge of superior courts of his circuit from January 1934 until January 1947, when he left that office to take his seat in the U.S. Congress. In 1917, he enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and served his country with the same devotion and fidelity that have characterized him in every undertaking.

Congressman Davis was a national Congressman, conscious of the fact that he represented the entire State of Georgia although elected from the Fifth District. He was my people's Congressman, representing them in the highly important, exceedingly laborious, and exacting civil service field, the postal service, and the manpower commission committee in Congress. Every Georgia Congressman represents his entire State, and they have fully accepted that responsibility. We are on different committees, and the only way our people can be served in all phases of government is for each Congressman to know he is the servant of all. Congressman Davis was superb in that role.

Probably no Congressman was ever more honored by his southern colleagues. I am certain that no Congressman ever rendered more ardent and magnificent service to his southern colleagues. In the many fights on the floor involving the rights of the States, constitutional government, and so forth, he was the Parliamentarian and handled that high responsibility with a dedication and ability that gained national recognition.

Mr. Speaker, my office was next door to the office of Congressman Davis for a number of years, and we were together almost daily. I had ample opportunity to know this man and to find out if there was anything cheap or selfish in him. I say there was not, for had there been I had ample time to find it. He is the hardest working man I ever knew. He is thoroughly dedicated to his work and profoundly respected by everyone, and his most ardent critics admit he is honest, brilliant, fair, and dedicated. He stands for constitutional government, the rights of the States, and economy in government. He thinks what he stands for is priceless, and I think so, too. He never hurt his people by any act or deed of commission or omission. When you look upon his completed work, everyone must say it is superb.

This country needs men like James Davis as never before. He will be missed in this Congress as few have ever been missed. We have lost a valiant man, and this is a blow to good government and to the world. We have this consolation, however. James Davis will fight on and on. Who knows but what there is still a great work for him to do back home or with the National Government. He will certainly be found fighting in the ranks trying to lead us back to the Government and the ideas that we, in our better moments, know are imperative, though sacrifice and devotion are required.

To sum it up, I would say that Congressman Davis is the type man you would choose as the executor of your estate, without bond, with perfect assurance that your loved ones would receive everything bequeathed them exactly as provided in the will.

To count James Davis as a friend is a cherished possession. We will all miss him and his devoted and splendid wife and daughter. We have the comfort, however, of knowing that they will never be found wanting in working for and fighting for our common country and destiny.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Speaker, I join with our distinguished colleague from Georgia in paying tribute to the service of the Honorable James C. Davis, of Georgia, who leaves the House of Representatives at the conclusion of this Congress.

I have had the privilege of working rather closely with Judge Davis on the floor of the House and more particularly on the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives. Everything the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester] has said about our distinguished colleague, Judge Davis, is supported by the record. Judge Davis has at all times been in the public eye with his views. He has not hidden his views and impressions of the right course to follow. I think those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him can take a great lesson from his legislative life of courage, character, and hard work.

I appreciate the fact that my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester] has taken this time to say in the Record of this body the things which he has said about the work and service of Judge Davis. I appreciate it as I know many, many others who have shared the experience of working with this great American, Judge Davis, will appreciate it. I thank the gentleman from Georgia and join with him in saying to our other colleagues and to the Nation that this legislative body is losing a great legislator as Judge Davis goes into retirement at the end of this session of Congress.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am exceedingly grateful to the gentleman from North Carolina. I know that Congressman Davis holds him in the highest esteem.

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to our majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for taking this time to pay tribute to one of the very finest gentlemen and colleagues it has been my pleasure to know in my time in the House of Representatives. Jim Davis and I came to Congress together 16 years ago. His wife, Mary Lou, and my wife became friends during our first week here in the House.

Madam Speaker, Jim Davis and I sat side by side on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, where he was a tower of strength and ability, during my first term in the House. He has since become one of the finest legislators ever to have served on that great and important committee.

Jim Davis is a man of rare judgment and of great ability with unswerving loyalty to his country and to his convictions. His departure is going to leave a void among us who know him. He has served his district and his country with distinction. He is my friend—one of the finest friends I have made in this House. I shall miss him. Mrs. Albert and I wish for him and Mrs. Davis every possible happiness and prosperity in their retirement.

Mr. FORRESTER. I express my deep gratitude to our majority leader and I know that the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman Davis, will receive much satisfaction and gratification from the gentleman's generous remarks.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 1 hour special order assigned to me to follow the gentleman from Georgia be given to the gentleman from Georgia at this time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mrs. Granahan). Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from South Carolina, a devoted friend of the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman Davis.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me and appreciate our colleagues of the Georgia delegation permitting me to speak at this time.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman for taking this time to eulogize a man whose indefatigable energy and unimpeachable character and dedication to duty will last as a hallmark in this Congress as long as representative government exists on this earth. The vicissitudes of politics are many and they attack us in various ways. Jim Davis is paying the price of defending the Constitution and States rights, and defending the law against expediency and the pressure groups. If one has to be defeated, I think I would rather be defeated on the grounds by which Jim Davis has been defeated because his defeat is not really a defeat, it is a defeat for the principle which he espouses and the convictions which he possesses. We who know him love him for his unswerving allegiance to those things for which he has given his illustrious life. We will miss him, as the majority leader has said, and this void will not be filled in the distant future either in Georgia or in Washington, D.C.

As the days come and as the days go and as time comes and as our problems wax more and more vexing, we will miss Jim Davis' counsel and his inspiration whose band—our band—grows smaller and smaller each day in the fight for those causes in which we believe. But his work and his dedication to those principles of States rights will inspire us to carry on the fight which he has waged. I want to thank the gentleman for taking this time. We will miss Jim Davis and the country will miss him, and mark you this word—Atlanta, Ga., will miss him.

Mr. FORRESTER. I appreciate the splendid remarks of our friend from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers].

Mr. FLYNT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Madam Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester] and the remarks of the majority leader of the House of Representatives and with the others who have spoken and those who will hereafter speak on this occasion.

I personally shall miss Jim Davis when he leaves the House of Representatives. He has been the living exemplification of courage, of loyalty, and of devotion to duty. He has been a dedicated Member of the House of Representatives just as he, during his entire lifetime, has been a devoted and dedicated patriot who believes in this country, who believes in the basic instrument of our Government, the Constitution of the United States.

James C. Davis, a Representative from Georgia, representing the Fifth Congressional District, was born in Fayette County which is one of the 15 counties comprising the Fourth Congressional District. I cannot remember when I did not know him. I really believe I have known him all my life. Jim's father and my father served together in the General Assembly of the State of Georgia. They were good friends. They remained good friends during the lifetime of my father.

Judge Davis served in World War I. He served as county attorney for De Kalb County. He served as a member of the General Assembly of Georgia. He served as a distinguished judge of the superior courts of Stone Mountain judicial circuit of Georgia. He was serving in the capacity of judge of the superior court when in 1946 he was elected to represent the Fifth District of Georgia in the 80th Congress. Since his election to the House of Representatives he has remained stanch and steadfast in adhering to those principles in which he believes. He has held fast to those things in which he believes, knowing, but not fearing, that the position which he should take might bring about his defeat for renomination to this body. He has campaigned hard, he has campaigned well; in each election up until the one of last month he has heretofore emerged as victor.

I want to say this, on the morning after the runoff primary in our State, Jim Davis showed himself in defeat to be a good loser as he has always demonstrated himself to be a good Congressman. When someone asked him to what he attributed his defeat, his reply was quick and unreserved. He said: "The only thing to which I attribute my defeat is the fact that my opponent received more votes than I did."

There is no bitterness in the heart of James C. Davis. He is a big man, he is a truly great man, he is a courageous man. He has a heart, a mind, and a soul dedicated to this country which we love and which we cherish, and to the principles which have caused it to grow to a position of leadership among the nations of the world.

Madam Speaker, it is with a tinge of sadness that we say our final goodbys to James C. Davis, a Representative from Georgia. We wish for him every success in whatever he undertakes, and a long life and many years of service to his country, to his State, and to our people.

We say to you, Jim Davis, as you return to private life: It has been a pleasure and a rare privilege and a high honor to have served with a man of your principle, of your courage, and of your prestige. We wish you good luck and Godspeed. May God bless you and your loved ones.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to one of the stanchest and best friends that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Davis] had. I believe he wants me to recognize him. Therefore, I take great pleasure in recognizing the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Colmer]. We all know that they would like for me to prefer him in order that he might speak in regard to a friend and one who battled all the way with him during the entire time he was in Congress.

Mr. COLMER. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to my very good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester] for yielding to me and for arranging this program so that some of us who were close to Jim Davis in his service in the House might have an opportunity to dwell upon his virtues and to wish him well as he leaves this Chamber.

Madam Speaker, so many people have already said what is in the minds and hearts of all of us about Jim Davis that there is really very little left to say. However, I do want to emphasize one of the things that has been said, and that is that Jim Davis never counted what the popular side of an issue was. He decided rather what was for the best interests of his people whom he had the honor to represent, and of his great country that he was so devoted to.

Jim Davis to me symbolized a virtue that I must confess I have found to be too rare in political life, and that is political courage. I worked with Jim Davis throughout his stay here in an effort to preserve this Republic to which he was so dedicated and its institutions.

Many, many times, when we met informally to discuss the approach to certain assaults that were being made upon the Constitution of the United States, and when a question was raised about the impracticability of doing anything about it, when someone would suggest, "That is fine, but we cannot get anywhere with it," his favorite reply was: "Well, if George Washington had sat down there on the front porch in his rocking chair at Mt. Vernon instead of going to Valley Forge, we might not have had this Republic."

Madam Speaker, in my book this Chamber and this Nation have lost the services of a true patriot.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. Landrum].

Mr. LANDRUM. Madam Speaker, I personally became acquainted with Jim Davis when he was judge of the superior court sitting in De Kalb County. While I knew him in this position as a practicing attorney only casually, I learned while he was in that position that he was a careful student of the law, a very thorough student, as a matter of fact.

It was not, however, until I had the privilege of coming to Congress that I got to know Jim on the intimate terms that we learn to know each other here and develop friendships. While here it was not long before I learned that Jim Davis was a man of deep convictions. As the gentleman from Mississippi who just preceded me so eloquently stated, he is a man who possesses rare political courage.

Madam Speaker, Jim served with absolutely no fear of the political consequences. He was a thorough student of all the legislation with which we are confronted here in the House of Representatives. If he did not have all of the information concerning a particular bill or a particular matter then pending before the House, he would search out a Member whom he thought might have that information and discuss it with him. While doing so, he impressed one as an extremely good listener. While he was a very good listener, he was not one just to listen and not disagree. If the one with whom he was discussing the matter took a position with which he disagreed or interpreted a matter of legislation in a different fashion from his interpretation, he could challenge that position with the grace, the ease, and the knowledge rarely found in an individual today. Associating with one who demonstrates such qualities as these which I have tried to enumerate is always pleasant. But to me it has gone beyond being a mere pleasant association, for I can say that his example as a thorough student, as a sound defender and a courageous defender of his own convictions, has been a reward for me in the form of a friendship that I shall not forget.

Madam Speaker, the friendship which I have been privileged to enjoy with him here shall continue with me through the years. It will be one which I shall always cherish and which I shall look upon as a source of inspiration at times when courage is needed.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I would be delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, I would not want the Record to indicate that the admirers of our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Jim Davis, all come from one State of this Nation or from one section of the country or indeed from one side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, I have served with our colleague for 10 years, and I think while he might not recognize it, I have always looked upon him as a person of the highest integrity. In some respects at times I may have differed as far as convictions were concerned, but never once have I ever failed to recognize that our colleague was motivated by the highest integrity and the utmost in intellect.

Certainly it comes to me that this House will be losing something we need very much when in the next session of Congress Jim Davis will not be here. We will be losing that something that has made this a great deliberative body. That something is a quality in a Member of the Congress which impels him to do what he thinks is right, to study every question and then to act as he thinks best.

Madam Speaker, I believe truly that when Jim Davis leaves this body he will have set an example to many of us who hope to return and will leave with us the hope that as we serve we may be as true to our ideals as he was to his.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Stephens].

Mr. STEPHENS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me so that I may have this opportunity to join with the Georgia delegation and other Members of the House in paying tribute to our colleague who is retiring, the Honorable James C. Davis of the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia.

As I have listened to my colleagues in the House, I know that Jim Davis is highly respected and well loved by everyone who has known him here. But there is one thing that has impressed me most of all as the Members have spoken about Congressman Davis. They have emphasized one word, and I think that one word personifies the career of the Honorable James C. Davis. That is the word "service." We are talking today about the end of his congressional service.

We have also spoken about the fact that he performed a service as judge in the courts of Georgia. We have also heard that he performed legislative service in the State of Georgia as a member of the Georgia Legislature. But there is one character of service that has not been mentioned, and that is the personal service that Jim Davis performed for every one of us.

I have been here for 2 years and whenever I asked him to do a personal service for me he never hesitated and went the extra mile to give me that personal service that perhaps I did not deserve but which he was unstintingly willing to give and gave most pleasantly and in every way performed as any deep friend could.

Before I actually took my seat in the House from the 10th Congressional District of Georgia I came here to visit and sat in the gallery with a man who pointed out various Members of the House to me. At that time they were only names. This man pointed out Jim Davis, of Georgia, and he said to me then that Jim Davis is one of the very few Members of the House of Representatives whose principles are so steadfast that he would rather go down in defeat than compromise his position. I think that is what happened to him in the present situation.

Madam Speaker, I would like to express one final thought about the Honorable James C. Davis. Knowing the pressures that were placed upon him, and knowing the pressures that are placed upon a Member of Congress, the deepest inspiration to me in my first term in the House of Representatives came from the way that he was able to withstand those pressures and to say stanchly that he would not compromise doing what he thought was right. That is the way I characterize him and shall always characterize him; he always did what he thought was right.

I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to our colleague from Georgia [Mr. Hagan].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciate also the opportunity which has been afforded me by my distinguished colleague, Congressman Forrester, to add a few comments to the many wonderful statements which have been made here this afternoon by those who have had the privilege of serving with Congressman Davis longer than I have. Certainly it has been a great privilege for me to serve this 1 term with our distinguished colleague, James C. Davis. I had the privilege of knowing of him for many years and the privilege of meeting him a number of years ago while I was serving as a member of the State Legislature of Georgia. It has been a great experience to be closely associated with him here in the Congress of the United States. Last year, after being sworn in, I was named to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and had the added privilege of serving on the same committee with him.

To the many statements that have been made about his personal integrity and his political courage, and these other fine comments about Jim Davis, I can say that I personally know that he is a man of great character and great ability. I wish it were possible to add up in sums of money the amounts that Jim Davis has been personally responsible for in savings to the taxpayers of this Nation while serving on that particular committee as chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, as well as his other actions on that committee and as a Member of this body.

He is a great individual to know. I will close my remarks by saying that it has been a rare privilege and pleasure for me to have served with James C. Davis in the Congress of the United States. To him and his charming lady, my wife and I extend our best wishes for the future. May their greatest years be yet to come.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I could not be on the floor on such an occasion and not join my colleagues from Georgia in paying tribute to a very fine gentleman, the Honorable James C. Davis.

When we come to Congress, of course, we have preconceived notions. I had an image of what the perfect southern gentleman should be—I thought. But I can truly say after having served 10 years in the House with Jim Davis that my image of a perfect southern gentleman now is almost a perfect likeness of the person and character of Jim Davis.

He is a man who has the courage of his convictions and the ability to articulate his convictions and, better than that, to stand up for them. We have too few people like that. I think on both sides of the aisle, whether or not we agree with everything said by the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable James C. Davis, we agree that this House will be the poorer because he will not be here. The reason this is so is that we will have lost a man who has the kind of courage which is becoming altogether too rare in this country. He combined this courage with the ability to point out the defects in our Government and laud those parts of it he thought praiseworthy. He has the quality of being not only a fine Congressman but a good citizen.

I can also say that he is a friend whom I will miss personally. I wish to him and to his fine wife, as they go into much deserved retirement, all of the best of everything which the good Lord can provide to people who deserve the best.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. John W. Davis] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHN W. DAVIS. Madam Speaker, strange as it may seem, I was not personally acquainted with my esteemed colleague from Georgia prior to the time I came to Washington as a Member of the 87th Congress, even though we bear the same surname and have backgrounds which are in many respects similar.

My acquaintance with him soon developed into lasting friendship, and my life has been made richer by virtue of my association with Jim Davis.

I do not think I ever saw a man more dedicated to his job, more conscientious in the performance of his work, more unswerving in his devotion to duty, or more uncompromising when it comes to choosing between right and wrong.

James C. Davis is loved and respected on both sides of the aisle, and he is noted for his keen ability to get to the heart of matters. His contributions to the work of this body have been many and will be long remembered.

Despite the many responsibilities imposed upon him by the work of his committees, he has always taken the time to inform himself of every important piece of legislation under consideration. Although he has assumed great responsibilities, he has always been most considerate, kind, and helpful to anyone who came to him regarding problems of government, legislation, or politics.

He leaves the House of Representatives a better legislative body because he served in it, and his record is one which deserves the emulation of every Member of Congress.

Mr. LIBONATI. Madam Speaker, our colleague, James Davis, of Georgia, affectionately called "the Judge," retires from the Congress where he has served for 16 years. He was unswerving in his loyalties to the philosophies and traditions of the South. His conservative attitudes in Government fiscal problems marked him as a keeper of the taxpayers' purse. His tight rein on legislation involving the expenditures and increased cost reforms of the District of Columbia's government earned for him both commendation and criticism.

He was a valued legislator in the economy bloc and frowned upon loose spending on new Government services that meant added funds.

He was uncompromising in any position that he took that he felt was right.

His philosophy of life was that of the true southern gentleman what must be, must be—let well enough alone. With his retirement a deep sense of nostalgia seizes us and we regret his passing into retirement. He treated his subject with finesse—although there was no question where he stood.

In sensitive areas of discussion as on civil rights he would hew straight to the line—he clung tenaciously to the social stratification of the white superiority of the race.

He was an industrious and active House Member. Even though we did not agree with his arguments in debate, yet his effort showed great preparation and meticulous care in arranging his facts and data. He cultivated a mental control over the sequence of evidence in his argument that sometimes were on their face irrefutable.

A great southern leader is leaving an old scene to him—16 years of membership in the House, 80th to 87th Congress. We bid him on his way with the good will and admiration of his colleagues and the blessings of good fortune in his future pursuits.

Mr. GROSS. Madam Speaker, it has been my privilege since coming to Congress 14 years ago to serve on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee with the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia.

It has also been my privilege to serve with him on the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of which he is the chairman and I the ranking minority member. Through this service and association I became intimately acquainted with him and I wish to say that there is no Member of Congress whom I hold in greater respect and esteem.

JAMES C. DAVIS, or Judge DAVIS as we often addressed him, has those rare qualities of courage, conviction, capability, and integrity. His word is his bond. Having taken a position, having reached a conviction, he does not waver nor succumb to pressure and blandishment.

It has been both a privilege and a pleasure to serve under the chairmanship of JAMES C. DAVIS, for he was fair at all times. Although of different political affiliation, I can say without fear of contradiction on the part of my colleagues on the subcommittee that Chairman DAVIS was never unfair to the minority members; never did partisan politics enter into the work of the subcommittee.

It may not be realized, but I want to say here and now that the retirement of JAMES C. DAVIS is a loss the Fifth District of Georgia, the State of Georgia, and the House of Representatives could ill afford.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] for offering this opportunity to make known my feeling toward my good friend, a true conservative American.

Whatever the future, I wish for Judge DAVIS and his wife, Mary Lou, the health and contentment they abundantly deserve.

Mr. McMILLAN. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I want to join all my colleagues in saying a few words concerning the fine service my colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, has rendered the people of his State and country during the 16 years he has been a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. It has been my pleasure and privilege to serve on the District Committee with Judge DAVIS and I am certain that my colleagues will agree with me that he has been solely responsible for saving the taxpayers of this country more than a billion dollars during the time he has been serving in the Congress.

Judge DAVIS is a great advocate of States' rights, law and order, and believes in the principles set out in the Constitution of the United States. I do not know of any man who has ever served in Congress, during the 24 years I have been privileged to be a Member of that body, who has made a better impression on me than Judge DAVIS. He has never been known to compromise a principle. I am certain that if the District Commissioners, the President, and the courts had supported the principles and legislation advocated by Judge DAVIS during the time he has been a Member of the District Committee, there would be very little crime here in the Nation's Capital at the present time.

The State of Georgia and the entire Nation have suffered a great loss in losing Judge DAVIS' services as a Member of the U.S. Congress. I personally do not know of any man who can properly fill his shoes as a lawmaker here on Capitol Hill. As chairman of the Police and Firemen's Subcommittee which also handles numerous judicial bills and other bills relative to legal matters in the District of Columbia, he has always done a wonderful job and will leave a record second to none as a lawmaker. I know that Judge DAVIS will be greatly relieved from the terrific pressure he has always had upon him from left-wing groups who were not satisfied to disagree with his viewpoints on legislation but made an effort to destroy his character on numerous instances by handling the truth extremely recklessly.

In my humble opinion the day will come when certain people in the city of Washington and the United States will wish that they had a person of Judge DAVIS' intestinal fortitude as a Member of the U.S. Congress. Madam Speaker, I could write pages and pages of history on the good work Judge DAVIS has done during the time he has served as a Member of Congress; however, I want to take this brief moment to express publicly my opinion as to how much his services will be missed and the people of the United States, including the people of Georgia, will be the losers in this case and not Judge DAVIS.

My sincere wish is for Judge DAVIS and Mrs. Davis to hâve an opportunity to enjoy some of the good things of life, after the Judge's retirement, which they have been unable to take advantage of during the busy years Judge DAVIS has served the people of his district and the United States so well.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Madam Speaker, JIM DAVIS, of Stone Mountain, Ga., and I have had a great deal in common during our term of service in Congress. JIM, of course, represents the district of which the great city of Atlanta is a part, and I come from the Birmingham district. In effect, Birmingham and Atlanta are sister cities, both making substantial contributions to the economic well-being of the Southeastern States.

Because of the similarity of our districts, it was natural when I first came to Congress in 1955 to immediately look up JIM DAVIS to get his advice on how best to represent the interests of my district in Congress. JIM's advice was at that time and over the years since has been most helpful and constructive.

The one quality I admire most in JIM DAVIS is his courage and the tenacity with which he stands by his convictions. I do not think that there is a Member of this House who has more strength of character and fortitude in resisting pressures than JIM DAVIS. His is a rich record of public service and his accomplishments in this body comprise a long list from which he will continue to draw great satisfaction.

JIM has represented the great metropolitan area of Atlanta well over the past 16 years and will be sorely missed by the people of Georgia's fifth district, the entire State of Georgia, and people throughout this country. I join with his many other friends, in Congress and out, in wishing him and his lovely wife, Mary Lou, much happiness in their retirement.

Mr. ABBITT. Madam Speaker, many fine Members of this body will be leaving us at the close of this session, but none, in my opinion, will be greater missed than the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia. Judge DAVIS has served here with distinction for 16 years. He has given his constituents, in the Fifth District of Georgia, excellent representation—and he has given to the people of the United States the benefit of his broad experience, his calm judgment, and his considered deliberation on matters of national scope.

As a member of the House District Committee, Judge DAVIS has rendered invaluable service in helping to administer the complicated and tedious affairs of the District of Columbia. Time does not permit a recitation of the scores of District activities in which he has had a role. His battles here have not all been won but the Judge has given unstintingly of his time and energies in trying to make this a better place in which to live.

He has likewise been a valuable member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. He knows the problems of the Federal worker and has given much time and attention to the activities of the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission.

Judge DAVIS is a stalwart defender of States' rights and is about as strong on principle as any man I have ever known. He has refused to yield to the pressure of minority groups and has taken a vigorous stand against Federal usurpation of power. The Judge believes wholeheartedly in good government—and has done all he could to promote it—but he believes that government should be the servant of the people and not their master.

Not only the State of Georgia but the Nation has suffered a loss when Judge DAVIS leaves this membership. His place will be difficult to fill. His memory will linger long.

I wish to express my personal appreciation of his friendship and extend to him my best wishes for the years that lie ahead.

Mr. DOWDY. Madam Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to our beloved colleague, James C. Davis, of Georgia. I regret that the House will lose the vast knowledge, experience, and service of this able legislator next session.

I have the very highest regard for Judge Davis, both as a colleague and friend. I have never met a man more dedicated to serving the interests of the people than Jim Davis. He has spent the most productive years of his life in their service, always vigilant in the protection of individual liberty and freedom. The American way of life and its preservation is a religion in this great statesman's life, second only to his service to God.

The people of Georgia and the Nation can forever be proud of his service and accomplishments. His matchless understanding, attention to minute detail, accuracy of information and honest frankness on all matters, whether great or small, caused an immense demand for his advice and counsel by all who know and respect him.

My very best wishes and warmest personal regards go with Judge Davis as he leaves his place of service in the House. He deserves the plaudit, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." I know his love for and service to our country will be no less devoted in his retirement.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Madam Speaker, as this session closes, we all realize that next year there will not be here with us a man from Georgia, whom we have all grown to love and to respect, Jim Davis. Personally, he is a living example to all that is best in Southern manhood, a true gentleman. Legislatively, he has contributed to the passage of much good legislation and to the defeat of much bad legislation. The quality that most significantly marks this man as outstanding is the quality of steadfast adherence to principal. This is the quality of public life that draws the line between men who are just politicians and those who are statesmen, too. Jim Davis has earned the title of statesman. As he goes back to his home State he does so with the respect and love of each of us here; and I hope that this may bring him joy in all of the days of his life.

Mr. DORN. Madam Speaker, Judge James C. Davis and I have stood together in many a fight for constitutional government; for States rights, for freedom of government at the local level, and for a maximum of individual liberty. Judge Davis epitomizes the rugged individual, self-reliant, early American who carved out of this wilderness America, the greatest civilization the world has ever known.

Judge, in your service here, you are devoted to the great free enterprise economic and political order which caused the United States to be known around the world as the arsenal of democracy and the heart and core of freedom. Judge, I will always remember you as one of our outstanding Congressmen, not only of our time, but of the history of our country.

The thinking people of the Nation's Capital are grateful to you for your service to them beyond the call of duty. You have served all of America by curbing the onward march of socialism, government bureaucracy, and excessive taxation. You hold high the high traditions, the heritage, and the honor of the great empire State of the South, and the magnificent State of Georgia.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for you, Mrs. Davis, Mary Martin, and your fine son-in-law the very best always, and, Judge, come to see us in South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. Madam Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when we lose a good friend. Upon the adjournment of this Congress one of the great Members of this body, James C. Davis, will conclude his services on the floor of this House. We who have had the privilege of working with him have learned to love him because of what he is and what he stands for.

Jim Davis has proven to his colleagues that he is a man of principle, honor, integrity, and ability. His unimpeachable character is reflected in the respect and trust of his colleagues. His record shows that he has always been a most devoted public servant who willingly, energetically, and capably represented his constituents. I have never know anyone to be more dedicated to the responsibilities and duties of his office. Robert E. Lee said: "Duty is the sublimest word in the language," and I am sure that if Lee were here today he would join me in describing Jim Davis as a living example of sublime duty.

Our friend has many wonderful attributes, but one of his most admirable qualities is courage. He has spiritual, mental, moral, physical, and political courage. When necessary he can be as stoical as any man. And he is always a stoic when defending the Constitution of this Nation and the principle of States rights, both of which he believes in to the very depths of his heart and soul. Too many people who hold public office today are willing to cast thin votes and use their influence for what is best described as political expediency, but Jim Davis did not let political expediency control his actions and voice in the House of Representatives. No doubt he could have been reelected as a Member of this body if he had put less emphasis on the U.S. Constitution and the philosophy of our Founding Fathers, and relied more heavily on political expediency. But he preferred defeat in the recent Georgia primary election rather than the surrendering of his lifelong principles in exchange for votes.

We desperately need more men like Jim Davis in high governmental offices today. And not only his congressional district but the welfare of the entire Nation will suffer as a result of his defeat. In the future, though he is not with us in person, the influence and spirit of this man will linger long in this Chamber.

Mr. FISHER. Madam Speaker, during the 20 years I have served in this body I cannot recall a Member who has deserved and won such profound respect as has been true with our colleague, Jim Davis. The Fifth District of Georgia has indeed been well represented. By his service on the District Committee the District of Columbia has been ably represented, in keeping with the interest of the entire Nation in District affairs. And above all, the entire country has been well represented by this great statesman from the State of Georgia.

He has been a tower of strength. He has been a leader at a time when leadership has been so useful and so valuable. Jim Davis has risen above the bickering and the petty partisanship to provide the courage and statesmanship that has contributed so often to the cause of good government.

Jim Davis has been a bastion of strength during many a House battle to maintain fiscal responsibility in this country. While others may have yielded to expediency and pressures, our friend from Georgia has been steadfast, regardless of the possible political repercussions. If it were possible for this Congress to be blessed with more men of the Jim Davis caliber, the future of our country would be much more secure.

His loss is indeed a tragedy for the Fifth District of Georgia, and in a broader sense it is a tragedy for the entire Nation. In these times of peril, plagued by a mammoth public debt, with our national security being challenged abroad and our free enterprise system facing an uncertain future here at home, the need for the type of courage, statesmanship, and leadership provided by Jim Davis is self-evident.

I join with the hundreds of others here who regret to see Jim Davis go. The loss of his example of good conduct and the absence of his inspiring leadership can hardly be replaced. I wish for him and his family good health, much happiness, and a continuation of his role as a citizen who loves his country and is dedicated to its preservation.

Mr. GARY. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to our fellow Member, the gentleman from Georgia, James C. Davis. He was an indefatigable worker and has established a record of which he may be justly proud. He has served his district, station, and Nation well. I extend to him my very best wishes for health, prosperity, and success in all of his future undertakings. We shall miss him here in the House of Representatives, but when he departs he will carry with him the best wishes of every Member.

Mr. HENDERSON. Madam Speaker, all of us who have had the privilege of serving on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 87th Congress with the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable James C. Davis, have particularly benefited from his wise counsel. His keen grasp of postal and civil service affairs, his patience, and his deep understanding of the legislative process made him a valuable and effective committee member.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I always found Judge Davis willing to go out of his way to assist me in every possible manner.

Washington's loss is Georgia's gain and Judge Davis undoubtedly will enjoy many pleasant and fruitful years in Stone Mountain.

We shall miss him deeply.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Madam Speaker, it was a great pleasure for me to find that our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] had arranged for this time during the busy closing days of this Congress in order that we might make this modest recognition of the extraordinary record of public service of the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JAMES CURRAN DAVIS.

This surely is the first time that I have referred to our colleague, JIM DAVIS, in so formal a way, for he has been, from first pleasant encounter to this day, and, I hope, will be for many years to come, just JIM DAVIS, my friend.

Friendly, forthright, conscientious, and courageous—these are just a few of the adjectives which come quickly to mind in thinking of JIM DAVIS. He has been a dedicated servant of his Nation, his State, and his district. That his counsel no longer will be available officially here is a loss to all levels of government, but we who have been privileged to serve with him know that our beloved colleague will not be lost to public service. JIM DAVIS, we know, will be called on to serve the people in some other capacity, and, as always, he will respond to the call with humility, but with determination to do his best in behalf of righteous causes.

I did not know, until I heard my friend, Judge FORRESTER, recall it, that Judge DAVIS had served as a Marine during World War I, but I was not surprised. JIM DAVIS is the epitome of the southern gentleman, but he is a fightingman. When he believes the cause just, he will not spare himself. Right is right to him, and political considerations are incidental.

Above all, our colleague reveres the Constitution of the United States. As an attorney and judge, he has studied constitutional law through the years. He has gained a remarkable insight into the genesis of this charter of our Government. He knows what its framers intended it to mean, and he knows it means the same today, despite the illicit redrafting by Federal judges turned legislators.

While he has other highly important committee assignments during his service here, I have always admired particularly his conscientious attention to his responsibilities as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. He has believed in the importance of making the Nation's Capital a safe place in which to live and to rear children. His investment of time and effort in support of this belief certainly meant little politically at home in Georgia, whose citizens he served devotedly here, but it is not in JIM DAVIS' makeup to slough off any responsibility. His retirement from the Congress will be as serious a loss to the District of Columbia, as it will be to Georgia, and to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Madam Speaker, I should like to add my voice to the chorus of regretful goodbyes which are being said to our esteemed and valued colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS.

I have had the privilege of knowing Judge DAVIS for only 2 years, but during this time I have come to entertain for him the highest respect and regard. As a freshman Member of the 87th Congress, I recall with appreciation the many kindnesses and courtesies which he extended to me and his unfailing interest and cooperation in any matter discussed with him.

Judge DAVIS has upheld the highest traditions of this body, and his presence and his influence will be greatly missed in these Halls. His devotion to constitutional principles and his adherence to what he believed to be right, never yielding to the blandishments of political expediency or the theory of the easy way out, have endeared him to all of us as a person of high and undeviating principle. He will be missed but his influence will still be felt in his State and Nation. He is a fine southern gentleman and a distinguished public servant, whom it was an honor and a privilege to know.

Mr. MATHIAS. Madam Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in expressing a few words concerning the loyal and dedicated service my colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, has rendered to the people of his State and country during his 16 years of service as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to serve on the District of Columbia Committee with Judge DAVIS, as he is familiarly referred to by his friends, during my first term of office. I would not want the record to show that the admirers of our colleague all come from one State, or section of the country, or from one side of the aisle. At times, I have differed as far as convictions were concerned on legislative issues with Judge DAVIS, but never once have I failed to recognize the fact that he was motivated by personal integrity and deepest concern. He had a quality to be admired by all of his colleagues, the determination to stand for what he thought was right under all circumstances. He is highly respected by both sides of the aisle and is noted for his unswerving loyalty to his country, his conscientious dedication to his job and his sterling character. His office lights burned from early morning to late at night. Judge DAVIS will be remembered as a vigorous Congressman and a stout-hearted American. I wish for him and his family much happiness and the blessing of good fortune in his future pursuits.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, I am proud to join others in paying deserving tribute to Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, of the State of Georgia, who leaves this body at the end of this session.

It has been my happy privilege to be closely associated with Judge DAVIS throughout the 16 years we have served together in the House of Representatives, both as a personal friend and fellow Congressman.

Judge DAVIS can take pride in the record of legislative accomplishments which he leaves behind. Indeed, his work as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has been outstanding, and much fine legislation bears his name as its author. As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, he has wielded a tremendous influence for good on the affairs of our Capital City. Judge DAVIS has been a relentless crusader for law and order, and perhaps the best friend the police and firemen have ever had in the Congress. Except for his work, I am sure the crime rate in the District would have been much higher, and he deserves the thanks and gratitude of all its peace-loving and law-abiding citizens.

Though Judge DAVIS' legislative record is one of great accomplishment, the qualities of character which he always exhibited in all matters, whether personal or political, have been his real hallmark of distinction.

Judge DAVIS is a man who has a profound faith in the genius of our American system. He has risen on many occasions to defend the cherished principles of our Constitution when they were being trampled upon by power-hungry political demagogs. While his people have been made the victims of political chicanery, he has always risen to their defense.

Judge DAVIS is a dedicated American patriot. He is a man of convictions, with the courage and ability to put those convictions forward.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that Judge DAVIS will not be with us next year, not only because of our warm personal friendship, but because America sorely needs his kind of statesmanship.

I am grateful for the opportunity of knowing Judge DAVIS as a friend, and I hope that in years to come, he will visit us often in this Chamber. I am sure others will join in wishing for him and his family an abundance of God's richest blessings throughout their future years.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the character and service of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. IRIS BLITCH

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, it is with deep regret that this House takes note of the fact that one of those extraordinary people, our lovable and capable colleague, Congresswoman IRIS BLITCH, will sever her official relationship with this House at the end of the present year. The respect and admiration which this entire House holds for her is exceedingly genuine and it is with sadness that we see her go. We all recognize the fact, however, that sickness has caused her to make the voluntary decision to leave this body, a decision we do not believe that the voters of her district would have made. She is a great fighter for what she thinks is right, and she will certainly be missed here. But she can leave with the knowledge that she has contributed much in the writing and making of history during the most crucial period of human existence.

Mrs. Blitch was the first woman ever elected in Georgia for a full term in the U.S. House of Representatives. She was elected by a large majority for three other terms, or for a period of 8 years, because she was an honor to the people she served, her native State, and her country.

She had served in the General Assembly of Georgia, both in the house and senate, and during that time she was one of the leaders in those bodies. I remember now that she took a leading part in changing the laws of our State so that women might serve on juries. For many years, she was a leader in the State Democratic Party, and one time occupied the position of secretary of the State party, and later she was national committeewoman from the State of Georgia in the National Democratic Party.

During her term in Congress, she received the great honor of being named Woman of the Year in Agriculture by the Progressive Farmer; she was cited for her fine work in soil conservation in an award from the Georgia Sportsmen's Federation; and she received the meritorious service citation from the Rehabilitation Commission of the American Legion. It was almost entirely due to her efforts that the great Okefenokee Swamp, one of nature's wonders, was afforded protection and efforts made for its full preservation. Mrs. Blitch was a member of the great Public Works Committee in the House and had the privilege of working for many of the fine flood control projects and rivers and harbors projects which have meant so much to our section and country. Her seniority, coupled with her ability and energy, has placed her where her services would have been of untold value to Georgia by bringing to our State the development of our streams.

Mrs. Blitch resides in the little town of Homerville, and she and her husband are and have been favorites of that community. She will, together with her husband, continue to work for the good of her community and for the good of humanity in every way that her health will permit.

I know this entire House joins me in expressing our very best wishes and our great affection to this family, and our deep appreciation for what they have meant to the human race.

Mr. LANDRUM. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Madam Speaker, in addition to the many splendid qualities of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester] has just spoken for the Record about this charming gentlewoman from Georgia, I think it can be truthfully said also that she is a real fighter for the things in which she believes.

I recall my first acquaintance with Mrs. Blitch, at a time when the State Legislature of Georgia was engaged in trying to decide who would be the Governor of Georgia. On that occasion I found myself on the opposite side of the aisle from her and lost. Later, through a court decision, we won; and then after the decision the side on which she was fighting was presented to the people, and we lost rather soundly. This experience told me that Mrs. Blitch was very skilled in politics, very determined in her convictions, and very courageous in her actions.

Then I had the rare privilege of serving with her as a Member of this House and observing the items in which we were in agreement the greater part of the time—the dedication, the skill, and the courage with which she advanced the interests of the southeastern district of Georgia which she represents, the Eighth District.

She was completely dedicated to the development of the great Okefenokee Swamp, so that all of those who were privileged to tour through Georgia and particularly South Georgia might have the advantage of seeing and studying this great natural beauty and asset. Moreover, she was a determined worker for the development of our water resources in this country and in her State as well. She was a determined worker for legislation that brought greater development in our highways and in the transportation facilities of this country.

Her voluntary retirement from the Congress resulted from a breakdown in her health, which in the opinion of those who were privileged to know her well, came from her complete dedication to her duties and the zeal and vigor with which she approached her responsibilities as a Member of Congress.

It has been a genuine personal privilege, a very happy experience to have served in this great legislative body with a gentlewoman from my own State of the courage, the character, and the charm—the real southern charm—this lady possesses.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Speaker, I want to join my friends from Georgia in the tribute they are paying to our lovely and lovable colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. Blitch]. She is a wonderful person, charming, intelligent and of good humor. She has courage, both physical and moral. I have never known anyone more persistent in her devotion to duty. I have seen her sit here on the floor attending to every item of duty when she was ill and in pain. She is a real soldier.

Madam Speaker, Iris Blitch is a lady, a gentlelady indeed, but she is also a knowledgeable legislator. She has fine judgment, an instinct for politics, the most difficult and yes, Madam Speaker, perhaps the most important of all the sciences and arts. She has been my friend, and I treasure her friendship. I shall miss her. I wish for her and her loved ones many years of health, happiness and prosperity.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I certainly want to express our deep gratitude to the majority leader, both for myself and for the entire Georgia delegation, for the splendid and well-deserved remarks that were made by our colleague on Congresswoman Blitch.

Now, with pleasure I yield to our colleague from Georgia [Mr. Flynt].

Mr. FLYNT. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester], the majority leader of the House of Representatives, and the other members of the Georgia delegation, and other Members of this body as we join together to pay tribute to the congressional service of the Honorable Iris Faircloth Blitch.

Congresswoman Blitch came to the House of Representatives in the 84th Congress. During four consecutive terms she has represented the Eighth District of Georgia with honor and distinction. She probably served her district with more attentiveness, with more personal contacts and with more genuine desire to be of service than almost any individual with whom I have ever had the pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives.

Iris Blitch is a loyal, devoted, and faithful wife. She is a good and devoted mother to two fine outstanding children. She is a pillar of strength in the community of Homerville, Clinch County, where she has lived with her family for more than a quarter of a century. She is an active member and worker in her church.

Iris Blitch is and has been and will continue to be a source of influence for good in her community, in her district, in our State, and in the Nation.

My friendship with the gentlewoman from Georgia, Mrs. Blitch, goes back to our service together in the General Assembly in Georgia in 1947–1948. At that time she represented the Fifth Senatorial District of Georgia. It was my honor to represent Spalding County in the House of Representatives. I came to know Iris quite well during that session. I came to admire and respect her as a member of the general assembly and as the fine woman she is.

Iris Blitch has been an active practitioner in the art of politics in Georgia for more than 2 decades. She has been a successful politician. She has served in the house of representatives and in the senate of our State. She has served as national committeewoman of the Democratic Party and, of course, she has served 4 terms as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. She has filled these positions with honor and distinction, not only to herself but to the great State of which she is a Representative.

She is the first lady to be elected to a full term in Congress from Georgia. She has fully justified the confidence placed in her by the citizens of her great district.

A good many years ago, at her warm and cordial invitation, I delivered the graduation address to the high school graduates in her hometown of Homerville, Ga. I was there as the guest of her and her husband, Dr. B. E. Blitch. During part of the 2 days that I was privileged to be in Homerville, I came to understand how and why the people of that fine community in southeast Georgia love IRIS BLITCH as they do. She has a genuine interest in people and she is never too busy to try to help alleviate the suffering of someone else and to be of service to those who need help and to be a friend to the friendless in time of need.

Madam Speaker, Mrs. BLITCH leaves the House of Representatives by her voluntary retirement. She will leave a place which will be hard to fill in this body. She will also leave a place that will be hard to fill in the hearts of those of us who love her and have served with her and who have known her so long. We are proud to have known IRIS and to have served with her in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, as she voluntarily retires, we hope and pray that the Almighty in His infinite wisdom will restore her to the good health which she enjoyed when we first knew her. We have seen her during the period of her service here, particularly during the early days of this session, when she was in severe pain and suffering. As the distinguished majority leader commented a few moments ago, she made every effort possible to be here to study legislation carefully and to vote wisely in the interests of her district, her people, and our Nation.

Madam Speaker, her district certainly owes her a very great debt of gratitude for the service which she has rendered. She has been an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives and she has done her job exceedingly well.

Madam Speaker, as she will soon leave us as a Member of the House, she will continue to hold an affectionate spot in the heart of each of us. We wish for her, her husband, her children, and her grandchildren every happiness that may come her way. We wish her Godspeed and may God bless her.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] for granting me this privilege of adding a few words to the splendid comments which have been made about our colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia, IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH, who is retiring after the completion of this term.

Madam Speaker, my association with IRIS BLITCH goes way back, as another colleague has said, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] to our days in the Georgia Legislature. IRIS BLITCH has performed a great service to her State and her Nation. I am glad that I have had the privilege of knowing her during all these years and of not only serving on the State level with her but also in the Nation's Congress.

Madam Speaker, IRIS BLITCH possesses rare charm, beauty, and graciousness, and yet the ability and the courage to stand her ground in the battles of politics and legislative bodies, with those of us who may have felt at one time required strength that only men possess.

IRIS BLITCH proved to us in Georgia and in Washington that women can hold their ground in the legislatures of our States and of our Nation. I am glad to add my tribute to those which have already been paid today on her service in this body. I only wish that her physical condition could have permitted her to remain in Congress and that I could have had the privilege of longer service with her in the National House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing the hope that her health may be restored and that the years to come will be even better years for IRIS BLITCH and her fine family.

I thank my distinguished colleague again for this privilege of making these few comments.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to pay my respects to the Congresswoman from Georgia [IRIS BLITCH] who is retiring. I first became acquainted with IRIS BLITCH when she was in the Georgia Senate. I found out then that she was a person with whom you could readily work. She was most helpful, most cooperative. She would not only work with you but under any circumstance she would work for you. I feel that Georgia will have lost the services of a very fine person because she felt it necessary to retire.

As you have heard my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] state, Congresswoman BLITCH is the first lady from Georgia to serve in the House of Representatives. When she joined the House of Representatives as the first lady to serve in that body from Georgia, she also followed another example that Georgia had set to the Nation by sending the first woman to serve in the Senate of the United States. So that she and Georgia have proven that the ladies have a definite and most important part in the political community of our State.

As she leaves the Congress, it puts me in mind of Francis S. Bartow, of Georgia, when, as a Confederate soldier he left home and what he said as he left his colleagues and friends at home was that, "I go to illustrate Georgia." Francis S. Bartow died in the First Battle of Manassas. IRIS BLITCH also came here to illustrate Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LANGEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I take this time so that I may join my distinguished colleagues from Georgia in paying a proper and much deserved recognition to the services of our colleague from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH].

It was not my privilege to learn to know her personally real well during the course of my service here, but I should say that it would have been impossible for anyone to serve here for long without having been completely aware of her effective, untiring, and dedicated efforts. I know that many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle who have had occasion to serve with her on committees and to work with her on the many projects she had occasion to support have recognized her dedication and the effectiveness of her efforts on so many noteworthy occasions. So to that degree it has truly been my loss that I did not have the opportunity of benefiting to a greater degree from the extent of knowledge and dedication that she brought to this House.

On occasions of this kind it always occurs to me that there are no combinations of words or phrases that can possibly pay deserved praise, and certainly not compensate, for this kind of untiring effort. It would be my hope that the knowledge might be conveyed to her that the results and fruits of her efforts will live on for a good many years and will be recognized by her constituents in the district she served so effectively, and certainly throughout the United States and the world.

I should like to add on behalf of myself and others on this side of the aisle our very fond hope that the future may hold for her a very generous portion of happiness.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, the Georgia delegation generally appreciates the splendid remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LIBONATI. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I would be most happy to yield to our distinguished colleague from Illinois, one who has the respect and effection of every member of the Georgia delegation, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

Mr. LIBONATI. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to speak of one who departs from this House voluntarily or otherwise. The profession of politics is a difficult one. It is not easy to determine the sacrifices one makes in following a career of public service because it is the constant application of one's service to others. This is doubly so for a woman who enters the political lists. Certainly for the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. BLITCH] the fact of her having the confidence of her constituency over the years and having served four terms in this Congress is enough evidence as to the high esteem in which she is held by the electorate of her district.

Unfortunately, her health gave way under the stress and strain that even the most strong of the men feel at times in this House, as evidenced by the high casualties that occur. When one sees the retirement of a woman whose fortitude and strength of purpose are measured in the records of this House, who served so valiantly and held so strongly to her understanding of other people and her determination to make her ideas felt in her decisions, being strong in her attitude toward those things which she supported, one cannot find fault with such a courageous person. The gentlewoman from Georgia, who has served so consistently without any regard to personal reactions on legislation, and who did so with honest strength and the feeling that what she was doing was right, deserves the commendation of all the Members of this House as well as the State of Georgia and the Nation.

Many times we are critical of others as to their point of view. But if one were only to look at a situation or a problem through the eyes of that person and understand the situation and the community as that person does, certainly, they could come to no other conclusion. Therefore, I rise at this time to pay my respects to her loyalty to her causes and to her understanding and to her work over the years—qualities that made her important to the State of Georgia and to her constituents in representing their problems and their philosophies on the floor of the House of Representatives for others to weigh and to adjudicate.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me at this time and extending to me this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation of this fine person.

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, the Georgia delegation is highly grateful to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati] for the splendid tribute paid to our colleague, Congresswoman Blitch.

Mr. McMILLAN. Madam Speaker, I sincerely regretted to learn that our colleague, Congresswoman Iris F. Blitch, will not run for reelection this year. We shall all greatly miss having the valuable services of Mrs. Blitch during the 88th Congress. It is regrettable that this fine young lady's health would not permit her to continue to serve the people of her district and the State of Georgia in the high manner in which she has rendered service not only to the people of Georgia but to the entire Nation since she has been a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I do not know of any young lady who has ever served in Congress during the 24 years I have been a Member of this body who has gained a higher respect from both sides of the aisle than Mrs. Blitch. She is an unusually effective legislator and always studied every bill and report thoroughly before casting her vote on any subject.

I will personally miss Mrs. Blitch as I enjoyed her friendship, agree with her philosophy on the manner in which this Government should be administered. I never heard Mrs. Blitch say an unkind word regarding anyone and my best wishes go out to her and her family during her retirement.

Mrs. PFOST. Madam Speaker, at this time, I rise to pay a warm tribute to one of our distinguished Members who has announced her retirement from this body. Congresswoman Iris Blitch has served her district in the State of Georgia with dedication and honor during the past 8 years, and she will be missed when the Congress reconvenes in January.

It has been my great privilege to know the gentlewoman from Georgia, [Mrs. Blitch] as a good friend and colleague in the House. I have worked with her on various projects over the past years and she has always been an inspiration to all of those concerned. Her devotion and service, at all times, has been in the highest traditions of the Democratic Party and of the Nation.

Mrs. Blitch was the first woman in the State of Georgia's history to be elected for a full term to the House. Through her fine record and the force of her personality, she easily won reelection to succeeding terms. I know that the voters of her district are most unhappy that her name is not on the ballot this November.

Mrs. Blitch made a name for herself with the people of Georgia long before she came to serve in the Congress. She served with distinction in the State's general assembly, both in the House and the Senate. She pioneered legislation at the State level that won for women the right to serve on juries. Always a leader, she played an active role in the State Democratic Party and served as national committeewoman in the national Democratic Party.

The honors she won while serving in the Congress were many. She was selected as "The Woman of the Year in Agriculture" by the Progressive Farmer because of her efforts on behalf of the farmer. The Georgia Sportsmen's Federation presented her with an award for her efforts on behalf of soil conservation. She received a meritorious service commendation from the American Legion's Rehabilitation Commission. She has led the fight to have the great Okefenokee Swamp, one of the wonders of nature, protected and preserved for the enjoyment of future generations.

It was, perhaps, working with her on the House Public Works Committee that I got to know her best. She had a tremendous understanding and insight into the complex problems of flood control, irrigation and reclamation and the scores of other matters which were the committee's immediate business. In this regard, not just the citizens of Georgia alone, but the people of all of the United States owe her a debt of gratitude for her distinguished service on their behalf.

All of the Members of the House of both parties, I am sure, join me in this tribute to a great American. I know that Congresswoman Blitch will continue being a great credit to her country when she returns to reside in her home in Homerville, Ga. I sincerely hope that she will be a frequent visitor to our Nation's Capital City.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FORRESTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the character and service of our colleague, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Mrs. Blitch].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Granahan). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. NATCHER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1962

Mr. FALLON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY AND RETIREMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1962

Mr. DOWDY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund.

REPORT ON THE 87TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Madam Speaker, after debate has ended in this 87th Congress, historians can discuss the considerable achievements and disappointments of this assembly which remained in continuous session longer than any other peacetime Congress. It was a hardworking Congress which carefully deliberated every proposal. There was time to think, time to act prudently. By these standards, it will rate higher than most.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

While the free world suffered a loss of valuable real estate in the Soviet takeover of Cuba, it must be recalled that Cuba was lost before President Kennedy took office. Since January 1961, the free world continues to strengthen and make steady gains. The phenomenal industrial recovery of Western Europe, first ignited by the Marshall Plan, has become one of the wonders of the modern world. The bitter hostility of Nikita Khrushchev to the Common Market success is testimony to the glowing success of the free enterprise system on the Soviet flank.

The dynamic industrial prosperity of free Europe threatened communism at home base. Good news travels fast and the Iron Curtain could not close it out. The publicly announced Soviet infiltration of Cuba was designed to distract from democratic victories in Europe.

Those who urge a blockade of Cuba forget that American ships are supplying troops and material to Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and to other countries surrounding the Communists. A blockade would be reciprocated. Cuba cannot threaten the United States. Modern missiles can fly as accurately and as destructively from Russia as they can from Cuba. The grave danger of Cuba is in the convenient base it provides for the Communist penetration of South America. Our efforts should be directed toward preventing the export of incendiary communism from Cuba to the South American Continent.

The successful formula of the Marshall Plan continues to be the wise policy of the Kennedy Administration. It is necessary to build the productive systems of the underdeveloped nations and provide military support for the allies of democracy, who must be prepared to fight communism in the distant fields and villages.

The objectives of American foreign policy cannot bear fruit in the vacuum of isolationism. The United Nations Organization is an essential tool for the preservation of international order. Without the United Nations, Korea would be totally Communist and Africa would be a political shambles. Financing the United Nations and meeting extra assessments for special services such as the restoration of orderly government in the Congo is a fact of life. This Congress very prudently responded to this need by appropriating $100 million to replenish the operating funds of the United Nations organization under conditions which would insure mutuality in support.

The Peace Corps was developed by the Kennedy Administration as a vehicle for bettering the plight of man in the downtrodden parts of the world. The magnificent achievement of the Peace Corps is one of the really great successes of our foreign policy. These dedicated "Crusaders for Democracy" are creating an exciting new image for America as they toil to help improve life, health, and the pursuit of gainful labor among the neglected people of the world. And the gains flow both ways. When the Peace Corps workers return home laden with their rich experience and glowing from the goodness of their sacrifice, they will be informed and infinitely better prepared Americans.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY

Congress responded to President Kennedy's request and appropriated $52.6 billion for the national security. In view of the world arms race, it is difficult to ascertain whether we are making gains or whether we are simply keeping up. We have almost 3 million men in the armed services. The superiority of our Navy and the strategic Air Force is unquestioned. Our nuclear weapons and missiles are in sufficient supply to provide total destruction.

Yet this military might is strained to meet the tremendous global requirements to defend against aggression in 45 different countries. The military is faced with the imponderable burden of placing and keeping men, weapons, and supplies at any place where trouble may erupt at any time.

In order to implement the military strength of our Nation, this Congress passed a resolution authorizing the President to call up 150,000 reservists if necessary to defend vital interests anywhere in the world. While this added reserve strength could not delay a nuclear missile attack more than 10 seconds, it can help maintain the peace and prevent a Communist takeover where these weapons are not employed. For our national security, we must be prepared for defending a cold war infiltration skirmish fought by men and guns as well as a missile holocaust in which a squadron of 12 ICBM's will mutilate the enemy and the world at a cost of $190 million.

It is regrettable that world conditions compel this otherwise needless expenditure, but there can be no price tag on freedom. We must face up to the cost of whatever is necessary to preserve our way of life.

TRADE EXPANSION

The dynamic success of the European Common Market has generated unprecedented free-trade pressures throughout the free world. To meet this trade crisis, Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act to give the President authority to reduce tariffs to meet the competition of the newly strengthened trade bloc which must eventually include the entire free world. While temporary disruptions may occur, because of foreign trade, the long-range prospects are good. American goods carry the mark of quality throughout the world. American labor is as high in productivity as it is in cost. Nowhere in the free world does the workingman or his union have more dependable respect for his employment contract.

While labor-management relationships are in peaceful productive accord in this country, an era of labor-management controversy is commencing in Europe and Japan. For example, France was plagued this year by 5,800 different strikes. Competition in a tariff-free world will require capacity for stabilized productivity. America is now ready.

THE HOME FRONT

Although all economic indicators point to 1962 as a banner year, with personal income and the gross national product breaking all previous records, there are prophets of gloom who seek to slow America down.

In September, unemployment dropped 420,000 to a September total of 3.5 million with 5.8 percent of the civilian labor force unemployed. While the national figures are encouraging, they are of little comfort to the man without a job. Automation and cost-cutting devices are dumping huge quantities of workers into the stream of the unemployed. The problem is one of creating new jobs for a million new workers each year.

The Kennedy Administration inherited the problem of 6 million unemployed. This has been reduced today to 3.5 million. Since 1.1 million new workers have been added to the work force, there are 4.6 million more people at work than there were in January 1961.

One of the grave disappointments of this session was the failure to pass the Unemployment Compensation Extension Act to provide 13 weeks of additional benefits to unemployed workers. This should be one of the first duties of the 88th Congress, particularly in view of the uncertainty in business conditions which businessmen seem anxious to promote into a tax cut.

The Manpower Development and Training Act is one of the great achievements of this session. Under the program, the unemployed head of a family may apply for retraining in a skill for which there is a demand and receive a subsistence retraining allowance. Youths between 19 and 22 are eligible for benefits where such allowances are necessary to provide occupational training.

Although this program has just begun, retraining groups are currently being organized in Cleveland for auto transmission repairmen, clerk-stenographers, machinists, machine operators, and practical nurses. Ten other new training programs are under study. Persons interested in job retraining should call at the Ohio State Employment Service at 2400 Euclid Avenue.

The ebb and flow of business conditions, employment, and consumer spending are phenomena which do not respond to national demands or hopes. Recession may come, but if it does, we can be sure that President Kennedy will take immediate steps to cushion the impact and plan long-range designs to eradicate this recurring economic blight from the American scene.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Kennedy Administration has endeavored to use the entire resources of the executive authority for developing and preserving civil rights and insuring equality of opportunity. Executive orders were issued to bring about the appointment of qualified persons without regard to race and religion. All agencies were directed to provide equality of opportunity at all levels of the Federal service.

In late August, Congress passed a constitutional amendment abolishing the poll tax in Federal elections. Although five states of the South still cling to this archaic abuse of the electoral franchise, it remains as a barrier to voter participation. There is every reason to expect that three-fourths of the states will ratify this amendment by next July. This year's Federal elections will be the last at which certain voters will be subject to the poll tax. Although all voters in the Southern States may soon be allowed to vote free, there is much to be done to make it possible for them to vote freely.

The Mississippi outrage should constitute the last stand of prejudice by force. The issue was whether the people of a single state had the choice to accept or reject the law of the land. How long could the United States remain united if Federal law could be rejected at the border?

President Kennedy deserves the gratitude of all Americans for remaining steadfast to principle. He gave the State time to acquiesce, and then he demonstrated that the law of the land was not to be defied. Although the Mississippi affair is only a skirmish in the fight against bigotry and discrimination, it is a milestone which more clearly establishes national purpose.

The President's order against discrimination in Federal activities has successfully been extended to defense industries. In Cleveland, I have personally investigated defense industries and have insisted upon full compliance with the Executive Order.

FEDERAL IMPACT ON CLEVELAND

Before Congress adjourned, I helped arrange for budget clearance for an allocation of $41.2 million to construct the new Federal office building. There is every reason to expect approval in time for construction to begin late next summer. Not only is this building the keystone to the Erieview development, it will be the basis for providing accommodations for new Federal agencies it will lure to Cleveland.

Much of my time in Washington is spent on urging additional defense contracts in the Cleveland area. While the recent announcement of the Thompson Ramo-Wooldridge $17.5 million contract for the M-14 rifle was heartening, the real excitement came with the assignment of the $117 million program to the NASA Lewis Research Center to develop the Centaur two-stage rocket project to land a surveyor spacecraft on the moon. In the meanwhile, activity at the Cadillac Tank Plant has been stepping up. These activities mean jobs for Cleveland and Northern Ohio. The search for important defense work has become an important part of a Congressman's work.

WHEN CONGRESS ADJOURNS

When Congress adjourns, I shall be available almost daily at my Cleveland office, 506 Federal Building, on Cleveland's Public Square. The telephone number is CH 1-7900. My staff and I will be pleased to meet constituents and carefully consider any special problem or matter relating to the Federal Government. I will try to personally meet everyone who calls. One of the most important functions of a Congressman is to personally discuss the effect Federal laws have upon the citizen as well as the needs of new legislation. It is from these discussions that I can learn how effectively Federal laws are being administered. If I am to legislate wisely, I need your help.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS LAUNCH PUBLIC PROPAGANDA PROGRAM "TO CURB UNION MONOPOLY POWER"—PURPOSE: TO BRAINWASH THE PUBLIC AGAINST LABOR PROCEDURES AND THUS PRESSURE CONGRESS TO PASS ANTITRUST LABOR LAWS DESTROYING UNION RIGHTS TO BARGAIN, ETC.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate for the future well-being of our economy that present standard methods and procedures in labor and capital relations in recent major controversies have resulted in industry claiming Government pressure and forced compromises on labor obstinacy and unfairness standoff stalemates unsatisfactory to both sides—resulting in continuing bitter incriminations and discontent against themselves. The Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin approaches to establish procedures for the solution of labor and industrial troubles in certain facets widened the breach between these two powerful segments of our economy. It is well known that if certain provisions of these laws would be enforced to the letter—an industrial revolution could result—causing distruction of property and loss of lives.

Madam Speaker, I have learned through labor circles that one of our most diligent and consciencious group of businessmen, on matters of legislation, have embarked on a foraging expedition to destroy the integral unit organizations representing union labor by unconscionable and un-American practices in using accentuated forms of propaganda to influence the public mind against labor union methods used in procuring labor's share in the profit returns of industry.

It has been called to my attention that industrial leaders have already embarked on a preliminary plan to brainwash the public, first in order to stimulate support for the passage of bills in the Congress that will in effect destroy the freedom of union activity in the labor movement and curb the operation of union organizations. This can be best accomplished through Federal statutes. The antitrust laws are considered to be the answer to this accomplishment. Several bills have been introduced in this session to place labor under the antitrust laws. Labor organizations under this type of control will succumb to death by strangulation. The groundwork to prepare the public mind has already been laid—various unique methods of public propaganda, the use of the radio, television, magazines, and the press, are prejudicing the cause of labor, as against public interest.

All of the hidden persuaders so effectively used to get us to buy soaps and cigarettes will be marshaled in this program. The plan, thoroughly detailed in secret instructions, calls for the use of sympathetic journalists who will cooperate.

It calls for sponsored TV special shows which will invade the homes of America in the guise of an objective portrayal.

It calls for carefully conducted studies by panels of distinguished persons to arrive at a predetermined set of facts.

In furtherance of this method of attack, the National Association of Manufacturers have inaugurated "A Program To Curb Union Monopoly Power," through its industrial relations division at 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

The basic policy is as follows:

> The NAM already has a position on monopolistic practices, as follows:
>
> "Any action, practices, or labor agreements by a combination of employers, or of unions, or of a union or unions with an employer or employers, which result in restraint of trade or endanger the public health, safety, or security, are contrary to the public interest and should be subject to statutory regulation."—"Industry Believes," page 13.
>
> The problem, therefore, is to implement this policy. Obviously, educational efforts on a broad scale must be undertaken, with legislation as the ultimate goal.
>
> PROGRAM
>
> We have a fourfold task:
>
> 1. To identify the problems, clarify the issues, and place proper emphasis on the causes of the abusive use of union monopoly power.
>
> 2. To collect pertinent information regarding the impact of union monopoly power on the economy, business, employees, etc.
>
> 3. To communicate this information to all who are interested and concerned—and to those who should be.
>
> 4. To recommend steps to management, government, public, etc., on what can be done to cope with this problem.

The blueprint for action and strategy is detailed in the long-range plan and timetable.

It calls for the heavy indoctrination of the teaching profession, which is recognized as "a major opinion molding agency."

It calls for a special essay contest, not on anything wholesome or patriotic, but on "What Union Monopoly Power Means to America" which would send the high-school kids of the country scurrying to find examples with which to bolster their attempts to win this competitive contest and thus prove the thesis which the NAM seeks to prove.

It calls for a "concerted effort to win the clergy" to the need for punitive legislation. The clergy, however, may be harder to mislead. Probably the first clergyman to read this infamous document is responsible for its disclosure. His reaction as a man of God was one of indignation at the immorality and the inhumanity of the attack that has been plotted on American labor. Let us give full credit to Rev. Claire M. Cook, Th. D., of the Religion & Labor Council of America.

I have enumerated a few of the rungs in the ladder spanning 1962, 1963, and 1964 in the timetable aimed to "accomplish the legislative goal" of forcing unions under the antitrust statutes as a monopoly.

Thus, this detailed blueprint, planned in 1961, is already part way toward completion. The long-range plan and timetable cites 11 bills already in the hopper in the 1962 phase of the schedule. It is interesting to note that the 1962 program is to be given no publicity under the plan.

I have not listed the distinguished Members of the Senate and House whose names are listed in the document as having introduced bills which are regarded as part of this grand design. Their names, however, appear in the 1962 phase of this long-range plan and timetable of the National Association of Manufacturers. Although I am inserting the entire document, more than 20 pages long, in the RECORD, it would be improper to list item 2 of the 1962 schedule naming sponsors of bills, for the good reason that it may cause embarrassment to the distinguished legislators who may innocently represent their point of view yet whose names together with the numbers of their bills, are listed in item 2 of the document.

Incidentally, the plan calls for obtaining maximum mileage on testimony or statements presented in support of these bills.

The cast of characters who are to participate in the objective studies, planned to arrive at predetermined results in support of this timetable, are listed in these confidential documents which I am about to place in the RECORD. The personnel of these study groups includes members of the faculties of such distinguished universities as Harvard, the University of Chicago, Vanderbilt, New York University, the University of California at Los Angeles, and McGill University of Montreal, Canada.

Other members of the NAM Center for the Study of Union Power, which will function under the chairmanship of NAM Vice President Charles A. Kothe, include a list of attorneys who are expert in labor law; a staff member of the U.S. Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, six college professors, and former Congressman Graham A. Barden, who for so long was chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor and is now practicing law at New Bern, N.C.

The 1963 schedule calls for "a hearing for a bill of our own design before the 88th session of Congress—1962 to 1963."

The first item on the program for 1964 calls for a poll by Opinion Research Corp. "regarding the need for control of union power." Even 3 years in advance of this scheduled poll, the blueprint and timetable states that "The results are certain to give us a better insight into current thinking, and therefore, some specific indication of the direction we should pursue." In other words, the blueprint calls for taking a reading early in 1964 on the success which has attended the program launched last year in brainwashing the American people and softening them up for the acceptance of the NAM drive for new straitjacket legislation to impair the effectiveness of trade unions.

A number of bills are in the hopper. The purport of the bills listed are as follows:

S. 87, introduced January 5, 1961—Labor and Public Welfare. Provides that nothing in the Labor-Management Relations Act shall be construed to nullify the provisions of any State or territorial law which regulate or prohibit strikes by employees of a public utility, or which regulate or prohibit lockouts by a public utility.

S. 2631, introduced September 23, 1961—Labor and Public Welfare. Prohibits any person employed at a strategic defense facility to engage or participate in a strike. Prohibits any labor organization encouraging any person so employed to engage in a strike. Provides for the appointment of an emergency board by the Secretary of Defense to ascertain the facts when there is a labor dispute at a strategic defense facility. Confers power on Federal district courts to enforce compliance with provisions of any order of an emergency board.

S. 2292, introduced July 20, 1961—Labor and Public Welfare—makes antitrust laws applicable to labor unions. Makes certain concerted activities—including attempts to reach a common understanding with respect to conditions of employment—unlawful when such activities interfere with commerce.

H.R. 7097 prohibits strikes, work stoppages, and slowdowns at critical defense facilities. Provides for issuance of restraining orders and injunctions.

The suggestion that labor unions should be subject to the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act, has the vice of seeming simple. Plausible as it may sound, it turns back upon three centuries of the struggle of working men to bargain collectively. Any student of the labor movement knows that the greatest obstacle that the labor unions had to overcome was their collective action fell under common law penalty for boycott.

It was only where the law has matured to recognize the legality of collective bargaining that the felt necessity of the working man could be realized by matching the joint activities of the men against the economic strength of capital.

None but the nearsighted will deny that there have been abuses in the labor movement, just as there were abuses when capital enjoyed a totality of economic strength. However, to place collective bargaining under the restrictions of the Sherman Act, would be to destroy all of the legitimate gains of labor, without the compensatory benefits to labor. The cure for the ills of labor and management must be found within the leadership of labor and of management. If labor may not organize, collectively, except under the threat of prosecution under the Sherman Act, then you would reduce the unions to a mere social study group. The only hope for labor then will be to secure coercive action through the Government. We will then degenerate into an economic society where the Congress must set the prices of labor, the prices of materials and the prices of goods.

I submit, Madam Speaker, that it is rather not advancing our country, its economy and its people, but would put us in the economic status of Poland and Yugoslavia.

If industry continues to pursue this course of action, the reaction in labor circles will result in counter moves that can only lead to a severe disturbance in the economy and well-being of our Nation.

We are facing the most critical period of our history and to create a schism in our overall employer and employee relationship, at this time, would result in economic chaos and the loss of our leadership in the free world. Every effort has been put forth in legislative halls to promote expansion of our industries and stimulation of production to take up the unemployment slack. As patriotic Americans, we cannot afford to disturb or lessen the confidence of both industry and labor in their economic functioning balances.

It would be disastrous to the very existence of our Nation's prosperity for two of the most all-powerful segments of our economic system to take steps to destroy one another.

It would be better if industry would pay more attention to the study of our economic imbalances. They are in a better position than any other unit to monitor voluntary regulated prices of the necessities of life, so as to arrest the spiraling of the cost of living. Industry and business are against legislation establishing ceiling regulations on prices. Yet, the discontent of labor is a result of a short weekly pay envelope to meet these rising living costs. The average home earner making $100 per week, with a family—five persons—goes deeper and deeper into debt. Naturally, costs of services and goods must go up with the cost of living. The worker goes to the union hall and complains that the homemaker—although frugal and saving—cannot make ends meet.

Leaders in industry complain that the margin of profit is close and will not support a raise; a conference between representative leaders results in a deadlock and leads to a walk-out or to a continuance of the strike.

If specialists in the field of the economics of production costs and sale prices, also giving study to excessive advertising and other burdensome costs that influence the increase of the market retail prices of the product, then if a percentage cost control table could be established to determine the incidental costs of handling, processing, marketing, and advertising, something could be done to lower the cost of living. Thus, restoration of the purchasing power of the dollar to an actual dollar's worth of value of predeflation priced goods. A dollar saved is a dollar earned.

A little attention to the movement of plants, from one State with shallow labor pools to another with plenty of labor, unorganized, would be a good study; at least, it would point to the selfish practices of employers who, in the end, defeat their very purposes—by adding to unemployment in certain areas with a higher spending number of dollars—to an area where payrolls reduce the laborers' spending dollars. Surely, a prosperous community can only remain so if the sales, by the purchaser, increase with the number of spending dollars he has to spend. It is a circle that is never ending in its reliance upon the ability to earn dollars to spend them in trade and the money is then deposited and taken up by industry to accelerate the reproduction of goods again. Money must flow into each of these reservoirs of trade and finance, in order that the prosperity of the economy continues.

We certainly do not need more trouble in labor-management relations than we now have.

Madam Speaker, in the last 2 years, there were over 800 concerns that moved their plants to low wage foreign country areas. American industry is presently busy investing its surplus moneys abroad, only to discover that it is not going to enjoy a free hand in cheap labor markets as it has in the past. It seems that the bargaining table has found its place in England, or any one of the 32 countries into which it has extended its industries.

Secondly, it is already finding out that freewheeling management decisions, like mass layoffs, are not being swallowed anywhere nearly so gracefully in these other countries as they are in the United States, so that these ordinary developments are an indication that some of the conditions that have made foreign investments so attractive to American business are going to be lost.

The Trainman News, of October 1, 1962, carries an interesting article by Press Associates, Inc., on the failure of runaway capital to face its labor responsibilities.

There is a movement afoot among the Ford employees internationally to unite Ford employees in all of the 32 countries where Ford is now located, in order to bargain with the employer on the level where key corporation decisions are made. This will lead to Ford workers, everywhere, harmonizing wages and workers conditions, to exchange information, to sponsor joint educational programs, to coordinate bargaining activities, to achieve an international fair labor standard and, through these measures, to maintain advancement to common goals. These goals are as follows: job security, a fair share of the product of rapidly advancing technology, policies leading to full production and full employment; and international wage and labor policies which insure social and economic justice for every Ford worker. The Ford Motor Co., expanding to 32 countries, has increased its assets to $5 billion and is now able to make economic decisions which exceed, in impact, those of many countries of the United Nations.

On the level of foreign governments involved comes a warning that American industry abroad may not be able to have its own way, forever. Published reports from Paris reveal that the French Government is unhappy that two American corporations recently laid off 1,000 workers, because of changed business conditions, without notifying the French Government. This action violated the basic French philosophy that certain isolated enterprise practices in French industry does not constitute a responsible policy that does not respect the rights of and the social contract linking a financially powerful enterprise to the labor it employs. The French Minister of Industry, Michel Maurice-Bokanowski, was quoted by the France-Presse, further, that foreign investments must take full account of the imperative obligation existing in France, to respect the production objectives of the plan without in any way neglecting its social objectives. He threatened to examine, with the greatest of care, new foreign investments in France, particularly American. The layoffs that have shocked France and French labor, involved 700 men employees of the General Motors refrigerator plant in Gennevilliers, and 200 men, laid off by the Remington Rand portable typewriter operations in Lyons, which were being shifted to a modern plant in the Netherlands. Thus, the fact remains that, although the criticism was for domestic consumption, yet the layoffs stirred union protests strong enough for official reaction. That indicates that run-away American capital is not going to be able to run away from its labor responsibilities as easily as it once appeared.

When we consider that the Department of Commerce will not release any pertinent information about the number of American concerns that have established factories abroad, or contributed to the extension of the local industries in Latin America, Europe, and the underdeveloped countries, it is evident that a critical situation is in the offing, especially in that the following amounts of American capital have been invested in foreign enterprises:

Here is a 6-year score on foreign investments by private American investors:

	Million
Investments in Western Europe (1956–61)	$5, 141
Profits returned to U.S. companies	[1] 2, 261
Investments in underdeveloped areas	5, 552
Profits returned to U.S. companies	[1] 8, 794
Investments in Latin America	3, 057
Profits returned to U.S. companies	[1] 4, 379
Grand total investments	13, 750
Grand total profits returned	15, 394

[1] This does not count money left overseas for reinvestment, expansion, automation, and cash reserves. The less restrictions we put on imports, the more profits for our American investors overseas and their stockholders but the less wages for American workers.

I include the following article from the Washington World, issue of September 25, 1962:

U.S. Business Spending More Abroad Than Home—Rising Plant, Equipment Expansion Caused by Low Labor, Supply Costs

American business is spending nearly twice as much on plant and equipment expansion abroad as it is at home, according to a recent survey from the Commerce Department's Office of Business Economics.

Projected rate of these foreign expenditures for 1962 is 14 percent above last year's outlay, compared with a domestic expansion of 8 percent. Trend in the figures: Latin American slowdown, pickup in Europe, the Near East and Africa.

Behind the expansion: Advantages of supply and low labor cost.

THIS YEAR'S OUTLAY NEAR $2 BILLION

Capital outlays by manufacturing firms abroad this year are reported at $1.9 billion, or 11 percent above the 1961 amount, led by a 25-percent growth in the Common Market area. Among individual industries, the transportation industry (mainly automobiles) shows the strongest rise—about $150 million, of which two-thirds is in Common Market countries.

Outlays abroad for plant and equipment by the petroleum industry have risen consistently in recent years, reaching a projected level of $1.8 billion for 1962, and are expected to remain at about this amount for 1963.

Continuing trends evidenced in earlier years, these capital outlays emphasize the buildup of new and improved refining and distribution systems in the rapidly growing consumer markets in Europe and the Far East, as well as the development of new producing fields in the North Africa-Middle Eastern area.

TWENTY PERCENT RISE FOR EASTERN HEMISPHERE

Expenditures in the Eastern Hemisphere are scheduled to rise in 1962 by more than 20 percent; this year's growth in the Western Hemisphere is less than 10 percent.

Mining companies expect to increase capital expenditures by one-fifth from 1961's relatively low amount, to a 1962 total of nearly $400 million. A renewed increase of expenditures in Canada, together with new projects in Africa and elsewhere, more than offset the recent completion of major expansion in Latin America.

Among other industries, capital investment in trade and distribution facilities is rising by one-fourth, to reach a level of $400 million in 1962. Most of this increase is centered in Europe, with other areas in the Eastern Hemisphere participating to a lesser extent. Service industries are showing a moderate gain; public utilities and agriculture continue their decline of recent years, the OBE survey shows.

EUROPEAN INVESTMENT INTENSIFIED IN 1962

The buildup of investments in Europe was intensified in 1962 with $1.8 billion, or nearly 40 percent, of plant expenditures channeled into that area. The figure for 1957, the first year for which these dates were collected, was less than 20 percent. More than half of current expenditures occur in the various manufacturing industries, with most of the remainder accounted for by the expansion of oil company facilities.

Manufacturing investments in plant facilities were highest in Germany, amounting to an estimated $432 million for 1962 ($318 million in 1961). In comparison, the rate of capital was in third position with $331 million. Other Common Market countries accounted for $160 million of manufacturing plant and equipment. Oil investments in Europe this year amount to $597 million, about evenly divided between Common Market countries and the rest of Europe.

Expenditures in Canada, where the increase in new plant and equipment is $60 million, totaled $1.1 billion. Half of the increase is being chalked up by the mining industry, which is projecting expenditures of $200 million for 1962, after having dropped to $165 million in the prior year. Expenditures for manufacturing industries are rising by 10 percent over the 1961 total, and are expected to reach $390 million for 1962. Little change is seen in petroleum or other industries.

LATIN AMERICAN OUTLAYS UP TO 15 PERCENT

For Latin America, the latest Office of Business Economics survey shows that U.S. companies plan total capital outlays above $900 million in 1962, up about 15 percent from last year. Petroleum levels off at about $350 million, but capital outlays by manufacturing companies show continued growth, with the major increase expected to occur in Argentina.

This generally higher rate of investment in fixed capital abroad tends to raise capital outflows from the United States. However, other sources of financing are growing in importance: Depreciation charges and retained earnings, along with external sources of financing abroad. The available data on direct-investment capital outflows in the first half of 1962 show some decline from the 1961 rate, indicating that the investing companies are relying more heavily on these alternative sources of funds to finance their expansion abroad.

The Office of Business Economics notes that the actual 1961 expenditures abroad now being reported are somewhat lower in major industries than those previously anticipated by the companies. On the other hand, the projections by the companies of 1962 outlays have been raised compared to those reported at this time last year, with most of the gain reported in European investments.

Madam Speaker, in an article written in the New York Times, Sunday edition, October 7, 1962, entitled "NAM Opens Fight on Unions' Power," subtitle, "Presses Long-Range Drive for Federal Law to Limit Labor Monopoly Role," Charles A. Kothe, head of the association's industrial relations division, is quoted:

> Some kind of restrictions should be designed just for labor. It might be possible—

He said—

> to prohibit industrywide or perhaps countrywide, collective bargaining.

It might also be possible, he said "to prevent unions from establishing national wage and fringe-benefit policies, or from calling industrywide strikes," Mr. Kothe said he hoped that as a result of the NAM program "the public will be so filled with disgust and revulsion at the abuses he will reveal that it will descend on Congress clamoring for legislation."

Madam Speaker, after 22 years' service in the Illinois Assembly—6 years in the House, and 16 years in the Senate—and three terms in the Congress, meeting and discussing legislation with leaders of the Illinois Association of Manufacturers—at committee hearings and social affairs—I cannot understand the national organization sponsoring this type of approach to the solution of labor-management differences. It is difficult to believe that these leaders of industry from many rising ranks of workers would condone a program of rule or ruin in their opposition to labor practices. There is still time for some of our level-headed business friends from Illinois to realize that the public is quick to recognize that this fresh approach to destroy the bargaining rights of labor in any other guise will exude the same nauseating stench that permeated the "yellow dog" contracts.

The progressive minded lawmakers that are elected from so-called labor districts are the best friends of industry in certain areas of legislation affecting its stability and expansion of corporation interests. At most levels, labor and capital have parallel interests. There is only friction where their respective rights are challenged by legislation. The leaders of these respective groups are well equipped to present their views. These two segments of our society give main support to our economy and the protection of their respective interests determines its prosperity. Radical measures that would curb or destroy their freedom of operation, thus affecting their respective initiatives to stimulate the economy would be disastrous to the financial interests of the whole Nation. The elimination of the bargaining rights of labor would sterilize both labor and capital. It must be protected at all costs.

I include the following article from the New York Times, Sunday, October 7, 1962, as follows:

NAM Opens Fight on Union's Power—Presses Long-Range Drive for Federal Law To Limit Labor Monopoly Role

Washington, October 6.—The National Association of Manufacturers has undertaken a long-range campaign to get Federal legislation curbing what it calls "union monopoly power."

As the campaign gathers strength, it may provoke a battle as fierce as the one that already rages over so-called State right-to-work laws. These laws prohibit labor contract clauses that make union membership a condition of continued employment.

The central NAM argument is that labor unions have special privileges and immunities not granted business organizations, and that unions thus possess monopoly power. Through the exercise of this power, the argument runs, unions can exact from employers increases in pay and fringe benefits that are not warranted by gains in output or by competitive realities.

ACTIVITIES CALLED PROPER

Organized labor regards this as a disingenuous rationalization for what is actually an attempt to destroy the effectiveness of labor unions in bettering the condition of their members. They say the manufacturers would restrict union activities that are entirely proper.

Copies of an internal working document put together by the association's Industrial Relations Division have fallen into union hands. Titled "A Program To Curb Union Monopoly Power," the document includes a section called "Long-Range Plan and Timetable." It has been given widespread publicity by labor newspapers in the last month.

Charles A. Kothe, who heads the division, said that the document had been prepared to support the division's request to the association's executive committee for $31,000. The money would be used to hire some graduate students to index 50,000 published items relating to union power and its abuse. However, the document was never presented because the executive committee had more pressing matters to consider, Mr. Kothe said.

GENERAL PROGRAM APPROVED

Although the specific steps set forth in the document have not been approved, Mr. Kothe said, the general program has. He said he was going ahead with parts of the program that did not require the committee's authorization for extra money.

The association established a "center for the study of union monopoly" last week. The center will collect and distribute information on the subject.

It will also draft legislation for introduction in Congress after a study of the legal issues involved.

Mr. Kothe hopes to enlist the aid of 30 leading manufacturers, educators, lawyers, and other persons interested in the issue to participate in the activities of the center.

A list of 29 names purporting to be those of "official members" of the center was attached to the program document. Mr. Kothe said, however, that the persons listed were not actually members but had attended one preliminary meeting or more. Some on the list, he said, indicated they would not participate further.

The association published in June a study of Lillian W. Kay of its research department titled "Economic Implications of Union Power."

Mr. Kothe's long-range timetable culminates in 1964 with "a full-powered drive * * * with all forces activated to accomplish the legislative goal."

Asked what the exact legislative goal was, he said he was not sure at this time. He indicated that he did not think the common business appeal to put unions under the antitrust laws was the answer.

FRESH APPROACH SOUGHT

"There should be an entirely fresh approach," Mr. Kothe said. "Some kind of restrictions should be designed just for labor."

It might be possible, he said, to prohibit industrywide, or perhaps companywide, collective bargaining. It might also be possible, he said, to prevent unions from establishing national wage and fringe-benefit policies or from calling industrywide strikes.

Mr. Kothe said he hoped that as a result of the NAM program, "the public will be so filled with disgust and revulsion at the abuses he will reveal that it will descend on Congress clamoring for legislation."

Experts on labor-management relations have been inclined to regard the labor monopoly issue as unimportant. Many believe that, practically, it would be impossible to enforce a law requiring local bargaining. Even if it were possible, many experts believe the results would be to promote fiercer competition among unions than there is now and to drive wages higher than they would otherwise go.

Madam Speaker, if industry ever succeeded in these efforts it would itself sicken and fail, the destruction of labor unions would result in free labor with each individual worker seeking a personal advantage in employment. The training of his talents by fellow workers would be lost and his efficiency would suffer. Industries demanding large numbers of artisans or workers for the same specific employment would have to set up employment bureaus to recruit workers. Today if 100 carpenters, plumbers, electricians, or laborers are needed, a call to the union headquarters for the men will bring results—even in the case of a limited supply of artisans—the union will send out a call to other locals in the distant areas for men. The disciplining of the men in their uncooperative attitudes, and so forth, on the job are now left to the union. With the union dissolved, industry would be forced to handle the labor relations to its industry. No bigger headache can be handled to the board of directors of a corporation. Industry would do better to give its attention to friendlier labor relations with unions and, at all costs, protect the existence and operation of unit unions related to their specific industry.

Madam Speaker, grave political complications would, inevitably, result: a vast majority of the 17 million organized union workers and their families would become active workers in an independent third party movement. Thus, a battle would ensue for control of the legislative functions of government at all levels of political subdivisions, both State and National, to protect their interests in union organizations. The movement would surely entice the millions of unorganized white-collar workers to organize, as well as the farm labor groups, who are subject to and affected by consumers interest. Thus, the Farmer-Labor Party would become a potentially powerful political voice in government. In majority it would absorb one of the major parties and, even with minority representation in government, would control legislation as between two competitive parties.

Nations all over the world have experienced these changes—Britain, especially, is a good example.

A Program To Curb Union Monopoly Power

(By Industrial Relations Division, National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.)

BASIC POLICY

The NAM already has a position on monopolistic practices, as follows:

"Any action, practices, or labor agreements by a combination of employers, or of unions, or of a union or unions with an employer or employers, which result in restraint of trade or endanger the public health, safety or security, are contrary to the public interest and should be subject to statutory regulation." ("Industry Believes," p. 13.)

The problem, therefore, is to implement this policy. Obviously, educational efforts on a broad scale must be undertaken, with legislation as the ultimate goal.

PROGRAM

We have a fourfold task:

1. To identify the problems, clarify the issues, and place proper emphasis on the causes of the abusive use of union monopoly power.

2. To collect pertinent information regarding the impact of union monopoly power on the economy, business, employees, and so forth.

3. To communicate this information to all who are interested and concerned—and to those who should be.

4. To recommend steps to management, government, public, and so forth, on what can be done to cope with this problem.

The blueprint for action and strategy is detailed in the long-range plan and timetable.

OUTLINE OF INTERNAL STRUCTURE

The timing is right for a coordinated, aggressive drive against union power. No time should be lost in pressing this endeavor.

The following plan is offered as an internal structure designed to get the job done:

1. Effective action to deal with the union monopoly issue will demand the best abilities available to the NAM. Furthermore, the nature and complexity of the issue require that every division of the organization bring to bear its special expertise, in full cooperation with every other division.

2. Necessarily, this is a team operation. The law department, the industrial relations division, the research department, the public relations division, the member relations division, all have a contribution to make in their respective specialities.

3. All activity of the association on this subject, of whatever nature, must head up in a single individual. There are at least two basic reasons for this:

(a) Divided management authority leads to ineffective action and confusion; sound management requires that responsibility for decisionmaking be focused in a single entity.

(b) Duplication and conflict could thus be avoided.

4. The vice president in charge of industrial relations is positioned most logically to function as the individual chiefly responsible for NAM's program and activities to curb union monopoly power. This is so because:

(a) He is the committee executive of the industrial relations committee in which policies with respect to this subject are originated, debated, and recommended to the board of directors. This question of union monopoly falls entirely within the purview of this committee.

(b) He is the chairman of the NAM Center for the Study of Union Power. Many of the individuals who comprise this group were appointed on the direct recommendations of leading Senators and Congressmen and these men themselves have written bills which are even now in the hopper.

It is important that the association make the best possible utilization of the prestige of this group, both in formulating the overall program and carrying it out.

5. The modus operandi would be to center total planning and coordinating responsibility in one head, as indicated in No. 4. He would draw upon the multiple resources of the association, gathering the necessary data from those in the best position to provide it, channeling assignments through normal sources.

Regarding legislation, while the Washington office would continue to carry on its activities in the formulation of a bill designed to meet the situation, these activities would also necessarily be responsive to and closely coordinated with, the designated individual responsible.

LONG-RANGE PLAN AND TIMETABLE

1962

1. Center for the study of union power will meet April 17. One or two additional meetings will be held this year. No publicity is to be given this effort.

2. A number of bills are in the hopper.

The need to find and prepare potential witnesses representing industry is a priority task which should be pressed without delay.

If hearings are held on any of these bills, decision will be made as to whether we should appear or file a statement, and maximum mileage will be sought from these efforts.

3. From time to time, additional materials are being sent to forensic squads which are debating the subject, "Resolved, that labor organizations should be under the jurisdiction of antitrust legislation."

4. The 34th NAM Institute on Industrial Relations will be giving attention to the problems created by union power, in its session on collective bargaining.

5. Union monopoly will be the principal subject discussed at a series of executive conferences, scheduled for October 1962 in four key cities.

6. Coordinate the efforts of the lawyers committee and the center in the drafting of a bill or bills to be introduced, as part of the long-range program.

7. The major study of the research department, "Union Power—Some Implications for the Economy," will be published this year. (This study should be reviewed by members of the center for the study of union power.)

8. Present files on union monopoly will be overhauled and expanded to make readily available such information as:

(a) Case histories showing effect on (1) national economy, (2) individual companies, (3) nature of labor unions, (4) individual union members.

(b) Legal aspects: (1) Interpretations of present laws, (2) effectiveness of proposed legislation, (3) cases handled up to present, (4) analysis of the administrative function (e.g., NLRB).

(c) Viewpoints stated by union leaders, union members, national organizations, individuals in industry, general public.

(d) Recommendations for legislation.

The purpose is to provide authoritative statements, instantly available, for use whenever and wherever requested. By acting as a sort of clearinghouse of vital materials we can perform a valuable service.

1963

1. Continuation of studies by center for the study of union power, launched in 1962, i.e., labor unions as institutional power centers, how best to refute union arguments in defense of their practices, etc.

2. Work toward getting a hearing for a bill of our own design before the 88th Congress (1962–63).

3. Sponsorship of competitive contest among high school students offering awards for the best essay on "What Union Monopoly Power Means to America."

4. Compilation of case examples along the lines of U.S. chamber's kit on secondary boycotts—but dealing with other and broader aspects of union monopoly.

5. Recruit as cohorts and idea salesmen men and women, by geographical areas and organization, to promote the program of education and eventual legislative action set up by the center and the association.

6. Secure a sponsor and plan for a TV special, focusing on the union monopoly problem and what it means to the Nation.

7. Preparation of program materials for women's clubs.

8. Production of a speakers' kit for use by businessmen and other opinion molders, and promotion of platform opportunities in which it might be used.

9. Set up a group of sympathetic journalists to work in liaison with the center for the study of union power; similarly, a group of public relations experts who might assist us in getting out the story.

1964

1. Retain Opinion Research Corp. to conduct new poll of public sentiment regarding the need for control of union power. The results are certain to give us a better insight into current thinking, and therefore, some specific indication of the direction we should pursue.

2. Preparation of a question and answer booklet, providing industry's answers to the union case.

3. Inasmuch as the teaching profession, at both the secondary and university levels, constitutes a major opinion-molding agency, and since few have had any real exposure to industry's views on the monopoly issue, a series of 2-day seminars for professors and businessmen are proposed.

4. Presentation of the total problem and program to trade associations and bar associations at their annual meetings, to important chambers of commerce and to other national organizations which might be drawn into the effort, so that we get a multiplier effect and a broadened audience for our materials.

5. A fully documented and objective movie should be released. This should be the occasion for a press conference which points up the reasons why union monopoly power is detrimental to our economy.

6. A concerted effort should be made to win the clergy to an understanding of the need for statutory control of union excesses.

7. A full-powered drive should be undertaken with all forces activated to accomplish the legislative goal.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNION POWER

The first meeting of this center was held on November 21, 1961.

Both education and legislation were recognized as imperative action areas and it is believed that these efforts can run concurrently. In effect, our goals are to educate the public, including employer members of NAM and U.S. Chamber of Commerce; to draft legislation which could command wide support of industry; to find and prepare witnesses for potential congressional hearings.

Certain research, much of it of a living nature flowing from current developments and day-to-day evidence, will provide the raw material for achievement of these goals. The kinds of information which now represent gaps in our resources have already been in part identified by members of the center.

Six study areas were revealed through discussion. The need for:

I. Determination, union by union, of what it is key unions do that is considered improper use of monopoly power.

II. Clarification of the elements of union power—what causes it, how is it manifested.

III. Documentation of union power—whether economic, political, financial.

IV. Dramatization of union power—through case examples.

V. Identification of predatory acts by unions.

VI. Collection of current developments and evidence, day by day, as it happens.

As for the approach, there was a difference of opinion as to whether it was best to go at this problem, abuse by abuse, or attack it at the root.

Those who hold for attacking at the root claim that collection of examples is a treatment of the symptoms rather than the causes; and that while we may be making some gains in one direction, the creative minds of union officials will fashion methods to achieve these gains in other directions.

Those who support specific legislation to deal with specific abuses think this may be a way to get around the political snafu that could ensue in any attempt to amend the antitrust laws; that it is more likely to achieve public acceptance and would not be frustrated as a hate labor maneuver.

The second meeting of this center is scheduled for April 17, 1962.

At this meeting we will attempt to arrive at a definition of "union monopoly" and to undertake specific activities in line with the above.

These eminent individuals have rallied to the cause and here displayed not only profound interest but a desire to work together in achieving the desired goals.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 20, 1961.

MR. CHARLES A. KOTHE,
Vice President, National Association of Manufacturers, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KOTHE: Please pardon the delay in answering your letter. It was made necessary by the deluge of correspondence and the heavy pressures of the closing days of Congress.

I consider Dr. John Van de Water, professor of law at the University of California at Los Angeles, one of the top authorities in the country. He has had a wide experience in industrial relations, is a good sound conservative, and a brilliant writer.

Mr. Kenneth McGuiness, a Washington lawyer, onetime Counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, is one of the most knowledgeable men I know on this subject.

I assume you are very close to the various corporation officials interested in this subject, and who may provide you with considerable data.

Thanks for writing, and best regards.

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR W. HIESTAND,
Member of Congress.

DR. JOHN R. VAN DE WATER, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Dr. Van de Water holds a bachelor of arts degree and a doctor of laws degree from the University of Chicago.

In his earlier years, he was a full-time member of the industrial relations staff at North American Aviation, Inc., where he served in dealing with the United Automobile Workers and other unions during World War II.

In 1946, Dr. Van de Water joined the faculty of the University of California. His first work there involved the direction of B.A. and management courses for adults. He also set up a pioneering program for the continuing education of the bar—approximately 16,000 lawyers in California.

Dr. Van de Water is a member of the faculty of the Graduate School of Business Administration and the School of Business Administration at the University of California in Los Angeles.

For 3 years, he served as director of executive development, administering and organizing course programs for senior members of management in which some 600 corporations participated. The courses were attended by presidents, executive vice presidents, vice presidents, and heads of major management functions within every type of commercial enterprise.

During this time, Dr. Van de Water lectured and made all case presentations for executive development programs in the field of labor law and industrial relations, including the economic aspects of union power and Government policy.

His teaching assignments at the University of California include management of industrial relations, labor law and Government policy, legal analysis for business managers, and organization and management principles.

Dr. Van de Water has lectured to national management associations on topics of industrial relations and government policy, on dealing with union-management affairs, ideological conflict, and American enterprise principles.

He is the author of numerous legal, industrial relations, and management articles.

As an attorney, he represents a large number of corporations, such as Borg-Warner, Ampex Computer, Packard Bell Electronics Corp., Walt Disney Productions, Litton Industries, Inc., Arrowhead-Puritas Waters, Inc., Star-Kist Foods, Inc., Hallemor Electronics Corp.

During the past 16 years, he has trained well over 1,000 management personnel who are specialists in the field of industrial relations and collective bargaining in special courses sponsored by the personnel and industrial relations association in Los Angeles. Well over 1,000 corporations were involved in this program.

He is chairman of the military relations committee on government policy and legislation for the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

OFFICIAL MEMBERS OF NAM CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNION POWER

Acting chairman: Charles A. Kothe, vice president, National Association of Manufacturers.

ATTORNEYS

John E. Branch, Esq., Wilson, Branch & Barwick, attorneys at law, Rhodes-Haverty Building, Atlanta, Ga.

Jim Clay, legislative assistant to Senator JOHN G. TOWER, U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

Theodore R. Iserman, Kelley, Drye, Newhall & Maginnes, 350 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Kenneth C. Kellar, Esq., Kellar & Kellar & Driscoll, attorneys at law, Lead, S. Dak.

John L. Kilcullen, Esq., McNutt, Dudley & Easterwood, attorneys at law, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

Denison Kitchel, Esq., Evans, Kitchel & Jenckes, attorneys at law, 363 North First Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz.

John F. Lane, Esq., Gall, Lane & Howe, attorneys at law, Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.

Edward A. McCabe, Esq., Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Kenneth C. McGuiness, Esq., 936 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Godfrey P. Schmidt, Esq., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

Ellison D. Smith, Jr., Esq., attorney at law, Barringer Building, Columbia, S.C.

J. Mack Swigert, Taft, Stettinius & Hollister, 603 Dixie Terminal Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Allan Trumbull, Wilkie, Farr, Gallagher, Walton & FitzGibbon, attorneys at law, 15 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

Joseph C. Wells, Esq., Reilly & Wells, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

EMPLOYERS

Frederick G. Atkinson, vice president, R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., Herald Square, New York, N.Y.

R. G. Jeter, vice president, general counsel, and secretary, the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. B. Williamson, vice president, general manager, bearing division, McGill Manufacturing Co., Inc., Valparaiso, Ind.

Joseph A. O'Reilly, associate counsel, industrial relations, Ford Motor Co., the American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

PROFESSORS

Prof. Gottfried Haberler, Galen L. Stone, professor of international trade, Harvard University, Graduate School of Public Administration, 326 Littauer Center, Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. Frank H. Knight, emeritus professor of social science and philosophy, the University of Chicago, Department of Economics, 1126 East 59th Street, Chicago, Ill.

Dr. James W. McKie, professor of economics and business administration, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. William H. Peterson, associate professor of economics, New York University Graduate School of Business Administration, 100 Trinity Place, New York, N.Y.

Dr. John R. Van de Water, University of California School of Business Administration, Los Angeles, Calif.

Dr. David McCord Wright, professor of economics and political science, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

OTHERS

The Honorable Graham A. Barden, Barden, Stith & McCotter, attorneys at law, New Bern, N.C.

William B. Barton, manager and general counsel, Labor Relations and Legal Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Carroll E. French, Industrial Relations Counselors Service, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

Lambert H. Miller, general counsel, National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

PERSONNEL OF STUDY GROUPS, NAM CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF UNION POWER

I. "Determination of What Key Unions Do That Is Monopolistic" (including "Identification of Unions' Predatory Acts"—formerly group IV).

Chairman: John F. Lane, Gall, Lane & Howe, Washington, D.C.

William B. Barton, manager and general counsel, Labor Relations and Legal Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C. (alternate: Joseph Fagan, Labor Relations and Legal Department).

John E. Branch, Wilson, Branch & Barwick, Atlanta, Ga.

Prof. Gottfried Haberler, Harvard University, Graduate School of Public Administration, Cambridge, Mass.

John L. Kilcullen, McNutt, Dudley & Easterwood, Washington, D.C.

Edward A. McCabe, Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, Washington, D.C.

Dr. James W. McKee, professor of economics and business administration, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Joseph A. O'Reilly, associate counsel, industrial relations, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

Godfrey P. Schmidt, New York, N.Y.

II. "Clarification of the Elements of Union Power" (sources of union power).

Chairman: J. Mack Swigert, Taft, Stettinius & Hollister, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Frederick G. Atkinson, vice president, R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., New York, N.Y. (alternate: Lester Block, counsel).

Jim Clay, legislative assistant to Senator JOHN G. TOWER, U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

Carroll E. French, Industrial Relations Counselors Service, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Kenneth C. Kellar, Kellar & Kellar & Driscoll, Lead, S. Dak.

Denison Kitchel, Evans, Kitchel & Jenckes, Phoenix, Ariz.

Kenneth C. McGuiness, Washington, D.C.

Dr. William H. Peterson, associate professor of economics, New York University Graduate School of Business Administration, New York, N.Y.

Allan Trumbull, Wilkie, Farr, Gallagher, Walton & FitzGibbon, New York, N.Y.

A. F. Williamson, vice president, general manager, bearing division, McGill Manufacturing Co., Inc., Valparaiso, Ind.

III. "Documentation of Union Power" (economic, political, financial).

Chairman: Dr. John R. Van de Water, University of California School of Business Administration, Los Angeles, Calif.

Theodore R. Iserman, Kelley, Drye, Newhall & Maginnes, New York, N.Y.

R. G. Jeter, vice president, general counsel, and secretary, the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

Dension Kitchel, Evans, Kitchel & Jenckes, Phoenix, Ariz. (on political facets).

Prof. Frank H. Knight, emeritus professor of social science and philosophy, the University of Chicago Department of Economics, Chicago, Ill.

Godfrey P. Schmidt, New York, N.Y.

Ellison D. Smith, Jr., Columbia, S.C.

Joseph C. Wells, Reilly & Wells, Washington, D.C.

Dr. David McCord Wright, professor of economics and political science, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

Proposal for Increase of Budget To Advance the Study of Union Monopoly Power

Consistent with the basic policy position on monopolistic practices set forth in "Industry Believes," the industrial relations division has designed a program to meet the problem of curbing union monopoly power, the outline of which is attached with a timetable.

To implement the program, an outstanding committee has been appointed and has met upon two occasions for the development of an action program. A list of the personnel of the committee and the task force subcommittee serving its purposes is attached.

A preliminary study of the subcommittee on the sources of union power under J. Mack Swigert, its chairman, is also attached. In addition, special studies and literature of various task forces and symposiums are being collected and cataloged.

The scattered efforts and sporadic writings on the general subject have never been collected and classified for instant use and availability. It is estimated that there are approximately 50,000 pieces of such literature. The abundant case histories and illustrations of the impact of union monopoly power relating to unemployment, inflation, limitations upon economic growth, and strangulation of economic progress, have—because of the limited resources of the groups interested in this undertaking—never been adequately compiled and evaluated.

The limitation of the size and time available to the staff of the industrial relations division makes it impracticable to develop adequate resource information to implement legislative proposals and provide for adequate programs for public information.

A special research program has therefore been designed by one of the outstanding members of our committee, Dr. John R. Van de Water of the University of California, whose writings and insight in this field have earned for him a reputation of being one of the foremost authorities on the subject. Moreover, he is of a conservative view and dedicated to the principles of exposing as well as correcting the abusive use of union power. He and a staff of graduate students would undertake a research program within the scope of the following outline:

1. The project will deal explicitly with the uses and abuses of union power.

2. Insofar as it is relevant to the abuse of union power, studies will relate the countermeasures which management has taken, such as industrywide bargaining and court and board action, the actions of government in dealing with the abuse of union power, and the adequacy and good and bad effects of such action economically, politically, and in terms of sound public policy.

3. Specific topics on which concrete information will be collected, collated, evaluated, and made available as requested, include:

Patterns of labor-management relationships.

Union action, by specific industries.

Dispute strike settlements.

Union wage, benefit, and power policies.

Union membership requirements and controls.

Work rules and standards.

Productivity tests and influences.

Technological change and automation influences.

Self-help techniques employed by unions.

Self-help techniques employed by management.

Featherbedding.

Strikes and boycotts.

Violence and threats.

Power relations by area, methods of power production, and power comparisons between parties.

Multicompany bargaining, strikes, and lockouts.

National emergency strikes and their treatment.

Union monopoly.

Special union immunities and privileges.

Methods of reducing union power.

Competitive and noncompetitive market structures as related to union conduct and management response.

Influences on inflation and deflation.

Influences and conduct affecting employment and unemployment.

Intraunion and interunion power focuses and rivalries.

Management rights and union action.

Current legislation.

Bills before Congress.

Additional proposed legislation.

4. Sources of information will include:

National management association source materials as made available.

Journals and magazines.

Newspaper reports and news items.

Published and unpublished theses.

Books.

Court decisions and records.

Decisions and reports of relevant government boards and commissions.

Arbitration awards.

Congressional and State legislative reports and evaluations as made available.

Personal interviewing and programing.

5. Materials collected may be useful to parties interested in action programs related to answering the abuse of union power. Such materials are also expected to become a rich source of materials for writing in the field. The research program itself is not intended to produce specific books, monographs or articles; yet the writer, and others making use of information secured, can be expected to prepare materials for publication on the strength of such information.

6. In process of such collection and evaluation of material, it is expected that there will be developed a comprehensive and detailed topical outline; in time and as the project so requires, information retrieval devices for quick access to information in the specific areas; an evaluation of information sources; and a method for continuing acquisition, collation, evaluation, and reporting of up-to-date information.

7. It is expected that the program will, during this year, produce in comprehensiveness, depth and detail, information sources substantially superior in content, methods of evaluation, availability, and outline analysis, to anything which has been attempted to date; and all that is produced during the current year becomes a base upon which to build for information retrieval and reporting in the years ahead.

To accomplish the foregoing, a supplemental budget allowance is required, commencing immediately and extending to the end of the calendar year.

An approach of this nature is indispensable to the ultimate success of any program that may be designed to reach a realistic solution to the problem. Absent the foregoing, it will be necessary for the business community to continue to rely upon the preachment of platitudes. There does not now exist satisfactory capacity to support those legislators who have introduced bills to correct the abuses of organized labor.

Labor organizations have set aside, through their vast research divisions, sums in the high six figures to prevent inroads upon their monopoly position. This, of course, does not include the $2,500,000 currently being expended by unions for short courses on college campuses during the summer months of 1962, nor funds used for political purposes.

It should be recognized that this is a continuing program and will require further, but lesser, resources over a period of several years. In this connection, it should not be overlooked that the industrial relations division, through its annual institutes, has made available a fund of $25,000 net, and has produced during the past 18 months approximately $60,000 gross, from industrial relations clinics conducted by its vice president. The expense of this latter program is minimal and is in any event more than offset by increased revenue from renewal, increase, and new membership.

All of the several programs which the industrial relations division provides for the field are on a self-sustaining basis. The literature which it distributes has returned many times its cost through minimal charges that are made. Furthermore, it will not be overlooked that much of the amount requested for this budget has been saved this year through a streamlining of the staff. The contemplated replacements should not increase the revised budgetary limitations.

RANSOM FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Granahan). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I feel compelled to rise today even at this late hour to raise my voice in objection, which I did yesterday and have done before for nearly 2 years now, to the abortive proposal of the tractors-for-prisoners deal and now the $62 million Cuban prisoner deal in the name of ransom because it is nothing more and no less than blackmail. The insulting proposals of Fidel Castro and his constant demands, extravagant demands, which he has repeated again just the other day, demanding $62 million—now $60 million—$2 million has been paid, this $62 million demand made by him in the name of indemnity for repayment for damages done in the abortive invasion in the Bay of Pigs.

I introduced a resolution in 1961 which stated very clearly my position in opposition to the tractors-for-prisoners abortive proposal. Finally, the administration itself withdrew its support on that particular proposition. Shortly thereafter, however, a new proposal was made in early 1962. This was not for tractors. This was not for $25 million worth of tractors as indemnity and ransom and blackmail. This was for $62 million—spendable American dollars. I brought out on the floor of the House, and it is in the Record, that earlier, this demand being made in 1962, that earlier even before the demand was made, the administration had been giving consideration to and had issued an order, a preliminary regulation of the Internal Revenue Service, on December 6, 1961, to the effect that contributions to the Cuban Family Committee would be tax deductible. Now this was as far back as 1961, December, even before Fidel Castro made his money demand, changing it from tractors to money. And during a period after it was publicly announced by the President that the United States was withdrawing any support of the tractor deal.

There is not any question but what the administration has directly or indirectly been working hand in hand with Fidel Castro in an effort to get the prisoners released by negotiating for the paying of ransom of some sort, and it appears obvious as an effort to apologize for the mistakes made by the administration in the invasion of the Bay of Pigs. This was probably the most serious mistake and one of the blackest blotches in the history of this country, the refusal and failure of the President of the United States to provide air cover in order that the invasion could be successful.

Now in an effort to bail out the administration because of the mistake, there is this second abortive proposal, and now for the first time in the history of this country ransom is being negotiated to be paid to an enemy government. For the first time in the history of this country a ransom and indemnity is being negotiated with Fidel Castro, which the Nation has already stated through this legislative body as being the head of an enemy government, a Communist government, in the Cuban resolution passed by the House recently.

The administration is still negotiating the payment of indemnity to that enemy Communist government. How silly we must look. How silly we must look in the eyes of the people of the free world, let alone how weak and vacillating to the Communist governments. How silly we must look in the eyes of all the world in condoning these ransom negotiations when this body passed a resolution of recent date—Public Law 87–733—demanding strong action on the part of the administration, saying we will back the President in any efforts necessary, that the United States is "determined"—

> (a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;
>
> (b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and
>
> (c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.
>
> Approved October 3, 1962.

Are we working toward the realization of the aspirations of freedom-loving Cubans, for the Cuban people themselves to achieve their self-determination when what we do is to make available to Fidel Castro badly needed, according to the latest press releases, foodstuffs, paid for by American taxpayers, foodstuffs to Fidel Castro which he needs as badly as he needs military materiel, and perhaps even worse? It is common knowledge that his efforts in agrarian reform and providing agricultural products for his people are a dismal failure. And so we are bailing him out of his failure, and at the same time compounding the failure of the administration in the Bay of Pigs invasion by paying indemnity.

This House has spoken further in the Mutual Security Act, and in no uncertain terms. How foolish we must look, Madam Speaker, in the eyes of other freedom-loving nations that we are asking to refrain from trading with Cuba, not only military materiel but all trade with Cuba. We passed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act—I have it before me now—to the effect that—

> None of the funds provided in this bill shall be available for assistance to any country the government of which sells arms, munitions, or implements of war to the Castro regime, or which furnishes any sort of aid, either military or economic, to the regime.

We also provided for the cutting off of funds to any country that trades with Castro, and with the Communists in Cuba or in this hemisphere.

This Government has spoken through Congress twice in unequivocal terms.

In the last consideration of the question of money or dollars for Castro I introduced a resolution in strong opposition to it, House Concurrent Resolution 459, on April 11, 1962. This was after I discovered that the Internal Revenue Service had already issued a preliminary order on December 6, 1961, that was then in effect based upon which contributions to this Cuban Family Committee were tax deductible.

I introduce an amendment to the mutual security bill which barely failed, which would have put this ransom proposal in its proper resting place—the ash can. It barely failed by a vote of 134 to 137, and it barely failed not because of a single Member on the Republican side voting against it. I was amazed at the offer by Mr. Donovan of ransom for the Cuban prisoners in the amount of $60 million or for foodstuffs which can be interpreted only as an indemnification by this Nation for the overt acts of this Nation. This was through a Mr. Donovan, who happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate. This is a way of playing a little politics at the same time.

This country through its overt acts is consenting to paying or having paid an indemnity to a Communist country—Cuba.

That is blackmail, that is extortion.

This demand for ransom is reminiscent of the days of piracy on the high seas, and repugnant to every principle of decency and self-respect.

This Nation by considering this proposal and authorizing Mr. Donovan to negotiate it is kowtowing to the demands of a Communist dictator, resulting from an imprisonment order handed down through a kangaroo court which resulted in the imprisonment, thus giving recognition to the court itself—an indirect recognition of Castro's Communist government. How can we say we do not recognize Castro on the one hand, and on the other hand recognize and negotiate with Castro through Donovan? This Nation's prestige is sinking in the eyes of the world, and as of this time this giving in to Castro's indemnity and ransom demands can only be interpreted as yielding to and being soft on and conciliatory toward the Communists and communism.

This is the thing I cannot understand. There are thousands more prisoners rotting in Castro's rathole prisons who could be traded and could be made the basis of further demands for further indemnifications from this country or its citizens. Where is the end of it? There are 100,000 of them, it is estimated, in Cuban prisons.

As a matter of fact, as I brought out earlier in the day, based upon a letter received by me from the Department of State dealing with the question, which replied to my inquiry of the State Department as to why they will not recognize the free and non-Communist government in exile to help them win back their own freedom. I could hardly believe the answer I got. But in that answer, in which the excuse was if we did so—recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile—we would not be able to continue, in effect, to do business with Castro through the Swiss Embassy, go on to say—this is from the letter of March 12, 1962, signed by Mr. Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State:

> In addition, there are, as you know, a number of U.S. citizens who still reside in Cuba. The Swiss are trying to assist them, including some who are in prison and who can only be reached through the efforts of the Swiss Embassy in Havana.

U.S. citizens are in prison. Where is the compassion for the U.S. citizens that are in prison equal to the compassion being shown by the administration through Mr. Donovan with regard to the Cuban exiles in prison?

No one has more sympathy for them than I—the Cuban prisoners—but everyone in Cuba is a prisoner today. The whole population—millions of them are prisoners. There are also Americans who are prisoners. There are a hundred thousand who are actually incarcerated.

Thousands of Americans lost their lives in the two World Wars and in Korea fighting to uphold the dignity of America and trying to affirm their dedication to freedom. Can we do less here today? Can we compromise away to Castro the causes for which they fought and died?

These are some of the questions and I want to get an answer to them. What right does a private citizen, in view of the Logan Act and the Trading With the Enemy Act have in doing business with Fidel Castro after it is stated that this Government finds the Castro Communist regime to be an enemy of this country?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think the gentleman will agree with me that there is certainly a very great difference between the proposals as we have them by rumor and the so-called tractors-for-freedom matter. As I remember, the tractors-for-freedom deal, with which neither the gentleman from Florida nor I agreed, they were to be bought with money collected by private citizens. However, if we can believe the reports which we have had today over the wires, which reports certainly have not been denied by the White House, there is every reason to think there will be taxpayers' money used to pay the ransom for the prisoners of the Bay of Pigs under this particular proposal.

If this is true and if we are actually going to pay from this Government to another government—to a dictator, if you will—for the release of prisoners, there will never be another American released by a dictator or by an enemy for free, will there?

I think the answer is obviously "No." We are starting on a course of action here which will rise to haunt us in the future and which will cause every American, wherever he may be throughout the world, to be in danger of being kidnaped and captured and held for ransom. Once you allow yourself to be stamped with that stamp which says you are a sucker for and weak enough to give in to ransom, then you will never get through paying until you rise up on your hind legs and solve the problem by physical force.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the question of ransom is not necessarily, in my opinion, whether the ransom is raised through a citizens' committee in the form of American dollars or whether it is a request for funds from the United States. Although I agree there is a differentiation as far as the taxpayers are concerned, because the people should be even more opposed and disturbed over any thought of using the taxpayer's money, their money, whether it be direct or not for payment of ransom to Castro.

Mr. Speaker, I read that there is even some possibility that U.S. cash may be involved, according to the news.

Mr. Speaker, I just read that according to the United Press "there were reports that the Kennedy administration itself was prepared to help finance part of the ransom, but State Department and White House officials declined comment on any aspect of the private negotiations."

Mr. Speaker, I thus also see by the press that this is a cloak-and-dagger operation. This is a very supersecret job. This is one of Bobby Kennedy's quickies—under the philosophy of do it before the people realize what is happening and the shock of realizing it has been done will not be quite so great—politically that is.

Mr. Speaker, I quote further from the UPI release today:

> Evidence mounted today that Government officials are playing a behind-the-scenes role in negotiations for the release of 1,113 prisoners in Cuba. Whatever the role may be, it was cloaked in official silence.

Mr. Speaker, is it not the American people's right to know what deal is being cooked up with possibly their money and wealth in the form of foodstuff surpluses or otherwise which is involved in these negotiations?

Mr. Speaker, I quote further:

> But there was this evidence to link the Government with efforts, ostensibly initiated by relatives of the prisoners, to free them:
>
> A report that James B. Donovan, Democratic candidate for U.S. Senator from New York and attorney official representing the families of the prisoners, actually was assigned to the negotiator's role last June by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Kennedy said the report—published by the New York World-Telegram and Sun—is untrue, but it was known that Donovan visited the Attorney General several times in recent months.

The American people have been denied any knowledge of these supersecret negotiations on this vital matter, and I ask why.

Permit me to say parenthetically that it was reported in the press just the other day, before his most recent visit, that he visited the Attorney General's office before he went down to Havana to continue negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, quoting further the UPI report today:

> A Justice spokesman declined to comment on the subject that the prisoner negotiations were discussed during these visits.
>
> On at least one of the visits, Donovan was accompanied by a State Department specialist on Cuban affairs.

Does that not speak for itself? And further quoting:

> Some Members of Congress informed on progress of the negotiations indicated that they expect Government funds to be used for part of the cost of effecting the liberation of the prisoners.

I am one of them. I have asked the President of the United States or the Secretary of State to advise me as to whether it is true or not, because all of the press releases indicate it is and I have condemned it. Under what statute and under what law, and what authority is this done, particularly in view of the strong action taken by this body recently, expecting that trade would be cut off and that any aid to Castro would be cut off? We see now that while the administration talks rough, the administration talks tough, when it comes to action it looks like it uses a powder puff. Talk tough and use a powderpuff—in dealing with the Communists seems to be the rule of the New Frontier.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Madam Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida for raising this issue on the floor of this House, this issue of secret negotiations by a U.S. citizen, a private citizen, Mr. Donovan, with the Castro-Communist Government of Cuba, looking toward the payment of $60 million of ransom.

I subscribe completely to the gentleman's protest and associate myself in asking for an answer to the questions as to the authority for such negotiations. I oppose any payment of ransom by anyone of any kind through the connivance of our Government, to anyone in Communist Cuba. And secondly, and just as important, I want to join the gentleman's protest to the withholding of facts and information from the American people.

It would be reprehensible it seems to me to keep such negotiations secret until they were an accomplished fact and it was too late for public indignation or congressional action, or anything else, to stop them. As a matter of fact, any such devious plan might so outrage public opinion, it seems to me, that it could well invite a congressional impeachment proceeding.

Madam Speaker, the Secretary of State should make immediately available to the press and to the public a full explanation of what is going on. Certainly no dealings could have been conducted without the aid and support of the Government. And I might say that it is an odd thing—the gentleman mentioned the Attorney General; the situation legally is such that any prosecution under the Logan Act would have to be by the Attorney General. And, indeed, only the President could pardon anyone who breached the law. So this, it seems to me, is a matter between, you might say, the Kennedy family and the American people.

Madam Speaker, I compliment the gentleman. He has done the right thing in asking that all the facts be given to the American people.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and to comment further; one of the things that is so disturbing to me is this. While these negotiations are going on to pay Castro $60 million in one form or another to help support his Communist regime—and that is the obvious result of it, it helps to keep him in power—at the very time these negotiations are going on, and inadvertently Mr. Donovan is campaigning for the Senate in New York down in Havana—we find Mr. Dorticos, the President of Cuba, calling upon the United Nations to condemn the United States, with resulting riots around the United Nations evidencing U.S. citizen distaste for Castro and communism in Cuba. So we find these negotiations for ransom continuing and we find that even while Mr. Donovan is in Havana, Castro, himself, is proclaiming again, "I am a true Communist; I believe in communism." He is telling it to the world again, so there can be no doubt about it, he is a Communist, his country under his rule is Communist, and at the same time the United States is hoping and planning to pay him $60 million for ransom of some prisoners through Mr. Donovan—which he will use to continue to keep all of Cuba a prison.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, today I sent a telegram to the President of the United States on this general subject. I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. GRANAHAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

The apparent involvement of your administration with the rumored $62 million ransom deal with Castro is disturbing. As an American citizen it disturbs me because if the rumors are correct, it is further evidence of the extent to which we have departed from the principles expressed by one of our prominent forefathers who was willing to provide "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." As a Member of the Congress, I am disturbed because this would be further admission on the part of your administration of its involvement in the Bay of Pigs tragedy. As a Senator, you were critical of the admission by President Eisenhower of our involvement in the U-2 incident. Yet that involvement certainly did not weaken our international prestige to the extent that your self-proclaimed failure in the Cuban invasion would do.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I am disturbed at the thought that in spite of the sentiments expressed and the safeguards adopted in both the authorizing legislation and the appropriations bill for foreign aid, funds appropriated for foreign aid may be used for the purpose of paying ransom to a Red dictator.

I respectfully request that your administration divulge the extent to which it is involved in the negotiations of one James B. Donovan, a Democratic candidate for the Senate from the State of New York, for the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners. Specifically, I would like to have the amount of money which has been or will be committed to this purpose from foreign aid appropriations, and the categories of aid from which such commitments have been or will be made.

J. J. R.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true that under the Logan Act the negotiations of Mr. Donovan probably are not legal; in fact, as a lawyer, having read the act, I would say they probably are not legal. If this is the situation, the only thing the Attorney General of the United States could have promised, if indeed he promised Mr. Donovan anything, is immunity from prosecution?

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman is eminently correct.

I just happen to have a copy of the Logan Act before me which I placed in the RECORD in the discussion on the tractor deal, and the $62 million deal previously. Here it is:

Title 18, United States Code, section 953: Private correspondence with foreign governments:

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If the gentleman will yield further, it follows that Mr. Donovan could not have been an agent of the U.S. Government for this purpose because the Attorney General could not have appointed him to carry on negotiations with a foreign government. Does it not follow that the only thing that Mr. Donovan could have received was the assurance of the Attorney General that under this administration, at least, he would not be prosecuted for the violation of the laws of the United States?

Mr. CRAMER. If his dealing had been with the Attorney General, under the language of the Logan Act it is my opinion that the Attorney General does not have power to give "the authority of the United States," and therefore if he is not able to give the authority to negotiate, which he obviously cannot do as Attorney General, that would have to come from the President or from the Secretary of State. Then the other thing that could be promised is what the gentleman is suggesting, and that is immunity from prosecution, because the Attorney General or one of the family clan or family dynasty would be the one that would have to bring the prosecution. I think the gentleman is eminently correct.

I think this is a matter, because it has come up now two or three times in recent years under this administration, that should get, and should get immediately, the attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, because I do not know of a greater invasion of the rights of this body or the rights of Congress, the Senate in particular, that could be involved than to have a private person negotiating with a foreign government without the Senate of the United States, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, having a right to look at the agreement entered into through the constitutional process of ratification.

I think that is an invasion of the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the Congress of the United States, let alone it is an invasion of the proper functions of the executive branch of the Government, the President, and the executive having the sole authority to do business with foreign governments. I know of no leaders in Congress who have—in the usual tradition—been kept advised of negotiations with this enemy government. Is not even the Congress entitled to know?

I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs, at least, ought to look into this entire matter. It ought to call Mr. Donovan before it and ought to find out exactly what this deal is and how much it is going to cost the American taxpayer, and consider the serious questions involved that I have raised.

I was coming up here on a plane just the other day, and I read my hometown paper. Interestingly enough, it did not appear in the Washington Post. I read the St. Petersburg Times of Tuesday, October 9, 1962, when Mr. Dorticos was taking off on us, condemning the United States. Here was the Associated Press release from Havana carried in that newspaper, again I say not in the Washington Post:

The U.S. Government was reported to have supplied the difference in funds or the equivalent in supplies after Cuban exile organizations were unable to raise the amount demanded.

The article was referring to the ransom for the prisoners.

The ransom for the prisoners reportedly will consist of $60 million worth of food and medicine which will be taken to Cuba in Cuban ships. Castro originally had demanded $62 million for release of the prisoners.

Again:

The U.S. Government was reported to have supplied the difference in funds or the equivalent in supplies after Cuban exile organizations were unable to raise the amount demanded.

Further, from the press or otherwise my source of information because I have not gotten a reply to my wire asking that this matter be brought to public attention and asking what authority exists for such action. It clearly appears that the U.S. Government is being put by this administration in the wholly untenable position, I might say unholy position, of negotiating with Fidel Castro for the relief of these prisoners in the amount of $60 million worth of money or foodstuffs, and it is being done in direct contravention of the statement made to the Congress of the United States in very recent months. It makes our policy in regard to non-shipments to Cuba look just as foolish as it could be. It makes our foreign policy about as two-faced as it could be. I, for one, do not understand it, and feel it is my duty to protest it. Apparently, this administration has the attitude when it comes to prisoner ransom and release: American prisoners, no; Cuban prisoners, si. That is apparently the policy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Communism has been a failure throughout the world. But of all the areas in which it has failed, it has failed most dismally in the area of providing food for its own people.

Mr. CRAMER. Right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It seems we are now in the process of giving food to Poland and giving food to Yugoslavia and now food to Cuba, and that apparently we are trying desperately to make up for the shortcomings of the Communist world. I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for bringing this to the attention of the House and to the attention of the American people. This is certainly a situation which, if the rumors are correct, deserves to be corrected and deserves to be investigated by the appropriate bodies of this House.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman and may I ask the gentleman, does he know of any excuse why the administration would keep this supersecret and not make the negotiations public?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly do not, particularly when I remember how, during the previous administration, many people who are prominent in this administration were talking so much about the right to know, about freedom of information. I believe in the right to know on the part of the American people, and I hope the administration will begin to practice the extension of this right to know as so many of those people were preaching during the previous administration.

Mr. CRAMER. The New Frontier propagandists have been trying to make it appear that those who oppose this are not interested in the release of these prisoners, are somehow more patriotic than humane. I say categorically now and I said so in a resolution I introduced, I am interested in their release but I am equally interested in the release of all other prisoners with dignity and permanent freedom—without getting down on our knees to Castro—without humiliation. The way to release them is by recognizing a government-in-exile of the refugees and by supporting them. They would win back freedom for all Cubans.

This is not only my view, but when I introduced the resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 459, and the previous resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 479, I received a letter from Dr. Elpidio Garcia which I put in the Record. He happens to be a former prosecutor for the Government before the supreme court of Cuba and attorney general, and he joined me in opposing the ransom deal. Here is what he said about it:

> A little over a year ago, a group of my fellow citizens, pledging their lives to their duty and their country, devoted themselves to the glorious task of reconquering their freedom and independence. The successful outcome of that valiant effort was prevented by reasons which are known to everybody. We are unable to render any other offering or tribute to the unselfishness and sacrifice of our captive brothers than our grief and self-denial as we see them imprisoned, but we cannot diminish the magnitude of their glory or of their service to the country by buying their freedom—the freedom of the unfortunate hostages in the hands of the wretch who seized them—or of the highwayman who imprisoned them—nor can we offer their hopes for freedom anything else but our unswerving determination to reconquer their freedom, even if it should cost us our lives.
>
> Thank you very much, Mr. Cramer, for the dignified, reasonable, and courageous bill presented by you to both the House and the Senate, which I have had the good fortune of reading and which preserves the dignity of our prisoners, the honor of our fellow citizens, and the decorum of our brothers. Grateful Cuba will know how to thank you for your noble and honorable initiative. May the Lord grant the Cubans success in the final battle for our freedom, with the aid, cooperation, and stimulus of our invincible brothers, the Americans.

That is what even the Cubans feel about this abortive ransom deal. Let us hope the New Frontier does not make the United States party to another Cuban debacle as seems to be planned and underway. God help America if we continue to compromise our honor, our dignity, and dissipate our moral strength in this fight against atheistic communism as we have been doing in Cuba and are apparently bent on doing again.

I include my wire and ask for some answers:

> October 9, 1962.
>
> The Honorable John F. Kennedy,
> *President of the United States,*
> *The White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
> The Honorable Joseph Campbell,
> *Comptroller General of the United States,*
> *General Accounting Office,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
> The Honorable Dean Rusk,
> *Secretary of State,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Regarding $60 million foodstuffs and medicine exchange as ransom for Cuban prisoners which by all news reports is to include U.S.-owned, taxpayer-paid-for foodstuffs to make up the difference between volunteered funds and the $62 million demanded, I strongly protest this or any expenditure of taxpayers' money through U.S.-owned foodstuffs for the ransom of Cuban prisoners as being contrary to the basic statement of policy by Congress calling for an authorizing specific action to rid this hemisphere of Castro and communism. In view of the strong public protest against the tractors-for-prisoners proposal, and in view of the downgrading of our prestige as the leading nation of the free nations of the world by thus admitting our participation in and backing of the Bay of Pigs invasion and our conciliatory attitude toward Castro, and having introduced resolutions opposing both the tractors deal and the $62 million ransom deal, I feel I must express my deep concern and shock over the secret negotiations that are even yet not fully revealed between the United States, through a private citizen, and Castro. In view of the restrictive language written into the mutual security bill instructing the withholding of aid to countries that do business with Castro, and the House Cuban resolution calling for strong and affirmative action to get rid of Castro and the Communists, I am specifically requesting information as to what possible authority exists for the spending of any portion of the $60 million by the Government of the United States in payment of ransom to the enemy Communist Fidel Castro and, further, even if such legal authority exists, which is unknown to me, how can the United States be put in the position of strengthening Castro and communism on the one hand by delivering shipments to Cuba of $60 million worth of American substance, when calling on the other hand for all other countries to stop all other types of shipments to Cuba. How two-faced can our foreign policy objectives be? How inconsistent can our actions be? How confused the entire free world must be? Historically, the United States has never paid ransom or indemnity and this precedent will come to haunt the United States and the free world of the future. I am asking that this supersecret negotiation be called to a halt before irreparable damage to U.S. prestige is done. It is further inconceivable to me that, and I question the legality of, a private citizen; namely, Mr. Donovan, would be allowed to negotiate with an enemy government on behalf of the United States—with the Castro government—declared to be an enemy government by the Congress in its resolution and by the President in invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act to prevent the inshipment of Havana tobacco of recent date. Such negotiations are considered a violation of the spirit if not the letter of the Logan Act and it has been the general policy of Congress to oppose any trade with the enemy as set forth in the Trading With the Enemy Act. The basic policies for freedom and against communism are all being violated, in my opinion, in this abortive deal—and I strongly protest making Castro stronger, our anti-Communist efforts a laughing stock throughout the world, and the establishment of a policy of paying taxpayer money to Castro for indemnity and ransom inherent in this supersecret deal, kept secret purposely and negotiated by a private citizen. I specifically ask these questions:
>
> 1. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S. Government-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?
> 2. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?
> 3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?
> 4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?
> 5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the $60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?
> 6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Castro and Donovan?
>
> William C. Cramer,
> *Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Granahan). The time of the gentleman has expired.

BONNEVILLE ELECTRIC POWER IN IDAHO MEANS INDUSTRIAL GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Granahan). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. Pfost] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. PFOST. Madam Speaker, for years the people of my State of Idaho have been seeking ways to expand opportunities for our businessmen, to spur our industrial growth, to create a stronger economy, and to widen the horizons of our children.

I am sincerely convinced, Madam Speaker, that if Idaho is to continue to move forward, and to keep pace with the rest of the Nation, we must bring low-cost electric power from the Federal Bonneville Dam into our State.

Two moves are in the making to do this. First, the Federal Government is considering action which will assure Idaho its fair share of Northwest public power, and second, the Congress has before it legislation to retain for the Northwest, first call on Northwest power. I am sponsoring both moves.

Now, there are those who say: "Let's keep low-cost Federal power out of Idaho."

I say: "Let's get our share."

Who is really fighting for the people of the State? I contend I am, and here in my hand is the proof.

These are Idaho Power Co. bills rendered within the last year to the citizens of Idaho. This bill is for $11.50 for 800 kilowatt hours. In Milton-Freewater, just across the State line in Oregon, the charge for the same service—the same number of kilowatt-hours—is $7, 63 percent more in Idaho than in Oregon.

Here is another one. It is for 1270 kilowatt-hours. The cost in Idaho was $18.88. It would have been only $9.35 in Milton-Freewater, 102 percent more in Idaho.

Here are some other bills. This one is 62 percent higher, this one 65 percent, and this one 105 percent higher.

Kilowatt-hours	Idaho power cost	BPA cost through public utilities	Percent higher	Higher
730	$10.87	$6.65	62	$4.25
800	11.50	7.00	63	4.50
890	12.31	7.45	65	4.86
1,270	18.88	9.35	102	9.53
1,310	19.58	9.55	105	10.03

Why are these costs so much higher in Idaho than Oregon? Because Oregon has Bonneville Power, and in the area in which these bills were rendered, Idaho does not.

Let us look at some examples of what it costs to run a business in Idaho.

Westvaco Corp. of Pocatello paid the Idaho Power Co. $3,110,500 for electricity in 1960. With BPA power they would have saved $1,380,000. How many jobs does that add up to?

In 1961, Monsanto Chemical Corp. paid $2,807,799 to the Utah Power & Light Co., while Central Farmers paid this same company $1,405,394. This is a total of almost $7½ million.

If these three big phosphate companies had been served directly by Bonneville, they would have saved more than half of their power costs, or nearly $4 million in 1 year.

Think what this much money could do to offset the high freight rates which plague the West, and how much more competitive it could make Idaho phosphates in a bigger marketing area—not to mention cheaper fertilizer for Idaho's own farmers. Convert that amount into plant facilities and monthly paychecks.

With lower Bonneville power rates Idaho phosphate companies could increase their production fourfold by 1980, create 3,000 new jobs in their plants and 6,000 new jobs in supporting industries and businesses. More out-of-State dollars would come into Idaho to help pay Idaho wages and Idaho taxes. Without low-cost power officials of these companies have made it clear that not only can there be no expansion in Idaho, but they may have to move their operations to another State.

I also say "let's get our share," because we are entitled to it.

Maybe you cannot tell by the color of the water, but that's Idaho water generating electricity at the Lower Snake and Columbia River Dams. Waters rising in Idaho produce almost 27 percent of the power at Ice Harbor, McNary, the Dalles and Bonneville Dams, and at John Day when it is completed.

This amounts to nearly 6 billion kilowatt-hours per year. Six billion not million—"B" as in bread and butter. Yet, only 207 million kilowatt-hours comes into Idaho, and that only in a few northern counties. And remember we are not talking about power that will be generated some time in the future, we are talking about power that is being generated today—this very minute.

Idaho water produces for others 33 times as much low-cost Federal power as Idaho now gets from BPA; 12 times as much as the Bureau of Reclamation produces in Idaho for Idaho.

Why are we not getting our share, and at rates homeowners and industries elsewhere in the Northwest are getting Federal power? Somebody is selling Idaho down the river.

What is worse we are being sold out by Idahoans—Idahoans who raise the phony arguments of "danger to our water rights," "unfair competition," and "who is going to pay the taxes?"

Idaho water rights will not be impaired by bringing Bonneville Power Administration into southern Idaho. Bonneville does not run the dams—the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers do that. Bonneville just sells the power. Here in Idaho, the Bureau of Reclamation will continue to make water releases in accordance with State laws. It is a well-established policy of the Bureau and the Corps of Engineers that irrigation rights come first, and power production must be consistent with such use.

Not once since the beginning has anybody in the Columbia Basin complained that the Bureau's operation of Grand Coulee Dam for the Bonneville Power system has kept needed water from the land.

Bonneville will provide competition for our private utilities, all right, but hardly "unfair competition." Just look at what has happened to the private utilities in Washington and Oregon who face Bonneville competition. Their rates are down, and their sales and profits and stock market values are up. They have learned how to make more money by selling more power at less cost. And none of them is applying for a 13-percent rate increase. They are selling residential power for less today than they did in 1938. Idaho Power Co. is not. But their profits are just as big as Idaho Power's. They have gained, and their customers have gained.

Taxes? As their sales and profits have gone up, so have the taxes of these private utilities outside Idaho. The same will be true of Idaho Power Co. when the competition of low-cost Federal power forces it to lower rates and increase sales. Idaho will not lose any taxes from Idaho Power Co., but will get more. Even more important, low-cost Federal power will create new taxable wealth, spread the tax burden, and keep your own taxes lower than they otherwise would be.

Low-cost power brings industrial growth that makes new payrolls and profits to be taxed. The industries attracted to Oregon and Washington and western Montana by low-cost Bonneville power generally are the biggest single taxpayers in their respective counties. Low-cost power creates the wealth that pays the taxes.

Now, as I have said, Madam Speaker, if we are going to get our share, two things must be done. First, we must get the Bonneville Power Administration's service area extended to include all of Idaho. Senator CHURCH, the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman HARDING, and and I have asked that this be done. Secretary Udall, who has the authority to extend BPA service into all of Idaho, has directed BPA to make a feasibility study in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation. That study is now well underway, and we hope it will be favorable. If it is favorable, and if the people of Idaho indicate they want Bonneville service, the Secretary will issue the necessary marketing order.

Second, the House of Representatives must pass my regional preference bill which assures the Northwest of first call on all Federal power produced in the Northwest. The Senate has already passed a companion measure. At present, any power in excess of the needs of the Northwest could be sold elsewhere. Right now Bonneville's marketing area includes all of Washington, most of Oregon, western Montana, and the panhandle of Idaho. All those areas will be protected by this legislation. If southern Idaho is included in the BPA marketing area, the legislation would extend the same protection to southern Idaho.

Advances in technology make this legislation absolutely necessary. Until very recently you could not transmit electric power, economically, more than 400 miles. There was no way for Northwest power to leave the Northwest. But today we can transmit electricity up to 1,000 miles, or even 2,000 miles, economically.

Further, existing law says Bonneville Power Administration shall sell its power anywhere within economic transmission distance, and give preference to public agencies. There are any number of public agencies within transmission distance who would like to have our power. If transmission lines are built, without regional preference legislation to protect us, these agencies could demand Northwest Federal power ahead of our industries, ahead of our private utilities, and on par with our own public utilities—municipalities, REA's, and so on.

Bonneville does not want to sell firm power elsewhere at the expense of Northwest customers. But Bonneville is willing and even anxious to sell its surplus secondary power to other areas. Unlike firm power, which is based on the lowest streamflows of record, secondary power cannot be guaranteed for delivery day in and day out, year in and year out because it is produced during high water periods.

As a result, there is practically no market for this kind of power in the Northwest. But there is a market for it in California as a cheaper substitute for electricity produced in steamplants that burn coal, oil, or gas. When low-cost northwest secondary power is available, these plants can be shut down, and fuel can be saved. When it is not available, these plants can be fired up again and electric service can be continued without interruption. California is willing to take our surplus power on that basis.

Bonneville is faced with the problem of either selling this secondary power wherever it can be sold, in order to help preserve its low rates, or to let it go to waste and raise rates. And rates are very important to us in the Northwest. It is not just an ample power supply, but an ample supply of low-cost power that attracts industries and makes jobs and builds our region.

As you may know, all Bonneville revenues go to the Federal Treasury to repay, with interest, the Federal Government's investment in Northwest power dams. Every year for its first 20 years, Bonneville always was ahead of schedule in repaying the Treasury. Five years ago BPA was, cumulatively, $78 million ahead of schedule. But 5 straight deficit years have cut BPA's surplus to $20 million. More annual deficits are threatened unless BPA can sell its secondary power. Ironically, in every deficit year BPA has had more unsold secondary power than the amount of the deficit. This secondary power could mean an extra $15 million in revenue each year.

The danger is this: if Bonneville builds the lines or otherwise makes arrangements to sell this secondary power in California without regional preference legislation being enacted first, California public agencies—under existing laws—can demand not only the Northwest's surplus secondary power, but firm power as well—power that is desperately needed here.

This is true whether the transmission lines be Federal or private.

Let us make one more point clear: This pending regional preference legislation does not authorize an intertie. BPA already has authority to sell anywhere within transmission distance. As a matter of fact, 3 years ago BPA was all set to hook up with a California private utility, and would have if the Senate Interior Committee, at the insistence of Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON and CHURCH, had not stopped them. These and other northwest Senators demanded that regional preference legislation be passed first, so the people of the Northwest would continue to have first call on northwest Federal power.

What this really gets down to is a case of protecting one of the Northwest's most valuable resources—its low-cost Federal power—rather than putting it in danger of export to California on a permanent and irrevocable basis. A vote against this legislation is a vote to risk the permanent sale of Northwest resources to other States. A vote for this legislation is a vote to protect our northwest resources and our people. That's why seven of the eight northwest Senators voted for regional preference legislation. I regret that our new Republican Senator from Idaho was the only northwest Senator who did not vote for this measure.

I have been fighting for it in the House of Representatives, along with most northwest Democrats in the House and most if not all the House Republicans from the Northwest.

We must keep BPA rates low. We must retain first call on Northwest Federal power. And we must get Bonneville power into all of Idaho. This is the way to build our State. This is the way to make more business opportunities and more jobs for Idaho people—the way to make a future for our children and keep them in Idaho. This is the way to lower our electric bills. This is the way every Idahoan can add $60, $90, $120 a year to his income by savings on his electric bills. This is the way to broaden our tax base.

This is the way the farmer, the homeowner, the worker, the businessman and, yes, even the Idaho Power Co. can profit and prosper in a healthy, vigorous, and growing Idaho economy.

THE 87TH CONGRESS—PROGRESSIVE AND IMPRESSIVE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. **STAGGERS**. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 2d session of the 87th Congress has indeed been both progressive and impressive. Legislative and administrative action has emerged which means so much to us nationally, internationally—and specifically to the citizens of the Second District of West Virginia, whom I have had the honor to represent for the past 14 years.

American leadership of the free world has been asserted—admitted by the slave world. Personal income is up some $28 billion. Inflation has been halted, making the gain a real gain. Corporate earnings have increased almost $10 billion, providing incentive to enterprise. Depreciation allowances are up approximately $30 billion, making available funds for industrial expansion and modernization.

In this age of outer space projects, nuclear energy utilization, communications satellites, and such—and considering the vast speed in which the whole world is moving—we must keep progressing. There are those, and many, who would like to stand still or look back. I sincerely believe we must keep stepping ahead, we must keep our vision forward, and continue working and striving to strengthen our Nation and make it a better place in which to live and rear your children and mine.

Space projects for exploration, for scientific research, for communication, and, if necessary, for military uses—are all "go." Military might has been increased; the Minuteman alone is described as the missile which closed the gap. We can take the offensive, if, and when, and where we choose.

I am proud to say we have been maneuvered into no hasty or imprudent action repugnant to good sense and national purposes, despite the efforts of our enemies and a few fanatics.

Uncle Sam seems to be in pretty good shape today.

No one can say that the 87th has been an idle or unproductive Congress. During the second session, from January to September 20, 1962, both Houses passed and the President signed no less than 65 major measures. As of that date, 17 additional ones had passed both Houses, and most of these bills were in conference. The total will be larger before adjournment, of course. Still more have been widely and vigorously discussed, with action delayed until the legislation can be put in more perfect form.

Each and every one of these legislative items enacted is important to some one or more segments of national life. I take the liberty of listing a few which I consider significant to the people of the 17 counties of West Virginia which constitute the Second Congressional District. Without classifying them in specific categories, they are:

Authorization for executive department reorganizations. This makes possible easier contact with executives.

Defense procurement contracts placed on a competitive basis—not negotiated. This action gives better opportunities for small business contracts.

Peace Corps expanded: With this expansion is shown foreign approval of our efforts for peace.

President authorized to restrict imports of foreign agricultural products. The fruit industries in the eastern panhandle of West Virginia and other States should be benefited.

President authorized to restrict exports of strategic and critical materials. By this authorization, no help can be given any enemies.

The amount of $12.97 billion for procurement of missiles and naval vessels; $1.45 billion for construction and improvement of military bases and installations; $3.81 billion for planetary and lunar exploration; $167.4 million for Atomic Energy Commission, all involving more contracts and uses for coal; $900 million for construction of needed public works, including roads, water and sewer systems, airports, and others.

Communications satellite system established, operated and controlled jointly by the Federal Government and private industry.

Rail and bus fare tax repealed; the air fare tax was cut in half.

Small Business Administration loan authorization increased by $1.109 billion.

Renegotiation Act extended to provide for recovery of excessive profits on defense contracts.

Small hydraulic electrical projects exempted from the Federal Power Act.

Secretary of Labor given additional power to enforce Welfare and Pensions Plan Disclosure Act of 1958.

Works programs established for the needy, making possible the means for reducing public assistance rolls.

The amount of $2.6 billion provided for construction and improvement loans to colleges and universities over a 5-year period.

The amount of $1 million to any State for educational television.

Armed Forces members permitted to accept scholarships, fellowships and grants for specific purposes.

Veterans' Administration hospital and medical care extended to peacetime veterans who have noncompensable service-connected disabilities—and an increase of 9.4 percent in rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities paid to 1.9 million veterans.

Not since the early days of our Nation has there been such full discussion of public questions and proposals as has characterized the 87th Congress. Every man, in and out of the Congress, has been free to do that which was right in his own eyes. No one is master—no subservience has been exacted or tendered. Nor has the integrity of any man's convictions been questioned.

The most dangerous issue throughout the world today is communism. I feel the greatest menace to our Nation and to free men everywhere is this deadly poisonous attitude of the Communists. It is certainly the most demoralizing and debasing influence on earth.

In talking with representatives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation they have given assurance that communism within the United States is on a downward trend. This is indeed good news. However, we must be on guard always—we cannot let down. We must face realistically that communism could ultimately prevail—this godless "ism" which is so insidious and destroys freedom and righteousness. All of us must never cease our efforts to eliminate and destroy its influence.

The prayer of each of us must be that Almighty God, in His infinite wisdom and glory, give us the strength and unity and foresight to work as a united people against this relentless foe.

We, individually and as a nation, must work together. We must believe in and practice loyalty to our country, to our God, and to the high ideals in which our Nation had its being.

The 87th Congress has indeed been a Congress in the true spirit of the Constitution as it was framed by its originators. With a record of achievement and stern devotion to responsibility, service to the people, faithfulness to duty, and loyalty to God and to country—we rest our case with the electors.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. STAGGERS. Madam Speaker, one of my first acts after coming to Congress in 1949 was to contact all members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, urging the passage of legislation helpful to our deserving State and municipal employees. A bill accomplishing that end was passed that year.

I am proud of the part I have had in enacting legislation which permitted State roadworkers, State employees, municipal workers and schoolteachers to come under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

The strengthening and liberalization of this humanitarian act has meant so much to thousands in my home State of West Virginia. State and municipal retirees are receiving benefits under social security and are thereby having some measure of security in these years when they are no longer able to be gainfully employed.

The Congress has been helpful since the existence of the social security program in improving its benefits, and I believe there is still room for further improvement.

Many of the retired State and city employees who are receiving some social security today say the benefits are not sufficient, considering the cost of living at present. Personally, I agree with them. Thousands of these citizens are receiving the bare minimum allowed under the existing law because of the fact that this is based on the low wages they received at the time they were working and the short period of time they had paid into the fund under the coverage amendment.

I sincerely believe one of the first acts of the 88th Congress when it convenes in January 1963, the Good Lord willing, should be to review the social security program and increase the benefits to those deserving retired State and municipal employees who are on retirement at this time and those who will retire in the future.

In recent years, some consideration has been extended almost all other segments of our society. Certainly, with such a strong and rich and powerful Nation as ours, we surely should have consideration for those worthy and deserving persons who were so helpful in building our great United States.

RETIREMENT OF HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

Mr. LANGEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Clancy] have permission to address the House on Thursday, October 11, for 30 minutes, to honor the retirement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Scherer]; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AN UNCONSCIONABLE DEFICIT

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I feel it imperative that I bring to the attention of this body information which I have received from reliable sources concerning the U.S. deficit.

An estimate of the U.S. deficit for fiscal 1963 is at least $6 billion and the deficit may be as much as $10 billion.

The U.S. Treasury reports show a deficit for the first quarter of 1963 of approximately $2.25 billion; at this rate the deficit could run well over $6 billion.

If the recommendations of the New Frontier budget makers are followed for fiscal 1964, reliable estimates are that the deficit may run from $12 to $16 billion. And now the President is barnstorming the country asking for a rubberstamp Congress, "a Kennedy Congress," to put these proposals into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the American people can afford a $12 to $16 billion deficit or a rubberstamp Congress. It is my strong belief that the American people should be cognizant of this wasteful extravaganza which depletes the value of their hard earned dollars.

MR. HOEVEN'S VOTE ON H.R. 7927

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven] was unavoidably absent from the House on October 5, 1962, during rollcall No. 279, the conference report on H.R. 7927, the Postal Revision Act of 1962. If present the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven] would have voted "aye."

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF WESTERN WESTCHESTER AND PUTNAM COUNTIES, N.Y.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful for those Westchester and Putnam County constituents who helped make representative government function more effectively by participating in the questionnaire on domestic and foreign issues which my office sent them earlier this year. The questionnaire reached approximately 225,000 voters in the 25th Congressional District of New York, with some 38,500, or 17 percent, participating. Returns were broken down according to locations in the district; answers were tabulated and computed percentagewise; final results were compiled in report form; and, where indicated, participants were added to my mailing list. This final phase was just recently completed.

I would like to take this opportunity, through the medium of the Congressional Record to report to my constituents the following: First, the results of the questionnaire; second, the status of relative legislation; and, third, how their Congressman represented them in these matters of great national concern.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

DOMESTIC ISSUES

First. Shelter construction: In answer to the question "Should the United States build and supply extensive fallout shelters?" 64 percent of those polled answered in the negative; 18 percent in the affirmative, and 18 percent were not sure.

The President in his opening address to the 2d session of the 87th Congress urged us to give priority consideration to legislation involving the expenditure of huge sums for the construction and supply of public fallout shelters. I thought it only appropriate, therefore, that the people of the 25th District be afforded the opportunity to censor this demand on their tax dollars, and I was pleased with the deliberation and foresight that obviously went into their response.

Ironically, it was in November 1961, that the Secretary of Defense embarked on a shelter survey program, and it was presumed that the results of the survey together with other data would serve as a basis for the Secretary's recommendations to the President. Apparently, the President felt that he did not have to wait for the results—as it was just 2 months later that he made his request to Congress for authority and funds to proceed with a large-scale shelter construction program. The survey has recently approached the halfway mark and Congress was prevailed upon to appropriate $38 million for its completion.

Neither the Senate nor the House Armed Services Committees have taken any action with respect to the administration's bill for shelter construction, for the very obvious reason that the proposal of the President is equally unappealing elsewhere in the United States as it is in Westchester and Putnam Counties.

Second. Medical aid for the aged: The people of the 25th District demonstrated a preference for a voluntary program of medical aid for the aged as opposed to the President's proposal for compulsory hospital care under social security. Of those polled, 57 percent were against the administration's compulsory plan, while 63 percent favored expanding the voluntary Kerr-Mills program, and 59 percent approved of the Blue Cross proposal based on income level.

We all know that the administration's proposal was defeated in the Senate and prior to this action the House Ways and Means Committee voted not to report the bill. The views of my constituents therefore reflected the mood of the Nation and of the Congress with respect to the administration's limited and compulsory payroll tax proposal which completely disregards the needs of approximately 4 million senior citizens.

Shortly after the questionnaire results were tabulated, I introduced, on behalf of the people of the 25th Congressional District, a bill that overcomes many of the shortcomings of the administration's proposal and offers what I feel is a most constructive solution to the medical problems of our senior citizens.

My bill, H.R. 11466, proposes a program of medical assistance to the aged which: First, is voluntary with the individual; second, provides a choice of insurance plans; third, offers broader and more inclusive protection; fourth, keeps the Federal Government out of the administrative aspects of the program, appropriately reserving these to the insurance industry; and fifth, is available to all people over age 65.

This bill permits a tax credit of $125 per year on behalf of every American 65 years of age and over, provided that the money is used to purchase his choice of the prescribed insurance plans. For those who pay no income tax—and, because of the special tax exemptions they already enjoy, they are in the majority—the bill authorizes the issuance by the Treasury Department of a medical care insurance certificate which the individual can use to pay premiums on a medical care policy. These certificates will be redeemed by the Treasury when presented by the insurance carrier.

I am pleased to report that this proposal has 32 cosponsors in the House and that it is steadily gaining congressional, organizational and, most important of all, popular support. I am hopeful that it will receive early and favorable consideration in the 88th Congress.

Third. Drug controls: Even before the thalidomide calamity became headlines, the people of the 25th District favored a drug law with teeth in it. The results of my poll reflected that 67 percent felt the present laws inadequate to insure quality control of drug manufacturing.

Had the thalidomide tragedy not occured this year, there probably would not have been drug legislation enacted during the 87th Congress, as major drug bills in the House and Senate were bottled up in committee. Ironically, therefore, some good did come about as a result of this terrible tragedy.

The Congress has approved, and I was privileged to support, a bill which reinforces the law with respect to the control, certification, marketing, and effectiveness of drugs for sale to the American public. The legislation—S. 1552—adds to the present law new provisions on: first, quality manufacturing controls; second, factory inspection; third, new drug effectiveness and safety; fourth, new drug testing and reports; fifth, new drug clearance procedure; sixth, antibiotic certification; seventh, use of official names, ingredients, quantities, side effects, and so forth, in descriptive printed matter on drugs.

This bill, which received bipartisan support in the House and Senate, is designed to close loopholes in the present law without frustrating research and development of drugs which have greatly contributed to our world leadership in medicine and public health.

Fourth. Aid to education—colleges and universities: A majority of voters—51 percent—of the congressional district indicated that they favor Federal aid in loans and grants to colleges and universities. By a greater majority—66 percent—they demonstrated a preference for indirect aid by an income tax credit for tuition costs.

Unfortunately, the major education bill of the 87th Congress, H.R. 8900—College Academic Facilities Act—which authorized grants and loans to public and private colleges for construction of classrooms, libraries, science and engineering buildings, has never cleared the final legislative hurdle. Originally passed by the House with my support in January 1962, the bill was amended by the Senate in February and was tied up in conference until September 19. The conference committee had more than sufficient time to resolve outstanding differences between House and Senate versions. However, as it later turned out the House conferees too willingly yielded to the Senate, accepting almost entirely its version including a controversial provision which would have established an entirely new program of scholarship assistance. This was done in the knowledge that there is never an opportunity to amend a conference report and that there was no real possibility of House acceptance of the scholarship provision, which would wastefully duplicate assistance already available under the National Defense Education Act. The NDEA itself was extended by Congress in 1961.

The Democratic chairmen of the Senate and House conference committees thus succeeded in blocking for possibly another year the passage of a higher education bill—and attempted to use the House as their scapegoat in this unwarranted parliamentary scheme. Members of the House remonstrated against the purely political maneuverings of the chairmen by rejecting the conference report at which time they made it clear that they—the chairmen—would be held solely responsible for the failure of the 87th Congress to legislate a higher education bill.

My bill, H.R. 5589, which allows a tax credit for income spent on education by any taxpayer either for his own tuition or for anyone he may wish to help educate is pending before the House Ways and Means Committee. Executive reports from the Treasury and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been requested. As of this date there are before the committee a total of 67 bills that provide tax relief for the costs of tuition, and there is a good possibility that this approach will be considered when the committee undertakes tax reform in the 88th Congress.

Elementary and secondary education: Of those responding to the poll, 61 percent favor Federal aid through loans and grants to public school districts, while 62 percent favor indirect aid by an income tax credit for local school taxes. Thus, the people of the 25th District indicated a desire for an extension of Federal assistance to the public school system. But, just as the results disclose an almost even division among the people on the two methods of aid cited, so is the Congress divided on vehicles rather than goals.

At the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the House refuted an attempt to bring up the administration's bill which authorized grants of Federal funds for the construction of elementary and secondary school classrooms or improvement of teachers' salaries. Main points of opposition to the administration's bill were: First, threat of Federal control over public school system; second, major shift of responsibility for local education to the Federal Government; third, decline in classroom shortage; fourth, Federal control over teachers' salaries; and fifth, the "equalization formula" under which New Yorkers would pay $312 million in Federal taxes to get $116 million in Federal aid. New York State would suffer a net loss of $196 million over a 3-year period were the administration's bill enacted into law. The House later extended the program of assistance to federally impacted school districts which I supported.

Still pending before the Congress is a proposal which I support providing that every taxpayer who pays a school tax on his real property or as a part of his real estate tax shall be permitted to subtract from the Federal income tax which he owes, the full amount of such school property tax, or such proportion of it as will result in an additional tax benefit. Under the present Federal income tax law, State and local school taxes are deductible from gross income but the amount actually saved by the taxpayer depends on his Federal income tax bracket. The tax credit would be available to real property school taxpayers whether they itemize their Federal income tax returns or take the standard deduction. This proposal would eliminate the dangers inherent in the administration's lower education bill, and would return to the local level tax resources for educational and other community needs.

My own aid to education bill is becoming law: In order to encourage a closer relationship between school district leaders and parents, and at the same time correct a grave inequity in the postal rate structure, I introduced a bill, H.R. 4975, to grant second-class mailing privileges to elementary and secondary schools. Under present law religious organizations, fraternal orders, many colleges and universities enjoy second-class mailing privileges, but our public school system does not. I am pleased to report that my bill was incorporated into H.R. 7927 which was finally approved by the Congress on October 5, 1962. It awaits the President's signature as this report is being made.

Fifth. Federal income tax rates: Months before the administration announced that there would be a "top to bottom reduction in the rates on income tax," people of the 25th Congressional District indicated that they would welcome rate reductions in all income brackets as follows: high—56 percent yes, 35 percent no; middle—73 percent yes, 19 percent no; and low—72 percent yes, 20 percent no.

Although my constituents expressed overwhelming support for income tax reductions, many of them qualified their answers with comments such as "only if conditions permit," and "welcome but not necessary," and so forth. There was a definite pattern to the answers—one that revealed a desirability for long overdue tax relief, but with a note of caution against taking such a step at the wrong time, which could prove disastrous. I am privileged to represent people who put the welfare of their country above personal gain.

The type of hasty tax reform that the administration was considering earlier this year did not get a good reception in the Westchester-Putnam area. People were outraged that the administration would contemplate making such a critical move for what they regarded as purely partisan reasons. Our people reflected the mood of the Nation and of the Congress once again, and consequently the President's so-called emergency tax cut was short lived. Instead the next Congress will undertake an orderly, and, what I hope, will be a thorough investigation of all economic factors before legislating a major tax reform. Key economic considerations such as employment and unemployment, industrial production, retail sales, personal income, construction rate, and gross national product, will have to be carefully studied in order to determine whether or not a tax reduction is in the long-term interest of the economic health of the Nation.

Sixth. Tax incentive for business: In accord with the views of my constituents the 87th Congress legislated an investment tax credit for business. The people of the 25th District favored tax incentive for business by 79 percent for as opposed to 11 percent against. As sent to the President, H.R. 10650 permits an investment credit against tax liability of up to 7 percent of investments in new and used tangible personal and real property; a maximum 3 percent credit—7 percent for gas pipelines—for utility companies that are subject to governmental regulation; 7 percent credit on tax liability up to $25,000 and on 25 percent of the liability above that level; a 3-year carryback and a 5-year carryforward of unused investment credits resulting when the dollar limitations on eligible tax liability prevented the taxpayer from taking the full credit to which otherwise entitled.

Many of my constituents were opposed to the provision dealing with the withholding of taxes on dividends and interest which was contained in the original House version of H.R. 10650. I am pleased to report that this provision was later substituted by the requirement that corporations and financial institutions report to the taxpayer and to the Government any dividend or interest payment of $10 or more per person per year, thus avoiding the many disadvantages of interest and dividend withholding.

Seventh. Fiscal responsibility: Reduction of Federal spending and the national debt, as well as adoption of a balanced budget, find strong support among the people of New York's 25th Congressional District. Of these polled, 76 percent favored cutting nondefense Federal spending and 86 percent advocated a balanced budget and a reduction in the national debt.

My constituents have left no doubt as to their feelings on matters of fiscal integrity and a sound economy, and I would like to make it clear that I am in complete agreement with their sentiments.

In 1940 the total cost of operating the Federal Government was a fraction over $9 billion which is less than our Government now spends just for interest on the national debt. Debt interest in 1962 will approximate $9½ billion.

In the last fiscal year the Federal Government spent $8.3 billion more than its income. The deficit for this year is already $6.3 billion and will probably exceed $8 billion by the time the fiscal year comes to a close.

It is high time for the administration to implement the same spirit of sacrifice which it repeatedly asks of our countrymen—by sacrificing its politically expedient policies of nonessential spending for the common good of the country as a whole.

Eighth. Civil Rights Commission: In answer to the question, "Should Congress make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency of the Government?" residents of Westchester-Putnam replied 43 percent in the affirmative, 36 percent in the negative, and 21 percent unsure. To date the Civil Rights Commission has conducted valuable studies in the fields of voting, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice, which are of considerable help to the Congress. Unfortunately, the work of the Commission often goes unnoticed by the general public which may account for the extremely large "undecided" vote on this question.

The Commission, established by Congress in 1957, is headed by six nonsalaried Commissioners and a staff Director, all appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Its main function is to investigate complaints that voting rights or equal protection under the law have been denied by reason of color, race, religion, or national origin.

In the 87th Congress approximately a dozen bills were introduced that called for the establishment of the Civil Rights Commission on a permanent basis, including my own bill, H.R. 12597, which is awaiting action by the House Judiciary Committee. In the meantime, I supported Public Law 87-264 which extended the life of the Commission until September 30, 1963.

In the field of civil rights I supported a constitutional amendment barring the requirement of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries. If ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years, Senate Joint Resolution 29 will become the 24th amendment to the Constitution. Unfortunately, many States have used means such as poll taxes and literacy tests to arbitrarily deny Federal voting rights which has forced the Federal Government to try to establish uniform standards for voting in Federal elections. The abolishment of the poll tax requirement for voting in Federal elections was an initial step in the right direction. However, the so-called literacy test is also used by some States as a means to arbitrarily deny Federal voting privileges. To remedy this situation I have sponsored a bill, H.R. 11465, by which the Federal Government would establish uniform testing standards to determine voter qualification in Federal elections. Such legislation was killed in the Senate following a lengthy filibuster led by southern Democrats. The House Judiciary Committee held hearings in this area, but postponed any further action.

Ninth. Manpower retraining: A majority, or 54 percent, of Westchester-Putnam constituents said they favored Federal programs to retrain those whose skills are no longer required due to technological progress. This question evoked a large—14 percent—undecided vote indicating that there was a lack of public information available on this issue. The 87th Congress legislated and I supported a 3-year program of vocational training and on-the-job training for unemployed workers with obsolete and insufficient skills. There was strong bipartisan support for the manpower retraining program which is aimed at hard-core joblessness caused by structural changes in the economy. Interestingly, such a plan was sponsored by Republicans long before the administration included it as part of the legislative program.

The Manpower Retraining Act—Public Law 87-415—requires the Federal Government to appraise the Nation's manpower requirements and resources and to develop and apply information and methods of dealing with unemployment. Under the act the Secretary of Labor is required to promote the development of training programs to qualify persons for employment who could not reasonably be expected to secure full time employment without such training.

In addition the act sets requirements for the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare in apportioning benefits to the States, prohibits use of the act to assist in relocating establishments from one area to another, and bars consideration of a trainee's membership or nonmembership in a union as a criterion for selection for placement under the act, and authorizes appropriations for planning and starting programs under the act. Because of the similarity of purpose between manpower retraining, and youth employment opportunities programs, provision was made in Public Law 87-415 for training of unemployed youth.

Since this law was recently enacted, it is too early yet to judge the effectiveness of the manpower retraining program. Its success to a large extent depends on administrative policies of the Federal and State Governments in implementing the law.

Tenth. Farm program: Even before the Billie Sol Estes scandal came to light, people of the 25th District indicated they were sick and tired of a federally controlled farm program of waste and corruption. In answer to the question, "Do you favor a farm program of fewer controls and subsidies?" 80 percent answered affirmatively, with only 9 percent responding negatively, and 11 percent undecided.

I am concerned with the farm question; first, because of the manner in which it affects the pocketbook of the consumer-taxpayer, and second, because of the failure of massive Government controls and spending to solve the country's agriculture dilemma. It is ironic that one of the biggest problems in the United States is overabundance of food, while so many of our foreign neighbors are suffering and dying of malnutrition and other terrible diseases associated with the lack of an adequate diet, and while the Soviet Union and its satellites are plagued with failure in producing food enough to meet their barest needs.

The Eisenhower administration inherited the farm program that was spawned during World War II by a Democrat administration. Time and again President Eisenhower sent to Congress sane proposals which called for an end to unrealistic price fixing, less Government in farming, emphasis on markets, increased efficiency, and competitive selling. The Democrat-controlled Congress, failing to act upon any constructive program, further involved us in what Ezra Taft Benson termed the "most costly, irrational, hodgepodge program ever patched together."

Two farm bills came before us during the 87th Congress. One, the Kennedy administration bill, had it passed, would have imposed strict and unworkable acreage allotments and marketing quotas on feed grains; depressed the income of feed grain farmers; placed new controls on the wheat farmer; and discriminated against the small farmer in several different ways. President Charles B. Schuman, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, largest U.S. farm organization, called rejection of the bill "a victory for farmers, consumers, and taxpayers." "The only losers," continued Mr. Schuman, "are the political empire builders in Washington."

As a result of this defeat, a substitute farm bill was introduced even though its supporters characterized it as "the lesser of two evils." I opposed this bill because of the excessive cost to the taxpayer—Secretary of Agriculture Freeman himself put the estimate at $2.4 billion. The bill constituted a further danger to the dairy industry because of a provision which could well be the beginning of supply management and compulsory milk quotas for all dairy farmers. Up to this time dairy farmers have entered into agreements among themselves to limit their production, and I feel that this type of voluntary control should be maintained and encouraged.

As I shall later outline under the section dealing with foreign issues, I voted to support the Trade Expansion Act, section 252 of which particularly affects the farm community—and empowers the President to use retaliatory action against any country discriminating against U.S. products, and specifically agriculture commodities. An expanded export market for our agriculture products will do much to help our surplus food problem, and may eventually pave the way for the elimination of Government controls so that a free agriculture market can play its role in bringing about an adjustment of world supply to world demand.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

As the only Republican member from the State of New York on either the Senate or the House committee having primarily to do with foreign affairs, I feel an especially heavy responsibility not only to know and interpret the facts of our foreign policy correctly but also to appraise in their proper perspective the events of the present in order to formulate judgments about the future.

Cuba: All of us have been concerned over the weakening of our position in Cuba. As far back as January, Westchester and Putnam shared this concern, when 80 percent favored sending U.S. troops into Latin America if this were the only way to prevent a Communist takeover. The stand taken by the people of Westchester-Putnam has since been endorsed by the majority of Americans everywhere who called upon their representatives in Congress to take firm measures against the Russian threat to Cuba. Compelled by a sense of urgency I participated as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the drafting of a strongly worded resolution overwhelmingly approved by the Congress which reaffirms the principles of the Monroe Doctrine and officially reiterates our position in the Western Hemisphere.

Berlin: Since assuming the role of spokesman and interpreter for a large number of people concerned over our international relations, I have been living almost constantly with the Berlin crisis. On several occasions I have visited that monument to injustice, the Berlin wall, and have conferred with Mayor Willy Brandt and Gen. Lucius Clay about the Communist pressures in Berlin and about the ultimate Western goal of a free and unified Germany.

Significantly, in the poll taken early this year a large majority anticipated the intensified campaign of the Soviets to remove the Western allies from Berlin and favored refusal of the West to negotiate until the artificially created pressure ceased as opposed to beginning negotiations at once. It was interesting to me that 14 percent of those polled did not consider the two alternatives mutually exclusive and, therefore, favored both refusal to negotiate until Communist pressures ceased and also immediate negotiation. A poll taken at the present time very likely would reflect less overlapping of views as a result of the stepped-up campaign of atrocities committed by the Communists.

Trade expansion: On the general subject of trade I posed the question to the people of my district as to whether or not they believed the United States should protect her $20 billion export market through mutual tariff and quota reductions in keeping with the steps being taken by the European Common Market even where such reductions could result in growth in certain industries but contraction in others. Sixty-seven percent voted in the affirmative, 13 percent voted against tariff reductions, and 20 percent stated they were unsure. This is a large percentage to be unsure on such an important issue. However, it may well be interpreted that at that time many were uncertain as to the success of the still young Common Market experiment but yet did not want to close the door through a negative vote to a change in our trade policy.

Since this poll was taken we in the Congress passed into law the Trade Expansion Act after extensive debate which was accorded wide publicity. I believe it would be a safe assumption that most of the questions in the minds of the uncertain 20 percent were resolved by the information forthcoming from both proponents and opponents of the program.

SEATO: The voters of Westchester and Putnam share with me a concern over the weaknesses of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and the existing veto provision whereby one abstaining vote could void the will of every other participating nation. Eighty-one percent of those polled expressed the opinion that the SEATO Charter should be amended to eliminate this provision, and in the event such a change could not be effected 80 percent favored establishing a new southeast Asian alliance patterned after NATO.

I have experienced grave misgivings over the weakening of our position in southeast Asia and as a consequence journeyed there to study a way to strengthen our SEATO pact. This study has included many conferences with Departments of State and Defense officials and commanders of our Pacific forces, all of which led to certain recommendations that the administration adopted—the most important being to send military forces into southeast Asia and to accelerate helicopter operations.

Aid to Poland and Yugoslavia: One of the thorniest problems facing us has been the decision whether or not to continue aid to Poland and Yugoslavia. In order to satisfy my own questions and judge for myself rather than wade through the mass of conflicting advice on the subject of these two countries, I spent last Easter in Poland traveling for miles around the countryside with our American Ambassador to inspect farms, villages and to visit the churches.

So disturbed have I been over the injustices perpetrated upon the captive peoples of Europe whose countries are now satellites of the Soviet Union that I have made a special study of their problems through my membership in the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe. I have broadcast over Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America which daily beam messages of hope behind the Iron Curtain. I have added my statements in committee and on the floor of the House in the cause of freedom for these beleaguered souls.

The Congo: I have been greatly distressed over the United Nations mishandling of the Congo's problems in the effort to achieve unity. In this I have been joined by many of the people of Westchester and Putnam Counties. In fact, people from all over the country have written to express their bewilderment, indignation, and despair over the chaos in the Congo. The Foreign Affairs Committee is holding the State Department strictly to account for its position at the United Nations with respect to Congo operations. We are hopeful that our demands will bring about a better day for the Congo.

India and Goa: Nehru's seizure of Goa reflects the contradictions that are rampant in the international behavior of other countries. On the one hand, all former colonial powers are subject to the cry "imperialist" at any action of theirs which displeases some of the newer nations, not to mention the Soviet Union and her hapless satellites. However, the world dare not give breath to a protest over the aggressive actions of a nation should it happen to be what we term "neutralist" or "uncommitted." It is unfortunate that such a nation can appoint herself the critic and judge of all her sister nations and yet permit herself to operate without the bounds of international law and justice when such action redounds to her own personal benefit. It is a sad commentary on our times that such a double standard does exist.

Military alliances: I have a consuming interest in strengthening our regional alliances and international organizations in order that we may arrive more fully at the goal of peaceful settlement of disputes rather than resort to strife and bloodshed. To this end I have several times served as delegate to the NATO Parliament in Paris and have had many conferences with our NATO military commanders. These deliberations have given me opportunity to prepare important resolutions adopted by that body, all of them designed to toughen the posture of the free world.

Long hours have been spent over the Mutual Security Act in an effort to determine the quality and quantity of military aid necessary to maintain the strength of our allies. In dozens of sessions of the Foreign Affairs Committee I have carefully studied our foreign assistance program for the purpose of improving its administration and effectiveness and to make reductions wherever possible in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Having occasion to confer with Prime Minister Ikeda, of Japan, I strongly urged that Japan assume a greater share of the burden of economic development in southeast Asia. That country in recognition of her responsibilities has since enlarged her foreign assistance program.

Bipartisanship in foreign affairs: On the question of whether the minority party in the United States should maintain a bipartisan approach in the field of foreign affairs or be outspoken in its criticism, 75 percent favored the former and 57 percent the latter. Here again, a very large percentage of those replying did not consider that one position could possibly rule out the other. Another interpretation is that a minority party can be constructively critical of the party in power and yet maintain bipartisanship on important international issues.

Throughout my efforts to maintain a bipartisan approach in the field of foreign affairs I have relied on personal meetings with many ambassadors, chiefs of state, foreign secretaries, active cabinet officers, diplomats and retired statesmen like General MacArthur and General Eisenhower.

In each attempt that I have made to better our foreign relations I have received the consideration of the executive branch. In a true spirit of bipartisanship on foreign policy I recently received a letter on behalf of Dean Rusk which stated:

> As the present session of Congress approaches adjournment, I want to express my appreciation and respect for the thought and time you have given to the Department of State and to the conduct of this country's foreign affairs. The role of Congress is essential to a clear definition of our foreign policy, and I think the past 9 months proves the validity of this principle.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT AT ITS BEST

When a Member of Congress can reflect the views of his people—without sacrificing his own personal convictions as I have been able to do—this is representative government in its best form. The compatibility that I have enjoyed with the people of western Westchester and Putnam Counties over the past 4 years has made my job a truly rare and rewarding experience.

U.S. HOSPITAL FOR DELINQUENTS

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday p.m., October 7, 1962, I returned from the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri, wherein in the city of Springfield is located the U.S. Federal Hospital for Defective Delinquents. It is a part of our Federal Prison System of the Department of Justice and is administered by the Attorney General, and jointly staffed by Department of Justice and U.S. Public Health Service personnel. For example, the warden, Russell O. Settle, M.D., is also a U.S. Public Health Service physician of great competency. He has an excellent staff of trained doctors, including specialists in psychiatry, and we are proud of the institution, as well as the professional ranking of the medical staff, the Department of Justice staff, and the civilian consultants in and around the city of Springfield, Mo. It should be clear that it cares for many chronic diseases, and performs much rehabilitation medicine and surgery in addition to caring for the U.S. prisoners of unsound mind—or defective delinquents. All informed members of this House are familiar with one of its most recent and famous "inmates," Mr. Edwin T. Walker, of Texas.

While in the district, in line with my official duties, I paid a call on the warden, assistant warden, and chiefs of medical staff of this hospital, as well as Mr. Edwin Walker. You will recall that this former Army officer has voluntarily retired and given up all his rights and privileges as a former major general of the U.S. Army. He recently ran in the primaries for Governor of the great State of Texas. Although a physician myself, with 2 years of internship and residency training at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D.C., in the mid 1930's—largely in neuropsychiatric training—before that institution forwarded most of its defective delinquent patients to the then newly opened U.S. Federal Medical Center in Springfield, Mo., I do not speak today as a physician.

I am not in the least interested in the Federal charges against Mr. Walker, insofar as inciting rebellion, leading an affray, or influencing insurrection against the law of the United States as interpreted by our Supreme Court is concerned. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in pronouncing professional judgment as to Mr. Walker's competency, or soundness of mind based on a short interview at a time he was finding himself in a strange place, under harassing circumstances, and contrary to the norm—with the wheels of justice moving swiftly.

I am concerned with the due process given any prisoner of the U.S. Department of Justice regardless of the cause, and his constitutional and Bill of Rights privileges under articles 4 and 6 of the latter. I am convinced that Mr. Walker, on the morning of Tuesday, the 2d of October, was mentally competent to understand the proceedings against him, and properly assist in his own defense. He personally stated to me that he was understandably—due to military usage, and so forth—not able to make a telephone call outside of the city of Oxford, Miss., in the 2 hours allowed before he was placed on a plane and started to Springfield, Mo., per telegraphic orders of the Director of Prisons, Mr. James V. Bennett, of the Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons. He stated he was not aware of his destination until he was airborne. It is also my understanding that he was not given the advantage of legal counsel in the hearings, under the 18th United States Code, section 4244.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the next morning, on Wednesday, October 3 at the direction of the Department of Justice in Washington, a request for examination to prove mental competency, or not, was granted through the Federal court in or near Tupelo, Miss. This, and the warden's own statement, were admission of lack of authority to retain in a mental institution, any person, be he political prisoner or not, without employing section 4244. There is no other section allowing for such expeditious transfer or assignment of any patient or detainee to a mental institution prior to due process, prior to determination of competency and soundness of mind, and finally, prior to a day in court.

There has been much concern on the part of responsible legislators in recent months, as well as many of our citizens—as witnessed the number of telephone calls I received in Springfield, Mo., on the mornings of October 2, 3, and 4. This stems in part perhaps from recent unfortunate publicity, and perhaps partial truths concerning the incarceration in St. Elizabeths Hospital—the Government hospital for the insane—in Washington, D.C., of a lady in the Department of Agriculture this city who had to do with the exposé in the Billie Sol Estes case, now famous to us all.

As I have previously said, I do not propose, as a physician, to pass judgment or to aline myself with the groups that find witches behind every shadow, but I am aware of the need for good legislation protecting the individual and civil rights of our people under the Constitution; and thereunto a perfection of our commitment laws to avoid interstate failure of legislation, and to allow crossing of State lines in the case of Federal prisoners.

It is indeed a paradox that Mr. Walker was erroneously directed on the basis of a so-called expert in the employ of the Government, admittedly not on personal examination but based on news releases and magazine articles only; to a Federal prison in Missouri where the Supreme Court has ruled along with Connecticut, Alaska and California, that commitment procedures now in existence represent a dangerous departure from Constitutional protection of individual rights.

Whenever an individual as a so-called proposed patient can be seized by any police or peace officer in his home or on the street and transported against his will and without due process to a mental hospital, where he can be forcibly examined and subjected to any type of therapy including drugs and narcotics, involving practices of modern psychiatry including hypnotism, shock therapy, or even lobotomy of the brain, we are approaching a very dark future unless such person has due process and protection of law, not men. My remarks are completely nonpartisan in this important area, and I actually feel this could never happen with the excellent professional staff that I know we have at the Federal Hospital for Defective Delinquents in Springfield, Mo., because they keep their honor above directive, and their professional integrity above reproach.

However, there is much ado throughout the land about these possibilities of producing mental robots for political purposes, and I submit this is no time to have faulty or inadequate legislation covering these points. It is to the credit of the Attorney General that he ordered the bail cut in half and the prisoner freed on stipulation that he would undergo psychiatric examination by a private clinician agreed upon jointly by the astute lawyers for the defendant and the Attorney General. On the other hand, there was little else they could do, as the Attorney General had not one leg upon which to stand.

Inasmuch as this delicate question involves not only our Federal statutes but those of the various States of the Union and our territorial governments, and even the United Nations and World Court; I think it is time that this body joined with recommendations for an investigation, as well as proper legislation, and indeed I intend to submit the latter with the convening of the next Congress. I have sought long-experienced and expert advice in this preparation.

In closing, since it is the commitment procedure which allows dangerous practice versus the constitutional protection of individual rights, I would like to summarize the United States-Missouri situation:

First. First of all, you will recall that the present Federal law provides that no one shall suffer commitment to an asylum unless and until he or she is found to be insane. Now, "insanity" is a fairly well defined, but legal term.

Second. But free and easy commitment procedures, and the substitution of what is tantamount to a mock trial before a kangaroo court for the traditional and accepted legal mental hearings, are of infinitely greater import and significance than are the portions of the bill which were responsible for the great popular outcry and clamor against it. Unless the individual can be guaranteed by due process of law against railroading and the disregard of his rights under any pretext whatsoever, regardless of how pontifically high sounding and ostensibly humanitarian that pretext may be alleged to be, then it would seem all but hopeless to waste time in considering what might be done to the patient after he is illegally so confined.

On June 14, 1954, the supreme court of Missouri, in the case of State ex rel. Fuller against Mullinax, found the commitment procedures as specified in the Draft Act and exhibited in the Missouri statute unconstitutional.

Third. Original proceeding in mandamus to compel admission of a mentally ill patient as a patient in a State mental hospital. Superintendent of hospital refused admission for reason that he had been informed that act whereunder patient had been committed was unconstitutional and void. The Supreme Court, Leedy, J., held that provisions for confinement upon application and certification or upon suspicion of mental illness, without notice or hearing in advance of commitment, were in violation of requirement of due process, notwithstanding provision for hearing upon demand after commitment.

Fourth. This is particularly pertinent since it goes right to the root of the whole controversy upon whether or not a patient may be confined upon application and certification or upon suspicion of mental illness without notice or hearing in advance of commitment.

Fifth. Moreover the doctrine of later relief by habeas corpus as effectuating due process has been expressly repudiated. In State ex rel. *Kowats* v. *Arnold*, 345 Mo. 661, 673, 204, S.W. 2d 254, 260, it was said:

> The exercise of the power (to hold insanity inquisitions and issue commitments thereunder) may deprive the subject of precious constitutional rights, liberty and the enjoyment of property, which cannot be done without due process of law.

And, it will not do to say in such a case that relief can be obtained afterward by habeas corpus.

It would appear that Missouri is the first of the States to adopt the model act, although some of its features, in varying forms and degrees, can be identified as having been taken from statutes of other States.

It is my intention to see that proper and needed Federal law is constitutional and within our Bill of Rights in permitting the right to a speedy and public trial, the right to be informed of the nature of the charge preferred against a patient, prisoner, or detainee—or first of kin if truly defective—and the right to be represented by an attorney at all stages of the proceedings, as well as the right to trial by an impartial jury, the right to be confronted by witnesses against him, and the right to subpena witnesses in his own behalf and for his own defense, as well as the right to bail under all but most necessarily protected circumstances. This will obviate the present condition which permits no examination under Federal indictment, and verbal directives for admission to mental hospitals with all the stigma attached thereunto, as well as no statement of cause needing to be filed in order to support the issuance of a warrant or arrest for apprehension, and no judge or magistrate needing issue a warrant for such arrest.

It will further correct the lack of examination, per the patient's desires or that of his own physician, no trial by judge or jury, and will preclude his being held in custody without bail for an undue length of time. Certainly it will protect writ of habeas corpus proceedings and the U.S. courts are to be congratulated in the cited case for ordering the warden to show cause within a lesser amount of time than the existing faulty law allowed.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope our colleagues will join me in correcting this evil situation, and thereby allaying our citizens' fears of a police state, and future incarceration thereby.

SUPREME COURT'S INTEGRATION "LAW"

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, since 1954 and the Supreme Court's making of the integration law, volumes have been written on the subject. Few statements, if any, have impressed me with their calm and clear logic, to the degree a statement published recently by the Honorable Wade O. Martin, Jr., secretary of state of Louisiana. Secretary Martin has served our State under seven State administrations and four Presidents. Few men are held in higher esteem in Louisiana than he is. I think his statement is worthy of attention by every Member of the Congress and I include it here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read and ponder.

STATEMENT BY HON. WADE O. MARTIN, JR.

Those of us who have deep-rooted love for our Nation and our States have been greatly concerned over the lack of understanding that the Federal courts, the Attorney General, the NAACP, and now you, our President, have been displaying in the matter of forcing integration of the Negro and white races in this country.

Individually and collectively, you are on the verge of being responsible for spilling the blood—not of criminals—but of loyal, dedicated, cultured, and respectable taxpaying Americans—with American guns in the hands of Americans under your control either directly or indirectly.

It is regrettable that there is not a forum for debating the matter at issue, but there is none, because even the President, in a statement via television, implied, if not directly stated, that this is a closed issue and not subject to debate.

NO ALTERNATIVE

So, following the lead of the President and the Court, there is no alternative but to utilize the press and other media of information, in order to make an urgent plea in the interest of the United States.

All of you to whom this letter is addressed realize that you have many marshals, many Federal soldiers, under your command. But quite obviously there are, have been and will be many State soldiers and civilians ready to repel your advances with guns of their own.

Before you fire any further shots or strike any additional blows, you should take one final look at your position. This may well be your last opportunity to save this Nation from the suicide which is so imminent.

In examining your position, you must resolve all doubts in favor of peace and tranquility among all Americans and a united front against our known enemies from without.

As one who is experienced in law, politics, and government, I offer these thoughts on the position of each of you.

The world will probably never know whether your position is right or wrong. But I maintain that the final answer in the years to come would be of little comfort to the American people if, in the interim, we destroy ourselves over our differences of opinion; if, in the interim, we become a nation without a Constitution and without courts—a nation in which Negroes and whites, Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and all the people are reduced to slavery much worse than that which existed before the Civil War.

Yes, whether you are right or wrong, each side should consider the sincerity of the other, and go slow on the trigger.

As we listened to your telecast, Mr. President, it occurred to many of us that you were hitting below the belt when you listed the names of the judges who were hearing the case involving Governor Barnett, of Mississippi. You pointedly named several judges from Southern States, but, Mr. President, were you not hiding behind the true facts?

FAIRER

Would it not have been better and fairer had you said that the orders in this case were inevitable, irrespective of which district lower judges were sitting, because under the Constitution they had no alternative but to follow not the dictates of southern judges as such, but the dictates of the U.S. Supreme Court, whose members are not elected, as you well know, but most of them were appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and you, Mr. President? The people of the United States have never had the opportunity to elect these Justices of the Supreme Court, and they are the ones who wrote this so-called law.

Now, true enough, courts can, and have always, interpreted law, and this is the function of the courts. As simply stated as it can be, that is the position taken by the Supreme Court as I understand it.

Some outstanding constitutional lawyers believe the decision to be wrong in that it repudiated the Constitution of the United States in favor of adopting Communist writings on psychology.

But there is another side to this proposition—one that the Supreme Court and all of you should consider. While the average American is not too well versed in the niceties of the law, the average American believes that the adoption or passage of a law, or the change of a law—particularly one which would affect his very life—is a matter for the lawmakers, the Congress and the legislators, that they, the people, elect and whom they can censure and recall if they so desire.

And if the law in question happens to be a provision of the Constitution, the average American has always felt, and does indeed now feel, that he should have the opportunity to see that amendment proposed by the Congress, the lawmakers of the Nation. Then he should have the opportunity to elect not only the Congressmen who propose it, but the Members of the legislature who ratify or reject it in the various States.

And if there was ever a travesty on American democracy, it was in the effective amendment of a provision of the Constitution that had been ratified and affirmed, for over a 100 years, by nine men appointed by the Presidents of the United States who could not be reached with a ballot.

So, when the people's homeland, their property, their families, are all placed in jeopardy, in danger of being injured or destroyed by a new or a changed law, which never had a hearing before their lawmakers with Congress or in their States, there is naturally a great resentment, untold frustration, and a consequent disrespect for the law and for those who promulgate and seek to enforce it.

DESTRUCTION

Need you be reminded, all of you, that the destruction of an American's property, the changing of his environment, the destruction of his culture and that of his community, are no less acceptable to him when imposed by the Federal Supreme Court, the President, the Attorney General, or the NAACP, than when imposed or threatened by outside enemies.

So, whether you are right or wrong about the ultimate effects of complete integration, these innumerable worthy Americans, who believe it is bad for the Nation and bad for them, will fight all of you almost as quickly as they would fight outside invaders of their country.

Besides having been deprived of the opportunity to vote for or against the lawmakers (they were all appointed by Presidents) in the integration law change, and besides having been deprived of the opportunity to be heard in committees of Congress and committees of the State legislatures on proposals to change the Constitution, as is usually the case in a democracy, those who oppose this so-called law are finding other strange and undemocratic practices.

This court-made law is applicable in some places, and not in others, and it is enforced only as fast as people are ready to accept it.

Even stranger and more deplorable is the fact that new laws (court orders by individual judges) are being written from day to day, naming by name who shall be entitled to the privileges of the law, and indirectly saying that its provisions are unavailable to others.

And possibly, most undemocratic of all is the fact that the citizens have no advance knowledge of the penalty for violating these so-called laws. A usual criminal law without specific penalty is unenforcible. And when a law enacted by legislators is cruel and unjust, it is always subject to review by the courts.

But in this case, judges, having written the law, are rewriting it from day to day, and they pick penalties out of the air. The death penalty? $10,000 a day? $100,000 a day? Who will decide whether a penalty is cruel and unjust when the penalty is written by the judge? What is imposed apparently depends on the whim or the mood of the Department of Justice, and the mood of the judge from day to day in each case. And apparently there is no recourse.

The courts, the President, the Attorney General, and the NAACP should recognize the un-American aspects of their actions, and should not press too hard for perpetuating this undemocratic procedure with bullets and bayonets. They could be wrong.

What is the alternative to bullets and bayonets and helicopters, and the use of the State National Guard to carry arms against the people of the States in which they were organized?

Here again as the President stood behind the names of district judges who were carrying out the Supreme Court's orders, we must wonder whether his actions in calling out the Mississippi National Guard were to enable him, in the event of violence, to say that killings in Mississippi were justified because they were done by the National Guard of Mississippi.

What is the alternative to the use of bullets and bayonets and helicopters and tear gas, and perhaps even atomic missiles by Americans against American people in this issue?

Three of the most vociferous outsiders advocating the use of force as the only alternative are former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Martin Luther King of the NAACP, and presumably Khrushchev for the Communists. Each of them may be entitled to his opinion and his objectives, but to some of us it seems that with the Nation on the verge of a shooting war, General Eisenhower, who knows the strategy of military science, should follow it, and stop backbiting the President who now has command. He didn't settle the issue with troops at Little Rock when he was in command.

It would seem also that the NAACP, were its members interested in this Nation and the welfare of our people, could have selected a less crucial place than the University of Mississippi to insist upon this buildup, and the use of military might by Americans against Americans at the same time that Russia is building up military might in Cuba.

FIGHTING

Khrushchev has only one real concern—our national strength; and anything we do to fight among ourselves is precisely what he wants.

So, when we fight each other at Ole Miss—or elsewhere—at the insistence of the President or a former President or the NAACP or Khrushchev, or the courts, or the so-called integrationists or anyone else, the cost of this operation and the lives lost will, in the showdown which must soon come, reduce our ability to fight off our enemies from without.

The extent to which we will be weakened will depend upon how far the President, the Attorney General, the NAACP, and the courts pursue their present course of using military might to integrate.

Even the forced capitulation of one Governor, even the winning of the battle of Ole Miss in the face of the military might of the United States, will not be the end of this internal war. Little Rock did not prevent the New Orleans school integration crisis; the New Orleans crisis did not prevent the Ole Miss crisis; and none of these will prevent other integration emergency situations within the United States, as long as the President, the Attorney General, the NAACP, and the Federal courts continue their present practices.

We should now be engaged in the effort to cope with the crises of Berlin, Cuba, Laos and Katanga, and stop creating crises among ourselves because of a so-called law that was adopted, and is sought to be enforced, outside the normal democratic processes.

We cannot continue to allow local hot spots to sap our time, energy, and talents, to damage our image abroad, and to weaken our national strength.

It seems the height of folly for us to undertake to achieve, with bayonets against our own people, the sudden abolition of segregation of the Negro and white races—something which occurs throughout the world.

When can a nation hope to resume internal peace and tranquility, if it is to be accomplished only when children of one race are to be transported away from their home environment, solely for the purpose of mixing them with children of another race and environment, and when every Negro or white person is to insist upon going to a particular school.

ROOM TO IMPROVE

Doubtless there is room for improvement of the lot of both the whites and blacks of our country, but the important thing is that both have more of everything here than they are afforded in any other country of the world. But if we continue to fight amongst ourselves before we defeat our ominous enemies from without, we will all be reduced to slavery.

Of course, the question will be asked, What about changing the attitudes of those on the other side of this controversy?

During my years in public office, I have observed that the seven State administrations with which I have served have provided more education, more welfare, health, and medical services for the Negro than have been provided for him in any other area of the world.

We want to help Negroes as well as whites; nevertheless human nature cannot be changed overnight. Most of the white people of Mississippi, Louisiana, New York, Michigan—in fact, not only in this Nation, but all over the world, will not live in Negro communities, under Negro cultures, in Negro environments, and under Negro leadership. This has been proven time and again in history, and more recently in Harlem and in the Nation's Capitol at Washington.

As soon as the Supreme Court, the President, the Attorney General, and the NAACP forced extensive integration in Washington, they effectively seized and confiscated from many white people their schools, residences, and places of business. Washington is no longer the white metropolitan area it once was. The integration program has removed most of the white children from its schools and a majority of the residents are now Negroes.

Many of the whites in the Nation's Capital did not own their homes and their businesses, but were renting. Washington was an area of displaced persons in the first instance, many of them having come from various nations of the world and States of the Union. So it was disturbing them little when they fled from Washington to Virginia and Maryland, a short distance away where they moved into white communities and commuted back and forth to work.

BLOW TO WHITES

In Washington, integration, therefore, was a blow to the whites, but nothing like it would be in Mississippi. Since most whites will not live in a Negro community for an extended period of time, when you send helicopters and marshals, and muster the National Guard to force integration in Mississippi, you are not forcing one Negro into the University of Mississippi, you are taking the first step which corresponds to what Castro did in Cuba. He took Cuba for the Communists, and when all the chips are down, it will in the final analysis probably make little difference to the people of Mississippi whether their State is seized by outside invaders, or whether President Kennedy, the Supreme Court, the NAACP, and the Attorney General take Mississippi and give it to the Negroes. Insofar as they are concerned, they will have lost their homelands, their communities. They will not live in the Negro community, which Mississippi will become if your present program of integration in both private business and educational institutions is successful. When you succeed in forcing complete integration in Mississippi and other areas where the Negro population outnumbers the white, those areas will be abandoned by most white people just as Washington, D.C., was virtually abandoned. This condition may change in the future, but we are dealing with the present, and these are the facts as of now.

When extreme violence is threatened, the national commentators ask the question repeatedly. How can everyone save face? I am not nearly as concerned about anyone saving face as I am about saving this great Nation, and I tell you without equivocation that there is only one way to save this great Nation from the suicide which is impending. This is not Mississippi, Louisiana, North or South Carolina—it is the Nation as a whole. The only way you can save it is to revert back to the democratic processes that were provided in our Constitution. Realize once and for all that education and the matters under consideration are matters that were not granted to the Federal Government under the original Constitution, but reserved to the States.

Let each State take care of its own business, as you are letting each of the small new African nations take care of their own.

As long as we remain free, let the States reserve to themselves the powers that the people did not give to the Federal Government.

If you feel that it is essential in this day and age to have complete integration of the white and Negros races through the means of a law, then have that law enacted as any major law is enacted. Bring it back into the Congress.

CEASE FIRE

First, cease firing, and let the democratic processes come into being. Let Congress propose, consider, and enact, if the majority of the people want it, the kind of an integration law that the Supreme Court of the United States enacted. If they do enact it, then let Congress prescribe the penalties, and after that is done, then let the various States in their legislatures vote on the adoption or rejection of the amendment.

Let the people of this country be heard in Congress, and in their State legislatures. Until this is done, we can only go on and on with another crisis, and another, and then more bloodshed.

Let's take Ole Miss and all cases like it off the front page, and return Cuba to page 1 where it belongs.

THE HONORABLE BRENT SPENCE

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this House has been graced by many great personalities. During my service here, which goes back to 1947, it has been my privilege and pleasure to meet many of the greatest.

One of those with whom I have had the honor to be most closely associated is certainly at the top of the list by any and all standards. My first committee assignment was with the effective and very influential Banking and Currency Committee. When I arrived there in the 80th Congress the ranking minority member was the gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE. He had already made his mark as chairman of that committee during Democratic Congresses and of course returned to that important post in the 81st Congress.

This fine man was able, diligent, effective, and, most important of all, he was friendly and kindly. The uppermost thought in his mind at all times was, "How can I help?"

He made my work immeasurably easier and certainly more pleasant, as he did for all of our colleagues.

We will miss his wise counsel.

I wish him good health and all of the best things in life when his voluntary retirement comes at the close of this session.

ADOLPH EICHMANN TRIAL

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1961, I delivered my views on the essential fairness and basic right in the State of Israel to bring Adolph Eichmann before its bar of justice to stand trial for offenses so heinous as to stagger the conscience of man.

Since then the trial was held. I am proud that justice ran its course unobstructed and unhindered. I noted in the September 1962, issue of the American Bar Association an article entitled "The Eichmann Trial and the Role of Law" which closely parallels my remarks published in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1961.

I then noted that Eichmann will be safer before an Israeli court which is determined to do impartial justice, and stand forever on its record, rather than before a temporary body convened to dispose of him and then disband. I noted that the full glare of publicity will permit no deviation from fairness both to the defendant and to the people whom he offended.

The American Bar Association Journal reports that—

> The conduct of the trial was exemplary; dignity and decorum were maintained throughout, continuously brought comments of respect from lawyers and journalists alike (p. 820).

In February 1961 I refuted the argument that the State of Israel had no jurisdiction in the Eichmann case on the premises that the State of Israel never ceased being a State. All through the ages Palestine was merely a possession of different temporary conquerors who held the land, but not the people. The people of Israel never surrendered. They were exiled from it but never surrendered their claim to it. Furthermore, I contended, Hitler waged war against Jews not as French Jews, or Dutch Jews or Polish Jews but simply as Jews, without recognizing them as citizens of the countries he invaded. He recognized them only as a people separate, distinct and apart from all other nations. Hitler himself, therefore, laid the ground rules for Eichmann's trial in Israel.

The article in the American Bar Association Journal confirmed the foregoing conclusions. The Israeli tribunal is cited as stating that "The connection between the State of Israel and the Jewish people needs no explanation" and that the annihilation of European Jews had no relation to the countries in which they resided, but had as its only basis their historical and ancestral relationship with the Holy Land. And the land of Israel has endured for thousands of years; there has been but a change of governments.

I stated that the crime of murder is so reprehensible as to be violative of that unwritten law commonly recognized as natural law. The American Bar Journal confirmed that statement by citing Prof. Robert Woetzel, of Fordham University; the "Trial Judgment"—page 27—"There is not any taint of ex post factoism in the law of murder"; and Hugo Grotius—that the apprehending state had not only a right to try one charged with violating "in extreme form" the law of nature or the law of nations, no matter where committed, but as well had a moral duty to other nations to do so. A fortiori with genocide.

I observed that there was no international tribunal to try that man. The International Court of Justice has no jurisdiction over the trial of individuals. The Nuremberg tribunal was no longer in existence. At best it was an imperfect court. What court is there to handle this case? Another imperfect international tribunal?

The American Bar Journal, in the aforesaid September issue, confirms my views. It states:

> There was not available any international tribunal for such a trial and the creation of an ad hoc international court free of cold-war politics and propaganda was highly unlikely. The World Court's jurisdiction does not extend to the trial of criminal cases, and the United Nations has on several occasions attempted without success to establish a permanent international criminal court of justice.

I concluded with the observation that if new law is to be written, on the principles of natural law, then it is fitting that it be written in Israel inasmuch as the prophet Isaiah said, "From out of Zion shall go forth law."

The American Bar Journal concludes in much the same vein:

> We have seen how long it required for many of the principles once laid down in the Holy Land to become written into the domestic statutes of most nations and accepted as binding upon all.
>
> But law in the modern age must go further than its traditional role of following the mores of the people it serves. It must undertake the role of leadership, and its jurists must continually stress and teach the rules of conduct to which the leaders of nations and all men must bind themselves for the survival of mankind.

The American Bar Association Journal article is commended to my colleagues, as follows:

THE EICHMANN TRIAL AND THE ROLE OF LAW

(By Zad Leavy, of the California Bar, Beverly Hills)

(NOTE.—In the interest of saving space, the author has deleted many citations of authority, both to the official record of *Attorney General* v. *Eichmann* and to outside sources. Interested readers will find most of these in the footnotes to Leavy, "The Eichmann Trial, Report from Jerusalem" (37 Calif. B.J. 243 (1962).)

The circumstances in which Adolf Eichmann was tried give rise to serious questions which some have seen as a possible challenge to the legality of the trial under the commonly accepted rules of international law and criminal law. Eichmann was kidnaped from another sovereign state and tried under a retroactive law for crimes committed outside the jurisdiction of Israel. There is no clear rule of international law which would have prevented Israel from trying Eichmann in the face of such facts, concludes Mr. Leavy. The result of the trial may be to strengthen the principle that the responsibility for crimes against humanity should lie with those who commit the crimes. If this is true, asserts the author, then the trial may have been a positive good, even if the kidnaping detracted from world law.

A sense of history swept over the hundreds of correspondents sitting in the huge courtroom as the Attorney General of Israel, using the language of the Old Testament, began his long and moving opening address to the Jerusalem district court:

"As I stand before you, judges of Israel, in this court to accuse Adolf Eichmann, I stand not alone. Here with me at this moment are 6 million accusers." [1]

Many of us recalled that not far from this courtroom were the chambers of the 71 ancient judges of Israel who comprised the Sanhedrin, or supreme court, which administered the law of the land from the time of Moses until beyond the destruction of the Jewish state, and that much of the law laid down and used by that court found its way through universal usage and acceptance into modern jurisprudence to guide orderly conduct among men.

Again here in Jerusalem, Holy City to three great religions of the world, we watched another eminent court of law proclaim and reaffirm the lofty precepts which offer hope to mankind in a turbulent age ahead.

THE TRIAL

Israel's primary motive, that of recording a tragic story of her people never before fully told, was reflected in the broad scope of the indictment and in the determination of the prosecution, in the face of the obvious impatience of both newsmen and the court, doggedly to place on the record every stark fact pertinent to the Nazis' final solution of the Jewish problem.[2]

In furtherance of the tradition under Ottoman and British rule, there are no juries in Israel. The criminal law is essentially English, with 13 years of Israeli case law strongly influenced by decisions in the United States.

Eichmann was captured in Argentina on May 11, 1960, and taken to Israel. Action was initiated shortly thereafter by Argentina against Israel in the U.N. Security Council, and after Israel's apology the matter was declared closed in a joint communique issued by the two nations on August 3, 1960.

The trial commenced on April 11, 1961, and final arguments were completed on August 14, 1961. Prosecution witnesses totaled 111 and the court admitted 1,434 prosecution exhibits, many of them individually voluminous. Only Eichmann testified in court for the defense, but statements of other defense witnesses were taken in foreign courts; 109 defense exhibits were admitted. Final judgment was handed down throughout the week of December 11, 1961. The accused was found guilty of all 15 counts in the indictment, but was acquitted of several allegations not proved beyond a reasonable doubt, and he was sentenced to die.

Execution of the death penalty in Israel is by hanging. There is no death penalty except for the crimes attributed to Eichmann and treason in wartime. Eichmann's execution was the first in the new state's short history.

---

[1] Transcript 17.4.61 session 6 C1, *Attorney General* v. *Eichmann*, crim. case 40/61, Jerusalem District Court [hereinafter cited as "transcript"].

[2] Eichmann was tried before the court of general jurisdiction in Israel, a district court, impaneled with three judges as in capital or other serious felony cases, with one of them a supreme court justice appointed by the president of the supreme court to preside over the tribunal. Since the acts charged to Eichmann were not committed in any part of Israel, venue lay in the central or Jerusalem district.

The conduct of the trial was exemplary; dignity and decorum were maintained throughout. The television facilities hardly affected the proceedings. The constant presence of a large crowd provided no more diversion than the audience in any criminal courtroom in the United States. The firm attitude with which Supreme Court Justice Moshe Landau, presiding, constantly maintained a near-absolute silence in the large auditorium, as it were, continuously brought comments of respect from lawyers and journalists alike.

Hearsay evidence tending to prove the corpus delicti for the most part came in without objection. Indeed, the defense admitted the bulk of the corpus, the holocaust itself, but disputed Eichmann's criminal responsibility. Defense counsel seldom cross-examined most witnesses, except when their testimony tended to link the accused to the corpus.

Evidence of questionable reliability, and hearsay tending to prove Eichmann's intent and connection with the crimes alleged, e.g., previous statements of other Nazis under oath and not under oath, were on occasion admitted under a special rule adopted at Nuremberg and codified in the statute under which Eichmann was tried, but the court in its judgment weighed such evidence with care and relied upon it only when corroborated by other more trustworthy proof.

The eyewitness evidence was unbelievable. There were not enough words nor adjectives adequately to describe what we saw and heard in the courtroom, and the correspondents' frustration was clearly evident. In the words of the Supreme Court of Israel:

"No human pen, no human tongue would ever succeed to describe the merest outline of the suffering of the millions who were killed, massacred and burned in the extermination camps and gas chambers through the murderous tools invented and improved by the 'fertile' brain and perverse fantasy of Nazi execration. Before the rise of Hitler's regime in the thirties of the 20th century, no one has envisaged any such spectacle."[3]

THE DEFENSE AND THE ANSWER

Eichmann's contention that he merely followed and transmitted orders from above and exercised no initiative whatsoever, was pleaded both to the indictment and in mitigation of penalty, and was overwhelmingly disproved by the evidence, much of it from the accused himself. He was shown to have exerted great initiative and enthusiasm on the top levels of command which planned and directed the "final solution."

"My honor is loyalty," he testified.[4] "I regard the violation of an oath of loyalty as the greatest crime a man can commit. The question of conscience is a matter for the head of state, not for me." But Eichmann admitted he knew from the inception of the "final solution" that it was contrary to law.

Only in recent generations has the law of nations come firmly to reject the plea of superior orders when the orders were manifestly unlawful, and in cases of high ranking officers who could have reflected upon the legality of the orders and had available the moral choice not to obey. In this and other postwar trials, an ideology of blind obedience was on trial and was soundly condemned.

Eichmann's counsel argued that only the sovereign should be held liable for the acts of its nationals in carrying out state policy on behalf of the state. He pragmatically stressed the plight of such an individual enmeshed in the mission of his country.

"The basic principle of every state is," said Dr. Robert Servatius, "loyalty to and confidence in the leadership. The deed is dumb and obedience is blind. These are the virtues on which alone a state can build its foundations."[5]

The trial court recognized that this may be true in a totalitarian regime based upon denial of law, as in Hitler's Germany, and that in such a system the criminal is not amenable to justice until the regime falls—

"But such arguments are not to be voiced in any state in the world which bases itself on the rule of law. The attempt to turn an order for the extermination of millions of innocent people into a political act with the aim of thus exempting from their personal criminal responsibility those who gave and those who carried out the order, is of no avail. And do not let counsel for the defense console us with the promise of world government to come, when such "acts of state" will become a thing of the past. We do not have to wait for such a radical change in the relations between nations in order to bring a criminal to judgment, according to his own personal responsibility for his acts, which is the basis of criminal judgment all over the world."[6]

Both the district court and the supreme court expressed their final answer through the penalty, and the judges of Israel declared they had but little choice in the matter. They explained that in the light of the evidence before them, they could do no less than express through the power of the court the greatest possible condemnation of the Nazi ideology and its doctrine of blind obedience, and of genocide, the most horrendous crime yet devised by man, not only as it was perpetrated in World War II but as well in the form it will assume in future holocausts. The trial court ruled:

"For the due punishment of the accused and for the deterrence of others, the maximum penalty laid down by the law has to be imposed in this case.

"Even had we found that the accused acted out of blind obedience, as he alleges, yet we would have said that one who had participated in crimes of such dimensions for years on end has to undergo the greatest punishment known to the law, and no order given to him could be a ground even for mitigating his punishment."[7]

THE APPEAL

Eichmann appealed[8] from both the conviction and the sentence, and raised basically the same jurisdictional issues and defense pleas that were brought up at the trial. His counsel also requested permission to present further evidence; but after he made his offers of proof the supreme court denied his request and set out its reasons therefor, the final one being that such evidence could not have altered the outcome.

The supreme court fully concurred "without hesitation or reserve" in all the conclusions and reasons of the district court, "because they are fully supported by copious judicial precedents that were cited in the judgment and by substantial proof culled and abstracted out of the monumental mass of evidence produced to the court."[9] Nevertheless, the appellate court disposed of each defense contention by either citing the pertinent portion of the district court judgment or by setting out its own answer at length.

JURISDICTION

Most interesting to lawyers was probably the question of the legal right of an Israel court to try Eichmann, but it is often difficult to disengage the legal issues from the thorny question of what Israel should or should not have done as a matter of national policy. The wisdom of Israel's actions, aside from the jurisdictional issues, is itself a lively subject of debate in the light of the effect of these actions upon obedience to the rule of law in the future.

First it must be understood that actually there lay no challenge to jurisdiction, for courts in Israel by and large follow British procedure and precedent and have no power of judicial review as we know it in the United States. The legislature is supreme, and its clear edict providing a trial for one charged under the statute pertaining to the prosecution of Nazis must be obeyed by the courts. Should there arise a conflict between such an edict and the international law, said the district and supreme courts, under the English system the law of the forum must prevail. Nonetheless, both courts attempted further to justify their position by seeking to demonstrate that the Nazis and Nazi collaborators (punishment) law of Israel and its present application "conforms to the best traditions of the law of nations."[10]

CONTROVERSY OVER KIPNAPING

The forcible abduction of Adolf Eichmann was clearly a violation of positive international law, but was technically cured by action in the United Nations. Eichmann as an individual had no right to speak in international law, and all nations which had some right to demand his body waived such rights, thus leaving Israel free to pursue the conduct of its own choice within its own territory and within the framework of its own law. Once a prisoner is within the physical control of a particular court and properly charged, according to the law of almost every nation, he may be tried by that court regardless of the manner by which he was brought before it.

There are those who argue that the abduction was justified by the nature and extent of the crimes charged and by the impossibility of extradition of Nazis from Argentina; that in some extreme situations the positive law must yield to the natural and moral law.[11] This is akin to the natural law of self-defense. But this question is as difficult to resolve as it is difficult to determine in advance just when and to what extent the positive law shall yield, so as to constitute a reasonably workable rule.

---

[3] Appeal judgment III 2, par. 1, *Adolf Eichmann, appellant* v. *Attorney General, respondent,* Crim. Appeal 336/61 in the Supreme Court of Israel sitting as a court of criminal appeal [hereinafter cited as appeal judgment].

[4] Transcript 13.7.61 session 95 S1. Transcript 7.7.61, session 88 I1.

[5] Trial Judgment, passage 216, *Attorney General* v. *Adolf Eichmann,* Crim. Case 40/61, Jerusalem district court [hereinafter cited as trial judgment, with passage number following].

[6] Trial judgment 216.

[7] Transcript 15.12.61, session 121 A2.

[8] The appeal from the district court's decisions was filed with the highest court in the land, the Supreme Court of Israel. There is no intermediate court. Unlike in the United States and England, an appeal lies both from the verdict and the sentence. The court sits with three justices, or in important cases with five or more of the total of nine justices; five in the Eichmann appeal. The justice who presided at the trial did not sit in judgment at the appellate stage. Further evidence may be taken if the court chooses not to rely solely on the record, or it may retry the case upon application of the accused or the attorney general. Judges in Israel are appointed for life, and are guaranteed their independence by a statute which provides that they are subject only to the law.

Argument before the supreme court commenced March 22, 1962, and continued for about 1 week. The court's affirmation of the verdict and sentence was announced May 29, 1962, and Eichmann immediately petitioned the President of Israel for clemency. Clemency was denied and shortly thereafter, at 11:58 p.m. on May 30, 1962, Adolf Eichmann was hanged. Within hours his body had been cremated, pursuant to his own request, and his ashes spread upon the Mediterranean.

[9] Appeal judgment I 2, par. 5.

[10] Trial judgment 11.

[11] Among the most eloquent: Silving, In re Eichmann: A Dilemma of Law and Morality, 55. Am. J. Intl. L. 307 (1961).

Israel had strong motives in her national interest to obtain Eichmann and have him tried before none but a Jewish court, and clandestine abduction was apparently the only way of obtaining him. Although kidnapping is and has been common practice among nations as the alternative to ineffective or nonexistent channels of extradition, this was a blow to the rule of law aggravated somewhat by the fact that the violating nation has been traditionally a champion of obedience of law, a nation which now seeks to be the bastion of democracy in the Middle East and whose people have advocated strict adherence to law for thousands of years.

Whatever sympathy lies with Israel for the crimes committed against her people and whatever moral justification there may have been, to those who firmly believe that the future of the world depends upon the ability of men and nations to lay down and follow positive rules for peaceful conduct among themselves, the bad taste of kidnapping, of achieving justice through an unlawful act, still remains.

LEGALITY VERSUS POLICY

In addition to the question of forcible abduction, the objections to the court's jurisdiction revolved primarily around indictment under the retroactive Israel statute, the Nazis and Nazi collaborators (punishment) law of 1950,[12] and the extraterritorial application of this law.

Though neither the district court nor the supreme court, under existing precedent could strike down and disregard the jurisdiction conferred by the Israel Parliament, argument to this question was heard before Eichmann pleaded to the indictment and again on appeal. As discussed infra, both courts declared there to be no violation of the law of nations by Israel's assumption of jurisdiction and subsequent trial.

Indeed, this seems to be so.[13] The case is sui generis and the relevant rules are far from settled and in a state of change. Although there was no rule or precedent directly in point which would allow the trial, neither was there a direct prohibition, and broadly speaking, unless there is a clear rule of international law forbidding a state from pursuing a particular line of conduct, it may exercise jurisdiction within its own territory even in cases involving acts committed abroad.[14]

Whether Israel should have gone ahead with the trial is again a question divorced from that of jurisdiction. There was not available any international tribunal for such a trial and the creation of an ad hoc international court free of cold war politics and propaganda was highly unlikely. The World Court's jurisdiction does not extend to the trial of criminal cases, and the United Nations has on several occasions attempted without success to establish a permanent international criminal court of justice.

It is doubtful, moreover, that Israel under any circumstances would have given up her power to have Eichmann tried before a Jewish court sitting in the Holy Land.

RETROACTIVE LAW

Israeli courts acknowledge that the Nazis law of 1950 is both retroactive and extraterritorial in nature, but the Eichmann trial court said:

"The Israel Legislature embodied into domestic law what have long been crimes under the laws of all civilized nations, including the German people, before and after the Nazi regime, while the law and criminal decrees of Hitler and his regime are no laws and have been set aside with retroactive effect even by the German courts themselves. It cannot be said that the perpetrators of the crimes defined in the law in question "could not have had a mens rea because they did not and could not know that what they were doing was a criminal act." On the contrary, the extensive measures taken by the Nazis to efface the traces of their crimes, such as the disinterment of the dead bodies of the murdered and their cremation into ashes, and the destruction of the Gestapo archives before the collapse of the Reich, clearly prove that the Nazis knew well the criminal character of their enormities." [15]

The 300-page Eichmann judgment traced the origin of the Nazis' law. It contains nearly verbatim the same description of murder, plunder, prevention of birth, uprooting of peoples, and other atrocities as found in the international law definitions of genocide and "crimes against humanity."

The court also indicated that in the development of law following World War II, several nations affected by the aggression and atrocities of the Third Reich enacted statutes similar to Israel's Nazis law.

The Hebrew maxim, "No one may be punished unless he was forewarned," and its Western counterparts, nullum crimen sine lege and the rule against ex post facto laws, constitute a generally accepted principle intended to guard against abuses of justice through retroactive legislation. It is seldom expressed as a rule of positive law, however, and is not considered a limitation upon a nation's sovereignty, but a general principle designed to prevent injustice. If no injustice is worked, then there is no violation of the principle.

"Whether or not an injustice is worked would depend on a variety of circumstances," according to Prof. Robert Woetzel, of Fordham University, in his recent "The Nuremberg Trials in International Law:[16]

"If the act was a heinous violation of international law; if it was recognizable as such to the individual; if he could reasonably be expected to know that it was punishable; and if he intended to do the thing he did which was in violation of his duties and obligations under international law. If all these conditions are met in a particular case, then it would not only be just to hold the individual criminally responsible for his misdeed, it would be an injustice not to do so. There could be no violation of the maxim nullum crimen, nulla poena in such a case."

"There is (not) any taint of ex post factoism in the law of murder," said the Jerusalem District Court.[17]

The supreme court pointed to the absence of a positive rule of international law banning criminal legislation with retroactive effect, and maintained there was no moral justification for preventing the application of such legislation to the offenses charged to Eichmann. The ethical import of the nulla poena maxim, ruled the high court, was not violated in this case.[18]

TWO SOURCES OF JURISDICTION

The State of Israel's right to try and punish Adolf Eichmann derives from two cumulative sources, according to the district court, and affirmed by the supreme court:

"A universal source (pertaining to the whole of mankind) which vests the right to prosecute and punish crimes of this order in every State within the family of nations; and a specific or national source which gives the victim nation the right to try any who assault their existence." [19]

The trial court noted the World Court's advisory opinion in 1951 that the right to try an individual for a crime against humanity was universal, and could be exercised by any nation in whose custody rested an accused. Universality by its very nature, moreover, implies the extraterritorial application of penal law. The territorial principle, i.e., trial where the acts were committed, is by no means the only basis of jurisdiction; it is but a compulsory minimum.

Citing Coke, Blackstone, and precedent from the Middle Ages, the Jerusalem court described the most frequent application of the universality of a pirate by any nation which apprehended him, on the ground that he was hostes generis humani, an enemy of the human race. Furthermore, according to the early scholar of international law, Hugo Grotius, the apprehending state had not only a right to try one charged with violating "in extreme form" the law of nature or the law of nations, no matter where committed, but as well had a moral duty to other nations to do so. A fortiori with genocide.

Turning to the national source of jurisdiction, the court relied heavily upon an elementary principle expounded in 1625 by Grotius in his "De Jure Belli ac Pacis," the basic right of the victim to punish his assailant. It is a matter of historical fact, the tribunal said, that the vital interests of Israel, both before and after it achieved its sovereignty, were seriously and adversely affected by the Nazis' attempt to destroy the Jewish people, and there was without question the "linking point" between prosecutor and crime, as required by Grotius.

When defense counsel argued the absence of a linking point between the crimes and Israel, that territoriality was the only true basis of jurisdiction, and that jurisdiction lay only in the countries of Europe where the acts were committed, the trial court in reply began to use stronger and more emotional language, and indicated annoyed impatience with anyone who might fail to see the connection between Israel and the holocaust:

"In other words, 18 nations do have the right to punish the accused for the murder of Jews who reside in their territories, but the nation of those who were murdered has no right to inflict such punishment because those persons were not exterminated on its territory." [20]

"The connection between the State of Israel and the Jewish people needs no explanation," the court said.[21] The annihilation of European Jews had no relation to the countries in which they resided, but had as its only basis their historical and ancestral relationship with the Holy Land. And the Land of Israel has endured for thousands of years; there has been but a change of governments.

"The people is one and the crime is one. * * * To argue that there is no connection is like cutting away a tree root and branch and saying to its trunk: 'I have not hurt you.' " [22]

Thus, the district court inadvertently announced one of the subtle but compelling motives of the government for holding the trial in Israel, that of asserting a sort of sovereignty, as it were, on behalf of all the Jewish people. Again citing Grotius, the court declared:

"The very existence of a people who can be murdered with impunity is in danger, to say nothing of the danger to its honor and authority. This has been the curse of dispersion and the want of sovereignty of the people of Israel, upon whom any criminal could commit his outrages without fear of being punished by the people outraged."[23]

---

[12] 4 Israel Laws 154 (5710–1949/50).

[13] Leavy, "The Eichmann Trial, Report from Jerusalem," 37 Calif. B. J. 243, 257, authorities cited at note 75.

[14] The Lotus Case. P.C.I.J. ser. A. No. 10, p. 18 (*France* v. *Turkey*, 1927).

[15] Trial judgment 7.

[16] Pp. 115, 116 (1960).

[17] Trial judgment 27.

[18] Appeal judgment I 4, 5, par. 8.

[19] Trial judgment 30.

[20] Trial judgment 34.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Trial judgment 35.

DETERIORATION OF LAW

At least as interesting as the question of jurisdiction, and far more startling to me as a lawyer, was the evidence which showed the clear, consistent pattern of deterioration of legal systems and principles in each country occupied by the Nazis, commencing with Germany itself.

First was the enactment of discriminatory laws which arbitrarily deprived certain groups of basic human and property rights, and the ruthless execution of those laws as Government policy. Then came the acquiescence and capitulation of the judiciary, which by and large had prostituted itself to the Government's wishes. Members of the bar who would not then cooperate with the new order were disposed of, for there was but small need for attorneys in such a system.

The demise of court-administered justice and an established, orderly legal system signaled the rise of police power, and the pattern was set most clearly in Nazi Germany. Minister of Justice Hugh Bormann reported to Hitler in 1942 that the courts were not handling the "volume of criminals" with sufficient speed and he urged that "the police should be given free rein and thus achieve better results".[24]

The inattention of lawyers to the criminal courts and to the administration of constitutional law gave needed encouragement to the regime in power. The first encroachments by the Government brought not an avalanche of protest from the legal profession, as we would expect in the United States, but instead hardly a trickle.

To a lawyer sitting in the Jerusalem courtroom, having been schooled in the traditions of Anglo-American constitutional law, this evidence and its implications registered with pounding force.

THE LAW MUST TEACH

Perhaps, though Eichmann's abduction at present detracted from world law, the trial itself may have been a noteworthy step toward acceptance of principles which someday may be the basis of peace and order among nations. The Eichmann court, in a major case some 16 years after the heat of war and its attendant passions have substantially subsided, reaffirmed that personal responsibility will lie with those who commit war crimes and crimes against humanity under blind obedience and as political acts in the name of national security.

Many quarrel with the soundness of this doctrine in the light of current world affairs. As with most precepts, it is not a perfect rule. It may be misused by the wrong victor. It cannot be applied against the criminal who has a powerful armed force to protect himself from apprehension; to him and his followers the principle of personal responsibility may presently be no deterrent at all.

It will never be binding upon the minds of all men, to prevent resort to force, until all men accept it as such. This indeed will take a great deal of time, much yielding of sovereignty in the interest of law and order, and constant usage of the doctrine until it is universally accepted as a matter of course.

Sovereign nations are most often reluctant to forgo their own interests in order to strengthen the rule of law, except under pressure of great world opinion, economic sanctions, or the threat of outright force. Achieving stability in law is a painfully long-term process of gradually increasing usage and acceptance. We have seen how long it required for many of the principles once laid down in the Holy Land to become written into the domestic statutes of most nations and accepted as binding upon all.

But law in the modern age must go further than its traditional role of following the mores of the people it serves. It must undertake the role of leadership, and its jurist must continually stress and teach the rules of conduct to which the leaders of nations and all men must bind themselves for the survival of mankind.

Oliver Wendell Holmes said in 1881, "The life of the law has not been logic: it has been experience."[25] But the world can ill afford to await experience before accepting as binding the principles laid down at Nuremberg. It is utterly frightening to contemplate that what required Hitler several years of the bloodiest and most intense methods may now be accomplished on an even greater scale in a matter of minutes and is a most simple and unfettered manner—in fact, even by accident.

Nuclear weapons have already been used upon human beings, though probably not with specific intent to destroy an entire people, and genocide by such means in the future is far from just a remote possibility. Who knows but that it is already upon us, with the effects of radioactive fallout to be registered in future generations—but of course, lacking the element of specific intent.

Israel, as with several other nations, accepted into her domestic law the principle of personal responsibility and the injunction against genocide. It used these in a trial of great import to the world. The concepts were again tested in the Supreme Court of Israel on appeal by judges schooled in the highest standards of Anglo-American law. And we hope it will not end there; perhaps responsible courts throughout the world will follow suit in other cases which arise over the decades, thus developing more firmly into law and upon the consciences of all men the principles which offer hope to the future of man. Said the Jerusalem District Court:

"Perhaps it is not a vain hope that the more this conviction becomes rooted in the minds of men, the more they will refrain from following criminal leaders, and the rule of law and order in the relations between nations will be strengthened accordingly."[26]

RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINNEGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, because I know of the continued interest of the constituents of my district in all of the accomplishments of Congress, I take this opportunity of reporting to them.

From the time that I raised my right hand and repeated the oath of office as given to me by the late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, I have conscientiously tried to discharge my duties in the national interest and in the interest of my constituents.

Of necessity the itemization by public laws is fragmentary. No attempt is made here to set out in detail all of the elements and provisions in each piece of legislation. However, my office, as always, holds itself available to provide any reasonable requests for the laws or explanations of them. We welcome your interest and will try to fill all demands, if at all possible.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The 87th Congress was a memorable one. We gathered in Washington on January 3, 1961, when the country was in the midst of a recession. Unemployment was high and the economy was stagnant. The voters of the United States had just elected a vigorous young man who had promised to get this country moving again. Almost 2 years later we are adjourning with a record of accomplishments that is very indicative of the temper of the times. In some areas we have made great advances with progressive legislation, in other areas a conservative mood is predominant.

In both sessions of the 87th Congress many steps were taken to stimulate the economy. Not only was it necessary to bring it back from the recession depths of January 1961, but in the last weeks of the second session additional measures were asked for by the President to forestall another downturn.

Some major legislation enacted dealing with these problems were:

Public Law 87-6: Authorized $928 million temporary program to provide 13 weeks additional unemployment compensation up to June 30, 1962, for jobless whose payments expire.

Public Law 87-7: Applied similar benefits to unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Public Law 87-27: Established Area Redevelopment Administration in Department of Commerce; authorized $300 million loans and $94 million grants for industrial plants and public facilities in areas of economic distress, provides for technical assistance, vocational rehabilitation, and subsistence grants for persons undergoing retraining, the program ending June 30, 1965.

Public Law 87-30: Increased $1 minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, extended coverage to 3.5 million additional workers by gradual wage step-ups, and amended Fair Labor Standards Act.

Public Law 87-31: Authorized temporary grants to States to finance inclusion of dependent children of unemployed under Federal-State assistance program for 15 months to June 1, 1962.

Public Law 87-61: Authorized additional $11.5 billion for completion of Interstate and Defense Highway System as scheduled by 1972, and to bring Federal apportionments for primary, secondary and urban programs, from $925 million to $1 billion annually; fixed Federal gas and diesel tax at 4 cents per gallon, raised levies on tires, tubes, retread rubber and on heavy trucks and buses.

Public Law 87-196: Directed Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate adequacy of rules and regulations of stock exchanges.

Public Law 87-255: Extended construction aid under the Airport Act for 3 years to June 30, 1964; authorized $225 million for grants on a matching basis at the rate of $75 million a year.

Public Law 87-415: Authorized $435 million, 3-year program of training of unemployed in vocational schools, or on-the-job retraining, to develop new skills, the first 2 years' cost to be paid by the Federal Government, the third year 50-50 with the States.

---

[23] Ibid.

[24] Transcript 28.4.61, session W1.

[25] The Common Law, p. 1.

[26] Trial judgment 220.

Public Law 87-624: Authorized creation of a commercial corporation, owned 50-50 by the public and the communication industry to establish and operate a communications satellite system under regulation of the FCC, in cooperation with NASA; three members of the board of directors to be appointed by the President.

Public Law 87-658: Was designed to combat the persistent high level of unemployment in those areas bypassed by general economic recovery and to stimulate the economy through the construction of needed public works. It authorized the appropriation of $900 million to undertake and accelerate Federal public works and for matching grants for local projects.

H.R. 10650: Amended the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit for investment in new equipment; reduced deductions for business expenses and increased taxes on income earned by American wholly owned subsidiaries abroad.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In this field of international relations some noteworthy legislation was passed:

Public Law 87-794: The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, empowers the President, subject to safeguard provisions, to cut duties on imports by agreements with other nations over a 5-year period by 50 percent, and gives him special authority to reduce tariffs up to 100 percent on those items in which the United States and the European Common Market together account for 80 percent of the free world trade.

The act is of particular importance to Illinois as our growth in exports has made us the leading State in the Union in this category. Expanded world trade will help favorably the more than 600 companies in Illinois, most of them in the Chicago area, whose exports exceed $25,000 per year and who employ 450,000 of a total of approximately 1,140,000 manufacturing workers in the State.

Public Law 87-297: Established a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to operate under guidance of the President and the Secretary of State—a good move toward turning the arms race into a "peace race."

Public Law 87-293 and Public Law 87-442: Established and expanded the Peace Corps as an independent agency subject to policy guidance by the State Department.

Public Law 87-731: Authorized loans up to total of $100 million by the United States to the U.N. based on matching combined subscriptions of all other countries.

Public Law 87-195: Authorized $4.2 billion for 1962 program of loans and grants for foreign economic aid and development, military assistance and support, and contributions to international programs; provided for 5-year programing of development loans.

Public Law 87-565: Authorized $4.6 billion foreign assistance program for 1963, including military support funds, development loans and grants, and programs for Latin America at $600 million a year through 1966.

Public Law 87-92: Extended indefinitely the President's authority to use surplus farm products to aid the people and economy of underdeveloped nations and permits broadened programs.

Public Law 87-256: Consolidated and broadened programs of educational and cultural exchange of persons between the United States and other countries.

Public Law 87-132: Reduced from $500 to $100 value of goods returning Americans may bring back duty free from abroad.

Public Law 87-63: Established a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to promote and encourage travel from abroad.

House Concurrent Resolution 226: Expressed the sense of Congress that the OAS reevaluate the role of Cuba in inter-American affairs and take such steps as it deems necessary toward imposition of sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE

Public Law 87-64 and Public Law 87-285: Raised minimum monthly old-age insurance payments under Social Security Act from $33 to $40, increased benefits to widows and provided male workers may draw reduced benefits upon retirement at age 62, liberalized disability provisions while increasing tax for workers and employers by one-eighth of 1 percent each.

Public Law 87-543: Amended Social Security Act so as to reduce public assistance rolls, by providing grants to States that establish work programs for needy, increasing U.S. share of administrative costs, extending for 5 years payments to families of unemployed fathers and other needy children, and raising by $4 per month the ceiling on Federal matching grants for aged, blind, and disabled.

Public Law 87-420: Amended Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 by providing Secretary of Labor with powers of enforcement, to establish regulations and interpret the statute.

S. 1552: Provided for stricter regulation of drug industry and of the distribution of new drugs.

H.R. 10541: Authorized 3-year, $36 million program of grants to aid States and communities in carrying out mass vaccination programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus.

H.R. 11665: Revised formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act.

Public Law 87-22: Extended for 4 years to June 30, 1965, $5 million a year program for grants and scholarships for the training of practical nurses under Vocational Education Act of 1946.

Public Law 87-529: Amended the Federal Communications Act to give FCC authority to require all newly manufactured TV sets to be equipped to receive all UHF and VHF channels.

Public Law 87-447: Authorized matching Federal grants up to $1 million for any State to purchase TV transmission equipment for educational purposes, providing the State or sponsoring agency furnish the land, buildings, and guarantee to operate and maintain the channel.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

Public Law 87-36: Created 63 additional U.S. district court judgeships and 10 in circuit courts to meet increasing caseloads.

Public Law 87-368: Authorized FBI to pursue across State lines any fugitive accused of an offense punishable by more than 1 year in prison.

Public Law 87-216: Prohibited and fixed the penalty for interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

Public Law 87-228: Prohibited and fixed the penalty for interstate and foreign travel, or use of the mails, for the purpose of unlawful activity.

House Document 372: Reorganization Plan No. 2, 1962. Established Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President to coordinate all Federal functions in this field.

Senate Joint Resolution 29: Proposed a constitutional amendment to prohibit poll taxes.

Public Law 87-264: Extended the life of the President's Civil Rights Commission for 2 years to September 30, 1963.

Public Law 87-128: Cut wheat acreage 10 percent for the 1961-62 crop year, offered payment for additional reductions and price support averaging $2 per bushel, continued present program of voluntary acreage cuts for feed grains, including barley, and fixed minimum price support at 65 percent while extending surplus disposal program.

H.R. 12391: Extended through the 1963 crop year a 10-percent cut in wheat acreage, offering payments for additional voluntary reductions; continued optional cuts and price support for corn, grain sorghums, and barley; and provided payments for dairy farmers who cut milk production.

Public Law 87-5: Provided for a 1-year voluntary cut in acreage and crops of feed grains; increased price-support payments to participants for corn, grain sorghums, and other feed grains and soybeans.

Public Law 87-28: Authorized the disposal of additional $2 billion in surplus commodities under provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Public Law 87-127: Authorized the distribution of feed at reduced price to livestock farmers suffering hardship from drought.

Public Law 87-198: Increased temporarily by $20 million, to $595 million, the amount available to Small Business Administration for regular business loans.

Public Law 87-305: Increased by $105 million, to $1.1 billion, the total borrowing authority of Small Business Administration, including $725 million for regular business loans.

Public Law 87-341: Raised the limit on amounts Small Business Administration may lend small business investment corporations and on latter's investments in individual enterprises.

Public Law 87-550: Increased the lending authority of Small Business Administration for business loans and disaster loans to a combined total of $1.09

billion, investment company loans from $325 million to $341 million, authorized loans to firms in need of assistance under Trade Expansion Act.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Public Law 87-84, H.R. 5723: Extended direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized $1.2 billion for direct loan program through fiscal year 1965.

Public Law 87-233, H.R. 4539: Authorized the payment of $60 million special dividend to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance.

Public Law 87-268, H.R. 6969: Increased payments to veterans' widows.

Public Law 87-138, H.R. 845: Increased to $100 per month special pensions to holders of Congressional Medal of Honor.

Public Law 87-3, S. 1173: Restored rank of General of the Army (five stars) to former President Eisenhower.

Public Law 87-583, S. 3109: Authorized VA hospital and medical care for peacetime veterans for noncompensable service-connected disabilities.

Public Law 87-645, H.R. 10743: Increased by average of 9.4 percent rates of compensation for service-connected disability paid to 1.9 million veterans.

Public Law 87-531, H.R. 11221: Increased basic allowance for living quarters for members of Armed Forces.

H.R. 852: Provided for review by independent medical experts of disputed disability or death claims of veterans. Passed both Houses.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Subcommittee on Housing, I have particular interest in legislation that has proceeded through our committee and been enacted into law. Since the House of Representatives is so large and cumbersome most of the important work is done within the committees of the House where proposed legislation receives open hearings and can be more thoroughly studied and debated than before the full House. For this reason, I am more intimately connected with the drafting and enacting of the following measures which originated in my committees.

Public Law 87-311: Authorized the Export-Import Bank to guarantee and insure U.S. exporters and importers against political and credit risks of loss in foreign countries.

Public Law 87-490: Authorized United States to lend up to $2 billion to International Monetary Fund as part of a $6 billion program by 10 nations to strengthen world currencies and uphold the dollar.

Public Law 87-506: Extended for 2 years to June 30, 1964, authority of Federal Reserve Board to buy up to $5 billion in U.S. securities directly from the Treasury.

Public Law 87-588: Authorized the Federal Reserve Board to permit foreign branches of American national banks to adopt practices of country where bank is located.

Public Law 87-717: Increased to 70 percent of deposits amount national banks may lend on real estate; extended maturity of construction loans.

Public Law 87-185: Approved an amendment to the agreement of the International Finance Corporation authorizing it to invest in common stocks.

Public Law 87-42: Authorized the President to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas A. Dooley for his humanitarian services abroad.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Public Law 87-70: Authorized 4 to 5 years $4.9 billion housing programs for: Low and moderate income families on liberalized terms; urban renewal; open spaces development in cities; college dormitory construction loans; 100,000 new units of public housing; community facilities. Extended farm housing program, increased funds for housing for the aged, and provided for loans to cities to acquire mass transportation facilities.

Public Law 87-38: Provided interim $1 billion increase in Federal Housing Administration mortage insurance authority.

Public Law 87-395: Expanded and extended programs of Federal grants to States and communities for: Construction of nursing homes, training of public health personnel, and studies to improve services for aged outside hospitals.

Public Law 87-723: Provided for low and moderate cost housing for elderly in urban and rural areas; authorized $200 million for loan funds for new construction and other programs.

This listing of many of the most important measures that received congressional approval is by no means complete, but I hope it will give you an idea of the wide variety of legislation dealt with by this Congress and how it directly affects you and your family.

Of course, there were many more bills enacted into law that were of equal importance to many persons. These include the hundreds of minor bills and private bills that affect specific situations or individuals.

It has been my privilege to introduce many such bills, the greater majority concerning immigration matters. Because our early immigration laws have followed the restrictive national-origins theory they have been discriminatory in many instances. We have managed to liberalize some of these restrictive policies in this Congress, and I hope we shall do much more next year. We have enacted Public Law 87-301, which established permanent authority for admission of alien orphans to the United States for the purpose of adoption; and provides for judicial review of deportation orders and otherwise amends the Immigration and Nationality Act, and we have removed from the waiting lists and permitted entry as nonquota those who have been registered in countries abroad for a period of 10 years.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, the legislative record of the 87th Congress is a good one, a progressive one, and one in which I am proud to have taken part. As I look over the past 2 years what is perhaps of more personal satisfaction to me are the individual services I have been able to perform for my constituents and friends back home. We have received and answered inquiries, requests, and correspondence numbering in the thousands. We have given individual attention to those with problems relating to such Federal matters as social security, veteran and military cases, post office matters and many others. We inaugurated a questionnaire to better determine the feelings of our constituents on important legislative matters before the Congress. We issue periodic newsletters and reports to a mailing list now composed of over 75,000 registered voters, and we are most fortunate to act as hosts to the hundreds of visitors who annually visit our Washington office and take advantage of the facilities available to them.

This is the record on which I go to the people on November 6; and I hope it meets with their approval.

ACTION NEEDED TO REGAIN INITIATIVE IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, October 8, 1962, I had the privilege of addressing the Florida Retail Federation at its annual meeting which was held at the Lago Mar Hotel in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. The text of my address, which follows, deals with the continuing Cuban crisis:

> In a few days the 87th Congress will be history. Some will remember this Congress for its legislative accomplishments, others for its legislative shortcomings. In my own case, as chairman of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, I will look back on the 87th Congress as the Congress which recognized and warned the American people of the growing Communist threat to our hemisphere.
>
> Whatever the final assessment of this past Congress—at the polls in November or at the hands of future historians—let the record speak clearly on that one point: its Members have been alert to the menace of Fidel Castro's Cuba and they have reflected the American people's rising concern over the establishment of a Communist fortress 90 miles from our shores.
>
> The able Congressman from this district, my colleague, Paul Rogers, has been a leading spokesman on this subject as has his neighbor to the south, Congressman Dante Fascell. As an example, only last week, in the final days of the session, Congressman Rogers took the lead in a successful effort to keep vessels which carry military cargoes to Cuba from using U.S. ports. On almost every occasion that I have spoken on this subject on the floor of the House of Representatives these two able Members have given me unqualified support. As a matter of fact, your entire Florida delegation has worked tirelessly to intensify this country's efforts to eliminate communism from our hemisphere.
>
> But Congress, as we know, has neither the ultimate power nor the final responsibility for the conduct of foreign policy. That power

and responsibility lies with the executive branch of Government. Congress can warn—Congress can implore—Congress can make its feelings and the feelings of its constituents known—but the final direction of American foreign policy lies with the President of the United States.

As an American and as a Member of Congress—not as a political partisan—I was critical of the Eisenhower administration's seeming complacency about the Castro menace to Latin America. During the 87th Congress, which convened in January 1961, I have been no less critical of our Democratic administration for its mistakes in Latin American policy.

To be sure, neither political party is free to cast stones over our present dilemma in Cuba and throughout Latin America.

Republicans who criticize the Kennedy administration's record on Castro would do well to remember that the Castro regime is an unwanted legacy from the Eisenhower administration and that the critical Latin American area was virtually ignored during the 8 years President Eisenhower was in office.

At the same time, Democrats who in 1960 criticized the Eisenhower administration's record on Castro might well consider the failure of the Kennedy administration thus far to remove the threat of Castro and communism from the hemisphere.

But partisanship—unfortunate as it may be when concerned with foreign policy—is not the fundamental source of our difficulties in Latin America. No one doubts that Democrats and Republicans alike would come together in mutual praise of a President who eliminated the threat of communism from our hemisphere.

The recent resolution passed by the Congress, in the wake of Soviet shipments of arms and military personnel to Cuba, demonstrates the essential unity of the country on this point. In brief, that resolution expressed congressional support of the President in whatever action he takes to meet this latest Soviet challenge to our hemispheric security.

No, if we have faltered in Latin America, let no one say that national disunity is the cause. On the basic point that communism must not be allowed a foothold in the Western Hemisphere, all Americans agree.

But although the country is united against the Communist threat to our hemisphere, we continue to lose ground in Latin America. This grim state of affairs frustrates our own people, and it mystifies our friends.

We are a rich nation, the richest in the world. We are a powerful nation, the most powerful in the world. And where Latin America is concerned, we are confronting our Communist adversaries on a cold war battlefield we know and understand through years of cultural and political ties.

Why then does the United States—rich, powerful, and determined to oppose communism in its own hemisphere—fail in this mission?

I submit that the erosion of U.S. power and prestige in Latin America is not the result of an inevitable historical tide, as the Communists would have the world believe.

I submit that we can cleanse our hemisphere of the cancer of Castro and communism if we first clear our minds of the cobwebs of illusion. For the bitter truth is that Khrushchev's success in Cuba has been possible only because of our own failure to see clearly our national and hemispheric responsibilities.

What steps can be taken to reverse the ominous trend of recent events in our hemisphere? First, we must examine the myths and illusions which form the basis of policy toward the Castro regime.

Illusion No. 1, of course, is that the threat posed by Castro's Cuba is minor. That this illusion serves as a foundation for our Latin American policy is pointed up by a recent statement of Under Secretary of State George Ball.

"Our policy toward Cuba," declared Mr. Ball, "is based upon the assessment that it does not today constitute a military threat to the United States."

That is one illusion on which our policy toward Castro's Cuba has been based. Now hear this conclusion from a report of a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee:

"In addition we must now concede an inflight refueling capability for long-range Soviet aircraft, with reasonable assurance that Cuba, as well as some other possible areas to the south, would be available as staging areas for inflight refueling of Soviet bombers.

"No one can now successfully contend," continues the committee report, "that the sole threat of Soviet attack by aircraft or air-breathing missiles is limited to the northern approach.

"The threat is now total and our defensive capability must be adjusted to meet it."

So much for the contention that a hostile Cuba, occupied by Soviet military personnel and possessing Soviet military hardware, does not constitute a threat to our security. Yet this contention forms the basis for present U.S. policy and planning regarding Cuba—according to no less an authority than the Under Secretary of State.

Illusion No. 2 is that the Castro regime, if economically isolated in the hemisphere, will collapse of its own weight. This illusion served as the fundamental thesis of U.S. Cuban policy in the period preceding recent Soviet shipments to the island.

It should be clear to all that the Kremlin views its Cuban satellite as an invaluable cold war base, both militarily and politically. The Castro regime is now being supported and maintained by its Soviet masters—and the Kremlin will invest whatever is needed to keep this Communist foothold in the Americas.

Khrushchev can be expected to reinforce the Castro regime's iron grip on the Cuban people with some amount of economic aid—and with an ever-increasing amount of military aid. The Castro government cannot fall of its own weight because it is not standing on its own feet. The source of its power lies not with the people of Cuba, but with the weapons supplied by the Soviet Union.

This leads directly to illusion No. 3: We are asked to believe that because Cuban military weaponry is quote—defensive—unquote, Castro poses no revolutionary threat to other Latin American nations.

But neither Fidel Castro nor his Kremlin advisors are foolish enough to attempt to export communism in the Americas by means of overt military aggression. Their chief hope of exporting communism throughout the hemisphere is not military aggression, but political subversion.

Cuba today serves as a base for possible future military operations against the United States—and as a base for current subversive operations against other governments in the hemisphere. The training of agents and the establishment of subversive networks to foment revolution throughout Latin America is a primary aim of the Castro regime.

Yet a fourth illusion leading to our present hemispheric crisis relates to our economic programs to raise the living standards of the hemisphere. The long-range purpose of the most extensive of these programs—the Alliance for Progress—is to remove the basic economic cause for the cancer of communism.

Let me be clear on this point. The Alliance for Progress is real and it offers our best hope for the prosperity and security of our hemisphere in the years ahead. But the illusion fostered by some policy planners is that the Alliance is an adequate answer to the immediate threat of Castro's aggressive, subversive activities in the Americas.

The fact is that so long as the Castro regime operates in Cuba, it will serve to thwart and block the success of the Alliance for Progress. We cannot cure the cancer without first eliminating its primary source. If the Alliance is to be provided a fair opportunity to operate, Castro's immediate threat to hemispheric security must be eradicated.

Our aspirations are long range—but the enemy's threat is immediate. Economic aid alone cannot withstand the insidious assault of communism in Latin America today. But economic aid coupled with a firm military policy can and will defeat the Khrushchev-Castro plans for our hemisphere.

So much for the greater illusions upon which our Latin American policy has been launched—and has foundered—in recent years. Each and all of these myths, you will observe, argue the same conclusion: That the best, if not the only course for the United States regarding Cuba is—to do nothing at all.

Once again, shocked though the American people have been by the physical presence of Russian military personnel in our own Caribbean, we are asked to drift and wait. Wait and see. This is the sum and substance of the policies nurtured by the illusions of our policy planners.

But now there are indications that our people are not content to sit back and await the next shock—the fall of another Latin American government to Castroism or the alliance of Castro Cuba to the Warsaw Pact. Indeed, as the President himself and Secretary Rusk have warned the Soviets in times past, our patience is not inexhaustible.

The patience of the American people has in fact been exhausted. It only remains for their leaders to understand and appreciate the meaning of the rising clamor for action—and action now—to regain the initiative in our own hemisphere.

We then return to the question, What kind of action is needed to reverse the ominous trend of recent events in our hemisphere?

To begin, let me express the opinion that we cannot expect to bring down the Castro regime by the sheer weight of the various proclamations, declarations, and resolutions approved by the Congress, the Organization of American States, and our own Department of State. Words alone cannot free Cuba from the Communist grip.

At the same time, we cannot completely discount the strength of political and economic pressure when it is exerted by the various nations of the hemisphere. As a member of the congressional delegation which attended the inter-American Foreign Ministers meeting early this year, I can state that the unified political and economic pressure brought to bear at Punta del Este has taken its toll of Castro's strength in Cuba.

Further, let us not overlook the fact that the significant inter-American agreements, notably the Declaration of Rio, the Bogotá Pact, and the policy agreement at Punta del Este, form a legal and juridical basis for whatever action is needed to bring down the Castro government.

The hemisphere's political and economic pressure against Castro's Cuba must be maintained. Yet we are far enough down the road to recognize that the ultimate burden for action against Castro is upon the shoulders of the United States. We welcome the moral and material assistance of other freedom-loving countries of the hemisphere—but in the final analysis, we must be prepared to move unilaterally if necessary to defend our own national security.

The day may come when our country must take upon itself the sole responsibility for maintaining our hemisphere's integrity.

But we may continue to hope for an alternative solution and for unified inter-American action against Communist encroachment.

In this regard, we may be encouraged by the new-found unanimity of opinion regarding the threat of Castroism which was displayed last week at the inter-American Foreign Ministers' meeting in Washington.

What then are our choices? First, let me make it clear that I do not consider our choices limited to either sending in U.S. troops or doing nothing at all to dislodge communism from its Cuban base.

No; there are alternative solutions and they are obvious enough if our policy planners will but open their eyes to see them. Let us consider our greatest potential resource in the battle to free Cuba—the Cuban people themselves. Obviously they cannot do the job alone and must depend on a major effort on our part to assist them. But the ultimate liberation of Cuba can be greatly accelerated if freedom-loving Cubans are provided the means and the support necessary to strike at their oppressors.

The time is long overdue for this country to provide active support and recognition to a government of free Cuba. The recent Soviet actions in Cuba only strengthen the argument that the Castro government no longer is a legitimate instrument of the Cuban peoples' will, but is in fact only an instrument of Soviet policy.

Let us then recognize a Cuban government-in-exile, whatever the difficulties involved, as the first step toward regaining the initiative in the battle against communism in our hemisphere. And let us then make clear our intention and purpose to aid, support, and equip such a government in its own battle against communism in its homeland.

By all means, let us have an end to the policy of hampering and discouraging the Cuban people and freedom-loving peoples throughout the hemisphere in their efforts to combat the Castro regime.

Indeed, this country does have a neutrality act. But let there be no misunderstanding that in any struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny in the Western Hemisphere the United States will sit on its hands.

Encouraging, organizing, and equipping the forces of free Cuba is only one step toward regaining the initiative in our hemisphere, however. We must also act boldly and firmly to draw a line against the presence of Soviet personnel in Cuba.

Let the warning be given to Khrushchev that we are supporting a free Cuban government and that he risks the loss of Soviet lives by maintaining military personnel on the island. And let there be no hesitation on our part out of fear that the Kremlin's strategists will use our action to justify a move against Berlin or any other free world base in Europe or the Middle East.

Anyone familiar with the history of the cold war must certainly know by now that if the Soviets were ready and able to move against Berlin or any other outpost of the free world, they would not need or await an excuse to take aggressive action.

Conceded there are risks involved in such a course of action but we must realize that the world we live in is one where risks cannot be avoided if we are to extend or even maintain the boundaries of freedom. Recent history demonstrated that the greater risk lies in doing nothing at all.

This Nation is committed irrevocably to the cause of freedom in the Americas. This Nation is committed irrevocably to the struggle against tyranny in the Americas. Recognition and support of a free Cuban government and the barring of Soviet military forces from Cuba are but the beginnings of a policy of action aimed at honoring our commitments.

Fidel Castro knows—as do his Soviet mentors, that once the people of the United States determine to make such a beginning, there can be but one ending. And that ending is the final liberation of Cuba from the yoke of Communist tyranny.

DEDICATED SENATE SERVICE OF BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it proper for the 87th Congress to adjourn sine die without my taking the floor to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague in the Massachusetts delegation in Congress, Senator Benjamin A. Smith II, who has served the Commonwealth with dignity and distinction and followed in the footsteps of another great Senator from our State, our own President John F. Kennedy.

Senator Ben Smith has made innumerable contributions to the welfare of his people, his country, and his beloved State during the 87th Congress. Only a man possessing his remarkable ability, astuteness, and acuity could enter that august Senate Chamber as a junior Member and demonstrate so quickly such an amazing mental grasp of how that body does its work, illustrate such profound understanding of the legislative work to be done, and show such initiative in helping to get this work underway.

Those of us who have worked closely with Senator Ben Smith, and his Senate colleagues, can attest to the quality of his contribution to the gigantic task of studying and formulating new legislation, and of persuading fellow Members of its value. He served on three extremely busy Senate committees, those of Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on Public Works, and the District of Columbia Committee. His work on these committees was notable.

Ben Smith, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, will always be remembered as cosponsor of one of the most important pieces of New Frontier legislation in the 87th Congress—the Area Redevelopment Act. Not only did he drop the bill into the hopper, but he worked actively in the Halls of Congress giving life to a piece of legislation that he eventually saw signed into law by his longtime personal friend, President Kennedy. Senator Smith's statesmanship was displayed in his championship of this act, which exemplifies the kind of assistance the Federal Government ought to offer, when necessary, to private enterprise and to municipalities.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts was also an active and articulate proponent of the new minimum wage law, and was, as a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, a member of the conference with the House which determined the final form of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly proud to have Senator Smith join with me, and with Senator Leverett Saltonstall, in cosponsoring the Cape Cod National Seashore Park bill. I had first sponsored this bill jointly with my colleague, Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill, of Massachusetts, back in May of 1958, and we were later joined on the Senate side by both Senator Saltonstall and the then Senator John F. Kennedy. Following his appointment to the Senate from Massachusetts to succeed President Kennedy in that seat, Senator Smith immediately conferred with me and the distinguished Congressman representing the Cape Cod area, the Honorable Hastings Keith, and joined in cosponsoring the legislation which led to the establishment of this great national seashore park so that the natural beauty of Cape Cod can be preserved in perpetuity for all Americans.

Senator Ben Smith's service to the United States, to Massachusetts, and to the legislative branch of Government deserves our recognition. He is a dedicated U.S. Senator. He is not with us today on Capitol Hill, because President Kennedy has sent him on a special mission, with the rank of ambassador, as the special representative of the President, to the celebration of the independence of Uganda as a Republic in East Africa. But I believe I speak for all of the members of the Massachusetts delegation and his friends here on the House side when I express the hope that the country will continue to have the benefit of Ben Smith's intelligence and devotion in the future, as we have in the past with his outstanding Senate service.

Mr. Speaker, I think that my colleagues will be interested in reading an excellent article on Senator Smith which appeared in the Springfield Daily News last Monday, October 8, and, under unanimous consent, I include it with my remarks:

For Services Rendered—Retiring Senator Ben Smith Ready for New Career—Special Ambassador to Uganda Independence Celebration Can Choose His Own Job

Washington, D.C.—When Senator Benjamin A. Smith 2d, Democrat, of Massachusetts, walked from his office on Friday, he was closing out one public career, beginning another, and had prospects of still a third in the future.

The boyish-looking junior Senator from the Bay State was ringing down the curtain on his brief but successful career in the U.S. Senate.

REPRESENTS J.F.K.

And he was on his way as the personal representative of the President, with the rank of ambassador, to the celebration observing the independence of Uganda as a republic of Africa.

"I feel honored to carry the best wishes of President Kennedy to this new nation," said Smith. "Of course I will add my own for the success and good fortune for the people of Uganda."

GOOD WILL AMBASSADOR

Smith will take on some of the duties of a general good will Ambassador at Large on the trip. As he and Mrs. Smith and State Department attachés flew out of Washington Friday night, their schedule called for an initial stopover at Rome on Saturday and the flight to Uganda yesterday.

He will meet with the Duke and Duchess of Kent at the 3-day independence celebration and deliver special gifts from the United States.

President Kennedy has sent an engraved desk set to Prime Minister Milton Obote. Already arrived are four mobile gifts from the United States—veterinary, library, and audiovisual units, and a combination library and audiovisual unit. Following the public ceremonies, SMITH and the American delegation are to spend several days in the scenic national parks of Uganda.

TO BE ROYAL ESCORT

On the way home next weekend, they are to stop at Tripoli where they will escort Hasan al-Rida al-Sanusi, Libyan Crown Prince, to Washington on an official state visit.

Almost the forgotten man in the Eddie-Teddy battle and in the current Kennedy-Lodge contest for the Senate seat he will vacate, SMITH was considered a natural choice to represent the United States at Uganda.

"He carries the image of youthful government leaders both here and in Africa," said one Senate colleague. "He had the vigor of the New Frontier in his Senate activities."

JOB WAITING FOR HIM

Now just 46, SMITH says he has no plans to cut down on this vigor for public activities. For the record, he said he plans to return to private business in Gloucester, but unofficially reports circulating in the Capital are that President Kennedy will find ample use for him in his administration.

One news magazine has reported that SMITH may have a blank check to choose his own job with the Government.

"I personally feel good about my 2 years in the Senate," he said.

HAS FOND MEMORIES

Most outstanding in his memory are the conferences he arranged and attended for city and county officials of Massachusetts with Government officers.

"They seem to have drawn the cities, State, and Federal governments closer together. We now understand each other's problems and can work toward solving them."

Like most fellow Democrats in the House and Senate, SMITH, too, looks upon the administration's trade bill and Peace Corps as two milestones in the country's legislative history.

Biggest disappointment were the defeats of medicare and the aid-to-education bills.

"They are matters that Congress must still face up to someday," he said.

"There is still much work to be done for the fisheries and boatmen of Massachusetts," SMITH said, "but I think we're on the way toward getting organized."

Leaving his fourth-floor office in the Old Senate Office Building, SMITH for the moment was walking out on a bit of New England transplanted to Washington.

Walls of the office were splashed with colorful posters of Nantucket, Cape Cod, and other scenic sites of the Commonwealth. The mantel over the fireplace in his office was decorated with a model of a Gloucester fishing schooner, two fishermen's lights and models of the nuclear powered destroyer *Long Beach* built at the Fall River yard.

Off in a corner, almost hidden, was something not expected in an outpost of the New Frontier. It was a single golf putter—a prominent symbol of the former Republican administration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE (at the request of Mr. DANIELS), for the balance of the session on account of official business.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mrs. RILEY (at the request of Mr. McMILLAN), for an indefinite period, on account of official business (for Committee on Science and Astronautics).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. LIBONATI, for 1 hour, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER, for one-half hour, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. FROST, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 10 minutes, on each of two subjects, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, Thursday, October 11, 1962.

Mrs. BOLTON, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. LANGEN, for 30 minutes, on October 11.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEROUNIAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. AVERY in two instances.

Mr. LINDSAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAGAN of Georgia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRIS.

Mr. EVINS in two instances.

Mr. SHELLEY.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial;

H.R. 7283. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses;

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles;

H.R. 10650. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13175. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 9, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10931. An act to revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11970. An act to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13241. An act to amend section 309 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 11, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2622. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2623. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the cranberry indemnity payment program administered by the Agricutural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 832. Resolution taking H.R. 13273 from the Speaker's table and sending it to conference; without amendment (Rept. No. 2547). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee of conference. H.R. 12276. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes without amendment (Rept. No. 2548). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FALLON: Committee of conference. H.R. 12135. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2549). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee of conference. S. 1447. A bill to amend the District of

Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (Rept. No. 2550). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 13383. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands at the Southern Regional Research Laboratory with the city of New Orleans, La., for certain other lands adjacent to such laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 13384. A bill to amend section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the adjournment of the Congress not later than the last day in the month of July except in time of war or national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 13385. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require certain findings before the issuance of a solicitation permit thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 13386. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands at the Southern Regional Research Laboratory with the city of New Orleans, La., for certain other lands adjacent to such laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 13387. A bill for the relief of Capt. Ted R. Sturm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H.R. 13388. A bill for relief of Lem Hong, Mrs. May Hong, and Rose Marie Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 13389. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Filopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 13390. A bill for the relief of Ely Sabidales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 13391. A bill for the relief of Filippa Fucarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13392. A bill for the relief of Paraskedi Stamadianou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 13393. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Vatalidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 13394. A bill for relief of Jan Cyganowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13395. A bill for the relief of Gabriel da Silva Lopes and Mrs. Maria da Trindade Lopes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

414. Mr. FOUNTAIN presented a petition of Jesse M. Seaver of Margarettsville, N.C., on behalf of the Carolina Christian Union, condemning the recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, outlawing the New York regent's prescribed prayer in public schools, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Bonneville Rate Schedule Manipulations—A Warning to Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Congress and as a warning to the public I have asked that the following letter to Secretary Udall be spread upon this RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1962.

Re Bonneville Project Administration: Repayment schedules/power rates.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that the BPA Regional Advisory Council has made a recommendation for changing the manner in which repayment schedules are computed for Columbia River dams and power facilities under cognizance of the Bonneville Power Administration.

The new scheme would lump all Federal projects in the system together and the payout for the whole system would be figured from the date of the newest dam in the system. In effect, this would mean pooling of revenues and costs for the 20-dam power system for the purpose of delaying repayment of the various dams from their present individual dates to fiscal year 2019, which is 50 years after the scheduled initial operation of John Day Dam, the last of the 20 dams existing or under construction at the present time.

The net effect of this scheme would amount to a reduction of as much as $7.5 million a year in annual repayment charges by BPA to the U.S. Treasury. Presumably, the principle would apply to stall further the payout schedules if dams subsequent to John Day are constructed and, thereby, further reduce Treasury repayments.

It also has come to my attention that even this rollback of payout schedules fails to satisfy the greed of Pacific Northwest public power adherents for subsidized below-cost power at the expense of the general taxpayers of the United States. BPA Administrator Charles F. Luce is reported to have up his sleeve follow-on plans for an additional raid on the pocketbooks of taxpaying Americans. They involve calculating a very generous overall service life for the BPA system—probably in the range of 75 to 100 years—then further lowering the annual payback charges on the basis of this fantasy.

In my opinion, these proposals constitute unconscionable machinations for withholding public moneys under spurious pretenses, and their acceptance would amount to a fraud on the taxpayers.

Capital outlays for BPA in each instance were obtained under the stipulation they would be paid back over an already overly generous payback period. The law under which BPA operates requires the fixing of its rates to meet these payback schedules. The history of authorization and appropriations on each of the 20 dams of the BPA system is replete with assurances that repayments would be made over a fixed period following each capital investment. Less than 2 weeks ago Administrator Luce testified before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with the Hanford project that rates based on these payback schedules would, if necessary, be adjusted upward to meet any possible losses on the Hanford arrangements.

Now, with Bonneville's wholesale power rates coming up for regular 5-year review for the period 1964–69, and with BPA having operated at a deficit for the last 5 years, an inner circle of something-for-nothing zealots seemingly has concocted what, to my mind, appears to be a double-barreled, faith-breaking hoax to victimize the U.S. Treasury on the installment plan.

I call upon you, Mr. Secretary, to direct those charged with the establishment of Bonneville rates to carry out their duties to the public in a straightforward manner and get on with the necessary business of raising Bonneville's wholesale power rates as may be required to meet established commitments for refund of public moneys.

Very truly yours,
CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Speech by Senator Frank Carlson at Dedication Ceremony, Lawrence, Kans., October 6, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 6, I was honored to be invited to the dedication of a nuclear reactor and environmental health center on the campus of the University of Kansas at Lawrence. The principal dedicatory address was delivered by the senior Senator from Kansas, the Honorable FRANK CARLSON.

It has been my observation that speakers on such an occasion tend to assume the role of an expert in sometimes unfamiliar fields. For example, it is quite common for a scientist to become a politician and conversely for a politician to become a scientist.

The remarks of Senator CARLSON at this occasion, however, were the very honest and simple observations of a man who has witnessed the transition from the elementary theories of physics into the electronic mysteries identified with the space age. Because of the very honest and simple logic of his remarks, yet reflecting such a great depth of thought and understanding, I am asking that they be inserted into the Congressional Record for today. I hope many high school and college students will be inspired to read them.

Speech by Senator Frank Carlson at the Dedication Ceremony of the Nuclear Reactor Center, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., October 6, 1962

Chancellor Wescoe, distinguished guests, and fellow Kansans, it is a privilege and pleasure to join with members of the faculty and honored guests in the dedication of this nuclear reactor and environmental health center here on the campus of the University of Kansas.

The days of my physics studies are long behind, and actually, so rapid has been the progress in this area that even the terminology we use today would have been completely unknown to my professors.

I am told that the teaching reactor which has been operating for some time is a 10-kilowatt pool-type reactor moderated by light water and cooled by natural convection. Furthermore, I am informed, it uses highly enriched uranium as its fuel.

Not knowing an atom from a tennis ball, in the sense of being specifically trained in physics, I accept these technical specifications without challenge.

This is a day of men and machines. This teaching reactor is one of the machines which the University of Kansas needs for student training, for laboratory courses, and for research by graduate students and the faculty in order to keep abreast of the times.

This is one of the machines by which we probe into the unknown, and by the use of which we add to man's storehouse of knowledge. Now today we dedicate the supporting facilities which will tremendously enhance the opportunities of our students and faculty to broaden their scope of activities in this area.

We all realize that machines and laboratory facilities are essential in modern science, and, insofar as I am able, I will encourage the acquisition by the university of other types of equipment for the further exploration of nature, such as high-particle accelerators.

May I add, however, that machines and laboratories without the men are but nuts and bolts, test tubes and cold, unthinking metal. If knowledge is to be gained from the apparatus and facilities we dedicate here today, it will be accomplished only by the probing, inquisitive activity of the brilliant minds of our students and faculty.

I wish also to call to your attention that in the field of atomic energy, the world has been dazzled by the brilliance of nuclear detonations, of the potential horrors of nuclear war, and the danger of radioactive fallout as it poses some threat to the contamination of our environment.

Yet, in my personal belief, the true wonder of atomic energy lies before us today—the constant search for a more complete understanding of the perfect design in which our Creator arranged the physical world in which we live.

The application of our information toward medicine, biology, industry, agriculture, and other peacetime uses of atomic energy will rebound to the benefit of humanity. These are the areas in which humanity will stride forward because of greater knowledge of matter.

As a layman, I must take this occasion to reiterate to you that the facility we dedicate today in and of itself possesses no morality. It can be utilized for good or for evil, depending upon the goals, the aspirations, and the ethics of its operators.

Consider that mysterious phenomenon known as the "binding force" which holds the atom together with such a grip that it takes millions of electron volts to penetrate. This "binding force" in many ways scientifically exemplifies the entire nature of our society. Three and one-half million square miles of land, stretching from ocean to ocean and beyond, containing its rivers, forests, its mountains, its plains, and populated by 186 million people of all different races, creeds, religions, occupations, and environmental controls, living in relative peace and harmony, and yet bound together as a great Nation by the great binding forces of belief in a Creator, devotion to liberty, justice, and equality of opportunity for all.

As one of your political representatives from the State of Kansas, I deeply feel a responsibility to see that your Government never suborns your science. Government too far to the right, or too far to the left, has in the past utilized science for vicious ends, has padlocked laboratories, closed churches, and destroyed the essential goodness of man. This we pledge shall not happen here.

Today, therefore, is in reality but a beginning at the University of Kansas for the exploration of nuclear science. Through the efforts of many people to whom I pay tribute, this facility was conceived, designed, tested, and made available for our use.

The thousands of people involved are faceless and nameless in many instances, but they have placed here on the plains of Kansas a scientific complex by which you, I am confident, will enhance man's store of knowledge and will develop new techniques for better living, new materials, and perhaps even new horizons for the advancement of all humanity.

May I congratulate each and every individual who made this day possible. And may I express my appreciation for your invitation to join with you.

To those who will now devote their God-given talents to the utilization of this facility, may I wish you inspiration and success.

Remarks by Hon. William J. Green at Pulaski Day Celebration, Philadelphia, Sunday, October 7, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday I was fortunate in being a visitor for a few hours in one of our major U.S. cities, the City of Brotherly Love, the great metropolis of our State of Pennsylvania, the progressive city of Philadelphia.

While there I visited with my friend and colleague, Jimmie Byrne, an old associate of mine from my Pennsylvania General Assembly days.

We attended the Pulaski Day celebration in Independence Hall sponsored by the Polish-American Congress, Eastern Pennsylvania District.

I was particularly impressed with the fine address delivered by another of our colleagues, the Honorable William J. Green, Jr., on this occasion of the 183d anniversary of the great sacrifice made by this great friend and fighter in the Revolution for Independence.

Congressman Green delivered a message from President Kennedy and followed with a historical and moving account of this great Polish patriot.

His talk should be read by every Member of Congress as it traces our early struggles, our growth, and resolution to preserve for all peoples from all lands the independence of thought, religion, and personal freedoms.

I submit for the Record the full text of this address by the leader of Philadelphia's Democratic forces and a distinguished Member of this body.

Remarks by Philadelphia Democratic Chairman William J. Green, Jr., at Pulaski Day Celebration, Independence Hall, Sunday, October 7, 1962, Sponsored by Polish-American Congress, Eastern Pennsylvania District

One hundred and eighty-three years ago this great hero fought for American independence and paid with his life at a time when our country was in its greatest need of help and sacrifice.

His deeds have found a glorious place in American history, his name shall always be remembered by our people.

This soldier of liberty sacrificed his fortune, personal happiness and dedicated his life to the defense of a noble cause. Daring and unflinching in his determination to fight for freedom, he took up arms in Poland against enemies of his country as a leader of the bar confederation.

Banished from his native Poland and sentenced to death under Russian instigation, he sought new frontiers to carry on his crusade for freedom. He came to America and offered his help to General Washington in the American Revolution.

On his arrival in this country, Pulaski met another great Polish soldier, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko. Through their heroic efforts for American freedom, both these men laid the first foundation of traditional friendship between the peoples of Poland and America.

On October 11, 1779, General Pulaski died of wounds he suffered while leading his cavalry in an attack on Savannah, Ga.

Recently President Kennedy proclaimed October 11 as Gen. Casimir Pulaski Day to honor the memory of this Polish patriot throughout our Nation.

In relation to this occasion, the President has asked me to relay a warm message of felicitations to the people of Polish ancestry here.

I am confident that the President's message speaks for all the American people.

The White House,
Washington, October 6, 1962.

Hon. William J. Green, Jr.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

It is a pleasure to extend warm greetings and best wishes to all those gathered at Independence Hall today to honor Gen. Casimir Pulaski—one of America's greatest patriots. I am especially pleased to convey these words through Congressman Bill Green.

Casimir Pulaski, a young Polish patriot, fought with bravery in the Continental Army and provided our struggling new Nation with brilliant military leadership. His dedication to the cause of liberty will always serve as an inspiration to all peoples throughout the world in their struggle for national freedom.

It is fitting indeed that you honor General Pulaski in Philadelphia today—and that all Americans show their deep gratitude to this extraordinarily brave patriot; to his countrymen and to the many other brave men who fought the cause of American freedom during the Revolutionary battles and in the many struggles for liberty and freedom since then.

I know the contributions and traditions of Polish-Americans will continue to enrich all our lives, and I am delighted to join all of you in honoring General Pulaski today.

John F. Kennedy.

I also am happy to announce today that the President has directed the Secretary of the Navy to name one of our new Polaris submarines after Casimir Pulaski, in recognition of the General's distinguished services to the United States.

In the present world struggle between the forces of evil and good, oppression and moral resistance—General Pulaski's romantic figure emerges today more vividly than ever from the past.

Men like Pulaski, who came from distant lands to these shores were deeply impressed by the Declaration of Independence, which was solemnly proclaimed in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

This great charter of human rights stressed, "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

America's future development and her greatness is based on these ideals which became the cornerstone of true democracy. Since those days, the United States has become a symbol of liberty and a support for the oppressed.

Generations of Poles have settled in this country. They have built new homes and contributed much to the progress and prosperity of the United States.

Throughout 18 decades of American history countless thousands of Poles have given their lives for freedom throughout the world, wherever there has been conflict between democracy and tyranny.

Today, Poland itself does not have the type of freedom for which these soldiers fought. The Polish nation and her people are unwillingly under the political domination and ecomonic exploitation of Soviet Russia.

The human rights and dignity of man, for which General Pulaski died, have been suppressed in Poland and many other nations taken into captivity by Russia.

Many nations are threatened by Communist aggression and infiltration.

The cold war forced upon us by the Soviets has created many problems. Problems as difficult and dangerous as those through which we lived during wars drenched in blood and gunfire.

The United States is observing world developments with greatest care. We are on guard, always ready for any crisis.

The Kennedy administration has made every effort to build up the Nation's military to such proportions that it can stop any aggressor and has capabilities of delivering a quick knockout blow.

Recently, our sons were sent to Vietnam just as they were sent to Korea 12 years ago—to help stem the Communist aggression. They were sent there because America has become a bulwark of freedom in a frightened world.

The United States is keeping a watchful eye on developments in Berlin and Cuba. We will never allow a buildup of enemy military bases in Cuba that can aim destruction at the heart of the American mainland.

We don't want war because we remember the graves of American fathers, sons, husbands, and brothers who paid the supreme sacrifice.

But, we cannot allow the spread of Communism anywhere in our hemisphere or in other parts of the world.

We are ready to use our strength to safeguard our country and our allies from any aggression.

I believe, that of all developments in the world today, the status of the Polish nation is closest to your heart.

Although there is a given appearance of freedom in Poland, today, under Communist domination, there is a rising persecution of the Catholic Church, clergy, and nuns.

There is a cold war in Poland, too. This is a determined struggle by the freedom-loving people of Poland for their nation's spirit, faith, and patriotic principles. This struggle is led by the unbending leadership of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski.

The increase of Communist persecution against the church comes at a time when the celebration of Poland's one thousand years of Christianity is approaching.

Most recently His Excellency Archbishop John J. Krol appealed in his distinguished sermons never to let up in providing spiritual assistance for Poland.

On September 14, of this year, I introduced in the U.S. Congress the following resolution:

"That the U.S. representative to the United Nations shall take such steps as may be appropriate to bring to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations the violations in recent years by the Government of Poland of article 26 of the universal declaration of human rights in denying to parents their prior right to direct the education of their children through nationalizing, expropriating, and closing religious schools in Poland, without regard to the protests of Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski and others in their attempts to prevent this annihilation of basic human rights."

The Kennedy administration is doing everything within its means to give economic aid to the Polish people. We are also using every occasion possible to help the Polish people in their struggle for true freedom.

We are confident that all Americans of Polish extraction support us in these aims.

Let us hope that the day of liberation for Poland and other behind-the-Iron-Curtain nations is not too far off.

Anniversary of Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the Pulaski Council of Milwaukee each year arranges a program in tribute to the memory of a hero of two continents—Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Three years ago on such an occasion, the people of Milwaukee had the privilege of having the now President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, participate in the ceremonies. This year the Attorney General of the United States was the honored guest, and he was received warmly and wholeheartedly.

The program begins with the National Anthem and a prayer and ends with a prayer. Since the proceedings this year were so impressive, it is my desire to share them with my colleagues, and ask permission to insert the text of the opening prayer given by Rev. Eldred B. Lesniewski, chaplain, St. Joseph Home for Children; my introduction of Attorney General Kennedy, and Mr. Kennedy's remarks at this point in the RECORD.

INVOCATION GIVEN AT PULASKI DAY CELEBRATION, MILWAUKEE, WIS., SUNDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1962, BY THE REVEREND ELDRED B. LESNIEWSKI, CHAPLAIN, ST. JOSEPH HOME FOR CHILDREN

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Let us invoke the blessing of God upon this assembly, gathered here in the name of freedom, to honor the memory of General Pulaski, champion of freedom in two continents.

We ask God to continue to inspire our great leaders with a zeal for freedom and the rights of man. We thank God for the blessings of freedom that we already enjoy, and, in particular today, for sending us the brother of our great President, who, like a modern Pulaski, had the courage to continue the fight for man's liberties in the battlefields of the South.

Bless our struggles, O Lord, and make us worthy of Your graces. Keep burning in us the flames of freedom kindled by General Pulaski, so that we may live as he died, breathing the free air of a great country and a great people.

We ask these blessings in the name of Jesus, who showed us how no man has greater love than when he lays down his life for his friends. Amen.

REMARKS BY HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI AT THE WREATH-LAYING CEREMONY, PULASKI MONUMENT, MILWAUKEE, WIS., OCTOBER 7, 1962

It is most fitting, as we commemorate the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski—fighter for justice and liberty—to rededicate ourselves to the principles for which General Pulaski made the supreme sacrifice.

We are indeed fortunate to have as our honored guest a man who epitomizes the qualities that made General Pulaski great.

Three years ago on a similar occasion we had the privilege of having President John F. Kennedy with us. We are today pleased to have as our honored guest the President's brother, the U.S. Attorney General the Honorable Robert Kennedy. Our distinguished guest, although young in age, has already earned for himself an enviable record. He has by his courageous work assured himself a place in our country's history.

It is my distinct privilege and singular honor to present to you Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

REMARKS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY, WREATH-LAYING CEREMONY, PULASKI MONUMENT, MILWAUKEE, WIS., OCTOBER 7, 1962

I want to express to you my deep appreciation for inviting me here today because I know I am among people who are dedicated forever to a love of country and liberty. Not only do I feel a close bond with the Polish people; the President shares this feeling. His sister-in-law is married to a Pole. The President has visited Poland, as have my mother, my brother, Ted, my sisters, and I. With virtually no other group has my family had a closer affiliation. So it is a great honor for me to join with you in honoring the memory of a brave Pole whose valor in his adopted country gave meaning to liberty in all countries.

Casimir Pulaski was 29 years old when he came to America as a volunteer to serve in the Continental Army in 1777. He fought with distinction at the battle of Brandywine and was promoted to brigadier general. Even that was not enough for him, however. He organized his own calvary and infantry corps, Pulaski's Legion, which fought with great gallantry. He was with the ragged American Army during the cruel winter at Valley Forge and he lost his life during the siege of Savannah, Ga., 183 years ago next Thursday.

He died fighting for America's freedom, but at the same time, he was fighting for Poland's freedom and, indeed, for man's freedom.

The history of Poland goes back many years—more than that of the United States, but almost since the Declaration of Independence, the history of Poland and the United States have been entwined. These close ties have existed between Poles and

Americans because of their respect for each other.

Through the years, Poles and Americans have stood steadfast for the cause of liberty. Poles, under Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, had the distinction of capturing Cassino and its historic abbey which blocked the Allied advance in Italy for so many months. I visited Monte Cassino several years ago and climbed up the steep rocky hillside where the Polish soldiers fought, shoulder to shoulder with American soldiers and British soldiers. I will never forget the inscription on a memorial there:

"We Polish soldiers, for our freedom and yours, have given ourselves to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy and our hearts to Poland."

Time and again, Americans have been inspired by the stubborn courage of the Poles. We cannot forget that at the start of the Second World War, Polish cavalrymen charged their horses against Nazi tanks.

Nor can we forget General Bor's uprising against the Germans in Warsaw, holding out for 63 days against the might of the German occupation force.

Nor have we forgotten our friend in the troubled days since the Second World War. We welcome and support the advances that have taken place in recent years.

We will continue to be concerned for the welfare of the Polish people and to maintain our traditional close ties of friendship with them.

We have been able to make partial payment on the debt we owe to the sons of Pulaski and Kosciusko.

I am happy that this Government has been able to extend over a half billion dollars in assistance to the Polish people in the past 5 years, and I am happy that this program is going to continue. This aid has been supplemented by the fine work of private organizations and citizens who have been sending generous assistance since the war.

American private and Government aid and assistance joined to build the new children's hospital which is nearing completion in Kracow.

We have invited leaders of the Polish Government and leaders of thought and opinion in Poland to visit America and see this land for themselves.

Cultural exchanges are continuing to increase. The Warsaw Philharmonic and the Polish Folk Dance groups have toured this country. A band from Warsaw played at the Washington, D.C., and Newport jazz festivals this summer.

Our program of exchanging students, teachers and technicians is continuing and I hope it will grow as both nations can benefit from it.

Each year, more and more American tourists are going to Poland. I hope that trend will increase and will flow both ways so that more Poles will visit us and see America.

These exchanges are but tangible evidence of the close bond between the people of Poland and the people of the United States.

Today, more than ever before, we need the courage and dedication to freedom which have made Americans and Poles such good friends through their history.

We face a resourceful foe who seeks to impose his totalitarian way on freemen everywhere. The threat takes many forms. It may be a wall in Berlin, occupied domination of proud old nations, guerrilla warfare in southeast Asia, military aid to Cuba, or espionage in our own country.

We are making a consistent, carefully planned effort to turn the arms race into a peace race to spread respect for the rule of law, and dedication to man's God-given right to be free.

We are convinced that a supreme effort must be made to halt the arms race, but until some progress is made, we are and will remain prepared to do what is necessary to protect our own interests and the security of our friends and allies.

We have a rich heritage of our own—revolution, toughness, industry, and unswerving belief in the fundamental rights of the individual—but we are a young nation. We look back to many lands for our basic beliefs and traditions.

The Poles brought to this country strength, courage, faith, and perseverance—and America is indebted to its Polish citizens for helping to forge our national character with this steel, from Pulaski to the present.

We have much in common, but perhaps nothing quite so much as the ideal symbolized by this monument and by this ceremony. It is an ideal that underlies the history both of Poland and America and it is expressed in the stern adage: "Polak nie sluga"—A Pole, and I might add, an American, will never be a serf.

Voting Record of Hon. Steven B. Derounian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to my constituents on my voting record as their Representative during the 87th Congress.

For 10 years I have had the honor of representing the people of the Second Congressional District of New York, and I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to serve my country. As my record shows, I am no rubberstamp; I am independent of thought and recognize no pressure from any quarter. I follow my conscience and good judgment, influenced only by what is best for my district, my State, and my country.

In the 2 years of this 87th Congress, I had maintained an attendance record of 99 percent. In addition to the rollcalls for the record votes, which I list here, there were a total of 282 quorum calls for the two sessions.

Limited space makes the description of the measures on which there were rollcall votes necessarily brief. Upon request, however, I shall be pleased to discuss any legislative action of interest to my constituents. I will comment briefly on some of them:

I supported the resolution expressing the determination of the United States to prevent the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending to any part of this hemisphere, and supported, also, efforts to rewrite the measure, so as to recognize the violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the massive Communist military buildup in Cuba. These efforts failed and the resolution that passed is, in my opinion, weak and ineffective. I believe that the Congress must show the strength that the President has failed to show in standing up to Khrushchev. History shows that appeasement will in the end bring us war and not peace.

Although no action was taken in Congress, I must mention my efforts to restore to the public schools the right of our children to recite a noncompulsory, nondenominational prayer. I have introduced a resolution to amend the Constitution, restoring this integral part of our American heritage—the right to pray in schools and other public places for those who want to.

I refused to support the action of Congress, in 1961, in striking out of the legislation establishing the Peace Corps, this provision:

> The Peace Corps shall not perform service in any foreign country in which, by reason of law or official policy, any member of the Peace Corps will be discriminated against because of his race, creed, or color.

With the exception of this one, serious flaw in its authority, the Peace Corps in the past year has functioned effectively and, in 1962, I supported the request for funds to carry on its operations.

Social security benefits were broadened further during the 1st session of this Congress and I supported this legislation. During consideration of the bill in my Committee on Ways and Means, I fought to liberalize the present retirement test so that a recipient of social security could earn up to $2,400 a year without loss of any benefit entitlement. My efforts had the support of the Republican members of the committee but the administration opposition refused to accept our proposal.

I am on record in support of a $1.25 per hour minimum wage, having voted for it in 1960. In 1961, when the subject of minimum wage was again considered in the House, I again supported it although, at the request of the Kennedy administration the increase was limited to $1.15 an hour for 2 years. In the Senate action that followed, an amendment was added to the bill giving the Federal Government the right to interfere in local and State commerce, violating the principles of our Constitution and I, therefore, refused to support the conference report.

In the final votes, I supported both the foreign aid appropriation bill and the purchase of bonds for the United Nations. I have consistently fought aid to any member of the Communist bloc and was able to support the appropriations for foreign aid because the act contained a clause denying U.S. aid to any nation whose government is based on communism. The amount appropriated by the House was $1.1 billion less than requested by the President. The U.N. bond bill is a far cry from the unrestricted authority and blank check requested by the administration and requires that any bond purchase made by the United States be matched by bond purchases by other nations and states specifically that the U.S. funds cannot be used to pay any other member's assessments. Further, a much-needed report on long-term financing by the United Nations must be submitted to the Congress by the Department of State not later than January 31, 1963.

I voted against President Kennedy's proposal to tax at the source the interest and savings of the people; against his request that the dividend credit now allowed the taxpayer be rescinded; against the so-called investment credit section of the bill which favors big

business and penalizes small business. I favor sound tax reform and believe the objective of legislation should be to simplify, not compound, tax problems.

My vote against the "bread tax" was a vote for the consumer. H.R. 12391, the Food and Agriculture Act puts two prices on a bushel of wheat—92 cents if it is fed to hogs, but $2 if it is used for bread or other foods for the children and adults. This is nothing more or less than a "tax" on the people of $1.08 per bushel of wheat. At committee hearings on this legislation, the representatives of the American Bakers Association testified "With an estimated annual consumption of 16 billion pounds of bread and bread-type products, the housewife would have $320 million added to her food bill annually."

The congressional district lines have been changed by the New York State Legislature and my present district, after December 31, 1962, will be known as the Third Congressional District, whose constituents I look forward with pleasure to serving again.

1st sess., 87th Cong., 1961

Date	Measure, question, and result	Derounian's vote
Jan. 3	**Election of Speaker. (Rayburn 258, Halleck 170.)**	**Halleck.**
	H. Res. 1, barring George O. Chambers from taking oath as Representative pending investigation by House Administration Committee of congressional election in Indiana's 5th District.	
Jan. 3	**On motion to order previous question (to prevent debate). (Adopted 252 to 166.)**	**Nay.**
Jan. 31	**H. Res. 127, enlarging the Rules Committee from 12 to 15 members:**	
	On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 217 to 212.)	**Nay.**
Mar. 1	**H.R. 4806, authorizing Federal grants to States for temporary extension of unemployment benefits to workers who had exhausted their benefits and providing for temporary unemployment tax increase to take care of cost:**	
	On passage. (Passed 392 to 30.)	**Yea.**
Mar. 1	**H. Res. 167, authorizing funds of the Committee on Un-American Activities for 1961:**	
	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 412 to 6.)	**Yea.**
Mar. 1	**H.R. 5188, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1961:**	
Mar. 7	**On amendment providing an additional $29,990,000 for aid to schools in impacted areas. (Adopted 339 to 62.)**	**Yea.**
Mar. 9	**H.R. 4510, providing for a special program for feed grains for 1961:**	
Mar. 9	**On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section permitting Secretary of Agriculture to drive down market price by selling Government-owned corn and grain sorghums at 17 percent below price-support price. (Rejected 196 to 214.).**	**Yea.**
Mar. 9	**On passage. (Passed 209 to 202.)**	**Nay.**
	H.R. 4510, providing for a special program for feed grains for 1961:	
Mar. 21	**On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 231 to 185.)**	**Nay.**
	H.R. 5463, amending and extending the Sugar Act to Dec. 31, 1962:	
Mar. 21	**On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 284 to 129.)**	**Nay.**
	H.R. 4806, authorizing Federal grants to States for temporary extension of unemployment benefits to workers who had exhausted their benefits and providing for temporary unemployment tax increase to take care of cost:	
Mar. 22	**On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 363 to 31.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 5000, authorizing certain construction at military installations:	
Mar. 23	**On amendment requiring feasibility study before authorizing $3,812,000 for transferring Food and Container Institute from Chicago, Ill., to Natick, Mass. (Adopted 200 to 145.)**	**Nay.**
Mar. 23	**On passage. (Passed 412 to 0)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 3935, increasing Federal minimum wage and extending coverage to additional workers on basis of dollar volume of sales of employer:	
Mar. 24	**On amendment substituting language increasing minimum wage to $1.15 an hour and extending coverage to additional workers on basis of interstate operations test. (Adopted 216 to 203.)**	**Yea.**
Mar. 24	**On motion to recommit. (Rejected 196 to 224)**	**Nay.**
Mar. 24	**On passage. (Passed 341 to 78)**	**Yea.**
	S. 1, authorizing $394,000,000 in Federal loans and grants for redevelopment of economically depressed areas:	
Mar. 29	**On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill, H.R. 5943. (Rejected 126 to 291.)**	**Yea.**
Mar. 29	**On passage. (Passed 251 to 167.)**	**Nay.**
	S. 912, providing 70 additional circuit and district judgeships:	
Apr. 19	**On passage. (Passed 336 to 76.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 6027, liberalizing certain social security benefits and increasing social security tax:	
Apr. 20	**On passage. (Passed 400 to 14.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 6518, making appropriations for inter-American social and economic program and the Chilean reconstruction program:	
Apr. 25	**On passage. (Passed 329 to 83.)**	**Yea.**
	S. 1, authorizing $394,000,000 in Federal loans and grants for redevelopment of economically depressed areas:	
Apr. 26	**On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 223 to 193.)**	**Nay.**
	H.R. 3935, increasing Federal minimum wage and extending coverage on dollar-volume test:	
May 3	**On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 230 to 196.)**	**Nay.**
	H.R. 6441, increasing annual Federal grants for sewage treatment works from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000 and the overall limit from $500,000,000 to $1,000,000,000:	
May 3	**On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce annual funds to $75,000,000 and overall limit to $750,000,000 and to require States after June 1964 to match all funds in excess of $50,000,000 annually. (Rejected 165 to 256.)**	**Yea.**
May 3	**On passage. (Passed 308 to 110.)**	**Nay.**
	H.R. 2010, extending Mexican farm labor program for 2 years:	
May 11	**On passage. (Passed 231 to 157.)**	**Nay.**
	H.R. 6094, increasing annual salary ceiling for Council of Economic Advisers personnel from $345,000 to $2,000,000:	
May 11	**On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce salary ceiling to $700,000. (Rejected 151 to 196.)**	**Yea.**
May 11	**On passage. (Passed 209 to 137.)**	**Nay.**
	H. Res. 284, providing for consideration of H.R. 4614, establishing a U.S. Travel Service in Department of Commerce:	
May 16	**On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 241 to 70.)**	**Yea.**
	H. Con. Res. 226, expressing sense of Congress favoring collective sanctions by the Organization of American States against Castro government of Cuba:	
May 17	**On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Passed 404 to 2.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 4614, establishing a U.S. Travel Service in Department of Commerce:	
May 17	**On passage. (Passed 305 to 104.)**	**Yea.**
	S. 1852, authorizing additional construction of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in fiscal 1962:	
May 24	**On passage. (Passed 402 to 0.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 1986, repealing provision intended to prevent railroads from charging higher rates for carrying non-first-class mail than for carrying express matter:	
May 25	**On motion to recommit with instructions to add amendment requiring the ICC to publish the difference in rates paid to the railroads by the Post Office and Railway Express Agency for carrying similar weight commodities. (Rejected 16 to 346.)**	**Not voting.**
	H.R. 7371, making appropriations for Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1962:	
June 1	**On passage. (Passed 256 to 71.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 7444, making appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1962:	
June 6	**On amendment reducing the $250,000,000 for agricultural conservation program to $150,000,000. (Rejected 184 to 196)**	**Yea.**
June 6	**On passage. (Passed 320 to 65.)**	**Nay.**
	H.R. 7446, providing 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax and of certain excise tax rates:	
June 8	**On motion to recommit with instructions to add language repealing the 10-percent transportation tax. (Rejected 189 to 196.)**	**Yea.**
June 8	**On passage. (Passed 295 to 88.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 7053, providing that evidence should not be inadmissible in the District of Columbia courts solely because of a delay in arraignment (qualifies Mallory rule):	
June 12	**On motion to recommit. (Rejected 104 to 252.)**	**Nay.**
	H. Res. 303, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Communications Commission:	
June 15	**On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 323 to 77.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 302 disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Securities and Exchange Commission:	
June 15	**On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 176 to 212.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 6765, authorizing an amendment to charter of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock:	
June 19	**On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 329 to 18.)**	**Yea.**
	H.R. 7712, making supplements appropriations for fiscal 1961:	
June 19	**On passage. (Passed 292 to 63.)**	**Nay.**
	H. Res. 304, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Civil Aeronautics Board:	
June 20	**On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 178 to 213.)**	**Yea.**
	H. Res. 305, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Trade Commission:	
June 20	**On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 178 to 221.)**	**Yea**
	H.R. 6028, authorizing $4,900,000,000 in Federal housing programs over 4 years:	
June 22	**On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute bill extending existing programs for 1 year with a $1,100,000,000 authorization. (Rejected 197 to 215.)**	**Yea.**
June 22	**On passage. (Passed 235 to 178.)**	**Nay.**

1st sess., 87th Cong., 1961—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Derounian's vote
	H.R. 7677, increasing the national debt limit:	
June 26	On passage. (Passed 231 to 148.)	Nay.
	H.R. 7851. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962:	
June 28	On amendment deleting language prohibiting use of funds for payment of price differentials on contracts in order to relieve economic dislocations. (Rejected 173 to 293.)	Nay.
June 28	On passage. (Passed 412 to 0.)	Yea.
	S. 1922, authorizing $4,880,000,000 in housing programs over 4 years:	
June 28	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 229 to 176.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 354, providing for a House of Representatives flag:	
June 29	On agreeing to resolution. (Rejected 108 to 270.)	Nay.
	H.J. Res. 225, granting the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact:	
June 29	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit Federal Government to nonvoting representation and exclude Federal Government from any financial responsibilities of the Commission. (Rejected 92 to 257.)	Nay.
	H.R. 187, providing for judicial review of orders for deportation:	
June 29	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 304 to 60.)	Yea.
	H.R. 5786, providing for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore:	
July 10	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 278 to 82.)	Nay.
	H.J. Res. 435, providing for observance of the Department of Agriculture centennial:	
July 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Adopted 367 to 12.)	Yea.
	H.R. 2555, providing for advanced pay for civilian Government employees in emergency evacuation:	
July 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 287 to 87.)	Yea.
July 19	H.R. 6874, authorizing appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
July 20	On adoption of the conference report. (Adopted 354 to 59.)	Yea.
	H.R. 328, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the National Labor Relations Board:	
July 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 231 to 179.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 336, disapproving the President's reorganization plan for the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administration:	
July 20	On motion to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of H. Res. 336. (Rejected 184 to 218.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8302, making appropriations for military construction for fiscal 1962:	
July 25	On amendment eliminating funds for transfer of Army Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Adopted 241 to 170.)	Nay.
July 25	On passage. (Passed 409 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.J. Res. 120, authorizing the President to order 250,000 members of the Ready Reserves to active duty for up to 12 months and to extend present Armed Forces tours of duty:	
July 31	On agreeing to the resolution. (Passed 403 to 2.)	Yea.
	S. 2311, authorizing additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, to meet possible Berlin crisis:	
Aug. 2	On passage. (Passed 406 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.R. 30, granting the consent of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact:	
Aug. 2	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit participation of Federal Government to nonvoting representation. (Rejected 140 to 261.)	Yea.
	S. 1643, providing wheat and feed grains program for 1962, and extending other farm laws (Agricultural Act of 1961):	
Aug. 3	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 224 to 170.)	Nay.
	H.R. 7856, reorganizing Federal Communications Commission to permit the FCC Board to delegate its functions in adjudicative cases to employees:	
Aug. 3	On passage. (Passed 198 to 151.)	Yea.
	H.R. 7728, authorizing the Secretary of a military department to sell goods and services to private aircraft owners:	
Aug. 7	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 307 to 78.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 404, providing for House-Senate conference on H.R. 7576, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1962:	
Aug. 8	On motion to table (kill) motion to instruct the House conferees not to agree to Senate amendment providing $95,000,000 to add electrical generating facilities to the Hanford, Wash.; atomic reactor. (Rejected 164 to 235.)	Nay.
Aug. 8	On motion to instruct the House conferees not to agree to Senate amendment authorizing $95,000,000 to add electrical generating facilities to the Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor. (Adopted 235 to 164.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8033, authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to delegate certain duties to employee boards:	
Aug. 8	On passage. (Passed 212 to 174.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 406, providing for the consideration of S. 1815, providing an Assistant Secretary of Labor, to handle the problems of women workers:	
Aug. 9	On adoption of the resolution. (Adopted 369 to 16.)	Yea.
	H.R. 6302, transferring Freedmen's Hospital, District of Columbia, from Federal Government to Howard University:	
Aug. 9	On passage. (Passed 321 to 61.)	Yea.
	H.R. 7851, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1962:	
Aug. 10	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 383 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8400, authorizing foreign economic and military aid in fiscal 1962:	
Aug. 18	On passage. (Passed 287 to 140.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8384, providing Federal penalties for airplane hijacking and other crimes committed aboard commercial aircraft:	
Aug. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 374 to 5.)	Yea.
	H.R. 7763, authorizing planning for U.S. participation in the New York World's Fair in 1964 and 1965:	
Aug. 22	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 353 to 42.)	Yea.
	H.R. 84, subsidizing lead and zinc producers:	
Aug. 24	On passage. (Passed 196 to 172.)	Nay.
	H.R. 8181, authorizing $20,000,000 for a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia:	
Aug. 28	On engrossment of and 3d reading of bill. (Ordered 223 to 120.)	Nay.
Aug. 28	On passage. (Passed 208 to 135.)	Nay.
	H.R. 7176, providing for a national hog cholera eradication program:	
Aug. 28	On passage. (Passed 337 to 3.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8773, increasing readjustment payments to Armed Forces Reserve personnel involuntarily released from active duty:	
Aug. 29	On passage. (Passed 394 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.R. 6242, exempting certain Department of Justice attorneys from the salary ceilings in their civil service classification:	
Aug. 29	On passage. (Rejected 172 to 223.)	Nay.
	H.R. 8890, authorizing a program of Federal aid to education:	
Aug. 30	On motion to consider bill under Calendar Wednesday procedure. (Rejected 170 to 242.)	Nay.
	H.R. 8028, authorizing $30,000,000 for studying juvenile delinquency:	
Aug. 30	On amendment restricting pilot projects to the District of Columbia. (Rejected 187 to 217.)	Yea.
	S. Con. Res. 34, expressing the sense of Congress that Communist China should not be seated in the United Nations:	
Aug. 31	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 395 to 0.)	Yea.
	S. 1983, authorizing foreign economic and military aid:	
Aug. 31	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 260 to 132.)	Yea.
	H.R. 9033, making appropriations for foreign economic and military aid for fiscal 1962:	
Sept. 5	On amendment increasing military assistance by additional $300,000,000. (Adopted 243 to 151.)	Nay.
Sept. 5	On passage. (Passed 270 to 123.)	Yea.
	H.R. 9000, extending for 2 years the National Defense Education Act and aid to federally impacted school areas:	
Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 378 to 32.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8723, amending the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act:	
Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 245 to 161, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Nay.
	H.R. 8666, promoting educational and cultural exchanges between the United States and other nations:	
Sept. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 329 to 66.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8302, making appropriations for military construction for fiscal 1962:	
Sept. 13	On motion to agree to Senate amendment eliminating funds for transfer of Army Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Adopted 212 to 185.)	Nay.
	H.R. 7371, making appropriations for Department of State, Justice, and the Judiciary:	
Sept. 13	On motion to agree with Senate amendment extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to September 1963. (Adopted 300 to 106.)	Yea.
	H.R. 9076, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, Department of the Interior, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority for fiscal 1962 (Public Works):	
Sept. 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate funds for Upper Colorado River Basin transmission lines. (Rejected 182 to 225.)	Yea.
Sept. 13	On passage. (Passed 378 to 31.)	Yea.
	H.R. 7576, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission:	
Sept. 13	On adoption of conference report and approval of construction of electric generating facilities at Hanford, Wash. (Rejected 157 to 251.)	Nay.
	H.R. 8102, extending the time for making grants under the Federal Airport Act:	
Sept. 13	On motion to agree with Senate amendment fixing extension at 3 years. (Adopted 398 to 4.)	Yea.
	H.R. 7500, providing for a Peace Corps:	
Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed 288 to 97.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 455, providing for a conference with Senate on H.R. 2010, extending Mexican farm labor program:	
Sept. 15	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 243 to 135.)	Nay.

1st sess., 87th Cong., 1961—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Derounian's vote
	H. Res. 464, providing for the consideration of committee substitute amendment to H.R. 7927, adjusting postal rates:	
Sept. 15	On motion to order previous question (to prevent debate). (Rejected 142 to 222.)	Nay.
	S. 2393, extending for 2 years the National Defense Education Act and aid to federally impacted school areas:	
Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 342 to 18.)	Yea.
	S. 1459, adjusting longevity step increases for postal employees:	
Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 362 to 4.)	Yea.
	H.R. 5751, providing for notification to recipient that his mail may contain Communist propaganda from abroad and providing for return to sender:	
Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 369 to 2.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8914, amending the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act regarding participation in 1962 feed grain program:	
Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 213 to 151, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Nay.
	H.R. 7377, increasing number of highest paid employees in Federal agencies:	
Sept. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 305 to 53.)	Yea.
	H.R. 9118, establishing U.S. Arms Control Agency:	
Sept. 19	On passage. (Passed 290 to 54.)	Nay.
	H.R. 7500, providing for a Peace Corps:	
Sept. 21	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 253 to 79.)	Nay.
	H.R. 5628, providing Federal funds to study the establishment of a botanic garden in Hawaii:	
Sept. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 215 to 125, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Nay.
	H.R. 4172, establishing a Federal Council on the Arts:	
Sept. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 166 to 173.)	Nay.
	H.R. 258, increasing the District of Columbia sales tax:	
Sept. 22	On adoption of conference report. (Rejected 142 to 159.)	Nay.
	H.R. 7377, increasing number of highest paid employees in Federal agencies:	
Sept. 23	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 229 to 71.)	Nay.
	H.R. 9118, establishing U.S. Arms Control Agency:	
Sept. 23	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 253 to 50.)	Nay.
	H.R. 258, increasing the District of Columbia sales tax:	
Sept. 26	On adoption of conference report. (Rejected 97 to 173.)	Not voting.
	H.R. 9033, making appropriations for foreign economic and military aid for fiscal 1962:	
Sept. 26	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 192 to 81.)	Not voting.
Sept. 26	On motion to agree with Senate amendment providing that foreign aid Inspector General need not honor a request for information from Congress if the President certifies he has forbidden him to do so.	Not voting.
	2d sess., 87th Cong., 1962	
Jan. 10	Election of Speaker. (McCormack 248, Halleck 166.)	Halleck.
	H.R. 8900. College Academic Facilities Act:	
Jan. 30	On passage. (Passed 319 to 80.)	Yea.
	S. 383, providing for acquisition of a patented mining claim, Grand Canyon National Park:	
Feb. 5	On suspending the rules and passing the bill. (Rejected 202 to 136.)	Nay.
	H.R. 6360, authorizing an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce:	
Feb. 6	On passage. (Passed 231 to 169.)	Nay.
	H.R. 10050, providing for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit:	
Feb. 20	On agreeing to H. Res. 549, the closed rule providing for consideration of the bill. (Adopted 258 to 133.)	Nay.
Feb. 20	On passage. (Passed 251 to 144.)	Nay.
	H. Res. 530. Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1, providing for the establishment in the executive branch of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing:	
Feb. 21	On agreeing to resolution. (Adopted 264 to 150.)	Yea.
	H.R. 6747, amending the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia:	
Feb. 26	On Multer amendment to substitute the text of S. 486 for the language of H.R. 6747. (Adopted 221 to 143.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8399, relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation:	
Feb. 28	On passage. (Passed 354 to 62.)	Yea.
	H.R. 132, establishing a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes:	
Mar. 7	On passage. (Passed 339 to 66.)	Yea.
	S. 167, authorizing the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws:	
Mar. 13	On passage. (Passed 339 to 56.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8723, amending the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act:	
Mar. 15	On conference report—on Ashbrook motion to recommit, designed to restore the Ashbrook amendment. (Rejected 182 to 218.)	Yea.
Mar. 15	On agreeing to conference report. (Adopted 284 to 108.)	Yea.
	H.R. 10606, extending and improving the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act:	
Mar. 15	On Byrnes of Wisconsin motion to recommit designed to supply the minority version of the program. (Rejected 155 to 233.)	Yea.
Mar. 15	On passage. No Federal control on spending and funds appropriated in excess of administration's request. (Passed 320 to 69.)	Nay.
	H.R. 9751, authorizing appropriations during the fiscal year 1963 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces:	
Mar. 21	On passage. (Passed 404 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.R. 10904, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health and Welfare, and related agencies, 1963:	
Mar. 27	On Johansen motion to recommit. (Defeated 24 to 373.)	Nay.
	H.R. 10650, Revenue Act of 1962:	
Mar. 28	On adoption of the previous question on H. Res. 576. (Adopted 224 to 185.)	Nay.
Mar. 28	On agreeing to H. Res. 576, the closed rule waiving points of order and providing for 8 hours of debate on H.R. 10650. (Adopted 234 to 172.)	Nay.
	H.R. 10650, Revenue Act of 1962:	
Mar. 29	On Byrnes of Wisconsin motion to recommit, designed to eliminate the investment credit provisions and withholding provisions of taxes on interest and dividends. (Rejected 190 to 225.)	Yea.
Mar. 29	On passage. (Passed 219 to 196.)	Nay.
	H.R. 10162, amending the Bretton Woods Agreements Act:	
Apr. 2	On suspending the rules and passing the bill. (Passed 257 to 94.)	Yea.
	H.R. 10743, providing increases in rates of disability compensation:	
Apr. 2	On suspending the rules and passing the bill. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.R. 10700, amending the Peace Corps Act:	
Apr. 3	On passage. (Passed 317 to 70.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11038, supplemental appropriations, 1962:	
Apr. 4	On Gross motion to recommit, designed to limit expenditures by the State Department from funds for contributions to international organizations to 30.02 percent of aggregate U.N. payments. (Rejected 153 to 235.)	Yea.
	H.R. 4441, authorizing appropriation of $3,063,500 as an ex gratia payment to New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations:	
Apr. 5	On Bow motion to recommit. (Rejected 143 to 217.)	Nay.
Apr. 5	On passage. (Passed 207 to 153.)	Yea.
	H.R. 10788, amending section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 regarding the regulation of textile imports:	
Apr. 10	On agreeing to H. Res. 589, the open rule providing for consideration of the bill. (Approved 265 to 76.)	Nay.
	H.R. 10788, amending section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 regarding the regulation of textile imports:	
Apr. 11	On passage. (Passed 312 to 81.)	Nay.
	H.R. 11151, making appropriations for the legislative branch, 1963:	
Apr. 11	On Conte motion to recommit, designed to bar use of any funds to finance "occupant" mail by Members of Congress. (Failed 192 to 197.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11289, making appropriations for the Department of Defense, 1963:	
Apr. 18	On passage. (Passed 388 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8031, amending the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus:	
May 2	On passage. (Passed 279 to 90.)	Nay.
	H.R. 11040, providing for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system:	
May 3	On passage. (Passed 354 to 9.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8617, relating to the payment of the unpaid balance of awards made by the Philippine War Damage Commission:	
May 9	On passage. (Rejected 171 to 201.)	Yea.
	H.R. 8900, authorizing assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education:	
May 9	On agreeing to H. Res. 625, providing for sending to conference of H.R. 8900. (Approved 295 to 77.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11737, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
May 28	On passage. (Passed 343 to 0.)	Yea.

2d sess., 87th Cong., 1962—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Derounian's vote
	H.R. 11665, revising the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act:	
June 6	On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed 160 to 220.)	Yea.
June 6	On passage. (Passed 370 to 11.)	Yea.
	H.R. 5532, amending the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947:	
June 7	On passage. (Passed 362 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11990, providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit:	
June 14	On Byrnes of Wisconsin motion to recommit, designed to substitute the text of H.R. 12026, a similar bill limiting the increase to $306,000,000,000 in lieu of $308,000,000,000. (Rejected 145 to 258.)	Paired for.
June 14	On passage. (Passed 211 to 192.)	Paired against.
	H.R. 12154, Sugar Act Amendments of 1962:	
June 18	On consideration of H. Res. 691, the closed rule waiving points of order and providing for 3 hours of debate on the bill. (Adopted 262 to 32.)	Yea.
June 19	On motion to recommit, designed to delete sec. 18 of the bill. (Rejected 174 to 222.)	Yea.
June 19	On passage. (Passed 319 to 72.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11222, Food and Agriculture Act of 1962:	
June 21	On committee amendment No. 10, which would establish the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to designate certain areas as deficit feed areas and thus exempt them from the mandatory acreage cutbacks. (Adopted 267 to 151.)	Nay.
June 21	On motion to recommit. (Adopted 215 to 205.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11500, extending the Defense Production Act of 1950:	
June 25	On passage. (Passed 329 to 0.)	Not voting.
	H.R. 11309, providing for continuation of authority for regulation of exports:	
June 25	On passage. (Passed 339 to 0.)	Not voting.
	H.R. 11970, Trade Expansion Act of 1962:	
June 28	On motion to recommit, designed to extend the present Reciprocal Trade Act for 1 year. (Rejected 171 to 253.)	Yea.
June 28	On passage. (Passed 298 to 125.)	Yea.
	S. 1658, amending act of Jan. 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce:	
June 29	On passage. (Passed 349 to 1.)	Yea.
	S. 1969, amending Federal Aviation Act of 1958.	
June 29	On agreeing to conference report. (Adopted 337 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.R. 12154, Sugar Act Amendments of 1962:	
June 30	On agreeing to conference report. (Adopted 248 to 31.)	Not voting.
	H.R. 11586, amending Merchant Marine Act of 1936, relative to vessel construction subsidies:	
July 2	On suspending the rules and passing the bill. (Adopted 293 to 5.)	Yea.
	S. 2775, removing the ceiling on the authorization for the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands:	
July 2	On suspending the rules and passing the bill. (Adopted 281 to 14.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 714, expressed the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the authorization by the Federal Communications Commission of class I-A clear channel operations:	
July 2	On suspending the rules and passing the bill. (Adopted 198 to 87.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11921, Foreign Aid Assistance Act of 1962:	
July 12	On passage. (Passed 250 to 164.)	Nay.
	H.R. 8050, relating to importation of honey bees:	
July 16	On agreeing to H. Res. 726, providing for House agreement to Senate amendment to H.R. 8050. (Approved 196 to 142.)	Nay.
	H.R. 11974, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission:	
July 17	On Van Zandt amendment to prohibit further Government competition with private power industry and protect congressional control over public funds. (Adopted 232 to 163.)	Yea.
	S. 167, authorizing the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws:	
July 18	Conference report: On McCulloch motion to recommit. (Approved 202 to 200.)	Yea.
	H.R. 12135, authorizing appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways:	
July 18	On Baldwin amendment to require the State highway department to provide relocation advisory assistance to families displaced by right-of-way acquisitions. (Adopted 236 to 159.)	Yea.
	H.R. 10606, Public Welfare Amendments of 1962:	
July 19	On agreeing to conference report. (Approved 358 to 34.)	Nay.
	H.R. 12391, Food and Agriculture Act of 1962:	
July 19	On passage. (Passed 229 to 163.)	Nay.
	H.R. 12580, Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies, 1963:	
July 20	On passage. (Passed 266 to 56.)	Yea.
	S. 2996, Foreign Assistance Act of 1962:	
July 24	On agreeing to conference report. (Adopted 221 to 162.)	Nay
	H.R. 12648, appropriations for the Department of Agriculture:	
July 25	On passage. (Passed 346 to 41.)	Nay.
	H.R. 529, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho:	
July 26	On passage. (Passed 199 to 162.)	Nay.
	H.R. 12711, independent offices appropriation bill, 1963:	
Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed 369 to 12.)	Yea.
	H.R. 575, upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon:	
Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed 200 to 182.)	Nay.
	H.R. 10904, appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Aug. 1	Conference report—On motion to recommit. (Failed 173 to 214.)	Yea.
Aug. 1	On agreeing to conference report. (Adopted 350 to 35.)	Yea.
	H.R. 4055, to amend Act Authorizing National Medals of Science:	
Aug. 8	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Failed 193 to 177.)	Nay.
	H.R. 7283, amending the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses:	
Aug. 8	On passage. (Passed 355 to 15.)	Yea.
	S. 1005, amending sec. 10 and sec. 3 of the Federal Reserve Act:	
Aug. 14	On passage. (Passed 314 to 50.)	Yea.
Aug. 27	On Albert motion that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. (298 to 65.)	Yea.
Aug. 27	On Albert motion that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. (312 to 62.)	Yea.
	S.J. Res. 29, proposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution outlawing payment of poll or other tax as qualification for voting in Federal elections:	
Aug. 27	On suspending the rules and passing the resolution. (Approved 295 to 86.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11040, providing for the establishment, ownership, operation and regulation of a communications satellite system:	
Aug. 27	On suspending the rules and passing the bill. (Adopted 372 to 10.)	Yea.
	H.R. 12628, Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962:	
Aug. 27	On suspending the rules and passing the bill. (Approved 367 to 6.)	Yea.
	H.R. 10113, establishing an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration:	
Aug. 29	On Cramer motion to recommit. (Defeated 192 to 221.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11974, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission:	
Aug. 29	On Van Zandt motion to instruct the House conferees to insist on disagreement to language authorizing construction of electric energy generating facilities for the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash. (Rejected 148 to 246.)	Yea. Yea.
	S. 4, providing for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore:	
Sept. 13	On passage. (Passed 258 to 87.)	Nay.
	S. 2768, authorizing a loan to the United Nations and appropriation of funds:	
Sept. 14	On Adair motion to recommit with instructions to add a section to prevent any loan to the U.N. until the General Assembly adopts the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice with respect to its financial status and arrearages of member nations. (Rejected 171 to 219.)	Yea.
Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed 256 to 134.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11974, Atomic Energy Authorizations:	
Sept. 14	On motion to recommit with instructions for House Conferees to insist on disagreement to sec. 112 (Hanford, Wash., generating facilities) of Senate amendment. (Rejected 150 to 186.)	Yea.
	S. 2429, revising the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, V.I.:	
Sept. 18	On H. Res. 777 granting an open rule. (Passed 267 to 5.)	Yea.
Sept. 19	On Albert motion that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. (355 to 17.)	Yea.
Sept. 19	On Albert motion that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with. (339 to 26.)	Yea.
	H.R. 12082, amending the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency:	
Sept. 10	On suspending the rules and passing the bill. (Passed 350 to 24.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11363, providing for the protection of classified information released to or within U.S. industry:	
Sept. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 247 to 132.)	Yea.
	H.R. 12648, Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, 1963:	
Sept. 19	On motion to recede and concur in Senate Amendment No. 19. (Rejected 143 to 221.)	Nay.

2d sess., 87th Cong., 1962—**Continued**

Date	Measure, question, and result	Derounian's vote
	H.R. 11151, appropriations for the legislative branch:	
Sept. 19	On motion to insist on disagreement to Senate Amendment No. 44. (Rejected 143 to 221.)	Nay.
	H.R. 12391, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962:	
Sept. 20	On adopting conference report. (Adopted 202 to 197.)	Nay.
	H.R. 8900, authorizing assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities:	
Sept. 20	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions. (Adopted 215 to 186.)	Yea.
	H.R. 13175, Foreign Aid Appropriations, 1963:	
Sept. 20	On recommittal motion designed to reduce the economic assistance funds by $100 million. (Rejected 180 to 203.)	Yea.
Sept. 20	On passage. (Passed 240 to 144.)	Yea.
	H.R. 12180, to temporarily extend existing law relating to free importation of personal and household effects brought into United States under Government orders:	
Sept. 21	Adoption of conference report. (Adopted 324 to 8.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11732, amending the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize foreign governments to operate radio stations in the District of Columbia for transmission of messages outside the United States:	
Sept. 21	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 95 to 208.)	Not voting.
	S.J. Res. 224, authorizing the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months:	
Sept. 24	On passage. (Passed 342 to 13.)	Yea.
	H.R. 10, the self-employed individuals tax retirement plan:	
Sept. 25	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 361 to 0.)	Yea.
	S.J. Res. 230, Cuban resolution:	
Sept. 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to strengthen. (Rejected 140 to 251.)	Yea.
Sept. 26	On passage. (Passed 384 to 7.)	Yea.
	H. Res. 818, disagreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 7927, postal rate and Government salary bill, and requesting a conference:	
Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 325 to 22.)	Yea.
	H.R. 5698, extending apportionment requirement of Civil Service Act to temporary summer employment:	
Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 308 to 19.)	Yea.
	H.R. 13241, amending section 309 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 relating to small farm exemption from 1963 wheat program:	
Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 255 to 60.)	Nay.
	H.R. 8181, to authorize Secretary of the Interior to construct a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia at a cost of $10,000,000:	
Oct. 2	On adopting H. Res. 822 providing for House agreement to Senate amendments. (Adopted 245 to 104.)	Nay.
	H.R. 13273, Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control Act:	
Oct. 3	On adopting H. Res. 823, providing for consideration of H.R. 13273. (Passed 344 to 4.)	Yea.
Oct. 3	On recommittal motion designed to delete the Burns Creek project in Idaho. (Approved 203 to 130.)	Yea.
	H.R. 11970, Trade Expansion Act of 1962:	
Oct. 4	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 256 to 91.)	Yea.
	S. 1552, to amend and supplement the law with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs:	
Oct. 4	On passage. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yea.
	H.R. 12648, Department of Agriculture appropriations and related agencies:	
Oct. 4	On motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 2 with an amendment. (Passed 337 to 5.)	Yea.
	S. 1123, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend child labor provisions to certain children employed in agriculture:	
Oct. 4	On adopting H. Res. 803 providing the rule for consideration of S. 1123 and 1 hour of debate. (Adopted 257 to 81.)	Yea.
Oct. 4	On motion to strike out the enacting clause (A "yea" vote would have killed the bill). (Rejected 137 to 193.)	Nay.
	H.R. 4670, amending the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia:	
Oct. 4	On adopting conference report. (Adopted 270 to 18.)	Yea.
	H.R. 7927, postal rate and pay raise legislation:	
Oct. 5	On adopting conference report. (Adopted 312 to 20.)	Paired for.
	H. Con. Res. 570, expressing sense of Congress with respect to situation in Berlin:	
Oct. 5	On passage. (Passed 311 to 0.)	Yea.
	S. 1447, amending the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to provide for adjustment of annuities paid:	
Oct. 5	On passage. (Passed 260 to 9.)	Yea.
	H.R. 13175, Foreign aid appropriations, 1963:	
Oct. 6	On adopting conference report. (Adopted 171 to 108.)	Yea.

A Tribute to ASC Committeemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture operates one of the largest and most important segments of the Department of Agriculture's program. More than 90,000 farmer-elected, local citizens help administer this program on the local level as ASC committeemen. These committeemen help administer a great number of the farm programs enacted by the Congress—programs which have been widely accepted by the farmers and others.

The agriculture conservation program, which is administered by ASC committeemen, has done much to conserve the Nation's soil and water resources. ASC committeemen have also played an important part in the success of the feed grain and wheat program over the past 2 years as well as the tobacco, cotton, rice, peanuts, wool, and other programs of the Department of Agriculture.

Americans are the best fed and best clothed people in the world. There are many factors responsible for this condition including soil and water conserving practices, research, better farming methods and machinery, ingenuity of our farmers and in no small degree to the service performed by our county ASC committeemen working conscientiously to see that farmers and others are informed about the agricultural programs available to them.

Without the farmer-elected ASC committeemen and office employees at the county level, there would be no real effective organization available to administer the many farm programs.

Farmers, in the last 2 years, seem to have a renewed hope in the future. They are displaying a new interest in farm programs and in their ASC committees. I think it is important to note the increased interest by the farmers in the election of local ASC committees as pointed out by the most recent election. In these ASC elections, held in the fall of 1961, approximately 500,000 eligible farmers participated in the elections and voted in the nine southeastern area States. This was a 64-percent increase over the number of eligible farmers voting in the same States in the fall of 1960.

Another item of interest and one which demonstrates the renewed interest of farmers in these programs is the result of voluntary efforts—without pay—by the 22,000 county and community committeemen in the southeast area States. These committeemen encouraged fellow farmers to improve their farming and to start needed conservation programs on their farms through cooperation with ACP programs.

As of September 1, this year, some 75,000 farmers in the southeast area who had not participated in the conservation program for the past 3 years signed up to get started with needed conservation measures.

In my own State of Tennessee, approximately 16,000 such farmers have indicated their interest in this project; more than for any other State in the southeastern area. It should be pointed out that this increased participation in the ACP was primarily the result of voluntary efforts by ASC committeemen performing a voluntary public service and without pay. Much of this obviously fruitful effort took the form of chats among neighbors at the local general store, meetings of farm organizations and local civic groups, at church and at every other opportunity, as the local committeeman manifested his interest in the welfare of his community by discussing with fellow farmers the advantages of conservation. Such patriotic service by ASC committeemen deserves commendation and recognition.

The ASC farmer committee system is one of our greatest democratic organizations and has done much to assist our farmers and to improve their status, and

I am pleased to add my own word of commendation and congratulations to the fine work of these volunteer-farmer-citizen committeemen working in the public interest to advance and improve our American agriculture.

Who's Winning the Cold War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a newsletter written by the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, Representative MORRIS K. UDALL. His report to constituents follows:

CONGRESSMAN'S REPORT
(By MORRIS K. UDALL)

WHO'S WINNING THE COLD WAR?

I am proud and fortunate to be an American living in a 20th century society which enjoys more basic freedoms and more material wealth than any nation in the history of this earth. All of us can rejoice in the blessings we now have. Yet, I sense from my mail a great deal of worry and concern about the future of our country. This uneasiness seems to boil down to two conclusions which are drummed into our people from many sources: (1) We are gradually losing our free enterprise system to socialism; and (2) we are slowly, but surely, losing the cold war and will eventually live under communism.

In a recent report I tried to refute the charge that we are blindly stumbling into a democratic socialism. In this report, I will suggest that we stand back a moment and compile a box score of Khrushchev's position in the cold war.

I heard an agitated radio commentator the other night picture Khrushchev as a ruthless giant astride his monolithic Communist empire "steamrolling across the face of the earth at a fantastic speed." This is a defeatist view taken by many constituents who write: We do nothing right; the Russians do nothing wrong; our foreign policy always is blind, foolish, futile; Russian foreign policy is masterful, devious, and always successful; the free world is gradually shrinking as communism nibbles away here and there. Is this a balanced view of events since World War II? What are the facts?

It is true that all is not rosy for us. Khrushchev has had some cold war scores; we have serious problems in Berlin, Cuba, and elsewhere. The path ahead of us is full of traps and dangers. Perhaps the world will plunge itself into nuclear war. But I venture to suggest that Khrushchev's scorecard isn't all hits and runs. He has a lot of errors and strikeouts, too.

THE LIABILITY SIDE OF KHRUSHCHEV'S LEDGER

All of us are familiar with communism's successes. Let us take a look at the debit side of its ledger. Here are some of the things worrying this 68-year-old dictator as he looks over the world from his Kremlin office.

WORRY: THE HOME FRONT

Food: Shortages remain a problem. The "virgin lands" reclamation project in central Asia is a failure. Sharp increases in food prices announced.

Housing: Adequate facilities are scarce. Construction generally is in a mess. It was recently ordered that no new projects will begin until existing ones are completed and some of these are years behind. Consumer goods are costly.

Industrial breakdown: Machines are idle for want of spare parts. Industrial output still is only around 45 percent of the U.S. level. Of 47 major products, the most recent comprehensive study shows the Soviet Union had forged ahead of the United States in only 5: bicycles, sewing machines, fish, flour, and footwear. In 25 other products it fell farther behind.

Space race strain: Five of six probes to other planets have failed. The cost of the space race and military programs have heavily strained the Soviet economy. Russia reduced its foreign aid program by half in the past year, reneged on promises to abolish income taxes.

Discontent: This generation of Russians wants more of the good things of life and is restless. The death penalty has been revived to cope with increased crime and corruption. Despite jamming, millions listen to the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. Millions of Russians have personal memories of slave labor camps which at one time held as many as 15 million persons. Despite growing population, membership in the Young Communist League has remained static. Press accounts indicate collection of dues from Communist Party members is sometimes difficult. Within the party ranks there is competition among old Stalinists and other enemies of Khrushchev, younger men striving for top positions and the powerful military.

None of this means an internal overthrow of the Communist regime is in the offing. But it indicates that this home base of all Communist power is not a place of enthusiastic multitudes. Perhaps it is the Communist economy (not the capitalist) which carries by its very nature the seeds of its own destruction.

WORRY: THE SATELLITE WORLD

Eastern Europe, with its 116 million people, had close ties with Western Europe in the past. Much evidence indicates the people of Eastern Europe remain restless and anti-Communist:

Revolts have flared in Poland, Hungary, and East Germany. In the latter country alone 22 Soviet divisions are used to hold the people in line.

The Berlin wall is a monument to weakness on the Soviet side, not ours. Successful societies do not have to build walls and string barbed wire against their own people.

Albania has publicly denounced the Soviet Union for aiding India; shut off vital ports to Russian submarines.

Yugoslavia continues to pursue a course independent of Khrushchev. English replaces Russian as the most widely taught foreign language. U.S. Information Service is permitted to carry out programs on greater scale than in any other East European country. New York Times and Herald Tribune received in some 70 libraries.

Poland, headed by a man who has resisted Soviet pressure for farm collectivization, quarreled with Soviets on boundary lines, and opposed Moscow's attacks on Tito. American magazines, films, exhibits permitted.

To a large degree the satellite captive nations are not Russian assets, but liabilities.

WORRY: RED CHINA

Along the border of K.'s homeland lies Red China. Its more than 650 million people—a fifth of mankind—are restless, impoverished, in desperate need of food and space. Red China might start war with India—a war Russia does not want. The risks increase as Red China moves closer to possession of nuclear weapons. With its massive manpower, China is too close geographically, and apparently too far away ideologically, to provide much comfort for K.

WORRY: JAPAN

Communists confidently expected to take over Japan when our occupation ended. Yet today, 93 million Japanese are enjoying a prosperous life vastly different from that available to the millions under Communist rule in Red China. Japan's progress has come under a working democracy, not under totalitarianism.

WORRY: THE UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS OF AFRICA AND ASIA

By Communist dogma, the former colonies should have turned in hatred against their ousted rulers. But most leaders of emerging countries have chosen to develop in cooperation with the industrially advanced free nations.

And in the Congo, at one time, a takeover by Communists seemed imminent. Successful intervention by the United Nations has stymied Red hopes so far.

Egypt: Nasser takes Russia's money and throws Communists in jail. So does Iraq. Communist parties are still underground, diminished in membership.

India: This prime Communist target is moving ahead, spreading democratic methods down to the villages.

Resentments still linger from the old colonial days and inflammation is still possible. But chances are good for a free world victory in keeping the world's new nations independent.

WORRY: WESTERN EUROPE

Here are 13 nations of 260 million prospering people. Nations are integrating economies and moving toward closer political cooperation. There are new factories, jobs, prosperity. This is nothing short of revolutionary, as the Communists see things. Red hopes and plans were based on the assumption that these Western European countries would fall to communism after World War II. According to dogma, the industrialized nations should be ripped by ever-deepening class struggle, economic crises, and by fighting among themselves.

Instead, the opposite is happening.

WORRY: FADING COMMUNIST POPULARITY

A certain indicater of the failure of communism to gain popularity is the score chalked up by Communist parties in recent free general elections. Some examples:

Communists elected

Sweden:	
In next to last election	5
In last election	5
Norway:	
In next to last election	1
In last election	0
Finland:	
In next to last election	50
In last election	47
France:	
In next to last election	150
In last election	10
Israel:	
In next to last election	3
In last election	5
Italy:	
In next to last election	143
In last election	140

In the United States, Communist Party strength is down 90 percent since 1944, its peak year.

WORRY: U.S. MILITARY MIGHT

Khrushchev knows he is facing a superbly equipped, well-trained, and ready offensive force which can devastate the Soviet Union. Arrayed against him are such publicized items as:

Some 65 intercontinental missiles carrying nuclear warheads.

At least six Polaris submarines, each of which can hurl 30 megatons of destruction from submerged positions from the North Pole to the Persian Gulf.

Hundreds of heavy bombers carrying nuclear bombs; some of these are based near Russia's borders.

The 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean mounting atomic bombs and rockets aboard its air arms. Other carrier fleets police the world in the Atlantic, the Caribbean, and the Pacific.

For limited wars, combat ready divisions, with sharply increased air and sea lift and firepower. A guerrilla warfare force is ready, too.

Adding to the U.S. might are nearly 30 NATO divisions which are or can be quickly equipped with atomic weapons; 60 H-bombs which Britain has in place on Thor IRMB's aimed at Russia; 20 Italian high-megaton range bombs ready to be launched via Jupiter IRBM's; 44 mutual assistance pacts in which other nations have agreed to come to our aid.

Two hundred military bases are located in Western Europe where 10 years ago only 20 existed.

COMMUNIST EXPANSION HAS BEEN CHECKED

Let us look at another part of the score:

In 8 years immediately after World War II, Stalin extended Communist control to 10 countries and 800 million people.

Since 1956 when Khrushchev took the reins, Communist control has been extended to only one country—Cuba—with 6 million people. Even this victory, serious as it is, was caused more by our mistakes than by Communist planning.

DO WE HAVE A FOREIGN POLICY?

Many people suggest that America has no long-range foreign policy. I do not agree. It is a tribute to leaders of both our political parties that American foreign policy 1946–62 has had a bipartisan framework. There have been difference in emphasis, skill, and tactics, but Eisenhower followed the essential threads of Truman's strategy, just as Kennedy has continued Eisenhower's. The end aims of our foreign policy have been:

First. Avoid world war III.

Second. Freedom for America.

Third. Freedom for our democratic partners.

Fourth. Non-Communist governments for the new and neutral nations of the world.

Fifth. Eventual freedom for the captive nations.

To achieve these goals, both Republicans and Democratic administrations have tried to:

First. Keep our Nation economically strong. In order to do this, a large balance-of-payments surplus must be maintained. Another major element is the trade legislation, soon to become law, a link to Europe in the great common enterprises of the free community of nations. Finally, we require a high and well-sustained rate of growth and relatively full employment.

Second. Maintain a large, flexible Military Establishment sufficient to deter attack and fight general or limited wars, and help our allies remain militarily strong.

Third. Strengthen the association and partnership among ourselves and the free highly industrialized nations of the Atlantic Community: Britain, France, Germany, Canada, and so forth, and with Japan.

Fourth. Develop friendly relations and economic partnership with the emerging nations of Latin America, Africa, and Asia so that they progress toward democracy and rising living standards.

Fifth. Divide Russia from its satellites and encourage the satellites to move toward more freedom.

U.S. COLD WAR PROGRAMS

The Communists have used various techniques to defeat our aims. But we have taken the initiative too. Our cold war offense in recent years has been bolstered with special programs such as these:

Peace Corps, highly successful and now operating in 44 countries.

Alliance for Progress, designed to help South America in its transition to modern industrial free partners.

Civic action program, just getting underway, to utilize military manpower in underdeveloped countries for public works projects.

Food for peace, helping to end hunger and to create a stronger alliance.

CONCLUSION

I do not believe in peace at any price. Along with most Americans I am willing, if need be, to risk a nuclear war rather than live under communism. But our aim is a world in which we are neither "Red nor dead" but alive, prosperous, free, and at peace.

In war, the best generals are calm in the midst of panic, willing to roll with the punch, ready to improvise new strategies and techniques for changing situations; ready for offense or defense as the events may require; prepared to wait, or to charge.

We are the "generals" of a free world's forces in a deadly serious struggle. Let us be strong, calm, reasonable, alert and united.

The cold war is not lost. On balance we are winning.

Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my regret that H.R. 11158, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962 did not come up for passage in this Congress.

During this Congress I introduced similar legislation to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and in other urban areas. It is my belief that if our urban areas, both large and small, are to escape strangulation by traffic congestion, the efforts of all levels of government are needed to solve the critical transportation problems now confronting them. A start in this direction was made in provisions of the Housing Act of 1961 and H.R. 11158 would have continued that program. Enactment of that legislation was urgently needed.

The transportation problems of the metropolitan or urban areas of national concern. Seventy percent of the Nation's population live in urban areas and it is here that the highest rate of population growth is occurring. It is manifest that because our Nation is predominantly an urban nation, the solution of urban problems is very much a part of the current worldwide race for economic, scientific, and cultural leadership. The strength of our economic system, the viability of our methods of government, and our way of life will have to be demonstrated in the cities. Our successes and responsibilities as a nation have come to be thought of primarily in terms of national, rather than in their local context. We speak of national wealth, national production, and national problems. In actual fact the effect of our total achievement is measured by the successes—or failures—of the many parts that constitute our Nation. Important parts that are added up to make our Nation are our metropolitan areas. These core cities of 50,000 or more and their surrounding urban and suburban territory have been the fastest growing sections of the country since the start of the century. In 1900 urban areas included only a third of our national population but today over two-thirds.

One of the key and unique pressures that faces the city today is the burden of handling a daytime population 30 to 50 percent greater than the residential population. The continuing decline in use of mass transit facilities is making this task enormously more difficult. It is a common sight throughout the country to find every morning long lines of individuals crawling toward the teeming center of the city, while parallel lines of automobiles head with determination in the opposite direction. In almost every metropolitan complex, with the notable exception of New York, the private automobile accounts for the significant and growing proportion of the commuting travel to the central city. Radial highways leading to the central business district are peppered with automobiles. The picture is much the same in many communities where the commuter heads from close-in residential districts to employment areas on the periphery of our cities.

A principal response of the cities has been to facilitate the shift from transit riding to the use of the private automobile by building or planning to build freeways to the central cities and by adding to the supply of parking spaces. It is obvious that the extent to which parking space can be provided at close-in locations will continue to be limited by both cost and space. For that reason a highway program alone, it appears, will fail to solve the problem of accessibility for many cities as they are constituted today. The question of accessibility has a great deal to do with the decision of the businessman to stay downtown or the decision of the shopper to go there. In fact the very question of accessibility to the modern city is closely tied to the question of the survival of the central city.

Within recent years a number of students of the modern American city have spoken of the "disappearing city," they have argued that the central metropolitan areas of our Nation are "doomed," "obsolete" and that by this view the city is seen to be dissolving, distributing the amenities of the urban center in a film of suburbia.

Faced with this unhappy prospect a number of communities have made great efforts to meet the manifold problems of moving people and goods with dispatch. The San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District was formed to meet the tremendous challenge of urban concentration and the movement of people. The facilities of this district are recognized to be the result of essential basic research to find the very finest system for the bay area. The voters of a number of bay area counties will go to the polls in November to make this system a living reality.

"When a man is tired of London," said Dr. Johnson, "he is tired of living for there is in London all that life can afford." This classic tribute to the qualities of living in an urban community can be matched by statements from many other observers from antiquity to the present time.

To our cities have come the young and energetic, the enterprisers and dreamers, everyone who seeks "all that life can afford." In my mind, it is apparent that the preservation of our central cities must be premised upon the recognition of its maintenance as a viable center for our culture. Its preservation cannot be left to blind chance but must base itself on the balanced and rational solution to a whole range of problems. Without question one of the most pressing and complex problems deals with transportation and traffic. A realistic and sober evaluation must be undertaken by our communities. Such an evaluation was undertaken in the San Francisco Bay area. In drawing up one of the model rapid transit programs in the Nation, the Bay Area Rapid Transit District provides balanced attention to all methods of movement in giving due stress and attention to a workable public transit system. The Bay Area Rapid Transit District will do much to prevent the bay area motorist from strangling in his own congestion.

I believe it to be evident that the movement of the great masses of people into and out of the central city can be accomplished only by mass rapid transit. Nationally, it matters little what form this transport takes—subways, surface trains, buses, elevated trains or a combination of any or all of them. What is clear is that the fact of galloping congestion in our urban areas be met—and with dispatch.

Our highway programs, our urban renewal projects, and all urban planning assistance programs would have become more effective with the enactment of H.R. 11158, which provides a framework for coordinating efforts to improve urban transportation with other metropolitan programs, all to the end of enabling urban areas to achieve the growth which is important to our national economy.

The Federal aid proposed in H.R. 11158 is most practicable. The assistance is to be given to State and local government agencies. They are in the best position to keep abreast of trends which indicate need for specific transportation facilities which will contribute to rather than hinder progress.

I wish to congratulate Mr. MULTER and the members of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Banking and Currency for framing such a comprehensive and well thought out measure.

In closing I wish to express my deep regret that this measure was not passed by the House of Representatives. We have come to a point in the development of our Nation at which neither the Federal Government nor the American economy as a whole can afford the expense and damage if metropolitan areas fail in their productive function. Enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act would have done much to insure the good health of the American city.

Edward R. Murrow and the Film Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on this floor in the closing days of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, much was spoken concerning the deteriorating economic status of the prominent magazines circulating in the United States. There was honest concern among Members of the House that the increase in postal rates would not be to the extent that it would force additional magazines to cease publication or to merge. There was, at the same time, a will on the part of most Members to make such adjustments in rates which would not result in the circulation of a popular magazine to become a further burden on the Post Office Department due to a lower than reasonable rate.

About the same time this debate on magazine survival was taking place, a new magazine appeared on the newsstand, founded by Huntington Hartford, the Show magazine. It is a magazine of culture, embracing diversified art from history to the modern theater. During its first year as a publication, it has not only dealt with the arts in Europe, the Far East and other parts of the world, but also has devoted a great share of its space to matters related to Washington politics and culture. It has dealt with such varied subjects as the theatergoing habits of Presidents, politics as a performing art—the Vice President's whistlestop tour of the South in 1960, the invasion of Washington by the "Advice and Consent" army, government and television, the showmanship at Cape Canaveral, and the relationship of government to the arts.

Although I am not a regular reader of this magazine, several issues have come to my attention; and I was particularly interested in the 1-year anniversary issue for November. One particular article which attracted my attention was an article by Frank Gervasi, "As Others See Us: Hollywood Exports, the Good Side of American Movies." The basis for this story was a recent conference requested by Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, to criticize the producers and directors of movie films, because their films presented an unhealthy image of America to the outside world.

I am not in any way attempting to defend the standards, the artistic quality, nor even the impression that is reflected from the American films. I think it is important to point out, however, the travesty of Edward R. Murrow in any capacity suggesting a criticism of a film which might unfavorably reflect on American prestige or social system.

Probably the most violence done to the American image was accomplished by a film produced by Edward Murrow himself, the "Harvest of Shame." If this alleged documentary film did not do sufficient damage to America's image, it could be supplemented by one of the last Ed Murrow shows on CBS, in which he reportedly placed on the air the voices of "call girls" who it stated were available for large conventions and other gatherings in certain American cities.

In good conscience, I could not see how Mr. Murrow could justify a criticism of a film by the movie industry which is not produced for information or enlightenment, but solely for entertainment. In my opinion, these films would be largely accepted for just that. In the case of a documentary film, however, it is not produced to entertain, but to objectively depict and portray any given situation or incident. It has since been established in a Senate debate that the "Harvest of Shame" was not factually accurate, and it is probably reasonable to assume that the criticism Mr. Murrow directed to the movie industry was also made without a careful development of facts.

The only conclusion I can reach from this conflict of positions by Mr. Murrow is that a film unfavorably picturing America under a Republican administration is quite all right and in the public interest. A similar film produced, even by private enterprise, under the New Frontier is to be scorned.

I cannot see how all of these expressions can serve the public interest.

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal Item Should Be Approved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that the most important waterway project before the Congress of the United States is the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. My support of this project is primarily based upon its defense value. Four Presidents of the United States have had an important part to play in the recent history of this project: Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and even way back in the 19th century President Andrew Jackson vigorously supported this canal. After extended studies through many years of other various possible alternative routes the present route was selected and the project was authorized in 1942 by a bill, "to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipeline and a navigable barge channel across Florida." This authorization by Congress was not on the basis of any economic justification but solely on its national defense values. The canal, however, was not built at that time because of the necessity in time of war to apply to all manpower and equipment in other directions in the emergencies involved.

As soon as I was discharged from the U.S. Army in 1947, I ran for Congress on the platform of the construction of this canal and came to Congress in January of 1949. I had the active help of President Truman in the accumulation of material necessary for a full presentation to Congress, but was not able to make such a presentation until during the administration of President Eisenhower. Under President Eisenhower's leadership it was thought that it would be well to see if the project could be justified not only for its defense values but also for its economic justifications, and President Eisenhower took the leadership in making this a budget item, and the studies were conducted and they showed economic justification for the project during the Eisenhower administration. Additional surveys were made in the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and they resulted in an even greater economic justification, 500 percent more than the original economic justification, or the final figure of 1.2 over 1.

During President Kennedy's campaign for the Presidency of the United States he had written me and allowed me to publish during that campaign the following statement over his signature:

> I know of your persistent work for the early construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. If I am elected President, I will be glad to cooperate with you in making this project a reality. I regard it not only as important to Florida, but to the economy of our entire country, which must fully utilize all of our natural resources if we are to achieve necessary economic expansion.

President Kennedy has done everything he can to bring this to Congress for prompt action, having placed in the budget an item for $205,000 to complete the planning and bring the project down to the place where construction can actually be started if Congress so provides that at some future date. The present item now under consideration is $205,000 for the final planning on this project. It does not bind the Congress to go ahead with the construction. The Senate has passed this item and has refused to agree with the House conferees, who have not approved the item since it was not included in the House bill. I sincerely hope that the House will approve these funds.

I would like to say something about the defense value of this project. On May 11, 1962, Chairman Carl Vinson of the Armed Services Committee wrote Chairman Clarence Cannon of the Appropriations Committee as follows:

> I am very hopeful that during this Congress your committee will see fit to appropriate sufficient funds to make a forward step in the construction of the Cross Florida Barge Canal which is to be a section of the Intracoastal Waterway.
>
> I am very much interested in this project because of its very important national defense aspects.

Chairman Vinson quoted the findings of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, August 30, 1946, in part, as follows:

> The Chief of Engineers has stated in his opinion (hearing before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Jan. 9, 1946) that the authorized canal will represent, in addition to its economic worth, a value in national security considerably greater than its cost.

On May 29, 1951, the Deputy Secretary of Defense in a letter to the President, stated as follows:

> The Corps of Engineers expressed the views that "a barge canal will afford a short, economical, protected route across Florida for the movement of a large amount of long-haul traffic by barge and small freighters between gulf and Atlantic ports. Large tonnages of raw materials as well as manufactured products are susceptible to movement between those points via protected inland waters at great saving. Completion of the canal would also permit quick, safe, and economical transfer between the east and west coasts of Florida, of floating plant and construction equipment now required to move via the circuitous and dangerous Florida Keys route.
>
> "During World War II, many cargo ships and tankers were lost off the coast of Florida due to enemy action. Many of the cargoes that were lost would and could have moved by barge or small freighter had the barge canal been in existence at that time. The saving in lives, ships, and valuable and critical cargoes would have been great. Similar and comparable savings would also accrue in future serious national emergencies if the canal is in operation."
>
> The Joint Chiefs of Staff find that either of these projects (i.e., the previously considered ship canal or the authorized barge canal) will provide an additional and shorter line of communication between the gulf coast, and the east coast, and would thus reduce exposure of shipping to submarine attack.

In the mentioned report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, they said to the Chief of Army Engineers:

> The economic analysis of a long-lived project could not be considered complete if it covered merely the interval of peacetime years and ignored the recurrent war periods. The insurance value of the avoidance of war losses is, therefore, distributable on an annual basis and can be at least roughly approximated in dollars and cents for measurement against the monetary annual charges of providing and maintaining the facilities.

The Board then goes on to compute the annual value of this wartime insurance afforded by the project as $3,600,000 based on price and replacement cost levels of 1946. In terms of today's price levels, this figure is above $10 million per year and more than doubles the total economic benefits currently reported by the Corps of Engineers in their interim report as to the peacetime economies to be yielded by the waterway.

The Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President, in the fall of last year, reviewed a memorandum on the national defense value of the project, prepared by H. H. Buckman, engineer, and said as follows about it:

> We have reviewed the Buckman memorandum and appended papers and feel that its thesis is sound and its findings still essentially valid with respect to civil as well as military defense. The desirability of a shorter line of communications between the gulf and east coasts is recognized.

Engineer Buckman further points out the tremendous cost of lost shipping in World War II due to the necessity of using the gulf-Atlantic open sealanes, and said:

> Over 1 million gross tons, or 25 percent of all the shipping in these lanes, was lost. The value was $987 million, and 167 ships went to the bottom.

From what I have pointed out to you the national defense value of this canal is outstanding and there should be no further delay in going forward with it.

The lone opposition to this canal has been from railroads, which have traditionally opposed canals all over the country. It should be pointed out, however, that the Florida East Coast Railroad supports the canal and that many individuals in the railroad industry favor the canal. General Morris of the U.S. Army Engineers this year in the House hearings said with regard to railroad interests as follows:

> In a short time the canal will assume its proper place in the overall transportation network. Developments along and adjacent to the canal will be accelerated, particularly by industries utilizing and processing raw materials. When this condition develops it can be anticipated that the volume of traffic transported by rail and truck will also expand due to their natural advantages in the transportation of certain classes of commodities. While this trend can be anticipated from the statistical studies made for the economic restudy of the canal, it has been clearly shown in the growth pattern of transportation in other sections of the country under similar conditions. It is believed that the provision of cheap water transportation for bulky commodities to this section of the Southeastern States will create such developments that loss of traffic to competing rail and truck transportation systems will not be of lasting importance and the resulting improvement of regional economic conditions will ultimately add materially to their traffic.

Before closing this talk, I would like to say a few things about arguments which have been raised against the canal: One is that when the canal reaches the Gulf of Mexico it reaches open waters and the route is no longer well protected until it reaches the next dug canal to the north in the shoreline of Florida some miles away. This question is answered completely by the fact that barges now safely use this partially protected area of the Apalachee Bay just as they now use partially protected routes in the Chesapeake Bay and in the Mississippi Sound. The question was answered point blank by the Chief of Engineers in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House under date of June 15, 1942, as follows:

> With reference to the use by Intracoastal Waterway traffic of the open gulf between the eastern terminus of the present Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Apalachee Bay and the gulf terminus of the above-men-

tioned barge canal, it may be stated that coastwise traffic now follows this route and that while some danger is connected therewith, I am informed that there is very little time lost in navigating this portion of the gulf. Accordingly, it would be possible to eliminate that section of the Intracoastal Waterway from the improvements proposed in H.R. 6999 and still move very large quantities of commerce by barge from terminals along the gulf coast to the eastern seaboard with the completion of the other improvements proposed in the bill.

Another argument that is made against this canal is that there is an existing canal running across the State of Florida in its southern portions, the Okeechobee Waterway. This southern route is 356 miles longer and is more expensive to construct and maintain even though it does exist in a very limited degree at the present time. Further, its utilization is much more limited than utilization of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal would be, according to authentic and careful studies that have been made over a period of many years. On this point there is a letter from the Office of Chief of Engineers dated May 17, 1962, which went into this question and stated as follows:

> The existing Okeechobee Waterway provides a channel 8 feet deep and 80 feet wide from the Intracoastal Waterway near St. Lucie Inlet to the Gulf of Mexico near Fort Myers Beach. This waterway includes three locks, 50 feet wide and 250 feet long. In 1958, preliminary cost estimates were made for enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway to the same design criteria established for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project. Those estimates showed that the cost of enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway would exceed $100 million. Traffic studies also showed that the volume of commerce that would use an enlarged Okeechobee Waterway, and the transportation savings therefrom, would be far from sufficient to justify the large cost of improvement of the existing waterway to the dimensions of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Finally, it is said by the railroad lobby that the economic justification of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is slight and that the benefits are primarily to Florida rather than to the Nation as a whole. As to the economic justification, I would like to point out that even on the most conservative figure presented by the Corps of Engineers, 1.2 over 1, this is an economic justification in excess of other projects which Congress has authorized, projects involving more money than this project, and we are spending money for such other developments right now in actual construction. As to the argument of the locality of the project, this is perhaps the most absurd argument which is raised against the Cross-Florida Barge Canal because it actually has more national significance than any waterway project ever undertaken by the U.S. Government. By a distortion of the facts and figures which were given to the committee an erroneous conclusion was drawn that on economic justification most of the transit would be within the State of Florida, but an accurate reading of the information given to the committee shows that although about 80 percent of the traffic would either start or stop in Florida, only 16 percent of it would be of the within-the-State variety even when most conservative analysis is used as to its interstate utilization. This compares very favorably with other projects. Moreover, it should finally be observed that this project was not authorized by Congress on the basis of economic justification, but was authorized on the basis of its defense value and that the defense value is certainly the paramount value of this project. Even if all of the economic justification of this project were thrown out the window, the project still should be built because of its defense values of which I have already spoken. I sincerely hope that the Congress will provide for the $205,000 budgeted Senate-passed appropriations for completing the final planning for this project.

Summary of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the 1959, 1960, and 1961 sessions of Congress, I summarized each year's activities and mailed reprints to constituents. There have been hundreds of requests asking me to follow the same procedure at the close of this Congress. I am complying with their requests and am making this summary as soon as possible at the end of this session, and I am going to have reprints made at my expense and distributed as soon as they can be processed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Our defense has been greatly strengthened. We increased by 45 percent the Regular Army divisions from 11 up to 16. Of the 11 we had in early 1961, only 3 were in the United States. Khrushchev undoubtedly knew we could not spare any more and was thus encouraged to precipitate the crisis. The Reserves were called and got us through this crucial period, and I think the Regular Forces will be kept at enough strength now so Reserves will not need to be called under such circumstances.

It was found that Reserve units at two-thirds strength could not be made battle ready in less than 4 or 5 months, and this is too slow to respond in present-day warfare; therefore, a realinement is underway by which several brigades will be kept at full strength instead of more brigades at partial strength.

Increased defense effort added 20 percent or $10 billion to the defense budget. The increased appropriation was supported by a unanimous vote which indicated agreement upon the need.

TAXES

Taxes were reduced by about $1.2 billion per year through changing the depreciation schedules effective last July. Also, an investment credit, such as most European countries have, was a part of a new tax law. New data collected from industry and farmers this month shows investments in new equipment sharply increasing, as was predicted would result. The results will be closely watched as new tax proposals are developed next year.

FOREIGN AID AND THE PEACE CORPS

Foreign aid requests were reduced by $1.7 billion for the 2-year period. President Eisenhower's requests to the 86th Congress were reduced about the same amount. The Peace Corps was established to get back on a technical-aid approach instead of so much of the grant-of-money approach. The administration is expected to propose only Peace Corps aid to some countries next year, and I think economic aid will be reduced.

EDUCATION

Federal aid to education under the Impacted Areas Act and the National Defense Education Act was extended for 2 more years, to expire June 30, 1963. There is a great deal of inequity and control in these laws. Some districts in the East and in California receiving this aid are much better off than districts in Iowa that do not receive any, but the vast majority of both Democrats and Republicans voted to extend these laws and voted against amending them.

A bill to provide grants and loans to colleges for classrooms passed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis in the House, but the Senate added loans for students to the bill, and the House then voted against loans for students. My bill for loans for students on a need basis was then sidetracked; however, I believe education legislation in the next Congress is most likely to involve loans for the 20 percent of the students with college ability who cannot pay all the increasing costs of tuition and subsistence without a partial loan.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

New national parks established were: first, Cape Cod National Seashore on the Atlantic Coast; second, Point Reyes National Seashore, immediately above San Francisco, and third, Padre Island National Seashore, which is located just off the coast of south Texas.

AGRICULTURE

The first Feed Grains Act was approved March 22, 1961. It provided that price supports would be limited to those who reduce production. Under it, production was reduced enough to provide a market for several hundred million bushels of the corn that had accumulated in Government bins. On August 8, 1961, it was extended to the 1962 crop year, and in September 1962, it was extended to cover the 1963 crop year. More than a billion tax dollars have been saved on two crops as a result of this legislation, and farm income has been increased at the same time. The estimated increase in Iowa income is $270 million.

A mandatory program was rejected by Congress, and it is now indicated that next year a more permanent voluntary proposal will be made. The 1962 bill also provided a cropland adjustment pilot program for turning farmland into recreational uses.

Programs to expand distribution of surplus foods to the needy and schools and a special milk program for children were also enacted or promulgated by Executive order.

Other laws approved provide for a hog cholera eradication program and guarding against dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry in order to further protect against a shortage of food occurring from some epidemic.

HOUSING

Public Law 87–70, approved June 30, 1961, extended existing programs and also provided programs to enable, first, private enterprise to provide housing for moderate income families; and, second, the owners of deteriorated homes to repair and improve them with FHA insured loans. There also was a provision increasing the loans available to colleges to build dormitories, and urban renewal grant authority was extended.

H.R. 12628, approved last month, authorizes loans for rental housing for the elderly.

Public Law 87–38 provided an increase in the authorization to insure mortgages by FHA so citizens can borrow money at the bank to buy a house with a smaller downpayment than otherwise would be possible. Thousands of houses in Iowa are purchased under this program.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS

A new Federal building for central Iowa to be located at Second and Walnut in Des Moines was approved, and money has been appropriated to acquire the site and for preconstruction planning. The Federal offices building on the east side in Des Moines will still be used, but the one at Fourth and Walnut will be sold.

RECESSION LEGISLATION

To help lift the recession, Congress passed depressed areas legislation and a Temporary Unemployment Act; increased social security benefits for widows and those receiving minimum benefits; stepped up the highway program; and enacted a Water Pollution Act to encourage local communities to build sewage plants and quit dumping sewage in streams used by downstream communities for a water supply.

MANPOWER RETRAINING

Most now agree that long-term reductions in unemployment will depend upon retraining the unskilled or those laid off by automation and upon educating the young to fill the professional and skilled jobs that are waiting for someone. Thirty percent of the teenagers are competing for unskilled jobs in short supply, and many skilled workers find their skill no longer needed—both need training. A bill was passed to provide schooling for jobs that are available. The program is now underway in Iowa.

PENSION AND WELFARE FUNDS

I was the author of a bill which passed and will require the administrators of pension and welfare funds to disclose their receipts, expenditures, and investments so that the participants will know the facts concerning the fund upon which they depend to give them their benefits. We had examples of administrators and insurance agents milking the funds by paying as much as 45 percent in commissions and of other abuses that should not exist. In order to protect the fund it requires an administrator to be bonded. There is now $60 billion in this kind of fund, and such funds are increasing at the rate of $4.5 billion per year.

DES MOINES RIVER PROJECTS

Further appropriations for Red Rock and Saylorville Dams and levees in Des Moines were secured. Sixteen and three-tenths million dollars was secured for Red Rock in the 2-year period, and construction is progressing. One hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars was appropriated for Saylorville planning last year, and there was enough left to carry another year. Planning on Saylorville is almost done and construction probably can start in another year.

I secured a final order increasing the Red Rock minimum lake to 9,000 acres on a permanent basis. It was originally to have been 6,300 acres and only temporarily.

SPACE RACE

The overwhelming majority of both Democrats and Republicans voted for the man-on-the-moon project which is expected to take 10 years. Of course, the real objective is to develop equipment which can also be used to detect and destroy missiles that are aimed at us.

MINIMUM WAGE

The Minimum Wage Act was amended to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour and to extend the act to about 3 million more workers, mostly retail workers. The amount per hour was not so controversial, but the extension to new workers was the first since 1938 when the law was originally passed and was strenuously resisted.

REORGANIZATION

I am on the committee which handles bills to reorganize the executive departments to make them operate more efficiently and economically. We had nine such proposals that reached the House for consideration in this Congress.

As predicted by the Hoover Commission, many people who have become accustomed to operating under existing procedures do not want to change. The coalition in the House defeated most of the proposals but the ones which passed will help.

I was the floor manager for the proposal to reorganize research programs. Over $12 billion per year is spent by the Federal Government on research. The proposal provides that projects will be reported through a central office so duplication and waste of both scientists and money can be detected and stopped. It passed and may very well result in saving $1 billion per year.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

The Trade Expansion Act was one of the most important bills passed in many years. It provides authority to negotiate with the Common Market for concessions that will be mutually beneficial and result in expanding our export sales. Iowa produces a great deal for export.

CIVIL RIGHTS

A constitutional amendment prohibiting the use of the poll tax to prevent voting was passed.

FORT DES MOINES

An order was obtained to use 340 acres of the Fort Des Moines property for school sites, a city park, roads, and a new college of osteopathy campus.

BUDGET

President Kennedy's budget requests were reduced a total of over $8 billion in the 2-year period. President Eisenhower's requests to the last Congress were reduced by $2.1 billion.

MISCELLANEOUS

Drug safeguards: The first major drug amendments since 1938 were passed to improve the quality and safety of drugs.

Small business: Public Law 87–305 provides for the dissemination of procurement information so more small businessmen can bid for business. Further loans were also provided.

Hanford power project: H.R. 11974 permits local public and private utilities to erect a generating facility near our atomic reactor at Hanford, Wash., and buy waste steam from the plant to produce electricity. There is no cost to the Federal Government, and it is estimated that the Federal Government will receive more than $100 million in 30 years from the sale of this waste steam.

Highway program: Public law 87–61 provides a continuation of the present construction program until 1966 and authorizes an additional 5 years of construction from money in the trust fund.

Airports: Public Law 87–255 extends the Federal aid for airports program through fiscal year 1964. Des Moines and several central Iowa cities depend on these funds and furnish airports that can be used by military planes when necessary.

Highway safety: Public Law 87–637 provides for determining and specifying what brake fluid is safe and efficient for motor vehicles in order to promote highway safety.

Drivers' registration: Public Law 87–359 authorizes States to report driving violations and cancellations of licenses to a central office so other States where a violator may apply for a license will have the information available. All but four States have already agreed to participate in the program.

Aircraft crimes: Public Law 87–197, arising out of the airliner hijacking cases, provides that certain crimes committed aboard airlines are also Federal crimes.

Public facilities: More loans for such community facilities as sewage disposal units were authorized. Of 330 applications filed last year, 45 percent were from communities of less than 1,000 population, many of which have not had proper sewage disposal, and thus dumped raw sewage into rivers and streams. Communities in central Iowa applying include Story City, Ankeny, Adel, Roland, Lehigh, Madrid, Altoona, Urbandale-Windsor Heights, and New Virginia.

Federal judgeships were increased and my bill providing for one for Iowa was incorporated in the bill.

An Arms Control Research Agency was established so our negotiators will not be going to negotiations as Harold Stassen did without a staff that can analyze the Russian proposals. It was endorsed by both President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower.

Blind children's education: I was the author of an act to increase materials available for blind children, such as braille books and sound tapes of textbooks, so these children can secure a better educational opportunity.

Juvenile delinquency was the subject of a bill passed to secure and distribute information to local officials. Des Moines has a plan under consideration.

United Nations bonds: Under a World Court ruling, countries not helping pay debts of the U.N. can be denied voting rights. Russia refused to pay for U.N. police action which stopped them in the Congo and on the Gaza strip. Under the U.N. bond proposal, which was approved, if Russia does not help pay, they will be denied their vote in the U.N.

Questionnaire: I sent out a questionnaire last winter. Since then, items 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, and 18 were enacted into law. Several have requested information as to the results, which were as follows:

	Those with an opinion		Percent of total with no opinion
	Percent for	Percent against	
1. Agreements for lower tariffs	85	15	18
2. Continued support of United Nations	85	15	29
3. Continued foreign aid	68	32	19
4. Aid to grade and high schools	54	46	15
5. Aid to increase college classrooms	57	43	10
6. Loans for college students	72	28	27
7. Pensions for World War I veterans	53	47	23
8. Increase disabled veterans' compensation	61	39	26
9. Extend feed grains program:			
Farmers voting	88	12	5
Nonfarmers voting	40	60	39
10. Administration's new farm proposal:			
Farmers voting	50	50	5
Nonfarmers voting	41	59	30
11. Health care for the aged under social security	57	43	10
12. Further civil rights laws	66	34	33
13. Establish Urban Affairs Department	62	38	36
14. Prohibit Federal officials hiring relatives	68	32	17
15. Increase social security benefits	57	43	14
16. Expand recreation areas	72	28	22
17. Continue $700,000,000 medical research program	87	13	18
18. Tax credits for new industrial machinery	59	41	-------

Election of Rev. Albert A. Chambers as Seventh Bishop of Diocese of Springfield, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, for 13 years Rev. Albert A. Chambers was rector of the Church of the Resurrection in New York City, and one of the most distinguished residents of the 17th Congressional District. Throughout the years of his ministry the spiritual growth of the parish was always closest to his heart. The hospital work of the church, which he has done so much to foster, has been accorded national recognition.

When Father Chambers came to New York, the Church of the Resurrection had not been consecrated, even though it was built in 1868 and had been in continuous use since then, because it had a mortgage. In 1957, marking the 25th anniversary of the ordination of Father Chambers to the priesthood, the mortgage was finally paid off, and Bishop Horace W. B. Donegan consecrated the building.

Rev. Albert A. Chambers, S.T.D., was born in Cleveland, Ohio, June 22, 1906. After his secondary education in Cleveland, he attended and was graduated from Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y., in 1928, with the bachelor of arts degree, and from the General Theological Seminary, New York City, in 1931, with the bachelor of sacred theology degree.

After ordination to the Episcopal priesthood, by his father-in-law, the Right Reverend Cameron J. Davis, bishop of western New York, Dr. Chambers began his work as a diocesan missionary in western New York, where he served missions in Angola, Forestville, and Irving. In June 1933 he became senior canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, Buffalo, N.Y., and diocesan director of youth work of the diocese of western New York.

From 1936 to 1942, Dr. Chambers was rector of St. Thomas' Church, Neenah-Menasha. During his rectorship in Wisconsin, he was chairman of the department of Christian education of the diocese of Fond-du-Lac and also chairman of the board of examining chaplains. Also while in Wisconsin, he took the initiative in establishing a Council of Social Agencies in Neenah-Menasha and served as its first president. He also started Girl Scouting work there and organized a regional council in Fox River Valley.

In January 1942 Dr. Chambers accepted election as rector of St. Peter's Church, Auburn, N.Y. While there, he was for more than 5 years a member of the diocesan council of the diocese of central New York, and from 1946 to 1949 he served as chairman of its department of promotion. He was also vice chairman of the Cayuga County chapter of the American Red Cross and field representative on the Sampson Air Base Council.

Since Dr. Chambers has been in New York, he has served on the committee on reorganization of the diocese of New York; and from October 1953 until May 1956, he was a member of the council of the diocese and chairman of the department of promotion. In May 1957 he was elected to a 4-year term as a member of the standing committee of the diocese of New York and served as its president for the year 1961. This year he was elected dean of the Manhattan Convocation. He was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of sacred theology by Hobart College in 1957 and by the General Theological Seminary in 1961. He is an alumni member of the board of trustees of the General Theological Seminary and former president of its alumni council. For 4 years he was chairman of the committee on theological education Sunday offering of the General Theological Seminary. Dr. Chambers is also a member of the council and the executive board of the American Church Union.

In June 1934 he married Frances Hewette Davis, daughter of Bishop and Mrs. Cameron J. Davis, of Buffalo, N.Y. They have two daughters, Frances Hewette, wife of the Reverend Harrison J. Owen, and Sally Ann, wife of Dr. Donald Goldberg.

The announcement of Reverend Chambers' election as seventh bishop of the diocese of Springfield, Ill., was greeted with deep feelings of pride and of sadness by his parishioners who hate to lose him. His letter of farewell to the Church of the Resurrection is a moving testimony of the deep and lasting bonds which had developed over the years between Dr. Chambers and the members and numerous friends of the church. I would like to insert his letter at this point:

JUNE 20, 1962.

To the Members and Friends of the Church of the Resurrection:

The conflicts and soul searching of the past 10 days, ever since I was notified of my unanimous election to be the seventh bishop of the diocese of Springfield, Ill., are impossible to describe. The joys of the past almost 13 years, the response of the people to my rectorship, the devotion and sacrifice that has been typical of the entire parish, the sharing of joys and sorrows in personal lives, the missionary outreach, and above all, the centrality of our worship and praise of God at His altar are but a few of the realizations that have crossed my mind. Surely, no rector has ever been more richly blessed by so devoted a people. I am sure that you have felt this family tie as strongly as I have.

Decisions are so difficult to make, especially when one feels inadequate to a call to a new order in the church, with heavier responsibilities. But over against this is the gentle prodding of the Holy Spirit and the assurance He gives that He will give the strength and grace needed to meet the new challenge.

I am accepting my election, and if the consents of the bishops and standing committees of the church are received, will be consecrated sometime in November. I ask your prayers most earnestly, that God may fit me for this new work.

The test of any priest's ministry begins the day he leaves. How well he has led his people to the worship of God and the service of God is inevitably revealed most clearly then. I have confidence that the people of this great family, to whom I feel so close, will continue to bear witness to their faith and Catholic heritage, and will give the same support, encouragement, and response to the new rector who will be privileged to serve here in this devoted place.

The vestry has asked Father Moore to be in charge of the parish after November 1, when I leave, until the new rector comes. He will be assisted full time by Father Udell.

Remember how deeply Mrs. Chambers and I love you in the Lord and may our parting be with gratitude that we have had so happy a life together these 13 years.

With deep affection,

Ever gratefully yours,

ALBERT A. CHAMBERS,

Rector.

Mr. Speaker, although Dr. Chambers' departure from our city is a sad event for the people of New York it is nonetheless a joyous occasion for the good people of Illinois. I know that I speak for thousands of New Yorkers who have the deepest admiration for Bishop Chambers when I wish him many happy years of service in the important work that lies ahead.

The 87th Congress Has Constructive and Impressive Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 10, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the 87th Congress has an impressive record and has made a great contribution to the national welfare. In my weekly newsletter, "Capitol Comments," I have summarized some of the important actions of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this report to the people of the great Fourth District of Tennessee in the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

THE 87TH CONGRESS HAS CONSTRUCTIVE AND IMPRESSIVE RECORD

The 87th Congress, which is now largely history, has compiled an impressive record of achievements and accomplishments and has made numerous significant contributions to the national welfare.

The fact that many of the accomplishments of this Congress have come slowly is to its credit. This indicates that the Congress has not been stampeded into hasty actions or quick passage of the many measures before it, but instead has considered each legislative measure carefully and extensively.

Few Congresses, if any, during this century have faced graver crises and more important decisions than the 87th. When the 87th Congress convened in January 1961, the Nation and the Congress faced great challenges and menacing problems on all fronts.

On the domestic front, the country was experiencing a severe economic slump. On the international scene, conditions were unsettled and unpromising in Berlin, Vietnam, Laos, Cuba, and the Congo. In the field of space exploration and missile development, there were great doubts about just where our country stood in this strategic race and many felt we were far behind in this important area of the cold war. There was a general realization that the Nation was drifting without purpose and that we lacked leadership and a sense of direction.

Numerous steps have been taken by the 87th Congress to reverse these trends and to bolster the economy and our defenses.

These included the Area Redevelopment Act, which had previously been vetoed under another administration, and which is already bringing benefits to many counties and many citizens in the Fourth District of Tennessee. The Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act, recently passed, is designed to stimulate capital investment programs in area redevelopment areas and speed up construction of Federal, State and local public works projects. We have appropriated $500 million to speed up needed public works under this program.

One of the most significant accomplishments of the Congress has been the passage of the Trade Expansion Act—the most significant piece of trade legislation since the passage of the Cordell Hull Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934. Passage of this bill should do much to stimulate foreign trade and in turn to provide new and larger markets for American-produced goods.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, which is aimed at training workers for skilled jobs in order that they may keep abreast of technological change and remain employed as automation becomes more widespread; the temporary extension of unemployment compensation to more than 2.3 million workers who had previously exhausted their benefits during the session; a measure to provide extra funds to help children whose parents were unemployed; the Housing Act, which provides for the largest home building program ever authorized in this country; the Senior Citizen Housing Act; a 5-year water pollution control program, which will benefit many of our towns and cities by enabling them to build or extend water and sewage facilities; the new drug bill to provide tighter control on the manufacturing and distribution of drugs; and a bill giving a needed boost to educational television are some of the important measures passed by this Congress.

The Congress passed an amended farm bill which generally extends the present farm control programs and includes provisions for reducing large farm surpluses while at the same time providing farmers with adequate prices for their products. Since the Democratic administration took office in January of 1961 and during the 87th Congress, net earnings of farmers already have increased by $2 billion, average income per farm is up 13 percent, the accumulation of surpluses in our warehouses and storage bins has decreased and the cost of farm programs has been correspondingly decreased.

An across-the-board increase in compensation to veterans with service-connected disabilities—those who have given the most for their country and who are disabled because of their service—is an important bill enacted by this Congress to benefit our veterans.

On the international scene, the Congress has passed resolutions stating the determination of this Nation and the Congress to prevent Castro and his Communist regime from exporting, either by open aggression or by subversion, communism to any country in the Western Hemisphere. We have reasserted freedom's stand regarding Berlin and our determination to stand by our commitments to the citizens of Berlin and West Germany.

The Congress has adopted amendments to the foreign aid or mutual assistance bills, which are designed to assure that our aid will be used for the purpose for which it is given and that it will benefit the people of the recipient countries. Waste and fat have been cut from foreign aid appropriations, tighter guidelines have been set up and more strict controls and supervision of this program established.

Three new and dramatic programs in the foreign affairs field were enacted by the 87th Congress. The Peace Corps, which already has successfully sent 5,000 young Americans into underdeveloped countries to assist in teaching, nursing, farming, and other activities, has been a great success. The food-for-peace program, which puts America's farm surplus to work feeding the hungry people of the world, and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which is an attempt by Congress to work out a solution to the problem of the threat of nuclear destruction, are significant programs enacted during this session of Congress.

Important steps have been taken to build our military and defensive strength. Our capabilities to wage conventional warfare, guerrilla or counterinsurgency warfare, or all-out nuclear warfare have been greatly increased.

On two occasions when the cold war threatened to break into a hot war over Berlin, the President asked and the Congress granted permission to call up Reserve Forces to strengthen our military might. This callup was an important demonstration of our willingness to fight if necessary to preserve and protect our rights around the world.

Military expenditures have been increased to give us a stronger fighting force. The Polaris submarine program, which provides our country with a potent and almost invulnerable nuclear striking force, was doubled by the 87th Congress. Missile development and production was sharply stepped up and a massive space exploration program has been authorized.

The Congress has responded effectively to the many challenges on the domestic scene and on the international front. The economy has started to move forward again. Certain international hot spots, which previously threatened to burst into all-out war, have been calmed.

The Congress has concentrated on building up the Nation's total strength to meet the broad demands and great challenges at home and abroad. The complete job of assuring the continuation of freedom and liberty cannot be done by any single Congress nor even in a decade, but this Congress has begun that job and has made significant contributions toward the important goals of assuring prosperity at home while maintaining stable prices and of maintaining world peace while furthering the cause of freedom and liberty.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1962

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in a world where so much is uncertain, we would keep ourselves in the constancy of Thy love—feeling solid foundations beneath our faltering feet, as with no clouds of doubt we say, "I know whom I have believed." With that one certainty—the assurance of Thy ceaseless and unchanging love—we can face whatever the years may bring, as we are saved from timidity and faintheartedness, into confidence, courage, and faith.

Now that in these solemn times the supreme test of the Nation and of all humanity has come, we pray that Thou wilt strip us of our illusions. Give us to see that if we are to march with Thy truth, we must be actively on the side of the legitimate strivings for more abundant life of Thy children under all skies. Send us forth with triumphant assurance that in spite of human blunders and folly, the victory of Thy love is sure in all the earth.

We ask it in the name of Him who came to do Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 10, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 208) to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13358) relating to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 13358) relating to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I ask unanimous consent that that committee be authorized to file in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, after the adjournment of the Congress, a report on the legislative activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia during the 87th Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the month of July 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION CONTRACT WITH HARVEY ALUMINUM, INC., TORRANCE, CALIF.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on General Services Administration Contract DMP-78 with Harvey Aluminum, Inc., Torrance, Calif., dated October 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF CRANBERRY INDEMNITY PAYMENT PROGRAM, AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of cranberry indemnity payment program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, June 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, ARVIN-EDISON WATER STORAGE DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Arvin-Edison Water Storage District, California, has been completed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 1663. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family; (Rept. No. 2289); and

H.R. 8269. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg; (Rept. No. 2290).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 3804. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the laws prohibiting espionage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3805. A bill for the relief of Abelardo Cerda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3806. A bill for the relief of Mother Azucena de San José, nee Carmen Hernandez Aguilar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF LAWS PROHIBITING ESPIONAGE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on September 18, I brought to the attention of the Senate the matter concerning the Russian employees of the United Nations engaged in spying in our country. At that time it was reported that certain Russian United Nations employees were leaving the country—scot free—after "engaging in illegitimate intelligence" activities, following a 3-year effort on their part to bribe a student assistant in the office of the U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York. These spies offered $3,000 in exchange for "information regarding internal operations of U.S. Government agencies."

I advised the Senate that I intended to call on the Justice Department for a full explanation concerning this matter. This I have done, and in response to my request the Attorney General has now responded by his letter of October 5, 1962, which I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Office of the Attorney General,
Washington, D.C., October 5, 1962.
Hon. John Stennis,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have your letter of September 18, 1962, relating to the recent incident involving two Soviet employees of the United Nations who had engaged in illegitimate intelligence activities in the United States. You asked if there had been a violation of American law and whether prosecution of these individuals was considered.

In seeking to buy the support of a candidate for legislative office in the United States and in trying to obtain information regarding internal operations of U.S. Government agencies, the two Soviets were clearly guilty of illegitimate and improper conduct, inconsistent with their obligations as international civil servants. Since these activities were a gross abuse of the privileges of residence accorded to employees of the Secretariat by the Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations, we asked the Department of State to inform the United Nations Secretariat of the activities of Mishukov and Zaitsev.

Although the activities of the two Soviet citizens were wholly improper, and in violation of their obligations as employees of the United Nations, their actions did not bring them within the literal meaning of our espionage laws which, as you may know, are strictly construed by our courts.

The information available to this Department reflected that while Mishukov urged that Flink obtain a position with the State Department in order to acquire certain information which would have been of a classified nature, Flink took no steps to obtain such a position, nor was any information of this type actually passed to Mishukov. Therefore, a substantive violation of the espionage statutes, based on the transmittal of classified information, could not be maintained. This request did, however, raise the question of whether there had been an attempt to violate the espionage statutes. Based on a study of the cases construing this point, it was concluded that Mishukov's request for information was in the nature of a solicitation or arrangement and hence constituted a preparation rather than an attempt, within the meaning of the espionage statutes. These cases hold, in general, that mere preparation is not sufficient to commit a crime (see *United States* v. *Coplon*, 185 F. 2d 629, certiorari denied 342 U.S. 920; *Lemke* v. *United States*, 211 F. 2d 73; and *Wooldridge* v. *United States*, 237 Fed. 775).

Until a short time before Mishukov left the United States on July 5, 1962, there was no evidence that other persons were acting in concert with him. Thus it was apparent that our evidence was insufficient to establish a conspiracy to violate the espionage statutes.

Prior to leaving the United States, Mishukov gave Flink $1,000, of a promised $3,000, for use in Flink's campaign for the New York State Legislature. In return for this money Flink was told the Soviets would expect him to obtain for them any "confidential documents" which might come into his possession if he was elected, and to espouse the "Soviet line" in the event of his election. Since both requests were conditioned upon Flink's election, neither could be construed as a criminal "attempt" to commit an unlawful act. Moreover, since the subject matter of the requests related, on the one hand, to nonspecific confidential documents, and on the other, to advocating Soviet policies, it could not be shown that the object of the requests was "information relating to the national defense of the United States." Thus, there could be no violation of our espionage laws.

Before he departed from this country, Mishukov introduced Flink to Yuri V. Zaitsev and told him that Zaitsev would act as his new contact. However, we have no evidence that Zaitsev had any knowledge of Mishukov's earlier request for classified information from Flink and no attempt was ever made by Zaitsev to get such information. In fact, Zaitsev's meetings with Flink appeared to be confined to making the remaining payment of $2,000. Flink's tacit agreement to advocate certain pro-Soviet policies, if elected to the State legislature, would not involve espionage. It would not have been possible, therefore, to charge Zaitsev and Mishukov with a conspiracy to violate the espionage statutes.

Thus, before calling the attention of the United Nations Secretariat to the improper actions of Mishukov and Zaitsev, this Department had already concluded that prosecution of these individuals for violation of the espionage statutes, or conspiracy to violate the espionage statutes, could not be maintained successfully.

Should you desire any additional information concerning this incident, we would be pleased to discuss the matter with you further.

Sincerely,

Robert F. Kennedy,
Attorney General.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Espionage Act now prohibits any attempt to obtain any information of designated categories connected with national defense (18 U.S.C. 793(c)), and any attempt to deliver to a foreign government any such information (18 U.S.C. 794), with intent or with reason to believe that such information is to be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of a foreign nation.

The letter of the Attorney General indicates that the Justice Department believed the evidence in the Flink case would not support a prosecution under either such provision because first, there was too little evidence to show that the "confidential information" sought by the Russians was information relating to or connected with the "national defense," and, second, the available evidence demonstrated only "preparation," as distinguished from an "attempt." It may be noted that the opinion of Judge Learned Hand in one of the cases cited by the Department, *United States* v. *Coplon*, 185 F. 2d 629, 632–633 (C.A. 2d, 1950), suggests that the interruption of an intended offense by police measures does not preclude a determination that action of the defendant constituted an "attempt," rather than mere "preparation." Although a conviction in that case was reversed on other grounds, the opinion evidences clearly a rejection of the older doctrine that preparation becomes an attempt only at the instant of consummation.

Mr. President, I am introducing at this time a bill proposing an extension of the Espionage Act to include soliciting other persons to obtain confidential information which might be used to injure the United States. I am introducing the bill at this time in order that we may have something before us immediately and for further careful study prior to the next session of Congress at which time the proposal may be reintroduced and enacted into law as early as practicable.

The bill would add to section 793 of title 18 a new subsection which adds to the presently prohibited acts of copying, taking, and obtaining, the act of soliciting or attempting to solicit any other person to copy, take, or obtain certain information from any department, agency, armed force, or other instrumentality of the United States. The proposed amendment also would broaden the class of information protected to include "any information which has been duly classified in the interest of national security as matter which may not be publicly disclosed." Finally, the proposed amendment would broaden the element of intent applicable to the new subsection by imposing criminal penalties upon persons committing the prohibited acts with reason to believe that information unlawfully obtained "may" be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of a foreign nation.

The proposed amendment contains two limiting features: First, it applies only to citizens and nationals of a foreign nation; and, second, it does not apply to any situation where the release of the information was approved in accordance with instructions promulgated by the head of the department, agency, armed force, or instrumentality concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3804) to amend title 18, United States Code, to extend the laws prohibiting espionage, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Stennis, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 793 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by—

(1) striking out the dash contained in subsection (f) thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or";

(2) adding thereto, immediately after the words "superior officer; or" in subsection (f) as so amended, the following new subsection:

"(g) Whoever, being a citizen or a national of a foreign nation, directly or indirectly by any means (1) copies, takes, or obtains, or attempts to copy, take, or obtain, or (2) solicits or attempts to solicit any other person to copy, take, or obtain, or to attempt to copy, take, or obtain, from any department, agency, armed force, or other instrumentality of the United States, without approval given by or in accordance with instructions given by the head of that department, agency, armed force, or instrumentality, any information which has been duly classified in the interest of national security as matter which may not be publicly disclosed, with intent or reason to believe that such information may be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation—" and

(3) redesignating subsection (g) thereof as subsection (h).

MOTHER AZUCENA DE SAN JOSÉ

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Mother Azucena de San José, who was born Carmen Hernández Aguilar.

Only once before have I ever taken the time of the Senate to discuss a private bill. This is such an unusual case that I feel it should be brought to the attention of the Senate by some remarks made in the RECORD. This case points up once more the harshness and inhumanity of some of the provisions of the present immigration laws.

Mother Azucena belongs to a Roman Catholic religious community known as the Mothers of the Helpless. The Mother House of this community is in Spain, where Mother Azucena was born. Before she entered the United States, Mother Azucena labored in Cuba. I know it will not be difficult for this body to imagine what happened to the Mothers of the Helpless after Castro and the Communists rose to power and took over. In 1960, as part of its relentless drive against religion and its persecution of the godly of all faiths. the Cuban regime literally put the Mothers out of the business of helping the helpless. Again, we are provided with a horrible example of how communism, with all its ideological baggage about serving the weak and oppressed, in practice stamps out every vestige of true human charity, even to the point of banishing those whose holy vows preclude physical resistance to Castro's tyranny. Mother Azucena was able to come to the United States, but only as a nonimmigrant. America is truly blessed by her presence here. For she is now back among members of her own religious order in New York City. In the New York archdiocese, the Mothers of the Helpless have been active some 40 years in ministering to the needs of the poor and the sick. Mother Azucena's work is at the Day Nursery of San José de la Montaña. There she cares for and educates children of working parents, both in a nursery for those of preschool age and in an after-school program for the older children.

To think of Mother Azucena as an alien, to my mind, Mr. President, smacks of irreverence. Her life and her work should not be confined within national boundaries. There are poor and needy people in all lands, not excluding our own. To serve them is a universal task. It obviously does not matter to Mother Azucena whether the children she cares for are the children of Spanish miners, Cuban factory workers, or New York cab drivers. In keeping with the life to which she has dedicated herself, Mother Azucena asks nothing for herself save the chance to continue to help those who need and who are now receiving her help.

But this is where our immigration laws come in. As an nonimmigrant, Mother Azucena cannot stay here indefinitely; her present visa has already expired. She is not eligible for a nonquota immigrant visa because she is not a "minister of religion" as that term is used in the law. She faces, if such a thing can be thought of, deportation from our country. She is not eligible for a first preference quota immigrant visa because her services have not been determined by the Attorney General to be of the type urgently needed in the United States. And she is not eligible for adjustment of her status to that of permanent resident because an immigrant visa would not be available to her under the oversubscribed Spanish quota to which she is chargeable.

In short, America, through its immigration laws, is saying to this mother of the helpless, to this religious who seeks nothing for herself but an opportunity to serve our people: "You have overstayed your welcome in our country and must now leave."

And so, Mother Azucena, through her Mother Superior, has had to turn to the Congress of the United States to let her remain in this country.

It makes little sense to require a special act of Congress to keep in this country a humble Mother of the Helpless, who fled here, not out of strict personal choice, but as a victim of a terrifying religious persecution by cheap tyrants for whom charity is sin and humanity antisocial.

I have the utmost faith that the Congress of the United States will not relegate Mother Azucena to the fate which our immigration statute dictates for her. But cases such as this expose the inequities of that statute. Congress will, I am confident, respond to this case with compassion. The cruel consequences wrought by the present law will not be allowed to run their course against this dedicated nun.

There is a moral to this which goes beyond the case of Mother Azucena. If our laws continue to drive from America, men and women who can contribute to our culture and skills, it is we who will suffer most. Our Nation's greatness was nourished by people who came here from every part of the world. This pipeline of human spirit cannot be shut off without draining from the United States one of the most essential ingredients of its future growth.

While I realize that there is not time remaining in this session to go through the usual processes necessary to get a report for passage of a special act in order to prevent deportation from our country of this worthy woman of God, I am introducing the bill in the hope that in the very first part of next session, when I shall reintroduce it, definitive action can be taken to enact it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3806) for the relief of Mother Azucena de San José, nee Carmen Hernandez Aguilar, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR LAWS AND TREATIES OF THE 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a supplement to the minority leader's report, as authorized by unanimous consent October 5, and printed on page 22462 of the RECORD, a summary of the major laws and treaties of the 87th Congress, 2d session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2230, House bill 8563.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8563) to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit certain policies to be issued to members of duly organized national veterans organizations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was about to ask for permission to insert in the RECORD portions of the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator make a brief statement about the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. The purpose of the bill is to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit duly authorized veterans' organizations domiciled in the District of Columbia to secure for their members participation in group life insurance programs.

Section 10 of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act (48 Stat. 1164), as amended (sec. 35-710, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), providing for the issuance of this form of insurance, does not include veterans' organizations among the persons eligible to be issued group life insurance policies.

Mr. RUSSELL. It refers to insurance from private companies?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD portions from the report other than what I have read.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Participation in group life insurance programs, therefore, has been denied to those veterans organizations headquartered in the District of Columbia. This is true even though two of the largest veterans organizations presently have in force group life insurance plans by virtue of permissive statutes in the State where they are incorporated. It does not seem desirable to the committee to discriminate against veterans organizations merely because they are domiciled in the District of Columbia. The committee therefore was unanimous in reporting favorably upon this bill.

In addition to authorizing veterans organizations to secure group life insurance for their members, the bill also establishes standards by which duly authorized veterans organizations may secure life insurance for their members, and delineates the conditions under which such members may participate in any such program. The standards and conditions so established are substantially similar to those in effect for presently eligible associations and groups.

The Board of Commissioners and the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia do not object to the bill and its enactment will not result in additional expenses for the government of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION DURING THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I wish to present a brief report on the work of that committee during the 87th Congress.

During the last 2 years the Committee on Rules and Administration had the largest legislative docket in its history. In addition, it studied and resolved a great many matters of policy related to the administration of the Senate.

In the Congress now drawing to a close, the Committee on Rules and Administration considered 379 legislative items. More than two-thirds of those measures were reported by the committee and approved by the Senate. Of the 23 bills and joint resolutions reported, 19 have become public laws as of this report.

During the first session, the committee reported on bills providing for a complete revision of the Federal election laws, for the creation of a National Portrait Gallery, for the establishment of a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board, and for the creation of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission. Also the committee reported a resolution to amend the cloture provision of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Legislative proposals reported by the committee during the second session included bills providing for the revision of the laws relating to depository libraries, for amendment of the Hatch Act to reduce the penalties for violations thereof, for the establishment in the Library of Congress of a collection of musical materials for the blind, for raising the statutory limitation on bequests to the Library of Congress, for creating and establishing a Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, for amending rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to transgression of the rule in debate, for sponsoring a Senate youth program, and for returning to the F.D.R. Memorial Commission the problem of an appropriate memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

From January 3, 1961, through October 11, 1962, the committee processed requests from Senate committees for additional funds for inquiries and investigations in the amount of $9,233,500. Legislation providing for such expenditures in the amount of $8,708,500 was approved by the committee and agreed to by the Senate.

During the 87th Congress, public hearings were held by the committee on the following subjects:

Nomination of James L. Harrison to be Public Printer.

Proposed amendments to and improvements in the Federal election laws.

Proposed amendments to the Standing Rules of the Senate and to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Preservation of evidence in Federal elections.

Adjournment of Congress.

Government Printing Office apprentices.

Depository libraries.

Senate youth program.

Among the more important administrative questions considered and resolved by the committee were those concerning reassignment of office locations in the Senate wing of the Capitol and the Senate Office Buildings; transfer of management of the Senate restaurants to the Architect of the Capitol; approval of a new legislative call system; adoption of rule designating ranking majority member as acting chairman of a standing committee in event of the death of the chairman during adjournment of Congress; conversion of old subway tunnel and disposition of old subway cars. The committee also approved and issued its customary regulations dealing with telephone and telegram allotments, travel, reporters' fees, and so forth. In addition, the staff of the committee was engaged daily in the investigation and solution of routine administrative matters.

The following publications—other than reports—were issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration during the 87th Congress:

"Election Law Guidebook, 1962"—Senate Document No. 86.

"Federal Corrupt Practices Act and Political Activities"—Senate Document No. 92.

"Legislative Recommendations of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs"—committee print.

"Proposed amendments to rule XXII"—committee print.

"Senate Election, Expulsion, and Censure Cases From 1789 to 1960"—Senate Document No. 71.

"Senate Information Folder."

"Senate Inquiries and Investigations"—committee print.

"Senate Manual"—Senate Document No. 2.

"Standing Rules of the U.S. Senate."

"U.S. Senate Travel Regulations."

Speaking as the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I am delighted to report that, throughout the 87th Congress, I enjoyed the wholehearted support of all of the members of the committee. I am beholden for the seasoned leadership brought to our deliberations by Senator Carl Hayden, the ranking majority member and former chairman of the committee, and likewise for the constant and understanding cooperation of Senator Carl T. Curtis, the ranking minority member of the committee. To Senator B. Everett Jordan, I am obligated because he has on several occasions courteously and efficiently presided over meetings as acting chairman and has also served as chairman of the demanding Subcommittees on the Library and on the Restaurant. I have been especially fortunate to have had the invaluable assistance on the committee, as well as in the Senate, of the ever-gracious and distinguished minority leader, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen. The committee and myself are also indebted for the excellent services contributed by Senator Howard W. Cannon, particularly in his challenging assignment as chairman of the very active Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. In addition, I greatly appreciate the zeal and dedication exemplified by Senators J. J. Hickey, Claiborne Pell, and Joe H. Bottum in all of the committee's activities. It was due to the excellent performance of all my colleagues on the Rules Committee that such a commendable record has been achieved and I want to take this occasion to recognize and thank them.

In closing, I also want to pay tribute to the highly competent and meritorious performance of the committee's devoted staff. In behalf of all the members of the committee, I want to express our gratitude to them for a job well done.

OFFICIAL DUTY AHEAD OF CAMPAIGNING

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the Bangor Daily News, of Bangor, Maine, has requested that I reply to a report that it has of criticism of me for not being in Maine campaigning. I have given a reply and I ask unanimous consent that my reply of today be placed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH IN ANSWER TO INQUIRY OF BANGOR DAILY NEWS, OCTOBER 11, 1962

In response to the inquiry made by the Bangor Daily News to me on reported criticism of me for not being back in Maine campaigning, I would first observe that I am doing only the very same thing that I did both in 1954 and 1960 when I was a candidate for reelection and when I put my official duty ahead of campaigning and stayed on the job in Washington and did not miss a single vote in either of those years.

Secondly, I am puzzled because none of the candidates have complained to me—no one on the State committee has complained to me—in fact, I have not received any complaint from anyone. To the contrary, in each instance where I have had to cancel my speaking engagements, people have been fully understanding in recognition that I have canceled because of the unexpected and unforeseen extension of the session—the longest session in 11 years. I am grateful for their understanding.

Thirdly, what is even more puzzling is that I should be criticized for staying on the job doing the official duties to which I was elected. One of the very difficulties of this session has been the high rate of absenteeism—so great at times that it has been impossible to muster up a quorum in order to do official business. Recently on the Senate floor, Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD made a bitter speech on absenteeism and the inability to muster up enough Senators to get a quorum because so many were out politicking instead of being in Washington attending to the official duties to which they had been elected.

And again yesterday, October 10, 1962, Majority Leader MANSFIELD made the statement on the Senate floor of "I hope that all Senators who are present will remain in the city of Washington until the business of the Senate is completed, and that those who are away and can return will do so in order that there may be enough Senators present to carry on the business of the Nation."

Had more Senators stayed in Washington on the job, the Senate would have long ago finished its business and adjourned and I would have been able to return to Maine by early September.

If I am to be criticized for staying on the job and attending to my official duties to which I was elected, then I cannot think of anything on which I would welcome criticism more. It would be helpful if the name identification of the critics would be given concurrently with the publication of their criticism instead of their being cloaked with anonymity and my being deprived of responding to them individually.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BUSH

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the adjournment of Congress in an election year always brings sadness to me because I know that some good friends will not return for the next session in January.

I am particularly sad that my very good friend, PRESCOTT BUSH, the senior Senator from Connecticut, has made the decision to retire and not seek reelection. I am confident that had he sought reelection he would have won easily.

His decision to retire is a distinct loss not only to the people of Connecticut but to the people of the entire Nation. It is a loss to the Senate. It is a distinct loss to the Republican Party—for his type of leadership is sorely needed by the Republican Party.

I have had an opportunity to observe PRESCOTT BUSH not only as a fellow member on the Senate Armed Services Committee who sat on my left—but as an individual Senator, whose seat on the Senate floor was next to mine.

I have never seen a Senator grow more in his job than PRESCOTT BUSH. Not only did he become an excellent politician in the very best sense of the word—not only did he become a leader and a respected authority in the field of legislation on which he chose to specialize—but he also became a truly dedicated and respected statesman.

The best way that I can sum up his performance and standing in the U.S. Senate is that he truly became a Senators' Senator.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on October 12 we celebrate, as do all of our fellow Americans, Columbus Day. Somehow, in recent years the drama and emotion of this holiday has grown dim. But, we should not let this happen, for this celebration symbolizes not only the beginning of the New World but also the character of the man who was responsible. Christopher Columbus was the embodiment of courage and hope, bravery and vision.

As the years rolled by, we saw many of his fellow countrymen come to this country from across the seas. They were, in essence, latter day Columbuses with a similar drive for personal exploration. These great people came here from abroad and settled our land. Some were driven by a wanderlust, some driven by oppression, but all with a similar brand of courage and hope.

So, on the day we celebrate in memory of Christopher Columbus, let us remember that the flow of immigration should not cease because now, more than ever, we need explorers from other lands far away, explorers in the sea of ideas.

We must remember that since 1492, men of vision, of hope and courage have been drawn to this country, even as if the New World were a magnet. And we, like the noble redmen, should be there to greet them.

PULASKI DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today, October 11, all over this Nation Americans of Polish extraction commemorate the contributions of the Poles to the victory of the American Revolution. Count Casimir Pulaski, a nobleman and army officer driven into exile, joined the American Revolutionary Army as an officer in 1777. He commanded a unit known as Pulaski's Legion, and was made a brigadier general and chief of cavalry in our U.S. Army. He died a hero's death leading a cavalry charge at the siege of Savannah on October 11, 1779.

Mr. President, I am proud to say that in my home State of Rhode Island in commemoration of this great Polish American, there is a Casimir Pulaski Memorial Forest of approximately 3,000 acres within which is the 100-acre Casimir Pulaski State Park. In the city of Providence, the hub of my State, in Roger Williams Park, there is a Casimir Pulaski statue. And, in Central Falls, where many Rhode Islanders of proud Polish ancestry live, there is a square and hall named after this most prominent American of Polish birth.

It is important that on this day we remember the great link of friendship that has existed for centuries between Poland and America. I myself have visited that great country several times both before World War II and since. On one occasion I recall joining the students participating in the Technical School uprising against the Communists that occurred in 1957; and, on the last, I toured the new Oder Neisse Territories now inhabited almost entirely by Poles, where 2½ million Poles have been born and an area which I believe should be recognized as an integral part of Poland.

Mr. President, let us hope that Poland will spawn more Pulaskis in order to help restore democracy to that country, just as the original Pulaski helped bring democracy to our own country.

RADIO CLEAR CHANNELS AND THE "BRECOM" PROJECT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on July 2, 1962, the House of Representatives passed House Resolution 714 concerning AM radio clear channels.

That resolution was deemed necessary by the House because in 1961 the Federal Communications Commission announced a decision to break down 13 of the 25 existing clear channels and assign other stations to share those frequencies.

House Resolution 714 expressed as the sense of the House that the FCC should preserve all 25 class I–A clear channels for a period of 1 year, during which time all stations using those channels would have an opportunity to apply for increased power above the present maximum of 50 kilowatts. The resolution further recommended that the FCC authorize such increased power, insofar as this is found to be in the public interest.

In hearings on House Resolution 714, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce received testimony that the FCC decision of 1961, if carried out, might destroy or diminish two national assets provided only by clear channel broadcasting facilities:

First. The assurance of radio reception in large rural areas comprising most of the United States, where there are no strong local nighttime stations and the population must rely on distant clear channel stations at night. This factor was ably discussed in the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan on August 7, and the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana on August 21, and I would commend attention to those remarks in the RECORD.

Second. The capability of clear channel radio stations to help maintain vital communications for defense or other Government purposes in a national emergency.

During the clear channel hearings in the House last February 2, Maj. Gen. John B. Bestic, Director of Telecommunications, U.S. Air Force, testifying for the Department of Defense, said, on a technical basis "we favor increased power and clear channel operation to aid in survivable communications."

The role clear channel stations might play in insuring "survivable communications" in a national emergency is now being demonstrated, through a 6-week test of the Broadcast Emergency Communications System—Brecom. Those tests will continue until the middle of October, under the direction of General Bestic's Air Force Telecommunications Command. They employ impulses relayed over clear channel stations during their regular broadcasts to sustain a cross-country radio-teletype circuit now operating between the Washington area and headquarters in Nebraska of the Strategic Air Command.

In that connection, Mr. President, I have been provided with a further description of the Brecom project by letter from Maj. Gen. Perry M. Hoisington II, Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, and I ask unanimous consent that his letter of October 4 and attachments thereto be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, October 4, 1962.
Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: We have attached the résumé of the Brecom project which you requested in your letter of September 27.

We hope this information will be useful. If you need further facts, please call on us.

Sincerely,
PERRY M. HOISINGTON, II,
Major General, U.S. Air Force,
Director, Legislative Liaison.

BRECOM

WHAT IS IT?

The Broadcast Radio Emergency Communications (Brecom) system provides teletype communications between high-level military command headquarters. It does so through use of commercial radio broadcasting stations without interruption to or interference with regularly scheduled commercial broadcasts.

WHAT IS ITS PURPOSE?

An enemy using nuclear weapons could disrupt essential military communications circuits. Therefore, the military must exploit every means of communicating which may survive. Brecom is one of these means which increases the probability of survival of vital military command and control capability. This capability is provided at a very nominal cost to the Government.

HOW DOES IT WORK?

Brecom is a 60-word-per-minute teletype circuit between Strategic Air Command, Offutt AFB, and the Joint Communications Agency at Fort Ritchie, Md. The circuit is capable of transmission in both directions, but not simultaneously. To provide additional reliability and survivability there are alternate routes which can be utilized. The circuits operate 24 hours daily, 7 days a week. Clear-channel broadcasting stations are utilized for Brecom because the signals emitted are sufficiently powerful and interference free to be reliably received 24 hours a day at adjacent stations a hundred or more miles away. It is this capability of the clear channel broadcasting stations which makes Brecom possible. At nighttime, when radio signals travel much farther, it is possible to operate the path between Offutt Air Force Base and Fort Ritchie with fewer relays (therefore, more reliability) than are required during the daytime. Additional power would provide this same advantage during the daytime. Because electrical storms cause severe disturbance at broadcast frequencies, maximum flexibility possible is being engineered into Brecom to provide routes around stations affected by such interference. The attachment shows the configuration of Brecom as being tested September 3, 1962–October 15, 1962. Other configurations are possible and will be tested.

OTHER COMMENT

Brecom is still in the testing stage. Results thus far indicate that Brecom is feasible and will provide a highly desirable emergency path for military communications. Subsequent to further technical improvement it is intended to include a cryptographic capability allowing transmission of classified information.

WHAT IS STATUS?

The first Brecom test was conducted from April 16, 1962–May 15, 1962. The test revealed several shortcomings, particularly in equipment and operating procedures. These were remedied. The second Brecom test is being conducted during the period September 3, 1962–October 15, 1962. Regardless of testing status of Brecom and future improvement actions, Brecom is currently an available and usable system and would be utilized in any emergency, if required.

BRECOM EAST TO WEST ROUTE

Normal route: Joint Communications Agency (JCA)—KDKA, Pittsburgh—WJR, Detroit—WGN, Chicago—WHO, Des Moines—Strategic Air Command Headquarters (SAC). (Path can be reversed.)

Alternate nighttime routes: JCA—KDKA, Pittsburgh—WSM, Nashville—SAC; or, JCA—WWL, New Orleans—SAC.

BRECOM WEST TO EAST ROUTE

Normal route: SAC—WOW, Omaha—WHO, Des Moines—KMOX, St. Louis—WHAS, Louisville—WLW, Cincinnati—KDKA, Pittsburgh—JCA. (Path can be reversed.)

Alternate nighttime routes: SAC—WOW, Omaha—WHO, Des Moines—JCA; or, SAC—WWL, New Orleans—JCA.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the last expression of the Senate on power limitations to be placed on clear channel stations was a resolution passed in the year 1938. In view of conditions pertaining at that time, it called upon the FCC to grant no station power greater than 50 kilowatts.

However, the situation prevailing now, 24 years later, would appear to recommend that the Senate restudy its position on this question; and I hope such action will be taken in the next session, if the FCC cannot take ample steps under its existing authority.

In the meantime, I would hope the FCC will follow carefully and fully the intent of the House resolution.

I believe also the clear channel stations mentioned above—including station KMOX of St. Louis, one of the great radio stations of my State—deserve our thanks for the time, the effort, and the very substantial expenditures on equipment they have contributed to development of the Brecom system.

This is but further evidence of their readiness to serve the public interest.

RESPONSIBLE LEGISLATION AT EVERY LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him, commenting upon the reporting of political news by Human Events magazine.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

It is hard for me to understand the purpose of the statement in the RECORD of October 4, 1962, entitled, "Increasing Tempo of Attack From Ultraconservative and Rightist Publications and Organizations."

I have been a long-time reader of Human Events, and I have every regard for its responsible, factual, and accurate interpretation of the news.

One principle that Human Events has proudly and openly proclaimed is that, "In reporting the news, Human Events is objective; its aims for accurate presentation of the facts." But it is not impartial. It looks at events through eyes that are biased—in favor of "limited constitutional government, States rights, private enterprise and individual freedom."

If those who are constantly supporting the New Frontier and its welfare state measures would openly proclaim their bias as honestly and frankly, the American people would not have been fooled during the past 30 years.

For in my judgment it is the support of programs and projects without telling what they will do to us—not just for us—that has led to an all-powerful centralized Government, and ostensibly in the name of "the general welfare." Human Events has helped to reveal that hidden truth.

We now see on every hand how the shameless grab for power, has been made possible by a myriad of laws, that provides the basis for such grab, even though the American people never knew that such centralization would occur, nor does the Constitution provide for it.

Human Events is among the responsible journals in America. It goes behind the scenes, and has constantly and accurately reported what is actually the consequences of important legislation, when measured against "limited constitutional government, States rights, private enterprise and individual freedom."

I do not believe that it is a crime to be for America, constitutional principles, for moral and ethical values, for local self-government, for economy in Government, for national security.

The list of those who support Human Events is impressive. I am proud to be among those who value it so highly.

Human Events has had many great statesmen on its political action conference platform, including the Senator from Virginia, HARRY BYRD, and Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, to name but two.

I have been impressed with the reporting in Human Events of the patriotic work of my colleagues in both Houses from both parties. I recall just a few to provide my colleagues with examples:

Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia.

Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota.

Senator LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio.

Senator GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona.

Senator HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida.

Congressman DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Congressman ALGER, Republican, of Texas.

Congressman UTT, Republican, of California.

Congressman WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi.

Congressman ABBITT, Democrat, of Virginia.

Congresswoman ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York.

Congressman SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia.

There are a host of others from both parties, frequently appearing in its pages.

I shall have to grant that Human Events has reported more news about Republicans than Democrats.

This, in my judgment proves not only consistency to principles but also accuracy in reporting the news. For it is clear by every measurement that in the leadership of the Democratic Party there are many more who are consistently voting for big spending and Government centralization than in the Republican Party. I would have little faith in a publication that did not report such facts. I am impressed, however, with the fact that news made by anyone—in either party—is reported without fear or favor when it involves the principles of good Government.

As I review back copies of Human Events, I am impressed with the almost prophetic implication of its reporting. For surely, the truths that have been reported ahead of events, are constantly appearing as reality today—more power, more spending, more meddling in private affairs, more loss of freedom, greater dependency on Federal handouts—to name but a few.

I am grateful that Human Events seeks to make these issues crystal clear. If only every citizen in America could read it—I am certain we would have more responsible legislation at every level of government—for our constituents would be better informed as a result.

TRIBUTE TO GORDON BROWNING

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Nashville Tennessean has just completed publication in its Sunday magazine of a three-part series about one of the most distinguished and colorful statesmen of my State, Gordon Browning.

"Cap" Browning, as he is affectionately referred to, was a hero in World War I and in World War II. He served with great distinction in the House of Representatives for a number of years; was three times the able, progressive Governor of Tennessee; chancellor of his judicial circuit; is now a successful businessman and continues an active interest in the political life of Tennessee. He is well known by many who served with him in Congress and has a host of friends throughout the United States who will be interested in this brief summary of his remarkable career.

The articles were written by George Barker in a way that aptly reflects, as the Tennessean puts it, "the huzzahs and heartaches of life in a goldfish bowl" by a great man who has been there.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF WAR, PEACE, AND POLITICS

(By George Barker)

His bold stride has shrunk to a shuffle and the scars of time and political conflict are plain to see. But Gordon Weaver Browning moved across the courthouse square at Jackson last week with the undefeated mien of a retired dragon slayer.

Men reached out to shake his hand, to squeeze his arm and ask, "How you doing, Cap?" Women shoppers went out of their way to smile up at him and to ask after his wife, "Miss Ida."

Browning accepted it all with grace befitting a 72-year-old veteran of a million hellos. He had a knee-slapping story for some of the men, flashes of southern gallantry for all the ladies.

At home in west Tennessee where it all started, Browning is basking in the reflected warmth of a remarkable career which encompassed 30 of the most politically heated years in Tennessee history.

The lives and times of Gordon Browning include three tempestuous terms as Governor of Tennesse, 12 years in Washington as Congressman from the Seventh District, soldiering in two World Wars, tussling with justice as a country judge and lawyer—besides winning questionable fame as an off-key vocalist and an incurable raconteur of yeasty homilies.

Browning also has suffered defeat in sufficient quantity to break most men. If man is a political animal, Browning carries the teeth marks on his hide to prove it.

And his words carry the echoes of a thousand caucuses, dozens of campaigns, won and lost:

"I don't think anybody has any doubts about my relationship with Ed Crump. I devoted my life to defeating that man and what he stood for."

"A judge isn't God. That one we were talking about was a black-robed braying jackass. And he had other faults."

"So I told Roosevelt, 'Mr. President, I came back to give you some free advice. Now listen.'

"I sang 'The Tennessee Waltz' on the 'Grand Ole Opre' stage and I was such a big hit they wanted me to come back. But I told them nothing doing. Not after the way they ran Roy Acuff against me in 1948."

"In politics, they seldom beat you with the issues. They just pick you to death with little things."

In towns and hamlets from the Smokies to the Mississippi, untold thousands can still tell about the last time they heard Browning.

Sparks flew when he spoke and there was thunder. There was laughter and tears.

Campaigning in the late summer heat, he would stand before the people in his shirt sleeves, his loud necktie resting damply against a bulging beltline, and he would pitch scalpel-sharp humor at his political enemies.

As if from a bottomless well, parables and anecdotes were marched forth to illustrate and help explain matters of finance. And when Browning spoke of fundamental Americanism and righteousness, nobody had to search for the meaning.

And he could eat.

"Eat? What you talking about," exclaims Hugh "Swat" Scarbrough, Carroll County Sheriff. "I've seen him put away, one after the other, big plates of barbecued possum, sheep, goat, coon, and pork—all the time shaking hands and smiling and eating. I can eat. But Gordon Browning—he could really eat."

Nowadays, the Browning appetite is more conventional, and he speaks with the easy candor of a man who no longer is running for anything. He has adjusted to his job as president of the Tennessee Valley Life Insurance Co. and he is learning to live with the effects of Parkinson's disease which hit him 2 years ago.

His thoughts are not being projected here as an instructional piece of how to make it from chopping cotton to the Governor's mansion.

Rather, Browning is important because his sometimes swashbuckling experiences help illuminate a bizarre hunk of history which started in 1920 when Tennessee elected a Republican Governor and continued through the reign of political bossism as patented by Memphis' Ed Crump.

Always a political slugger, Browning doesn't hide his pride for his great-grandfather, Thomas Brooks, who is credited with clobbering Gov. John Sevier during an all-day fist fight on the Jonesboro square a century and a half ago. A stonemason, the man had helped build the Hermitage for Andrew Jackson and was defending Jackson's reputation when he took on Sevier.

A more constructive segment of the Browning heritage undoubtedly was supplied by his grandfather, Thomas V. Brooks, who served in the Tennessee Legislature. Brooks was a liberal, remembered for his demands that America abandon the gold standard.

Browning enjoys a couple of classic advantages for an American politician—he was born poor and on a farm.

He was the youngest of four children born to James H. and Melissa Browning who scratched subsistence out of a hillside farm near Atwood in Carroll County.

After a youth spent in classroom and cottonfield—and listening to his grandfather's political arguments on back porches of their homes in Carroll and Gibson Counties—Browning got a job teaching school at Milan.

At age 20, however, he left home to attend Valparaiso University in Indiana ("because it was cheap") and later studied law at Cumberland University in Lebanon.

And in 1915 he came to Huntington to practice law.

"My father said, 'Son, you're making a terrible mistake setting up your office here,'" Browning recalls. "'Nobody in Carroll County has any money. You'll be taking your fees in jars of jam.'"

"But I told him I didn't really intend to be a lawyer very long. I just came back to beat Thetus Sims out of his seat in Congress. Sims has had the seat too long and he isn't doing very much. I know I can take him."

While the advent of World War I undoubtedly postponed Browning's political debut, it did much to insure his future success. He came out of the war adrip with confidence, heroism, and desire for true-blue rugged Americanism.

Browning's wartime adventures are woven with threads of high comedy.

By usual perverse military logic, his legal training won him a commission in the Field Artilley and he was dispatched to assume command of Battery A, 114th Field Artillery Regiment in training in South Carolina.

It didn't take Browning long to decide he'd been had.

Battery A was a high-spirited bunch, some of whom responded to military order with the enthusiasm of dead end kids. They had "run off" the previous battery commander and was prepared to give their young Lieutenant Browning the same treatment.

"I decided right off I was going to have to make a deal," Browning says. "So I called together my sergeants and we had a little talk.

"I told them if they wanted to continue being a no-account outfit, of no value to themselves or their country, I wouldn't try to stop them. But, on the other hand, if they wanted to amount to something and have a lot of fun and glory whipping the pants off Kaiser Bill, I would be honored to help them."

Some say this must have been Browning's greatest campaign speech. Within a few months he was promoted to captain and took his outfit overseas where they fought with valor in three major engagements—Meuse-Argonne, St. Mihiel, and Woevre—which helped break the German's famous Hindenburg line. Browning maintains "no better fighters existed in World War I—or any war."

Browning was decorated by the American and French Governments for his leadership in these battles. On two occasions he was knocked down and covered with dirt by shell explosions.

"I came nearer getting killed the last 15 minutes of the war than at any other time," Browning recalled years later. "We had orders to cease firing at 11 a.m., November 11, 1918. I put all my men under cover in a big German concrete pillbox we had taken.

"Together with two other officers, I slipped into a smaller pillbox that faced out toward the lines. Fifteen minutes before 11 o'clock they opened fire on us with a battery of 77's. They fired more than 300 rounds and hit the box twice.

"But they quit promptly at 11 o'clock and we crawled out. We went over and talked to those Germans. You'll never believe it, but they thought they had won the war. That nearly started an argument all over again."

Browning brought his outfit home and prepared to vent his political ambition on Congressman Sims. He campaigned tirelessly, accompanied by a German police dog, "Kaiser," he had liberated. (Sims is reported to have said later, "Browning didn't beat me, the dog did.")

Just before the primary, the members of Battery A threw a party in Browning's honor. It was held in Memphis.

After the usual amenities, a special "two-man election committee" called Browning aside.

"Now, Cap," one of the men said. "We want to help you win that election and we understand there's one particular Sims man who's giving you fits. What's his name and where does he live?"

Browning told them and asked what they intended to do.

"Well, Cap, there doesn't seem to be much we can do except kill the——."

It came as a distinct disappointment to the men when Browning insisted that nobody be killed. It was this same brand of loyalty, however, which persisted and prompted some of the same men to start a "Browning for President" campaign after World War II.

At any rate, he defeated Sims in a bloodless Democratic primary in 1920. At the same time, Lon Scott, a young Savannah lawyer, won the Republican nomination.

Scott and Browning had been friends at law school, and this friendship continued into the campaign. The men canvassed the district in joint debate, riding in the same auto to save expenses.

Browning was confident of victory. Then the roof caved in.

The landslide for President Warren G. Harding reached into Tennessee where Republican Alfred A. Taylor was swept into the Governor's office. And Republican Scott defeated Democrat Browning in the congressional race.

The defeat was doubly bitter for young Browning. He and Miss Ida Leach, an attractive young lady whose folks ran a boarding house at Huntingdon, had planned to marry on November 11. Browning had dreamed of carrying his bride off to Washington.

"But Miss Ida married me anyway," Browning says.

Two years later Browning took on Scott again. This time he won and was elected to the first of six consecutive terms.

In 1933, Browning bucked the powerful influence of President Roosevelt on a provision in the administration's economy bill. Browning charged that it lopped 50 percent off veterans' appropriations and left some totally disabled veterans with grants of only $8 a month.

"I fought the veterans' provision tooth and toenail in committee," Browning recalls. "Speaker Rainey told me in advance he wouldn't even recognize me if I tried to fight it on the floor. So all I could do was watch them enact it into law."

After the law was passed, veterans' complaints followed in such volume that many Congressmen got together on a move to liberalize the provisions. Browning led this fight. All benefits were restored.

Fed by such victory, Browning decided to step up to the Senate. In 1934 he announced himself a candidate against U.S. Senator Nathan L. Bachman. In his platform Browning pledged support of veterans, farmers, and the TVA, opposed cancellation of war debts and praised the Roosevelt administration. His campaign manager was a young man from Carthage named ALBERT GORE.

One of the factors against him in this campaign was that the State's other Senator, K. D. McKellar, also was from west Tennessee. Browning said there was no real reason why both Senators should not come from the same grand division of the State.

"Modern transportation has moved us so close together that this fiction has no use except as a political bogey," he said.

Another factor against Browning was Edward Hull Crump, political boss of Shelby County. Crump supported Senator Bachman.

And Browning lost the election.

Many political observers have said Browning never forgave Crump for his "interference" in the election—despite the strange twist in their relationship a few years later.

In 1936 Browning announced his candidacy for Governor of Tennessee. Hill McAlister had stepped down and Browning was opposed in the primary by Burgin E. Dossett, young superintendent of Campbell County schools.

Ten days before the election, Crump unerringly sensed the public mood and embraced Browning. Browning achieved victory by a margin of 100,000 votes—60,000 of which came from Crump's Shelby County.

The romance, however, was destined to be a short one.

Political know-it-alls were shocked out of their galluses when Browning openly broke with Crump just a few weeks after the inauguration.

Crumpians accused Browning of doublecross. Browning's best friends wondered if maybe "Cap" wasn't committing political suicide.

What triggered the break?

"Ed Crump came to me a few weeks before the election and asked how much influence Luke Lea was going to have with me," Browning says. "As you know, Lea was my colonel in France. He was publisher of the Nashville Tennessean and a fierce foe of Crump.

"Well, I told Crump that I valued my friendship with Colonel Lea and that I would walk a long way to help him. But that neither Lea nor Crump nor anyone else was going to run the governor's office if I won the election.

"Well, 10 days before the voting, Crump came out for me. But I wasn't in office anytime at all before he became highly irritated. I wasn't consulting him before making appointments. I wasn't asking for his advice.

"I told him I was going to reorganize finances and get the State's business out of the hands of bondholders to whom we had been in debt since 1911—I told him this was going to be done without graft or rake-off."

Browning says Ed Crump grew increasingly belligerent and accused him of "selling out to the Luke Lea crowd."

"Finally, I just had to tell him the score straight out.

"I said, 'Mr. Crump, you're not giving instructions here. You can ride if you want to but you can't drive. I'm driving this wagon. I'm Governor of Tennessee.'"

VICTORY, DEFEAT, AND VICTORY

(By George Barker)

As polling places across the State closed on a warm August evening in 1936, a Crumpman from west Tennessee squealed his steaming auto to a stop outside Gordon Browning's election headquarters in Nashville.

"How did it look when you left your district?" asked Browning, sweating out the results of his first race for the governorship of Tennessee.

"Cap, you don't have a thing to worry about," the visitor crowed. "You won my box, 732 to 3."

"But how can you be so sure?" Browning asked. "You must have left your place 4 hours ago. The votes are just now being counted."

"I tell you the vote is 732 to 3," the man winked. "If it comes out any different, then it's crooked."

The vote from that box did, indeed, come up 732 to 3.

And while Browning won the Democratic primary by 100,000 votes, he couldn't shake his concern about the methods Ed Crump had employed to get him 60,000 of those votes out of Shelby County.

As we spoke in his office at Jackson a couple of weeks ago, Browning recalled the incident with unmasked regret. It touched off what may well have been the stormiest term of a Tennessee Governor ever spent on Capitol Hill—a term which affected a fantastic career virtually unmatched by any American.

After serving 12 years in Congress, Browning was to be a three-time Governor of a State, a judge, and a military governor in World War II Europe.

"I never asked for Crump's support back in 1936 and I surely didn't ask for—nor need—stolen votes," Browning said. "The Crump method of vote getting at the voting booth level was sure and simple. * * *"

Every legitimate ballot box had a twin hiding under the table. When the polls closed, the honest box was taken for an unromantic ride to the river while poll workers gleefully went through the motions of counting the premarked ballots in the other.

When, a few months after his inauguration, Governor Browning told Crump to pack his bag of tricks and get out, the Governor knew too well the tactics he would face in his bid for reelection.

If Browning ever suffered from self doubt or moments of political misgiving, he kept it a secret. Abristle with determination, he swung boldly into a two-way offensive to "show the people of Tennessee what good government could do" and to break up the Crump machine.

The first part of his program stands as a monument to the man's vision: Among other things, he employed outside financial experts to help him draw up a plan for the orderly retirement of the State's debts. He launched the State's first major rural roads program and pushed pay raises for teachers. He created the department of conservation and ordered it to plan the system of State parks which now covers the State.

He felt himself at one with the people and he played the State's business like a nightclub pianist doing nothing but request numbers.

It was in this spirit of ebullience that he confronted President Roosevelt in Washington—a confrontation never described publicly until now.

"Senator Bachman had died unexpectedly and there was a lot of speculation as to whom I would appoint to serve out his term," Browning recalls. "One day the President called and asked me to come see him in Washington.

"When I got there he told me 'Now, Governor, I'm not going to tell you whom to appoint to that Senate post. I'm just going to tell you whom not to appoint. You are not to name Cordell Hull. I need him here.'

"Well, as you probably know, Judge Hull wasn't especially happy about his position as Secretary of State at that time. He felt the President was bypassing him in too many instances—that he wasn't being allowed to do a job.

"Anyway, I told the President, 'I certainly appreciate your advice in this matter. But I can assure you the right to name the next Senator belongs to the people of Tennessee, not to the President of the United States. I'll let you know what I decide.'"

Browning went to see Hull the same day. He told the Secretary of his interview with President Roosevelt. Browning offered the Senate seat to Hull, then and there, if Hull wanted it.

"After I finished talking, Judge Hull just sat there in a straight chair with his long legs stretched out in front of him, his hands in his pants pockets. He just sat there for awhile staring at a crack in the floor.

"Then he said, 'Gordon, I am honored by your offer. But if the President says he needs me, I had better stay. You know, this is the first time I have ever been sure he even knew I was in town'."

Browning returned to President Roosevelt and told him he could relax about the Hull matter. At the same time, he lectured the President on the art of getting along better with people who worked for him. The President took it with a grin.

While Browning rode high as an able and honest administrator of the State's affairs, he kept finding himself unhorsed in his role as dragon slayer.

Specifically, he had hoped to dehorn Crump by ramming a county unit vote law through the legislature. This would have nullified the large blocs of votes the Crump machine could build up in Shelby County. The Governor would have been elected by a sort of electoral college system.

Metropolitan newspapers jumped all over Browning on this issue and the bitterness prevailed even after the State supreme court ruled the law unconstitutional.

And when Browning threatened to send the National Guard into Shelby County to supervise the election, criticism of his strong-arm tactics mounted.

"Americans will not be made to vote at bayonet point," one editorial warned. "Browning wants to be a bigger dictator than the dictator he is fighting."

Crump backed Prentice Cooper in 1938 and the race was on.

In characteristic rock-'em, sock-'em manner, Browning carried his fight to courthouse squares across the State.

"Just give me something to stand on and ring a bell," he would shout at his campaign helpers. "I'll tell the people the score and they'll understand."

Cooper campaigned a lot more quietly. He said little and smiled a lot. And he won.

In 1939, at age 50, it appeared to many that Gordon Browning was through as a political personality of consequence.

"I didn't feel as if I were through," Browning says. "I felt then as I feel now—that the election was stolen from me. The people never had a chance."

Browning returned to Huntingdon and set up a small law office near the courthouse square. Soon afterward, however, he was elected to the job of chancellor of the eighth chancery division. He describes the position as the "best job a country lawyer could ask for."

"I could size up a case and decide to hear it myself. Or I could order a jury to hear it. And if I didn't agree with the jury's verdict, I could throw it out and decide it myself. It was an interesting situation. A real good job."

But World War II was on and old soldier Browning wanted in. After maneuvering around Washington political foes who didn't want to see him get a chance to make political hay with another Army career, Browning climbed back into uniform with his World War I rank of captain.

He attended an Armed Forces School of Military Government and in early 1944 was dispatched to England where he directed the organization of military government for Gen. Dwight Eisenhower.

He was a colonel when he followed the troops into Belgium and personally reestablished civil government there. Characteristically, he was a lot more popular with the Belgians than he was with the U.S. Army brass.

"When I set up headquarters in Brussels, Belgium, I had maybe a 30-day supply of food on hand," Browning recalls. "The Army told me to let the people go ahead and use up what they had—that the Army would supply them after that.

"Well, that's what we did. But about the time the Army was supposed to start supplying us, the Battle of the Bulge hit and everything went a little haywire.

"The Belgian Government, which had gone to England when the Germans invaded their country, kept calling to ask if it was safe for them to return. They wondered if the Germans would retake Belgium. And I had to keep telling them to stay in England a while longer.

"But the worst part was I had promised 8 million Belgians I would feed them and the Army was too involved in the Bulge to ship in any food. I was told I was just out of luck. Well, I went over a lot of heads and laid the matter before General Eisenhower. I said, 'This is no way to treat our friends.'

"Pretty soon, the food started coming in. But my name wasn't worth much in certain Quartermaster outfits from that time on."

Browning speaks fondly of his association with the Belgians. He says they were quick to exercise their democratic rights after years of Nazi dictatorship.

"They were great on calling 1-day general strikes. They pulled three of them on me. The first time they were protesting the shortage of pit props—you know, the timbers you use to shore up mines. Well, we went into Germany and liberated some pit props for them.

"The next general strike was called in protest to an acute shortage of bicycle tires. They go almost everywhere on their bicycles there. I settled that with a few shipments of tires.

"But the last time they struck it was the protest of President Roosevelt's death. I told them, 'I got you the pit props and I got you the bicycle tires. But believe me, there's nothing I can do about the President's death. You might just as well get back to work.' They did."

Browning had moved on into Germany and was Governor of the State of Bavaria when thousands of his friends back in Tennessee entered his name in the 1946 race for Governor. Browning said, in effect, he would do nothing to hinder such action but he would not further his candidacy.

"There was nothing I could do," Browning says. "I was still in the Army and I had agreed to do a job over there that needed doing."

As the campaign for Browning grew, the forces of incumbent Gov. Jim McCord circulated the idea that "Browning has no intention of returning to politics. He doesn't want to be Governor." Browning, involved in the German denazification program, kept mum. His silence seemed to add credence to the McCord claims.

Finally, Mrs. Ida Browning stepped into the picture. To fully understand the enormity of her action, you have to know a little about "Miss Ida," the darling of Carroll County. She had, and has, a passion for staying out of the picture.

A woman of great wit and charm she, nonetheless, had observed a self-imposed rule that "the most important thing a politician's wife can do for her husband is to keep her mouth shut."

At any rate, in July of 1946, Miss Ida could hold her silence no longer. "I couldn't stand by and watch my husband's enemies profess to tell the people what my husband was thinking."

She taped a 15-minute radio talk that declared "Gordon Browning is in this race to win." She prefaced her remarks with the apology, "I'm much better at canning than I am at speaking."

Mrs. Browning, an excellent canner, was wrong about her speaking. Browning didn't win in 1946, but Miss Ida's talk helped him win 120,000 votes, without his ever setting foot in Tennessee which helped set the stage for the climactic 1948 campaign.

Browning squared off against McCord but never took his eye off Crump.

Both men were fighting for their lives—Browning, trying to make a comeback after a decade off the hill; Crump, certain he would be finished if Browning succeeded.

"Browning is the kind of man who would milk his neighbor's cow through a crack in the fence." Crump raged. "He has as much chance of becoming Governor again as a one-legged grasshopper in a turkey field."

Browning hurled his answer to crowds which gathered at almost every town and city to hear him. He was up at dawn each day, barreling from one speech to the next at goosepimply speeds. He made from six to eight talks during the day—a couple more at night.

Fatigued reporters assigned to cover Browning called their editors and begged for relief—"I don't know what's keeping the Old Man going, but I've had it."

"We are headed for the most thorough housecleaning in Tennessee that ever confronted abusers of power!" Browning shouted, "There is work, to be done * * * we must improve our penal system * * * our best chance to save TVA is with me and Harry Truman—no matter what you think of his civil rights program."

At the same time, Representative ESTES KEFAUVER announced his candidacy for the U.S. Senate. He was opposed by the incumbent Senator Tom Stewart and Judge John Mitchell of Cookeville. Crump abandoned Stewart and threw his support to Mitchell. In usual fine voice, Crump compared KEFAUVER to a pet coon.

Browning and KEFAUVER stumped the State with a common target—Crump. KEFAUVER took the pet coon tag and ran with it. "I may be a pet coon," he admitted, "but I assure you I'm not Mr. Crump's pet coon."

Browning felt the tide of battle going his way. His only concern was for the ballot box shenanigans which might be pulled in Shelby County.

It was here he decided to marshal his "secret army."

"I got together about 30 good-looking, strong young men and sent them to Shelby County on election day," Browning says with a chuckle. "Each one of them had a 'Federal badge.' They had instructions to show themselves at each polling place. That's all. Just show themselves!"

As Browning tells the story he laughs harder and harder until his face pinks up and his eyes shut.

"Well, these young men just circulated around the polling places. Anytime anyone asked who they were they would just show this badge. Pretty soon, these racketeers were calling Crump, one by one, and saying, 'Hey, my place is crawling with FBI men! The deal is off!'

"I believe it's the first honest election Shelby County had seen in 20 years!"

Browning beat McCord, Kefauver beat Stewart with Crump's Mitchell running a poor third. Crump was beaten—as it turned out, for all time.

Who were the men in Browning's "secret army" and where did they get those badges?

"That," says Browning, "is a military secret!"

THREE TIMES AND YOU'RE OUT

(By George Barker)

Far better is it to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat.—THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

It's about 35 miles from Gordon Browning's home in Huntingdon to his insurance company office in Jackson and Browning drives it 5 days a week, batting down U.S. 70 like his pants are on fire.

The road is straight and good and runs between gentle hills upon which the leaves have begun to turn. Some already are bright and beautiful and frost can no longer hurt them.

Browning likes the drive; the barns and farms that zip past the car are steadfast and friendly. As are the towns—Leach and Cedar Grove, Springcreek and Gilmore. The drive gives him time to think and to talk.

For a man who first successfully stumped the district 40 years ago to win a seat in Congress, there is much to think and talk about:

"I remember when Mizz Idy and I first went to Washington. You know, she never was much of a social butterfly," he chortled. "One night she just refused to attend some social function we had been invited to and I accused her of being a terrible wife for a Congressman to have.

" 'That's all right, Sonny,' she told me, 'I'll be a mighty fine wife to settle down with after you get beat.' "

Browning laughed so hard at the memory of it, he had to fish a handkerchief from his pocket and wipe his eyes.

"Poor girl, she had to wait a long time. You know, until 10 years ago, she never had a home of her own—Washington apartments, two different Governor's mansions in Nashville, living with her folks or her sister in-between times and when I was overseas.

"But in 1953 we built this place. She loves it."

I asked Browning why they didn't move into Jackson to be closer to his work.

"I married a Huntingdon girl," he said. "She just won't go. And I'm too old to start living alone—or to organize another woman."

Browning was a long time getting beat—really beat. For awhile, it seemed he never would.

Gordon Browning's return to the governorship of Tennessee in 1949 could have been more triumphant only if he had galloped up Capitol Hill on a white charger.

In defeating Jim McCord, he had evened the score with his old nemesis, Ed Crump.

He had confounded the skeptics who didn't believe Browning could make a comeback after 10 years of political inactivity.

Times were good and Browning moved with sure-footed confidence to make them better.

He cut insurance rates and launched the Capitol Hill redevelopment program. He started work on the Cordell Hull Building, the State Library Building, a new State school for the blind at Donelson.

Miles of paved roads were carved into the countryside and new bridges were thrown across rivers. Central State Hospital was expanded, a new State tuberculosis hospital was built and A. & I. State College was beefed up to qualify for university status.

Loopholes were plugged in tax collecting agencies. Deadbeats (including the family of a wealthy banker) were pruned off welfare roles.

Teachers got pay increases averaging $500, more free textbooks were shipped to the schools, new parks sprung up across the land, more industry moved in.

No less than his grandfather who had fought bare-knucks for Andrew Jackson 150 years ago, Browning is a Jacksonian. He rewarded his friends and punished his enemies.

One of his first acts as Governor was to march into the State highway patrol radio room and ask to be connected with a particular trooper who had "tried to steal votes from me."

When the hookup was established, Browning grabbed the microphone:

"Trooper ———. I have it on good authority that you have been messing with ballot boxes," Browning's voice went out over the airwaves. "What do you say to that?"

"Well, Governor," replied the officer, "I guess I can't deny it."

"You're fired. As of right now. Fired."

Browning moved his wife into the new Governor's mansion on Curtiswood Lane. And from various sections of the State he brought in men he knew, men he thought he could trust to help him run an honest administration.

Not the least of these was his brother, Flavius, who served as his administrative assistant. The relationship between Flavius and Gordon Browning was an uncommon one.

"We were mighty close," Browning says. "F. L. was 22 months older than I. But when it was his time to start school he had to wait for me, so we could both use the same books. We went all through school together.

"We fought now and then—but never to a finish. He was different from me. He was the quiet, studious one * * * he's the one who never lost his temper * * *"

When Browning's critics accused him of nepotism, Browning said "I can't do without F. L. and I won't do without him if I can help it—and I can help it."

The days were long and busy. And sometimes Browning took his work home with him.

"I remember one night in particular," Browning says. "There was a young boy out at State prison awaiting execution. He had killed a policeman, I think. The Supreme Court was asking me to commute his sentence; the district attorney and the police were advising me to let the execution go ahead. The answer seems clear now, but I couldn't make up my mind * * *.

"I went home and laid the problem out before Miss Ida, I asked her what she would do.

"She said, 'Sonny, who has more experience at recognizing justice—you, or the district attorney, or the police, or the Supreme Court?'

"I told her the Supreme Court did, of course.

"She just picked up the phone and dialed the prison number. Then she handed it to me and said 'Now you just tell the warden to let that boy go.'

"You know? That's exactly what I did. Today that boy is in business in California and is raising a beautiful little family. I don't think they realize what they owe Miss Ida."

The Browning day in office was fast and frantic, but the Governor watched for a chance to slip out with the zeal of a schoolboy.

He would call old friends and without much notice take off—hunting for geese on Hudson Bay with Attorney John Hooker, Sr.; fishing in Florida's St. John River with Sam Neal of Carthage; long bull sessions with Nashville Mayor Tom Cummings and the late Silliman Evans, Sr., publisher of the Nashville Tennessean; trips to Chicago to "eat and talk" with Attorney Jack Norman.

When Texas Governor Allan Shivers challenged Browning to a musical bout during Sugar Bowl festivities in 1951, Gordon laid back the audience with a powerful rendition of "The Tennessee Waltz"—delivered with far more enthusiasm than talent.

And when Patti Page recorded the song, he commissioned her a colonel on his staff. He liked the idea so well, he followed it with similar presentations to Dinah Shore, Grace Moore, Walt Disney, and Elmer Hinton.

During all this he ran for reelection in 1950 and defeated Clifford Allen without hardly raising sweat.

It seemed there was little Browning could do wrong. He spent the State's money in a grand manner but he counted every dime of it with the diligence of a country storekeeper. Going against the advice of the State's attorney, he sued a major oil company for taxes on products they sold on a U.S. airfield near Memphis. And he collected $5 million for Tennessee.

Browning did things.

But as any student of political history might have warned him, he was inexorably approaching the point of doing "too much."

Every action incites reaction. Every reaction reduces the margin of political advantage—until the margin is so slim the candidate can't afford a single mistake.

In 1952, during the months that preceded his reelection campaign against Frank Clement, Governor Browning made two "mistakes."

The first was manifested by what Clement was to call "the Memorial Apartment Hotel scandal."

The Memorial Apartment Hotel, now occupied by a portion of the National Life & Accident Insurance Co., stood across Seventh Avenue from the War Memorial Building at Charlotte.

A group of investors bought it for about $600,000. The Browning administration then took an option to buy it for about $1,700,000—the money to come from rents paid by the Federal Employment Security Agency which was then occupying the premises. After 15 years, the building would have reverted to State use.

Thus, Browning claimed, the State would have acquired a valuable piece of office property at virtually no out-of-pocket expense while the Federal Government paid no higher rents than it was paying anyhow.

Clement, however, charged that Browning's friends stood to clear a cool million dollars on the deal and left no doubt that Browning would help cut the pie.

Browning challenged Clement to prove his insinuations in court. Clement wouldn't—but he kept making the charge in his speeches. And people listened.

Browning also had to contend with trouble from other directions. It was the kind of trouble that transformed one of his greatest strengths—a stubborn loyalty to those he loved—into a glaring weakness.

For one thing, his brother Flavius died of cancer and it hit the Governor hard.

And Browning had to start watching over his shoulder for increasing instances of financial chicanery among some people who took advantage of his trust in them.

"Good men, such as Browning, are too often naive as to the intentions of their contemporaries," says one of Browning's loyal friends. "Good men indulge too deep in the presumption that others are as good—and that their intentions are as correct. Evil men will attach themselves to such a man to share his mantle of dignity. And when, finally, their evil deeds become known, the good man must share their guilt before an undiscerning public which is often cruel in its wrath."

There is reason to believe Browning might have survived all this, had it not been for the Democratic National Convention which broke just a couple of months before the Tennessee primary.

"Governor Browning asked me to arrange for the Tennessee delegation to Chicago," says Jack Norman. "I told him I would. At the same time I begged him to stay home.

"No Governor should allow himself to get involved in the controversy of national politics. But we were going to Chicago to nominate Estes Kefauver for President and Gordon said he wouldn't turn his back on Kefauver."

The convention was one of the most tumultuous on record. Much of the tumult centered about Kefauver's middle-of-the road stand on integration and his insistence that all State delegations support the nominee chosen by the convention—a sort of "loyalty oath" was needed, the Senator said.

This was aimed at Dixiecrats who had bolted the party in the presidential election of 1948.

"Gordon was told he would be given the opportunity to speak in Kefauver's behalf the next day," Norman says. "That night I went to him and pleaded with him. 'This is going to cause scars back home,' I said. 'Be smart. Say nothing. I'm vice chairman of the delegation—I'll make your talk for you. You have nothing to gain and everything to lose.'

"He said, simply, 'ESTES KEFAUVER is a Tennessean. The Governor of his State has been asked to take a position * * * I can't walk away from it.' "

That was Browning's second "mistake."

When he came home, Browning found segregationist newspapers charging that he had "turned his back on the South"—an irony in that Browning was, and is, a segregationist.

Undismayed, he climbed back into his car and, with an entourage of reporters, stumped the State.

"Frank Clement is trying to sew up places that haven't been ripped," he roared. "He has a torch with which to burn—but no hammer with which to build—he's nothing but a political adventurer."

Of the Memorial Apartment Hotel deal he said, "I'm not defending it—I'm bragging about it."

He termed his Chicago stand for KEFAUVER "a call to duty."

During brief moments of relaxation, usually caught at night while he was being driven from one campaign stop to the next, Browning would produce his French harp (harmonica) and provide accompaniment to the "old timey" songs being sung by others in the car.

But the next morning he would be ready to roar and roll again.

"Efforts to defeat me include slanders, vilifications, denunciations, and misstatements of facts and principles the like of which I never before encountered in 30 years of politics * * *."

Browning's forensic slugging still packed the old wallop. But, somehow, the contest was that of a slugger tangling with a fancy dan. Clement was dazzling them with his footwork.

When Browning attacked Clement's career in the FBI with the jibe. "An FBI man? Why Frank Clement couldn't track an elephant in 10 feet of snow."

Clement would answer "That may be, but I sure tracked down that Memorial Apartment deal."

And when they carried the fight to the people via television, Browning looked as comfortable in the TV glare as a man trying to scratch his nose in an iron lung.

He spoke of the need to keep the State out of debt to people whose TV sets were owned, as often as not, by a finance company.

He spoke resentfully of "outsiders who were subsidizing Clement's subtle campaign to end segregation"—this, to a State being increasingly populated by "outsiders" who believed, along with many Tennesseans, that something was going to have to be done about segregation.

Browning, like such other gaslight era phenomena as the free lunch and the torchlight parade, just was not cut out for the age of television.

He lost in 1952. Bad.

"The people expect full bodily sacrifice on the public altar," he said during his farewell speech. "But I love people and I have enjoyed serving them. There will never be a time in my life when political interest will be lost by me. There is no way to get rid of me."

In 1954, at age 65, he ran again against Clement, trying to make a third comeback. It didn't work. He lost again.

Some of his friends say Browning lost a lot more than an election in 1954. They say he suffered a personal loss from which he never fully recovered—a loss of his identification with the people. Those who see him every day on the streets of Jackson or at home in Huntingdon know this isn't so.

Browning's Ford carries the license number "3X." As we sped up U.S. 70 toward Huntingdon, people saw the plate and waved.

"The number says I'm the third living ex-Governor," he said. "Cooper, McCord, and me.

"A man in politics has to accept defeat when it comes," he said. "A lot of things have been said in the heat of a campaign. I've won and I've lost. But thinking back, there's really only man I find it hard to forgive.

"So far as I know, Gov. Frank Clement is the only person to impute dishonesty and crookedness to me in public office."

Browning wheeled his car up the driveway of his home. Miss Ida came out of the kitchen to meet him. Dinner was about ready, she said.

THE REPUBLICAN REPORT OF U.S. SENATOR EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN, OF ILLINOIS, MINORITY LEADER FOR THE 2D SESSION, 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, never in the history of the Nation has the Congress spent so much time accomplishing so little as it did in the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The President made over 550 legislative requests of the 87th Congress, employing over 225,000 words in so doing. Despite the fact that he had a nearly two-thirds majority in the Senate, and a 3-to-2 majority in the House, he obtained less than 10 percent of what he requested. Part of the vast amount of time expended in this legislative effort in which a lion gave birth to a mouse involved three mutinies by his own party, the most notable conducted by the Democrat liberals who had always denounced filibusters. Twenty-two business days, almost a full month, were lost in filibustering.

One problem clearly, too, was that the President's program involved a fundamental change in the American system with big government intended to supersede the place of the free enterprise system, which has made America great. Incorporated, in fact, in this program for a basic change were over 85 requests for additional spending and 28 requests for increased Executive power. Apparently his own party leaders in the Congress felt that the President's program was unpopular with the public. In any case, the 16 committee chairmen of the Senate, all Democrats, voted an accumulative total of some 500 times against Presidential requests. Liberals were among those who voted repeatedly against measures the Executive considered important; general legislation, not just civil rights, was involved. Defeated in this manner were the urban affairs bill, the medicare bill, and the financing features of the watered-down standby public works bill.

By one count alone—its failure to pass any of 12 major appropriations bills by June 30, the end of the fiscal year—this second session of the 87th Congress set a modern record for inaction, probably an alltime one. It was apparent that some irreconcilable conflict existed between the Senate and House Appropriations Committee. By July 30, only three appropriations bills had been passed. By August 30, only four had passed. By September 30, eight, leaving four to be passed in October in the closing rush of the session. This unprecedented collapse of the appropriation process alone underlined the fact that a Democratic President cannot today legislate with a Democrat Congress. It was proved that the Democrat Party is no longer a national party but a schizophrenic body of two parts. By way of comparison, the famed Republican 80th Congress, which President Truman mislabeled, for political reasons, a "do nothing" Congress, had passed all of its appropriations bills by June 30, 1948.

President Kennedy, as a candidate in 1960, had stated to the Nation that if he were given a Democrat Congress, he could pledge forward progress. He was given such a Congress, and the distressing results are apparent to the Nation.

I had been under the impression that I was the minority leader in the Senate, but as the Congress stalled and the public grumbled, I suddenly found to my amazement that I had been promoted to majority leader. At least the Republicans were publicly blamed by the Executive for the greatest legislative mess in Washington history. This myth was quickly exploded. I had only to point to the fact that 64 Senators were Democrats, while only 36 were Republicans.

Indeed, most of the constructive legislation which passed the Senate and the Congress, did so either because of Republican votes, or because of Republican action in changing proposed, measures to make them practical and palatable. The communications satellite bill, desired by the White House, the Defense and State Departments, and the public, was passed only with the help of the Republican minority in the face of a liberal Democrat filibuster. Four times, on major issues, the Republican policy committee, and conference, took a unanimous stand, and in two cases, this leadership resulted in the Senate's taking the legislative action sought.

Part of the legislative mess, it must be emphasized, was the fault of the executive branch, completely controlled by the Democrats.

Under the Constitution the President is directed to "give to the Congress information on the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

But the Constitution clearly envisaged, in fact it in many instances specified, that the origination, preparation, and passage of laws be vested in the Congress.

The Kennedy administration, however, tried to manage completely the 87th Congress. It originated the legislative proposals, it drafted the bills, it dispatched them to the Congress, it had them introduced, it demanded their passage. Each of the over 550 legislative requests bore an "urgent" tag. The legislative pipeline was glutted with ill-conceived, ill-drafted New Frontier proposals. For most of these, there was no need, frequently no public demand, and in the big spending, big government aspects, open opposition by the people. No living Member of the Senate has ever witnessed anything like this. No intelligent American way of meeting the impact of the onrushing scientific age was evident. Instead, flying squadrons of White House and departmental "liaison men" rushed about the Halls of Congress attempting to reduce the chaos to recognizable disorder.

Forgotten were proposals for major civil rights legislation, youth conservation corps, broad-scale education, a fallout shelter program, a mass transit plan, standby tax authority, and many others.

The farm plan, entirely different from the original administration proposal, and containing provisions not passed by either House, was agreed upon in conference, and passed, clearly, in my opinion, to the detriment of the farmer.

Compromised also were the tax bill, the U.N. bond issue, the poll rate increase, and the Hanford power project.

Abandoned after it reached the Senate floor: a curb on literacy tests for voters. Passed, with active Republican participation in rewriting the legislation: a Welfare and Pension Disclosures Act, an Export Control Act, and a manpower retraining program.

Introduced and passed by Republican instigation was the Cuban resolution. Also passed, pension credits for the self-employed.

Perhaps the most successful Presidential actions were to increase the national debt limit twice to $308 billion and to obtain appropriations to increase the bureaucracy at the rate of one bureaucrat every 2 minutes 24 hours of every day. Poll taxes were outlawed, laws were enacted to increase the channels on TV sets, and to promote educational TV. Continued were certain corporate and excise taxes.

For the second time, despite the unhappy results of the first, the President decided once again to call up Ready Reserves, if needed, and the Congress immediately authorized calling up 150,000 of these citizens.

The most far-reaching enactment of the present session was the trade bill, which gives the President broad authority to lower tariffs in a move aimed at meeting the competition of the European Common Market and other impediments to U.S. trade. There were many serious reservations as to the effect of this measure on American workingmen, but it passed on insistent Presidential request with bipartisan support. In the Senate the vote was 78 to 8; in the House 298 to 125.

At a moment when the exigencies of our age demands great and constructive action, the 87th Congress was called upon to deal with a quantity of legislative requests with little quality, and with patchwork proposals, disorganization, and half-baked social concepts at odds with the American way.

Campaign promises of vigorous leadership requiring sacrifice and dedication from all people were apparently forgotten. Measured in any nautical fashion the sails may be up and there is a lot of wind, but the anchor is still dragging.

This was a "do little" year at a time when this Nation and the world do not have time to waste. To paraphrase Bismarck, the administration has "such a large appetite and such poor teeth."

One of the Congress' major problems has been to meet unprecedented spending requests. Despite Republican attempts to reduce nonessential expenditures in the interest of national solvency, spending for such purposes has skyrocketed; the 1960 calls upon the public for sacrifices have been forgotten. During the 87th Congress, total annual spending increased 21 percent. While spending by the military went up but 16 percent, spending by departments dealing solely with routine matters has jumped incredibly—for instance, the Department of the Interior's spending increased 49 percent, that of the Department of Commerce 51 percent, and that of the Housing and Home Finance Agency 347 percent. In short, civilian spending is increasing faster than defense and military spending.

The fact that the Democrat helmsmen in the Senate felt it was necessary to disobey the skipper's orders to stay off the rocks was best demonstrated in the defeat of three major Executive proposals.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

This measure would have clearly established Federal control over our cities at the expense of traditional local administration, and 13 of the 16 Senate Democrat chairmen voted disapproval of the plan.

The specific proposal, through the medium of Reorganization Plan No. 1, was to create a new Department of Urban Affairs headed by a Cabinet rank official. The Senate disapproved the plan by a vote of 42 to 58 in the first Senate rollcall since 1936 at which all Senators were present and voting. The Senators' action effectively defeated the proposal, but the House indicated its disapproval by a vote of 264 to 150.

STANDBY PUBLIC WORKS

The financing provisions of the administration's $2.6 billion standby public works bill were revolutionary.

The measure would have permitted the President to take from funds earmarked in the U.S. Treasury to protect the savings and homes of American citizens, up to $2 billion. Included in the agencies whose earmarked funds could have been thus looted were the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which insures the deposits of individual American citizens, up to $10,000. Also included were the earmarked funds of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Federal Home Loan banks, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Republicans were instrumental in completely defeating this dangerous financing proposal and in greatly reducing the funds.

The Republican policy committee unanimously adopted a declaration against this financing procedure on the grounds that it would jeopardize the financial stability of the agencies concerned and would have constituted a unique and peculiar method of backdoor deficit spending.

Thereafter, when the measure came to the floor of the Senate not a single Democrat chairman voted for it, and 11 of the 16, including the majority leader, voted against it. The Senate vote was 44 to 32.

As approved by the Senate, the $2.6 billion requested by the administration was cut by $1.1 billion to $1.5 billion, $750 million of which was allocated to the standby program. The House accepted the Senate bill but eliminated the standby program entirely because in any emergency the Congress would obviously be in session. The House authorized instead $900 million for an immediate program, $300 million of which would be allocated for public works in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as distressed areas. The remaining $600 million would go to areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as having substantial unemployment in at least 9 of the preceding 12 months. The Senate accepted the revised version.

Because it was recognized that a program of this type in an election year could be used for partisan purposes, the Democrat floor manager of the bill put through the Senate an unprecedented unanimous-consent request: "That the RECORD reflect it to be the sense of the Senate that this bill be administered on a basis that will be free of any partisan favoritism by any agencies of Government having responsibilities under it."

The bill which has now become law is a much better bill than that proposed by the Democrat administration and will, because of responsible Republican action, provide work for those who need it and to whom we owe the responsibility of providing employment and an opportunity to earn a decent wage.

The public works appropriation for fiscal year 1963 included, besides funds for the special accelerated public works program, funds for regular projects of the Department of the Army, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior, for the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The final appropriation was $5,067,869,400, almost $500 million below the 1963 estimate of $5,651,761,000. The final action was taken by the Senate, 64 to 8.

MEDICARE

The name "medicare" was a misnomer for a bill which was misrepresented to the public as answering the problems of the aged. Actually, it gave only about 25 percent of hospitalization costs and no doctors', surgeons', or diagnostic fees, at an added 17-percent cost to everyone paying for social security.

It was my contention that in attempting to perpetuate what can only be termed a hoax on the public, the administration completely ignored a law already on the books—the Kerr-Mills Act—a true medicare law which is in effect in over half of the States so far. This law, in cooperation with the States, provides for doctors, surgeons, nursing homes, and other measures, leaving it to the people of the States, instead of the Federal bureaucracy, to administer medicare. The so-called medicare bill was not, as alleged by the Executive, defeated by Republicans and a "handful of Democrats." It was defeated with one-third of the Democrats present voting against it, among them 10 of the 16 chairmen of standing Senate committees. I would call this a "truckload" of Democrats, not a "handful," and would comment that we Republicans were happy to have them help defeat a measure recognized by the public as unhelpful. The final Senate vote was 52 to 48.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE

Liberal Democrats had long opposed filibusters on civil rights by southern Democrats, loudly and emphatically. These liberals completely reversed themselves and proved to the world at large that they are willing to eschew principle if it serves their purpose.

At the time the Democratic liberals began a protracted filibuster, the communications satellite bill had passed the House by a vote of 354 to 9. It had been given careful consideration in five comcommittees of the Senate. It had been described by the President as having been "carefully drafted" and "the most effective way of providing for the development of a communications satellite." It had the support of interested agencies of the Government, including the State and Defense Departments.

The bill provided for the creation of a communications satellite corporation which would operate for profit and not as an agency of the U.S. Government.

Shares of stock would be offered in equal amounts to the public and to the FCC—authorized communications common carriers at a price initially not in excess of $100 per share. The corporation would have a 15-member board of directors, 3 of them appointed by the President and subject to Senate confirmation, 6 to be elected annually by stockholders who were not communications carriers, and only the remaining 6 to be chosen by the common carriers participating in the enterprise. The president and other officers would be elected by the board members.

All of the development of the satellite in the field of communications had been carried out by private enterprise at tremendous cost. The Government's participation had been the development of missiles or boosters employed in getting the satellites into orbit.

This traditional American system of private enterprise under reasonable Government regulation is the obvious method of dealing with the future of such space satellites.

Every measure was taken to protect the public interest. The international problems created were taken into account and the President's authority in the field of foreign relations was of course recognized. The Federal Communications Commission was required to insure that small business would be given an opportunity to share in procurement and to grant such authorizations as necessary to serve the public interest, convenience, and necessity for the construction and operation of such terminal stations. The legislation would not create a private monopoly controlled by the communications common carriers—it would not carve out a general exception to the antitrust laws, for the bill required the corporation's activities to be consistent with our antitrust laws.

What it did was to permit presently competing entities to participate in the ownership of the corporation because it was not feasible to have multiple satellite systems in which each carrier would establish its own system. Moreover, the public was provided the opportunity to participate in ownership.

Important was the fact that the type of system to be established would be determined largely by agreement reached by our Government with other governments as to the frequencies in which such a system would operate and the technical standards which would define the operation. An administrative radio conference is scheduled to meet in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1963 to negotiate allocation of frequencies of communications satellite systems. As a practical matter, all actions of the corporation would have to conform with any international agreements reached and with the national policy objectives of the bill.

It was in the face of all this that a small group of liberal Democrats charged that this bill was a "giveaway" program in favor of private monopoly upon national resources. It was claimed that by vesting legal rights in a private corporate entity, we would inform the world that we were guided by the profit motive.

Eventually the liberal filibusters forced the Senate to vote cloture on debate—one responsible newspaper reported that the Senate had been forced to adopt a "gag rule" for the first time in 35 years of unlimited debate.

The vote on final passage showed that there was no public support for the viewpoint of the liberal filibusters. The vote was 66 in favor and 11 against.

SPACE

In addition to passing the so-called Telstar bill by overwhelming vote, the Congress supported expansion of the U.S. space program, more than doubling the funds voted in the first session of this Congress, mainly along the lines requested by the President. These funds will be used for a space-radiation effects laboratory; for a two-man lunar excursion vehicle by means of which it is hoped to place several men on the moon; for scientific satellites and for other vehicles for various space probes.

The Government's Goddard Space Flight Center at Greenbelt, Md., reported July 31 that the United States now has 41 satellites in orbit around the earth and sun. The U.S. satellite longest in orbit is Explorer I, launched February 1, 1958. One of the more glamorous satellites still in space is Echo I, a 100-foot aluminized plastic balloon, the only satelite now in orbit visible to the naked eye if one is watching at the proper time.

All of the planning and the scientific work involved in launching every one of these space bodies on a sequential basis was done during the Eisenhower administration. Only three new space efforts, or programs, have been begun under the Kennedy administration—one for the advance Saturn, one for industrial application, and a third for advance manned space flight.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The administration has sent no request for a broad civil rights program to the Congress at any time. This is extraordinary because during the 1960 presidential campaign a pledge was made that a major civil rights bill "would be amongst the first orders of business" when the Congress convened in January 1961.

Congress is still waiting.

But that is not all. The overwhelming Democratic majority defeated in this session two Republican civil rights proposals, one, to prevent Federal funds being used in impacted areas for schools practicing segregation and, two, barring use of Federal funds for hospitals which are segregated. Republicans supported both these proposals by wide margins.

Filibustering accompanied attempts to eliminate literacy tests as a requirement for voting. In this connection the first session of the 87th Congress began with a filibuster on an amendment to the cloture rule, a filibuster that was postponed because the President's Cabinet could not be confirmed if it continued, and the first session also ended with another fight on the same matter.

The second session bogged down at the very beginning over the literacy test issue. Various attempts by the majority and minority leaders to obtain a cloture rule were unsuccessful, one of the votes being 43 for and 53 against, and another, a week later, 42 to 52. Finally, by a vote of 49 to 34 the Senate agreed to drop the literacy test issue and proceed to other business.

Here again was shown the schizophrenic nature of the Democratic Party of today, its two wings battling each other into legislative impotency.

POLL TAX

The one gain in the civil rights field came on a Senate vote of 77 to 16 to eliminate the poll tax as a requirement for voting. As the joint resolution was passed, it provided that the right of citizens "to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax." This could only be passed in the House under suspension of the rule.

This is a sorry civil rights record legislatively, and an even sorrier one overall.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CUBA

Despite the fact that American "prestige" abroad was made an issue by the Democrats in 1960, I am proud of the fact that the Republicans resisted any impulse to retaliate during and immediately after, the disaster of the landing on the Bay of Pigs in Cuba, April 17, 1961. Discussion came later in a cooler atmosphere.

After that landing failure, no effective positive action was taken with respect to Cuba, and the Cuban situation rapidly deteriorated. The Russians and Red Chinese began a buildup both of weapons systems and of their technicians. Accelerated in the late summer of 1962, it assumed alarming and dangerous proportions. This buildup was exposed by Republican Senators.

Thereupon the Republican leadership called for a Cuban resolution like the effective Formosa and Middle East resolutions. They cited the Monroe Doctrine and later treaties in a press conference.

An hour and a half later, after their declaration, the President requested the power to call up 150,000 Ready Reserves for 1 year, in the light of this buildup and of another prospective Berlin crisis. Congress of course acceded to the President's request. It also, as the result of the Republican instigation, approved by a vote of 86 to 1, a Cuban resolution empowering the President to take such action as was necessary to prevent the establishment of a foreign offensive military base just off our coast. The only contrary vote was registered by a Republican who did not feel the following resolution was strong enough:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas President James Monroe, announcing the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, declared to the Congress that we should consider any attempt on the part of European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Whereas in the Rio Treaty of 1947 the parties agreed that "an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all the American states, and, consequently, each one of the said contracting parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations."

Whereas the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States at Punta del Este in January 1962 unanimously declared: "The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extracontinental Communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union";

Whereas since 1958 the international Communist movement has increasingly extended into Cuba its political, economic, and military sphere of influence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States is supported in his determination and possesses all necessary authority—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Castro regime from exporting its aggressive purposes to any part of this hemisphere by force or the threat of force;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported offensive military base capable of endangering the United States Naval Base at Guantanamo, free passage to the Panama Canal, United States missile and space preparations or the security of this Nation and its citizens; and

(c) to work with other free citizens of this hemisphere and with freedom-loving Cuban refugees to support the legitimate aspirations of the people of Cuba for a return to self-determination.

LAOS

As the result of the Yalta and Teheran secret agreements, the Republicans have firmly insisted for years that the Senate exercise its constitutional duty and approve all important international agreements.

It is with regret, therefore, that we must report that the Kennedy administration felt compelled to treat its agreement on Laos as an "executive agreement" rather than as a treaty requiring Senate approval. When the Secretary of State contracted on July 27, 1962, for the United States to enter into the Laos accord, it was the first multilateral policy document that the U.S. Government has ever signed with Red China. This agreement differed from the Korean cease-fire compact in July of 1953 in that the United States signed that armistice with the Red Chinese and North Korean Communists on behalf of the United Nations command.

In signing the general accord with Laos, it is to be feared that we have repeated basic errors of the past. We cut off aid to an anti-Communist Lao Government to compel acceptance of a coalition government with the Communists, a move which, when made by the Truman administration with respect to Chiang Kai-shek, contributed to the fall of mainland China. From the beginning of their takeover of other nations, the Communists have used participation in coalition governments as a means of taking over the governments completely. They first obtain the so-called lever-of-power Cabinet posts such as interior, with the police, communications, and defense, and then employ the power obtained to seize the entire government.

This was their procedure, for instance, in Czechoslovakia, which they took over in 1948.

In giving Communist Poland a veto in the International Control Commission, set up to administer the provisions of the Lao accord, have we not repeated the Roosevelt administration's error in Yalta, of promising the Soviet Union a veto in the United Nations? It was unfortunate that this highly questionable Lao accord was reached after the President publicly declared that we would defend the sovereignty of Laos and that this was vital to the security of southeast Asia.

VIETNAM

As a result of what happened in Laos, the President strengthened our military units in neighboring Vietnam. Guerrilla fighting began, and we suffered some casualties. The President had made it possible for the troops engaged in Vietnam to obtain the Purple Heart if wounded or killed. But Republicans felt that full benefits, such as those extended to the veterans of World Wars I and II and ex post facto of the Korean conflict, should be extended to our men in action in Vietnam. The Senate Policy Committee took note of Senate Joint Resolution 180 introduced by the minority leader on April 25, 1962, proposing wartime benefits in case of hostilities, for members of the Armed Forces in Vietnam. They called for action on this resolution which would extend identical benefits, insurance, survivor, and other wartime awards to the men risking their lives. Unfortunately, the interested Government agency did not report back to the appropriate Senate committee in time for action to be taken in this session of Congress.

BERLIN

In their meeting in Vienna on June 3 and 4, 1961, Soviet Premier Khrushchev handed President Kennedy an ultimatum on Berlin. The ultimatum called for recognition of East Berlin and the internationalization of the city of Berlin, presently divided into two sectors—East and West. The flight of refugees from Communist controlled East Germany into West Berlin continued. This flight was used as an excuse by the East Berliners for the erection, first, of a barbed wire fence and when this was not interfered with, second, the erection of a concrete wall between East and West Berlin. The fact that the construction of this wall was allowed to continue unimpeded, and that the wall was subsequently allowed to remain, constituted de facto recognition of East Berlin's action.

The wall is illegal under the terms of agreement on Berlin by the occupying powers. The President first mobilized U.S. Ready Reserves and then dismissed them from service apparently without result and with considerable dislocation for them. The Western allies were in Berlin by a solemn agreement with the Soviets under which the United States, for instance, gave up territory in East Germany which is now occupied by the Communists. Since the first days of joint occupation of Berlin, the United States has insisted on the maintenance of Western rights there, including our own, pending any Allied agreement on all Germany. Emboldened by probes in Berlin, Khrushchev is pushing to eliminate the presence of Western troops in that city. With determination, our rights in Berlin can be maintained. West Berlin must remain free.

BERLIN RESOLUTION

By a voice vote on October 10 in the Senate following a vote of 311 to 0 on October 5 in the House, the Congress took final action on a concurrent resolution expressing determination to uphold Western rights in Berlin. The resolution expressed the sense of Congress that even the "use of arms" may be employed in this connection.

The resolution read as follows:

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is and has been to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas it is the purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Germany; and

Whereas in connection with the termination of hostilities in World War II the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union freely entered into binding agreements under which the four powers have the right to remain in Berlin, with the right of ingress and egress, until the conclusion of a final settlement with the Governmnt of Germany; and

Whereas no such final settlement has been concluded by the four powers and the aforementioned agreements continue in force: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress—

(a) that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin

> constitutes a fundamental political and moral determination;
>
> (b) that the United States would regard as intolerable any violation by the Soviet Union directly or through others of those rights in Berlin, including the right of ingress and egress;
>
> (c) that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

REPUBLICAN DECLARATION

In the light of the repeatedly demonstrated tendency of the present administration to first talk tough and then give way, there was published on June 5, 1962, a declaration of Republican policy which stated:

> In foreign policy, the overriding national goal must be victory over communism through the establishment of a world in which men can live in freedom, security, and national independence. There can be no real peace short of it. An active strategy aimed at victory does not increase the risk of nuclear war.
>
> Weakness and irresolution on the part of the United States which could lead the Communists to underestimate the intensity of the devotion of freemen to their freedom are more likely to bring the world to hot war than are strength and firmness.

FOREIGN AID

The United States has spent more than $130 billion on foreign aid since the beginning of World War II.

Foreign aid has cost the people of the United States $90.5 billion in the 16 years since World War II—the equivalent of almost one-third of our national debt. At least 88 nations and some colonies and dependencies have received foreign aid in cash, grants, loans, food, and other commodities.

The American people are becoming increasingly concerned with the waste revealed in connection with foreign aid administration and the failure of foreign aid to do the job in such countries as Laos. The American people find it difficult to comprehend why, for the first time in history, a nation provides assistance to its enemies who have announced their intention of destroying it and their sympathizers.

This increasingly critical attitude of the American people was reflected in the actions of Congress in this session. For the first time, the Senate took the lead in putting Congress on record against aid to Communist and Communist-dominated countries.

By a vote of 57 to 24, the Senate agreed to an amendment to the foreign aid authorization which barred aid to all Communist countries, including all agricultural surplus commodity shipments. No time limit was set. A high proportion of Republicans supported this action. The administration immediately objected and contended that, by interfering with the shipment of certain agricultural commodities under Public Law 480, an adverse effect would be registered under present conditions on our domestic economy and certain nations would be pushed all the way into the Communist camp.

It also was contended that the President's right to conduct foreign relations was infringed. As finally passed by the House and agreed to in the Senate, 39 to 37, the bill forbade any mutual security aid to "governments based upon that theory known as communism." The committee approved a substitute barring any aid to a Communist country. The restriction could be waived if the President found and so reported to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, that, first, such assistance was vital to the security of the United States; second, the recipient was not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; and, third, such assistance would further promote the independence of the recipient from international communism. The amendment identified 18 countries, including Poland and Yugoslavia, as Communist countries.

Also included in the compromise was the Hickenlooper amendment which barred aid to any nation which seized American property without the prompt and adequate compensation required under international law. The objective of this amendment was to prevent Latin-American and other countries from following the example of Brazil and Ceylon in confiscating the properties and investments of American citizens abroad.

Since foreign aid is not, as some foreign nations are unhappily beginning to believe, a right, but a matter of grace and voluntary assistance, the United States has a perfect right to withhold such aid for any reason it decides upon, and international law is not involved in such withholding.

Congress thus reflected the increasingly insistent attitude of the American taxpayer and the American citizen on the need for great economy and effectiveness in connection with foreign aid.

The President requested $4,961,300,000 for foreign aid, including Alliance for Progress funds. The House cut this somewhat over $1 billion. By a vote of 57 to 24 the Senate then approved a $4,422,800,000 appropriation. The final conference report approved by both Houses set the appropriation at $3,928 million. This was $14,300,000 above last year's appropriation.

Also passed in the Senate 39 to 36 was a House amendment barring aid to any country granting economic aid to the Castro regime or permitting its flagships to carry military or subsidiary supplies to Cuba. Again the President can waive this restriction in the national interest.

The Congress prevented any substantial increase in foreign aid despite the demands upon it and placed squarely upon the President himself the responsibility with regard to any shipments to Iron Curtain countries. An amendment by Senator KEATING required the President to publish his decisions in this connection as required by law in the Federal Register. With regard to the amendment to prevent foreign aid to countries seizing U.S. property, the sentiment was expressed by spokesmen of both parties on the Senate floor that this should be enforced and could be if the State Department had the will to do so.

Authorization was given for funds for the last 3 years of the so-called Alliance for Progress program for Latin America at a rate of $600 million a year, about $200 million less than requested. The present contingency fund was set at $300 million, with supporting assistance at $415 million and $300 million for development grants.

UNITED NATIONS

The place of a United Nations in foreign policy must be carefully considered and constantly reappraised.

While Democrats now in official position have advocated an end to "nationhood," and official proposals have been made by the administration to turn our Armed Forces over to the United Nations within 10 years, it is the Republican belief that this Nation's sovereignty, and its responsibility in free world leadership, must not be abdicated to the United Nations.

The Republican declaration emphasized:

> The United States must work to reorganize and revitalize the United Nations. Toward this end, it would be desirable to change the method of voting in the General Assembly and in the specialized agencies so as to reflect population disparities among the member States and to recognize relative ability and willingness to meet the obligations of the charter.

It is questionable whether newly formed, so-called independent nations, unable as yet to govern themselves in a democratic manner, with populations no larger than some of our least populated States should have an equal vote on matters of substance with the United States, or other nations, both democratically and economically sound and mature.

Our people are beginning to question whether they are not being called upon to carry far more than their share of the financial load of the United Nations. Nevertheless, the United Nations bond issue requested by the President to pay for United Nations activities in the Congo and other places, was approved. The legislation provides that the United States may match the bond purchases of other nations up to $100 million. These bonds mature in 25 years and carry a 2-percent interest. There is a stipulation in the legislation restricting the funds from being used by the United Nations to pay any member nation's assessment.

COMMUNISM

The Senate Republican conference released a statement unanimously endorsing H.R. 3247, to amend the Smith Act by clarifying the term "organize" as used in the act. This action was the result of the Supreme Court decision in the case of Yates against United States involving the question whether 14 known Communists violated the Smith Act. The decision reversed their convictions for conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence and for organizing groups for the same purpose by holding that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party and not to a continuing process of organization.

The Republican policy declaration stated:

> The Republican conference is in complete agreement with the statement in the unanimous Judiciary report that: "From a study of the legislative history of the Smith Act and as a matter of commonsense, the term 'organize' was intended to mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members and not merely the original organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States."

The Smith Act was amended, as a result of Republican initiative. It is now the law of the land.

It was thus recognized by the Congress this session that the danger to the United States from communism is internal as well as external.

ADDITIONAL FACTS ON COMMUNISM

The enormous flow of Communist propaganda and pornographic material into this country through the mail is one of much concern. Despite the administration's disapproval of any action to put a stop to such material, a new subsection to the 1950 Subversive Activities Control Act authorized the Postmaster General to alert the general public and the recipients of such mail by posting appropriate notices in all post offices and notifying the recipients directly. It does not authorize the Postmaster General to open, inspect, or censor any mail.

Republicans, by unanimous vote, strengthened the Export Control Act through amendments which made it the intent of Congress that the United States employ its economic power to the fullest extent in the fight against communism; that the United States exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to national security; that control over exports be used to further the foreign policy of the United States; and added to the law newer and heavier penalties for violations of the act.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION DIRECTOR

The Senate Republican conference on July 31 unanimously endorsed legislation containing the principle that future Directors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be Presidential nominees, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Republican conference declared such legislation, at this time, would help settle any future issues over appointments, although the present Director, J. Edgar Hoover, is still 3 years away from possible mandatory retirement.

The proposal to make the FBI Director, as well as the Associate Director, subject to Presidential nomination was contained in S. 3523, introduced by the minority leader on July 10. Unfortunately, this bill was not acted upon in committee in this session but it is hoped that action will be taken in the next.

FOREIGN TRADE

The President proposed more authority and flexibility in tariff bargaining as a result of the growth of the European Common Market, the balance-of-payments problem, the need to accelerate our own economic growth, the Communist aid and trade efforts and the alleged need for new markets for Japan and the developing nations.

As finally approved by the Congress, the President received authority to extend for 5 years his negotiating authority on trade agreements. Authority is given to the President to cut any tariff 50 percent below the 1962 level, or raise it 50 percent above the 1934 level.

The President was given authority to eliminate tariffs entirely on categories of goods in which he finds that the United States and the European Common Market account for 80 percent of the free world trade.

Omitted in the new law is the "peril point" system of existing law under which the Tariff Commission was required to notify the President in advance of negotiations of a level below which it would be harmful to American industry to lower the tariff.

The "escape clause" of the existing law, which is used to restore tariff cuts or quotas when experience shows that a trade agreement has been injurious, is retained in a modified form. It permits the President to suspend trade concessions whenever a foreign country maintains unreasonable import restrictions which would, either directly or indirectly, substantially burden U.S. commerce.

Although the administration wished no limitation on benefits accruing to Communist countries such as Poland and Yugoslavia, the Congress barred Communist Poland and Yugoslavia from sharing in the benefits of the American tariff cuts by denying to those countries the most-favored-nation treatment. This permits any concession made in tariffs to one country to be made available to others.

There was concern for the effect of the tariff action under this law on some U.S. workers and companies. For suffering firms, technical assistance, loans, or a 5-year carryback of net operating loss was approved.

In the human realm, workers affected would be compensated at the rate of 65 percent of workers' weekly wages, limited to 65 percent of the national average manufacturing wage, for 52 weeks, except that an extra 26 weeks would be allowed for retraining and an extra 13 weeks for workers over 60.

States would be reimbursed in full by the Federal Government for expenditures incurred in carrying out the adjustment assistance features of the bill.

FOREIGN BANK DEPOSITS

The Congress passed a bill to help the wavering position of the dollar by exempting from the interest ceilings now imposed by regulation under the Federal Reserve Act and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act the time deposits of foreign governments, their central banks or other monetary authorities, and international financial institutions of which the United States was a member.

The measure was passed by 50 to 21 in line with the President's balance-of-payments message of February 6, 1961. It is intended to encourage foreign governments to maintain thier dollar accounts in this country rather than converting them into gold or transferring them to other countries. Over $2 billion of the reserve funds of foreign governments and international institutions were held by U.S. banks in the form of time deposits.

FINANCES AND SPENDING

This was the year in which we not only placed astronauts in orbit but when we shot our national debt into outer space. Under the propulsion of huge deficits the debt limit was increased twice within a year for a total rise of $15 billion. Whereas in 1960 the now Chief Executive stated "it is extremely important that the United States maintain, to the extent possible, a balanced budget," he was by June of 1962 calling a balanced budget an old-fashioned "myth."

There is a virtual taxpayers' revolt today which is evidenced in reluctance to approve local bonds to match Federal spending and in many other ways. It is difficult to see how taxes can be lowered to get the economy moving again without a cut in nonessential spending, and this is the Republican position.

The New Frontier has hired so many new plainsmen that for the fiscal year 1963 it plans to employ 2,538,390 civilians in the executive agencies of the Federal Government. This is 46,045 over the estimate for the fiscal year 1962 and 139,763 more than the actual employment on June 30, 1962. Federal employment already has reached a 10-year high.

Where are all these new employees paid by the taxpayer to be put? On July 17 of this year, the New Frontier asked real estate firms to submit bids on July 24 on an additional 1 million square feet of Federal office space. This is not all. The New Frontier is also planning several new buildings to be built to house more Federal employees. And so the Federal bureaucracy grows.

Today the Veterans' Administration employs 174,110. The American Army responsible for the security of the United States, counted only 120,000 officers and men in 1935, 2 years after Hitler took power in Germany.

The Department of Agriculture had almost as large an army—102,000 members in 1961.

Today roughly one out of every six working people in the United States are employed by Federal, State, or local governments. Congress has had a very difficult time in this session keeping the thinkers of the New Frontier from carrying out their plans to expand Government spending in all directions and to extend bureaucratic controls to all points of the compass.

The so-called Federal debt of $308 billion only tells part of the story. The actual and contingent liabilities of the Federal Government, the legal and moral commitments which the Federal Government has pledged itself to redeem, are so great that they exceed by four times the assessed real estate value of all real and tangible property in the United States.

If every citizen gave every cent he made in the year to the Federal Government to redeem the existing and developing debt, it would take 3 years to accomplish this.

The Federal Government spends $10.5 million every hour.

There is a $9.4 billion annual interest on the national debt.

The Federal Government owns 405,433 buildings with a cost of almost $20 billion, and 224,270 civilian vehicles which travel over 2 billion miles a year.

The Federal Government owns one-third of the total land acreage of the United States, or 771,512,000 acres, which is valued at almost $3 billion.

No wonder the Nation is worried over our economy.

On January 10 of this year the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission issued a ruling which stated, in part, that Federal civil service employees could appeal before interested groups to explain the Kennedy administration position on legislation.

In effect, this ruling converted more than 2½ million Federal employees into one huge lobby for the President's program.

To prevent any further effort along this line, a Republican-sponsored amendment to the 2d supplemental appropriations bill of 1962 was offered which specified that no part of the money could be used to propagandize the public.

TAXES

The President has vaguely promised tax concessions a year from now, and prior to the 1964 elections, for the announced purpose of stimulating business. It is axiomatic that uncertainty with regard to taxes slows up business and industry which want to know what the decisions are going to be before acting. Having to wait a year for basic tax revision is, therefore, unfortunate.

Nevertheless, the President insisted on radical changes in the existing tax bill during this session—changes which will barely come into effect before the new, far-reaching tax bill he has promised is being written.

The President was beaten by Congress on two of his three main recommendations for tax changes this year. The proposal to tax income from dividends and interest in advance was defeated. Instead an amendment requiring reporting of dividends and interest payments passed the Senate by 66 votes to 20. Thirty-two Republicans voted for killing the tax, and three did not vote.

The President proposed a standby tax cut authority giving him the unprecedented power to take personal action to cut taxes, a matter which constitutionally and by custom is a prerogative of the Congress. This proposal was not even reported out the House Ways and Means Committee.

A 7-percent tax credit for business expansion was approved when the Senate, by a vote of 52 to 30, rejected an amendment which would have eliminated this credit. This credit is expected to cost the Treasury $1.3 billion a year; it was passed in the hope that it would stimulate business.

Inserted in the bill over White House objection were deductions for lobbying expenses.

Excise taxes were extended for another year, an annual action, it seems, as long as "big spending" continues. The 10-percent tax on train, bus, and domestic water travel was repealed and the tax on airline tickets was reduced from 10 to 5 percent. The tax measure in final form passed the Senate by a 56-to-22 vote and the House by voice vote.

The Congress approved another bill strongly supported by the minority leader permitting self-employed persons to take a deduction voluntarily on tax payments for that part of their income placed in retirement funds. This bill became a law October 10.

Approved also was a bill easing the heavy tax on Du Pont stockholders that could have resulted from a Supreme Court order for Du Pont to divest itself of its 63 million shares of General Motors stock.

FARM BILL

The farm program of 1962 cost nearly $2 billion in Federal funds more than in 1960 and the farmers parity income, despite New Frontier promises, is only 60 percent that of his city cousin.

The New Frontier farm program in fact would have meant controls on 250 different commodities. It would have meant a horde of inspectors, a shrinking farm plant, jobless people, and high management costs. The Freeman program is intended to bring about Federal management of the farmer as well as of his acres; the Government is trying to control the farmer, the feed, food, and fiber of the Nation.

Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, sent a program to Congress for what he called supply management. It called for allotted acres to each farmer producing grain and a quota, or limit, on the number of bushels he could sell. In the case of dairy farmers there was a limit on the pounds of milk he could sell. In the case of turkey growers, it was the number of turkeys and hatching eggs he could sell.

There was an interesting gimmick in all this. The farmer would be permitted to place the fetter of control on himself. He would be permitted to vote. It would take the approval of two-thirds of those voting to bring about this self-imposed enslavement. But there are other gimmicks, in the case of corn, hogs, and soybeans.

For instance, Secretary Freeman was pointed in saying that if the farmers did not vote acreage reduction and controls, the Government, out of its surplus stocks, could dump 200 million bushels of wheat and 10 million tons of feed grains on the market. That was like placing a sword of Damocles suspended over the farmer's head. The sword would drop—there would be no Government support for farmers' prices—if the farmer did not vote right.

Think of what dumping of these surplus stocks on the market would do to farm prices and how much the cost would go up on lumber, fencing, machinery, and appliances.

What all this adds up to is a New Frontier blueprint to replace free American farming and farmers with Government-regulated farms and farmers. The farmer did not buy this. Neither did Congress—especially the Republicans in Congress.

Last year the New Frontier had to settle for what it called an emergency feed grain program. A volume of publicity said this was going to save a vast amount of money. Well, it was this program that cost $2 billion more.

Now we have a new Farm Act. It was born out of heavy labor. First the Senate passed a bill. The House didn't like it and rejected it. The House Agriculture Committee produced its own version. The House rejected that and came up with something else, which finally came to the Senate and was changed again. A conference committee of 12 Senators and Representatives met to adjust the differences. Seven signed the report. Five did not. All this in a Congress completely dominated by Democrats.

The new farm program drives the farmer toward regimentation. In its second year, particularly, it will depress prices for the farmer in certain key commodities.

This act consisted of title I, relating to land use adjustment; title II, relating to Public Law 480, surplus commodities; title III, which was revised substantially and contained far-reaching provisions concerning feed grains and wheat; title IV, dealing with general matters; and title V, relating to the increased industrial uses of agricultural commodities, which was stricken.

The congressional debate centered largely on the controversial feed grains and wheat provisions. With respect to feed grains—title III, subtitle A—the following was agreed upon in conference:

First. A 1963 corn, sorghum, and barley program, under which producers would divert 20 to 50 percent of their 1959 to 1960 acreage of those crops to conservation or named oilseed crops for (i) payments-in-kind of up to 50 percent on the normal yield of the diverted acreage multiplied by the support price; (ii) payments-in-kind of 18 cents per bushel of the normal yield of their planted acreage (in the case of corn and corresponding amounts for sorghum and barley); and (iii) price support by loan or other method at not less than 65 percent of parity, minus 18 cents per bushel, for corn and comparable levels for sorghum and barley.

Second. Effective with the 1964 crop, the support price for corn would be at such level, from 50 to 90 percent of parity, as will not increase CCC stocks. The Senate bill had set this support at from 0 to 90 percent.

With respect to wheat—title III, subtitle B—the following was provided:

First. A voluntary 1963 wheat program under which producers could divert 20 to 50 percent of their allotment—or average 1959, 1960, and 1961 acreage, if not in excess of 15 acres—to conservaton or named oilseed crops in return for (i) payments-in-kind of up to 50 percent of the normal yield of the acreage diverted multiplied by the loan level—$1.82 national average; and (ii) payment-in-kind certificates of 18 cents per bushel on the normal yield of their planted acreage. No changes would be made in marketing quotas for 1963. The same yield figures, based on 1959-60 yields, would be used in computing kinds of payments.

Second. For 1964 and subsequent crops the marketing quota program would be substantially revised and would include an acreage diversion program, with payments for 1964 and 1965 diversion, and a marketing certificate plan.

Under the latter noncertificated wheat would be supported at a level determined after consideration of its feed value and world price, and certificated wheat would be supported at between 65 and 90 percent of parity. Certificates would be issued to producers for all wheat consumed domestically for food and such part of the exports as determined by the Secretary as would carry out the price and income objectives of the bill. If marketing quotas were disapproved by producers, the support level would be 50 percent of parity. Substitution of wheat and feed grain acreage would be permitted only if a feed grain diversion program is in effect.

Republicans generally felt that:

The administration had already demonstrated its lack of qualifications in the administration of food production programs. Its price-support regulations in 1961 had successively demoralized the milk market, the cotton export program, and the soybean market. In an effort to control corn production it had reduced acreage and raised price supports. Such planned confusion might well make it appear to farmers that their salvation could be found only in complete control by the Government. What was proposed in title III of the bill could be the first step toward such control.

The justification for the controls proposed was that burdensome surpluses of feed grains and wheat existed. This was not true. The corn carryover had been reduced by 350 million bushels last year. Increased use of corn domestically and abroad had accounted for 250 million bushels of this reduction. One hundred million of this reduction was due to the costly $1 billion emergency program of 1961. Estimates for 1962 indicated that the use of corn would exceed that of 1961. As a result, the estimated carryover of corn, as of October 1962, amounted to only a 4 or 5 months' supply, which was not a burdensome surplus.

The wheat carryover now amounted to no more than 10 or 11 months' supply, again with the likelihood that this would be further reduced. With the present world situation, we should not allow our carryover to be less than 1 year's supply.

The export of wheat and other grains to Asia, Africa, and Latin America had become one of our most potent weapons in the cold war. To curtail production at this time would be extremely shortsighted.

The program proposed would not encourage acreage diversion. The producer would receive higher benefits for his entire crop if he reduced his acreage by only the minimum 20 percent, rather than the maximum 45 percent.

The Kennedy emergency feed grains and wheat programs had proven enormously expensive. Figures on their cost which had been handed out to encourage support of the administration program were false. The actual cost would be somewhat between $2.4 and $3 billion.

While the administration was promising great benefits to corn producers who retired land under the 1963 feed grains program, this was but bait to lure them into support of what was to follow. The Secretary of Agriculture was given broad discretionary power to establish corn support prices between 50 and 90 percent of parity, but at such level as would not increase CCC stocks. This latter proviso could mean much lower corn prices, about 80 cents a bushel. The producer would become so enmeshed in production control by that time, that the "management-supply" theories espoused by the administration might be accepted.

The multiple price certificate plan for wheat would cut back acreage of all producers by the same percentage. This ignores the fact that there were several types of wheat, one of which might be in short supply at the time. It assures as well that growers of poor quality milling wheat could continue to produce in excess of market demand, since they too will get their wheat certificates on a pro rata basis.

The bill includes all export wheat—including so-called Public Law 480 and other giveaway wheat—in the primary market, along with domestic food wheat. This would in turn permit a high price for both domestic food and export wheat and a feed price for all surplus wheat. The subsidized feed price wheat could be dumped into an already glutted feed grain market, providing unfair competition for feed grain growers.

Such a dumping operation would disrupt feed grain-livestock ratios, and lower the returns for all livestock, dairy, and poultry producers. At the same time, the higher net blend price for wheat would increase both the cost of flour and of bread for consumers.

The discriminatory multiple price plan for wheat would invite retaliation by Common Market countries, and by such food producing countries as Canada and Australia.

The program would give unparalleled discretionary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture. The certificate plan—really a processing tax in disguise—was so complicated that it would be rejected out of hand by many producers. Because of its intricacies and gimmicks, it also offered opportunities for thievery on a large scale. The administration claim that a permanent, less costly program would go into effect in 1964 was highly suspect. It was more likely that another "emergency" program would be devised to coincide with the presidential election.

In the Senate, the conference report passed, 52 to 41.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Looking to our defense efforts, the Congress approved a record-shattering $48.1 billion defense spending bill, close to the President's request.

Overriding the President's specific suggestions, Congress gave the administration $191 million to speed development of the RS-70 supersonic bomber. Funds were voted also to keep the National Guard at a pay drill strength of 400,000 and the Army Reserves at a strength of 300,000 although the Secretary of Defense expressed himself as desiring to cut both forces.

FALLOUT SHELTER PROGRAM

The President requested as one of his "must" bills a sum of $567 million for a nationwide fallout shelter program.

Congress did not see the necessity at this time for a program of that dimension and therefore agreed to add $75 million to bring the civilian defense appropriations for fiscal 1963 to $113 million, which the Defense Department stated would be sufficient to carry on existing programs. The additional amount of $75 million is primarily to provide funds to continue the Defense Department's nationwide survey to locate and mark shelter space in existing buildings.

SMALL BUSINESS

The greatest number of small business failures since 1933 has been registered.

Republicans are proud that the Small Business Administration came into being under a Republican administration, the first time that the problems of small business were recognized on a national scale. Specifications written into the act creating the agency included that special effort should be made to help small businesses obtain Government contracts. Under this act many small businesses prospered.

This year, Republican-sponsored changes in another Kennedy administration proposal were adopted when the Senate approved a measure increasing by $250 million the authorization for the Small Business Administration's revolving fund. The new authorization raises the total amount available for loans to $1.45 billion.

An important Republican amendment requires the SBA to report promptly to the Appropriations and Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses of Congress whenever the aggregate amount of regular business and prime contract loans exceed $1,012,200,000. The same requirement is mandatory whenever disaster loans exceed $96.8 million. This amendment requiring congressional review of expenditures will prevent possible depletion of funds and thus help protect the small businessman.

SUGAR ACT

One of the controversial proposals to come before the Congress was the Sugar Act amendments. Cuba, before Castro, received the largest allotment of sugar imports at world premium prices. The controversy arose over the division of this big allotment among other sugar-producing nations. Finally, a compromise was reached by which various countries were allocated certain of the Cuban allotment. On the vote on final passage of the Sugar Act amendments, Republicans in the Senate voted unanimous approval. Democrats did not.

PEACE CORPS

The Peace Corps, for which $30 million was appropriated for the current year, received $63.7 million for fiscal year 1963.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee, in approving the bill, said that at the end of the first year of its operations:

> It is too soon to evaluate the performance of the Peace Corps in terms of tangible accomplishment.

The committee stated that as yet there are only 698 volunteers in six countries, of which 136 are still in training. This $60-odd million appropriation is to enable the Corps to have 6,700 men and women in service or in training by June 30, 1963.

TRANSPORTATION

The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962, recommended by the President, was nothing more than a Federal subsidization of local and commuter services—in other words, more spending and greater concentration of power in the Federal Government.

In some areas local transit and commuter services are admittedly in trouble. The transit problems of major concern, however, are not those of small, weak, or impoverished cities but those of major, wealthy, industrialized communities which have know-how and resources to cope with the problem.

This bill would have authorized $500 million in Federal grants to States and public bodies to assist in financing purchase, construction, and improvement of mass transportation facilities and equipment and made permanent the present $50 million loan fund established in the Housing Act of last year for local transit operations. The bill would require submission of areawide transportation plans; authorize interstate compacts; allocate some funds to research, development, and demonstration projects; provide relocation assistance to families and businesses displaced by the transit program—and a further sweetener was added to place the responsibility in local hands. Communities would contribute one-third of the cost over a 3-year period. The bill failed of action.

EDUCATION

The President's proposals for farflung Federal aid to education fell largely by the wayside.

Action was not completed on the administration's college loan proposal to assist colleges in the building of academic facilities. Action was completed on legislation providing for matching public grants with the States to aid in the construction of State or other nonprofit educational television stations.

However, no legislation was enacted to provide scholarships for students seeking assistance in higher education.

The School Lunch Act of 1946, amending the State allotment formula apportioning the cash assistance funds to the States, was approved, as was the continuation of the impacted area grants.

The administration's bill to combat adult illiteracy did not gain approval. There also fell by the wayside in this Democrat-controlled Congress many other aids to education recommendations, such as those providing 4-year scholarships and cost-of-education grants for one-fourth of entering students in each medical and dental school in the Nation, appropriations for various fellowships.

In the first session of the 87th Congress the President's proposals for grants for school construction and teachers' salaries, approved by the Senate, failed of approval in the House mainly on the issue of paying teachers' salaries and grants to parochial schools.

DRUG INDUSTRY ACT

Republicans voted unanimous approval to the Drug Industry Act of 1962. The act provides for cooperation between the Patent Office and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on questions relating to drug patents and insures greater Government supervision of drug production.

Largely as a result of the tragic thalidomide episode, the act authorizes withdrawal of ineffective drugs from the market, strengthens the authority to withdraw unsafe drugs from the market, and adds to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare's authority to issue regulations to control the testing of new drugs before they are placed on the general market. The new legislation gives the Secretary specific authority to require records and reports as to data obtained as the result of investigational use of, and clinical experience with, both new drugs and antibiotics.

It is hoped that this new legislation will provide a framework under which industry and Government, working together, can continue to make available improved medicines within the system of incentives which has made the U.S. drug industry the most productive and inventive in the world. In the case of drugs already in the market, they must give the name of a product prominently showing quantitatively each ingredient and "such other information in brief summary relating to side effects, contraindications, and effectiveness as shall be required in regulations which shall be issued by the Secretary."

WELFARE

Many of the rehabilitation and vocational training measures were broadened. Some programs were made permanent, such as provisions for Federal financial assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled.

Other laws were amended, such as one earmarking certain funds for local programs for day care of children of working mothers; extending of Federal sharing in assistance payments to both parents of a needy child when both are residing with the child; increasing the Federal assistance to the States to maintain community work and training projects for unemployed persons receiving welfare benefits; and other laws bearing on the problems of needy children and those receiving welfare benefits.

Not enacted were bills which would have prohibited the States from making residence requirements for welfare assistance longer than 1 year and amending the Social Security Act to provide a small increase in assistance funds to States removing residence requirements in any of their federally aided welfare programs.

The public welfare legislation which was approved had as its principal purpose the encouragement of States to expand the rehabilitation of persons on the relief rolls, increasing services to children, establishing of community work and training projects, guarding against misuse of welfare funds paid for the benefit of dependent children, and the strengthening and improvement of welfare administration.

CONCLUSION

In general Republicans voted against big government and big spending.

For instance, on an amendment to exempt from controls feed grain fed to stock on farms where they are grown, Senate Republicans voted 29 to 1 in favor of it; Democrats defeated it—May 24.

On a motion to kill an amendment similar to the feed grain fed to homegrown stock, Senate Republicans opposed the motion, 31 to 1; Democrats succeeded in killing the proposal—May 25.

On passage of the administration's Freemanized farm bill—later defeated in the House—Senate Republicans voted against it, 30 to 1. The 2 to 1 Democratic majority in the Senate approved the revolutionary proposals for extraordinary Government farm powers—May 25.

On final agreement to the conference report of the manpower retraining bill—S. 1991, H.R. 1416—Republicans in the Senate, on March 8, and Republicans in the House, on March 13, shouted their approval of the measure. When Mr. Kennedy signed the bill March 15 he termed it "perhaps the most significant legislation in the area of employment" since 1946. This was a nice compliment to Republicans, for while the New Frontier may try to claim it as its legislation, this bill is a Republican measure and would never have become a law without Republican revision.

On an amendment to give the President unusual standby authority on public works, Republicans in the Senate voted overwhelmingly against it, 29 to 1—May 28.

On the foreign aid amendment to bar aid to any nation which exported to the Soviet bloc any strategic materials, Republicans voted approval, 28 to 5. A majority of Democrats defeated it—June 7.

On the tax revision measure in the House, Republicans voted 162 to 1 against such a so-called revision—March 29.

On two amendments distinctly favoring civil rights, Republicans in the Senate favored them by wide margins, but Democrats defeated both.

The only two tax bills of the present session that had become law by July 20 were Republican measures. They were measures for storm tax relief—March 19—and the Du Pont stock "breakup" bill. Here are examples of a Republican humanitarian measure and a Republican "widows and orphans" bill, the latter so termed because of the numerous letters from persons who owned just one or two shares of stock and did not think they should innocently be subjected to possible double taxation.

Then there are Republican revisions to the extension of the Export Control Act, strengthening its use of economic power to fight communism. Republicans voted overwhelmingly in favor of this.

On final passage of the Export Control Act, with Republican revisions, Republicans voted unanimously in the Senate.

Senate Republicans forced equal treatment for farm commodity exports when the Senate amended section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

On the vote on final passage of the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962, Republicans in the Senate voted unanimous approval; Democrats did not—June 27.

On limiting the public debt ceiling to $306 billion, Republicans in the Senate voted 28 to 4, while the Democrats rejected it, 48 to 9—June 28.

On the nomination of Matthew H. McCloskey to be Ambassador to Ireland, Republicans voted 30 to 1 in the Senate to recommit the nomination to committee—July 12.

On an amendment to establish a program of medical care for the aged so as to provide a voluntary, three-option choice of benefits, Republicans in the Senate voted approval, 27 to 4—July 12.

On an amendment to provide the elderly up to $9 per month for the purchase of private health insurance, Republicans in the Senate voted approval, 25 to 3. Democrats voted "antiprivate enterprise," 50 to 2, with 11 more Democrats, who did not vote, paired the same way as the other 50.

On the motion to kill the so-called compromise Kennedy medicare plan, Republications in the Senate voted 31 to 5 in approval, while the Democrats were badly split, 43 to 21, thus killing the New Frontier's plan—July 17.

On the aid for higher education measure—substituting language of S. 1241—Senate Republicans voted 24 to 7—February 6.

On the New Frontier's urban affairs plan, Senate Republicans opposed it 32 to 4, while the split Democratic vote was 38 to 26 against it—February 20.

On the final passage on the important civil rights measure dealing with a constitutional amendment re the poll tax, Senate Republicans voted 30 to 1 in favor.

On a motion to kill an antidiscrimination amendment, Republican Senators voted for the amendment, 31 to 1, while the Democrats, who propagandized their supposed antidiscrimination views, voted for killing the amendment 42 to 9—May 25.

On a Democrat-sponsored attempt to eliminate funds for the New York World's Fair—although funds were appropriated for the Seattle Fair and others—Senate Republicans supported the New York Fair by voting 27 to 1—April 16.

There are numerous examples of unified Republican attempts to reduce New Frontier spending proposals.

These are just a few examples of Republican Party responsibility and unity this session. And Republicans in the Senate also have caused the New Frontier to change its mind at the very instant such legislation is being considered on the Senate floor. For example:

On April 16, during debate on the second supplemental appropriations bill, Republicans offered an amendment to void the administration's ruling—by the Democrat-controlled Civil Service Commission—that Government employees could "explain"—lobby—the plans of the New Frontier.

In an effort to forestall a record vote to void this outrageous ruling, the Kennedy administration actually telephoned to Republicans on the Senate floor to promise that the civil service ruling was immediately being withdrawn. Republicans were asked "Please not to bring the amendment to a vote."

It is interesting, indeed, to hear administration spokesmen complain that so much more could be done if it were not for the Republicans in Congress. We must always bear in mind that today Democrats outnumber the Republicans 2 to 1 in the Senate and 3 to 2 in the House of Representatives.

It seems, then, that the administration program is not popular with the American people and not popular with the Congress.

Big talk and small action—that is the true record of the Kennedy administration in the 87th Congress.

RICE UNIVERSITY INAUGURATES PRESIDENT, CELEBRATES HALF CENTURY, AND LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Rice University will observe its golden anniversary on October 12, 1962.

The new president of Rice, Dr. Kenneth Sanborn Pitzer, inaugurated October 10, 1962, will assume a leadership role as this great university moves forward for a second half century of progress in the boundless field of human knowledge.

Dr. Pitzer, world-renowned scientist, published an article in a special section of the Houston Chronicle on Sunday, October 7.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Pitzer's article entitled "Rice Looks to the Future" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICE LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

(By Kenneth Sanborn Pitzer)

As Rice University celebrates 50 years of continuous excellence in higher education, it is not difficult for a new president to review a distinguished past and visualize with well-founded conviction an even more distinguished future.

The future of which I speak is based on the traditional emphasis on excellence at Rice. In its educational programs, the university has striven for the highest standards and will continue to do so. The rapid expansion of human knowledge in all areas of activity requires not only that we teach these new fields, but also that we better organize our instruction so the student will be able to learn more in the time available.

But the role of a great university includes research as well as instruction. Research investigations are directed toward the understanding of presently unexplained phenomena and the exploration of new areas of knowledge. We are concerned with understanding human affairs as well as the properties of inanimate nature.

The faculty and students at Rice have made important research contributions throughout the past 50 years. In the future, we shall intensify our efforts and extend the range of our research to include new fields of investigation.

With equal attention to the various fields of academic endeavor in mind, let me outline briefly some of the plans for expansion at Rice.

We must meet the needs of a growing range of industry in the rapidly developing gulf coast and southwest region. We must meet space-age needs, and we must meet these needs at all levels, not the least of which is the graduate student level.

The graduate program at Rice presently enrolls approximately 400 students with a substantial fraction in Ph. D. programs. Present plans call for an expansion of the graduate enrollment to about 800 students as rapidly as is feasible with retention of those of the highest quality. Additions are already being made to the faculty at various levels including several senior appointments.

The presence of the NASA Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston will assist Rice in this expansion of its graduate programs by dramatizing the importance of advanced scientific education. In turn, Rice graduates constitute a select group including many with specialization in exactly the fields of primary interest to the NASA laboratory. Rice already has received a training grant from NASA for the support and training of 10 graduate students in space-related science and technology.

Plans also call for the addition of laboratory space and facilities. Preliminary designs are being prepared for a new civil engineering laboratory made possible by the gift of L. B. Ryon, professor emeritus of civil engineering. We hope to be able to expand space-science activities on the Rice campus by the addition of a new building for an expanded space science laboratory.

A good library is essential to effective research. The Fondren Library at Rice already contains excellent works on various fields of knowledge including one of the country's best collections of Civil War and Confederate literature. However, the library must be expanded in order to accommodate the rapidly increasing record of human knowledge. Also, I would emphasize that the library is as important to the humanities as the laboratory is to the scientist.

There has been recent discussion of increasing the programs in psychology and in the area of political science and government. Also, remarkable advances are being made in the area between biology, chemistry and physics, sometimes called molecular biology. This field, as well as the science of outer space, will receive increasing emphasis.

So these are the areas in which we see an immediate need for careful and steady expansion of Rice University. But in planning these developments for the future, we must recognize that costs will increase. It is not that Rice does not have adequate financial basis for its present program. But we believe our opportunities for educational service and for increased contribution to the intellectual and technical community are far greater than our present resources.

To fulfill its role for the future, the university must have the financial support, not only of alumni and friends, but also of industry and commerce. Government grants will be important, as well as those from foundations. Rice University must move forward. We shall do so with the dedicated efforts of our board of governors and the support of all those who believe in the future of this great institution.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the same special edition of the Chronicle, Mr. Martin Dreyer wrote an article on Dr. Pitzer who followed in the footsteps of Dr. Edgar Odell Lovett, first president of Rice, and Dr. William V. Houston, second president of Rice.

I ask unanimous consent that the following article by Mr. Dreyer be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed, as follows:

(By Martin Dreyer)

At Sammy's, the campus cafeteria, groups of students are taking a coffee break. The place is lively with banter. Especially at the table where a lanky man sits laughing and exchanging small talk.

One of the students? Maybe a graduate student, with early frost in his hair?

You step closer, see that it is Dr. Kenneth Sanborn Pitzer, Rice's third president, who is to be formally inaugurated at 2:30 p.m. October 10 at the semicentennial celebration.

This 49-year-old man, an internationally known chemist, does not fit the usual conception of a famous scientist. No chemicals course through his veins, nor does he have an acid tongue or a test tube for a heart.

He's a warm human being, pleasant mannered and soft spoken. Despite his appearance of boyish shyness, he's easy to know.

The students will vouch for that. He joins them at Sammy's, hails them on the campus. He's a quick man with a clever story and has been known to use one to brighten up the chemistry class he teaches.

You interview him in his study on the second floor of Lovett Hall—a study distinguished by the absence of disorder.

Steady blues eyes regard you, the eyes of a man who is an attentive listener and who chooses his words carefully.

"Rice has one of the best undergraduate schools anywhere," Dr. Pitzer says. "Of course, there are areas for improvement which we shall make as we go along."

The focal point of expansion will be the graduate program, he stresses. And he explains that this area needs a top graduate school and that Rice's raw material should make such a goal possible.

Former Director of Research for the Atomic Energy Commission, he is keenly aware of the heavy responsibility that Rice must shoulder in a man-to-the-moon effort. The requirements for providing trained manpower and advanced technology demand that only the very best will serve, he says.

"The increasing emphasis on research to meet these high standards of quality, originality and performance creates a natural place for distinguished university development. The next decade will bring development of advanced education in Houston and the entire Southwest."

This man, widely known in two scientific fields—chemical physics and petroleum chemistry—feels strongly that the freedom to think, freedom to teach, and freedom to learn must be jealously guarded at Rice.

Dr. Pitzer was born in Pomona, Calif., where he took up his hobby of sailboating at 12. In high school he won debate contests—and sailboat model contests. Since then he has designed and built several sailboats.

There was a girl, Jean Mosher, who was in the same class with him all through school. They were married in 1935. It was the year he got his bachelor of science degree from California Institute of Technology. Two years later he received his doctorate at the University of California.

There he served as chemistry professor, assistant dean of the college of letters and science, dean of the college of chemistry, and held other administrative posts.

At University of California he was invited to deliver the lecture at the Phi Beta Kappa chapter's initiation ceremonies. It was discovered that he wasn't a member—there wasn't a chapter at Cal Tech. So the University of California chapter promptly made him a member.

He says, with a grin: "I'm probably the only honorary Phi Beta Kappa in the world."

Among top honors was his appointment as Chairman of the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission. He was its Director of Research from 1949 to 1951.

Dr. Pitzer was associated with two research projects of the American Petroleum Institute. In 1949, in Houston, he received the Precision Scientific Co. award in petroleum chemistry.

In 1943 he won the American Chemical Society award in pure chemistry. Seven years later the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce named him one of the 10 outstanding young men in the Nation.

In 1951 he became a Guggenheim fellow.

Dr. Pitzer is a member of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and a fellow in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences as well as numerous other scientific societies. He has authored three technical books and contributed 159 articles to scientific journals and reviews.

This is the man who took over Rice's helm in July 1961.

His father, Russell Kelly Pitzer, received his law degree at University of California. Now retired, he has philanthropic interests in several colleges in Claremont, Calif.

Dr. Pitzer and his wife, who finds the academic life "extremely stimulating and rewarding," have three children who rank as scholars.

Ann, 25, got her B.S. and M.S. degrees at University of California.

Russell, 24, former Cal Tech football star, is completing work for his Ph. D. in physical chemistry at Harvard.

John, 21, got his B.A. degree from University of California, is now enrolled in the graduate school at University of Wisconsin.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business, as a pro forma matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The Chief Clerk. A bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I object. I do not understand what the amendment is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. It is proposed, at the proper place in the bill, to insert the following:

Sec. . Deduction of Depletion Allowances With Respect to Oil and Gas Wells.

(a) 1963.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962, and before January 1, 1964, section 613(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage depletion in case of oil and gas wells) is amended by striking out "27½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "25 percent".

(b) 1964.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963, and before January 1, 1965, such section is amended by striking out "25 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "22½ percent".

(c) 1965 and Subsequent Years.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964, such section is amended by striking out "22½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 percent".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will want a record vote on this amendment, and I recognize there are not enough Senators in the Chamber. To avoid the necessity of having a quorum call first, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate votes on the amendment, the yeas and nays be ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think a unanimous-consent request is in order for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the yeas and nays could be ordered by unanimous consent. That would save bringing Senators into the Chamber. I wanted to be sure of having the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that under the rules a unanimous-consent request is applicable, but the minority leader and I have discussed this question over the years. We feel that this would be a bad precedent. However, I assure the Senator from Delaware that if and when this question comes to a vote, I shall be most happy to join with him and the Senator from Georgia in making sure that there will be a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This assurance from the majority leader is satisfactory to me. I wanted Senators to be on notice that a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment is expected. With that assurance from the majority leader to protect me I am satisfied.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment, it is similar to another amendment which was proposed earlier in the session by the distinguished Senator from Delaware, to another measure. Before the Senate takes any action on a proposal once voted on in the Senate, by a record vote, a live quorum should be present to consider it. I do not know whether that may comport with the desires of the majority leader, but I am prepared to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, his statement does comport with my desires. I have no choice in the matter, but I hope the Senator will withhold his request for a live quorum at this time and allow the Senate to take a recess.

Mr. RUSSELL. I defer to the judgment of the distinguished majority leader.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may stand in recess until 1 o'clock p.m.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the Senate will now stand in recess until 1 o'clock p.m.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes a.m., the Senate took a recess until 1 o'clock p.m.

The Senate reassembled when called to order by Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request that the Senate stand in recess until 4 p.m. today, so that it will be possible to have as much business as is available considered at the same time, rather than for the Senate to operate in spurts, as the recent procedure would seem to indicate.

It is the intention of the leadership today to bring up the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which I understand has cleared the House of Representatives. It is also the intention to bring up the conference report on the pay bill for the teachers in the District of Columbia; also the conference report on the Highway Act; and, depending on developments, the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

If that is brought up today, I wish to say to the Acting President pro tempore, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], that it is the intention to try to proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, as well.

At the present time the public works authorization bill is in conference. I understand that the conferees are meeting this afternoon. What progress will be made remains to be seen.

There will also be the conference report on the public works appropriation bill, which will come up at the conclusion of consideration of the pending business.

To the best of my knowledge, that is the schedule of the remaining measures for the Senate and the House to consider.

RECESS UNTIL 4 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if no Senator wishes to speak at this time, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 4 p.m. this afternoon.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess until 4 p.m. on the same day.

The Senate reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 19, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54 to the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3451) to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6371) to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1934 with respect to the limitation on retirement income.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 8517. An act to grant emergency officers' retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929; and

H.R. 9045. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. MASON, and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 10, 12, 19, 25, 26, and 27 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, 11 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 555. An act for the relief of Elmore County, Ala.;

H.R. 1691. An act for the relief of Elaine Veronica Brathwaite and Jessie Bamer;

H.R. 3131. An act for the relief of Richard C. Collins;

H.R. 5260. An act to continue for an additional 3-year period the existing suspensions of the tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations or mixtures thereof;

H.R. 5700. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise;

H.R. 6190. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the repair or replacement for veterans of certain prosthetic or other appliances damaged or destroyed as a result of certain accidents;

H.R. 6691. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6836. An act to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act;

H.R. 7791. An act to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for the collection and publication of foreign commerce and trade statistics, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8140. An act to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8355. An act to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8874. An act to authorize certain banks to invest in corporations whose purpose is to provide clerical services for them, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8952. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes and relating to the taxation of life insurance companies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9285. An act for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson;

H.R. 9777. An act to amend Private Law 87–197;

H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of civilian employees of the New York Naval Shipyard and the San Francisco Naval Shipyard erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to a misinterpretation of a Navy civilian personnel instruction;

H.R. 10026. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power;

H.R. 10129. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees;

H.R. 10199. An act for the relief of Lester A. Kocher;

H.R. 10423. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy H. Johnson;

H.R. 10541. An act to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs designed to protect their populations, particularly all preschool children; against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus;

H.R. 10605. An act for the relief of Joan Rosa Orr;

H.R. 10708. An act to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricty;

H.R. 10936. An act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11058. An act for the relief of Carl Adams;

H.R. 11578. An act for the relief of Don C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner;

H.R. 11899. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund;

H.R. 12313. An act for the relief of Jane Froman, Gypsy Markoff, and Jean Rosen;

H.R. 12402. An act for the relief of Concetta Maria, Rosetta, and Tomasino Mangiaracina;

H.R. 12513. An act to provide for public notice of settlements in patent interferences, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12599. An act relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, and for other purposes.

RELIEF FOR RESIDENTIAL OCCUPANTS OF UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield briefly to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill—S. 3451—to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 10, 1962, p. 23049, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the conference report on S. 3451 is a fair and workable measure to do justice and equity to a number of private American citizens who have relied upon long and well-established custom and precedent in the mining States of our West. The measure I introduced into the Senate on June 20 was based on my personal investigation, study, and knowledge of cases in which men and women, many of them elderly, in Idaho, California, and other States are threatened with the loss of the homes where they have lived all of their lives, into which they have put their lifetime savings, and which in some cases represent their only property. Literally, they have no place to go to live.

The bill I introduced into the Senate was the subject of public hearings and executive agency reports. Based on the hearings and reports, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs amended the bill, and the Senate adopted the amendments and the bill on September 6. The House amended the Senate bill to make its provisions conform more closely to the original measure.

I can assure my colleagues in the Senate that the measure agreed upon by the conferees in no way violates the spirit of the bill approved by the Senate and in the judgment of the Senate conferees is a fair and workable measure.

I should like to touch on a few of the points in the conference version of the bill by way of giving assurance to those who will be affected by it and those who will be charged with administering this legislation.

Section 2 of the bill was revised to make the legislation applicable to any person who was a qualified applicant as of the date of enactment of this act rather than as of January 10, 1962. This was done in order that there would be no one unjustly deprived of the opportunity to benefit from this legislation.

In section 3 certain language dealing with consultation with local governments was eliminated because it was believed that even where such government was not directly concerned the consultation would take place.

Section 4 is essentially the same as the Senate bill.

Section 5 also is essentially the same. The Senate receded from the extensive formula which it spelled out for setting value in order to provide the Secretary of the Interior with full latitude to prescribe by regulation the payment formula in accordance with the many different situations which may confront him.

Section 6 is also essentially unchanged, as is the balance of the bill.

In section 1 of the bill the conferees made certain that the conveyance could include an interest up to and including a fee simple, and this taken together with the language in section 3 forms the basis of my pointing out that the elimination of the last sentence of section 4 of the Senate-passed bill remains intact in purpose. In other words, in the conference version of the bill an interest less than a fee simple may be granted on either withdrawn or nonwithdrawn lands, and the question is left entirely up to the administering agency with the further proviso in section 3 that on withdrawn land consent must be obtained from the agency having jurisdiction over that land or on whose behalf the land has been withdrawn, and this agency shall set forth the terms and conditions appropriate to the situation.

This legislation therefore provides, in the judgment of the Senate conferees, a full kit of legal tools and the discretion, when it is in the public interest, to permit persons residing on mining claims for residential purposes as of the date of enactment of this act to obtain the opportunity to continue to reside upon these lands if they meet the criteria set forth in the legislation.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report on S. 3451.

The motion was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is at the desk a message having to do with the agricultural appropriations. I ask that the message be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, announcing its further insistence upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 19, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54 to the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 2, 19, 44, and 47 through 54, and request a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the purpose of consideration of seven postmaster nominations which I am about to report from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I report seven postmaster nominations which I send to the desk; and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the following nominations of postmasters:

CONNECTICUT

Carmine J. Grote, Chester.

INDIANA

Vaughn L. Kostielnay, Arvilla.
Hiram T. Staples, Greensburg.

MISSISSIPPI

Arjenter B. Cardwell, Harrisville.

VERMONT

Howard H. Bartlett, West Dover.

TEXAS

Jacob E. Shoaf, Quitman.

ILLINOIS

Floyd R. Chapin, Harvey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the nominations?

Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider these nominations en bloc; and without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADVISORY BOARD, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I report the nomination of Kenneth P. Steinreich, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department. This nomination is approved by both Senators from the State. The nominee is to serve in an advisory capacity for the Post Office Department, without pay. Such an appointment is customary, and confirmation of the appointment is requested by the Post Office Department.

Mr. President, I request the immediate consideration of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth P. Steinreich, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be considered; and, without objection, it is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY AND RETIREMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1962—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY ACT OF 1958

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 3705.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3705) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, in the table heading above line 1, strike out "salary" and insert " 'salary"; on page 2, at the top of column 1, strike out "salary" and insert " 'salary"; on page 2, in the line preceding line 1, strike out "days" and insert "days.' "; on page 2, strike out lines 1 through 3, inclusive, and insert:

> SEC. 2. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members to whom the amendment made by the first section of this Act apply shall be adjusted in accordance with this section, and on and after the effective date of this Act section 201 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 shall not apply to any such officer or member whose rate of basic compensation is so adjusted in accordance with this section. Such rates of basic compensation shall be adjusted as follows:

On page 10, after line 19, insert:

> SEC. 4. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, United States Park Police, the White House Police, and for other purposes", approved September 8, 1960 (Public Law 86-734), is hereby repealed.

And on page 11, line 1, strike out "SEC. 4." and insert "SEC. 5."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the House amendments are acceptable. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

Mr. President, let me say here that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], is briefly unavoidably absent on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the report is most extraordinary in one way: The conferees had to consider, not a difference of opinion between the two Houses in regard to an appropriation item, but a difference of opinion in regard to certain words contained in the report made by the Senate committee.

The words in the Senate committee report which were under consideration were:

> In approving the item of $300,000 for construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, the Senate Committee on Appropriations takes this action with the understanding that the District of Columbia Highway Department will not proceed with the project until the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency has been submitted in November 1962, and if that report is against the Three Sisters Bridge, the Commissioners shall proceed with the construction of the bridge unless before March 1, 1963, action to negate such construction shall have been taken by either the Senate Committee on Appropriations or the House Committee on Appropriations. Furthermore, it is the view of this committee that no funds allocated to the District of Columbia's highway program shall be used for the construction of the Glover-Archbold Parkway. The committee further recommends that the District of Columbia cooperate in the preservation of this natural park.

The Senate committee's report on this subject was the matter in disagreement.

The Senate report recommended that the District of Columbia Highway Department not proceed with the project until the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency has been submitted. This Agency was established to investigate transportation facilities within the metropolitan area and to make a report to the President by November 1, 1962. Approximately $2 million was appropriated for that purpose.

The words in the Senate committee report were that if the Commission's report was in the affirmative, there would be no question about going forward with the Three Sisters Bridge. But if the report was in the negative—I refer to the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency—then the matter should be held up until the question of construction had been taken up by the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

Those were the words which the House conferees insisted be eliminated or superseded by the words in the conference report, which is, of course, a House document.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Senate conferees split on this question, four being for the building of the bridge now, and four desiring to stand by what the Senate conferees stated in the conference. In order to break that tie, the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], appointed as a ninth conferee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who voted in favor of the construction. I think the chairman of the committee was entirely correct in trying to break the tie.

My purpose in rising today is to point out that that vote represents the views of only five members of the Senate committee. The remainder of the committee, so far as I know, are still in favor of the language in the Senate report.

In addition, the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Mr. Walter N. Tobriner, has written the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

> OCTOBER 10, 1962.
>
> Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
> *Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In connection with the conference now going forward between conferees of the House and Senate relating to the 1963 appropriations bill for the District of Columbia, this is to advise you that before the Commissioners proceed with the construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, they will give most careful consideration to any recommendations pertaining thereto that may appear in the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which is expected to be delivered to the President on November 1, 1962.
>
> With kindest personal regards, I am
> Sincerely yours,
> WALTER N. TOBRINER,
> *President, Board of Commissioners, D.C.*

I rise to point out that in that letter the President of the Board of Commissioners states unequivocally that the Commissioners will receive the report before taking any action.

I also point out that the language in the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee, under all the precedents of our body, was not in conference between the two bodies, as the amount of money was not in dispute.

So I hope the Commissioners of the District of Columbia will bear carefully in mind, before proceeding with the construction of the bridge, the report of the Senate committee, and the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency, which, I understand, was appointed to consider all these subjects, and for which some $2 million was appropriated.

My purpose in making the statement at this time is in order that the matter may be given the most careful consideration by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in connection with the thoughtful consideration by the Commissioners of the language in this report, I call attention to the fact that it would have been utterly absurd to have held the Congress here until Thanksgiving or later to pass only on language in a report, the only purpose of which was to prevent the building of a necessary bridge.

Every highway agency in Virginia favored the Three Sisters Bridge. Every highway agency in the District of Columbia favored the Three Sisters Bridge. But we have a Commission indulging in a pipedream of a proposed subway to cost $300 to $600 million, that will go under the river and into a highway to relieve traffic congestion. We are to wait and spend millions of dollars in building U.S. Highway 66, and when it gets to the river, people will either have to swim across or stay on the Virginia side.

In my opinion, there was no opposition but that of a few citizens who did not want any more traffic. The allegation was made that we were going to interfere with the Washington Memorial Highway, which we fully disclaimed. We placed in the RECORD a statement from our Highway Department showing that they had no idea of making a connection between U.S. Highway 66 and the parkway. This Commission is indulging in a pipedream of a subway, or an elevated system—I do not know which—but they have no plans or money, and it will be many years before they have either. So I say that the Commissioners should very seriously consider this problem, because nothing is involved but an effort to stop the building of a necessary bridge.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call attention to certain language in the report of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which I now quote:

> Furthermore, it is the view of the committee of conference that no funds allocated to the District of Columbia's highway program shall be used for the construction of the Glover-Archbold Parkway. The committee of conference further recommends that the District of Columbia cooperate in the preservation of this natural park.

I hope this admonition will be considered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I hope more than that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So do I.

Mr. MORSE. I think we had better make it something more than admonition, by legislative history here and now. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I carried through the District of Columbia Committee this year the Mansfield bill which preserves the park for future generations.

Does the Senator from Montana care to tell me what is the status of the bill now in the Congress?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that it is in the House District of Columbia legislative committee.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Montana knows, that bill passed the Senate without any difficulty whatsoever.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true.

Mr. MORSE. The Senate has expressed itself on it. I serve notice on the District of Columbia Commissioners, that I intend to be here in January 1963, and I strongly recommend that they take note of the colloquy now taking place on the floor of the Senate between the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], author of the bill, and the senior Senator from Oregon, in whose subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee this subject matter falls.

I strongly advise the District of Columbia Commissioners to see to it that this park remains untouched, either from the standpoint of building a highway through it or sacrificing it to selfish commercial interests in the District of Columbia. I suggest to the District of Columbia Commissioners that they not attempt any end run play, because if they do, they will be breaking faith with our committee, in my judgment, and with the Senate, and they will be breaking faith with a majority of the House of Representatives, if we can ever get an issue such as this to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. I am sure the Commissioners will read every word that has been said on the floor of the Senate about this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two summary tables relating to the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1963, H.R. 12276, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Summary of bill

FEDERAL PAYMENT

[Out of the general revenues of the Federal Treasury]

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	House bill, 1963	Senate bill, 1963	Conference action
Federal payment to the District of Columbia (general fund)	$30,000,000	$32,000,000	$30,000,000	$30,000,000	$30,000,000
Federal payment to the District of Columbia (water fund)	1,855,000	1,938,000	1,938,000	1,938,000	1,938,000
Federal payment to the District of Columbia (sanitary sewage works fund)	898,000	961,000	961,000	961,000	961,000
Federal payment to the District of Columbia (metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund)		300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Total, Federal payment	32,753,000	35,199,000	33,199,000	33,199,000	33,199,000

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

[Out of the general revenues of the Federal Treasury]

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	House bill, 1963	Senate bill, 1963	Conference action
Loans to District of Columbia for capital outlay (general fund)	$20,400,000	$18,700,000	$18,700,000	$18,700,000	$18,700,000
Loans to District of Columbia for capital outlay (highway fund)		1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Loans to District of Columbia for capital outlay (sanitary sewage works fund)	8,600,000	3,242,000	3,242,000	3,242,000	3,242,000
Loan to metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund		2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Total, loan authorizations	29,000,000	26,042,000	26,042,000	26,042,000	26,042,000

Summary of appropriation bill, H.R. 12276

Activities	Appropriation, 1962	Revised estimates, 1963	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
Operating Expenses					
General operating expenses:					
Executive Office	$716,600	$887,300	$786,500	$791,800	$791,800
General administration	6,403,360	6,798,400	6,613,000	6,779,700	6,761,350
Regulatory agencies	1,839,000	1,878,500	1,862,000	1,862,000	1,862,000
Occupations and professions	480,000	442,500	442,500	441,000	441,000
Public Library	3,043,000	3,168,000	3,147,400	3,140,200	3,140,200
Veterans' affairs	118,000	119,600	119,600	119,600	119,600
Buildings and grounds	2,656,700	2,884,700	2,830,000	2,654,300	2,654,300
Surveyor's Office	212,000	204,000	204,000	204,000	204,000
Total, general operating expenses	15,468,660	16,373,000	16,005,000	15,992,600	15,974,250
Public safety:					
Corporation Counsel	902,000	1,034,900	941,000	965,400	965,400
Metropolitan Police	26,261,534	26,999,800	26,999,800	26,901,900	26,901,900
Fire Department	11,780,000	12,623,000	12,595,000	12,595,000	12,595,000
Civil defense	93,500	154,000	95,000	95,000	95,000
Courts	6,065,000	6,290,200	6,126,000	6,212,500	6,209,400
Corrections	7,607,000	8,105,000	7,831,600	7,935,000	7,849,500
Licenses and inspections	2,787,593	2,918,500	2,784,000	2,784,000	2,784,000
National Guard	185,000	187,600	187,600	187,600	187,600
Total, public safety	55,690,627	58,313,000	57,560,000	57,676,400	57,587,800
Education:					
Public schools	54,206,110	57,770,000	56,817,000	57,284,600	57,248,400
Parks and recreation:					
Recreation Department	3,245,100	3,358,900	3,356,900	3,350,400	3,348,400
National Capital parks	3,479,700	3,541,200	3,541,200	3,541,200	3,541,200
National Zoological Park	1,379,800	1,512,900	1,478,900	1,470,200	1,470,200
Total, parks and recreation	8,104,600	8,413,000	8,377,000	8,361,800	8,359,800
Health and welfare:					
Vocational rehabilitation	376,000	412,900	403,000	401,800	401,800
Public health	40,518,000	44,554,400	44,269,000	43,727,800	43,727,800
Public welfare	21,401,090	24,035,700	21,856,000	21,378,500	21,256,700
Total, health and welfare	62,295,090	69,003,000	66,528,000	65,508,100	65,386,300
Highways and traffic:					
Department of Highways and Traffic	9,204,600	9,683,600	9,650,000	9,624,500	9,624,500
Motor vehicles	1,502,000	1,648,600	1,613,000	1,588,400	1,588,400
Motor Vehicle Parking Agency	197,500	208,000	207,000	205,100	205,100
Total, highways and traffic	10,904,100	11,540,200	11,470,000	11,418,000	11,418,000
Sanitary engineering:					
Department of Sanitary Engineering	17,337,600	18,137,400	17,914,000	17,897,400	17,897,400
Washington aqueduct	2,742,000	2,878,600	2,875,000	2,863,400	2,863,400
Total, sanitary engineering	20,079,600	21,016,000	20,789,000	20,760,800	20,760,800
Miscellaneous (claims, suits, wage scale costs, etc.)	61,210				
Total, operating expenses, by funds:					
General fund	208,558,997	223,102,200	218,448,649	217,958,490	217,709,899
Highway fund	7,484,900	6,333,000	6,238,476	6,210,376	6,192,026
Highway fund (parking account)		2,137,000	2,007,000	2,005,100	2,005,100
Water fund	6,699,400	6,901,000	6,896,875	6,885,275	6,885,275
Sanitary sewage works fund	3,710,200	3,955,000	3,955,000	3,943,050	3,943,050
Motor vehicle parking fund	356,500				
Total, operating expenses, by funds	226,809,997	242,428,200	237,546,000	237,002,300	236,735,350

Summary of appropriation bill, H.R. 12276—Continued

Activities	Appropriation, 1962	Revised estimates, 1963	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
Capital Outlay					
District debt service	$1,995,000	$2,468,278	$2,468,278	$2,468,278	$2,468,278
Public building construction	16,552,900	25,446,000	24,211,197	24,709,197	24,709,197
Highways and traffic	6,880,000	11,973,000	10,738,525	9,978,525	9,978,525
Sanitary engineering	17,830,000	13,630,000	12,235,000	12,235,000	12,235,000
Washington aqueduct		1,356,000			
Motor Vehicle Parking Agency		60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Potomac interceptor sewerline		2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Total, capital outlay, by funds:					
General fund	24,032,541	31,784,972	30,250,169	30,748,169	30,748,169
Highway fund	6,630,000	11,805,617	10,571,142	9,811,142	9,811,142
Highway fund (parking account)		60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Water fund	2,840,359	3,104,053	1,748,053	1,748,053	1,748,053
Sanitary sewage works fund	9,755,000	8,178,636	7,083,636	7,083,636	7,083,636
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund		2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Total, capital outlay, by funds	43,257,900	57,733,278	52,513,000	52,251,000	52,251,000
Recapitulation by Funds					
General fund	232,591,538	254,887,172	248,698,818	248,706,668	248,458,068
Highway fund	14,114,900	18,138,617	16,809,618	16,021,518	16,003,168
Highway fund (parking account)		2,197,000	2,067,000	2,065,100	2,065,100
Water fund	9,539,759	10,005,053	8,644,928	8,633,328	8,633,328
Sanitary sewage works fund	13,465,200	12,133,636	11,038,636	11,026,686	11,026,686
Motor vehicle parking fund	356,500				
Metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund		2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Total, all funds	270,067,897	300,161,478	290,059,000	289,253,300	288,986,350

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to state that I still support the reservation regarding the Three Sisters Bridge that was reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee and passed by the Senate.

I understand there are honest differences of opinion on this matter and I respect these differences. However, I have felt that Congress should have the benefit of the National Capital Transportation Agency mass transit plan before giving a final decision as to construction of the Three Sisters Bridge. Since the bridge will be an integral part of the District's transportation pattern, I still believe we can afford a delay of no longer than 5 months, as provided for by the language of the Senate Appropriations Committee report.

The extent to which the Three Sisters Bridge commits the District to the controversial inner loop system before the proposals of the NCTA are released is unfortunate. I do not believe we can make an objective assessment of the transportation needs of the area until the entire highway system is evaluated in light of the forthcoming mass transit proposals. While I fully respect the judgment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on this matter, I do adhere to my original positions; namely, that it would be wiser to wait until the NCTA report is released in about 2 weeks.

The Senate proviso that held up construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, if the NCTA report so recommended, was limited to March 1, 1963. After that date, the construction on the bridge could begin unless the Appropriations Committee of either House decided otherwise. I believe this was a sound proposal. It did not deny the initial appropriation of $300,000. But it did provide for full consideration of all relevant facts before the final decision on Three Sisters Bridge was reached. I felt that this accommodation was a wise one and I still support it. I regret that the Senate and House conferees finally determined to do otherwise.

Mr. President, I was very pleased to see that the conference committee did approve the full $135,400 needed to complete the replacement of obsolete and outworn textbooks in the District of Columbia public schools. I have spoken at some length about the shameful condition of the textbooks in the District schools and I am most grateful that these facts were fully appreciated by my colleagues in both Houses.

The situation was critical. You cannot teach our young citizens with books so hopelessly obsolete or physically decrepit that they are useless. I believe the District now has adequate funds to replace these obsolete books. I am confident that the educational opportunities of our young citizens in the District will improve commensurately.

But I was disappointed to learn that funds for providing books for elementary school libraries and funds to provide for two school librarians were deleted. While not as urgent as the textbook emergency, I do believe the District's schoolchildren should have the opportunity to have a library at their disposal during their elementary school years.

These were not luxury items. Reading is one of the fundamental learning skills taught in the elementary school. It is, in fact, the most important skill. School libraries are a great boon to young students learning to read. They provide the resources for opening up the wide world of knowledge to these young pupils. They assist greatly in providing the basic reading skills that a child will carry with him throughout his life.

Mr. President, I intend to request these items again next year. Educators across the country testify to the importance of elementary school libraries and I hope that the District schoolchildren will eventually have the benefit of them.

Once again I wish to compliment the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for his diligent work on this appropriation measure. We have agreed on almost every item in the bill. He has done a fine and praiseworthy job. Where we have disagreed, they have been honest disagreements that can be respected.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure to serve with him on the District of Columbia Subcommittee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12276, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
October 11, 1962.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 10, 12, 19, 25, 26, and 27 to the bill (H.R. 12276) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$15,974,250".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$8,359,800".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,386,300".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 8, and 11.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1962—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the report was agreed to by all the conferees of both Houses, and signed by all the members of the conference committee.

The action of the conferees may be summarized as follows:

The authorization for A-B-C funds for fiscal year 1965 of $975 million was approved, as included in the House-passed bill, rather than $950 million approved by the Senate.

The House figure of $10 million additional funds for forest development roads and trails for fiscal year 1963 was approved, rather than $20 million as approved by the Senate.

The Senate amendment increasing the funds for parkways for fiscal year 1964 by $550,000 was approved. The House managers insisted on inclusion in their report a statement that nothing shall be construed as specifically earmarking any of the authorization for parkways for particular projects in any State.

The increased authorization of $18 million for public lands highways for fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965 was approved by the conferees, with a similar statement in the House managers' report on earmarking any of the funds for specific projects.

An authorization of $850,000 for completion of the Rama Road in Nicaragua was approved, as passed by the Senate.

The authorization of an additional amount of $32 million for completion of the Inter-American Highway was approved. The contract authority was limited to $12 million, such contractual authority to be reduced by any amounts appropriated for the Inter-American Highway during this session of Congress.

The language in the House bill on the use of 0.5 percent of A-B-C funds for each fiscal year beginning with 1964, for highway research, planning, and other purposes, was agreed to by the conferees.

The provision for a study of highway matters in Alaska and interconnections between Alaskan highways and Canadian highways at the international boundary was agreed to by the conferees.

Mr. President, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962 is a good bill, and is urgently needed to keep the highway program moving forward. It will permit immediate apportionment of the A-B-C funds to the States, and allow them to award contracts and proceed with their highway work. It will also permit advancement of construction on important roads on Federal lands and reservations to provide for their full development and utilization.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Before the conference report is adopted, I wish to say that, as one Senator, I think I speak for most, if not all, of my colleagues in the Senate in expressing my appreciation to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] for his very wise and able leadership in resolving the differences between the Senate and the House in regard to this measure. This bill is of importance not only to every State in the Union from an economic standpoint, but important also to the whole country from the standpoint of the great problem which confronts us; namely, the shocking record of fatalities on the highways. I am told that 40,000 to 50,000 persons a year are killed on the highways, and that many times that number are seriously injured, yet the highway engineers tell us over and over again that we cannot reduce the fatalities except by improving the highways, because many highways cannot accommodate modern automobiles.

The safety programs cannot possibly cut down fatalities, yet there has been some controversy as to whether we ought to put a dollar sign ahead of those lives.

I commend the Senator from Michigan for the social conscience which has motivated him, in my judgment, in his leadership on this bill, because, as we pass the bill this afternoon, we are probably taking the most effective safety step we can take toward cutting down the shocking loss of life and injuries on American highways.

I congratulate the Senator again.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. This is a part of our highway program which, I think, is too often overlooked and too frequently not recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

LUMBER IMPORTS AND THE TRADE ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have told the majority leader that when he needed time for a little off-the-floor negotiating on other matters, I would use some time—not very much—to present a lumber matter which is of vital concern to the lumber industry of my State. Therefore, Mr. President, I take the floor to discuss my understanding of the legislative intent of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which was passed by this distinguished body last week, as it applies to a matter presently before the U.S. Tariff Commission.

This trade bill was, by its very comprehensive nature, of concern to a great many, and I might add, especially to the American lumber industry, and its strong elements in the great Pacific Northwest, as to the effect it would have on its struggle for equitable treatment in the face of foreign attacks on its traditional domestic markets.

I am advised that Chairman Ben D. Dorfman, of the U.S. Tariff Commission, in opening the lumber industry proceeding, analyzed the elements of the case and interpreted the laws with respect to the hearing and the potential Commission findings. In apprising the parties to the hearing of the pertinent laws, Chairman Dorfman apparently said that there was a difference between section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act and section 301(b) of the newly passed Trade Expansion Act in relation to how the Commission must consider what causes or threatens serious injury. Explaining his interpretation of the escape clause provision of the new bill, Chairman Dorfman said:

> The escape clause provisions of the two acts differ also with respect to the description of the injury criteria that the Tariff Commission is to take into account. The Trade Expansion Act omits reference to any of the injury factors specifically enumerated in section 7.

The Commission should not misunderstand legislative intent upon this point since it could materially affect both the presentation of pertinent facts in this proceeding and the arrival at a just and equitable provision for relief.

It was on this very point that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Virginia, acting as floor manager for the trade bill, assured me that there was no intention that there would be any difference between section 7 of the present Trade Agreement Extension Act and section 301(b) of the new bill as it was passed by Congress. The Senators will recall that I asked the senior Senator from Virginia, floor manager for the trade bill, the following question:

> Does the Senator agree with me that insofar as deciding what economic factors shall be considered by the Tariff Commission in determining injury to a domestic industry, there is no difference between 301(b) of the pending bill and section 7 of the Trade Agreement Extension Act?

The senior Senator from Virginia answered in the affirmative. He said:

> The Tariff Commission shall consider all relevant economic factors and in this respect the criteria for determining injury does not differ in any way from the present law.

To further support this interpretation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I call attention to pages 10 and 11 of Report No. 2059 which is a Senate report on the trade bill. The report states, and I quote:

> The language in the bill which modifies present law, as it relates to the criteria for determining injury in an escape clause proceeding before the Tariff Commission, is to

make perfectly clear that all relevant economic factors should be considered. In this respect the criteria for determining injury does not differ from present law.

It is clear, then, that the new trade bill had no intention of changing the criteria for determining injury in cases before the Tariff Commission. Because lumbermen of my State have been before the Tariff Commission and their case is presently being considered by the Tariff Commission at this very moment, I thought it was important that I make perfectly clear my feeling in the matter and my view of the legislative intent of the trade bill. It is important that the Commission, in the final analysis, consider all the economic factors before making a recommendation to the President as to what he should do in invoking the escape clause provision or the other useful provisions in this act.

My colleagues in the Senate know how hard we in the Northwest have fought for the lumber industry of our States, of the Pacific Northwest, and of the United States. It is quite clear, with the importation of Canadian softwood lumber into this country reportedly taking close to 17 percent of our total domestic market, that something must be done. Loggers, woodsmen, and lumbermen, mills and communities feel the effect of competition from Canadian softwood lumber. We cannot afford to weaken our own economy by exporting American lumber jobs to Canada.

I think the proper procedure has been for the lumber industry to take its case to the Tariff Commission, and I urged that this be done.

At the Portland, Oreg., hearings earlier this year I cross-examined witnesses representing the lumber industry. I sought to elicit from them why they had not filed a request for a hearing before the Tariff Commission. Whatever the reasons, the fact is that on the basis of that discussion they reached a decision that they would proceed forthwith to prepare their application for hearings before the Tariff Commission. They completed that application and the hearings now going on are the result. Their case is now being heard by the Tariff Commission.

I hope that the Commission will act expeditiously, as requested by the President, so that a prompt and equitable solution can be found.

I propose to do all that I can to assist the lumber industry in its efforts in getting relief.

As I said on the floor of the Senate, if it becomes necessary, I will be back in January with proposed legislation to assist the industry.

In my earlier speeches on this subject, I outlined some of the proposed legislation that I shall introduce in January if the Canadian Government does not see the fairness and wisdom of arriving at a reasonable voluntary arrangement with the United States on lumber. In my judgment the application of industrial statesmanship and trade statesmanship could produce an arrangement which will be helpful to both industries. I am told the Canadians, too, contend that their industry is not in the best condition. Well, it is doing all right. I suggest it could do better if it will cooperate, for the real issue is to expand the use and market for wood.

Today I sent a letter to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, Mr. Ben Dorfman, setting forth my views as to what I understand is his interpretation of the recently passed trade bill as reported when the lumber hearings opened on October 4. His reported present interpretation is at variance with my understanding of the interpretation we in both Houses of Congress place on the act. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the Chairman of the Commission be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

October 10, 1962.

Hon. Ben D. Dorfman,
Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The current hearing before the Tariff Commission to determine whether there is sufficient reason to recommend to the President that he invoke the escape clause of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade with respect to softwood lumber importations from Canada is fraught with significance for my constituents in Oregon and, indeed, throughout the Pacific Northwest.

I interpret your opening statement in that proceeding to indicate that you consider that the Trade Expansion Act of 1952, as passed by the Congress varies from present law as concerns escape clause procedure. I have difficulty reconciling this interpretation with the legislative history of the bill in the Senate.

There are, obviously, many differences between the Trade Agreements Act and the new Trade Expansion Act. I believe, however, that a complete review of the language and legislative history of the bill now in the White House will reveal that the differences are principally confined to the tariff cutting authority and assistance relief. The section referred to in your opening remarks of the present proceeding, section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act, does not vary materially from section 301(b) of the Trade Expansion Act. You suggest that the differences are such that the criteria for applying for relief under the escape clause provision of the new act will make a substantial difference in the present proceeding.

I invite your attention to the colloquy between Senator Harry F. Byrd, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and myself when the present bill was debated on the floor of the Senate September 18, 1962.

Specifically, I asked Senator Byrd: "Is it intended that the Tariff Commission shall consider all relevant economic evidence of injury to a domestic industry in an escape-clause case?" The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee answered in the affirmative.

During the floor colloquy I asked the Finance Committee chairman if there would be any difference between section 301(b) of the new bill and section 7 of the old law in determining injury to a domestic industry. Senator Byrd replied: "The Tariff Commission shall consider all relevant economic factors, and in this respect the criteria for determining injury does not differ in any way from present law."

You will agree, I am sure, that the legislative intent differs from your statement, "The escape-clause provisions of the two acts differ also with respect to the description of injury criteria that the Tariff Commission is to take into account." I respectfully suggest that through this statement, you have inadvertently misinterpreted the legislative intent as the law was written and specifically commented upon by the legislative branch of the Government.

It may be helpful in your consideration of the problem if you would refer to the colloquy between the floor manager of the Trade Expansion Act in the Senate and the senior Senator from Oregon. I am enclosing a copy of the colloquy as reported in the Congressional Record for your reference.

The industry of my State is vitally interested in full protection of the rights given to it by legislation before your Commission. It seeks only that it be given every opportunity to establish its just claims within the scope and intent of the law.

I am satisfied that you and your fellow commissioners will conduct a fair and comprehensive hearing into the lumber problem as it involves the importation of Canadian softwood lumber. It is essential, however, that the basic rules under which the hearing is conducted and the finding prepared be clearly within the intent of the Congress in drafting and passing the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

With some 17 percent of the total domestic consumption of softwood lumber in the United States coming from Canadian sources, I am sure you can understand my compelling interest in the recommendation the Tariff Commission will make to the President with respect to this mounting problem which is taking jobs and closing mills in my State.

This case may well be the first one decided under the new trade bill. Certainly it will be the first major case. The decision you make will involve, therefore, more than the lumber industry. It will be widely interpreted as setting the tone for the approach that will be taken to trade adjustment issues.

This will then be a landmark decision and management and labor alike, all across this land, will begin to form opinions on the effectiveness of our new trade policy.

As a man elected to represent the Nation's leading lumber-producing State, I have a deep interest in the issue now before you. In my broader capacity as a U.S. Senator, I have an equal obligation to the national interest.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne Morse.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make perfectly clear that I have considered the problem before my State to be a nonpartisan matter. The issue in my State is of interest not only to the lumber mill owners and workers in the mills and in the forests, but also of great concern to all segments of the economy of Oregon. On a nonpartisan basis it is of great concern to both Democrats and Republicans, irrespective of their political affiliation.

Mr President, even though the Governor and I are of different parties, and even though I am supporting enthusiastically the Democratic opponent of the Governor in the present campaign in my State, I think I owe it to the Governor, to the lumber industry, and to the people of my State to make clear in the Record that Republicans and Democrats alike here in the Congress are greatly concerned about the economic injustice that the lumber industry is suffering at the hands of the Canadian Government and has in effect perhaps suffered from our own Government.

In defense of the Federal Government I wish to say that, in my judgment, the Federal Government has been doing a great deal on this subject, althought the Governor of my State, in the speech that I shall refer to, seems to give the impression that the Democratic administration has done hardly anything in behalf of protecting the lumber industry. I think the Governor is very much mistaken on that point. I do not think he has knowledge of or has properly appraised the very effective action that the President of the United States took at the White House Conference on the United States-Canadian lumber problems of July 26, 1962.

I believe the Governor of our State properly presents a point of view on the part of the State as a whole in regard to the necessity of taking action that will protect the American lumber industry from the unfair competition to which the American lumber mills are being subjected as a result of the Canadian Government support and subsidy to Canadian mills.

In fact, on forest policy and trade policy, we have been operating under policies derived of the last 8 years of national Republican administration—yes, and some policies in the forest that, in some cases, go back until 1897. President Kennedy has moved vigorously. In fairness I must say that some proposals for change in forest policy the industry says it has sought for 10 years with no success from the Secretary of Agriculture. In other cases proposals have been made for the first time just a few months ago.

I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper story published in the Oregonian on October 7, 1962, entitled "Hatfield Joins Attack on Federal Handling of Canadian Import Controversy," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hatfield Joins Attack on Federal Handling of Canadian Lumber Import Controversy

> Mill City.—Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, his patience broken by the cruel hoax the Federal administration has dealt the lumber industry, picked up the attack on Canadian lumber imports Saturday and charged the Canadians with the theft of our domestic lumber markets.
>
> Hatfield, who has waited long for the Senate hearings and then the White House to take action on what he calls a Federal matter involving Federal law, announced: "I can refrain no longer from attacking this matter with all of the vigor at the disposal of our State."
>
> He chose the Mill City Junior Chamber of Commerce Douglas Fir Harvest Day celebration as the site for his first roundhouse at the Federal handling of the lumber industry plight, stating:
>
> "There have been hearings. There have been vague promises of relief. The administration has issued all sorts of statements."
>
> QUOTA CRUEL HOAX
>
> "The cruelest hoax the Federal Government has dealt the lumber industry is a proposal that the Canadians accept a voluntary quota. And the Canadians have been laughing ever since."
>
> Hatfield reviewed the advantages the Canadian mills operate under in the U.S. market, their 92-cent dollar that gives them a $5 to $6 a thousand edge; their shipping cost saving of about $10 a thousand, free of the Jones Act; the lower pay of Canadian millhands and warned: "This is a problem that demands solution.
>
> "Even the Canadians who prate about their right to our markets have erected a tariff wall against Japanese plywood, American automobiles, and, only recently, in a unilateral move, arbitrarily imposed an import tariff of from 5 to 15 percent on all goods entering Canada from this country."
>
> The reverse story, he pointed out, is this country's handling of Canadian imports. While American lumber shipped to Canada must pay a duty amounting to about $10 a thousand, "a trifling duty of 25 cents to $1 is imposed by our Government against Canadian lumber."
>
> LIMIT SAID FAIR
>
> Hatfield, in one of the strongest of any attacks on the unequal competition between the Canadian and American producers, charged that the U.S. Government appears to be proposing that Americans lower their standard of living to maintain Canadian production.
>
> Hatfield certified the lumber industry proposal to limit Canadian imports to 10 percent of the American market eminently fair, pointing out that in the years of 1950 through 1960 the Canadian imports were less than 10 percent of the U.S. market.
>
> But, he said, the Canadians have taken 15 percent of the U.S. market and will possibly take 16 to 18 percent this year.
>
> The Governor suggested the final action rests largely with the Federal Government, but told the chamber gathering, "I have joined with the leaders of the industry in seeking a solution."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall quote a paragraph or two in the hope of giving the Senate a better understanding of the united nonpartisan attitude in my State in regard to the program. The article states—

> Hatfield, who has waited long for the Senate hearings and then the White House to take action on what he calls a Federal matter involving Federal law, announced: "I can refrain no longer from attacking this matter with all of the vigor at the disposal of our State.
>
> "There have been hearings. There have been vague promises of relief. The administration has issued all sorts of statements."
>
> QUOTA CRUEL HOAX
>
> "The cruelest hoax the Federal Government has dealt the lumber industry is a proposal that the Canadians accept a voluntary quota. And the Canadians have been laughing ever since."

Mr. President, I believe the Governor is in error about that. The administration has done a remarkable job, in its first meeting with the Canadians to make clear to the Canadians that we mean business, and to make clear to the Canadians that we intend to try to reach a mutually beneficial settlement of this controversy on a voluntary basis if it can be thus settled.

I would much prefer a voluntary trade agreement with Canada than to follow the legislative route in the United States to protect our lumber industry, because the legislative route represents a strong course of unilateral action. I think Canadians want something better. The legislative route runs the danger of creating misunderstandings and ill will, although we will have to take this course if it is necessary to run it in order to protect our industry.

Therefore, I would enter this caveat to the suggestion of the Governor with regard to a voluntary agreement. It would be no hoax if we could reach a voluntary agreement. It would be much to be desired. I am sure that, upon reflection, the Governor will agree. In fact, I am inclined to think that probably he would point out that his statement is based upon what he fears is the probability that there will be no agreement. I do not share his fears at the present time. There is always that possibility, but I believe that the United States-Canadian negotiations, which will reconvene next week, will reconvene on the basis of a clear understanding on the part of the Canadians that we mean business with regard to this matter of working out, either on a voluntary basis or, if necessary, by way of legislation, come January, protection of the U.S. lumber industry from unfair Canadian competition.

And if negotiations fail, we will know this by January. After all, we owe it to Canada and we have an obligation ourselves to negotiate with some patience and restraint. We all seek faster progress but it is too much to expect Canada to agree immediately. She has her problems and we have been educating her about ours. In my judgment Canada will soon have all the facts before her and we will have a better understanding of her situation. We can then expect a clear statement from Canada and from our Government on where we stand in our relations.

The article goes on to state:

> Hatfield reviewed the advantages the Canadian mills operate under in the U.S. market, their 92-cent dollar that gives them a $5 to $6 a thousand edge; their shipping cost saving of about $10 a thousand, free of the Jones Act; the lower pay of Canadian millhands, and warned: "This is a problem that demands solution."

The record is clear that for many months the Oregon delegation in Congress has been pointing out those facts. The pointing out of such facts is what led to the White House Conference on July 26. It was the recognition of those facts that caused the President, on July 26, to promulgate the White House 6-point program aimed at finding a solution to this very critical trade problem, which has arisen between our neighbor to the north of us and the United States.

The Governor goes on to make another point which some of us have made on the floor of the Senate, on several occasions, but it bears repeating. I point out that the Governor of my State is making the same argument in order to show Congress, and also to serve notice upon our officials downtown, that there is unity on this subject in my State, and that there is unity in recognition of the serious economic crisis in my State, which this problem has created.

The Governor points out:

> Even the Canadians who prate about their right to our markets, have erected a tariff wall against Japanese plywood, American automobiles, and, only recently, in a unilateral move, arbitrarily imposed an import tariff of from 5 to 15 percent on all goods entering Canada from this country.

The Senate will recall that when the United States, some weeks ago, made a loan of many millions of dollars to the Canadian Government, in order to stabilize the monetary and economic situation of the Canadian Government, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] walked onto the floor of the Senate—and he was joined in support of his statement by the Senators from Oregon—that within a matter of a very short time after we loaned these millions of dollars to the Canadian Government, the Canadian Government also increased tariffs on various American imports.

The Governor of our State is merely calling attention to that fact, as it was pointed out on the floor of the Senate some weeks ago. He points out:

> The reverse story is this country's handling of Canadian imports. While American lumber shipped to Canada must pay a duty amounting to about $10 a thousand, a trifling duty of 25 cents to $1 is imposed by our Government against Canadian lumber.

I think it was only fair to my State and also to the administration, at the Federal level, to point out the unanimity of opinion, irrespective of party affiliation, on the great wrong that Canada is being allowed to commit against the lumber industry of my State and the entire Pacific Northwest and, for that matter, as I have said to southern Senators, to the South, too, because the southern lumber industry is beginning to feel the economic pinch of this Canadian competition.

The Governor reviews some of the suggestions that those of us in the congressional delegation from the Pacific Northwest have been making for some time. I have no doubt that the speech of the Governor, made in a political campaign, had its political overtones and undertones. However, I am not going to pay any attention to that at this time. I am going to pay attention to the economic problem involved and the way to achieve solutions.

Our negotiators, our Tariff Commission, and the officers of the executive branch of the Government should take note now, right now, that they must face an economic problem in the Pacific Northwest.

I can assure the spokesmen for this administration, as they hit the campaign trail through the West, that they will be expected to comment on what the administration proposes to do about the lumber problem in the Pacific Northwest.

I wish to say to the Governor that he ought to take note of a good many things the administration has already done to help the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest. The Canadian problem is not the only problem. We have a good many problems involving access roads. President Kennedy has recommended some substantial increases in funds for that purpose. We will get some increases, but not nearly enough. However, the road bill provides $165 million for paved roads compared to only $75 million in the last bill. That last bill was enacted over protests from a Republican President. So we are moving ahead at a rate 100 percent faster than we were 2 years ago. This is progress, though I think we could and should move faster. I suppose that one of the greatest benefits which developed from our July 26 conference with the President has been some long overdue changes in procedure on the part of the Forest Service, which lumberman after lumberman has commented upon in our State by thanking the Senators from Oregon for the part they played in making the fight for procedural changes in the Forest Service, which are bound to accrue to the great economic advantage of the lumbermen.

The President has ordered the Forest Service to submit a report not later than October 15, 1962, which is just ahead, in regard to its program concerning the allowable cut and the handling of Forest Service timber sales, because those two problems have created great difficulties in the lumber industry.

On July 26, the President—and the Governor did not take note of this in his speech—promulgated an order that American timber shall be used in connection with the foreign aid program. Only yesterday I sent a series of telegrams to the State of Oregon and various lumber mills, pointing out the decision just reached at the Washington level with respect to the purchase of timber for the implementation of the foreign aid program. This action will result in the purchase of a good many thousands of dollars worth of lumber which will inure to the benefit of American lumber mills. The Governor forgot to point out in his speech that this administration has taken such steps. Therefore, I think a little partisanship overcame our Governor when he made such a blanket attack on this administration with respect to the handling of the lumber problem.

I think we must be fair and give all credit that is due. I do not propose that anyone withhold any censure. So far as the criticism the Governor has made with respect to modifications and reservations is concerned, I have pointed out where I believe those criticisms were warranted. I am glad the Governor made them. I do not intend to falsely proclaim that all virtue resides in one party. But I say this—President Kennedy has acted with vigor and sincerity. He has not worked a hoax on lumber. Irrespective of our party affiliation, we must work together in our State, Republicans and Democrats alike, to protect the economy of the State. Everyone in our State should recognize that President Kennedy, Secretary Freeman, Secretary Udall, and Secretary Hodges have done a great deal to promote a healthy lumber industry.

There are some other points which the Governor did not cover in his speech with respect to what this administration has done for the benefit of the American lumber industry. After all, remarkable achievements have been made in the whole field through the administration and the Bureau of Land Management in connection with Federal timberlands which fall within the Federal jurisdiction. I think the Governor might say he was not proposing to cover the whole subject matter in one speech; but merely a brief reference would have been helpful, if he had taken note that he was limiting his criticisms solely to the Canadian matter. But I assure the Governor that, in my opinion, great progress is being made by this administration. I assure him that, irrespective of all the attempts that will be made by his party to produce a different result, I fully expect to be standing, come next January, in the place where I am now standing. Then I shall be introducing the proposed legislation which I have promised to introduce, if my administration, in the meantime, reports it sees no chance for our arrangement with Canada on a voluntary basis. If an arrangement can be made on a voluntary basis, in keeping with the good-neighbor policy which we have always pursued with respect to Canada, that would be more satisfactory. But I assure the Governor that, come January, I expect to be at this desk, introducing whatever legislation may be necessary to protect our lumber industry, if this is the only course open to us.

REVIEWS OF THE BOOK "A STUDY OF COMMUNISM," BY J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. HAYDEN. Madam President, as the majority of Senators already undoubtedly know, J. Edgar Hoover has just completed a sequel to his first, widely read book on communism, entitled "Masters of Deceit." This new book, "A Study of Communism," reaffirms his position as an unquestioned authority on communism and as one of its most vigorous opponents. I do not need to remind Senators that since 1924, when Mr. Hoover became Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, he has been in a position to observe even the most insignificant details of communism's growth and to realize—perhaps more than any other individual—its very real threat to the security of the free nations of the world. Judging from the reviews I have seen of Mr. Hoover's book, it will be widely read and well received. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD three reviews which I believe are representative of Mr. Hoover's fine book.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Oct. 1, 1962]

HOOVER EXPOSES COMMUNIST AIMS

(By Sam Acheson)

The most important assignment of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is one which, by its nature, can never be laid bare in all its details to the public view. This is its round-the-clock curbing of spying and subversion by enemy agents. Now and for years this has meant primarily the foiling of the Communist conspiracy against us by Soviet Russia and her satellites.

Fortunately for the mission of the FBI, no less than the security of our Nation, this counterintelligence agency has been headed almost from its start by an unusually able and well-balanced public servant.

J. Edgar Hoover may have known no more about the fanatical danger of Marxism than the average American when he first took office. But by years of firsthand experience with its adherents and constant effort to grasp its strange inner workings, he has become our one unquestioned authority on the menace.

Following the success of his earlier book, "Masters of Deceit," Mr. Hoover has been persuaded to write "A Study of Communism" (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.,

$3.95). It is designed to highlight contrasts between the freedoms enjoyed by Americans and the dreary, stultifying lack of liberty suffered by the one-third of the world's population living under Communist dictatorships.

That aim is fully realized in this new volume. It is inherent throughout and is summed up in a helpful digest of differences between communism and freedom which concludes the book. But for most readers the main value of this work may be its placing of the whole story of communism in fresh and vivid perspective.

"A Study of Communism," is no dry, historical survey or ponderous exposition of its doctrines and dogmas. But in 212 pages, the book gives a connected picture of how communism was spawned and how it has worked its baneful influence. Thumbnail sketches of its chief practitioners—Engels as well as Marx, Trotsky as well as Lenin, Khrushchev as well as Stalin and others—enliven the account of its ideology and machinations.

Mr. Hoover answers many questions of the ordinary reader about communism and its adherents. He is particularly successful in probing the psychology of its converts and stooges. His explanation of why most of them end up in bitter disillusionment is this sub rosa effort.

One of the more puzzling questions cleared up by the author relates to the vast underground, or covert spy system, maintained by Communists in our country. Since 90 percent of our inventive, industrial and other state secrets are revealed constantly in publications for sale to the general public, it may be asked why the Soviets go to the trouble and expense of this sub rosa effort.

Mr. Hoover points out that communism's secret intelligence network is chiefly an effort to insure a continued flow of information from the United States in the event of a hot war between us and the Soviets.

It operates independently of the vast espionage effort carried on by members of diplomatic and consular services of Communist nations.

This latter would be severed instantly upon the outbreak of a shooting war. The Red underground is also concerned with subverting individual Americans, especially the more naive of our young people, who are duped into serving the cause of communism.

The question of Soviet propaganda figures prominently in his book. Much of Mr. Hoover's most trenchant analysis is centered in the highest level of propaganda, that put out by Khrushchev himself.

In exposing the hypocrisy and falsity of the points Khrushchev seeks to put over to the American people, he demolishes Soviet pretense that it seeks to live peacefully with the free world. Khrushchev's talk about "peaceful coexistence and friendly cooperation" with us and the rest of the free world is punctured completely by words and acts cited here.

That the United States remains the prime target for destruction by the Communist world movement is patent from evidence submitted by Mr. Hoover. He recalls the meeting in Moscow in November 1960, when delegates from 81 Communist parties around the globe met.

There they hammered out what Hoover calls a new Communist Manifesto. It restated more vigorously than ever that the movement seeks nothing less than absolute world domination. And in that declaration of purpose, our country was singled out as the main enemy of communism, the chief stumbling block to its goal of world domination.

As late as this year, Mikhail Suslov, one of Khrushchev's favorites in a key spot in the governing committee of the Russian Communist Party, punctured his boss's unctuous appeal for peaceful coexistence.

"Peaceful coexistence in the ideological sphere," wrote Suslov, "any reconciliation, even a temporary compromise with the bourgeois ideology both in the internal and external spheres, is impossible. This is impossible without betraying the interests of communism."

Mr. Hoover emphasizes the necessity of more Americans becoming alert to the danger confronting our country in the world Communist movement.

Yet, awareness alone is not enough, in his estimation. It is essential that an aroused people also become informed. It is up to the rank and file to learn as much as possible about this enemy sworn to "bury us" by wiping out our freedoms and our way of life. Such an accurate understanding of the nature of communism is vital to the defense of America.

It is obvious, Mr. Hoover adds, that no real defense against communism can be maintained unless our Government continues to move positively and firmly to protect our freedoms. The capacity of Government to do this depends, in turn, upon the alertness and understanding of the American people. It is up to individuals to support effective countermeasures against communism in all its forms.

As a caution, Mr. Hoover urges individuals and lay groups not to undertake the ferreting out of Communist spies. That, he points out, is a job requiring the special skills and training of a counterintelligence agency such as the FBI. The well-meaning and patriotic amateur may often do more harm than good in such efforts.

But the individual citizen is able to develop and enrich in a positive way, concludes Mr. Hoover, what he feels is our greatest weapon against communism—individual freedom under law. Thus he appeals to his readers, young and old, to seek greater understanding and appreciation of what freedom really is. We are urged to live our individual, family and community lives "in the responsible manner which this freedom demands." An inspiring as well as eminently practical work, "A Study of Communism" is a manual to be followed safely in arming ourselves against our most mortal enemy.

[From the Police Chief, August 1962]

FBI DIRECTOR SEES INCREASED RED THREAT

"A Study of Communism," a new book by Federal Bureau of Investigation Director J. Edgar Hoover, will be published October 1, 1962, by Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Designed for the general reader as well as for students in high schools and colleges, Mr. Hoover's new book has been written in response to numerous requests for a handbook on the nature of communism. The book traces the history of communism since its inception and carefully contrasts American liberty and Communist totalitarianism.

Emphasizing that the way to defeat communism is through knowledge, information, and reliance on democratic principles, Mr. Hoover's book, based on his many years of experience, sets forth answers to the false claims of communism and emphasizes the positive values of our democratic heritage.

FBI Director since 1924, Mr. Hoover is recognized as an expert on communism. "Masters of Deceit," his earlier treatise on the subject, was published 4 years ago by Holt, Rinehart & Winston and quickly became a bestseller. Today it is recognized a standard definitive work.

"A Study of Communism" analyzes Communist theory and practice and outlines the growth of the international Communist movement since Lenin's seizure of state power in Russia in 1917.

With world party membership totaling more than 40 million, Mr. Hoover believes that the danger which communism presents to the free world has not abated but increased. To meet this challenge, he believes that the student and the citizen cannot remain uninformed of the Communist danger.

[From the Deseret News & Telegram, Sept. 27, 1962]

PRIMER ON SUBVERSION—FBI CHIEF SPELLS OUT THE RED CHALLENGE

("A Study of Communism," by J. Edgar Hoover, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., N.Y., 212 pages, $3.95.)

American education in recent years has become convinced that one of its responsibilities should be to provide instruction, preferably at the high school level, on the dangers of communism.

Doing that, however, is easier said than done. One of the difficulties is that of finding an acceptable textbook. Many textbooks have been objected to on the grounds that they were not sufficiently authoritative, that they were outdated, or that they were not sufficiently tough on communism.

J. Edgar Hoover's latest book, however, goes a long way toward meeting such objections. So it probably deserves to be considered as a text for such courses.

As director of the FBI, which has jurisdiction in internal security matters involving communism, Mr. Hoover's credentials as an authority in the field are more than sufficient.

As to being tough on communism, Mr. Hoover makes it plain that when its outer trappings are stripped away, communism is nothing more than lust for power, and that it is long on promise but short on performance.

Moreover, the book is so up to date that it even includes a brief section on the Soviet arms buildup in Cuba.

One other thing that might qualify "A Study of Communism" for use as a high school text: It is sufficiently complete to tell the average citizen just about all he needs to know about communism and how to fight it. And it is written in such a manner that a difficult subject is made easily understandable.

The elementary manner with which the book treats communism will make it something of a disappointment to anyone who reads his daily newspaper thoroughly. Yet there is a definite need for such a treatment. Anyone who has ever attended an anti-communism seminar such as those put on by Harding College of Arkansas or by the National Guard is amazed at how unaware many adults are of the extent of the Communist menace. Mr. Hoover's book could do much to help erase such ignorance.

In this connection, the final chapter of the book points out that the real struggle is not between communism and capitalism but between communism and freedom, and it provides a list of the differences between the two in such fields as their aims, their views on education, elections, employment, economics, government, human rights, travel and trade unions. This list seems like a good pedagogical technique.

Finally, a further advantage of the book as a possible classroom text is the way it avoids certain pitfalls. It avoids becoming bogged down in controversy over whether or not the United States should conduct a thorough housecleaning of its State Department and withdraw from the United Nations. Moreover, it discusses the relationship of socialism to communism without becoming embroiled in the dispute over whether or not socialism inevitably leads to communism. And it sidesteps the argument over which aspect of communism constitutes the greater danger to the United States—that of internal subversion, or that of external aggression.

However, one section of the book seems likely to make it objectionable to certain groups. That's the section in which Mr.

Hoover warns that "citizens should not circulate rumors about subversive activities or draw conclusions from information which may come to their attention. Vigilante action weakens our society. It is just as important to protect the innocent as to identify our enemies.

"Reckless charges against individuals and false statements about the nature of communism and the extent of its penetration into various areas of our life serve the cause of communism by creating disunity among Americans."

That's eminently sound advice, of course. But the John Birch Society, for one, seems likely to take umbrage at it. Perhaps any displeasure on its part, however, will be eased by Mr. Hoover's solid record in fighting communism, by the fact that many Birch Society members look with favor on his previous book on communism called "Masters of Deceit," and by the responsible approach of his most recent book. For as this book points out:

"The ultimate guarantee against Communist encroachment is a deep and abiding awareness on the part of each citizen that freedom is inherently superior to communism."

VALIDATION OF COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES IN ARKANSAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 2014, H.R. 12820, which was previously considered by the Senate on Monday, October 8, as appears on page 22780 of the Congressional Record.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12820) to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, the purpose of H.R. 12820 is to validate the coverage under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance of the employees of certain agencies in Arkansas which have been included in good faith but erroneously as separate political subdivisions under the coverage agreement between the State of Arkansas and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The employees of the agencies involved should properly have been covered as employees of the political subdivisions of which the agencies are integral parts. Under H.R. 12820 each of the agencies in question would be deemed to have been a separate political subdivision from the first day for which such an agency was included in the Arkansas coverage agreement, or modification to that agreement, through the last day of the year in which the bill is enacted.

Madam President, I submit an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new sections:

Sec. 2. That (a) paragraph 1518(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended—

(1) by striking out "when bleached, 50 per centum ad valorem;", and

(2) by striking out "or other material above mentioned, shall be subject to the rate of duty provided in this paragraph for such materials" and inserting in lieu thereof "or other material above mentioned, or wholly or in chief value of any bleached natural grasses, grains, leaves, plants, shrubs, herbs, trees, or parts thereof provided for in paragraph 1722, shall be subject to the rate of duty provided for such materials".

(b) Paragraph 1722 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by striking out "and" before "seaweeds", and by inserting before the period at the end of such paragraph the following: "; and natural grasses, grains, leaves, plants, shrubs, herbs, trees, and parts thereof, not specially provided for, not further advanced than bleached."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by section 2 of this Act shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, this amendment has been approved by the Departments of Commerce, Interior, Labor, State, and Treasury. Its purpose is to incorporate H.R. 12109, which passed the House, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I further understand that the bill has also been amended by an amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] and agreed to on October 8. I further understand that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, which has just been adopted, has been cleared on both sides of the aisle and meets with the approval of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], so far as it affects the text of the bill, despite the fact that he previously contemplated attaching several amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 12820) was passed.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR MEDICAL EXPENSES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowed as a deduction for medical, dental, et cetera, expenses. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Oct. 12, 1962, p. 23366.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, the House conferees accepted amendment No. 1, relating to medical benefits for retired employees and their spouses and dependents; amendment No. 2, relating to intangible drilling and development costs; amendment No. 3, relating to special tax on retail liquor dealers; amendment No. 4, relating to claim of right; and amendment No. 5, relating to the enforcement authority of internal revenue officers. However, the House conferees insisted that amendments Nos. 6, 7, and 8 be deleted.

Amendment No. 6—bunker fuel—was deleted because it did not meet the objections raised by the conferees when it was considered earlier. Amendment No. 7—concentrated risks—was deleted because it has been deleted by the conferees on the Revenue Act of 1962. Amendment No. 8—small business investment companies—was deleted because the House conferees felt it needed more study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

COMMISSION TO PLAN FOR CELEBRATION OF 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 208.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 208) to establish a commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes, which were, on page 4, line 2, after "functions" insert ": *Provided, however,* That no employee whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if said Act were applicable to such position, shall be paid a salary at a rate in excess of the rate payable under said Act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility. Such rates of compensation may be adopted by the Commission as may be authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as of the same date such rates are authorized for positions subject to said Act. The Commission shall make adequate provision for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee"; on page 4, lines 10 and 11, strike out ", without regard to the laws and procedures applicable to Federal agencies"; on page 4, line 15, after "resolution" insert ": *Provided, however,* That all expenditures of the Commission shall be made from donated funds only"; and on page 5, strike out lines 8 through 11, inclusive, and insert:

(d) Mail matter sent by the Commission as penalty mail or franked mail shall be accepted for mail subject to section 4156 of title 39, United States Code, as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

RELOCATION OF BUSTS OF PULASKI, KOSCIUSZKO, AND GARIBALDI

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, today has been designated as General Pulaski's Memorial Day by the President of the United States. One hundred and eighty-three years ago General Pulaski died of mortal wounds he received during the American Revolution while leading a cavalry charge against British troops at Savannah, Ga.

The Presidential proclamation describes the historic contribution made by this great Polish patriot and nobleman in the cause of American liberty. The proclamation reads:

> THE WHITE HOUSE.
>
> GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY, 1962—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION
>
> Whereas Casimir Pulaski, a young Polish patriot and lifelong fighter against tyranny, volunteered in the Continental Army during the American Revolution, fought with bravery, provided the struggling new Nation with brilliant military leadership, was made a brigadier general by Congress, and formed his own famed Pulaski's Legion; and
>
> Whereas this year marks the 183d anniversary of his death on October 11, 1779, at Savannah, Ga., where he received mortal wounds while leading a cavalry charge in the battle to recapture that city; and
>
> Whereas the American people feel deep gratitude to General Pulaski and to his countrymen and the many other foreign patriots who joined in and fought for the cause of our freedom; and
>
> Whereas General Pulaski's distinguished dedication to the cause of liberty will always serve as an inspiration to all peoples in their struggle for national freedom: Now, therefore,
>
> I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Thursday, October 11, 1962, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and I direct the appropriate officials of the Federal Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day.
>
> I also invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in honor of the memory of General Pulaski and the high ideals for which he sacrificed his life.
>
> In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.
>
> Done at the city of Washington this 10th day of September in the year of our Lord 1962 and of the independence of the United States of America the 187th.
>
> JOHN F. KENNEDY.
>
> By the President:
>
> DEAN RUSK,
> *Secretary of State.*

Madam President, Casimir Pulaski came to the country to take an active part in the American struggle for independence. Although only 29 years of age, his reputation as a cavalry officer had preceded him across the Atlantic; and the Continental Congress soon commissioned him a brigadier general. He organized a separate command known as Pulaski's Legion, and this small cavalry outfit became noted for their fearless attacks and brilliant military actions. In fact, today he is remembered as the "Father of the American Cavalry." It is said that when the King of Poland heard of Pulaski's death, he exclaimed:

> Pulaski has died as he lived, a hero—but an enemy of kings.

Indeed he was—an enemy of kings and a friend of liberty.

A bust of General Pulaski has been displayed in the Halls of Congress since 1882. I am sure many of my colleagues have never seen this bust, and I am not surprised. It has been situated in one of the back recesses of the gallery floor, and has been very difficult to locate and identify. How many Members of Congress have been able to find the bust of this great patriot?

That has been a great injustice. The bust of this patriot, hero, and courageous fighter for American freedom and independence, deserves a better fate than the back recesses of the gallery, largely removed from the many visitors to the Capitol and from the Members of Congress themselves—particularly since this great patriot symbolizes the forces of freedom which were at work in the 18th century and also the forces of freedom which are at work today in Poland and in the United States.

My friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], suggested that a relocation of the bust of General Pulaski was in order. I heartily agreed. I know of no more appropriate time than the official memorial day to this revolutionary hero, to announce the relocation of his bust from the gallery to a more prominent position—on the first floor of the Capitol, in the new section of the east front.

Our national gratitude for the great contributions of General Pulaski to American independence should, I believe, include an expression of hope that some day the great Polish people will once again experience the blessings of liberty and self-government. The traditional friendship between the Polish and the American people still is a vibrant and living reality. I am convinced that the fundamental basis for this indestructible friendship rests on a mutual love of freedom held by the Polish and American people. It is unquenchable. I pray that before many years pass, the Polish people will again possess the right of self-government.

The relocation of the bust of General Pulaski disclosed that the busts of two other foreign-born fighters for liberty and self-government also were situated in sparsely traveled areas of the gallery floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Let me ask whether something is to be done about the bust of Garibaldi.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; it, too, has now been relocated. The busts of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Giuseppe Garibaldi were almost impossible to locate. Surely, the reasons for relocating the bust of General Pulaski are just as relevant for the relocation of the busts of these other Revolutionary heroes.

General Kosciuszko served as George Washington's aide-de-camp, and also as adjutant during the American Revolution. He was a skilled engineer, and was responsible for the American fortifications of the Delaware River, Saratoga, and West Point. He was among the first of the Continental Army to enter Charleston, S.C., after its evacuation by the British. Following the American independence, Kosciuszko returned to Poland and tried unsuccessfully to win that country's freedom. He died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

The bust of General Kosciuszko was purchased by the Congress in 1857.

Giuseppe Garibaldi, the father of Italian independence, spent a period of time in America in 1850. He came to this country to seek refuge and safety while he gathered strength for a return to Italy, to resume the battle for independence. He remained in this country for 4 years, and, while here, made this prophetic statement about the United States:

> This Nation is certainly living up to its reputation and will soon become the first among great nations.

In 1888 a group of Italian residents of Washington who had acquired American citizenship wrote to Congress, requesting permission to give a bust of Garibaldi to the American people, through their elected Representatives. In their letter these new American citizens from Italy described Garibaldi as "the lover and defender of universal liberty, the fearless soldier, and the unblemished patriot."

They further resolved in their letter "to commemorate his great and noble deeds by adding his to the monuments of the brave and unselfish patriots who in the cycle of American history so greatly contributed to the creation and preservation of this great Republic."

In the name of the American people, the Congress gratefully accepted this inspiring gift. Since 1882, the bust of Garibaldi has been a constant reminder to us of his fiery dedication to liberty and his unquenchable opposition to tyrants.

The relocation of the three busts of Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and Garibaldi has been done. Each one is now prominently situated on the first floor. I invite my colleagues and the many visitors to the Capitol to view these inspiring figures in their new locations.

As we hurry by them in the future, I sincerely hope we shall find time to remember why these three men have been honored by the American people. Very few foreign citizens have been so honored. But the reasons are clear: The lives of Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and Garibaldi are an integral part of America's struggle for independence and self-government, and of the subsequent struggles, patterned after the American Revolution, that have occurred, and are still occurring, around the world.

We honor these men today. Let us always be worthy of the sacrifices they made in our behalf.

By official Presidential proclamation, today is Pulaski Day.

As I recall, on Saturday there will be a special commemoration, at least in New York City, and I am sure around the world, of Columbus Day. We are reminded again not only of the contributions made by the fearless explorations of those from Italy, but by those who had a passion for freedom and for seeking out justice and truth. I only wish I could be in New York on that day, as the President of the United States and the mayor of the city of New York lead the parade down Fifth Avenue, which I am sure will be one of the greatest parades in New York City.

I am hopeful that before our colleagues wander back to their constituencies they will take note of the changes that have been made in the scenery and in the location of these statues.

I want to thank the office of the Sergeant at Arms, the Architect of the Capitol, and others who have so helpfully and generously cooperated.

ARMED CONFLICT IN VIETNAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, yesterday I commented at length on the need for better weapons to fight the limited, guerrilla-type conflicts that have been initiated by Communist forces for the past 25 years throughout the world. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] so correctly emphasized at the conclusion of my statement, this country's overriding objective of disarmament with adequate inspection safeguards cannot become a reality unless the United States now has the capacity to defend freedom whenever and wherever it is challenged.

I hope some of my colleagues will find time, particularly those on the Armed Services Committee and on the Foreign Relations Committee, to look into the material I placed in the RECORD yesterday, because I think it merits their attention.

As I noted yesterday, one of the most difficult challenges we face is the type of armed conflict currently underway in Vietnam. Our troops must be equipped with the conventional arms able to counter the Communist guerillas in such difficult and inhospitable places as Vietnam. While we have made a little progress in development of such weapons, a great deal more needs to be accomplished. I want to repeat to our friends of the Defense Department that I intend to pursue this matter vigorously in the coming year, because information I have received indicates that while much attention has been directed toward Nike-Zeus, the Pershing missile, and all the other fantastic weapons, little or no attention has been paid to conventional arms that our troops are compelled to use as they stand as guardians on many frontiers and many perimeters of defense throughout the world. The guns that are made available to the troops of our allies and to our own troops are of World War II vintage—for example, the M-1, a 10-pound 6-ounce weapon, surely anything but adequate for the kind of guerrilla jungle warfare being fought in that part of the world.

This morning's New York Times carries a dispatch from Vietnam illustrating the difficulty of this struggle. It describes the progress that has been achieved in the past year, but it also emphasizes the problems remaining before internal stability in South Vietnam becomes a reality.

I bring this brief article to the attention of my colleagues. It is based on the first-hand observations of the Time's fine correspondent, David Halberstam. I believe it provides valuable insight into the difficult struggle facing the free world from such Communist guerrilla operations.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article by David Halberstam describing the current fighting in Vietnam be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETCONG MAINTAINING STRENGTH DESPITE SETBACKS

(By David Halberstam)

MY THO, VIETNAM, October 9.—Since U.S. military aid started arriving in this Mekong Delta region January 1, Government forces are estimated to have killed about 5,000 Communist guerrillas. The Communists, in turn, have sent in about that number of replacements.

The Vietcong's ability to rebuild its forces despite increased Government mobility indicates to Americans here the difficulty of the war ahead. It also shows the limitations of even the most modern weapons here even when they are employed by unusually active South Vietnamese regulars.

The Seventh Division, under Col. Hunynh Van Cau, covers a five-province area in the delta region. Considered a first-rate outfit, it is the most active regular force in a war where there is concern over the willingness of some Vietnamese commanders to launch operations. It is believed that since January 7,000 Communists have been killed in Government operations in the rest of the country.

During this time Government casualties in the Seventh Division's area are believed to have been about 2,000. Few of them are regular troops, most being from outposts or points the Communists can overrun. The Communists, like the Government forces, rarely attack unless they have overwhelming odds.

The area of the division's operations is rice-paddy land and swampland south of Saigon that looks as though it was designed by an expert on guerrilla warfare to test his theories. Historically it has served as a haven for bandits, pirates and opposition leaders. It consists of the provinces of Dinh Tuong, Kien Hoa, Vinh Binh, Vinh Long and Kien Phong.

The Vietcong is said to operate at three levels here.

The first is what the Americans call hard helmets, tough, disciplined, veteran troops, uniformed and deeply indoctrinated. The second group is the district or provincial force, a sort of paramilitary outfit with a hard-helmet cadre that can be called together but does not stay together. Finally there are village guerrillas, who are strictly local in operation and are the newest recruits.

According to American sources, when a hard helmet is killed, his place is taken by a member of the middle force. A village guerrilla is moved up and the Communists then recruit a youth from a peasant hut.

Contrary to some reports, the Communists in this area are recruiting just as effectively as they have in the past. They make their greatest effort among peasant youths and, according to the Americans, are strikingly effective in areas of great poverty. The Americans note that the Vietcong has easy access to the peasants and that its propaganda efforts are rarely matched by the Government.

The guerrillas' ability to rebuild their forces in this area and continue their basic operations tempers some observers' optimism about the year's tangible military results. Most observers agree, however, that the situation has improved markedly over that of a year ago, when the Communists had the initiative.

Some Americans feel that, despite the improved striking power of the Government forces, the Communists, though they may be more cautious in their movements and have an increasing rate of defection, still operate much the way they have. They still collect taxes, still recruit well and still conduct a superior propaganda drive.

The observers do see benefits from the increased governmental activity. For the first time the Government is able to keep Communists off balance, it has limited the base for guerrilla operations and its ability to recruit men for the civil guard and the self-defense corps has improved.

NATIONAL PHARMACEUTICAL WEEK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I call attention to the fact that the week of October 7 through 13, the current week, is being observed throughout the Nation as National Pharmaceutical Week. The President of the United States, in a letter to the president of the American Pharmaceutical Association, Dr. George F. Archambault, has paid appropriate tribute to the pharmacists for their activities in the health field, and particularly their services to the American people in the healing arts.

The letter from the President to Dr. Archambault is indeed a compliment to the pharmacists of the Nation and those who are so busily engaged these days in the developing of new drugs and new medications required for a healthy people.

I salute our pharamacists and call the attention of the Congress to the fact that this week we observe National Pharmaceutical Week.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter from the President to Dr. Archambault be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 6, 1962.

DR. GEORGE F. ARCHAMBAULT,
President, American Pharmaceutical Association, Washington, D.C.:

It is a pleasure to extend greetings to you and your colleagues as we observe National Pharmaceutical Week, October 7 through 13.

The pharmacists of America constitute an important segment of our health profession in their day by day contact with the people who need their services. They carry a great responsibility, and more and more they serve as consultants on medications and as health educators to the general public.

Please express my sincere good wishes to the members of the American Pharmaceutical Association.

With all best wishes,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered

DR. HANS J. V. TIEDEMANN AND FAMILY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1663, reported from the Committee on the Judiciary today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 1663) for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, the bill has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open for amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 1663) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DR. WALTER H. DUISBERG

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 8269, which was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 8269) for the relief of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8269) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT'S REMARKS UPON THE SIGNING OF H.R. 11970, THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, today I had the honor to be at the White House with the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the ranking Democratic member of that committee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Kerr], and other distinguished Senators, including the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, Wilbur Mills, and some of his distinguished colleagues also were in attendance, including the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh], the gentleman from California [Mr. King], and others. Members of the Cabinet were also present, as were also Mr. Howard Peterson, who has been the President's assistant in relation to the foreign trade proposal which has now become law, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and others.

At that time the President made some remarks on the occasion of attaching his signature to H.R. 11970, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the President of the United States on that occasion be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the President Upon the Signing of H.R. 11970, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, in the White House

Today I am signing H.R. 11970, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

This is the most important international piece of legislation, I think, affecting economics since the passage of the Marshall plan. It marks a decisive point for the future of our economy, for our relations with our friends and allies, and for the prospects of free institutions and free societies everywhere.

This act recognizes, fully and completely, that we cannot protect our economy by stagnating behind tariff walls, but that the best protection possible is a mutual lowering of tariff barriers among friendly nations so that all may benefit from a free flow of goods. Increased economic activity resulting from increased trade will provide more job opportunities for our workers. Our industry, our agriculture, our mining will benefit from increased export opportunities as other nations agree to lower their tariffs. Increased exports and imports will benefit our ports, steamship lines, and air lines as they handle an increased amount of trade. Lowering of our tariffs will provide an increased flow of goods for our American consumers. Our industries will be stimulated by increased export opportunities and by freer competition with the industries of other nations for an even greater effort to develop an efficient, economic and productive system. The results can bring a dynamic new era of growth.

By means of agreements authorized by the act, we can move forward to partnership with the nations of the Atlantic Community. Together with the Common Market, we account for 90 percent of the free world's trade in industrial products. Together we make up—and I think this is most important in this vital period—the greatest aggregation of economic power in the history of the world. We now have the means to make certain that we build our strength together and that we can maintain this preeminence.

We shall also use the authority of the act to negotiate with our other great trading partners, Canada and Japan, and with the countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa—and we are particularly concerned that the countries of Latin America shall have an opportunity to participate in this period of economic growth particularly as it affects the Common Market as well as our own United States. We will use the specific authorities designed to widen markets for the raw materials and manufactures of the less developed nations whose economic growth is so important to us all and to strengthen our efforts to end discriminatory and preferential arrangements which in the long run can only make everyone poorer and the free world less united.

A vital expanding economy in the free world is a strong counter to the threat of the world Communist movement. This act is, therefore, an important new weapon to advance the cause of freedom.

I want to express my strong appreciation to the Members of the Congress who were so greatly involved in the passage of this bill—Chairman Mills and members of the House Ways and Means Committee who reported it to the floor, and the Members of the House of Representatives who passed it; Senator Byrd and the members of the Senate Finance Committee; Senator Kerr and others who participated in the passage of this legislation; the leadership of the House and Senate and all those on both sides who made this legislation possible; citizens groups, Mr. Petersen, Mr. Gilbert, and the labor organizations, Mr. George Meany, who is here today, who was of great importance to the passage of this bill which—if administered as it must be and will be directly from the White House, with the cooperation of the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor—can mean so much to this country.

BLUE CROSS IS PLAYING POLITICS WITH HEALTH CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Madam President, with great regret and disappointment, I am compelled to rise in protest over the role that the national Blue Cross Association is playing in the current congressional campaign over the issue of health care for the elderly.

But the fact of the matter is that the national organization is playing politics with this vital issue, and in doing so it is doing a grave disservice to itself, to the good name of local Blue-Cross plans all across the country, and most importantly to the elderly people of this Nation who do not deserve to be misled and disillusioned by such a reputable organization on a matter so important to their well-being.

These remarks, Madam President, are occasioned by the series of expensive half-page advertisements currently appearing in Life, Look, Newsweek, Time, and the Saturday Evening Post. Advertisements paid for by people who thought their money was going to buy hospital insurance.

These advertisements set forth the idea that local Blue Cross plans without exception are now expanding the effectiveness of their programs for senior citizens: that they are preparing to offer "amplified programs" to our older people. And, a few weeks before an election in which hospital care for our elderly is a major issue, these ads, by advising readers that "for full details of the programs for senior citizens in your area, write or telephone your local Blue Cross" calculatingly imply that these new, expanded, amplified programs are now available throughout the Nation.

Madam President, as a member of the Senate's Committee on Aging, I have investigated this advertisement.

It is bad advertising.

It is misleading advertising.

It is untrue advertising.

It is, in fact, not advertising but political propaganda unbecoming to a tax-exempt, nonprofit, presumably public-interest organization.

The only possible purpose I can see in running these ads at this time is to give political candidates opposed to the King-Anderson bill something to wave in the air as they declare, "I hold in my hand this advertisement by the Blue Cross Association announcing that throughout the country Blue Cross is about to meet the needs of the elderly."

But the ads are not true, Madam President. And the Blue Cross Association knew they were not true in their promises when they had them run in our leading magazines.

The day that ad first appeared calls were made to some 33 Blue Cross plans around the country. You will remember the association's ad had urged people to call their local plans to learn the full details of the "expanded," amplified programs supposedly available.

Here is what the callers were told in response to the inquiry by the four local Blue Cross plans first in the alphabet:

Arizona Blue Cross said, "We have nothing on any new plan now";

Arkansas Blue Cross said, "No idea when a new plan will take effect or what the coverage will be";

California Blue Cross, southern, said: "Don't know of any new plan"; and

Colorado Blue Cross said, "Final arrangements on any new plan won't be made until the end of the year. We have a plan available. The same-we have had for several years."

These four display the pattern. Furthermore, when it ran the ad, the Blue Cross Association knew that the Blue Cross of Michigan had had its new plan, which it offered in conjunction with Blue Shield, turned down by the State's insurance commissioner because the only thing noticeably amplified in its new program was the price—an increase from $203 per year to $306 per year per elderly couple, an increase of 50 percent.

Madam President, this is not the first, but the second time that the once proudly independent Blue Cross Association has demonstrated its willingness under the present management to become, not the defender of the public and its hospitals, but a tail to the AMA's high flown political kite.

I am glad, Madam President, to say that the Blue Cross plan in my State of New Jersey has not had anything to do with this political play.

I should like to add that the Blue Cross plan of Maine, the Associated Hospital Service of Maine, has also rejected the national organization's promotion scheme.

In response to inquiries about the advertisement, the Blue Cross of Maine writes that the national organization does not have "the legal capacity to issue on its own responsibility a contract of insurance in Maine or anywhere else."

They go on to notify inquirers that "it is the judgment of the present management of the Associated Hospital Service of Maine that it is important to its solvency and in the interest of present members and the providers of service who guarantee the benefits that AHS of Maine should retain reasonable underwriting requirements and an incentive for people to establish their membership before reaching the abnormally high-risk age of retirement."

It is clear from this statement the AHS of Maine has determined to maintain an honest and fiscally responsible service. It does not issue policies to people who initially apply after having reached the age of 65 because it knows, as national Blue Cross knows, that, in the words of the Chicago Daily News, "over 94 percent of the Nation's 16 million aged cannot pay their health bill without crimping their low-budget set aside for life's necessity."

Incidentally, Madam President, the Blue Cross Association knew in advance that the State of Maine's local Blue Cross was having no part of its political promotion before it ran its ad. It knew that Maine was not and Michigan could not. Yet it ran its ad without advising readers in those States of the fact.

I am sure, Madam President, that most if not all of our local Blue Cross plans are run by men who are more concerned about solving the problems of providing hospital insurance on a community-wide basis for the protection of their people and the fiscal security of their hospitals than they are with winning the plaudits and patronage of the American Medical Association. Beset as they are with the competition of commercial companies which offer lower rates to the healthiest groups and try to leave local Blue Cross plans with the old, poorer, and less healthy groups, many of them realize I am sure, that a Federal program such as the President advocates would assure their hospitals of payment for care of the highest risk group in the Nation—the over 65—and enable them to cover the rest of the population on a true community rating, community service basis. People have and will respect Blue Cross, people will buy Blue Cross—even employers of young people who could get coverage at lower rates from experience-rating companies—if they remain convinced that Blue Cross is really doing a job for the community. If Blue Cross either attempts the obviously impossible or, worse, pretends to do the job of meeting the real needs of the elderly at a price the elderly can afford to pay, it will have lost the confidence and support of the community. The Blue Cross Association, Madam President, seems to me to be coming very close to making that pretense.

Madam President, I have said that this current advertisement of the Blue Cross Association represents the second time this year that it has engaged in politics. Let me now talk of the first incident.

In January of this year, the Blue Cross Association called a meeting in Chicago just as the Congress was to meet—with the President's program for hospital insurance of the elderly high on its agenda.

The timing was so obvious that no knowledgeable person in the country was surprised to find the president of the association choosing that occasion to announce the imminence of "the national Blue Cross benefit program for the aged."

In a release issued on January 6, he spoke of "the historic decision taken by the Blue Cross plans of the United States to finance a program of comprehensive health care benefits for the aged, with assistance from the Government to those retired aged who need help in purchasing it."

Despite the ambiguities of the statement, the Blue Cross Association clearly conveyed to the press the belief that it had in being a nationwide program which would provide the care our older people need and render the President's program unnecessary.

It was not true. It was false. It was obviously politically motivated and a hoax on our older citizens who have since looked in vain for that fine program.

There was no such program. There was no nationwide plan for the elderly upon which the local Blue Cross plans were agreed—with or without assistance in financing from the Government.

The association's own release stated that—

> The outlines of such a program, including care in acute hospitals, nursing homes, chronic hospitals, outpatient clinics and by visiting nurse services at home were presented to the hospital and Blue Cross plan representatives at the Chicago meeting, but now require organization into technical language to implement the general approval given at that session.

The plan had been approved, the association said. All it needed was a little reworking into technical language. Well, either it had not been approved or the technicians failed. The fact is that no nationwide plan has yet been developed.

Thus the Blue Cross Association had made an announcement fraught with political meaning and so worded as to make sure that the press and the public and the Congress would be left with the impression that the new plan was a reality.

The highly respected Medical World News in its issue of February 2 quoted Mr. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association, as one who "launched into a detailed description of the National Blue Cross benefit program for the aged on a nationwide basis at uniform rates," without age limits, with no restrictions because of pre-existing conditions and no waiting periods. It was to cost, Medical World News said, $10 to $12 a month and cover about 70 days of hospitalization, 90 days in other institutions such as nursing homes and visiting nurse services.

A harmless fantasy if only it had not been presented in such a way that the press and then the public accepted it as fact.

But the motivation for the fantasy was revealed by the further quote from Mr. McNerney appearing in the same article and reading as follows:

> If we are to have an impact on Congress, we should be tooled up in a couple of months. If we must be ready earlier, we will be.

If they had been honest, the Blue Cross Association could easily have told the press that they were talking not of a program, not of a reality, not of something agreed to, but rather of a story properly headed, "McNerney hopes perhaps to maybe sell local Blue Cross plans on a perhaps meaningful plan for the elderly." That they could have said. But that would have made page 50 of the newspapers, and would not have had "an impact on Congress."

On January 22, an Illinois Congressman referred to this announcement of the Blue Cross Association, and said that, in contrast to the administration's program it "is the recent proposal through which the utmost effectiveness of our free enterprise system could be used to meet this important social problem" and then went on to quote an editorial in the Chicago Sun Times of January 22 which said:

> Now with Congress again facing the issue, it is encouraging to note that the foes of the administration's plan have produced an alternative proposal which is well worth examining.

The editorial went on to say that—

> On hospitalization, the A.H.A. and the Blue Cross have agreed on a plan for private hospitalization insurance for retired persons over 65 to cost $10 to $12 per month. The Federal Government would pay the premiums only for those unable to do so.

Yes, the Blue Cross Association had most adroitly sold the press, the public and some Members of the Congress who trusted it, on something that simply was not so.

My esteemed colleague, Senator JAVITS, who is most concerned with the health care of the elderly and who proved most helpful in perfecting the King-Anderson bill, on May 24 placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a comparison of what he termed "the major health care proposals before us." It was prepared, he explained, by the staff of the Republican policy committee and it listed what it called "the Blue Shield-Blue Cross program." Under the Blue Cross part of the so-called program, it set forth the same service benefits that had been outlined by Mr. McNerney in Chicago in January and stated that these benefits would be "paid for by individuals at an estimated cost of $10 to $12 per month."

Thus months had gone by since the Blue Cross Association's press release of January 6 announced its "historic" new program for the elderly. On April 21, the Scripps-Howard papers stated that the Blue Cross plan might go on sale in July. They went on to say that the "American Medical Association is pressuring Blue Cross to act fast to head off the Kennedy administration's plan for medical care under social security. Aim is for a uniform, nationwide, low-cost policy available at once for the elderly."

Madam President, the Blue Cross Association undoubtedly subscribes to a press clipping service. It has representatives in Washington reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Its people read the papers. It knew the people thought it had a program for older people.

It knew that was not true.

It had no program.

But it did not inform the press that its president's dream had died aborning.

It did not advise the Senate's Republican policy committee that in truth it had no such program as the committee, in good faith, had presented to the Congress.

And it did not tell America's older people—even those relatively few who could pay $10 or $12 a month for hospital care—that there was not, in fact, a nationwide program available to them.

It said not a word publicly about the bold new plan of January 6. Rebuffed by its own member plans, it quietly shelved the great nationwide program and proceeded with the planning and execution of "Operation Second Best."

This latest venture into politics was noted as far back as August 31, by the Medical World News. Writing of the association's attempt to retrieve something from the January flop by promoting an extravaganza timed for preelection days in October, it said:

> Political pressures appear to be at least partially guiding these efforts. The Blue Cross local-oriented program also substitutes for a nationwide uniform-benefit package publicly announced early this year and since quietly shelved. Observers say that efforts by private health organizations to provide new and improved programs will give political ammunition this fall to candidates who oppose King-Anderson and similar bills. These candidates will be provided with concrete examples showing how health insurance is coping with the problem.

It is important to emphasize that the Blue Cross Association is running the advertisements knowing that many States have no new programs to offer now; knowing that others making their offers after the election may well be raising their rates out of the reach of the elderly; knowing full well that some fiscally responsible local plans will make no offer at all.

That the association knew these things is undeniable. Moreover, back in August one Blue Cross official, speaking of the October date for this announcement, said:

> This is a rather tight schedule and we are not now in a position to judge whether a sufficient number of plans will have been able to obtain regulatory clearance in time. If not, it will be necessary to delay the open enrollment period.

Well, it proved necessary in State after State to delay the enrollment period during which older people could inspect and perhaps buy the promised bright new package of benefits. In other States no delay was necessary because all that is being offered is the same old unsatisfactory package. In still other States, there is no package at all. Yet, neither honesty nor their obligations to hospitals or the public led them to kill these advertisements or even to postpone them until—perhaps after November 6—they might have given some semblance of approximation to the truth.

Madam President, this chronology is all the more unfortunate in light of the fine history of the Blue Cross movement in this country. Starting in the depths of the depression of the thirties, Blue Cross provided a desperately needed mechanism which saved our hospitals from the threat of insolvency and which enabled millions to prepay much of their hospital expenses on a rational and self-respecting basis. Blue Cross did this with courage and great social consciousness. It did it with true independence, thinking of people and of hospitals, and despite the blind opposition of the AMA. It built its independent local plans on a truly nonprofit basis. It devised its plans so as to serve the needs of entire communities and not just the needs of the best risks, the young and the healthy. When it proved the job could be done for most if not all of our population, it began to meet tough competition from commercial companies which, offering experience-rated contracts, tried to skim off the cream of the hospital insurance business and leave the community-rated Blue Cross plans with the whey. In many instances, it has succumbed to that competition and itself offered experience-rated plans. But, by and large, it has tried to fight valiantly against this threat to the basic concept of successful voluntary health insurance. It has fought well and honestly. Relieved of the burden of trying to underwrite hospital care for the elderly it might well take a new lease on life and restore to the overwhelming majority of our people the community-rated voluntary health insurance system of which we think so highly.

But Madam President, Blue Cross cannot do this if the National Blue Cross Association, through actions I have recounted, jeopardizes its reputation for honesty and responsibility by throwing itself into a political arena where it does not belong.

That is why I have spoken, Madam President. I have not enjoyed taking on this task. I do it not because I am antagonistic to Blue Cross, but because I have thought so highly of it. I do it because the record must be set straight before the November 6 election which it is so obviously trying to affect. I do it because someone must point out to the fine people who serve on the boards of directors of our local Blue Cross plans the things which are being done to Blue Cross prestige and honor in their name and by their association.

Through its current advertisement, the Blue Cross Association is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to tout local programs which in many cases consist of undetermined benefits at undetermined costs to be perhaps offered at an undetermined time. When we read an advertisement bearing the Blue Cross insignia, we should neither have to read between the lines nor search for fine print. In this case, the fine print was not even there. There is no indication at all in the advertisements that in some States there would be no program at all. No indication that in some States it would merely represent a reopening of the same too limited, too expensive program already in existence. No indication that in some States the new program would mean primarily a 50-percent increase in rates. No indication that in some States the contemplated proposals had not yet received approval of regulatory bodies. No fine print at all.

Madam President, to document this case a little further, I ask unanimous consent to set forth here a stenographic transcript of what was said when, in response to this advertisement, a call was made to the Blue Cross plan here in the District of Columbia:

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Voice. Group Hospitalization.

Inquirer. I'd like to speak to someone about the Blue Cross plan for senior citizens, please.

Voice. You want Subscriber Service; they are busy. Would you wait?

Inquirer. Yes, I'll hold.

Voice. Subscriber Service.

Inquirer. Hello. I saw your ad on the Blue Cross plans for senior citizens in the new Life magazine.

Voice. Yes.

Inquirer. And I'm interested in knowing a little more about it for my mother. Could you tell me about it please?

Voice. Well, not really. It's still in the proposal stages and I can't tell you about what the rates will be, or even what the benefits will be. It hasn't been finally drawn up yet. When it is completed, which should be around the beginning of October, the first or second week, we will make a public announcement so that everything will be specified, and I know now * * * they first would have to be over 65, and then there won't be any physical required. But because of the group coverage that will come under the contract, and because it is mainly for older people, the rates may be quite high. But as to any specific amount, I can't really give that to you yet.

Inquirer. I see. Well, will you take my name and let me know then later on?

Voice. We'll make a general announcement as soon as everything is solidified. Then we'll have some benefits drawn up exactly, and we'll publish it in the papers.

Inquirer. That's funny. I wonder why this big ad was put in, then, if it's not determined yet.

Voice. It shouldn't be. It was put in by the Blue Cross Association just as a general statement—but, of course, it doesn't sound like a general statement.

Inquirer. No, it doesn't.

Voice. Not any of the Blue Cross plans were happy about it because it isn't ready for subscribers and we don't have any information for them yet, really. It's silly to make it known before you can give them any help and particulars on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Madam President, you can well imagine what effect that conversation would have on the esteem of the Blue Cross and its pronouncements in the future.

Madam President, I hope and trust that the responsible people in Blue Cross will put a stop to this sort of irresponsibility.

Let me close, Madam President, by quoting one of the great former presidents of the National Blue Cross Association, Dr. Basil C. MacLean. Dr. MacLean was also president of the American Hospital Association. He said:

> A lifetime's experience has led me at last to conclude that the costs of care of the aged cannot be met, unaided, by the mechanism of insurance or prepayment as they exist today. The aged simply cannot afford to buy from any of these the scope of care that is required, nor do the stern competitive realities permit any carrier, whether nonprofit or commercial, to provide benefits which are adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged (Feb. 5, 1960).

Let us hope that we will soon see the Blue Cross Association acting on the basis of this knowledge and working with our Government to help devise a way to really meet the health problems of our older people instead of letting them become the sad losers in a sorry venture into politics.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the comments made by the thirty-some local Blue Cross plans which were queried about this advertisement when it first appeared.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the letter which the Associated Hospital Service of Maine has prepared as an answer to those of our fine older people whose hopes may be raised by the national association's advertisement and who, as the ad urges them to do, write their local plan for details.

I ask unanimous consent, too, that the advertisement to which I have referred to be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the comments, letters, and advertisement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State	No information on rates or benefits currently available on any new plan for senior citizens	Comments	Mentioned coverage available to senior citizens	Comments
Arizona	X	"We have nothing on any new plan now."	X	"Present plan will be open to senior citizens in November."
Arkansas	X	"No idea when new plan would take effect or what coverage would be."		
California (southern)	X	"Don't know of any new plan."	X	"Present plan has been available to senior citizens for about 1 year."
Colorado	X	"Final arrangements on any new plan won't be made until the end of the year."	X	"Have plan available—same as we have had for several years."
Connecticut			X	"New plan open to all ages, drive starts Oct. 1, rates and benefits will be in paper then."
District of Columbia	X	"I realize that advertising has appeared concerning this but we will not be inaugurating it until the end of this year. Information on rates and coverage will be available probably at the end of November or 1st of December."		
Florida	X	"We don't have a new plan, there has been some talk about it * * *. We hope to hear something about it sometime in October."		
Idaho	X	"We do not have any idea of rates or coverage but will have enrollment in later part of November * * * Hope to have some information available sometime in November."		
Illinois	(?)		X	"Open enrollment during October at $12.65 monthly per person."
Indiana	(?)		X	"Open enrollment for anyone Sept. 30 to Oct. 8, with 2 options at $21.24 or $15.40 monthly per couple."
Iowa (Sioux City, and including South Dakota).	X	"We don't have any information on that but hope to have some information in October sometime."		
Kentucky			X	"Plan will be effective Jan. 1, 1963, details to be available Oct. 1, cost $21.60 per month per couple."
Maryland	X	"It is just being talked about right now * * *. More information will be available in November."		
Massachusetts			X	"The age limit on their existing plan has now been eliminated and individual enrollment is available for people over 65. There is an 8-month waiting period for persons except for accidents or acute conditions." [1]
Michigan	X	"The ad does not apply in Michigan because the Michigan insurance commissioner did not approve the proposed plan * * *. We are still working on it."		
Minnesota	X	"We don't have any plan for senior citizens, are you sure you saw an ad for Blue Cross? (Yes, in Life magazine.) Oh yes, I have heard of that, but we have no information at all and don't know when we will have."		
Missouri (St. Louis)	X	"No definite plans, nothing accepted yet, nothing on benefits or rates."		

See footnote at end of table.

State	No information on rates or benefits currently available on any new plan for senior citizens	Comments	Mentioned coverage available to senior citizens	Comments
New Hampshire (including Vermont).	X	"Just recently you saw something advertised? We have no information on that, we don't have anything now, we won't have any information until October or November."		
New Jersey	X	"We don't know how much it is going to cost or what it will cover, but will be glad to send you information whenever we receive it ourselves—have no idea when that will be."		
New Mexico	X	"We have no information on that, would be glad to mail information in the near future."		
New York (Buffalo)			X	"Plans are tentative, have no approval from State insurance commissioner. Hope to have by Oct. 1. Rates would be $13.50 per person per month for BC–BS. 6-month waiting period for preexisting conditions."[1]
New York (New York City)	X	"A new program for the over 65 is in the speaking stage, but there has been no decision on that."	X	"Plan now being sold which has been available to people over 65 for the last 2 years."
Ohio (Columbus)	X	"We know nothing of any new plan"	X	"Regular plan enrollment now open, $13.50 per month per person for BC, $6 per month per person for BS."
Oklahoma	X		X	"Current plan for senior citizens has been in existence for 2 years. Originally intended to stop enrollment July 1962 but will now extend enrollment date to Dec. 31, 1962."
Oregon	X	"Unfortunately we have nothing on this, probably will have information available by end of November."		
Pennsylvania (Pittsburgh)	X	"Did you see that ad recently * * *? We have nothing on it * * *. We have a senior citizen policy but enrollment on it is closed. It may be opened this fall but they didn't give us any rates."		
Tennessee (Chattanooga)	X	"No idea of cost of coverage, can't offer now, may be available before first of the year."		
Texas			X	"Have new plan, details available by mail."
Utah	X	"The announcement was a little premature for the State of Utah, will have further information later in November or early in December."		
Virginia (Richmond)	X	"Haven't received anything on it, hope will have something about Oct. 15."		
Washington			X	"Literature just being printed, hope to have it by Oct. 1. Will be effective Nov. 1. Cost: $13.75 per month, Blue Cross; $6.75 per month Blue Shield."
West Virginia (Wheeling)	X	"New plan expected in early December to be effective in December or January."		
Wisconsin			X	"Enrollment not set up, but will take place Oct. 14 to Nov. 16, plan to be effective Dec. 1; high option $15 per month for Blue Cross-Blue Shield, low option $12 per month."

---

[1] Only Massachusetts and Buffalo, N.Y., were asked whether there was a waiting period for benefits.

ASSOCIATED HOSPITAL SERVICE
OF MAINE,
Portland, Maine.

SPECIMEN

Thank you for your inquiry regarding enrollment in our Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans.

It has been and continues to be the policy of the Associated Hospital Service of Maine to require the establishment of nongroup enrollment before the attainment of age 65, although continuation of nongroup enrollment or conversion from group to nongroup status are allowed after age 65. This policy may seem to be inconsistent with Blue Cross and Blue Shield advertising originating outside the State of Maine. Accordingly, permit us to explain as follows:

In general, each Blue Cross plan and each Blue Shield plan is an independent, locally governed corporation, operating not for profit in the interest of community health goals. In Maine, a single corporation, the Associated Hospital Service of Maine, operates a hospital service plan approved by the American Hospital Association; it also operates the physician-sponsored medical care plan approved by the National Association of Blue Shield Plans.

The Blue Cross Association and the National Association of Blue Shield Plans are central coordinating agencies, neither of which has the legal capacity to issue on its own responsibility a contract of insurance in Maine or anywhere else. These central agencies have seen fit to advertise that Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans are preparing to offer programs for senior citizens. Some plans are doing so but it is the judgment of the present management of the Associated Hospital Service of Maine that it is important to its solvency and in the interest of present members and the providers of service who guarantee the benefits that AHS of Maine should retain reasonable underwriting requirements and an incentive for people to establish their membership before reaching the abnormally high-risk age of retirement.

We regret that it seems necessary to deny you the privilege of nongroup enrollment at your attained age.

Yours very truly,

PAUL A. WEBB,
Executive Director.

BLUE CROSS PLANS EXPAND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THEIR PROGRAMS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Nationwide, more than 5 million citizens 65 or over already have Blue Cross protection.

Based on this experience and a comprehensive study of senior citizens' requirements, local Blue Cross plans are preparing to offer amplified programs of protection for this age group.

This is in keeping with the Blue Cross aim to help all members of the community, not just those considered to be good risks.

There are no upper age limits. No physical examinations are required. The benefits will be established by local plans to help meet the special needs of senior citizens.

Rates, too, will be determined locally, so that they may reflect, to the advantage of each member, local differences in costs of care.

Blue Cross realizes that there will still be some senior citizens who cannot afford to purchase this protection. In such cases, local Blue Cross plans make it possible for relatives or others to arrange the protection for them.

Blue Cross plans, because of their traditional concern with the costs of care to subscribers, and their direct working relationship with hospitals, have always offered outstanding value. In 1961, for instance, Blue Cross plans as a whole returned in benefits an average of 93 cents of every dollar paid in. That's far more than the average return for other forms of health protection.

As a result, Blue Cross is the organization most preferred by the American people to help assure the payment of their hospital bills. Today, 59 million in all are enrolled in Blue Cross plans.

For full details of the programs for senior citizens in your area, write or telephone your local Blue Cross office.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILWAUKEE'S PRIDE: RALPH VOTAPEK, WINNER OF THE FIRST VAN CLIBURN INTERNATIONAL PIANO COMPETITION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, Wisconsin, and especially Milwaukee, are very proud of our gifted young pianist who won, in Texas, a world contest in which there was the stiffest kind of international competition from outstanding pianists, including the greatest pianists of Russia, Japan, and other countries. Ralph Votapek has brought glory and honor to his country, and also, of course, to the city of Milwaukee and to the State of Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials, from the Milwaukee Sentinel and the Milwaukee Journal, praising him and expressing pride that he is a Milwaukeean, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROUD MOMENT

Milwaukee and all Wisconsin take pride in the accomplishment of Ralph Votapek, winner of the first Van Cliburn international piano competition.

To be sure, the winning of this competition is an individual triumph. Teacher, family, and sponsors play important supporting parts. But in the moment of truth, achievement rests on the individual.

Obviously, Votapek proved more than equal to the challenge. He has earned every right to be proud, although news reports concerning him strongly suggest that he is as blessed with humility as he is with talent. In saluting and congratulating him, his hometown and State may be pardoned for taking a heaping measure of pride in Votapek's behalf.

Votapek has demonstrated his modesty by his attitude toward impending draft induction. With a chance of a lifetime opportunity to capitalize on the Van Cliburn honor in the next year, he should have, however, no qualms about asking for deferment. And his draft board should have no hesitation about granting it.

CAUSE FOR PRIDE

Milwaukee's fine young pianist Ralph Votapek has distinguished not only himself but also his home city and State by outplaying the 86 best from 17 countries in the Van Cliburn competition at Fort Worth.

Local pride may not preen itself much on the happenstance of birth. But Votapek's talent was basically trained and developed here, and of that the community may fairly boast. His international recognition is a big leap forward in Milwaukee's quest of artistic renaissance.

The 23-year-old may now look forward (after a possible Army stint) to furthering both his own career and his country's interest as a cultural missionary, with concert halls opened and audiences made eager around the world by his achievement.

JIM McCARTNEY'S FINE SERIES ON THE LOBBYING PROBLEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, on yesterday I had printed in the RECORD a series of three articles, written by James McCartney, on the problem of lobbying in Washington and describing in detail how the lobbyists operate to frustrate the public interest in behalf of special interests.

Jim McCartney is one of the finest reporters on Capitol Hill, and in this series of articles he has done a superb job. In the fourth article which I include tonight he deals with the fine work which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has done in getting his drug bill through, despite the opposition of the drug lobbyists.

I ask unanimous consent that the fourth article by James McCartney be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DRUG LOBBYISTS LOST BIG BATTLE—KEFAUVER PLANTED STORY, SAVED BILL

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—Bigtime lobbyists don't always win in Washington. They can be beaten at their own game.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, in a story not previously told, killed one huge lobbying campaign in the battle over a new drug bill with a single, well-timed thrust.

At the crucial moment in the campaign, after his own tough bill appeared dead, KEFAUVER carefully planted a dramatic, front-page story his subcommittee had been researching for more than 2 months.

It was the story of Dr. Frances O. Kelsey and her heroic battle against private industry pressures to keep the baby-deforming drug thalidomide off the market in the United States.

The drug control issue caught fire. Within weeks the tide shifted, as KEFAUVER had expected it might.

His tough approach was saved.

The incident—commonly thought mere happenstance—came as a fitting climax to a rough, tough 2½-year battle between KEFAUVER, as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, and the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

The battle began on December 7, 1959, when KEFAUVER dropped his first bombshell on the Nation's drug industry.

His subcommittee launched a series of hearings with charges of sensational markups in the prices of drugs—markups like 1,118 percent and 7,089 percent over manufacturing costs.

The drug industry was caught flatfooted—unprepared to defend itself against what it later described as one of the most vindictive attacks ever made on an industry.

KEFAUVER has always had to depend on a flair for personal publicity in his battles in the Senate. Democratic "liberals" on his subcommittee are clearly outvoted on the main Judiciary Committee, to which the subcommittee reports.

To get past the Judiciary Committee KEFAUVER frequently plays directly to the public. Some think he is an authentic publicity genius.

When KEFAUVER launched his onslaught, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association was almost brandnew. It had no large staff, no organized program. But it had money and brains and in the months and years that followed it mounted an elaborate and well-planned counterattack.

One of the Nation's largest public relations firms, Hill & Knowlton, with offices in key cities throughout the country, appeared on the PMA payroll at $5,000 a month to help plan basic public relations policy.

Hill & Knowlton's president, Bert Goss, of New York, took personal charge of preparing a nationwide grassroots public relations program to fend off KEFAUVER's charges and improve the industry's "image."

Millions of pamphlets and brochures were printed and distributed, films were made, hundreds of speeches given by industry men in large and small clubs from coast to coast.

In Washington a more subtle effort was underway. The industry, in one way or another, signed up for the services of more than half a dozen of the town's most politically influential law firms.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson's firm was on the list. So were firms of Paul Porter, President Truman's OPA Administrator; George Ball, now Under Secretary of State, and Fowler Hamilton, now foreign aid Administrator.

A key lawyer hired was Edward Foley, Under Secretary of the Treasury in the Truman administration and chairman of President Kennedy's inaugural committee.

The theory is that well-known Democratic lawyers with roots in the administration have friendships and personal contacts that can open doors. In Washington the theory is sound.

One PMA official explained why Foley was hired: "He is an old Washington hand. He knows the individuals who make up the Government."

The PMA keyed the main thrust of its counterattack to the presentation of its own case before the Kefauver subcommittee in December of last year, nearly 2 years after KEFAUVER had attacked the industry.

It spent more than 6 months in preparing 3 days of testimony and then promoted the substance of the testimony with press releases, news conferences, pamphlets, brochures and even movies.

Says William Kloepfer, the PMA's public relations man: "This was the great turning point. Even KEFAUVER praised our approach as an act of industrial statesmanship."

The industry hadn't convinced KEFAUVER, but it was winning friends elsewhere on Capitol Hill and in the months that followed everything seemed to go its way.

It won its biggest victory when another Judiciary subcommittee knocked a section on patents that was a keystone of Senator KEFAUVER's strong approach out of the bill.

Despite this, KEFAUVER expected that the rest of the bill would be fairly tough and lead to "more reasonably priced, safer and more accurately and honestly advertised drugs."

Then, on the morning of June 11 this year, the roof fell in. KEFAUVER learned of a secret meeting set up by Senator JAMES EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the main Judiciary Committee, with Republicans on the committee and representatives of the Kennedy administration—to rewrite his bill.

KEFAUVER and other Democratic members of his subcommittee, though they had worked on the drug bill for more than 2 years, were not invited.

Those attending, however, represented a clear-cut majority of the main Judiciary Committee. Republicans were represented by aids of Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, and Senator ROMAN HRUSKA, Republican, of Nebraska.

KEFAUVER said the group watered his bill down to the point where it was all but useless.

They swung a "haymaker," he said, "and just about knocked this bill out of the ring."

The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association felt that it had won.

Senator EASTLAND, on the Senate floor, told KEFAUVER bluntly that the Kennedy administration was against him and that he only had three or four votes on the 15-man Judiciary Committee.

But at the time the world had not heard the story of Dr. Kelsey. KEFAUVER had.

Subcommittee staff members had read of problems with the drug thalidomide in Europe as early as February.

John Blair, chief economist for KEFAUVER's subcommittee, said he began to build a dossier on thalidomide in March and April.

In May, testimony about thalidomide was given before a House committee, but somehow the press missed it—or didn't recognize its significance.

After the secret meeting at which his bill was watered down Kefauver decided something had to be done to save it.

He recognized the publicity possibilities in thalidomide and in Dr. Kelsey's story even though the thalidomide problem had little to do with his earlier primary concern with drug prices.

"We knew we had something big from a publicity point of view," says Blair. "We just didn't know how big it was."

One day late in June or early in July a friendly reporter from the Washington Post was told by Blair about Dr. Kelsey. On July 15 the Post front-paged the story, documented through the Food and Drug Administration. Soon it spread around the Nation.

An obscure Arizona housewife read about it in a newspaper in her hometown and realized she had taken thalidomide. That was Mrs. Sherri Finkbine, whose search for a legal abortion gave further publicity to drug problems.

"Dr. Kelsey we publicized," says Blair. "Mrs. Finkbine was a bonus."

Soon the Judiciary Committee was busily rewriting the bill again. This time they were putting back parts that had been taken out June 11.

President Kennedy was soon talking about tough drug legislation, which he had neglected to support fully in his consumers message to Congress.

Republicans Dirksen and Hruska were now on Kefauver's side.

The payoff came August 23 on the Senate floor. The vote for Kefauver's strong approach: 78 to 0.

PROXMIRE'S FIGHT TO REDUCE SPENDING DURING 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, in the course of this session several of us have offered amendments to cut spending. My staff and I have been working for the last several days to compute the total amounts which would have been saved if the amendments had been agreed to and had been enacted into law. We have included every amendment offered in 1962 to reduce spending except those representing reductions in spending which have been included in other amendments providing larger cuts.

I have before me a tabulation which describes each one of the amendments, what its effect would have been, the amount of saving involved, what the vote on each amendment was and what my vote was. It also includes the few amendments that passed the Senate and raised spending above the level recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I earnestly hope the consideration of these amendments will serve notice on the administration and on various of its agencies that a number of Senators are deeply concerned about the level of spending, that they have every intention or doing everything they can on the floor of the Senate to cut back every dollar or spending which cannot be justified, and that we expect in the future, as we did this year, to insist whenever possible on justification for every dollar of spending proposed, particularly when the proposed spending exceeds the budget requests or exceeds the amounts voted by the House of Representatives. The total savings involved amount to billions of dollars. I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amendments to appropriation bills, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

MONEYSAVING AMENDMENTS TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

	Saving	Senate vote	Proxmire vote
Miller motion to recommit bill to Senate Appropriations Committee with instructions to cut the total by $275,000,000.	$275,000,000	Rejected, 12 to 57; Aug. 31, Congressional Record, p. 18371.	For.
Proxmire amendment to eliminate the entire subsidy of $10,000,000 for helicopter service	[1] 5,025,000	Rejected by voice vote; Aug. 31, Congressional Record, p. 18340.	
Proxmire amendments to cut back Veterans' Administration funds by $5,000,000 for medical research and $3,000,000 for construction of research facilities to the level requested by the administration.	[2] 0	Rejected, 21 to 57; Aug. 31, Congressional Record, p. 18355.	
Proxmire amendment to cut NASA funds by $104,960,000, which would have reduced the appropriation $188,121,000 or 5 percent, below the President's request.	[3] 44,960,000	Rejected, 4 to 66; Aug. 31, Congressional Record, p. 18367.	
Total saving	324,985,000		

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

	Saving	Senate vote	Proxmire vote
Morse amendment to increase by $2,000,000, funds for the Bureau of Land Management to rehabilitate and conserve rangelands in the Western States.	[4] $2,000,000	Approved 42 to 28; June 11, Congressional Record, p. 10121.	Against.
Magnuson amendment to increase from $2,000,000 to $6,000,000 funds for acquiring additional roads for access to national forest lands.	[4] 4,000,000	Approved 47 to 41; June 12, Congressional Record, p. 10251.	Against.
Dirksen motion to recommit bill to Senate Appropriations Committee with instructions to reduce the total to the House-passed figure of $868,595,000.	53,965,820	Rejected 26 to 60; June 12, Congressional Record, p. 10273.	For.
Total saving	53,965,820		

PROXMIRE MONEYSAVING AMENDMENTS TO LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

	Saving	Senate vote
Amendments to reduce by $247,105,000 27 items to the amount requested by the administration.	[5] $247,105,000	Rejected 24 to 59; July 20, Congressional Record, p. 14285.
Amendment to cut funds for the National Institutes of Health by $120,400,000 to the level requested by the administration.	120,400,000	Rejected 32 to 48; July 20, Congressional Record, p. 14302.
Total saving	247,105,000	

PROXMIRE MONEYSAVING AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Proxmire amendment to eliminate the $60,000 increase for the Senate majority and minority policy committees.	$60,000	Rejected by voice vote; Aug. 2, Congressional Record, p. 15416.

MONEYSAVING AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1963

	Saving	Senate vote	Proxmire vote
Proxmire amendment to delete funds for the Glen Elder dam and irrigation project in Kansas	$750,000	Rejected 17 to 52; Oct. 1, Congressional Record, p. 21407.	
Hruska amendment to reduce from $500,000,000 to $300,000,000 funds appropriated for public works acceleration.	200,000,000	Rejected 16 to 44; Sept. 29, Congressional Record, p. 21306.	For.
Total saving	200,750,000		

---

[1] The remaining $4,975,000, the figure provided by the House, is reflected in the $275,000,000 saving.

[2] The $8,000,000 saving is already reflected in the $275,000,000 figure.

[3] The remaining $60,000,000 has already been accounted for in the $275,000,000 saving.

[4] These figures are not included in the total saving since there were no provisions for them in the House-passed bill.

[5] This figure includes the saving of $120,400,000 for the National Institutes of Health.

Amendments to appropriations bills, 87th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

PROXMIRE MONEYSAVING AMENDMENTS TO STATE-JUSTICE-COMMERCE-JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

	Saving	Senate vote
Amendment to reduce funds for Maritime Administration ship construction from $64,200,000 to $50,000,000.	$14, 200, 000	Rejected 30 to 52; Oct. 3, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 22017.

PROXMIRE MONEYSAVING AMENDMENT TO 2D SUPPLEMENTAL, 1962, APPROPRIATION BILL

	Saving	Senate vote
Amendment to delete $15,000,000 for Federal participation in the New York World's Fair	$15, 000, 000	Rejected 13 to 60; Apr. 16, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6632.

PROXMIRE MONEYSAVING AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1963

	Saving	Senate vote
Amendment to eliminate $280,000,000 for construction of a conventionally powered aircraft carrier of the Forrestal class.	$280, 000, 000	Rejected by voice vote; June 13, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10383.
Amendment to reduce funds from $491,000,000 to the administration-requested amount of $171,000,000 for developing a "reconnaissance" and "strike" version of the B-70 bomber, known as the RS-70.	320, 000, 000	Rejected 13 to 74; June 13, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10378.
Total saving	600, 000, 000	

PROXMIRE MONEYSAVING AMENDMENTS TO FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

	Saving	Senate vote
Amendments to reduce the Senate Appropriations Committee figures by $785,000,000 to the amounts passed by the House.	$785, 000, 000	Rejected 47 to 28; Oct. 1, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 21447.

BREAKDOWN OF REDUCTION TOTALING $785,000,000

	Saving
(1) Reduce funds for development grants from $275,000,000 to $225,000,000	$50, 000, 000
(2) Reduce funds for investment guarantees from $100,000,000 to $30,000,000	70, 000, 000
(3) Reduce supporting assistance funds from $400,000,000 to $350,000,000	50, 000, 000
(4) Reduce contingency fund from $290,000,000 to $225,000,000	65, 000, 000
(5) Reduce funds for Alliance for Progress from $575,000,000 to $525,000,000	50, 000, 000
(6) Reduce Development Loan Fund from $1,125,000,000 to $775,000,000	350, 000, 000
(7) Reduce military assistance funds from $1,450,000,000 to $1,300,000,000	150, 000, 000
Total saving	785, 000, 000

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1961. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired); and

S. 3124. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

The message also announced that the House had further disagreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 19, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54 to the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 51, and 53 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I should like to have the clerk read the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 in order that I may check it against some notes. There are a number of items involved and this matter has been rather confused this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following:

"Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, and for acquisition of land by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, $77,473,000; plus additional amounts for research as follows: $325,000 for staffing new research laboratories, $670,000 for research on cost of production, and $4,875,000 for expanded utilization research; and plus the following amounts, to remain available until expended, for construction, alteration and equipping of facilities: $395,000 for soil and water research facilities at Sidney, Montana, $450,000 for poultry research facilities at East Lansing, Michigan, $400,000 for Mandan, North Dakota, $125,000 for the Southern Piedmont soil and water facility, $585,000 for Tuscon, Arizona, $500,000 for the regional tree fruit and nut crops station in the Southeast, $165,000 for the research station at Carbondale, Illinois, and $160,000 for improvement of heating, water, and electrical systems at the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Maryland; in all, $86,123,000: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113(a)):".

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12648, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
October 11, 1962.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 to the bill (H.R. 12648) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following:

"Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, and for acquisition of land by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, $77,473,000; plus additional amounts for research as follows: $325,000 for staffing new research laboratories, $670,000 for research on cost of production, and $4,875,000 for expanded utilization research; and plus the following amounts, to remain available until expended, for construction, alteration and equipping of facilities: $395,000 for soil and water research facilities at Sidney, Montana, $450,000 for poultry research facilities at East Lansing, Michigan, $400,000 for Mandan, North Dakota, $125,000 for the Southern Piedmont soil and water facility, $585,000 for Tucson, Arizona, $500,000 for the regional tree fruit and nut crops station in the Southeast, $165,000 for the research station at Carbondale, Illinois, and $160,000 for improvement of heating, water and electrical systems at the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Maryland; in all, $86,123,000: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113(a));".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "expenses during fiscal year 1963 and unrecovered prior years' cost, including interest thereon,".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "expenses during fiscal year 1963 and unrecovered prior years' costs".

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 51, and 53.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table on the Department of Agriculture and related agencies showing appropriations for fiscal year 1962, the budget estimates for 1963, and the House and Senate action and the conference allowance.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1962 and estimates for 1963, and amounts recommended in bill for 1963, and conference allowances

TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in House bill for 1963	Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1963	Conference allowances, 1963
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Research	$76,973,000	[1] $78,082,000	$77,473,000	$106,126,500	$86,123,000
Plant and animal disease and pest control	[2] 58,080,500	58,902,500	56,330,500	59,180,500	58,055,500
Meat inspection	24,211,000	25,241,000	24,711,000	25,211,000	25,000,000
Total	159,264,500	162,225,500	158,514,500	190,518,000	169,178,500
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	5,265,000	5,265,000	5,265,000	5,265,000	5,265,000
Construction of facilities	800,000	1,680,000	760,000		
Total, Agricultural Research Service	165,329,500	169,170,500	164,539,500	195,783,000	174,443,500
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service: Payments and expenses	36,207,000	38,207,000	38,207,000	38,207,000	38,207,000
Extension Service:					
Payments to States and Puerto Rico	59,590,000	60,590,000	60,590,000	63,590,000	63,590,000
Retirement costs for extension agents	6,260,000	6,605,000	6,605,000	7,105,000	6,765,000
Penalty mail	2,490,000	2,490,000	2,490,000	2,490,000	2,490,000
Federal Extension Service	2,464,500	2,724,500	2,464,500	2,724,500	2,499,500
Total, Extension Service	70,804,500	72,409,500	72,149,500	75,909,500	75,344,500
Farmer Cooperative Service	657,000	757,000	657,000	707,000	682,000
Soil Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	89,636,000	90,725,000	90,280,000	90,825,000	90,705,500
Watershed protection	53,746,000	[3] 60,585,000	60,585,000	60,585,000	60,585,000
Flood prevention	24,999,000	24,000,000	25,000,000	24,000,000	25,000,000
Great Plains conservation program	10,167,000	13,000,000	12,000,000	12,500,000	12,250,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	178,548,000	188,310,000	187,865,000	187,910,000	188,540,500
Economic Research Service: Salaries and expenses	9,410,000	10,440,000	9,410,000	9,910,000	9,500,000
Statistical Reporting Service: Salaries and expenses	8,758,000	9,693,000	9,518,000	9,693,000	9,693,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing research and service	38,269,500	[4] 40,485,000	38,857,000	40,107,000	39,794,500
Construction of facilities		1,600,000		1,600,000	
Payments to States and possessions	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,425,000	1,425,000
Special milk program		105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000
School lunch program	[5] 125,000,000	[5] 125,000,000	[5] 125,000,000	[5] 125,000,000	[5] 125,000,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	164,594,500	273,410,000	270,182,000	273,132,000	271,219,500
Foreign Agricultural Service:					
Salaries and expenses	[6] 13,045,000	21,841,000	[6] 16,145,000	[6] 16,895,000	[6] 16,895,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)	2,856,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Total, Foreign Agricultural Service	15,901,000	25,841,000	20,145,000	20,895,000	20,895,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	1,007,000	1,022,000	1,022,000	1,022,000	1,022,000

See footnotes at end of table.

***Comparative statement of appropriations for 1962 and estimates for 1963, and amounts recommended in bill for 1963, and conference allowances*—Continued**

TITLE I—GENERAL ACTIVITIES

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in House bill for 1963	Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1963	Conference allowances, 1963
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:					
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	$44,098,000	[7] $44,481,000	$44,098,000	([8])	([8])
Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	(106,548,000)	(104,435,000)	(100,423,000)	[8] $95,423,000	[8] $95,423,000
Sugar Act program	78,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	[8] 77,650,000	[8] 77,650,000
Agricultural conservation program	238,000,000	244,500,000	242,000,000	[8] 212,900,000	[8] 212,900,000
Emergency conservation measures	5,000,000				
Conservation reserve program	312,000,000	323,000,000	300,000,000	[8] 305,000,000	[8] 300,000,000
Special agricultural conservation and adjustment programs	18,500,000	18,500,000	15,000,000	([8])	([8])
Total, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	695,598,000	710,481,000	681,098,000	[8] 690,973,000	[8] 685,973,000
Office of the General Counsel	3,645,000	3,800,000	3,645,000	3,695,000	3,695,000
Office of Information	1,590,500	1,610,000	1,610,000	1,610,000	1,610,000
Centennial observance of agriculture	100,000				
National Agricultural Library	1,028,500	1,220,000	1,028,500	1,153,500	1,153,500
General administration	3,096,000	3,698,000	3,506,000	3,256,000	3,341,000
Total, title I, general activities	1,356,274,500	1,510,069,000	1,464,582,500	1,513,856,000	1,485,319,500

TITLE II—CREDIT AGENCIES

Rural Electrification Administration:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electrification	[9] ($245,000,000)	[10] ($400,000,000)	[11] ($400,000,000)	[11] ($400,000,000)	($400,000,000)
Telephone	[12] (162,500,000)	[10] (80,000,000)	[11] (80,000,000)	(80,000,000)	(80,000,000)
Total, loan authorizations	(407,500,000)	(480,000,000)	(480,000,000)	(480,000,000)	(480,000,000)
Salaries and expenses	10,024,000	10,324,000	10,024,000	10,024,000	10,024,000
Total, Rural Electrification Administration	10,024,000	10,324,000	10,024,000	10,024,000	10,024,000
Farmers Home Administration:					
Rural housing grants and loans	10.000,000	10,000,000			
Direct loan account:					
Real estate loans	[13] (51,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)
Operating loans	[14] (285,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(275,000,000)	[15] (290,000,000)	[15] (290,000,000)
Total, direct loan account	(336,000,000)	(325,000,000)	(325,000,000)	(340,000,000)	(340,000,000)
Salaries and expenses	34,382,000	35,000,000	34,382,000	34,582,000	34,582,000
Total, Farmers Home Administration	44,382,000	45,000,000	34,382,000	34,582,000	34,582,000
Total, title II, credit agencies:					
Loan authorizations	(743,500,000)	(805,000,000)	(805,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(820,000,000)
Direct appropriation	54,406,000	55,324,000	44,406,000	44,606,000	44,606,000

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Administrative and operating expenses:					
Appropriation	$6,549,000	$7,500,000	$6,549,000	$7,049,000	$6,799,000
Premium income	(2,830,000)	(2,830,000)	(3,330,000)	(2,830,000)	(3,080,000)
Total, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	6,549,000	7,500,000	6,549,000	7,049,000	6,799,000
Commodity Credit Corporation:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	1,017,610,000	2,489,955,000	2,278,455,000	2,066,955,000	2,278,455,000
Reimbursements for special activities:					
International Wheat Agreement	88,790,000				
Emergency famine relief	225,685,000				
Sales for local currencies (Public Law 480)	1,353,000,000				
Migratory waterfowl feed	13,000				
Bartered materials for stockpile	163,163,000				
Grading and classing activities	1,264,000				
Total reimbursements for special activities	1,861,915,000				
Reimbursement for special milk program	90,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000
Limitation on administrative expenses	(47,916,000)	(48,000,000)	(47,116,000)	(43,188,500)	(43,188,500)
Total, Commodity Credit Corporation	2,969,525,000	2,594,955,000	2,383,455,000	2,161,955,000	2,373,455,000
Total, title III, corporations	2,976,074,000	2,602,455,000	2,390,004,000	2,169,004,000	2,380,254,000

TITLE IV—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Public Law 480:					
Sales for foreign currencies	$1,250,451,000	$1,293,000,000	$1,080,632,000	$700,000,000	$1,080,632,000
Emergency famine relief	140,868,000	364,000,000	250,000,000	189,000,000	250,000,000
Long-term supply contracts	13,000,000	90,000,000	40,000,000	50,000,000	40,000,000
Total, Public Law 480	1,404,319,000	1,747,000,000	1,370,632,000	939,000,000	1,370,632,000
International Wheat Agreement	70,681,000	96,868,000	81,218,000	15,650,000	81,218,000
Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile	125,000,000	343,067,000	125,000,000	92,867,000	125,000,000
Total, title IV, foreign assistance programs	1,600,000,000	2,186,935,000	1,576,850,000	1,047,517,000	1,576,850,000

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses	($2,590,000)	($2,565,000)	($2,565,000)	($2,565,000)	($2,565,000)
Interior Department: Grain for migratory waterfowl	35,000				
Total, title V, related agencies	35,000				

See footnotes at end of table.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1962 and estimates for 1963, and amounts recommended in bill for 1963, and conference allowances—Continued

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in House bill for 1963	Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1963	Conference allowances, 1963
Total appropriations:					
Title I—General activities	$1,356,274,500	$1,510,069,000	$1,464,582,500	$1,513,856,000	$1,485,319,500
Title II—Credit agencies	54,406,000	55,324,000	44,406,000	44,606,000	44,606,000
Title III—Corporations	2,976,074,000	2,602,455,000	2,390,004,000	2,169,004,000	2,380,254,000
Title IV—Foreign assistance programs	1,600,000,000	2,186,935,000	1,576,850,000	1,047,517,000	1,576,850,000
Title V—Related agencies	35,000				
Grand total	5,986,789,500	6,354,783,000	5,475,842,500	4,774,983,000	5,487,029,500

[1] Includes $100,000 increase contained in H. Doc. No. 447 for research on strontium 90 in milk.

[2] Includes $2,750,000 for screw-worm eradication for which estimate carried in 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1962, available in 1963.

[3] Includes $950,000 increase contained in H. Doc. No. 447 for river basin surveys.

[4] Includes $150,000 increase contained in H. Doc. No. 447 for food management planning.

[5] In addition, $45,000,000 transferred from sec. 32 funds.

[6] In addition, $3,117,000 transferred from sec. 32 funds.

[7] Includes $300,000 increase contained in H. Doc. Nc. 447 for food management planning.

[8] Established a consolidated appropriation item under the head "Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service," for items formerly appropriated for within the items of "Acreage allotments and quotas" through "Special agricultural conservation and adjustment programs," for administrative expense costs.

[9] Includes $70,000,000 contingency authorization.

[10] Includes amendment in H. Doc. No. 447 transferring $55,000,000 from telephone to electrification loans.

[11] Of this amount, $100,000,000 placed in contingency reserve for both electrification and telephone loans.

[12] Includes $30,000,000 contingency reserve.

[13] Includes $40,000,000 for ownership and $11,000,000 for soil and water conservation loans.

[14] Includes $37,500,000 for contingency reserve, plus $10,000,000 additional approved 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[15] Of which $50,000,000 placed in contingency reserve.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, it was with a heavy heart that I moved that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 19, which involved a budgeted item for a marketing research peanut facility in my State. I regret very much to see that project lost this year. It was omitted due to some controversy that arose among the peanut producers and the confectionery makers, and on account of false statements on the floor of the House. I hope that the Department will resubmit the item next year. In that event I trust that the Senate will see fit to approve it, and we will try again.

In the conference report the Senate did not get all that was contained in the amendments, but we did sustain the principle that the Senate could amend an appropriation bill to include facilities even though the other body had not included any facilities specifically requested by the Members of that body.

We were not able to get all the money the Senate allowed for the utilization research in which so many Members were interested. But we got a rather substantial amount—$4,875,000. I hope that next year we shall be able to approach the problem on a broader front and more intelligently than we have done in the past in order to avoid the wastage of the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been lost because production research has so far outrun the knowledge that we have accumulated on how to use the things that we produce. All in all, I believe the Senate has done about as well as it could be expected to do on this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], went a long way toward resolving the difference between the House and the Senate. Contrary to many newspaper stories, long ago the senior Senator from Georgia agreed to recede in relation to a peanut laboratory, despite the fact that the item was contained in the budget estimate. Planning funds were appropriated last year. I understand that the city of Dawson spent approximately $200,000 to $300,000 in extending sewer and water systems to the proposed plant. In spite of all that, in order to reach an agreement among the conferees, the Senator from Georgia agreed weeks ago to delete that item. His action went a long way, but I could see no other course that he could take. The House was adamant on this laboratory.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I corroborate every word spoken by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I know how hard they worked, despite the stories, falsehoods, innuendos, and rumors that have been spread. The RECORD has been cleared in that respect. The Senate can be proud of the action taken by its conferees, and certainly as satisfied as we could be, all circumstances considered, in the final settlement arrived at.

MOLLY KWAUK

Mr. COOPER. Madam President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I ask that the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 9669) entitled "An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk", and the Senate amendments to that bill, be laid before the Senate. I shall then move that the Senate recede from its amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9669) for the relief of Molly Kwauk, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, H.R. 9669, entitled "An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk," was passed by the House. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which had also an identical bill I had introduced in the Senate.

The Committee on the Judiciary reported the bill favorably to the Senate, but added an amendment, which was an act for the relief of Yom Tov Briszk. The bill with the amendment was passed by the Senate and, as has just been noted, the House has asked for a conference.

The Senate has not appointed conferees.

The bill which was attached was introduced by my friend the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I have discussed the subject with him. I shall let him speak for himself. He is willing to agree that the Senate should recede from its amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I shall not oppose the motion of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. But I take that position with a very heavy heart. It is based on the sole consideration that the bill for the relief of Molly Kwauk might not be enacted if I were to insist upon the action taken by the Senate.

Molly Kwauk is a feeble-minded young lady, 25 years old, who is now in Hong Kong. If the bill for her relief dies in this session, she will be sent back to Communist China, where her only relative is an 80-year-old grandmother.

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary added to the bill for Molly Kwauk my bill for the relief of Yom Tov Briszk. It did so because in its considered judgment Yom Tov Briszk's case was similar on its facts and therefore was deserving of the same sympathetic treatment as the bill for the relief of Molly Kwauk.

Yom Tov Briszk is a little boy, now 10 years old, whose father, a rabbi, came to this country from Israel in August 1958. Rabbi Briszk was required to leave his wife and four children behind, because the little boy, Yom Tov, who is afflicted not with feeblemindedness, but another mental defect, was unable to pass the physical examination.

It is very difficult for me to understand why the House was not willing to look with compassion on this little boy's case, as it did with the older Molly Kwauk. Both cases involved the question of waiving, for humanitarian and compassionate reasons, the same basic exclusion provision of our immigration laws, that relates to the mental health of the visa applicant. It defies reason, Madam President, to attempt to draw any distinction between these two unfortunate cases on the ground that one involves feeblemindedness and the other mental defect.

We of the Senate Judiciary Committee have smarted under what we have felt was—and we still feel is—unjust treatment of our private immigration measures in the other body. As in the case of my bill for Yom Tov Briszk, the House committee has frequently tabled Senate-passed bills which were of the same general character as some sent to us from the House. However, so far as I am concerned, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House, Representative CELLER, has assured me he will cooperate in the next session in trying to have the bill for Yom Tov Briszk enacted.

For now, Madam President, I cannot have it on my conscience to add to the misfortune of Molly Kwauk by forcing her to return to Communist China where, quite obviously, her 80-year-old grandmother would be unable to give her the loving care and attention she desperately needs. For that reason I shall not oppose the motion of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from New York for his compassion.

I hope very much that final action can now be taken on the bill for the relief of Molly Kwauk, H.R. 9669. The bill was approved by both the House and the Senate Committees on the Judiciary so far as the Molly Kwauk case is concerned, and passed both houses—but in the Senate with an amendment adding to it a separate bill for the relief of another person.

Molly Kwauk is now in Hong Kong, where she faces deportation to Communist China if action on this bill is not completed. Her mother, who escaped from the Communists, is chief of anesthesia at the Veteran's Hospital in Louisville, Ky., and has been trying very hard for a long time to secure clearance for Molly to enter the United States.

Molly Kwauk's mother, a U.S. citizen, is her only living relative except for an 80-year-old grandmother in Communist China; she has satisfied the Committees on the Judiciary that Molly will not become a public charge. The mother was formerly chief of anesthesia at Peiping Union Medical College, and associate professor at the Shanghai Medical College, prior to coming to the United States in 1948 for advanced study and becoming a citizen in 1955.

Molly is living with refugees in Hong Kong, but her situation there is most insecure. There will be no one to care for her if she is returned to Communist China. Her mother, who is a doctor, pleads for the chance to care for her daughter. While the daughter has been determined mentally deficient, she is said to have a mental age of 10, and is not a hopeless case.

Congressman FRANK BURKE, of Louisville, and I have been working on this case for over a year. While I cannot be familiar with the details in the second case, added by the Senate to the bill for Molly Kwauk, I think it would be tragic if the case approved by both committees on its merits were to fail because of disagreement over an entirely separate case which has no connection with the facts in this case.

Madam President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments to H.R. 9669.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2246 (H.R. 13290).

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13290) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported by the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I hope it will be possible for the Senate to complete the consideration of the pending bill, the last supplemental appropriation bill, this evening. Whether or not that can be done, of course, rests with the Senate as a whole to decide. However, if it could be done, it would take a weight off our shoulders. Conferees could be appointed. There would be no meetings of the conferees until tomorrow, but it would mean that most of the remaining proposed legislation—practically all, if not all of it—would be in conference and would be in the process of being worked out between the conferees of both Houses.

Therefore, I hope that the Senate will be patient and that it will be possible to complete the consideration of the bill this evening. If so, we would clear the decks to that extent.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I join the distinguished majority leader in hoping that we can complete consideration of the bill tonight. I have at the desk a motion to suspend the rules with reference to this bill, in order to include in it an item for a million and a half dollar appropriation for the city of New York. The bill authorizing these funds has been reported, with only two dissenting votes, by the Committee on Foreign Relations. Unfortunately, we have not been able to get any further action in this Senate. Therefore, at the appropriate time, I shall move to suspend the rule. There has been a great deal of talk about this bill. Everyone seems to be in favor of it, but there has been very little action on it. I merely advise the majority leader of what I intend to do, in order that he may be acquainted with my intention.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from New York has said. I hope that he will not press his point. I realize that he has ample justification for taking the attitude he is now taking. I know how hard—and I mean hard—the Senator from New York has been working on the proposal to which he has referred. I hope, in view of the attendant circumstances at this particular time in the session, and in view of the fact that we are trying to dispose of the business of the Senate and get back to our States to visit with our people, the Senator from New York will reconsider his position, of which everyone is fully aware, and will not force the majority leader, if no other Senator were to do so, to make a motion to table the request of the distinguished Senator from New York, on the basis that we will be able to get action more quickly on the bill next year than we have been able to get this year, and that we will try to get it reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations as soon as possible and in that way have a little more success with the policy committee as well. The Senator knows that I am very much in favor of his proposal. If the Senator were to adopt the procedure I have outlined it would in the long run react to his best interest.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, in reply to what the Senator from Montana has said, I know that the majority leader has discussed this subject with the Democratic policy committee. I know too that he is in favor of this bill. The assistant majority leader has also expressed himself as favoring it. I believe that the best solution in the present situation would be to add it by unanimous consent to the pending bill. It has been before the Committee on Foreign Relations. That committee cut the amount in half. The other body passed the bill by a substantial vote. The amount which the other body voted was $3 million. The Foreign Relations Committee cut the amount to $1½ million. The subject has been fully reviewed with all concerned, including the mayor of New York, and under the present circumstances the $1½ million figure is acceptable to all concerned.

I am hopeful that after an explanation of the bill is made, it will be accepted as an amendment. I do not wish to go into great detail on it at this time. If it were adopted by the Senate and taken to conference, I feel certain that the House would accept it, having already passed such a bill in a larger amount.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope the Senator will keep an open mind on this matter during the rest of the debate.

Mr. KEATING. I always have an open mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Before I begin my discussion of the pending bill, I wish to say that I too hope that the Senator from New York will reconsider his decision and agree to submit his proposal to the supplemental appropriation bill, which will be taken up immediately after we come back.

The first supplemental bill this year was passed in early February and signed by the President on February 13.

The proposal of the Senator from New York has not been considered by our committee. We worked exceedingly hard on the pending bill, and we have had to wait, under the rule, until this closing hour to take it up. I remember that the Senators from New York tied us up for a considerable length of time in our consideration of the last supplemental bill in connection with a subject on which I was of material help to them. I do not want to be put in the position of having to object, but I will object, to bringing in at this time something that has not been before our committee. I do not believe it is fair to bring it up at this time, and I feel that I should say so at this time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator yield for an explanation?

Mr. HOLLAND. We worked very hard on this matter in committee, and we are ready to get through with it and go home. To be held up in this way on a matter of legislation, which has not been passed through the legislative process, is not fair to the Senators who have worked hard on the pending bill, and to the House Members, who are waiting until tomorrow to serve as conferees on the bill. I hope the Senator will not insist on his position.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The difficulty with the course of action the Senator from Florida has recommended—and the reason why it is now necessary to move to suspend the rule—is that although the Foreign Relations Committee reported the bill, it has not been passed by the Senate. Therefore, there is no authorization. That is why the distinguished Senator's committee has never considered it. I would be remiss in my duty if I did not express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Florida for the great assistance he gave us with regard to an appropriation for the World's Fair. He did a splendid job. However, it is most unfortunate that because apparently one or two members of the Democratic policy committee opposed the bill, it could not be programed for action. I am sure, if it were to come to a vote, it would be passed by a large majority. I understand it had almost unanimous support in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the people with whom the Senator will consult will decide, in the present state of exhaustion of both the Senate and the House, and the need to close the session and to get home, it will not be necessary to consider such a proposal, which requires the waiver of the rule.

The bill, as reported to the Senate, carries recommended appropriations totaling $518,750,876, an increase of $114,002,996 over the House version of the bill. The committee had before it for consideration estimates totaling $631,785,376, and in addition was requested to reconsider estimates totaling $104,708,000 previously deferred. The estimates considered by the Senate committee included requests in Senate Documents 147, 149, 150, 152, 154, 156, and 157, totaling $89,131,396 for items not considered by the House.

The recommendations of the committee in this supplemental bill include $40,045,000 for the Department of Agriculture; $16,350,000 for the Department of Commerce; $402,367,500 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, of which $350 million is for payment to the States for social security funds due the States; $205,000 for the Office of Emergency Planning; $19,285,000 for various agencies under Independent Offices; $21,770,250 for the Department of the Interior; $120,000 for the Judiciary; $1,000,000 for the Department of Labor; $22,500 for the legislative branch; $3,609,000 for the Department of State; $3,258,500 for the Treasury Department; and $10,718,126 for Claims and Judgments.

I have read these items in detail so that the Senate may realize that the bill covers almost the whole machinery of the Government and has involved long hearings, discussions with agency heads, deliberations, and decisions in the full Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. The details of the recommendations will be found in the committee report, which comprises 32 pages of narrative and tabular material, and a copy of which is on the desk of every Senator.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill as thus amended be regarded for purposes of amendment as original text; and that no point of order be considered as waived by reason of agreement to this order.

Mr. FONG. Madam President, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the purpose of my request is simply to have the committee amendments agreed to, so as to make the bill original text. We do not ask any Senator to waive any rights. He has a perfect right to bring up any matter he wishes to bring up, and he will be protected in that right by the handler of the bill or, I am sure, by the Presiding Officer. It is desired to follow the process I have suggested. There are so many amendments in the bill that this procedure will materially shorten the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. FONG. Madam President, with that assurance, I shall withhold my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Plant and animal disease and pest control', $250,000."

On page 2, after line 5, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"For construction of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by purchase, donation or exchange, $895,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 2, after line 9, to insert:

"EXTENSION SERVICE

"Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Payments to States and Puerto Rico' for payments for cooperative agricultural extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended by the Act of June 26, 1953 (7 U.S.C. 341–348), and the Act of August 11, 1955 (7 U.S.C. 347a), $12,300,000."

On page 2, after line 17, to insert:

"COOPERATIVE STATE EXPERIMENT STATION SERVICE

"Payments and expenses

"For an additional amount for payments to agricultural experiment stations to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act, approved March 2, 1887, as amended by the Act approved August 11, 1955 (7 U.S.C. 361a–361i), $5,000,000."

At the top of page 3, to insert:

"AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

"Marketing research and service

"For an additional amount for 'Marketing Research and Service', $100,000."

On page 3, after line 4, to insert:

"SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

"For an additional amount for 'School lunch program', $10,000,000."

On page 3, after line 7, to insert:

"FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Rental housing loans revolving fund

"For establishment of a revolving fund to carry out section 515(a) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, including advances as authorized by section 335(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 315) in connection with security for such loans, $10,000,000."

On page 3, after line 15, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $500,000."

On page 3, after line 18, to insert:

"GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out the provisions of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and other authorities amended thereby, $1,250,000."

On page 4, line 4, after the word "expenses", to insert "for the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation", and in line 10, after the figures "$1,000,000", to insert "of which not to exceed $25,000 may be advanced to the appropriation for 'Salaries and expenses' under 'General Administration'."

On page 4, line 19, after the word "expended", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,400,000, of which not to exceed $40,000 may be advanced to the appropriation for 'Salaries and expenses' under 'General Administration'."

On page 4, line 21, to insert:

"TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

"For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary of

Commerce under title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and expenses of technical assistance to firms under such title, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $450,000, of which not to exceed $12,000 may be advanced to the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses' under 'General Administration'."

On page 5, after line 8, to insert:

"BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

"Inter-American Highway

"For necessary expenses for the construction of the Inter-American Highway, as authorized by law, $12,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 5, after line 15, to insert:

"FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', including $30,000 for reimbursement to the Office of the General Counsel for legal services, $1,500,000."

On page 6, line 13, after the word "Services", to strike out "$307,500" and insert "$507,500".

On page 7, after line 4, to insert:

"COMMUNITY HEALTH PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

"For an additional amount for 'Community health practice and research', including carrying out section 310 of the Public Health Service Act, $1,000,000."

On page 7, after line 8, to insert:

"RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH

"For an additional amount for 'Radiological health', $1,500,000, of which $500,000 shall be available only for allotments and payments to States pursuant to section 314(c) of the Act for the establishment and maintenance of adequate radiological public health services."

On page 8, after line 7, to insert:

"DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

"For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities', $35,000,000, to be available only for capital contributions to student loan funds: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 3760, Eighty-seventh Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 9, line 1, after the word "expanded", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000", and in line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000".

On page 9, line 12, to strike out "$187,000" and insert "$205,000".

On page 9, after line 14, to insert:

"SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for 'Sites and Expenses, Public Buildings Projects', $3,000,000.

On page 10, line 11, after the word "therewith", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,150,000".

On page 10, after line 18, to strike out:

"NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $110,000."

On page 11, after line 4, to insert:

"SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

"Trade adjustment loan assistance

"For loans as authorized by section 2 of Public Law 87-550, approved July 25, 1962, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, $3,000,000, of which not to exceed $50,000 may be transferred to the appropriation for the current fiscal year for 'Salaries and expenses', Small Business Administration, for administrative expenses in connection with activities financed under this appropriation."

On page 12, after line 6, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for 'Construction' $1,450,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That hereafter such amounts as may be available for construction of the Navajo Indian irrigation project may be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation."

On page 12, after line 18, to insert:

"PAYMENTS TO LOWER BRULE SIOUX AND CROW CREEK SIOUX TRIBES OF INDIANS

"For rehabilitation, relocation, and other assistance of the Lower Brule Sioux and the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribes, in connection with the taking of lands for the Big Bend project, as authorized by law, $5,771,250, of which $3,802,500 is for the account of the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe and $1,968,750 is for the account of the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe."

On page 13, after line 2, to insert:

"NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Construction', for acquisition of lands, interests therein, improvements, and related personal property, $5,000,000."

On page 13, line 12, after the word "resources", to strike out "$375,000" and insert "$500,000".

On page 13, after line 12, to insert:

"BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

"Management and investigations of resources

"For an additional amount for 'Management and Investigations of Resources', $59,000.

At top of page 14, to insert:

"GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"For an additional amount for 'Surveys, Investigations, and Research', $350,000."

On page 14, line 10, to strike out "$3,850,000" and insert "$850,000".

At the top of page 15, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Trade adjustment activities

"For necessary expenses to carry out the functions of the Secretary of Labor under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, $1,000,000."

On page 15, after line 5, to insert:

"LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

"Senate

"For payment to Georgia Lowe Dworshak, widow of Henry C. Dworshak, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, $22,500."

On page 15, line 15, to strike out "$1,739,400" and insert "$3,597,000".

On page 16, after line 2, to insert:

"OPERATING EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Operating expenses', $1,200,000."

On page 16, line 8, after the word "improvements", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$700,000".

On page 16, line 17, to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$502,500".

On page 17, line 19, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 156, Eighty-seventh Congress and", and in line 21, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$10,705,980" and insert "$10,718,126".

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I desire to offer two amendments, neither of which should involve much discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, after line 10, it is proposed to insert:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Katharine S. Miller, widow of Clem Miller, late a Representative from the State of California, $22,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the next amendment is proposed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is absent from the Senate on official business. He has asked me to submit it for him. The amendment is at the desk. After it has been stated, I shall describe it briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund

For financing the annuity benefits and increases provided by part III of the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, $30,000,000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the amendment is merely to provide for the Federal contribution to the retirement fund under the act which Congress recently passed and which recently has been signed by the President. Because the section that provided for payment otherwise was stricken on a point of order in the House, it is necessary to include an appropriation of this kind in the bill. I understand there could be no objection to it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Was this amendment requested by the administration? Is it included in the budget estimate?

Mr. HOLLAND. We have received a special request from the Bureau of the Budget stating that it is necessary. The amendment has been prepared in conformity with the Bureau of the Budget's desires.

Madam President, I desire to read into the RECORD a statement by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON

Unless the pending amendment is adopted, the Congress will find itself in the embarrassing position of having voted increased benefits for our former employees on the retirement roll and not taking the necessary action to provide for the payment of such benefits.

This peculiar situation developed as the result of a point of order sustained in the House of Representatives to a provision in H.R. 7927 which authorized the payment of the increased benefits out of the civil service retirement and disability fund. Incidentally for the information of the Senate, there are some $12 billion in that fund. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will accept the amendment so that the benefits for our retired employees will become a reality and not just a promise unfulfilled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida for the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator is aware that within recent days $25,000 has been authorized under House Joint Resolution 712 for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to make a study into the possibilities of a memorial. The Commission's recommendations are to be submitted by June 30, 1963.

The Bureau of the Budget has recommended that $25,000 be provided so that this work might be carried on. The Commission is now out of funds. If funds are not provided, the work of the Commission will be considerably delayed. I have been asked by Members of the House who are deeply interested in the proposal and by the Commission—and I speak on behalf of the Commission—to request that funds be made available. The amount is modest. I should like to have the view of the Senator from Florida about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, I am willing to have that done. All the memorial commissions require small amounts of funds.

The Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, as Senators know, was recently disappointed in its recommendations—I am glad it was—by the action of the House in refusing to go along with a proposal which I thought was bizarre and quite out of place.

The letter I received from the distinguished Representative who is the Secretary of that Commission suggested an appropriation of $10,000. But whatever the appropriate amount is, I shall have no objection to the inclusion of such an item at the proper place in the bill, if the Senator from Minnesota will offer such an amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I had planned to offer an amendment to provide $25,000 in order to take care of the needs of the Memorial Commission. This amount will take care of those needs until June 30, 1963, when the Commission is required to submit its report.

Mr. HOLLAND. At present, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and also the ranking minority member of this particular subcommittee are present. What are their views? I am perfectly willing to accept whatever will be the needed amount.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Madam President, I think this is an item which should be taken to conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I certainly agree that it should be taken to conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I suggest that the Senator from Minnesota prepare a written amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I was about to move—and I so move—that $25,000 be added at the appropriate place in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, before the vote is taken in connection with the amendment, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In this connection and also in connection with another provision in the supplemental appropriation bill, the one for $10,000 for the Woodrow Wilson Memorial—I believe that also is included, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida to language in a report by the Committee on Rules and Administration which reads:

> Furthermore, such plans and recommendations shall be consistent with the premise that the construction of the memorial would not be financed by public funds.
>
> By this action the committee gives expression to its conviction that except under the most extraordinary circumstances, the cost of constructing memorials to distinguished Americans should be met by private subscription.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know there are now very fine plans being pressed to build a memorial to Woodrow Wilson. Of course, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt are truly very great Americans; but in connection with this appropriation, I wish to stress the point that the appropriations will result, I hope, in the construction of the memorials out of private funds, not public funds. The proposal to spend $39 million of public money to build a memorial to James Madison makes me very apprehensive, indeed, in these matters.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I certainly accept with all gratitude the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin. I think that is involved in the fundamental legislation under which these commissions function.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Illinois wishes me to yield to him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I was about to suggest to the Senator from Florida that the amount in the amendment to the bill which he proposes to make be increased by $260,000, which would provide $50,000 for the replacement of the bascule bridge on the Sabine-Neches Waterway at Port Arthur. I understand there is grave danger that the existing bridge will drop into the waterway. That would completely close all navigation. I understand that some obstruction already exists.

Also included in this proposal would be $110,000 for the Calumet Harbor at Chicago; and $100,000 for the Kaskaskia River, to enlarge it into a 9-foot by 200-foot canal, for the purpose of making waterborne commerce available.

There has been much discussion about these items.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I am not at all out of sympathy with the proposal of the Senator from Illinois. However, I have prepared an amendment addressed to the particular part of this bill which also would be affected by his amendments. I wish to submit this amendment, and then have his amendments added to it. The amendments of the Senator from Illinois would merely require that the amount carried in my amendment be increased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, after line 13, it is proposed to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Department of the Army

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

Construction, general

For an additional amount for "Construction, general," $1,005,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, this amount covers four items:

The sum of $500,000 for initiation of construction of the Blue River Reservoir in Oregon—an authorized project.

The sum of $200,000 to initiate construction of the Yaquina Bay and Harbor project, Oregon. It is a construction project which also has been authorized.

The sum of $100,000 to initiate preconstruction planning on projects for the Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.

The remaining $205,000 is for one of two planning items, approved by the Senate and disallowed by the conferees, relating to the State of Florida. The $205,000 included in this amendment will complete preconstruction planning on the Cross Florida Barge Canal, and this amount was included in the President's budget request for fiscal year 1963.

The total requested by this amendment is $1,005,000; and if the amendments of the Senator from Illinois are added thereto, they will simply involve changing the amount from $1,005,000 by adding the total amount called for by his amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, these items were heretofore authorized in the bill which previously passed the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is also the case with respect to these items in my amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

If it is agreeable to the chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent that $260,000 be added to the amendment of the Senator from Florida, for the purposes stated.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. These are all projects for which there are budget estimates, and which have previously been authorized; is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is also my understanding. They were in the bill as passed by the Senate, and as approved by the subcommittee of which the Senator and I are members, and as approved by the full committee, except for the item for the bascule bridge, which is in poor condition, and must be replaced. The other items were in the Senate's version of the bill, as the Senator from North Dakota has suggested.

Madam President, unless there be objection on the part of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] or the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], I am agreeable to the addition of this net amount to the amount set forth in the amendment I have submitted.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have no objection.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection. I think these items should be taken to conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am willing to take these items to conference, and to have that net amount added to the amount called for by my amendment.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield. However, Madam President, it seems that Senators are beginning to form in line on the right. I do not know how many similar suggestions will be made. I hope there will be only a few.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement on these projects printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

I was greatly distressed the other day when I learned that the House of Representatives had deleted from the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1963 two items for preconstruction planning of two navigation projects which are of the utmost importance to the State of Illinois. One item was $100,000 for advance engineering of the Kaskaskia River navigation project, and the other was $110,000 for the Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana.

It is my sincere hope that if funds for any public works projects are included in the supplemental appropriations bill now on the Senate Calendar that funds for the planning of these projects will be included.

Local interests desire a 9-foot navigation channel in the lower 50 miles of the Kaskaskia River to facilitate the outbound movements of coal and grain and to augment the local economy.

The Kaskaskia River rises in Champaign County in eastern Illinois and flows southwesterly about 325 miles to the Mississippi River at a point 60 miles downstream from St. Louis, Mo. The Senate Committee on Public Works adopted a resolution, at my request, on August 17, 1954, authorizing this project. It has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Army, and is in the omnibus river and harbor bill of 1962, which is now in conference.

The original Federal improvement of the river for navigation by deepening to 3 feet and removing snags was abandoned in 1895, and it is not used by commercial craft at the present time.

The present plan provides for a channel, 9 feet deep and 200 feet wide, from the mouth of Kaskaskia River to Fayetteville, Ill., by enlarging the present channel where required and making overbank cuts to eliminate sharp bends; and a dam with a single lock 84 feet wide and 600 feet long. The plan of improvement also provides for modification of the storage allocations in the Carlyle and Shelbyville Reservoirs, to provide water for Kaskaskia River navigation in lieu of Mississippi River navigation; and further reallocation of storage in the two reservoirs when additional water is needed for navigation if the use of storage is found by the Chief of Engineers to be feasible and more economical than pumping water from below the dam into the navigation pool. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.9, and local interests have agreed to provide all cooperation and participation required under existing laws.

Furthermore, the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Interior submitted favorable reports to the Public Works Committee, and the State of Illinois heartily approves of the proposal.

The Calumet Harbor is located at the south end of Lake Michigan on the State line between Illinois and Indiana. The interim report is in partial response to similar resolutions adopted at my request by the Senate Committee on Public Works on May 18, 1956, and one adopted by the House Public Works Committee in June of that year.

The existing project depths are not adequate to allow vessels calling at points along the river and in Lake Calumet, to be loaded to the drafts permitted by the Great Lakes connecting channels and the St. Lawrence Seaway. Widening in rock section of the river, enlargement of turning basins and extension of the existing project are needed for safe navigation and development. The benefit-cost ratio is 2.4. It also has the approval of the Department of the Interior, the State of Illinois and the State of Indiana.

The Kaskaskia navigation project is a tremendously important thing because a good many major industries, including a powerplant with an estimated capital investment of $132 million is ready to come into that area. All they need now is the navigation improvement.

The Calumet Harbor is equally as important, as the records will show over 22 million tons of waterborne commerce is handled by the Illinois Waterway, and because of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Calumet-Sag and its connection with the Illinois and Mississippi River, this tonnage is growing by leaps and bounds. Therefore, I believe my disappointment over the deletion of funds to start the planning of these projects is merited.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Department of the Army

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

Construction, general

For an additional amount for "Construction, general," $1,265,000.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Let me ask the Senator from Florida whether he will consider adding $100,000 to the "Construction, general" item about which he has spoken—being an amount of planning funds for a $6 million flood-control project at Ansonia and Derby, Conn. This item has already been passed by the Senate in the appropriation bill, but it was eliminated in conference. It was in the budget. I ask the Senator whether he will agree to add that amount to the amount of his amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, if there is no objection on the part of my distinguished friends, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], I shall be willing to have this item treated in the same way as the last one was.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection. There are several more; and I think that in justice to all concerned, these items should be taken to conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I understand that from the strictly parliamentary standpoint, these amendments are not appropriate, because the Senate has already agreed to my amendment as modified. But I waive that point, because I want Senators to have this opportunity; and I ask that no point of order be considered in connection with this matter.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator from Florida request unanimous consent for that purpose?

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I see my friend, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], in the Chamber. I ask whether he also consents to carrying this additional amount to conference.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amount of my amendment, as modified, and as agreed to a moment ago, be increased by the amount of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, namely, $100,000, budgeted, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, in the amended budget, for this project.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amount of the amendment, as modified, is accordingly increased by $100,000, making a total of $1,365,000.

Mr. MORTON. Madam President, I make a similar request for the addition of an item of $100,000 for planning funds for the Booneville Reservoir, a similar flood-control project in a depressed part of Kentucky. This item was passed by the Senate, but was eliminated in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, this is not a budgeted item, nor was it in the supplemental budget; and I have not asked for inclusion in this measure of a similar amendment for a project in Florida. But assuming that this is the only matter for which the Senator from Kentucky requests inclusion, I am willing to take this item to conference, with the others.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator from Florida. This item passed the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this $100,000 be added to the total of my amendment, as modified.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amount of the amendment, as modified, is accordingly increased by $100,000, making a total of $1,465,000.

Mr. FONG. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. I wonder whether the Senator from Florida will accept an item of $115,000 for advance engineering for the deepwater harbor at Kaunakakai, Molokai, Hawaii. The Corps of Engineers has given it a benefit-cost ratio of 4.4.

The House Public Works Committee has authorized this, and the Senate

Public Works Committee has authorized it. It is for very necessary planning for the harbor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, this is an item which should be included, in the judgment of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, which hears the testimony on these items. At this time he is absent on official business. This item was approved by the committee, and the amount was allocated; but, for some unfortunate reason, the item was deleted in conference.

I am willing, under the same arrangement, to accept this amendment; and I ask unanimous consent that this amount be added to the amount called for by my amendment, as modified, so that this item may be taken to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amount of the amendment, as modified, is accordingly increased by $115,000, making a total of $1,580,000.

Mr. FONG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the Corps of Engineers relative to the project, as well as a statement by me, be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Fong

There is no project in the entire State of Hawaii more urgently needed than this one at this time. In a very real sense the future of Hawaii will be the future of Molokai, which has been for decades a largely overlooked, picturesque bit of old Hawaii. The forthcoming 50 years no doubt will bring prosperity and importance to Molokai that we could not have dreamed of 50 years ago. A deepwater harbor is implicit to the anticipated development.

In brief, this is the situation: The State of Hawaii is faced with two perennial problems, that of providing food to feed our people and that of providing jobs for our expanding population. An island State, Hawaii imports from abroad two-thirds of the food we consume. Any disruption of transportation soon causes shortages in our food supplies. During the recent west coast shipping strike, supplies of many consumer goods were exhausted within only a few weeks.

Therefore, Hawaii must grow more foodstuffs at home as a protection against emergencies. The island of Molokai is being developed into the breadbasket of our State. A large irrigation project in the central part of Molokai is underway. This will make 14,600 acres arable and will permit diversified truck farming as well as increased pineapple production and will provide more jobs both in fields and in canneries. Already, certain pineapple companies have announced their intention to locate canneries on Molokai.

These two developments will greatly increase the industrial and agricultural output of Molokai. But neither can be exploited to fullest advantage without an adequate harbor.

At present, farm products are transported to Honolulu from Molokai by barge and shallow-draft vessels. Commodities destined for export then must be transshipped at Honolulu. Once the canneries are operating on Molokai, it will be much more practical and economical for products to be exported directly from Molokai on deep-draft vessels, avoiding transshipment at Honolulu.

Completion of the irrigation project within the next 2 to 3 years and the imminent construction of canneries on Molokai require that the deepwater harbor at Kaunakakai be authorized as soon as possible.

I would like to direct your attention to the fact that Molokai is only 38 miles from our principal island, Oahu, where five-sixths of our total State population reside. It is not beyond possibility that part of Molokai may eventually house a suburban, commuting population. In almost every way, however, the future depends upon adequate shipping facilities.

The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget have recommended that this important project be authorized. The estimated cost of slightly more than $8 million seems modest, indeed, considering the immense potential that construction of the harbor will release. The benefit-cost ratio is 4.4 to 1, which is unusually high.

Kaunakakai Harbor, Molokai, Hawaii

(H. Doc. 484, 87th Cong.)

Location: On the south-central coast of the island of Molokai, about 60 miles from Honolulu Harbor on the island of Oahu.

Authority: House Public Works Committee resolution adopted April 9, 1957.

Existing project: Completed in 1934, provides an entrance channel 530 feet wide, and a basin 1,500 feet long, 600 feet wide, and 23 feet deep at mean lower low water.

Navigation problem: Molokai is the only large Hawaiian island without a deepwater harbor for transpacific shipping. Commerce consists principally of pineapples grown on the island and shipped by barge to Honolulu for processing. Savings could be effected by processing pineapples on Molokai for direct shipment by deep-draft vessels to the mainland. Also, additional harbor area is needed for commercial fishing and recreational boating.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for (a) a new entrance channel 500 feet wide and 40 feet deep; (b) a deepwater harbor of about 62 acres, 35 feet deep; (c) a harbor basin for light-draft vessels of about 10 acres, 15 feet deep; (d) a south breakwater 2,300 feet long; and (e) a west breakwater and stream jetty 4,000 feet long.

Estimated cost (price level of May 1961):

Federal	$7,919,000
Non-Federal	702,000
Total	8,621,000

Project economics:

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$290,000	$33,000	$323,000
Maintenance and operation	24,000	4,000	28,000
Total	314,000	37,000	351,000

Annual Benefits:	
Transportation savings	$1,453,000
Land fill	19,400
Damages prevented	28,000
Recreational boating	24,400
Commercial fishing	4,400
Total	1,529,200

Local cooperation: Construction be contingent upon the prior or concurrent establishment and operation on Molokai by local interest of industrial facilities related to transpacific commerce, and local interests agree to: (a) contribute in cash 0.5 percent of the first cost of the general navigation facilities for the deepwater harbor, and 42.5 percent of the first cost of the general navigation facilities for the light-draft harbor, such contributions presently estimated at $202,000; (b) provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including royalty-free borrow and quarry materials, and suitable areas for disposal of spoil and necessary retaining dikes, bulkheads, and embankments; (c) hold and save the United States free from damage which might result from construction and maintenance of the project; (d) accomplish all alterations of roads and utilities; (e) provide and maintain berthing areas, public terminal and transfer facilities for the deepwater basin, and adequate mooring facilities and a public landing in the light-draft harbor open to all on equal terms; and (f) an adequate refrigeration and storage facility at the light-draft harbor in support of commercial fishing operations. Local interests have given informal assurances that the requirements of local cooperation will be met.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies:

Department of the Interior: Favorable.

State of Hawaii: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget: No objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask consent to offer two amendments having to do with the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, before I take my seat, let me say that while I sat with the subcommittee and the full committee in considering the activities of the Corps of Engineers, I do not serve with the similar committee that deals with the Bureau of Reclamation. That subcommittee, as well as the full committee, has as its chairman the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], and I will ask him to make such statement as he wishes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, before the Senator from Florida takes his seat, I have a question on the Small Business Administration increase. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida about it either now or when the matter in which the Senator from Montana is interested is completed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will be available when the Senator from Montana completes his proposal.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, before leaving the public works items, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], who is unable to get away from an engagement, has a brief statement relative to the proposal for an Environmental Health Center in Montgomery County, Md., which the House did not put in the budget this year.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Senator from Maryland may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator J. Glenn Beall

The supplemental appropriations bill, as it passed the House, deleted an item of $2.7 million for land acquisition and site planning for the proposed Environmental Health Center in Montgomery County, Md. In its report, the House committee stated:

"The committee is favorably inclined to the creation of a National Environmental Health Center. However, it is of the opinion that the Washington, D.C., site is an improper location. The committee therefore suggests that the center be passed over for study by the regular subcommittee when the budget estimates for the Public Health Service are considered in the regular bill next year."

I do not object to the deletion of this item. I do, however, take issue with the statement in the House report "that the Washington, D.C., site is an improper location." On the one hand, the House committee suggests that this matter be passed over for study by the regular subcommittee. On the other hand, it attempts to prejudge the merits of the Washington area location.

This location was first approved by a special committee appointed by the Surgeon General in 1960. Subsequent approval followed by the Gross committee, the President's Science Advisory Committee Ad Hoc Panel on Environmental Health, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Regional Planning Council, the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Montgomery County Council, and the Maryland Economic Development Commission.

I welcome a full study of this matter in the coming year. I am confident that the factors which led to the selection of the present site will be just as valid. I am confident that further consideration of this matter will justify the selection of Montgomery County as the site for the proposed Environmental Health Center.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk, which I ask the clerk to state.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 13, after line 16, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General investigations

For an additional amount for "General Investigations," $20,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, this has to do with the Baker project in Oregon. I hope the committee will accept it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Madam President, I have no objection.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain pertinent information relating to the value and significance of the project.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Addition of this amount will permit initiation of advance planning on the Baker project, authorized by the act of September 27, 1962 (Public Law 87-706). This amount would provide for review of water supply and water requirements, detailed land classification studies, topographic mapping of pumping plant sites and highway relocation, geologic investigations and initiation of preparation of the definite plan report. Collection of basic field data necessary for the preparation of final designs and specifications also would be started as well as repayment contract negotiations and negotiations for the purchase of rights-of-way.

DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT, JULY 6, 1962

The lands of the upper division lie along the Powder River in Baker County, northeastern Oregon. The present plan of development includes construction of the Mason Dam and Reservoir for irrigation, flood control, and other purposes. Stored water would be released into the Powder River for diversion to 18,000 acres of project lands in Baker Valley. At the north and lower end of Baker Valley, an existing pumping plant supplies water to about 1,380 acres, known locally as the Lilley Pump Tracts. This pumping plant would be rebuilt to serve 3,080 acres of lands by pumping from the Powder River.

A proposal for development of this division is presently before the Congress for consideration of authorization for construction. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of both Houses of the Congress have held hearings on authorizing legislation and the House committee has reported the bill out favorably. As of the present time, the Senate committee has not yet reported on the legislation.

Subsequent to authorization, the first year fund requirement for the advance planning phase would be $150,000. This amount would provide for review of water supply and water requirements, detailed land classification studies, topographic mapping of pumping plant sites and highway relocation, geologic investigations and initiation of preparation of the definite plan report. Collection of basic field data necessary for the preparation of final designs and specifications also would be started as well as repayment contract negotiations and negotiations for the purchase of rights-of-way.

The economy of Baker Valley is based on agriculture and the main industry is cattle raising. That industry is dependent upon irrigated farming to produce winter feed. Late season irrigation supplies, however, are not adequate at the current time. A supplemental water supply is badly needed to insure optimum crop production and to stabilize and improve the existing cattle economy. The water users and other interests strongly support this proposed plan and have expressed their desire for early authorization and construction. This support is evidenced by the fact that the Baker Valley Irrigation District already has been formed for the purpose of contracting for repayment of costs allocated to irrigation. Early construction also is highly desirable to eliminate the spring floodflows which periodically cause heavy damage in Baker Valley.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I send another amendment to the desk, having to do with the Pendleton project in Oregon.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 13, after line 16, to insert:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation," $145,000.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain pertinent information relative to the value and significance of the project.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This additional amount would permit resumption of investigations on the Pendleton project, Oregon.

An earlier investigation was based on a dam and reservoir at a site near Mission, Oreg., to which the Umatilla Indians objected because of the irrigated land which would be flooded. An alternate upstream site (Thorn Hollow) was selected. A summary of available data was compiled and released to local people in 1959.

Interest in the project has been renewed recently, and this money would be used for working with the local interests toward reaching agreement on a reservoir site and initiating studies of the selected plan.

DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT

The Pendleton project is located along the Umatilla River in Umatilla County in north-central Oregon. It is in an area where irrigation has been practiced successfully since the early 1860's. The existing Umatilla project was one of the first Federal reclamation projects undertaken in the Northwest. As a result, there has been local interest over the years in further expanding irrigation. Any further development, however, will be dependent upon conservation storage as the natural flows of the river after May of every year are generally appropriated by the present users.

The Bureau's recent investigation of the Pendleton project initially was based on a dam and reservoir at the Mission site on the Umatilla River about 2½ miles east of the municipality of Mission. This site, which is within the Umatilla Indian Reservation, appeared to be more favorable from an economic standpoint than any of the alternatives. Early in the course of the study, however, the Indians expressed strong opposition to a reservoir at that site because of the amount of irrigated land that would be inundated. An upstream site, the Thorn Hollow site, was selected as an alternative. Because of this substantial change in plan, and lack of local agreement on the reservoir site, the Bureau of Reclamation prepared a special report in 1959 and released it to the local people summarizing the available data so as to aid them in formulating their opinion.

On the basis of a reservoir at the Thorn Hollow site, the preliminary plan outlined in the 1959 report would provide for the irrigation of about 16,500 acres of land in the vicinity of Echo, Oreg., in the Paradise and Stanfield Extension Divisions. In addition to the 150,000 acre-foot Thorn Hollow Dam and Reservoir, the project features would include a main canal about 12 miles in length, two pumping plants, and the necessary laterals, drains, and related facilities. In addition to irrigation water supplies, the project would provide flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits.

In recent months there has been evidence of increasing interest in proceeding with the studies of the Pendelton project as soon as possible. Owners of some 15,000 acres of land have indicated an interest in obtaining irrigation water from the project and steps are being taken to reach agreement on the reservoir site. Also, two municipalities in the area have indicated an interest in receiving municipal and industrial water. In view of these events, it is highly desirable that the Bureau's investigation of the Pendleton project be resumed at the earliest opportunity.

There are no funds currently available for resumption of investigations on this project nor does the budget now before the Congress contain funds for that purpose. Twenty thousand dollars could be used to a good advantage in fiscal year 1963 for working with the local interests toward reaching agreement on the reservoir site and initiating studies of the selected plan.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I understand the Senator from Wisconsin desires to ask a question of me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

On page 13 of the report on the supplemental appropriation bill, there is included an item of $3 million as the committee's recommendation for trade adjustment loans and guarantees for the Small Business Administration. The House provided no money in the supplemental bill.

I am very much interested in this item because I am chairman of the Authorization Subcommittee. At the time the authorization came before our subcommittee we provided for an unlimited authorization because no one had any firm estimate of the total amount to be needed under the loan program. Another imponderable was the division of responsibility for the administration of the program as between the Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration. Since those questions could not be answered by the Small Business Committee on the basis of any available information, I should like to have the Senator comment on what basis the Appropriations Committee made the determination for this fiscal year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, in reply to the question of the Senator from Wisconsin, may I say that this is one of three items in which we had to use our best judgment as to what proportion of the budget request for this new authorization having to do with a new trade bill should be granted. In the case of the Small Business Administration, which has wide responsibilities under that law, $5 million was requested. The committee recommended $3 million. The Senator from Wisconsin will find similar reductions for the Department of Labor, which also has responsibilities in that field, and for the Commerce Department, which likewise has responsibilities in this field.

I must say to the distinguished Senator that these items are more or less on a judgment basis as to what proportion of the work that will be done by the three agencies will be done between now and the end of the year. We granted less than they asked for, with the knowledge that there will be another supplemental appropriation bill next spring, and if the amount proves to be inadequate, we will hear from them again. If it proves to be more than adequate, the funds cannot be used for any other purpose. We felt the reductions made would still provide all the funds that could be justified under the conditions explained to us.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The House allowed nothing.

Mr. HOLLAND. The House did not consider it. At the time the House passed on this question this budget request had not been submitted. It is to be found in Senate Document No. 150, which shows that the item first came to the Senate for consideration.

I believe in my opening statement I mentioned some seven documents that had come to us, as is not unusual in the closing days of the Congress. We generally receive a considerable number of such documents. This item was not passed upon by the House.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand, there are no estimates which can be relied on, and there can be no detailed estimates of the requirements of loan assistance for several years. By the time the trade bill goes into effect, there will be about 6 months left in fiscal 1963. Is it expected that there will be enough experience under the Trade Expansion Act to provide enough information and to provide administrative regulations that will enable these funds to be disposed of properly? I wonder if we should not wait until fiscal 1964, so that enough information will be obtained, and so we can provide funds in an appropriate manner.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, the bill will become fully operative on December 15. In the second place, the full personnel has to be provided before that time. In the third place, under the terms of the bill, business and working people who have been displaced by the reciprocal trade agreement structure will have the right to claim compensation, provided their claims are approved by the Tariff Commission.

As the Senator has suggested, this is completely a shot in the dark. For that reason we have materially reduced the estimates. We have done the best we could to make sure that there will be adequate funds, and they cannot be used for any other purpose.

Since we set up this important new structure, the Senator from Florida feels that these three agencies, which will be charged with heavy responsibilities under the new law, should be enabled to discharge those responsibilities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate the fact that the committee reduced the request by $2 million, namely, from $5 million to $3 million. I hope, before additional amounts are appropriated, that careful consideration will be given to the justification for them, since the authorization committee was strapped at the time the authorization limitation was provided, or I should say was not provided; and no experience, no guidelines, are available. There is no basis, really, for careful provision for these loans and guarantees.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his comments. I am glad he is interested in these activities. I think the RECORD should show that as the chairman of the legislative subcommittee which handles legislation affecting the Small Business Administration, he has been exceedingly diligent in that responsibility, especially when the Senator from Florida has had the responsibility of handling items of appropriation having to do with the Small Business Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open for further amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 13, after line 16, to insert the following:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Construction and rehabilitation

For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation," $125,000.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, the Mann Creek project, which is located in Mann and Monroe Creeks in southwestern Idaho, was authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation by Public Law 87-589, approved by the President on August 16, 1962. Because of the timing of the authorization, there were no funds for this project in the regular 1963 budget. However, the President has submitted a request for a supplemental appropriation of $125,000 for fiscal year 1963 to permit the Bureau to proceed with the advance planning studies. Because of the serious need for this project in the Mann Creek area and the strong support on the part of the local people, it is important that this work leading to actual construction be gotten underway without delay.

The primary purpose of the Mann Creek project is to supply supplemental irrigation water to 4,465 acres of presently irrigated farmland. The project also will provide full supplies for the irrigation of 595 acres of new lands.

The economy of the Mann Creek area is based almost entirely on agriculture which, in turn, is dependent upon irrigated farming operations, the majority of which are small. The average annual rainfall during the growing season, April–October, is 4 inches, however, and the natural flows of the creeks are at their lowest points during the critical part of the growing season when the need for water is greatest. This condition not only restricts crops to essentially hay and grain for livestock feed but also limits the production per acre to much less than the land is inherently capable of. This is particularly critical in the case of the livestock operations, as the farmers are handicapped by a shortage of pasture. As water supplies become short early in the irrigation season, they are applied to the more valuable crops and the pastures dry up. Because of the shortage of irrigation water in the summer and fall, only small acreages of row crops can be produced, although the climate and land are highly suitable for that purpose.

When the supplemental supplies which the Mann Creek project will provide become available, the overall agricultural production will expand to the inherent capability of the lands, and the livestock industry will be stabilized. An adequate water supply also will permit operators of small farms to diversify their production by adding high value cash crops which will add to their income. Thus the most important effects which this development will have will be to raise the living standards of families on the small-size farms in the area, many of which are now marginal, and to permit the utilization of a valuable water resource, which is now being wasted.

Water users in the Mann Creek and Monroe Creek areas have been interested in the development of the water resources of the area for many years. The Monroe Creek users have continued the improvement of their service facilities and have explored every reasonable means of obtaining supplemental water. The Mann Creek water users formed an irrigation district more than 36 years ago. They were active supporters for the investigations leading to the authorization of the project and are very much interested in proceeding with the project as rapidly as possible.

The supplemental request for $125,000 which this amendment would provide, would be used for the collection of additional design data, the completion of a definite plan report, negotiations for securing right-of-way, and other preconstruction activities. This would permit the actual start of construction to be undertaken without delay when funds are appropriated for that purpose. In order that the benefits inherent in this project may now be obtained as soon as possible, I hope this amendment will be approved.

I hope the committee will see fit to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. Madam President, I have no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the amount originally agreed to will be increased by the amount provided in the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, which is agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add the following:

FOREIGN AID—MUTUAL SECURITY

Funds appropriated to the President; development grants

For an additional amount for "Development grants," $25,000,000 of which $20,000,000 shall be available only for malaria eradication.

Reduction of prior appropriations

The aggregate amount of unobligated balances, as of June 30, 1962, of funds heretofore appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which have been continued available by the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963, or by any prior appropriation Act, is hereby reduced by $25,000,000, such reduction to be applied to such specific items or projects as the President shall designate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I think I can explain the amendment very briefly. What it seeks to do is to make available $25 million to the President for development grants and to earmark, as we have done in the past, $20 million for malaria eradication work. It would not provide any new money, because the second part of the amendment would take away from the President's contingency fund or other allowances the amount of $25 million. The amendment would merely transfer the money into the malaria eradication work.

In the foreign aid bill there was an unduly heavy cut in this portion of the work, and I am seeking in part to restore it. I believe this would create a better balance, if we are to continue the malaria eradication work, which has been an outstanding program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the amendment would not increase the appropriations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would merely transfer funds from one account to another?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is not a proposed $25 million increase?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I cannot agree to take the amendment. In the report on the foreign aid bill of our Appropriations Committee, on page 5, there appears this statement:

> The committee also feels that the full requirements for the bilateral malaria eradication program be financed out of this appropriation notwithstanding the reductions made herein.

I suppose that every member of the committee is highly sympathetic with the Senator's objective. We raised the amount in the contingency fund to $250 million, to be used solely at the discretion of the President. The Congress will be back in session soon.

The Senator has made a request to divert $25 million of what was handled only the other night in a very solemn conference between the two Houses in connection with a very much larger bill. I hope the Senator will not press his amendment. I have no lack of sympathy with the amendment, but I feel that we should not accept a $25 million amendment on the floor, to change to that extent a bill just agreed to by a joint conference committee and just approved by both Houses, now either on the President's desk or just signed. I think that would be improper.

No hearings have been held upon that subject. I do not feel that we should accept the amendment. I hope the Senator will withdraw the amendment, because I do not wish to have anything happen which would make it appear that there is a lack of sympathy with regard to the Senator's objective.

The Senator is asking us—only a few of whom sat in on the conference the other night, which was not an easy conference—to change by $25 million a conference report which involved considerable discussion. There was no bloodletting, but there were many difficulties before we could reach a settlement I hope the Senator will not insist upon his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest to the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Alabama that the point of the amendment is to make sure that the language which was in the Senate committee report which related to malaria control should not be diluted or, for all practical purposes, erased because of the rather drastic reduction which took place in the development grants section of the foreign aid bill.

The President's contingency fund can be used in part for the malaria eradication work. It is a fact also that the development grants fund can be used. As I recall, there was a $75 million reduction from the authorization in the development grants fund.

What I am worried about—and what I think the Senator from Alabama is concerned about—is that the AID Agency, because of that sharp reduction, may feel it should cut back on the malaria control program, which is so well underway at the present time and which is within a year or so of being completed.

I believe that in this colloquy we have developed the point that it is the intention of the Senate committee and of the Senate itself, in the passage of the Appropriation Act, to fulfill the mandate of the committee report. That is still the intention of the Congress. In this way I think we have accomplished our purpose, because the amendment of the Senator from Alabama would not change the overall aggregate total of funds. The amendment would merely transfer some funds.

The legislative history not only indicates, but I believe also states clearly, that the mandate of the report should be fulfilled. As the report says, this is a priority item. The mandate of the report should be fulfilled. I believe the amendment may not be necessary. The purpose may well be accomplished by administrative action.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, no single word was uttered by any conferee even remotely indicating that there was any hostility toward a continuation of and the completion of the malaria control work. The fact that we were successful in raising the House figure quite materially on the contingency item, from $225 million to $250 million, indicates rather clearly that we intended to give the President discretion to deal with the objectives which he thought were worth while.

It would be inconceivable to me that the President should not think this was one of the most worthwhile things we have been doing.

I see in the Chamber the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who was the senior conferee from his side of the aisle. I would be surprised if he were not also of the opinion that nothing we did disturbed the Senate recommendation in this matter. To the contrary, I hope it is his belief—it is mine—that every conferee would want the malaria control work continued.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator from Florida has said. As the Senator from Minnesota said, we have made some legislative history as to the intent of the Congress. Personally, I think it would be better to leave the money in the contingency fund, so that as much as was necessary could be used, and not put it in the development grants fund, where it would have to be used for certain specified purposes. The President could use as much of the money as he needed for the malaria control work from the contingency fund, and have available any balance for any other purpose. I think that would carry out the intent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Florida, and the Senator from Massachusetts, all of whom serve on the Appropriations Committee and all of whom are interested in this program, for what they have said about the amendment. I wish to add one additional word, if the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Florida will give me their attention.

I certainly accept it as being true, as the Senator from Florida said, that not a single word was uttered by any member of the committee. But this is the situation as it looks on the record:

Last year, if I recall correctly, a definite amount of money was earmarked for malaria eradication work. This year all earmarking has been omitted. Not only that, but probably the heaviest percentage cut of any—or certainly one of the heaviest cuts of any—came in the item under which malaria eradication appears. That is the $75 million appropriation to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred. None of that amount was restored. That cut was made in the House. None of it was put back by the Senate.

It would be easy for some individuals downtown to get the impression that, the earmarking having been omitted, and a deep cut having been made in that particular item, we were not as greatly interested in malaria control as we have been in the past.

I fully agree with the sentiments expressed here. All I wish is that word go down to those who operate the program that antimalaria work is one of high priority, not low priority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Alabama has spoken about certain individuals downtown.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not mean that disrespectfully.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No Senator has more influence on the men downtown than has the Senator who is speaking. After all that he, the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from Florida have said, and the very brief statement of the Senator from Massachusetts, I am sure that the Senator from Alabama will see that the men downtown will provide the proper malaria control.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I desire them to understand clearly and unmistakably that Congress intends our great and fine malaria eradication program to continue with high priority.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator has won his point.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I am correct in my inference that what I have expressed is the feeling of the members of the Appropriations Committee who handled the bill, I ask that my amendment be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama is withdrawn.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I thank the Senator for his decision. I wish him to know that if the people downtown, about whom he has spoken and whom I do not know, would make any such decision as to reduce malaria control, they would meet with a much less friendly attitude next year on the part of the members of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate than they have met with heretofore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, there is at the desk, offered on behalf of my distinguished colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, an amendment. An appropriate motion to suspend the rules has been filed.

The amendment would provide a payment to the City of New York of $1,500,000 to defray the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses which the city incurred in affording protection to visiting chiefs of state and heads of government during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations.

It had been my earnest hope that the leadership would call up the authorization bill (H.R. 4441) on this subject before this week. The bill as passed in the House would authorize $3 million to pay for the overtime hours of the New York Police Force at straight-time rates.

When the bill reached the Committee on Foreign Relations the amount was reduced to $1.5 million. The bill was passed in the other body on April 5 of this year by a vote of 207 to 152. Three months later the Foreign Relations Committee reported the bill, as I understand, with only 2 votes against it.

I took the step of filing the motion with extreme reluctance. It would certainly be far preferable if the leadership would act upon the bill which is on the calendar. But I understand that it has not been cleared by the Democratic policy committee. For that reason the distinguished majority leader feels that he cannot bring it up.

I have exhausted my efforts with various members of the committee to try to bring the bill before the Senate.

This episode, which took place in the fall of 1960, may have gone out of the minds of many Senators, but it certainly represented a most exciting human drama when Khrushchev, Castro, Kadar, and many other Communist leaders were in New York. Castro landed at Idlewild with a heavy security guard. He arrived at the same time as Hurricane Donna and he created quite a storm of his own. It will be remembered that he picked chickens in his hotel and was moved to another hotel.

The day after Castro arrived Mr. Khrushchev arrived.

There were 26 heads of State in New York City for the opening of the U.N. Many of them were hated and ruthless bosses from the Soviet bloc. The New York City Police Department faced its greatest crisis in 100 years. They did a magnificent job in protecting those people. There were no major incidents. There were many small skirmishes. The police department apprehended one young man who had been drinking, and who, appropriately enough, tried to throw a Molotov cocktail at Premier Khrushchev. A Texas housewife sent the Premier an apple pie bomb that was detected. One young girl was killed in some shooting that occurred in a gathering of Cuban exiles. But in general the police did a perfectly magnificent job. They canceled all leaves. They worked day and night. They were away from their homes and families at all hours of the day and night. They thwarted the unpleasant incidents that were anticipated by the appearance in New York of so many unpopular world figures.

In fact, President Eisenhower who attended that stormy session of the U.N. wrote two letters to Police Commissioner Kennedy. I quote from his letters:

> And, in view of the problems posed by so many visitors to the General Assembly of the United Nations, I marvel at the way my own appearance was so efficiently handled.
>
> I am delighted that you gave me an opportunity to greet, probably for the last time as President of the United States, so many of the people of New York City.
>
> I hope all continues to go as smoothly as possible with regard to the multitude of complex responsibilities you presently have.

I quote also from a letter, dated January 12, 1961, from Secretary of State Christian A. Herter to Vice President Nixon:

> The presence in New York City during the early weeks of the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations of a large number of chiefs of state and heads of government was unforeseen and unprecedented. The burden placed upon the New York City Police Department to provide protection for members of General Assembly delegations and to meet the additional traffic control problems was unusual and extraordinary. It is believed, therefore, that the circumstances which existed during the early weeks of the Assembly session would make it inappropriate to expect the city of New York to bear this additional expense in its entirety.
>
> According to estimates prepared by the New York City Police Department, the cost of reimbursing the overtime work performed on the basis of the regular salary rate, would be approximately $2,936,000. The amount requested to be authorized in the proposed legislation represents approximately 50 percent of this cost. Funds in the amount that would be authorized by this proposal have been included in the President's budget for 1962 under the allowance for contingencies. It is contemplated that a supplemental estimate for the appropriation of such funds would be recommended if this measure is enacted by the Congress.

For the new administration, Brooks Hays, then Assistance Secretary of State, wrote as follows to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the other body:

> The Department, after review of the question by this administration, is in agreement

with the principle of an ex gratia payment but believes that the amount of $1,500,000 recommended in its proposed legislation submitted to the Congress on January 12, 1961, is both appropriate and adequate partially to compensate the city for the additional expenses in question.

Mr. President, I recognize that a certain part of the responsibility for protecting delegates and visitors to the United Nations, while in the city of New York, rests with the city. The city wanted the United Nations located at Lake Success and derives great benefit from its being there. However, the extraordinary and unprecedented circumstances of last fall go far beyond the responsibility of the city. In part, this responsibility must be borne by our Nation as a whole, acting in its capacity as leader of the free world and host to the United Nations.

Although these funds are badly needed by the city of New York, no amount of money in the world could repay the policemen of the city of New York for the fine way in which they carried out their duties in connection with the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations. They certainly lived up to their reputation as "New York's finest."

The proposal has had the support of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. They have both endorsed the measure. But it does not do much good to endorse the measure if it cannot be gotten through Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, what the Senator from New York has said is true. No Senator could have worked harder for a piece of legislation than has our distinguished colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

However, I hope that he has an opportunity to consider the matter in a little greater detail. I make that wish having in mind what I am about to say. If the Senator will not press his proposal at this late point in the session, I assure him that I will do my very best to see that one of the first pieces of business to be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee in the forthcoming 1st session of the 88th Congress will be the proposal now under consideration.

Furthermore, it is my strong belief that the Foreign Relations Committee will report the measure by an overwhelming vote.

In addition, when that action is taken and the measure comes before the Democratic policy committee, I shall make an effort, based on a majority vote, to get the bill out of the policy committee and bring it to the floor of the Senate for a vote either for or against it.

I am sure that the Senator is aware that if the question were brought to the floor in that manner, its chances of success would be greatly enhanced.

I know that the one thing the Senator has consistently wanted is an opportunity of that sort. So if he will give the matter some thought and take what I have said as a promise, I assure him I will do everything in my power to fulfill that promise and obtain action as soon as possible at the first session of the new Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, before I yield, may I first reply to the Senator from Montana. I wish to express my gratitude to the majority leader. He has personally expressed to me his support of the measure, as has also the distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

We all know that when the majority leader makes a statement such as he has made this evening, he will see to it that it is carried out. I have little doubt that the Foreign Relations Committee will again approve the measure. I know of no reason why it should not, or why the situation will have changed. I rather gather that in this session the Democratic policy committee, which acts as a sort of——

Mr. MANSFIELD. A clearinghouse.

Mr. KEATING. Clearinghouse? I do not know. I was accustomed to the work of the Rules Committee in the other body, and in that connection we encountered some roadblocks at times. I do not believe that the Democratic policy committee in that regard quite compares to the Rules Committee, although we sometimes find in the Senate that after a committee has favorably acted, it is very difficult to get a bill programed.

However, I am heartened by the expression of the Senator from Montana, because we know, having made this promise, that it will be carried out. It is wonderful to serve with someone on whom we can rely so completely. His statement that the bill will be put to a vote in the Democratic policy committee is encouraging and gratifying to me. I am mindful that this was a very unusual step for me to take. I am aware of that. The situation is such that if the motion were to be pressed it might well be defeated at this late stage in the session.

Therefore, Madam President, based on the assurances of the distinguished majority leader, I shall not press my motion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I express my deep appreciation to the Senator from New York.

Mr. HOLLAND. I, too, express my appreciation to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I am happy that the Senator from New York has accepted the proposal of the majority leader in connection with the Senator's proposed amendment. I should like to comment on the merits of his proposal. If the Senator from New York would care to have me give him this assurance, I am sure the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will join me in cosponsoring the Senator's bill in the next session of Congress. Both the Senator from Vermont and I are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations: I assure the Senator from New York that we will press for early consideration of the bill in committee and on the floor.

It is quite appropriate that we make this offer to the Senator from New York.

Although the Senator from Vermont is not present, there is no question in my mind as to his willingness to join me in the offer I have made to the Senator from New York. He and I were delegates to the United Nations at the time this extra police expense was incurred by the city of New York.

DISCUSSED AT THE TIME

The head of our delegation at that time was Ambassador Wadsworth. This subject was discussed by our delegation while we were still in New York. We were very much concerned at that time about the extra expense that New York City was incurring in supplying the required police protection for that General Assembly session.

The delegation was unanimous in its position that we should make clear to our Government that the city of New York should receive some financial assistance to cover the extra cost to which it was put. As the Senator from New York knows, the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations was turbulent and hectic and extraordinary police protection was called for.

PROPERLY A NATIONAL EXPENSE

It is not fair to the city of New York to expect it to take on what amounts to a national expense. It is of vital importance to the whole country that no untoward incident occur while the General Assembly of the United Nations is meeting in New York City.

It is not fair to expect the taxpayers of New York City to assume the extra burden when the situation involves the type of General Assembly meeting that the 15th General Assembly proved to be.

MAGNIFICENT JOB DONE

Unless Senators were there and saw what the Senator from Vermont and I saw, they cannot begin to appreciate the magnificent job the New York Police Force did in handling the difficult situation that arose during the 15th General Assembly meeting of the United Nations. Had it not been for the efficiency of the New York City Police Department, some very serious and nationally embarrassing incidents might have occurred. Therefore, I believe the Senator's case rests in equity. There is no question about the obligation the whole Nation owes to the city of New York and, through the city of New York, to the Police Department of New York.

I was quite unaware, because of the many duties which each of us has to discharge in the Senate, that we had reached the end of this session without the matter having been resolved. It is only fair, in turn, because of the fact that these are the dying hours of this session—we hope—that the Senator oblige us by agreeing to postpone consideration of the proposal until January. I assure him, if he wants me to do so, that he can have cosponsorship of his proposal of the two Senate delegates to the 15th General Assembly. These delegates are in a position to testify on the basis of direct observation as to the justice of the cause of the Senator from New York, and are very willing to do so.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. It will be extremely helpful to have the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Vermont join as cosponsors of the bill. I welcome their assistance. They were on the spot, and they saw what happened. No one could give us greater support toward enactment of the proposed legislation than the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Vermont. I am very grateful for the assistance which the Senator from Oregon has evidenced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

First, I should like to make a statement, and then I have some questions of the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

FOREST SERVICE

I desire to speak briefly on two items in this bill. The House did not have an opportunity to consider the request by the President for the money to facilitate the contract authority proposed for forest roads and trails.

The highway bill conference report passed the Senate earlier today. It is my understanding that the Appropriations Committee report clearly shows that it is willing to consider a request for the cash in the supplemental bill when the 88th Congress convenes.

In view of the short time which will elapse between now and January, I am advised that this action should not diminish or curtail the ability of the Forest Service to move ahead on its road program. It is my hope and expectation, however, that the fund requests will be made at an early date in January, when the House will have its opportunity to review this situation.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Neither the Senate nor the House have agreed to provide an additional $525,000 requested for timber sales for the Bureau of Land Management. I was prepared to make a case on the floor of the Senate for additional funds. However, after gathering together certain facts regarding the timber sale program, I have concluded that both the House and Senate committees were correct in their decision not to grant these additional funds at this time. I wrote to the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to obtain data on timber sale costs.

I have had great difficulty in determining the actual cost for timber sale management for each agency individually or comparatively. This is a situation which should be corrected. It would seem to me that each agency should be able to present comparable information on the cost of selling timber and that it should not be necessary to have a handbook and a slide rule to get the costs on a comparable basis.

In addition, I think there is validity to the position taken by the committees, particularly the House committee, that there may be some room for increased efficiency. There have been consistent and substantial increases made for the Bureau of Land Management forestry program. For fiscal year 1963 there was an increase of $1,200,000. I am not convinced that an increase in allowable cuts should automatically carry with it a request for an increase in funds.

I would therefore like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he would agree that both the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, and other major Federal timber selling agencies should make a careful analysis of the cost of selling timber and in January bring before the Appropriations Committee a consolidated and comparable analysis of the cost of doing business?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; I think it ought to be done.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Arizona. I want him to know that I shall press both the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service for an intelligible analysis of comparable costs. I believe the Senate has a right to know the facts concerning the costs of selling Federal timber.

I have had an opportunity to talk with some people from my State about the particular situation in the Bureau of Land Management. They believe the program is generally well operated but suggest that there is room for some savings through increased efficiency. For example, in 1961, the average size of a Bureau of Land Management timber sale was approximately 1,300,000 board feet, and last year it was under 1,200,000 board feet. One suggestion has been made to me that the Bureau might increase its efficiency by a modest increase in sale size to an average of perhaps 3 million board feet. Another suggestion is in the administration of timber sales.

One view is that the Bureau might ascertain whether it is making the most effective use of its personnel in sale development or supervising.

Another is that the method of timber cruising might be improved. A final suggestion is that the cost of advertising timber sales might be reduced if it were found that the long legal advertisements were not essential to public notice on a sale of timber.

I make no judgment as to the soundness of the proposals which have been made to me and I am certain that there are other proposals which persons acquainted with the operations might have.

I would therefore hope that the Bureau of Land Management and for that matter the Forest Service too, might make use of their advisory boards and through other appropriate consultation as well as by their own studies make a determination of savings and possible efficiencies which could be developed.

If in January, it is a fact that the savings are not sufficient to make it possible to conduct the sustained-yield level of sales with existing funds, I would be hopeful that the Committee on Appropriations would continue its policies of the past and provide the needed money.

I take particular note of the fact that the committee does direct the expenditure of presently available funds for timber sales to increase the sales from the O. & C. grant lands and interspersed public domain forest land in western Oregon.

Madam President, before the vote is taken on the supplemental appropriation bill, I wish to express sincere thanks to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Majority Leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for the handling of the Oregon projects. I deeply appreciate the offer of the Senator from Florida to add the three Oregon projects which were approved by the Corps of Army Engineers. The Majority Leader asked for the privilege of offering the projects which were approved by the Bureau of Reclamation. My reasons for expressing appreciation are well known to them.

I desire to have the record show that I am privileged to say that the President of the United States enthusiastically supports the addition of these Oregon projects to the supplemental appropriation bill. Common justice and fair treatment call for their addition. I desire Senators to know that I appreciate every courtesy they have extended to me as we have discussed this subject prior to the offering of these projects on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 13290) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1833, H.R. 7932.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7932) to amend the act of July 2, 1948, so as to repeal portions thereof relating to residual rights in certain land on Santa Rosa Island, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments on page 2, line 10, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to insert "current", and in the same line, after the word "value", to strike out the comma and "as of May 22, 1950".

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and to ask if he does not mind my making a short statement about H.R. 7932.

The bill relates to a piece of property which has involved the Morse formula since 1948. The Senate knows that whenever any bill has involved the Morse formula, I have always sought to make a statement to make perfectly clear for future reference the position of the senior Senator from Oregon with respect to the bill.

The Senators from Florida and I have had a considerable amount of discussion on the bill and there has been a meeting of the minds. I think the legislative history I propose to make now, in addition to whatever comment the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] may wish to make about the bill, will leave no room for doubt as to the background and meaning of the bill. A part of our problem has really been the meaning of certain words in the House bill, about which I shall now comment.

This measure was reported from the House Armed Services Committee on August 23, 1961, and passed the House on September 6, 1961. The Senate Armed Services Committee reported the measure on August 9, 1962, and it has since been on the calendar (No. 1833) pending my investigation of the formula aspects of the legislation.

The Senators from Florida have been patient and cooperative during the time that it has taken to study the bill.

To the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], with whom I have carried on most of the discussions, I wish to extend my special appreciation for his never-failing courtesy in discussing the subject with me. I wish also to thank the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] for the conferences I have had with him, although, as I say, most of the conversation has been between the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Florida.

HISTORY OF THIS LAND

The background of the bill is set forth at pages 2 and 3 of Senate Report No. 1871. In addition, the measure has a complex history going back to 1948.

The effect of H.R. 7932, taken together with Public Law 885 of the 80th Congress and Public Law 395 of the 81st Congress, is to convey a fee simple interest, free of any Government restriction, to a parcel of real estate comprising 875 acres on the Island of Santa Rosa, which lies along the upper gulf coast of Florida. The title would be acquired by the Okaloosa Island Authority, which is the county authority created by a special act of the Florida Legislature in 1953. From the Senate report it appears that the immediate need for the proposed legislation is to show a clear title which is required in order to market bonds. The island authority evidently wishes to negotiate the sale of such bonds in order to further develop this real estate.

The proposed legislation relating to this land has been before the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate on three occasions. The first occasion was upon the consideration of H.R. 3735, which became Public Law 885 of the 80th Congress on July 2, 1948. That bill provided for the conveyance and restricted the use of the property "only for public recreational purposes." It further required that "such conveyance shall be made upon payment by said county of the sum which shall be 50 percent of the fair market value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale regardless of its former character or use."

The second occasion for congressional attention was in connection with H.R. 3155 of the 81st Congress, which was approved as Public Law 395 on October 26, 1949. This legislation was enacted prior to the actual conveyance of the property to Okaloosa County, which took place in 1950. The second bill deleted the language "based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale regardless of its former character or use." It therefore had the effect of reducing the amount of money the U.S. Treasury would receive for the property.

At that time I was a member of the Armed Services Committee and was seriously concerned about the valuation upon this property by the Army, which was then in the neighborhood of $2,500. I recall writing a rather lengthy letter to the Secretary of the Army, setting forth emphatically my opinion that $2,500 was an unconscionably low valuation and that reappraisal of this property should receive the Army's very careful attention. Subsequently, prior to the actual conveyance, the property was reappraised in the neighborhood of $60,000 and compensation of $4,000 was paid by the county to the U.S. Government, pursuant to the Morse formula provisions of the legislation.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter I wrote to Hon. Gordon Gray, Secretary of the Army, on October 14, 1949, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 14, 1949.

HON. GORDON GRAY,
Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the meeting of the Armed Services Commttee of the Senate on October 13, we had before us for consideration H.R. 3155, which pertains to the transfer of certain real property situated on Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, for recreational purposes. This property is presently owned by the Federal Government and is under the jurisdiction of the Army. Its transfer was authorized under Public Law 885, 80th Congress, which law authorizes the Secretary of the Army to convey it to Okaloosa County subject to the condition that Okaloosa County should pay 50 percent of fair value of the property conveyed, based upon the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for sale, regardless of the former character and use, as determined by the Secretary. Public Law 885 also provides that the Secretary in fixing the value of the property should take into account such portion of the price originally paid by said county for said island prior to its conveyance to the United States.

It is my opinion that in the matter of law, H.R. 3155 is not at all necessary in order to authorize the Secretary of the Army to take into account, when appraising the value of the property, such restrictions and reservations as to the future use of the property which the Army deems necessary in order to protect the future military interests and use that our Government may wish to exercise in connection with the property. However, we have been advised that the Department of the Army believes that H.R. 3155 is necessary as an amendment to Public Law 885 in order to authorize the Army to take into account proposed Army restrictions upon the use of the property by Okaloosa County.

Therefore, the Armed Services Committee yesterday, upon my motion, voted to report H.R. 3155 favorably to the Senate. However, we wish to make it emphatically clear to you that in reporting H.R. 3155 favorably, we do not accept or approve the report of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in regard to H.R. 3155. We wish to advise that we are very much disturbed about the apparent low appraisal which the Army is reported to be considering in regard to this piece of property. For instance, the House committee report, a copy of which I am enclosing in this letter, states in part: "An appraisal of this property was made which resulted in determination of fair value as being $2,500."

I wish to call to your attention the fact that this strip of property is valuable beach resort property extending 3 miles long and a quarter to 1 mile wide. I have looked into the value of beach resort property in this area of Florida sufficiently to assure myself that any such appraisal on this property would have to be characterized as an unconscionably low one and I wish to advise you at this time that I intend to follow very carefully this case in order to satisfy myself as to whether the Department of the Army, when such bills as this are passed by the Congress, takes the steps necessary to see to it that a fair market value, after taking into account any restrictions that the Federal Government retains in connection with the property, is placed on the property.

As I said at the meeting of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate yesterday, I am very much disturbed about the fact that during the past several years the attempt on the part of some of us in the Senate in preventing Federal property from being practically given away to local government units, such as city, county, and State, without the taxpayers of the entire United States receiving a fair return for the property, has not met with the cooperation of the various Government departments having jurisdiction over such property as in our opinion we should have received. Therefore, we are considering changing our policy in regard to allowing Government departments concerned to make the appraisal of any property covered by such public laws as 885, by requiring that independent appraisers having no connection with the department concerned be appointed to make such appraisements. As you know that is the common practice in handling civilian property transfers in all civil transactions. However, we have not been making that requirement because we believed that our Government departments could be counted upon to protect fully the interests of the American taxpayers in connection with the transfer of Federal property to any local government agencies or group covered by any particular bill which provides for the transfer of Federal property.

Unfortunately, our experience to date in too many instances has been that the Government departments concerned have not kept faith with the spirit or the intent of those of us in the Senate who have refused to allow Government departments to give away Federal property belonging to the taxpayers of this Nation. In too many cases I have discovered that the Government department concerned has fixed the appraisal of property at a ridiculously low figure, with the result that the Members of Congress who, in the first instance, tried to get the property for nothing for some group of their constituents have in effect succeeded in a large measure because the appraisal figure fixed by the Government departments has been far below the fair market value of the property.

However, I say very frankly that I think we are confronted with exactly that danger in connection with the transfer of this property on Santa Rosa Island to Okaloosa County, if it is true as the House committee report seems to indicate that the Army is fixing an appraised value of $2,500 on this property. I wish to call your attention to the fact that report of the Senate committee on H.R. 3735, which was the forerunner of Public Law 885, said report submitted by our committee in the 80th Congress, points out that "The bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, proposes to donate the tract of land for recreational purposes to Okaloosa County, with certain restrictions, including right of reentry. The proposed public recreational purposes include the erection and operation by private persons for profit of houses, hotels, restaurants, etc., normally found at beach resorts. It is considered that Okaloosa County will derive a substantial profit from such an enterprise."

You will note from this report that the use to which this property is going to be put is for purely recreational purposes. In fact, in our hearings on the bill a year ago it was brought out that it is the intention of Okaloosa County, under the term "recreational purposes" to build gambling casinos, night clubs, and other types of beach resort recreational facilities. Not only will Okaloosa County receive a large income from the civilians living in that area who spend their money in these resort places, but our military personnel stationed at Eglin Field will be a source of large income for Okaloosa County.

Thus, there is no reason whatsoever for the Federal Government giving, for a nominal sum, such a valuable strip of beach resort land to Okaloosa County. Anyone who looks into the facts of this case can take judicial notice that the people of our country as a whole would thoroughly disapprove of giving to Okaloosa County this property for a nominal sum. In fact, I seriously question whether we should have, in the first instance, granted to Okaloosa County the right to obtain this property at 50 percent of its fair value. I think a strong case could be made for requiring Okaloosa County to pay 100 cents on the dollar of value for this property because, while the public use to which it is to be put appears to be very nominal, to the contrary, the primary use to which the property is to be put apparently is to make profitable use of recreational facilities for Okaloosa County and thereby save the taxpayers of that county a considerable sum of money. I see no reason why the people of the United States as a whole should make that kind of a grant to the people of Okaloosa County.

The fact that Eglin Field is located nearby does not entitle Okaloosa County to this sort of grant. You know what Okaloosa County would say if the suggestion were made to move Eglin Field out of the territory. The location of Eglin Field in that territory is a great economic asset to Okaloosa County, and the location of the field there is certainly no justification for giving this beach land to Okaloosa County for any such nominal figure as $2,500.

I discussed this matter at the Armed Services Committee meeting yesterday, and I am authorized to inform you that the members of the Armed Services Committee agree with me, that the appraisal of this property should receive very careful attention from the Army, and that it should be appraised in accordance with its fair market value subject to such restrictions as the Army wishes to impose upon it as to reservations for military use. However, as we listened to a discussion of those property restrictions yesterday, the committee was satisfied that private enterprise would not be hesitant to take the property under the same terms as it is being offered to Okaloosa County.

In regard to the matter of lowering the price of the property because of Government restrictions reserved in the conveyance, I wish to call your attention to the fact that Public Law 885 provides "that in the event of a national emergency the United States of America, acting through the Secretary of the Army, shall have the right to take over from Okaloosa County, its successors or assigns, complete control and operation of the property herein described for such use and for such length of time as the emergency shall require, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army; without rental or other charge as far as Okaloosa County is concerned but subject to all valid existing private rights in and to the said property or any part or parts thereof: *Provided*, That just compensation shall be given to the owners, lessees, or other persons interested for the taking of control or operation of, or rights in, improvements of said property."

In other words, the parties who build recreational facilities on this property are guaranteed in advance that, if the U.S. Government ever finds it necessary to take back property for military purposes, then the owners of the recreational facilities shall receive just compensation for the facilities which they have constructed. I think it is perfectly obvious that such a restriction should be considered as increasing the value of the property, rather than decreasing it.

Those who build recreational facilities on this strip of property simply can't lose by the restriction but, rather, are guaranteed in advance that if the Government ever reclaims the property, they will be made financially whole. Yet, I understand that there are those in your Department who felt that H.R. 3155 needed to be passed so that you could lower the appraisement of the property because of this restriction. Such a position is perfectly absurd. As a lawyer, I have been involved in hundreds of property appraisements, and I am satisfied that the restrictions involved in Public Law 885 do not justify any substantial reduction from the fair market value of the property concerned when it comes to figuring the 50 percent of fair market value which Okaloosa County under the law is to be required to pay for the property.

Therefore, we want you to know that although we have reported H.R. 3155, it is with the definite understanding that you will see to it that the property will be appraised for an amount equal to what a group of expert independent appraisers would appraise it. We are not voting to approve H.R. 3155 with any intention that the amendment can be used by the Army as an excuse for practically giving away this property to Okaloosa County. Unless a fair appraisement is placed on this property I can assure you this will be the last bill that will ever receive unanimous consent in the Senate authorizing the Army to place its own appraisement on property to be conveyed by the Army to any local government unit or individual provided for in any bill proposed in the future by any Members of the House or Senate.

During the past 3½ years, Senator BYRD, Senator SALTONSTALL, and I, as a result of the policy we adopted in the Senate Armed Services Committee with respect to requiring some payment for transferring Federal property to local government units even for public purposes have saved the taxpayers of the United States a good many millions of dollars. However, the trend to appraise Federal property which is about to be conveyed at an amount far below its fair market value is giving us some concern, as we mentioned yesterday at our Armed Services Committee meeting, and therefore we think it is only fair to put Government departments on notice that we consider them under a binding obligation to appraise property involved in these transfers at its full and fair market value.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I point out that, although only $4,000 was paid for a 50 percent interest in this $60,000 property under the Morse formula at the time of conveyance, that amount was consonant with the Morse formula. This was so because of the many restrictions and reservations which the Federal Government maintained attached to the property. Of course, they greatly decreased its value to the purchasers, because of the very limited use to which the property could be put.

Now it is proposed by H.R. 7932 "to remove the restriction that the property be used only for public recreational purposes." It is also proposed to convey any other restrictions and interests of the U.S. Government in order that the county receive an absolutely free and clear title.

ISSUE IS VALUATION OF THE PROPERTY

The issue to be resolved is thus to set a fair market evaluation upon this property and upon the interest that the U.S. Government has retained. My letter of October 14, 1949, calls attention to the fact that part of this property constitutes a strip of beach about 3 miles long and one-quarter to one-half a mile wide, which is valuable beach resort property. It further appears from the Senate report that a substantial volume of construction has been put on the island under Okaloosa County ownership, including hotels, motels, apartments, private beach cottages, restaurants, auto service stations, and various types of resort buildings. Some leases extend for terms of up to 99 years, with privileges of renewal for a like term.

There is no question about the right of the owners, under their restricted ownership, to make those additions and improvements to the property.

It should be noted in that connection that the "public recreational purposes" provided for in the bill are specified by subsection (g) of Public Law 885 to include "the erection and operation by private persons for profit of houses, hotels, restaurants, cafes, bathhouses, casinos, night clubs, and other enterprises and uses usual to beach resorts and resort housing developments."

PROPERTY CONSTITUTES A BEACH COMMUNITY

It therefore appears that a considerable amount of improvement of the property has taken place pursuant to the latitude allowed by the original legislation.

We must not lose sight of that fact, because the power to make these improvements was given by the law which was passed in 1949.

It also appears, however, that this beach resort area is a going concern which has justified a substantial volume of investment by private persons based upon the commercial potential of this resort community.

LANGUAGE OF THE BILL IS AMBIGUOUS

When the present bill, H.R. 7932, was brought up, the problem of evaluation was approached by means of the provision that the Secretary of the Army be authorized to "sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States, including any restriction on use thereof," including the striking of the words "for recreational purposes" from the original act. Section 2 of the bill further states that the county of Okaloosa shall pay to the Secretary of the Army "the current fair market value of the property interest authorized to be conveyed."

That is the language which has troubled me. I think it is most difficult to determine exactly what interests are involved and what standards and criteria of evaluation the Secretary of the Army is to apply in connection with that language. But, as I have told the Senator from Florida, I cannot escape the legal conclusion that whatever that interest is, it is the total of the interests that the Federal Government has. What these interests are automatically flows from the previous legislation which Congress has enacted in this connection with this property.

I believe that in fairness it should be stated that when the act of 1949 was passed, there was an understanding among all of us, I believe, that the ownership, insofar as Okaloosa County was concerned, would be limited to the ownership which would be framed by the recreational use. Consequently the amount paid by the county authority, under the application of the Morse formula, was much less than the amount it would have had to pay if we had conveyed a fee simple title—which is what, in effect, the county is now seeking under this bill it will be lawfully entitled to, and will be authorized to obtain such a clear title.

With this restriction removed, there is no doubt that the value of the property to the Okaloosa County Authority is increased. There is no doubt in my mind that the restriction to the use solely for recreational purposes makes the property less valuable than it would be with that restriction removed, and the action of the bonding company in this regard is evidence of that fact.

Yet, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has pointed out to me, under existing law this agency can continue indefinitely to use the property for recreational purposes only. I suspect that is about the only use to which it will be put. Nevertheless, in order to sell the bonds, apparently in order to obtain funds with which to build more recreational facilities, it needs a fee simple title.

But I state to the Senator from Florida that, so far as I am concerned, the elimination of this restriction "for recreational use only" in my judgment does not justify merely a nominal evaluation or appraisal. However, I must say that I do not know what the exact appraisal should be.

FORMULA DOES NOT CALL FOR AN EXACT DOLLAR VALUE TO BE SET IN CONGRESS

We have pondered on this matter. In my judgment, it will require the Secretary of the Army to interview and counsel with and get the advice of real estate people in the Florida area. Such experts would know the value of property and will be in a position to give him professional advice as to what change in the value will be brought about by eliminating from the bill, and from application to the property, the language restricting it to use solely for recreational purposes. In this way, and by use of standard legal techniques the language of the bill can be reduced to an amount stated in dollars and cents.

Whatever it is, the bill makes perfectly clear that the Morse formula applies to that evaluation.

I cannot ask for more. I say to the Senator from Florida that I have no right to propose a certain figure. The Morse formula does not call for that, and I have never done it in connection with any bill. I have watched almost 450 applications of the Morse formula. Whenever I felt that any agency of the Government which was given authority under a bill to make an appraisal was trimming incorrectly in any way or was not protecting the interests of the taxpayers, I have protested, just as I protested in my letter of 1949 to the Secretary of the Army. I said then that I did not think the appraisal of this piece of property at $2,500 was fair. They reconsidered, and found my complaint proper, and increased the amount considerably—from $2,500 to $60,000. The difference in these figures was explained on the basis of the fact that an honest error of judgment had been made.

I think it is due the Senator from Florida to state that the bill complies with the Morse formula. It makes clear that the taxpayers of the United States will be paid for whatever value the removal of all the restrictions will amount to, in terms of property value.

I say this language has given me some difficulty. There is some danger of ambiguity, in that evaluation, which might possibly be approached by setting a value on the restrictions, exceptions, and reservations which are contained in the original act. I point out that the Senate committee report notes that one of these reservations with respect to fissionable materials was extinguished by section 68 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Another, the defense requirement, seems to have been extinguished by a determination of the Department of Defense that the property would not longer be needed in the event of a national emergency.

APPLICATION OF MORSE FORMULA WOULD ASSURE THAT CONVEYANCE WOULD BE BASED UPON THE FAIR MARKET VALUE

It would appear that the sounder course would be to take a positive approach to the problem of evaluation and to state explicitly that the Secretary of the Army shall make an appraisal of the current market value of the property which can serve as the basis for the compensation to be paid by the Okaloosa County. Of course, the county should have the benefit of money that it has previously paid to the United States for the interest in the property which it has acquired. This should be deducted in full from the total.

The county should also certainly receive full credit for all the improvements and, in my judgment, the increased value of the property resulting from the improvements which the county has put in, and which it had the legal right to do and which improvements the law permitted it to make.

I want to make it clear that in this case, in view of the legal authorizations which the Congress has already given to the county of Okaloosa to build these resort facilities, we would not be justified in insisting that the Federal Government should get the benefit of the increased value of the real estate itself as the result of the building of the improvements on it. That would be the case if the improvements had been made without the legal authorization contained in the previous acts with which Congress authorized the conveyance.

I want to make that clear to the Secretary of the Army as I make this legislative history.

LANGUAGE CONFORMING TO FORMULA

I want the RECORD to show that, as written, H.R. 7932 in my judgment conforms to the Morse formula.

On page 2, starting with line 8, it reads:

> 2. The first section of this Act shall take effect on the date the county of Okaloosa, Florida, shall pay to the Secretary of the Army the current fair market value (as determined by the Secretary) of the property interest authorized to be conveyed to such county under the first section of this Act.

The language of the first section of the act, of course, goes to the restriction with reference to public recreational purposes to which the land is now subject. That language is to be eliminated. There is to be a fair value placed on the elimination of the language. That may be difficult to do, but not impossible.

Therefore, in my judgment, the principle of the Morse formula is clearly embedded in the bill. It is a rare, exceptional bill in that, in my judgment, it has been made somewhat more complex and difficult because of the previous legal action that has been taken with regard to this piece of property.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATION IS UPON SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

I close by saying that the job of the Secretary of the Army is to determine how much it is worth to Okaloosa County, in terms of value, to have removed the restriction "for recreational purposes" only and the other reservations and exceptions. In my judgment, it seems that it is not a nominal amount. Whatever amount that is determined to be Okaloosa County shall pay. H.R. 7932 provides for this and thus complies with the Morse formula.

I express my regret to the Senator from Florida that I have been delayed in completing my analysis. The Senator from Florida has been understanding. I have to make certain, before any bill involving the Morse formula goes through the Senate, that no exception is being made. Any time I make an exception, the principle of the Morse formula is undermined and the Treasury and the taxpayers of the United States suffer.

I now recommend that the bill be passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I appreciate very much the analysis of the situation, which is an able and I think correct one, made by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent, first, Madam President, that that portion of the report of the Senate committee appearing on pages 2 and 3, and beginning with the words "Background of the bill," and ending at the bottom of page 3, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

Santa Rosa Island, Fla.

Santa Rosa Island, about 45 miles long and from one-quarter to one-half mile wide, lies along the upper gulf coast of Florida. Prior to 1928 the island was owned by the United States. During that year all of the island, with the exception of the Fort Pickens Military Reservation, was sold by the War Department to Escambia County, Fla., for $10,000.

Conveyance to Interior

In 1937 Escambia County conveyed to the Department of the Interior without cost all of Santa Rosa Island except Fort Pickens. It was the intent that the Department of the Interior would develop the island for park and recreational purposes. Little was done, however, and in 1941 the Department of the Interior conveyed the eastern half of the island to the War Department for use as a part of Eglin Field. This consisted of some 4,700 acres which included the acreage subject to this bill.

Change in county line

The boundary line between the counties was later changed, upon payment by Okaloosa County to Escambia County of $10,000 for sovereignty of the property over the eastern part of the island, which includes the land to which H.R. 7932 pertains.

Conveyance by Army

The real property involved in these bills comprises 875 acres of land, more or less, on Santa Rosa Island in Okaloosa County, which were conveyed to Okaloosa County by deed executed by the Secretary of the Army on May 22, 1950, pursuant to the abovecited act of July 2, 1948, as amended by the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 921). The conveyance was subject to the various restrictions and limitations stated in the enabling act, the major ones of which provided for (*a*) use of the land by the county or its lessees only for such public recreational purposes as the county deems to be in the public interest, with reverter of title to the United States in the event the property is not used for this purpose or is used for other purposes; (*b*) restriction against alienation of title except to the United States or any agency of the State of Florida; and (*c*) the right of the United States to use the property in the event of a national emergency without rental or other payments to Okaloosa County, but subject to existing private rights and to payment of just compensation to others, including owners and lessees involved for taking control over improvements on the property.

Exceptions and reservations

Excepted and reserved from the conveyance were perpetual easement interests for airspace and for access rights-of-way, and fissionable materials, pursuant to section 5(b)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 761). The reservation of fissionable materials was extinguished by section 68 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 934; 72. Stat. 632). The deed provided for a monetary consideration of $4,000, which represented 50 percent of the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary of the Army after taking into consideration the limitations and restrictions in the conveyance, less the price originally paid by Okaloosa County for that portion of the island prior to its conveyance to the United States.

According to information furnished the committee by the Office of the Chief of Engineers, the estimated fair market value of this property in 1950 was $60,000.

Improvements to land

By special act of the 1953 Florida Legislature, the Okaloosa Island Authority was created as an instrumentality of the county vested with administrative powers over the portion of Santa Rosa Island owned by the county. A substantial volume of construction has been put on the island under Okaloosa County ownership, including hotels, motels, apartments, private beach cottages, restaurants, auto service stations, and various types of resort business. Some leases extend for terms up to 99 years, with privileges of renewal for a like term. Authorized public recreational purposes are defined in the conveyance and enabling legislation to include "erection and operation by private persons, for profit, of houses, hotels, restaurants, cafes, bathhouses, casinos, nightclubs, and other enterprises and usages usual to beach resorts and resort housing developments."

Difficulty in marketing bonds

The committee has been informed that a serious handicap in marketing bonds for further development on Santa Rosa Island exists because the right of the Government to use the property in the event of a national emergency and the other restrictions against use of the property present a difficulty in furnishing a completely marketable title as required by bonding companies. H.R. 7931 is designed to remedy this situation.

No defense requirement

It has been determined that the military departments of the Department of Defense no longer require the use of the property involved in the event of a national emergency and that there is no need to retain a right of reverter for failure to comply with the use for which the property was granted.

Fair market value

It will be noted that the bill provides that Okaloosa County shall pay to the Secretary of the Army the fair market value as of May 22, 1950 (as determined by the Secretary), of the property interest authorized to be conveyed to such county.

The Department of Defense recommended that the fair market value be determined as of the present time rather than as of May 22, 1950. The committee agrees with this reasoning and has amended the bill accordingly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Second, I want to say that, fair and kind and courteous as the analysis of the bill by the Senator from Oregon was and is, there are yet two matters which I wish to call to the attention of the Senate and have appear in the RECORD, because I think they should be taken into consideration in the fixation of value as this transaction is carried out.

One is the item found in the second paragraph on page 2 of the report, under "Background of the bill," entitled "Conveyance to Interior."

For many years this property belonged to the United States. The whole island was bought from the United States by Escambia County, which is the richer county farther west, of which Pensacola is the county seat. I read from the report:

> In 1937 Escambia County conveyed to the Department of the Interior without cost all of Santa Rosa Island except Fort Pickens. It was the intent that the Department of the Interior would develop the island for park and recreational purposes.

I call attention to the fact that there was an obligation on the Federal Government in connection with that transaction for the development of the island, which is nearly 50 miles long, by the Federal Government for park and recreational purposes. That obligation would not only be discharged by the giving of full fee simple title to this small part of the island, 875 acres, to Okaloosa County by the granting of that part, but it was really discharged in 1941 without the consent or joinder of the parties entitled to fulfillment of that obligation by the granting from the Department of the Interior of the eastern half of the island, which includes the part in issue here, to the War Department for use as a part of Eglin Field.

In other words, there is still an unfulfilled obligation on the part of the Federal Government in connection with the grant of the island for development as park or recreational purposes which should be taken into account, because Okaloosa County, which now has become the sovereign of the east half of the island, although Escambia County at one time was the full owner, was entitled to the fulfillment of the obligation by the Federal Government for the development of park and recreational facilities. That fact should be taken into consideration.

Second, I call attention to the fact already mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that the Federal Government has now decided, and the Department of Defense has so stated, that it has no further use for any military purposes of this tract or any part of the island except the limited portions which are used for that purpose and which are not contained in this tract.

Senators would have to see the island to realize the necessity of the decision. It is really a white sand dune from end to end, with little vegetation. With every storm, water breaks through some portion of the island to carry salt water of the Gulf of Mexico into the Santa Rosa Sound, which is the small strip of salt water lying back of the island and between the island and the mainland.

There is no value for the Federal Government in the continuation of the reservation for military use. The whole value, as I see it, is substantially as stated by the distinguished Senator from Oregon in his remarks, except that I think account should be taken of the fact that the Federal Government is to be relieved of a definite obligation assumed by it to develop park and recreational facilities on that island. I have not heard any discussion of that in this matter.

Madam President, one more thing and I shall be through. Under the grants heretofore made and carried out, there is no doubt that from now on until the end of time, unless the military reserved part had been relied upon, so long as the Santa Rosa Island Authority continued a use of the 875 acres in question for recreation facilities, as so broadly described in the Federal act under which the grant was made, there could be no disturbance of its occupancy. That fact stands out very clearly. I think that is probably one of the facts which has given trouble to all of us in trying to figure what is the value of the reserved title in the United States.

The words appearing in the bill under which the grant to the Santa Rosa Island Authority was made are "erection and operation by private persons, for profit, of houses, hotels, restaurants, cafes, bathhouses, casinos, nightclubs, and other enterprises and usages usual to beach resorts and resort housing developments."

That language is broad enough to cover almost anything under the lawful purview of use for recreational and entertainment purposes, and without any limitation as to time except the one for the recovery of the use in the event needed for military purposes, which is now to be waived by the Government; and except also for another reservation, which held that though adaptable to those uses the land could never be deeded outright to any individual other than the Federal Government or the State of Florida or a public unit of the county.

Madam President, the situation is a little complex, but I do not think this involves any tremendous value. I am glad I do not have to fix the value. I think the Senator from Oregon, with his accustomed acuteness, relieved himself of that difficulty by stating that he never attempted to fix value. I cannot think of any situation under which it would be more difficult to fix the value of the reverter than appears to be true in this case. The value cannot be great, because of the right throughout eternity to continue to use this island for the broad purposes of recreation and enjoyment and amusement outlined in the act and in the deed, subject only to the two exceptions I have already mentioned.

I appreciate the careful study which the distinguished Senator and his able legal assistant have made of this case. I think they have very clearly stated the matter in the Record. I appreciate their kindness.

I ask that the bill be passed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chairs hears none; and, without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc, and are agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 7932) was read the third time and passed.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOLLAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I wish to pay a compliment to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] for the fine work he has done, not only today, but also throughout the year, and in the managing of appropriation bills most especially. I compliment him on this occasion because I know that it meant a sacrifice for him to be present. He had to forgo a celebration at which he has been the featured guest for many years.

I am hopeful that on the basis of what the Senate and the House have done today, it may be possible to complete the work of the 87th Congress some time tomorrow. However, I would not bet on it. I am hopeful. In this job one always lives in hope.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, for the information of the Senate I wish to point out that we shall consider three conference reports. One has been completed but held in the House; that is, the conference report on the Public Works appropriation bill. Second is the conference report on the public works authorization bill, which is now in progress. Third is the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, which the Senate passed this afternoon.

In view of the fact that when the Senate meets at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow it will very likely meet only to recess, it is my hope that the appropriate conference committees will be able to start work immediately after breakfast—say at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning—and speed their work so that the Senate and the House can consider the results of their labors and in that way speed toward the happy hour of adjournment of the Congress.

DANGER POSED BY POWER COMPANY TACTICS

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the Portland Oregonian recently ran several stories on the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference, held in Portland, Oreg., early this month. One of these stories was by Harold Hughes, and it unfortunately misquoted Mr. Clyde T. Ellis on the danger which power company tactics pose.

The Oregonian's stories were inserted in the Congressional Record on October 8 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative John Saylor. They appear on pages 22816 to 22818 of the Record of that date.

Mr. Ellis has written to the Oregonian stating his views in detail on the threat of economic dictatorship by power companies, and he has protested to Mr. Saylor the latter's comments as they were based upon those stories.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record the letter Mr. Ellis sent the Oregonian, correcting the story by Mr. Hughes.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

October 10, 1962.

Editor, the Oregonian,
Portland, Oreg.

Dear Sir: In a story on the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference, the October 3 edition of the Oregonian failed to fully and accurately reflect my views on the question of the threat of economic dictatorship by the commercial power companies. I am sure that this occurred through an inadvertent misquote of my extemporaneous remarks.

I intended my remarks to reflect deep concern over the intensified effort of the power companies to take over and completely dominate every facet of the electric power industry, and to extend their control to the total economy and the government. Due to their concentration of power, I feel that the commercial electric utilities are the No. 1 threat from within to our free enterprise system. They are more dangerous even than Communists who no longer are considered a substantial threat from within.

Economic dictatorship of the type exhibited by the power companies is a threat and is something that can seriously weaken us in our battle to stop the spread of communism in the world.

The private sector of the power industry is the largest American industry, doubling its sales every 10 years—far faster than any other major industry. I am convinced that those who control energy in the future will control the economy of the Nation.

We all recognize the extremely dangerous threat of communism. That is the reason why we must guard against the excesses, the extremism, and the scare tactics of groups such as the power companies which would use legitimate fears about security to turn American people against one another.

In their national advertising, propaganda booklets and speeches, the power company spokesmen mouth the line that power development by anyone other than themselves is socialism or at best un-American. Such a vicious propaganda line is indicative of the extremes to which the power companies are willing to go to gain control of all power production and distribution in the United States.

The so-called public service power companies are using almost unbelievable monopoly pressure tactics to kill all proposed Federal multipurpose river development projects so vital to the West. They used the same tactics to first kill the Government's efforts to generate power from the waste steam of its atomic energy plant at Hanford, Wash. They succeeded. Then they used the same tactics to prevent consumer-owned utilities of Washington from doing it, even though consumer-owned systems would pay the Government up to $125 million for it and no Federal expenditures would be involved. They killed it once in the House, but Congress finally rebuffed them and passed it.

The Idaho Power Co. last February made a tremendous drive to kill off the Raft River Electric Cooperative at Malta, Idaho, just as it had already killed two electric co-ops in Oregon and one in Idaho. Power company campaigns to kill off electric co-ops are now active in the courts and before State commissions in California, Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado, Mississippi, Alabama, Indiana, and Illinois.

I hope the Oregonian as well as the rest of the Nation's press will use their great services to expose the power company tactics. The American people, once aroused to the dangers, will demand reform in the commercial power industry.

Sincerely,

Clyde T. Ellis,
General Manager.

THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE BILL

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, one of the most penetrating and able analyses of the Senate debate on the satellite bill appeared in the last issue of the Progressive magazine, written by Mr. James A. Wechsler. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Satellite, Incorporated

(By James A. Wechsler)

The congressional battle over the administration's communications satellite bill ended in late summer with a crushing defeat for the small band of men who had dared to oppose it. Their lost cause is probably already largely forgotten by most Americans, if, indeed, it was ever seriously noticed by many. Yet one ventures the prediction that we have not heard the last of this affair. It might be described as one of the great untold stories of the early space age—and, conceivably, the first momentous scandal of this new era. In a free society such episodes have a way of haunting the participants long after the deals have ostensibly been completed.

This does not purport to be the definitive history of that battle. There are many aspects of it that still defy explanation and elude inquiry. In large measure what is set forth here is based primarily on a reading—sometimes between the lines—of a 456-page volume called "Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, on H.R. 11040, an Act for the Establishment, Ownership, Operation, and Regulation of a Commercial Communications Satellite System, and for Other Purposes." The story is supplemented by conversations with some actors in the drama who could move behind the scenes.

There will be little recorded here that was not accessible to the press; but it will also be apparent that much of it was never clearly or dramatically defined in most news organs. There were a few reporters who early sensed the dimensions of the story, but they were only a handful.

While we gaped and blinked in wonderment over the dawn of Telstar, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. staged the first and perhaps decisive commercial coup of the space epoch. That it had the official blessing of the Kennedy administration (and the natural sympathy of the Republican leadership) in this endeavor merely underlines the magnitude of the feat. Ultimately we must ask: Why? But first let us turn to the record, where the heart of the story can be found.

In December 1961 Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, speaking before the Political Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, revealed that in his view the communications satellite represents a "fundamental breakthrough in communications [which] could affect the lives of people everywhere. It could forge new bonds of mutual knowledge and understanding between the nations. The United States wishes to see this facility made available to all States on a global and nondiscriminatory basis. We would like to see United Nations members not only use this service, but also participate in its ownership and operation."

As Ernest Gross, former U.S. representative to the United Nations, testified before the Senate group, Mr. Stevenson's large view of the new day, originally the official administration view, was in dramatic contrast with remarks which Senator Robert Kerr, chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, had addressed in February to Under Secretary of State George McGhee on the same subject: "It occurs to me," the Senator said, "that you do not understand that the only new thing about this hoped-for satellite communications system is that it is just an improved method of doing what is now being done."

Obviously Mr. Stevenson and Senator Kerr were talking about two different worlds. Yet in the end it was essentially the perspective of the Oklahoma tycoon that shaped the legislative outcome. In the measure as finally enacted there was not a single reference to Mr. Stevenson's vision of the United Nations role in the expanding satellite universe. In the final phase of debate, a letter was extracted from Mr. Stevenson and read on the Senate floor by Senator Hubert Humphrey expressing approval of the pending bill. How Mr. Stevenson reconciled his earlier words with the legislative deed is one of the unanswered mysteries of this story. But it is perhaps relevant that he succeeded in avoiding a personal appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee despite persistent demands from Senator Wayne Morse that he submit himself to interrogation.

One begins with the Stevenson contradiction, even though he took almost no direct part in the controversy, because it points up so many of the paradoxes and puzzles of this strange proceeding.

What was fundamentally at stake in the legislative dispute was whether the Government should control the nascent system of satellite communications for primarily public ends, or whether it should cede dominance of the enterprise to A.T. & T. for primarily profitable purposes. There was much byplay over the totality of A.T. & T.'s grip under the prospective bill, but even the stanchest supporters of the measure offered weak and contradictory testimony on that point; indeed, they seemed divided between the pretense that A.T. & T.'s role would be limited, and the insistence that the Republic was fortunate to have A.T. & T. volunteer to take over.

Obviously, if one accepted Senator Kerr's view that the whole project involved more of what had already been done, no great debate was at hand. But if one accepted Mr. Stevenson's portrait of a fateful turning point in men's lives, the abdication of government was inexplicable. Yet this is basically what has occurred, under the direction of an administration rhetorically committed to the earlier Stevenson position.

Whodunit? How?

The case for the bill was won by a compound of confusion and inertia. It is surely not my contention that all those who voted for the bill were tools of corporate power. I would argue, however, on the basis of the printed record, that those who were to be damned as the "filibusterers"—a charge worthy of fuller inquiry—were generally those who paid the closest attention to the argument. Some of the stakes at issue were first set forth on March 6, 1962, when Senator Estes Kefauver, leader of the small band, appeared before the Senate Space Committee. The issues were intensively explored a few weeks later at hearings before his subcommittee, but almost none of the press bothered to attend, even though these hearings contained some of the few direct confrontations between the proponents and opponents of the bill prior to the floor debate in June. And rarely have I read as brilliant and diligent an exercise in congressional cross-examination as that conducted by Senator Wayne Morse in the hearing held before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Yet in most of the cryptic newspaper accounts of the whole episode, Morse emerged as a cranky curmudgeon laboring an obscure point.

How, then, does one dramatize what really happened? How does one translate the devastating impact of the hundreds of pages of hearings that so few Americans have read and that were so inadequately reported in most places? One can try by writing some of the headlines that the testimony might have received, and by suggesting to the reader how different the outcome might have been if these headlines had been widely used. Imagine what echoes may have been stirred if there had been large headlines saying:

STEVENSON REVERSES STAND ON SATELLITE BILL
BUT SPURNS DEMAND THAT HE TESTIFY

The biggest headlines might have been won by Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency; they would have said that he had resigned in protest over the administration's support of a measure which exposed his agency to the dubious mercy of A.T. & T. He did not do so; instead he engaged in the difficult exercise of trying to deprecate the bill without betraying "the team." Yet, even within those limitations, his testimony might have rocked the country if its significance had been accurately appraised and heralded. For what he said was that the fees required by A.T. & T. might be so high as to bar USIA programs from the satellite system. Murrow testified that, unless the Government received preferential rates (nowhere provided for in the bill), it would cost USIA $900 million annually at commercial rates to utilize the satellite network for 90 minutes a day in underdeveloped areas. Now consider this testimony:

"Senator Morse. Would it be desirable, Mr. Murrow, if we set up a satellite communications system, to have the facilities of that system made available to our Government for the transmitting of the type of freedom programs that you and I have had in mind as we have been discussing the problem?

"Mr. Murrow. It seems to me that this would be desirable, sir.

"Mr. Morse. Is there anything in this bill that guarantees to the U.S. Government a reduction in commercial rates for the transmission of U.S. programs of freedom to the areas of the world where the Communists are a 24-hour-night-and-day threat to freedom?

"Mr. Murrow. No, sir."

In Murrow's view, the United States might find itself at a severe disadvantage in competition with Communist programs around the world unless "we could secure a reduced rate or increased appropriations."

As the hearings progressed, Senator Stuart Symington, a chief advocate of the leave-it-to-A.T. & T. bloc at these seminars, questioned Murrow's figures on prospective cost. He accused the USIA chief of vastly overstating them. Murrow held his ground, conceding only that in the great uncharted areas we are about to enter any estimate is necessarily hazardous. Perhaps the sharpest commentary on the proceedings is that no conclusive effort was made to resolve the gap between them before the vote sealed the choice.

A reader can only assume that the Senate chose to ignore Mr. Murrow's warning. But then, so did he. For when the climactic question came, he announced that, if he were a member of the Senate, he would vote for the bill. As in the case of Mr. Stevenson, the team spirit was apparently irresistible—or compulsory.

Now let us suppose that in many cities in the land citizens picked up their newspapers and saw this headline: "Mystery Move Curbs U.S. Rights in Satellite Plan, Probe Hears."

As initially drafted, the satellite bill contained this clear clause, based directly on the President's words of July 24, 1961:

"The corporation shall not enter into negotiations with any international agency, foreign government or entity without a prior notification to the Department of State, which will conduct or supervise such negotiations. All agreements and arrangements with any such agency, government or entity shall be subject to the approval of the Department of State."

At first the State Department and other administration spokesmen argued vehemently for this provision, despite questioning by Senator Kerr which was considered by many to be as acid and blistering as any ever heard on Capitol Hill. Apparently this assertion of Government influence in the business of the emerging monopoly was unsatisfactory to the men who were taking over the show. And so this language was substituted:

"Whenever the corporation shall enter into business negotiations with respect to facilities, corporations or services authorized by this act with any international or foreign entity, it shall notify the Department of State of the negotiations. The Department of State shall advise the corporation of relevant foreign policy considerations. Throughout such negotiations the corporation shall keep the Department of State informed with respect to such consideration. The corporation may request the Department of State to assist in the negotiations, and that Department shall render such assistance as may be appropriate."

The State Department, in effect, abdicated any controlling rule over the conduct of negotiations; in return the corporation pledged only to let the Department know what it was doing. As someone remarked, the whole thing might have been simplified by admitting A.T. & T. to the United Nations.

Who dictated the change? Was not this single episode, embodying a complete reversal on the part of the administration, sufficient to cast doubt and discredit on the whole operation? Yet I would guess that not one in a million Americans knows that such a remarkable alteration was engineered, and that Secretary of State Dean Rusk eventually found himself defending it.

This was not a minor matter of rhetoric, concerning only the handling of business arrangements. The real point was underlined by Benjamin V. Cohen, that wise old New Dealer who came forward to challenge the bill. In response to a question concerning the possibility of separating business matters from foreign policy in negotiations involving the satellite communications system, Cohen responded, "I think it is utterly impossible at this stage * * * almost all problems are mixed problems, and the State Department should not be embarrassed by having to negotiate through an instrument of this character. It becomes embarrassing, even in the case of companies on whose boards the Government has appointed no directors, to say these (business matters) are private negotiations that do not bind the Government. It is much more difficult to escape responsibility for a corporation three directors of which are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate."

But the mystery of why the bill was rewritten on this crucial point was neither aired in any serious form in most public places, nor ever satisfactorily resolved.

Much of the argument for swift enactment of the bill rested on the popular cry that we could not afford any delay in the great space competition. The note of urgency dominated many headlines. Now let us dream that many of the stories on August 8 had been headlined this way: "Witness asks Senate probers; Will A.T. & T. strike against Government rule of satellite plan?"

This was the thrust of Joseph Rauh's testimony in opposition to the measure. One of a handful of citizens who testified against the bill, he argued—as did Cohen, and as had the dissident Senate bloc—that there was no desperate need for passage of any such final legislation at this time; that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration could proceed, in cooperation with private industry technicians, in promoting the satellite program, just as it had managed the Telstar achievement. Meanwhile the country could continue to weigh its ultimate course; it should not be stampeded into surrendering to A.T. & T.'s demands.

There could be only one plausible reason for haste, Rauh observed: "If we lose any time through not passing this bill, it would be because of a sitdown strike by A.T. & T. If they are not prepared to cooperate without this bill, then I think there ought to be an investigation of A.T. & T., and that fact ought to be known to the American public: that they are putting their dollars ahead of the fight against communism."

Nowhere have I found any effective answer to this contention; nowhere have I read or heard any compelling explanation as to why time was so desperately of the essence in this proceeding unless A.T. & T. had whispered the word that it would "strike" unless its terms were met. As far as I know, A.T. & T. never felt obliged to proclaim that its services were at the Government's disposal regardless of the outcome of the legislative argument.

There were many days on which testimony offered the committee would have justified such headline language as:

PROFITS COME FIRST IN SATELLITE BILL,
SENATE PROBERS TOLD

Defenders as well as critics of the bill were obliged to acknowledge the point, for the wording of the statute is unmistakable. There were, of course, some Government witnesses who engaged in the painfully innocent exercise of suggesting that there could be no serious conflict between corporate profit and national interest.

Thus, Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow, a bright and able young man who will, I predict, some day read his testimony with some degree of anguish, valiantly voiced his confidence that the directors of the satellite corporation would be Americans first.

Former U.N. Ambassador Gross, addressing himself to the same question, quietly recited the facts of life that should hardly have eluded Mr. Minow. Discussing the duality of interest that might confront the directors of the satellite corporation, he said, in response to a question from Senator Albert Gore, that the aims and goals of a corporation director were quite different from those of a Government official. "It seems to me," said Gross, "that the perspective has to be different. The director of a corporation for profit is bound, in the interests of the stockholders, to do the profitable thing. I think it would not be a matter of lack of patriotism or wisdom at all."

What he was saying, of course, was nothing more than that what is good for A.T. & T. is not necessarily good for the country.

Enterprising journalists might have found some further headline material if they had pursued the gap between the administration's ultimate position and the stand taken by Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger, chief of the antitrust division of the Department of Justice, in earlier testimony before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoloy Subcommittee. Discussing the prospect of A.T. & T. control of the satellite program, Loevinger suggested how the persent vested interests of the corporation might cast a shadow over its operations in the great new venture: "There would be a natural reluctance on the part of companies with large investments in existing facilities to take speedy action which would make these facilities obsolete. A company controlled by A.T. & T. could scarcely avoid considering the effect of satellite facilities on existing investments in cable facilities."

It was this point which Senators Kefauver and Long tried to stress, citing instances where A.T. & T. had held back on new developments. Again no one was listening.

Despite Mr. Loevinger's warning, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy warmly saluted the satellite bill and Loevinger ceased and desisted from any further public statements along these lines. The Attorney General based his stand on the assumption that the Federal Communications Commission would keep A.T. & T. in line. He conceded that nothing in the past justified this assumption but added wistfully that he hoped the FCC would "start to meet its responsibilities."

Yet even this pious hope did not confront the central problem. For the act explicitly declares that "there is hereby authorized to be created a communications satellite corporation for profit." This is language that A.T. & T. understands.

And an International Telephone & Telegraph vice president testified that he thought the satellite corporation should get a special subsidy if the Government wanted it to conduct initially unprofitable operations in poor territory.

So it would seem that the Government—meaning the people—loses on both ends. It is denied any real assurance that A.T. & T. will carry the satellite program into those impoverished areas where it may be most urgently needed but where the returns may be least lucrative. Nor does it obtain any pledge of preferential rates for direct Government programs.

In a way the most unheralded story of all, which got almost no attention except in those subscribing newspapers which chose to print Drew Pearson's column on that day, involved the press itself.

On August 3, during Newton Minow's interrogation by the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Russell B. Long had commented on the extensive volume of tax-deductible advertising published by A.T. & T. to hail its own role in Telstar. Then he observed that "any daily newspaper in the country which might undertake to attack editorially the bill that we have before us is subject to the complete right of this corporation either to advertise or not advertise in that paper. Also the corporation has the right to deduct this advertising expense but they don't have to place their advertising with any newspaper."

To which Minow responded: "I can't believe that the press would be influenced in taking editorial judgment on the basis of that."

One hopes that Minow's expression of innocence is not a true reflection of his worldliness in dealing with corporate pressures.

There are cynical men who say that it does not really matter whether A.T. & T. assumes corporate command of the satellite program or whether the Government retains nominal control while leasing the venture. They may not be entirely wrong. It may well be that opponents of the measure should have fought for full-fledged Government ownership and operation of the program, despite the counsels of caution from those who asserted that such a course was politically impossible.

It is said that public opinion would have rebelled against any radical approach. But those who profess to speak for public opinion usually bear little resemblance to the man in the street. The only poll I have seen, conducted by an agency called "What America Thinks," reported in mid-August rather startling answers to the question: "Do you think the future network of American communication satellites—like Telstar—should be owned and developed by the Government or by private industry?" The replies: 44.1 percent favored Government ownership, 39.3 percent voted for private industry, 16.6 percent were uncertain or had no opinion. This arithmetic is hardly consistent with the overwhelming proindustry vote in a Congress that treated opponents of the bill as if they were village idiots or dangerous subversives.

Inevitably one comes to the question of the filibuster. It was, in fact, only when the embattled opponents of the bill began their last-ditch fight that the issue became page 1 news; then it was largely featured as a parody on the behavior of those liberals who were allegedly employing the device they professed to abhor, and they were generally pictured as cranky men reciting old Populist slogans.

There was a surface touché in this portrait. But once again the indolence and indifference of the press—mingled with a certain chronic disdain for the liberal set—sustained a false image. For one thing, the filibusterers repeatedly explained that they were not attempting to bury the bill; they were fighting for time. On numerous occasions they made it plain that they would be ready to vote immediately after the fall elections; have southern filibusterers against civil rights ever similarly offered a deadline for decision?

Wayne Morse pointed out, at the time Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield was piously saying "today we begin the 15th day of debate on this bill," that the measure had actually been before the Senate on 13 days for a total of 33 hours and 15 minutes. In 1957, during the debate on the civil rights bill, Strom Thurmond made a speech lasting 24 hours and 18 minutes.

Thus the cry of filibuster was in many respects a fraud. The summit of hypocrisy was reached when cloture was finally voted by those who, in the memorable words of Senator Long, would do for A.T. & T. what they would never do for the NAACP—and who thereby told the world that property rights held a large priority over human rights in the U.S. Senate.

In the end the big story is the mystery story: Whodunit?

It was a bill that for the first time in our history placed the U.S. Government in the role of promoter of a private profitmaking monopoly venture, with the President himself designating three directors as his agents. As Benjamin Cohen pointed out, "It will be difficult to convince those who buy the stock that the President has not recommended its purchase." There is no precedent for this use of the Presidency for the sponsorship of a business enterprise.

Why did a New Frontier administration become the architect of this strange deal? Why was there such frantic pressure for quick action? Why were the voices of dissent within the administration forced to fall into line, creating such odd and embarrassing spectacles as the conflicts between Mr. Stevenson's wise words to the United Nations and his desultory letter of capitulation to Senator Humphrey? Why was Mr. Murrow obliged to say that he would vote for a bill that is implicitly damned by his own testimony? And why did Senator Humphrey, who had earlier counseled against deciding on organization until the system became operational, join those who clamored for haste?

President Kennedy has lamented the pervasiveness of mythology in our economic thought. Yet rarely has a measure been camouflaged in so much myth—most basically the myth that there can be no conflict of interest between corporate profit and national needs. Perhaps most wondrous of all were the testimonials to the glories of the free enterprise system recited by the Senators who were in the process of creating a vast new monopoly, paving the way for its dominance by the patriarch of monopolies, A.T. & T., and resisting an alternative "leasing" setup that would have guaranteed a maximum of free competition.

One is compelled to assume that the clamor for immediate action, the manifest distaste for debate, the derision heaped on the lonely man who challenged the bill, reflected a fear that the truth would out if the controversy were prolonged. Perhaps this is why they refused to consider any amendments proposed but tabled every single one offered by opponents of the bill without even trying to debate them on their merits.

In the aftermath of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, and in the time of the New Frontier, we may be too prone to dismiss as fantasy evidence of the survival of established corporate power over economic and political institutions. There were, of course, many men who voted for the bill who did so out of loyalty to the President. There were others who no doubt did so absent-mindedly. There were probably some whose faith in Mr. Minow (which I share in many areas) persuaded them that the present FCC would somehow impose those restraints on A.T. & T. which its predecessors were never able to achieve, even though this Commission has shown no greater interest or ability in this area and has permitted A.T. & T. to earn a higher rate of profit than was permitted by the Eisenhower FCC.

Thus, many elements contributed to the final dismal result. But one cannot escape the sense as one reviews the record that this was also a high-pressure coup staged by a corporate body that recognized the enormous stakes in Satellite, Inc.

That the Government was divided within itself is beyond dispute; there is little overt evidence that even President Kennedy passionately favored the course finally chosen. In the Senate, Mr. Kerr's dedication to the care and feeding of corporate interests is a celebrated and not entirely impersonal fact; once the bill had been drafted (and spuriously proclaimed as a compromise between private domination and public ownership). Senate Leader Mansfield apparently concluded that it was a matter of honor that he finally prevail in some large legislative test. One can only hope that he will some day exhibit comparable ardor in dealing with the Republican-Dixiecrat obstructionists as he did in crushing the liberal dissenters.

Many informed men in Washington believe Vice President Lyndon Johnson played a decisive hand in shaping the outcome. Mr. Johnson is Chairman of the President's Space Council and thus officially the President's "man on space"; it is said that when the State Department and some forces within the Justice Department resisted the evolving pattern, Mr. Kennedy in effect let it be known that he would defer to the Vice President's judgment. It is a matter of fact that Tom Corcoran's law firm, with which Johnson has continuous and intimate relations, displayed an active interest in A.T. & T.'s cause.

But whoever called the legislative tune, the President's responsibility is in no way diminished. There are those who believe his own attitude in the final phases of the battle was influenced by his desire to assure the business community that he harbored no doctrinaire enmity toward it. If so, the country may be paying a heavy price to underwrite this form of therapy.

In a way, what stands out as sharply as the power of the battalions mobilized in behalf of the bill was the frailty of the opposition. Once again we are reminded that, on great issues involving giveaway to special interests, there is usually no major public lobby operating to contest the deal. Traditionally this was the function of the labor movement, but labor's leaders have increasingly abdicated that role in return for the nourishment of their own special interests. In the satellite battle no labor witness took the stand. There was a telegram from Walter Reuther suggesting that "there is no more reason for turning space development over to A.T. & T. than there is for turning the Pentagon over to General Motors." The AFL–CIO executive council belatedly adopted a resolution reflecting those sentiments. The impact of even those gestures was largely outweighed by the support which the Communication Workers Union threw to the bill, presumably in return for some hints of future dispensations at the collective bargaining tables of Satellite, Inc., or of A.T. & T. itself.

The result might have been different if the press had covered the story with greater zeal and fidelity, and if the editorial pages had been less unanimous in hailing the handiwork of the legislative drafters. But the combination of labor listlessness and press hostility, joined with the lobbying legions of A.T. & T., rendered the struggle of Senators Kefauver, Morse, and company a hopeless one. Nevertheless, they have made the record, and it stands, and Americans may have many reasons to turn back to it as the saga of space unfolds.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. Johnston, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Harold B. Swan, to be postmaster at Beach City, Ohio; and John D. McCray, to be postmaster at Greenfield, Ohio.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, if there is no further business, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, October 12, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 11, 1962:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Amanda E. Meisgeier, Los Olivos.
Doris E. Van Meter, Redway.
Lenora A. Milhoan, San Ardo.

IDAHO

Berniece B. Evans, McCammon.

MISSISSIPPI

Beryl P. Kaigler, Fernwood.

OKLAHOMA

J. Hugh Bryant, Sand Springs.

WISCONSIN

Ivan J. Cowen, Caledonia.
Iva E. Beech, Coloma.

CONNECTICUT

Carmine J. Grote, Chester.

ILLINOIS

Floyd R. Chapin, Harvey.

INDIANA

Vaughn L. Kostielney, Avilla.
Hiram T. Staples, Greensburg.

MISSISSIPPI

Arjenter B. Cardwell, Harrisville.

VERMONT

Howard H. Bartlett, West Dover.

TEXAS

Jacob E. Shoaf, Quitman.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Kenneth P. Steinreich, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 4: 1: *I therefore beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.*

Almighty God, we earnestly pray that the holiness of the life and the heroism of the faith of our blessed Lord may daily be given a larger and more welcome place in our minds and hearts and find a richer outflow in Christlike character and conduct.

May we yield ourselves without reservation or restraint to those disciplines whereby we are made ready to know and worthy to receive a more vivid experience of the spiritual realities and a more intimate fellowship with Him whose name is above every name.

Show us how to be rich in that love and those ambitions which never seek their own and in that courage which remains strong and steadfast when the winds are contrary.

Grant that our mental attitudes, and our methods of approach to our difficult problems may all be under the inspiration and guidance of Thy Holy Spirit whose will and ways are fundamental and final, immutable and inescapable.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 555. An act for the relief of Elmore County, Ala.;

H. Con. Res. 570. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin; and

H. Con. Res. 583. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 185,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6371. An act to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income; and

H.R. 9045. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10620. An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12580) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 20, 27, and 33.

The message also announced the appointment of Mr. ROBERTSON as a conferee on the bill (H.R. 12276) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the adoption of the conference report on the bill (S. 3451) to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes.

The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on this I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 78, not voting 176, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—182

Abernethy
Albert
Alford
Andersen, Minn.
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Bailey
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brooks, Tex.
Broomfield
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Casey
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Cook
Cooley
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Everett
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Garmatz
Gary
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Wyo.
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Huddleston
Ichord, Mo.
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kearns
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kitchin
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Matthews
Merrow
Mills
Monagan
Montoya
Morris
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Pilcher
Poff
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
St. Germain
Selden
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Taylor
Thomas
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Waggonner
Walter
Weaver
Westland
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Winstead
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—78

Abbitt
Alger
Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Ayres
Bates
Becker
Beermann
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Broyhill
Bruce
Cannon
Chamberlain
Church
Clancy
Collier
Corbett
Cramer
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Derounian
Dole
Dorn
Ford
Fulton
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser

Hall
Harsha
Hosmer
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Langen
Lindsay
Mathias
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moeller
Moore
Morse
Mosher
Norblad
Ostertag
Pike
Pirnie
Quie
Ray
Reece
Riehlman
Roudebush
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Springer
Stafford
Taber
Thomson, Wis.
Tupper
Utt
Van Pelt
Wharton
Williams

NOT VOTING—176

Adair
Addabbo
Alexander
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baker
Baring
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Byrnes, Wis.
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chiperfield
Coad
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Denton
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Doyle
Durno
Elliott
Ellsworth
Evins
Farbstein
Fenton
Findley
Fino
Flynt
Fogarty
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Gathings
Glenn
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Haley
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hull
Inouye
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kowalski
Kyl
Laird
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Mack
Magnuson
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Michel
Miller, George P.
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Peterson
Philbin
Pillion
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rousselot
Ryan, Mich.
Santangelo
Saund
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Staggers
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Tollefson
Ullman
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wallhauser for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Schadeberg against.

Mr. Harding for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Adair against.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Brown against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Hiestand against.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Inouye for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Teague of California against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Garland against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Wilson of Indiana against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Mack for, with Mr. Hoeven against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Harvey of Michigan against.

Mr. Loser for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. McVey against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Sibal for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Haley with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Durno.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Garvin.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. John W. Davis with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Michel.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Berry of South Dakota.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Curtin of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Breeding with Mr. Scranton.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Alexander with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Brewster with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Mason.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BECKER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 12648, with Senate amendments Nos. 2, 19, 44, and 47 through 54, and further insist upon disagreement to said amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I submit a report (Rept. No. 2551) on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 903) making continuing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes and ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up at any time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate and other revenues, receipts, and funds, such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities which were conducted in the fiscal year 1962 by the Department of Agriculture, including the corporations therein, and the Farm Credit Administration, at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate (amount appropriated or authorized to be expended in fiscal year 1962), together with such amounts as may be necessary to finance additional projects or increased activities of the Department of Agriculture as agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives at the rate for operations and under the terms, conditions, and provisions contained in H.R. 12648, Eighty-seventh Congress, and additional projects or increased activities included by the Senate and agreed to by the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution is referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] that it be in order to consider the joint resolution at any time?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman, this is exactly the same bill as passed by the House but is provided in resolution form and it is not expected that it will have to be called up at all.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Is this a continuing resolution for the appropriations?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is, and it is merely in reserve. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have discussed the bill with the Members on the other side. We anticipate a meeting this afternoon, and it is anticipated that this matter will be resolved. In fact I feel certain we can and will agree.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I would like to say to the gentleman I can see absolutely no reason why the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate cannot get together on an appropriation bill in a period of 9 or 10 months. For us to be delayed here for this period of time and then be forced into the necessity of adopting a continuing resolution for an appropriation bill because of conflict between the House and the Senate over a fight that was perpetrated not by the membership but by some longstanding disagreements of individuals, I think it is high time that we got down to work and these conference committees come back with a conference report and get the work of this body finished.

I sincerely believe that the work of this House can be terminated today, and this sort of resolution is going to continue it on.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I withhold my objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that his objection defeats his own argument. I expect to bring the report back today in agreement and to move on. Should the gentleman object to this proposal, he could thereby have delayed the House 3 days before we could act if ever we should have to fall back on this motion.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman give the rule of the House under which it would be delayed 3 days?

Mr. WHITTEN. In that unless I get such consent, this resolution could not be brought up until it has been filed and laid over.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. This resolution cannot, but a conference report can; so I am not delaying anything.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. But we want this in case we have to fall back on it. Frankly in view of the state of the record and statements in the press I feel the facts concerning your House Committee should be made a matter of record. I would hope that the membership of the conferees both of this body and the other body would get to work and bring back a report today.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that there has been very little difference at all in my opinion. This is the first time there has been any discussion of the relative merits of the two positions despite press comments and despite debate in the other body.

May I say that if objection is raised here it will lessen the chances of our getting together.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The action we are taking carries out exactly what the gentleman from Tennessee wants.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I do not see that it does. This Congress certainly cannot adjourn unless we perfect appropriation bills, and if conference reports are not filed, we cannot work them out.

Mr. HORAN. If we proceed under the regular order, we would have to wait 3 days more before we could consider the matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that of course he can object; that is his privilege, but I hope he will not.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If you gentleman can get together in the next few minutes, why do you not go ahead and have your conference and let us delay this resolution for a few minutes so that you can get together?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. I say to the gentleman that I do not anticipate actually needing or using this resolution, but I want to have it for the reasons I have given. My effort is to expedite the business of the House.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. My only effort is to protect the Members who want to go home and who very badly need to be home.

They have got to campaign. This business of having these arguments in conference committees and not bringing the bills back for consideration is nonsensical.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN reserved all points of order.

SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO DECLARE RECESS AT ANY TIME

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the balance of this week it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the 2d session of the 87th Congress it may be in order to consider conference reports at any time they are reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House well know, I have been in opposition to this abortive Castro blackmail and indemnity demand of dollars for prisoners, $60 million. I see now that there is a suggestion that CIA funds may be used for this purpose.

I would like to ask anyone in this House, did they knowingly and willingly vote any money or any authorization that would permit $60 million of the taxpayers' money or even foodstuffs to go to Fidel Castro, whom I thought Congress in its recent resolution said is the enemy of freedom, whom we are fighting, not helping—even authorizing the President to use force of arms to dispose of this Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere?

Why do we not be compassionate for American prisoners over there? I am just as compassionate for the prisoners Castro now holds as anyone. Why do we not follow up the situation in Cuba by a strong anti-Castro drive? I am compassionate for Americans who are prisoners in Cuba as well. I said yestereday there were 10 of them. I say now there are at least 20. I have a list of 10 right here.

Why are we not compassionate for American prisoners held in Cuba? Apparently we should be compassionate for all citizens of Cuba who are prisoners of Castro's communism—compassionate for the 100,000 other Cuban prisoners held by Castro on trumped-up charges in Cuban prisons—and certainly for the American prisoners held on charges of a trumped-up nature that Cuba will not even reveal the nature of to the Swiss Embassy.

If we are truly compassionate for all prisoners of communism and Castro's domination our efforts should be consistent with the position taken by this House and the Congress time and time again this session, to exert every effort and pressure to rid this hemisphere of Castro—rather than giving him this added strength in money and/or foodstuffs which he needs badly now because of the failure of his agrarian reform—failure which will have the effect of keeping him in power that much longer.

WEST VIRGINIA NO LONGER SHORTCHANGED—II

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I presented official statistics of the Department of Defense indicating that West Virginia, which ranked 46th in the Nation in the per capita amount of military prime contracts in the last full fiscal year under the Eisenhower administration, now ranks 30th in the Nation under President Kennedy.

In the fiscal year 1960, the total amount of prime military contracts awarded by the Department of Defense amounted to $36,098,000 for West Virginia—or $19.51 per person. In the fiscal year 1962, West Virginia obtained $133,782,000—or $72.31 per person.

This is a phenomenal rate of increase in military contracts for West Virginia. It represents an increase of 270 percent when measured per capita according to the population of the State of West Virginia. As President Kennedy himself recently pointed out at Wheeling, W. Va., it is an absolute increase of 272 percent.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this rate of increase is third in the Nation. There are only two States in the Union—Arkansas and North Dakota—whose rate of increase in per capita military prime contracts was greater than that of West Virginia between the years 1960 and 1962.

This rate of increase for West Virginia is still another example of the fact that President Kennedy is fulfilling his 1960 campaign pledges to the people of West Virginia.

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WILLIAMS.** Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present on October 8 when tribute was paid our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, FRANK SMITH. I was unavoidably absent because of the illness of Mrs. Williams.

The gentleman from Mississippi, FRANK SMITH, has made many contributions to the Nation. As an expert on flood control and water resources development, he worked diligently and energetically in those areas. He has been especially helpful on projects in Mississippi and the Midsouth. I am grateful for the assistance he has given me and the residents of my district on matters before the Committee on Public Works.

We are all delighted that FRANK will have further opportunity to serve his country as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He is well qualified for the position and I know that he will serve with dignity, honor, and integrity. He has my sincere best wishes in the future.

THE VALOR AND THE SACRIFICES OF JEWS IN DEFENSE OF OUR COUNTRY AND ITS FREEDOMS

Mr. **LANE.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. **LANE.** Mr. Speaker, few of us have fully appreciated the remarkable contributions of our fellow Americans who profess the Jewish faith, to the Armed Forces of our Nation. From colonial days to the present they have been in the forefront of freedom's defenders. In proportion to their numbers, they have compiled an amazing record of heroism that deserves recognition in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The impressive book "Jews in American Wars," by J. George Fredman and Louis A. Falk, gives us this information in complete detail. With this reference, plus extensive research of his own, one of my constituents, Anthony Cama, of Lynn, Mass., has condensed this factual story in a very graphic way. The fact that he, director of the Italian School in Lynn, devoted so much time and writing skill to this unified account of Jewish courage, is in itself a tribute to those ideals that join the separate elements of our pluralistic society into the fellowship of freemen; and their willingness to fight and die for these principles.

The Jewish people are proud of their service in defense of our Nation. As more Americans learn of their inspiring patriotism, it will strengthen all of us to meet the tests ahead, confident that no power on earth can ever divide us because we measure a man not by race or creed but by what he does for our shared heritage.

In this spirit I bring you "A Tribute to Jews in the American Wars," written by Anthony Cama, from the September 30, 1962, edition of the Lynn (Mass.) Sunday Post:

A TRIBUTE TO JEWS IN THE AMERICAN WARS

(By Anthony Cama)

Out of the tormented cauldron and the crucible of old Europe came the children of Israel to a new and challenging world, a vast virgin continent peopled by a strange and bizarre race of redskin mortals. They came out of thousands of years of struggles and strife, out of the seeds of Moses and Abraham, down from the sacred Mt. Sinai bringing the Ten Commandments to civilizations mute at the presentation of a Divine Creator, the Father of the universe.

They came to America, where the fantastic, unbelievable miracle of freedom of religion was taking place. In their torrential spiritual veins they carried the irresistible ripples of a Messiah called Jesus, who enlightened and inflamed the world with the Cross of love and salvation of man.

And so, into the American colonies came the Jews, a trickle of 2,000 scattered along the Atlantic coast amid a population of 3 million other colonists. Here they had come as Sephardic Jews, who, like the other races, had ventured forth over the menacing ocean roads to escape religious, economical, and political oppression. At last, perhaps, the promised land had been found—thousands of miles away from Judea.

Speaking directly to the many gracious readers who have followed my articles in the pages of the Lynn Sunday Post let it be said that this writer is, above all, a teacher. It is my mission, with the help of God, that I may bring forth to the people how much we owe to the foreign-born for the blessings we enjoy in this great democratic country of ours. This article speaks on this last Sunday of September about the Jews and their undeniable sacrifices to the United States of America.

That I may weave well their historic threads into the resplendent fabric of our Nation's birth and growth let it be known that there were Jews on the voyage of discovery led to America by that immortal Genovese mariner, Christopher Columbus. That intrepid sailer was aided by Spanish Jews and Jewish map and instrument makers.

In the New World the first Jew appeared in New Amsterdam in 1654. He was a determined and proud person by the name of Asser Levy, who mounted guard on equal standing with the Gentiles at the timber walls of a fort in Manhattan. He fought Peter Stuyvesant unwaveringly until he and other Jews were admitted to citizenship in New Amsterdam on April 21, 1657.

I quote from the stirring book, "Jews in American Wars," by J. George Fredman and Louis A. Falk:

"The colonists, who had crossed the Atlantic, likened themselves to the Israelites, who had traversed the Red Sea to reach the Promised Land. They had fought the Indians as the Twelve Tribes had struggled against the Canaanites, Rev. Ezra Stiles, president of Yale College, liked to call America the New Israel. In a sermon in 1775, President Samuel Langdon of Harvard told the Massachusetts Congress that the Hebrew government (as described in the Bible) was a 'perfect republic.' Thomas Paine, in his 'Common Sense,' pointed to the prophet Samuel's rebuke of Israel for desiring a king as a divine 'protest against monarchial government.' The Reverend Jonathan Mayhew, of Boston, argued that 'God gave Israel a king in his anger because they had not sense and virtue enough to like a free commonwealth and have Himself for their King.' "

Is it small wonder, indeed, that the tocsin tongue of the Liberty Bell rang out its joyous cry at the signing of the Declaration of Independence, since it carried an inscription taken from the Old Testament: "Proclaim liberty to all the land and to all the inhabitants thereof."

When the blood of the new Nation erupted like volcanic lava, many Jews joined the Revolutionary cause, serving with honor in George Washington's army. Solomon Etting, of Baltimore, wrote: "The Jews were always at their posts and always foremost in all hazardous enterprises."

Salvador Francis, a popular plantation owner of South Carolina, who earned the appellation of "The Southern Paul Revere," fought three merciless engagements until he was killed and scalped.

David Emanuel, later elected to the governorship of Georgia, was one of the distinguished, fearless spirits in Rebel Town, not far from Augusta. He was sentenced to be shot for his Revolutionary work, but in a daring leap upon a horse, he escaped within the intricate wilds of a dense swampland.

Colonel Franks was an aid, first to Gen. Benjamin Lincoln and later to Gen. Benedict Arnold. After the complete exoneration of himself and others in the treason trial of Benedict Arnold, Franks was promoted and dispatched with secret documents for Ambassador Benjamin Franklin in France. He was included by Thomas Jefferson in his planned delegation to the peace conference.

In the Revolutionary Army, Lt. Col. Solomon Bush served with distinction in the Pennsylvania Supreme Executive Council. A member of his militia, earning a citation for valor by the State's family, Capt. Lewis Bush was fatally wounded in the struggle for Brandywine.

Among the Frenchmen who came to America with Lafayette in 1777 was colorful and dynamic Maj. Benjamin Nones. He served as a private under Count Pulaski and Baron DeKalb. When DeKalb fell in the Battle of Camden in 1780, it was Nones who helped to remove him from the battlefield.

Dr. Phillip Moses Russel was with the Army at Valley Forge during the tragic and trying days of the winter of 1777–78.

No historic writing concerning the valiant Jews who sacrificed and fought for America would be complete without adding to the pages of glory the name of Haym Salomon, a unique hero of the War for Independence. It is estimated that he was instrumental in the pouring of more than $640,000 into the Revolution in loans for the Army, salaries for the officials and cash for other needed financial aids. He died impoverished at the age of 45. Salomon was born in Lissa, Poland, in 1740 and came to New York after the anguished dismemberment of his native land. He was well educated and could speak 10 languages. He cast his lot with the Sons of Liberty and was arrested many times by the British and flung into prison. Finally caught and tortured, he was condemned to be hanged. With the help of friends he escaped to Philadelphia, where he reestablished his business and supported the starving Colonial Army. James Madison wrote:

"When any member of the Revolutionary Congress was in need, all that was necessary was to call on Salomon."

Another unforgettable man, reputed to be the wealthiest Jew in America, was Aaron Lopez, whose fleet of merchant ships and other properties were confiscated by the British. He gave invaluable financial aid to the cause of liberty during the Revolution.

In the War of 1812, when our young Nation was spreading its sails across the oceans, America fought and destroyed the threat of the Tripolitanian pirates. At that time the freedom of the seas was endangered by the powerful fleets of England, locked in a battle with France. This was mainly a battle of the seas, and the outstanding hero was the French Jewish privateersman, Commodore John Ordoneauz, whose notable feats are described by William Maclay, historian of the American Navy. The defeat of a British

40-gun frigate by his armed ship, *Prince de Neudchatel*, is a most magnificent naval saga.

Another great fighting mariner was Commodore Uriah P. Levy, who died in 1862 and was one of the highest ranking officers in the Navy. On his return from France his armed ship, *Argus*, destroyed 21 British merchant vessels and captured a number of other ships. Meeting the heavily armed British frigate, *Pelican*, Levy fought a courageous and audacious battle until the *Argus* was sunk and he was taken prisoner. He suffered for 16 months in Dartmoor prison.

When Commodore Levy returned to the United States he worked tirelessly to effect important changes in American Navy procedure. He finally achieved his greatest feat by bringing about the abolishment of corporal punishment in the Navy. On his tombstone is inscribed this singular humanitarianism:

"He was the father of the law for the abolition of the barbarous practice of corporal punishment in the Navy of the United States."

Many were the Jewish hearts and spirits which stood in "the rockets' red glare" when Francis Scott Key wrote "The Star-Spangled Banner."

After the cessation of hostilities in the War of 1812, the growing and expanding America embarked upon an era of the unprecedented growth in all areas. In the 1840's and 1850's the iron rails linked East and West. Telegraph poles sprouted over desert and plain. The eyes and feet of this ambitious infant Nation pointed westward. Then came war with Mexico over Texas.

The doctor who accompanied Gen. Samuel Houston through the war in Texas was a surgeon, Moses Albert Levy. Abraham Wolf was killed in the Battle of the Alamo. A famous Jewish officer of the Mexican War was Surgeon General David de Leon of South Carolina.

General de Leon won the sobriquet "the fighting doctor" in the Battle of Chapultepec. Twice he led cavalry charges into the cannon's mouth. In 1861 he resigned as surgeon major in the Union Army to accept an appointment as First Surgeon General of the Confederacy. More than 57 Jews are prominently mentioned in the records of the Mexican War.

In the War Between the States thousands of Americans fought one another in the unflinching belief that they were right. This grief-filled fratricidal war of South and North, free land and slaveland, revealed the agony of a people fighting 100 years ago for what they believed in via a bloody civil war. Through this episode of heartbreak and chaos Jews fought and died on both sides.

In those days of feverish controversy over slavery Ernestine Rose, an eloquent orator of Polish origin, who was eulogized repeatedly by Susan B. Anthony in her memoirs as a precursor of the movement for women's suffrage, fought slavery heart and voice.

After President Lincoln's call for volunteers, Bret Harte, whose grandfather had been among the Jews who fought in the War of 1812, read a stirring poem, "The Reveille," at a patriotic meeting in California. It became the most widely repeated poem of the day. The last stanza cried out thusly:

"Better there in death united than in life
a recreant, come!
Thus they answered hoping, fearing,
some in faith and doubting some
till a trumpet voice proclaiming,
said, my chosen people, come,
then the drum,
lo! was dumb
for the great heart of the Nation,
throbbing, answered,
Lord we come."

Thousands of Jews answered this call. Simon Wolf, who made the most thorough study of the subject, estimates that 8,400 Jews served in the Civil War out of a Jewish population estimated at between 100,000 and 150,000. John Seddon, the Confederate secretary of war, is said to have refused a request for high holy day furloughs for Jewish soldiers on the ground that there were 10,000 to 12,000 Jews in the Confederate army, and that "it would disintegrate certain commands if the request was granted."

In New York alone more than 2,000 Jews entered the Union service, and more than 1,000 Jews volunteered from Illinois. It is recorded that there were 8 generals, 21 colonels, nine lieutenant colonels, 40 majors, 205 captains, 325 lieutenants, 48 adjutants, and 25 surgeons.

Seven Jews won the Congressional Medal of Honor during the holocaust and terrible carnage of the Civil War. They were Sgt. Leopold Karpeles, Sgt. Benjamin B. Levy, Sgt. Maj. Abraham Cohn, Sgt. Henry Heller, Pvt. David Orbansky, Pvt. Abraham Vruenwalt, and Cpl. Isaac Gause. How proud, how resplendent, and how brilliant the Star of David glowed into the heart of America.

Wrote Gen. Oliver O. Howard:

"Intrinsically there are no more patriotic men to be found in the country than those who claim to be of Hebrew descent, and who served with me in parallel commands or more directly under my instructions."

The commander of a Southern legion, T. N. Waul said:

"The Jews, as soldiers, were brave, orderly, and well disciplined and in no respect inferior to the gallant body of which they formed a prominent part. Their behavior in camp and in the field was exemplary. No Jew in the command was arraigned before a court martial, and in proportion to their numbers, there were fewer applications for leave of absence, and their regular habits caused very few of their names to appear on the hospital rolls. In battle, without distinction as to race or religion, all were apparently willing and eager for the contest. I will say, however, I never saw nor heard of any Jew shrinking or failing to answer to any call of duty or danger."

An important factor in the development of this wonderful Nation of ours was immigration, which expanded until it reached large proportions. The Jews of America, about 100,000 of them during the Civil War period, now magnified their numbers, as they fled from pogroms in eastern Europe after 1880.

This was the era of the boiling racial cauldron, the crucible melting and blending new foreigners into the virile bloodstream of America, as symbolized by the Statue of Liberty, presented to the United States by France in 1884 and emblazoned with the spiritual poetic cry of Emma Lazarus:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

During the Spanish-American War more than 5,000 Jews served their country. Casualties among the Jews were 29 killed, 47 wounded, and 28 dead of disease, a total of 104, or 2 percent of the 5,000 Jews under arms.

In 1917 the United States found itself again involved in a war for the preservation of liberty and the rights of man to freedom and human dignity. The Kaiser's Germany, ruthless and merciless, sank American ships and plotted a course of aggression aimed at conquering the world and destroying the great democratic land of America.

In our sanctuary of human rights and unparalleled religious freedom the Jews stood up to be counted, ready to fight and die for the United States, this star-spangled land of promise and hope. Battered and beaten by pogroms and inhuman persecutions in the Old World, they were prepared to sacrifice their lives that this land of ours should not be engulfed by the monstrous tyrannies of despotic imperialism.

Jewish casualties in World War I were 3,500 dead and 12,000 wounded. They had a general of the Army, a general of the Marines, and an admiral in the Navy. The total of officers who served was 9,177.

Congressional Medal of Honor winners were three. They were Sgt. Benjamin Kaufman, a gentle, unassuming lad, who was a product of Brooklyn, N.Y., and who was decorated by nine governments for his deeds of valor and sacrifice in addition to being honored by his country; Sgt. William Sawelson, who was killed in action at Grand Pre on October 26, 1918, and got the award posthumously for bravery above and beyond the call of duty; and Sgt. Sydney Gumpertz, who performed deeds of valor at Bois de Forge on September 26, 1918.

These brave Jews, and innumerable others who had come to our beckoning shores, had escaped from the savage maws of terror, persecution, and suppression rampant in eastern and central Europe. They had thrust themselves forward out of the tyrannical slime and the pestholes of unspeakable pogroms to find the magnificent American dream. They had come into the measureless melting pot of America to become a part of humanity's great hunger for freedom and equality—for justice and a new horizon of hope for their children. It is no wonder, indeed, that they responded so valiantly to fight for their adopted land.

Said Gen. John J. Pershing:

"When the time came to serve their country under arms, no class of people served with more patriotism or with higher motives than the young Jews who volunteered or were drafted, with our other young Americans. I well remember in my inspection of New York divisions seeing so many patriotic, well-disciplined, well-behaved young Jewish soldiers, whose commanders spoke of them in the highest terms."

It is no wonder, indeed, that decorations and citations for valor given to Jewish-American soldiers in World War I totaled 1,132.

There are no words which this writer can find to speak and write adequately about the awesome suffering of the Jews during the ghastly period of World War II, when the Nazi plague poisoned and infested the whole world. The fearsome carnage in the destruction of more than 6 million Jews by the Nazi regime and all its evil cohorts belongs in so vile an abyss of inhumanity that, for such a puny mortal as myself, words are unattainable.

Let the judgment of the Lord alone stand forever and eternally in the star-filled heavens to shine accusatively upon those nations which dared to challenge the Divine Creator's omnipotence by a decision to annihilate a race of people who had contributed so much priceless spiritual and cultural treasures to the world.

It is with great pride that this writer can point to America, where every man, regardless of race, color, or creed, can walk the earth in dignity and in grace; where any man may enjoy the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And so we come to the monstrous days of World War II. Here we find our Nation with a total Jewish population of 4,500,000. Out of the 13 million Americans under arms there were 550,000 Jews serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. Their casualties were 11,000 dead and 40,000 wounded. They had one Congressional Medal of Honor winner and 52,000 decorations and citations for valor.

Lieutenant Zussman was just an ordinary youngster from Detroit, Mich., who had held a job as shipping clerk in a store. He was 23 when he joined the Army and was 26 when he made the supreme sacrifice in France on September 21, 1944, as a tank officer to win the Congressional Medal of Honor.

"Four Jewish families contributed 8 members each, 12 Jewish families contributed 7 members each; and 19 Jewish families contributed 6 members each to the Armed Forces. About 60 percent of all Jewish physicians in the United States under 45 were in the service.

"In World War II a different kind of Jewish community participated. In the intervening years the Jews of the United States had developed and matured. The process of Americanization had proceeded unfailingly. The immigrants had made their adjustments. The children, now grown into adults were native born, products of American schools and an American environment. They differed from their fellow Americans only in the traditionally acceptable American way, which leaves to each man the free exercise of his religious convictions."

The above is a direct quotation from the splendid book, "Jews in American Wars," by J. George Fredman and Louis A. Falk. This writer is not only deeply indebted to this book for most of the historic facts used in this article but gives profound thanks to Mrs. Harry Levine of 72 Harwood Street, Lynn, who one most auspicious morning stood in her doorway to speak to me about the value of my articles in the Lynn Sunday Post.

When I mentioned that I had been encountering difficulties in completing such a large writing as this, she graciously let me borrow the book without which I could not have completed this task. I can honestly say that she, a proud Jewess, and I, a teacher-Gentile, were that morning but humble instruments of the Lord in this patriotic endeavor.

The writer cannot conclude this article without mentioning the 309 rabbis who served in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. This represented two-thirds of the eligible qualified rabbis of the entire country. Of these, 210 served overseas, accompanying American troops to all the areas of struggle from North Africa to Iwo Jima and Okinawa.

Seven rabbis died in combat areas. They were Rabbis Henry Goody, Samuel D. Hurwitz, Herman L. Rosen, Louis Werfel, Irving Tepper, Nachman S. Oronoff, and Alexander Goode.

It was Rabbi Goode, who, together with three other chaplains, two of the Protestant faith and one of the Catholic faith, figured in the most unique spiritual story of the war. Chaplain Goode and his fellow clergymen; Chaplains Clark V. Poling and George L. Fox, Protestant ministers, and Chaplain John P. Washington, a Catholic priest, made the supreme sacrifice aboard the USS Dorchester. They sank with the ship into the depths of the cold Atlantic Ocean, their arms locked together, each one in his own way spiritually intertwined with the Divine Creator.

This will be enternally symbolic of the inextinguishable democratic torch which today sheds its halo lumination over the entire globe—a light, guiding, warming, comforting the millions of oppressed peoples, showing the way to this incomparable land of ours, where before the eyes of all other races and creeds the sacred Star of David, glorious and unsullied, emblazons the eloquence of ancient Hebrew contributions to civilization in the words of the Prophet Micah:

"What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy and walk humble with thy God."

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 287, which was a vote on Senate Joint Resolution 234 to send the joint resolution back to the Senate, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH IN BALTIMORE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post quotes the President, speaking in Baltimore last night, as praising the 87th Congress, and saying:

> No Congress in our time—and this the records prove—has had a more exceptional 2 years of positive and progressive accomplishment.

As proof of this statement he cited seven acts of this Congress—the trade bill, area redevelopment, manpower retraining, defense appropriations, the space program, drug laws, and minimum wage, each of which received bipartisan support.

He then called for my defeat based on a "negative record."

The record shows that I supported six of the seven bills mentioned by the President. How can they be called positive and negative in the same breath?

I excuse the President of trying to mislead the people of Maryland. I suspect he was provided a political text drafted by a hobgoblin instead of a ghost.

At the same time, since the question has been raised, I want to stand here, Mr. Speaker, in the presence of my colleagues who were witnesses to my votes, and remove any doubts on the score of my position, and in the presence of our Clerk of the House of Representatives, whose official records of this House show how I voted.

From time to time during this Congress the President called for bipartisan support. He received help from the Republican side in many cases, and without it there would be little in the record of this Congress to be praised as "positive and progressive accomplishment."

Mr. Speaker, having given such support, when I thought it was merited, I consider it an injustice to be called "negative".

Such a response from Mr. Kennedy is untrue, ungenerous, and lacking in the spirit of equity that the American people expect of their Presidents.

PRESIDENT'S EFFORTS TO ELECT MORE DEMOCRATS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] who just spoke, is so naive as to think that the present President of the United States concerns himself with the facts when he is making political speeches, I am afraid the gentleman must be sadly disillusioned, because of the President's action in attempting to elect more Democrats to the House of Representatives and the Senate, when he does not know what to do with the great majority he has right now in both Houses.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day that we have a President who is out in the hustings campaigning for the election of more Democrats and it can somewhat be likened to the old expression of "Nero fiddling, while Rome burns."

This is exactly what is going on. The people are aware of what is going on, and I know they will reflect it come election day, November 6, and reject the President's request to send to Congress just a flock of "yes" men.

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT NOT ACKNOWLEDGED BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a P.S. to the remarks just made by our distinguished colleague from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. Just a few days ago we were here on the floor of the House of Representatives attempting to put through the Kennedy foreign aid bill, which has long had bipartisan support. A great many Republican Members have for years continued to support this program actively on the floor of the House. And yet at the very moment when the distinguished Republican delegation from Minnesota was on the floor speaking for the President's foreign aid bill, the President was in Minnesota knocking their brains out politically. This is not only bad politics, it is bad government and it is against the public interest.

THE CUBAN RANSOM SITUATION

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield so that I may read the rest of these names that I had started to read, when my time had expired. These are Americans who are held prisoners in Cuba, American citizens who are being held prisoners in Cuba on bogus charges:

Raefael del Pino of New York and Miami; Austin Young of Miami; James Wellington King, Miami; Donald Joe Green, York, S.C.; Alfred E. Gibson, Mount Gilbuss, N.C.; James G. Dean, Franklinville, N.C.; Thomas Baker, Dothan, Ala.; Eustace Denbrunt, Baltimore, Md.; Daniel Carswell, East Chester, N.Y.; and Edmund Taransky, New York City.

Those Members who serve these areas I hope will hear this. These are American citizens.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

REPUBLICANS WHISTLING IN THE DARK

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the big, kind heart of our Speaker; and never has it been shown in greater degree than today. Here we find on the Republican side our good colleagues, many of whom will not be back next year, whistling in the dark. They want to make speeches, loud and long speeches, hoping that by shouting into the gathering hurricane they can quiet the fury of the storm. So our beloved Speaker, out of the kindly depths of a good heart, recognizes them for 1-minute talks, then stops the watch, and permits them ample time to relieve themselves of wind pains.

If the great and gallant soldier from Florida shoots as loudly as he talks, good Providence help the enemy. I never knew a man who could talk louder and do more fighting with words.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great day, a great day to be here to listen to our Republicans whistling to the winds.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that it may be very well understood that this session of Congress which has already run much too long should be adjourned as soon as possible.

In saying that I am not taking anyone to task, whether on the other side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle. But certainly if representative government is to be truly representative it is essential that Members who stand for election have an opportunity to be home, back in their districts, in their States, to be with their constituents, to talk with them, to tell them where they stand.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Speaker, the majority leader, and the Parliamentarian discussed with me certain arrangements that are always made as we come into the final days of a session. One of those was that conference reports would not have to lay over a day, as provided in the rules of the House, but could be considered after they are filed.

I want to make it very clear that, first of all, I agreed to that arrangement, as I have agreed to it heretofore when in the minority, as have the leaders on the other side of the aisle when they have been in the minority. As I understand it, it is not designed to take advantage of anyone, to slip through something without knowledge of the Members, but simply to expedite the business of the House of Representatives, and to speed the sine die adjournment.

As far as I can understand, the principal business which still confronts us here in the House of Representatives has to do with conference action and the adoption of conference reports. As far as I am concerned, I have confidence in our conferees on these various matters and I trust that those conference actions that are still in disagreement can be speedily resolved; and when they are resolved, as far as I am concerned, I want it understood that I am ready to take them up whenever there is reasonable information and notice about when they are coming up. But I must say that if one of them is filed on Saturday and we are still here, as we would be if it is filed, I would not want us to have to adjourn over to Monday before we could take up the conference report.

LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT INCOME

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill—H.R. 6371—to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to general rule for taxable year of deduction) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) DIVIDENDS OR INTEREST PAID ON CERTAIN DEPOSITS OR WITHDRAWABLE ACCOUNTS.—Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, amounts paid to, or credited to the accounts of, depositors or holders of accounts as dividends or interest on their deposits or withdrawable accounts (if such amounts paid or credited are withdrawable on demand subject only to customary notice to withdraw) by a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, or a cooperative bank shall not be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year to the extent such amounts are paid or credited for periods representing more than 12 months. Any such amount not allowed as a deduction as the result of the application of the preceding sentence shall be allowed as a deduction for such other taxable year as the Secretary or his delegate determines to be consistent with the preceding sentence.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1962."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income, and with respect to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is an example of what I have been talking about for a number of days, and a rather flagrant one, I might say, of nongermane amendments tacked on in the other body which the House has not had an opportunity to consider before a committee.

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman refers to a different matter. This is H.R. 6371, which has one amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am sorry. I do have the wrong bill.

Let me ask the gentleman this under the reservation of the right to object. What is this amendment? Is it germane?

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will yield, this amendment to this bill, which of course involved the retirement income credit as it passed the House, is the amendment the House passed yesterday in the form of H.R. 13358, dealing with the mutual savings banks and building and loan association matter, that we discussed yesterday. It is the identical language of the House bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did have the wrong bill. I had it on this list, but let me say although this is a nongermane amendment, it does not violate the provisions that I have been trying to drive home because it is a matter that was considered and passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, since I could not get recognition under the 1-minute rule, I should like to say in response to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that I can easily recall the many weeks of this session when all too little was accomplished. I have been constant in my attendance. I have not missed a rollcall and I do not intend at this late stage of the session to watch the deficiency appropriation bill go through this House with only a few minutes of consideration, for it is my understanding that bill is being loaded with more spending in the other body. I want to know what is in it and I would think other Members of the House would want to know what is in this final deficiency appropriation bill. If I can get that information when it comes up for consideration I will have no desire to prolong the session, but I am not going to forfeit my right to put it over for 1 day or even 1 hour or 2 in order to know what is in the bill. I do not care if this session of the Congress continues until Christmas if that is the price that must be paid for the right to know how several hundred million dollars of the taxpayers' money is to be spent. That is the only reason why I have objected to the unanimous consent request, and I have no apology for so doing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as it originally passed the House, it will be recalled, conforms the provisions of the retirement income credit to recent changes in social security legislation. The retirement income credit is designed to provide equivalent treatment for retired citizens who receive taxable retirement income and little or nothing in the form of tax exempt old-age and survivors insurance or railroad retirement. This provision was in the House bill and was accepted by the other body without amendment.

The substantive amendment to the bill was to add without change the language of H.R. 13358 which passed the House without objection yesterday. That bill, as you will recall, will prevent the artificial shifting of the date of crediting interest payments by savings institutions in order to minimize the impact of the new provisions for these institutions contained in the Revenue Act of 1962.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 833

Resolved, That ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2548)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, and 9.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,587,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$57,248,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 19, 25, 26, and 27.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
CARL HAYDEN,
GALE W. MCGEE,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 1—General operating expenses: Reported in disagreement. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment which will provide an appropriation of $15,974,250 instead of $16,005,000 as proposed by the House and $15,992,600 as proposed by the Senate.

In this item as in all subsequent cases reductions proposed by the Senate due to late passage of the bill have been agreed to. Increases proposed by the Senate have been agreed to with the exception of $18,350 for a realty officer, an appraiser, and one clerk.

Amendment No. 2—General operating expenses: Provides $161,000 payable from the highway fund as proposed by the House instead of $179,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Public safety: Appropriates $57,587,800 instead of $57,560,000 as proposed by the House and $57,676,400 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to provide for 10 additional correctional officers in the amount of $28,500 in lieu of 40 such officers provided for by the Senate. Other revisions made by the Senate in the House bill have been approved with the exception of the budget clerk in the Municipal Court.

Amendment No. 4—Education: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—Education: Appropriates $57,248,400 instead of $56,817,000 as proposed by the House and $57,284,600 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have approved the following increases: $192,300 for 41 additional teachers, $61,800 for additional counselors and $63,100 for costs related to the program to improve education for culturally deprived children, as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement with the proposal of the Senate to provide $135,400 for a one-time complete replacement of obsolete textbooks, but the additional amount of $25,000 proposed by the Senate for elementary school library books has been denied. Increases provided by the Senate for 2 librarians in elementary schools and for membership in the Research Council of the Great Cities Program have been denied.

Amendment No. 6—Education: Provides $574,200 for the development of vocational education as proposed by the Senate instead of $576,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7—Education: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8—Parks and recreation: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9—Health and welfare: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Health and welfare: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11—Health and welfare: Reported in disagreement. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment which will appropriate $65,386,300 instead of $66,528,000 as proposed by the House and $65,508,100 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement with the action of the Senate with the exception that an increase of 25 rather than 50 positions is provided for Junior Village.

In agreeing to the amount of $48,750 for the continuation of the Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors the committee of conference wishes it understood that next year some other arrangement for financing this activity must be undertaken.

Amendment No. 12—Health and welfare: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15—Highways and traffic: Appropriate $11,418,000, of which $7,652,126 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $1,642,100 from the motor vehicle parking account), as proposed by the Senate instead of $11,470,000, of which $7,700,476 shall be payable from the highway fund (including $1,644,000 from the motor vehicle parking account), as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 16, 17, and 18—Sanitary engineering: Appropriate $20,760,800 of which $6,861,375 shall be payable from the water fund and $3,936,650 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,789,000, of which $6,872,975 shall be payable from the water fund and $3,948,600 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the House.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Amendment No. 19—Capital outlay: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20—Capital outlay: Provides $162,000 for purchase of equipment for new school buildings as proposed by the Senate instead of $223,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23, and 24—Capital outlay: Appropriate $49,451,000 of which $14,500,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1963, $9,871,142 shall be payable from the highway fund and $1,193,700 shall be available for construction services as proposed by the Senate instead of $49,713,000 of which $13,500,000 shall not be available for expenditure until July 1, 1963, $10,631,142 shall be payable from the highway fund and $1,158,700 shall be available for construction services as proposed by the House.

The committee of conference is agreed that construction of the Three Sisters Bridge should proceed according to the plan set forth in the budget in the amount of $300,000 as provided in the bill. Furthermore, it is the view of the committee of conference that no funds allocated to the District of Columbia's highway program shall be used for the construction of the Glover-Archbold Parkway. The committee of conference further recommends that the District of Columbia cooperate in the preservation of this natural park.

Amendment No. 25—Capital outlay: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27—General provisions: Reported in disagreement.

William H. Natcher,
Alfred E. Santangelo,
Clarence Cannon,
John J. Rhodes,
John Taber,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House considered budget estimates totaling $299,134,478 for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1963. Our committee recommended and the House approved a total of $290,059,000. This was a reduction of $9,075,478 below the budget estimates. The bill provided for a Federal payment of $30 million, which was $2 million below the budget estimate and the same amount appropriated for fiscal year 1962.

The bill as it passed the Senate contained $289,253,300, which is a decrease of $805,700 under the amount approved by the House. The increases in the Senate totaled $2,420,798 and, due to late passage of the bill in that body, decreases totaled $526,200. Other reductions totaled $2,700,298.

For the first time since I have been a member of this committee, the other body made reductions in our bill. Mr. Speaker, this is good procedure and I want you and the Members of the House to know that I commend the action of the Senate subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations. We have worked in complete harmony, not only on the welfare program, but on all proposals for the welfare of our capital city. Not only has the House committee carefully considered the budget proposals, but the same action applies to the Senate.

The hearings on both sides disclosed that here in the District of Columbia we are faced with a large public welfare caseload, a difficult crime situation, and increasing governmental costs. All serious problems, but not insurmountable.

The Federal payment approved by the Senate committee is in the same amount as the House bill.

At the time of the hearings before our committee, the two additional juvenile judges had not been appointed; therefore, the request for more employees and housing space was not in order.

We denied all of these requests. They were granted by the other body because the judges were subsequently named and the requests were then in order.

The welfare program was presented to our committee in such a manner that we could not grant the additional request for employees which were to be used to correct the many deficiencies in this Department. The full report from the General Accounting Office had not been received by our committee when we concluded our hearings. At the time of the hearings on the other side, the final report was in and the Welfare Department was able to make certain sound proposals which could be accepted. Most of the additional employees added to the bill are in this section and were added by the other body after a reasonable program was submitted by the Department of Welfare.

We receded on a great many items in the two programs just described.

During the hearings on the House side, partisans of rapid transit and the proponents of the highway program used every political issue and every possible source of opposition to bring about confusion and disorder. We soon discovered that the rivalry between these two groups is dangerous and certainly not to the best interests of the future development of our Capital City.

During the hearings before the House subcommittee, two of the Commissioners requested that certain sections of the inner loop be held in abeyance and, since our committee is not a policymaking committee, we agreed to this request. We deleted $170,000 for the east leg; $450,000 for the Northeast Freeway; and $546,700 for interchange C. Our committee believes that, where thousands of people will be displaced, every precaution should be taken prior to construction to protect these people before they are forced out of their homes. We have been assured by the Commissioners that, before funds are requested for the deleted items, some solution will be reached solving this major problem.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 291]

Alexander
Alger
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chiperfield
Coad
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Doyle
Durno
Elliott
Ellsworth
Evins
Farbstein
Fenton
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Gavin
Glenn
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Haley
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hull
Inouye
Jarman
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kowalski
Kyl
Laird
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDowell
McIntire
McSween
McVey
MacGregor
Mack
Magnuson
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Michel
Miller, George P.
Moorehead, Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Nedzi
Nelsen
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Peterson
Philbin
Pillion
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rousselot
Santangelo
Saund
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Stratton
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Ullman
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Albert). On this rollcall, 262 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, when the Commissioners appeared before our committee in behalf of the budget requests for fiscal year 1963, the sum of $300,000 was requested for the Three Sisters Bridge, and $1,876,800 was requested for the Potomac River Freeway. We approved the two requests and the same action took place in the other body. After approving the $300,000 for the Three Sisters Bridge, the committee on the other side decided to include certain language in their committee report, which states as follows:

> In approving the item of $300,000 for construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, the Senate Committee on Appropriations takes this action with the understanding that the District of Columbia Highway Department will not proceed with the project until the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency has been submitted in November 1962, and if that report is against the Three Sisters Bridge, the Commissioners shall proceed with the construction of the bridge unless before March 1, 1963, action to negate such construction shall have been taken by either the Senate Committee on Appropriations or the House Committee on Appropriations.

Under no circumstances would we agree to such language and so informed the conferees on the other side. They refused to yield and a stalemate resulted.

I offered language to the conferees which states that the committee of conference is agreed that construction of the Three Sisters Bridge should proceed according to the plan set forth in the budget, in the amount of $300,000 as provided in the bill. The conferees on the other side refused to drop the language in their report and to accept this language. We refused to yield and, after several days, the vote of the conferees on the other side was tied 4 to 4. The chairman of the full committee on the other side had another conferee named and the Senate finally yielded to the House. The conference report contains the language offered by me under the statement on the part of the managers, and takes the place of the Senate language contained in the Senate committee's report.

The action insisted upon by the House assures the city of Washington that the freeway program will proceed and there is a place in our Capital City for both freeways and rapid transit.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which is in balance. In fact, the bill provides for $17,255,000 in surplus for the District of Columbia. This, I am told, is ample to meet the pending pay increases as a result of the legislative action which we took in the House and in the Senate this last week.

This is a bill which provides, in my opinion, things the District of Columbia needs in the way of funds for the next fiscal year. Some of the things provided in this bill are schoolbooks, among others. We have heard on the floor of the House and we have seen in the press that the schoolbooks which some of the children in the District of Columbia must use are obsolete; they are in bad condition. All of it to some extent is true.

The conferees appropriated every cent of money which the school system said was needed to replace all obsolescent and wornout books. So it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that no longer will we have the spectacle of children who go to the District of Columbia schools walking around with tattered books, many of which were written some 25 years ago, containing material which is not only obsolescent but obsolete.

Also I think it is fair to state that we have done a good job on the physical plant of the schools of the District of Columbia. There is money in this bill for the acquisition of a site and for the planning for replacement of the Hine Junior High School. That is one of the eyesores of the whole District school system, a building the upper stories of which were condemned after a fire that occurred some years ago. This will provide the necessary money for beginning the job of building a new junior high school.

Also we have provided funds for further enlargement of Junior Village. We have provided funds for the construction of additional cottages and an increase in the capacity of that very vital installation.

I think one of the outstanding jobs that has been done as far as the District is concerned since I have been a Member of Congress was done by the committee of the other body, in the welfare program. They held long hearings and they came up with a report which I think makes a lot of sense and certainly brings to light circumstances which none of us ever dreamed existed. They made very sound recommendations for the correction of those matters, and they are included in this conference report.

I might say also that in giving credit to the committee on the other side I would feel remiss if I did not also mention the fact that the committee on this side of the Capitol, in my estimation, under the very able chairmanship of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has also done as good a job in this field as I have seen done since I have been a Member of Congress.

In my opinion, this bill will in many ways settle many of the questions which existed in the operation of the District of Columbia. But, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than candid if I did not say that many questions still remain unsolved. The District of Columbia has all of the problems inherent in any city, in any State and, in fact, any county; and those problems are still with them, but I think we have made a fairly good start on dealing with many of them.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman, but I want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee for insisting on an appropriation for the Three Sisters Bridge and including it in this bill. I have no particular interest in this one segment of the highway system that has been proposed for the District of Columbia, but I think it is about time that the House took a firm position in support of continued progress on a highway program for the District. It appears that anyone who has an objection to one particular connection or one particular interchange can object and immediately a "hold" is put on that increment. The result is to destroy the usefulness of the whole circumferential system or the inner and the outer loop as well. So I think it is particularly important and to be appreciated that the House subcommittee held firm on this one item at least so it does provide a connection that will provide one loop that will eventually be complete and make available a bypass for the District.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman, of course, is correct. This will go a long way toward helping solve the dilemma of the District of Columbia highway system. But this is one of the remaining problems to which I had reference and, believe me, this problem is not solved and it will not be solved for quite some time. I do feel the action taken by the conferees goes a long way toward a solution.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I note by the headlines in the paper this morning that Central Intelligence Agency funds apparently are being contemplated to be used for the purpose of paying ransom to Castro. The gentleman is a very distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations. I would like to ask the gentleman, Does he know of any authority voted by the Congress for any funds that the President could possibly use, or anyone else, as a matter of fact, for this purpose?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May I say to the gentleman from Florida, as far as funds for the Central Intelligence Agency are concerned, the amount of those funds and the purposes for which they are to be used, is one of the best and most closely guarded secrets in Washington. I am not sure it is such a closely guarded secret in Moscow, but it is in Washington. I do not know too much about it. This is true of all the members of the Committee on Appropriations. This appropriation is handled by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not happen to be on that subcommittee, therefore I am unable to answer the gentleman's question. I do not know, of my own knowledge, of any law either authorizing such funds to be used or appropriating such funds for that purpose. If, indeed, such funds have been appropriated, I am ignorant of that fact.

Mr. CRAMER. I may say so far as I am concerned I certainly have never knowingly or intentionally voted for any funds for such purpose, and I do not know that any other Member of the House did.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. I agree with him.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question and to make an observation.

My question is this: Is there any money in this bill for the newly approved project in the District of Columbia known as the $10 million fish bowl?

Mr. NATCHER. This bill contains no funds for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

May I commend the gentleman and the members of his subcommittee for standing fast with respect to language dealing with the so-called rapid transit project in the District of Columbia. This, as I understand it, might very well involve some several hundred million dollars.

As I further understand the situation, no one is in a position as of this time to state how this money should be expended. I compliment the gentleman from Kentucky and the members of his subcommittee for their tenacity in dealing with the other body in this respect.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman, and will say he is absolutely correct about the rapid transit system.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the able gentleman from Kentucky and his fellow managers on the conference committee, and also the members of the Appropriations Committees of both bodies for their diligent work. I am particularly pleased that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] mentioned the work of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia in the other body. I have been impressed by the fine leadership which has been provided for the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, as evidenced by the thorough investigations conducted into the welfare program of the District of Columbia. These investigations have been carried on above and beyond the call of average legislative duty, and represent a fine contribution to the work of Congress.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend this fine committee, its chairman, and the ranking members, for the fine job which it has done on this bill.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal of controversy among the conferees on this appropriation bill concerning a delay in the proposed construction of the Three Sisters Island Bridge across the Potomac River. The District of Columbia's share of the cost of this construction is in the amount of $300,000, and was included in this bill by both houses of Congress.

The controversy, however, was over language added to the bill by the Senate Committee which provided veto power for the Senate Appropriations Committee, wherein they could halt the commencement of construction of the bridge during the next 5 months. It is my understanding that the objections of the House conferees to this language was over whether or not the House Appropriations Committee should be permitted to have the same veto power.

I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that I advised some of the conferees that I supported the veto power being included in the bill, and, in fact, would have preferred both Houses having the veto power, due to the fact that there is some feeling that the pending report from the National Capital Transportation Agency, due on November 1, 1962, might show that the construction of this facility may not be necessary. Of course, if this situation does occur I feel that provision should be made to halt construction and therefore I would support any provision to delay construction of this facility until the report is evaluated.

Now, however, the Senate has receded from their insistence on their position and we now find that the appropriation for construction of the bridge contains no restriction to the commencement of construction whatsoever.

As all Members of the House of Representatives know, I have fought continuously for additional river crossings and highway improvements in the metropolitan area throughout the years of my service in the Congress. I have likewise supported appropriations for the construction of the Three Sisters Island Bridge. However, we must recognize that in recent months objections have developed, some of which are from people in my congressional district, to the construction of the bridge, since there is a possibility that a pending rapid transit program may eliminate the necessity for this construction.

The 86th Congress approved a law creating the National Capital Transportation Agency, which was instructed to make a report recommending a mass transit system; showing a need for such a system, the cost of such a system, the financial feasibility and how its costs would be repaid. There is speculation that this report, which is due on November 1, may well show that the Three Sisters Island Bridge is not needed. Furthermore, a subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee has expressed the desirability of holding up any further highway construction of this type which might be proven unnecessary in the report I just referred to.

In view of the fact that this report is forthcoming in the immediate future, I feel that the record should clearly show that even though appropriations have been granted without restrictions the District Commissioners should delay commencement of construction of this facility until the National Capital Transportation Agency report is received and thoroughly evaluated.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to see unnecessary delay in the construction of any of our needed transportation facilities in the National Capital area, but, in view of the statements I have just made, as well as the resolution recently issued by a subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee, I would urge that the District Commissioners proceed very slowly with developing their plans for this facility during the next 5-months period, until Congress has had an opportunity to consider and act on the National Capital Transportation Agency report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: On page 3, strike out "$16,005,000" and insert "$15,992,600".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,974,250".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: On page 6, strike out "amended" and insert: "and the limitation of $6,000 included under the heading 'Public Schools' in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, for services of experts and consultants is hereby increased to $7,600."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: On page 6, strike out $8,377,000 and insert "$8,361,800."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,359,800."

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 7, insert "and for care and treatment of indigent patients in institutions, including those under sectarian control, under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health;".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: On page 7, strike out "$66,528,000" and insert "$65,508,100".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$65,386,300".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: On page 7, insert: "*Provided*, That the inpatient rate and outpatient rate under such contracts and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed $32 per diem and the outpatient rate shall not exceed $5 per visit: *Provided further*,".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 10, line 2, insert "and three children's cottages".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: On page 10, line 19, insert "*Provided*, That not to exceed $300,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under the heading 'Capital Outlay' shall be available for purchase of furniture and equipment for new dormitories at the District of Columbia Village."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: On page 12, line 4, strike out "seventy five" and insert "one hundred and twenty-five (fifty for investigators in the Department of Public Welfare)".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: On page 15, line 4, insert: "Sec. 16. The salary of the Controller for the Department of Public Welfare shall be at the rate of Grade GS-16 and the Commissioners are authorized to appoint supervisors of investigators for the Department of Public Welfare at Grade GS-11 and investigators at Grade GS-9."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Natcher moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record a chart concerning the operating expenses and capital outlay at this point.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1963

Item	Budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Operating expenses	$242,428,200	$237,546,000	$237,002.300	$236,735,350	−$5,692,850	−$810,650	−$266,950
Capital outlay	57,733,278	52,513,000	52,251,000	52,251,000	−5,482,278	−262,000	
Total	300,161,478	290,059,000	289,253,300	288,986,350	−11,175,128	−1,072,650	−266,950

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks; and that all Members have 3 legislative days to extend their remarks in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1962

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 2549)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

"Sec. 4. For the purpose of completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $32,000,000 to be expended in accordance with the provisions of section 212 of title 23 of the United States Code: *Provided*, That no part of such sum shall be obligated in any country until that country demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that it is capable of and willing to meet its commitment for maintenance under the agreements entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(5) of title 23, United States Code. Not to exceed $12,000,000 of the funds authorized herein shall be available for contract immediately upon enactment of this Act in compliance with such commitment, except that such contract authority shall be reduced by such amounts as are appropriated for construction of the Inter-American Highway by the Eighty-seventh Congress, second session."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"ALASKA HIGHWAY STUDY

"Sec. 13. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State of Alaska, is hereby authorized to make engineering studies and estimates and planning surveys relative to a highway construction program for the State of Alaska, and, in accordance with treaties or other agreements to be negotiated with Canada by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, engineering studies, estimates, and planning surveys relative to connecting Alaskan roads with Canadian roads at the International boundary.

"(b) On or before May 15, 1964, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress which shall include—

"(1) an analysis of the adequacy of the Federal-aid highway program to provide for a satisfactory program in both the populated and the undeveloped areas in Alaska;

"(2) specific recommendations as to the construction of roads through undeveloped areas of Alaska and connection of such roads with Canadian roads at the International boundary; and

"(3) a feasible program for implementing such specific recommendations, including cost estimates, recommendations as to the sharing of cost responsibilities, and other pertinent matters.

"(c) From time to time, either before or after submission of the report provided for in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary of Commerce may submit recommendations to the Congress with respect to the construction of particular highways to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed as creating any obligation in the Congress, express or implied, to carry out the recommendations referred to in subsections (b) and (c).

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended, the sum of $800,000 for the purpose of making the studies, surveys, and report authorized by subsections (a) and (b) hereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

George H. Fallon,
John C. Kluczynski,
Robert E. Jones,
William C. Cramer,
John F. Baldwin, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Robert S. Kerr,
Pat McNamara,
Jennings Randolph,
John Sherman Cooper,
Hiram L. Fong,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 3: The House bill provided an authorization of $16,000,000 for parkways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. Senate amendment No. 3 provided for an authorization of $16,550,000 for such purpose. It is the intention of the conferees that nothing shall be construed as specifically earmarking any of this authorization for particular projects in particular States. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: The House bill provided authorization of $3,000,000 for public lands highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Senate amendment No. 4 provided authorization of an additional $6,000,000 for public lands highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; and $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. It is the intention of the conferees that nothing shall be construed as specifically earmarking any of this authorization for particular projects in particular States. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: The House bill contained no comparable provision. Senate amendment No. 5 provides for the completion of the Rama Road with an additional authorization of $850,000 for that purpose. It requires that survey and construction work shall be under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce and requires the expenditure of funds to be under the conditions set forth in section 213 of title 23 of the United States Code which apply to the authorization contained in that section. It also authorizes funds to be available for contract immediately. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: The House bill contains no comparable provision. Senate amendment No. 6 authorizes an additional appropriation of $32,000,000 for the completion of the Inter-American Highway. This sum is to be expended in accordance with section 212 of title 23 of the United States Code. No part of that sum shall be obligated in any country until it demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Commerce that it is capable of and willing to meet its commitment for maintenance. These sums are authorized to be available for contract immediately on passage of the Act and compliance with the commitment. The House recedes with an amendment which is identical with the Senate amendment, except that there is imposed a restriction of not to exceed $12,000,000 on the contractual authority, with the further limitation that this $12,000,000 contractual authority shall be reduced by any amounts appropriated for the Inter-American Highway during this session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

Amendment No. 16: Senate amendment No. 16 requires the Secretary of Commerce to make engineering studies and estimates and planning surveys relative to the Alaska highway construction program, including possible interconnections between Alaskan and Canadian highways, requires detailed reports to Congress, authorizes the submission of recommendations to Congress, disclaims the creation of any obligation on the part of Congress to carry out these recommendations, and authorizes the expenditure of $800,000 to carry out these purposes. The House bill contained no such provision. The House recedes with an amendment which is the same as the Senate amendment except for clarification of certain language to insure that there is no authority to make any extraterritorial study, estimate, or plan of highways in Canada.

Amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15: These amendments are clerical; the House recedes.

George H. Fallon,
John C. Kluczynski,
Robert E. Jones,
William C. Cramer,
John F. Baldwin, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the difference between the bill the House passed and the bill passed by the other body amounted to $51,400,000 more than the House bill, as we came out of conference.

The additions put in on the Senate side to which the House agreed were, Public Lands and Highways, for 3 years, in the amount of $18 million; an increase of $550,000 on parkways; and $850,000 for the completion of the Rama Road. Also $32 million for the American Highway completion and $800,000 for the Alaskan study.

Mr. Speaker, the committee held hearings on all these items that were not in the House bill that were included in the Senate bill. The conferees were very familiar with the need for these items that were included in the House bill to which the conferees receded and concurred in the Senate amendments.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman, the chairman of this very important subcommittee, who has given great leadership throughout the years to this highway legislation. This conference comes back with a unanimous agreement. I think the conferees accomplished some good end results. We certainly did not capitulate to the other body. For instance, we took out $10 million that had been put in for forest roads and trails. The other body had increased the amount from $10 million to $20 million. We were able to get the conferees to agree on the ABC authorizations consistent with the basic law and understanding of the ABC system, on a rate of $25 million per year going to $1 billion at that rate.

Therefore, the conferees agreed to accept the House version of the 1960 authorization for ABC at $950 million; that the 1965 authorization shall be $975 million, that being $25 million over the Senate version. Those of us on the committee have felt for some time that this having been understood and agreeable to the committee and in the basic authorization, this should be complied with and that all the States could rely on this.

On parkways $550,000 was added but, consistent with my views and those of the conferees on the House side the Senate receded on the question of earmarking funds in the parkways program. I have been opposed and remain opposed in this program, which is traditionally a lump sum amount program, to earmarking projects.

On the public lands highways the conferees acceded to the Senate position. On the Inter-American Highway the amendments of the House conferees were agreed to.

On the Alaskan Highway study authorization, pursuant to the House bill, the conferees took the language requested by the House conferees, to make certain that the studies that are made would not authorize either in the form of studies or by implication future construction of any highways, extraterritorial highways, highways outside the territorial limits and boundaries of Alaska. But it does permit consideration to be given to how highways shall be connected up with—obviously the Canadian highways.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good conference report and I recommend its adoption.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to serve on the committee of conference which was headed on the House side by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon]. It has been a privilege to serve with him for the last 8 years on the Roads Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works. I have admired his fairness and integrity in all the hearings and executive sessions and all the negotiations on this highway bill. The House was represented ably by our House conferees headed by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Fallon] in the conference.

I share the views of all the other conferees who have spoken that this is a fair and equitable conference report. There was a point in this session where there was some doubt as to whether the Senate was going to request any conference on the highway bill and there was considerable concern on the part of many of the State highway departments that possibly Congress might not take any action on this bill this year. From a date standpoint this bill could have been carried over to January because it applies to the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, but as a practical matter many of the departments need a good deal of leadtime for advance engineering designs and plans and to take the necessary time to put in their own budgets the amounts they will require from Federal funds. Therefore, from the standpoint of keeping the Federal-State highway program moving as quickly as possible, it is highly desirable that we pass this legislation now in this session of Congress.

I am glad we have been able to arrive at an agreement and bring it back to the House in time for passage before adjournment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think it might be well to point out that as in the case of parkways the conferees also agreed that on public lands highways where there was a substantial increase in funds, even though the Senate report contains specific States where this amount was contemplated to be spent, it was the view of the conferees on our side, and the Senate agreed to go along with it, that these additional funds would not be earmarked to any specific States nor denied to any other States who have public land highways. Otherwise, it would not be fair or equitable.

I congratulate the gentleman from California for being one that led that fight in that his State would have been denied these funds otherwise. Is that not correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. The gentleman from Florida has made an accurate statement of the agreement which was arrived at by all conferees on both sides, that no funds in this bill should be given any priority as to any State whatsoever.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the conferees on the fine work they have done on this program, the Federal Highway Act of 1962. I support the conference report. I think the conferees have done a fine job for the United States.

I want particularly to express my thanks and appreciation to the conferees for accepting the provisions of the bill with reference to the public lands highway. I testified before the committee in the House and the committee in the Senate on the need for a road under this program in the Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas and Oklahoma. This recreation and scenic road is between Mena, Ark., in my district and U.S. Highway No. 271. It runs over into the State of Oklahoma, the district represented by the distinguished majority leader of the House. We jointly have been interested in this. It is one of those projects that qualifies to be included for construction with the authorization. It will be about 55 miles long and estimated to cost about $7 million.

I want to thank the conferees, particularly the chairman, for his courteous consideration of this matter in which our people are so tremendously interested.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the other body put in this provision concerning the Rama Road?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thought we were told in the House some 3 years ago that the authorization at that time would be the last dollar to be spent on the Rama Road, yet here I find in this bill $850,000 or nearly $1 million more. When is this thing going to end?

Mr. FALLON. I understand it ends after this last 5 miles is completed so that it will be an all-purpose road or all-weather road from San Benito to Rama. This is the last 5 miles of the 155 miles going from the Inter-American Highway to the Pacific Coast.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says this is the last money that we will be called upon to spend on the Rama Road?

Mr. FALLON. That is the assurance that was given to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman is more right on that than was the information given the House some 3 years ago when we were told there would not be another dime going to the Rama Road.

Mr. FALLON. May I say to the gentleman I share the same hope as the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and I hope this is the end.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report on the bill, H.R. 12135. It was a pleasure to serve on the conference committee with such outstanding gentlemen as the father of the Interstate Highway System, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and also with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN]. As I say, it was a pleasure to serve with them on the committee and I believe the committee has done a fine job. I think that the Members of the House should be proud of the outstanding work they have done both in the Committee on Public Works and also in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report and know that it will be overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY AND RETIREMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1962

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 2550)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The Act entitled 'An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 521, ch. 569), as amended, is amended, as follows:

"(1) Section 1 is amended by striking everything after the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following salary schedules:

"'Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9
Class 1: Superintendent of Schools	$19,000								
Class 2: Deputy superintendent	16,500								
Class 3: Assistant superintendent; president, teachers college	14,350	$14,600	$14,850	$15,100	$15,350	$15,600	$15,850	$16,100	$16,350
Class 4: Director, curriculum; dean, teachers college	12,700	12,950	13,200	13,450	13,700	13,950	14,200	14,450	14,700
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	11,000	11,250	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000
Group B, master's degree	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,700	11,950	12,200	12,450	12,700	12,950	13,200	13,450	13,700
Chief examiner.									
Director, food services.									
Director, industrial and adult education.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Psychiatrist.									

" 'Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	$11,050	$11,300	$11,550	$11,800	$12,050	$12,300	$12,550	$12,800	$13,050
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,250	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization School.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	10,350	10,600	10,850	11,100	11,350	11,600	11,850	12,100	12,350
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050	12,300	12,550
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Director in elementary education.									
Director, special education.									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850	11,100	11,350	11,600	11,850
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,050	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization School.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Director, school attendance.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	8,940	9,190	9,440	9,690	9,940	10,190	10,440	10,690	10,940
Group B, master's degree	9,440	9,690	9,940	10,190	10,440	10,690	10,940	11,190	11,440
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,640	9,890	10,140	10,390	10,640	10,890	11,140	11,390	11,640
Assistant director, food services.									
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	9,030	9,280	9,530	9,780	10,030	10,280	10,530	10,780	11,030
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	9,230	9,480	9,730	9,980	10,230	10,480	10,730	10,980	11,230
Assistant director, adult education and summer schools.									
Statistician.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	8,620	8,870	9,120	9,370	9,620	9,870	10,120	10,370	10,620
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,820	9,070	9,320	9,570	9,820	10,070	10,320	10,570	10,820
Assistant director, audiovisual.									
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	8,210	8,460	8,710	8,960	9,210	9,460	9,710	9,960	10,210
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,410	8,666	8,910	9,160	9,410	9,660	9,910	10,160	10,410
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	7,395	7,710	8,025	8,340	8,655	8,970	9,285	9,600	9,915
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,595	7,910	8,225	8,540	8,855	9,170	9,485	9,800	10,115
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Psychiatric social worker.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									

" 'Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7
Class 14:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$6,030	$6,285	$6,540	$6,795	$7,050	$7,305	$7,560
Group B, master's degree	6,530	6,785	7,040	7,295	7,550	7,805	8,060
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	6,730	6,985	7,240	7,495	7,750	8,005	8,260

" 'Salary class and position	Service step 8	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13
Class 14:						
Group A, bachelor's degree	$7,815	$8,070	$8,525	$8,580	$8,835	$9,090
Group B, master's degree	8,315	8,570	8,825	9,080	9,335	9,590
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,515	8,770	9,025	9,280	9,535	9,790

" 'Salary class and position	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8
Class 15:								
Group A, bachelor's degree	$5,000	$5,200	$5,520	$5,735	$5,950	$6,165	$6,380	$6,595
Group B, master's degree	5,500	5,700	6,020	6,235	6,450	6,665	6,880	7,095
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	5,700	5,900	6,220	6,435	6,650	6,865	7,080	7,295
Attendance officer.								
Census supervisor.								
School psychologist.								
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.								
Instructor, teachers college.								
Instructor, laboratory school.								
Child labor inspector.								
Counselor, placement.								
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.								
Librarian, teachers college.								
Research assistant.								
School social worker.								
Speech correctionist.								
Coordinator of practical nursing.								
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.								

" 'Salary class and position	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13	Longevity step X	Longevity step Y
Class 15:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$6,810	$7,025	$7,240	$7,455	$7,670	$8,190	$8,710
Group B, master's degree	7,310	7,525	7,740	7,955	8,170	8,690	9,210
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,510	7,725	7,940	8,155	8,370	8,890	9,410
Attendance officer.							
Census supervisor.							
School psychologist.							
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.							
Instructor, teachers college.							
Instructor, laboratory school.							
Child labor inspector.							
Counselor, placement.							
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.							
Librarian, teachers college.							
Research assistant.							
School social worker.							
Speech correctionist.							
Coordinator of practical nursing.							
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.'							

"(2) Section 2, subsection (a), is amended by striking from the third sentence 'December 31, 1957' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1962'; by striking from the fourth sentence the words 'counselor in the vocational high schools, counselor in the junior high schools', and the words 'school social workers,', and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the same sentence the following: ', and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was appointed on probationary or permanent status before January 1, 1963, to a position as a nonshop teacher in a vocational education program, or counselor in the vocational high schools, or counselor in the junior high schools may continue to be employed in such a position, and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was on the list of eligible candidates for any such position before January 1, 1963, may continue to be eligible for such position until the expiration of such eligible list'; and by striking from the fifth sentence 'December 31, 1957' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1962'.

"(3) Section 2, subsection (b), is amended by striking the figure '18' wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '15'.

"(4) Section 4 is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 4. Each teacher, school officer, or other employee in the service of the Board on January 1, 1963, who occupies a position held by him on December 31, 1962, under the provisions of this Act, shall be placed in a salary class covered by section 1 of this Act as indicated at the end of this section. Any employee in group A, B, or C of his salary class on December 31, 1962, shall be assigned to the same letter group of the salary class to which he is transferred on January 1, 1963.

" '*Title and class of position on December 31, 1962*

Title	Class
Superintendent	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
Assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers College	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College	4
Chief examiner	5
Dean of students, teachers college	5
Executive assistant to the superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Director, food services	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools)	6
Director, curriculum	4
Director, elementary education (administration)	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	6
Director in elementary education	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety	6
Director, industrial and adult education	5
Director, special education	7
Principal, senior high school	6
Principal, vocational high school	6
Principal, junior high school	7
Registrar, teachers college	7
Principal, Americanization School	7
Principal, junior high school	7
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools	8
Supervising director, athletics	8
Supervising director, curriculum	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget and legislation)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools)	7
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study and atendance)	8
Supervising director, reading clinic	8
Supervising director, subject field	8
Director, school attendance	8
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction	9
Principal, elementary school	8
Principal, Capitol Page School	8
Principal, health school	7
Principal, laboratory school	7
Assistant principal, senior high school	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school	8
Assistant director, food services	9
Assistant principal, junior high school	9
Assistant principal, Americanization School	9
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Assistant principal, elementary school	11
Assistant principal, health school	14
Assistant director, audio-visual instruction	13
Assistant director, evening and summer schools	11
Principal, veterans high school	8
Assistant director, practical nursing	18
Assistant director, subject field	13
Statistician	11
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	10
Assistant professor, laboratory school	16
Chief attendance officer	15
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Clinical psychologist	15
Supervisor, elementary education	13
Psychiatric social worker	16
Attendance officer	18
Census supervisor	18
Child labor inspector	18
Coordinator, practical nursing	18
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools	18
Counselor, placement	18

"'Title and class of position on December 31, 1962—Continued

Title	Class
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	18
Instructor, laboratory schools	18
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools	18
Librarian	18
Research assistant	18
School psychologist	18
School social worker	18
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College	18
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	18

"'Title and class of position on January 1, 1963

Title	Class
Superintendent	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
Assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers College	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College	4
Chief examiner	5
Dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Executive assistant to the superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Director, food services	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools)	6
Director, curriculum	4
Director, elementary education (administration	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	6
Director in elementary education	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety	6
Director, industrial and adult education	5
Director, special education	7
Principal, senior high school	6
Principal, vocational high school	6
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school	6
Registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Principal, Americanization School	6
Principal, junior high school	6
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools	8
Supervising director, athletics	8
Supervising director, curriculum	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction)	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation)	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools)	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance)	6
Supervising director, reading clinic	8
Supervising director, subject field	8
Director, school attendance	8
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction	9
Principal, elementary school	6
Principal, Capitol Page School	6
Principal, health school	6
Principal, laboratory school	6
Assistant principal, senior high school	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school	8
Assistant director, food services	9
Assistant principal, junior high school	8
Assistant principal, Americanization School	8
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	11
Assistant principal, elementary school	8
Assistant principal, health school	8
Assistant director, audio-visual instruction	11
Assistant director, evening and summer schools	10
Principal, veterans high school	6
Assistant director, practical nursing	11
Assistant director, subject field	11
Statistician	10
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	13
Assistant professor, laboratory school	13
Chief attendance officer	12
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College	11
Clinical psychologist	12
Supervisor, elementary education	11
Psychiatric social worker	13
Attendance officer	15
Census supervisor	15
Child labor inspector	15
Coordinator, practical nursing	15
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools	15
Counselor, placement	15
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	15
Instructor, laboratory schools	15
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools	15
Librarian	15
Research assistant	15
School psychologist	15
School social worker	15
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College	15
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools	15'.

"(5) Section 6, subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) On January 1, 1963, each permanent employee assigned to salary classes 2 through 15 in accordance with section 1 and section 4 of this Act shall be assigned to the same numerical service step on the schedule for his salary class, or salary class and group, under this Act as he occupied on December 31, 1962, except that employees assigned to salary class 15 on January 1, 1963, who on December 31, 1962, were on service step 13 shall be assigned to service steps for their respective groups as follows: An employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed fifteen years of creditable service but less than eighteen years shall be assigned to longevity step X, and an employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed eighteen years of creditable service shall be assigned to longevity step Y. In determining years of creditable service for placement on service steps, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the placement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned or who are brought under this Act in accordance with the provisions of section 5.'

"(6) Section 6, subsection (b), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ', except that each employee in salary class 15 shall advance from service step 13 to longevity step X on July 1 following the completion of fifteen years of creditable service; from longevity step X to longevity step Y on July 1 following the completion of eighteen years of creditable service: *Provided,* That beginning with the step increase normally due July 1, 1963, the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of "satisfactory" from his superior officer.'.

"(7) Section 7, subsection (a), is amended by striking the figure '18' both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '15', by striking the figure '17' and inserting in lieu thereof '14', and by striking the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Employees newly appointed or reappointed to positions of assistant professor (salary class 13), chief librarian and associate professor (salary class 11), and professor (salary class 8) shall receive one year of placement credit for each year of satisfactory service, not in excess of five years, in a position of the same or higher rank in a college or university of recognized standing, outside the District of Columbia public schools, as determined by the Board.'

"(8) Section 8, subsection (a), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ', except that beginning with any such step increase normally due subsequent to June 30, 1963, the Board of Education, on written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such increase in salary for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of "satisfactory" from his superior officer.'

"(9) Section 11, (1), is amended by inserting after the word 'increment' the words, 'or longevity increment'.

"(10) Section 13, subsection (a), is amended by striking the classification and pay rates for educational employees in the summer and evening schools and inserting in lieu thereof the following classification and pay rates:

"'Classification	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	Per Diem		
SUMMER SCHOOL (REGULAR)			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools, and instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College	$19.72	$21.69	$23.66
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	22.68	24.94	27.21
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	25.64	28.20	30.76
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools	28.59	31.45	34.31
Supervising director, and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College	28.59	31.45	34.31
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	31.55	34.70	37.86
	Per Diem		
VETERANS' SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL CENTERS			
Teacher	$29.58	$32.54	$35.49
	Per Period		
EVENING SCHOOLS			
Teacher	$5.04	$5.39	$5.79
Assistant principal	6.98	7.68	8.40
Principal	7.71	8.48	9.25'

"(11) Section 13, subsection (b), is amended by striking 'January 1, 1958' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1963'.

"(12) Section 14 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 14. Each employee assigned to salary class 15 in the schedule provided in section 1 of this Act, each assistant professor in salary class 13, each associate professor and chief librarian in salary class 11 and each professor in salary class 8 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in ten monthly installments in accordance with existing law.'

"(13) Section 15 is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 15. On and after January 1, 1963, the Act entitled "An Act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved March 5, 1952, as amended, shall apply to employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed in salary classes 6 through 14, inclusive, under this Act, except the following: Executive assistant to deputy superintendent and assistants to assistant superintendents in salary class 6; dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College, professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, director, school attendance, and registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 8; assistant director, department of food services, in salary class 9; statistician, in salary class 10; associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, and chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 11; and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 13.'

"(14) Section 16 is amended by striking 'January 1, 1958' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1963'; by striking 'salary class 18' and inserting in lieu thereof 'salary class 15'; by striking 'chief librarian and assistant professor, salary class 14' and inserting in lieu thereof 'assistant professor, salary class 13; and chief librarian, salary class 11'.

"SEC. 102. Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended', approved September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 913), is repealed.

"SEC. 103. Sections 101 and 102 of this title shall take effect as of January 1, 1963."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN DOWDY,
BASIL WHITENER,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1447), to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of title I of the Senate bill and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with amendments to the House amendment. The differences between the Senate bill as amended by the House and the bill agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of the agreement reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

The conference action substitutes a new title I for both the House and the Senate versions, which in general follows the provisions of the House bill providing for an overall average increase of approximately 10 percent. Whereas the House amendment placed Senior High School Principals in Salary Class 6, Junior High School and several other principals in Class 7, and Elementary School Principals in Class 8, the conferees' amendment places all principals in Salary Class 6, as was the case in the original Senate bill. A similar amendment by the conferees places all assistant principals in Salary Class 8, as the original Senate bill had provided, whereas the House amendment had distributed them into Classes 8, 9, and 10. Consistent with these changes, the conferees also placed the assistants to the several assistant superintendents in Salary Class 6. This also had been provided in the Senate bill, but in the House amendment thereto they were placed in Classes 6, 7, and 8.

The House amendment contained five position classifications in Salary Class 14. The conferees agreed to incorporate all these positions into Class 15, as had been provided in the Senate bill.

JOHN DOWDY,
BASIL WHITENER,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are the amendments in this bill germane?

Mr. DOWDY. I would like to say to the gentleman that the amendments made were negligible. We sustained 90 percent of the position of the House. They are all germane.

Mr. GROSS. All amendments to this bill are strictly germane to the subject matter of the bill as it passed the House. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And what is the increase above the 10.1 percent that the House approved?

Mr. DOWDY. There is probably a very negligible increase, up to maybe 10.2 percent. I will state it this way. The House bill as we passed it was for $2 million less than the Senate bill. The amendments perhaps will cost $160,000.

Mr. GROSS. This bill deals only with teachers?

Mr. DOWDY. No one was added to the bill who was not in the House bill when it passed this body. That deals with principals, superintendents, and teachers. This is for the assistant superintendents and various professional grades.

Mr. GROSS. The District police are in another bill?

Mr. DOWDY. The police are in another bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED DEDUCTIONS FOR MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical and dental expenses and so forth, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do this for the purpose of going over the Senate amendments with the gentleman as I have been doing heretofore. The basic bill as it passed the House liberalized the maximum dollar limitations on the amount of deductible medical expenses. The first amendment is a bill that passed the House.

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The second amendment is one dealing with new election to deduct intangible drilling and development expenses. This is mostly procedural, and the gentleman has said that the conferees will explore it further. If that is what it is, I think it would conform at least to my concept in these procedural questions.

Third is occupational taxes paid by State liquor stores, which did pass the Ways and Means Committee and passed the House.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Fourth is restoration of amounts held under a claim of right. That looks to be purely procedural, and if it is procedural, that would be all right.

The fifth is very definitely procedural: authority of Internal Revenue criminal investigators to carry certain side arms. The next is definitely nongermane, and I assume the conferees will hold the line.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. This amendment was part of the Revenue Act of 1962 as it went to conference. It was eliminated from that bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Sixth is the exemption for bunker fuel.

Mr. MILLS. That was an amendment to another bill that went to conference and was eliminated. It is identical to language that I understand was eliminated in conference.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But the bunker fuel item——

Mr. MILLS. That was already covered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. By the House conferees?

Mr. MILLS. We were opposed to that on that occasion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. 7 is a very simple proposition. That was attempted to be put in before and was knocked out by the conferees. It should be knocked out again.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. 8 is probably a conforming amendment, of course, but probably that could be done next year.

Mr. MILLS. It is conforming. I understand this conforms the tax to the Small Business Investment Act with the changes that were made by the Congress in that act this year. Very frankly, I admit it could be done next year.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is what I thought.

Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would not object to the matter going to conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. Mills, King of California, Boggs, Mason, and Byrnes of Wisconsin.

AMENDING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9045) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1246; 50 U.S.C., App., sec. 39), is amended to read as follows: 'Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of section 32, 40, 41, 42, or 43 of this Act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946.'

"Sec. 2. The Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following sections:

" 'Sec. 42. (a) As used in this section, the word "trademarks" includes trademarks, trade names, and the goodwill of the business to which a trademark or trade name is appurtenant.

" '(b) Trademarks vested in the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under the provisions of this Act subsequent to December 17, 1941, which have not been returned or otherwise disposed of under this Act, except trademarks vested by vesting orders 284, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 9754, 9 Fed. Reg. 1038), 2354 (8 Fed. Reg. 14635), 5592 (11 Fed. Reg. 1675), and 18805 (17 Fed. Reg. 4364), are hereby divested as a matter of grace, effective the ninety-first day after the date of enactment of this section, and the persons entitled to such trademarks shall on that day succeed to the rights, privileges, and obligations arising therefrom, subject, however, to the rights of licensees under licenses issued by the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General in respect to such trademarks. The rights and interests remaining in the Attorney General under licenses issued by him or by the Alien Property Custodian in respect to trademarks divested hereunder are hereby transferred, effective the day of divestment, to the persons entitled to such trademarks: *Provided*, That all unpaid royalties or other income accrued in favor of the Attorney General under such licenses prior to the day of divestment shall be paid by the licensees to the Attorney General.

" '(c) All rights or interests vested in the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under the provisions of this Act subsequent to December 17, 1941, arising out of prevesting contracts entered into with respect to trademarks, except—

" '(1) royalties or other income received by or accrued in favor of the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under such contracts;

" '(2) rights or interests which have been returned or otherwise disposed of under this Act; and

" '(3) rights or interests vested by vesting orders 284, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 9754; 9 Fed. Reg. 1038), 2354 (8 Fed. Reg. 14635), 5592 (11 Fed. Reg. 1675), and 18805 (17 Fed. Reg. 4364), are hereby divested as a matter of grace, effective the ninety-first day after the date of enactment of this section, and the persons entitled to such rights or interests shall succeed thereto, subject to the right of the Attorney General to collect and receive all unpaid royalties or other income accrued in his favor under such prevesting contracts prior to the day of divestment.

" '(d) The Attorney General shall within forty-five days after the date of enactment of this section publish in the Federal Register a list of trademarks which at the date of vesting in the Alien Property Custodian or Attorney General were owned by persons who were resident in or had their sole or primary seat in the area of Germany now in the Soviet Zone of Occupation or in the Soviet sector of Berlin or in German territory under provisional Soviet or Polish administration. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the effective date of divestment of the trademarks so listed and published in the Federal Register shall be the date of publication in the Federal Register by the Secretary of State of a certification identifying the cases in which an equivalent trademark has been registered in the Federal Republic of Germany for a person residing or having its sole or primary seat in the Federal Republic of Germany or in the western sectors of Berlin. In those cases of an equivalent trademark certified by the Secretary of State, the person registered by the Federal Republic of Germany as owner of such equivalent trademark shall succeed to the ownership of the divested trademark in the United States.

" 'Sec. 42. (a) The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Library of Congress the title to all prints of motion pictures now in the custody of the Library, which prints were vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General pursuant to this Act after December 17, 1941, except prints of motion pictures which are the subject of suits or claims under section 9(a) or section 32 of this Act.

" '(b) Subject to the right of selection by the Library of Congress, the authorization, direction, and exception contained in subsection (a) hereof shall apply with respect to such prints now in the custody of the Attorney General. Prints not selected by the Library of Congress may be disposed of by the Attorney General in any manner he deems appropriate.

" '(c) With respect to all prints concerning which title is transferred to the Library of Congress pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) hereof, the Library shall have complete discretion to retain such prints and to reproduce copies thereof, or to dispose of them in any manner it deems appropriate.' "

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to explain the changes made by the Senate amendment in H.R. 9045.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to do so. It will be recalled this bill, H.R. 9045, was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 31 of this year. It was a unanimous report from the committee, and it was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives.

The bill, by way of reminding the House of the provisions of the bill, would divest a Government interest in copyrights, trademarks, and unexpired copyright contract interests.

The bill would authorize the transfer of all vested motion picture films and prints to the Library of Congress, and the Library in turn would be given the discretion to retain or dispose of such prints. This property was vested in the United States, as you will recall, under the Trading With the Enemy Act during or following World War II.

The bill terminates administration by the Attorney General of the property described. In the absence of legislation, the administration setup would continue indefinitely.

As the bill passed the House on August 13, 1962, it would accomplish the purposes just briefly explained.

The Senate inadvertently included only one-half of the bill; that is, that portion dealing with copyrights, when they consolidated it with the War Claims and Trading With the Enemy measure into one omnibus bill, you will recall, H.R. 7283. That bill, H.R. 7283, has been agreed to and finally passed, and is now awaiting the signature of the President.

Yesterday, the other body having discovered the inadvertence of leaving out part of the provisions of the bill, called it up and amended this bill, H.R. 9045, to include the other half of the bill that they had left out.

What this does is approve that part of the bill having to do with trademarks as the copyright provision contained in the bill passed a few days ago.

This completes the program.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPECTED SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that the leadership is making every possible effort to reach sine die adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that all Members will remain in Washington and at the Capitol until we have disposed of the necessary legislative business. The lack of a quorum, of course, could delay adjournment. It is therefore very, very important that the Members stay here until a sine die adjournment resolution has been agreed to.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. We are all delighted, of course, to hear that the leadership is driving for adjournment. But the gentleman from Oklahoma did not say at what time they are driving for adjournment. Is the gentleman anticipating that that might occur today yet?

Mr. ALBERT. I will not rule that out, but I certainly am most anxious that we adjourn the Congress before the end of the week.

Mr. AVERY. If the gentleman will yield further, I can assure the gentleman of the support of everyone on this side of the aisle on that subject.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Would the majority leader say that it is now the intention of the leadership that it is pressing with every effort to try to get out tonight?

Mr. ALBERT. We shall try to get out tonight, if we can resolve certain matters which have to be resolved. We have to get conference reports up by unanimous consent. That would be one of the contingencies.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say to the distinguished majority leader that I have every confidence in his great ability as an outstanding and strong leader. With the help of the distinguished Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Iowa will allow these conference reports to come up by unanimous consent, as the gentleman said, if the gentleman had some time in which to study them before they came up. I really believe that with all of this cooperation on the part of everyone we can get out of here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I hope he has the same confidence in other Members of this body and the other body and that the gentleman's confidence is well founded.

ADJOURNMENT BY THE WEEKEND?

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] if the problems of the House remain in status quo for today and tomorrow, will we adjourn without taking the bills which are in conference?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, as the gentlewoman from New York knows, there are outstanding appropriation bills on which action must be had prior to adjournment. It is hoped that action can be had on all of the bills that are now in conference, and it is expected that action will be had.

EMERGENCY OFFICER'S RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8517) to grant emergency officer's retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 2, after line 11, insert:
>
> "The limitations of time contained in section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, are hereby waived in favor of Walter J. Johnson (Veterans' Administration claim numbered C–6048500), and his application for benefits under chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such chapter if he applies for such benefits within the six-month period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is only one Senate amendment to this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is only one Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. And, it is strictly germane; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is not germane.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, I think we had better have an explanation of the Senate amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I shall be glad to give the gentleman an explanation.

Mr. Speaker, the basic bill is a veterans bill that passed by a unanimous-consent request. There is no money involved. The amendment of the Senate is really a bill which came from the Judiciary Committee which gives a veteran who lost his hand in World War II $1,600. It was passed by the Committee on the Judiciary as a private bill. It went to the other body and they attached it to our veterans bill. This bill has been cleared with the Committee on the Judiciary, on the minority and majority sides, the leadership on both sides, and by Mr. CURTIS, I hope.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not know why my name was brought in. It was not cleared with me, but I am very happy to have this procedure followed when there are nongermane amendments, that they be explained; and if they are explained in this fashion I, myself, would have no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that this was cleared with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] a member of the subcommittee, and by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], who is the ranking member and who is now present.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE NEXT PRESIDENT AFTER PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a pledge. If we get out of here tonight, at the end of the second Kennedy administration I am going to flip a coin for the next President of the United States to succeed President Kennedy. On one side of the coin will be our beloved Speaker; on the other side our beloved majority leader. If working together they will get us out of here tonight, either MCCORMACK or ALBERT, the flip of the coin deciding, is entitled to be the next President of the United States following the second Kennedy administration.

KNOWLES DAM PROJECT

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 10, my colleague, the gentleman from Montana, the Honorable ARNOLD OLSEN, from the First Congressional District, made a statement on the floor of the House to the effect that since news of the inclusion of the proposed 1963 public works bill that he had received over 200 telegrams in favor of the project and none against. He inserted in the RECORD those telegrams.

So that the House may know that the question of the construction of Knowles Dam in Montana is a most highly controversial issue in that State, and that there are people in the State of Montana who oppose this project, I should like to give the House the benefit of the communications I have had upon this subject. First let me state that my mail would indicate that this issue is one of the most important to Montanans during my term in Congress. The Knowles project is not in my district. However, because of the intense interest of the State of Montana in this project, I feel it my duty to set the record straight with respect to the feeling of the people of Montana about this project.

To date, I have received in my office 774 letters on the subject of the Knowles project. While a few of these letters are from out of the State of Montana, 97 percent are an expression from within

Montana. Thirty-one of the communications indicated they favored the construction of Knowles Dam. Seven hundred forty-one of the communications expressed vigorous objections to the project, and two letters merely requested information on Knowles. Many of the opposing communications were signed by as many as 200 people. The bulk of the correspondence indicates a real and sincere concern about the wisdom of the construction of this project.

In addition, I have received many resolutions from various organizations in the area affected by this project and throughout Montana, which I think is of interest to the House.

The organizations which have indicated to me by resolution that they favor the Knowles project are as follows:

Cascade County Trades & Labor Assembly.

Board of Trustees of Mid-Yellowstone Electric Cooperative, Hysham, Mont.

South Valley County Farmers Union.

Montana Council of Cooperatives.

Yellowstone Valley Cooperative, Huntley, Mont.

Montana State AFL-CIO.

Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, Sun River Lodge No. 456.

The organizations which have indicated their opposition to the Knowles project by resolution sent to me are:

County Commissioners of Lake County, Mont.

Polson, Mont., Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Polson Chamber of Commerce.

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation.

Western Montana Citizens Committee.

Montana State Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Ravalli County Farm Bureau.

Kalispell Chamber of Commerce.

Montana Fish and Game Commission.

Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Local No. 652.

Western Montana Stockmen's Association.

Camas Prairie Grange.

Montana Farm Bureau.

Montana Reclamation Association.

Montana Water Users' Association.

Flathead Lakers' Inc., a nonprofit corporation of approximately 800 members and taxpayers of Lake and Flathead Counties, Mont.

Little Bitterroot Landowners' Association.

The Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest.

Flathead Sweet Cherry Growers' Association.

Jocko Valley Irrigation District.

Flathead Irrigation District.

Mission Irrigation District, St. Ignatius, Mont.

Montana Stockgrowers Association.

Montana Wildlife Federation.

Montana Bankers Association.

Montana Chamber of Commerce.

Paradise Parent Teachers Association.

Montana State Water Conservation Board.

Western Montana Fish & Game Association.

Eastshoremen, Inc., Bigfork, Mont.

City Council of Ronan, Mont.

Ronan Area Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Western Montana Beetgrowers' Association.

Round Butte Grange.

Montana Electrical Contractors' Association.

Elmo Electric Cooperative Association, Inc.

Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board.

Polson Indian Livestock Association.

Dixon Indian Livestock Association.

Mission Range Stock Association.

Valley Creek Indian Livestock Association.

Rosebud-Treasure Wildlife Association, Hysham, Mont.

Jocko Stock Association.

Bozeman Chamber of Commerce, Bozeman, Mont.

Hobson Women's Club, Hobson, Mont.

Plains Grange No. 101.

Hoo-Hoo Club—Fraternal Order of Lumbermen, Missoula, Mont.

Leon Grange No. 131 of St. Ignatius, Mont.

Montana County Commissioners Association, District No. 8.

School District No. 8 of Sanders County.

Polson Valley Grange No. 144, Polson, Mont.

Malta Chamber of Commerce, Malta, Mont.

Malta Irrigation District.

Glasgow Irrigation District.

City Council of Polson, Mont.

LaSalle Grange of Flathead County, Mont.

Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Townsend, Mont.

Indian Rights Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Miles City Chamber of Commerce, Miles City, Mont.

Nyah Grange No. 133, Hot Springs, Mont.

Ronan Chamber of Commerce, Ronan, Mont.

Kalispell Chamber of Commerce, Kalispell, Mont.

Montana Wood Products Association.

Every Governor of the State of Montana, since this project was first proposed, has strongly indicated the opposition of the State of Montana to the project. Those Governors are: the late Gov. Sam C. Ford, Gov. John W. Bonner, Gov. J. Hugo Aronson, the late Gov. Donald G. Nutter, and the present Gov. Tim Babcock.

It is evident to me that the people of Montana and the area to be affected by this project, are overwhelmingly against it. It is certainly not a project which should be included in any rivers and harbors bill before it has had thorough hearings in the Public Works Committee or the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

It would appear to me that there is a serious jurisdictional question that the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has the authority to authorize this project, since it is to be built and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation. The jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation rests with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House. Additionally, there are serious problems involving the treaty rights of the Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation in which power sites which would be flooded by the Knowles project were specifically reserved to the tribes. This is a subject which also falls within the jurisdiction of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

My distinguished colleague in his statement to the House said that the Knowles project will irrigate more than 21,000 acres. The feasibility study of the Corps of Army Engineers shows absolutely no irrigation benefits from this project. In recent Senate hearings Mr. Holum, Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Development of the Department of the Interior, indicated that the Bureau of Reclamation had not made a feasibility study of this project. So that to say that this project would irrigate some 21,000 acres of land simply is not substantiated by the studies so far made on the project. One thing is certain, however, this project inundates 59,000 acres of Montana land in two counties. It floods over 9,500 acres of good, fertile, highly productive irrigated land now in production. It displaces over 1,300 residents of Montana who must seek new homes and new opportunities to make a livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I must take issue with my good friend and colleague, Mr. OLSEN, and urge the conferees of the public works bill to reject the Knowles project until the people of Montana have had an opportunity to present their views on this subject to a proper committee of the House of Representatives. To date, they have not been accorded that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks two petitions which I have received from the area directly affected by this project, signed by over 265 people indicating their strenuous opposition to this project:

Hearings held in this area in the past on the Knowles-Paradise Dam project prove that the opponents of this project are in the majority 3 to 1. We are opposed to the inclusion of the Knowles Dam project in the rivers and harbors omnibus bill without first conducting a public hearing on this project in this area.

O. J. Murphy, Paradise; H. G. Sears, Paradise; E. L. Sears, Paradise; B. K. Ekinan, Paradise; W. E. Meredith, Plains; H. C. Mathies, Paradise; Charles E. Porter, Paradise; Arthur Fortner, Paradise; H. W. Pickering, Paradise; R. A. Delus, Plains; Fay D. Sears, Paradise; E. O. Willcutt, Paradise; F. R. Minear, Paradise; E. W. Farrington, Plains; H. D. Wagenius, Paradise; C. E. Herman, Paradise.

Agnes L. Ogden, Paradise; Robert Connell, Paradise; Alice P. Calder, Paradise; L. E. Howry, Paradise; Henry H. Bartsch, Paradise; Robert A. Kangas, Paradise; Mrs. Robert Kangas, Paradise; Kathryn Andair, Paradise; Sally L. Sears, Paradise; Agnes H. Minear, Paradise; Gerald Hobson, Paradise; W. A. Parrish, Paradise; Donna J. Barber, Paradise; Olaf Z. Dirkson, Paradise; Mrs. Olaf Dirkson, Paradise; J. W. Kurn, Paradise; E. E. Day, Paradise; Maxine V. Pickering, Paradise; Mrs. C. L. Willcutt, Paradise; C. L. Willcutt, Paradise; Mrs. Art Fortner, Paradise; Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Porter, Jr., Paradise; Mr. and Mrs. Victor L. Cyr, Paradise; Mrs.

Robert E. Stephens, Paradise; Nellie J. Petersen, Paradise; Mrs. Karen K. Brox, Plains.

W. N. Brox, Plains; R. H. Jacobson, Hot Springs; Essie Sanks, Paradise; Robert E. Stephens, Paradise; Sally Stephens, Paradise; Roscoe Henderson, Paradise; Jean Mathies, Paradise; Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Colyer, Paradise; Robt. L. Nunch, Paradise; Steve V. Malmberg, Paradise; Chas. C. Bowser, Paradise; Clara M. Bowser, Paradise; H. A. McMichael, Paradise; Sylvia McMichael, Paradise; Mrs. O. J. Murphy, Paradise; Bertha B. Gingery, Perma; Mrs. Marie A. Ardes, Perma; June Marie Acenedo, Perma; H. H. Burgess, Perma; L. M. Burgess, Perma; John B. Adams, Perma; Mrs. W. E. Phillips, Perma; Mr. W. E. Phillips, Perma; Rita Knerr, Perma; Lottie Cummings, Perma.

Archie M. Knerr, Perma; Molly Mogus, Perma; N. J. Mogus, Perma; James A. Holland, Perma; Marriel Marriman, Perma; Jack Marriman, Perma; Anna Marriman, Perma; Virginia Erchnl, Perma; Mrs. Betty Jo Holland, Perma; Hal Pelley, Perma; R. J. Holland, Perma; Nell M. Holland, Perma; J. P. Holland, Perma; Joseph P. Erchnl, Perma; Mabel E. Webber, Perma; H. S. Webber, Perma; Ruth Helming, Perma; Grover Helming; Perma; Edna Rice, Perma; Ruth Jorgenson, Perma; Harold Lorass, Perma; Arthur Harper, Perma; John Stanislarx, Perma; Lillie Harper, Perma; Allen Lorass, Perma; Virgil L. Pitts, Perma.

Loretta Pelley, Perma; Mary Cross, Perma; Sid Cross, Perma; Bernice Rost, Perma; Irene Ulviek, Perma; Mrs. E. Bulger, Perma; Emmett Bulger, Perma; Marie Muster, Perma; Andrew Burgess, Perma; Gloria Burgess, Perma; Leila McClary, Perma; Therese M. Holland, Perma; Thomas J. Holland, Perma; Joe M. Erchrel, Perma; Beverly Erchrel, Perma; Joe Klawitter, Perma; Mary Nell Klawitter, Perma; Leila A. Kelly, Plains; Dan S. Kelly, Plains; Ruby E. Goodrich, Plains; Marie Coe, Plains; Yvonne Tompkins, Plains; May Knox, Plains; Columbia Kahtel, Plains; J. Norman Coe, Plains; H. L. Doty, Plains.

Jean C. Doty, Plains; Gloria Mainwaring, St. Regis; C. B. Kelly, Plains; Jeanette H. Smith, Plains; Lillie A. Kennedy, Plains; Harvey Baber, Hot Springs; J. Pilley, Perma; B. W. Howard, Perma; Wm. J. Buck, Perma; Lee Rost, Perma; Doris D. Pelley, Perma; James P. Pelley, Perma; Paul Argo, Perma; Rose Ellen Argo, Perma; Bessie Argo, Perma; Arthur Argo, Perma.

Edgar Walter, Perma; Gladys Sipes, Perma; Ray Jorgenson, Perma; Ross Bartlett, Perma; Jessie L. Bartlett, Perma; Donald E. Rice, Perma; Donald L. Ross, Perma; Arlene J. Ross, Perma; Robert L. Pelley, Perma; Bertha Pelley, Perma; Jimmie Balsert, Plains; Robert S. Loder, Plains; Lester A. Gingery, Paradise; Wendell Stephens, Paradise; Helen Stephens, Paradise; Preston Nayer, Paradise; Marlin Stephens, Paradise; Edward Hermes, Paradise; Elizabeth V. Hermes, Paradise; Bess Van Derlsoff, Paradise; Merl Shrader, Paradise; Ann Crandall, Paradise; Ruby McDonald, Paradise; Warren Ardis, Paradise; Jess Cook, Paradise.

We, the people of this area, are worried about your actions with respect to the proposed Knowles-Paradise Dam on the Clark's Fork of the Columbia River in western Montana.

Included in a pork-barrel appropriation measure, now before you for consideration, are funds for the construction of Knowles Dam which the politicians seem determined to build in spite of our continued protests to the contrary.

The tax bite from the people of the United States for this monstrosity will be $688 million over a period of 50 years.

Our concern and our question is: "Would you, as an elected representative of the people of this country, have the audacity to sit up in the Congress of the United States and vote for a gouge of this magnitude when practically the same output of power can be produced by private enterprise on two Indian-owned sites nearby on this same river for one-tenth of the cost, and at the same time preserve the economy of the area as well as protect the treaty rights of the Indians, who, under the Knowles proposal, would be flooded out and lose a potential income of $15 million during the next 50 years?"

It is high time for some serious thinking in high places with respect to the throwing around of public funds.

Respectfully,

Polson Junior Chamber of Commerce, board of directors and members: Clinton Johhete, president; Dr. John W. Frazier, executive vice president; Donald G. Lucas, board of directors, State chairman Americanism and governmental affairs; John Nelson, international vice president; Loren J. Master, treasurer; Phillip Zanzick.

Polson Chamber of Commerce, board of directors and members: Paul H. Friedeberg, president, editor, Flathead Courier; Ole Belland, secretary, chamber of commerce; C. Wayne Mahugh, vice president, chamber of commerce, Mahugh Food Sales; Ceula W. Donovan, treasurer, Polson Chamber of Commerce, D. & D. Shoe Mart; M. E. Bailey, director of Polson Chamber of Commerce; John D. Davis, director of Polson COPE; Hu Black, Gamble Store.

Arle Johnson, Betty Zimmer, Tower & Robinson by Elmer W. Robinson; Maynard Nixon, Edna Wesker (Edna's Tall 'n Teen); Ray L. Nunnally, Leonard Aewgood, Thelma Hann, Ralph D. Davis, J. L. Brusletter, Keith A. Johnson, executive vice president, Security State Bank, Polson, Mont.; G. Ellenwood Sr., mayor of Polson, Mont.; Ronald Oldis, city council, Polson, Mont.; Ralph Maxwell, George Davis, Jr., commissioner Lake County; H. M. Hendrickson, commissioner Lake County; Hazel Kinnick, Marian De Saussure, Don Butler, Lake County treasurer; Muriel Hamman, Lake County superintendent; Charles W. Reynolds, Lake County assessor; Bill Giaham, Lake County sheriff; J. A. Inmage, Lake County attorney, Giana A. Wilson, M. E. Pinkney, Eddies Drug, Leland J. Newgard, public accountant, Polson, Mont.; J. E. Burlingame, Polson, Mont.; Ruthe A. Olsen, Gladys Frantz, Polson, Mont.; Irene Fite, Stan Davies, Homer G. Murphy, Gene Hamman, public accountant, Polson, Mont.; Ralph Fite, Polson, Mont.; Pauline M. Manning, Doris A. Webb, Laurence M. Strauss, Smoke House, C. E. Sufict, Elliot M. Johnson, Walter E. Maddy, Smith Electric.

Lyman Claridge Logging Co., Polson, Mont.; Lyman Claridge, Tastee Freez, Aurther E. Robinson; Thomas E. Nenda, E. E. Eunke, J. H. Hanson, president, Security State Bank, Polson, Mont.; W. L. Rader, Polson, Mont.; Norm T. Johnson, city councilman, Security State Bank, Polson, Mont.; Lloyd I. Wassace, Irene M. Pronovost; Helmer Harris Chevrolet Co., A. R. Helmer, president, Polson, Mont.; Amy V. Howel, rancher, Polson, Mont.; A. E. Crawford, Polson, Mont.; C. L. Sterling, blacksmith, Polson, Mont.; Jerry C. Paul, wardrobe cleaner; Vesnou Utsovd, locker operator; Mary Ann Mastad, Valley Furniture Center; Harold T. Korloqodti, Korloqodti Agency; Betty J. Shime, secretary, Katesgodt's Agency; Mabel Fralin, H. Everett Smith, J. R. Grinde, Helen M. Lewis, Roberts Morse, Frances Dehne, Marilyn Jensen, Lucy Wills, Chorline Warren, Janet L. Keller, Thelma Herman, Evelyn Peters, Maxine J. Gilbert, Jean K. Welch, June Maynard, Dora H. Thibert, Dansed F. Redman, Esther V. Buzzard, Lois K. Farnsmann; John Nelson, Polson, Mont., pharmacist; Otis W. Nelson, Diana M. Nelson, Luella S. Smith, N. B. Coppedge, Ruth I. Coppedge; Sheneman's Mens Wear, R. E. Sheneman; Carl's Union Service, Polson, Mont.; Brown's Jewelry Store, Dr. S. Brown, J. L. Brown; Emmett C. Hinst, D. & H. Food Mart; Jim Duford, D. & H. Food Mart; O. R. Hinst, Polson Plumbing & Heating; William A. Coyers, barber; Calvin Hubbard, Hubbard's Pharmacy, Inc.; Walter Davis, Work Board, Flathead Lake; Lowell M. Berison, outfitter, 2 Box B; Donald G. Lucas, L. & F. Tire Co.; Paul C. Lane, electrical maintenance; V. P. Powell, Marjorie Smith.

SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the work of this session of the Congress is nearing its end. Judging by the comments that I have heard on the floor for the last several days I think most Members on both sides of the aisle will be quite happy when that adjournment will arrive. I personally hope that that may occur tonight or tomorrow at the latest. But I do not want this session to close without taking a minute or two to pay tribute to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

I think all of us will look back at this session of Congress and call it a constructive session of Congress. I know that there have been disagreements, that we fought some battles here, many of which have been resolved on the basis of just a few votes. But I think all of us will agree that Speaker JOHN McCORMACK has presided over this body with fairness, and with a sense of the great purpose of the House of Representatives. He has carried on the magnificent tradition of Speaker Rayburn; namely, that there is no body on earth comparable to this legislative body, the House of Representatives of the United States.

I think all of the people of the United States are indebted to him for having upheld and carried on that great tradition. Of course, all of us, Mr. Speaker, who have had the pleasure of working with you for many years have not been surprised in the slightest. You were a great party leader and I am certain that no one would say that you did not discharge those responsibilities with vigor. But by the same token you have discharged the responsibilities of the office of Speaker with fine, impartial, nonpartisan fairness, and this, I think the gentlemen on my left will agree, has been so throughout this session.

So as we go home, Mr. Speaker, I think I express the sentiments of all of us in wishing you well and in hoping that you have a well-earned and a well-deserved rest. I think I speak for all of us on this side when I say that when the Congress reconvenes in January, the 88th Congress will be presided over by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, as Speaker.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, of course I speak only for myself, but I think most of us on this side of the aisle would agree with the comments made by our friend from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], at least with respect to the fairness of the Speaker and the diligence with which he has discharged his duties. I want the RECORD to show now that when we elect the gentleman from Indiana, CHARLIE HALLECK, as the next Speaker of the House it is not a personal matter but just a matter of principle upon which we are divided.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair say that he appreciates very much the statements of friendship just made by his colleagues.

RUSSIAN ORGANIZATION CONTROL ACT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which may be referred to as the "Russian Organization Control Act." It has been perfected with the help and coordination of many interested parties. It is so simple and timely that I am submitting it even at this late date of the session so that the members of the committee to which it is referred can study it and familiarize themselves with it in event we adjourn in this calendar year. Otherwise, it will be resubmitted early in the next session.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Communist Party to register under the 1950 act, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, in fact, outlaws that organization. These laws and the ruling of the Supreme Court are not being enforced. The Department of Justice says the Communist agents in this country are ineffective. Other responsible people relate that the Russian servants are deeply infiltrated in every walk of American life. It is my personal opinion that they succeed in confusing U.S. issues to the extent that it is difficult for us to make rational decisions in foreign affairs. Certainly we are in an era of defeatism, fear, and lack of firm unity in this country. This law would constitute a legislative check on the power of the Attorney General and cause grand juries to investigate enforcement in their districts. I see how no one could oppose this bill.

I have no pride in authorship, but am anxious to get on with the job, and would hope that the committee chairman, Members and my colleagues in this House will read it, investigate it, improve it, and adopt it at the earliest possible date. It has been too long since the Supreme Court decision and the date of implementation thereof with only two indictments to date in an admitted Communist Party in the United States of America of over 10,000 members. Technically, it might be said that existing law requires registration only until the party and its members defied the Supreme Court verification which outlawed them; but this bill will outlaw both by amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950—50 U.S.C. 781.

Mr. Speaker, the bill may be summarized as follows:

Section 2: Specific congressional findings are made with respect to events since 1950 and present necessity.

Section 3: The Attorney General or any district attorney may apply to the district court for an injunction against any organization while Board proceedings are pending.

Section 4: Orders of the Subversive Activities Board to register are enforceable after 30 days unless stayed by the majority of an appellate court. Presently one judge or justice can grant such a stay. This practice lets Russia string out interminably the finality of Board orders and a new provision would make such delay far more difficult.

Section 5: This is in three parts: 14A amended provides for grand jury examination of the Attorney General or his designated assistant to inquire into his enforcement of this act in the district and for grand jury petition to Congress if dissatisfied with his diligence. This calls on Congress to investigate the enforcement and contains impeachment proceedings. This might force the Attorney General's hand. In any event it would keep the Congress informed and it would give the people some hand in opposing Russia. If it does not work, the special district attorney provisions can be put into effect in a later act. Subsection 14B: Absolute priority of trials is provided for. This is badly needed to combat delay. Subsection 14C: Violations of the 1950 act are pinpointed as violations against the law of nations. The Constitution gives the Congress specific power to "define and punish offenses against the law of nations," article I, section 8, chapter 10. A good case on the point is *United States* v. *Rodrigues* (California, 1960), 182 Fed. Supp. 479, and other cases are found at 339 U.S. 382, 187 Fed. 2d 991 at 997, affirmed 342 U.S. 524. The Litvinov 1930 agreement between Russia and the United States, which has the effect of a treaty, provided that on recognition of the Soviet Union, Russia would disband her organization in this country, which she has not done and she and the members of that organization have committed and still commit offenses against the law of nations under that agreement, which Congress specifically has the power to "define and punish."

Section 6: Direct and immediate employees of Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court, who violate the act henceforth, may be given the death penalty. This is because they operate at the core of Government which is more dangerous to us even than operations in the Army and in defense facilities.

Section 7: This is in two parts: Subsection 15A of the act as amended provides for the denial of bail after conviction in the trial court and particularly where Russia or one of her Communist agents is furnishing the bail. The objection to the denial of bail before conviction is cured. This provision is badly needed as witness the flights of Eisler, Soblen—convicted under the Espionage Act—and others. Presently, Russia merely pays a ransom in the form of "bail," for those she wants. Subsection 15B of the act as amended provides for power in the superintendents of penitentiaries to keep convicts under the act from carrying on their work in the organization while in prison.

Section 8 is a technical section providing that conflict with prior laws shall be resolved in favor of this law and that if any part of this act should be unconstitutional, the rest of it should be constitutional.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, before this session adjourns, I feel impelled to direct the attention of the House to circumstances and conditions which are detracting from the national good and prosperity.

When President Kennedy took office in January 1961, the gross national product stood at the annual rate of $500 billion; personal income was at the annual rate of $403½ billion; corporate income was at the annual rate of $39.8 billion. Over 6 million persons were unemployed of a total work force of 70 million or at a rate of 6.7 percent. According to most economists and business forecasters, the country was headed for a recession in the spring of 1961, apparently scheduled to begin the cold day of President Kennedy's inauguration.

The year 1961 ended up as a record-breaker. The GNP soared to $538 billion, unemployment soared to 70.6 million, the stock market was hitting the ceiling with the Dow Jones average hitting 728.44, and price levels were being maintained.

When President Kennedy decided to resist the steel price increase proposed by a price-fixing deal arranged by big steel, he was charged with destroying the historical privilege of the steel industry to "rig" prices upward on an industrywide basis.

The business community shivered and trembled at the President's reaction to their scheme, but they did not raise their prices. If big steel was right and the President wrong, as they contended, why did not they hold their ground and prove their case? The same courts which could try them for price fixing and conspiracy in restraint of trade, could also try the President for arbitrary abuse of executive authority. The question is now moot, but which side would have prevailed in the courts under our Constitution, the President or big steel?

The discovered avarice and spattered pride of big steel plunged it and its industrial cohorts to show the President a lesson. Almost immediately the stock market quivered. Dow-Jones and the other services advised their customers and thousands of nonsubscribers who did not solicit this advice to get themselves in a more substantial cash position and out of the market. Those steel companies which threatened action independent of big steel headed the prepared lists of stocks made prime candidates for sale. The selling began on "Black Monday," May 28, 1962. The selloff plunged the Dow-Jones averages 150 points. Timid, credit-heavy buyers were washed out. Recession talk was in the air.

Recession talk became the incendiary ammunition of those who despised the President's determination to hold the price line. The President is the enemy of business, they said. Enemy of business? Who provided the industrial and business community with the best lures and windfalls of this generation? In 1954, under Mr. Eisenhower, business got tremendous tax bonanzas in the Revenue Act of 1954. During the Korean war, certain war industries got advantages in the quick tax write-off. But look what this antibusiness President was doing for business. Early this summer the Treasury issued a revised depreciation schedule which increases corporate profits and Treasury losses by a billion and one-half this year and $14 billion over the next 10 years. On top of this, the Kennedy administration presented hostile business with a 7-percent investment credit which should raise corporate income and reduce Treasury collections over $1 billion this year and $16 billion over the next 10 years. If President Eisenhower had tried to do as much for American business, the Members on my side of the aisle would have cried for his impeachment. What does business want—an abolition of all taxes?

The fact of the matter is that there is nothing that President Kennedy can do to please that portion of the business community which elects to remain in rebellion with the Government.

Today, the stock market is solely a barometer of the gambling urge. Stock prices bear no more ratio to earnings and liquid value than a parimutuel ticket does to the trading value of a horse. The stock market today is a national lottery and ought to be taxed as one. When prices hit bottom, the smart guys bought what the timid fellows sold. Right now, many corporations are buying up their own stock for future stock-option giveaways to their own executives.

The fact of the matter is that we are no closer to a recession today than we were last year or the year before. We are only as close as the American people can be led to believe we are. The chronic and constant talk of recession is the organized claptrap of the Madison Avenue crowd who are conspiring to mess up the program of President Kennedy. His failure would be their frenzied delight, but he will not fail.

Today, after 21 months of the Kennedy administration, we see that the GNP has risen over 10 percent to $552 billion; personal income has risen over 10 percent to $443 billion; corporate income has risen over 27 percent to almost 51 billion. Factory profits have risen 15 percent over last year. Unemployment has been reduced 58 percent from 6 million to 3.5 million in a work force which has grown to 72.2 million. September witnessed an unprecedented jab at unemployment. Inventories are low. Retail stores report an unseasonal increase in sales. The 1963 model automobiles are inviting brisk interest. Housing starts have broken all records. Residential housing at year end promises to be $3 to $4 billion or 25 percent over last year.

Does this look like recession? Who and where are the prophets of doom and gloom? Wall Street and Madison Avenue are neck deep in the quicksands of politics. The income tax laws are the target. The main assault is planned early next year. If this recession comes, it will be the first one in history foisted on us by the Madison Avenue gloommakers who find it profitable to sell America short.

Take a look at the 1963 model, try it and buy it. It is the best automobile you have ever owned, and it is made in America. If you need it, buy your new house—that new furniture, and get yourself a new suit today. The price is right. The bargains next year are bound to be more scarce.

The big bad wolves have been planning a little recession—but I think President Kennedy is outfoxing them.

THE HONORABLE JOHN R. RAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of the year, which we devoutly hope will be the closing days of this session of Congress, when we take leave of some of our colleagues.

Sometimes this leave is involuntary. But there are cases where a friend and colleague of many years decides to retire voluntarily.

This is the case of the gentleman to whom I wish to pay tribute today. John H. Ray has represented the 15th Congressional District of New York State since being elected to the 83d Congress in November of 1952.

During these years he has represented his district faithfully and with diligence. He has also represented the best principles and philosophy of the Republican Party.

John Ray has had a brilliant career in the law and has served his country and his community in peace and war—at home and abroad.

I am reasonably sure that when he decided to come to Congress he decided to do so because he wanted once more to serve his people and his country.

We of the New York delegation are proud of John Ray. We regret to see him retire. We shall miss his companionship and his example. But we wish him well in the years ahead in whatever he undertakes. And may these years ahead be happily shared by his wife and family.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the New York delegation, I want to associate myself with everything my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], has just said about the retirement of our colleague John Ray.

Some of us have been very closely associated with him both on the floor of the House and off, but I think for many of us one of our outstanding associations with him was in the Wednesday morning breakfasts. During all those meetings we were wisely entertained and guided by the gentleman from New York, John Ray.

As our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], has said, the end of the session is always tinged somewhat with sadness because we know that some will not return to be with us. I, for one, want to say, and I know the New York delegation feels likewise, that the Members of the House will miss their association with John Ray. They wish for him and his good wife many, many years of good health and happiness.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Derounian].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a very happy occasion for me to speak for a few moments about one of our colleagues who will be leaving us at the end of this year.

John Ray was born in the great Midwest, in Minnesota, and just a few weeks ago was 76 years young. He got his B.A. degree at the University of Minnesota. He then went to Harvard but he did not turn left. He was admitted to the Minnesota Bar in 1912, and later became vice president and general counsel of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in 1942, from which position he had to retire under the mandatory age limit in 1951.

It was then this youngster of 66 decided to run for Congress. He has been reelected five times. He has served his constituents honorably, with diligence, and is the epitome of wisdom, in my opinion. I have never heard him raise his voice. He is a gentleman in every sense of the word. We will all miss him.

To his gracious wife, Hama, and his three children, Virginia, Jack, and Gordon, I offer my congratulations and hope that he will spend the remaining years of his very fruitful life in happiness and ease.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have an opportunity to say a word about the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ray].

His thoughts and deliberations in the Congress have been helpful to all of us. He has been a friend to every Member of the House. I do not know of anyone who does not hold him not only in high regard for his intelligence and his character but also because of his warm friendship which he gave to everyone who came to him with any problem or associated with him in the business of the House.

Speaking as a Democrat now, I want to say he has a great number of friends on the Democratic side of the aisle. We admire him, we respect him, and we will feel his loss very greatly when he leaves the House of Representatives.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York making it possible for me to express these sentiments which I am sure are shared by Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate this privilege of saying a few words in tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ray].

For some time I have served as chairman of the Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary. Our colleague, Mr. Ray, was the ranking Republican on that subcommittee.

During all of our service I have never seen John Ray where he was not great. He is certainly one of the greatest lawyers in this House. In passing upon any pending legislation he has always been nonpartisan, nonpolitical. I have never seen one instance during his entire service where he had any purpose other than to do the gentlemanly, loyal, and patriotic thing.

It has been a benediction to know John Ray. He has my unqualified approval and affection. I know no better man. I know no better public servant. I am a better man for having had the privilege of association and service with him. It is my judgment that he has improved everything he has ever touched. God bless you John and I hope that when you are back home in New York, you may think sometimes of your Georgia colleague who will always remember you as a magnificent American.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I am glad and happy to have this privilege of joining with the gentlewoman from New York in paying tribute to one of our esteemed colleagues who is about to retire to private life.

I know of no Member of this House who is held in higher esteem and who is more respected than the gentleman from New York, John H. Ray. He is, perhaps, what might be termed a perfect legislator. He has carried out his duties and responsibilities well. He has performed his homework and he has during his tenure here in the Congress of the United States held religiously to principle and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that John Ray reflects the ideals respected by every American. During the period of his service in the Congress of the United States he has stood firm in his application of the fundamental principles in which he so strongly believes in every approach that he has taken in relation to these many problems and issues that have been presented to us from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we shall miss him in this House. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester] has so aptly put it, John Ray has done yeoman service during his membership in the House of Representatives and we can all agree that he has made a valued contribution to the cause of good government.

Mr. Speaker, John H. Ray is a great American. His record of service to his country will long be remembered and will influence those to follow for many years to come. I join with you in extending best wishes to John Ray for many years of good health and happiness in the period of his retirement which he so richly deserves.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New York yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable John Ray. I want to thank our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], for giving me just a moment in which to express my sincere tribute to him. Above everything, our colleague, the gentleman from New York, John Ray, is a man of character. I feel that a big need in our Republic today is not the desire so much to know new things, but to do the old things that we know ought to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I think as much as any man in the Congress of the United States, John Ray has always reserved for himself the privilege of the free exercise of his conscience. The fact that he has done that so successfully and that he has been reelected is a tribute not only to him, Mr. Speaker, but to the wonderful people who sent him here.

Mr. Speaker, may I, too, again say to John Ray how much we shall miss him, and I wish for him, along with his many, many other friends here, many more years of happiness.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the gentlewoman from New York has taken this time in which to pay tribute to our friend John Ray.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I had some prepared remarks to honor John Ray, because certainly any words uttered in his honor should be well prepared and well phrased. But the thoughts which come to my mind can be extemporaneously expressed, because John Ray's friendliness, his ability, his knowledge and the good will he held toward all of his colleagues and toward all mankind is something which is very easy to bring out extemporaneously.

Mr. Speaker, if I were asked at this moment to characterize John Ray, the first word that would come to my mind is that he is a gentleman. Then, I would think of his efficiency, of his quiet forcefulness, and of his stamina, as well as his persistence in the pursuit of principle.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the privileged to come to Congress as a freshman with John Ray in the 83d Congress. I was one of those privileged to participate in a Wednesday morning breakfast group which met every week for a good many years to discuss the issues before the Congress. I can safely say that that group never would have existed through the years and remained active had it not been for the fact that John Ray personally held it together.

Mr. Speaker, John Ray's attendance record here on the floor of the House certainly can be equaled by no other Member. Always John was here in the back row, listening, watching over the people's business. John Ray has contributed a great deal to his party and, the Republican Party is better because of changes his suggestions have brought about. And yet his partisanship was always tempered, as it should be under our two-party system, by what is good for his country first. We of the 83d club will particularly miss John Ray. We wish him everything that is good.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay a tribute to the service of the gentleman from New York, John Ray, in the House and particularly in the Merchant Marine Committee. I have had the honor and the pleasure to serve with him on the Merchant Marine Committee, and I can testify to his good, sound judgment, his faithful adherence to his duties on the committee, his interest in the American merchant marine and the other subjects that come under the jurisdiction of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House.

I, too, will miss John Ray. He is a fine, outstanding Christian gentleman, and I have learned to hold him in high regard and with warm and deep affection. I wish for him the many good things he is entitled to in his retirement.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay my tribute to John Ray. I should like to say that when I first heard his name it was in 1954 when my committee was deliberating over the expenditure of moneys that we had raised in behalf of Congressmen from the State of New York. It was not hard, when the name of John Ray came up, for those who were deliberating because everyone there commented on the fine record that he had made. Therefore, it is not surprising that in 1958, when I first ran for Congress, constituents of the 27th Congressional District of New York began to let me know that I would be joining a very great man, John Ray, when I got down here.

I remember especially a conversation with the chairman of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. who lives in my district, and who was keen that I meet and get to know John Ray. Believe me, when I arrived, I was very thankful that I had the introduction that brought John Ray close to me in some of the deliberations that we have had here.

When I think of John Ray I think of him as a Congressman's Congressman. So often he is on the back rail in the House as we are trying to reach a decision whether to vote yea or nay on an issue. I know that I have left my seat here on innumerable occasions to go to the back rail and find John Ray and ask him, "What are the fundamentals of this bill?" This is where he has contributed so much to us here in the House. He is a deep thinker, one who has a fund of information and background which few can match.

Mr. Speaker, I know I shall miss him very much, and more especially than missing him I am going to carry with me some of the quality of thinking that I hope I have learned from him.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with my colleagues who have made remarks about our colleague from New York, John Ray, who is retiring at the end of this session. Congressman Ray and I came to the House of Representatives during the same session. I was privileged to get to know him early in my service.

John Ray possesses one of the finest analytical minds in the House of Representatives. He is recognized as one of the outstanding lawyers of this country to come to Congress. His contributions have been manifold. His efforts and his effectiveness have contributed in large measure to the enactment of good legislation and oftentimes to the defeat of bad legislation. Even though Mr. Ray and I are of different political parties and come from parts of the country widely separated in distance, I have found that on many occasions our thoughts and our philosophies were somewhat parallel one with the other.

He has performed a magnificent service to his district, to his State, and to our Nation during the five terms that he has served as a Member of this body.

I wish to thank the gentlewoman from New York for taking this special order today so that we may join with her and with the Members of the New York delegation in paying tribute to our friend.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during the period of my service in this body to have served with a great many men of all kinds of political philosophy, but I can say in all truth that John Ray represented to those of us who came in everyday contact with him the type of man who always attempted to do the right thing, whatever his political philosophy.

Those of us on the Committee on the Judiciary, a committee that considers all sorts of legislation, and as you know, over 60 percent of the bills introduced in the House come to this committee, are going to miss him because ours is truly a pick-and-shovel job. It is only because of the efforts and attainments of men like John Ray that we are able to boast that more of our legislation is reported unanimously than that which comes from any other committee of the House. He has been literally a Rock of Gibraltar in that committee. We are all going to miss him.

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of all of the members of the committee when I say that we hope for him many, many years of happiness.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ray] has been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. When I came to the Congress it was my privilege to be assigned to that committee. Thus I feel that I have stood in a very personal relationship to the gentleman from New York. Coming to Congress as a freshman, I had much to learn, and it was through his patience, his wisdom, and his counsel that I did learn much about the workings of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the House. I think this is an important function that a veteran Member of the House can perform. It carries on the traditions of the House. It carries on the work of the Congress with a continuity which contributes much to the stability of the country.

Therefore, it is with a sense of personal gratitude and appreciation that I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from New York and to express a deep debt to Mr. Ray. I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in extending personal wishes to him for many, many years of life and happiness and continued constructive service as a citizen of the United States.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the gentlewoman from New York has taken this time to publicly acclaim our regard and affection for John Ray. I join with all of my colleagues here in expressing our esteem for him.

For my part, let me say I think he is one of the most delightful persons I have ever met. No matter what the weather, no matter what the problem, John Ray's personality and character are always the same. He is always pleasant, happy, and affable. He, indeed, is a gentleman in the highest and most noble sense of that word. He is a dedicated individual tremendously interested in the problems that affect America and the matters that are resolved here on the floor of this great body.

He was, indeed, an extraordinarily successful man in private life and he carried this talent for success into public life and into the Halls of Congress. His character and personality pervaded his office and was reflected in the people who worked with him and for him.

Again I say, for my part I am delighted to have had the opportunity to meet him and to know him and I am delighted that I have this opportunity so graciously presented to us by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], to express to John Ray and to his lovely wife my best wishes for many, many years of happiness and health.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman from New York, that I am glad Mr. Mathias rose to speak. In the four or five eulogies I have heard in commendation of retiring colleagues, I think more often than not, it has been the Members with a number of years of service who rise to speak. But I think in many ways, those of us who are freshmen are going to miss people like John Ray even more than the gentlewoman from New York or my more senior colleagues who have already spoken. I would like to add something that probably not very many can. We have all mentioned and commended Mr. Ray for how wonderful he is and for his gentlemanly qualities and for his ability and intellect and the way he conducts himself on the committee, but possibly I can add a point to that. I happen to believe that even more than all of this that—I think most of the time he is right. Not only is he able, not only is he decisive, not only is he an expert on the committee, but I think more often than not he takes the right position on legislation. I hope you will not think that is a backdoor approach in complimenting myself because I consider it an honor when I look at the voting record each morning and about 95 percent of the time I find myself in association with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ray].

I might say at this point, whenever I see I have voted in a different way than the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ray], I usually want to take a second look at the reason why I voted in the opposite camp. So I think he is not only a gentleman, he is not only able, but I think he expresses a philosophy that I would add, unfortunately, does not have enough advocates at the present time. I, too, wish him the very best and those of us of the 87 Club are going to miss him more and feel the void more than many of the Members who have already spoken. I am very glad to associate myself with the gentlewoman and those who have spoken previously.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentlewoman from New York for giving the Members of the House this opportunity to speak about the character and service of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ray]. John H. Ray is possessed of warm and human qualities. Very seldom do we on the Committee on the Judiciary have the opportunity to associate with one whose high sense of justice and equity as applied to the legal problems confronting us in our work on the committee so keenly manifests itself as in the case of Mr. John Ray.

I believe each Congressman and each Congresswoman reflects the attitude of his or her community, and certainly the attitude and aspirations of their constituents and of the advisory group in that community. Mr. Ray personifies the true lawyer who weighs principles of equity with rules of evidence, and in committee I have always found that his opinion on any legal question was substantial and basic. This faculty of making determinations in such matters indicates a legal mind both brilliant and excellent. Many times witnesses who have come before the committee have undergone that experience and they and every one of his colleagues on the committee respect him in his judgments. His reasonableness of approach has been a guide to us in voting on the basic questions involved in legislation.

As one member of the committee and I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues on the committee, I want to say we are losing a strong adjunct of our committee insofar as the capacity to determine legal questions is involved. I regret that he is retiring from this great service and dedication that he has given to our great Nation and to his wonderful State, as he has expressed it in conversation with us, to enjoy the later years of his life.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOHN RAY, who is retiring voluntarily from the Congress.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve on the same committee with JOHN RAY. No Member has been more constant in his attendance or more diligent in his duties in committee and on the floor of the House.

As the gentlewoman from New York has already stated, he is a brilliant lawyer. I have often gone to him for advice and counsel, which has been patiently, freely, and wisely given.

I deeply regret that my warm friend, JOHN RAY, is leaving this body, for he is truly a great American, and I should like to add, a constitutional American.

I want to wish for him and to Mrs. Ray many years of health and happiness.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues in expressing regret at the retirement from Congress of the gentleman from New York, Representative JOHN RAY.

When I contemplate the absence from this House of JOHN RAY I am reminded of a senator of ancient Rome who once said: "I would rather people would ask why there was no statue of me than why there was a statue of me."

Such is the modesty and quiet way of JOHN RAY that I am led to predict that no statue in his honor will be erected and yet those of us who are acquainted with the conscious manner in which he has carried out his legislative responsibilities might well agree that if such recognition—even a statue—should ever be erected to honor any of us who are presently Members of this House properly and on the basis of pure merit it should be JOHN RAY. As one who came to Congress at the same time as JOHN RAY and was a member of a group with him who had breakfast together each week to exchange views on matters before this House my association with him has been a deeply appreciated experience. Certainly no Member of Congress, past, present or future, will ever reflect a greater measure of intellectual honesty and integrity in his record of service. Every one of JOHN's colleagues knows that his votes on legislation have never been influenced by political expediency. Invariably he exercised wisdom based on a combination of careful study, sound principle and the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN RAY has held the respect and admiration of all his colleagues on both sides of the aisle and like other Members I shall always look on my service with him as a wonderful privilege. Especially, I enjoyed sharing membership on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with him and JOHN RAY was a most valuable member due to his long legal experience and familiarity with business. I am, of course, sorry that I lack words to more fully express my admiration for his contribution but I can and do say, thank you, JOHN, for your friendship and fine example and I hope that our paths will cross frequently in the future and that adequate satisfaction will always be yours for rendering such outstanding public service.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years I have served in Congress, I know of none whose retirement from this body I regret more than that of the gentleman from New York. [Mr. RAY]. To this body he brought a vast reservoir of experience and training. On this reservoir I have drawn liberally. The advice and guidance he has given me has made my task easier, my path smoother, my experience happier.

Time will not permit me here to inventory his many talents and virtues. His own demeanor, conduct, and achievement speak more eloquently than my feeble tongue can articulate. During his service in the House of Representatives, no challenge has been too big and no chore too small. Every challenge he has met with courage. Every chore he has undertaken with a cheerful spirit of altruism. To every challenge and every chore he has applied a patient, meticulous methodology which produces definitive results. In the performance of his official duties as a representative of the people of his district, and in the discharge of his obligations to the people of the United States at large, he has been motivated and inspired by the noblest principles and purest purposes. Always zealous to conserve and perpetuate the good ideas of the past, he has also been willing to embrace new ideas when they are proven to be true ideas. Intellectual honesty is the soul of integrity; JOHN RAY is the soul of integrity; and things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other.

Knowing him, fondly and intimately, as I do, I am confident that his years of retirement, which he has so richly earned, will not be idle years. Whatever he may later add to his record of service to his fellow men, he can rest content in the certain knowledge that he has already left footprints on the sands of time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the public service of our colleague from New York, JOHN RAY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentlewoman from New York and my other colleagues in the House in paying tribute to JOHN RAY on his retirement from this body. It has been a great pleasure to serve with JOHN RAY in Congress, and I have enjoyed my association with him.

JOHN RAY is not only a brilliant lawyer but a great American. He is a sound thinker on national issues, and is a strong believer in constitutional government.

It has been a privilege to know JOHN RAY, and I have enjoyed our frequent visits. I hope he enjoys his retirement, and I wish him much happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join with my colleagues from New York State and all over the Nation in this earnest appreciation of JOHN RAY as he leaves the House of Representatives and retires.

It has been a real pleasure to have served with JOHN. This quiet, solid American has been a rewarding and steadying influence on all of us who have had the privilege of knowing and associating with him.

I join all my colleagues in wishing JOHN many, many happy years to come.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague JOHN RAY, who has announced his retirement from Congress.

I have leaned heavily upon him during this session because I have found him to have one of the most outstanding legal minds in Congress. He is, without doubt, one of the best constitutional lawyers that I have had the opportunity to meet. He always looks at an issue in the first instance to determine whether or not it is constitutional and then whether or not it is good for the Nation.

Above all, I have never known him to sacrifice principle for political expediency. I deem it a rare privilege to have had the honor to serve with JOHN RAY this short time, and I shall never forget his many kindnesses to me.

I wish to extend to him and Mrs. Ray my very best wishes for their continued health and happiness, now that he has decided to leave the political arena.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] and to pay affectionate respect to our beloved retiring colleague John Ray after a decade of distinguished service to the House as the Representative of Staten Island in my home city of New York. In the 86th and 87th Congresses it was our pleasure and profit to have the counsel of John Ray as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which he served tirelessly and with great good will. A distinguished lawyer, John Ray was always thoughtful and considerate in his relations with the committee and its chairman. All on our side of the aisle will miss him sorely. We hope he will not forget us. We shall surely remember him affectionately.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the decision of our colleague, John H. Ray, to retire from the Congress at the end of this session is deeply regretted in the House and in his 15th New York District.

John is a man of quite force, sound judgment and firm principles. His attention to his responsibilities is well known. No one could be more faithful. We have observed his regular attendance on the Floor, appreciating that he is following all legislative action with understanding and objectivity. His legal training has made him keenly perceptive, prompting us to welcome his observations and opinions on complex bills.

His sincere interest in all that affected his district has made him responsive to its special needs. His constituents have appreciated the effective response he has given to their problems.

Personally, I will always remember the warm, friendly greeting with which John welcomed me when I first entered this body. I have valued greatly his friendship and I wish for him health and happiness in his retirement. He carries with him the respect and admiration of all who have been privileged to know him.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, over the years it has been most interesting to observe the biennial contributions to the House from various segments of our economy. Industry and the legal profession gave us the gentleman from New York, John Ray, in the 83d Congress and a most valuable contribution, as it has been proven. We have seldom observed such sincere tributes from both sides of the aisle as we have heard here today.

Meticulous study of legislative problems, a perfect attendance record, and a rare ability to weigh the consequences of untried proposals, have all combined to make our departing colleague an ideal Congressman. This is not his first retirement, however; he has a previous record along that line, and I suspect that we have not yet heard the last of his varied accomplishments.

However, the end of his present tenure gives us this opportunity to wish John and Mrs. Ray Godspeed and best wishes in all of their future activities.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join and associate myself with the statements that have been made about the character and service of our colleague, the Honorable John Ray, of New York. The tributes paid to him are most highly deserved. I concur in them completely.

The district he has represented and the Nation he has served have been greatly benefited by Congressman Ray's membership in the House of Representatives.

We shall all miss him. I will particularly feel his absence. My hope is that in his retirement I can still call upon him for counsel as I have so many times during his membership here.

He is a great statesman, combining a keen mind and sound judgment with a willingness to work untiringly for the good of his country and his neighbors.

As he leaves, I join in saluting him and wishing him and his wife many years of pleasant retirement.

FACILITATING ENTRY OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, one of the main problems to be considered next year by the new Congress must pertain to the serious troubles besetting the educational system.

As Congress struggles through the mass of conflicting reports, pressures, and opposing sides in the dispute on Federal aid to education, our teachers and our school systems are carrying on under difficult conditions.

Every State and almost every school district are running into the same perennial troubles: loss of tax base, insufficient revenues, mounting costs for all services, supplies, and maintenance of our school plants and finally the most important, losing good qualified teachers for the lack of finances to put into effect and maintain a reasonable salary schedule.

Too many of our legislators seem to be completely unaware of the seriousness of the situation in some areas.

Even the most dedicated teacher must pay bills, taxes, and live in our high cost economy. The problem is one of simple economics. A recent report shows that the average income earner must earn at least $6,000 a year to be able to provide the needs of our cost of living indexes.

This means that the drive and appeal by schoolteachers for a salary schedule from $6,000 minimum to $14,000 with required degrees after 8 years of teaching is indeed within the range of a reasonable goal.

This Congress failed in its attempts to write Federal law to help the local districts with their financial problems.

The problem may be called a local one by some but the harmful effects of the present situation go beyond the local geographical and political limits and are rapidly adding up to a national crisis.

Every day we are reminded of our school problem by radio, TV, and our newspapers. But like Mark Twain's remarks about the weather, "Everyone talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it."

It seems to this Member of Congress and as a member of the Committee on Education of the Congress that our records and our hearings on this question have run their full course and now the Congress as a whole must accept the full responsibility for action without reservation on the main question.

The main question as I see it is this: "Can this Nation continue its economic and social gains, plus its military strength, without the aid of the Federal Government in our educational system?"

It is as simple as that; none of us has any desire to, nor do we intend to, allow a Federal takeover any more than we have allowed a takeover of our highways or other federally assisted State operated activities.

In no way would the aid be more than a distribution of funds from the Federal Treasury for disbursement of the States under State laws according to the needs of the educational departments of the various State governments.

We find that our American public schools are plagued by shortages of everything—everything, that is, but students. There is a classroom shortage of more than 140,000, and a teacher shortage estimated from 140,000 to 250,000. In the words of Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, these shortages cheat at least 10 million American schoolchildren of a first-rate education.

With more than 37½ million youngsters crowding our public schools now, enrollment is expected to climb by at least a million a year for many years to come. At present, it is up 10 million over 5 years ago. Despite the fact that classroom construction has been at alltime highs over the past 5 years, it has not dented the backlog and barely keeps abreast of annual enrollment increases.

The problem will grow more, not less, acute unless programs of Federal aid to school construction and teachers' salaries are enacted by the Congress.

The fountainhead of the problems hampering our school systems is another critical shortage: money. State and community tax resources already are strained to the hilt. They cannot keep pace with growing requirements. Further, there is a huge gap in quality of education separating wealthy States and communities from their low-income counterparts. Only Federal taxing power is able to insure equality of educational opportunity among States.

It is not that States and municipalities are not trying hard to meet the school crisis. Many are. For example, Idaho spends the same percentage of its total income on schools as does New York. But in Idaho, this results in an annual expenditure per pupil of only $285; in New York $585. The difference in terms of education is staggering. Yet no one would argue that the school child in Idaho is less entitled to a good education than the pupil in New York. The spread between rich State and poor ranges from New York, which spends the highest, to Alabama, whose $217 annual expenditure per pupil is the Nation's lowest.

The problem goes deeper than that, however. Within States, children in low-income communities—and children in low-income neighborhoods of large cities—do not enjoy equal educational opportunities. In the same State there may be a community which spends more than $1,000 per child and a neighboring community which spends only $100. The unfairness of this is obvious. Through no fault of his own, the child in a poor neighborhood becomes disadvantaged in education, has less chance for higher education, less chance for a good job—and the pattern will repeat itself with his own children.

THE TEACHER SHORTAGE—ITS REASONS

The size of the teacher shortage cannot be pinpointed to an exact figure. Since there is a teacher for every classroom in the Nation, it might be argued that there is no shortage. But it is real, nevertheless. It is overcome only by crowding more pupils into already jammed classrooms, by holding half-day sessions and by hiring teachers who are not fully qualified.

Presently, about 92,000 public school teachers have substandard training. Annually, 22 percent of newly hired elementary school teachers do not have college degrees. This condition is aggravated by an annual withdrawal of approximately 10 percent of public school teachers, which exceeds the number of new college graduates who enter the profession.

One of the main reasons for the shortage of teachers is obvious: low salary schedules. Teachers comprise one of the lowest paid professional groups. Their average salary is about $5,200. This is far from the $9,476 which the University of California's Heller committee recommended as a minimum income for a "junior professional family."

THE FIGHT IN CONGRESS

Failure of the House to act on a Federal aid-to-education bill passed by the Senate killed chances to begin remedying our school problems.

Early in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, President Kennedy made three major recommendations in the field of education. The first was for Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries. Calling for $2.5 billion over a 3-year span, the bill was passed by the Senate, 49–34, supported by 41 Democrats and 8 Republicans, opposed by 12 Democrats, 22 Republicans.

A similar bill, reported out by the House Education and Labor Committee, died in Howard Smith's House Rules Committee.

Kennedy's second proposal on education also was roughed up. He urged substantial improvement in the National Defense Education Act, which provides loans for students and teaching equipment to strengthen science, math, and foreign language instruction in the Nation's colleges. All that came of this was a simple extension of the present program.

A third Presidential request got the ax, the College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act; different versions were first approved by the House and Senate. House-Senate conferees agreed on a compromise bill authorizing $1.5 billion in grants and loans over 5 years to public and private colleges for construction of classrooms and colleges; $250 million in grants to public community junior colleges; $600 million for student loans.

The House voted 214–186 to recommit, thus killing the bill. Voting to bury it were 130 Republicans and 84 Democrats, mostly from the South. Upholding the aid bill were 30 Republicans and 156 Democrats.

THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FEDERAL AID

The same tired attacks which have been leveled at most forward-looking social legislation have hit school aid proposals. The primary objection is that Federal aid to the schools would lead to Federal control of the schools.. This completely ignores the fact that Federal programs have been in effect for more than a century without any attempt by the Government to decide what shall be taught, how, or by whom. Among Federal programs are the Land Grant Act of 1862 which made possible the growth of State universities; the GI bill of rights which helped millions of veterans of World War II attain a higher education; the National Defense Education Act; school milk and school lunch programs—and many others.

The charges against aid to school construction and teachers' salaries also overlook the important point that States and communities would not be required to submit to Federal interference in curricula. Their school systems would be tampered with in no way by the Federal Government.

RECORD ENROLLMENT IN SCHOOLS

From the latest issue of the NSBA official publication we learn that enrollment in the Nation's public schools, from kindergarten through college, reached a new alltime high of 51.3 million at the start of the current school year, according to U.S. Office of Education estimates. This marks the 18th consecutive year that enrollments have increased.

Current figures represent a 2 million jump over those registered at the start of the 1961 school year. The rate of increase is also climbing, as the 1961 figures were only 1.4 million higher than those of the year before.

Of the total enrollment, 39.7 million students are enrolled in the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools, 6.7 million in nonpublic schools, and 4.6 million in colleges and universities.

By breaking down the increase into categories, it becomes apparent that the secondary schools and colleges are shouldering the brunt of the increase. Secondary school enrollments are up 8.3 percent over last year; higher education enrollments are up 7 percent; and elementary enrollments, 2.3 percent.

The Office of Education also estimated that 1,744,000 teachers would be needed by the public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. According to the National Education Association, the Nation will be about 250,000 short of meeting this figure. The NEA says this many new teachers are needed to replace ones who left the profession, to relieve overcrowded classrooms, and to replace teachers who are not as well qualified as they should be.

News of special interest to teachers comes out of New York where the 70,000 member American Federation of Teachers announces its drive for a $6,000 a year minimum starting salary for teachers with a goal of $14,000 for teachers with bachelor degrees and 8 years of service. The teachers have been pledged full support from all segments of the AFL–CIO, according to the statement of Walter Reuther, vice president of the organization.

The Supreme Court prayer ban is still causing many arguments. The controversy and confusion over the Court's ruling that it was unconstitutional to recite a State prescribed prayer in New York schools has heightened with the opening of a new school year. Boards of education, caught in the middle of the conflict, are looking for some direction in the legal maze that exists.

When the Court's decision was first handed down, many educators and legal experts tried to explain the ruling by saying it merely prohibited the reciting of a prayer which had been composed by any unit of government. The Court's opinion said that government should stay out of the business of writing official prayers. However, more recent developments seem to indicate that the Court was ruling against any form of prayer sanctioned or prescribed by a school board, regardless of the author.

This interpretation is borne out by the most recent ruling of New York State Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr., concerning religious practices in the schools. Allen ruled that it would be in violation of the Court order for the Hicksville, Long Island, school board to designate part of the national anthem as an official prayer. The crux of Allen's opinion was that the lines of "The Star-Spangled Banner" had been adopted as an official prayer. However, the commissioner said he could find nothing that would prevent the reading, reciting, or singing of the national anthem.

These developments show that much has been said and more will be said before we arrive at a common policy for all 50 States.

Cases before the Court including Perma's practices will be decided in the near future if the petitions now before the Court are acted upon.

At least one district has moved on the question of leaves of absence for teachers who wish to enroll in the Peace Corps.

The Los Angeles Board of Education approved a policy which will grant such leaves to all teachers who join the Peace Corps.

Retired teachers are in demand and the Peace Corps is giving preferential consideration to all applicants. In most of the nations requesting Peace Corps men and women the first request is for qualified teachers. The Peace Corps offices in Washington welcome all inquiries.

Most observers are enthusiastic over the great record made to date by this latest weapon in our fight against the spread of communism. I have personally talked to some of our own local residents who have been sent to Ethiopia as teachers.

EDUCATIONAL TV GROWING UP

More than 1,000 additional television channels will be needed to satisfy the educational television requirements of the Nation in the next decade.

That was the conclusion of the first nationwide survey of educational television conducted by the National Association of Education Broadcasters for the Office of Education. In carrying out the survey, NAEB took into account the projected needs of colleges and universities, local school systems, and State departments of education.

A primary concern of the NAEB in basing its estimate was that educational television "must reach far beyond the formal system of schools and provide opportunities for continuing education at every stage of life."

The survey found that the school systems of the country reported a greater need for educational television than the colleges and universities. More than 95 percent of the public schools surveyed reported serious curriculum deficiencies or teaching needs. Most said these could be met, or greatly helped, by educational television.

The survey recommended that the primary educational television channel in a community should be in the very high frequency—standard broadcast—band, because most of the larger population centers are equipped for VHF reception and it also offers greater coverage at less cost. Since sufficient VHF channels are not now available, the survey concludes that the deficit must be met with ultrahigh frequency channels as UHF sets become available.

In arriving at its estimate of the number of channels needed, the NAEB believes that each community or educational complex using television for systematic instruction will need from 2 to 12 channels for simultaneous transmission. In most instances, they found, UHF will serve these local multichannel needs.

It has been my custom over the years to give a report of the status of the bills on education.

The following list is comprised of legislation our committee acted upon and the present status of the proposals:

A. LEGISLATION ENACTED

1. The Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961; Public Law 87-22 (April 24, 1961). Amended to include practical nurse training. Important for Negroes since so many Negro women are employed in this field.

2. Establishment of teaching hospital for Howard University; Public Law 87-262 (September 22, 1961). Important for Negroes since more than 50 percent of Negro physicians have been trained at Howard University. The transferral of Freedmen's Hospital as a teaching hospital enhances the professional preparation possible at Howard.

3. Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; Public Law 87-274 (September 22, 1961). The first legislation of its kind to be passed. Provides Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training of personnel for work in these fields.

4. Teachers for the deaf and speech pathologists and audiologists; Public Law 87-276 (September 22, 1961).

5. Education of the blind and increased appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind; Public Law 87-294 (September 22, 1961).

6. Extend National Defense Education Act of 1958; extend impacted areas (extension of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874); Public Law 87-344 (October 3, 1961).

7. Amendment to title II of National Defense Education Act; Public Law 87-400 (October 5, 1961). National Defense Education Act important especially for student loan provisions.

8. Passed House and Senate, awaiting President's signature—captioned films for the deaf. Passed House September 17, 1962. Passed Senate August 13, 1962; with House amendments September 18, 1962.

B. PASSED HOUSE

1. School Lunch Act (amended) (June 6, 1962.) Important to Negroes since it removes the specific designation to race.

C. BILLS PASSED BY COMMITTEE AND IN RULES COMMITTEE—DATE REFERRED TO RULES COMMITTEE

1. University extension (May 31, 1962).

2. Special education and vocational rehabilitation (July 5, 1962).

3. Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts (July 19, 1961).

4. Adult basic education (April 2, 1962); recommended by President.

5. Quality Education Act (May 31, 1962); recommended by President.

6. General aid to elementary and secondary education.

7. Overall revision of National Defense Education Act (July 6, 1961).

8. Amendment to Land Grant Colleges Act to eliminate the "separate but equitable" clause of the act (May 23, 1962).

9. Amendments to impacted areas laws to deny payments to school districts that practice racial discrimination and segregation (May 31, 1962).

For those who have a special interest in certain phases of our legislative programs the following list catalogs the committee reports available as long as they are in print.

A request to my Washington office can be made for any committee prints still available.

D. COMMITTEE PRINTS ON EDUCATION

1. "Federal Aid for Education" (May 1961).

2. "The University in Latin America: Argentina and the Alliance for Progress" (September 1961).

3. "Federal Interest in Education" (September 1961).

4. "Higher Education in Soviet Union" (January 1962).

5. "Congressional Action for Higher Education" (January 1962).

6. "The New Image in Education" (February 1962).

7. "A Directory of Federally Financed Student Loans, Fellowships, and Career Training Programs in the Field of Higher Education in the United States" (April 1962).

8. "Views on Relationships of Church and State in the Field of Education" (May 1962).

9. "Integration in Public Education Programs" (May 1962).

10. "Interim Report on Education and Citizenship in the Public School System of Puerto Rico" (August 1962).

CRITICAL OIL PROBLEMS CONTINUE

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the independent oil industry in my home State of Texas, and in other oil-producing States, remains in a critically depressed condition. Every day independent oil producers go out of business and more people are unemployed.

It had been hoped, of course, that this problem could have been somewhat alleviated by amendment of the national security clause in the Trade Expansion Act which was signed by the President today.

The supporters of this amendment were assured that they would receive instead an Executive order dealing effectively with imports from the Near East and Canada.

Extensive hearings have proved the need for import restrictions. This vital industry must retain its ability to produce the fuel needed for our military operations, as well as our increasing everyday needs.

The facts indicate that this ability to produce, to find new reserves, is being seriously hampered by excessive oil imports. This is because the domestic oil industry has not shared at all in the increased demands for oil and its products in the past 5 years. All the increase in demand has been satisfied by import of cheap foreign oil.

This has meant that independent operators no longer find it economically feasible to search for new oil reserves. In my own district, which is one of the centers of independent oil producers, drilling rigs are selling for almost literally a dime a dozen. Operations have come to a near standstill. Most of the oil production today comes from secondary recovery, a process of gaining the last available drop of oil from old wells which are almost exhausted.

When these reserves are gone, we will be seriously lacking in new reserves unless the situation is changed soon.

Mr. Speaker, the Trade Expansion Act was signed into law today by President Kennedy. Congress is about to adjourn. A new Executive order is due to be issued before January 1, 1963.

The oil producers and the people from oil-producing areas need to know where they stand in this picture. This need is vital and urgent. We have been given assurance by the administration that this order will be forthcoming, and will be favorable to the independent producers. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this order will be issued immediately. If this is not possible, then the President should tell the public what will be contained in the order when it is issued.

This problem must be resolved quickly in order to save one of our most important industries from further serious damage.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY REFORM BILL

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, since its creation in September of 1959, the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, of which I am now ranking minority member, has held a number of public hearings involving highway practices and procedures followed in several selected States. The disclosures have been shocking.

In our own State of Florida it was shown that over the years many of the big highway contractors have been making payments of cash, whisky, turkeys, and other merchandise of substantial value to officials and employees of the State road department who were, of course, paid by the State to see that these same contractors complied with specifications. The Florida hearings have also shown that due to inadequate planning and worse, the State has disposed of valuable improvements on rights-of-way in total disregard of the public interest and has allowed the contractors and speculators to reap windfall profits that should have been realized by the State, a system that has permitted some contractors to use these valuable assets for what might be euphemistically called payola to grease the palms of two city commissioners and at least one highway official.

In Oklahoma, it was disclosed that there had been a deplorable failure to meet specifications during the construction of at least one highway. The hearings disclosed an amazing picture of inadequate or no supervision, failure to make proper tests and inspections, falsification of test reports and samples, and the fact that a member of the Oklahoma Highway Commission was a hidden member of a firm bidding on highway department sodding contracts.

Hearings concerning highway construction practices in the State of New Mexico disclosed events somewhat similar to those which occurred in Oklahoma. Detailed evidence was presented showing negligent or nonexistent inspections, failure to comply with construction specifications and the failure of a highway project before it was opened to traffic.

Hearings involving right-of-way acquisition practices in Massachusetts were started last February and continued for several weeks. These hearings disclosed a revolting pattern of conspiracy between certain State employees, appraisers, and attorneys resulting in the payment of clearly inflated prices for property needed for highway rights-of-way. The hearings did not cover fraudulent practices of contractors and consulting engineers despite my insistence that these matters be fully exposed. However, I understand the Bureau of Public Roads is continuing to investigate these matters.

The latest hearings of the subcommittee held last July concerning right-of-way acquisition practices in West Virginia. Among other things, it was disclosed at these hearings that the practice is followed of requiring State highway department employees to make regular monthly contributions to the Democratic Party sustaining fund. State employees are furnished with a coupon book for their use in making the regular payment. State officials have denied that these contributions are mandatory but I have letters in my files from State employees who state that the only way they can keep their job or get a promotion is to make these so-called voluntary contributions.

The disclosures are certainly not at an end and investigations are continuing in a number of areas. However, it has become disturbingly clear that the Federal laws need to be greatly strengthened in order to protect the public interest. In September of 1961, more than a year ago, I introduced a bill to provide for a Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act. This bill would add several new provisions to the law and amend some portions of existing law and would, in my opinion, greatly strengthen the Federal law enforcement agencies in their efforts to prevent frauds and abuses and to punish such actions when they are detected.

Among other things, my bill, H.R. 9353, would prohibit political contributions by firms or individuals contracting with States on Federal-aid highway projects, prohibit kickbacks and other unauthorized compensation to State employees working on Federal-aid highway projects and make it unlawful for certain officials or employees of a State or any federally aided projects to engage in conflicts of interest such as the subcommittee has found in Florida and other States.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has also recognized the need for revising existing Federal statutes and, in March of this year, submitted proposed legislation to the Congress as part of its legislative program. However, when asked to submit its views on my earlier bill, the Department of Commerce urged enactment of their proposed legislation on the apparent grounds that it objected to two essential provisions of my bill. In the letter commenting on my bill, Under-secretary Edward Gudeman stated:

> It is considered that the provisions of the pending bill which would amend title 18, United States Code, section 611, to prohibit political contributions by firms or individuals contracting with States on Federal-aid highway projects may be exceedingly restrictive. It is suggested that such provisions may not achieve their apparent purpose and would be extremely difficult of enforcement. That section of the proposed legislation relating to conflicts of interest is very similar to the provisions of section 1.33 of Regulations for the Administration of Federal Aid for Highways which are required to be enforced by the State.

This is a most amazing position to take. In the first place, existing Federal law, enacted in 1940, prohibits firms and individuals performing certain contracts with the United States from making political contributions to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use, and equally punishes anyone who knowingly solicits any such contributions. This in my judgment is sound public policy designed to prevent indirect financing of campaigns for and elections to public office out of the U.S. Treasury. The statute does not, however, extend the same protections with regard to abuses of Federal-aid highway funds because in this case the contracts are with the States and not the United States. But if it is bad to misuse Federal funds for political purposes at the Federal level, it is equally bad at the State level for the obvious evil to be remedied is that Congress has not appropriated these funds for political use.

My bill would simply extend to State contracts on Federal-aid highway projects substantially the same provisions which now apply with respect to contracts with the United States. I simply do not understand why the Department of Commerce would take the position that this change in the law should not be made.

With respect to the portion of my bill having to do with conflicts of interest, the Secretary of Commerce commented that the provision is very similar to one of the regulations for the administration of Federal aid for highways promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce but required to be enforced by the States. This comment is an obvious non sequitur. First, the sordid episodes which have been revealed by our subcommittee have demonstrated that the regulation of the Secretary of Commerce is obviously ineffective. Secondly, my purpose in introducing this bill was to provide the Federal Government with weapons with which to protect Federal funds rather than to leave this a matter to be enforced by the States.

It may be that further investigations and further hearings of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway

Program will disclose a need for further legislation needs in the bill I have introduced. If so, I shall prepare and introduce such legislation. In the meantime, I am convinced that H.R. 9353 is urgently needed and I plan to reintroduce the bill next session of Congress and to continue to press for its enactment.

I requested that hearings be held by the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I serve, and made a request to the chairman that this be done shortly after introducing the bill early this session. It is deplorable that action has not been taken on this much-needed legislation, particularly in view of the findings of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, indicating the need for this legislation. Apparently it was not considered important by the New Frontier or consideration would have been pushed and hearings would have been held, and perhaps a bill to prevent wrongdoing in the highway program, which could to some extent be avoided in the future, would have been passed. I am sure that everyone who saw the Brinkley report, entitled "The Great Highway Robbery," are at a loss to know why action has not been taken.

JOBS GOING BEGGING

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, recently Ewan Clague, the distinguished Commissioner of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, made a highly valuable contribution to the discussion of our Nation's employment and unemployment problem. The occasion for Mr. Clague's remarks was the first conference on the Manpower and Development Training Act of 1962, held at New York University on September 12, 1962.

One of the main points made by Mr. Clague—and something I have been trying to emphasize for some time—is that there are a great many jobs, both actual and potential, going begging in our economy because no one is qualified to fill them. There are widespread and persistent shortages in many professional and technical occupations, as well as further down the occupational scale, which, Mr. Clague said, could be filled if some of the unemployed were given sufficient training.

Mr. Clague made clear that this problem is likely to grow worse in the future as the shift from unskilled jobs to professional, technical, and service occupations continue.

Mr. Clague also discussed the role of technological unemployment and indicated its importance in our overall unemployment situation. A study prepared by Mr. Clague and Leon Greenberg, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics staff, showed that from 1953 to 1959 the decrease in employment for all workers in manufacturing as a whole, due to technological factors, was about three-quarters of a million jobs. Separate estimates for production workers only showed a loss in employment caused by advancing technology of over 1,100,000 workers. For a number of reasons, which Mr. Clague spelled out, these figures understate the problem of technological unemployment.

I think this address by Mr. Clague should be read with great care and thought by those who are interested in seeking a solution to the persistence of a high level of unemployment in this country, even during a period of relative prosperity. While falling demand may affect output and thus eliminate jobs, there has been altogether too much emphasis placed on inadequate demand as a cause of our high level of unemployment. The time is long overdue for an increase in emphasis and attention on our job vacancies and on the efforts that are required on all levels of government, and in the private sector, to ease the adjustments which automation and technological changes are forcing upon us. We need an upgrading of the Nation's education and training throughout the entire skill spectrum, and I think Mr. Clague's address helps contribute to this goal. Under unanimous consent, I ask that this address be included in the RECORD at this point:

THE ECONOMIC SETTING FOR THE MANPOWER TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(By Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, before the first conference on Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, New York University, New York, N.Y., September 12, 1962)

The manpower training and development program is the product of the last 5 years' experience with unemployment in the American economy. The passage of the act by the Congress in the spring of 1962 represented the first public decision for a longer range solution of the unemployment problem; the temporary extensions of unemployment benefits in 1958 and again in 1961 were strictly short range in purpose, being based upon the hope that recession unemployment would disappear in subsequent prosperity periods.

Two facts about unemployment influenced the decision to seek a longer range solution. These were, first, the higher level of unemployment in recent years, even during business prosperity; and second, the increased duration of unemployment, especially the number of unemployed out of work more than 26 weeks, which is the usual duration of unemployment insurance benefits. There is, of course, a direct relationship between level and duration; as the volume of unemployment rises, the duration is generally longer also. However, a clear distinction can be drawn between these two aspects of the problem. If industrial change is rapid, and labor turnover is high, millions of workers may experience temporary periods of unemployment; but if industry is expanding and jobs are plentiful, these millions can be reemployed within reasonable periods of time. Under such conditions, unemployment insurance is the appropriate program for the problem; what the unemployed worker and his family need is temporary assistance to tide them over until another job is obtained. During the decade and a half from 1941 to 1957 this was the only program that was needed. It is still the basic bulwark against unemployment; even during the last 5 years, the great majority of the unemployed have found jobs within their benefit periods.

However, it is the duration aspect of unemployment which has become intensified in these last few years. In 1953, according to the monthly report on the labor force, there were less than an average of 100,000 unemployed out of work for more than 26 weeks. The Nation had no longrun unemployment problem at that time. During 1956, which was a highly prosperous year, the number averaged about 250,000; but in 1959 it rose to 550,000, and in the last year, from the summer of 1961 to the summer of 1962, it was still higher, on the average about 700,000. The latest figure (August 1962) is approximately 600,000—a little less than 1 percent of the labor force.

The growing number of these long-term unemployed points to the existence of some new factors affecting the employability of considerable numbers of them. Labor market analysts have pointed to a series of factors which tend to prolong the unemployment of an employable man or woman. One is geographic immobility—the continued existence of labor surplus areas, communities in which the decline of industry has left a pocket of unemployed workers. To get jobs the workers have to move out or industry has to be brought in. The area redevelopment program was designed to deal with this aspect of the problem.

The area problem is accentuated by personal and family immobility, which consists of all those factors that operate to tie the family to the community. Homeownership is an obvious one of these—the extent of homeownership among workers' families has practically doubled in the last quarter century, and the proportion is still going up. During World War II, and again during Korea, war industries paid moving expenses and other costs in order to facilitate the recruitment of workers. Of course, in such circumstances there was a job in sight in the new location. In the absence of such protections and assurances, workers today hesitate to pull up stakes and leave their home communities.

The 1960's may eventually bring some easing of this particular aspect of the problem. Young workers are far more willing to move than the oldsters. Statistics from the Bureau of the Census on the movement of the population show that young men and women in their twenties move to new places four times as often as people over age 45. So as the postwar wave of youngsters enter the labor force in the next 2 or 3 years they should constitute a more mobile element in the labor market.

Equally important in prolonging unemployment are the twin factors of industrial and occupational immobility. I call these "twins" rather than two different factors because they are closely interrelated, although they are different. For example, they can be different in that an occupation may be expanding even though the industry may be suffering a decline in employment; and the reverse can also be true. At the same time, workers attached to an industry (and to a successful firm within it) may retain their employment even though they are required to shift their jobs, their skills, and their occupations.

Industrial and occupational shifts are major factors in long-term unemployment and in the generally lengthened duration of recent years. Take industry, for example. For this purpose, I have chosen the last 5 years, since this is the period on which we are concentrating our attention; and for the comparison I have selected the first 6 months of 1957 and the first 6 months of 1962.

Total employment in the United States in the first half of 1957 averaged 64.3 million; in the first half of 1962, 67 million, an increase of 2.7 million.

However, this increase in jobs was very unevenly distributed over the industries in our economy. For example, in agriculture there was a decline from 5.9 million to 5.1 million, a net loss of over 800,000 jobs (as reported in the household survey). Fully as dramatic as this were some of the shifts of employment among nonfarm industries, as reported by employers in the employment, hours, and earnings survey. The table below highlights the contrast between those industries in which employment has expanded over the 5-year period and those in which employment has declined:

TABLE 1.—*Employees on nonfarm payrolls, 1st half year averages, 1957 and 1962*

[In thousands]

Industry group	1957	1962	1957-62 change
Mining	826	649	−177
Construction	2,790	2,514	−276
Manufacturing	17,223	16,589	−634
Durable goods	9,973	9,382	−591
Nondurable goods	7,251	7,207	−44
Transportation and public utilities	4,233	3,900	−333
Wholesale and retail trade	10,734	11,368	+634
Finance, insurance, and real estate	2,450	2,768	+318
Service industries	6,684	7,661	+977
Federal Government	2,203	2,306	+103
State and local government	5,384	6,819	+1,435

In mining, construction, manufacturing (both durable and nondurable), and transportation and public utilities, there were fewer jobs in 1962 than in 1957. For these groups combined, the total loss was over 2 million jobs. Yet at the same time there was a net gain of nearly 3½ million jobs in the other industry groups—about 1½ million in government, about 1 million in service industries, and about 1 million in trade and finance, insurance and real estate. It is hardly necessary to point out that the drift of employment has been away from the basic industries producing food, clothing, and shelter and into those industries (and government) servicing the American people as consumers. For example, the rapid growth in State and local government employment is directly the result of the expansion of our schools and the servicing of the community needs of our expanding city population.

But even these industrial shifts do not portray the whole picture. Within many industries there have been marked occupational shifts from blue-collar jobs to white-collar. The table below highlights this shift in manufacturing (data from employer reports):

TABLE 2.—*Employees on manufacturing payrolls 1st half year averages, 1957 and 1962*

	Production workers	Nonproduction workers
1957	13,264	3,959
1962	12,295	4,294
1957-62 change	−969	+335

There was a loss of nearly a million plant jobs and an increase of a third of a million office jobs. However, the plant workers do not usually cross over into office jobs.

There is still another factor which must be taken into account in analyzing the shifts in employment among industries. Employment in industry may decline (a) because of a lack of demand for its products, or (b) because technological improvements make it possible to produce the same output with fewer workers. It is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain precise quantitative estimates of the effect of technological change in causing unemployment, but there are data which furnish some indications of the ways in which this factor operates and the industries where it may be having some effect. In the July 1962 issue of the Monthly Labor Review, Leon Greenberg, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics staff, and I made some estimates of the interindustry effects of technological change. What we did was to take 200 industries within manufacturing as a whole and divide them into those which showed an increase in employment over the 6-year period from 1953 to 1959 and those which showed a loss in employment over the same period. Then we further subdivided both groups into those in which productivity, expressed as output per man-hour, increased and those in which it decreased.

I shall not attempt here to outline the details of our study, since I want only to summarize our results. Of course, some of the decreases in employment in particular industries were due to declines in demand for their products—their output in 1959 was less than in 1953. Then, taking this factor of declining output into account, we estimated the extent to which decreases in employment arose primarily because of rising output per man-hour. For manufacturing as a whole, the decrease in employment due to technological factors was about three-quarters of a million jobs. This figure included all workers in manufacturing, both blue collar and white collar. When we made a separate estimate for production workers only, that is, blue-collar workers in the plants, the net loss in employment was over 1,100,000. Thus, the plant workers were the ones primarily affected by changing technology.

There are two points of caution which must be expressed in connection with these figures. Mr. Greenberg and I used the term "disemployment," to describe the net loss of employment which occurred due to technological change. Disemployment is not the same as unemployment; the decrease in jobs may have been brought about by the failure to hire new employees, or by the retirement of older workers; meanwhile, some laid-off workers may have obtained jobs in other industries. However, it is obvious that workers in industries with declining employment are more likely to experience spells of unemployment than are the workers in expanding industries.

In another sense, the above figures understate the problem of technological unemployment, not only because they relate only to manufacturing rather than to the whole economy, but also because they do not take account of job losses among the firms within particular industries, even those industries in which employment increased. All that our figures measure is the extent of interindustry disemployment, not intra-industry.

The characteristics of the unemployed reflect the influence of these factors causing unemployment, that is, causing certain kinds of workers to be unemployed rather than others. For example, data from the household survey show that the annual average rate of unemployment for experienced wage and salary workers was 6.8 percent for the year 1961. However, the rate for mining, forestry, and fisheries was 11.6 percent; construction, 14.1 percent; manufacturing, 7.7 percent; while at the other extreme, the unemployment rates were as follows: public administration, 2.7 percent; finance, insurance and real estate, 3.3 percent; service industries, 4.9 percent.

The contrast among occupational groups was even more striking. The 1961 annual average rate for operatives was 9.6 percent, and for laborers (except farm and mine), 14.5 percent; while the rate for professional and technical was 2 percent; clerical workers, 4.6 percent; sales workers, 4.7 percent. Service workers (except domestics) had somewhat higher than average rates, 7.4 percent.

Finally, the long-term unemployed reflect still another part of the problem; namely, the disadvantages of age with respect to reemployment. Among the unemployed, who had been out of work more than 26 weeks, the men 45 to 64 years of age had a rate of unemployment more than a third higher than the rate for all men. Likewise, women in those age groups had an unemployment rate well over a third higher than all women. The above data from the household survey indicate that older workers adversely affected by industrial and occupational shifts are constituting a growing unemployment problem.

If these trends could be halted at present levels, the situation might be manageable with our existing programs. But the outlook for the future is for a further development of these past trends. Our projections for the future indicate that the shift to the white-collar employments is continuing and may even accelerate—to professional and technical occupations, to sales and clerical work, to service jobs, and away from unskilled jobs, both on the farms and in industry. For young workers, both boys and girls, this emphasizes the vital importance of education and the preparation for a career. The Department of Labor has been emphasizing this point for the past several years. This coming autumn the Bureau of Labor Statistics is issuing the sixth edition of the "Occupational Outlook Handbook," which sketches the outlook for approximately 600 occupations. This book is designed to enable the young workers, high school and college, to check on the prospects for their prospective careers.

However, for established and experienced workers of all occupations the problem is different. A male head of a family in his forties or fifties is unlikely to return to school for several years to qualify for a profession. But he may be capable of learning a new occupation if afforded that opportunity. So the Manpower Development and Training Act was designed to provide opportunities for workers to obtain help to enable them to qualify for new jobs and occupations to replace the ones they have lost. The logic on which the act is based is that the great majority of the unemployed are out of work because they are unemployable, or because they aren't willing to work, or because jobs don't exist; but rather that the unemployed can and will find jobs when they are qualified to hold them. This, in turn, implies that there are actual or potential jobs in our economy which are not being filled because there is no one qualified to take them. What is the evidence that such jobs exist?

We have in this country ample qualitative evidence that such jobs do exist—unfilled orders in the public employment offices, advertisements in newspapers, the expansion of private placement agencies devoted to finding men for critical jobs. But we lack concrete statistical evidence on this point. Such data have been collected on occasion in some countries. For many years, during and after World War II, the employment offices in Great Britain collected and published such information. In fact, at one time, social security experts in Great Britain defined full employment as a condition in which the number of job vacancies in the nation was equal to the number of unemployed. That statistic had the great advantage of emphasizing that the unemployment in the economy was not due to lack of jobs, but to the inability of the unemployed to fill the jobs. It pointed toward the need for a training program to match men and jobs.

However, in recent years Great Britain has ceased compiling this statistic, largely because the conditions which made it reasonably accurate no longer exist. During World War II and in the tight labor market in the early postwar period, the British Government exercised strong control over the labor market. For example, they required employers to register all vacancies with the public employment offices and further required them to report the filling of such vacancies to the employment service. The effect was to channel the vast majority of job orders in the economy through the employment offices, where they could be counted, tabulated, and published. With the relaxation of labor market controls, these procedures have been modified, and the job orders in the British employment offices no longer measure the job vacancies in the economy.

On a number of occasions during the past 5 years, the question has been raised as to why the Bureau of Labor Statistics does not make some effort to compile statistics of job vacancies. In the condition of the labor market of the United States today the job orders in the public employment service do not measure at all accurately the unfilled jobs in the economy—there are so many other methods of filling jobs. So the only way to obtain such a figure is to devise a questionnaire to a sample of employers, asking them to report the number of job vacancies they are trying to fill. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is planning a pilot survey on that subject. Without prejudging the test, I can only say cautiously that a job vacancy is very hard to define—is it when a job order is actually placed with a public (or private) placement agency? Is it the number of vacancies which the corporate (or Government) placement office has authorization to fill? How do we avoid exaggeration in that employers in a tight labor market often place more orders than they actually plan to fill? Despite all these problems and difficulties, the Bureau is exploring the situation to see what, if anything, can be done to quantify this crucial economic statistic.

In the absence of quantitative data, what can be said on this subject of job vacancies? There are a few points on which we are reasonably sure of the basic facts. One is that in the higher professional and technical occupations there are widespread and persistent shortages—doctors, nurses, engineers, scientists, teachers, statisticians, technicians, etc., etc. These shortages are slow to respond to placement efforts because of the fundamental educational and preparatory requirements of the jobs. But there are other shortages strung down through the occupational scale—stenographers, clerical workers, service workers, even down to domestics in the home. These are jobs which could be filled if some of the unemployed (or the underemployed) were given sufficient training—and for many of these jobs only a reasonable training period is required.

REAL ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for some time, I have been saying, in answer to those who claim that ours is a stagnant economy, that the gross national product is not an accurate indicator of the Nation's economic growth.

The leading article in the Wall Street Journal of October 9, 1962, sheds some needed light on those areas which give a clear picture of how fast our economy is really growing. The article, for example, talks about the many new goods and services on the market, the high level of research and development spending, the growth in consumer services, such as hospital care, and the very rapid rise in per capita disposable income, adjusted for changes in the level of prices.

Our citizens are vastly better off today than they were even a decade ago. According to this article, the American standard of living has grown twice as fast in the past 8 years as in the first 8 after World War II. This is true economic growth, and I wish that those who diagnose incorrectly some of our economic problems, because of their belief in the stagnation theory, would take note of this article. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

ECONOMIC GROWTH: U.S. LIVING STANDARD RISES TWICE AS FAST IN EARLY POSTWAR ERA—PERSONAL INCOME AFTER TAXES GAINS 16 PERCENT IN PAST 8 YEARS—NINE OF TEN HOMES HAVE TV—FLAW IN GROWTH COMPARISON

(By Alfred D. Malabre, Jr.)

The American standard of living has grown twice as fast in the last 8 years as in the first 8 after World War II.

This fundamental fact shines through the fog of Federal statistics in an era of much fretting over slow growth in the Nation's economy.

There is no index of the standard of living. Measuring it precisely is impossible. But one figure comes close to the mark. This is per capita disposable income adjusted for changes in the level of prices. The disposable means it's after all personal taxes.

Since late last year this figure has held above $2,000 for the first time. Latest tally puts it at $2,030 in terms of 1961 prices. That's an upward bounce of 16 percent in less than 8 years. In the 8 years ended with 1954 it rose less than 7 percent.

The $2,000-plus figure on the statistically average American's ultimate ability to buy the goods and services of life is now nearly double the $1,212 of prewar 1939. (The 1939 total, to make it comparable despite price changes, is in terms of 1961 dollars. In 1939 dollars it was only $537.)

EVIDENCE IN HOMES, GOLF COURSES

Evidence of how this great growth in real buying power has bettered the lot of the citizen is abundant. It's found in homes and on highways, in bowling alleys and on golf courses. It shows in bookstores and concert halls. And—for the sick—in hospitals.

The 48 million new U.S. autos made in the last 8 years alone add up to twice as many cars as there are today on all the roads of Europe (including Russia). Once-a-week bowlers in the United States, now at 36 million, double the total of 1955. The golfing army has grown 25 percent.

The leap of living standards goes beyond the enjoyment of material things. Columbia Records reports the recording of classical music is the fastest growing part of its business—up 80 percent from the year earlier period in the first half of 1962. Book sales over $1.2 billion yearly, are twice the 1955 total. The number of persons now entering hospitals is nearly half again as large as in the mid-1950's.

Growth of consumer products has accelerated sharply in recent years.

The table below shows U.S. production of some familiar goods. The postwar years, starting with 1947, have been divided into two 8-year periods to match recent output against that in the supposedly fast-growing early years. Total for 1955–62 include full-year estimates for this year. Figures are in millions of units:

	Output in—	
	1955–56	1947–54
Autos	48.4	40.6
TV sets	51.9	37.7
Washing machines	30.8	29.0
Air conditioners	12.6	3.2
Clothes dryers	10.6	3.3
Dishwashers	3.9	1.6

The quantity of goods produced in the more recent 8-year span, in every case, exceeds the earlier output. In two instances—air conditioners and clothes dryers—1955–62 production is more than three times the 1947–54 total.

And the list doesn't include many items not even produced in the early years. Examples: Washer-dryer combination appliances (100,000 units sold by manufacturers last year), electric can openers (1.7 million), electric knife sharpeners (500,000), and tape recorders (500,000).

OUTSTRIPS POPULATION RISE

The great burst of consumer goods production in recent years far outpaces the population rise. Since 1955, the U.S. population has increased 12 percent. But the number of motor vehicles in use, for example, has climbed 24 percent. Some 8 million families own more than one auto now, nearly double the 1955 total.

Witness the rise of television in recent years: Nine of 10 homes have sets today, up from seven in 10 in 1955.

Or clothes dryers: Nearly a quarter of U.S. households are now equipped with them, up from 6 percent in 1955.

Or beef consumption: Per capita, Americans ate 67 pounds of it last year, a 12-pound jump from the 1955 average.

The home-building surge—over 10 million new homes in less than 8 years—has reduced "doubling up" among families. In 1955, about 1.5 million married couples were without homes of their own and had to live with relatives or others. The total now is close to 900,000.

And homes are getting bigger. Floor space in a new single-family house averages about 1,500 square feet, a third more space than the average new home contained in 1955.

DEPRESSING DEMAND?

Paradoxically, the great boom in things for consumers has caused some fears that consumers now possess so many items there is little room for continuing strong demand.

Many economists, however, believe such concern is unwarranted. Norris O. Johnson, vice president and economist of First National City Bank, New York, puts it this way:

"Human wants are insatiable. If the old worries about people having everything were valid, our economy would still be in the horse-and-buggy stage."

Living-standard growth through access to more so-called services has been sweeping.

A dramatic example: U.S. hospitals last year handled a record 25.5 million admissions. That's about 40 percent above the mid-1950's level.

To supply the growing wants of Americans, U.S. industry has carried out a vast expansion in recent years. Industry's massive ability to produce has prompted some concern about "excessive" capacity. But it also has paved the way for fast growth in the years just ahead, many experts contend.

ELECTRICITY TO SPARE

Note the gigantic growth in facilities to generate labor-saving electricity. The country's generating capacity now exceeds 180 million kilowatts, that's nearly 70 million above the 1955 level.

"We have the capacity now to handle a 25-percent jump in demand," says an official of Edison Electric Institute, a trade group representing electric utility companies. In the mid-1950's, he estimates, generating capacity was only 15 to 20 percent higher than demand.

To increase and otherwise improve production, the Nation's manufacturers have pumped $101.3 billion into new plant and equipment projects since 1955. That's some $17 billion more than they spent for plant and equipment in the entire previous postwar era.

One result of such spending has been a 30-percent leap in production capacity in basic industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, textiles, lumber, and cement) in the past 8 years. These industries as a whole are now using some 80 percent of their capacity, according to Government estimates, down from about 85 percent in 1955.

Rapidly rising research and development spending in recent years has laid the groundwork for further betterment in living standards. The $50 billion so spent in the United States in the past 4 years is nearly double the sum spent in the previous 4 years. This spending has increased yearly, through recovery and recession, since totals first were compiled in 1954.

Much of the concern over "slow growth" in the United States centers in comparisons between the increase of gross national product (the market value of all goods produced and services performed) in the United States and in other lands.

GNP in the United States has risen only 2.7 percent annually since the middle of the last decade (after allowing for price increases), far below the comparable rise in some other lands.

But such comparisons can be misleading. Many foreign economies were smashed by World War II. All are expanding from levels far below the U.S. postwar base.

Japan's GNP, for instance, has soared over 130 percent since the mid-1950's, far steeper than the comparable rise of GNP in the United States. In absolute terms, however, the gap between the two nations has widened. U.S. GNP, at the year's start, was $491.4 billion greater than that of Japan. Eight years ago, the U.S. lead was only $342.6 billion. At last count U.S. GNP was more than 10 times Japan's.

"It's impossible to say for certain how fast we should expand—there's a tendency to pick a figure out of the air," asserts F. L. Simmons, vice president and economist of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York. "The statements made, moreover, often reflect the political underpinnings of the speakers."

DON'T TREAD ON ME

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a very thought-provoking essay by one of my constituents, Mr. John R. Randall, of Johnstown, Ohio. Mr. Randall has a great interest in history and government and has produced a very thought-provoking article which is very germane to the great debates and issues of the day. Under unanimous consent, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

DON'T TREAD ON ME

The flag of the Virginia patriots served as an inspiration and most appropriate symbol for this work.

Benjamin Franklin defended the rattlesnake symbol [1] and in so doing gave the following reasons: "That the rattlesnake is found only in North America; that among the ancients, serpents were considered possessed of wisdom and vigilance; that the rattlesnake does not attack without first giving warning; and that the number of rattles increases with age—hence the symbol was especially appropriate for the anticipated growth of the United States."

To the author it suggests steadfastness, and in addition it serves as a bridge to the past, to the time when liberty was something sought for and not assumed, to a time when individual and national freedom was a concept cherished and not an actuality to be compromised or conceded.

BACKGROUND

As we travel the road of life, we pass many mileposts but few of them have real significance when we take that long-studied look at our past and try to recall the really big things, the really important things in our life.

Sometimes—much to our surprise—the thing or things that have had the greatest cumulative impact on our thinking and our actions are things that, at the time of their occurrence, were minute and inconsequential.

There are many reasons for this. Our conscious mind is a great sifter (selecting only those thoughts we most desire to recall for ready reference and selection); or perhaps it is due to our innate ability to make a mountain out of a molehill or vice versa.

In any event, when I was 6 years old a friend of my father's, Mr. Harry Hager, gave me a little framed picture for a birthday present. This was not much of a gift, I thought at the time, but I dutifully hung it on my bedroom wall. There it remained through childhood and adolescence, and today it hangs on my den wall. This little picture, because of its message, is one of my most valued possessions. I would say, realizing the full scope of its meaning or message, it was a very important milestone in my life.

With the passage of time our sense of values change; or stated another way, as we become more disciplined, more mature, the more likely we are to comprehend the full significance, the true meaning of a simple statement. The wiser we become, the more experienced we become, the more we realize that size and complexity do not guarantee quality.

My first milestone is reproduced here for your benefit. Read into it what you will. Enjoy it and make it a milestone in your life—if you care to:

"It's easy to drift in the current swift,
Just lie in your boat and dream,
But in Nature's plan it takes a real man,
To paddle his boat upstream."

My second milestone came while I was an eighth grader at Franklin Junior High School, Columbus, Ohio, while studying Latin in a general language course taught by Miss Ethel Ewing.

Miss Ewing taught Latin and history and over the door to her classroom was the word "salve." To the uninstructed this word signified the mysterious, the formidable and the arduous labor usually associated with learning a foreign language. Like the subject matter she taught, Miss Ewing herself was thought of as a hard taskmaster, immovable and impersonal. Again I say, those were the thoughts of the uninstructed.

Once you passed through this door and the learning process began you learned the meaning of this word—"good day." You also learned that the teacher was warm and dedicated to her work and that she wanted all her pupils to acquire the same interest and enthusiasm for knowledge and language that she had, to know and appreciate this ancient language and how it influenced history and current events.

I had the enthusiasm, but insofar as I was concerned she had little else to work with. But I wasn't to be outdone by Caesar and his "Veni, Vidi, Vici." I, too, would have a motto.

My inspiration came the day of a surprise quiz on a day when I was woefully unprepared. I tried but knew I couldn't fool her; therefore, on my paper I merely wrote "Rursus Temptavi" and didn't sign my name. "I tried again."

My motto has become a part of my philosophy or my way of life from that day on. I am grateful that I met Miss Ewing and I owe much to the inspiring motto, that in times of distress or adversity, has buoyed my spirits, mustered my thoughts and energy for that one last try.

One might say at this point that I believe: One should try, should stand up for his convictions, and not be afraid to run against the current of opinion, prejudice, and apathy whenever and wherever the occasion demands it.

Another milestone came when I was 14—in the home of my Sunday school teacher, Miss Elizabeth Lehman, who for 30-odd years had been a missionary in China. Miss Lehman aroused my interest in religion and provided the other and most important part of the equation—belief in God and in His power that is available to you if you believe in Him and if you try to help yourself.

TODAY

Today, as always, the world abounds in problems, in crises, and the question comes to mind—is this any different than it ever was or are we simply more aware of what is happening throughout the world because of the vast communication and transportation complexes?

No doubt both observations are true. One thing is certain, there are more people in existence than ever before and they are more vocal and expressive. Distance and timelag are things of the past. Change is constant and sometimes sudden, sometimes violent.

This can be both a blessing and a curse depending on your outlook, but one thing is certain—it exists. Another thing is equally important. It does have a bearing on you—today and from this day forward.

We live in a fast, noisy, worrisome and wearisome or wonderful (here again depending on your outlook) world.

It is said that our world is on the verge of reverting to a dark age or entering a golden era. The cause and the direction is of our own (mankind's) making and the only question to be resolved is: Will 20th-century man be capable of the effort to turn this challenge in the favor of future generations or will he succumb and cast himself and civilization into oblivion?

Personally, I have confidence in man. I believe in his Creator. I believe man to be made in the image of God and that God intended man to master himself and the universe he inhabits.

A big job confronts man in his race for survival. He lives in a paradoxical society when he, as an individual, is confronted with enormous problems as his society is one of plenty and poverty, peace and war, life and death, sickness and health, growth and decay. On top of all this is man who for years has witnessed his individual identity eroding (sometimes at his insistence); his dependence on others increasing and then subjected to disillusionment when he discovers those in whom he placed his trust, his dependence, failed him.

---

[1] "The Flag of Our United States," by James A. Moss.

It's a chaotic scene; but out of chaos comes order—the first law of the universe. Man will find order when he rediscovers his confidence and once again sets out on the path of mastery his Creator intended him to follow.

All of mankind's history has been but a prelude for the great play now being enacted. This play has a cast of billions but only two stars and it plays to one critic.

The play is life; the cast the world's inhabitants; the stars good and evil or Godlike and Godless; the critic, your Creator.

The plot is economic or materialistic with variations. On one hand we have good playing, its theme stressing the importance of man and human dignity; and on the other we have evil making her point of the importance of the system as opposed to the individual. You are soon to go on—soon to be counted. From whence will you make your entry—the right or left wing? You choose now and live, die, and be judged by your decision. Will it be from the right—alined with God in support of individual human dignity, or from the left—denying God and favoring "a materialistic" system and the denial of man, his freedoms, his individuality?

EDUCATION

Not long ago, sputnik was launched and with its every orbit cries arose in this country to modify our educational system and its content. What we really need is more concentration. Concentration of study in the sciences, concentration of administrative responsibility, increased appropriations, and bigger and better facilities. "Off with the old, on with the new." Russia's being first meant American education's failure. How idiotic.

Few outcries are made today. Perhaps the system isn't so bad. The old decentralized system, the one that lets nature's law work, with a minimum of impairment—the law referred to is: "Water seeks its own level."

Let's take a look at the subject of education. In this country of ours, education is a basic necessity if our system of self-government is to be maintained. It goes without saying in a democracy or a federal republic the public must be knowledgeable if they are to exercise their franchise intelligently and be productive members of their society.

Is our educational system currently as good as it should be or could be? I think not. Is our shortage of college facilities as real as it is reported to be? I think not. Should we segregate the brilliant from the average and the average from the slow student? I think not. Should the determination of curriculums in our schools, the administration of building and maintenance funds be determined at the Federal level? I think not. Should parochial schools be subsidized in any way by any government agency at any level? I think not.

Perhaps the above sounds negative, but let's explore these areas one at a time—just briefly—and see if the above stands or beliefs make sense.

Our educational system could be improved in many ways. The first step in improving the efficiency and productivity of our educational system is for every adult to take an interest in it with the idea in mind of ascertaining what problems are facing school administrators, teachers, pupils, employers, and last but not least, the taxpayers. When was the last time you visited your school during school hours, during an open house, during a PTA or PTO meeting? How long has it been since you attended the last school board meeting? Did you vote for your school board members or trustees? Were you satisfied with their background or did you just vote for a name? These men and women in a very real and final sense determine the effectiveness and cost of maintaining your school or schools.

Let's face it. If we are too apathetic to take an active interest in our local schools—here's where most of your real estate taxes go and more—then how can we possibly understand the problem at the national level let alone supporting or offering a solution to resolve the problem? In the final analysis, the biggest problem confronting our educators today is the lack of adult support or understanding of the school program. This part of the problem can be solved for nothing—except your time. Everyone should take an interest in education in their community whether or not they have children in school. I shudder when I think of living in a community where education was thought unnecessary or a waste of time. In a matter of time neither your person nor your property would be safe and your community would soon die.

Is the shortage or anticipated shortage of college classrooms real or fancied? Yes and no. Yes; if we are to run every young man and woman through them regardless of their fitness or qualifications. No, if we are to operate a college system in the classical sense—for those sufficiently endowed intellectually. One of our greatest mistakes today from a standpoint of quality, cost, and social significance is the idea that everyone must go to college. Forcing college attendance on our youth is morally and economically wrong.

Society—parents especially—does a grave injustice to our youth when they send them off to college when they are not prepared for it intellectually or when the young people do not care to seriously undertake a course of study in the arts and sciences.

The college degree is becoming meaningless because it is becoming so essential as a status symbol and in the quest for employment. Business creates a wasteful and meaningless standard when they demand a degree for a clerk's job. Whom are they kidding? They're only kidding themselves because they force academic standards down to a level that makes a degree obtainable by almost anyone who has the patience to sit through 4 years of a high school rehash. Who loses? We all lose. The student loses time—in many cases—that could be better spent learning a vocation or trade or otherwise getting experience.

The taxpayer loses because this adds to the cost of maintaining an extremely expensive educational plant. Our economy loses because the dollars so spent have not been productive dollars and this is vital in a free enterprise society—every person, every dollar must be productive in a real way if we are to win the real battle against communism—the economic and ideological battle.

Everyone loses—and this can be the most tragic loss—if the student breaks and becomes neurotic and morose. This loss is impossible to calculate.

Why don't we face up to the fact that every job doesn't require a degree. Let's not kid ourselves by saying a college degree is an end in itself. Let's not—I pray—make labor and work degrading but let us encourage our youth—all of our citizens to pursue that vocation that their talents can best be used in and in which they'll find contentment and the satisfaction of being productive.

The time has come to carefully examine the use of our high schools on a two shift basis or around the clock if need be and offer advanced courses—junior college level or trade school courses to prepare our clerks, et cetera. This approach offers many real opportunities for good—social, economic as well as educational.

Should we segregate the brilliant students from the average and slow students in public schools? No. What we should strive for in educating our youth is balance—the equal development of minds, bodies, and personalities. By association with their slower associates, the extremely bright student can help lift the level of aspiration and accomplishment of the entire class or group and at the same time he can learn patience and understanding, to say the least.

Another facet of this, one of the most important or most discussed topics of public education is the cost of this type of segregation. I think this a burden costwise, that the public should not be forced to bear. Many people will find this objectionable as they feel the bright, the gifted child has a far greater potential for social good than the average or slow students. This may be true but think of the number or percentage of this type of student as opposed to the balance and the consequence of this action when you think of the damage done to the average or slow student by his being labeled in a negative way, early in life. This labeling is extremely damaging and it is sad that "labels" are being used so extensively in our society and many times without thought to their consequences.

Insofar as the Federal Government is concerned it should not in any way interfere with public education at any level. This principle is clearly and concisely stated in our Constitution. Local problems—local solutions should be the benchmark in our educational system.

Federal or public support of parochial schools is strictly taboo in our society and it is best that the principle of segregation of church and state be maintained lest confusion arise and freedoms be abridged because the will of one is forced on the other or on society itself. A free lunch or a free ride is not worth sacrificing so great a principle, now or ever.

THE ECONOMY

"Baa, baa, black sheep,
Have you any wool?
Yes sir, yes sir;
Three bags full.
One for the master,
One for the dame,
One for the little boy
Who cries in the lane."

Nursery rhyme? Not originally. A bit of satire protesting oppressive taxation in a time when freedom of speech and criticism of government was not permitted.

Today our economy is lagging behind that of other free countries in Western Europe and our President's economic advisers are desperately floundering about trying to find the answer; however, the solution to the problem has long been known and advocated but the "eggheads" can't grasp the concept because it is so obvious, so simple, and so effective, and offers less of a haven for "spoilers" and bureaucrats.

It seems the "experts" have learned little while driving this great Nation to the abyss of bankruptcy. They have recently advocated a revision of their basic premise. Albeit the reasons for this are to take advantage of the taxpayer's basic dislike of Federal taxes and the usurpage of his income, his purchasing power, and his savings. It is offered to gain his favor, his vote, and thereby propagate and perpetuate their grasp or death grip on his destiny. They have dropped the tax, half of their panacea of tax and spend. Now the whole scheme is merely spend, spend, spend.

Spend what? The only money the Government has to spend is the money the citizenry permits it to usurp from them through taxation. Of course there is always credit but this presents a stumbling block to the spenders in time because even the lenders to Government are apt to ask for justification on the basis of character, capacity, and collateral.

The sad truth is the time has come when this hurdle must be overcome or the bubble will burst.

As a matter of fact, today, if the collective foreign demand on our gold reserves was exercised we would be adrift. Like a ship at sea without a rudder—friendless and lost—with no friendly beach on the horizon.

You think this can't happen? You are wrong. This dilemma has caused many sleepless nights in financial circles the world over in recent months and still we continue plodding along not caring and oblivious to reality.

This is exactly what "Khru" predicted would happen. He knew he could depend on the selfishness, the greed, and the apathy of the American electorate to bring about its own destruction. We failed to learn from history that democratic societies usually destroy themselves from within and not fall to their obvious enemies from without. The "good life" does not come free—enslavement does.

This is an emergency. What's the solution—if there is one? We have the question before us. Let's explore the possibilities—just a few of them.

No. 1: Let's assume, if you haven't been convinced already, that a huge and domineering Federal bureaucracy is the cause. Before we go any further, the responsibility is yours and mine.

Let's look at this again a little closer just to make sure—we don't want to start down the wrong path. Again, our major trouble is too much Government and the cause of this is the apathy, the greed, and the transference of responsibility by the electorate—starting with you and me. We haven't fulfilled our responsibility as citizens and we haven't expected our leaders to do any better.

Now, for many years our Federal Government has been trying to fill the gap created by our apathy and a few—give the people responsible for our leadership the benefit of the doubt—tyrants, power hungry, and in some cases outright gangsters and subversives have ambitiously sought to grab all the "marbles" or as many as possible for themselves and in so doing exercise absolute control over our lives from the cradle to the grave.

Their progress has exceeded their wildest expectations and we have played our role to perfection. We have asked for more, while at the same time we decided to do less and less. In this situation all that was asked was a small part of our birthright with each giveaway. This we gladly gave—it cost us little or nothing and think of the returns. "Easy come, easy go."

As always, there is an answer but the price is greater, the cure more costly, than it would have been 30 years ago.

The first thing we must do is return to some of the basic facts of life—morally, politically, and economically. We must again face up to the fact that waste must be eliminated. Waste of our natural, human, and economic resources, featherbedding, extravagance, "pork barreling," excessive Government spending, and excessive taxation must be a thing of the past—immediately. Confidence must be restored.

This will result in victory on every front and increase the stature of mankind globally.

Cuts in expenditures must come first. Taxation can be revised downward slowly but the cost of debt reduction must be set at a faster pace. The size and scope of Federal control and business activity must shrink.

What follows from this course? People in nonproductive and wasteful endeavors will be forced to seek employment in productive enterprises (there will be plenty of opportunities for them when the reduction in taxation takes the burden off John Q. Public—who has tremendous, insatiable propensity to consume goods and services) and the cost of these people and the programs that employ them will be diverted to the economy for use in expansion and improvement of our industrial plant which will be required as a result of more disposable income in the hands of millions of American consumers—the working men and women of America.

To give the economy an immediate boost, we should eliminate the practice of withholding Federal income tax from the paychecks of the millions of Americans who usually have the entire amount refunded or at least a large portion of it. Let's put this money in circulation where it should be now.

The impact would be tremendous and immediate, and confidence—consumer and investor confidence—would be buoyed. Confidence is what expands a nation's growth rate, not government spending for public works projects and other made work and stopgap measures. The man on the street realizes this endless process of declaring, collecting, and returning tax moneys is costly and detrimental to the economy—odd that the experts can't see it. Too obvious, no doubt, or too unsophisticated. We are foolish if we don't eliminate withholding taxes and reap the benefits that accrue from more jobs and a lot more confidence. We should seek more confidence and demand less control.

If this sounds reasonable to you, look for candidates for the Congress, the Senate, and the Presidency who agree and are dedicated to the belief that the average man (the one who assumes the tax burden), woman and child believes in human dignity, that the average or majority of Americans if given the money now surrendered to the Federal Government would welcome the opportunity to meet their current and future needs—independently—for education, medical care, and retirement, etc.

RACE RELATIONS

More articles in the Constitution are devoted to this subject and its salient ramifications (arts. XIII, XIV, and XV) than any other and yet every time a politician wants an issue—a real votegetter and support winner—he pulls this issue out of his hat. It is very much with us today.

With all of this smoke there must be a little fire and more than sufficient reason to explore it.

This is a moral issue and certainly the framers of the Declaration of Independence—even though some were slave owners—had a great moral truth in mind when in the preamble they set forth our doctrine, "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to assure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, etc."

This was the first tangible evidence that supports the line of reasoning that the United States of America was truly a land of prophecy in a very real sense. Certainly the Creator's hand was and is reflected in this.

After so noble a start, why should race relations, segregation, and discrimination be so much in the news and politics of the day?

Few people would deny this principle but many would qualify it and interpret its "true meaning" or the meaning that the writers of the preamble had in mind when they wrote it.

Personally, I accept it prima facie. If this cannot be done, then any part of the Declaration of Independence and much of the Constitution can be "explained away," leaving only the empty shell wherein the hope of all mankind once resided.

This issue has been kept alive for the following basic reasons: greed (politicians), ignorance (general public), and the minority groups own defeatist, self-pitying attitude.

This seems to be an endless problem politically, socially, and economically because many opportunists are feeding on it—opportunists of all racial extractions.

In keeping with our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, this issue should be considered on a personal basis under the broadest interpretation of the highest laws of our land and the Supreme Law of the Universe.

Let's not degrade any individual or group of individuals because of the slothful or seemingly undesirable mode of conduct of some of the members of their race. Keeping in mind that as a society we are responsible in large measure for their inability to find employment and the educational opportunities necessary to improve their lot, enjoy the good life and become useful, productive citizens.

Simplification, not legislation, is the key—person to person acceptance and a personal desire to seek understanding will resolve this problem.

Keep in mind your own rights when you would abridge the rights of others.

LABOR

This vital area of our economy and society is one of the most paradoxical and hard to understand.

Complacency and greed brought it into being and love and brotherhood were its nutrients, but as strange as it may seem it appears that the complacency today is that of the union members, the greed is that of the union bosses or leaders and not owners or management. Love today is that of political bosses and the brotherhood seems to be that of the gangsters and labor pros. Stranger than fiction, isn't it, but true?

We have come a long way since families were self-sufficient, since the earlier days of the industrial revolution, since child and female labor were "exploited," since the days of the Pinkerton "goon squads," from the days of idealism in the union movement and days of overwork and underpay.

We must now hold labor accountable as it is mature and mighty and must assume the vital and responsible role it is expected to play in a free enterprise society. Labor must now do more than demand. It must pay. It must contribute in a real sense to increased productivity and social awareness. It must truly represent its members and not the selfish interests of its leaders and hangers on. It must exclude itself from the political scene where it feeds the caprices of selfish bigots and aspiring politicians. It must rid itself of the gangster element and the scavengers that through their selfishness and ignorance will bring it into disrepute and render it ineffective as a bargaining agent for the honest and hard working members whose faith and finances have made it the power that it is.

THE FARM FANTASY

In the 1960 general election, there was one mandate given by the electorate. "Get the Government out of agriculture." This mandate is reflected in the election of those Congressmen and Senators who campaigned against a federally subsidized, federally controlled farm program in those States where agriculture is a basic industry, in those States that furnish the bulk of the food and fiber of this great Nation, the areas that are responsible for our leadership in agricultural productivity.

In light of this mandate, why do we find ourselves constantly besieged by solutions by the present administration? The American farmer has been laboring under the weight of Government solutions since the enactment of the AAA in 1933 and he wants no more of them. He has had—more than any other segment of our economy—been the victim of control for 30 years and knows better than anyone else how ridiculous, how wasteful, and how inefficient bureaucratic planning and operations really are.

Still we continue down the path of planning to oblivion. What is our motivation? Certainly one must wonder. Certainly the experts can't have the best interests of the Nation at heart. It must, therefore, be for purely selfish and political reasons.

Perhaps it was because of an intense desire on the part of the New Dealers to sway the electorate in those historically Republican States to elect Democratic candidates to the House and Senate of the United States and thereby facilitate the passage of legislation that would make possible a planned economy, "a welfare state"—a Utopia—wherein the citizenry would be planned for, controlled, and provided for from the cradle to the grave, that it got its start. The New Deal has passed from the scene, the Fair Deal too, but now in the New Frontier we are still confronted with this issue—more intensely than ever before. It reminds me of the lyrics "the song is ended but the melody lingers on."

Our surplus in agriculture is a nightmare—physically and fiscally—and yet the bureaucrats stick to their guns. Government planning and Government control is the answer. The problem now is how to get more control over the entire economy, in the hopes of covering the "goofs" made in one area. If they could only control distribution and consumption as well as production and storage, they could solve the problem. The farmer is cognizant of this line of reasoning and he has been quite outspoken about it, but his remonstrations, his pleas have fell on deaf ears—except for the career "goofers" and the administration, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman in particular.

Freeman laid his cards on the table when he addressed the Farm Bureau Federation in Chicago in 1961. In an effort to stifle the Farm Bureau's vehement opposition, he reportedly said, "You'd better go along with my program of farm management and increased controls or we will dump our surpluses on the market and ruin you." Hardly the sentiment of a benefactor, but in the true form of a demagog. The next step in this chain of events is for the Government to act without the citizenry having benefit of even making a token expression. In polite society, they call this some kind of an ism but I would call it hell.

Let's examine this agriculture problem arithmetically. Believe me, it is of astronomical proportions—out of 2,258,000 civilian employees on the Federal payroll, we find 102,557 nestled under the wing of the Secretary of Agriculture (this does not include an equal sized army of "conservationists," etc.).

We have 3,710,228 farms, or 1 Agriculture Department employee for every 37 farms. Cash farm receipts from farm marketings were $34,013,666,000 in 1960 and in addition to this, the Agriculture Department kicked in $693,087,000 through some of its various payment programs—of this $369,953,000 was paid out through the soil bank program.

The soil bank, this is where the rub comes in, has proven to be a bonanza for almost everyone—including insurance companies, banks, corporations, doctors, lawyers, engineers, ad infinitum—as they have all shared in the benefits of a program designed and implemented to help the farmer. The point is this—you don't have to be a farmer to get a cut out of the USDA pie. Just buy some land and sooner or later you'll be getting a check from Uncle Sam.

The 1961 budget made provision for agricultural expenditures of $5,954,069,674. By comparison, our mining industry produced only $5,516 million in 1960 and in the same year, our lumber industry produced only $5,065 million and our automobile industry $8,387 million.

Now let's compare this to some revenue figures. In 1960 the Federal Government collected $3,193,714,000 from alcohol taxes and $1,931,504,000 from tobacco taxes.

Historically we have hated taxes—people through the ages have hated taxes. Our Revolution was really fought because of taxes. As a matter of fact, we might have still been British subjects if King George had a little different attitude toward taxing us or if he realized the limit he could go before a fellow like Patrick Henry, down in Virginia, would stand up and say "Give me liberty or give me death" and in the same speech say "If this be treason, make the most of it."

What have we come to when we pay the hated taxes to Government and instead of being used to defray the legitimate cost of Government or being applied to the reduction of the national debt, it is used as an incentive to encourage people not to work, not to produce, and further increase the cost of Government?

To say this is fantastic is not enough. This type of fiscal policy is inconceivable in the 20th century when we are fighting for our very lives—for this to happen and for it to be common knowledge and our citizenry to sit idly by means only one thing—the citizens of this great Nation really don't give a damn and perhaps they justly deserve the end that surely awaits them—enslavement.

If the amount of money collected in the alcohol and tobacco taxes was returned in the economy, look at the good it would do; look at the jobs it would create; the contribution it would make toward resolving our unemployment problem. Now think of the answer, the mandate given by the farmers themselves—"Get the Government out of agriculture."

What do the farmers mean when they say "Get the Government out of agriculture"? They mean that they want their freedom. Freedom to plant or not to plant; freedom to market or not to market. Briefly stated, they want the freedom to use their property as they see fit without an abridgement of their rights to do so as outlined in our Constitution.

What would happen if farm subsidies were withdrawn systematically and the law of supply and demand allowed to function freely and establish the volume of production of goods and their prices? One thing for sure would happen—the cost of Government would go down and farm efficiency would go up.

No doubt many so-called farmers, the beneficiaries of the parity system, would withdraw from farming and just continue to work at their regular job in town. Other farmers would expand their operations by buying the land the fellows mentioned above vacated and they would make greater capital expenditures for equipment, etc. (this creates jobs, not deficits), because they would have a greater productive capacity to pay for it. Other farmers would specialize. That is to say, they would go into grain programs, feeder programs, dairy or poultry programs exclusively and not mix or vary their programs as they do today to take advantage of parity, price supports, no work and no production incentives. The end result would be better quality, balanced production, lower prices, more profitable farmers and happy, healthier, less harried consumers. In finance there is a law—Gresham's law—and I think it applies equally as well in farming, "cheap money drives out good money," by substituting we get "Government supported marginal farmers who bring about the control of the agriculture industry drive out the efficient farmer."

When we get the Federal Government out of farming, who will guide the farmer and keep the farming industry from failing and with it the economy? We still have a Committee on Agriculture in the House and Senate and their membership is knowledgeable enough to prevent any slippage of dire consequences. In addition, we have our extensive agricultural programs carried on at the State level by our colleges and universities—especially our land-grant colleges—not to mention the myriad of farm cooperatives, feeder associations, and organizations like the Farm Bureau Federation. These organizations do a tremendous job today advising and informing their members and could do an even greater job with the farmers—as they are close to him in interest and physically—if they didn't have so much USDA redtape to restrict and retard them.

Farmers and their associations have done a lot already on their own initiative to alleviate the surplus problem we are faced with. For example, the wheatgrowers have on their own initiative attempted to increase the wheat consumption in Japan and other free world countries where wheat and bread are not the diet staples that they are here. They have done an excellent job in some countries by encouraging the use of wheat and wheat products in school lunch programs.

In summary, by reducing the Federal Government's role in agricultural spending, we could conceivably make an appreciable increase in the growth rate of our gross national product because the diversion of funds from the Government to the consumer would expand the demand for goods and services. This would create more jobs which in turn would cut unemployment and this would result in reduced outlays by Government for various and sundry welfare programs. "Get the Government out of agriculture."

FOREIGN POLICY

Our basic foreign policy should be reexamined, reevaluated, and restated in a concise statement that everyone, here and abroad, can understand and appreciate. This statement should be direct and to the point. Once given, it should be adhered to and not deviated from until the world is free and communism obliterated.

I recommend that our policy be stated along the following lines: the foreign policy of the Government of the United States is to achieve victory over communism in every corner of the world—economically, politically, and in warfare if need be; to aid and assist enslaved and emerging nations in every practical way to achieve and maintain national independence and to work with them in establishing and maintaining free governments and self-sustaining economies; to work toward the objective of establishing personal freedom and individual dignity for all mankind; to promote and preserve world peace and progress.

We are long overdue in the establishment of a dynamic and meaningful foreign policy. This has hurt us and the resultant damage is incalculable.

No doubt there are many reasons for this, but certainly naivete and immaturity must head the list, followed closely by fear.

We have been naive in many ways. Naive to think the Communists are earnestly seeking peace, promoting good, and desirable as members of a free society—any society. The time has come to face up to reality. We can no longer tolerate their evil and we must immediately take broad, sweeping, and effective steps to counteract the damage they have done and are doing.

Our naivete has permitted the Communists to poison the minds of educators, writers, government officials, labor leaders, social workers, lawyers, doctors, engineers, entertainers, servicemen, and citizens throughout the world for over 40 years through their efforts in degrading and defaming the basic institutions of a free and moral society. We stood idly by while they spread their vermin. Stood by while they destroyed or attempted to destroy all that is good in society today, especially the concept of individual dignity and civil rights.

This is, in large measure, due to the fact that their philosophy and behavior is so repugnant to the average man that he finds it difficult to comprehend how any thinking individual could subscribe to it. Maybe so. But the thing to remember is this: The Communists seldom act in an outward and obvious manner. They don't come out with banners flying, trumpets blaring, but as thieves in the night and usually with some dupe-a-dupe, who is usually respected and revered in his society, doing their bidding.

Don't be mistaken by their subtlety as they can be and usually are so base and sadistic that it defies the imagination of any healthy, thinking individual. They are determined, ruthless, flexible, patient, and to top it all off, they know that free men are usually apathetic, and they depend on us—yes, you and I—to further their cause by being apathetic, appeasing, and wishy-washy in our conduct.

If you think they aren't a menace, if you think they are fit to exist in society, take a quick glimpse at their record and their objectives, bearing in mind they have enslaved a third of the world's population and a fourth of the area of the world.

A symbol of their system and its unworthiness is the Berlin wall. Created to keep the starved and economically destitute members of their Utopian society in subjugation.

With all of their controls, mental, physical, economic, and political, they have yet to extinguish the spark of freedom and spirituality in the hearts of their slaves and they have made a determined, fanatical effort to do so since their inception.

Now you are saying the above recital proves they are inadequate and not to be feared. Better think it through. The sad truth is this: they have made such terrific inroads in our own and other free world societies that nothing positive, nothing really effective can, or is, being done to undo the damage done by them.

Let's stop here and take a quick glimpse at our society and what makes the above statement more easy to comprehend. The basic premise of our Nation, our society, is that man—made in God's image—is supreme. That government is a by-product of man's association with other men—"governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." [2]

It follows that the first objective of the Communists everywhere must be to destroy this image of man and his confidence in himself and the basic institutions of his society if they are to succeed in their goal of world enslavement.

This technique has been most successful for they have made great progress here. First, they have convinced many that man cannot master himself, let alone his destiny. They have made materialism the objective of his life as opposed to spiritualism and as a result, government has grown, and conversely, the importance of man has diminished. At this point, the basic premise of our philosophy has had a severe jolt.

With man reduced to a mere statistic, we find that they are really underway because now we have man controlled by government and without confidence in himself. The next step is to convince this mass of protoplasm—they think of man as nothing more—that the institutions of his society are meaningless. Here again, government grows and as stated before, man dedicated to materialism, lacking in confidence, will permit them to take over now that he has arrived at the point of no return, where government is supreme and he has lost faith in it. He is ready to sacrifice the balance of his birthright—and there is little of it left at this point—to the system, any system, capable of usurping the last vestige of human dignity from him with an empty promise of bread and circuses—economic security.

Exit free man. **Exit God.**

Sounds gloomy. When one stands on the threshold of oblivion, he is not in a happy state of mind. Remorse, anger, and indignation fill his soul—he is ashamed, saddened to think he has, or nearly has, destroyed himself. If he has time, he so reasons, but there is not always time—"tempus fugit."

In our case, there is time, just enough, I hope, to shore up our confidence and reenergize ourselves spiritually for the job ahead. There are signs. In the past there have been signs but we have ignored them. Now we must act positively, correctly, and without hesitation.

Before we embark upon the project of "liberating" the world, we must rediscover ourselves, we must reacquaint ourselves with the principles and philosophy that have been responsible for our growth, our progress—for the establishment of the most desired and most rewarding social system man has ever known.

Simultaneously, we must orient ourselves in the world. We must define or determine its current status, its needs—present and long range—and relate our activities to the achievement of those goals and objectives that will enhance mankind's understanding of his total environment and the opportunities for his enjoyment of it.

Politically, this must be a bipartisan determination because bipartisanism will give a degree of perpetuity to our foreign affairs—an essential ingredient if our policy is to be understood and depended upon by every nation. A part of our growing up that is urgently needed is the understanding that foreign policy, knowledge of every nation's foreign policy, is vital, especially in those countries which border on hostile or quasi-hostile foreign countries. We tend to lose sight of this important principle because of the relationship of each of our States to the Nation and the good neighbors we have to our north and the south. This has been a glaring failure of our policy for years—no one could count on our policy from one day to the next.

Foreign aid or assistance must not necessarily imply economic and military aid. Dollars and obsolete military hardware are poor substitutes for compassion, understanding, genuine friendliness, and the creation of an environment where nations can enjoy friendly intercourse and the exchange of ideas, goods, and services—especially on a person to person basis.

Governments (in ours with Senate approval) make treaties and otherwise establish the framework within which their respective citizens can contribute on the international level. This is essential as individuals cannot and should not make foreign policy but it's the people that make it work or fail to work in large measure.

If ever a nation should have learned the fallacy of monetary (dollar) diplomacy, it should have been the United States. Billions upon billions of American dollars have been sent abroad to help less fortunate nations and peoples to achieve a better life or to maintain their freedom. At least that was the intent or the purpose the American people had in mind when they gladly gave it. But the failure came about when we assumed dollars would or could do it all and do it alone. In foreign affairs, the attitudes of the citizenry of the nation helped and helping are of equal importance to the aid itself.

One question we must ask ourselves, "Has our foreign aid always done the beneficial job for the recipient people that the American citizen intended it to do?" Quite frankly, we must admit our efforts have fallen short of this noble objective. Many millions, perhaps billions, of dollars have gone into the personal bank accounts of foreign despots and has in no way contributed to the improvement of the living standards of our intended beneficiaries. This proves quite embarrassing when we ask these people, or tell the world how much we helped them, and then, much to our surprise and their harassment, find there has been no realistic American aid. No aid—only resentment.

Another factor we must keep in mind is that foreign and domestic policy cannot be entirely disassociated as a matter of fact; fiscally they must be or should be complementary. As a general rule, our foreign policy must be articulate, goals and objectives must be spelled out, and costs realistically determined, and last but not least, results should be expected and accountability enforced.

For example, whenever we appropriate a vast sum of money for highway improvement projects or similar public works programs abroad, we should first review the plans and specifications—having previously ascertained the real need for the project—to see if they are realistic; next we should ascertain the cost of the project based on actual bids; and finally we should not authorize payment for the work until it has been completed—at least by phases—to the satisfaction of our Corps of Engineers or State Department representatives.

The concept of aiding and abetting pro-Communist regimes through food handouts, etc., should be discontinued immediately. I agree it is moral to relieve sickness and starvation wherever and whenever it occurs if we possibly can, but on the other side of the coin it is equally immoral to save a social system or government from failing by these generous acts—humanitarian acts—when the ultimate objective of these systems or governments is the enslavement of their own people or ultimately us. The principle of positive expected results in foreign aid is dramatically pointed up in these situations.

The Peace Corps in my mind is the ultimate in foreign aid and assistance if it is carried out to its logical conclusion and on a nonpartisan basis—nonpartisan as to membership, indoctrination, and in leadership.

In this type of aid or assistance, the people being aided are aided in a direct and personal manner in a most positive way. They are being taught to help themselves by people who are definitely and personally interested in them. Every American should be proud of our Peace Corps volunteers and the work they are doing. Everyone of us should support and encourage them in their efforts as they are bearing our cross in the remote and lonely areas of the world and in many cases alone, insofar as other Americans are concerned, and under extreme pressures.

One way we can help them is by writing them while abroad and offering them encouragement. Another way is to encourage returning Peace Corps volunteers to visit our schools and various meetings to show us the pictures and slides they prepared while abroad and relate to us their impressions, etc. And those of us who travel abroad can help immeasurably by conducting ourselves in such a manner that our activities and conduct reflect breeding, understanding, and decency to all those who see us.

We can and should reinforce the Peace Corps efforts in the area of education by following up and assisting these people to become economically self-sustaining; here again, on a person-to-person, State-to-Nation basis, without a vast expenditure of Federal tax moneys. We private American citizens have great capacity for charity and understanding and through our efforts to help others we can in large measure realize the fullness of life that our Creator intended all mankind to enjoy.

---

[2] Preamble of the Declaration of Independence.

any other segment of our economy—been the victim of control for 30 years and knows better than anyone else how ridiculous, how wasteful, and how inefficient bureaucratic planning and operations really are.

Still we continue down the path of planning to oblivion. What is our motivation? Certainly one must wonder. Certainly the experts can't have the best interests of the Nation at heart. It must, therefore, be for purely selfish and political reasons.

Perhaps it was because of an intense desire on the part of the New Dealers to sway the electorate in those historically Republican States to elect Democratic candidates to the House and Senate of the United States and thereby facilitate the passage of legislation that would make possible a planned economy, "a welfare state"—a Utopia—wherein the citizenry would be planned for, controlled, and provided for from the cradle to the grave, that it got its start. The New Deal has passed from the scene, the Fair Deal too, but now in the New Frontier we are still confronted with this issue—more intensely than ever before. It reminds me of the lyrics "the song is ended but the melody lingers on."

Our surplus in agriculture is a nightmare—physically and fiscally—and yet the bureaucrats stick to their guns. Government planning and Government control is the answer. The problem now is how to get more control over the entire economy, in the hopes of covering the "goofs" made in one area. If they could only control distribution and consumption as well as production and storage, they could solve the problem. The farmer is cognizant of this line of reasoning and he has been quite outspoken about it, but his remonstrations, his pleas have fell on deaf ears—except for the career "goofers" and the administration, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman in particular.

Freeman laid his cards on the table when he addressed the Farm Bureau Federation in Chicago in 1961. In an effort to stifle the Farm Bureau's vehement opposition, he reportedly said, "You'd better go along with my program of farm management and increased controls or we will dump our surpluses on the market and ruin you." Hardly the sentiment of a benefactor, but in the true form of a demagog. The next step in this chain of events is for the Government to act without the citizenry having benefit of even making a token expression. In polite society, they call this some kind of an ism but I would call it hell.

Let's examine this agriculture problem arithmetically. Believe me, it is of astronomical proportions—out of 2,258,000 civilian employees on the Federal payroll, we find 102,557 nestled under the wing of the Secretary of Agriculture (this does not include an equal sized army of "conservationists," etc.).

We have 3,710,228 farms, or 1 Agriculture Department employee for every 37 farms. Cash farm receipts from farm marketings were $34,013,666,000 in 1960 and in addition to this, the Agriculture Department kicked in $693,087,000 through some of its various payment programs—of this $369,953,000 was paid out through the soil bank program.

The soil bank, this is where the rub comes in, has proven to be a bonanza for almost everyone—including insurance companies, banks, corporations, doctors, lawyers, engineers, ad infinitum—as they have all shared in the benefits of a program designed and implemented to help the farmer. The point is this—you don't have to be a farmer to get a cut out of the USDA pie. Just buy some land and sooner or later you'll be getting a check from Uncle Sam.

The 1961 budget made provision for agricultural expenditures of $5,954,069,674. By comparison, our mining industry produced only $5,516 million in 1960 and in the same year, our lumber industry produced only $5,065 million and our automobile industry $8,387 million.

Now let's compare this to some revenue figures. In 1960 the Federal Government collected $3,193,714,000 from alcohol taxes and $1,931,504,000 from tobacco taxes.

Historically we have hated taxes—people through the ages have hated taxes. Our Revolution was really fought because of taxes. As a matter of fact, we might have still been British subjects if King George had a little different attitude toward taxing us or if he realized the limit he could go before a fellow like Patrick Henry, down in Virginia, would stand up and say "Give me liberty or give me death" and in the same speech say "If this be treason, make the most of it."

What have we come to when we pay the hated taxes to Government and instead of being used to defray the legitimate cost of Government or being applied to the reduction of the national debt, it is used as an incentive to encourage people not to work, not to produce, and further increase the cost of Government?

To say this is fantastic is not enough. This type of fiscal policy is inconceivable in the 20th century when we are fighting for our very lives—for this to happen and for it to be common knowledge and our citizenry to sit idly by means only one thing—the citizens of this great Nation really don't give a damn and perhaps they justly deserve the end that surely awaits them—enslavement.

If the amount of money collected in the alcohol and tobacco taxes was returned in the economy, look at the good it would do; look at the jobs it would create; the contribution it would make toward resolving our unemployment problem. Now think of the answer, the mandate given by the farmers themselves—"Get the Government out of agriculture."

What do the farmers mean when they say "Get the Government out of agriculture"? They mean that they want their freedom. Freedom to plant or not to plant; freedom to market or not to market. Briefly stated, they want the freedom to use their property as they see fit without an abridgement of their rights to do so as outlined in our Constitution.

What would happen if farm subsidies were withdrawn systematically and the law of supply and demand allowed to function freely and establish the volume of production of goods and their prices? One thing for sure would happen—the cost of Government would go down and farm efficiency would go up.

No doubt many so-called farmers, the beneficiaries of the parity system, would withdraw from farming and just continue to work at their regular job in town. Other farmers would expand their operations by buying the land the fellows mentioned above vacated and they would make greater capital expenditures for equipment, etc. (this creates jobs, not deficits), because they would have a greater productive capacity to pay for it. Other farmers would specialize. That is to say, they would go into grain programs, feeder programs, dairy or poultry programs exclusively and not mix or vary their programs as they do today to take advantage of parity, price supports, no work and no production incentives. The end result would be better quality, balanced production, lower prices, more profitable farmers and happy, healthier, less harried consumers. In finance there is a law—Gresham's law—and I think it applies equally as well in farming, "cheap money drives out good money," by substituting we get "Government supported marginal farmers who bring about the control of the agriculture industry drive out the efficient farmer."

When we get the Federal Government out of farming, who will guide the farmer and keep the farming industry from failing and with it the economy? We still have a Committee on Agriculture in the House and Senate and their membership is knowledgeable enough to prevent any slippage of dire consequences. In addition, we have our extensive agricultural programs carried on at the State level by our colleges and universities—especially our land-grant colleges—not to mention the myriad of farm cooperatives, feeder associations, and organizations like the Farm Bureau Federation. These organizations do a tremendous job today advising and informing their members and could do an even greater job with the farmers—as they are close to him in interest and physically—if they didn't have so much USDA redtape to restrict and retard them.

Farmers and their associations have done a lot already on their own initiative to alleviate the surplus problem we are faced with. For example, the wheatgrowers have on their own initiative attempted to increase the wheat consumption in Japan and other free world countries where wheat and bread are not the diet staples that they are here. They have done an excellent job in some countries by encouraging the use of wheat and wheat products in school lunch programs.

In summary, by reducing the Federal Government's role in agricultural spending, we could conceivably make an appreciable increase in the growth rate of our gross national product because the diversion of funds from the Government to the consumer would expand the demand for goods and services. This would create more jobs which in turn would cut unemployment and this would result in reduced outlays by Government for various and sundry welfare programs. "Get the Government out of agriculture."

FOREIGN POLICY

Our basic foreign policy should be reexamined, reevaluated, and restated in a concise statement that everyone, here and abroad, can understand and appreciate. This statement should be direct and to the point. Once given, it should be adhered to and not deviated from until the world is free and communism obliterated.

I recommend that our policy be stated along the following lines: the foreign policy of the Government of the United States is to achieve victory over communism in every corner of the world—economically, politically, and in warfare if need be; to aid and assist enslaved and emerging nations in every practical way to achieve and maintain national independence and to work with them in establishing and maintaining free governments and self-sustaining economies; to work toward the objective of establishing personal freedom and individual dignity for all mankind; to promote and preserve world peace and progress.

We are long overdue in the establishment of a dynamic and meaningful foreign policy. This has hurt us and the resultant damage is incalculable.

No doubt there are many reasons for this, but certainly naivete and immaturity must head the list, followed closely by fear.

We have been naive in many ways. Naive to think the Communists are earnestly seeking peace, promoting good, and desirable as members of a free society—any society. The time has come to face up to reality. We can no longer tolerate their evil and we must immediately take broad, sweeping, and effective steps to counteract the damage they have done and are doing.

Our naivete has permitted the Communists to poison the minds of educators, writers, government officials, labor leaders, social workers, lawyers, doctors, engineers, entertainers, servicemen, and citizens throughout the world for over 40 years through their efforts in degrading and defaming the basic institutions of a free and moral society. We stood idly by while they spread their vermin. Stood by while they destroyed or attempted to destroy all that is good in society today, especially the concept of individual dignity and civil rights.

This is, in large measure, due to the fact that their philosophy and behavior is so repugnant to the average man that he finds it difficult to comprehend how any thinking individual could subscribe to it. Maybe so. But the thing to remember is this: The Communists seldom act in an outward and obvious manner. They don't come out with banners flying, trumpets blaring, but as thieves in the night and usually with some dupe-a-dupe, who is usually respected and revered in his society, doing their bidding.

Don't be mistaken by their subtlety as they can be and usually are so base and sadistic that it defies the imagination of any healthy, thinking individual. They are determined, ruthless, flexible, patient, and to top it all off, they know that free men are usually apathetic, and they depend on us—yes, you and I—to further their cause by being apathetic, appeasing, and wishy-washy in our conduct.

If you think they aren't a menace, if you think they are fit to exist in society, take a quick glimpse at their record and their objectives, bearing in mind they have enslaved a third of the world's population and a fourth of the area of the world.

A symbol of their system and its unworthiness is the Berlin wall. Created to keep the starved and economically destitute members of their Utopian society in subjugation.

With all of their controls, mental, physical, economic, and political, they have yet to extinguish the spark of freedom and spirituality in the hearts of their slaves and they have made a determined, fanatical effort to do so since their inception.

Now you are saying the above recital proves they are inadequate and not to be feared. Better think it through. The sad truth is this: they have made such terrific inroads in our own and other free world societies that nothing positive, nothing really effective can, or is, being done to undo the damage done by them.

Let's stop here and take a quick glimpse at our society and what makes the above statement more easy to comprehend. The basic premise of our Nation, our society, is that man—made in God's image—is supreme. That government is a by-product of man's association with other men—"governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." [3]

It follows that the first objective of the Communists everywhere must be to destroy this image of man and his confidence in himself and the basic institutions of his society if they are to succeed in their goal of world enslavement.

This technique has been most successful for they have made great progress here. First, they have convinced many that man cannot master himself, let alone his destiny. They have made materialism the objective of his life as opposed to spiritualism and as a result, government has grown, and conversely, the importance of man has diminished. At this point, the basic premise of our philosophy has had a severe jolt.

With man reduced to a mere statistic, we find that they are really underway because now we have man controlled by government and without confidence in himself. The next step is to convince this mass of protoplasm—they think of man as nothing more—that the institutions of his society are meaningless. Here again, government grows and as stated before, man dedicated to materialism, lacking in confidence, will permit them to take over now that he has arrived at the point of no return, where government is supreme and he has lost faith in it. He is ready to sacrifice the balance of his birthright—and there is little of it left at this point—to the system, any system, capable of usurping the last vestige of human dignity from him with an empty promise of bread and circuses—economic security.

Exit free man. Exit God.

Sounds gloomy. When one stands on the threshold of oblivion, he is not in a happy state of mind. Remorse, anger, and indignation fill his soul—he is ashamed, saddened to think he has, or nearly has, destroyed himself. If he has time, he so reasons, but there is not always time—"tempus fugit."

In our case, there is time, just enough, I hope, to shore up our confidence and reenergize ourselves spiritually for the job ahead. There are signs. In the past there have been signs but we have ignored them. Now we must act positively, correctly, and without hesitation.

Before we embark upon the project of "liberating" the world, we must rediscover ourselves, we must reacquaint ourselves with the principles and philosophy that have been responsible for our growth, our progress—for the establishment of the most desired and most rewarding social system man has ever known.

Simultaneously, we must orient ourselves in the world. We must define or determine its current status, its needs—present and long range—and relate our activities to the achievement of those goals and objectives that will enhance mankind's understanding of his total environment and the opportunities for his enjoyment of it.

Politically, this must be a bipartisan determination because bipartisanism will give a degree of perpetuity to our foreign affairs—an essential ingredient if our policy is to be understood and depended upon by every nation. A part of our growing up that is urgently needed is the understanding that foreign policy, knowledge of every nation's foreign policy, is vital, especially in those countries which border on hostile or quasi-hostile foreign countries. We tend to lose sight of this important principle because of the relationship of each of our States to the Nation and the good neighbors we have to our north and the south. This has been a glaring failure of our policy for years—no one could count on our policy from one day to the next.

Foreign aid or assistance must not necessarily imply economic and military aid. Dollars and obsolete military hardware are poor substitutes for compassion, understanding, genuine friendliness, and the creation of an environment where nations can enjoy friendly intercourse and the exchange of ideas, goods, and services—especially on a person to person basis.

Governments (in ours with Senate approval) make treaties and otherwise establish the framework within which their respective citizens can contribute on the international level. This is essential as individuals cannot and should not make foreign policy but it's the people that make it work or fail to work in large measure.

If ever a nation should have learned the fallacy of monetary (dollar) diplomacy, it should have been the United States. Billions upon billions of American dollars have been sent abroad to help less fortunate nations and peoples to achieve a better life or to maintain their freedom. At least that was the intent or the purpose the American people had in mind when they gladly gave it. But the failure came about when we assumed dollars would or could do it all and do it alone. In foreign affairs, the attitudes of the citizenry of the nation helped and helping are of equal importance to the aid itself.

One question we must ask ourselves, "Has our foreign aid always done the beneficial job for the recipient people that the American citizen intended it to do?" Quite frankly, we must admit our efforts have fallen short of this noble objective. Many millions, perhaps billions, of dollars have gone into the personal bank accounts of foreign despots and has in no way contributed to the improvement of the living standards of our intended beneficiaries. This proves quite embarrassing when we ask these people, or tell the world how much we helped them, and then, much to our surprise and their harassment, find there has been no realistic American aid. No aid—only resentment.

Another factor we must keep in mind is that foreign and domestic policy cannot be entirely disassociated as a matter of fact; fiscally they must be or should be complementary. As a general rule, our foreign policy must be articulate, goals and objectives must be spelled out, and costs realistically determined, and last but not least, results should be expected and accountability enforced.

For example, whenever we appropriate a vast sum of money for highway improvement projects or similar public works programs abroad, we should first review the plans and specifications—having previously ascertained the real need for the project—to see if they are realistic; next we should ascertain the cost of the project based on actual bids; and finally we should not authorize payment for the work until it has been completed—at least by phases—to the satisfaction of our Corps of Engineers or State Department representatives.

The concept of aiding and abetting pro-Communist regimes through food handouts, etc., should be discontinued immediately. I agree it is moral to relieve sickness and starvation wherever and whenever it occurs if we possibly can, but on the other side of the coin it is equally immoral to save a social system or government from failing by these generous acts—humanitarian acts—when the ultimate objective of these systems or governments is the enslavement of their own people or ultimately us. The principle of positive expected results in foreign aid is dramatically pointed up in these situations.

The Peace Corps in my mind is the ultimate in foreign aid and assistance if it is carried out to its logical conclusion and on a nonpartisan basis—nonpartisan as to membership, indoctrination, and in leadership.

In this type of aid or assistance, the people being aided are aided in a direct and personal manner in a most positive way. They are being taught to help themselves by people who are definitely and personally interested in them. Every American should be proud of our Peace Corps volunteers and the work they are doing. Everyone of us should support and encourage them in their efforts as they are bearing our cross in the remote and lonely areas of the world and in many cases alone, insofar as other Americans are concerned, and under extreme pressures.

One way we can help them is by writing them while abroad and offering them encouragement. Another way is to encourage returning Peace Corps volunteers to visit our schools and various meetings to show us the pictures and slides they prepared while abroad and relate to us their impressions, etc. And those of us who travel abroad can help immeasurably by conducting ourselves in such a manner that our activities and conduct reflect breeding, understanding, and decency to all those who see us.

We can and should reinforce the Peace Corps efforts in the area of education by following up and assisting these people to become economically self-sustaining; here again, on a person-to-person, State-to-Nation basis, without a vast expenditure of Federal tax moneys. We private American citizens have great capacity for charity and understanding and through our efforts to help others we can in large measure realize the fullness of life that our Creator intended all mankind to enjoy.

---

[3] Preamble of the Declaration of Independence.

Economically, we can benefit, and all the free world, because as the standard of living in these remote and densely populated areas increases, the greater their needs will be for goods and services. From this they become partners in trade and not aid and this is what develops people and adds new heights to their level of aspirations. Aid—outright, continued dole—is a depressant. Both to the donor and donee. Think this over and I'm sure you will agree.

In summary, our foreign policy should be firm and positive—we have the best product (way of life in the world) to offer people—we should strive to help others help themselves and we must truly represent as citizens to the world the mode of behavior and conduct at home and abroad that exemplifies the American way of life. Finally, we must confess to ourselves and the world "dollars can't do it"—and shouldn't be expected to.

DON'T TREAD ON ME

The spirit of Patrick Henry is evident in the land again.

Yes; Americans for the first time in 30 years are coming to the realization that excessive taxation and government license are not a panacea.

The 30-year era of graft, gifts, and goofs is drawing to an end. The taxpayer, the voter, has had enough of big government, big bosses, and big blunders. He is concerned about his freedoms—which have been eroding for 30 years, he is concerned about the direction, the purpose, and the integrity of his government and its advisers. Unlike his forebears who resorted to war, today's "minutemen" will revolt at the polls.

In a democracy or democratic Republic the apathy of the electorate is axiomatic. It is the system's greatest weakness, it is the path of destruction unless and until the electorate blows the whistle and exclaims: "Don't tread on me."

In a "free enterprise" society, the basis of its philosophy is economic—predicated on the assumption that price and production are dependent upon "supply and demand in the marketplace."

It's more than that. It's a system based on law—moral law or, if you will, the fusion of Mosaic law, Roman law, and English law. It is a system that assumes and assures that its citizenry are more than animals. Morality and human dignity are the bulwark of the free enterprise society. A society in which honor, trust, and fidelity are a must.

Another facet of this, the most wonderful of all systems, is productivity, productivity of labor, land, and capital. The system depends on this; without it, it couldn't exist. Here is another crucial or perhaps a fatal pitfall of our type of society—the kind of society based on freedom and plenty. In our plenitude we are susceptible to greed, waste, hypocrisy, and again apathy. The good life with attendant lack of value or loss of sense of value breeds contempt and insecurity.

Contempt for the things that made and make this type of society possible—the strength, moral, physical, and financial, of the individual citizen. The most obvious evidence of this type of decay is insecurity and the attendant extensionalism, extensionalism that finds expression in going without oneself or community for the answers, the guidance, the direction, and solutions. Here is where government grows, freedoms erode, and apathy sets in.

You don't get something for nothing. You always pay. If you are a coward, your reward is defeat; if you are slothful or without purpose, your reward is enslavement; and if you are apathetic, your reward is subjugation. What follows from your outlook or mode of behavior does not always come as a bolt out of the blue but as a thief in the night.

Many times the consequence is slow coming and unnoticed, as cancer; but it comes as surely as day follows night. This is sad, cruel. For if a sign appeared suddenly, a change would follow and more than likely, a change in attitude.

In our society the signs have appeared and they have gone unheeded, but now they are so obvious and glaring, they cannot be ignored if our way of life is to exist. The time for action and rededication is now—today.

Have we forgotten the basic fundamentals upon which this great Nation was founded? Our economic growth is being stifled. Why? Because we have forfeited much of our purchasing power to Government; we have sacrificed much of our labor force on the altar of bureaucracy and rendered it nonproductive and parasitic. We have created a monster—big government—and today many feel it is a hopeless dilemma, too hopeless to resolve. This is not true. A solution is at hand. All that is necessary is for each and every citizen to rededicate himself to the principles of self-determination and demand a reduction in Government expenditures. Remember, "good government begins with each individual citizen."

Don't expect something for nothing; don't tolerate government and its bureaucrats to make a mockery of our way of life by giving anyone something for "nothing." Remember: "The haves and have-nots can usually be traced to the dids and the did-nots."

Everyone in this great country of ours does not have all the essentials, let alone the luxuries they would like to have, and chances are they never will as long as we pay approximately 32 percent of our income to government. This in itself is a sign, a dramatic one, for a nation can be socialized as readily through taxation as through revolt, and when taxation is at a rate of 30 percent or more, socialism is a fact.

Socialism. Wake up, America. This utopian concept has been proven time and again to be fallacious. Look at England. Once a mighty power and world leader and now a weak dissipate half shell of a nation. Look at Germany and the dynamic recovery she has made. Even Khrushchev admits the communistic trend is toward a more democratic and individualistic form of society; this is of necessity. Socialism does not work as it is contrary to the basic nature of man.

We have what people through the ages have aspired to and we don't realize it. Let's not lose it through indifference and apathy. Longing for it once it's gone will never bring it back. When further encroachment is imminent, think of Patrick Henry and his reaction to taxes and impairment of civil liberties: "Give me liberty or give me death," and the flag many early patriots fought under and its caption: "Don't Tread on Me."

JOHN M. RANDALL.

NIGHTLY REPORTS ON CONGRESS OVER WMAL RADIO

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress draws to a close I would like to voice my appreciation of one of the most worthwhile services performed both for the Members of Congress and the people in the Washington area—the nightly reports on Congress by veteran correspondent Joseph McCaffrey and his associate Les Higbie over WMAL radio.

Probably more Members of the House and Senate listen to these nightly reports than to any other radio or television program. This program, "Today in Congress," has become a listening habit since Mr. McCaffrey first put it on the air in 1958.

It is the best capsule review of the day's work of Congress available to Members, their staffs, and members of the executive departments, presented in a straightforward, nonpartisan way.

Having once been an on-air reporter myself, I admire the way Mr. McCaffrey picks out the meat of the day's happenings, both on the floor of both Houses and in the committees, and then reports it in a neat summary so that he is able to get in almost all of the day's most important developments.

I have often thought of the great value such a program would be to the people around the Nation if they had available to them Mr. McCaffrey's knowledgeable report each night on what their Representatives and Senators were doing. It would help link the Congress and the people and give the people a greater understanding, not only of the problems facing their National Legislature, but how the Congress and its Members are meeting, or not meeting, such problems.

Both Mr. McCaffrey and Mr. Higbie have won the respect and confidence of Members of Congress by their work on this program. The U.S. Savings & Loan League, which sponsored the program, is to be congratulated for its public spirited interest.

When we adjourn, as I hope we eventually will, "Today in Congress" will adjourn as well. But when we return here in January, I expect that "Today in Congress" will be back as well, keeping a close eye on what we do and reporting each night on how we do it.

FLORIDA CROSS STATE BARGE CANAL

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am asking in strongest terms that the budget recommendation for an appropriation item for the Florida Cross State Barge Canal be accepted. At the moment this may come to the House in one of two ways; either by action of the conference committee of the supplemental appropriations bill, or by action of the conference committee of the public works appropriations bill. In either event, I ask that the item for the completion of the preconstruction planning for this project be approved by the House. I am talking about a very small amount of money as appropriations go. This item is for $205,000. It is a budget item. It came to us with the recommendation of the Kennedy administration. The President committed himself to this project in his 1960 campaign. That commitment is a matter of public record. The item was deleted by the House committee in its deliberations, and out of respect to this committee, the Florida delegation did not contest that action on the floor. The Senate restored the item and in the conference a deadlocked House conference committee could not agree. Therefore, the item was reported in disagreement. The House conferees are recommending that the item not be placed in the bill. I am urging that the report of the House conferees be rejected and if that is done, I shall offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate version which restores the $205,000.

Remember, I am speaking for a budget item for advanced engineering and design of the Florida Cross State Canal. We are told that this will complete all preconstruction design. Then we can take another look to decide whether actual construction should begin. But unless we spend this money, we shall have wasted a large part of the money heretofore spent in engineering and design. Starts and stops in any program are costly. We want to finish what we have begun.

This project has been authorized for years. There is no rhyme or reason in suggesting that we go back to the Public Works Committee for another authorization. The engineers have periodically checked this project and they have found that the benefit ratio is steadily improving. Any talk of a new authorization is purely a device to kill the project.

The project now has economic justification of approximately 1.2. It is important not only to Florida, but the U.S. Engineers have stated it will have direct economic benefit to 36 States. It closes a gap between the Atlantic and gulf coastal waterway systems. And let me emphasize here and now, there is no problem in connection with the use by barge traffic of the stretch of open gulf between the western terminus of the canal and the eastern terminus of the Gulf intercoastal canal at St. Marks. This is sheltered water which barges and other craft now traverse everyday without difficulty. The use of the Florida Cross State Barge Canal is not tied to the completion of a canal from St. Marks to the Atlantic.

Now, here is something that deserves your special consideration. Henceforth, most of the missiles to be fired at Cape Canaveral will be so big they must go there by water. Those that go from the gulf coast to Cape Canaveral will save 500 miles if the Cross State Barge Canal is available.

The Caribbean is no longer a placid American lake. The Panama Canal is no longer a certain, safe artery for American and world commerce. Castro and Khrushchev have changed all this.

In World War II the United States lost to enemy submarines, 77 tankers and 88 dry cargo ships operating in the gulf and off the Atlantic coast of Florida. The loss of these 165 ships, their cargoes, many of their crewmembers, resulted in a cost many times as much as the entire Cross State Barge Canal. Anyone who heard the cries of men on those torpedoed and burning ships, or saw the wrecks of men who came ashore, some of them more dead than alive, will not want that experience repeated.

But Hitler had no base of operations in Cuba or in the Carribbean. He had only a handful of submarines. Khrushchev has a naval base in Cuba. Khrushchev has many times the number of submarines that Hitler had and much better subs. They are missile-carrying subs which endanger the whole eastern seaboard—as well as shipping. The Reds can create havoc along our coasts any day they wish.

So, the canal is a defense measure, too. It will free ships. It will save crews. It will free railroads for coast-to-coast shipping. It will save shipping costs in peace and in war.

For $205,000—a budget item—we can be ready to go ahead with construction when the time is right. We will have a completed preconstruction package. We will not have spent without avail the $1½ million which already has gone into this preconstruction package. We will be pennywise and pound foolish to reject this low-cost item at this late and dangerous date in the security of America.

RETIRING MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure to me to be the one to speak in reference to the retirement of several members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who are leaving the Congress this year. The Democrats of the committee were good enough to suggest that I bring this matter up because the five members who are retiring are Republicans.

On the other hand, I am sure they will all want to insert their own remarks relative to the loss we shall sustain when these five retire at the end of this session.

These members are: The gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ROBERT CHIPERFIELD; the gentleman from New Hampshire, the Honorable CHESTER MERROW; the gentlewoman from Illinois, the Honorable MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH; the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable LAURENCE CURTIS; and the gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN.

BOB CHIPERFIELD, of the 19th Illinois District, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 83d Congress and since then its ranking Republican, had a long and arduous service on the committee. A brilliant mind, he has contributed much, a very constructive member on the committee trips in which he played a part. Those of us who knew her loved his wife, Kitty, whose long illness finally terminated in her death. Their two children, Robert, now 27, and Virginia, now 21, can be proud of the record their father has made here on Capitol Hill. We shall miss you inordinately, BOB, and we wish for you continued activities in constructive living and unexpected joy.

Next in seniority is CHESTER MERROW of the First District of New Hampshire. A teacher of general science, physics, chemistry, and biology, later the dean of a Vermont junior college, a Phi Beta Kappa, and a Mason, he has served his people conscientiously and well, lo, these many years. I had the pleasure of going into his district one fall and speaking in his behalf. It was very impressive to see the respect and affection in which he was held by the throng that greeted him. We shall miss, you, CHESTER, none more than I. We have sat beside each other for so long.

It is difficult to express my own warm feelings toward MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH of the 13th District of Illinois. Our acquaintance began while we were both just wives of Congressmen, when she filled many responsible positions of influence, not the least of which was the presidency of the Congressional Club. A Wellesley graduate with an A.M. in political science from Columbia University, with honorary degrees from other colleges, she has been a very constructive, earnest member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her efforts have been directed toward insistence upon more careful checking of every item in foreign aid in all the various ramifications of the committee. We owe her a great deal and frankly, I do not know just where we shall find another who will be as fair, as just, as honest in her criticisms and in her efforts to build more constructive programs. President of the National Alumnae Association of Wellesley College, vice president of the Women's National Republican Club of Chicago, member of the American Association of University Women, a member of the League of Women Voters, one of the Phi Beta Kappa Associates, and a highly respected member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, she represented the United States at the 16th Session of the Assembly of the United Nations. Her two sons and her daughter, Mrs. James O. Wood, Jr., have given her nine grandchildren, to whom she is charmingly devoted. MARGUERITE, we hate to see you go. We are certain that this will be just another step in a life of constructive doing and we shall hope that you will visit us here very often. All power to you.

LAURENCE CURTIS, 10th District of Massachusetts, a strong consecrated American. He served in the U.S. Navy in World War I, where he lost a leg in a training crash in naval aviation and was awarded a Silver Star citation. For 16 years he was elected to the Boston City Council, the State house of representatives of Massachusetts, the State senate, and to the office of State treasurer. Since coming to Washington in 1953 he has been a diligent and faithful servant of the people. His district has lost much and we of the committee are deeply grieved that he was not able to win a very close primary in his State of Massachusetts for the U.S. Senate. LARRY, we wish you so very well. We know what you can do. We know what you have done as a member of the Moose, Elks, Masons, Sons of the Revolution, American Legion, Boston and Massachusetts Bar Association. We fully expect you to go steadily forward in your service to the Nation.

Horace Seeley-Brown, Jr., Connecticut's Second District Representative in the House. It has been good to serve with such a man—head of the science department in the Pomfret School in Connecticut, air operations officer in the Pacific in World War II, once a State chairman of the Connecticut Young Republicans, member of Den Grange No. 61, of the American Legion, AMVETS of World War II, a Reserve officer of the United States and active in the Boy Scouts of America.

What a variety of experience your life has brought you. We need men in this country, such as you. We sincerely hope at this writing that you will come back to Capitol Hill in the other body. Heaven bless you.

Mr. Speaker, I have had great joy in serving with these Members of the House of Representatives. They have been fine, honorable members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I shall miss them very, very much. I also know, based upon what the Democratic members have said to me, that they also will miss them.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. Zablocki].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio for taking this time to bring to the attention of our colleagues the forthcoming retirement of five outstanding Members of the Congress of the United States, and in pointing out their contributions to the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to our country and to their constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that we will be saying farewell to these five members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Their departure will leave a void which will not be easy to fill for many years.

The Honorable Robert B. Chiperfield, former chairman and currently the ranking minority member of the committee, is retiring after 24 years of service in the Congress. His service in this body has spanned a period of unparalleled crises and change in the world, and witnessed the ascendancy of the United States to the leadership of the free world. He has participated with distinction in the task of shaping our Nation's foreign policy under four administrations. A man of few words, but of great ability and steadfast adherence to principles, he has been a true friend and a respected colleague. I have worked with him in the committee since my first election to the Congress, and I have benefited from our association. I shall miss his wise counsel, his kind and generous disposition.

The sense of loss increases when I think of the other committee members who will be retiring this year:

The Honorable Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire, whose efforts to strengthen the mutual security program, and to promote public understanding of the purposes and objectives of our foreign policy programs, won him national recognition.

The Honorable Marguerite Stitt Church, of Illinois, whose incisive approach to foreign policy issues, unfailing equanimity, moving eloquence and charm brightened the long executive sessions of the committee and contributed so much to a thorough consideration of both sides of each question;

The Honorable Laurence Curtis, of Massachusetts, who never waivered in his support of the fundamental purposes of our foreign policy and, in his inimitable fashion, contributed to the resolution of many differences of opinion and conflicts within the committee; and

The Honorable Horace Seely-Brown, of Connecticut, whose openmindedness, driving force, mature judgment, and pithy comments have helped to clarify many issues and had considerable effect on the committee's decisions.

Each and every one of them has served his or her district, and our Nation, with devotion and distinction. I shall miss them and I am certain, so will the rest of the Committee.

I want to take this opportunity to wish our retiring colleagues from the Foreign Affairs Committee good health and success in their future endeavors. I hope that they will come back frequently to see us, and to give us the benefit of their counsel.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time for the purpose of paying tribute to the five members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who are not candidates for reelection to the House of Representatives, but who are either retiring voluntarily or entering careers in other areas of public service.

It has been my honor and privilege to serve with the Honorable Robert B. Chiperfield, who is retiring after 24 years of service in the Congress. Bob Chiperfield served with distinction as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs during the 83d Congress, and he has been an invaluable member of the committee. He is among the foremost of those who advocate that politics end at the water's edge and that bipartisanship should characterize our approach to the problems of foreign policy. Bob Chiperfield is a man whose ability is equaled only by his personal modesty and his deep sense of responsibility. As chairman of the committee I have come to value his assistance and sage counsel as the ranking minority member, and I know that all members of the committee will share with me the sense of loss that I feel at his departure from the House of Representatives and our committee.

It so happens that each of the members leaving the committee are Republicans, but I regret their loss to the committee nonetheless. Our committee has for so many years pursued a nonpartisan policy in the field of foreign affairs that our differences have been such as to close party lines, and we have worked equally together for the overall good of our country in promoting measures to improve and help our foreign policy objectives.

Another member who has been foremost in these efforts is the Honorable Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire. Chester Merrow has untiringly devoted himself to the promotion of major foreign policy legislation and has done much to increase public understanding of U.S. foreign policy objectives, especially in complex areas subject to misinterpretation and the misunderstanding that sometimes plagues our best efforts to secure the backing of a fully informed public opinion.

One of the foremost of the loyal opposition has been the Honorable Marguerite Stitt Church, of Illinois. Mrs. Church is retiring voluntarily this year after having served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs since January 1953. We shall all miss Mrs. Church's keen analyses of foreign political problems. Mrs. Church has long proved herself one of the most eloquent and articulate Members of the House, and I firmly believe that her constructive criticisms have done much to improve many of the bills which have run the gauntlet of committee hearings and the 5-minute rule.

I shall always cherish fond memories of the Honorable Laurence Curtis of Massachusetts, who brought with him to the committee a deep knowledge of the fundamentals of our Constitution and our public law. He has been an indefatigable member of the committee and with his inherent sense of fair play has contributed greatly to the benefit of the final wording of many major resolutions, and bills, emanating from the committee.

And last, but not least, I must mention the Honorable Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., of Connecticut. His unfailing good humor and his conscientious attention to the details of committee assignments has endeared Horace Seely-Brown to all of his colleagues of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has long proved himself an outstanding legislator of great ability, and we shall sorely miss his participation in our future committee meetings.

I shall always cherish the memory of my close association and work with these retiring members of our committee. I consider it a rare personal privilege to have had the honor to serve with members so unselfishly dedicated and conscientious in the discharge of their congressional responsibilities. I know that my feelings are shared by their other colleagues on the committee who, I am certain, join with me in wishing them every success and happiness. I hope also that we will have the pleasure of seeing them from time to time in the future and of benefiting from their counsel and deep knowledge of foreign affairs.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like also to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Ohio for taking this time. I am happy to join in the observance of the departure of these Members. I am not happy to see them leave the committee, because they, each in his own way, have contributed very substantially to the work of the committee at a time when the foreign affairs and foreign policy of this country is of greater importance than at any other time in our history.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly shall miss them and miss their contributions to the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as to the overall program of work of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton], in her eulogy and the respect which she is paying to five Members whom she named who are leaving the service here in the Congress of the United States. These Members have performed their service well.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to say a few words in behalf of the Honorable Robert Chiperfield. Bob and I came to Congress together 24 years ago. I have enjoyed my association with Mr. Chiperfield very much. He is the sort of fellow who goes about doing his job in a rather quiet way. But he has served his people well. He is an honorable gentleman, able and respected by each and every one of his colleagues. I am sorry to see Bob leave the Halls of Congress. I wish for him and the others who leave us a most joyful retirement. May God be good to all of them.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio for taking this time. It is typically thoughtful of her to point up to the Congress and to the Nation that five Republican members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be retiring at the end of this Congress. These Members have a cumulative experience of over 50 years on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Imagine, 50 years of delving into the problems that beset our Government, our Nation, and our free way of life. Think of the vast void that will be caused by their departure. When we consider that Congress goes on from year to year, even though the executive branch of the Government may change every 4 years, the continuity of thought and experience in a committee is vital to the Nation's success, not only in the field of foreign affairs but in all fields.

I think every one of these Members who is retiring has given devoted service. Each has had a special contribution to make. Some have been more effective in the committee than on the floor; some have been effective with junior members of the committee, such as myself, in the advice and help that they have given, in helping them to become acclimated to the work of this committee and to a realization of the importance of the various matters before us.

I think that the Nation should realize that there is a void that is being created by the departure of five members of this committee at this time. I think also that the Nation should realize, and that we should take the time right now to point up the bipartisan nature of the Foreign Affairs Committee; that the deliberations of these five members do not represent a purely partisan view, that they have more often than not, almost altogether I should say, been concerned with the national effort, with partisanship playing a minimum, in fact almost a negligible, part in the committee. And this is true of the Democratic members of the committee as well, because there we are deliberating on matters concerning not only the future of our own country but the future of the world.

Members who serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs do so with dedication, even though sometimes their positions are misunderstood, especially when they are not reflective of the popular will of the majority.

Mr. Speaker, this may appear as a lengthy tribute to these five distinguished colleagues of ours, but it does not in any way do justice to their great service not only in the matter of the great length of time they served but in the excellence of their contribution to making this a more peaceful world in which to live.

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall see God." Each of the departing Members were peacemakers.

We shall miss them very much, indeed.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, we are very grateful for this moment in which to express our admiration for these retiring Members and our regret that they are leaving us.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand how a committee that functions so meticulously in a very sensitive area can lose so many distinguished servants of the people at one time. I feel that this committee is one of the most important in the Congress. It has the responsibility of making determinations as to what nations should be aided and what nations should not. Its members lead and mold the thinking of their constituents, and at first hand see the effects of the appropriations which the legislation from that committee authorizes.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Church] has contributed to this House so much in fields of legislative importance. The gentlewoman from Ohio herself has given so much of her time and effort to the work of the committee. I know how she feels at this time at losing so many fine colleagues whose diligent work on the committee has come under her observation. We commend her for bringing to our attention the fact that membership in the House of Representatives changes rapidly from year to year, and that the servants of the Nation are retiring because under the pressure of circumstances they are not able to carry on further in responding to the multitudinous requests made of them by their constituents and the Nation.

I say again it is wonderful that the gentlewoman has taken the time to bring to our attention the loss of so many fine Members of the House, who have contributed so much to the welfare of this Nation by their service on this important committee, which the Members of the House respect so highly.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the retirement of these five members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to five outstanding members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who are voluntarily terminating their services at the end of this session; namely, Robert B. Chiperfield, Chester E. Merrow, Marguerite Stitt Church, Laurence Curtis, and Horace Seely-Brown, Jr.

The Foreign Affairs Committee will feel keenly the loss of these true statesmen, loyal representatives, and hardworking legislators. Their dedication to duty as members of this committee will long be remembered as they spared no amount of time and energy to accomplish their goal.

The contributions to the work of the committee have been constructive, and their brilliant approach to the problems of foreign policy and foreign affairs, for which the committee is responsible, reflected thorough research and tremendous effort to master the issue concerned. At all times, during the tenure of these members on the committee, the spirit of bipartisanship prevailed.

The Foreign Affairs Committee and the Nation profited and were favored in having such dedicated members serve on this important committee.

As these loyal servants leave the House of Representatives, I wish them well, and express the hope that our friendship, which has meant a great deal to me, will continue.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the five members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who are retiring and will not be with us in the 88th Congress starting next January.

To those of us who are relatively new on the committee, these Members, headed by the Honorable Robert B. Chiperfield, ranking minority member and former chairman, have been an inspiration to all of us.

There is little doubt that service on the House Foreign Affairs Committee is the most complicated, the most exhausting and often the most exasperating of any committee in Congress.

Problems are not only national, they are global in scope. Finding rules and guidelines which apply to all nations in the free world at times seems like an impossible task.

Yet these Members have taken a leading part in steering a course through the confusion and in creating effective, bipartisan legislation which has served the principles of our Nation efficiently and adequately over the years.

The members of the committee who are leaving us have a sound record of accomplishment which spans a number of years and a number of administrations.

In addition to Representative CHIPERFIELD, they are CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire; Mrs. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, of Illinois; LAURENCE CURTIS, of Massachusetts; and HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut.

Not only was it an honor working so closely on problems of such great importance to the world, but it was a pleasure in every respect.

I am sure all of my colleagues join me in wishing them every success in the years ahead. They have been distinguished members of this committee, most able Members of Congress, and good friends to all of us.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] in expression of the break that is in all our hearts as we contemplate the vacant seats when the Committee on Foreign Affairs meets again in January. These seats will be occupied, of course, by replacements, new members of our committee who I am sure in time as we work with them will become entrenched in our esteem and affection; but they will be vacant of the members long associated with us and with whom long years of association have woven ties, the breaking of which we cannot contemplate without tears in our eyes.

Ours is a closely knit family, perhaps more so than any committee in the House. Five members of our committee are not candidates for reelection. They are all Republicans, but on our committee there is no cold division along party lines. We have differences, of course, but every member of the committee accepts and follows the rule that politics ends at the ocean line. It would be an evil day for our country if ever it were otherwise.

Two of the departing Members, both retiring voluntarily, are from Illinois, my dear friends for many years. The late Honorable Ralph Church, husband of the gentlewoman from Illinois, Congresswoman MARGUERITE CHURCH, from early manhood was one of my warm and close friends. I have never ceased to mourn his passing. I have felt very close in friendship to MARGUERITE CHURCH. We have had so much in common interest and in the broad outlines the philosophy that guides our thinking and our actions is the same. MARGUERITE CHURCH is one of the ablest women in America. I rate her in the top flight of effective women public speakers, that I have known in a period of half a century. She is a dedicated servator of mankind. I will miss more than I can contemplate with equanimity our association in the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. My only consolation is that in the years ahead she will be enjoying, not the relaxation of vacation, but the great experience of devoting her hours to expanding her knowledgeable understanding in new and worthy fields, freed from the congressional pressures.

I will miss the gentleman from Illinois [BOB CHIPERFIELD] as keenly as it is possible for one to feel a separation. I knew his father, Burnett Mitchell Chiperfield, a Member of the Congress in 1915, when I was lieutenant governor of Illinois, and again in 1929 and 1933, one of the outstanding sons of Illinois, in war and in peace. Indeed, of all the illustrious sons of Illinois none have been higher in the esteem of our people than the Chiperfields, father and son. BOB came to the Congress in 1939, 6 years after the retirement of his distinguished father and 1 year after his father's death. He was a great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. During my service on that committee he was the ranking minority member.

I can never adequately convey to him my deep appreciation of his many kindnesses to me and his helpfulness to me on the committee of which he had been chairman and was then the ranking minority member. BOB CHIPERFIELD is a great American in every sense of the word. He is an American patriot in the fullest sense, a worthy son of a father who raised a regiment to serve in the Spanish American War and in World War I served in France with the famous 33d Division and was retired as a brigadier general.

I never knew BOB CHIPERFIELD to be guilty of a petty act. I never knew him to speak a word unless it were in kindness.

Mr. Speaker, this country of ours can ill afford to lose the service of CHESTER MERROW, and if it were in the power of my selection, he, although a Republican, would be drafted for a high position in the Foreign Service. I have never known a more dedicated person. I do not think that anyone has made a larger contribution to the education of the American people to the purpose of our foreign aid. Under Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy his always has been the bipartisan approach, and while loyal to his party, his first thought has always been of what is good for the country. He leaves our committee with the admiration and the affection of every member on the Democratic side and I am sure that this also is the sentiment among all his colleagues on the Republican side.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that I was thrilled when I listened to the early returns from Massachusetts in the recent primary and our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, LAURENCE CURTIS, was leading with the prospect of pulling an upset. Of course, as a Democrat and from another State, there was no legitimacy in my interest. Moreover, I did not know the young man with whom LAURENCE CURTIS was in contest. But, Mr. Speaker, friendship gives a legitimacy in interest that transcends geography and political affiliation.

I have been enriched by my association with LAURENCE CURTIS. I was not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when first I met him, as occasionally we would dine at the Congressional Hotel. I did not know that the absent leg had been given in the service of his country. I did not know of his wealth and of his proud ancestry. There was nothing pompous, nothing self-aggrandizing. I got the picture of a humble man of human kindness. That impression was deepened when we became associated together on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I learned then of his great ability and I had no prouder moments than when on a few occasions, when on some question we were very much in the minority, his vote and mine were the same. In my book LAURENCE CURTIS is a true representative of the finest traits of character. My only hope is that after his recent experience in a Republican primary in Massachusetts, he will see the light and come into the Democratic fold. This, of course, I know he will not do because no one on earth could shake him in his convictions. I shall miss him very, very much when our committee meets again in January.

The gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable HORACE SEELEY-BROWN, JR., came to the Congress in 1947, a Member of the 80th Congress that was praised by the Republicans and used as a whipping boy by the Democrats. He had the misfortune to come from one of those swing districts that puts you in, then yanks you out, then puts you in again. He was not a Member of the 81st Congress, but he did return to the 82d Congress and that was the beginning of our association. He came to our Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 87th Congress as a successor of the Honorable Chester Bowles. No member of that committee ever came with a greater challenge. Chester Bowles had been one of our outstanding ambassadors. He had been Governor of his State. He had been one of the outstanding members of the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. To the Committee on Foreign Affairs he brought a tremendous wealth of experience and of knowledge. It was not an easy matter to follow in the footsteps of Chester Bowles. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that anyone on the Democratic side of our committee had anything but the kindliest sentiment toward HORACE SEELY-BROWN. He quickly became a member of our closely knit family, and I can assure him that we will miss him very very much. I cannot, of course, extend to him my good wishes in the elections in November. But I can say to him that all of us were happy at the great honor bestowed upon him by his party, the honor of designation as its senatorial nominee. While I do not anticipate his election, nor would I wish to be placed in the position of advocating it, I am nevertheless convinced that the Republicans of his State picked the best of the crop. He will leave the committee with the affectionate wishes of his colleagues for his future success and happiness, with only this difference, that his Republican colleagues will wish that success and happiness come in public life while his Democratic colleagues wish it to be in private life.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to compliment the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] for taking this time to mark the departure from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of five of its members.

Each of these members has been a substantial member of this committee at a time when the foreign policy of the United States has more significance than ever before in our history and through that membership has contributed to making that policy strong.

We shall miss the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Chiperfield] for the pertinent contribution which he has been able to make because of his unique experience and his long knowledge of the foreign affairs problems of the United States.

We shall miss the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Merrow] because of his sympathetic and kindly approach to all the problems of our committee and, in particular, for the great contribution which he made following the war, to the cause of creating an international organization to preserve the peace of the world.

We shall miss the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Church] because of her analytical mind and the skill with which she was able to describe a problem and articulate a response to any problem that arose.

We shall miss the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Curtis] because of the craftsmanship with which his legal training and judicial approach enabled him to plumb to the depths of problems of legal draftsmanship and legislative policy.

Finally, we shall miss the presence of my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Seely-Brown], who was a faithful member of our committee and who, through his long congressional experience, was enabled to bring to our task of legislating, a practical approach which added greatly to the finished work.

Each of these members, in his own way, has lived up to the American ideal of service and has helped by his skilled labors to make our democratic system function more effectively.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, Marguerite Church and I came to Congress at the same time and my admiration for her as a legislator and a lady has continued unabated throughout her service in the House. Her contributions to good government include not only diligence in her work but a polished performance as an orator. In the critical field of foreign affairs she has displayed a fearless and highly intelligent approach to the bewildering problems of our Nation's position in international relations. In addition, her constant and serious attention to all matters of legislation has been outstanding and should stand out as a shining example to all of us. Her code of duty as a Member of the House included faithful attendance at its sessions.

Mrs. Church leaves Congress with a record of many accomplishments and contributions to the cause of clean and decent government. I personally regret that she has seen fit not to be a candidate for reelection and I wish to extend my best wishes for her future health and happiness.

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Edmondson). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Clancy] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, as this session draws to a close, we face the loss of our esteemed colleague, Gordon H. Scherer, who will retire after 10 years of ably and tirelessly representing the First Congressional District of Ohio.

I know he will be missed by us all, but I particularly will feel his absence. He has been of invaluable help to me, a freshman Member of this body, as well as a loyal friend. I have thanked him personally and now wish to take this opportunity to publicly express my appreciation to him.

A lawyer by profession, Mr. Scherer began his public service on the staff of the prosecuting attorney's office in his native Cincinnati. He then served as Cincinnati's director of safety, as a member of the Cincinnati City Council for two terms, and as a member of the Cincinnati Planning Commission. His numerous significant accomplishments in these posts were recognized and applauded.

In November of 1952, by nearly a 2-to-1 majority, the people of his district wisely elected Mr. Scherer to the 83d Congress and since then to each succeeding Congress. His record during these past 10 years as Representative of the First District of Ohio speaks for itself. It is well known that he is a diligent and energetic legislators who has executed his responsibilities in a conscientious and dedicated manner. He has rendered memorable service not only to the fine people of his district, but to the entire Nation as well.

I would like especially to pay tribute to Gordon Scherer's eminently creditable service as ranking minority member of the House Un-American Activities Committee. In the face of widespread abuse heaped upon members of that committee by Communists and Communist sympathizers his convictions remained unshaken. In the face of proposals to abolish the committee, he courageously defended its uncompromising and relentless efforts to uncover subversion in our Government and to recommend remedial legislation.

As the ranking minority member of the Roads Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, Gordon Scherer worked long and hard on legislative proposals which led to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. The largest peacetime public works program in our history, it is providing this Nation with an interstate network of highways on a pay-as-you-go basis. When it became apparent that the Federal cost of completing the interstate system would exceed original estimates, Mr. Scherer promptly introduced legislation to raise the money to pay for these highways as they were being built so the obligation would not be passed on to future generations.

I commend Gordon Scherer's intellectual honesty and his courage, his high principles and his refusal to compromise those principles. He has consistently voted and voiced his convictions.

His career to date has been a distinguished one but, I feel sure, is but a prologue to continued achievements and dedicated service. I know my colleagues join me in wishing him success in whatever new ventures he may undertake and many years of happiness.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Gordon Scherer]. I had the great pleasure and privilege of serving on the Public Works Committee with him and I know that he has rendered an outstanding service to the Nation. He has been one of the most effective members of this committee where his enormous experience and ability has earned him the respect and admiration of his colleagues from both sides of the aisle. The enlightened and aggressive manner in which he helped to accelerate our highway program will, in my judgment, make this country preeminent in metropolitan, regional, and transcontinental travel.

Gordon Scherer has also been a hard-hitting member of the Un-American Activities Committee. His efforts to keep the Congress and the American people properly informed of the shifting Communist Party strategy and tactics so that they may better cope with the Communist challenge both here and abroad, has been outstanding. He deserves the gratitude of every American citizen for what he has accomplished on this important committee.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I have thoroughly enjoyed my personal friendship and association with Gordon Scherer and I shall always remember his kindness and willingness to be helpful at all times. I wish to extend to him my profound wishes for his continued good health, vigor, and happiness.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to join my colleague in this much deserved tribute to a great American, Gordon Scherer. I will always remember that I served with Gordon and if I am fortunate enough to continue as a Member of this House I will be a better Member because of the philosophy and the advice of this great American.

Possibly I take a particularly great measure of pride in the fact that Gordon and I are usually found on the same side of the tally after the roll is called. If we do vote differently—and that is rare—it is a good signal to me to reconsider my position.

His work on the Committee on Un-American Activities has gone without the great tribute he deserves. Few

Americans, I am sure, fully appreciate the value of his service here. Certainly the Communists will be among the only ones in this country who will look with favor upon his retirement.

I trust that he will have many years of public service ahead though he won't be in this House. His sense of civic duty, I know, will demand his continued interest and participation in the affairs of our country and I wish the very best to him as he goes back to Cincinnati.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that only for one term have I had the good fortune to serve in this body with the very distinguished Member from Ohio's First District, GORDON SCHERER.

I look forward to the opportunities future years will afford to continue and cultivate my friendship with GORDON, as he begins his very important new service in the great Cincinnati community as leader of our Republican Party there, and as an active leader in many other important aspects of that area's progress.

But, selfishly, I wish that I could have continued the day-to-day association with the gentleman from Cincinnati here in the House. We have need of his ability and experience, as well as the friendly assistance he has given to so many of us in our personal relationships with him. He will be sorely missed. He leaves a void in this body which I doubt can be adequately filled for a long time to come.

Congressman SCHERER, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, and as is known to all of us in the House, is one of the most sincerely dedicated, most conscientiously hard-working, studious Members. Those traits have made him the acknowledged expert and respected authority on every subject on which he has concentrated in his extraordinary devotion to his important committee assignments.

But I will miss him most, personally, as one of those experienced and dependable Members who have been so willing and so generous in their sound advice and the sharing of their wisdom and knowledge, as we first-termers have called upon them for assistance.

One of the happiest aspects of my experiences as a first-termer has been the valuable help, on a completely genial and generous basis, which has been made available to the new here, by the more senior Members on both sides of the aisle. And high on the list of those who have been most helpful, certainly, is our friend, GORDON SCHERER.

All of us, new and older Members alike, will miss him greatly. But all of us certainly wish him complete success and happiness as he moves on to perform the further great public service which, with characteristic devotion, he feels is his proper calling.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the 87th Congress we, in Ohio and the citizens of this Nation, are losing one of the most able and effective Congressmen in the history of this Nation.

The Honorable GORDON H. SCHERER, of the First Congressional District of Ohio, is retiring from service to his country. His record has been indelibly written in the proceedings of the House of Representatives and it will be certainly difficult to fill his shoes.

In my short tenure here, it has been my privilege to serve with Mr. SCHERER on the Committee on Public Works. In this field, Congressman SCHERER has made a most outstanding record. He is known throughout the Nation as one of the foremost authorities on Federal highways program. He has been one of of the most effective advocates of this, the largest peacetime Federal highways program in our history and Mr. SCHERER has had the courage to insist that this tremendous effort be placed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis.

GORDON has served with the same distinction on other subcommittees of the great Committee on Public Works and it has been through this service that I had the great fortune to come in contact with him.

As a freshman member of that committee, GORDON has been of invaluable service and help to me and for this assistance and service I wish to personally thank him and take this opportunity to publicly express my appreciation.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think that while Mr. SCHERER has been a diligent and effective legislator in matters dealing with public works, I feel that his greatest service to this Nation has been the outstanding effort he has made as a ranking minority member of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

In the face of widespread abuse, threat and intimidation by Communists and their fellow travelers, his convictions have remained unshaken. He has courageously and uncompromisingly fought to protect the American way of life. He truly has rendered a great service to this country.

It is with the deepest regret that I watch GORDON SCHERER retire from this active, dedicated service to his fellow Americans. His devotion to duty and his responsibility to his constituents and to the overall welfare of this Nation, have been foremost in his thoughts as he has labored in these hallowed halls.

I cannot but deeply regret GORDON'S decision to retire, but that is a personal matter which we all at times are confronted with. My only hope is that he will continue to have success in whatever new venture he undertakes and that he will have many years of happiness.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned of our colleague, GORDON SCHERER'S decision to retire from membership in the House of Representatives.

His long service, spanning five Congresses, has earned him the respect of every Member of this body. His keen and tenacious participation in the crucial work of the Public Works Committee, and especially of the House Un-American Activities Committee, has been of incalculable value to the security of the Nation. Through his work on the Public Works Committee he has contributed much to the highway program of America.

Our long personal association has been of the greatest value to me. His advice has been sound, his understanding profound and we shall all miss the presence of his wisdom and integrity

May I wish him every success and satisfaction upon his return to his home and his law practice. I know that the Cincinnati Republican organization will be in good hands with GORDON SHERER as its leader, and that his great contributions to public service and civic welfare will continue to benefit his city, his State and the Nation.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentlemen from Ohio about our colleague, Hon. GORDON H. SCHERER, of the First District, who is voluntarily retiring at the end of this Congress. GORDON was first elected to the 83d Congress—taking his seat in January 1953. He has been a hard worker and one of the most conscientious Members of this body. We all know about his effective work as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the Public Works Committee. When GORDON speaks on any of the subjects under the jurisdiction of these committees, we know that his words are authoritative.

We are going to miss you very much GORDON, but we wish for you and yours all the best things of life. Good luck to you in all your endeavors.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the voluntary retirement from Congress of GORDON SCHERER is a genuine loss to the Nation and the State of Ohio. Capable, industrious, and highly intelligent, he has dignified the office of Congressman during his five terms as Representative from Ohio's First District. His service on the Public Works Committee of the House was so outstanding in the field of Federal highway program that he has been recognized as a national authority on the subject. On the Un-American Activities Committee his fearless and unrelenting efforts to ferret out Reds in government and expose the Communist apparatus have marked him as a true patriot. My personal affection for him and respect for his performance as a Member of the House is exceeded only by my sincere regret in seeing him depart from Congress. A man of his stature will always contribute much to the Nation and his community regardless of his position and I join with my colleagues and his many friends here in Washington in extending my best wishes for his future endeavors.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to an outstanding Ohioan and a great American who retires from the Congress at the close of this session. I have reference to our good friend, the Honorable GORDON H. SCHERER, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

GORDON SCHERER'S retirement from Congress will leave a terrific void in these Halls as he has been a most effective Member of the House-Un-American Activities Committee to say nothing of his effective work on the House Public Works Committee. Any member of the House Un-American Activities Committee is subjected to ridicule and abuse by the Communists, fellow travelers, and left wingers but because of GORDON SCHERER'S dedication, unusual abilities, and effectiveness, he has been subjected to more than his share. During these trying times, however, he has been able to take solace from the fact that freedom-loving, patriotic Americans everywhere were in his corner. In addition, GORDON SCHERER believed in what he was doing with all his strength and with all his heart.

Knowing GORDON SCHERER as I do, I know that his retirement from Congress will not be the end of his work to keep America free from Communist domination.

It is an honor for me to wish this truly great American good health, happiness and success in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, GORDON SCHERER has been my friend for a lifetime, and I have the greatest admiration for him. He will be sorely missed in the Ohio Republican delegation and by his other colleagues in the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle. He has rendered exceptionally good service in the Congress and in local office, as well. He has carried the flag for Americanism high as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and he has made an outstanding contribution to the welfare of this Republic through exposure of its enemies engaged in subversion and other activities.

Not only the people of his hometown and his home State of Ohio, but the people of the Nation as a whole, owe GORDON SCHERER a great debt of gratitude for the wonderful service he has given.

Our respect, affection, and love go with him as he returns to private life.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to say "so long" to a colleague and friend with whom one has worked for a number of years. It is especially difficult for me to do so in the case of GORDON SCHERER because he has done such an outstandingly good job here in the Congress of the United States.

GORDON SCHERER was eminently well qualified to meet and perform his duties and responsibilities as a Member of the Congress. He is not only recognized and highly respected as a very able attorney, and a man who performed his duties in a very distinguished manner as an assistant prosecuting attorney for Hamilton County, Ohio; the director of safety for the city of Cincinnati, and a member of the city of Cincinnati City Council, along with many other civic and fraternal activities, but he has also served with great distinction for 8 years here in the Congress.

GORDON SCHERER is thorough and sincere in meeting every responsibility and in everything he does. He, as a member of the House Committee on Public Works and as the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, has had a leading and important part in developing the greatest roadbuilding program in the history of our Nation.

As a member and later as the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities he has always been an unrelenting foe of anyone who sought to interfere with, tear down, or to destroy in any way the sound principles upon which our Nation has been founded and has become the greatest Nation in the world. GORDON SCHERER has been completely fair to anyone and everyone who has been called to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities but he has also been completely courageous and unyielding against any person or organization he is convinced is trying to compromise or destroy our American way of life.

We, of the Ohio Republican delegation in the House of Representatives, try to hold luncheons at regular intervals during the months when the House is in session if we can do so without interfering with our responsibilities on the floor of the House. We are most fortunate in having each member of our delegation as a member of important legislative and appropriation committees. These luncheons give us an opportunity to obtain firsthand information on and to discuss measures which are being considered in our respective committees. We find that by so doing we are better informed and hence better able to serve the district we each represent and the entire Nation. GORDON SCHERER, not only because of his devoted service on his committees but also because of his personal knowledge gained through his on-the-spot hearings on the road construction programs and the matters before his Committee on Un-American Activities, has been able to give his Ohio colleagues the benefit of his knowledge and experience. This has enabled each of us to better serve our district and the Nation.

It has been a privilege, inspiration, and pleasure to serve and work here in the Congress with our colleague, GORDON SCHERER. We shall miss him and the Nation shall miss him. Personally, I sincerely regret that he is leaving the Congress. I can only say a very sincere "thank you" to him and to express my wishes that he will have many more years of good health, happiness, and success.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the 87th Congress reaches toward adjournment, I think it is altogether fitting that we pay tribute to a distinguished legislator who has compiled an outstanding record of public service. GORDON H. SCHERER, of Cincinnati, Ohio, has served the people of his district and the Nation in a truly distinguished manner and it has been a great pleasure to serve with him in the House of Representatives.

When I came to Congress in January of 1961, GORDON SCHERER was among the first to offer me advice and a helping hand. His years of experience were shared with me and I shall always be grateful for the assistance he gave me as a freshman Member of this Chamber.

We will all miss his advice and counsel just as we treasure his friendship. I would very much like to join my colleagues in wishing him every possible future happiness and assure him that he has every right to be proud of the fine record he has established here in the House of Representatives.

WHITE HOUSE REGIONAL CONFERENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I reported to the House on the progress or lack of progress, in the General Accounting Office investigation of the cost and legality of the White House Regional Conferences held in November of 1961. My remarks are found on pages 22677 through 22680 of the RECORD of October 5, 1962.

I have been advised today that one of the five agencies which had failed to report as of last week, the Department of Commerce, had now reported that 93 employees had participated and that a total of 2,876 man hours had been consumed at an estimated cost of $30,276.13.

I have also been advised by the General Accounting Office that they had determined that the Government Printing Office had printed 24,910 copies of the 84 page magazine-size brochure entitled "Report to the President—White House Regional Conferences—November 1961," at a cost of $9,602.19, and that this cost was charged to the Special Projects Account of the White House office. Thus, if we add these two additional items to the $111,300 previously reported, we find that the cost of the White House Regional Conferences estimated to date total $151,178.32.

There still remain three departments and one agency to report. The Departments of Agriculture, Interior and Labor, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

It is fair to say that these four agencies might well provide a very sizable addition to the estimated cost of the White House Regional Conferences' propaganda effort. It should be noted that one of the principle topics plugged by the New Frontier propagandists was under the heading of "Opportunities for Our Cities." Another was "Conservation and Recreational Development," and still another was "Farm and Rural Progress," and another, "Full Employment and Economic Growth." Some of the stars of this Madison Avenue-type road show whose campaign-type photographs are sprinkled through the 84-page booklet, were the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Robert Weaver, Secretary of Labor Goldberg, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, and Secretary of Interior Udall. It appears to me that these agencies may have engaged in this program so extensively, and the cost to the taxpayer have been so high, that they would like to delay their reports until after the November 6 election.

I am also disappointed that the General Accounting Office has not yet reached a final opinion on the legality of these expenditures. Certainly I am aware that the General Accounting Office has had plenty of trouble in extracting from these departments the figures on personnel, man-hours, and estimated costs, and it is perfectly understandable why the New Frontier bureaucrats are reluctant to divulge these figures. Yet I cannot completely absolve the General Accounting Office from failure to have arrived at some decision concerning the legality of these expenditures, since their attention has been called to this matter for almost 1 year, and whether they were legal or illegal does not require waiting until all of the figures were in.

Whatever research on the legality of these expenditures needed to have been done, should have been commenced so that a conclusion could have been reached when the report of estimated costs of some $111,000 was furnished to the members of the House Government Operations Committee on September 12.

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, as we approach what I hope may be the closing hours of the session we are reminded of Members of this House who will not be back here to serve when the House convenes again next January.

I want to take a brief moment at this point to remind the House of the very distinguished service of my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. H. Carl Andersen]. Such a dissertation might well be entitled "A Quarter of a Century of Service," for Carl came to this House 24 years ago and since that time has served in a most admirable, a most dedicated, and a most distinguishd manner.

Were I now to take the time to reiterate to the Members of the House the great volume of service, the monuments, if you will, that he leaves not only to his district, to his State, and to his Nation, I know that I would further prolong the adjournment of the House. So I hope that it may suffice that I should refer to just a very few of them.

It is no secret, I know, to anyone here that during the course of these many years of service Carl has been a champion of every cause which he in his judgment felt would best serve the interests of his district, his State, and his Nation.

I should be remiss were I not to mention as a most distinguished area, the field of agriculture, and the degree to which he has directed his attention and his effective endeavors in this cause. I do not suppose there is a single facet of the entire agricultural scene that exists throughout the Nation to which he has not directed his attention and been alert at all times in his concern to improve the economic opportunities of farm people. This has been evidenced in the field of conservation, in price supports, in problems having to do with water use and conservation, and in problems of surplus or whatever the problems have been over the course of these many years. While I have made reference only to this particular part of his service, I think it follows that he has directed the very same dedication and the very same interest and the very same sound judgment to every problem that has come before this Congress.

I suppose that possibly from my standpoint, I being in comparison to Carl's service at this point but a freshman in this body, that I have had a closer degree of association with him, during the time that I have been here at least, than have a good many others because I have lived right across the street from him. Consequently, we have had occasion to be exposed to him and his very charming wife, Martha, on many social occasions as well as in the performance of duties that we have shared in common as Members of this body. This has served to further alert me to the degree of dedication that he displays. But possibly even more important, and I recall this so well when I came here as a freshman: As all of you know, there are some problems involved in becoming initiated to all of the intricate functions of this body, and I shall always cherish the counsel and the advice that Carl so willingly provided to me as I know he did to so many other Members. Always I found it to be most reliable, most dependable, and the kind of advice that served me in good stead in many, many instances.

I think it should be noted at this point that in spite of his many duties here and the number of hours that he devoted to such duties, he still at the same time found sufficient time to care for and to devote his energetic efforts in behalf of his church. Because it so happens that he and I attended the same church, consequently, I had occasion to witness the degree of his contribution in that field as well.

Mr. Speaker, even with this brief reference to these many most distinguished areas of service, I still have barely scratched the surface so far as Mr. Andersen's contributions to our society are concerned. I should want to add just one more point because I think this becomes really pertinent in analyzing the character and the degree of his dedication. It is no secret that he was called upon to participate in a very delicate election contest, a contest that became difficult because of a redistricting problem that we had in Minnesota. The results, of course, were such that they made the speech I am making here now necessary. The really remarkable and the notable part of it is the very wonderful attitude he has displayed since that election. I had occasion to call him immediately upon his return to Washington after that occasion and found him at that point to display again the same kind of calm judgment, the same kind of concern for society, and registered his observation that this was one of the hazards that all of us are subject to when we perform in a political arena. I suppose you could not give greater credit to any man than when one in adversity is able to recognize and talk with that kind of grace of the experience that he had just gone through at that particular point.

So it is almost trite for me to say at this point that we recognize the great loss to this legislative body, for it is so true. By the same token, I think we are recognizing the wealth of benefits all of us as Members of this body as well as the citizens throughout the United States and throughout the world are going to continue to enjoy and to cherish for years and years to come.

There is no combination of words or phrases that I know of or that is within my limited ability to reach that could properly recognize in the manner that they should be, the benefits that have accrued to all of us by virtue of his dedication to the field of public service. Probably the closest we could come to that at this point would be for each of us to rededicate our efforts in the sense that we would try to achieve the same magnitude of accomplishment it has been the good fortune of H. Carl Andersen to have achieved.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I am proud to yield to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. I should like to join in tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, H. Carl Andersen, and subscribe to all the gentleman has said.

It has been my great honor and privilege to serve on the Appropriations Committee for the last 10 years with the gentleman from Minnesota, H. Carl Andersen. I know of his dedication to the work; I know of the many hard and grueling hours he has put in on that committee. I think the entire Nation owes a debt to the gentleman from Minnesota, H. Carl Andersen, for his foresight in the subcommittee work that he did and particularly I have the firm conviction that the Nation owes him a great debt of gratitude for the work that he has done. I think he has been a great champion of the farm population of this Nation. But in addition to that, it seems to me that the taxpayers should also pay a tribute to the gentleman from Minnesota, H. Carl Andersen, because in his service on that committee I know of the millions of dollars he has saved from waste in his diligent work.

I compliment the gentleman for bringing this matter to the floor; and to the gentleman from Minnesota, Carl Andersen, I say: "Godspeed and happy, happy days ahead when you are no longer in this grueling job in the House of Representatives."

The gentleman from Minnesota, H. Carl Andersen, is a fine friend, a distinguished gentleman, and a great patriot.

Mr. LANGEN. We of Minnesota are very proud of the gentleman from Minnesota, H. Carl Andersen, and we are grateful for the gentleman's most appropriate comments.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I came to Congress the same year that the gentleman from Minnesota, H. Carl Andersen, came here. We have been closely associated for the past 24 years. We have been on the Committee on Appropriations together for the past 20 years. Carl and I have sat together and have worked together on that committee, he being just next to me on that very important committee for the past 20 years.

I know the gentleman from Minnesota, Carl Andersen. I know the wonderful work that the gentleman from Minnesota, H. Carl Andersen, has done on the many wonderful things which he has accomplished for the farmers of this great blessed land of ours. He was coauthor of the Watershed Act, which will prove to be one of the greatest things to conserve our priceless topsoil that has ever been accomplished in this country of ours for the future of America.

I have traveled with CARL to foreign lands to look into matters of great importance to this country and to try to find out what these many foreign lands were doing with our taxpayers' dollars. We brought back a report which has saved this Nation many, many millions of dollars, because it was used by the Committee on Appropriations in its deliberations to determine what the different nations should have under the Foreign Aid Act.

I am going to miss CARL, possibly more than most any other Member of this House, because of our close association and my great regard for his integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I can only hope and pray that CARL will have many, many years in which to enjoy his retirement from this body. He deserves much. I know that the Supreme Ruler of the Universe will see to it that the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, his good wife and family, will enjoy many, many years of happy life together.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that CARL will be close here. I want to counsel with CARL about the farm problem and about a lot of problems, as I have always done, on which occasions I have found his counsel always good.

Mr. Speaker, CARL and I introduced a farm bill a number of years ago. It was called the green pastures bill. I say advisedly that had that bill been made law the farm problem would be nonexistent today. I believe that just as surely as I stand here. So, we hope that CARL will come back and visit the House often and that we may profit by his counsel and by his fine friendship.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are greatly indebted to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN. It has been my privilege to serve on the Appropriations Committee with CARL for about 19 years and on the Subcommittee for Agriculture for about 17 years. During several of those years he was chairman.

During all that period he has been my friend but even more a tireless worker for American agriculture. I know of no man who has done more for those who work than has the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN.

Thereby he has made the greatest contribution to the American people, for food, clothing, and shelter remain basic. Our agriculture does such a fine job that it frees 90 percent of the American people to do other things.

It was my privilege to serve under CARL's chairmanship when with his leadership the watershed protection and flood prevention pilot plant program was initiated, without budget approval. Truly this program and the resulting benefits is monument enough for any man. The gentleman from Minnesota, H CARL ANDERSEN, has many other outstanding and consistent services to which he can point with pride. The American people today and tomorrow will be indebted to the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN.

As one who works with appropriations, defense, public works, agriculture, and all the rest, I shall personally miss the fine work done by my friend and colleague.

To him and his fine family I wish the very best and many fruitful years which he has so richly earned.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have served with my friend the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, for 8 years. I have seen him tested time after time.

All down through the years he has been a true friend of the American farmer. He has supported all programs which have benefited the family farmer. No Member of the House has been a stronger advocate of REA and soil conservation than the gentleman from Minnesota, CARL ANDERSEN. He believes that agriculture must prosper if our Nation is to prosper.

I want to wish for him a long, happy life and best of everything in his retirement as a Member of Congress.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in paying sincere tribute to our fellow Member, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN.

Like myself CARL is a native of the State of Washington and so we in the Evergreen State have a special interest as well as Minnesota.

I have served with CARL on the Appropriations Committee since 1945 and have served with him continuously on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for most of those 18 years. The Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN, CARL and I have worked together for a long while on that same subcommittee.

You get to know your fellow man pretty well in such close relationship. You get to know what makes a man click; what his uprisings and his downsittings are.

H. CARL ANDERSEN's great love is agriculture and the welfare of the farmers of this great Nation.

He worked hard at his Appropriations Committee work. He labored hard and long as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations in the 83d Congress and is one of the authors of the watershed program of 1954. He should be particularly proud of this for the work of this action has been of great benefit.

Along with my fellows I wish CARL, his lovely wife and fine family every positive good for many, many years to come.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe wholeheartedly and fully to the tribute which has been paid here today to our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's remarks about our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN. Although I did not know the gentleman from Minnesota as intimately as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN], in my 10 years here in the House I was always impressed by the fervor with which H. CARL ANDERSEN defended the rights of the farmers of his district. Although at times we did not agree on that farm policy, he was a very eloquent advocate and a very successful one.

Mr. Speaker, to him I wish a very healthy, happy retirement, and many years of ease in the future.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have served in the Congress of the United States with the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, have known him as a man with an established reputation, integrity, effectiveness. H. CARL's dedication to his convictions has been such that he has even come from a hospital bed to return to the floor of the House of Representatives to cast his vote. Little wonder, then, that the people of his district in Minnesota sent H. CARL to Washington 12 times to represent them in Congress. In his 24 years of service to Minnesotans, he has been a leader in appropriations for agriculture and has been one of the mainstays on that committee. It is generally acknowledged that without his assistance on the Appropriations Committee the St. Paul and South St. Paul flood control project may not have gone forward as it has. For this and many other services he has rendered, he will not be forgotten by his colleagues. I want to express a personal word of gratitude for the many times H. CARL has helped me as I was learning the congressional procedures in years past, and for the encouragement and consideration he has always shown me as we worked together in more recent years. He will always be remembered most kindly for those things and my every good wish goes with him and Mrs. Andersen as they leave the Congress at the end of 24 years of service.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for those most appropriate remarks.

Mr. Speaker, if I may say in conclusion, it is my desire, and I am sure the desire of a good many others, that Mr. and Mrs. Andersen be afforded a very generous portion of comfort and satisfaction in the years ahead.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the retirement of the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FROM YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the critical plight of the Yugoslav refugee.

The report of the House Appropriations Committee on the foreign aid bill creates the distinct impression that the framers of the report are uncertain as to the legitimacy of U.S. assistance to Yugoslav refugees.

I want to express the hope that the Department of State will not interpret congressional ambiguity as authorizing any discrimination against the Yugoslav refugees, for they are among our strongest allies in the continuing struggle against Communist totalitarianism.

I would at this time like to insert in the RECORD an excellent statement on this subject prepared by the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the International Rescue Committee. I hope that it will receive the widest possible attention:

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FLEEING FROM YUGOSLAVIA

Prior to the erection of the Berlin wall, East Germany was not the only refugee-producing Communist country in Europe. Mass flights occurred from other areas, such as Hungary in 1956, and year after year about 10,000 Yugoslav refugees have fled that country. Yet how many Americans know that a large segment of the Yugoslavs have not been able to obtain asylum in the West and that many have been forcibly returned to Yugoslavia?

It almost appears that it required a wall and the merciless terror of the Communist police at the wall to create concern for today's refugees and to have them accepted for what they are: victims of totalitarian oppression who flee from pervasive political, spiritual, and economic devastations which they correctly identify with the Communist system.

It is the same type of refugee who is seeking freedom, whether he comes from East Germany, Hungary, or Yugoslavia. Most are young, some are very young. Although they may not be able to articulate the reason which makes them come, it is invariably a desire to escape the police state, its totalitarian control as well as its economic deprivation. A man's yearning for freedom and human dignity is quite compatible with his hope of economic betterment.

Mass flights are always an expression of disaffection and opposition, the final protest where other protests are made impossible by political terror. Where people have no other vote, they are forced to vote with their feet. Our answer to the refugee problem is an index of the political imagination and the moral temper of the West.

The ambivalent attitude of the West toward Communist Yugoslavia has resulted in an ambivalent attitude toward Yugoslav refugees. Nothing can strengthen a totalitarian power so successfully as the feeling of resignation and apathy among its subjects. When we challenge the refugees' motivations, we appear unable to grasp why people would be fleeing and we seem to be turning our backs on them. When we acquiesce in the forcible return of escapees, we contribute to the feeling of hopelessness and thereby weaken the democratic cause within Yugoslavia—and without.

The age and the social background of most of the Yugoslav refugees, predominantly working class with a good admixture of peasant youth, instead of being interpreted as a symptom of the failure of the Yugoslav Government to gain the allegiance of the strata in whose name it purports to rule, have been used as proof of the economic character of the refugees' escape motivations. The refugees' opposition to communism is being impunged because they are poor. And because, when asked what they intend to do, they express a desire to work and to earn decent wages, it is adduced that they are not victims of Communist oppression and have not suffered from the absence of personal, political, and religious freedom. It is as if the economic hardships to which they were exposed were not manmade, the result of Communist misplanning. And it is as if a desire to work and to earn a decent living were in itself improper and shameful, an attitude which calls for the label "economic" refugee, that is one who does not deserve our sympathy and can be returned behind the curtain without qualms. When misgivings do arise, they are dismissed, sometimes smugly and sometimes uneasily.

The kind of repression rather than the repression itself is considered, and no attention is paid to the possibility of later retribution and the certainty that people who express their dissatisfaction with the regime by trying to escape from it will remain marked as enemies of the state. It is forgotten that the very act of escape makes a man an enemy of the state.

Everyone knows that in Communist countries, the economy is a phase of politics. In those countries where people are not free to choose their own political creed, they are not free to make their own way in the social and economic field. Freedom of initiative is either nonexistent or is permitted on a minimum scale. Savings are meaningless because sooner or later the state swallows everything. Plans for the future are better left unmade. Everyone knows what civic and family life has been reduced to. Now, with all this, when someone escapes from such distressing conditions can he really be considered an economic refugee?

Is physical persecution necessarily physical torture? The loss of freedom, political pressure and its inevitable consequence, economic misery, are also persecution; veiled persecution, daily persecution, persecution which these young people feel deeply, although they are often unable to give expression to their feeling, for lack of education, or difficulty in choosing the right words.

Even those few Yugoslaves who are granted asylum are frequently put in a lower category than refugees from other Communist countries by the U.S. escapee program. Thus Yugoslavs either do not qualify as refugees or they are treated as second-class refugees.

And when they come before the so-called screening commissions in the West, having crossed their Rubicon, although they have, for very valid reasons, chosen to be, as it were, "without family, without country, and without means," the only thing they find to say is "We came away to be free and to find work." Then we say, "They are young, they ran away from their parents; discipline; they are, as you can see, economic refugees."

Should we not give the matter a little more thought? There are many who are discontented with their jobs or unemployed. Do you think that they would, even with a passport, i.e., without any risk to themselves, leave Belgium, for example, leave it forever, abandoning their families, their possessions, for the unknown?

A further contention is that by permitting Yugoslav refugees to stay in Western Europe or by accepting them for immigration in the Western Hemisphere, we are alleviating Communist Yugoslavia's economic problems and underemployment. If this were true, Tito could have done better by negotiating labor agreements with other European countries which have manpower shortages. The 10,000 refugees from Yugoslavia annually do not alter the employment picture inside Yugoslavia to any appreciable degree. Even if it were the policy of the West to aggravate the economic difficulties of Yugoslavia, as it clearly has not been, these goals should not be pursued at the expense of the refugees, the victims of Tito's brand of communism.

The repression of freedom of religion and other fundamental human rights in Yugoslavia hardly differs even in degree from that practiced in the U.S.S.R. itself.

Yet the subtle campaign of the Yugoslav authorities to popularize the term "economic" refugee has been more than successful. It has carried over into the language of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and that of certain officials of the U.S. Government. It has influenced the policy of countries which formerly granted asylum to these refugees to the point where substantial numbers of them are now being repatriated instead of welcomed. It has created a situation where Italy permits most of those fleeing to remain on its soil, but Austria, using U.S. equivocal policies as an excuse, forcibly returns the majority of the Yugoslav refugees. It has resulted in drastic reductions in U.S. aid to refugees from Yugoslavia. It has resulted in resentment by true democratic people from Yugoslavia who see U.S. aid helping to build a strong Communist state, but refusing to help those anti-Communist elements that escape its oppression. It has caused confusion among the Americans because policymakers fail to understand that the basic philosophy of the Communist state is the same, whether that of the Soviet Union, China, or Yugoslavia.

American policy today leaves refugees bewildered by its policy of being selective about the kind of communism and oppression from which a person must flee in order to benefit from the help of the American people.

At a time when we are granting asylum to thousands of refugees from Castro's communism, which, supported by Soviet communism, is threatening the Western Hemisphere, should the United States not take a forthright stand and give full recognition to the refugees fleeing Yugoslavia which is today linked again with the Soviet in its conspiracy to have communism dominate the world?

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most significant action taken by this Congress was the sweeping revision of our trade policies. As one of the supporters of the President's trade program, I believe that its provisions will result in great economic prosperity and development for this country and the other markets of the free world.

One of the best expositions of the problems of world trade in the 1960's and the relationship between the United States and the European Common Market was recently made by Mr. Hans H. Bohlmann, export manager of the Seamless Rubber Co., New Haven, Conn. Mr. Bohlmann spells out with clarity and effectiveness the historical development of the European Economic Community and its importance to our country. He is a recognized authority in this field and I commend his articulate and informative remarks to the especial attention of this House.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

(By Hans H. Bohlmann)

Europe is at last getting together—which to us in the United States, with our own vast open market, would have seemed to have been the logical thing to do a long time ago. The European Economic Community, better known as the European Common Market, created by the Treaty of Rome in 1957, provides that after a certain length of time goods of the member countries made up of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, West Germany, and Italy can be sold without internal duties anywhere within the Community. No doubt the Swiss Federation and our own United States served as inspiring examples.

The 170 million consumers of the Common Market already have benefited so much from the initial cuts of internal tariffs that the rate of economic integration is now exceeding the original timetable. The latest tariff cut went into effect last month, raising the total to as high as 50 percent on industrial products. It is now hoped to eliminate all tariffs among the members by 1966, considerably ahead of the original schedule.

This is a momentous development, although plans for unifying Europe are not new. In the 19th century, for example, many notable and influential men such as Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Victor Hugo considered all Europeans as members of one family, with a background of similar traditions and culture. They complained about the lack of unity causing constant wars in which even the victors lost more than they gained.

The hope for unification disappeared with World War I. Nevertheless, in 1922 Aristide Briand, several times French Prime Minister, revived the idea of the unification of Europe and in 1926 the movement had made such progress that a Pan-European Congress took place in Vienna which 2,000 representatives of all the nations of Europe attended. As a result of that Congress the Pan-European Union was formed. Briand became honorary president of the Union. The second Congress took place in Berlin in 1930 and the third in Basle in 1932 at which time Winston Churchill expressed himself enthusiastically in favor of the idea of a United States of Europe although apparently he did not want the United Kingdom to be included due to her ties with the British Commonwealth countries.

The advocates of a European union pointed to Switzerland as an example of a Pan-Europe in miniature. It seemed that the European union supported by 28 governments was going to realize its plan, but due to the rise of Hitler in 1933 the movement did not come back to life again until 1943 when Winston Churchill declared again his belief in a European union with all principal members of the Western European family as partners, and suggested the establishment of a Council of Europe with a supreme court that would decide on every dispute and would have sufficient power to see to it that the decision of the court would be carried out.

At the Potsdam Conference in 1945 President Truman supported the proposal of a union of Western European nations and in addition urged the unification of military forces and foreign policy.

On a 1953 business trip to Europe I met leaders of the Belgian Committee for the Creation of a United States of Europe. At that time the European Coal and Steel Community came into being under which the six countries of the present Common Market were pooling their steel and coal without assessing any internal import duties. I was given to understand that 8 out of 10 people in Belgium wanted a United States of Europe in one form or another, and I learned subsequently that there was great enthusiasm for this also in the other countries which now comprise the European Economic Community.

Due to the division of Europe in the past, there has been no free access to natural resources, but now, with lowered internal tariffs and increasing productivity as well as a higher standard of living in the Common Market, goods from all six member countries are increasingly being interchanged and at much lower prices than before. Manufacturers within this area are able to produce cheaper for the much larger market that will become even more attractive after a completely free movement of goods is achieved.

As economic integration progresses many problems will necessarily have to be ironed out due to difference in fiscal and labor policy for which reason the leaders of the Common Market foresee not only economic but also political integration. They feel that once full economic integration has been accomplished the matured economic ties can be relied upon as a tremendous force in helping achieve political unification in spite of a long history of frequently conflicting interests of the nations involved.

Some of the countries in the European Common Market have a low import duty at present but the average duty of the member countries will be reflected in a higher common customs tariff. For example, the low present duty rate of 4 percent ad valorem in West Germany on plumbing and heating equipment will be increased to 16 percent in the common customs tariff. Textile machinery now paying 6 percent duty in the Benelux countries (made up of Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg) will be subject to 13 percent under the external customs tariff. Rubber goods in general paying 14 percent ad valorem import duty in West Germany will later have to hurdle a 22-percent EEC common tariff wall.

These examples are indicative of the handicap the external EEC tariff wall can become for many manufacturing exporters on the outside.

An organization somewhat similar to the Common Market is the European Free Trade Association or EFTA, consisting of the United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Austria, Portugal, and Switzerland. The same as in the case of the six-nation Common Market, the EFTA, or so-called "Outer Seven" countries, aim at eventual complete liberalization of trade with themselves. However, within the EFTA this applies to industrial products only, and whereas the Common Market countries are moving steadily toward increased economic and eventual political integration, EFTA, as set up by the 1960 Stockholm Convention, does not plan to have a common tariff wall against nonmembers nor a coordination of social and economic policies. Moreover, the EFTA has expressed an interest in promoting closer economic cooperation between the countries of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) which include the members of the European Economic Community. Therefore, the EFTA has recently announced a new reduction in internal duties on industrial products to keep pace with similar steps within the European Common Market.

As the products of most manufacturers outside EEC will be subject to higher duties than before and face competition from similar goods made locally on which no duties at all are paid, members of the EFTA, led by Britain, are negotiating for membership in EEC or associate membership. They see in advance that their economies will suffer drastically if they stay on the outside, and from visits to these countries I have learned that many industrialists there are hopeful that EFTA will be instrumental in reaching an agreement to join the Common Market.

Negotiations by Britain to reach a provisional agreement were interrupted recently over the question of pricing and gradual assessment of duties on imports into the Common Market of foodstuffs from the Commonwealth. In this regard EEC has offered to assist underdeveloped Commonwealth countries such as Pakistan and India in adjusting to a future tariff wall. Negotiations are scheduled to be resumed in October and there are wide differences of opinion as to when a final agreement on Britain's entry into the EEC may come about. The earliest guess is perhaps sometime in 1963.

Whereas in the European Common Market free trade serves to merge the economies of the member countries, this is not possible in Eastern Europe because trading there is done by the state. Import and export accounts between any two Communist nations must balance since none of their currencies are convertible. Thus the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance or Comecon, comprising Moscow's East European satellites and Outer Mongolia, cannot lead to effective economic integration. For example, Moscow usually buys from its Eastern European satellites at lower prices than it pays to West European countries for similar goods. Besides, when the Soviets sell comparable goods to both East Europe and West Europe, the Communist satellites generally pay more. As the economies of the bloc countries are not complementary, further forced economic integration could violate existing trade relations with Common Market countries which in that case would be likely to retaliate. Already Czechoslovakia and Poland are reported to be resisting further economic integration into the Soviet bloc.

The Common Market, with its internal economic cooperation and pooling of enormous raw material reserves, not only contradicts Communist ideas about capitalism but also their expressed statements to the effect that capitalist states are headed toward destructive competition. Therefore, the economic progress of EEC has already put the Soviet Union on the defensive, as has the Common Market's aim of eventual political union with a resulting increase in military power. How much Moscow is disturbed by these developments can be seen from its recent attacks on the Common Market at meetings and at press conferences. At a reception given for the Italian Foreign Trade Minister in Moscow in June, Premier Khrushchev urged Italy to withdraw from EEC and also from NATO and to trade with the Soviet Union.

Thus the Communist economic offensive is, in effect, being countered by the success of the EEC which has also impressed neutral nations in Africa and elsewhere who can see the economic advantages of trade relations with the Common Market rather than with the Soviet bloc to the exclusion of others.

Now let us examine what effect European integration and the resulting common tariff wall is likely to have on American exports. As far as raw materials are concerned, which represent about 25 percent of our current total exports to Europe, the effect is apt to be negligible since import duties in Western Europe are generally low. Coal exports, too, will probably continue on about the same scale as heretofore of roughly 21 percent of our total exports to Europe, although oil from the Sahara, for the transportation of which pipelines are now being built, may eventually reduce U.S. coal exports. American coal continues to be one of the leading sources of first-class coking and energy coal for industry in Europe as extensive automation permits the distribution of U.S. bituminous coal to European consumers at prices below those of most European producers.

Shipments of food products which have been running at about 19 percent of total U.S. exports to Europe may increase as European dietary tastes change with the increasing standard of living. Tobacco exports included in this group are expected to remain at present levels for some time to come.

When it comes to U.S. exports of manufactured goods, however, such as motor cars and aircraft, electric household appliances and office equipment, agricultural machinery and mining tools, pharmaceutical products and chemical fertilizers, they are likely to diminish as European integration progresses, and Common Market manufacturers have the advantage of a higher EEC external tariff wall.

It is primarily to meet this situation that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 has been designed. After passing the House of Representatives by a substantial margin on June 28, the 5-year bill went to the Senate where it was passed yesterday, September 19, by a vote of 78 to 8. Thus the United States will now be able to bargain with strength for reciprocal reductions up to 50 percent in existing duties and for the gradual elimination of tariffs on those items where the enlarged Common Market (including Britain) and the United States account for 80 percent of the free world's trade.

The new trade bill is also intended to assist the expansion of trade of the less-developed countries by eliminating all duties on tropical agricultural and forestry products not produced in the United States, provided similar reductions are instituted by the EEC. A byproduct of such strengthening of the economies of countries in this group is that they will become less vulnerable to the Soviet economic offensive.

For quite a few years an ever larger number of American manufacturers has been entering into licensing agreements or making direct investments in branch plants or joint ventures with European firms in the EEC or EFTA areas, when it became apparent that that was the only way of remaining in the market and of expanding local sales. As Common Market internal tariffs are lowered further and the external tariffs are raised, this may induce additional U.S. private capital investments within the Common Market. On the other hand, if as expected the external EEC tariffs are bargained down under the Trade Expansion Act, the resulting increased sales opportunities for U.S. products may well make it much less attractive for American manufacturers to establish new subsidiary plants inside the Common Market. This in turn will not only help increase U.S. exports and employment but also improve our current adverse balance of payments caused by foreign aid and military expenditures as well as by the outflow of American investments. The tariff reductions will be negotiated by the United States in the same across-the-board way on broad categories of goods as the members of the EEC are doing in gradually reducing their internal tariffs.

New U.S. tariff negotiations will continue on the traditional most-favored-nation principle whereby concessions agreed upon will apply as well to other free world trading countries. Thus the negotiating power under the trade bill in reducing our tariffs in return for similar concessions will help expand our trade also with other parts of the free world.

These expected tariff reductions should increase our exports to Europe more than our imports from the area because the fairly recent removal of European import restrictions on many American products has created opportunities for expanding U.S. exports. European sales to us, on the other hand, have already been expanding for about 10 years and little further increases can be expected for some time to come.

Another factor favoring more American exports is that here in the United States of America we have long been geared to mass production and distribution which is something quite new to Europe. Therefore, with a shortage of labor and with wages rising more rapidly in the EEC than over here, there will be good export possibilities for advanced U.S. capital equipment and other goods. The reduction of trade barriers under the Trade Expansion Act should prove particularly helpful to companies of all sizes now selling specialized products successfully in the domestic market. Accordingly, they should be able to do very nicely also in developing sales of their goods abroad.

In President Kennedy's July 4 declaration of interdependence between the United States and Western Europe, including Britain, he called for closer ties between the two sides, involving a more equitable sharing of the financial responsibilities of the new partnership such as assuming more of the economic aid to the underdeveloped areas and a greater portion of the military expenditures now incurred by the United States in behalf of European defense against the Communist bloc.

Under the auspices of the Atlantic Institute in Paris, economists will make a study of the different aspects of the proposed economic partnership between a unified Western Europe and the United States. This includes the common policies and guarantees that should be developed to bring about the drastic lowering of tariff walls, as foreseen in the U.S. trade expansion bill.

In line with the national export expansion program, we are constantly being reminded from all sides that our national survival depends partly on keeping our exports flowing in increasing volume to ease the pressure on our international balance of payments. In this respect the claim that our goods are too expensive for the world market is contradicted by the fact that our merchandise exports currently exceed our imports by about $5¼ billion and that our vast domestic market enables us to produce many goods more economically than our foreign competitors who often pay much lower wages than we. In fact, competition between U.S. industry and European Common Market industry in the world market will stimulate even greater production efficiency and increased overall productivity.

The new opportunities opening up in the Common Market are of tremendous importance for American manufacturers. It is estimated that so far only about 12,000 American companies are exporting, but that another 100,000 have products that can be sold abroad. Of course, it is up to each firm to make the effort to secure some of the business. There are sales opportunities in Western Europe and in practically every country of the free world that can be tapped through systematic market investigation and coverage.

Increased imports into the United States may require some American manufacturers to make changes in their products to meet competition. Those U.S. industries that may be injured by imports can obtain relief under the Trade Expansion Act in the form of aid in adjusting their products to meet the new situation and in connection with retraining programs.

The legislation under the new trade expansion bill is necessary especially at this time because it will facilitate an increase in American exports to the European Economic Community before its common tariff wall against the United States and other outside countries has reached its full height and before the Common Market members have become accustomed to it.

Those American manufacturers who have heretofore been considering exports as a relatively unimportant part of their business are missing a good bet. They remind me of the college freshman who telegraphed his sister: "Failed four exams. Prepare Dad." His sister wired back, "Dad prepared; prepare yourself." Those companies that have prepared themselves by having an export business with resulting bigger sales and profits have weathered recessions in the past far better than those with only domestic sales. As business cycles overseas usually do not coincide with ours, exports are in effect an insurance against recessions, especially now that dramatic new export sales opportunities are opening up due to the growing economic strength of Western Europe and other parts of the free world. Businessmen wanting to exploit these opportunities can obtain much help from the U.S. Department of Commerce which includes assistance to newcomers in developing an export business. In this connection the commercial sections of American Foreign Service posts are well prepared to aid visiting international traders with their marketing problems.

There is one service in particular which for years has been very useful to me on oversea business trips. By supplying my itinerary to the Commerce Department, the Foreign Service posts are alerted to my approximate date of arrival and to any problems I may want to work out. In this way valuable time is saved and in addition oversea branches and correspondents of American banks can also be extremely helpful.

An excellent means of building export sales can be through participation in U.S. exhibits at international trade fairs in principal trading centers of Western Europe and elsewhere. American trade missions are also effective because they will assist manufacturers, upon request, through the U.S. Department of Commerce in locating firms or individuals interested in acting as their agents or distributors.

Another aid to expanding exports is the new export credit insurance system administered by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association (FCIA) providing protection against political and commercial risks. As you may know, FCIA shares the commercial risks with the Export-Import Bank and the latter carries the political risks.

Thus, with the aid already available, most American exporters can expect the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to assist them substantially in increasing their sales not only to the original six-country Common Market but also to a subsequent larger European Economic Community including Britain and other West European countries that will embrace about 300 million consumers.

Accordingly, American business should gain tremendously from an expanded trade program because of its stimulating effect on our economy even in the face of increased imports since the latter will be a challenge to American industry to remain competitive. These imports will also benefit the American consumer as he will be able to buy at lower prices from a greater selection of goods. We all enjoy imported merchandise.

Mounting economic strength and a higher standard of living in the European Economic Community could well increase the demand for American goods to such an extent that it may offset any reduction in U.S. export sales that may occur in the beginning in certain kinds of goods. This is illustrated by the experience of many exporters who are now receiving orders for products that only several years ago would have been impossible to obtain. Of course, this reflects the greater buying power of people in Western Europe who can now indulge in a taste for a wider variety of imported goods.

Accordingly, those companies that actively go after sales abroad by offering top quality merchandise at the right price and realistic payment terms as well as speedy delivery are bound to expand their businesses and strengthen the country as a whole.

If I don't stop now I'll be like the lecturer who at the end of his talk finally asked, "Are there any questions?" A hand shot up and one of the long-suffering listeners inquired, "What time is it?"

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY: FIRST AMBASSADOR TO JAMAICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that President Kennedy has made any nomination for high office during his administration to this time that has received such unanimous and enthusiastic approval from the membership of both Houses of the Congress than his nomination of William C. Doherty as this country's first Ambassador to Jamaica.

During his 21 years as president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, William C. Doherty has earned the respect and the friendship of every Member of both Houses—and on both sides of the aisle of both Houses of the Congress. He has been a peerless leader of men. He has built his organization into a showcase union for the entire labor movement in America, an example of integrity and effectiveness. Probably no man in the country, excepting only those who have actually been Members of the Congress, has as many friends on Capitol Hill as has Bill Doherty.

But, in commending this nomination I am, for the moment disregarding personal matters of friendship, although these considerations are great. I commend this nomination because of its logic and its tremendous good sense.

For the past 17 years, in his capacity as a major vice president, first of the old American Federation of Labor and, since the amalgamation in 1955, of the AFL-CIO, Bill Doherty's career has been an intensive and magnificent training ground for the job for which he has been nominated.

In 1945, for instance, Gen. Lucius D. Clay invited him to Germany to assist in the reestablishment of the free trade union movement which had been killed during the Hitler reign of terror. Bill Doherty had a great deal to do with uncovering Communist elements in certain unions in Germany and these unions, as a result, were driven behind the Iron Curtain where they are still operating as propoganda outlets of the international Communist conspiracy.

In 1945 also he attended the British Trade Union Congress in Blackpool, England, as a fraternal delegate. He impressed his British colleagues so well that he was afforded the very rare honor of being invited back again for a second visit in 1959. It should be added at this point that his work in England earned him the close friendship of his fellow trade unionist Ernest Bevin, who later became Great Britain's highly regarded Foreign Minister.

Ever since 1951 Bill Doherty has been a principal figure in the Postal Telegraph & Telephone International, an intensely effective anti-Communist trade secretariat of communications workers throughout the free world. His top-level activity in this trade secretariat has been a major force in frustrating the efforts of Communists to infiltrate and control the communications workers in key countries. In fact, just last month in Denver, William Norton, a former president of the PTTI, and a man who twice has served as Deputy Prime Minister of his native land of Ireland, paid tribute to Bill Doherty as the one man in the entire world who has given the most direction to struggle against communistic influence which the Postal Telegraph & Telephone International has been carrying on since the end of World War II.

Bill Doherty has been preaching the gospel of democracy and the free enterprise system on a person-to-person level within the trade unions where susceptibility to the siren-song of the collectivists was greatest. He has been one of the most effective freedom fighters in the labor movement in Latin America and has carried the anti-Communist battle in those greatly troubled and highly important neighbor nations that lie south of us.

His natural genius for international affairs has been recognized by two Presidents of the United States of different political faiths. In 1956 President Dwight D. Eisenhower appointed him to the official U.S. party attending the inauguration ceremonies of President Juscelino Kubitschek de Oliveira of Brazil. Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon was the leader of this mission.

In 1961, President Kennedy appointed him as a special representative to the highly important conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay. Bill Doherty's performance there was so impressive that the President, just last August, appointed him as Special Ambassador to the Independence Day ceremonies in Kingston, Jamaica. This mission was headed by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Once again, Bill Doherty's work on this mission was so effective that the nomination as Ambassador to Jamaica was a "natural."

But, there are many more reasons why Bill Doherty's nomination makes great good sense, over and above the reasons I have cited. First of all, Bill Doherty is a trade unionist of great experience and great reputation. He is perhaps even more widely known in Latin America and in Europe than he is in the United States because of his unremitting opposition to dictatorship, to tyranny of any political shade or coloration, to totalitarianism of either the left or the right. Jamaica, the land to which he is being assigned as Ambassador, is a country in which organized labor is the dominant political force.

Sir Alexander Bustamente, the Jamaican Prime Minister, is a longtime leader of union labor.

Both major political parties in Jamaica are closely alined with labor.

In Jamaica, Bill Doherty will be speaking to the political leaders in their own ideological and sociological language, the language they understand. This is an inestimable advantage, an advantage that no career diplomat could possibly possess.

There is a further consideration and this is geographical. Fidel Castro's Cuba lies just 90 miles away from Jamaica, and the Communist leaders of that unhappy land are already casting greedy eyes on the Jamaican shores. The Communist pressures on the emerging nation of Jamaica are bound to be enormous and I say: "Thank God we have an Ambassador who is ideally equipped, enormously experienced, and prodigiously endowed with courage and integrity who can fight these pressures in our behalf."

Mr. Speaker, this is a brilliant appointment. I know that the vast majority of the Members of this body wish to congratulate William C. "Bill" Doherty on being the first representative from the ranks of organized labor in this country to be raised to ambassadorial rank. But—as a member of the opposite political party I want to extend my warm congratulations to the President, John F. Kennedy, for having the imagination, the wisdom, and the foresight to nominate such an outstandingly qualified American citizen for this extremely important mission to a very important sector of our hemisphere.

I shall miss the smiling, cheery countenance of Bill Doherty, as will many of my colleagues. Because of his absence from the Capitol Hill scene there will be a little void. And in some of the social gatherings which Bill presided over as President of the NALC, I shall also miss his fine Irish tenor voice singing "Beautiful Ohio" and "My Wild Irish Rose."

To Bill Doherty, his charming and wonderful wife, and his lovely family, go my prayers and best wishes for continued good health, happiness, and success.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 2, 19, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54 to the bill (H.R. 12648) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes", requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12820. An act to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3705. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1447) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3451) entitled "An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10620) entitled "An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12135) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12276) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 1, 8, and 11 to the above-entitled bill.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 12648, with Senate amendments Nos. 2, 19, 44, and 47 through 54, further disagree to said amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, may I proceed for one moment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the membership that we have had preliminary discussions with our colleagues on the other side, and if you will bear with us, I am sure it will be only a matter of a very few minutes until we will be able to be back with an agreement, because we have discussed and we understand each other. If you will just bear with us and stay on the floor for a few minutes longer, I think we can be back shortly.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, NATCHER, CANNON, HORAN, and TABER.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I had preliminarily indicated what I felt and appealed to the membership to stay on the floor. I should have asked the Speaker if it would be all right to consider this later in the day.

I now assure the Speaker that it will be but a very brief time before we will be back, and I hope we can have unanimous consent to take this matter up in a few moments when we return.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF ST. AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87-586, the Chair appoints as members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MATTHEWS of Florida and Mr. CRAMER of Florida.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess until 5:30 o'clock p.m.

Thereupon, at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m., the House stood in recess until 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2554)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 19, 44, 48, 49, 50, 52, and 54.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 47, 51, and 53.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 2.—Research: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment which will include the following Senate increases and amounts to which the conferees have agreed:

Research:	
To staff new research laboratories	$325,000
Cost of production research	670,000
Expanded utilization research	4,875,000
	5,870,000
Construction:	
Soil and water facilities, Sidney, Mont	395,000
Soil and water facilities, Mandan, N. Dak	400,000
Soil and water facilities, Watkinsville, Ga	125,000
Entomology and crop facilities, Tucson, Ariz	$585,000
Tree fruit and nut crops facilities, Byron, Ga	500,000
Small fruit facilities, Carbondale, Ill	165,000
Modernization of facilities, Beltsville, Md	160,000
Poultry research facilities, East Lansing, Mich	450,000
	2,780,000
Total increases	8,650,000
House bill total	77,473,000
Total 1963 appropriation	86,123,000

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 19—Construction of facilities: Eliminates $1,600,000 for research facility in Georgia.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 44—Reimbursement for net realized losses: Appropriates $2,278,455,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,066,955,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Foreign assistance programs

Amendments Nos. 47 through 50—Public Law 480: Include language inserted by the Senate and appropriate $1,080,632,000 under title I as proposed by the House instead of $700,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $250,000,000 under title II as proposed by the House instead of $189,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $40,000,000 under title IV as proposed by the House instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 51 and 52—International Wheat Agreement: Restore House language, insert Senate language, and appropriate $81,218,000 as proposed by the House instead of $15,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 53 and 54—Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile: Restore House language, insert Senate language, and appropriate $125,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $92,867,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H.R. 12648 and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the two bodies having agreed on most of the items in this bill, there are only a few items left in disagreement.

Briefly, in the report which we have brought to you, on which both sides have agreed, the Senate has receded on the $1,600,000 for the peanut laboratory. They have receded on the $17,500,000 of unearmarked funds for construction under utilization research. They have gone along with the House figures on financing price supports for a full year instead of a half year.

The House in turn has agreed to go along with $1,775,000 for five research laboratories added by the Senate. Insofar as the figures in disagreement for the actual running of the Department are concerned, we have tied down all the funds that are approved. In substitution for the peanut laboratory we have gone along with the other five which were added in the other body. I think that on the whole this will enable the Department to operate on a sound basis for the coming year.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the conferees on this side for the splendid work they have done and for their determination to stand by the position of the House of Representatives on this bill. I realize this was done under great pressure and they were subject to unjustified criticism. I extend to you my thanks for your work in this connection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for his comment and wish to assure him that in the final analysis we had the cooperation of the folks on both sides of the Capitol. We think we have reached what can be termed a fair solution of a difficult problem.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I, too, want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and all of the House conferees for the splendid job they have done in sustaining the position of the House. Theirs has not been an easy task, as we all know.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the only comment I have to make is in behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. In this conference we were faced with a rather difficult task. I think he carried off his duties with dignity and with some concern for the taxpayers' dollars. I do think that in this Congress of ours we should have processes of orderly and controlled appropriations. I said before and I say now, I do not think a person can serve on the Appropriations Committee and win any popularity contests if he does his job seriously. I am concerned with the budget. I have developed an allergy against red ink. I may retire from the House one of these days—now I will be frank with you, I do not want to retire on a 10-cent dollar. When the final report is made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], I think you are going to find that we have spent more than we have taken in, as measured by any system of budgeting that we might consider in this country. I just say that as we make this report to you, I think you owe a debt of gratitude for the hard work JAMIE WHITTEN has put in on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know it has been a pleasure for me to work with him. With as much knowledge as we could bring to bear on this matter, we bring back to you a final conference report that we hope meets the needs of American agriculture. That is all I have to say at this time, but I do want to pledge to you that if I am reelected and remain a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that we will continue to consider our duties on this committee, which is an agency of this House, and that it will be done to the best of my ability and with some idea as to maintaining the fiscal solvency of the United States.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the statement of my friend and colleague from the State of Washington. Through the years we have worked together on this subcommittee. At present he is the ranking Republican member. Earlier today some speeches were made with reference to his predecessor who served many years in this capacity, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, who has rendered a real service to American agriculture. I say for the record that the conference this year was handled for the minority by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington. Certainly I know, as is evidenced by the conference report which is now before you, he will do a fine job for the American people and for American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, may I say for the record that we have never approached this bill in a partisan manner and I know that we never will.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a table in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The table is as follows:

H.R. 12648—Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1963

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—General activities	$1,510,069,000	$1,464,582,500	$1,513,856,000	$1,485,319,500	−$24,749,500	+$20,737,000	−$28,536,500
Title II—Credit agencies	55,324,000	44,406,000	44,606,000	44,606,000	−10,718,000	+200,000	
Title III—Corporations	2,602,455,000	2,390,004,000	2,169,004,000	2,380,254,000	−222,201,000	−9,750,000	+211,250,000
Title IV—Foreign assistance programs	2,186,935,000	1,576,850,000	1,047,517,000	1,576,850,000	−610,085,000		+529,333,000
Total appropriations	6,354,783,000	5,475,842,500	4,774,983,000	5,487,029,500	−867,753,500	+11,187,000	+712,046,500
Total loan authorizations	(805,000,000)	(805,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 9, strike out:

"Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, $77,473,000: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a);".

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, $106,126,500, including such amounts as may be necessary, notwithstanding the foregoing limitations, to remain available until expended, for the construction, alteration, and equipping of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by purchase, donation or exchange: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a);".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following:

"Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, and for acquisition of land by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, $77,473,000; plus additional amounts for research as follows: $325,000 for staffing new research laboratories, $670,000 for research on cost of production, and $4,875,000 for expanded utilization research; and plus the following amounts, to remain available until expended, for construction, alteration and equipping of facilities: $395,000 for soil and water research facilites at Sidney, Montana, $450,000 for poultry research facilities at East Lansing, Michigan, $400,000 for Mandan, North Dakota, $125,000 for the Southern Piedmont soil and water facility, $585,000 for Tucson, Arizona, $500,000 for the regional tree fruit and nut crops station in the Southeast, $165,000 for the research station at Carbondale, Illinois, and $160,000 for improvement of heating, water and electrical systems at the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Maryland; in all, $86,123,000: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113(a));".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 32, line 4, after "recoverable," insert "and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon,".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 32, line 16, strike out "expenses during fiscal year 1963" and insert "unrecovered prior years' cost, including interest thereon,".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "expenses during fiscal year 1963 and unrecovered prior years' cost, including interest thereon,".

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 32, line 22, strike out "expenses during fiscal year 1963" and insert "unrecovered prior years' costs".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "expenses during fiscal year 1963 and unrecovered prior years costs".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

INCREASE DEDUCTIONS ON MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, and so forth, expenses.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

1ST LT. CHARLES M. COX

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1961) for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army, retired.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LANE. This bill would relieve a retired Army man of liability to pay $6,800.58 representing payments of longevity pay based upon credit for service in the New York organized militia from January 1920 to October 1926. This was based upon a certificate of service made during World War II in 1942. The payments were spread over the years from 1942 through 1960.

The Department of the Army found that the man has been subjected to a severe financial hardship by reason of this liability. The Army has no objection to the bill.

Mr. BATTIN. This is the general type of legislation where a mistake was made, and it would be at this time a hardship upon the man to have to repay something through an error that was not his fault?

Mr. LANE. That is true, and that is what the record shows.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as I understand it this bill and the bill that follows provide there will be no collection of overpayments from each of these individuals.

Once again we have before us the administrative failures that have resulted in overpayments to these two Army officers. I want to renew again my protest—I shall not object to these bills—to the fact that nowhere have I been able to discover in the report on this bill any showing that anyone has been held responsible, that there has been any penalization of those who made these administrative errors.

I hope in the next session of Congress we will begin to get reports where responsibility for errors has been fixed.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That First Lieutenant Charles M. Cox, United States Army (retired), of Buxton, Oregon, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $6,800.58, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay received by him for the period from June 1, 1942, through March 13, 1960, while the said Lieutenant Charles M. Cox was serving as a member of the United States Army, such overpayments having been made as a result of his being erroneously credited, for pay purposes, with service performed in the organized militia of the State of New York.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said First Lieutenant Charles M. Cox, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. GUSTAVE M. MINTON, JR.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3124) for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand this bill is about the same as the last one where an administrative error was made?

Mr. LANE. Yes. This error was found in 1961 for the first time and goes back to 1918, 1919, and 1920. It is similar to the other bill I just brought up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be in enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Gustave M. Minton, Junior, lieutenant colonel, United States Air Force (AO915777), is relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $2,822.85, representing the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by him for the period from August 22, 1952, through December 31, 1961, while he was serving as a member of the United States Air Force, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents of the Army, Navy, and Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in section 1 of this Act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of those officers or agents for payments which are found to be free from fraud and collusion.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Gustave M. Minton, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in section 1 of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUTURE PLANNING FOR THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best, clearest, commonsense statements that I have read on the Nation's Capital is the address of Philip L. Graham delivered last evening at the 25th anniversary dinner of the Washington Building Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include the statement with my remarks:

ADDRESS BY PHILIP GRAHAM BEFORE BUILDING CONGRESS

Our Nation's Capital has never been at a loss for planners and prophets.

The first act of prophecy about our city and its future was made 171 years ago by a planner, Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant. He conceived of the Capital of this Revolutionary Republic in the grand baroque manner of 17th century European monarchy.

While we may question L'Enfant's sense of history—it is difficult—even after nearly two centuries—to question his sheer genius as a physical planner.

L'Enfant was a far shrewder visionary than any among the generations of his successors. His plan was in fact compelling enough to be revived a full century after it was grudgingly received by our first President and all but torn to pieces by the land speculators of those days.

L'Enfant, luckily for him, started with nothing. Some of our contemporary planners seem to feel that they too are starting with nothing—a strange and delusive way, of thinking about the 1960's.

Today we have still another plan, this one for the National Capital region of 38 years hence—our plan for the year 2000. And this is what I want to talk about tonight.

LOOKING BACK

The year 2000 is 38 years off. Let's skip back 38 years and see how prescient the lesser breed of L'Enfant's were when they planned for the year 1962 back in the early twenties.

They, like us today, were merely human beings, not seventh sons of seventh sons. Thus, their population projection from that era showed that no one had any idea of the revolutionary changes—the urban explosion, if you will—that would transform the Federal City into a metropolis stretching from Leesburg to Upper Marlboro and from Bowie to Manassas.

Although our research could not turn up forecasts that were actually made in 1924, we did discover that as late as 1930 the experts were confident that the District of Columbia in 1962 would still hold some 60 percent of the metropolitan population.

What has actually happened? Nearly two-thirds of the population has migrated to the suburbs.

The prognosticators of more than three decades ago foresaw a metropolitan population of 1.5 million people in 1962—with 875,000 of these numbers housed inside the District and 625,000 in the suburbs.

MISSING THE MARK

As it turned out, our suburbs are well over the million-and-a-quarter mark and suburban growth rates have not abated. So you see the suburban growth projections were a mere 200 percent off the mark.

Of course, the science of population was still in its bow-and-arrow stage back in the twenties. It is no surprise that the arrow went so wide of its mark.

After all, it was shot from a world in which airplanes lumbered along at less than 150 miles an hour; where mass dispersion of buying power was undreamed of for such amenities as washing machines, refrigerators, air conditioners, cars, and even homes; a world in which radio was still in its infancy and television unknown.

And in the District there existed ghetto boundaries for the Negro population which everyone thought would remain fixed in perpetuity.

Back in 1924 there was no comprehensive planning as such. And officials were only dimly aware of the beginnings of those two forces which would profoundly alter the face of our city—the automobile and urban sprawl.

MORE VEHICLES

There were about 100,000 motor vehicles on our streets in 1924. There are 700,000 today.

Commissioner James F. Oyster was warning in 1924 that within 5 years the municipal authorities may be turning to the possibilities of underground parking and the creation of parking hotels to get some of the machines off the streets during the hours of the day.

In 1924 steam shovels were crunching into such remote spots as Klingle Ford and Piney Branch within 3 miles of the White House to clear the way for new homes and apartment houses.

At the 59th anniversary meeting of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, Col. Clarence O. Sherrill, officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, lamented that Piney Branch has been completely destroyed.

Each year, Sherrill protested, the dumping and denuding of the (city's) forested areas has progressively continued.

In the year when the foxtrot was king, when Coolidge was reelected President, when a new Ford touring car sold for $295—the citizens of Washington were only beginning to show any awareness of the need for civic leadership to guide the great new thrust of development that came with prosperity.

COMMITTEE ROLE

Their concern showed itself in formation of the Committee of One Hundred and the National Capital Park Commission. But in the 38 ensuing years neither organization has been able to play a vital role in the National Capital area's development.

How did the District respond in 1924 to the storm warnings of change and growth?

Except for a handful of farsighted citizens, the prevailing preoccupation was with the cosmetic needs of our streets, parks, and monuments rather than corrective surgery. The dominant desire was to make the Capital City a place of monumental beauty surpassing Paris and Vienna.

Thoroughly in the spirit of the time, the Washington Post declared editorially that Washington "is going bravely forward to the Augustan age of its development."

And yet one prophetic soul—an obscure assistant engineer commissioner, Capt. John E. Wood—recognized that needs of the new age would cut far deeper than mere physical ornamentation and display.

"MUSTS" OF 1924

In 1924, after 4 years of service to the city, Wood drew up this remarkable farsighted list of "must" endeavors:

1. Development of the Washington Channel waterfront.
2. Acquisition and development of the Potomac Palisades.
3. Completion of a metropolitan plan embracing the Maryland and Virginia suburbs.
4. Construction of radial boulevards into the city.
5. Construction of belt highways in the suburbs to bypass congested residential areas and connect parkland.
6. Special architectural treatment for sections of the city such as Georgetown.

Wood was especially emphatic about the need for a beltway system as a "key to the plan of Greater Washington." Today we can take rueful measure of his warning that "further delay in establishing a proper plan for Washington outside Florida Avenue will mean glowing opportunities lost and tragedy invited."

But no one—not even the perceptive Captain Wood—suggested that Washington would benefit from a subway system which had already been tried and proven in other world capitals. Even as late as the New Deal era when land was cheap and massive public works were needed to combat unemployment, the city's first detailed plans for a subway were laughed into oblivion.

LOOKING AHEAD

So much for planning and prophesying in 1924. The truth is that no one was then trying to plan or capable of planning 38 years ahead.

In 1962 are we any more capable of planning, in detail, for 38 years from now? Are we so sure we have inherited the vision and talent of L'Enfant? Of course, we must have goals, long-term goals. But are we not better advised to temper our detailed planning to a period within our foresight and tangible grasp?

Let's look ahead to the year 2000.

Most of you are familiar with the year 2000 plan.

As a rough-sketch statement of goals toward which we may grow over the next four decades, it isn't bad.

Suburban planners and politicians have responded well to the notion of fixed growth corridors to permit balanced patterns of urban growth and open space.

But I must confess that I have fears about the actual operative effects of the year 2000 plan.

We are already seeing it used as an opiate by planners and by out and out obstructionists to tranquilize us against our day-to-day and year-to-year problems. In some quarters it is being invoked as holy writ to justify delay and deferral on decisions for the critical needs of today and 5 years from today.

OLD ARMY GAME

A military friend once told me of an old army gamesmanship device to avoid making decisions. If you're assigned a problem, he said, all you have to do is make it so big that everyone finally agrees it's insoluble.

The so-called year 2000 plan is being used in just this fashion. It has been grasped by too many of our planning policymakers and technicians to sidestep painful but necessary controversy. It has been exploited by the philosophers of negativity.

One troublesome aspect of our current year 2000 planning is that it treats the central city as a sort of hole in the doughnut. Our planning sights must be set in the central city, in the midst of the forces that shape metropolitan development, rather than at the periphery. How can we intelligently tell where our development spokes should go if we haven't planned the hub of the system, our metropolitan core?

And the truth is that we haven't faced other most fundamental development issues within the District of Columbia in the year 2000 plan or anywhere else.

GAPS IN POLICY

For example: Although we have a so-called plan for 38 years hence, we still have no existing policy to control the development of our most treasured asset, the Potomac Valley from Great Falls to Mount Vernon.

Is it any surprise that one controversy chases another down the shoreline—the battle of Merrywood, the battle of Watergate Towne and even our bridge controversies?

When we fasten our eyes on the next millennium we are piling new atrocities on the old mistakes. Our most precious visual heritage, the vista of the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials as well as the Washington Monument, have already been defiled by commercial excrescenses of unsurpassed ugliness along the Georgetown waterfront.

And just as the monumental skyline sweeps into view from Whitehurst Freeway, our nostrils tell us that we have entered the foulest pocket of industrially polluted air in the city. Perhaps we ought to post a roadside warning to out-of-town motorists: "You are entering a monumental area. Hold your nose."

Still further downstream, along Rock Creek Parkway, comes the reek of raw sewage from one of the world's filthiest rivers—a monument itself to what has been called our effluent society.

HUMAN NEEDS

Yes, we have an image for the year 2000. But meanwhile who has devised a way for a $65-a-week wage earner with three kids in an urban renewal area to qualify for a section 221 rehabilitation loan today, or next year, or 5 years from now?

How will the plan unsnarl tomorrow's traffic jam along Shirley Highway created by a Federal agency that decided to plunk down a major employment center at, say, Cameron Station in Alexandria?

How will it provide "decent, safe, and sanitary housing" next year for families chased out of their homes by a big new motel in midtown, by a freeway, or by the latest brainstorm of our Capitol Architect?

What can we find in the year 2000 plan to take care of the blight factor that we are building into our new Southwest right now by not providing parking to go with the thousands of Federal employees flocking into the new office buildings along Independence Avenue?

What should we do about the Anacostia River which has been completely ignored as another great natural asset of our region as a planning tool for revitalizing a section of Washington that has been left to rot? Should it have a 20- or 40-foot channel? How should we treat its shoreline? Must we also despoil the lovely and neglected Arboretum?

PRESENTING PLEA

I simply want to make this plea.

Let's not take the year 2000 plan for what it is not—an answer to problems that are now on the frying pan.

We must not be tranquilized into a sense of complacency that Washington's pressing issues have been solved on paper and that all we need to do is follow our blueprint down the garden—or the corridor—path.

Ten years ago I was invited to your birthday and I spoke to you of the serious, costly, and dangerous problems that lay ahead for our city. In almost every respect, our worst fears have been surpassed.

The flight to the suburbs that was well underway in 1952 is still running full tide, draining the central city of middle income families, depriving the District of their taxpayments and their retail shopping dollars.

Then at your 20th birthday party, 5 years ago, we took another look into our familiar metropolitan "can of worms" to find that our problems were bloating and multiplying beyond imagination.

NEEDS IN 1958

We took stock at the 1958 reunion of our needs:

To redevelop and rehabilitate large parts of the central city.

To create healthful, balanced and economically viable suburban growth.

To find means toward redistributing the racial elements of our population.

To start moving on our water supply and pollution problems.

To expand our transportation plant both on rail and asphalt.

At our last meeting I complained to you that our brainpower and energies were being dissipated in prolonged and sterile disputes such as the 7-year bridge-tunnel debate for our Constitution Avenue crossing of the Potomac. It is absolutely scandalous that after 11 years that bridge is still incomplete. It is dangling there in midair, a monument to the obstruction of the Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, the Park Service, and others.

In 1958 I reported to you that Southwest redevelopment has "continually been delayed and bedevilled by crisis after crisis—all of them involving matters of essentially minor importance." The Southwest could have been largely completed by 1958. But again the obstructionists have had a field day. And it may not be done by 1968, unless someone takes action.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

The capital outlay needs we faced in 1952 and 1958 to replenish and care for our antiquated municipal plant have multiplied greatly. Yet only within the past week Congress has once again displayed, in the most revolting form, its lack of responsibility to the National Capital when it shelved the city's request for expanded borrowing authority.

For sheer obstructionism toward the District, the record of this session of Congress is hard to match.

Before the demise of the city's borrowing authority bill, Washingtonians witnessed the spectacle of a southern-dominated House District Subcommittee interposing itself between the Commissioners and a proposed fair housing regulation in an ugly act of legislative extortion.

Just a few days earlier came the burial of a modest piece of legislation that would have cleared the way for planning the revitalization of our blighted downtown.

The action plan for downtown and supporting legislative proposals represent an investment of more than half a million dollars and 2 years of work by two of our most valuable civic action groups—Downtown Progress and the Federal City Council. It was an investment, I need not remind you, by Washington's much maligned business community.

CONGRESS ROLE

Yet an unresponsive Congress shrugged off the city's pleas for legislation to start the action plan on the road toward realization.

Somewhere in the innumerable pigeonholes on Capitol Hill dust is also gathering on a bill that would have allowed the city to go ahead with a badly needed 2,000-car garage under the Southwest Mall. A selfish and shortsighted minority of our business fraternity, together with their friends on Capitol Hill, put the Mall parking bill in "cold storage." In the process, they upset a major element of our Southwest plan, which has already been bedeviled by delay and disruption.

The 87th Congress also took a 20-year backward step when it all but abolished the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency and in the process wrecked any hopes for rational parking strategy at the very time our midcity building boom is creating a parking crisis—and with it a potential blighting influence—of major proportions.

But all the blame cannot be unburdened at the doorstep of an obstructionist Congress.

Civic and governmental leadership in the National Capital area is in a bad way. The agencies to which we look for leadership are fighting among themselves and in the process, paralyzing our decisionmaking faculties.

GUERRILLA WARFARE

We have seen our desperately needed expressway system lose all forward momentum during the past 12 months, falling prey to jurisdictional guerrilla warfare between transit partisans and roadbuilders. Mr. Stolzenbach, Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, conceived it as one of his first duties to polarize the transit-freeway battle.

I can think of no more palpable nonsense than the way the obstructionists have urged us to delay project after project until Mr. Stolzenbach's plan is finished. One would think Mr. Stolzenbach was away on a flight to Mars; he has never yet once said that any action could be taken without injuring his mysterious plan.

Our Planning Commission, with one foot solidly planted in the year 2000, has recently tried to soft-shoe its way through controversies over the highway program, and the need for renewal of Georgetown's industrial waterfront. The Commission has not exercised its full measure of leadership in coordinating Federal moves throughout the metropolitan area.

DART GAME

And the Federal Government has been one of the worst transgressors. Executive agencies have been playing a reckless game of darts with the map of Metropolitan Washington.

Instead of working as a positive influence in shaping a rational metropolitan environment, it has done just the opposite. The Central Intelligence Agency's new home at Langley did not even place in a list of 25 sites picked after careful planning research. But Allen Dulles, you may remember, wanted a Princeton type campus setting for his employees and Congressman BROYHILL could not have been more sympathetic.

If that massive blockhouse of the CIA's is campus-type architecture, then I think we ought to rename the Pentagon Harvard Yard.

Another incredible monument to Federal whimsy is the Atomic Energy Commission building, a 45- or 50-minute or longer drive from downtown Washington. The secretaries were the first to rebel at this exile to exurbia. As usual, they had more sense than the planning technicians.

In fact, we have become so numbed by this sort of folly that the scandalous waste of moving NSA to Fort Meade has hardly ever been noted. And now we have the Bureau of Standards and other dispersal-minded agencies doing violence to the most elementary concepts of sound metropolitan planning.

CHAOS UNLEASHED

The dispersers and decentralizers in the Federal Establishment have failed to prove the wisdom of their argument. Instead they have further unleashed the forces of urban chaos in the National Capital region.

There is, on the contrary great sense in the new cluster of Federal buildings along Independence Avenue and at the gateway to the new Southwest. But without companion action to accommodate both the traffic and parking demands of this vast new employment center, it will only build new blight factors into our downtown.

Because of the city's enormous public and private investment in the Southwest, GSA has a compelling responsibility to provide underground parking in the Southwest Mall far at least 4,000 cars. Secondly, GSA should join others in demanding the earliest possible completion of the inner loop, no later than 1970.

There is urgent need for a strong, central checkrein over the various agencies in the executive branch.

It is notable that Washington's best days, as far as the executive branch is concerned, were the years from 1953 to 1958 when under President Eisenhower, Gov. Sherman Adams displayed continuing and intelligent interest in National Capital affairs.

Someday Washington should recognize formally Governor Adams' contribution to our city.

KENNEDY ACTION

It is strange, on the other hand, that the New Frontier waited more than a year and a half before extending its influence to the citizens of Metropolitan Washington through the appointment of Charlie Horsky as Presidential Adviser on National Capital Affairs.

Washington, after all, has been our President's most permanent hometown. It has also been home to many who serve in his administration.

The saving of Lafayette Square is just one example of how much can be achieved with the active, personal interest of President and Mrs. Kennedy. And we can now welcome enthusiastically the appointment of Mr. Horsky for giving institutional support to the President's determination to help Washington.

In Congress, the work of Senator ALAN BIBLE and his Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems has shown us what can be achieved with constructive and enlightened leadership on Capitol Hill. Without Senator BIBLE, we would certainly not have been even as far along toward transit modernization as we are today.

And now I should like to place before you tonight an agenda for action in the National Capital region.

FIVE-YEAR GOALS

It is a program not for the year 2000 but for 1967—5 years from now, something that falls within our mortal capabilities. We have the tools, the money, the civic genius to achieve it. We need only the will.

First, a clean Potomac in which we can once again swim and fish.

Second, a national cultural center to enhance both our Nation and our culture.

Third, although my editorial colleagues at the Washington Post disagree with me, a national aquarium to celebrate nature along with our zoo and opera. For I believe the gifts and wonders of the ocean are as enhancing to man as opera.

Fourth, the rapid flowering of a new downtown which will serve as the vital center rather than the shame of our metropolitan area.

Fifth, an innerloop freeway that is fully under contract.

Sixth, a functioning metropolitan authority to manage the financing and construction of a regional mass transit system.

Seventh, modern high-speed subway service in our downtown core.

Eighth, a humane and efficient relocation service for families and businesses to insure that our public works undertakings do not streamroller over proprietary rights and individual initiative.

Ninth, completion of plans for the long-neglected Southeast and Northeast quadrants of our city, along both sides of the Anacostia.

Tenth, the blossoming of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Eleventh, completion of the Three Sisters Bridge with perhaps a start on the Fourth or Fifth Sister, as well as a completed access road system to Dulles Airport.

OTHER ASPECTS

But we cannot build a greater National Capital with public works alone.

We must also set our 1967 sights on such goals as these:

Achieving equal housing and job opportunities for Negroes and other minorities.

Strengthening our institutions of higher learning so that we may attract the Nation's keenest and most cultivated minds as well as our due share of the new scientific industries on our periphery.

Coming to grips with our spiraling welfare problems in a way that will attack the underlying social conditions from which our relief loads spring.

Creating larger banking and commercial institutions worthy of a world capital.

Getting more intelligent and responsive representation in the District committees of Congress.

In conclusion, I would say that there has been some good news during the past year to go with the bad. Mr. Horsky's appointment was a heartening demonstration that the administration is recognizing its responsibility to the National Capital.

COOPERATION NEEDED

But, remarkable as he is, and prodigal as are his gifts, he is no miracle man.

He will need the ear of a sympathetic President.

He will need the cooperation of a citizenry that must stop its nay-saying and must, in the words of New York's Bob Moses, ignore the "babel of strident voices" that counsel delay and negativism.

It is not simply an array of problems that face Metropolitan Washington. It is a full-blown crisis.

We must learn to accept the signs of change and growth that will make our Federal City as different in the year 2000 as it was in 1924.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Graham speaks with great feeling and deep concern over long-range future planning. He expresses anxiety over the apparent failure of those responsible to recognize that the present and near future—not alone the distant years—must be reckoned with in any sensible planning for the Capital City of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, as the legislative body of this Capital, the Congress of the United States must heed the warning and advice that this dedicated citizen speaks to. I hope that Mr. Graham's words do not fall on deaf ears in the Congress, and I trust that the official planners look to tomorrow and next year as well as the year 2000.

As one of many in this House of Representatives jealous of and interested in the beauty and proper growth of Washington, I congratulate Mr. Graham for the thought that went into and the excellence of his address to an organization that is so vitally concerned with the affairs of this great city.

PREVIOUS SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the 87th Congress lingers into the middle of the month of October and witnesses the falling leaves in the streets of Washington, many Members of the House have expressed curiosity as to the precedents for such a protracted session. For their information I should like to quote the following statistics with regard to previous sessions of unusual length, which occurred during an election year.

In 1940 the session lasted 366 days—from January 3, 1940, to January 3, 1941.

In 1922 the session lasted 292 days—from December 5, 1921, to September 22, 1922.

In 1914 the session lasted 328 days—from December 1, 1913, to October 24, 1914.

In 1888 the session lasted 321 days—from December 5, 1887, to October 20, 1888.

RETIRING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as another session comes to an end, all of use are saddened by the knowledge that some of our good friends and colleagues are retiring from the Congress. I rise today to salute the devoted service, patriotism, and workmanship of five of my colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Representatives Robert B. Chiperfield, Chester E. Merrow, Marguerite Stitt Church, Laurence Curtis, and Horace Seeley-Brown, Jr., will retire from the Congress and from their seats on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Each of these distinguished Representatives has earned the respect and admiration of their fellow colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Although a Democrat and a junior member of the committee, I have received their unfailing assistance and good will in my work on the committee. Without partisan feeling and with the utmost devotion to duty, these Members of Congress have attempted to work for the ideal that only by advancing and protecting freedom throughout the world can the United States maintain its security and dedication to the principles on which it was founded.

I salute them for their dedicated service to their country and to their constituencies, and I wish them all success in their future endeavors.

RANSOM MONEY FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we all have great compassion for the men and the families of men taken prisoner by Castro's Communist regime during the Bay of Pigs invasion attempt of Cuba last year. While we all have compassion for their plight and the people of the United States greatly feel that the causes of freedom must be upheld, the principles of this Nation do not condone the payment of ransom by the U.S. Government.

I have already urged the President and the Secretary of State to refuse to allow any U.S. tax dollars to be used for this purpose.

This Nation was faced with a ransom payment in 1805 and defeated those who were so brazen to demand it. That incident occurred in Tripoli and we refused to pay ransom while our Nation was young.

We should do no less while our Nation is great.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Pelly for October 13 and October 15 on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Derounian, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. Meader, for 30 minutes, following the special order granted to Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Giaimo (at the request of Mr. Libonati), today and tomorrow, for 30 minutes each, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. Dwyer (at the request of Mr. Barry of New York), for 10 minutes, on October 12.

Mr. Morse (at the request of Mr. Barry of New York), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Morse (at the request of Mr. Barry of New York), for 15 minutes, on October 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Williams.

Mr. Pillion (at the request of Mr. Barry) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Collier.

Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. Boland.

Mr. Farbstein.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Libonati) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Anfuso.

Mr. Toll.

Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Johnson of California in two instances and to include tables.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pelly) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Daddario.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gary) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Ichord of Missouri.

Mr. Multer in three instances.

Mr. Gallagher in three instances.

Mr. Smith of Mississippi.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 555. An act for the relief of Elmore County, Ala.;

H.R. 1691. An act for the relief of Elaine Veronica Brathwaite and Jessie Bamer;

H.R. 3131. An act for the relief of Richard C. Collins;

H.R. 5260. An act to continue for an additional 3-year period the existing suspensions of the tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations, or mixtures thereof;

H.R. 5700. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise;

H.R. 6190. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the repair or replacement for veterans of certain prosthetic or other appliances damaged or destroyed as a result of certain accidents;

H.R. 6691. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6836. An act to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act;

H.R. 7791. An act to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for the collection and publication of foreign commerce and trade statistics, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8140. An act to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8355. An act to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8874. An act to authorize certain banks to invest in corporations whose purpose is to provide clerical services for them, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8952. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes and relating to the taxation of life insurance companies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9285. An act for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson;

H.R. 9777. An act to amend Private Law 87-197;

H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of civilian employees of the New York Naval Shipyard and the San Francisco Naval Shipyard erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to a misinterpretation of a Navy civilian personnel instruction;

H.R. 10026. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power;

H.R. 10129. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees;

H.R. 10199. An act for the relief of Lester A. Kocher;

H.R. 10423. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy H. Johnson;

H.R. 10541. An act to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs designed to protect their populations, particularly all preschool children, against poliomyelitis, diptheria, whooping cough, and tetanus;

H.R. 10605. An act for the relief of Joan Rosa Orr;

H.R. 10708. An act to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity;

H.R. 10936. An act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11058. An act for the relief of Carl Adams;

H.R. 11578. An act for the relief of Don C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner;

H.R. 11899. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund;

H.R. 12313. An act for the relief of Jane Froman, Gypsy Markoff, and Jean Rosen;

H.R. 12402. An act for the relief of Concetta Maria, Rosetta, and Tomasino Mangiaracina;

H.R. 12513. An act to provide for public notice of settlement in patent interferences, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12599. An act relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 10, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7283. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses;

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles;

H.R. 10650. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 12, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2624. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of General Services Administration (GSA) contract DMP-78 with Harvey Aluminum (Inc.) of Torrance, Calif.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2625. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2626. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 903. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee of conference. S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2552). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on the activities of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 2553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H.R. 12648. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2554). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 10620. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses (Rept. No. 2555). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 13396. A bill to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 13397. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Permanent Commission on Governmental Operations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 13398. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by the addition of certain provisions for injunctions against Communist organizations; grand jury investigations of enforcement; priority of trials; more severe punishment in cases of violations by employees on the staff of the White House, Congress and Supreme Court; power to deny bail; appropriate supervision of convicts during confinement; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13399. A bill to provide that no Federal financial or other assistance may be extended to any educational institution which discriminates against students or prospective students on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 13400. A bill to facilitate payroll administration in the House of Representatives by fixing at multiples of $60 the basic compensation of certain positions thereunder; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13401. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Johnstown-Conemaugh National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 903. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appriations.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 904. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multi-State authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. Res. 834. Resolution to provide for printing of the transcript of the remarks incident to the character and service of Hon. James C. Davis; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 13402. A bill for the relief of Lily Isabell Watkis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 13403. A bill for the relief of Johnny Brodersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 13404. A bill for the relief of Mark Blais Ellingsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13405. A bill for the relief of Eleni Papapostolou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 13406. A bill for the relief of Grazia R. Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 13407. A bill for the relief of Changeez Banikarim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13408. A bill to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former enlisted members of the Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 13409. A bill for the relief of Paja Radojevic and his wife Zlata Radojevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

415. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Omaha Branch Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

416. By Mr. FOUNTAIN: Petition of Jesse M. Seaver, Margarettsville, N.C., on behalf of the Carolina Christian Union, disapproving the recent decision of the Supreme Court on the subject of prayer in the public schools of New York and proposing an amendment with respect to freedom of religion providing that "the conduct of traditional and customary religious customs and practices in public schools and other public institutions, including the reading of the Bible, prayers and singing, shall not be enjoined or prohibited"; that "neither the United States nor any State may deny or abridge the right of any person to engage in or refrain from engaging in any bona fide religious custom or practice, or from holding any religious belief" and that "neither the United States nor any State may establish a sectarian religion"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Casimir Pulaski—A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 183 years ago, on October 11, 1779, a great Polish patriot died for a great cause, the American Revolution.

Our observance today of Casimir Pulaski's death is a reminder to all Americans that the cause of freedom transcends national boundaries and that it joins together in common brotherhood brave and courageous men whatever their origin.

Casimir Pulaski was a freedom fighter in his native Poland before he gave his life to the cause of American independence. The son of a Polish count, Pulaski had fought valiantly but unsuccessfully to overthrow the Russian domination of his beloved Poland. His military achievements were heroic, but the forces he led were crushed and scattered and his personal property was confiscated. Pulaski, at 24 years of age, was forced to flee to Turkey. There he spent several years unsuccessfully trying to influence Turkey to help Poland. Finally, he reached Paris. Penniless and without employment, the young Pulaski eagerly sought to lend his valuable services to the American cause.

It was through the assistance of Benjamin Franklin that Pulaski sailed for the United States with a letter of introduction to George Washington. He joined Washington's forces and distinguished himself in the Battle of Brandywine. As a reward, Congress appointed this gallant soldier a brigadier general in charge of cavalry. He soon organized an independent corps of cavalry and light infantry which became known as Pulaski's Legion. This legion participated in the seige of Savannah, Ga. It was in this battle that the young Polish freedom fighter was mortally wounded on October 9, 1799. He died 2 days later.

This anniversary of Casimir Pulaski's death provides a welcome opportunity to reaffirm traditional Polish-American friendship. The courage and idealism displayed by this Polish patriot during our Revolution rekindles our great admiration for the Polish people and reinforces our faith in their ultimate victory in restoring freedom to Poland.

Racial Discrimination in Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides that no Federal financial or other assistance may be extended to any educational institution which discriminates against students or prospective students on account of race, religion, color, ancestry or national origin.

This legislation has been offered primarily in an effort to put a stop to the shameful exhibitions of racial discrimination now in existence in some of our institutions of higher learning, a practice most recently spotlighted by the actions of the University of Mississippi in refusing admission to a young Negro, who, as an American citizen, is entitled to the rights and privileges guaranteed under the Constitution.

Our great country was founded on the basic principles that all men are created equal, regardless of race, creed or color. If we are to continue our position of leadership in the world today, and if we are to continue to preach democracy, freedom, and equality to the rest of the world, then we must put our own house in order and eliminate every vestige of racial discrimination which exists in these United States.

In 1954 the Supreme Court handed down its historic desegregation decision. Yet in 1962—8 years later—there are still educational institutions flagrantly violating the law of the land and the basic principles upon which our country was founded. It is the responsibility of the Congress to enact strong laws for the protection of the rights and freedoms of each and every citizen. For that reason I am hopeful that the Congress will give favorable consideration in the future to the enactment of my bill. In my opinion, any educational institution which restricts admission of students in defiance of our Constitution, certainly is not entitled to any assistance from the Federal Government in the development or furtherance of its educational programs.

Voting Record of Congressman Richard H. Ichord on Major Issues and Measures of Great Import in the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my voting record on 35 of the most important bills to come before the House of Representatives during the 1961 and 1962 sessions of the 87th Congress. I am doing this after observing the record vote of Congressman WAYNE HAYS, which he inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 2. Congressman HAYS stated that he has done this every 2 years since coming to Congress and mailed out the same in order that his constituents may conveniently check his record. I am doing likewise as I, too, believe that the voters of every district not only have the right to know how their Congressman votes, but also they have the duty to know. Democracy must have a fully informed electorate in order to continue and prosper.

All of the voters will obviously not agree with their Congressman on every issue as it is impossible for any two men or women to always see alike; but nevertheless the record should be made available to the electorate.

I have reviewed my record closely and have attempted to set forth my record vote on all important legislation whether controversial or not. Of course, it should be understood that there were several bills of interest to many people which were passed or defeated without a record rollcall vote, usually because of the absence of nationwide interest or because of their noncontroversial character.

The record is as follows:

	How I voted	Number and description of bills
1	Against	S. 1983 and H.R. 8400—Authorization for 1962 foreign aid program.
2	Against	H.R. 9033—Appropriation for 1962 foreign aid program.
3	Against	S. 2996 and H.R. 11921—Authorization for 1963 foreign aid program.
4	Against	H.R. 13175—Appropriation of funds for 1963 foreign aid program.
5	For	S.J. Res. 230—Resolution expressing recommendation of Congress that the Cuban situation be resolved with arms if necessary.
6	Against	Executive Reorganization Plan No. 1—To establish the Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.
7	For	S. Con. Res. 34—Resolution expressing recommendation of Congress that Red China not be recognized in the United Nations.
8	Against	S. 2768—Purchase by the United States of $100,000,000 in United Nations bonds.
9	For	H.R. 7927—Provision to intercept at ports of entry into the United States Communist or pro-Russian literature sent via the mail.
10	For	S.J. Res. 29—Constitutional amendment prohibiting poll taxes.
11	For	H. Res. 167—Resolution to provide funds for operation expenses of House Un-American Activities Committee, which in effect assured continuation of that committee.
12	For	H.R. 7677—Raises temporary limit on national debt from $293,000,000,000 to $298,000,000,000 (1961).
13	Against	H.R. 11990—Raises temporary limit on national debt from $300,000,000,000 to $308,000,000,000 (1962).
14	For	H.R. 4806—Temporary extension of unemployment compensation benefits of 13 additional weeks.
15	For	S. 1—Establishment of the Area Redevelopment Administration and an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and authorizing Federal loans and grants for industrial plants and public facilities.
16	For	S. 1552—A provision for stricter regulation of drug industry and of distribution of new drugs.
17	For	H.R. 3935—Increasing $1 minimum wage to $1.25 per hour, and extending coverage to additional workers.
18	For	H.R. 12628—Providing for low- and moderate-cost housing for elderly in urban and rural reas.
19	For	H.R. 10—Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act.
20	For	S. 2393—2-year extension of the National Defense Education Act.
21	For	S. 205—Federal assistance and aid for construction of TV facilities to be used for educational purposes.
22	For	H.R. 11665—Changing formula for allocation of funds under National School Lunch Act to benefit smaller schools and school districts and to better aid areas of greater need.
23	For	H.R. 8900—An educational program of Federal aid to colleges and institutions of higher learning including scholarships for students and facility construction.
24	For	H.R. 6028—An act to improve housing for low and moderate income families; to promote urban renewal and open space development in cities and other community facilities.
25	For	H.R. 7927—Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962—provision for salary increases for postal and other Federal employees.
26	For	H.R. 7500—Establishment of the Peace Corps.
27	For	H.R. 8399—Manpower retraining program for retraining of persons unemployed because of the closing of shops, mines, mills, factories, etc.
28	For	S. 2965—Measure to coordinate and accelerate public works projects in communities where excessive unemployment prevails.
29	For	H.R. 9118—Establishment of U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
30	For	S.J. Res. 120—Authorization for the President to call up 250,000 reservists and National Guardsmen for active duty of not more than 1 year.
31	For	S. 1852, S. 2311, H.R. 5000, H.R. 6874—Stepped-up defense appropriations, including funds for increased aircraft production; improvement projects at military bases (home and abroad) and missile sites and for National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
32	For	H.R. 6027—1961 Amendments to the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefits to $40 per month and to increase benefits to widows and liberalizing disability provisions.
33	For	H.R. 10650—Amendments to Internal Revenue Code to provide tax credit for investment in new equipment; tax savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks; reduce deductions for business expenses and increase taxes on income earned by American subsidiaries abroad.
34	Against	H.R. 11970—Trade Expansion Act delegating authority to the President to reduce or eliminate tariffs and duties on foreign imports.
35	For	H.R. 8773—Increases readjustment payments to members of Reserve components involuntarily released from active duty.

Fisheries Center Is Step Toward Revitalizing Our Threatened Fisheries Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the approval by President Kennedy of legislation establishing a $10-million National Fisheries Center and Aquarium here in Washington, D.C. This is a notable step toward revitalizing our threatened fisheries resources.

Too little attention has been given our fisheries industry and that, as a consequence, the Nation ranks fifth in commercial seafood production, whereas we could, and should, rank first.

The National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the Nation's Capital will combine scientific, cultural, and educational programs which will benefit millions of Americans who are presently unaware of fisheries resources and problems, which this industry faces.

The Nation's Capital has over 7 million visitors each year, including 3,000 groups of schoolchildren. They come to see their Government in operation, to visit the White House, the Congress, and other historic buildings and monuments, and to view the great works of art in the city's museums. They come, too, to gain scientific knowledge. The new National Fisheries Center will help impart to these children and to their parents the extreme importance of our fisheries commercially, in providing foods that prevent malnutrition, and in affording countless millions opportunities for wholesome recreation.

Although fishing has been a basic pursuit in the United States since the first settlers came to this country, it has failed to attain its deserved public recognition and support. Today, the world produces about 400 million tons of fish annually, but only 2½ million tons of this amount is produced by the United States. Due to their scientific research in finding and harvesting this vast treasure of the sea, other nations have moved ahead of the United States in the commercial fisheries field.

The Department of Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service has done a remarkable job of research with the very limited funds made available to it. I am convinced that the National Center for Fisheries will motivate more people to become interested in the fisheries problem, to enter actively into the commercial fisheries business, and to engage in fisheries sciences and oceanography as lifetime pursuits.

Each year some 25 million Americans engage in sports fishing, and this number is expected to double by 1980. The new center will increase the knowledge of these many millions who have a basic concern with the continuation of the Nation's sport fisheries through restocking the streams, rivers and lakes, through protection of game fish from disease and other dangers, and through educational programs aimed at keeping our waterways clean so fish may thrive.

Critics of this important legislation tried to ridicule and distort its true objectives, but the need for increased attention to the problems of both our commercial and sport fisheries is very real.

The education center to be built in Washington, D.C., will contain exhibits of all types depicting what this Nation has done, and stressing what it must do and can do, to safeguard one of its most important resources.

Outstanding Service to Veterans: the Brooklyn Veterans' Administration Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Philip R. Casesa is director of the Veterans' Administration hospital located in Brooklyn, N.Y. Dr. Casesa has brought to his task all of the great qualities that Americans have come to expect from the members of the medical profession plus the administrative ability to direct a hospital devoted to the special needs of the veterans of our Nation's wars.

During the 1962 fiscal year this hospital provided the following services to Brooklyn veterans: 7,416 admissions; 11,238 examinations; 32,881 laboratory tests per month; 22,923 prescriptions filled; 29,575 X-ray examinations; 88,670 X-ray films exposed; 3,230 surgical procedures; 1,051,257 meals served; 97,644 physical medical treatments; 11,888 dental treatments; 92,389 volunteer hours served. The total budget for the hospital during fiscal 1962 was $8,807,739.97. All of these services are aimed at the individual veteran and represent only a partial record of the services provided—only that part which can be rendered statistically.

The Veterans' Administration hospital—under Dr. Casesa's able direction—is an institution of which we can all be proud. It will serve as an example of public service carried out with devotion to those who depend upon its ministrations.

The Main Splendor at the Golden Ox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, we cannot bring back the easygoing way of life of the turn of the century, but we can bring back some of the graceful atmosphere and the good food of those days. We New Yorkers are very proud of our restaurants and the many varieties of excellent foods served there, and we consider ourselves as connoisseurs in this respect. But a delicious Kansas City stockyards steak of "the good old days" is something which even we New Yorkers prefer.

More than a decade ago a man out in Kansas City, Mo., conceived an idea, gave it much thought, and then decided to make it a reality. It was the idea to set up the Golden Ox Restaurant as a service to clients and associates in the stockyard industry in that city. That man was Mr. Jay B. Dillingham, president of the Kansas City Stockyard Co., today still the head of the company and one of the Nation's most industrious businessmen and promoters.

It was to be a nonprofit, convenience-type of operation catering primarily to the industry. Soon, however, its fame for unsurpassed quality food spread far and wide and its success became almost legendary. Today the Golden Ox ranks as one of the top three profit-producing restaurants in the country, and its annual gross is about $1½ million.

This did not come about through sheer miracle. There is a long tradition behind it, the tradition of the Mark Twain country, its homelife, its hospitality, its love of good food and good cooking. There is a long history behind it, too, a history dating back to the Santa Fe Trail and the Chisholm Trail which were established as a means of bringing cattle to the stockyards of Kansas City. Today it is a part of the folklore of America.

It was in these stockyards in Kansas City that the now famous Kansas City sirloin steak was originated. In other words, these were the stockyards where the "steak is born," to quote a well-known writer. And this is where the Dillingham idea came in. It was not merely an idea to establish another restaurant, but one that would specialize in the best the stockyards can offer, with emphasis on quality, good cooking, and service in the turn-of-the-century Western atmosphere.

This explains the phenomenal success of Mr. Dillingham and the Golden Ox in Kansas City. In time, other areas of the country kept asking the company to open up similar type restaurants where people could enjoy individually selected and aged beef prepared and served in the Golden Ox fashion. About 2½ years ago a Golden Ox Restaurant was opened in Denver, which also is enjoying great success and is doing a terrific volume of business.

Now the Golden Ox is coming to the Nation's Capital. Mr. Dillingham felt that his many friends on Capitol Hill, and the people of Washington in general, would welcome this type of a restaurant here. An excellent location was found at 1615 L Street NW., about midway between the Statler Hilton and Mayflower Hotels and in the very heart of Washington's finest business and shopping area. The official opening took place on Wednesday, October 10, 1962, and all indications are that it will be a great success. Before very long, I am sure, many people in government, politics, business, industry, the professions, and others, will come there to enjoy the pleasant atmosphere, the good food, and the excellent service.

Incidentally, Mr. Dillingham is an outstanding authority on the livestock industry and has served as an adviser to the Department of Agriculture on this industry. He is a close personal friend of two of our beloved former Presidents, Harry Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, as well as Senator STUART SYMINGTON and many others in both Houses of Congress. He is also a former president of the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce and was selected in 1957 as the Missouri "Father of the Year."

And finally, a word about the man who manages the Golden Ox Restaurant in Washington, Mr. Charles F. Snyder. Although only 30 years of age, he has had about 10 years of experience in quality food management in restaurants from Nantucket Island, Mass., to Dallas, Tex., his most recent position having been with the Marriott Motor Hotels. He was born and raised in the Pennsylvania Dutch country, has a B.A. degree from Middlebury College at Middlebury, Vt.

It was during his college years that he developed the desire to learn the restaurant business, and this has come to a successful and happy fruition. He has acquired extensive knowledge about beef and is considered an authority on fat beef cattle, and aging, selection, and cutting of fine beef. He was manager of the famous Safari Beef House in Dallas and served as special training adviser to the Dallas Restaurant Association and the University of Texas Extension School. Mr. Snyder now resides with his wife and three children in Fairfax, Va.

These are the people who have now brought to Washington a taste of the graceful atmosphere and the good food of long ago. Mark Twain described it beautifully in his autobiography where, in speaking of the sumptuous meals of Midwest America of his day, he writes that "the way the food was cooked was perhaps the main splendor." At the Golden Ox this old Missouri tradition is today "the main splendor." Which only proves once again the spirit of enterprise, the great resources and the rich heritage of the American people, today and yesterday.

Pulaski Day, October 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Casimir Pulaski, one of the bravest soldiers of Poland, and a soldier of freedom, was born in 1748 in the little-known Province of Podolia into a middle-class family. From his childhood he showed exceptional abilities which destined him to become a leader in everything he undertook—and a brave one at that.

Early in his youth he felt the need to serve the cause of his country, the freedom of his people. With that noble purpose in mind, he prepared himself to be a soldier and a leader. Before he was 20 he had gathered around him a group of Polish youths who were of the same mind and were willing to dedicate themselves to the same cause. With this small band of fighters he fought gallantly in a number of engagements in which he and his group did very well against superior forces of oppressing Russians.

During the middle of 1770, when he saw that his service in Poland was not producing the results he had in mind, in his last engagements against the Russians, he barely managed to escape and save his life. He fled Poland and in 1777 we find him in Paris. There he learned of the American War of Independence. He met with Benjamin Franklin and impressed him most favorably—so favorably that he was advanced sufficient funds to sail to the United States.

Armed with a letter of introduction from Benjamin Franklin he presented himself to General Washington who recommended him to the Continental Congress with the suggestion that he be entrusted with the reorganization and formation of our cavalry forces. He performed this difficult task so successfully that he was commended very highly both by the Congress and General Washington. He was subsequently placed in charge of our cavalry forces and took part in numerous engagements in various theaters of war. He distinguished himself in every one. In the fall of 1779, he was transferred to South Carolina where he participated in the Battle of Savannah. On October 9, he was fatally wounded in the battle and 2 days later, on October 11, at the age of 31, succumbed to his wounds.

The service of this gallant son of Poland was duly recognized by the Continental Congress and he was given the rank of brigadier general. He was later honored by his colleagues who had fought with him in every field of battle.

His name is today revered among Polish Americans who commemorate the contributions of the Poles to the victory of the American Revolution. On this, the 183d anniversary of the death of this noble defender and fighter for freedom we pay him tribute.

Pulaski Day, October 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 183 years ago today, Gen. Casimir Pulaski died of wounds received fighting the British in the American War for Independence.

When this brilliant military leader died at the age of 32, he was already a patriotic hero of two countries—Poland and America.

After becoming commander in chief of Polish patriot forces, and taking part in the rebellion of 1768–1772, in an attempt to loosen Russia's grip on Poland, he was driven into exile. He made his way to France, and then to America in 1777 carrying a letter of introduction to George Washington written by Benjamin Franklin.

Too impatient to wait for Congress to decide on his request for a commission, he volunteered for the Army and fought with distinction at Brandywine and Germantown. Only then was he commissioned as a brigadier general by the Continental Congress and given the task of organizing an independent cavalry corps, as suggested by General Washington.

In 1779 he was ordered to aid in the defense of Charleston, S.C. His arrival with his famous cavalry legion lifted the morale of that beleaguered city and after a swift attack, the British withdrew.

Then Pulaski was ordered south to help drive the British out of Savannah. Tragically, he was struck down on the first day of attack, before victory was in sight.

Pulaski had spent all of his adult life fighting energetically for liberty. His devotion to liberty was not the academic sort. He met the raw forces of oppression on the field of battle and had little aptitude or patience for political maneuvering or abstract theorizing. He was truly a man of action.

Nor was his passion for liberty based on narrow nationalistic feelings. Although he remained devoted to the cause of liberty in his native Poland, he was no less zealous in his desire to join the struggle to free America from alien rule. He intended to make his home in the United States after the war.

Pulaski was in the finest tradition of foreign born Americans who immediately took this Nation to their hearts. His dedication to the ideal of national independence prevents Pulaski from seeming dated.

Were he alive today he would undoubtedly be anxious to serve against the great forces of oppression that still threaten hard-won liberty and independence in the free world.

The Record of the 87th Congress, 2d Session: Report to the People of the 2d Congressional District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as has been my custom since my first election to Congress, I wish to report to the people of the mountain-valley 2d Congressional District concerning my votes and actions during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

At this point I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which lists my rollcall votes during 1962:

Voting record of Congressman Harold T. Johnson, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

My stand	Issue	Status
For McCormack	Election of Speaker John W. McCormack	McCormack elected.
Voted for	Federal assistance for construction of college academic facilities	Rejected.
Voted for	To permit acquisition, free of charge, of 21 acres of privately owned land in Grand Canyon National Park	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize Fourth Assistant Secretary of Commerce	Became law.
Voted for	To increase national debt limit ceiling to $300,000,000,000	Became law.
Voted against	Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 (Urban Affairs). ("No" vote favored reorganization.)	Reorganization approved.
Voted for	Approve improvements in the District of Columbia juvenile court system	Became law.
Voted for	Adopt a 2-year program to train unemployed workers	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize assistance to States developing educational television programs and facilities	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize Attorney General to issue civil investigative demands in antitrust cases	Became law.
Voted for	Strengthen Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to reduce Federal payments to needy aged, blind, and disabled to $66 per month	Motion defeated.
Voted for	Passage of bill designed to stress rehabilitation of welfare recipients, improve welfare services, and eliminate abuses	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize standby authority for the United States to lend $2,000,000,000 to International Monetary Fund	Became law.
Voted for	Raise compensation payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize an appropriation of $63,750,000 for Peace Corps to permit expansion of Corps to about 10,000 volunteers	Became law.
Voted against	Recommital motion on 2d supplemental appropriations. (Bill subsequently passed by voice vote.)	Became law.
Voted for	Authorizes appropriation of $13,000,000,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill $5,170,788,000 appropriation for Departments of Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare. (Bill which included assistance to schools in federally impacted areas, subsequently passed by a voice vote.)	Motion defeated.
Voted for	Passage of 1962 tax revision bill	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize appropriation of $3,000,000 to reimburse New York City for overtime payments to police force during the 1960 U.N. General Assembly.	Passed House.
Voted for	Authorize President to regulate imports of cotton and textiles	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill legislative appropriations. (Bill subsequently passed by a voice vote.)	Became law.
Voted for	To appropriate $48,000,000,000 for defense of our Nation	Became law.
Voted for	To authorize Federal Communications Commission to require television manufacturers to equip all sets for receiving ultra-high frequency channels in addition to very high frequency.	Became law.
Voted for	To establish private corporation to operate a commercial communications satellite system	Became law.
Voted against	To authorize payment of $73,000,000 to Philippine Islands for World War II damages	Defeated.
Voted for	To authorize assistance for construction of facilities at public and nonprofit colleges	Passed House.
Voted for	To authorize $3,600,000,000 appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in fiscal 1963	Became law.
Voted for	To amend the National School Lunch Act to improve provisions and establish special fund for needy schools	Became law.
Voted for	To bring negotiated defense procurement contracts under more rigid legislative control	Became law.
Voted for	Temporary increase in national debt	Became law.
Voted for	Sugar Act Amendments for 1962	Became law.
Voted for	To amend farm bill to permit planting additional grain in feed deficit areas	Amendment passed.
Voted against	To kill farm bill	Bill killed.
Voted for	To extend Defense Production Act	Became law.
Voted for	To amend Export Control Act	Became law.
Voted for	Trade Expansion Act	Became law.
Voted for	To ban interstate transportation of gambling machines	Became law.
Voted for	To give Civil Aeronautics Board permanent authority to regulate supplemental airlines	Became law.
Announced for	To extend ceiling on subsidies for domestic ship construction and conversion	Passed House.
Voted for	Mutual Security Act of 1962	Became law.
Announced for	Increase authorizations for Pacific Trust Islands	Became law.

Voting record of Congressman Harold T. Johnson, 87th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

My stand	Issue	Status
Announced for	Urging Federal Communications Commission to permit increase of power on clear-channel AM radio stations	Passed House.
Voted for	To appropriate $1,900,000,000 for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce	Became law.
Voted for	To appropriate $5,400,000,000 for Department of Agriculture	Became law.
Voted for	To authorize construction of Mann Creek reclamation project in Idaho	Became law.
Voted for	To appropriate $11,500,000,000 for operation of 23 independent and executive offices	Became law.
Voted for	To authorize construction of Baker reclamation project in Oregon	Became law.
Voted for	To appropriate $5,300,000,000 for Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare	Became law.
Voted for	To authorize cash awards for winners of National Medal of Science (a ⅔ majority required)	Failed to receive ⅔ majority.
Voted for	To authorize compensation to U.S. citizens for personal or property losses in World War II	Became law.
Voted for	To permit President to distribute additional sugar quotas to Western nations	Passed House.
Voted against	Motion to permit continued waste of steam energy at Hanford nuclear reactor	Motion defeated.
Voted against	Enactment of temporary farm bill to continue programs for 1 year	Became law.
Voted for	To increase limits on size of Federal Reserve Bank branch bank buildings and require Federal Reserve Board approval of contracts.	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act. (Subsequently passed by voice vote.)	Motion rejected.
Voted against	Motion to reject Senate amendment to AEC appropriations which would permit utilization of waste steam energy at Hanford nuclear reactor.	Motion defeated.
Voted for	Constitutional amendment to ban poll taxes in Federal elections	Passed House.
Voted for	Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of Padre Island National Seashore	Became law.
Voted for	United Nations bond issue	Became law.
Voted for	Rule to permit expansion of Virgin Islands National Park. (Bill subsequently passed by voice vote.)	Became law.
Voted for	To increase security provisions at National Security Agency	Passed House.
Voted against	To extend Federal internal security programs into private enterprise including denial of right of cross-examination	Defeated.
Voted for	To permit construction of a peanut research laboratory	Defeated.
Voted for	To permit continued expeditious handling of legislative franked mail to postal patrons	Defeated.
Voted against	Final passage of Food and Agriculture Act of 1962	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill College Assistance Act	Act rejected.
Voted for	To pass a reduced foreign-aid appropriations bill	Became law.
Voted for	To permit duty-free entry of personal and household goods of Government personnel on orders	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill bill to permit President to authorize diplomatic radio facilities in the District of Columbia	Became law.
Voted for	Standby authority for callup of 150,000 members of Ready Reserve	Became law.
Voted for	To require that temporary summer jobs in Government agencies in Washington, D.C., be apportioned among 50 States	Passed House.
Voted for	To amend 1962 farm bill to permit farmers to grow up to 15 acres of wheat in 1963 without becoming subject to overplanting penalties.	Became law.
Voted for	To approve National Fisheries Center	Became law.
Voted against	To delete Burns Creek, Idaho, project from public works bill	Project deleted.
Voted for	Trade Expansion Act of 1962	Became law.
Voted for	Drug Act of 1962	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	To curb indecent publications in District of Columbia	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	Postal Service and Federal Employees Act of 1962	Became law.
Voted for	Berlin resolution	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	Adjust annuities for District of Columbia teachers retirement fund	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	To return to Senate continuing Agriculture appropriations bill	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	To exclude certain household items from manufacturers excise taxes	Approved by Congress.

Christopher Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the United States owes much of its greatness and glory to the peoples of many lands.

But first and foremost among these countries comes Italy. That native home of the arts and learning gave birth to the famous 15th century explorer whose name and fame are inextricably associated with the New World. This native son of Genoa, born into a little known family some time between 1446 and 1451, would have attained greatness in any age and under any clime as a daring and dauntless adventurer and resourceful explorer, but it was his great good fortune to live at the time he did, and to have immortalized his name by the discovery of the New World. It is true that his countryman and contemporary, Amerigo Vespucci, gave his name to the new continent, but Columbus discovered it.

This epoch-making and historic discovery by the adventurous and highly gifted son of a Genoese weaver easily ranks at the top of all explorations and discoveries of all time, or, at least it should be classed among the topmost of such discoveries in recorded human history. The discovery of America has been a real and lasting blessing to humanity in many ways—materially and spiritually, politically, socially, and culturally.

It is difficult to assess and evaluate the benefits the Old World derived by this discovery, and also the way the natives in the New World benefited by their contacts with the people of the Old World. Of course, there is the great and overriding living fact, the birth, rise, and growth of this great Republic, the United States of America.

On the 470th anniversary of his discovery of America, we pay tribute and honor the memory of this great Genoese discoverer, Christopher Columbus.

Frank Boykin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the absence of FRANK BOYKIN in the next Congress will create a void not likely to be filled ever. His abundant love for people, his abiding faith in America and her institutions, and his indefatigable promotion of his cherished State, Alabama, all combine to make FRANK BOYKIN one of the best known, best liked, and most effective Member of Congress.

I look forward to many years of continued association with FRANK and, even though it might be less frequent, I know it will be as rewarding.

Morgan M. Moulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, one of our more distinguished and able Members, MORGAN MOULDER, of Missouri, announced earlier this year that he would not seek reelection. This was most regrettable because Mr. MOULDER has established an enviable record during the 14 years he has so faithfully served in this body. It happened, however, that Missouri lost one Member because of population following the last census, and Mr. MOULDER decided to retire.

Mr. MOULDER has established an enviable record in public office, having served as assistant U.S. attorney for the western district of Missouri, as a judge of the Circuit Court in the 18th Judicial Circuit of that State, before being promoted to membership in the House of Representatives.

While in the House he has been a member of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and has been a faithful and effective member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In the latter position he has presided over scores of hearings as a subcommittee chairman. In that capacity he has been instrumental in exposing Communist activity in many areas. For this he is entitled to the gratitude of the entire Nation.

Mr. MOULDER is an affable individual, a loyal friend, and has been a valuable and effective spokesman for the people who elected him. In his retirement from the House, I extend my felicitations and best wishes to him and to his family.

New Pulaski Polaris Submarine Has a Rich Tradition To Uphold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker today marks the 183d anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who came to this country to assist the newly emerging American colonies in their Revolutionary War with England.

This date is particularly significant because President Kennedy recently ordered the naming of a new Polaris submarine in memory of this gallant and heroic soldier who repeatedly demonstrated his unflinching bravery and who died defending the new Nation which had won his allegiance at the Battle of Savannah on October 11, 1779.

Casimir Pulaski's heroism on the battlefield has become legendary. He formed a crack fighting unit which was a model for the untrained companies, regiments, and battalions which were being formed under General Washington. Their reputation for spirit, courage, versatility, and leadership was unexcelled. And this reputation persisted largely owing to the awe-inspiring presence of General Pulaski who never asked his men to do more than he did himself. His unrelenting willingness to expose himself to enemy fire has been rarely equaled and never surpassed in our long history of brave military men.

This new Polaris submarine, with its ability to provide instant retaliation, with its high degree of mobility, with its powers of concealment, and its dedication to protecting America regardless of the odds placed against it, is a fitting memorial to this great Revolutionary hero who came here from Poland so many years ago.

Casimir Pulaski was recognized by some of our most astute Founding Fathers as a man of rare qualities. When he expressed his willingness to join America's fight for independence from Great Britain, Benjamin Franklin wrote a personal letter of recommendation to Gen. George Washington asking him to review his record of valor and capabilities as a commander.

General Washington was so impressed with Pulaski's qualifications that he immediately dispatched a letter to the Congress requesting his appointment as an officer in the American Army.

It is apparent from historical records of the time that Pulaski, who had left Poland to escape retaliation for his efforts to prevent partition of Poland, dedicated his life to the cause of American freedom in the hope that his deeds would win a strong ally for the Polish cause, which was so similar in ideals to the American one.

It is difficult to measure the respect and affection which has been paid him by the descendants of the original participants in the Revolutionary War. Pulaski, more than any single individual, has stood for the past 183 years as the symbol of Polish-American unity and friendship and devotion to the common ideals of brotherhood and human freedom.

May I offer my congratulations to the crew of the submarine which will bear this gallant name. The men who serve on her will have a noble tradition to uphold, and a fighting spirit which has set an example for military and naval men throughout our history. Gen. Casimir Pulaski continues, in spirit, to protect America from those who would destroy her.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on this 11th day of October 1962, celebrated as Pulaski Day throughout many parts of the United States I wish to take this opportunity to add my own eulogy to that of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin on October 10, 1962, and of others in tribute to the memory of Count Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish patriot who contributed so much to the victory of the American Revolution, including the supreme sacrifice of giving his life for its cause.

Pulaski Day is known throughout the world and it has come to have deep meaning to many Americans who appreciate the value of liberty and freedom. It has come to have special significance to the many people of Polish extraction in the United States who celebrate it as the anniversary of the death of one of their great compatriots who fought for and gave his life in the cause of freedom he held so dear.

This anniversary of the death of a great Polish patriot and exponent of freedom was widely observed in Poland during the brief period that young postwar nation was able to freely give expression to the great traditions of freedom exercised by Poles when not fettered by foreign tyranny. Doubtlessly many Poles in their homeland are even today paying private tribute to the memory of Count Pulaski on this 183d anniversary of that great patriot's death, but significantly, the anniversary is not recognized officially nor observed publicly by the Communist Polish regime.

Let us therefore pause, albeit briefly, to pay public tribute to and to give thanks for all the notable contribution and final unselfish sacrifice of Count Pulaski, a great patriot who served notably in the cause of American freedom.

The lifespan of this crusader for freedom was short but within the years of his birth in 1748 and his death on the field of battle in 1779, Count Pulaski proved himself to be a great champion of freedom. Driven into exile by forces opposing freedom in Poland, Count Pulaski without hesitation joined the American Revolution as an officer in 1777. It was not long until Count Pulaski's military capabilities were recognized, and he rapidly rose to prominence in the Continental Army. He was soon appointed to brigadier general, and eventually became chief of cavalry, a branch of service organized largely through his own personal efforts and inspiring leadership. Count Pulaski also distinguished himself as commander of Pulaski's Legion, a cavalry unit he organized and led. Significantly, Count Pulaski died of wounds sustained while heroically leading a cavalry charge at the siege of Savannah on October 11, 1779, which we observe as the anniversary of the memory of this great man.

In pausing here to pay tribute to the memory of Count Pulaski we are mindful that he was a great Polish patriot whose unselfish example in the cause of freedom has been emulated many times by many other Poles throughout the world in their untiring and unselfish efforts to keep alive the spark of freedom which they so highly revere and which was such a notable contribution in initial American efforts to achieve freedom and independence.

A Blueprint for Survival To Avoid Thermonuclear War, To Avoid Surrender, To Preserve Freedom, To Insure a Just and Enduring Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the life of every man, woman, and child is at stake in the present climactic phase of the total war being waged against the United States and the Free World by the Soviet-Communist forces.

The accelerating relative decline of the strength of the Free World has resulted in our present position of extreme peril.

Khrushchev is now presenting to us a series of military thrusts, political demands and ultimatums for our retreat.

In Southeast Asia, Laos has been delivered to a Communist-dominated coalition government. Our U.S. soldiers are now fighting in an undeclared guerrilla war to prevent a Communist takeover of South Vietnam.

Khrushchev is actively inciting the Berlin crisis. His objectives are to first neutralize West Germany and then to disintegrate our North Atlantic Treaty Organization military alliance.

In Europe, Soviet and United States nuclear artillery are positioned for action.

In Cuba, the Soviet is now constructing land, sea, and air nuclear missile weapons systems designed to menace the people of the United States. This Soviet nuclear complex will be completed within 6 months to 1 year.

The Free World and the United States are almost paralyzed by confusion, disunity, indecisions and vacillations.

The United States is relentlessly being squeezed into the grim alternatives of thermonuclear destruction or abject surrender.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of years, I have presented to Congress a series of national goals, policies, strategies, tactics, and implementing organizational structures to effectively counter the Soviet-Communist global politico-military war for our destruction.

I have summarized these proposals into a blueprint for our survival, to avoid thermonuclear war, to avoid abject surrender, to preserve our freedom, to insure a just and enduring peace.

THE DECLINE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE FREE WORLD; THE RISING POWER OF THE SOVIET-COMMUNIST FORCES

Since the inception of the International Communist Movement in 1919, one free country after another has fallen before the Soviet-Communist advance. Since 1939, total power has been seized in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, North Korea, Red China, North Vietnam, Tibet, and Cuba.

The Soviet-Communist forces now directly control the economic and political resources, the labor productivity, and the military power of 1 billion people, 35 percent of the world's population.

The genesis of the decline of the relative power of the United States was the diplomatic recognition of the Soviet-Communist Government by the United States in 1933.

Due to the total lack of comprehension of the nature, purposes, scope, magnitude, strategies, and tactics of the Soviet-Communist forces, the United States and the Free World have completely failed to counter the realities of this war.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed for 30 years during the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, or Kennedy.

Today, Khrushchev claims that the balance of world power has shifted to a Soviet-Communist supremacy. No one, to my knowledge, can categorically deny his conclusion.

On this premise, he is gambling for the entire world, nothing less.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY, THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT, OTHER COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS

We must recognize, once and for all, that the actual enemy is the International Communist Conspiracy.

It is composed of 98 national Communist Parties. All of these Communist Parties acknowledge the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Politburo of the Soviet, and Khrushchev as first secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in fact, exercise leadership, direction, and discipline over these national parties and their over 40 million member agents.

Members of this Communist alliance may at times differ about the timing, method or means to be used for the destruction of the Free World.

All Communist Parties acknowledge allegiance to, and solidarity with, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The International Communist Conspiracy is a supranational organization. In every nation where the Communist Party has seized power, the national government is completely subordinated to the political and military objectives of the Soviet-led International Communist alliance.

Khrushchev, as the acknowledged Commander-in-Chief of the International Communist Conspiracy, has at his command two gigantic power systems for waging his war of destruction.

He directs an army of 40,000,000 Communist Party member agents strategically placed in every nation of the world. He also controls the total economic, political, and military resources of all Communist-governed nations.

GOALS, POLICIES AND ORGANIZATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AND FREE WORLD TO COUNTER SOVIET UNION, SOVIET BLOC NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

The United States and the Free World have aspirations toward a world society of free and independent nations. But, they have failed to formulate and implement positive goals, policies, programs and implementing organizations to match the rallying cries, the organizations, the strategies and tactics of the Soviet directed world Communist total war.

Without goals or objectives we are unable to develop effective international or national policies for extending the area of freedom in the world.

UNITED STATES AND FREE WORLD POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONAL FAILURES

Due to a lack of comprehension of the Soviet-Communist organization and offensive, the United States and the Free World have failed to formulate, agree upon, and pursue righteous international and national goals.

We have attempted to counter Soviet-Communist campaigns with the following policies and organizations:

Policy of containment, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, other military alliances, massive retaliation, the United Nations, summit meetings, cultural exchanges, foreign aid, the Peace Corps, disarmament negotiations, the Disarmament Agency, international gifts and loans, Atoms for Peace Agency.

While the purpose and intent of these policies and organizations are commendable, they have failed to ward off or stem the Soviet-Communist advances. They are defensive, self-deceptive, and self-defeating in practical effect.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL AND CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Congress has delegated to the National Security Council the vital function of advising the President with respect to the integration of the policies of this Nation involving national security.

It lacks both the authority and the organizational structure to fulfill its functions to integrate and coordinate domestic, foreign, and military policies for survival.

Today the National Security Council is a nonfunctioning agency as far as its national security responsibilities are concerned.

The Central Intelligence Agency—CIA—which reports to the National Security Council, is primarily an intelligence information gathering and disseminating agency.

The organizational breakdown between the CIA and the ineffective National Security Council prevents the translation of intelligence information into productive foreign policies and actions.

STATE DEPARTMENT AND DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

The State Department, today, is the prime adviser to the President on foreign policy and is the prime agency for its execution.

The State Department has become, almost exclusively, the sole and dominating general staff for the development and execution of objectives, policies, strategies, and tactics to counter the Soviet-Communist world politico-military offensive.

The exacting and extensive requirements for waging a successful political, diplomatic, economic, psychological, para-military, and military conflict with the highly organized Soviet-Communist forces is far beyond the intended function and capabilities of the Department of State.

The State Department has deliberately undermined and vitiated the basic policies and purposes of the U.S. Congress for confronting the Soviet-Communist aggressions.

A highly influential minority of State Department officials continuously obstruct the formulation and execution of effective policies and programs, strategies and tactics to eliminate the Communist menace.

As much as we respect the Defense Department, it must be conceded that the Defense Department is not empowered, organized or staffed to wage political, psychological, or economic war. Nor can it coordinate these forms of war with para-military and military war.

BALANCE OF POLITICO-MILITARY FORCES, SOVIET UNION VERSUS UNITED STATES

It is generally conceded that:

First. The Soviet Union has the largest airborne force in the world today.

Second. The Soviet Army is the largest, most powerful ground force in the world.

Third. The Soviet Navy ranks second in the world.

Fourth. The Soviet has the largest submarine fleet in the world.

Fifth. The Soviet has the largest force of ready medium-range nuclear missiles.

Sixth. The Soviet has the largest force of intercontinental nuclear ballistic missiles in the world.

Seventh. The Soviet is the only nation producing intercontinental rockets capable of delivering hydrogen bomb warheads.

Eighth. The Soviet Union has an undisputed superiority in rocket power thrust engines.

Ninth. The Soviet Union is in the lead in overall space technology and performance.

In economic production, Khrushchev boasts that the Soviet-Communist bloc produces one-third of the world's industrial output.

The Soviet-Communist political, psychological, propaganda, and agitation world apparatus is without competition in its relentless and unswerving drive to Sovietize the entire world.

There is a tight correlation and integration of the ideological, political, economic, and military forces between the world Communist Parties and the Communist nations.

Khrushchev is convinced that the world balance of forces has irrevocably shifted in favor of the Communist camp. His contemptuous challenges in Cuba and Berlin are based upon this conviction.

The Soviet-Communist military power is the decisive factor in Khrushchev's assessment of a favorable Soviet-Communist world power.

ALTERNATIVE CHOICES FOR THE UNITED STATES

Khrushchev is stepping up the tempo of his nuclear threats and his political demands and advances. The continuing retreats of the United States and the Free World are leading us to the inevitable choice between the alternatives of:

First alternative: Eventual total surrender by the process of conciliation, appeasement, and concession. (This is our present course of action.)

Second alternative: Thermonuclear war arising from a desperation stand to prevent a total Soviet-Communist world takeover.

Mr. Speaker, these alternatives of surrender or thermonuclear destruction, being forced upon us by Khrushchev, should be and must be rejected.

Another alternative course of action must be found for our survival and the preservation of our freedoms.

Public opinion in this country and in the Free World must be awakened to the need for the great now-or-never decision that must be made.

Mr. Speaker, I present the only other alternative that remains to us:

Third alternative: To fully engage the Soviet-Communist forces in a total political, psychological, economic, and diplomatic conflict and to win that conflict.

The essential requirements for a capability to engage in and win such a conflict are:

First. Full comprehension of the form and operation of the weapons systems of such a conflict.

Second. Establishment of new organizational structures capable of planning and waging these new forms of warfare.

Third. A dominant military superiority to give us the strength to attain our national goals of survival with freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit a blueprint of the steps needed to assure this Nation's survival.

THE BLUEPRINT FOR SURVIVAL

First. Identification and full comprehension by the United States of the Soviet-Communist forces seeking our destruction.

Second. Recognition by the United States that the purpose of the Soviet-Communist politico-military war is the demoralization, disintegration and destruction of all non-Communist nations, all other economic systems, all religious bodies, all other political and social structures.

Third. Acknowledgment by the United States of the new forms of war, conceived by Lenin, for the seizure of political power; namely, political, psychological, economic, diplomatic, social and para-military.

Fourth. Acceptance by the United States that the war being waged by the Soviet-Communist forces is an incessant war of indefinite duration.

Fifth. Recognition by the United States of the dual nature of the Soviet-Communist weapons systems.

The weapons systems of the Communist Parties include: psychopolitical warfare; propaganda and agitation; infiltration and subversion of schools, unions, religious bodies, business enterprises and governments; guerrilla warfare; creating thousands of local, national and world front organizations to promote Communism and to oppose anti-Communist resistance; and infiltration and manipulation of all forms of mass communications media, including newspapers, magazines, radio, television and movies.

The weapons systems of the Communist national governments include: military power and the threat of nuclear power; economic warfare; diplomatic warfare; and political warfare.

Sixth. Comprehension by the United States of how these weapons systems, centrally directed out of the Politburo in Moscow, are used separately, jointly, always mutually supporting, to attain strategic and tactical political objectives.

Seventh. A momentous decision by the U.S. Government and the American people to make the necessary sacrifices for survival as a free people, and to avoid the desperate alternatives of thermonuclear war or abject surrender.

Eighth. An official declaration by the Congress and the President of the United States pledging the resources of this Nation to maintain the freedoms of the Free World by our maximum confrontation of all Soviet-Communist forces around the world.

Ninth. Establish righteous national and international goals for survival, with freedom and peace, to unify this Nation and the Free World for concerted action against the Soviet-Communist forces.

Tenth. Establish a new Cabinet-level Department in our Government to be known as the Department of National Security and International Affairs.

This Department would assist the President and the Congress in formulating national and international goals and objectives relating to national security and international affairs.

This Department would be empowered to, and charged with the responsibility to correlate and assess all intelligence information; analyze and evaluate Soviet-Communist objectives, forces, strategies and tactics, being used to anticipate and counter specific Soviet-Communist campaigns and offensives; establish priorities for the political objectives to be attained; centralize planning for the coordinated utilization of all U.S. non-military and military resources for the attainment of designated political objectives; calculate and weigh the relative risks and gains from alternative courses of action; determine the optimum courses of action and designate the political, psychological, economic, fiscal, diplomatic, and military elements for their successful execution; and coordinate, oversee, and follow through all policies, programs, and actions of the United States relating to national security.

Eleventh. Undertake a crash program to attain an immediate clear U.S. superiority of military power by: deploying and dispersing our present military, air, and naval forces to prevent a nuclear Pearl Harbor and to preserve a maximum retaliatory force; converting adaptable naval ships into dispersed mobile nuclear missile launching platforms capable of retaliatory action against the Soviet Union; development of neutron bomb, nuclear rocket engines, and missiles; development of manned earth orbiting space ships with nuclear launching capability; a concentrated and accelerated program for technological development of all forms of new and improved weapons systems to attain an undisputed military superiority for the United States.

Our international and national political objectives, policies, strategies, and tactics can be no stronger than the military base supporting them.

Only military superiority will permit the United States to wage a successful political, psychological, economic, and diplomatic conflict without the resort to or fear from thermonuclear war.

This Nation must wage a total psychopolitical and economic campaign against the Soviet-Communist forces if it wishes to stave off thermonuclear war or surrender.

The United States possesses the industrial capacity and the technological resources to regain undisputed military supremacy over the Soviet Union.

Twelfth. Although the rushing tides of recent history appear to favor the Soviet, the human mind and the human will remain the ultimate weapon.

To survive, to preserve our freedoms, to restore a true and enduring peace, the United States must inspire all free peoples with a unity of mind, a unity of purpose, a unity of will, and a unity of action.

SUPPLEMENTING EXCERPTS

Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to present various excerpts from my previous addresses to this House. They are intended to amplify and supplement "The Blueprint for Survival."

From address, June 12, 1961, accompanying introduction of House Joint Resolution 447 calling for recognition of the total global war being waged against the United States and its citizens by the Soviet-Communist forces:

The prosecution of this war will call for dedication to outmatch the dedication of a fanatical enemy. It will call for sacrifice surpassing that which the Communists are ready to endure. But the price which we will have to pay for ultimate victory will be cheap, because it will repurchase the most priceless possession of man—his freedom under God.

Permit me to enumerate some of the practical results of the passage by Congress of this resolution.

First, by identifying the enemy, and secondly, by recognizing the war which the Communists have been waging against us, we shall have a basis for shaping our policies to prosecute the war. How can we formulate effective programs to defeat an enemy if we neither specify who he is, nor acknowledge that we are at war with him?

Second, we shall raise a standard to which free men everywhere can rally. The enemy is not just our enemy, but of all who love freedom.

We shall, by raising this standard, assert our rightful place as leaders of the yet Free World.

We shall give renewed hope to the millions whom the Communists hold in bondage.

Third, we shall have a guide for our domestic policies which must be consistent with the demands of the life-and-death struggle in which we are engaged.

Finally, we shall have a justifiable hope that by accepting the challenge which the enemy poses to civilization itself, we can someday usher in an era of genuine peace, and the fulfillment of the highest aspirations of mankind.

From address, October 3, 1962, accompanying H.R. 13315 to establish the Department of National Security and International Affairs:

Mr. Speaker, the President carries a most heavy burden of responsibilities in both the foreign and domestic areas. These are time consuming.

The Soviet-Communist aggressions are conducted in more than 100 nations around the world. The battles and the skirmishes take place in the form of political, psychological, economic, diplomatic, and paramilitary thrusts and counterthrusts.

The President, as Commander-in-Chief, cannot carry the additional, all-absorbing burdens of being a field general for each of these battles.

The President needs, and must have, a competent general staff. He must have at his command a suitable and reliable organization to mobilize the forces of this Nation and of the Free World to engage and to defeat the Soviet-Communist non-military forces of 40 million agents and provocateurs.

The President must have an organization to make accurate assessments and judgments of the capabilities of the enemies' politico-military forces; an organization which can anticipate and act promptly to prevent Communist offensives; an organization to establish targets, and develop necessary strategies and tactics.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, today, a bill to establish a new department in the executive branch of our Government.

The basic purpose of this department is to provide the organizational structure required to assist the President and the Congress in formulating national objectives and developing an integrated strategy to defend against the International Communist political, psychological, economic, diplomatic and military conflict being waged against the Free World; and for the defeat of the Communist forces.

This bill proposes to centralize into one agency the responsibility of coordinating and overseeing the execution of this Nation's efforts in the prosecution of the politico-military war in which we are engaged.

This department would be empowered to create a suitable organizational structure to provide a national unity of purpose and effort at the highest level.

It will be entrusted with the crucial task of assuring the survival of this Nation.

Bulgarian National Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the Bulgarian National Committee recently held memorial ceremonies commemorating the 15th annual Bulgarian National Day for the fight for freedom, independence, and democracy.

The memorial ceremony commemorated the heroic death of Nikoia Petkov, whose courageous death at the hands of Soviet tyrants has set a stellar example for freedom-loving people the world over.

I include the message of salutation prepared by me for the memorial ceremonies in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

BULGARIAN NATIONAL DAY—SEPTEMBER 23, 1962

The history of Bulgaria is the saga of an ancient nation. The Bulgars, a Slavic people, settled Bulgaria in the seventh century. By the early 13th century Great Bulgaria stretched from the Black Sea to the Adriatic, and from the Danube to the Aegean. It included the whole of the Balkan Peninsula except Greece. In 1393 the country was conquered by the Turks, and from the 15th through the 19th centuries the Bulgarian provinces were part of the Ottoman Empire. In 1875 the Bulgarian people revolted, and in 1878 Bulgaria became a principality. On September 22, 1908, Bulgaria became an independent kingdom under Czar Ferdinand I of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha.

Since 1944, however, Bulgaria has been independent in name only. The invasion of her territory by the Red army reduced her independence to a trivial formality. The desperate battle of her people for liberation brought them not independence but slavery. Political dictatorship, economic control, police terror were the fruits of her valiant but vain struggle. The Red army, together with the fatherland front coup d'etat against the democratic government, succeeded in foisting on her an unwanted Communist regime. The Bulgarian Communist Party—which in 1944 numbered no more than 15,000 members—had been trying for a quarter of a century to seize power both by parliamentary and by violent means, but without success. Only with the help of an insidious outside agent could it attain its goal.

Today life is hard for the Bulgarian people. Drabness and poverty persist. As in all Communist-dominated countries, it is difficult to find goods in the stores. The housing problem in the cities is acute. For the Communist regime ignores the basic needs—material and spiritual—of the people. But the Bulgarian people have not given up hope. Communist propaganda and political repression have not succeeded in destroying their vision of freedom. Reports filter to us in the free world of discontent and of challenges of the Communist Party. A satirical story early this year in a Sofia weekly, for example, expressed popular boredom and annoyance with party agitators who swamp their audience with figures and statistics but who never answer questions like: "Why have electric lights to be turned off at certain times? Why is there no meat? Who is responsible and why?" The Communist Party is responsible; only they can answer "why."

The Communist Party is also responsible for the murder of Nikoia Petkov, the heroic Bulgarian patriot who was hanged on September 23, 1947. Petkov had denounced Communist tyranny, Soviet imperialism, and Soviet domination of the Bulgarian Parliament. Petkov's courageous death set a heroic example that the Bulgarian National Committee has commemorated as the Bulgarian National Day for the fight for freedom, independence and democracy.

The commemoration of September 23 reminds us that the freedom-loving people of Bulgaria still cherish their inalienable rights of freedom and self-government. It is our sincere desire that it soon be independent once more. We are confident that the Bulgaria people will not give up hope; we commend them for their invincible courage; we express our deepest sympathy for their cause of liberation.

Dr. Alfred Benjamin Butts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Alfred Benjamin Butts, a distinguished American educator, died suddenly here in Washington. Dr. Butts for the past 15 years has been director of education for the Department of the Army.

Prior to assuming his work with the Army, Dr. Butts served for 11 years as chancellor of the University of Mississippi and before that was vice president of Mississippi State College.

Dr. Butts was an outstanding chancellor of the University of Mississippi. He aided materially in its development and had on outstanding record in support of the academic freedom of the faculty.

While with the Army here, Dr. Butts supervised the graduate studies of over 6,000 officers enrolled in American and European universities. On his retirement from this post a year ago, Dr. Butts received a plaque from the superintendent and faculty of the U.S. Military Academy in recognition of his contribution to the advancement of higher education in the Army.

Born in Durham, N.C., Dr. Butts received bachelor's and master's degrees from Mississippi State College, advanced degrees in public law from Columbia University, and a bachelor of laws degree from Yale University Law School. He was head of the Department of Government at Mississippi State for 5 years before going to the University of Mississippi.

During World War II, Dr. Butts was a lieutenant colonel and assistant staff judge advocate at Second Army headquarters in Memphis, Tenn.

Since his retirement last year, he had lectured at American University School of Law.

He is survived by his wife, Mary Lampkin; three daughters, Mrs. Read Dunn, Jr., 3501 Leland Street, Chevy Chase; Dorothy Butts, 2144 California Street, NW.; and Mrs. J. A. Latimer of Ridgewood, N.J., and a son, Lampkin, of Laurel, Miss.

The passing of Dr. Butts is mourned by friends throughout the country and I join in extending my sympathy to his wife and family.

Socialism, Spending, and the Welfare State—What Are the Facts?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, one of our most able colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL] has prepared a most penetrating and interesting report on "Socialism, Spending, and the Welfare State—What Are the Facts?"

This report was sent to his constituents in the form of a newsletter on August 31, 1962.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this report would be read by all the prophets of financial gloom and doom who are so quick to condemn our Government and our way of life.

The report, which follows, is most factual, timely, and enlightening:

SOCIALISM, SPENDING, AND THE WELFARE STATE—WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

(By MORRIS K. UDALL)

For years now we have been hearing about the "drift to socialism" in this Nation's Federal spending programs. Charges have been made and denied. Millions of angry words have been exchanged. But what are the facts? A look at the Federal budget—the only reliable indicator of what the Government is doing—can be quite revealing.

DEFINING OUR TERMS

In most such discussions problems arise concerning definitions. A program one person calls socialism another will label as "bolstering the free enterprise system." I do not intend to get into any such argument. We can all agree on that part of the Federal budget where these disputes arise, and for purposes of this discussion I am going to consider the unlikely possibility that every bit of it fits the description of socialism and welfare state spending. If it's getting larger, we will take note of that; if it is getting smaller, we will know that charges of a drift to socialism are unfounded.

THE FISCAL 1963 BUDGET

In January of this year the Bureau of the Budget published its annual bestseller, "The Budget in Brief," an analysis of Federal spending plans for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1962. We're now into that year, and it might be interesting to see how much we expect to take in, how much we expect to spend, and how we expect to apportion your tax money.

In this fiscal year it was estimated this Nation's gross national product would reach $570 billion, that Federal receipts would be $93 billion and Federal expenditures $92.5 billion, or roughly 16 percent of the total value of all goods and services produced by individuals and corporations during the year. Today it appears the $570 billion figure was overly optimistic and that the total will be about $555 billion, a new high but not enough to save us from a loss of tax revenue and a deficit rather than a surplus.

The budget pamphlet explains where these tax funds will be spent. Going through the list of budget items, one can see rather quickly that the expenditures fall into two categories: (1) Those which are caused by the needs of national security, including preparation for war (which we hope will never come) and paying the costs of past wars, and (2) all other expenditures, which can be called nondefense or domestic expenditures.

With these groupings established, let's take a look at the 1963 administrative budget.

WAR-RELATED EXPENDITURES

All Americans, regardless of party, recognize that the defense and security of our country in the world require heavy expenditures to meet the challenge of the Soviet system. Following are the expenditures which arise because of past wars, the present cold war, and preparation for future wars:

A. Major national security, $52.7 billion (57 cents of your tax dollar): Cost of armed services, ships, planes, missiles, atomic energy, military assistance, research activities. Military foreign aid is included here—aid to our military allies.

B. Space research and technology, $2.4 billion (2½ cents of your tax dollar): This is the program that put our astronauts into orbit and is calculated to prevent any aggression from a Russian-dominated outer space. Supported by nearly everyone in Congress.

C. Interest on public debt, $9.4 billion (10 cents of your tax dollar): Public debt jumped from $1 to $25 billion level after World War I, to $270 billion level after World War II. Our present public debt is wholly caused by our involvement in two Great Wars plus Korean war and cold war; welfare state spending is responsible for very little of this expense.

D. International affairs and finance, $3 billion (3¼ cents of your tax dollar): All the activities directed toward maintenance of peace and strengthening free world alliances. Economic foreign aid of $2.5 billion is included here.

E. Veterans' services and benefits, $5.3 billion (6 cents of your tax dollar): VA hospitals, rehabilitation, compensation, and pensions—a debt of honor to 4½ million disabled veterans, widows, orphans, and other beneficiaries.

Total for defense, diplomacy, and to pay the cost of past wars (79 cents of your tax dollar): $72.8 billion.

NONDEFENSE EXPENDITURES

While there is no serious dispute over defense expenditures, no one would suggest that Government exists only to prepare for and fight wars. As it turns out, even in the nondefense category there is more agreement than disagreement. Following are the expenditures which are thus classified:

A. General Government, $2 billion (2 cents of your tax dollar): Congress, courts, buildings, FBI, etc. There is no question about the need for these expenditures.

B. Natural resources, $2.3 billion (2½ cents of your tax dollar): Reclamation, flood control, national parks, mineral resources, Indian affairs. There are some differences about particular programs, but there is general agreement on the value of nearly all these expenditures.

C. Commerce and housing, $3.4 billion (3½ cents of your tax dollar): Post Office, Weather Bureau, aviation, Census, and FHA and VA housing, the programs that have enabled 60 percent of our people to own their own homes. This category also includes the funds for urban renewal and public housing—subjects of some controversy—but 90 percent of these expenditures are noncontroversial.

D. Agriculture and agricultural resources, $5.8 billion (6¼ cents of your tax dollar): Price supports, soil conservation, agricultural extension, Forest Service, REA, etc. Nearly everyone wants to find a way to reduce the price support program in the years ahead.

E. Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, $6.6 billion (7 cents of your tax dollar): Here it is—this is the segment of the budget which produces nearly all the controversy over socialism and welfare state spending. I will go into this further below.

Total for nondefense expenditures, $19.7 billion (21 cents of your tax dollar).

A POINT TO REMEMBER

It's important to note that if all expenditures included in that last 7-cent welfare state portion of the budget were eliminated, the person who paid $1,000 in income tax last year would pay $930 next year.

Should they all be eliminated? I'm sure no one would suggest this. Perhaps, some reductions or economies can be made. Here is how that 7 cents will be spent:

Aid to States for aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children, $2.9 billion.

Health services and research—the National Institutes of Health, aid for hospital construction, medical scholarships, etc., $1.4 billion.

Education—Federal aid for college housing and academic buildings, college scholarships, the National Defense Education Act, Federal impact aid, the National Science Foundation, libraries and museums, $1.5 billion.

Labor and manpower services—on-the-job training, unemployment compensation, policing labor unions, U.S. Employment Service, etc., $0.3 billion.

School lunch and special milk program, $0.3 billion.

Vocational rehabilitation and other services—program returning approximately 110,000 disabled and handicapped persons to gainful employment, $0.2 billion.

Total welfare state expenditures, $6.6 billion (7 cents of your tax dollar).

WHERE ARE WE HEADED?

The common assumption, expressed frequently, is that every year this country finds itself further involved in programs of a socialistic or welfare state nature. As we have seen, in fiscal 1963 we will spend 7 percent of our Federal budget for programs that are sometimes described in this manner. How does this compare with former years?

I had the Library of Congress dig out a copy of the fiscal 1939 budget for a comparison, and the makeup of this typical prewar budget was a real eye opener. Consider these facts:

In 1939 we spent, not 7 percent, but 44 percent, of our budget for labor and welfare programs.

In 1939 we spent $30 per capita on these programs.

In fiscal 1963, using the 1939 dollar to provide a fixed basis of comparison, we will spend $16 per capita for these same programs.

Is it true, then, that the Federal Government is creating a vast welfare state by leaps and bounds? Quite obviously not. The brutal fact is that in the past 24 years our welfare state programs have withered to little more than half their prewar level. The charge of creeping socialism simply is not supported by the facts.

NO REASON FOR APATHY

The fact that the record of Federal spending fails to support the charge of "socialism" is no reason for apathy. Of course, we want to be on the alert against proposals that would weaken or harm our economic or social structure. I am a strong believer in the merits of the free enterprise system; I want to see more competitiveness in our economy—not less; and I believe this is the view of most Americans. If any portion of our present Federal budget needs to be eliminated, let's root it out with vigor. Let us always be alert for waste and inefficiency. (For example, I believe the time is approaching when we should drastically reduce our expensive farm support programs.) But let's make our analysis calmly and responsibly, as the President and Members of Congress must do, and let's not be frightened by the false notion, nurtured so long, that this country is "going down the road to socialism." Sweeping charges such as this, unsupported by the facts, contribute little to the solution of real problems that beset us—problems such as substantial, persistent unemployment and inadequate educational facilities for our children.

OUR POPULATION PRESSURES

In 1939 this Nation had a population of 130 million people. Today we have 186 million people. That we should be spending today less, in terms of 1939 dollars, than we spent 24 years ago is a startling revelation of our defensiveness about the issue of "creeping socialism."

Considering the 56 percent decline in the purchasing value of the dollar since 1939, we will spend this year, in 1939 dollars, slightly over $3 billion for labor, health, education, and welfare. In 1939, with 56 million fewer people, we spent nearly $4 billion.

Now, a housewife with nine children isn't expected to keep her grocery bill to the level set by her neighbor with six children, and yet that is what we as a nation have been doing. In fact, we have actually cut back our total expenditures as our population has grown. This may or may not be right, but I think we ought to recognize what we're doing.

IS OUR GOVERNMENT GROWING?

In 1946 our Federal debt per person was $1,900. Today it is down to $1,600. In 1946, out of every 1,000 persons in the United States, 19 were civilian employees of the Federal Government. Today that number has dropped to 13, and of these 13, 6 are civilian employees of our Armed Forces. These are further evidences that what so many critics say is not true—that the Federal Government is not growing out of proportion to our population and economy.

A further indication of this came to light through comparing the Federal debt with State, local, and private debt in the United States. I doubt whether many citizens realize that between 1946 and 1960—the last year for which figures are available—the Federal debt grew just 6 percent while State-local debt grew 328 percent and private debt 278 percent. Even more startling is the fact that, whereas private debt in this country was well below the Federal debt in 1946, it now is more than double the Federal debt. The facts thus refute the "ever-bigger government" argument so often linked with charges of socialism.

WHERE'S THE SOCIALISM?

One of the basic goals of traditional socialism is economic equality—from each according to ability; to each according to need. Thus, if we are approaching socialism we should see a general leveling of society, fewer rich, fewer poor. We should see less opportunity for an individual to become wealthy or well off. In this spirit let's look at some factual indicators. What's happening to personal income in this country? How much of our industrial capacity is owned by the Federal Government? What part does our system play in equalizing income and impeding the accumulation of wealth? Here are some pertinent facts:

In 1953 there were 27,000 millionaires in the United States; today there are 100,000. According to the Wall Street Journal, the last 9 years have seen the greatest growth in number of millionaires in our Nation's history.

The United States, with 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of its land area has 35 percent of all its wealth—more automobiles, telephones, and other luxuries than all the other countries of the world combined.

Personal income totals over $400 billion, with a median of $5,700, but the top 5 percent of U.S. families receive 20 percent of all income, and the bottom 20 percent of families receive 5 percent of all income.

Persons owning common stock increased in numbers from 6.5 million in 1952 to 12.5 million in 1959.

The top 9 percent of our population owns 46 percent of this Nation's private assets.

Government—Federal, State, and local—owns only 12 percent of the reproducible, tangible assets and 17 percent of the land in the United States. All the remainder is privately owned.

A traditional goal of socialism is public ownership of mines, factories, railroads, airlines, and communications. All of these key industries are privately owned in our country, in sharp contrast to the countries of Europe, Scandinavia, etc.

LET'S DEBATE ISSUES ON THEIR MERITS

I have written this report, not to argue for increased Federal spending or enlarging our Federal Government, but to help my constituents get a better picture of where we are, where we have been, and where we are going. We can do whatever we, as a nation, believe is right. Each of us has his own ideas about the proper role of the Federal Government, and I am certain we will continue to debate these issues. All I hope is that, in the future, we will debate them on their merits and will discard the wholly false notion that this Nation is about to abandon its competitive, free enterprise system for socialism.

President Eisenhower was an outspoken foe of Federal spending, and yet his budget increased 19 percent, from $68 billion to $81 billion, in 8 years. If our population continues to grow at the rate of 3 million a year, and if the cold war goes on, it is obvious that we will continue to have large Federal budgets—regardless of which party is in power. Anyone who holds out the promise of wholesale reductions in the cost of government under these circumstances is either uninformed or insincere.

Some time ago Walter Lippmann concluded a study of the creeping socialism charge with these words: "It is evident," he wrote, "that creeping socialism has not crept very far."

Ukrainians and Their Russian Oppressors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the eighth triennial convention of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is being held starting today in New York City. This distinguished organization, representing over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian background, is dedicated to U.S. victory in the cold war by concentration of thought and action on all the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union.

The convention meets to highlight Soviet Russian colonialism among the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. and to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation and its global meaning for the slave half of the world today.

I include the remarks I have prepared saluting the freedom-loving Americans of Ukrainian descent in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

UKRAINIANS AND THEIR RUSSIAN OPPRESSORS

The gifted and gallant Ukrainians are among the most numerous and most industrious peoples in Eastern Europe. They form the second largest Slavic nation in the large family of Slav peoples; only the Russians are more numerous, as they have always been. The Ukraine itself is both one of the fairest and perhaps the most fertile country in the entire East European region. From time immemorial these simple peasant folk lived there in their chosen ways and enjoyed life as best they could, until the rise and expansion of modern Russia. In the middle of the 17th century, as Russia's aggressive tide was sweeping westward and endangered Ukrainian territorial integrity and freedom, Ukraine's leaders signed a compact with the Czar of Russia in 1656, by which the two countries became allies and associates. But Russia's wily and autocratic Czar never intended to keep his end of the bargain. Instead of helping the Ukrainians when the latter were in trouble, he deliberately disregarded the terms of this compact he had signed, and in flagrant bad faith began to encroach upon the territorial integrity of the Ukraine, and infringe upon the rights of the Ukrainian people. All their remonstrances and protests were of no avail. The Russians, being more powerful, prevailed.

That was the beginning of Ukrainian subjection to Russia, and, with a brief but happy interlude, it has been going on for more than 300 years. Under autocratic czars and their callous agents Ukrainians suffered much and sacrificed most of their worldly possessions. Today they suffer no less and sacrifice far more under Russia's new masters than they did under the czars. The personnel of the Russian rulers in the Ukraine have of course changed, but their alien and oppressive character has not changed much.

Under Russia's new masters, Soviet colonialism has taken on another form—scores of non-Russian peoples have been brought, by pressure and brute force, under the direct rule, or beneath the "protective" armor of the Red army, under the well understood name, "satellites." It takes no imagination to understand the nature and extent of Soviet colonialism. But there is one sharp and contrasting difference between Soviet colonialism and the colonialism practiced by the West in the past. While Western colonialism aimed at the exploitation of colonized countries, it seldom ideologically stifled the people in these countries. The Soviets are not content with mere material exploitation; they also want to enslave the people, forcing them to accept Soviet ideology to the exclusion of all other beliefs and creeds.

In this connection it is eminently appropriate to observe, as you are going to in the Eighth Triennial Convention of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. It is a tribute to the genius of Lincoln that, since his signing of that historic document, hundreds of millions of peoples have been freed and have attained independence. Unfortunately, however, the true meaning of that ageless proclamation has been totally and flagrantly ignored by the tyrannical masters of Russia. I deeply hope that the Ukraine can eventually be freed from its Soviet masters. If we in the free world can encourage the natural and rightful trend toward nationalism in the subjected nations, we may see in our lifetime the termination of the Communist threat everywhere.

Here in this great Republic Ukrainians have always been welcome and have made an immense contribution to American life and culture. They have become loyal and patriotic citizens. They have worked hard in the strengthening of our democratic institutions, and in time of war have gladly sacrificed their lives in defense of American democracy. In Bayonne, N.J., where Ukrainian-Americans are very active in all forms of communal life, we were honored recently by the visit of His Excellency the Most Reverend John Theodorovich, metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States who came to commemorate the 25th anniversary celebration of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of St. Sophia. Metropolitan John, the Reverend Michael Zemlachenko, and the faithful parishioners of St. Sophia joined together to give tribute to God on the jubilee of the founding of St. Sophia. By keeping alive the liturgy and devotion of their religion, as you are keeping alive the memory and the hope of an independent Ukraine, the parishioners of St. Sophia and their fellow Americans of Ukrainian descent here assembled are contributing to the achievement of the goal of spiritual and religious freedom for all men.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of American has been in the forefront of all organizations whose goal is to warn us against the tyranny of godless Communists in Communist-dominated satellite countries. The committee has rendered a real service in carrying on this work, and also in the education of Ukraine's-Americans in the real values of Ukraine's historic heritage. I wish you success at this convention and in all your future endeavors.

Representative Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of Illinois 10th Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith the report to the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois covering a résumé of major legislation and my activities as their Representative in the 87th Congress.

Convening on January 10, 1962, and extending through the second week of October, the recent session of the 87th Congress was the longest in peacetime history.

Few congressional sessions in the annals of the Nation's Federal legislative body brought the degree of controversy, delays, and indecision which marked this one. Deadlocks and "behind the scene" pressures of every nature contributed to the early stagnancy of committee deliberations from the start of spring until the session came to its painful end with more than 175 Members having departed Washington by the time the foreign aid bill was passed on October 6. Midway into the second week of October, a record for rollcalls had been established in the House with a total exceeding the 290 mark, running the figure for the 2-year period of the 87th Congress to well over 500.

Disagreements in many areas on major legislation between the House and the Senate became a frequent occurrence. The total number of bills introduced in the House of Representatives during the near 10-month session extended 6,000 and brought the 2-year total of bills to more than 13,600. Less than 8 percent became law and many of these were bills of a private nature. As is generally true in our legislative process, many bills of prime importance were not even considered—and other bills which had "political sex appeal" were given priority in this election year. To attempt to sum up this Congress as being one primarily of achievement or failure is, of course, entirely a matter of one's personal point of view.

It must be remembered, of course, that many factors contributed to the congressional pressures which in turn affect the thinking and actions of a legislative body which has an obligation to reflect the will of the people in the vast majority of instances.

The heat of critical developments in Cuba, Laos, Berlin, and many other far-flung areas of the world increased from time to time as did the tensions within Congress.

On the domestic front throughout the past year, spotty unemployment remained in the face of the so-called emergency programs designed to bolster the American economy.

Though we have lived in an aura of cold war tensions for more than a decade, the situation in Cuba, Russia's satellite colony 90 miles off the coast of Florida, has become far more explosive, and the attempted invasion of Cuba by its exile and refugee citizens became a fiasco which strengthened Castro's hand. There has been a tremendous military buildup in Cuba which is continuing as this report is being written.

New undercurrents continue elsewhere as the struggle between free nations in the world and Communist-dominated countries erupts with new fervor. Deep-grained international strife continues to exist in the new African nations as well as in South America. As I suggested would be the case nearly 2 years ago, Laos might well be "written off" as a pro-Western nation. In fact, its base of government has been broadened into a "coalition" which is dominately pro-Communist and promises to eventually fall totally into the Communist orbit. All of these things have demanded a continued acceleration of our national defense cost and program.

In these difficult times we must have two prime concerns; first, to maintain peace through strength but only without yielding or risking freedom or the growth of Communist tyranny; and, second, to strengthen our economic and fiscal stability on the domestic front. Certainly there is grave question whether we are pursuing the course of fulfilling these two demands as fully as we should.

While the industry and business economy of the country remains generally strong, we have undergone a decline in new capital investment and our economic growth has by no means measured up to the promises and predictions of the administration's economic experts. Our fiscal situation is far less stable today than it has ever been in the past. Public indebtedness has again been sharply increased and our gold reserve continued to drop this past year. To fully understand the latter situation one must realize that on December 31, 1946, U.S. gold holdings were in excess of $25 billion while on September 17, 1962, these holdings shrunk to slightly more than $16 billion. In the meantime, the gold holdings of other foreign nations have increased from $13 billion in 1952 to nearly $24 billion as of the start of this past year.

Twice in a span of 7 months, Congress voted to increase the statutory debt ceiling by an accumulated sum of $10 billion, thus carrying the public debt beyond the $300 billion mark, highest in the history of the country. While there are many factors which could substantially change the deficit spending figure for this fiscal year, it would appear that the outlay of Federal revenues by the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, will reach the $7 billion mark. Had the suggested tax cut been ordered for fiscal 1962, we would have experienced an even greater deficit. Many of us who are concerned with the mushrooming national debt have been critical of many domestic programs which reflect imprudence at a time when a nation has been called upon to make sacrifices. It has frequently been stated that "an America which goes broke would be of no help to the world" and the forces of communism would then be left without the opposition of a great nation which has been the bastion of the free world for many decades.

While it is impossible to list all important business transactions and legislation in the Congress this year, here are several with which Congress tussled throughout the past 10 months:

DEFENSE BUDGET

An alltime record high defense budget was unanimously approved by both the House and Senate for fiscal 1963, totaling $52,600 million. Of this amount nearly $15.5 billion will be used for the purchase of new weapons; $13.5 billion for military pay and allowances; and $11.5 billion for operations and maintenance. The more than $12 billion balance will be expended for research and development, atomic energy, military aid abroad, et cetera.

TRADE BILL

Congress passed a controversial trade bill granting the President unprecedented powers to cut U.S. tariffs, to impose market quotas, and to provide subsidy payments for both workers and business firms injured by imports. This bill recently became the law of the land, and only time will establish how effectively it provides the tools for dealing with the complex problems of international trade and the side effects of recent trends in both the world market and our shrinking balance of gold reserves.

FOREIGN AID

Although the funds requested by the administration for foreign aid were sharply cut, Congress approved an appropriation bill which increased the House figure by nearly $800 million, thus bringing the total to $4,400 million again this year. This is an increase of $14,300,000 over last year's foreign aid appropriation.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Legislation which would have established a new Cabinet post and another bureau of the Federal Government to be known as the Department of Urban Affairs was defeated in the House. The defeat might well be a temporary one, however; authoritative source has it that a renewed effort to create an Urban Affairs Department will be made by House liberals in the next session.

FARM LEGISLATION

President Kennedy got a farm bill through both the House and Senate in the closing days of the session, but it fell very short of the original program requested which would have given vastly expanded power to the Secretary of Agriculture. The bill contained a new wheat program for 1964. Although it is designed to cut grain production and surpluses next year, many legislators feel that it will result in an expanded subsidy without any cutback in production.

RESERVE CALLUP

In a bipartisan and almost unanimous vote in both the House and Senate, President Kennedy was given standby authority to call up 150,000 reservists. The measure also provides for authority to extend the service tenure of regular military personnel. It must be understood that this is standby authority which may or may not be used at the discretion of the President.

EDUCATION

The Federal aid to education bill which would have provided Federal funds for school construction and teachers' salaries, remained tangled in a web of politics and religion where it died in committee during the previous session. It appears that it will take a great deal more unified support to extricate it in the future than is prevalent. However, Congress did expand the aid to school districts and federally impacted areas, as well as approving the school milk program and renewing other general educational programs.

It expanded the National Defense Education Act for institutions of higher learning, but revolted against the Senate version of the so-called college facilities bill which passed the House void of scholarship loans and grants earlier in the year.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The House of Representatives was not given an opportunity to debate the medical care program under social security on the floor because the Senate shortstopped the measure and killed it in the upper body in mid-August. Needless to say, other measures to place a program in effect with a tax allowance on certificate system fell by the wayside as a result of the Senate action, also.

POSTAL RATES AND PAY BILL

Congress almost unanimously approved a bill combining postal rate hikes with a $1 billion pay raise and increased retirement benefits for Federal employees.

SELF-EMPLOYED RETIREMENT PROGRAM

After years of consideration, both the House and the Senate finally passed by a substantial majority a measure giving professional people and other self-employed persons new tax incentives to set up their own retirement funds. The bill known as H.R. 10 which came from the Senate included an amendment to tax certain profit-sharing and private retirement benefits. The House refused to go along with this amendment, introduced by Senator Gore, thus striking this section of the bill in conference.

PUBLIC WORKS

A mammoth public works bill, which will cost the taxpayers of this country at least $900 million, was passed by a voice vote late in August after Republicans lost by a narrow margin a motion to send it back to committee. It provides sweeping authority for the administration to establish almost every type of project including recreational facilities of every nature and description. Mind you, this was entirely separate from another public works bill which was passed for rivers and harbors projects.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Congress enacted legislation providing a cost-of-living increase for service-connected disabled veterans and voted unanimously to increase the program for veterans' hospital facilities to insure adequate care and outpatient treatment for disabled veterans.

TAX REVISIONS

The 1962 tax revision bill, including new tax credits for outlays on machinery and equipment and tighter rules for deductions on income expenses was approved after multiple changes in both legislative bodies in the original proposal.

SPECIAL LEGISLATION

Among the measures of special legislation which Congress passed this year were those which established the Space Satellite Communications Corporation; a plan to give the President authority to assist the United Nations through the purchase of $100 million in U.N. bonds; a bill tightening the Federal Drug Administration's control over the manufacture and distribution of drugs; and resolutions calling for a firm policy in dealing with the explosive Cuban and Berlin situations.

PERSONAL REPORT

During the 1962 session more than 400 residents of the 10th Congressional District visited my office in Washington. My staff arranges tours of the White House, provides gallery passes for both the House and Senate, and schedules tours of many other places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital.

Early in each session of Congress, I take a special opinion poll in my district to determine how the majority of my constituents feel about the many controversial legislative issues. The poll taken during the 87th Congress brought a tremendous response running considerably higher than the average mail public opinion poll return. Tabulations on each question were carefully summarized and the results placed in the press as well as in the Congressional Record.

As was the case during the previous year, I was obliged to cancel out scores of speaking engagements and meeting commitments during September and October because of the prolonged session.

Congressional mail, which was heavier this year than at any time during my 5 previous years in Congress, was given careful and considered attention. Replies were sometimes delayed as a result of the fact that often a particular issue will draw a deluge of mail in a 2- or 3-day period making it impossible to answer within 24 hours as we do under normal conditions.

During the second session of this Congress, I introduced 12 public bills although several other measures which I proposed were under committee consideration at the time the 1962 session began. Among the bills introduced this year were the following:

H.R. 9505, a bill to prohibit exports to Communist countries.

H.R. 10645, a bill to amend section 20 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to prohibit the assistance under that act to the government of any country which is delinquent in compensating U.S. citizens for loss of any property by expropriation.

H.R. 10731, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of the principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years.

H.R. 10092, a bill to authorize the conveyance of certain surplus Federal lands to the State of Illinois for wildlife, conservation, and recreation purposes.

H.R. 11087, a bill to provide medical and hospital care to the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance.

H.R. 11589, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed a deduction from gross income.

H.R. 12505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for additional education or training.

H.R. 12392, relating to the refund to the States of any unexpended balance of taxes collected under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961.

H.R. 13001, a bill to establish a permanent commission on aircraft noise abatement problems.

H.R. 13220, a bill to terminate the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics, my special assignments for the adjournment period have not been definitely designated, as yet. However, I assisted in the writing of several important bills which emanated from our committee and which were ultimately either reported to the House or enacted into law, including the proposal to provide more stringent regulations on the sale of drugs, the quality stabilization bill, regulation of shipment of gambling devices and parts for such devices shipped in interstate commerce, the bill to establish the Communications Satellite Corporation, and a score of bills dealing with changes in the Nation's transportation system. This committee will resume its work on the jet noise problem which has plagued the residents of our own area as well as those adjacent to other airports throughout the Nation where there are jet aircraft airport facilities.

Although this report might appear quite lengthy, it is actually but a brief analysis of what Congress did during this past session and, specifically, the work of your own Representative. We are, however, prepared to provide detailed information to all my constituents on any and all bills of special interest. These inquiries may be directed either to my Washington office or to the district office in Berwyn.

By way of special information, it should be remembered that most of the congressional districts throughout the United States underwent boundary changes as a result of the 1960 decennial census. The 10th Congressional District, which previously embraced 5 suburban townships and approximately 135,000 residents in 3 Chicago wards, has been drastically changed. We now have the largest population of any congressional district in Illinois with a figure of nearly 575,000 residents. It includes only that portion of Chicago in which O'Hare International Airport is located. The townships of Maine, Leyden, and Cicero have been added to our congressional area, along with those townships which have been in the 10th District since 1958, specifically, Oak Park, Berwyn, Proviso, Riverside, and River Forest. With the newly reapportioned district, the work of this office is certain to be increased considerably during the 88th Congress.

The 87th Congress—An Outstanding Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration and the 87th Congress have produced an outstanding record in the first half of President Kennedy's term. Although many new ideas were resisted by the opposition and the conservative Members, the resounding success of the Peace Corps should encourage the Kennedy administration to start bold new programs. The Trade Expansion Act is a dramatic new approach in the field of world commerce. Area redevelopment and manpower retraining show the determination of the administration to revitalize distressed areas and bring hope to those who lost out because of automation.

The following legislation of major importance was enacted in the 87th Congress:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The 87th Congress supported the policy which the Kennedy administration adopted that a strong national defense and powerful military force for both striking and deterrent purposes is necessary for both national security and implementation of foreign policy. In order to maintain our "margin of superiority," our military forces and power have been increased qualitatively and quantitatively, while flexibility and reaction time to meet any international crisis have been increased.

SPACE PROGRAM

The effort in this field has more than tripled since 1960. The second session authorized $3.81 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1963, including $263 million for planetary and lunar exploration.

The first session authorized $1.7 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1962; included increases for manned moon-orbiting project and for research on solid and nuclear propellants.

These measures will enable American science to keep pace with developments in the space age and advance American space exploration programs.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The first session authorized a $4.2 billion 1962 program of loans and grants for foreign economic aid and development, military assistance and support, and contributions to international programs; provided for 5-year programing of development loans and a contingency fund for use at the President's discretion. It was the first time Congress has ever given the President such long-term authority. It was positive evidence of U.S. interest in constructive and productive foreign aid. The measure also established AID—Agency for International Development—to coordinate the development program and assure efficient use of money.

The second session increased the authorization to $4.6 billion foreign assistance program for 1963, including military support funds, development loans and grants.

LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAM

The 87th Congress effectuated a previously authorized Latin American program by appropriating $600 million; included $100 million in disaster relief for Chile, $394 million for loans by Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million for social and economic programs of OAS, and $100 million for loans and grants by ICA. The bill implements the President's Alliance for Progress program to promote inter-American social and economic cooperation. This strengthens our friendship with nations in Central and South America through loans and grants for economic progress and political stability and strength. It demonstrates that we are sincere in our desire to construct a true pan-American community.

The second session authorized the continuation of the program at $600 million a year through 1966.

U.S. PEACE CORPS

A U.S. Peace Corps has been established as an independent agency subject to policy guidance of State Department; authorized $40 million for operations in fiscal 1962. The Peace Corps has already achieved great success as can be seen by its unparalleled, enthusiastic acceptance in foreign countries. It indicates that programs of a relatively modest size, if tailored to fit the social and economic needs of other countries, may be the most effective kind of foreign aid. President Kennedy's bold approach has been most successful.

In the second session the Peace Corps was extended and expanded and the authorization for 1963 increased to $63.7 million. This agency has been acclaimed by many writers on foreign affairs as the most significant and advantageous change in our relationship with the underdeveloped countries of the world in the 20th century.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

This Agency was established to operate under the guidance of the President and Secretary of State. It represents the active desire of the American people and the Government to achieve a workable world peace. It created the governmental machinery necessary to develop a disarmament agreement. Plans were presented by this new Agency at the Geneva conferences.

The 2d session of the 87th Congress supported the progress of the Agency and its plans to create a world agreement which will lead to world peace.

UNITED NATIONS LOANS

The inability of the United Nations to continue its activities to maintain peace in trouble locations would reduce its potential as an instrument of world peace. The advisory ruling of the World Court regarding loss of vote for failure to pay assessments encouraged the 2d session of the 87th Congress to authorize the President to lend up to $100 million to the United Nations.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The second session authorized a $435 million, 3-year program of training of unemployed in vocational schools, or on-the-job retraining, to develop new skills; first 2 years' cost to be paid by Federal Government, third year 50–50 with States.

It also provided for $900 million in immediate loans or grants for public works projects in communities with excess unemployment.

In the first session Congress authorized $928 million temporary program to provide 13 weeks' additional unemployment compensation, up to June 30, 1962.

for jobless whose payments expired; increased tax on employers by four-tenths of 1 percent for 2 years beginning January 1, 1962; gave similar benefits to unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. In the second session a similar request from President Kennedy failed by a vote of 12 to 13 to get out of the Ways and Means Committee.

The first session also authorized temporary grants to States to finance inclusion of dependent children of unemployed under Federal-State assistance program for 15 months to June 1, 1962. This act enabled some 250,000 adults and 750,000 children to feed and clothe themselves until such time that work could be obtained for the family supporter.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The first session established the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce; authorized $300 million loans and $94 million grants for industrial plants and public facilities in areas of economic distress; provided for technical assistance, vocational rehabilitation, and subsistence grants for persons undergoing retraining; terminates program June 30, 1963. This measure provided relief to those areas of chronic high unemployment and encouraged industrial expansion in these cases. Pennsylvania received a great portion of these moneys to enable the distressed areas of its economy to recover. The vocational rehabilitation program will enable the country to diversify its work force and provide qualified personnel to fill jobs presently in need of such people.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

The 1st session of the 87th Congress increased $1 minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, extended coverage to 3.5 million additional workers by gradual wage stepups; amended Fair Labor Standards Act. This measure assured a living wage to all workers employed by concerns presently covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act as well as many engaged in large retail trade concerns.

HOUSING

The greatest Housing Act in over a decade authorized 4 to 5 year $4.9 billion housing programs for: low- and moderate-income families on liberalized terms; urban renewal; open-spaces development in cities; college dormitory construction loans; 100,000 new units of public housing; community facilities. Extended farm housing program, increased funds for housing for the aged, and provided for loans to cities to acquire mass transportation facilities. The Housing Act of 1961 was a step to aid those in the middle and lower income ranges who were previously ineligible for public housing and were unable to purchase their own homes. It is a great stride toward complete urban renewal and aids considerably cities in their efforts toward civic improvement.

The second session provided for low- and moderate-cost housing for elderly in urban and rural areas and authorized $100 million loan funds for new construction.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The first session raised the minimum monthly old-age insurance payments under the Social Security Act from $33 to $40; increased benefits to widows; provided male workers may draw reduced benefits upon retirement at age 62; liberalized disability provisions; increased tax for workers and employers by one-eighth of 1 percent each. This omnibus measure was designed to insure that all people who have paid into social security will receive sufficient benefits for retirement. The lowered retirement age for males now permits retirement for all at 62 instead of 65.

The second session amended the Social Security Act to reduce public assistance rolls, by: providing grants to States that establish work programs for needy; increasing U.S. share of administrative costs; extending for 5 years payments to families of unemployed fathers and other needy children; raising by $4 per month ceiling on Federal matching grants for aged, blind, and disabled; and increasing grants for child welfare services.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The first session extended the life of the President's Civil Rights Commission for 2 years to September 30, 1963. The bill provided for continued life of the Commission so that all citizens may receive "equal protection under the law" as guaranteed by the Constitution.

The second session adopted the resolution for a proposed constitutional amendment outlawing the poll tax in Federal elections.

EDUCATION

The first session extended aid to federally impacted school districts, for school construction and operations, for 2 years to June 30, 1963, and the National Defense Education Act for 1 year to the same date; authorized $1.3 billion for both programs. This bill allows the country to move forward in the vital field of education and enables those who are needy to obtain a college education.

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, is the first legislation of its kind to be passed. Provides Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training of personnel for work in these fields.

HEALTH LEGISLATION

The first session expanded and extended programs of Federal grants to States and communities for: construction of nursing homes, training of public health personnel, and studies to improve services for aged outside hospitals. This bill provides much needed funds for urban areas to construct hospitals facilities, improve present facilities, and staff these facilities with adequately trained personnel.

It also expanded water pollution control program; increased grants to State and interstate agencies from $3 million annually to $5 million for operations through June 30, 1968, and from $50 million to $100 million annually for construction of treatment works; substituted sliding-scale formula for present 30 percent limitation on Federal grants. This measure will enable urban communities to remain supplied with sufficient quantities of pure water to meet both present and future needs.

The second session extended to 1966 authorization of $5 million a year in grants to State and local governments under the Air Pollution Control Act. It also enacted a law to tighten controls over the manufacture and distribution of drugs. Advertisement must include information, in brief summary, on side effects and other characteristics.

SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATION

The first session increased temporarily by $20 million, to $595 million, the amount available to Small Business Administration for regular business loans. Increased by $105 million, to $1.1 billion, the total borrowing authority of SBA, including $725 million for regular business loans. Raised limit on amounts Small Business Administration may lend small business investment corporations and on latters' investment in individual enterprises. The combined effect of these three measures is to give greater flexibility to the operations of the small businessman, enable him to receive additional loans for improvement and expansion and to compete in the business world of today.

The second session increased lending authority of Small Business Administration for business loans and disaster loans to a combined total of $1.109 billion; investment company loans from $325 million limit to $341 million; authorized loans to firms in need of assistance under Trade Expansion Act; established combined revolving fund. This session also passed a law to permit self-employed individuals to establish retirement funds for themselves and for their employees and receive tax deferrals on part of their contributions to the funds.

TRADE EXPANSION

The second session passed a law which empowers the President, subject to safeguard provisions, to cut duties on imports by agreements with other nations, particularly European Economic Community, for concessions to U.S.-exported products; provides aid to domestic workers and industries adversely affected.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE

The second session authorized creation of a commercial corporation, owned 50–50 by the public and the communications industry, to establish and operate a communications satellite system under regulations of the FCC, in cooperation with NASA; three members of the board of directors to be appointed by the President.

LABOR

The second session amended the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 by providing Secretary of Labor with powers of enforcement, to establish regulations and interpret the statute; fix penalties for violations.

EDUCATIONAL TV

The second session authorized matching Federal grants up to $1 million for any State to purchase TV transmission equipment for educational purposes, providing the State or sponsoring agency furnish the land, building, and guarantee to operate and maintain the channel.

It also amended the Federal Communications Act to give FCC authority to require all newly manufactured TV sets be equipped to receive all UHF and VHF channels.

VETERANS

The first session authorized payment of $60 million special dividend to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance. It extended direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized additional $1.2 billion for direct loans program through fiscal year 1967.

The second session increased by average of 9.4 percent rates of compensation for service-connected disability paid to 1.9 million veterans; provided increased benefits to parents and children of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities; provides for a permanent program of vocational rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disability serving between World War II and Korean conflict and thereafter; increased compensation for blinded veterans; provided for review of death claims of veterans.

PHILADELPHIA LEGISLATION

Our city greatly benefited from general legislation which affects the cities of the Nation, such as the Housing Act, the Public Works Acceleration Act; the Trade Expansion Act; educational TV; and the Impacted School District Act; the water pollution control program; and air pollution control program; small business legislation, and health legislation.

Our city specifically benefited from the commitment by the Internal Revenue Service to build the Data Processing Center in the northeast; a program approved by General Services Administration to build a Federal office building on a site suitable to both the judges and the administration; GSA also agreed to transfer Fort Mifflin to the city as a historic park; approval of Navy Capehart housing project; commitment for additional block for parking at Independence National Park; Water Pollution Control Laboratory; $3 million loan for new commuter passenger cars; acquisition of regional office of Public Housing Administration; favorable arrangements for the city to acquire the Army piers under urban renewal with two-thirds of the net cost being met by Federal Government; widening of Delaware Channel above Allegheny Avenue; approval of sound and light display at Independence Hall; modernization and renovation of hospitals under Hill-Burton Act; Delaware River compact; Philadelphia Navy Yard work program.

It has been a real pleasure to represent my constitutents in the 87th Congress and I want to express my appreciation for this great privilege. If reelected on November 6 to the 88th Congress, I shall diligently continue to keep up with all matters which affect the district and the Nation and to serve my people in every possible way.

Columbus Day Should Be a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Columbus Day is observed as a legal holiday in more than two-thirds of the States and is celebrated in many of our neighboring Republics. It is entirely fitting that our Federal Government should join the States and the neighboring nations in according wholehearted official national recognition to this day.

As I have told my colleagues before, the event that is marked by Columbus Day is worthy of celebration. The discovery, which in effect doubled the size of the world, is one of the major happenings of world history. Certainly no event in secular history is more calculated to stir the heart of man by the magnitude of its daring, both of conception and of execution, and by its incalculable results to mankind.

Nearly five centuries have passed since that day in 1492 when Columbus discovered the New World and inaugurated a new era in human affairs. From that day the world moved forward toward greater freedom, achievement, and opportunity.

All of us recall the many obstacles encountered by Columbus, the delays, mutiny, and threats against his life. His unconquerable spirit enabled him to carry on. Faith in divine guidance enabled him to pursue steadfastly his chosen course until he reached the shores of the New World.

Columbus Day is very definitely a day of national interest and significance, qualities which should be the first test of a national holiday. Our failure to place it in the highest category of American holidays can only be construed as an act of neglect and an example of man's ingratitude. Of all that we see around us, of all that we have, the wealth, the power and the glory, this we know: It began with this remarkable Italian explorer and it is because of him, in the first instance, that we are able to walk here on American soil today.

Despite the great advances mankind has made since the days of Columbus, serious problems still confront us. There are goals that the world has not yet reached—peace, brotherhood, justice, and human dignity for all. The attainment of these goals will require the best efforts of all of us. It will demand those qualities which placed Columbus among the immortals—vision, courage, skill, and, above all, great faith.

The observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday would serve as both a reminder and an inspiration to the people of America and the free world—a reminder of the difficulties he faced and overcame with fortitude and perseverance and an inspiration for us to match his courage and faith in meeting the problems of our day.

It is perhaps a belated recognition of Columbus, but in this way our great Nation can pay tribute to its great discoverer and commemorate his achievement.

Silver Anniversary of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the constituents of the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, have benefited from the housing acts passed by the Congress since 1937. Low income families and senior citizens have been able to live in decent surroundings in adequate housing at prices they can afford as the result of the foresight this Congress showed in 1937 and subsequent years when it passed badly needed housing legislation.

Today the Housing Act of 1937 is being commemorated in a birthday party given by the Jersey City Housing Authority at Currie's Woods Gardens Community Hall in Jersey City. I request unanimous consent that the remarks I have prepared for that occasion be inserted in the RECORD:

THE SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Thirty years ago a revolutionary concept of government responsibility was introduced into American society. It was not a revolution of guns but of reason. The victory was a human victory over lust and greed. It was a victory for all the people.

Under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, a Democratic Congress squarely faced the challenge of social chaos caused by a depressed economy and refused to accept the postulates of the Marxists that the free society they loved was doomed. This group of dedicated men, the New Dealers, reversed the inevitable consequences of political inertia by enacting a series of measures that changed history and thwarted the Marxian prediction of the demise of capitalism.

Perhaps the most significant legislation enacted in those trying times was the Housing Act of 1937, which we commemorate here today. For it was with this act that the Government of the United States accepted as its policy, not only the elimination of unemployment, which was the main purpose of previous housing acts, but also the concept of decent housing for every family regardless of income or status.

It was with this New Deal measure as a base that successive Democratic Congresses have been able to amplify the benefits and expand the underlying philosophy of decent housing for all. Let me list some of these major housing measures.

In 1940 several laws, including the Lanham Act, were passed to alleviate the housing problems arising out of defense and military needs.

In 1944 the Servicemen's Readjustment Act authorized the guarantee and insurance, by the Veterans' Administration, of GI housing loans.

The following year the provisions of the Lanham Act were expanded to provide temporary housing for servicemen and veterans.

After several unsuccessful attempts at legislation during the Republican 80th Congress, Public Law 171, the Housing Act of 1949 was passed. It established national housing objectives and policies, enlarged the 1937 act, expanded FHA programs, and established slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs.

In 1951 defense housing was again a problem due to the Korean conflict. The Housing Act of this year provided for these needs.

With a Democratic Congress, 1956 saw a significant breakthrough in housing legislation. Public Law 1020 redefined "low-rent family" to include single elderly persons and authorized priorities and special construction features for elderly occupancy of low rent projects. Again, as in 1937, the Democratic Party came forth to meet a pressing social need. Senior citizens were given full status in the community and their past contributions to society were granted at least partial recognition.

This same act provided for the relocation of families and businesses dislocated by urban renewal and at the same time expanded the overall urban renewal program.

In 1961, additional comprehensive housing legislation was passed by a Democratic Congress, under a Democratic President. The Housing Act of 1961 authorized the completion of the 810,000 low rent housing units begun by the Housing Act of 1949, provided $120 additional annual payment on units occupied by senior citizens, attacked "upper low income" housing problems by authorizing below-the-market loans insured by FHA, liberalized FHA home-improvement loans to aid renewal, and provided funds for experimentation in low cost housing.

I strongly supported this legislation, as I have supported every sound housing bill that has come to a vote during my service in the Congress. I share with President Kennedy the pledge he made to the Nation in 1961, that one goal of his administration and the Democratic Party was to provide decent housing for all our people.

The most recent Housing Act, the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, authorized an additional $100 million for the program of direct loans to provide housing for the elderly. This will permit houcing ror the elderly to be provided at rents of $15 to $20 a month below projects financed either conventionally or with FHA insurance. This act expands on the Housing Act of 1961 and goes a long way toward implementing the pledge made by President Kennedy in 1961.

Thus, the story of housing since 1937 is a story of growth—social as well as economic. In the spring of 1962, there were 3,719 active low-rent public housing projects which included 643,704 units. Of these, 50,356 units have been provided for our senior citizens. In all, 2,500,000 persons are now living in decent housing because of public housing projects.

But proud as we may be of past accomplishments, we must bear in mind that any program designed to meet the growing housing needs of an expanding population can never be completely achieved. For example, in 1960, 23 percent of the families in the United States still had net disposable incomes of less than $3,000 per year. If these Americans, many of whom are part of our 16,500,000 senior citizens, are to realize the benefits of the promise made in the Housing Act of 1937, our programs must be continually expanded and improved.

The Democratic Party is committed to the proposition that a decent place in which to live is a right of every human being. Times have improved since the New Deal but new needs are constantly arising. The growing population plus the constant stream of humanity that is seeking its livelihood in our communities will continue to press us for solutions to the indignities of substandard housing. Juvenile delinquency and immorality will spread due to the crowded housing conditions that rob individuals of their privacy, and the beauty that has been made possible by our architects and designers will be muted by the spectacle of urban decay unless we act decisively.

Congress 25 years ago exhibited the courage and foresight necessary to meet the social and economic needs of the great depression by passing the Housing Act of 1937. The Democratic Party of today stands ready to display the same fortitude by continuing to exercise its capacity for leadership in social and economic progress.

Report to the Citizens of the First Congressional District of the State of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to review the activities of the 2d session of the 87th Congress and to set forth for the information of the citizens of the First Congressional District my views concerning the achievements and failures of this Congress and to express my personal thoughts on the present state of the Union.

First, let me point out to the citizens of the First District that Congress became involved in many legislative snarls during this particular session and, therefore, this has been the longest Congress has stayed in session since the Korean war period of 1951. The 87th Congress was composed of 64 Democrats and 36 Republicans in the Senate and 174 Republicans and 261 Democrats in the House of Representatives. Members of the Democratic Party, therefore, were chairmen of all congressional committees through which legislation is channeled before action is undertaken by the Congress. Representation on the various committees was in the ratio of approximately 2 Democrats to 1 Republican.

In my last report to the citizens of the First Congressional District, I indicated the most pressing problems facing the Nation were related to the international crises existing throughout the world. This, in my opinion, is still true. Because of these crises our defense budget for this year has soared to $52,690 million and Congress passed a mutual security bill extending aid to foreign countries in the amount of $3,928,900,000. The high taxation necessitated by these expenditures has produced an atmosphere of caution on the part of Congress to provide additional funds for the development of some projects in our own domestic economy.

A casual observation of occurrences throughout the world clearly illustrates the enormity of our problems. Since last year conditions in Berlin and Cuba have worsened. The Berlin situation has been particularly acute since the wall was constructed to separate the people of East and West Berlin thereby closing the escape hatch for many freedom-seeking people. The construction of this barricade has brought about a number of incidents any one of which has the potential of propelling us into armed conflict. Berlin is still the No. 1 trouble spot in the world.

During the past year, conditions in Cuba have also deteriorated. Soviet Russia has been admittedly supplying men and materiel to the Castro regime and is now attempting to develop fortifications on this island located 90 miles from the coast of Florida. It has been established that the ships of so-called friendly nations have been used to carry these Soviet supplies to Cuba. I am pleased to report that the U.S. Government is finally taking some positive action to exclude such ships from American ports. The Cuban situation has caused heated debate in Congress and criticism has been evident in many quarters.

Congress reflected its sentiments concerning the gravity of the situations in Berlin and Cuba by overwhelmingly adopting strongly worded resolutions stating that Soviet intrusions in our hemisphere constituted a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and that Berlin must be defended at all costs. These resolutions, both of which I supported, pledged to the President the complete support of both Houses of Congress in any action he may recommend, even to the extent of armed conflict, in protecting our Nation from the Soviet armed threat.

Troubles were also apparent in the Congo, Laos, South America, and China. Indeed, through many parts of the world unrest and upheaval supplanted orderliness and peace. Because of the tense international situation, the President called up 157,457 Reserves and made many recommendations to improve the defense of our Nation. I supported the President in this action in the same manner that I have supported all recommendations of both former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy in matters relating to the national defense and in their decisions concerning foreign policy.

The area trouble spots also caused Congress to give attention once more to the passage of foreign aid for friendly nations. Although the House of Representatives originally reduced the President's request for foreign aid from $4,961,300,000 to $3,630,400,000, the Senate restored a substantial amount of these cuts. As a result, when the bill was finally approved by the conferees and the Congress, it was $298,500,000 higher than the bill recommended by the House but was $1,032,400,000 less than the amount recommended by the President.

In my opinion, the most important legislation enacted by the 87th Congress was the trade bill. During the past year, many Americans expressed apprehension concerning our eventual inability to successfully compete in foreign trade with the countries associated in the European Common Market. The trade bill which had the support of most business and labor leaders not only provides our Nation with a better opportunity to compete with the European Common Market, but it also effectively reduces the opportunity for world trade by the Soviet Union. The President recommended considerable flexibility in relation to existing trade regulations, and the Congress agreed with his suggestions and overwhelmingly passed the trade bill. Under this bill the President has authority to cut or completely eliminate tariffs and to negotiate tariff reductions on entire categories or commodities. Under this bill companies injured financially by foreign competition are eligible for special loans and workers made idle by such foreign competition are eligible to receive cash payments for unemployment. It is the hope of all of us who supported this legislation that there will be an increase in the exports of the United States and that this bill will bring about greater employment, more profits for American industries, higher wages for the American workers, and a higher standard of living for all Americans. It is entirely possible that, because of extraordinary powers of negotiation given to the President for the reduction of tariffs, this bill could conceivably endanger some American industries, and, therefore, I believe the Congress should carefully observe any unfavorable consequences that may develop from this legislation and take where necessary, immediate remedial measures.

There was considerable discussion in Congress this year concerning the purchase of U.N. bonds required for the preservation of the United Nations. The President had asked that Congress authorize our purchase of bonds because of the depletion of funds of the United Nations brought on by police action taken by this organization in the Congo and in the Middle East. Although the United Nations has not been very effective in many instances, it nevertheless is the only existing international body through which the United States can act in its efforts to promote and maintain peace throughout the world. I therefore supported the President's recommendation to purchase United Nations bonds. This international organization is being subjected to more intense investigation and careful scrutiny by the Congress than at any prior time and will, I hope, improve its effectiveness as a result.

Among the other important legislation enacted during the 2d session of the 87th Congress were the following:

(a) A bill creating a communications satellite system which will establish a corporation to construct, develop, and maintain a communications system utilizing the new developments and achievements of science, thereby permitting us to have quicker and more effective communications with nations outside the United States. I supported this legislation. Some evidence of the potential results attainable under this legislation has already been demonstrated through the orbiting of the Telstar satellite. Millions of Americans have already witnessed live television and engaged in telephone conversations through the direct application of the Telstar satellite.

In relation to our space program, it is encouraging to note that tremendous progress was made in this field during the year 1962. The earlier exploits of Shepard, Grissom, Glenn, and Carpenter were surpassed by the thrilling accomplishments of Comdr. Walter Schirra, Jr., who on October 3, 1962, orbited the earth six times. This is indicative of the strides being made by NASA and will according to our scientific experts enhance our hopes of being the first nation to send a man to the moon.

(b) A bill increasing postal rates on all classes of mail. Although I did not agree entirely with the contents of this bill, believing that more revenue should have been obtained by substantially increasing junk mail rates than by placing the burden upon those using first-class mail, I supported the legislation because it was the only bill approved by the postal committees of the House and Senate. This bill as passed by the House of Representatives provided solely for postal increases to remove the deficit existing in the Post Office Department. In the Senate, Federal employee pay legislation was attached to the bill resulting in across-the-board increases for most Federal employees with particular emphasis given to those in the lower income bracket.

(c) The drug bill. This legislation was urgently and speedily enacted after an investigation had disclosed the thalidomide drug had many harmful effects. Under this legislation, the public is given additional protection from the limited number of unethical and unqualified pharmaceutical firms manufacturing drugs. I supported this measure because, in my opinion, it serves the best interests of the drug industry, the medical profession, and our entire citizenry.

(d) The Manpower and Retraining Act. This legislation has as its objective the retraining of the unemployed where the worker's job has been eliminated because of automation, the removal of industries from an area and other causes. Under this legislation the unemployed are taught new skills to enable them to obtain gainful employment in their communities. In the belief that this is an intelligent approach to the continuing blight of unemployment in the United States, I supported this bill.

(e) The Revenue Act of 1962. I originally opposed the tax bill recommended by the President because it included withholding taxes on dividends and interest which, in my opinion, would have been more costly in implementation than could have been justified in the returns received. There were also other aspects of this bill which I believed were unfavorable but, when it finally was acted upon by the Senate, the objectional part relating to withholding taxes on dividends and interest was eliminated and I, therefore, supported the measure on final passage.

(f) The Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act, known popularly as H.R. 10, is intended to create pension funds for self-employed individuals. This bill would permit individuals who are self-employed to set aside a certain amount of tax deductible income to provide personal pension plans. When this bill was before the Senate, it was amended to recommend a change in status of those individuals presently participating in existing employer-employee trust funds. I opposed these amendments because of the effect they would have on existing pension plans and the disastrous effect on the wage earners of these companies who are about to retire. Fortunately, these amendments were eliminated by the House conferees and I, therefore, supported this bill on final passage. The President signed the bill on October 10, 1962.

Some of the legislation passed in this session of the 87th Congress and signed into law, in my opinion, should not have been enacted. I therefore expressed my opposition by voting against such legislation. An example of this type of legislation is the administration's farm bill. In my judgment, this bill provides no solution for reducing the enormous and outrageous costs of the farm program and it merely benefits a limited number of big farmers in the Midwest. Incidentally, both the American Farm Bureau and the New Jersey Farm Bureau opposed this bill which seems to substantiate my opinion that this bill was not beneficial to the vast majority of farmers operating throughout the United States and certainly not in the interests of the American taxpayer.

I also expressed opposition to the Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act which was later enacted by the Congress and signed into law by the President. This bill as passed by the House of Representatives authorized expenditures of Government funds, at the discretion of the President, in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. Inasmuch as this bill had little application to the First Congressional District and because, in my opinion, it was politically inspired and typically "pork barrel" legislation, I voted to recommit the bill. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that, when the Senate gave consideration to appropriations for implementation of the bill, the original $900 million authorization was reduced to $400 million. It is important to remember that the national budget now totals $92,537 million, which imposes a tremendous burden on the taxpayers of our country. Although a considerable portion of the Federal budget is necessitated by expenditures for national defense, space exploration and mutual security, as referred to in other parts of this report, there is nevertheless frequently included in the budget many unnecessary expenditures for various domestic programs. I placed the public works bill in this category and, therefore, expressed my opposition to it in the House of Representatives.

I should now like to refer to certain omissions in this 2d session of the 87th Congress. In most instances these omissions resulted from the failures of the various congressional committees to take positive action on bills for later consideration by the Senate and the House of Representatives. For example, while there was much publicity and political conversation concerning medical care for the aged, the House committee responsible for the preparation of such legislation never cleared any bill for action by the House of Representatives. In the Senate an attempt was made by Senator JAVITS and Senator ANDERSON to gain passage of legislation to provide medical assistance for the aged, but it was rejected by that body and, therefore, was never presented to the House of Representatives for action. It is my personal opinion that some legislation is necessary to provide for the catastrophic illnesses of our aged coming at a time when they are least able to afford the financial burdens associated with such illnesses. It is generally agreed that this problem demands an early solution and it is my expectation that some legislation in this category will develop in the next Congress.

There was also a considerable discussion concerning Federal aid to education but no significant legislation was enacted by the 87th Congress. Bills pertaining to Federal aid to education were either disapproved in committee or rejected by either the House or the Senate. The college aid bill, the school construction bill, the public and private school aid bills all met the same fate and no education bill of any significance was enacted. In the field of education, aid for deserving and needy colleges throughout the country, together with plans for scholarship aid for deserving students, was likewise ignored. Furthermore, aid for the construction of medical schools, so vital throughout the Nation, was rejected.

One of the greatest omissions of the 87th Congress, in my opinion, was its failure to enact any constructive and equitable legislation in the field of civil rights. Although the need for adoption of further civil rights legislation is quite evident, the President did not recommend any specific civil rights bill and this conceivably is the reason that no action was taken. The only legislation in this field was the introduction of a constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll tax in the various States. Since only five States still have a poll tax and since this could have been accomplished, in my judgment, by statute as well as by constitutional amendment, it was in effect an empty gesture in this important field.

Two other important subjects were neglected by this Congress. The problem of civil defense was postponed again and the important problem of mass transportation was rejected although the Congress voted to continue a study of the mass transportation problem for an additional 6 months.

With respect to legislation specifically affecting citizens of the First Congressional District, I am happy to report that the Philadelphia wage tax bill authorizing withholding of this tax from the wages of Federal employees was again defeated. The Delaware River and Bay Authority legislation which I cosponsored was approved by the Congress and signed into law by the President. This legislation had the approval of the Governors of New Jersey and Delaware as well as the legislatures of both States. It will, I believe, aid immeasurably in the further development of the south Jersey area providing as it does a means of financing the construction of additional crossings over the Delaware River.

I am also pleased that the Congress corrected an existing inequity concerning the importation of electron microscopes. This scientific marvel was pioneered and developed by the Radio Corp. of America some 30 years ago. In later years, Germany, Holland, and Japan began manufacturing the electron microscope. The legislation enacted by the House which I cosponsored restored tariffs on the importation of these microscopes thus permitting the domestically manufactured electron microscope a competitive position in the world market.

The First Congressional District is largely dependent for its economic stability and growth on the large industries located within the district. These industries have made great contributions to the national defense, national welfare, and the scientific achievements of our country. In many conferences with various Government agencies I have frequently emphasized the quality of work and the availability of experienced manpower in these industries and it is, therefore, satisfying to me to note that during this past year the New York Shipbuilding Corp. was awarded some $80 million of contracts by the Navy Department for the construction of U.S. warships and that RCA, a giant in electronic pioneering and development, contributed to our national defense by processing some $300 million of defense contracts.

Scores of other smaller industries were awarded defense and other governmental contracts and many of the smaller businesses were aided through the assistance provided by the Small Business Administration. All of this had as its end result the creation of more employment in the First Congressional District and the continuation of a normal economy.

Although the principal function of a Member of Congress is to devote himself to legislation benefiting the United States in general and his own district in particular, he also represents the constituents of his district in their relationship with the Federal Government.

During this session of Congress, my office has processed literally thousands of requests for assistance in this field. We have handled matters relating to social security, veterans' affairs, immigration, watershed problems, small business, area redevelopment, military academies, post offices, and farm problems—to mention but a few. I have been fortunate, too, in receiving expressions of opinion on pending legislation before the Congress from thousands of constituents. This has been most helpful in aiding me in obtaining the views of the citizens of the First District and in focusing my attention on matters of particular import to individuals, businesses, and corporations of the area.

An office has been maintained with a full-time staff in both Washington and Camden for the servicing of the constituency and the solution of the problems presented. Without exception, the correspondence addressed to either the Camden or Washington office has been answered and it is my hope that all citizens received efficient, prompt, and courteous attention.

In closing, this report, I wish to express my appreciation to the people of the First Congressional District for the honor of serving them as their Representative in both the 86th and 87th Congresses.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God and the God of their succeeding race: As the hour draws near when the last words will be said and this people's temple of governance will be left empty and silent, as the tumult and the shouting dies and the captains of legislative authority depart, we come with the fervent prayer in our hearts:

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

May those who here in the exercise of their public stewardship have spoken and acted according to their conscience and convictions, having followed flickering lights in darkened times, cling not to any vain regrets. As the sands of the session run out, we know that what is written is written, as there comes the final entry in another volume of the Republic's history.

Grant the deep desire of Thy servants that in Thy wisdom Thou wilt overrule what has been done unworthily or done amiss, and forgive for what has been left undone.

And now may the Lord bless you and keep you, may the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you, may the Lord lift the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace—peace in your own hearts, peace in the dear land where still burns freedom's holy light, and peace throughout all the earth to men of good will.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 11, 1962, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR INSERTIONS IN RECORD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the Record following the adjournment of Congress until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had thought the Senate had acted yesterday on the nominations on the Executive Calendar. But if that was not the case, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the Record, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the Record, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR BUTLER, SENATOR BUSH, AND SENATOR MURPHY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the other side of the aisle three distinguished Senators are retiring this year. I should like to say a few words about each of them and I do so because of my respect and liking for them.

The distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler] will have served 12 years in this body, when his term expires on January 3, next. He has been a most conscientious, most diligent, and most effective Senator for the interests of his State. It will be with sorrow that we shall see him depart, because we shall miss the many contributions he has made as a Member of this body.

The distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush] is likewise retiring voluntarily, and is returning to his State to live—where, I am sure, he will still make many contributions, not only on behalf of the people of the Nation whom he has so ably represented during the years, but also on behalf of the State in which he resides. He has been an effective member of the committees to which he has been assigned. He has made many contributions to the welfare of his State, and has been a stalwart Senator in behalf of the best interests of the Nation. We shall miss him, when he leaves this body.

The third Member on the other side of the aisle who is retiring is the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Murphy]. He has not been with us very long; but while he has served in this body, he has been effective and efficient; he has attended to his duties; and has tried to do the best he could—as all of us try—for the State he has so ably represented and for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, let me say that I, personally, will miss these three distinguished Senators, and I regret greatly their prospective departure. I wish them well in the years ahead, because they have served here well; their retirement is a loss to the Senate. They have earned the plaudits of all the Members of this body, because of the contributions they have made and because of the effectiveness of their work as Senators. The Senate wishes them the best of everything in the years ahead and we will always welcome their return.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING (for Mr. Wiley):

S. 3807. A bill for the relief of Pericles Ioanis Zombolas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3808. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949, to increase the maximum amount of relocation payments to be made to a business concern displaced by an urban renewal project and to provide a method for ascertaining the amount of such payments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3809. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the original "Armory Show of 1913" of New York City, N.Y.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McNAMARA (for Mr. Yarborough) (by request):

S. 3810. A bill for the relief of Filomeno B. Kasilag and Erlinda Lucero Kasilag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S.J. Res. 238. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a Commission on the Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

TWO-YEAR REVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES DURING 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from now until November the achievements or failures of this Congress are likely to be measured by the inaccurate yardstick of partisan politics. A lasting evaluation will not come until history has sifted the record. That this record may be accurate, I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the Record and a summary and digest be printed as a Senate document, as is customary.

I want to express, at this time, my deep appreciation to the Members of the Senate for the restraint, cooperation, and help which they have seen fit to extend to the leadership in these 2 trying years. The leadership has done what it could to secure a fair consideration of the administration's program and to lighten the immense burdens of the Presidency, bearing in mind at the same time the separate constitutional functions of the Congress. As I have said, the successes and failures of this Congress—and there have been both—will be seen in accurate perspective only through the lenses of history. But I am inclined to think, Mr. President, that whatever they may be, both might have been registered more expeditiously. It may well be that there is a need for some soul searching as to the efficacy of some of our procedures and the abuses to which they sometimes lend themselves. For we have, all of us, a responsibility to contribute to the preservation of the constitutional vitality of the Senate and the Congress and public confidence in the legislative branch of the Government of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Metcalf in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement presented by Mr. Mansfield is as follows:

Statement of Majority Leader Mike Mansfield

The gavel is about to fall and the 87th Congress pass into history. For the first time in 6 years both the legislative and the executive branches of the Government were controlled by the same political party. In addition, new leadership teams were chosen for both the Senate and the House.

If this Congress had passed no measure other than the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, it may well have won a role among the most significant Congresses of American history. This measure, passed with strong bipartisan support, opens the way for a more unified West. Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, had this to say: "The passage of the bill is a signal achievement of the administration and the Congress during the present session." Senator JAVITS, of New York, said: "* * * the Congress is to be congratulated on producing a measure which * * * represents the most signal achievement since the establishment of the European Economic Community. * * *" As stated by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, passage of this bill marks "the prospect of the first meaningful partnership in history between the Old World and the New." Senator MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, described it as a "forward-looking and far-reaching bill which faces up to the challenges of a rapidly changing world, a world in which yesterday's formulas are no longer adequate for today's problems."

But this was not the only accomplishment. Not in many, many years has so much been asked of a Congress and so much delivered.

This is the Congress that made the decision, requested by the President, to embark upon the venture to the moon and voted a record budget of $5.4 billion to get us on the way.

It did not neglect to keep a sharp eye on its domestic economy. At the same time, it sought to maintain a strong defense by voting the largest peacetime defense appropriation in our history.

This is the Congress that inaugurated the Peace Corps—a measure not only daringly new but of such promise that when it came up for renewal in the second session, Members who had opposed its creation were among its strongest supporters.

This Congress acted to strengthen the Defense Establishment. But it also revealed its farsightedness and its desire for a lessening of international tension by initiating a measure to establish a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, to assume responsibility within the Government for directing and coordinating disarmament matters.

This Congress did more in the domestic field to meet the challenges posed by automation—particularly the problem of displacement of skilled workers by machines—than any other Congress in history. This is the Congress that enacted the area redevelopment bill so the skills of American men and women would not be wasted and their economic livelihood wrecked because of technological advances and social change. Area redevelopment is a means of avoiding this. America must not squander its most precious resource—its own citizens.

With the area redevelopment program underway, Congress then moved into the field of manpower retraining by authorizing a 3-year, $435 million program of training unemployed workers in vocational schools or on-the-job retraining to help them develop new skills and trades.

This Congress raised the minimum wage level to $1.25 an hour. It authorized a $3 million Federal grant program to aid in establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families.

A Democratic Congress ready to take action when a recession threatens the country recently authorized an appropriation of $900 million to initiate and accelerate Federal public works projects, and to provide Federal assistance for a similar expansion of local public works, to relieve unemployment and spur economic expansion in those areas of the country which have failed to share fully in the economic gains of the recovery from the 1960–61 recession. This measure will strengthen the economy and provide a greater measure of economic security to the unemployed.

This is the Congress that created three new national parks—Cape Cod National Seashore, Padre Island in Texas, and Point Reyes in California. There is a universal recognition of the need for more recreational facilities. The creation of these parks will help respond to this need.

This Congress has passed the most comprehensive housing bill in our Nation's history, keeping in mind, particularly, elderly and lower income groups.

With the enactment of the communications satellite bill, the 87th Congress moved quickly to maintain this Nation's lead in peacetime communications through space.

After six failures in previous Congresses, this Congress approved the proposition of a constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax which has been submitted to the States for ratification.

This Congress, on the heels of the thalidomide tragedy, passed legislation to regulate—even more carefully—the manufacture, distribution, and use of prescription drugs in an effort to avert such tragedies in American homes.

This Congress has enacted an omnibus farm bill designed to curb wheat and feed grain surpluses by setting up pilot programs to find other income-producing uses for cropland and expanding the Government's authority to make long-term dollar loans to foreign countries to purchase our surpluses. The bill establishes the administration's system of two prices for wheat. Wheat for domestic consumption and export will be supported at $2 a bushel; wheat for feed will be supported at a lower price, pegged in part on the support price for corn.

This Congress also responded to the long-felt need of professional groups and the self-employed to establish means of financial security upon retirement by passing H.R. 10, a bill granting tax deductions for contributions to pension funds.

Three more firsts in our resources area have been charted by establishing a long-term program of oceanographic and Great Lakes research to promote commerce and navigation; by Senate passage of a bill to promote Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation by authorizing $50 million for grants to States over a 5-year period to assist them in a long-range planning program; and by Senate passage of a bill establishing the National Wilderness System to preserve our wilderness areas.

For the first time, this Congress enacted a long-range foreign aid program, and to meet the needs of the Western Hemisphere established the Alliance for Progress. The goals and purposes of the Alliance include an accelerated rate of economic growth, a more equitable distribution of national income, economic diversification, the elimination of adult illiteracy by 1970, and the provision of at least 6 years of schooling for each child, substantial improvement of health conditions, increase in low-cost housing, and progress toward economic integration. Broad bipartisan support by this Congress was given to the President by approving a joint resolution on Cuban policy.

In these 2 years the President has sent down 50 messages containing a hundred or more major legislative recommendations. During the 2 years we have taken action on all but a few of these.

There have been disappointments. We failed to create a Department of Urban Affairs and the growing demands and needs of the residents of America's cities cannot and will not be fulfilled until such a Department is set up.

Two other administration recommendations which met defeat in this Congress were the proposed medicare program for our aged throughout the 50 States, who must be, and will be, taken care of; and the literacy test for voters in Federal elections.

Below is a brief description of our 2-year review highlights.

ECONOMIC AREA

Agriculture

1961

Omnibus farm bill: Enacted a major farm bill to reduce wheat and feed grain surpluses; authorized Secretary to consult with farmers, farm organizations, and other groups to develop new farm programs; extend the Agricultural Trade and Development Act to December 31, 1964; consolidated and modernized the Farmers Home Administration; extended the Wool Act for 4 years to March 31, 1965; extended Great Plains conservation program to December 31, 1971; authorized a 5-year extension of the school milk program to be paid by direct appropriations; and extended the Veterans' Administration and armed services milk program to 1964, with CCC furnishing the funds. Public Law 87–128.

Feed grains: Authorized a 1-year emergency price support for the 1961 crop of corn at $1.20 a bushel with the other feed grains to be supported at fair and reasonable levels in relation to corn, in an effort to raise the incomes of feed grain producers and to reduce the mounting surpluses of feed grains in Government hands. Public Law 87–5.

Drought relief: Enacted a temporary 1-year program authorizing the sale of Government surplus corn and feed grains to needy farmers and ranchers in drought areas at 75 percent of Government price-support levels and permitting grazing of livestock on grasslands idled by the soil bank and other conservation programs, or moving hay on these lands in or near drought areas. Public Law 87–127.

Farm loans: Increased proportion of appropriated farm loan funds available for individual farms with debt over $10,000 from 10 to 25 percent to help meet the rapid and increased cost of farming. Public Law 87–8.

Mexican farm labor: Extended and revised the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years, to December 31, 1963; prohibited infringement upon the rights of domestic workers. Public Law 87–345.

Cotton farmers' relief: Authorized emergency relief to cotton farmers where floods have made it impossible to plant. Public Law 87–37.

Farm credit: Liberalized farm credit laws to permit installment payments on Federal land bank loans to be scheduled more frequently than semiannually if desirable to the borrower; permit Federal land bank loans to be made to corporations set up by farming families (now restricted to persons); extend from 5 to 7 years the permissible maturity of intermediate-term loans; require in applying the earnings at the end of each fiscal year that one-half of 1 percent of the loans outstanding be held in reserve up to the accumulation of 3½ percent of the outstanding loans. Public Law 87–343.

1962

Senate passed two farm bills during the 2d session of the 87th Congress. The first bill, S. 3225, with two exceptions was very much like the second farm bill which has been enacted into law. The two exceptions were the provisions relating to price supports and production controls for feed grains. (S. 3225—was killed in the House.)

Second farm bill: As enacted this bill has four major titles, which contain numerous innovations as aids to reducing farm surpluses and solving agricultural problems by providing for a new permanent supply-management wheat program, a 1-year extension of present feed grain program and replacing the 1958 corn law with a provision effective in 1964 permitting the Secretary to set price supports for corn between 50 and 90 percent of parity and expansion of surplus disposal under Public Law 480. Includes a new land-use-adjustment program to take land out of production and divert its use to recreational and public purposes. Public Law 87-703.

Sugar Act extension: Extended to December 31, 1966, the Sugar Act of 1948 and set new quotas for domestic and foreign sugar producing areas. Public Law 87-535.

Sugar—Western Hemisphere: Reserved 150,000 tons of premium-priced sugar for Latin American supplies for 1963 and 1964, and 75,000 for balance of 1962. Public Law 87-539.

International Wheat Act extension: Extends International Wheat Agreement of 1949 to implement the International Wheat Agreement ratified in 1962, by authorizing the President, acting through Commodity Credit Corporation, to make available wheat and wheat flour at prices necessary to exercise the rights, obtain the benefits, and fulfill obligations of United States. Public Law 87-632.

Farmers Home Administration loans: Raised the annual limitation on Farmers Home Administration insured loans from $150 million to $200 million. These farm ownership loans made to families with a farm background and experience or training to help them buy, enlarge, or develop farms and to refinance debts. Public Law 87-749.

Textile imports: Authorized the President, for the purpose of carrying out any agreement under section 204 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1956, to limit imports of any agricultural commodity or product covered by such agreement from countries not participating in the agreement, if, in his judgment, such imports would seriously affect domestic producers. Public Law 87-488.

Migrant farmworkers' health clinics: Authorized a $3 million a year, 3-year program in Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families. Public Law 87-692.

Wheat: Deferred the final date for the proclamation of the 1963 crop wheat-marketing quotas and acreage allotments and deferred the final date for the referendum on 1963 crop-marketing quotas until July 25, 1963. Public Law 87-485.

Wheat: Extended the above law for proclamation of the 1963 crop wheat-marketing quotas and acreage allotments and the referendum on the 1963 crop-marketing quotas from July 25, 1962, to August 31, 1963. Public Law 87-540.

Wheat: Enacted a measure correcting an inequity in the Agricultural Act of 1961 relating to the withdrawal of wheat stored to avoid penalty. Public Law 87-410.

Wheat: Extended to June 15, 1962, the time for proclaiming 1963 wheat-marketing quota and national acreage allotment. Public Law 87-450.

Cotton disposal: Provided for disposal of all extra-long-staple cotton in the strategic stockpile by transferring domestic cotton to the CCC for unrestricted use at not less than 115 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges, and foreign cotton for export only at not less than the world price. Public Law 87-548.

Cotton farmers: Extended for 1 year an emergency measure enacted last year to bring relief to cotton farmers whose land has been and is unplantable because of recent floods or whose plantings have been washed out. Public Law 87-446.

Diverted acreage: Authorized production in 1962 of flax, castor beans, guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, and other annual field crops not surplus on acreage diverted from wheat and feed grains; authorized payment up to 50 percent of the amount the producer would receive if acreage were devoted to conservation uses. Public Law 87-451.

Feed grains: Liberalized requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program by permitting farmers to plant barley on land taken out of wheat production and make barley interchangeable with other feed grains. Public Law 87-425.

Rice acreage: Enacted a measure providing for the transfer of rice acreage history where the producer has withdrawn from rice production. Public Law 87-412.

Crop insurance: Increased from 100 to 150 the number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year. (S. 2859—House Calendar.)

Wet lands—Drainage: Prescribed methods and procedures for approval of agreements to furnish financial and technical assistance for agricultural drainage. Public Law 87-732.

Forest management: Doubled the authorization under the Cooperative Forest Management Act which furnishes technical assistance to small forest and woodlot owners. Public Law 87-680.

Federal Extension Service: Authorized funds appropriated in excess of the 1962 funds to be distributed on the basis of an equalized formula for the first 20 percent. Public Law 87-749.

Forestry research: Authorized matching grants for forestry research to land-grant colleges, agricultural experiment stations, other colleges and universities offering graduate training in sciences basic to forestry and having a forestry school. Public Law 87-788.

Alaska: Authorized $1,250,000 to aid agricultural producers in Alaska to carry out farmland development measures. (S. 2805.)

General economy

1961

Federal unemployment compensation: Authorized Federal advances to permit the States to extend unemployment benefits up to an additional 13 weeks for workers who have exhausted their regular benefits during the recession, thus providing an unemployed worker with benefits up to a total of 39 weeks—in an effort to ease the unemployment problem throughout the country. Public Law 87-62.

Aid to dependent children: Authorized a 14-month program, from May 1, 1961, through June 1962 of aid to dependent children—permitting States to aid needy parents and their children who are not now eligible for aid in which the Federal Government participates; and increased by $3 the minimum amount to which the Federal Government will participate on a matching basis in State programs carrying out the special medical care provision for recipients of old-age assistance. Public Law 87-31.

Railroad unemployment compensation: Approved benefits of a similar nature for unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Public Law 87-7.

Railroad retirees: To bring the railroad retirees in line with the beneficiaries of social security, this amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act permits men without 30 years' service to receive reduced annuities upon reaching age 62; and reduces from 3 to 1 year the required time which must elapse after marriage before a wife or husband, otherwise qualified, may receive the annuity. Public Law 87-285.

Minimum wage: Increased minimum wage to $1.25 (from $1) and extended coverage to 3.6 million additional workers. Public Law 87-30.

Area redevelopment: Established the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce, and authorized a 4-year program of $300 million in loans and $94 million in grants for industrial plants and public facilities in economically distressed areas. Public Law 87-27.

Social security: Increased minimum old-age insurance benefits and benefits to widows under the Social Security Act; provided reduced benefits to men at 62; liberalized disability provisions; increased tax for workers and employers by one-eighth of 1 percent; increased (for 1 year) the amount of public assistance payments for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Public Law 87-64.

Housing Act of 1961: Enacted a housing program, authorizing $4.9 billion in new funds. The act provides for a new 2-year experimental plan of low-interest rate, 35-year mortgage loans for middle-income housing (except in hardship cases the mortgages may be extended to 40 years); requires a 3-percent downpayment on low-income housing, with a permissive inclusion of settlement costs; authorizes $75 million for mass transportation systems, and $50 million for "open space" grants; and includes a reauthorization of approximately 100,000 public housing units. Public Law 87-70.

FHA: Increased by $1 billion the mortgage insurance authorization of FHA. Public Law 87-38.

Federal Aid Highway Act: Enacted the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961, revising the original estimated authorization for 41,000-mile, 13-year program of interstate highways by increasing the Federal Government's share from $25 billion to $37 billion; extended for 2 years the incentive bonus for States to enter into agreements for billboard controls. Public Law 87-61.

Federal Airport Act extension: Extended the Federal Airport Act for 3 years to, June 30, 1964, and authorized a total appropriation of $225 million, or $75 million annually. Public Law 87-255.

Small business loans: Increased by $20 million the amount that the Small Business Administration may commit for loans under their regular business loan program, which will enable SBA to continue its loan program without interruption for approximately 1 month. Public Law 87-198.

Small business amendments: Increased SBA's revolving fund by $105 million which, in addition to the $20 million approved in Public Law 87-198, increases the total SBA revolving fund to $1,125 million. Public Law 87-305.

Small Business Investment Act: Increased limit on amounts Small Business Administration may lend small business investment corporations and on latter's investments in individual enterprises. Public Law 87-341.

ICC loans: Extended for 27 months (to June 30, 1963) authority of Interstate Commerce Commission to make loans to help ease the credit difficulties of railroads. Public Law 87-16.

Small towns and rural counties: Established a 20-member bipartisan Commission on Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties to study and investigate Federal policies and programs relating to the economic needs and problems of these areas. (S. 1869.)

Water pollution control: Authorized an additional $270 million to help communities construct sewage treatment plants to control water pollution, thus raising the annual limit on grants from $50 million yearly to $80 million for fiscal 1962, $90 million for fiscal 1963, $100 million for fiscal 1964, through and including 1967. In addition, this measure increased from $3 to $5 million the annual Federal matching grants to States to administer water pollution control programs and extended the program through June 30, 1968, and authorized $5 million a year for the Secretary to use to develop demonstration program to treat sewage, to measure pollutants, and to evaluate the effects of sewage treatment. Public Law 87–88.

Debt limit: Increased the public debt limit by $13 billion to $298 billion through June 30, 1962. Public Law 87–69.

Lead-zinc subsidy: Aided the domestic lead-zinc industry by authorizing a 4-year program of stabilization payments for small mineowners—75 percent for lead and 55 percent for zinc of the difference between 14½ cents a pound and the market price whenever the market falls below 14½ cents. Public Law 87–347.

Mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska: Authorized construction of the Mid-State reclamation project in Nebraska and provided for its inclusion in the Missouri River Basin project. Estimated cost is $81,467,000, repayable within the 40-year contract period. (S. 970.)

Illinois River: Authorized a $58 million project to improve and deepen the channel of the Kaskaskia River in Illinois to enable coal producers to transport coal by barges at reduced rates to permit competitive market pricing. (S. 520.)

1962

Manpower retraining: Authorized a 3-year, $435 million, program of training of unemployed in vocational schools or on-the-job retraining to develop new skills; first 2 years' cost to be paid with Federal funds, third year 50–50 matching with the States. Public Law 87–415.

Work Hours Act: Provided for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time and a half for overtime after an 8-hour day or 40-hour week. Public Law 87–581.

Accelerated public works program: Authorized the President to allocate $900 million for job-creating public works projects in areas where there is heavy unemployment, the funds to be allocated to Federal agencies for acceleration or initiation of authorized projects. Public Law 87–658.

Public debt: Enacted a $2 billion temporary increase in the public debt—from $298 billion to $300 billion (to June 30, 1962). Public Law 87–414.

Tax revision: Enacted a major revision and reform of our Federal tax system which would (1) permit a business to claim a tax credit up to 7 percent (3 percent in the case of certain utilities) of the price of newly purchased business equipment, but requires a businessman to reduce his tax reductions for the depreciation of an item if he claims the investment credit at time of purchase; (2) tighten the allowable tax deductions on business expense accounts; (3) legalize tax reductions for lobbying expenses directly relating to appearances before and communications with any legislative body or individual legislator providing this affects the taxpayer's business; (4) continue the current deferral privileges for manufacturing subsidiaries of controlled foreign corporations, but would tax earnings of nonmanufacturing subsidiaries unless they were located in an underdeveloped country and their earnings put back into an underdeveloped nation; (5) impose on U.S. citizens who are bona fide residents of foreign countries a tax on income in excess of $20,000 in the first 3 years of residence abroad and in excess of $35,000 thereafter; (6) increase taxes on earnings of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks, which are now largely tax exempt; and (7) require that corporations and financial institutions report to the taxpayer and to the Government any dividend, interest, or patronage dividend payments of $10 or more. (H.R. 10650.) Public Law 87– .

Tax changes: Permitted an employer to claim tax deductions for his contributions to employee pension plans which include medical care among their retirement benefits; broadened the allowable individual tax deductions for medical expenses; permitted oil companies, for 1962 only, to deduct drilling costs on tax returns in 1 year rather than claim them as depreciation over several years; and required a State or local government operating retail liquor stores to buy only one $54 Federal liquor tax stamp a year instead of one for each store. (H.R. 10620.) Public Law 87– .

Tax Rate Extension Act of 1962: Extended for 1 year the existing corporate tax rate and certain excise tax rates, while reducing or eliminating taxes on the transportation of persons. Public Law 87–508.

Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962: Authorized an additional $100 million (to $225 million) for the existing program of direct loans to provide housing for the elderly. Established a new program for rural areas and authorized $50 million for loans to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies to build rental housing for the elderly and related facilities such as dining halls and infirmaries. The new plan to be administered by the Farmers Home Administration includes $50 million loan fund to help elderly persons purchase an existing home or housing site. Public Law 87–723.

Foreign bank deposits: To help slow the U.S. gold outflow, removed for a period of 3 years the Federal Reserve Board's present ceiling—which ranges up to 4 percent, varying with the duration of a deposit—on interest rates paid by U.S. commercial banks on time deposits of foreign governments, their central banks or other monetary authorities, and international institutions of which the United States is a member. (H.R. 12080.) Public Law 87– .

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962: Authorized a total of $2.3 billion for fiscal years 1963–65 to continue the Federal-aid highway program for the regular system; for additional amounts for roads on Federal lands; for completion of the Rama Road in Nicaragua, the Inter-American Highway in Central America and Panama; and for relocation payments for families and businesses displaced by acquisition or clearance of rights-of-way for Federal-aid highways. Authorized a new category of public lands development roads and trails for important roads on the public domain. Permits use of secondary highway funds for roads on that system located in urban areas. Promotes cooperative transportation planning in certain urban areas by Federal, State, and local authorities; and permits the use of additional Federal-aid funds for highway planning and research. (H.R. 12135.) Public Law 87– .

Public debt limit increase: Provided for a temporary debt limit of $308 billion through March 31, 1963, and $305 billion from April 1, 1963, through June 24, 1963, and $300 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963. Public Law 87–512.

SBA amendments: Increased the Small Business Administration's revolving fund ceiling to $1,666 million. Of the $1,666 million authorized, $1,325 million will be used for regular business and disaster loans. Earmarks a separate fund of $341 million for loans to small business investment companies. Public Law 87–550.

Customs simplification: Reclassified the U.S. tariff schedule to adapt the classifications to the changes which have occurred since 1930 in the character and importance of articles produced in and imported into the United States and in the markets in which they are sold. Public Law 87–456.

Export controls: Extended for 3 years the Export Control Act of 1949 which authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail exportation from the United States certain articles because of security reasons or because they are in short supply. Strengthened the criminal provisions and provided for a fine of five times the value of exports involved in a willful exporting of certain materials with knowledge that it will be used for benefit of any Communist-dominated nation and/or 5 years' imprisonment. Public Law 87–515.

Mobile trade fairs: Authorized the Secretary of Commerce to provide technical assistance, as well as limited financial aid, to operators of mobile trade fairs which have value in promoting sale abroad of American goods and products. (S. 3389.) Public Law 87– .

Self-employed voluntary pension plans: Encouraged establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed professionals by permitting them to set aside up to $2,500 or 10 percent of their income, whichever is lesser, in an approved retirement program and permits them to deduct from taxable income up to a maximum of $1,250 in any one year for contributions to the fund. Public Law 87–792.

Civil service retirees: Provided a 5-percent increase, effective January 1, 1963, to all entitled annuitants on that date. Public Law 87–793.

Retirement income credit: Increased to $1,524 from $1,200 the maximum annual amount a retired person can subtract from his tax payment. (H.R. 6371.) Public Law 87– .

District of Columbia police and firemen: Provided for an average salary increase of 11.6 percent for policemen and firemen. (S. 3705.) Public Law 87– .

Missouri River Basin project: Authorized the Department of Interior to defer the collection of operation and maintenance charges due in 1962 from the Angostura Irrigation District to ease the financial problem in that area resulting from decreased crop production caused by droughts. Public Law 87–440.

Federal Reserve banks: Extended to June 30, 1964, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury—up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time. Public Law 87–506.

Lumber research: Enacted a bill designed to assist the domestic lumber industry by devoting half of the lumber import duties to Government research on lumber production and marketing. (S. 3517.)

Metal scrap—Temporary suspension of duties: Continues to June 30, 1963, the duty-free importation of certain metal scraps, including iron, steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel alloys. Public Law 87–514.

Alumina and bauxite—Duty free: Continued to July 16, 1964, suspension of duty on alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum, crude bauxite, and calcined bauxite. Public Law 87–567.

Duty suspension—Shoe lathes: Continues to August 7, 1964, existing suspension of duties on shoe lathes. Public Law 87–607.

Spun silk—Suspension of duties: Continues to November 7, 1965, existing suspension of duties on spun silk or schappe silk yarn. Public Law 87–602.

Casein—Duty free: Because of severe shortage in this country casein used in the manufacture of coated paper, adhesives, emulsions, plastics, paints, and fibers is transferred to the duty-free list. Public Law 87–606.

Stained glass—Duty free: Authorized Secretary of Treasury to admit duty free, stained glass, prefabricated panels and other items imported for use in certain churches. Public Law 87–572.

Coconut and palm oils: Suspended to June 30, 1966, the processing tax on coconut and palm oils. (H.R. 5260.) (Public Law 87– .

Bicycles: Provided a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles to preclude middleweights from coming in as lightweights. (H.R. 8938.) Public Law 87- .

Corkboard—Duties: Provided a temporary suspension of duties on corkboard, waterproofed cloth, and other items. (H.R. 12213—in conference.)

Design protection: Granted protection against copying original designs. (S. 1884.)

Disasters: Authorized taxpayers in any disaster area declared as such by the President of the United States to charge off their casualty losses on the preceding year's tax return when the disaster happens after January 1 and before the time prescribed by law for filing their income tax returns. Public Law 87–426.

Unpatented mining claims: Granted Secretary of Interior discretionary authority to alleviate hardships by permitting persons who reside on mining claims and were in possession at least 7 years prior to July 23, 1962, to continue to maintain this residence as a home even though the claim has been invalidated or relinquished. (S. 3451.) Public Law 87- .

Copyright extension: Continued through December 31, 1965, the renewal term of any copyright subsisting on the date of approval of this measure where the renewal term would otherwise expire prior to December 31, 1965. Public Law 87–668.

War claims: Authorized payments to Americans who lost property abroad during World War II and permitted the Government to sell General Aniline & Film Corp. seized during the war as German owned. (H.R. 7283.) Public Law 87- .

Real estate loans: Increased the aggregate real estate loan limitation from 60 to 70 percent of a bank's time and savings deposits. Public Law 87–717.

Consumer finance companies: Excluded certain lending companies engaged in the consumer finance business from the personal holding company tax. Public Law 87–768.

Witness per diem increase: Increased per diem of witnesses in a court proceeding, or required to appear before a U.S. commissioner or before a person authorized to take a deposition from $4 to $6 a day; increased mileage fee to 10 cents and subsistence to $10 a day. (S. 2949.)

Savings-and-loan loans on apartment houses: Authorized federally insured savings and loan associations to invest more of their assets in apartment buildings. Existing law requires these associations to include apartment loans with certain other loans in a group which cannot exceed 20 percent of their assets. This act allows the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to authorize them to invest up to 15 percent of their assets in apartment loans. Public Law 87–779.

Trade and communications economy

1961

Foreign trade: Expanded Commerce Department services to importers and exporters and accelerates programs to promote foreign trade. (S. 1729.)

Ship trade-ins: Liberalized the law regarding obsolete trade-ins by authorizing the Federal Maritime Commission to take trade-ins either when the owner signs the contract for construction or purchase of a new vessel or (at the owner's option) within 5 days of the delivery date of the new vessel. Public Law 87–401.

Dual-rate shipping: Permanently legalized the operation of steamship conferences and dual systems of contracts for shippers and strengthened the antimonopoly provisions. Public Law 87–34.

Steamship operators: Authorized steamship operators under subsidy contracts to use part of their required reserve for research and planning. Public Law 87–271.

Broadcasting: Liberalized antitrust law to validate certain contracts for television broadcasting of professional sports games. Public Law 87–331.

Duty-free allowance: Reduced the duty-free exemption from $500 to $100 through June 30, 1963, to counter our unfavorable balance of payments. Public Law 87–132.

AEC sales: Accelerated property sales to stimulate the economic growth of atomic energy communities. Public Law 87–174.

Metal scrap: Extended to June 30, 1962, the existing suspension of import duties on metal scrap. Public Law 87–110.

Corporate excise extension: Extended for an additional year the existing 52-percent corporate income tax rate, excise tax rates on automobiles, liquor, and tobacco, and taxes on local telephone calls and passenger transportation, thus preventing a loss of revenue of some $2.5 billion. Public Law 87–72.

Clay and shale—Tax treatment: Permits miners of clay and shale to include as a depletion allowance the process of manufacturing brick and tile. Public Law 87–312.

Income-tax returns: Curbed tax evasion by assigning identifying numbers of all taxpayers. Public Law 87–397.

Unemployment tax credits: Prevented double taxation in the case of Federal and State unemployment taxes arising as a result of a technical deficiency in the Federal tax law. Public Law 87–321.

Federal savings and loan: Strengthened the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and the National Housing Act by increasing the reserves and cutting the overcapitalization of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation created as a reserve credit facility for savings and home mortgage credit institutions. Public Law 87–210.

1962

Trade Expansion Act of 1962: Gave the President general authority to cut all tariffs as much as 50 percent over the next 5 years; empowered him to remove tariffs as much as he believes desirable on products in which the United States and Western Europe account for most of the world trade; permitted the President to negotiate tariff reductions on entire categories of commodities instead of item by item as at present; established a new program of subsidies to serve as a substitute for tariff protection for workers and companies hurt by import competition; prohibited the United States from granting tariff concessions to Poland and Yugoslavia and eliminated present concessions to these nations; and removed the peril-point provision of present law which empowers the Tariff Commission to recommend minimum safe tariffs on specific items prior to international trade negotiations, and authorizes the Commission only to advise the President on the probable economic effect of any proposed trade agreement action. Public Law 87–794.

All-channel television receivers: Authorized Federal Communications Commission to require all television receivers shipped in interstate commerce or imported into the United States must, at the time of manufacture, be capable of adequately receiving all TV channels. Public Law 87–529.

Supplemental air carrier: Authorized the CAB to limit the number of supplemental carriers, to require performance books, and prescribe the minimum service which must be provided under a supplemental certificate. Public Law 87–528.

Alaska highway study: Authorized $800,000 for a study of Alaska highways with a report to Congress by May 15, 1963. (S.J. Res. 137—House Calendar.)

Alaska-Hawaii through routes: Established through routes and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States. Public Law 87–595.

Vessel loadlines: Established new loadline regulations for oceangoing and coastwise vessels with increased penalties for violations. Public Law 87–620.

Gas rates: Granting Federal Power Commission authority to suspend changes in gas-rate schedules covering sales for industrial use only. Public Law 87–454.

Maritime medical care: Restored to self-employed U.S. fishermen eligible for medical care in hospitals, outpatient clinics, and other medical facilities of the Public Health Service in the event of illness and injury incurred while engaged in their hazardous but essential occupation. (S. 367.)

Western Union: Eliminated from the Communications Act the requirement that Western Union divest itself of its international telegraph operations. (S. 3646.)

Patent interferences: Requires that all agreements settling patent interference proceedings be filed with the Patent Office. (H.R. 12513.) Public Law 87- .

Civil aircraft: To ease aircraft financing, this bill provided for recording security conveyances of interests in civil aircraft and making these records valid throughout the United States. (S. 2773.)

Fishermen taxation: Permits fishermen to file their declaration of estimated tax and paying the estimated tax by January 15 after the end of the year in question. This privilege will begin after tax years beginning December 31, 1962. Public Law 87–682.

Aircraft accidents: Provided express authority in the Federal Aviation Act to facilitate the investigation of aircraft accidents. (S. 962.) Public Law 87- .

Aircraft loan guarantees: Extended the aircraft guarantee loan program an additional 5 years to September 7, 1967, and increased the amount of the loans from $5 to $10 million except for all-cargo carriers—which amount is $15 million. (H.R. 10129—in conference.)

Railway Express: Exempted the Railway Express Agency, Inc, from the long- and short-haul rate provision of the Interstate Commerce Act. Public Law 87–707.

Intrastate motor carriers: Authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant the right to common motor carriers operating within a single State to engage in interstate, or foreign operations within the State. (S. 320.) Public Law 87- .

Vessel subsidy—Extension: Extended to July 7, 1965, authority to pay maximum of 55-percent subsidy for construction of vessels whose keels were laid after June 30, 1959. (H.R. 11586—in conference.)

Construction subsidized vessels: Permitted vessels built with construction differential subsidy to secure war-risk insurance coverage at their normal commercial value as determined by Secretary of Commerce. (S. 2829.)

Trademarks—Registration and protection: Broadened the provisions of the Trademark Act of 1946 relating to improper use of a mark to include instances where use would cause confusion; and clarified the administrative and court procedure. Public Law 87–772.

Contract carriers: Permitted contract motor carriers to be designated as carriers of bonded merchandise for purposes of the custom laws. (H.R. 5700.) Public Law 87- .

Railroads—Tax relief: Permitted any regulated transportation company to spread its net operating loss over 7 succeeding years in computing its taxable income. Public Law 87–710.

Potomac River compact: Granted congressional approval for the States of Maryland and Virginia to enter into the Potomac River compact which created the Potomac River Fisheries Commission to regulate taking seafood and fish from the Potomac between the District line and the Chesapeake Bay. Public Law 87–783.

Washington metropolitan transit compact: Granted congressional approval to four amendments adopted by Maryland and Virginia to the Washington metropolitan area transit regulation compact between Maryland, Virginia, and District of Columbia. One amendment enlarges the metropolitan area to include Dulles International Airport; all cities incorporated with the metropolitan district subsequent to the effective date of the compact are to become part of the metropolitan district; limits the jurisdiction of the Transit Commission to the metropolitan district; and provides for the submission of the annual report on a fiscal year basis instead of calendar year. Public Law 87-767.

DEFENSE AND SPACE EXPLORATION AREAS

1961

Ready Reserves: Granted authority, requested by the President, to call to active duty up to 250,000 ready reservists, authority to continue until July 1, 1962; and to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of Defense to extend enlistments, appointments, and other service obligations up to 12 months, which would otherwise expire on July 1, 1962. Public Law 87-117.

Alien enlistment: Authorized peacetime enlistments in the Army and Air Force by persons who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Public Law 87-143.

Military procurement: Authorized $12.4 billion procurement program for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for fiscal 1962. Public Law 87-53.

Military: Clarified the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Public Law 87-391.

Additional military procurement authorizations: As requested by the President, authorized additional funds to provide for additional equipment primarily to improve the nonnuclear defense capabilities of our ground forces and of the Navy and Air Force; to provide increased air and sea lift; and to expand our antisubmarine warfare program. The overall request for additional authorization for procurement of weapons, equipment, and ammunition was for $1,753 million; however, of this amount, additional authorizations are required only for $958,570,000. Public Law 87-118.

Military construction: Authorizes $831 million for construction and improvement projects at military bases at home and abroad, including missile sites and nuclear submarine bases. Public Law 87-57.

Aeronautics and Space Council: Reactivated and strengthened the usefulness of the Aeronautics and Space Council, and provided that it be administered by the Vice President. Public Law 87-26.

NASA authorization: Authorized $1,784,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. Public Law 87-98.

Civil aviation insurance: Extended until 1966, for 5 years, title XII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to provide that in the event of war the Nation's civil air fleet would have adequate insurance coverage for war risks. Public Law 87-89.

War hazards: Increased monthly disability and death compensation payable under the War Hazards Compensation Act. Public Law 87-380.

Military: Amended the Uniform Code of Military Justice to provide specific authority for prosecution of bad check offenses. Public Law 87-385.

Marine Corps: Improved the combat effectiveness of the Marine Corps by providing for the expanded assignment of supply-duty-only officers to unrestricted duty. Public Law 87-123.

Emergency evacuation: Provided for advances in pay to Armed Forces personnel in cases of emergency evacuation of dependents from oversea areas. Public Law 87-188.

Coast Guard—Temporary appointments: Extended to January 1, 1964, the authority of the President to make temporary appointments in the Coast Guard, or until such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the number of officers holding permanent appointments on the active list of the Coast Guard is equal to 95 percent of the number authorized by law. Public Law 87-257.

AEC authorization: Authorized $270,440,000 for a total of 40 new AEC projects including the Stanford linear electron accelerator and electric generating facilities. Public Law 87-315.

AEC omnibus amendments: Enacted numerous amendments to the AEC Act designed to provide a better framework and to help us keep pace with emerging developments in atomic energy. Amendments included the transfer of 3 kilograms of plutonium and 500 grams of uranium 233 to the International Atomic Energy Agency to aid in the prestige of the LAEA as a center for distribution of special nuclear materials, and the transfer of 8 additional kilograms of plutonium and 30 kilograms of uranium 233 to Euratom for research purposes and to help start an experimental plan for reprocessing fuel elements. Public Law 87-206.

Air Force promotions: Provided a temporary program through June 30, 1963, for promotion for all active duty Air Force officers below the grade of colonel. Public Law 87-194.

Reserves: Provides more flexible regulations regarding terms of enlistment in the National Guard to make service in that unit more attractive, and other changes include making ROTC graduate training program run from 3 to 6 months at the discretion of the service Secretary. Public Law 87-378.

1962

Ready Reserves: Gave President standby authority to call 150,000 military reservists to active duty if an international crisis should require it. Public Law 87-736.

Berlin resolution: Approved a concurrent resolution putting Congress on record for any action, including the use of military force, needed to uphold Western rights in Berlin. Adopted unanimously by both Houses.

Cuban resolution: Approved a resolution on Cuba stating the United States will use force if necessary to halt the spread of communism in this hemisphere. Public Law 87-733.

Military procurement: Authorized $12,969,300,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels during fiscal 1963. Public Law 87-436.

Military construction authorization: Authorized $1,455,672,500 for construction and related authority for the military departments and the Department of Defense. Public Law 87-554.

Space authorization: Authorized $3.7 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1963. Public Law 87-584.

Communications satellite system: Established Communications Satellite Corporation, subject to Government regulation, to plan and operate with foreign governments and businesses a commercial communications satellite system. Public Law 87-624.

AEC authorization: Authorized appropriations of $242,695,000 for AEC construction projects; of this amount $159,415,000 was authorized for 42 new projects; authorized AEC to contract with Washington Public Power Supply System for sale of byproduct steam under certain conditions and for construction of electric generating facilities in connection with AEC's atomic reactor in Hanford, Wash. Act stipulates that sale of Hanford steam must provide a substantial financial return to the Treasury, any modification of the reactor for utilization of the steam must be paid by the purchaser of the steam, and the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee must be given an opportunity to review the contract before the Government signs it. If these and other conditions are not met, the steam cannot be sold. Public Law 87-701.

AEC amendments: Amended Atomic Energy Commission Act of 1954 by authorizing establishment of one or more atomic safety and licensing boards; provided Government indemnity coverage for oversea nuclear accidents involving contractors or subcontractors of AEC and limited oversea coverage to $100 million. Public Law 87-615.

Armed services procurement: Amends the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 controlling procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces and NASA—to encourage procurement by formal advertising; to obtain more competition in negotiated procurement; and to provide safeguards for the Government against inflated cost estimates in negotiated contracts. Public Law 87-653.

Quarters allowance for the military: Increased the basic quarters allowance for military career people, from corporal to general, in order to meet the increased cost of housing in the civilian market; and increased the housing allowance for dependents of temporary military personnel. Public Law 87-531.

Armed Forces travel expenses: Increased to $16 (now $12) a day the maximum per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence for members of the Armed Forces. Public Law 87-500.

Southern interstate nuclear compact: Granted congressional consent to southern interstate nuclear compact which will establish a regional agency, the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board, to develop and control peaceful uses of nuclear energy throughout the compact area. Public Law 87-563.

Army reorganization: Approved plan to reorganize the command and management structure of the Army. Effective February 17, 1962.

Public facility loans: Makes certain federally impacted areas in which there is located a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration eligible for a loan under the public facility loan program. Public Law 87-634.

Amorphous graphite: Extended to June 30, 1964, the present suspension of duties on amorphous graphite; the extension is necessary because the United States is dependent entirely upon imports of this type graphite for certain strategic items required by the Air Force. Public Law 87-497.

Defense production extension: Extended to June 30, 1964, the remaining powers of the President under the Defense Production Act of 1950, to establish priorities for defense contracts; power to allocate materials for defense purposes. Public Law 87-505.

Renegotiation Act extension: Extended to June 30, 1964, the authority of the Government to recapture excessive profits on certain Government contracts. Public Law 87-520.

Civil defense emergency authorities extended: Extended to June 30, 1966, the provision of title III of the Civil Defense Act which authorized the President to declare a national emergency for civil defense purposes and to assume emergency powers during such an emergency. Public Law 87-501.

Reserves—Lump-sum payments: Equalized the treatment between "Reserves" and "Regulars" by increasing the readjustment payments to 2 months' basic pay for each year of active duty for a Reserve member released after 5 years' active duty; and authorized maximum readjustment of 2 years' basic pay or $15,000, whichever is lesser. Public Law 87-509.

Armed Forces—Educational opportunities: Permitted qualified members of armed services and Public Health Service to accept, from nongovernmental sources, competitive fellowships, scholarships, or grants for educational purposes. Public Law 87-555.

World War I emergency officer retirement: Reopened the emergency officers' retirement program to permit a limited group of former World War I emergency officers to apply for and receive the benefits of that program. (H.R. 8517.) Public Law 87– .

Retired officers: Repealed the law which imposed a lifetime ban on retired Navy and Marine Corps officers selling supplies and war materials to the Navy Department. Public Law 87–777.

Service academies: Authorized Secretaries of Army and Air Force to appoint up to 250 additional cadets under the qualified alternate system; 95 percent to come from congressional sources. Purpose is to permit cadet corps at each academy to be at full strength at end of academic year immediately prior to graduation. (H.R. 7913—in conference.)

Nonjudicial punishment: Amended article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to give increased authority to designated commanders in the Armed Forces to impose nonjudicial punishment; the increased authority will enable them to deal with minor disciplinary problems and offenses without resort to trial by court-martial. Public Law 87–648.

Diplomatic radio stations: Granted authority to license a foreign government to operate low-power point-to-point radio stations in the District of Columbia to transmit messages to points outside the United States whenever the President considers it to be in the interest of national security. (H.R. 11732.) Public Law 87– .

INTERNATIONAL AREA

1961

Foreign assistance authorization: Authorized a total appropriation of $4,253,500,000 for fiscal 1962; a long-term (5 year) Development Loan Fund program authorizing an appropriation of $1.2 billion for fiscal 1962 and $1.5 billion for each fiscal year from 1963 to 1966; and established a new foreign aid agency. Public Law 87–195.

Latin American aid: Appropriated $600 million for Latin American aid program, which includes $100 million in disaster relief for Chile, $394 million for loans by the Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million for social and economic programs of the Organization of American States, and $100 million for loans and grants by the International Cooperation Administration. Public Law 87–41.

OECD: Ratified the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development consisting of 18 European member nations, the United States, and Canada, to promote economic stability and an orderly growth of the economies of the member states.

OECD—Permanent representation: Authorized the President to appoint, subject to Senate confirmation, a permanent representative of the United States to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and provided for the cost of U.S. participation in OECD including salaries of the American representative and his staff. (U.S. share is 25 percent of the OECD budget which will run to about $5 million annually.) (S. 2423.)

Battle Act revision: Strengthen U.S. policy abroad by authorizing the President to permit economic aid to Iron Curtain countries, except the Soviet Union and Communist-held areas of the Far East, when he considers it important to U.S. security. (S. 1215.)

Foreign bank tax exemption: Exempted foreign central banks from payment of taxes in this country on interest accrued from ownership of U.S. Government securities not used or held for commercial purposes. Public Law 87–27.

Peace Corps: Carried out the President's recommendation to establish a Peace Corps of American volunteers to carry America's skills and talents and idealism abroad to help other peoples to help themselves. The Peace Corps is designed to provide the framework through which America's idealism, her humanitarianism, and her generosity can find a personal expression in the task of helping to build with our own hands a better world for our mankind. Public Law 87–293.

Disarmament: Established a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament. Public Law 87–297.

U.S. Travel Service: Established a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to promote and encourage tourist travel from abroad. Public Law 87–63.

Surplus as aid: Authorized disposal of additional $2 billion in surplus commodities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. Public Law 87–27.

Sugar Act: Extended the Sugar Act of 1948 for 15 months to June 30, 1962, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers; and continuing the President's authority to exclude Cuban sugar imports and reallocate its quota. Public Law 87–15.

Agricultural aid: Authorized the administration to continue and expand the use of our agricultural abundance in helping needy people in the less-developed countries through development programs under title II of Public Law 480, Agricultural Trade Development Act. Public Law 87–92.

Alien Orphan Adoption Act: Made permanent and expanded the Alien Orphan Adoption Act which permits orphans adopted or to be adopted by U.S. citizens to enter the country on nonquota visas. Public Law 87–301.

Repatriation assistance: Enacted an emergency 1-year repatriation assistance program to provide temporary assistance to U.S. citizens and dependents of U.S. citizens returning from abroad without available resources. Aid can consist of money payments, medical care, temporary billeting, or other goods or services needed for the health and welfare of the recipients. Public Law 87–64.

Caribbean Organization: Authorized the President to accept on behalf of the United States the agreement establishing the Caribbean Organization; the participation of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the Organization; made available to the Organization the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act; and authorized the Secretary of State to appoint a U.S. observer to the Organization. (Organization is to concern itself with social, cultural, and economic matters of common interest to the Caribbean area.) Public Law 87–73.

Fulbright Act: Authorized legally classified American nationals to qualify and receive financial assistance under the Fulbright Act for advanced education abroad. Public Law 87–153.

Cultural exchange: Consolidated all cultural and educational exchange programs in an effort to promote these programs to a more important position in our foreign relations. The exchange programs combined are the Fulbright Act, the Smith-Mundt Act, the Finnish Debt Payments Act, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956. Public Law 87–256.

U.S. food reserve: Expressed an interest in exploring with other nations the possibility of establishing an international food and raw materials reserve under the United Nations and related international organizations to acquire and store in appropriate countries raw or processed farm products and other raw materials exclusive of minerals. (S. Res. 128.) Adopted June 1, 1961.

Export-Import Bank: Authorized Export-Import Bank to guarantee and insure U.S. exporters and importers against political and credit risks of loss in foreign countries. Public Law 87–311.

Red China: Expressed as the sense of the Congress that—

1. The United States should continue to support the Government of the Republic of China as the representative of China in the United Nations;

2. The United States shall continue to oppose seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the U.N. so long as that regime persists in defying the principles of the U.N. Charter; and

3. The American people support the President in not according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime.

International Finance Corporation amendment: Amended the charter of the IFC to allow purchase of capital stock to encourage private investment in underdeveloped countries by creating a wider flexibility of financing to meet the varying needs of private enterprise. Public Law 87–185.

Mercy fleet: Supported the establishment by the President of a White Fleet—a force of mercy ships to assist in disaster areas in any coastal region of the world, as well as to carry on a regular program of logistics support in the public health field and other works of technical assistance.

Inter-American Children's Institute: Continued U.S. participation in and contributions to the Inter-American Children's Institute. Public Law 87–365.

NATO: Extended through June 30, 1962, the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, a Commission established to explore means of increasing cooperation and unity of purpose among NATO countries. Public Law 87–116.

United States-France: Provided immediate effectiveness for atomic cooperation for mutual defense purposes between the United States and France. Public Law 87–363.

Loans to friendly nations: Authorized loan of naval vessels to certain friendly nations. Public Law 87–387.

1962

Foreign aid authorization: Authorized $1.2 billion in foreign aid for fiscal 1963 for development grants, investment guarantees, investment surveys, international organizations and programs, supporting assistance and the contingency fund, and $2.4 billion over a 4-year period for the Alliance for Progress, which includes $600 million for fiscal 1963. Public Law 87–565.

International Monetary Fund: Granted the Secretary of the Treasury standby authority to lend up to $2 billion to the International Monetary Fund so that 10 industrialized nations, including the United States, can participate in a special lending program. Public Law 87–490.

Peace Corps: Authorized $63,750,000 to finance the operations of the Peace Corps during fiscal 1963. (Forty million dollars was authorized last year but only $30 million appropriated.) Public Law 87–442.

U.N. bonds: Authorized an appropriation of $100 million for a loan to the U.N. on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis with other nations for the purchase of U.N. bonds to ease the financial crisis caused by the Congo. Public Law 87–731.

Migration and Refugee Assistance Act: Assists in the resettlement of refugees and escapees by authorizing the President to participate in three programs: contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM); contributions to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); and the U.S. escapee program (USEP). Establishes specific authority to assist Cuban refugees who have come to the United States. Public Law 87–510.

Philippine war damage claims: Authorized an appropriation of $73 million for unpaid balance of awards made to claimants under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; payments to be made only to claimants or their successors in interest; no new claims will be allowed. Public Law 87-616.

Naval Academy: Authorized admission of two citizens of Belgium to the Naval Academy on a reimbursable basis. Public Law 87-463.

Air Force Academy: Authorized admission of a citizen of Thailand to the Air Force Academy on a reimbursable basis. Public Law 87-462.

Military academies: Authorized appointment of a person from Guam, Virgin Islands, or American Samoa to each of the three military academies. Public Law 87-663.

Inter-American Development Bank: Authorized domestic insurance companies to invest in bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness of the Inter-American Development Bank. Public Law 87-739.

Ryukyu Islands: Increased from $6 to $12 million the authorization of funds for economic development in the Ryukyu Islands. Public Law 87-746.

World Food Congress: Authorized up to $300,000 to defray the expenses of organizing and holding a World Food Congress in the United States in June of 1963, to help combat the international problem of hunger and malnutrition. (S. 3679.) Public Law 87- .

Foreign Service Buildings Act: Authorized an appropriation of $53.9 million for a 2-year Foreign Service building construction and rehabilitation program abroad. (H.R. 11880—in conference.)

Copyrights-trademarks-films: Copyrights and trademarks vested under Trading With the Enemy Act authorized to be returned to entitled persons subject to certain vested rights; authorized transfer of vested motion picture films of Library of Congress. (H.R. 9045.) Public Law 87- .

Treaties

1961

Belgium treaty: Ratified a commercial treaty with Belgium to provide protection for property and interests of American citizens and companies in Belgium and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment in commercial, industrial, and financial activities, in return for like assurances in the United States.

Brazil: Ratified a treaty of extradition with Brazil.

Columbia River: Ratified a treaty between the United States and Canada for cooperative development of the Columbia River.

Geneva radio regulations: Ratified the Geneva radio regulations containing a number of provisions relating to the international regulation of radio communication to assist the United States in carrying out its scientific efforts in radio astronomy and space research.

German war bonds: Ratified a second agreement with Germany for the validation of East German dollar bonds to enable owners of these bonds to establish they were acquired from legitimate sources and not through Soviet sources in Berlin at close of World War II.

International Telecommunications Convention: Ratified Executive J which continues in effect the principal provisions of the International Telecommunications Convention to maintain and extend international cooperation of the improvement and rational use of telecommunications of all kinds.

Loadline: Ratified a modification to the International Load Line Convention.

Oil pollution: Ratified the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the High Seas by Oil.

Vietnam treaty: Ratified a commercial treaty with Vietnam to provide protection for property and interest of American citizens and companies in Vietnam and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to engaging in commercial, industrial, and financial activities, in return for like assurances in the United States.

Pollution of sea by oil: Implemented the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, which prohibits discharge of oil from tankers and imposes fines and penalties for violations. Public Law 87-167.

1962

Ratified a 3-year extension, to July 31, 1965, of the wheat agreement: The agreement, which supersedes a pact due to expire July 31, embraces 25 wheat importing countries and 10 exporters including the United States. (July 9, 1962.)

ICAO: Ratified an amendment to the International Civil Aviation Convention increasing the size of the ICAO Council from 21 to 27 members. (January 31, 1962.)

IAEA: Ratified amendment enlarging the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency from 23 to 25 members. (March 13, 1962.)

WMO: Ratified amendments to the World Meteorological Organization increasing the membership of the Executive Committee of the Organization and eliminating an inconsistency relative to voting on membership. (March 13, 1962.)

Tax treaty: Ratified a tax convention between the United States and Canada. (January 31, 1962.)

NAFC: Ratified a declaration of understanding to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention. (January 31, 1962.)

SOLAS Convention: Ratified the 1960 Safety of Life at Sea Convention which was signed by our Government and 39 other governments to promote maritime safety. (April 12, 1962.)

Luxembourg: Ratified a commercial treaty between the United States and Luxembourg to provide an agreed basis for protection of property and interests of American citizens and companies in Luxembourg with reciprocal rights for Luxembourg's citizens in the United States. (September 19, 1962.)

HEALTH AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

1961

National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor: Established a 15-member Council to advise the President and Congress on the operation of Federal law, regulations, programs, policies, and all other matters relating to migratory agricultural labor to provide a better understanding of conditions, needs, and long-range solutions of this problem. (S. 1132—House Calendar.)

Community health services: Expanded and improved community health services and facilities for the health care of the aged, construction of nursing homes, and training of public health personnel. Public Law 87-395.

Mass transit: Authorized a new $75 million program to help overcome commuting problems in cities; $25 million is authorized for demonstration grants (covering up to two-thirds of project cost) for projects to explore ways of overcoming mass transit problems; $50 million is authorized for low-interest loans to public bodies for acquiring, constructing, and improving transportation facilities and equipment. Public Law 87-70.

1962

Drugs: Strengthened Federal regulation under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide consumers with better, safer, and less expensive drugs. Public Law 87-781.

Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962: Authorized a 3-year program of special project grants to States and, with State approval, to local communities to pay part of the cost of intensive vaccination programs against four contagious diseases—polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. (H.R. 10541.) Public Law 87- .

Major disasters: Authorized assistance to be given by the Federal Government to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in case of a national disaster. Public Law 87-502.

Community facilities: Increased from $7.5 to $15 million the appropriation authorization for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to permit construction of needed hospitals, utility systems, and school buildings as well as the political and economic development of the area. Public Law 87-419.

Public facility loans: Provided eligibility to Indian tribes for assistance under the public facility loan program, title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. Under present law, eligibility for loans under the public facility loan program is limited to "municipalities and other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of States." This provision has been interpreted as not including Indian tribes which resulted not only in discrimination but an inconsistency since all tribes are eligible for low-rent public housing, housing for the elderly, and assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act. (S. 2454.) Public Law 87- .

American Samoa: Extended to American Samoa the application of our laws relating to agriculture, vocational training, school lunch, public health, and library services—to promote the welfare of the territory. Public Law 87-688.

Air pollution control study: Extends to June 30, 1966, and authorizes up to $5 million annually in appropriations for a continuation of the present study being conducted by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in conjunction with various State agencies into the causes, effects, and ways to abate air pollution with special emphasis on the effects of automobile exhaust fumes. Public Law 87-761.

National school lunch funds: Revised the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds to States in the school lunch program to base it on the number of lunches served the previous year plus the assistance-need-factor instead of the present system of number of children aged 5 to 17 plus the assistance-need factor. (H.R. 11665.) Public Law 87- .

Public health: Authorized establishment within PHS a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and a National Institute of General Medical Sciences. (H.R. 11099.) Public Law 87- .

Children of migrant workers: Authorized an annual grant of $750,000 to States having large number of migratory farmworkers to help provide day-care facilities for the children. (H.R. 12213—in conference.)

Migratory health services: Authorized $3 million annually in Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families. Public Law 87-692.

Anthracite coal resources: Broadened the Federal-State program to include filling or sealing abandoned anthracite coal mines as a safety and public health device. (H.R. 4094.) Public Law 87- .

Nonquota immigrant status: Provided nonquota status for certain first preference quota immigrants needed urgently in the United States because of their education, training, experience, skills, and abilities and also for certain fourth preference quota immigrants such a brothers, sisters, married sons, or married daughters of citizens of the United States including spouses and children. (S. 3361—in conference.)

CRIMINAL LAWS STRENGTHENED

1961

Circuit judges: Created 73 additional U.S. district and circuit court judgships to help ease the present workload and overcrowded court calendars. Public Law 87–36.

Tax Court judges' widows and dependent children: Provided a system of annuities for the surviving widows and dependent children of judges of the Tax Court of the United States. Public Law 87–370.

Judgment and compromise settlement: Provided for the swift payment of judgments and compromise settlements against the U.S. Government won by State and foreign claimants. Public Law 87–187.

Jury commissioners: For the first time since 1884, increased the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts from the present $5 to $10 per diem for each day employed in the performance of duties. (S. 1899.)

Agency investigations: Prohibits obstruction of any lawful inquiry or investigation by the Department of Justice or Treasury and strengthens prohibitions against injuries to persons furnishing information in connection with the inquiry. (S. 1665.)

Racketeering enterprises: Prohibits the use of the mail or any transportation in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of distributing the proceeds of any unlawful activities (business enterprises involving gambling, bootlegging, narcotics, etc.) Public Law 87–228.

Transmission of bets: Forbids the use of wire communications (telephone, telegraph, or any other means of interstate wire communications) for gambling. Exempts information carried for use of the press and wireless communication. Public Law 87–216.

Wagering paraphernalia: Prohibits interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia for bookmaking, wagering pools, numbers games, or similar games carried by means other than common carrier in the usual course of its business, but allows transportation of equipment from a State where it is manufactured into a State where parimutuel betting is legal. Public Law 87–218.

Felons: Extended Fugitive Felon Act to all felonies. Public Law 87–368.

Espionage: Extended laws against espionage and censorship to acts committed anywhere in the world. Public Law 87–369.

Tax stamps: Made it a Federal crime to transport fraudulent State tax stamps in interstate commerce. Public Law 371.

Plane hijacking: Made airplane hijacking a Federal crime subject to a possible death penalty. Public Law 87–197.

Aircraft claims: Authorized immediate payment of up to $1,000 to anyone who might suffer injury or personal damages as a result of an accident involving military aircraft or missiles. Public Law 87–212.

1962

Gambling devices: Broadened the definition of gambling devices to cover additional types of machines manufactured for gambling purposes, and requires detailed records of all such devices shipped in interstate commerce. (S. 1658.) Public Law 87– .

Antitrust: Authorized Department of Justice to demand the records of business firms under investigation for possible use in antitrust cases. Public Law 87–664.

Smith Act amendment: Defines and clarifies the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act of 1940 to make it apply to continuing as well as original Communist activities. Public Law 87–486.

Juvenile delinquents: Requires juveniles adjudged delinquents be committed to the custody of Attorney General for observation and study and that a full report be submitted within 60 days by the Bureau of Prisons. Public Law 87–428.

Guam: Extend to Guam power to enter into interstate compacts to enforce criminal laws and policies of the States. Public Law 87–406.

Vending-machine slugs: Broadened the Federal criminal law dealing with the manufacture and sale of slugs and similar devices which could be used in lieu of coins in vending machines. Public Law 87–667.

District court jurisdiction: Makes it possible to bring actions against Government officials and agencies in U.S. district courts outside the District of Columbia which, because of certain limitations on jurisdiction and venue, could formerly be brought only in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–748.

Torts: Provided for the recovery by the Government of the value of hospital care furnished to an individual tortiously injured by a third party. Public Law 87–693.

Sports—Bribery: Made it a criminal offense to influence by bribery the outcome of sports contests through schemes which make use of interstate or foreign commerce facilities. (S. 2182.)

Federal-State law enforcement: Authorized further cooperation with the States in administering and enforcing Federal laws. Public Law 87–718.

Adoption of minors: Imposing criminal penalties on persons trafficking for profit in interstate commerce in placing, or in arranging for placement of, children for adoption or permanent free care. (S. 654.)

Trafficking in phonograph records: Provided a criminal penalty for counterfeiting phonograph records and labels. Public Law 87–773.

WELFARE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT AREAS

Education and training

1961

Aid to education: Enacted a $2,550 million 3-year Federal-aid-to-education program for school construction and increasing teachers salaries. (S. 1021.)

Impacted areas—NDEA extensions: Enacted bill which extends for 2 years, until June 30, 1963, Federal assistance to help build schools in districts burdened with substantial increases in their school memberships due to Federal activities, and authorizes an additional $20 million for this purpose. Also, extended for 2 years, until June 30, 1964, the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, passed in 1958, to stimulate a nationwide effort to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Public Law 87–344.

College housing: Increased the loan authorization by $300 million for each of the 4 years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1964. Public Law 87–70.

Educational opportunities for migratory farm families: Authorized a 5-year program to aid in educating children of migratory workers. The Federal Government is to pay 100 percent of the program the first 2 years and the States and Federal Government will match costs for the next 3 years. (S. 1124.)

Freedmen's Hospital: Transfers Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University as its teaching hospital. Public Law 87–262.

Juvenile delinquency: Authorized a program of Federal grants to communities and nonprofit agencies of $10 million a year for 3 years to aid in financing projects to combat juvenile delinquency. Public Law 87–274.

Geodetic Survey: Improved and expanded the Coast and Geodetic Survey Act of 1948 to induce qualified scientists and mathematicians to join the service. Public Law 87–233.

Nurses scholarships: Extended for 4 years (to June 30, 1965), $5 million a year program for grants and scholarships for training of practical nurses under Vocational Education Act. Public Law 87–22.

Vocational teacher training: Authorized two 1-year programs of Federal grants for training teachers of the deaf, and advanced training of speech pathologists and audiologists. Public Law 87–276.

1962

Higher education: Authorized a 5-year program of higher education for construction and improvement of classrooms, libraries, and laboratories, and scholarship aid for college students. (H.R. 8900—in conference.)

Educational television: Authorized a 5-year, $32-million program of grants to the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, to establish or improve the educational television broadcasting facilities in our public schools, colleges, and in adult training programs. Grantees may be any nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting and which is eligible according to the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in effect on April 12, 1962, to receive a license from the Commission for a noncommercial educational broadcasting station. Public Law 87–447.

NDEA—Student loan payments: Clarified the forgiveness provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 providing Federal loans to college students. Existing law permits canceling repayment up to half of a loan if the recipient becomes a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school. This bill extends this cancellation privilege to students who become teachers in private nonprofit elementary or secondary schools or in colleges or universities. (S. 3326.)

Surplus personal property to schools: Clarified the provisions of existing law permitting disposal of surplus Federal property for activities providing educational or occupational training for mentally retarded children, schools for the physically handicapped, educational television stations, and public libraries. Public Law 87–786.

War orphans education aid: Raised the present ceiling-age of 23 to 31 when a war orphan must have completed his education provided the suspension was due to conditions beyond his control. (H.R. 9737.) Public Law 87– .

NDEA—Student loans: Authorized an increase in the fund that finances Federal loans to college and university students by raising the ceiling on the fund for the 1963 and 1964 fiscal years to $125 million a year from the present $90 million. In addition, it would raise the limit on student loan funds for each participating college or university to $500,000 from $250,000. (S. 3760.)

University Extension Act of 1962: Established a publicly supported program of general extension education, at the college level or above, to be operated by State universities and land-grant colleges. Authorized an annual appropriation of $9,020,000 for fiscal year 1963 and for each of the 3 succeeding years. (S. 3477.)

Federal educational assistance for the District of Columbia: Broadened the provisions of existing law to include the District of Columbia within the areas to receive payments for current operating expenses of public schools because of losses in revenue due to the existence of tax-exempt, federally owned property. (S. 2830.)

District of Columbia teachers' salary increase: Provided an overall increase of approximately 10 percent for District teachers and a 5-percent increase in annuities. (S. 1447.) Public Law 87– .

Flood disaster study: Directed HHFA to make a study of possible programs to financially assist flood disaster victims, to report and make recommendations within 9 months. (S. 3066.)

Research costs: Authorized Federal agencies, when awarding research and development contracts to education institutions, to provide for payment of a fixed percentage of the direct research or development cost to cover the indirect overhead costs associated with the work. Public Law 87-638.

Safety standards for hydraulic brake fluid: Improved highway safety by requiring hydraulic brake fluid sold or shipped in commerce for use in motor vehicles must meet certain specifications prescribed by Secretary of Commerce. Public Law 87-637.

State taxation—Interstate commerce income: Extended to July 1, 1963, the reporting date of the congressional studies on all matters affecting State taxation of income derived from interstate commerce. Public Law 87-435.

Alexander Hamilton: Established the former dwelling of Alexander Hamilton as a national shrine in New York. Public Law 87-438.

Bob Hope: Authorized the President to present Bob Hope, in the name of the people of the United States, a gold medal in recognition of his service to his country and to the cause of world peace. Public Law 87-478.

Sagamore Hill National Historic Site: Established Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace and Sagamore Hill National Historic Sites, New York. Public Law 87-547.

Capitol Commission: Established a Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol. (S.J. Res. 195.)

Religious articles—Duty free: Broadened coverage of certain duty-free imports to include cemeteries, schools, hospitals, orphanages, and similar nonprofit activities staffed and controlled by corporations or associations organized and operated for religious reasons. Public Law 87-604.

MacArthur Medal: Authorized the President to award a gold medal to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. Public Law 87-760.

Social Security Amendments of 1962: Extended and improved public assistance and child welfare service programs of the Social Security Act. Public Law 87-543.

Pension plans: Strengthened the 1958 Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act by providing additional enforcement procedures and imposing criminal sanctions. Public Law 87-420.

School lunches: Authorizes appropriations for school lunches for all needy elementary and secondary public school children in the District of Columbia. (S. 3314.)

Depository libraries: Increased total of depository libraries from 594 to 1,174. Public Law 87-579.

Captioned films for the deaf: Strengthened and improved the existing program of providing captioned films for nonprofit purposes to groups of deaf persons, by authorizing the production and distribution of training films for the deaf, research in the use of educational and training films and training persons in the use of these films for the deaf and raised the established loan ceiling of $250,000 to $1,250,000. Public Law 87-715.

Du Pont: Enacted into law the so-called Du Pont bill providing that a distribution of stock made to an individual, or certain corporations, pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall be treated as a return of capital; and that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value. Public Law 87-403.

Payments in lieu of taxes: Extended to December 31, 1964, the period in which payments in lieu of taxes may be made to State and local taxing authorities by the Federal Government. Public Law 87-787.

National Cultural Center Week: Proclaimed the period from November 26, 1962, through December 2, 1962, as National Cultural Center Week. (S.J. Res. 214.)

Sam Rayburn Medal: Authorized the Secretary of Treasury to strike and present to the estate of Sam Rayburn a gold medal "for services rendered to the people of the United States." Public Law 87-702.

National Science Foundation amendment: Eliminated the non-Communist disclaimer affidavit required in the existing National Science Foundation Act; made it a crime for any member of a Communist organization to apply for or to use any scholarship or fellowship awarded under section 10 of the act; required each applicant for scholarship or fellowship to provide the NSF with a full statement of the crime of which he has been convicted and information regarding any criminal charges punishable by confinement of 30 days or more. (H.R. 8556.) Public Law 87- .

Pay reform: Enacted a two-step pay-reform measure for the classified, postal, Foreign Service, and Veterans' Administration employees in an effort to lessen the discrepancies between industry and the Federal worker. Public Law 87-793.

Resource buildup

1961

Saline water conversion program: Extended the saline water conversion program, enacted in 1952, from 1962 through 1967 and authorized a total appropriation of $75 million, but does not limit the annual appropriation to a pro rata share of the total amount. Public Law 87-295.

National fuels study: Approved a resolution authorizing the Senate Interior Committee to make an investigation and study of the current and prospective Government policies, to determine changes for an effective national fuels policy. Report of the findings to be submitted by January 31, 1961. (S. Res. 105.)

Wabash River Commission: Established a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission to coordinate Federal, State, and local plans for developing the water and land resources in the Wabash River Basin. (S. 811.)

Cape Cod Park: Established Cape Cod National Seashore Park to preserve for public enjoyment the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the cape. Public Law 87-126.

Migratory waterfowl conservation: Authorized a 7-year migratory waterfowl conservation program permitting advances to States to purchase necessary lands. Public Law 87-383.

Shoreline areas: Authorized the Department of Interior to study mean and costs of acquiring and preserving 14 ocean, lake, and river shoreline areas appropriate for recreational parks. Authorized the Department of Agriculture to study appropriate shorelines within the Nation's 186 million acres of national forests. Each Department is to report its findings and recommendations within 2 years. Authorized $400,000 for each survey and a grand total of $25 million of matching funds to assist the States in acquiring State shoreline areas. (S. 543.)

Wilderness bill: Established a National Wilderness Preservation System providing that any time within 10 years, the President may recommend to Congress the permanent inclusion within the wilderness system areas totaling approximately 54 million acres. (S. 174.)

1962

Point Reyes National Seashore: Authorized an appropriation of $14 million to acquire land to preserve, for public recreational purposes, Point Reyes National Seashore in California. Public Law 87-657.

Padre Island: Established Padre Island National Seashore as as seashore recreational area. Public Law 87-712.

Oceanography: Established a national 10-year program of oceanographic and Great Lakes research to promote commerce and navigation, to secure the national defense, to expand ocean, coastal and Great Lakes resources and to enhance the public health and general welfare. (S. 901.) Public Law 87- .

River and harbors and flood control: Authorized $3.5 billion for 86 rivers and harbors projects and 119 flood control projects. (H.R. 13273.) In conference.

Navajo-San Juan-Chama projects: Authorized $221 million in appropriations to construct the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the San Juan-Chama project to supplement water supplies for domestic and industrial uses, and to provide recreation and fish and wildlife benefits. Public Law 87-483.

Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado: Authorized Department of Interior to spend up to $170 million to construct facilities for the diversion of water from the Colorado River Basin in western Colorado to the Arkansas River Basin. Water will be used for irrigation, flood control, power, and to meet the municipal water needs of Colorado Springs and other cities. Public Law 87-590.

Great Basin National Park: Established the Great Basin National Park in Nevada to provide additional recreational facilities. (S. 1760.)

Rogue River Basin project, Oregon: Authorized Federal construction of the Agate Dam and Reservoir as an addition to the irrigation works of the Rogue River Valley Irrigation District in Oregon at a total cost of $1,802,000. Public Law 87-727.

Elephant Butte-Caballo Reservoirs: Provided for establishing additional facilities at Elephant Butte Reservoir and at Caballo Reservoir—cost limited to $607,000. Public Law 87-542.

Pacific Northwest power preference: Guaranteed permanent priority on Pacific Northwest power to consumers of electricity from Bonneville Power's marketing area, whether public or private users. Permits Bonneville to sell surplus power outside its marketing area but subject to recall when power is needed in the Northwest. Areas given priority include Oregon, Washington, Montana, and, on determination by Secretary of Interior, parts of Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, and Idaho. (S. 3153.)

Arbuckle reclamation project, Oklahoma: Authorized Federal construction of multiple-purpose Arbuckle project in south-central Oklahoma to provide municipal, domestic, industrial water supplies, and flood control at a cost of $13.3 million, of which $10.5 million is reimbursable. Public Law 87-594.

Spokane Valley project: Modified earlier legislation to enlarge the present irrigation plant at an estimated cost of $7,232,000 to furnish more water for irrigation purposes. Public Law 87-630.

Outer Continental Shelf: Extends the authority of the Secretary of Interior to permit the Geological Survey to perform certain of its work in areas outside the continental limits of the United States. Public Law 87-626.

Forest survey authorization: Increased from $1.5 to $2.5 million the authorization for keeping current a survey of the Nation's forest resources. Public Law 87-685.

World Conference on National Parks: Authorized the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the First World Conference on National Parks to be held in Seattle in July of this year. The Conference is sponsored by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, an international body of nations and organizations concerned with conservation of the world's resources. Public Law 87-504.

Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana: Authorized appropriations of $6.2 million for completion of irrigation and power distribution system of Flathead Indian irrigation project in northwestern Montana. (S. 1912.)

Mann Creek reclamation project, Idaho: Authorized $3.4 million for Federal construction of Mann Creek Federal reclamation project in Idaho for irrigation and recreational purposes. Public Law 87-589.

Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma: Authorized $25 million for Federal construction of the multipurpose Waurika reclamation project in Oklahoma to furnish water supplies, irrigate land, flood control, and recreational purposes. (S. 114.)

Oysterbeds—Delaware Bay: Authorized $100,000 for grants to five States presently involved in rehabilitating oysterbeds in Delaware Bay—grants to be used for research and related activities necessary in developing and propagating disease-resistant strains of oysters. Public Law 87–580.

Sport fish study: Authorized an annual appropriation of $2.5 million for Department of Interior to make a genetics study of sport fish to develop new strains by selective breeding and to generally rehabilitate fishing resources. (S. 1542.)

Delaware-New Jersey compact: Granted congressional consent to States of Delaware and New Jersey to enter into a compact to establish the Delaware River and Bay Authority for developing the border areas. Public Law 87–678.

Fish and wildlife: Authorized the use of national fish and wildlife conservation areas for public recreation. Public Law 87–714.

Outdoor Recreation Act of 1962: Establish Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in Department of Interior with overall responsibility for leadership of a nationwide effort by coordinating various Federal programs and assisting other levels of government to meet demands for outdoor recreation. (S. 3117.)

Minerals study: Authorized a comprehensive 2-year study of the efficacy of modern metallurgical methods including electrometallurgy on ores found in the United States. Study to be made under direction of Secretary of Interior in cooperation with other agencies of the Federal Government, with the States, and with private industry. (S.J. Res. 136.)

Quincy Columbia Basin contract: Approved the execution of an amended repayment contract with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District and with either or both of the other two Columbia Basin project districts. Amended contract is to increase the average construction charge from $85 to $131.60 per irrigable acre and extend the repayment period to 50 years. Public Law 87–728.

Baker reclamation project, Oregon: Authorized Federal construction of a $6,168,000 multipurpose reclamation, flood control, and recreational project in northeastern Oregon. Public Law 87–706.

National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in District of Columbia: Authorized Federal construction and operation of a $10 million National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–758.

Oil shale reserves: Authorized Secretary of Navy to take possession of and administer the naval oil shale reserves, and authorized Secretary of Interior to take possession of and administer the experimental mine and plant located on Naval Shale Reserves Nos. 1 and 3 near Rifle, Colo. (H.R. 5423.) Public Law 87– .

Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington: Authorized $3,210,000 for construction of control works and a pumping plant at Palmer Lake to enlarge the facilities to irrigate an additional 1,500 acres and supply about 3,650 acre-feet of supplemental water annually to the remaining irrigable area. Public Law 87–762.

Veterans' aid

1961

Disabled veterans' compensation increase: Provided increases in rates of service-connected disability compensation (to reflect cost-of-living increases since last compensation raise in 1957) ranging from 2.6 to 16.7 percent, depending upon degree of disability; restores for 2 years after January 1, 1962, the eligibility of veterans who served between October 8, 1940, and April 24, 1951, to apply for national service life insurance. (H.R. 879.)

Disability benefits: Increased weekly disability benefits for longshoremen and harbor workers to $70 (from $54); provided comparable increases in death cases from $81 to $105; and increased statutory maximum compensation payable for all injuries other than cases of permanent total disability or death from $17,280 to $24,000. Public Law 87–87.

Veterans' widows: Increased payments to veterans' widows. Public Law 87–268.

Veterans' home loans: Extended direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized an additional $1.2 billion for direct loan program through fiscal 1967. Public Law 87–84.

1962

Disability compensation increase: Provided for increases from 5.3 to 11.1 percent for veterans disabled 10 to 100 percent, retroactive to July 1, 1962. Public Law 87–645.

Veterans' Administration: Appropriated an additional $55 million for readjustment benefits payments to Korean war veterans attending school under the GI bill of rights; and provided for a $115,247,000 increase, by transfer, in the VA loan guarantee revolving fund to enable the Federal Government to repossess homes on which GI home mortgages have been foreclosed. Public Law 87–404.

Veterans: Extended the time during which individuals affected by Public Law 87–117 may pursue and complete a program of education or training under the Korean GI bill or the War Orphans' Education Act. The individuals affected served an additional tour of duty because of the war threats in 1961. (S. 2697.) Public Law 87– .

VA pensions—Hospitalization: Continue pensions for married veterans while hospitalized in veterans' hospitals. Public Law 87–556.

Disability compensation: Increases compensation for certain veterans disabled by blindness or kidney involvements. Public Law 87–610.

National Service Life Insurance—Assignments: Broadened assignment provisions of national service life insurance available to World War II veterans and maturing on or after date of enactment of this bill. Public Law 87–557.

War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act: Permits eligible beneficiaries under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act to attend foreign educational institutions. Public Law 87–546.

VA—Hospital and medical care: Furnished hospital and medical care, including outpatient treatment, to peacetime ex-servicemen for service-connected disabilities on same basis as care and treatment is furnished war veterans. Public Law 87–583.

Deceased veterans' benefits: Permits payment of compensation, retirement, or pension benefits withheld from deceased veterans during VA hospitalization only to spouse, children, or dependent parents. Public Law 87–544.

Prosthetic research—VA: Removed the $1 million ceiling on funds for research in the fields of prosthesis, prosthetic appliances, orthopedic appliances, and sensory devices. Public Law 87–557.

Endowment at age 96: Permits veterans holding U.S. Government life insurance to exchange for a policy providing death protection only—with reduced premiums. Public Law 87–549.

Blind veterans: Vocational rehabilitation.—Permits World War II or Korean veterans blinded by reason of a service-connected disability to obtain vocational rehabilitation training up to June 30, 1975. Public Law 87–591.

GI insurance: Reopened GI insurance program to millions of World War II and Korean war veterans, and makes the insurance available at premiums varying with the veteran's age. (S. 3597—in conference.)

VA—Prosthetic appliances: Broadened the provisions of existing law by authorizing the Veterans' Administration to repair or replace a prosthetic or other appliance (other than dental appliances) if the appliance is damaged or destroyed in a fall or other accident caused by a compensable service-connected disability. (H.R. 6190.) Public Law 87– .

Elections and the White House

1961

Federal election laws: Passed a clean-elections bill to strengthen our electoral system, provide more realistic ceilings on campaign expenses, make available at the State level information on campaign financing, and provides for a tax credit for political contributions to candidates for Federal office or to political committees acting for such candidates. (S. 2426.)

National conventions: The Senate adopted unanimously a resolution expressing as the sense of the Senate that the party conventions held every 4 years to nominate candidates for President and Vice President should not be commenced prior to the first Monday in September of the year in which the election is to be held. (S. Res. 141.)

District of Columbia elections: Implements the 23d amendment to the Constitution giving the residents of the Distirct of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President; retains the voting age at 21 and provides for a 1-year residency requirement. Public Law 87–389.

White House: Established the White House as a national monument. Public Law 87–286.

1962

Poll taxes abolished: Congress approved a constitutional amendment barring the requirement of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries. The amendment, if ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years, will become the 24th amendment to the Constitution. There are only five States with such a requirement: Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia. (S.J. Res. 29—submitted to States.)

White House Police force: Created a permanent White House Police force under the supervision and control of the Secretary of the Treasury to protect the Executive Mansion and grounds in the District, any building in which White House offices are located, and the President and members of his immediate family. Increased the force from 170 to 250. Public Law 87–481.

Reorganization and Government aids

1961

Government reorganization: Restored the authority of the President to submit plans for the reorganization of the Government. Public Law 87–18.

Civil Rights Commission: Extends the life of the Commission for 2 years, or until September 30, 1963. Public Law 87–264.

HEW: Authorized two additional Assistant Secretaries—one to handle international affairs, the second to handle medical and scientific matters. (S. 2073.)

Labor: Authorized an additional Assistant Secretary to perform functions relating primarily to the employment and effective utilization of women in our labor force. Public Law 87–137.

FTC reorganization: Provided for the reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission to expedite the present workload (plan No. 4). Effective July 9.

CAB reorganization: Authorized the reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide greater flexibility and a more expeditious handling of CAB cases (plan No. 3). Effective July 3.

Maritime reorganization: Authorized reorganization of Maritime Board (plan No. 7). Effective August 12.

ICC reorganization: Authorized reorganization of Interstate Commerce Commission. Public Law 87-247.

FCC reorganization: Authorized FCC to delegate functions in adjudicatory cases to expedite and improve the administrative process. Public Law 87-192.

SEC investigation: Authorized $750,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a special investigation of the adequacy of its rules, for the protection of the investor, governing stock exchanges and over-the-counter securities trading. SEC is to report its findings to Congress by January 3, 1963. Public Law 87-196.

Internal revenue employees: Appropriated funds for an additional 4,265 Internal Revenue Service employees. Public Law 87-159.

Alien employment: Removed the prohibition against Department of Commerce employing alien scientists and technicians in an effort to relieve a general shortage of personnel in scientific, engineering, and technical areas. (S. 2236.)

Travel expenses: Increased the allowances of Government employees for traveling expenses when on official business. Increases include from $10 to $16 per diem allowances and from 10 to 12 cents a mile by private automobile. Public Law 87-139.

Interstate commerce—Property destruction: Strengthened existing Federal law by making it unlawful to destroy, injure, set fire to, or otherwise damage goods moving in interstate or foreign commerce, break into or enter any railroad car, vessel, aircraft, truck, or other vehicle for such purpose. Public Law 87-221.

Rural carriers: Increased equipment allowance for rural mail carriers to 12 cents a mile. (S. 189.)

Postal employees: Extended to employees in the postal field service the same salary retention protection in cases of reduction in grade as provided under the Classification Act since 1956. Public Law 87-270.

Scientific and supergrades: Authorized an additional 480 supergrade positions and 280 additional scientific positions for the executive branch. Public Law 87-367.

NSLI special dividend: Authorized the payment of a special insurance dividend averaging from $100 to $150, for those veterans who have RS or W insurance. The RS insurance is entirely term insurance and the premium increases at the end of each 5-year period. The W insurance is both term and permanent, with the increased rate at the end of each 5-year period. Public Law 87-233.

1962

Reorganization Plan II: Established Office of Science and Technology as a new unit within the Executive Office of the President—capable of and designed to keep the President informed and advised on national policy matters relating to science and technology. (Plan went into effect June 8, 1962.)

Science and Technology Commission: Creates a 12-member Commission on Science and Technology to strengthen American Science and Technology. (S. 2771.)

SEC reorganization: Permits Securities and Exchange Commission to lighten its workload by delegating certain functions to individual commissioners or staff members; gives rulings or decisions made by a single commissioner or staff member the same force and effect of judgment by the full commission. The commission, however, can review any decision and would be required to do so on the request of a single commissioner. Public Law 87-592.

Postal-rate increase: Raised postal rates to produce an estimated $600 million in additional revenues to cut the large postal deficit. Increased first class from 4 to 5 cents an ounce, airmail from 7 to 8 cents effective next January 7; with graduated increases for second- and third-class mail. (H.R. 7927.) Public Law 87- .

Federal Reserve System: Authorized the Federal Reserve System to spend an additional $30 million to build branches and other facilities. Public Law 87-622.

Census reports—Confidential status: Specificially provided that company-retained copies of reports submitted to the Census Bureau be kept confidential. (S. 3631.)

Equal pay for women: Prohibited an employer from discriminating on the basis of sex in paying wages to men and women for equal work on jobs requiring equal skills. (H.R. 11880—in conference.)

Conflicts of interest: Enacted a measure making major revisions in Federal Government conflicts-of-interest laws to make uniform and bring up to date existing laws aimed at preventing present and former Government employees from improperly mixing private interest with their public office. (H.R. 8140.) Public Law 87- .

FCC: Added a new section to the Communications Act of 1934 to grant authority to the Commission to impose monetary forfeitures for violation of the Commission's rules and regulations by radio stations operating the common carrier and safety and special radio fields. It also provides for the remission or mediation by the Commission of such forfeitures if warranted. Public Law 87-448.

Federal Power Commission: Authorized the FPC to delegate certain matters pending before it to an individual commissioner, commissioners, or to one or more officers or employees of the Commission; however, the Commission retained a discretionary right of review of any action taken under a delegation of authority by a vote for review of two of the five member commissioners. (S. 1605.)

Commerce: Enacted into law authority for an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce to provide an effective review of the expanding scientific activities within the Department. Public Law 87-405.

FCC—Station license: Authorized the Federal Communications Commission to renew a license in the safety and special radio services field more than 30 days prior to the expiration of the original license. Public Law 87-439.

FCC—American Samoa: Authorized the Federal Communications Commission to issue radio operator licenses to natives of American Samoa who are nationals of the United States and owe allegiance to it, but to whom full citizenship has not been extended. Public Law 87-445.

FCC documents: Repealed the requirement that, prior to submission, all annual and certain other reports, applications for construction permits, station licenses, modifications, or renewals must be notarized. Public Law 87-444.

Music for blind: Estabilshes in the Library of Congress a library of musical scores and other educational materials for blind persons. Public Law 87-765.

Household and personal effects under Government orders: Extends to July 1, 1964, free-entry provisions for personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. (H.R. 12180.) Public Law 87-790.

Government Training Act: Restored travel authority to attend training meetings to Foreign Service employees of Department of State, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Presidential appointees. Public Law 87-566.

U.S. Park Police: Provided for the creation of trial boards for the U.S. Park Police as a means of assuring better discipline and more equitable treatment. (H.R. 8567.) Public Law 87- .

Government employees—Pacific islands: Extends benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to employees who perform services for the Government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under an appointment from the Department of Interior or any other Federal agency. (S. 3319.)

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Restored permanent authority for retired vessel employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and their dependents to receive treatment at Public Health Services facilities. Provides for an eventual transition to medical care coverage under the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959, rather than under the Public Health Service Act, for retired vessel employees and for dependents of all vessel employees, active or retired. (S. 3318.)

U.S. marshals' fees: Increases fees for U.S. marshals' services to private litigants. Public Law 87-621.

Hatch Act: Liberalized the provision requiring the Civil Service Commission to impose a minimum penalty of 90 days' suspension for violations of section 9 of the Hatch Act by reducing the suspension period to 30 days. Public Law 87-753.

Trust territory: Removed ceiling on authorization for government of Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Public Law 87-541.

Guamanian benefits: Provided benefits under War Claims Act for Guamanians killed or captured by Japanese at Wake Island. Public Law 87-617.

Lake Ontario water level: Authorized investigation of citizens' claims resulting from artificial raising of Lake Ontario water level by Canada. Public Law 87-587.

One-cent piece: Eliminated tin in the alloy of the 1-cent piece. Public Law 87-643.

Home loan bank directors: Extended to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico a status comparable to that of a State in the nomination and election of directors of the Federal home loan bank of the district in which Puerto Rico is located. Public Law 87-676.

U.S. real property: Permitted executive agencies to grant easements over real property under the control of the agency, provided the easement will not be adverse to U.S. interests. (H.R. 8355.) Public Law 87- .

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Letter by him to the Attorney General on the case of Nicolae Malaxa, and his relationships with former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

By Mr. METCALF:

Letter dated October 10, 1962, from Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, commending him for his work in anticrime legislation.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, about 470 years ago, the brave Italian sailor, Christopher Columbus, set sail under the Spanish flag to discover the Spice Islands, to seek the wealth of the Indies. He died believing he had accomplished his goal. Little did Columbus know that the land on which he set foot was the sprawling, sparsely settled land of America—a country with a future of greatness and prosperity. Four hundred and seventy years ago today, this brave Italian opened the door to the future of a great country and continent.

Mr. President, every child's textbook, every American history book, describes the harrowing adventures of this great Italian seaman: the tossing seas, the fierce winds, the shipboard plagues and turmoil. But out of struggle ofttimes comes greatness—and, to be sure, this old maxim proved true. Columbus discovered a land which was to offer not only vast resources and riches to the world, but also was to stand as a symbol of hope and promise to the world's oppressed.

America has attracted people from many lands, from all walks of life. To them, it has offered new hope and new lives. In turn, these people have brought to America gifts, skills, and abilities. And from Italy, the homeland of Columbus, have come many great and gifted citizens: Doctors, lawyers, singers, actors, craftsmen—people who over the years have made America great. Mr. President, America is proud of the Italians who have come to this country. They have added to the culture of America; they have contributed to the industrial growth and economic prosperity of this great land. Beginning with Columbus, our Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the millions who have braved the vast expanse of the Atlantic to find new opportunity in the land Columbus discovered. Today we pay them tribute and congratulate them all on their rich contributions to the American way of life.

DRINK MILK, EAT PLENTY OF BUTTER TO BE HEALTHY, AMA SAYS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this year our Wisconsin farmers have been in trouble. Their income has already been slashed 10 percent because the Government has cut price supports. And why did they? Not because of overproduction by the farmers, but because of a decrease in consumption, not only on a per capita basis, but also in total volume. This drop in milk drinking was in spite of a rising population—2 million bigger than the year before. The people of the United States as a whole are consuming smaller amounts of dairy products. Why?

Here is why: There has been a suspicion or a rumor or a feeling on the part of many Americans that dairy products cause cholesterol, and result in early death through heart disease.

For these reasons I am delighted to find that the American Medical Association—certainly the outstanding authority in this field—spoke out yesterday in very definite terms. It pointed out that "The anticholesterol 'food fad' is a wasted, dangerous effort"—"not just foolish and futile; it also carries some risk." The American Medical Association proceeded to indict not only the food faddists but the advertisers of anticholesterol foods, including the producers of margarine and other substitutes for butter, who have said that butter can be dangerous to health.

The association states that the following diet is the best the American people can have: milk, cheese, ice cream, beef, veal, lamb, pork, poultry, eggs, fish, butter—and I stress butter—margarine, fats, and oils.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the story to which I refer, which was published on the front page of the New York Times, is being reported by newspapers throughout the country. I also hope the American people will realize that there is no better authority on diet than the American Medical Association, and will recognize that all the talk to the effect that dairy products are potentially harmful has no support whatever by the outstanding authority on this subject in the country.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 12, 1962]

ANTIFAT FOOD FAD ASSAILED BY AMA

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

CHICAGO, October 11.—The anticholesterol food fad is a wasted, dangerous effort, the American Medical Association said today.

The association had in mind widespread fears linking animal fats to heart attacks.

"The antifat, anticholesterol fad is not just foolish and futile; it also carries some risk," the group said.

Its five-page statement was designed as a warning both to what is called "do-it-yourself Americans" and to food processors who have built advertising campaigns on cooking oils, margarine and other foods derived from vegetable oils.

Few medical subjects have aroused more interest among laymen than discussion of the connection between dairy and meat products and heart trouble. Both the meat and the dairy industry have been up in arms about the antifat campaign for some time.

Today's statement was a sequel to a report in the August 4 issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. That report was issued by the 12-member AMA Council on Foods and Nutrition headed by Dr. William J. Darby of the Vanderbilt Medical School.

That report suggested that only physicians ought to consider altering the diets of patients with hardening of the arteries. However, at least one vegetable oil company used portions of the report in a national advertising campaign.

Today's statement, prepared under the supervision of Dr. Philip L. White, executive secretary of the council on foods, said:

"Dieters who believe they can cut down their blood cholesterol without medical supervision are in for a rude awakening. It can't be done. It could even be dangerous to try."

CHOLESTEROL IS DEFINED

Cholesterol is a white, fatty crystalline alcohol. Produced by the body, it coats the inner surface of arteries somewhat as a pipe would be clogged by minerals in water. This coating tends to restrict blood flow.

The report said that only laboratory tests could show whether an individual had excessive cholesterol in his blood and whether a change of diet would raise or lower the level.

"Willy-nilly substitution of a few food items without overall control of the diet accomplishes little if anything in reducing cholesterol," the report said, continuing:

"What is more important, the elimination of certain foods of proven nutritional value could be detrimental to health."

Success in reducing blood cholesterol by diet has been achieved only in strictly controlled experimental groups, the report said.

The experiments are not yet of "practical importance to the general public," it said.

"There have been few investigations," the report said, "on the effect of different types of fat in the normal diet over a long period of time. It is not known what type of fat, if any, may be beneficial in preventing heart disease, nor is it known that certain fats are harmful."

Generally, it continued, the American diet provides all the nutrients essential to health and a varied diet, is the best rule for health.

"Any changes in a diet of such proved worth must await much more study and experience," the report warned.

The statement said that the council of foods recommended this diet: milk, cheese, ice cream, beef, veal, lamb, pork, poultry, eggs, fish, butter, margarine, fats and oils.

"Even those on weight-reduction regimens need food from all these groups," the statement said.

"Although someday science may come up with a diet that can prevent heart disease, such a development appears to be well into the future," the statement said.

Although science is seeking ways to reduce cholesterol, and drugs may turn out to be the best way, high blood cholesterol is only one of the factors in heart disease, the statement said.

The danger is that when an individual omits certain foods, he runs the risk of depriving his body of essential nutrients, it said. It concluded:

"The current concern about diet reflects a healthy interest on the part of the public. This interest should be directed away from hopeless pursuits to a worthwhile goal that can be attained by most individuals—maintaining normal weight. Overweight plays the villain in many diseases, and overweight can be avoided by not eating more calories than the body needs."

The August report had recommended a reduction in the consumption of saturated fats, contributed chiefly by dairy products and meat, and substitution of polyunsaturated fats, found in such vegetable oils as those made from corn, cottonseed, soybeans and safflower.

In laymen's terms, saturated fats are solid at room temperature, as in the case of lard, whereas the other kind are liquid, as in the case of corn cooking oil.

The council report said, however, that there was no clear proof that hardening of the arteries was caused by concentrations of fat in the blood.

INCORPORATORS OF COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I make the following statement on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], chairman of the Senate Space Committee, and myself, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Commerce Committee.

On October 4, 1962, the President of the United States, pursuant to section 302 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-624, 87th Cong.) referred to the Senate 13 names to be incorporators. Section 302 of such act stated that—

> The President of the United States shall appoint incorporators, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve as the initial board of directors until the first annual meeting of stockholders or until their successors are elected and qualified. Such incorporators shall arrange for an initial stock offering and take whatever other

actions are necessary to establish the corporation, including the filing of articles of incorporation, as approved by the President.

The names submitted by the President were Edgar F. Kaiser, David M. Kennedy, Philip M. Graham, Sidney J. Weinberg, Bruce Sundlun, A. Byrne Litschgi, Beardsley Graham, Leonard Woodcock, Sam Harris, George Feldman, Leonard Marks, John T. Connor, and George L. Killion. These incorporators were referred by the Senate to the Senate Space Committee and the Commerce Committee.

It would be extremely difficult and almost impossible to conduct hearings and report the nominations in time for action by the Senate during this session of the Congress. Therefore, because of the time element involved and the anticipated adjournment of the Congress, it has been suggested to the President that he offer recess appointments to the nominees so that the business of proceeding with the establishment of the corporation can proceed without delay and the Senate can act on his nominations after our return in January.

These incorporators will arrange for an initial stock offering and take whatever actions are necessary to establish the corporation, including the filing of the articles of incorporation as approved by the President. The permanent directors will be chosen subsequent to the issuance of stock and will be elected by the stockholders of the corporation. At the time of such election the President will appoint, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, three directors to the corporation.

For the benefit of the Members of the Senate I am submitting for the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the biographies of the nominees selected by President Kennedy as incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation.

There being no objection, the biographies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ CONCERNING MR. EDGAR F. KAISER

Vital statistics: (1) Edgar F. Kaiser, son of Henry J. Kaiser and Bessie Fosburgh Kaiser, was born July 29, 1908, at Spokane, Wash.; (2) he married Sue Mead Kaiser in August 1932 (though born in Australia, Sue Mead Kaiser is a citizen of the United States by reason of the U.S. citizenship of her parents.)

Education: (1) high school, Oakland, Calif.; (2) University of California, 1927–30—majored in economics.

Early career:

1. Engaged in part-time work for a predecessor of the present Henry J. Kaiser Co. while attending school.

2. Construction superintendent for a predecessor of the present Henry J. Kaiser Co. on pipeline installation in Kansas and Montana from 1930–32.

3. Years 1932–33—shift superintendent on Hoover Dam, Nev., constructed by Six Companies, Inc., in which a predecessor of the present Henry J. Kaiser Co. was a stockholder.

4. Years 1934–38—administrative manager, Bonneville Dam, Oreg., constructed by Columbia Construction Co., in which a predecessor of the present Henry J. Kaiser Co. was a stockholder.

5. Years 1938–41—administrative manager of Grand Coulee Dam, Wash., constructed by Consolidated Builders, Inc., in which a predecessor of the present Henry J. Kaiser Co. was a stockholder.

6. Years 1941–45—vice president and general manager of Oregon Shipbuilding Corp. (in which a predecessor of the present Henry J. Kaiser Co. was a stockholder) and Kaiser Co., Inc. (now Kaiser Steel Corp.). These companies operated three shipyards in the Portland, Oreg., area which built merchant ships during World War II for the Maritime Administration and baby aircraft carriers for the Navy.

7. In 1946 Mr. Kaiser became vice president and general manager of the Kaiser-Frazer Corp. (now Kaiser Industries Corp.) which manufactured automobiles and he later became president of that corporation and also of Willys Motors, Inc., upon acquisition by it of the Jeep vehicle and passenger car business of Willys-Overland Corp.

Current activities and interests:

1. President and director of Kaiser Industries Corp. which is engaged in the production of aircraft and missile components and electronic devices and is also engaged in radio and television broadcasting. Also, Kaiser Industries Corp. is the owner of all of the stock of Henry J. Kaiser Co. (engaged directly or indirectly through subsidiaries in engineering and construction on a national and international scale, sand and gravel operations in the San Francisco Bay area and land and community development in Hawaii, California, and Oregon). Kaiser Industries Corp. is also the owner of all the common stock of Willys Motors, Inc., which is engaged directly or indirectly through subsidiaries or affiliates in the production and sale of Jeep vehicles and other vehicles in the United States and abroad.

2. Attached as exhibit A is a list of all of the corporations in which Edgar Kaiser is an officer or director or both. Except for the Bank of America, N.T. and S.A., and the corporations designated as nonprofit corporations on exhibit A attached, Kaiser Industries Corp. is directly or indirectly a stockholder of all such corporations in which Mr. Kaiser is listed as an officer or director on said exhibit A.

3. Attached as exhibit B is a chart showing the principal corporations in which Kaiser Industries Corp. directly or indirectly owns an interest; namely, Henry J. Kaiser Co. and Willys Motors, Inc. (whose principal businesses are described above), Kaiser Steel Corp. (engaged primarily in the manufacture and sale of iron and steel products and the fabrication of steel products), Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. (engaged primarily in the manufacture and sale of aluminum, refractories and chemical products), Permanente Cement Co. (engaged primarily in the production and sale of cement and through its wholly owned subsidiary, Kaiser Gypsum Co., in the manufacture of gypsum and acoustical products), and Kaiser Community Homes (engaged primarily in land and community developments). All of such principal corporations own interests in other corporations in many of which Mr. Kaiser is an officer or director or both as shown on exhibit A attached hereto.

Memberships, honors, and degrees:

1. Principal groups and other organizations with which Mr. Kaiser is associated are as follows:

Alameda County United Fund, Oakland, Calif., board of governors.

Allen-Chase Foundation Eaglebrook School, Deerfield, Mass., trustee.

AMA Automotive Safety Foundation, Detroit, Mich., trustee.

American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, Inc., trustee.

American Ordnance Association, Washington, D.C., member.

American Society of Civil Engineers, New York, member.

Association of the U.S. Army, Washington, D.C., member.

Automobile Old Timers, New York, life member.

Business Council for International Understanding, New York, member policy board.

The Beavers, Los Angeles, Calif., senior vice president, 1960; president, 1961; member.

California Committee for the Eisenhower Presidential Library, member.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, member board of trustees.

Chi Psi Fraternity, member.

Claremont Country Club, Oakland, Calif., member.

Commonwealth Club of California, San Francisco, Calif., member.

Committee on Latin American Business Advisory Council, member.

Detroit Club, Detroit, Mich., member.

Community Health Association, Detroit, Mich., board of governors.

The Kaiser Foundation (a charitable trust) president and director.

National Council of Boy Scouts of America, member at large.

National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., New York, member.

Newcomen Society of England, American Branch, member.

Northern California World Trade Group, San Francisco, Calif., member.

Pacific Union Club, San Francisco, Calif., member.

Pan American Society of United States, council member, lifetime member.

President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, Washington, D.C., member.

President's Missile Sites Labor Commission, Washington, D.C., member.

President's Committee on Status of Women, Washington, D.C., member.

The Recess Club, New York, member.

San Francisco Bay Area Council, San Francisco, Calif., president, 1958–59, 1960; chairman, 1960; director.

Society of Automotive Engineers, Inc., New York, member.

Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, member.

Stanford Research Institute Menlo Park, Calif., board of directors.

West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia, life member.

2. Mr. Kaiser holds honorary LL.D.'s from the University of Portland and Pepperdine College.

Exhibit A

List of corporate offices held by Edgar F. Kaiser:

Bank of America, National Trust and Savings, Association, San Francisco, Calif., director.

Kaiser Industries Corp., director and president.

Henry J. Kaiser Co., director and president.

Foothill Electric Corp., director and president.

Gilpin Construction Co., Ltd., Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, chairman of the board of directors.

Hawaii Kai Community Services Co., director and president.

The Kaiser Co., director and president.

Kaiser Engineers and Constructors, Inc., director and president.

Kaiser Engineers International, Inc., director and president.

Kaiser Engineers Overseas Corp., director and president.

Kaiser Engineers Pakistan, Inc., director and president.

Kaiser Hawaii Kai Development Co., director and president.

Kaiser-Teleprompter of Hawaii, Inc., vice chairman of the board.

Kaiser International, Ltd., director and president.

Kaiser Office Corp., director.

Henry J. Kaiser Co. (Canada), Ltd., Westmount, Quebec, Canada, chairman of the board of directors.

National Steel & Shipbuilding Co., chairman of the board of directors and president.

Kaiser Electronics Corp., chairman of the board.

Kaiser Fleetwings, Inc., vice chairman of the board of directors.

Kaiser Metal Products Co., vice chairman of the board of directors.

Willys Motors, Inc., Toledo, Ohio, chairman of the board of directors.

Willys-Overland Export Corp., Toledo, Ohio, chairman of the board of directors.

Kaiser Engineers International Corp., president and director.

Industrias Kaiser Argentina Sociedad Anonima Industrial, Comercial y Financiera, Buenos Aires, Argentina, director.

Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., chairman of the board of directors.

Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Sales, Inc., chairman of the board of directors.

Kaiser Aluminum International Corp., chairman of the board of directors.

Kaiser Bauxite Co., chairman of the board of directors.

Kaiser Exploration Co., chairman of the board of directors.

Permanente Cement Co., chairman of the board of directors.

Glacier Sand & Gravel Co., chairman of the board of directors.

Kaiser Gypsum Co., Inc., chairman of the board of directors.

Gypsum Carrier, Inc., chairman of the board of directors.

Permanente Steamship Corp., chairman of the board of directors.

Permanente Trucking Co., chairman of the board of directors.

Kaiser Steel Corp., chairman of the board of directors.

Kaiser Community Homes, vice president.

Kaiser Center, Inc., vice chairman of the board of directors and president.

Kaiser Foundation Hospitals,[1] director and president.

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.,[1] director and president.

Kaiser Foundation Health Plan of Oregon,[1] director and president.

Dapite, Inc.[1] (wholly owned by Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.), director.

Kaiser Foundation School of Nursing,[1] director and president.

The Utah Permanente Hospital,[1] director and president.

Sequoia Corp., Nassau, Bahamas, director.

Hindustan Aluminium Corp., Ltd., Bombay, director.

Mysore Cements, Ltd., Bangalore, director.

NOTE.—Unless otherwise indicated the mailing address of the above-listed companies is 300 Lakeside Drive, Oakland, Calif.

DAVID M. KENNEDY

Born: Randolph, Utah, July 21, 1905.

Education: 1928, A.B. Weber College, Ogden, Utah; 1935, A.M. George Washington University, Washington; 1937, LL.B.; 1939, grad., Graduate School Banking, Rutgers University.

Marital status: Married.

Experience: Years 1930–46, member of staff, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, serving successively as technical assistant, director, bank operations, economist, division research and statistics and as special assistant to Chairman, Board of Governors; 1946, became vice president, bond department, Continental Illinois, National Bank & Trust Co., Chicago; 1954–56, vice president; 1956–59, director-president; 1959, chairman of board, chief executive officer; 1953–54, assistant to Secretary, U.S. Treasury, director, International Harvester Corp., Commonwealth Edison Co.; trustee, Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa; director, Abbott Laboratory; director, U.S. Gypsum, Swift & Co.; trustee, Sears, Roebuck & Co., pension and profit sharing trust fund.

Clubs: Bankers University; Union League, Chicago; Old Elm Country; Glenview Country.

Home: 33 Meadow View Drive, North Field, Ill.

Office: 231 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA—PHILIP L. GRAHAM

Address: Office, the Washington Post, 1515 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.; home, 2920 R Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Date and place of birth: Terry, S. Dak., July 18, 1915; family moved to southeast Florida, 1921.

Career: Attended public schools of Miami, Fla., and the University of Florida (A.B., 1936), and was graduated from Harvard Law School in 1939 (LL.B.); was president of the Harvard Law Review.

Served as law secretary for 1 year each under Justice Stanley Reed (1939–40) and Justice Felix Frankfurter (1940–41) of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1941 joined the General Counsel's Office of the Lend-Lease Administration and the Office of Emergency Management.

Entered the Army Air Force as a private in 1942. Commissioned in 1943. Served with Military Intelligence and later attached to Headquarters, Far East Air Forces in Southwest Pacific. Discharged as major. Legion of Merit.

Became associate publisher of the Washington Post, January, 1 1946, and publisher in June of the same year. Now president of the Washington Post Co., which publishes the Washington Post, Newsweek, Art News & Portfolio; own and operate WTOP–TV, AM and FM in Washington, D.C., and WJXT in Jacksonville, Fla. Chairman of the board of Newsweek which was purchased by the Washington Post Co. in March of 1961.

In June 1940 married Katharine Meyer. Four children: Elizabeth Morris, Donald Edward, William Welsh, and Stephen Meyer.

Director, National Press Building Corp.; director, the Advertising Council, Inc.; director, American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods; trustee, Committee for Economic Development; trustee, University of Chicago; trustee, Rand Corp.

Member, National Press Club, Metropolitan Club, Washington, D.C., Burning Tree Club, Bethesda, Md.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH, SIDNEY JAMES WEINBERG

Born: New York City, October 12, 1891.

Education: 1906, graduated, public school No. 13, Brooklyn; 1907, Browne's Business College, Brooklyn; 1946, LL.D. Trinity College.

Marital status: Married.

Experience: 1907, began business career with Goldman, Sachs & Co., partner since 1927; director Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc., Continental Can Co., Inc., General Cigar Co., General Electric Co., General Foods Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., Ford Motor Co., McKesson & Robbins, Inc., National Dairy Products Corp., Champion Paper & Fibre Co., Van Raalte Co., Inc.

Military experience: 1917, enlisted as seaman U.S. Navy; became special agent, Navy Intelligence Department; special agent, War Trade Board; and deputy collector of customs at Norfolk, Va.; demobilized December 1918; honorable discharge, June 5, 1921.

Memberships: Business Advisory Council for U.S. Department of Commerce; member, Industrial Advisory Board, N.R.A.; governor, New York Stock Exchange; governor, Investment Bankers Association of America; awarded Medal for Merit by President Truman, 1946.

Clubs: Bond, Century Country, Recess, Madison Square Garden (New York City), Town (Scarsdale).

Home: 8 Reimer Road, Scarsdale, N.Y.

Office: 30 Pine Street, New York City, N.Y.

BRUCE SUNDLUN

Address: 2713 35th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; and 23 Half Mile Road, Barrington, R.I.

Age: 40 years.

Occupation: partner, Amram, Hahn & Sundlun, attorneys, Washington Building, Washington D.C.

Education: Tabor Academy, Marion, Mass., 1938; Williams College, bachelor of arts 1946 (class 142); Harvard Law School, bachelor of law, 1949; Air Force Command & Staff School (associate course), 1948..

Experience: (a) Legal: Assistant U.S. Attorney, District of Columbia, 1949–51; Special Assistant to U.S. Attorney General, Civil Division, Department of Justice, 1951–53; trial attorney, Court of Claims section, Department of Justice, 1953–55; partner, Hahn & Sundlun, 1955–57; partner, Amram, Hahn & Sundlun, 1957 to present; member, American, Federal, District of Columbia, and Rhode Island Bar Associations; rating, average by Martindale-Hubbell.

(b) Military aviation: World War II, pilot, 384th Bomb Group (H), ETO, 1942–43; shot down, Solingen, Germany, December 1, 1943, evaded capture through Belgium and France to Switzerland, May 6, 1944. Rejoined USAF, September 9, 1944, and flew in the Pacific until September 1945.

Assistant wing operations officer, 3d Bomb Wing (L), (Res.), Bedford, Mass., 1946–49.

Member, 5-man Civilian Operations Analysis Team sent to United Kingdom in 1950 by General Vandenberg to determine defensibility of SAC United Kingdom bases. Wrote report thereon.

Commander, 30th Troop Carrier Squadron (Res.), Bedford, Mass., 1949–51.

Office, Secretary of the Air Force, legislative liaison, 1952–54.

D/Ops, 459th Troop Carrier Wing (Res.), Andrews AFB, Md., 1955–57.

Commander, 756th Troop Carrier Squadron (Res.), Andrews AFB, Md., 1957 to present.

Decoration: Distinguished Flying Cross, Purple Heart, Air Medal with one cluster.

(c) Civil aviation: Private pilot's license, 1940; commercial pilot's license, 1946; single and multiengine rating, 1946; instrument rating, 1958 (U.S. Air Force green card and senior pilot rating); 3,500 hours flying time; owner, Cessna 310C, now flown personally 300 hours a year; member, AOPA, 1946; member, National Pilots Association, 1960.

(d) Business: Director, secretary, and general counsel, the Outlet Co., Rhode Island's largest department store, television, and radio station; director, Ariguanabo Co. of Jamaica, Ltd., Jamaica largest cotton manufacturer; cofounder, the Northern Virginia Sun, daily newspaper, Arlington, Va.

(e) Political: Campaign director, District of Columbia, Kefauver for President, 1956; codirector, Advance Men, Democratic National Committee, 1956; campaign consultant, Senator-elect CLAIBORNE PELL, 1960; chairman, Inaugural Medal Committee, 1960; vice chairman for 1960 parade organization; Inaugural Parade Committee, 1960; various District of Columbia and Rhode Island fund committees.

Family: Married, Madeleine Schieffer, November 10, 1949; children, Tracy, 8; Stuart, 8; Peter Bruce, 6.

Religion: Jewish.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF A. BYRNE LITSCHGI, TAMPA, FLA.

Personal: Born December 31, 1920, Charleston, S.C.; married, two children.

Education: Bachelor of science in business administration, University of Florida, 1941, with major in accounting; member Florida Blue Key leadership fraternity; bachelor of laws, Law School of Harvard University, 1948; winner, Ames Competition, business manager Harvard Law School Record.

---

[1] Charitable or nonprofit corporations.

Military service: Presently commander, U.S. Naval Reserve; 1941–45, naval combat sea duty in all war theaters.

Professional career: Presently a partner in the firm of Coles, Himes & Litschigi, of Tampa, Fla. Practice consists chiefly of work in Federal income, estate, gift, and excise tax fields.

Year, 1952–60, member of the firm of Hedrick & Lane, Washington, D.C. Practice involved Federal income, estate, gift, and excise tax matters and cases before regulatory agencies. Represented number of large national corporate clients in tax matters. Prepared and implemented tax legislative programs involving overall revision of Federal tax laws and those of narrower scope. General counsel for the Federal Excise Tax Council, Inc., whose membership is composed of major appliance manufacturing companies and major national retailing organizations. Practice required constant contact with the Internal Revenue Service, the Treasury staff, and Members of Congress. Enjoyed excellent working relationships with service and Treasury personnel as well as with a number of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, Senate Committee on Finance and their staffs.

Year 1952, legislative assistant to Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, of Florida, 1949–52, attorney in the Office of the General Counsel of the Treasury Department: 1949–51, assigned to legal staff for the Office of International Finance and Bureau of the Mint where work covered following areas—

1. Legal work for National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems in areas involving Export-Import Bank, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and International Monetary Fund.

2. Member interdepartmental committee preparing point 4 technical assistance program and implementing legislation; member similar committee handling policy questions arising during operation of ECA (Marshall plan).

3. Policy development for and support of U.S. representative to GATT meetings.

4. Creation of foreign assets control and blocking of financial transactions with Communist China.

5. Various custom duty matters.

Years 1951–52, attorney in the Office of the Tax Legislative Counsel. Advised on development of tax policy and participated in drafting and reviewing Treasury regulations issued under the Internal Revenue Code. Worked with congressional committees and staffs on tax legislation. Responsible for handling problems on taxation of foreign income and interdepartmental relationships concerning foreign tax problems. Tax adviser to the U.S. representative, United Nations Fiscal Commission.

Member of bars of Florida and of the District of Columbia. Admitted to practice before Supreme Court of the United States, various lower Federal courts and Federal regulatory agencies.

Professional associations: American Bar Association, chairman, committee on excise and miscellaneous taxes, tax section, 1956–59; presently adviser to this committee. Active in work of tax section in preparing recommendations to the Congress and the Internal Revenue Service on the Federal tax laws; member of the National Council of the Harvard Law School Association which supervises all Harvard Law School alumni and fundraising activities; trustee, University of South Florida Foundation; writer of various articles on tax subjects for American Bar Association Journal, Tax Executive, and other publications; member of planning committee for 16th Annual Institute on Federal Taxation, New York University, and directly responsible for institute panel on Federal excises; member of several District of Columbia and Florida bar organizations; presently chairman, Committee on Unauthorized Practice of Hillsborough County (Fla.) Bar Association.

Business activities: director and general counsel for G-L Electronics Co., Inc., and related companies; member and former head of General Realty Ventures partnership, Washington, D.C.

Democratic Party activities: served as advance man for Governor Stevenson during 1956 presidental campaign and again for President Kennedy during 1960 campaign; member, committee for 1960 presidential kickoff dinner and for later fundraising dinner.

Club memberships: University Club of Washington, D.C.; Kenwood Golf and Country Club, Washington, D.C.; Tampa Yacht and Country Club; National Capital Democratic Club; National Association Executives Club.

BEARDSLEY GRAHAM, PRESIDENT, SPINDLETOP RESEARCH, INC., LEXINGTON, KY.

Education: B.S., College of Chemistry, 1935, University of California, Berkeley; graduate study, electrical engineering and physics, 1935–40, University of California, Berkeley; completed all requirements for E.E. degree and M.S. degree except theses; graduate study, electrical engineering, 1942, Columbia University, New York.

Experience: 1962, Spindletop Research Inc., Lexington, Ky., president, responsible for planning, development, staff, and operations of new industrial research center; 1957–62, Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Palo Alto, Calif.; 1960–62, special assistant, communication satellites, responsible for development and coordination of Lockheed Aircraft Corp.'s communication satellite system activities. Manager of satellite research planning and commercial satellite systems organization; 1958–60, manager, satellite systems planning, responsible for reviewing operational requirements and providing concept and design parameters for systems under development or expected to evolve in the Air Force satellite systems program. Developed, established, maintained, and modified the satellite systems development plan; 1957–58, special assistant to the manager, XA weapon system branch. Carried out special assignments for the manager and aided in administration of the weapon system research and development program; 1957, manager, specialty sales department.

Commercial communication satellite activities: Recognizing in 1959 that the technical feasibility of commercial communication satellites was clearly established, Graham conceived of the joint venture plan and initiated, implemented, and directed all Lockheed commercial satellite activities until December 1961.

Early in-house studies indicated economic feasibility and focused attention on business and regulatory problems. To investigate these aspects, Booz, Allen & Hamilton and Pierson, Ball & Dowd were engaged early in 1960.

During the last half of 1960 and in 1961 the results of these studies were presented at high corporate levels to A.T. & T., I.T. & T., RCA, G.T. & E., Time, Inc., and to various governmental and legislative agencies, including FCC, OCDM, Department of Justice, Department of Defense, Department of State, Department of Commerce, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Senate and House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, House Science and Astronautics Committee, and Senate Judiciary Committee.

A railroad release was obtained from Justice, and RCA and G.T. & E. elected to join Lockheed in further studies refining the joint venture concept.

Certain refinements were presented, and original studies were made public in response to various FCC dockets and legislative hearings.

Lockheed's (and Graham's) commercial communication satellite activities essentially ended with a presentation to the FCC Ad Hoc Carrier Committee on September 7, 1961.

Communication satellite bibliography

LMSD–895069: "Telecommunication Satellite Business Planning Study," volume 1, October 1960; volume 2, January 1961.

FCC Docket No. 11866: "In the Matter of Allocation of Frequencies in the Bands Above 890 Mc." (July 1960).

FCC Docket No. 14024: "In the Matter of an Inquiry Into the Administrative and Regulatory Problems Relating to the Authorization of Commercially Operable Space Communications Systems" (May 1961).

FCC Docket No. 13522: "In the Matter of Allocation of Frequency Bands for Space Communications" (March, June 1961).

House hearing of Committee on Science and Astronautics: L. E. Root, president, Lockheed Missiles & Space Division, accompanied by Beardsley Graham.

Senate hearing of Subcommittee on Monopoly, Committee on Small Business Administration: Courtlandt S. Gross, president, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., accompanied by Beardsley Graham.

Ad Hoc Carrier Committee report: Beardsley Graham, accompanied by D. Sailor.

Years 1956–57: Sequoia Process Corp., Redwood City, Calif., executive vice president. Directed and administered electronic wire and cable development and manufacturing program.

Years 1951–56: Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, Calif., assistant director of institute; 1953–56 assistant director and manager, Mountain States Division, Phoenix, Ariz.—opened, directed and developed new research division of institute; 1952–53, assistant director, responsible for development of industrial research program and acquisition of project support; 1951–52, assistant director, engineering research—directed development of automation and large-scale computer program.

Years 1946–51: Bendix Aviation Corp., Detroit, Mich.; 1949–51, technical consultant to vice president for research—responsible for development of BAC nuclear and computing machine programs; 1947–49, chief engineer, research laboratory—in charge of all electronic, physical and chemical research; 1946–47, chief engineer, department head of Special Products Development Laboratories, Eclipse—Pioneer Division and Pacific Division—in charge of groups developing missile systems and components.

Years 1944–46: Lewyt Corp., Brooklyn, N.Y., senior project engineer; responsible for production of microwave radar equipment and components.

Years 1942–44: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, radiation laboratory, Cambridge, Mass.; staff member; engaged in research, development, design, fabrication, installation, and operation of microwave radar equipment.

Years 1940–42: National Broadcasting Co., New York, N.Y., and Hollywood, Calif., development engineer. Engaged in development, operation and maintenance of television equipment in the studio and in the field.

Years 1939–40: RCA Manufacturing Co., Exhibit GGIE, San Francisco, Calif., engineer in charge. Supervised installation, operation, and maintenance of television, facsimile, and public address equipment.

1936–37: Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., San Francisco, Calif., frameman; worked on operation, testing, and maintenance of automatic switching central office equipment.

1935–36: Techna Corp., San Francisco, Calif., chemical engineer; worked on design and installation of chemical laboratory to maintain control in electric recording equipment manufacturing.

Special activities: Consultant, President's Joint Disarmament Committee, 1959-60.

Professional societies: Institute of Radio Engineers (senior member); American Rocket Society (senior member); Association for Applied Solar Energy (member, board of directors).

Listed in: American Men of Science, Who's Who in Engineering, Who's Who in the West, Registered Professional Engineer, State of California, State of Arizona.

LEONARD WOODCOCK

Address: Home, 950 Pemberton Street, Grosse Point Park, Mich., business, 8000 East Jefferson Street, Detroit, Mich.

Present position: vice president, UAW (International Union, United (AFL-CIO) Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America).

Born: Providence, R.I., February 15, 1911; son of Ernest and Margaret Freel Woodcock.

Education: St. Wilfred's College, England, 1920-23; North Hampton Town and Country School, England, 1923-26; Walsh Institute of Accountancy, Detroit, Mich., 1928-30; Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich., 1928-30.

Marital status: Married Loula Martin, March 28, 1941; three children.

Employment: UAW, 1940- ; where he has been successively: 1947-50, staff representative, administrative assistant to the international president, regional director; international vice president, 1951—UAW; Muskegon Aviation & Engineering Co., Muskegon, 1947.

Member of board of governors, Wayne State University, 1959; board of directors, Metropolitan Detroit, YMCA; Greater Detroit Hospital Council, Inc., American Civil Liberties Union, NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), American Public Health Association.

SAM HARRIS

Born: Pennsylvania, July 17, 1912.

Education: 1933, graduated from UCLA with highest honors—elected Phi Beta Kappa; 1933-36, attended the Yale Law School on scholarships and was graduated cum laude—comment editor of Yale Law Journal, Order of Coif.

Marital status: Married, two sons, ages 14 and 16.

Experience: 1936, admitted to the California bar; 1936, joined the general counsel's staff on the SEC; 1939, appointed chief of the opinion section of the SEC; 1940, as a result of experience at the SEC, was invited to join the staff of the trustees of the Associated Gas & Electric Corp. in New York; 1942-46, Army, served in Judge Advocate General's Department. Chief of economic section at Nuremburg trial, discharged as captain; received Bronze Star and commendation ribbon; 1947, admitted to New York bar and joined present firm (Strasser, Speigelberg, Fried & Frank), currently a director of Rio Algom Mines, Ltd., Callahan Mining Co., and the Energy Fund Registered Investment Co.; chairman, American Bar Association Committee on Securities Regulation; New York County Lawyers Association; American Judicature Society.

Clubs: Yale Club, New York City; Bankers Club of America; Century Country Club.

Residence: 14 East 75th Street, New York City, N.Y.

GEORGE J. FELDMAN

Address: Residence, 1010 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; business, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Date and place of birth: November 6, 1904, Boston, Mass.

Marital status: Married, two children.

Military service: Army Air Corps, 1942-45.

Profession: Lawyer—admitted to practice in the States of Massachusetts, New York, and in the District of Columbia.

Current: Private practice of law. Counsel, vice president, and member of the board of directors of the Mastan Co., Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. (commercial finance company); member, executive committee and board of directors of Columbia Mills, main office, Syracuse, N.Y. (manufacturers of coated fabrics, etc.); member, U.S. Citizens Commission to NATO (current); member, U.S. Delegation to the United Nations 14th Assembly; member, U.S. Delegation to Second United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, Geneva, Switzerland (March and April 1960); consultant to Legal Adviser, State Department (1959-60); consultant, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives (current); Director and Chief Counsel, Select Committee on Astronautics and Outer Space, House of Representatives (1958).

Previous experience: Administrative assistant, U.S. Senator David Walsh, 1927-30; attorney, Federal Trade Commission, April 1930-September 1932; lecturer, Boston University Law School (trade regulation and Federal antitrust law); practiced law with the firm of Walsh & Walsh, Boston, Mass., September 1932-June 1935; litigation counsel, NRA, June 1934-June 1935; formed law firm of Feldman, Kittalls, Campbell & Ewing; engaged in private practice of law from 1935 to 1942 and acted as general counsel to Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., New York, N.Y., October 1937-May 1942 until entry into military service; private practice of law from 1946 to date.

Principal clients represented: Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., New York, N.Y.; Diamond Watch Co., New York, N.Y.; Excello Corp., Detroit, Mich.; Lerner Shops, New York, N.Y.; Dictograph Products, Inc., New York, N.Y.; Avco Corp., New York, N.Y.; Columbia Mills, Syracuse, N.Y.; American Greetings Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.; The Mastan Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.; D.C.A. Corp., New York, N.Y.

Author of the following books:

"Does Trade Need Antitrust Laws," published by Long & Smith, 1932.

"Antitrust Laws and Unfair Competition," an NRA study published in book form (NRA Work Materials No. 1), 1935.

"Business Under the New Price Laws," a book dealing with the Robinson-Patman Act and State price laws, by Burton A. Zorn and George J. Feldman, published by Prentice-Hall, 1937.

"Advertising and Promotional Allowances," deals with advertising and promotional allowances and demonstrator services under the Robinson-Patman Act, published by the Bureau of National Affairs, 1948.

Author of the following articles:

"The New Federal Securities Act," in the Boston University Law Review, January 1934.

"Legal Aspects of Federal and State Price Control," in the Boston University Law Review, June 1936.

"Legal Aspects of Resale Price Maintenance," an NRA study (NRA Work Materials No. 57, at p. 298), 1935.

"Administrative Hearings and Due Process of Law," in the U.S. Law Week, June 16, 1936.

"The Federal Trade Commission and the Robinson-Patman Act," in the U.S. Law Week.

"Burden of Proof Under the Robinson-Patman Act," for Prentice-Hall, Trade Regulation Service, October 14, 1936.

"Legislative Opposition to Chain Stores and its Minimization," Law and Contemporary Problems, Duke University, Vol. VIII, No. 2, Spring 1941 (p. 334).

"Antitrust Paradoxes," in the Journal of Marketing, Vol. 6, No. 2, October 1941.

"Basing Points and the O'Mahoney Bill," in Fortune magazine, September 1949.

"An American View of Jurisdiction in Outer Space" (First Colloquium on the Law of Outer Space, The Hague, 1958), 1959.

"The Report of the United Nations Legal Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space: A Provisional Appraisal" (Second Colloquim on the Law of Outer Space, London, 1959), 1960.

"Current Developments in the Law of the Sea and Outer Space," U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

"Communication Satellites," missiles and rockets, May 22, 1961.

As Director and Chief Counsel of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, was responsible for the publication of the following staff reports:

"The International Geophysical Year and Space Research," December 22, 1958.

"Survey of Space Law," December 22, 1958.

"Summary of Hearings, Astronautics and Space Exploration," December 22, 1958.

"The National Space Problem," May 21, 1958.

"Space Handbook: Astronautics and Its Applications," December 29, 1958.

"The United States in Outer Space," January 3, 1959.

"The Next 10 Years in Space, 1959-69," February 3, 1959.

"International Cooperation in the Exploration of Space," February 3, 1959.

Other activities: Collaborated with Bernard Baruch in the drafting of the so-called wage and hour law; assisted Senator Walsh and Congressman Healey in the drafting of the so-called Walsh-Healey Act; counsel for Democratic platform committee and drafting committee, Democratic Convention, Chicago, 1952; vice chairman, national Democratic committee's finance committee, 1960.

Clearances: "Q" clearance with the Atomic Energy Commission, "Top Secret" with the Department of Defense.

Clubs: Sands Point Golf Club, Sands Point, N.Y.; National Democratic Club, New York, N.Y.; City Athletic Club, New York, N.Y.; American Legion.

"World TV by Satellite," Show Business Illustrated, September 19, 1961.

"Communications Satellite Legislation and International Cooperation," Federal Bar Association, May 25, 1962.

LEONARD H. MARKS

Education: University of Pittsburgh, B.A., 1935; University of Pittsburgh Law School, LL.B., 1938.

Teaching: Faculty fellow, University of Pittsburgh Law School, 1938-39; assistant professor, University of Pittsburgh Law School, 1939-42; assistant professor, National University Law School, Washington, D.C., 1943-50.

Governmental positions: Assistant to the General Counsel, Federal Communications Commission, 1942-46; member of, or adviser to, various U.S. delegations to International Broadcast Conferences, Mexico City, 1948; Montreal, 1949; Mexico City, 1952; Geneva, 1960; appointed by Department of State to lecture on constitutional administrative law in India in 1958; national defense executive reserve, 1959 to date.

Legal experience: Admitted to bar in Pennsylvania, 1938; admitted to bar in District of Columbia, 1946; admitted to practice before various courts in Pennsylvania and District of Columbia, including U.S. Supreme Court; president, Federal Communications Bar Association, 1959-60; member, house of delegates, American Bar Association, 1961-63; partner, Cohn & Marks, Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C., 1946 to date.

Miscellaneous: Has written articles on legal matters in various professional and trade journals throughout the years.

JOHN THOMAS CONNOR

Address: Home, 49 Prospect Hill Avenue, Summit, N.J.; business, Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J., president.

Occupation: Lawyer, business executive.

Born: Syracuse, N.Y., November 3, 1914; son of Michael J. and Mary V. (Sullivan) Connor.

Education: A.B. magna cum laude. Syracuse University, 1936; LL.B., Harvard University, 1939.

Marital status: Married Mary O'Boyle, June 22, 1940; children—John Thomas, Geoffrey, Lisa Forrestal.

Experience: Admitted to New York bar, 1939; associate, Cravath, De Gersdorff, Swaine & Wood, New York City, 1939–42; general counsel, Office Science Research and Development, Washington, 1942–44; general attorney, Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N.J., 1947; secretary, counsel 1947–50, vice president, 1950–55, president, director, 1955–; director Fidelity Union Trust Co. (Newark). Board Health Information Foundation, Commission Economic Development, National Industrial Conference Board, Overlook Hospital, Summit.

Member, New Jersey Water Resources Advisory Commission; chairman, New Jersey Commission for Improving Science and Mathematics in Secondary Schools; member, board trustees Pingry School, Elizabeth, N.J.; trustee, Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, Inc.; Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association (director, member, executive committee), Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Psi, Phi Kappa Phi, Phi Kappa Alpha, Beta Gamma Sigma (honorary).

Clubs: Beacon Hill (Summit, N.J.); Economic, the Pinnacle, Harvard (New York City); Morris County Golf (Convent, N.J.); Essex (Newark); Baltusrol Golf.

Military service: Served from second to first lieutenant, USMC, 1944–45, retired captain, USMCR, counsel, Office Naval Research and special assistant to Secretary of Navy, 1945–47.

Miscellaneous: Mr. Connor received the 1962 Jefferson Medal of the New Jersey Patent Law Association for outstanding services to the cause of the American patent system. In 1959, he was awarded an honorary doctor of science degree by the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science and also received the New Jersey Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Religion: Roman Catholic.

Present affiliations:

The Business Council, Washington, D.C., member.

Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., member.

Committee for Economic Development, member, board of trustees.

American Management Association, member, board of directors.

Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, member, board of directors.

National Commission on Community Health Services, member.

Second Citizens Advisory Committee, Food and Drug Administration, member.

Syracuse University, trustee.

Johns Hopkins University, member, visiting committee for school of hygiene and public health.

Seton Hall University, member, board of advisers to the president.

Pingry School, Elizabeth, N.J., member, board of trustees.

Economic Club of New York, member, board of directors.

General Foods Corp., member, board of directors.

Sperry & Hutchinson Co., member, board of directors.

Research Analysis Corp., trustee.

Phi Beta Kappa Associates, member.

Former affiliations:

Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., chairman, board of directors, 1959–60.

Crusade for Freedom Committee, New Jersey chairman for 1957.

Fourth Annual Rutgers Pharmaceutical Conference, 1955, chairman.

Fidelity Union Trust Co., member, board of directors.

National Industrial Conference Board, member, board of directors.

New Jersey Committee for Improving Science and Mathematics in the Secondary Schools, chairman, 1959–60.

New Jersey Association for Mental Health, 1954 fund campaign, chairman.

New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, member, board of directors; member, executive committee.

New Jersey State Water Resources Advisory Committee, member.

Overlook Hospital, Summit, N.J., member, board of trustees.

Tenth Annual Business Conference at Rutgers, May 15, 1958, general chairman.

Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry fundraising campaign, head of chemical industry subcommittee.

Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, member, board of trustees.

Business Council for International Understanding, member, policy board.

National Advisory Heart Council of the National Institutes of Health, member.

GEORGE KILLION

Place and date of birth: Steamboat Springs, Colo., April 15, 1901.

Parents: father, James Abraham Killion, rancher, druggist; born Springfield, Ill.; mother, Lydia Jane Harris, born Chattanooga, Tenn.

Education: Attended Grand Valley, Colo., public schools; attended University of Southern California and University of California.

Career: president and member of the board of directors, American President Lines, 601 California Street, San Francisco (1947 to present); chairman of the board of directors of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc., 1540 Broadway, New York, N.Y. (1957 to present); member of the board of directors of American Mail Line, Seattle, Wash. (1954 to present); member of the board of directors, Pacific National Bank, San Francisco (1960 to present); member of the board of directors, Natomas Co., Sacramento (June 1956 to present); special assistant to the Petroleum Administrator for War, Washington, D.C. (1943–44); major, U.S. Army (staff of Allied Military Government) (1943); director of finance, State of California, in charge of all financial, budget and business affairs of State Government (1940–43); Secretary to the Governor of California (1939); commissioner, Golden Gate International Exposition, San Francisco (1939–40); executive, Safeway Stores, Oakland, Calif.; consultant on public relations, advertising, legislation and business development (1935–39); owned and directed a public relations firm engaged in handling tax, financial and political campaigns (1930–35); engaged in newspaper work, California, as reporter, city editor, managing editor and editorial writer (1922–30).

Clubs:

American Bureau of Shipping (member of board of managers).

Commonwealth Club of California.

Stock Exchange Club.

Propeller Club of the United States (national executive committee).

India House, Inc., New York.

Olympic Club, San Francisco.

Pacific Maritime Association (director, passenger line group).

Pacific American Steamship Association (member, advisory board and board of directors).

Press & Union League Club.

San Francisco World Trade Center Authority (member, May 1959 to present).

Governor's Business Advisory Council, State of California (member, January 1959 to present).

World Trade Club (president, April 1957 to present).

The Burning Tree Club, Washington, D.C.

The Metropolitan Club, Washington, D.C.

United Seamen's Service (vice president, July 1959 to present).

Association of the U.S. Army.

The Bohemian Club.

American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, Inc. (member of board of trustees).

National Defense Transportation Association (life member).

National Export Expansion Council (member).

Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation (member, board of governors); honors, Italian Government conferred "Knight in the Order of Merit to the Republic of Italy."

WHOSE CIVIL RIGHTS?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal there appears an editorial entitled "Whose Civil Rights?"

The editorial should be read by Members of Congress, and particularly it should be read by the Attorney General of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHOSE CIVIL RIGHTS?

Former General Walker and new heavyweight champion Sonny Liston don't have too much in common, but each of them ought to have a little sympathy for the other. Both of them have recently been the victims of some strange encounters with Federal police authorities.

To be sure, the Federal tax authorities had reasonable grounds for suspicion that the Government might not get its due share of the receipts from the Liston-Patterson fight unless it stepped in and grabbed them first. Fight managers and promoters are not noted for their scrupulous accounting or for being pillars of society, and the IRS has had trouble before with the fight promoters.

Nonetheless, the new champion is not involved in this past dispute. Moreover, the internal revenue agents didn't pause long enough to give anybody a chance to make an accounting in good faith. Nor did they content themselves with putting a tab on some reasonable proportion of the fight take. They moved almost as fast as Sonny Liston moved on Patterson, and just as thoroughly. They seized the money first and talked about it afterwards.

Possibly also General Walker's speeches contributed to the riots in Mississippi; that is a matter for the courts to decide. But when he was arrested some of the niceties of civil rights got lost in the rush.

He was arraigned without benefit of counsel, and then without even going through the motions of a proper hearing the authorities had him hustled off for psychiatric examination. His bail was set at the unusually large figure of $100,000, the same figure used for the late Dr. Soblen, a man duly convicted in open court of having spied for the enemies of his country.

We'll leave the lawyers to debate the legal points in these two cases, as they are now doing. Subsequently General Walker's bail was cut in half and he is now out of jail. Doubtless in the end Sonny Liston will receive his proper share of the fight proceeds. But there is something more disturbing here than legal technicalities.

One of these cases puts aside the concept that a man is punished only for crimes committed; here is punishment for tax evasion—certainly seizing all a man's pay is punishment—merely on the policeman's suspicion that taxes might be evaded. The other puts aside the doctrine that a man charged with a crime is entitled to the protection of certain ancient processes of the law, including the right to counsel.

The reply of the policeman in each case is that haste was necessary. If the revenue agent hadn't acted then it might have been too late. The Justice Department had to move swiftly against General Walker to teach a lesson to other people.

Perhaps so; yet it's an argument become all too familiar. A Justice of the Supreme Court makes a ruling, as Justice Black did in the Mississippi school case, by concluding from conversations what the full court might decide—because everybody was too impatient to wait a few weeks. A corporation angers the Attorney General, as United States Steel did by trying to raise prices, and the next day its offices are crawling with Government agents, hustling to find evidence for an indictment not yet drawn.

It may be hard to drum up much sympathy for General Walker or Sonny Liston. But if we are going to set aside all the due processes of law every time the policeman is in a hurry, then no man can be safe from the scowl of the tax collector or the Attorney General.

ACTIVITIES OF RED REGIME IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA — ADOPTION AND REPORT BY CONVENTION OF CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss a resolution adopted at the convention of the Czechoslovak National Council of America several days ago. The resolution sets forth that there has been a scarcity of food and consumers' goods in Czechoslovakia, and that in the past American citizens have been sending gift packages containing American goods, food, and other necessities to their relatives and friends in Czechoslovakia.

According to the resolution, the Czechoslovak Government was not pleased with Americans sending these packages into their country, and it proceeded to adopt a program that would dissuade relatives in our country from helping their relatives in Communist Czechoslovakia.

The program of dissuasion began first by restricting the sending of canned goods; second, requiring a disinfection certificate accompanying the goods; third, the number of gifts packages to a recipient each year was limited; fourth, likewise, the number of items contained in the package was limited; fifth, in 1961 the Czechoslovak Government imposed duties upon goods going into Czechoslovakia that were so large as to make the receipt of the goods prohibitive. Finally, custom duties on used clothing were increased over those imposed in 1961.

An American citizen might well ask, "Why did the Czechoslovak Government impose restrictions which made it impossible for Americans to send food and clothing to needy Czechoslovaks?" The answer is that the Czechoslovak Government wanted the Americans to send dollars to Czechoslovakia and have those dollars used to buy food and consumer goods in Czechoslovakia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Czechoslovak Communist Government has quite well achieved its objective. American food, clothing, and other necessities are prohibited. American dollars are permitted to be received. Goods and clothing are bought in Czechoslovakia, and the Czechoslovakia Government is receiving American dollars.

Czechoslovaks in the United States see a wrong in that course, and I concur with them. I think our State Department ought to look into the subject. In addition to Czechoslovakia, the same plan is taking place in Hungary and other Communist countries.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I referred earlier be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I suggest that the State Department take a look at the subject with the view of ascertaining why humane Americans cannot send to needy Czechoslovaks and Hungarians food and clothing, but, instead, have agreed to send American dollars there, increasing the draft on our dollars and causing an imbalance in our international accounts.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE CONVENTION OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA, CHICAGO, 1962

REVIEW OF CZECHOSLOVAK COMMUNIST POLICY

Tuzex

Under Communist rule, there has been a continued scarcity of food and consumer goods in Czechoslovakia. In the past, a flood of American gift packages with American goods brought relief to grateful Czechoslovak relatives and friends. However, the freedom of entry for such merchandise has been gradually restricted by the following Czechoslovak regulations: (a) First sending of canned goods was prohibited; (b) a disinfection certificate was required; (c) the number of gift packages to a recipient per year was limited; (d) likewise the number of any item contained in the package was limited to one; (e) in 1961, customs duties on all items were raised to prohibitive rates, especially on such items as wool, nylon, coffee. For instance, the duty on an ordinary pullover amounts to 180 crowns (hourly wage of an average worker is 8 crowns); (f) finally, customs duties on used clothing were increased to 50 crowns a kilogram (2.2 pounds). With duties raised sky-high, the recipient cannot possibly pay for a gift package. On a package valued at $15 the customs duty equals a weekly wage.

Through these measures, the Czechoslovak regime has forced American citizens either to stop their aid to needy relatives or else to deposit dollars with the Czechoslovak State Office Tuzex, established for the purpose of collecting abroad highly desirable dollars and other hard currencies, in exchange for goods made in Czechoslovakia that are sold to Czechoslovak citizens, the recipients of the dollar remittances. The dollars are retained by the Czechoslovak Government and the beneficiaries of the remittances receive only Czechoslovak goods. Thus the export of U.S. produced goods has been stopped and the outflow of U.S. dollars has increased, thereby damaging doubly our economy. Moreover, the U.S. currency thus acquired is available to the Czechoslovak Government for the financing of Communist subversive activities, espionage and other action against the free world, the United States in particular.

Americans of Czechoslovak descent feel that such a monopoly should not be allowed to operate on American soil. We not only tolerate the advantages which the Czechoslovak Government derives from the operations of the Tuzex agency, but also accept without protest the disadvantages inflicted upon our country. Instead, we should at least insist on the following: That for each $15 deposited with Tuzex for Czechoslovak merchandise, American senders be allowed to send a 20-pound gift package of American goods; moreover, that no excessive customs duties be levied on the American goods.

It is our considered opinion that the Czechoslovak Government needs the U.S. dollars collected by the Tuzex agency badly enough to be willing to make concessions if faced with the possibility of a ban on Tuzex monopoly operations by appropriate action of the Department of State or the Department of Justice.

Other hostile acts against Americans

1. The Czechoslovak regime blackmails American citizens who intend to obtain a Czechoslovak emigration visa for a member of their immediate family into paying large amounts of money;

2. Czechoslovak authorities collect amounts in U.S. dollars from American citizens purported to cover maintenance, installment payments, or interest on loans on property in Czechoslovakia, although such property has already been confiscated and is now the property of the Czechoslovak State;

3. By arranging conducted tours with a propaganda slant for Americans visiting Czechoslovakia, by offering them free medical care and hospital services, the Communist regime tries to turn them into Communist agents or fellow travelers upon their return to the United States;

4. The Czechoslovak regime reduces pension payments to persons related to American citizens who are active anti-Communists in this country, threatening them with annulment of pension benefits and other persecution. In this way the Czechoslovak Government extends its influence on Americans on American soil, curtailing their lawful rights and sometimes even obstructing them in fulfilling their duties as American citizens.

These methods and means by which the present Government of Czechoslovakia misuses, disregards, and restricts—unchallenged—the normal conduct of Czechoslovak American relations is a matter of grave concern to us.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America is not arguing for a restriction of contacts with Czechoslovakia and other Communist countries. On the contrary, such contacts should be enlarged upon in order to reduce international tensions, promote understanding, and inspire hope for freedom everywhere. This, however, cannot be accomplished by permitting one party to erect more and more artificial barriers, to enforce more and more restrictions, to impose more and more limitations upon such contacts.

We consider it inadmissible that an antidemocratic government be allowed to enforce, by devious means, obedience from American citizens on American soil. This cannot be the meaning and purpose of our desire to multiply contacts between the United States and Communist countries. Quite the contrary, it is in the very interests of international peace and understanding to oppose such detrimental policies of a Communist regime.

NOMINATION OF JOHN G. GREEN, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Last night I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the day before yesterday, containing the discussion as to the problem with regard to the collector of customs in Wisconsin, which involves a controversy between the junior Senator from Wisconsin and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

I should like to have the RECORD show that in my judgment it is most regrettable that steps were not taken early enough in this session to obtain the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Green to be collector of customs in the State of Wisconsin. I feel that the position which the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has taken in this matter, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is unanswerable; and that the senior Senator from Wisconsin is completely wrong in the position he has taken on this issue. I shall state my reasons.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin, so the RECORD shows, alleges that the appointment of Mr. Green really was requested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH]. As a lawyer accustomed to looking for proof, evidence, and documentation of allegations, I wish to say I think the senior Senator from Wisconsin "fell flat on his face," so to speak, in respect to that argument, for the correspondence placed in the RECORD by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] leaves no room for doubt that the correspondence itself shows that the appointment was at the initiation of the junior Senator from Wisconsin and had his approval and enthusiastic support from the very beginning.

The second point I wish to make is that this issue involves each one of us. It may be the junior Senator from Wisconsin today, but it may be the majority leader tomorrow, or the senior Senator from Oregon the next session, or any other Senator at some time in the future. These matters of historic tradition and precedent in the Senate in regard to such subjects as nominations are of concern to each of us when we find a situation such as has developed in the State of Wisconsin over the appointment of the collector of customs.

I note in the RECORD that the senior Senator from Wisconsin has not been willing to declare the nominee personally obnoxious. The long history of the Senate makes perfectly clear that unless a Senator is willing to declare a nominee personally obnoxious, that Senator loses his standing in the Senate by way of raising an objection to a nominee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The RECORD is perfectly clear that the senior Senator from Wisconsin has taken the position that he really does not have anything against the nominee personally. I can only reach one conclusion; he must have something against the junior Senator from Wisconsin. At least, he is not in a position to cooperate with his colleague in regard to the nomination. I think that is regrettable and reflects discredit upon the senior Senator from Wisconsin and not the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Third, I point out that we are dealing with a matter of patronage. The position of collector of customs is a patronage position. That is our system. So long as it is the system, the majority party has the traditional right to make the appointment and, in the absence of any showing of disqualification on the part of the nominee, on the basis of the four historic criteria which have always been applied under the advise and consent clause, the nomination should be confirmed.

As the Senator from Wisconsin knows, the senior Senator from Oregon has applied those historic criteria ever since the famous fight in 1945 involving the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, when, as a Republican, I defended that nomination by a Democratic President because there was no showing on my side of the aisle that Henry Wallace violated any of the four historic criteria.

I say, on the basis of those four historic criteria, that patronage positions should automatically be filled, unless the opposition can show that the nominee does not fulfill one or more of those criteria.

There is not a scintilla of evidence in this record as to the nomination to be collector of customs in Wisconsin which raises any question as to the nominee's qualifications under those criteria. Therefore, in my judgment, the senior Senator from Wisconsin has no meritorious standing in opposition to the nomination.

After all, this is a patronage job. So long as we have the patronage system, the majority party ought to have the right to fill the position, and it should not be necessary to wait, as we shall now have to wait, to have a matter such as this cleared up because of a technicality, merely because the Committee on Finance reported the nomination by way of a poll rather than a vote in the committee.

I close by saying that I sincerely hope the President of the United States will make an interim appointment. It is my understanding the President can make an interim appointment. In view of the objection raised by the senior Senator from Wisconsin, which, in my judgment, has no merit on the record, I think the President of the United States owes it to the junior Senator from Wisconsin to appoint Mr. Green on an interim basis to be collector of customs. Then, when the Congress comes back into session in January, we can proceed to take the nomination from the Finance Committee and place it before the Senate.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin ought to be made to answer the question now as to whether he has changed his mind and wishes to raise a point of objection to the nomination on the ground that the nominee is personally obnoxious.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Oregon from the heart. I deeply appreciate what the Senator has said. It is very helpful, indeed.

John Green was nominated on March 1. On March 26 I wrote to the senior Senator from Wisconsin and urged him to return an approval slip. He wrote back the next day, and said that he would look into the question.

I again wrote to the Senator on March 30, and I asked him once again to indicate his approval.

It was obvious then that I was not going to get much action from the senior Senator from Wisconsin, so I started working on the Finance Committee. I asked the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee to hold hearings on the nomination. He said he was holding the hearings up until the senior Senator from Wisconsin would consent to have a hearing.

Eventually there was a hearing on June 13.

The reason the nomination was never reported was that at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, a Democratic member of the committee objected to having the nomination taken up. The committee is a very busy committee, as the Senator from Oregon realizes. If I have called the chairman of the committee once on this issue, I have called him at least a dozen times. I talked with members of the committee, with the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, and with the Senator from Tennessee. They cooperated and did all they could. We tried everything we could think of to have the nomination reported from the committee. It was impossible to get the nomination from the committee until the closing days of the session, when a quorum of the Finance Committee could not be obtained. The chairman of the committee tried a number of times to get a quorum. He could not get a quorum. This was the only way to have the nomination reported.

I am glad that the senior Senator from Oregon has raised this point. This could be a very bad precedent, indeed. It might mean that any time a minority Senator wishes to block an appointment all he will have to do is to persuade one member of the committee to stall the appointment to death. If he can stall it until the end of the session, he can then make a point of order as to polling the committee, and nothing can be done. I think this is a precedent we should not permit to be established.

I am delighted the senior Senator from Oregon has raised his voice against this procedure. I am very grateful to him for doing so.

I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

PRESIDENT TRADE BAN CRACKS DOWN ON CASTRO

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I speak as the Senator who led the fight on the floor of the Senate against weakening the language of the House in the foreign aid appropriation bill, which would have prohibited aid to any country whose ships were bringing military cargoes from the Iron Curtain countries to Cuba. In this connection, I think that what the State Department has done in recent days has been far more effective than could have been done if we had won that fight on the floor of the Senate. Incidentally, the fight was won in the conference.

What the President and the State Department has done should be recognized and praised by Americans all over the country. Recent developments have made crystal clear how effective the State Department has been in this regard.

The President will next week close American ports to all ships from any country whose vessels are carrying military supplies to Cuba. Incidentally, that is what we tried to provide in the foreign aid bill. We have done it now, and I believe we have done it more effectively. But that's just the beginning.

Second, he will close American ports to any ships that seek to come here during a voyage in which that ship engages in trade of any sort between a member of the Communist bloc and Cuba.

Also, we have prevented any U.S. shipowner from taking part in the Cuban trade.

Most important of all—we have denied U.S. Government cargoes to any shipping company whose vessels are used for trading between Cuba and the Communist bloc.

Mr. President, the blow to Castro in this action can be appreciated when it is recognized that most of the trade between Cuba and the outside world was with our country until our embargo in February of this year. Since then the trade has shifted to Russia. Of course, the total foreign trade of Cuba has dropped considerably because Russia cannot possibly supply what we supplied.

Seventy percent of the trade of Cuba with the outside world is with Russia. Two-thirds of that trade is being carried on in ships of allied countries or free countries of the world. The action the President will take will cut off virtually all of that trade. Anyone who doubts this will have much effect has only to note the British reaction. British shipowners are protesting the President's Executive order vehemently. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "British Shipowners Oppose Bars to Cuba Trade," published in this morning's issue of the New York Times, emphasizing that protest, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

British Shipowners Oppose Bars to Cuba Trade

London, October 11.—British shipowners insisted today that they would accept no restriction on their trade with Cuba.

They agreed at a meeting that they had to rely on British diplomacy if the United States carried out its proposed sanctions against shipping engaged in carrying cargo from Communist countries to Cuba.

The meeting, called by the Council of the British Chamber of Shipping, was held to discuss U.S. plans for a shipping boycott of Cuba.

After the meeting, David M. Robinson, the Chamber's president, said that British shipowners intended to retain their right to trade throughout the world.

This was the first formal pronouncement from the Chamber since United States proposed to bar from American ports all ships of any country if even a single ship of that country's registry carried arms to Cuba, and to forbid the picking up of return cargoes in the United States by ships that had unloaded nonmilitary Communist freight in Cuban ports.

Mr. Robinson also condemned a suggestion by American shipowners' organizations that owners throughout the world should agree voluntarily to cease trade with Cuba.

Mr. Robinson said that a British Government request to the chamber that British concerns should not carry arms or military equipment to Cuba had been passed on to shipowners.

He added that there was no evidence that British shipowners were involved in such trade.

He said he "did not quarrel" with a U.S. statement that 78 British ships carried cargoes to Cuba between January 15 and August 31.

Peiping Said To Seek Ships

London, October 4.—Shipping sources said today that Communist China had appeared on the London market as a bidder for chartered shipping for the first time in more than a year.

The Chinese were reported to be seeking to charter vessels for 4 to 7 months.

According to a report today in the Financial Times, a British business newspaper, the Chinese want to stipulate that chartered ships must call at Cuban ports.

In the past, Communist China has made a substantial number of charters in London, the newspaper said, and its absence in the last year had been one factor in the low freight rates in recent months.

London has told the United States that the British Government has no power to interfere with the chartering or to ships to carry goods to Cuba.

The United States has proposed a series of reprisal measures to halt Western shipping from engaging in the Cuban trade. The U.S. measures are causing some owners, who would otherwise have accepted the Chinese offers, to hesitate, the Financial Times said.

Swedes Balk at U.S. Plan

Stockholm, October 11.—Sweden indicated disapproval today of a U.S. plan to try to bar non-Communist shipping from carrying nonmilitary cargoes to Cuba from the Soviet bloc.

The Government announced that the Swedish Embassy in Washington had communicated Sweden's "anxiety" over measures abridging "the possibilities of freedom of the seas."

The Government said it had also told the United States that "as far as we know, no Swedish ships have been carrying arms to Cuba."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Norwegian shipowners are protesting the action, but they are agreeing to go along with it. The West German, Greek, and Turkish Governments have agreed to comply and to go along with us. I ask unanimous consent that an article by Frank Porter entitled "United States Ignores Outcry on Cuba Shipping Ban," published in the Washington Post of recent date, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

United States Ignores Outcry on Cuba Shipping Ban

(By Frank C. Porter)

British and Norwegian shipowners yesterday attacked drastic American plans to retaliate against free world ships carrying Communist bloc cargoes to Cuba.

At the same time, there were indications that the United States intends to take a tough line, no matter what opposition develops overseas.

"It comes down to this: Do they want to trade with Cuba or do they want to trade with us?" one Government source said.

State Department and other Government officials spent most of yesterday hammering out details of the four-point program, which is expected to go into effect early next week.

The program provides for—

Closing American ports to all ships from any country whose vessels carry military supplies to Cuba.

Closing American ports to any ship which seeks to come here during a voyage in which it engages in trade of any sort between the Communist bloc and Cuba.

Preventing any U.S. shipowner from participating in Cuban trade.

Denying U.S. Government cargoes to any shipping company whose vessels are used for trading between Cuba and the Communist bloc.

Questions on putting these policies into effect, enforcing them, and clearing away any obstacles were reportedly discussed at yesterday's sessions at State. One trade official said unofficially that the Trading With the Enemy Act will undoubtedly be invoked and that the program may be administered by the Division of Foreign Assets Control of the Treasury Department.

Government spokesmen say they believe no free world ships have as yet carried arms to Cuba.

In Oslo yesterday, the Norwegian Shipowners Association said it "viewed with concern any development where shipping is being used as an instrument of foreign policy." But it said that its annual convention fully endorsed a request that members refuse to carry goods to Cuba.

British shipowners were more adamant. Their trade group, the Council of Shipping, decided unanimously to oppose any restrictions on their trade with Cuba, United Press International reported. "It is a matter of gravest concern to owners engaged in trade that they could be involved in sanctions," the council said.

The British Government has advised shipowners not to carry strategic goods to Cuba but it has no legal power to prevent them from doing so.

West Germany has endorsed a decree expected to cut off almost all its shipping trade with Cuba. Greek shipowners have approved a Cuban boycott. The Turkish Government has agreed to prohibit state-owned vessels from engaging in Cuban commerce and has asked private shippers not to haul Soviet cargoes there.

As explained by American officials, the embargo is designed to make the Soviet commitment to sustain Cuba economically and militarily as expensive and difficult as possible.

It has also been pointed out that any added hardship suffered by Cuba as a result of withdrawing free world shipping would serve as an example to other Latin American nations which might be tempted to follow the Castro road.

About 70 percent of Cuban trade presently is with the Soviet Union and other Communist-bloc nations. But more than two-thirds of total Cuban trade has been carried in free world ships.

Thus, 35 percent of Communist cargoes have been transported by vessels under charter of nonbloc nations.

A recent Maritime Administration report indicates that free world ships made 571 calls at Cuban ports from January 1, through August 31. No vessels flying the U.S. flag visited ports other than the naval base at Guantanamo Bay.

Ships from Greece, the United Kingdom, West Germany and Norway accounted for 60 percent of the total. Following is a breakdown by country:

Greece, 125 trips; United Kingdom, 109; Norway, 55; West Germany, 50; Denmark, 33; Spain, 30; Lebanon, 29; Italy, 22; Japan, 20; Yugoslavia, 20; Sweden, 19; Liberia, 18; Netherlands, 14; Panama, 6; France, 5; Belgium, Finland and Chile, 3 each; Morocco, 2; and Honduras, Switzerland and Turkey, 1 each.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Tries To Make Soviet Support of Cuba as Expensive as Possible," written by Chalmers M. Roberts and published in the Washington Post of recent date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TRIES TO MAKE SOVIET SUPPORT OF CUBA AS EXPENSIVE AS POSSIBLE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

A new phase in the Kennedy administration's policy toward Cuba is now coming into focus. But there are still some blurry aspects.

In the first place, the administration is leaving on the shelf the possibility of a frontal U.S. military assault to topple Fidel Castro's regime, as President Kennedy said publicly a month ago. Up to now nothing has occurred to alter this view and no change is now in sight unless Castro by some new move threatens American security or interests more than he does today.

In the second place, the United States is trying to make support of Cuba by the Soviet Union as expensive as possible.

It is doing this by putting an economic squeeze on Cuba. Both Latin American and Western European nations are being asked and cajoled into trimming or eliminating their trade ties to Cuba. This policy has had some success recently, but the administration has not gone to the point of preemptive buying of goods which other nations sell to Castro. However, it may come to that.

Nobody doubts that the Soviet investment in Cuba now is considerable enough both in terms of prestige and money, nor that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev will keep on doing what is necessary to keep Castro afloat. The United States hopes the cost will continue to mount.

One hope here is that worsening economic conditions and increasing diplomatic isolation will further known current differences inside Cuba between the hard-core Communist Party leaders and Castro's other supporters who are not Communists. But so far there is more hope than hard fact in this line of reasoning.

Official sources do believe, however, that Castro himself daily walks in fear of internal enemies.

What all this type of policy amounts to is a hope that at some point something will give inside Cuba.

The blurry part of the picture of U.S. policy on Cuba has to do with sub rosa activities involving Cuban refugees and other non-U.S. citizens who might be willing to help in harassment of the Castro regime.

American officials are chary of using the term "harassment," to describe this aspect of U.S. policy. There is much talk of how difficult some of them have bungled various clandestine attacks inside Cuba. And it is said that Castro's internal security forces have grown more efficient, thus making such things as sabotage more difficult.

Whether this is just alibi talk for inaction is not totally clear but there are reasons for thinking so. On the other hand, the administration can hardly be expected to talk out loud about clandestine operations. The problem is whether any American hand in such operations can be kept secret. Refugees are notoriously gabby and Cubans are at the top of the list.

The net of all this is that the administration, in part under political pressures to "do something about Cuba," is doing about all it can do through normal diplomatic channels. But there is no more than a vague hope that this sort of thing can someday topple Castro.

What more can or will be done at the covert level is fuzzy. Cuban refugee groups are full of complaints of lack of cooperation.

On one point there is a clear administration policy line. There is no link between the Berlin problem and the Cuban problem susceptible of any sort of "deal" with the Soviet Union. There are differences of opinion as to what Khrushchev would do if there were a full-scale American assault on Cuba, but no one in authority seems to doubt that short of that the Soviet boss will do everything necessary to hold his Latin American beachhead.

And between Berlin and Cuba, U.S. sources are positive that Berlin is the major league problem, however much Cuba arouses American anger.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most outstanding writers of financial news, Sylvia Porter, commented last night in the Washington Evening Star on this subject. In the conclusion of the article she said:

> The "kicker" is No. 2—for what it does is give the free world's shippers a choice between making short-term profits on Soviet-Cuban trade or long-term profits on hauling U.S. cargoes—and we offer the world's largest total of cargoes of all sorts. The choice, experts believe, is almost certainly to be what w want it to be.
>
> Russia will, of course, be able to replace the ships. But it'll be far more expensive, far tougher, far more burdensome for her to push the Cuban buildup. From an economic-commercial standpoint, this is truly drastic action against the Soviet satellite 90 miles from our shores.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET-CUBA TRADE FACING CURBS

(By Sylvia Porter)

As the United States proposes to curb free world shipping, carrying cargoes from Russia to Cuba, two obvious questions arise: How big has the Soviet bloc's trade with Cuba become? How lucrative has carrying these cargoes from Russia to Cuba been to non-Communist shipping nations?

The answers to both questions are: The Soviet bloc's trade with Cuba has grown at an enormous rate in the past 2 years and carrying the cargoes has been exceedingly lucrative to shipowners in the free world's maritime nations, including our closest allies.

Soviet trade with Cuba this year will reach $750 million, according to a study published in Geneva on the Iron Curtain economies by the Economic Commission for Europe. The ECE is a United Nations organization with headquarters in Geneva.

This represents a 40-percent jump over Russian-Cuban trade in 1961 and this trade in 1961 was in turn 300 percent above 1960.

Poland's sales to Cuba more than tripled from 1960 to 1961, rising from $4 million to $23 million, while her purchases from Cuba more than doubled, rising from $10 million to $24 million.

U.S. TRADE REDUCED

Rumania's sales to Cuba climbed from next to nothing in 1960 to $11 million in 1961. Czechoslovakia's trade followed a similar course, is scheduled to increase another 20 percent this year.

While our trade with Cuba has been reduced from 4.3 million tons in 1959 to 75,000 tons in 1961 (mostly medicines), the Soviet bloc nations have taken our place.

Implicit in the statistics on the tremendous rise in Soviet Russia's trade with Cuba is the answer to the second question about its financial value to nations whose ships are transporting the millions of tons of food, materials, machinery. The estimate is shipping fees on the traffic are now running at over $100 million a year—a welcome bonanza at a time of world-wide maritime recession.

Between January 1 and the end of August, a total of 433 ships carrying free world flags docked at Cuban ports.

In the 3 months of June, July, and August, the U.S. Maritime Commission reports, owners of 169 ships of free world nations made 185 trips in and out of Cuban ports, with ships of such countries as Greece, Britain, West Germany, and Norway accounting for more than 60 percent of the trade.

Under mounting pressure from us, though, the nations have begun to act. Turkey has banned all shipments; West Germany and Italy are blocking the trade via licensing policies; Denmark has told shipowners she doesn't approve of the shipments; Norway has asked shipowners to "reconsider" hauling cargoes; Britain is "considering" our request for restrictions; Greece is asking shipowners to cancel chartering agreements.

ACTIONS OUTLINED

And now the United States, on its own, is taking action to tighten the trade noose around Russia's new satellite.

1. We're going to close all U.S. ports to all ships of any country if any of that nation's ships carry arms to Cuba.
2. We're going to withhold any U.S.-owned or financed cargoes from a foreign shipowner if any of that shipowner's vessels are used to carry Soviet cargoes to Cuba after the crackdown goes into effect.
3. We're going to bar from all U.S. ports any ship which delivers even clearly nonmilitary Soviet cargoes to Cuba and then tries on the same continuous voyage to come to our ports to pick up cargoes to carry home.
4. We are forbidding all U.S. flagships or U.S.-owned ships to carry goods to and from Cuba.

The kicker is No. 2—for what it does is give the free world's shippers a choice between making short-term profits on Soviet-Cuban trade or long-term profits on hauling U.S. cargoes—and we offer the world's largest total of cargoes of all sorts. The choice, experts believe, is almost certainly to be what we want it to be.

Russia will, of course, be able to replace the ships. But it'll be far more expensive, far tougher, far more burdensome for her to push the Cuban buildup. From an economic-commercial standpoint, this is truly drastic action against the Soviet satellite 90 miles from our shores.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In conclusion, this is not an act of war. It is not an act of war, but it will be singularly effective. The President and the State Department deserve a great deal of credit for this ingenious action.

PUBLIC KEPT IN DARK ON LOBBYING BY LOOPHOLES IN LAW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been inserting in the Record a series of articles on the lobbying problem by James McCartney of the Chicago Daily News, who is an outstanding Washington correspondent.

This morning I have before me the fifth and final article in the McCartney series. The article shows how loopholes in the lobbying law prevent any kind of effective enforcement. Mr. McCartney dramatically describes how a top lobbyist for the American Medical Association took advantage of the loophole. Certainly that organization was exceedingly effective in killing the President's medicare proposal.

Yet, as the writer points out, the effort of the AMA does not show in the lobbying expenses that the AMA has reported under the Nation's 16-year-old Regulation of Lobbying Act. This is so, although the AMA has been conscientious in reporting its expenses and reports more than any other lobby working Washington.

For example, Paul R. M. Donelan, a top AMA lobbyist reported some expenses for the first three months of the year. The expenses he reported, however, in April, May, and June, the period when the battle over care for the aged reached a climax were nil. He reported no expenses at all in April, May, and June for travel, food, lodging, entertainment, or for anything else.

Mr. McCartney has shown that in the case of the AMA and the U.S. Savings and Loan League, a lobby which won a smashing victory over the President this year, and in other cases, the lobbyists can report or not report, pretty much depending on how they want to operate, with the result that the public is kept in the dark. The present lobbying regulation law serves virtually no purpose whatsoever.

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful article, entitled "Loopholes in Lobbying Law Prevent Enforcement," by James McCartney, published in the Chicago Daily Times on October 11 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Loopholes in Lobbying Law Prevent Enforcement—Sixteen-Year-Old Act Keeps Congress, Public in Dark

(By James McCartney)

Washington.—The American Medical Association has been credited with one of the great lobbying campaigns of modern times with its drive this year to kill hospital care for the aged under Social Security.

But it doesn't show in the lobbying expenses the AMA has reported under the Nation's 16-year-old Regulation of Lobbying Act.

One of the AMA's six registered lobbyists, Paul R. M. Donelan, for example, has listed his total expenses for the first 3 months of this year for travel, food, lodging, and entertainment at 50 cents—one-half a dollar.

This would be in a period when the medical issue was much in doubt and AMA efforts intense.

Even then, Donelan spent more for those purposes in the first 3 months of the year, according to the report, than he did during April, May, and June—the period when the battle over care for the aged reached a climax.

He reported no expenses at all in April, May, and June for travel, food, lodging, entertainment—or for anything else.

These expenses are not far out of line, however, with those reported by some other lobbyists engaged in big campaigns.

A lobbyist for the U.S. Savings & Loan League—which staged one of the largest mail campaigns in history this year—reported $9.50 as his total expenses for the first 3 months of the year.

But neither Donelan nor the savings and loan lobbyist should be blamed if the figures appear to be somewhat ludicrous.

The fault lies not with them but with an act that has been labeled as ineffective by almost everyone who has taken the time to study it—including both the American Medical Association and the Savings & Loan League.

An AMA spokesman as long ago as 1957 described the act as "full of ambiguities" and suggested that it would be "a great service to the country to see the laws cleared up."

As the act stands now, no one knows who is supposed to register or how expenses are supposed to be listed.

And because the writers of the act failed to set up an administrative or an enforcement agency there is no one around to provide answers. The Justice Department abandoned serious enforcement efforts years ago because of the law's vagueness.

The last congressional group to study the problem, a Senate committee headed by Senator John McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, in 1957, said the law needed a major overhaul.

The report was signed by Senator John F. Kennedy, since promoted.

But Congress—never anxious to crack down on lobbyists—has never moved.

The result of the peculiar, unenforced law is to create the impression that lobbying is regulated, while, in fact, it is not.

The National Association of Manufacturers has a Washington office of about 40 persons and the stated goal of acting as the "spokesman for American industry."

But the NAM does not register under the regulation of Lobbying Act.

Americans for Democratic Action, at the opposite political pole from the NAM, was formed to voice liberal, independent views.

It doesn't register under the act either.

The General Dynamics Corp., is the Nation's largest defense contractor with more than $1 billion in Government contracts.

It maintains an office of 35 to 40 persons in Washington to service the contracts and, often, to see what can be done to get more.

Its representatives roam the corridors of the Pentagon.

It has no registered lobbyists. But then, neither, apparently, does any other of the Nation's top defense contractors.

More than 6,000 individuals or groups have registered since the law went on the books but no one knows what that means. If someone had registered in 1946 and died the next day his name would still be on the lists, and will presumably stay there through eternity.

But other groups among the most influential in the country and very much alive aren't on the lists at all.

Ridiculous situations arise, too, in reporting lobbying expenses by organizations.

The American Medical Association campaign against hospital care for the aged has been estimated on the floor of the House to have cost more than $7 million.

The AMA's reported lobbying expenses have been much less than $200,000.

The fact is that the present lobbying law doesn't cover the kind of grassroots lobbying campaign that the AMA has waged—by far the most common kind of major campaign today.

Most lobbying authorities, including the McClellan committee in 1957, have noted the trend toward massive letterwriting campaigns, but the lobby law completely overlooked them.

There are other important areas the lobby registrations law does not touch, too.

It does not, for example, cover lobbying with the excecutive branch of the Government—either to enlist the support of administrative officers for a legislative program or to influence rule and regulation making.

The president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Crawford M. Greenewalt, who came to Washington many times to visit top Government officials about the "Du Pont bill" did not register under the Lobby Registration Act.

The attorney who planned the campaign, however, registered fully.

Former Senator Majority Leader Scott Lucas, of Illinois, now a lobbyist, estimates that he spends more than 95 percent of his time working with executive agencies. He is no exception.

Nor does the law cover "groups or corporations" which do not solicit or collect money—a large category indeed.

The law was passed in 1946 almost as an afterthought as part of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which "streamlined" Congress.

It has been existing as an afterthought almost ever since. It was dealt a crippling blow in 1954 when the Supreme Court ruled, among other things, that it covered only groups with the principal purpose of influencing legislation.

Many groups—like the NAM and the ADA—say this is not their "principal purpose" and thus they need not register. No one is around to say they must.

The Supreme Court, however, did not mean to kill the effectiveness of the law, which many lawyers believe was poorly drawn in the first place.

Said Chief Justice Earl Warren in rendering the Court's opinion:

"A full realization of the American ideal of government by elected representatives depends to no small extent on their ability to properly evaluate * * * pressures.

"Congress has not sought to prohibit pressures. It has merely provided for a modicum of information from those who for hire attempt to influence legislation or who collect or spend funds for that purpose.

"It wants only to know who is being hired, who is putting up the money, and how much."

Congress today does not have that information. Nor do you.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

BERLIN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I was very glad to learn that the President and the Secretary of State are seriously concerned over the up-coming crisis expected on Berlin. I rejoice that this subject is now being discussed at length with our allies and others throughout the world. It is perhaps the most important problem which our Nation faces. But more effective than any words at this point would be some decisive action on our part, a move that would show the Communists that we do not intend to be pushed around or taken by surprise in Berlin. So far we have seen no deeds at all, only words, even though there are clearly steps within our power which we can take now that would better prepare us to meet a new threat in Berlin that would warn the Communists that we are serious in our determination there.

My purpose today—because I assume we are bringing the Congress to a close—is to propose one constructive step that we can take now in that direction, and that is the consolidation of Allied authority in Berlin, at least temporarily, so that there will be one Allied commander to meet the crisis expected within the next few months, so that action can be fast and decisive without lengthy consultation at every step. That is the kind of leadership which in my judgment the United States must strive to produce at this point if we are really to convince the world of our determination in Berlin. If our allies do not agree on that, we may have to go it alone. But, first of all, a strenuous effort must be made to set up a single supreme Allied commander, as we had in World War II, at the critical point.

The Communist refusal to permit a British ambulance to come to the aid of a West German injured person last weekend by East German police was a bitter rebuff to Western rights of access throughout the city. It is an ominous sign of what we can expect from the East Germans if a peace treaty is ever signed.

Yet what was the allied reaction to this clear violation of our rights? After 24 hours of consultation, we decided to send a note of protest, which the Soviet Ambassador in East Berlin promptly rejected. Frankly, I am not at all surprised. Why should he continue to take these futile slips of paper that come out of our diplomatic mills with increasing frequency, full of sound and fury, but signifying, in terms of policy or action, absolutely nothing? No doubt the rejection of the note required another 24 hours of consultation between the allies before we came up with another statement, protesting the rejection of the note and publishing it in the press. Perhaps next time, for variety's sake, we might try to deliver our protest in Moscow instead of Berlin. To all intents and purposes, note-passing is the extent of our firm and determined Berlin policy at the moment.

Mr. President, a review of published sources indicates that between last August 13, when the Wall of Shame first went up, and the end of August 1962, 39 notes of protest were sent by the Western Allies to the Soviets. These include Big Three joint protests, parallel notes of protest by all the powers separately, and individual protests by the United States, Britain, and France independently. These protests covered such flagrant violations of allied rights as the building of the wall, the stepped up harassment in the air corridors, and the persistent Soviet massacre of unarmed refugees trying to make their escape; they also included protests over mistreatment of individual allied servicemen. So far as can be determined from the published reports not one of the Big Three protests was satisfactorily answered, and the great majority were rejected entirely, like our latest protest over the ambulance.

None of these protests have had any effect whatsoever. Note-passing is no substitute for effective action, and I for one think that it is time we prepared ourselves to anticipate the next Soviet move ahead of time and try to block it instead of protesting when it is too late to change the facts.

Furthermore, Mr. President, of even greater concern than the ease with which the Soviets have gotten away with this latest slap at our rights, are the reports that no attempt will be made to force access to East Berlin for any allied vehicle, whether it be on an errand of mercy or a military patrol. This report, prominently featured in the press and not subsequently denied in any source that I have seen, indicates that the Western nations have apparently agreed among themselves not to insist on their rights in East Berlin. At the same time, we have not demanded or asserted any other rights in retaliation. In effect, we are accepting the status quo while leafing desperately through the protocol books to find a new Soviet representative to whom we can deliver our unending spate of diplomatic protests.

Mr. President, as I have said before, it would be disgraceful to trade the freedom of West Berlin in any kind of a deal. It has been denied that any deal is under consideration. It is even more disgraceful simply to give it away without even mentioning a quid pro quo. This appears in fact to be what we may be in danger of doing.

I speak today in the hope that it will be one small voice in protest against this, and one small voice which will try to prevent this action from being taken.

Furthermore, Mr. President, another trial balloon seems to be lofting up into the harassed Berlin skies, the plan for internationally controlled access authority. The indications are that pressure is again being put on the Bonn government to go along with a plan that, in my judgment, can have no justification whatsoever. The plan to set up an international control authority as originally suggested several months ago was to have included the United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Sweden Switzerland, Austria, West and East Germany, and West and East Berlin. Originally there were strong West German objections, as well there might be. Now we are led to believe that some of those objections have disappeared, a report which I for one find very difficult to believe.

It is being reported from authoritative official resources. They are always very careful never to use names in these cases.

I am deeply puzzled, Mr. President, to understand the predeliction of our officials for the establishment of international agreements, guarantees, and authorities to settle matters which are basically beyond the scope of genuine international agreement. Surely the course of the much-vaunted settlement in Laos, which was to guarantee the exodus of foreign troops and provide for a neutral nation under international agreement, should have awakened us to just what we can expect from the Communists. Our troops have left; the Communists are still there. We have kept the agreement. They have, as usual, paid no attention to the agreement.

Do we never learn? How much further do we have to go in Berlin, how much more do we have to yield, before we recognize that our position in Berlin, eroding steadily as it is, will be weakened, not strengthened, by any kind of hydraheaded international control authority?

Surely, Mr. President, if we have learned anything in the 17 years of tangled negotiations, deadlines, and crises over Berlin, we must have recognized that one of the great weaknesses of the Western position vis-a-vis the Soviets in Berlin is that we are three whereas they are one. They can act quickly and decisively.

We always have to confer for 3 days first. They can in fact erect an entire wall around their part of the city without any responsible person in allied circles having any idea that they were going to do it. Whether we blame ourselves for incredible blindness or the Soviets for incredible skill, it is clear that such efforts are completely out of the question for the Western Allies when the simple matter of access for an ambulance has to be discussed for 24 hours before a note of protest can be drafted.

Moreover, after 17 years of experience with Soviet harassment in Berlin air corridors, there is no indication to this day that we have devised effective methods for protecting the lives of air travelers in and out of Berlin or the security of the Berliners themselves who are consistently subjected to Soviet buzzing. Meanwhile the Communists are now lining up fighters, to harass even more viciously. All we have thus far devised, after lengthy conferences, is the threat that, should harassment in the air corridors become unbearable, we would use fighter escort—not a very satisfactory approach in my judgment.

What is more, there have been virtually no measures to meet the Soviet trick of flying low over the city, buzzing houses, and thus trying to lower morale and build up new anxiety in West Berlin. I know only too well, from my own experiences and from the steady flow of letters from New Yorkers who live around the larger airports, what an ordeal continued airplane noise can be. In 1948 and 1949 this sound meant freedom and survival to Berliners. Someday again we may have to resort to such measures. But in the meantime, I should not think it would be beyond the ability of our forces, in cooperation with the West Berlin government, to provide some kind of protection against this wanton provocation and harassment by the Soviets. Mere notes of protest will not solve the problem. Some effort, imagination, and enterprise on our part might.

All those who have tried to act decisively in Berlin, and in particular Gen. Lucius Clay, who has rightly won the confidence of the people of Berlin for his appreciation of what firm action can accomplish, have emphasized again and again the great handicaps and problems of three-power control. Even though this status was inevitable and does reinforce the united support of Western Europe for the freedom of West Berlin, it has been a serious tactical disadvantage.

Yet despite this lesson, which is very evident to anyone who has been on the spot, we are now apparently prepared to move even further in this direction and to tie our hands, not only to 2 other powers, but to 12 others. Our position in West Berlin under such an arrangement would be like Gulliver in Lilliput: we would be tied down by a maze of threads. Our every move would be restricted by the lines of multilateral commitments, each one small in itself, but taken as a whole quite sufficient to immobilize even the giant power of the United States.

Why should our Government deliberately draw up plans to try to hamper its freedom of action in this way? Everywhere in the world, from Cuba, to Berlin, to Laos, we are bound by the requirements of consultation and deliberations with our allies before we can take action. Cooperation among allies is fine, and I am all for it under existing treaties. It is essential to have cooperation among allies. But I see no valid reason for deliberately creating new organizations for consultation when, so far, we have not yet succeeded in getting any effective action out of the organizations we already have. Moreover, any such organization, with Communist membership, could be driven into deadlock—or worse—as easily as the United Nations.

Let us also not forget, in assessing a possible role for neutrals, that India's Prime Minister Nehru stated right after the wall was built that the East Germans had a perfect right to seal their border and that the allies were in Berlin, not by right, but as a Soviet concession. He was wrong—dead wrong; but that was his position. That is what we can expect from neutrals. On Berlin as on the question of Soviet nuclear testing, the neutrals at their Belgrade conference right after the wall went up generally refused to condemn Communist acts and preferred to look the other way.

There is only one condition under which I believe an international authority for access to Berlin could be successful—and that is if the authority really were "authority"; if it really had power; if it were headed by someone who had the right to make on-the-spot decisions and carry them out. But let us not fool ourselves. It would be difficult enough to get the United States, Britain, and France to delegate such authority to anyone. The Communists would never do so. Certainly I cannot conceive that any 13-member body, particularly with neutrals and Communists as members, would ever agree to a strong, effective central authority, especially since the main purpose of that authority would be the defense of the access routes necessary to preserve the freedom and independence of West Berlin from communism.

Let me conclude by making these three points:

First, after the successful refusal of the Western Powers to permit Soviet armored vehicles into West Berlin and the demonstration of the value of firmness, we have once again reverted to our previous pattern in the ambulance incident. We accepted the new restrictions imposed. We sent a note of protest. We complained. We reaffirmed our determination to stand fast. And we did nothing more.

Mr. President, in my judgment, every action of the Soviets must be met by a reaction on the part of the West, and I do not mean a reaction of pen on paper. I mean a tangible, evident, physical reaction in Berlin such as refusing admittance to Soviet guards for the Soviet memorial, or detaining of Soviet troops within West Berlin, or best of all, insisting even against the point of a gun that the ambulance be admitted on its errand of mercy. The principle laid down by General Clay is valid for all such incidents: So act that the Communists, not the West, must be the first to use force to accomplish their objectives. I cannot believe the Communists would have been prepared to fire on a British military ambulance for trying to help a wounded man; but if they were, then the burden of responsibility would have been on them beyond all shadow of doubt, and world opinion would have backed up the position of the Western Powers, not the Soviets.

Mr. President, several weeks ago I denounced the possibility of a deal on Berlin. After the latest events, I think that I may have been overly optimistic. There is no sign of a deal. All I see now is a giveaway. We are asking nothing at all, and we are getting nothing in return, except perhaps a new set of Communist pledges which are not worth the paper they are written on, as the events in Laos have most recently demonstrated.

Second, what we must aim for in Berlin is not a further diminution and dispersion of power and authority in a 13- or even a 5-power agreement, so that whenever a crisis comes up it will take 2 weeks to confer and reach a decision. Twenty-four hours is too long as it is. We need a consolidation of power and authority in Berlin, a strengthening, not weakening, of decisionmaking power. Any action which would make it more difficult to reach rapid and firm decisions is an action which in the long run will aid the Soviets, not the West. That point must never be forgotten.

Third, and most important, in preparation for the serious crisis which is anticipated later this year, we cannot afford to continue the present bureaucratic channels of responsibility. We must be ready, not only with stacks of documents and policy-planning alternatives stacked in the basements of Washington, D.C., but with an enterprising, imaginative, and competent person on the spot who has the authority to make an immediate decision and enforce it. Only when we have stationed in Berlin—not in Bonn, or Geneva, or Paris, or Washington, but right in Berlin—one person who can speak for all three powers in a voice that will carry instant weight will we be in a position to meet the next Soviet move.

Mr. President, over the last few years we have been taken by surprise around the globe—first, by Castro's turn to the left in Cuba; second, by the erection of the wall of shame in Berlin; third, by the great influx over the last few months of Soviet men and munitions into Cuba. The mistakes have been bipartisan, I freely admit; but all of us can learn from them. When, oh when, Mr. President, are we going to be ready? How much longer can we afford to shilly-shally? When are we going to take the necessary steps to defend our interests? In my judgment, in spite of such sweeping measures as the reserve callup authority bill, and the latest, somewhat overdue, restrictions on shipping for Cuba, we still are not ready for the next Soviet step. The ambulance incident clearly shows that. We do not know what will happen next, or where, or how to cope with it.

By the way, Mr. President, the restrictions on shipping for Cuba are not, in my judgment, as effective as some have thought them to be, although they do have some effect, and I commend the Secretary of State for moving in that direction.

Mr. President, there is no time to waste. At this point we have nothing to gain by tossing about nebulous plans for international agreements. We must quickly get our own house in order, so that the right hand will know what the left hand is doing. I am very deeply concerned that as yet we have not done this where the danger has been greatest and still is greatest—in Berlin.

Mr. President, the resolution adopted on Wednesday is undoubtedly a plus; but it contributes very little, one way or another, to effective action in Berlin. If I may paraphrase one of the great American orations of all time: The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did there—in Berlin. If the city of Berlin is not again to become a graveyard, a place where another generation of youth will have to give their lives for the freedom and self-determination they hold dear, we must do more than talk. If this resolution can awaken the Government of this country and the governments of the countries of Europe to the threat we face, it may serve a useful purpose. But if it does not, our strongest words today will be as idle as all the notes of protest over Berlin that during the last 17 years we have conveyed to the Soviet Union.

Finally, Mr. President, I have one additional suggestion to make: I think it would be an important and worthwhile act of solidarity between the people of the United States and the people of Berlin if the original text of this resolution could be officially conveyed to the people of Berlin, for permanent exhibition and display in that city, as a continuing sign that the United States recognizes and stands by its international obligations. It will do more good in Berlin, where it can be seen by friend and foe alike, than to be buried in the cellars of the National Archives, where its existence would soon be forgotten.

In sum and substance, Mr. President, I am sincerely convinced that the way to peace lies in firm action, not just words; whereas the way to war is through concessions and retreats, to a point where one's back is against the wall, and there is nothing to do but fight. It is to avoid such a situation that I urge firm action. It is for that purpose that I have spoken today, in making what I hope are some constructive suggestions.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE HEARINGS THAT CHANGED TELEVISION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, more than 5 years ago, as chairman of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I investigated the overemphasis on crime, violence, and lurid sex on our Nation's television screens. At the conclusion of those hearings, the television industry promised to clean things up, to police itself, to establish standards of practice that would bring about more wholesome types of television shows, particularly during the hours when millions of children are among the viewing audience.

Performance, however, is not always up to the promise. Over the last 15 months, under the inspired chairmanship of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the television industry's performance was reexamined, to see how well its pledge was kept. It was at once obvious that not only was the industry's pledge to police itself and to improve the quality of programing not kept, but the programing had deteriorated in almost every category.

In that 5-year interim, television programing that many experts in human behavior consider undesirable for children, increased from 15 percent of the prime program time to 50 percent of prime time. More killings were portrayed per show, and the killings were more vicious. Senator Dodd found that more than half the programs broadcast during prime time were devoted to shows glorifying sex, violence, and antisocial behavior in general—shows that tended to give children the impression that life's problems are solved with the knife, the fist, and the gun.

Since Senator Dodd adjourned the television hearings earlier this year, there has been a noticeable change in television programing, and I am convinced that further changes and improvements are imminent.

Mr. President, an excellent summary of Senator Dodd's long months of investigation and hearings were published in the fall issue of Telefilm magazine. The article is taken largely from the records of the hearings, and is authoritative in detail. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and ask that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Hearings That Changed Television

As congressional investigations go, few have been more useful than the one just completed by the Senate's Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. The investigators did not document precisely the amount of juvenile delinquency which can be charged to TV, but they certainly succeeded in dramatizing the sterility and deadliness of the sex-and-violence cycle which dominated TV in recent years.

Beyond that, however, the investigation was unusually successful in demonstrating that the networks are exercising immense power over the kind of programs that go into the air, and that this concentration of power can be readily abused.

The investigation came at a time when networks were in unusually good standing in Washington. Recent increases in the volume of public service programing pleases many of the Washington critics who have been demanding "better TV." It seems to confirm the claim that networks need a free hand to plan their programing so that the public gets a "balanced" selection.

In its investigation of sex and violence, however, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee found a situation where competition among networks led to disturbing results, with "bad" programing on one network driving out "good" programing on others. The process was able to go unchecked, largely because a few people at the top have so much to say about the programs that get the prime time.

Senator Thomas Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, the subcommittee chairman, emphasized the fact that the three network programing executives—Oliver Treyz, then of ABC, James Aubrey, Jr., of CBS, and Robert Kintner of NBC—were all high officials of ABC in the embryonic development of ABC's concept of how to entice the viewing audience.

"This concept emphasized crime, violence, and sex," he said. "When these three men eventually became the operating heads of our giant networks, the race for ratings was on."

By digging deep into the industry's most intimate interoffice correspondence, the investigators were able to strip away the platitudes which smother most investigations in Congress or the FCC, and to provide the outside world for the first time with authentic vignettes of the scurrying that occurs in Hollywood and even in the ad agencies when the network bosses swing into action.

The subcommittee estimated that the crime-detective action-adventure, western type eventually accounted for fully 50 percent of total prime time, compared with only 15 percent in 1955. To demonstrate the danger of such a situation, it noted that fully 20 million children watch during these hours and that as many as 5 to 8 million children under 17 watch such shows as "The Untouchables," "Route 66," "Malibu Run," "Whispering Smith," etc., every night of the week.

The subcommittee drew on industry files to show that networks knowingly stepped up the sex and violence in programs which were favorites among children and teenagers.

"BUS STOP" AND "ROUTE 66" EPISODES MADE TO APPEAL TO TEENAGERS

Perhaps the best publicized example involved an episode of "Bus Stop" starring Fabian, the teenage idol. This particularly sadistic episode drew protests from sponsors and affiliates, but it went on the air on the personal insistence of ABC President Oliver Treyz.

The subcommitte record showed that ratings of "Bus Stop" had been sluggish at the time the Fabian episode was offered, and the future of the program was in doubt. The subcommittee also showed that special promotional arrangements were used to call attention to the forthcoming program.

In the end, the record showed the Fabian episode scored a substantially higher arbitron than preceding "Bus Stop" episodes. The increase was particularly sharp in children under 13, with 1.1 million tuned in for Fabian, compared with an average of 0.5 million during the preceding month.

During his appearance before the subcommittee, Mr. Treyz was asked: "Were you not aware of Fabian's special appeal to 10- to 14-year-olds?" He replied: "I was aware of his appeal to teenagers."

In the view of the subcommittee, ABC wasn't the only network to knowingly inject sex and violence into programs with big followings of teenagers. From the files of "Route 66" the subcommittee staff turned up a continuing hassle between CBS and Screen Gems, with CBS protesting that the program was too "downbeat," lacking romantic interest. The Screen Gems version, in the same documents, was that CBS was demanding more "broads, bosoms, and fun."

Wherever the responsibility rested, a subcommittee chart showed that there was continuing increase in the number of protests lodged by CBS program continuity department over sex in the program. In April 1961, W. H. Tankersley, director of program practices, Hollywood, spelled out his misgivings in a letter to Selmer Chalif, of Screen Gems.

He started by pointing out that TvQ showed "Route 66" to be particularly popular with young people, tied for second in the 12 to 17 age group, down to 6th for 18 to 34, and 14th for the 35 to 49 age group. "The appeal of this program to teenagers precludes such fare as 'The Newborn,'" Mr. Tankersley wrote. "Because of its time slot and built-in appeal to youth, this program cannot be regarded as a peripatetic 'Playhouse 90'; and it is hoped that Bert Leonard and Sterling Silliphant will cooperate with us in trying to avoid extremes which will be resented by parents."

"BROADS, BOSOMS, AND FUN," SHOW BUSINESS VERNACULAR

The industry files proved to be fully as titillating as any of the sexpots and he-men who were written into the programs. In fact the networks contended that the very validity of the memos was discredited by the extravagant language, and that such phrases as "broads, bosoms and fun" should be discounted as the normal vernacular of show business.

"The word 'broad', for example," Mr. Aubrey told the subcommittee, "is commonly used by show business people to refer to any woman." A memo by Howard G. Barnes, a CBS west coast executive had referred to an Aubrey "dictum" to put "broads, bosoms and fun" into "Route 66," but the CBS TV president assured the subcommittee these couldn't be his words, since he does not make a practice of using the word "broad."

There was a great deal of "torturing" of the English language—trying to avoid the connotations and meanings of simple words. The words "broads, bosoms and fun" were not accepted as being the jargon of Hollywood by the subcommittee.

The investigators have not, of course, achieved any revolution in the character of network programing. But they undoubtedly contributed to the dismissal of at least one network head; they supplied valuable ammunition to those who hope to put some curb on the power exercised by network heads; and they strengthened the hands of those in the continuity acceptance branches of the networks and the code authority of the National Association of Broadcasters who must resist the efforts to hypo-mediocre programs with injections of material to stir the libido of the teenagers, and the depraved imagination of those who crave violence.

CREATIVITY HAMPERED UNDER NETWORK DICTATES

The concentration of power in the networks has been a matter of controversy in Washington for fully half a dozen years. Initially it was denounced as a bad thing, with independent creativity crushed under the harsh dictates of the networks. By the time the FCC organized its massive public hearing on TV programing early this year, however, networks were no longer discounting their power, but were insisting that they need—and ought to have—the final authority to dictate what goes onto the air.

Even the FCC attitude on option time has softened under the most recent network blandishments. For the networks, basking in the popularity in Washington of their new "public service" programs, have successfully "sold" the idea that the affiliates—if left to themselves—would surely reject all "quality" programing in order to put on programs with "mass appeal."

The ability of networks to control the programs that go into prime time, and the tendency of the programing executives to pick the programs that have high ratings had been fully demonstrated nearly 3 years ago, when the House Committee on Legislative Oversight, under Representative Oren Harris, was looking into TV quiz shows. But the Harris subcommittee was content to merely blast the quiz shows off the air. Far from levying scorn on the networks, or the network executives for tolerating the rigged quiz shows, the Harris subcommittee willingly advanced the idea that the networks had been "victimized" by outside producers whose affairs the networks were powerless to control.

It is interesting to note that the TV network executives called to Washington on the earlier TV quiz scandals were the same men called before the Dodd subcommittee on "sex and violence" charges.

In the early stages of the juvenile delinquency probe in mid-1961 the network testimony seemed to be following the same course that it took before the Harris subcommittee. Networks argued that the increase in sex and violence simply reflected the taste of the American people, or the paucity of imagination of writers and producers.

Networks pictured a continuing tug-of-war in which the producers are at least as adamant as the networks. While they readily conceded they attempted to influence the content of programs, the networks wanted the subcommittee to believe they exercise only a benevolent influence which seeks to assure "quality" programing, rather than the sordid material which the subcommittee questioned.

SEX AND VIOLENCE; A MATTER OF ECONOMIC SURVIVAL

It was indeed a discouraging prospect. Producers and writers were putting sex and violence into programs as a matter of economic survival, the networks argued. Even where network personnel were parties to the decisions, the decisions were group decisions, so no one man could be regarded as responsible.

If it were not for the skepticism of the subcommittee staff, the juvenile delinquency investigation might have ended—as so many other investigations by Congress and the FCC have ended before—with the conclusion that the country gets just about the kind of TV it wants and demands. But the investigators—led by Carl Perian—dug behind the oral testimony into the written files, and the documents which were placed on the public record demonstrated—according to Senator Dodd—that networks are in a position to, and do control program content, and this control is not necessarily exercised with a sense of responsibility.

Whether the network bosses are as venal as some of the documents imply continued to be a matter of dispute. But the existence of such vast power necessarily represents a serious problem, the Senator believes, and some form of regulation is indicated to assure that the networks exercise their power in the public interest.

AUDIENCE RESEARCH NOT FOLLOWED

The subcommittee also examined at length "Whispering Smith," a half-hour western series. "Whispering Smith" was produced by Revue Productions, a division of MCA–TV, Inc., in 1959 and 1960 for NBC and was held by NBC in inventory until May of last year. The first episode appeared on May 15, 1961, at 9 p.m. on the east coast. In March 1960 NBC had submitted the "Hemp Reeger" episode to Communication & Media Research Services, Inc., of Peekskill, N.Y., an independent testing organization, to conduct a study of audience reaction to the "Whispering Smith" series. The "Hemp Reeger" episode was viewed by 262 men, women, and children on March 28 and 30, 1960. The test findings of Communication & Media Research Services are summarized in a memorandum from Mr. Willis Grant, an NBC employee, to Mr. H. M. Beville, Jr., NBC's director of research. Among the detailed findings was the following:

"The sexual implications of the show were disliked by men and children as well as by women. Nearly all (97 percent) of the people felt there was too much emphasis on sex. The scene with Flo in Smith's room was disliked by 63 percent of the people. Three-quarters of the people (men, women and children) felt that this show was unsuitable for children."

On July 17, 1961, the "Hemp Reeger" episode was shown on the home TV screen—apparently with no regard to this audience reaction test.

ABC and CBS were less successful in defending "Bus Stop" and "Route 66." After Oliver Treyz had been removed as head of ABC, Leonard Goldenson testified that he regarded the broadcasting of the Fabian episode as a mistake in judgment as soon as he saw it on the air. CBS argued vehemently, but not entirely successfully, that its sole interest of "Route 66" was to insist that it be less "downbeat."

ADVERTISING AGENCIES' POINT OF VIEW CITED

Documents turned up by the investigators showed that three out of the six advertising agencies which viewed a pilot of "Route 66" in April 1959 warned the network that they were concerned about the amount of violence, and the report showed that Leo Burnett of the Burnett agency made a mighty—but unsuccessful—effort to persuade Philip Morris that it should not be associated with a show featuring so much "violence and morbidity."

When the show was enmeshed in rating troubles the producers and the network huddled in November 1960. Later, William Dozier, vice president in charge of west coast operations for Screen Gems, wrote Herbert B. Leonard, head of Lancer Productions: "There is not enough sex in the programs. Neither lead has gotten involved for a single episode with the normal wants of a young man, namely, to get involved with a girl or to even kiss her.

"Jim Aubrey made the concrete suggestion that the boys settle down for a period of weeks in one location and get involved with a locale, the people in it, and some one or both might get a job for a while in some kind of transient-type business."

But CBS west coast officials remained uneasy. In a memorandum dated January 5, 1961, Howard G. Barnes, of CBS, reviewed for Guy della-Cioppa, his superior (both have subsequently left CBS), four episodes of "Route 66" written or filmed since the November crisis. "As a one-line critique of the stories," he wrote. "I should like to say that they are a far cry from Jim Aubrey's dictum of 'broads, bosoms and fun.'" The subcommittee found some juicy reading in his memorandum:

At the meeting in your office, he recalled, Mr. Aubrey had laid down "in quite clear and unmistakable terms" to Mr. Leonard and other Screen Gems people "the direction in which he felt the series should go" to "gain strength on the air and attract considerably larger audiences."

"You will recall at the end of this meeting there could be little misunderstanding on the part of anyone as to what was expected to materialize. You will, I am sure, further recall that Mr. Leonard's response to all this ultimately was, in essence, 'I like success as well as anyone, and if you feel this is the way to achieve it, I'll do what you say.' Further," he reported, "you'll recall that Mr. Dozier expressed his agreement and assured us that what we wanted would be forthcoming; Mr. Chalif sagely nodded in agreement."

"The Quick and the Dead," a story about autoracing, which was the first to follow from the conference, "seemed to have the lush, fun atmosphere we wanted," he wrote. But the casting of Susan Kohner as the daughter resulted in a "psychologically downbeat" situation. "Her sharp-featured, somewhat bugeyed, neurotic countenance, along with the direction of Doug Heyea, left little question that this girl was a sick one indeed."

"The Clover Throne," he reported, "is the story of an older man—a date rancher—in love with his ward, a hypersexy 'Baby Doll' character who is on the make for every pair of pants that comes by." She eventually becomes involved with a neurotic convict, "who is planning to murder the rancher in conspiracy with 'Baby Doll,' but who takes his eye off the ball long enough to attempt to rape the kid."

The setting of this episode in the stark, hot, perspiration-producing bleak countryside around Indio, Calif. (a far cry from the Bel Air Hotel swimming pool), worried Mr. Barnes. "However," he added, "in defense of their spirit of cooperation, I must acknowledge that 'Baby Doll' has a more than generous share of bosom, amply displayed, and wears over a pair of very high spiked heels the tighest pair of slacks ever to be entered by womankind without mechanical assistance."

The Barnes comment on "The Clover Throne" was not the only evidence that the producer made some attempt to comply with "The Aubrey dictum," Senator Dodd later said. A staff analysis of CBS–TV continuity acceptance reports on "Route 66" indicated a definite increase in the number of objections based on sex by continuity acceptance officials.

A January memo from Dancer-Fitzgerald-Sample reported: "Numerous recent stories have included an almost standard character in the shapely form of a sexpot—usually young—whose aim in life is to stir the libido of (a) the villain; (b) Buz; (c) male viewers just anywhere. This tightpants type, with variations, has turned up in 'Three Sides,' 'Layout at Glen Canyon,' 'The Beryllium

Eater,' 'The Quick and the Dead,' 'The Clover Throne' and 'Fly Away Home.' In some of the episodes the part was well handled; in 'Layout' and 'Quick and the Dead,' it was an embarrassing and gratuitous display."

PROPER APPROACH FOR SERIES DISCUSSED

By April the program was in trouble again, and a letter from Mr. Aubrey warned that "we will be forced to take into consideration the possibility of discontinuing our association" if the production team "continues to disregard our repeated and emphatic suggestions on the proper approach for this series."

Mr. Aubrey compained that stories were too "downbeat," but a response from Herbert Leonard, cocreator and owner of the series, to William Dozier complained that Mr. Aubrey was trying to change the character of the show "and make it nothing more than an hour situation comedy or an ordinary action show."

The sponsors—Sterling Drug and Chevrolet—are asking, he wrote, "What has happened to the hardhitting show they both bought based on the pilot?"

"Where is the reality?" they are asking. "Where is the drama? Where is the movement? For God's sake get rid of those baby doll sexpots and the rather obvious and cliche characters."

In his comments on these memos, Mr. Aubrey took the position that his problem was "to lighten up the show," to "take the violence out" and make the backgrounds "more recognizable." He favored "normal, attractive girls," rather than "neurotic broads."

"Unless we continue to apply pressures constantly," he complained to the subcommittee, "there is a tendency by the people who create these programs to do things they term 'box office.' "

ADVERTISING AGENCY ACCEPTANCE WAS A FACT

Critical material by continuity acceptance personnel, or by advertising agencies was based on pilots or unedited episodes for the most part, he contended. As proof of the propriety of the material that actually went on the air he pointed out that the sponsors—Chevrolet, Sterling Drug and Philip Morris—were all going into their third season. "These are companies of high integrity. They sponsor it and merchandise it. If they felt that it was in any way bad taste they would have nothing to do with it."

Thomas W. Moore, now head of ABC–TV, came under fire for "sanctioning and actively supporting"—while head of programing for the network—"the high level and types of violence that were the hallmarks of "The Untouchables.' " It was late in the afternoon; and he was dismissed after only a brief appearance. The September 1959 removal of Norman Retchin, as producer for the program, was not his doing, he declared. But he made no apology for the violence in "The Untouchables." It was an era of violence. Action was a necessary and proper element in the program.

NETWORK HEADS DENY ALL

At a final summing up session in mid-May, the subcommittee heard Frank Stanton of CBS, Robert Kintner of NBC and Leonard Goldenson of ABC all deny there was any conscious effort to introduce unnecessary sex and violence into programs.

Asked to comment on the memos which reported that Jim Aubrey called for broads, bosoms, and fun in "Route 66," Dr. Stanton snapped, "It never happened." Mr. Kintner declared, "There is absolutely no truth in any statement that I have directed the inclusion of any improper elements of sex and violence in any NBC program." Yet the subcommittee has direct testimony to the contrary and supporting documentation. Mr. Goldenson deplored the fact that ABC let the Fabian episode of "Bus Stop" go out on its network, but he insisted that the writers of "The Untouchables" are merely trying to portray the prohibition era as it actually was.

In his verbal jousting with Senator Dodd, Dr. Stanton took the position that it was not necessary that he be informed of every controversy that arises over programs since it's his job "to study overall network policy, not keep track of individual incidents." "Even a situation where a sponsor protested that there was too much brutality on a "Route 66" episode which showed a man beaten with a chain?" Senator Dodd asked. "Even an episode like that," Dr. Stanton replied.

At the hearing, the dialog between the Senator and the network heads was often sharp. After Dr. Stanton denied he can be expected to watch everything, the Senator snapped, "If you are going to take the attitude that your head is in the clouds I don't think there is any hope for us." When Mr. Kintner and Mr. Goldenson proved equally nonresponsive he complained, "This fascinates me. It is a frustrating thing to have witness after witness from the television industry deny that a concentrated effort has been made to emphasize sex and violence" in view of the programs which the subcommittee has screened and the evidence it has reviewed.

Even the attractive NBC presentations with promises of better programing to come seemed to fall flat with Senator Dodd. "The abortive attempt to create children's programs and keep them on the air are all too frequent," he commented. "I refer to such programs as '1–2–3 Go' and 'National Velvet.' 'National Velvet,' " he recalled, "was awarded the 'Children's Show of the Year' award in 1961. But neither of these two fine programs is returning to the air next season."

REGULATORY CLIMATE FOR BROADCASTERS IN SEASON

While the network executives may have stalked indignantly away from the subcommittee hearings, there is no escaping the impact that the investigations have made on the regulatory climate for the broadcasters.

From a Government standpoint, there is not much that can be done in relation to the writers, the producers, the advertising agencies, and the sponsors, Senator Dodd recognizes. But there are actions to be taken by the industry, by Congress, and by the Federal Communications Commission to insure that the networks adhere to responsible programing standards.

Senator Dodd is proposing legislation to increase the power of the FCC over networks. Since he is not a member of the committees that handle Communications Act legislation, it hardly seems likely that his legislative proposals will go far.

Meanwhile, however, the factual information collected by his subcommittee has already been turned over to the Federal Communications Commission, where the whole subject of network responsibility in the field of programing is under consideration. From this voluminous study—including its own lengthy public hearing in January and February—the FCC is expected soon to consider new regulations or legislation to make networks accountable in some form for the power they exercise.

Network appearances at the publicly televised FCC hearings reflected the polish and self-assurance of a power group confident that its position is unassailable. The documents supplied to FCC as a result of the efforts of the staff of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee caused some uncomfortable moments, and tended to erase some of the gloss from the network case.

In one respect, the subcommittee has already scored an extensive victory. From the start, it wanted to know about the achievements of the NAB's code staff. Largely as a result of the pressure generated by the subcommittee's disclosures, the industry now seems prepared to take the code activity more seriously.

NETWORK POWER AGAIN DEMONSTRATED

The subcommittee's most telling blow was struck as a result of its investigation of the "Bus Stop" episode called "A Lion Walks Among Us," starring the teenage idol, Fabian. The determination of former ABC president Oliver Treyz to put that episode on the air despite the misgivings of sponsors and affiliates and his refusal to let NAB prescreen the program demonstrated conclusively the immense power held by network heads, and the great danger that such power can be abused.

During his appearance before the Dodd committee in January, Mr. Treyz was uncompromising in his determination to make the programing decisions without interference from anyone, including the NAB. Shortly afterward when the same evidence was reexamined before the FCC's public hearing on programing, he was ready to admit that perhaps he had made a bad judgment. It was shortly after that that ABC decided the time had come for Mr. Treyz to leave.

ABC's successful defiance of NAB shocked Senator Dodd and embarrassed the industry. "At our earlier hearings," he said, "you insisted that if we would give you a chance, you would police your own industry. But here you are," he told Mr. Treyz, "confronted with a request for NAB to screen one of your programs and you turn them down."

POWER TO CENSOR BY NAB REFUSED

His determination that NAB have power to prescreen programs became a matter of considerable controversy in the industry. NBC was ready to comply. But CBS, like ABC, continued to take the position that it was not going to let any outside authority see its programs before they went on the air.

All agreed, however, that the code was meaningless unless there was a serious effort to apply it. As an initial move, the code board was broadened to include representatives of each of the networks. Arrangements were worked out for the code board staff to get advance information which is supposed to provide an opportunity to spot questionable program practices before the programs go into production.

Seizing the opportunity presented by the "Bus Stop" episode, NAB President LeRoy Collins and Code Authority Director Robert Swezey have continued to press for other changes to breathe real life into the code. The staff is being expanded. Stations are to submit their logs for review. Closer contacts are being developed at the working levels in Hollywood and New York.

More recently, the FCC has said it may make the NAB Code applicable as a rule, if the networks continue to defy or ignore or evade the code.

In one further respect, the industry will continue to be reminded of its obligations in the field of juvenile delinquency. By mutual agreement of the industry and the subcommittee, some extensive studies are to be conducted to try to determine "the effect of television on children." The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is to coordinate the work, with much of the "guidance" and financing provided by the broadcasting industry, and much of the actual research under the direction of Dr. Ralph Garry of the College of Education, Boston College, a member of the subcommittee staff.

The longer the research goes on, the longer the industry will find that TV's role in juvenile delinquency will be in the headlines. With Senator Dodd in the picture, it is not something that will be quickly forgotten, or swept under the rug.

POULTRY RESEARCH FACILITIES, EAST LANSING, MICH.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I know all Members of the Senate are aware of the valiant fight waged by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in behalf of a sound appropriation measure for the Department of Agriculture.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, he was charged with heavy responsibility.

At this time, I want to extend my personal thanks, and the thanks of my State of Michigan, for his efforts to restore to the final bill $450,000 for poultry research facilities at the Department of Agriculture research laboratory in East Lansing, Mich.

On August 25, when the bill first came before the Senate, the Senator from Georgia promised me on the floor of the Senate that he would do everything he could to see that the funds were appropriated.

As always, the Senator was just as good as his word. The $450,000 for the laboratory is in the bill now awaiting the President's signature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from the director of the East Lansing facility, describing the work done there, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Again, my sincere thanks to the Senator from Georgia for his assistance.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
East Lansing, Mich., August 31, 1962.
Hon. PATRICK V. MCNAMARA,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCNAMARA: On page 17562 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, I note that Senator RUSSELL referred to the additional information you provided on the support and work of this laboratory.

I am listing below the grants that have been received in support of this research. This financial aid is in addition to funds allocated by our administrative agency, the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Donor	Amount	Fiscal year
Swift & Co	$28,000.00	1947
Do	6,600.00	1951
National Cancer Institute	3,000.00	1948
Do	16,750.00	1949
Do	8,800.00	1950
Do	9,400.00	1951
American Poultry & Hatchery Federation	20,000.00	1951
Atomic Energy Commission	12,667.50	1951
Do	29,648.00	1952
Do	26,873.00	1953
Do	20,612.00	1954
American Cancer Society	23,068.00	1960
Do	76,749.00	1961
Do	54,881.00	1962
Do	59,164.00	1963

These funds have accentuated greatly the work we have been able to do.

Research at this laboratory is designed to bring about control measures for leukosis among chickens and turkeys. This disease complex is a malignant disease and causes a higher mortality and a higher financial loss ($65 million annually in United States) than any other poultry disease. This laboratory has shown it is caused by a virus and may be spread through hatching eggs, fecal material, incubator debris and by "carrier" hens which are clinically normal in appearance. We are now pursuing leads that we hope will result in an effective vaccine. Even though avian leukosis is a cancerous disease, there is no indication that it is transmissible to man.

The grants mentioned above by the National Cancer Institute and the American Cancer Society indicate that these organizations directly interested in human cancer not only follow closely the results of our research but lend financial support to it. This is also emphasized by the fact that just recently the National Cancer Institute requested this laboratory to produce hatching eggs from its inbred line of highly susceptible chickens for use by all of its scientists engaged in the study of leukosis and related tumors. Their previous use of small lots of such eggs from our laboratory stock has given a more favorable response than from any other source. We regret that our present facilities will not permit this laboratory to engage in this cooperative effort. However, there is a possibility that we may be able to locate nearby facilities that can be altered to meet requirements.

On behalf of this laboratory, I want to express to you our sincere appreciation for the timely support you gave recently in making it possible for us to continue uninterrupted, the research program. We hope the service rendered now and in the future will warrant your confidence and continued support.

Sincerely yours,
BERLEY WINTON,
Director.

THE CONGO

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, at the time when the extremist elements in the United Nations are again threatening military action in the Congo, it is more than ever imperative that we all try to understand what is going on in this remote area of central Africa.

There has been some excellent newspaper reporting from the Congo, but it has suffered from the inevitable weakness of all such reporting. By its very nature, newspaper accounts are piecemeal—they are fragments of a mosaic which must be seen whole before the situation can be truly understood. In a situation that is as complicated as the Congo, this is something that requires nothing less than book length treatment.

Two months ago there was published in the United States a book on the Congo which I would commend, in all earnestness, to my colleagues and to the American people.

The title of the book is "Rebels, Mercenaries, and Dividends."

The author is Mr. Smith Hempstone, correspondent in Africa for the Chicago Daily News and New York Post, author of "Africa—Angry Young Giant," and a winner of the Sigma Delta Chi Award for foreign correspondence. Mr. Hempstone has lived and worked in Africa since 1956. He has probably spent more time in the Congo and certainly spent more time in Katanga than any other American correspondent. He is a man, in short, who represents the profession of foreign correspondent at its very best. He was an eyewitness to both the September and December fighting in Katanga.

Mr. Hempstone is not an extremist. On the contrary, he is disturbed by the evidences of extremism that have characterized the support of United Nations policy in the Congo. Speaking about this situation, Mr. Hempstone said in his introductory remarks:

> It is a commentary on America today that I should feel compelled to say that I do not belong to the American Committee for Aid to Katanga Freedom Fighters, am not a member of the John Birch Society, am not in the pay of the Katangan Government or Union Miniere, and really could not care less about the fluoridation of water. I am a registered Republican, although I did not vote Republican in the 1960 presidential election. I do believe that the United Nations has a role to play in the world today—I had the privilege of fighting in a just war under its banner in Korea—and I believe the United States should remain in the international organization. I do not believe, however, that the U.N. is, or should be, regarded as a sacred cow endowed—through the laying on of political hands—with a supranational infallibility. When it becomes sacrilege to criticize the U.N. (or the U.S. Government, for that matter), the organization has lost its usefulness. The U.N. is not, to my mind, automatically a power for good in the world. It was created primarily to provide the machinery for the peaceful solution of international problems. If it is to be used for the adjudication of domestic disputes by majority verdict, only international anarchy can result. The U.N. has an immense capacity for good or evil, depending entirely on how it is used. If it is to be used to implement or condone aggression, as it has been in Katanga and in Goa, then it is a power for evil. It cannot, of course, act more morally or more effectively than the nations which constitute it. When the U.N. abandons the rule of law and permits the unbridled pursuit of national passions, no matter how popular these passions may be, it becomes worthless as an instrument for world peace. The United States, in this regard, bears a heavy responsibility, both because of its membership in the Security Council and its heavy financial support.
>
> I state all this only because spokesmen of the present administration have found it convenient to tar with the brush of neofascism all those who find the position of the U.N. and the United States in Katanga to be morally and practicably indefensible. Some administration spokesmen apparently find dissent intolerable. I would have thought that we, as Americans, would have had quite enough of that sort of thing with Senator McCarthy. You do not have to be white supremists or to favor the impeachment of the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, to have a feeling of revulsion and sadness about what the U.N. and the United States have done and are doing in Katanga. One serves neither one's country nor the U.N. by saying they are right when they are wrong.

Nor is Mr. Hempstone an unconditional hero-worshiper of President Tshombe. Again quoting from his introduction, Mr. Hempstone said:

> This is not intended as an apologia for President Moise Tshombe or his regime. I am probably more aware of the weaknesses of the man and his government than many of those who criticize him most vociferously. I know Tshombe personally. My life has been threatened by his gendarmes. I have few illusions about him or about Katanga. Yet I also know his good qualities, his intelligence, bravery, and racial tolerance. I know

that his government, with all its faults, has the one essential characteristic of any administration and one too seldom encountered in Africa: the capacity to govern. I remember Katanga as it was in happier days, with mines working, shops open, children in school, churches full. I remember it as the U.N. and United States made it in December, with mortar shells falling in the parks where people used to walk, machineguns stuttering in the deserted, smoke-filled streets. If you listened hard then, you could hear a thighbone beating on that tinpan gong.

I have serious reasons for believing, Mr. President, although I cannot now reveal the details, that the Department of State over the past several months has been endeavoring to reestablish a friendly relationship with President Tshombe and to pursue a policy of conciliation, rather than passively supporting the U.N.'s tragically misguided policy of force in the Congo.

I have reason for believing that the State Department has been seeking to restrain the U.N. in recent months.

I have reason for believing that, while the Department approved the general terms of U Thant's proposals for the federation of the Congo, it was distinctly unhappy over the fact that U Thant saw fit to couple this proposal with a crude 10-day ultimatum, and with the threat that economic sanctions would go into effect automatically if the proposal were not accepted within that time.

I have reason for believing that the State Department was equally unhappy over the U.N.'s decision to move Léopoldville troops into Katanga under the U.N. umbrella, on the very day that Tshombe stated his acceptance in principle of the proposed federation; that it did not approve the irritating and pointless aerial blockade which the U.N. imposed on Katanga at the request of the Léopoldville Government; that it has not approved of some of the provocative military actions of the U.N. forces in Katanga in recent weeks and of the incredible rudeness of the U.N.'s official communications with Tshombe.

As an example of this rudeness, I want to read to my colleagues the text of the letter written by Mr. E. W. Mathu, U.N. representative in Elisabethville, to President Tshombe on August 29:

> Mr. President: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 28, 1962 (reference No. SR/106/) relative to the delay in accepting the plan for national reconciliation.
>
> Mr. R. K. Gardiner has instructed me to advise you that the word "reply" which he employed in his accompanying letter of August 24, 1962 (KAT-133/62), should be interpreted as signifying "acceptance or refusal of the plan" and does not allow of any commentary or discussion.
>
> Mr. Gardiner instructed me, among other things, to make it clear that if the Katangan authorities have recourse to such quibblings (in an effort) to avoid a frank decision, we shall consider such an attitude as a rejection of the plan.
>
> Please accept, Mr. President, the expression of my very high esteem.
>
> E. W. Mathu,
> *Representative of the United Nations in Elisabethville, September 2.*

The State Department is endeavoring to pursue a policy of conciliation in the Congo. But the U.N. unfortunately is still pursuing the old, discredited policy of force; and this policy undercuts and subverts our policy of conciliation.

This indeed was the theme of a column by the distinguished commentator, Mr. Arthur Krock, in the New York Times yesterday, October 11. I quote the opening paragraph of this column:

> Not until Under Secretary of State McGhee returns from the Congo, and his report on his efforts to unify the factions there is published, can the puzzle created by the timing of a statement issued yesterday by the U.N. Secretariat be fully dispelled. The puzzle is why, while McGhee was still in Léopoldville, after conversations with Moise Tshombe in Katanga that imbued him with "guarded optimism," Acting U.N. Secretary General Thant decided to resume his war of words with Tshombe and make another show of U.N. armed force at Elisabethville.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of this article be incorporated into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Who Threw a Rock at Our Peacemaker?

(By Arthur Krock)

Washington, October 10.—Not until Under Secretary of State McGhee returns from the Congo, and his report on his efforts to unify the factions there is published, can the puzzle created by the timing of a statement issued yesterday by the U.N. Secretariat be fully dispelled. The puzzle is why, while McGhee was still in Léopoldville, after conversations with Moise Tshombe in Katanga that imbued him with "guarded optimism," Acting U.N. Secretary General Thant decided to resume his war of words with Tshombe and make another show of U.N. armed force at Elisabethville.

In the earlier chapters of the U.N.'s procedure to end Katanga's secession by military force interspersed with a recurrent series of ultimatums, the Kennedy administration, represented by the Departments of State and Defense, was a full partner. This Government supplied the materiel and the air transport without which the troops of the U.N. and the central Congo regime at Léopoldville could not have fought the war in Katanga. And the Department of State was as busy as the U.N. Secretariat in producing official statements designed to picture Tshombe to the world as solely responsible for every obstruction to a peaceful settlement in the Congo.

But, with the dispatch of Under Secretary McGhee, the Department returned to the policy of getting the Congo unified by diplomatic measures in which Tshombe would get solid assurances, previously lacking, that the constitutional compromise plan worked out by the United States, Great Britain and Belgium (though it is "still being drafted by the U.N. authorities at Léopoldville," according to our dispatch today) would be executed in good faith. The Under Secretary was a good choice, because he has a special gift for difficult negotiation.

What happened in the McGhee-Tshombe conversations, except that the Under Secretary is understood to have left Elisabethville for Léopoldville with guarded optimism, is not yet public property. But McGhee was still engaged in his mission when the U.N. issued the new bellicose statements.

It may develop that he previously had reported a failure of his mission to Katanga, and therefore the sponsors of the compromise decided that the only recourse was a public reversion to strong-arm measures.

Certainly that describes the U.N. announcements yesterday. These were that Tshombe is engaged in a major military buildup, complete with fresh drafts of "mercenaries," and that Thant will urge prompt approval by the Security Council of his proposal for the economic boycott of Katanga. And certainly another strong-arm measure was the provocative show of U.N. military force at the Elisabethville post office this week.

MERCENARIES IN THE CONGO

But, if this assumption of the cause of the U.N. actions is not borne out, then U Thant's immediate publication of the report of a major military buildup in Katanga that he received from the U.N. representative in the Congo, and U Thant's announcement of renewed activity for his economic boycott of the Province, were heavy and deliberate handicaps of the Under Secretary's mission while he was still engaged in it. If so, the feuding spirit of U Thant's procedures with Tshombe and his ministers continues as a chief obstruction to peaceful unification of the Congo.

It is also in this spirit that the foreign aids, without whom Tshombe could not possibly obtain the measure of Katangan autonomy he has been promised, are constantly and exclusively identified as "mercenaries" by a U.N. whose foreign aids, military and civilian, in the Congo are on hire, too.

Until McGhee's report of his mission is published, another odd aspect of the U.N. sudden reassumption of belligerency against Tshombe will have to await explanation. In the compromise plan sponsored by the U.N. the United States, the United Kingdom, and Belgium the promise was made that the "National Government" of the Congo, "after consultation with the provincial governments and interested political groups, will present a Federal Constitution to the Parliament in September." Since that is still being drafted, the question is whether more evidence than the military buildup report caused the Acting Secretary General to arraign Tshombe on October 9 for noncompliance with a constitution that doesn't yet exist.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, what worries me most about the present situation is the fact that the bulk of the U.N. Army in Katanga owes its loyalty and obedience not to the Secretary General and the Security Council, but to the Indian Minister of Defense, Krishna Menon—a man who has supported the Soviet Union on every major foreign policy issue, who during World War II openly contributed articles to the official organs of the British Communist Party and of the Communist International, and who, since taking over command of the Indian armed forces, has compelled the retirement of General Thimaya and many others of the most respected Indian military leaders.

Theoretically, the Indian Army forces in the Congo are under the control of the Secretary General. But the officers in command of these forces owe their careers and their future not to U Thant but to Krishna Menon. The significance of this should be crystal clear.

I am convinced that Krishna Menon does not want any settlement in the Congo. I am convinced that Khrushchev and Krishna Menon want to see Tshombe destroyed rather than see the differences between Tshombe and Adoula peacefully composed. And the fact that it is this man who commands the bulk of the U.N. contingent in Katanga is, in my opinion, a reason for the gravest concern.

I believe that if all my colleagues in the Senate and House could find the time to read "Rebels, Mercenaries, and Dividends," by Smith Hempstone, there would be such an outcry of indignation that even the extremists in the United Nations would be compelled to moderate their position.

Because I consider this one of the truly great works of current history published in this decade, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point several of the most significant excerpts from Mr. Hempstone's book.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM "REBELS, MERCENARIES, AND DIVIDENDS—THE KATANGA STORY," BY SMITH HEMPSTONE

IX. THE DECEMBER WAR

"Let Katangan fighters arise at the given moment in every street, every lane, every road, and every village" (Moise Tshombe, speaking to the people of Katanga on November 26, 1961).

The ink of the cease-fire agreement was not yet dry when the Central Government made it clear that it was intent on war in Katanga. On September 22, 1961, Adoula stated in Léopoldville that the Central Government would resort "to its own means to put an end to the secession of Katanga." The Congolese Prime Minister wrote to Linner expressing extreme reserve about the agreement concluded between Tshombe and the U.N. Earlier, Adoula had stated that the Congolese troops were "ready to answer force with force in Katanga." Also on September 22, Mobutu broadcast an appeal to the Katanga gendarmery to refuse to obey its white officers.

On the face of it, any invasion of Katanga by Central Government troops would constitute civil war, an event the U.N. officials in the Congo were bound to prevent under the terms of the Security Council's resolution of February 21 "by use of force, if necessary, in the last resort." Yet both Linner and Khiari, again indulging in curious mental and semantic gymnastics, declared that, in their opinion, such a move would be only a police action and hence could not be stopped.

On September 23, the Congolese cabinet unanimously approved the House of Assembly's motion, carried the previous day in secret session, that Katanga should be attacked. Gizenga, now Vice Premier in Adoula's government, was the prime mover in these maneuvers. Central Government troops on the Katangan border were alerted to be ready to attack and reinforcements were flown into Luluabourg, the capital of Kasai. On September 27, Tshombe appealed to Adoula for negotiations "with the shortest delay and on neutral territory," a suggestion Adoula quickly rejected. If Tshombe wanted to talk, said Adoula, he must come to Léopoldville. Since he had spent 2 months in detention after his last visit to territory under Central Government control, Tshombe's unwillingness to come to Léopoldville certainly was understandable.

Meanwhile, relations between Tshombe and the U.N. had not improved. Katanga and the U.N. repeatedly charged each other with violating the cease-fire agreement. O'Brien denied Tshombe's charge that he was flying in reinforcements, but said that the U.N. had flown in additional armored cars 4 hours before the signing of the cease-fire agreement. Bars, cafes, laundries, and breweries in Elisabethville refused to do business with U.N. personnel, either voluntarily or out of fear of reprisals from the CONAKAT Jeunesse. No one had much confidence in the permanence of the cease-fire, and 431 white civilians, mostly women and children, took advantage of the truce to flee from Katanga. Four Ethiopian F-86's, the first of 14 Ethiopian, Swedish, and Indian jets, flew into Léopoldville. Meanwhile, O'Brien kept up constant pressure on Tshombe to expel his remaining 104 white mercenaries. On October 1, Tshombe formally released these men, although few apparently left the Katangan forces. On October 5, Khiari complained that Katanga had refused to let the four-man cease-fire commission visit the Katangan strongholds of Kipushi, Kolwezi, and Jadotville. Mercenaries and war materials, the Tunisian said, were entering Katanga through Kipushi.

Tshombe would have been a great fool had he not, under the circumstances, been bringing in reinforcements. As Khiari pointed out, neither the Central Government nor the U.N. in Central Government territory were bound by the cease-fire agreement. As the Tunisian put it, the Central Government was free to "arm itself to the teeth" for action against Katanga but Tshombe, under the terms of the cease-fire, had no right to reinforce his troops to defend Katanga against such attacks. By the same token, while it could not bring jets into Katanga, the U.N. could bring them to Luluabourg, 30 minutes' flying time away. Yet it was clear that the jets were for future use against Katanga.

On October 20, 5,000 Central Government troops (including 4,000 former Force Publique mutineers who had served in Katanga) crossed from Kasai into Katanga and were engaged by Katangan gendarmes. Adoula stated that the troops were carrying out a police action against outlaws and added that the operation was part of a plan to end Katanga's secession. Norman Ho, a U.N. spokesman in Léopoldville, stated the same day that Katangan planes had made air strikes in the area of the Kasai-Katanga border. The raids, he said, were "a serious breach of the cease-fire in Katanga" and six U.N.-Swedish jets in the future would give aircover to Mobutu's troops. Ho had nothing to say about the civil war nature of the Congolese offensive.

The Congolese troops, however, did not act much like liberators. They put villages to the torch, slaughtered women and children, and sent an estimated 10,000 families fleeing to the south. On November 1, another 1,500 Gizengist troops under the command of General Lundula were flown into Kivu, presumably in U.N. aircraft, to attack Katanga from that direction.

Mobutu announced on November 2, that he had ordered the offensive and that his troops had captured 72 villages within a 30-mile belt inside Katanga. But Kimba (Tshombe at the time was in Geneva for medical treatment) denied Mobutu's claim of victory and said Katangan troops had thrown back the Congolese at both Kaniama on the Kasai front and at Kongolo on the Kivu front.

The following day, Linner, in a report to the Security Council, made the remarkable statement that the activities of the Katangan Air Force "represent offensive civil war action" prohibited under the resolution of February 21. He thus conveniently ignored the stipulation in the cease-fire agreement between the U.N. and Katanga which allowed the gendarmerie to reply to an attack from beyond Katanga's frontiers. Khiari with a straight face then stated that the Congo was not considered as "beyond Katanga's frontiers." Perhaps he thought Katanga feared an invasion from Angola or Rhodesia.

It soon became clear that Kimba was closer to the truth as regards the military situation than Mobutu. On November 5, Léopoldville admitted that Katangan gendarmes had defeated and inflicted heavy losses on the Congolese troops north of Kaniama, taking many prisoners and much equipment. Tshombe, speaking in Geneva, once more stated his willingness to negotiate a settlement with Adoula. Said he: "We want to come to an agreement with our brothers in the Congo but there must be no coercion or repression. We will defend ourselves when attacked."

But if Mobutu's troops could not fight very well, they had other talents that were revealed only on November 6, when 10 white refugees reached Brussels from Luluabourg. It was revealed then that, enraged at their defeat, Congolese soldiers had arrested 400 whites, raped 15 women including some nuns, and beaten up 18 missionaries. Linner and Ho, so quick off the mark with information about the Katangan air attacks on Congolese troops, were surprisingly slow in hearing about this sort of thing or about announcing it to the world. About the only creditable aspect of the whole nasty incident was the fact that Mobutu had the courage to arrest 123 of the soldiers involved and to send them back to Léopoldville. The fact remains that the U.N. was directly responsible for what happened at Luluabourg because it encouraged the Léopoldville government to move against Katanga. This was to be far from the last time that innocent men and women were to pay a bitter price for the U.N.'s actions.

Things were not going so well on the Kivu front either for Tshombe or for anyone genuinely interested in the maintenance of law and order. The Katangan gendarmes pulled out of Albertville on the approach of a large body of Baluba warriors backed up by Gizengist troops who quickly captured the lightly held towns of Kabalo, Nyunzu, Manono, and Nyemba. Only in Kongolo did 1,600 gendarmes stand firm.

The Congolese troops immediately distinguished themselves in their usual fashion. At Kindu (in Kivu Province) they seized and brutally beat 13 Italian U.N. airmen. The Italians had flown some Malayan Ferret armored cars into Kindu. Drunken Congolese soldiers accused them of being,Belgian mercenaries, beat them, shot them all, and then dismembered their bodies. According to witnesses, parts of the bodies were thrown into the Congo River. Others were sold in the marketplace and a human hand was presented to a World Health Organization doctor by a giggling Congolese soldier. Colonel Alphonse Pakassa, the commanding officer of the Gizengist unit, who refused either to withdraw his troops from the airport or to punish the murderers, when questioned by General Lundula on the subject of the massacre, came up with the quote of the week: "You know how soldiers are." Linner, however, managed to top this one by stating later that it was "inopportune" to disarm the Congolese troops at Kindu. These same troops were later to slay 22 Belgian priests at Kongolo. One began to wonder just how many men and women were going to have to die because of the criminal stupidity of U.N. officials and the political bias of some member states of the United Nations. It was, or should have been, clear from the beginning that the Congolese invasion of Katanga amounted to civil war. It was, or should have been, clear from the beginning that the U.N., by allowing half-savage Congolese troops to enter Katanga, was signing the death warrants of hundreds of innocent civilians, black and white. Yet the U.N. preferred to carp about Tshombe's violations of the cease-fire agreement. Certainly he violated the cease-fire by reinforcing his troops and bringing in military supplies. And more civilians, white and African alike, would be dead today if he had not done so.

In Albertville, the activities of the Congolese troops were slighty less dramatic. Demonstrating admirable restraint, they restricted themselves to looting white homes, stealing cars, and arresting whites and Africans identified by Balubakat Jeunesse as pro-Tshombe. All but about 30 of Albertville's 1,200 whites fled across the lake to Tanganyika, as drug-crazed Balubas emptied the prison. In Léopoldville, U.N. Spokesman George Ivan Smith primly described "the behavior" of the Congolese troops as "impossible."

Meanwhile, Tshombe reiterated his recognition of Kasavubu as the head of a confederal Congo and repeated that he was "always ready" to negotiate with Adoula. He asked only that the U.N. should end its "subversive" acts in Albertville and that the Central Government should halt hostilities in northern Katanga. But neither Léopoldville nor the U.N., despite the tragedies of Luluabourg, Kindu, and Albertville, were in a mood for negotiations. Adoula declined the offer and demanded Katanga's unconditional reintegration into the Congo.

The Security Council met on November 13, in an air of mixed anger, frustration, and quiet desperation. Tshombe's white soldiers, military successes, wealth, and defiance had raised the antagonism of the Afro-Asian bloc to an almost hysterical pitch. The United States and the Western Powers were anxious that the U.N. should not fail in Katanga. On the other hand, it was clear that they had nothing really positive to suggest.

Bomboko, speaking for the Léopoldville Government, made three main points: Léopoldville expected the U.N. to give it "direct assistance" in maintaining law and order; it wanted all of Tshombe's white mercenaries turned over to it for punishment for their "dastardly crimes against the Congo" (in November, the Belgian Government withdrew the passports of its nationals still serving in the Katangan forces); and it wanted a new and clear U.N. mandate on the Congo.

What Bomboko was asking for, obviously, was a new U.N. military offensive against Katanga to replace that of the Central Government which had ended in defeat. In view of the happenings at Kindu, turning over the mercenaries to Léopoldville would have been the equivalent of murdering them in cold blood.

The one draft resolution before the Security Council contained no more wisdom and balance. Sponsored by Ceylon, Liberia, and the U.A.R. (the Security Council's three Afro-Asian members) it authorized U Thant, the new Acting Secretary General, to take vigorous action, including the use of the requisite measure of force, if necessary, for the immediate apprehension, detention pending legal action and/or deportation of all foreign mercenaries and hostile elements.

The resolution strongly deprecated the secessionist activities illegally carried out by the provincial administration of Katanga. The three powers also attacked the Katangan regime for resisting the U.N.'s attempt to topple it by force.

That such a resolution, a clear violation of the U.N.'s charter forbidding interference in the internal affairs of a member nation, should even be debated seriously must some day be recalled with astonishment, regret, and perhaps amusement. The "hostile elements" phrase could in fact quite easily be interpreted to mean that the U.N. had the right to deport any Katangan not in agreement with it, including Tshombe, his entire government, his 11,600 gendarmes, and every member of CONAKAT.

But not only was the resolution debated, it was accepted virtually as written. The U.S. State Department, perhaps becoming vaguely aware of the nature of the monster it had helped to create, made a feeble attempt to expand the resolution to cover Gizengist activity as well as that of Katanga. U.S. Delegate Adlai Stevenson also proposed that negotiations should be urged upon the Katangan and Congolese Governments and that the Congolese Army should be reorganized, retrained, and equipped with a small air force. These amendments Soviet Delegate Valerian Zorin promptly vetoed. He let pass a Stevenson amendment rejecting Katanga's independence. Unlike Britain and France, the United States lacked the moral courage even to abstain from the resolution, much less to veto it. It passed by a vote of 9 to 0 and the U.N. found itself in a virtual military alliance with the Congolese Government, with U Thant holding carte blanche to end Katanga's secession in any way he saw fit.

The Security Council resolution of November 24 amounted to an obvious declaration of war against Katanga. Tshombe was quick to realize this.

Addressing 8,000 cheering Africans in Elisabethville on November 26, Tshombe told them that the U.N. would soon "undertake war on our territory." Said the Katangan President:

"Tomorrow or the day after, there will be a trial of strength. Let us prepare for it. Let Katangan fighters arise at the given moment in every street, every lane, every road, and every village. I will give you the signal at the opportune time. You will not be able to have guns and automatic weapons but we still have our poisoned arrows, our spears, our axes."

Meanwhile, U Thant had conferred with his 18-nation Congo Advisory Commission composed of delegates from Malaya, India, Pakistan, Senegal, Canada, Ethiopia, Ireland, Liberia, Sweden, Nigeria, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Morocco, Sudan, Mali, Tunisia, and the U.A.R., all nations that had, or had had, military units in the Congo (the last 8 had withdrawn their troops). The Acting Secretary General appealed to them for more troops and transport. The U.N.'s military strength in the Congo at the time amounted to 15,418 men, a force clearly inadequate to both crush Tshombe and maintain order in the remainder of the country. About two-thirds of the U.N.'s troops were deployed in Katanga. I cabled to my paper in late November that the "military subjugation of Katanga which is, after all, larger than Portugal, cannot be undertaken with any prospect of success unless a minimum of 25,000 troops are placed at the disposal of the United Nations." To undertake Tshombe's overthrow with fewer troops would be doubly criminal since it clearly could not succeed and hence the lives lost on both sides would be wasted. But the U.N. was intent on war. U Thant's only concession to Tshombe and the West was to replace O'Brien (already recalled to New York "for consultations") with Brian Urquhart, a Briton, as special representative in Elisabethville.

Katanga's fortunes unquestionably had suffered at the U.N. through the publication on the eve of the Security Council meeting—the timing can hardly be considered coincidental—of the commission of inquiry's findings concerning Lumumba's death. At this critical moment, a second event occurred that was to blacken Tshombe in the eyes of many of those otherwise not ill-disposed toward him.

U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, a man sharply critical of the State Department's position regarding Katanga, was visiting Elisabethville. On November 28, a private dinner party to which U.N. officials and members of the consular corps were invited was given for Senator DODD at a private home in Elisabethville. Katangan paracommandos guarding the nearby home of gendarmery Commander General Norbert Moke became suspicious at the number of cars arriving at the villa. A car bearing U.N. plates arrived. In the car was Urquhart with his assistant, 46-year-old Australian-born George Ivan Smith. When the paracommandos recognized the pair, they chased them into the house, dragged them out into the street, beat them up, and threw them into a truck. A Belgian employee of the Banque du Congo tried to intervene on their behalf and was himself beaten and thrown into the truck. At this moment, Senator and Mrs. Dodd, accompanied by the U.S. consul in Elisabethville, Lewis Hoffacker, and preceded by a motorcycle escort of Katangan gendarmes, arrived on the scene. Hoffacker, sizing up the situation at a glance, jumped from the car and, with the assistance of the escort, dragged Smith and the Belgian from the truck and drove immediately to Tshombe's residence. Urquhart, meanwhile, was driven away to the Katangan army camp by the half-crazed paracommandos. Three hours later, Urquhart was released on the personal intervention of Tshombe, Munongo, and Kimba. He had suffered cracked ribs and a broken nose from his beating. A Gurkha driver and a Sikh major were killed while searching for Urquhart. Tshombe later "abjectly apologized" for the incident.

It is necessary to pause for a minute to give credit to Lew Hoffacker. Hoffacker is everything that a State Department official should be and seldom is: intelligent, courteous, resourceful, courageous, unpretentious, and well-informed. In the days to come (he was a newcomer to Katanga) we were to see a great deal of each other. During the fighting that followed, he always made it his business to get about (at some danger to himself), to find out what was going on, and to do everything he could to ease tension. Had we more men like him in Africa (and in the higher echelons of the State Department), it is unlikely that the United States would have made the major errors it did make in Katanga.

It is difficult to evaluate the effect that the brutal and stupid beating of Urquhart and Smith had on the U.N.'s actions. It would be silly to imply that the U.N. later waged was against Tshombe because of the incident. U Thant already had his mandate and his plans were laid. But the incident did go a long way toward exacerbating relations in Elisabethville between the Katangan Government and the U.N., and it did provide Tshombe's foes with a potent propaganda weapon. Urquhart's broken nose seemed to wipe out the memory of the 13 Italians slaughtered at Kindu by the Congolese troops.

The situation in the north had not improved. A force of about 3,000 Congolese troops, including the Kindu murderers, was pressing south against Kongolo while Baluba warriors edged in from the east and west. Cotanga, the textile company that operates in Kongolo, ordered the evacuation by air of its employees. Sendwe arrived in Albertville to set up a Baluba government. Kongolo's 1,500-man gendarme garrison, running short of ammunition, dispatched a request for arms and munitions to Elisabethville. But the U.N. refused to let a Katangan plane fly the war materials into the beleaguered town. Under the circumstances, Tshombe had no alternative but to order Kongolo's evacuation. One month later, 22 Belgian priests were murdered by the same troops whom Linner had found it "inopportune" to disarm after the Kindu massacre. And so there were 22 more murders on the head of the U.N.

Meanwhile, Tshombe had not given up hope of a negotiated settlement with Léopoldville. On November 29, he dispatched a message through Welensky, suggesting the appointment of a distinguished statesman from an uncommitted independent African country to act as mediator between Katanga and the Central Congolese Government. The following day, Tshombe flew to Brazzaville, across the river from Léopoldville, in the hope that he might personally be able to arrange a meeting with Adoula on neutral territory. His overture was rejected. The Katangan President then flew on to Paris.

But the die was already cast and the U.N.'s own propaganda drums were beating. On December 1, a report from Linner was published in New York which alleged that Tshombe's regime was "approaching the point where it cannot control the forces it has unleashed, and where it cannot change the direction of its policy away from violence and toward peaceful collaboration with the U.N."

"Unless the regime alters its course immediately," Linner continued, "neither Mr. Tshombe nor his associates may be able to control its direction, and elements of their military forces and of the civil population may initiate further hostilities against the United Nations."

The report, capitalizing on the Urquhart-Smith incident, was a clear attempt to develop the thesis that no peaceful solution was possible in Katanga. Tshombe, as he was to show within a fortnight, was in full control of both his army and his people. He was quite capable of changing his policy to one of "peaceful collaboration" with the U.N., had there been any point in so doing. But to expect Tshombe to quietly lie down and lick the U.N.'s boots while it was openly preparing for war against him was expecting rather much. Over the last 10 months, the U.N. had done everything possible, including resorting to arms and unleashing the Central Congolese troops, to overthrow Tshombe's regime and subjugate Katanga to Léopoldville. Under the circumstances, collaboration with the U.N. was out of the question. Tshombe's reply to Linner was more realistic than the Swede's charge:

"When I put my people on guard against the danger the U.N. represents for Katanga, I am said to be conducting a campaign of incitement. If I understand things correctly, Katanga is not only being forced to let itself be strangled but must also permit this to happen in silence."

On December 2, while Tshombe was in Brazzaville, the situation in Elisabethville deteriorated sharply. It is difficult to apportion the blame but each side seems to have been at fault. The initial incident took place at Elisabethville Airport when Indian troops arrested and disarmed 32 Katangan gendarmes who allegedly had drunkenly molested an African woman. Within hours, other gendarmes had set up roadblocks, arrested 11 United Nations personnel, fired on a U.N. aircraft, killed 1 Swedish soldier and wounded 2 others when they tried to force their way through a roadblock. The U.N. moved all its civilian personnel within its Elisabethville defense perimeter as U Thant directed Linner and Smith "to act vigorously to reestablish law and order and protect life and property in Katanga." Smith tersely ordered Kimba to have the roadblocks removed or face the consequences.

On December 4, Smith announced that Kimba had threatened to shoot down U.N. aircraft flying over Katanga and added that he regarded this as "a very grave statement." Kimba denied this, asserting that his statement applied only to unannounced and unscheduled aircraft. Kimba added that he had agreed that U.N. personnel should have freedom of movement in Elisabethville when engaged in their normal duties. But the Katangan roadblock across the highway leading from the city to the airport 10 miles away remained in position, although Kimba agreed (Smith said) to remove it.

Speaking in Paris, where he allegedly had gone to see his 17-year-old son before continuing to a Moral Rearmament Conference in Brazil, Tshombe sounded a grave note:

"If the United Nations forces undertake fresh armed intervention in violation of the cease-fire," he said, "the Secretary General will bear heavy responsibility for the hostilities. This time I give a solemn warning to the United Nations and its executives: Any new conflict would today be a major one, because since September 13, and since the attack of the Congolese National Army, the people of Katanga have realized that they are a free nation, determined to preserve their liberty."

Those of us stationed in other parts of Africa packed our bags and bought our airplane tickets to Ndola (Northern Rhodesia), the jump-off point for Elisabethville.

We had not long to wait. On December 5, Urquhart (who was U.N. Special Adviser in Katanga; Smith's title was U.N. Chief Representative) charged that "in a final act of bad faith," Katangan gendarmes were infiltrating through the bush toward the airport. Within a matter of minutes, Gurkha troops had assaulted the main roadblock on the airport road, held by a company of paracommandos led by three white officers and supported by three armored cars and some 60-millimeter mortars. When the smoke cleared, 38 gendarmes lay dead. The Indians had suffered one dead and four wounded. It was war. And this time there was nothing phony about it.

With Tshombe away in Paris (was it coincidence that the fighting began then or did the U.N. command believe that its chances of success would be improved by Tshombe's absence?), Munongo took charge. Said he, replying to false press reports that the Katangan Government had fled:

"We are all here, resolved to fight and die if necessary. The United Nations may take our cities. There will remain our villages and the bush. All the tribal chiefs are alerted. We are savages; we are Negroes. So be it. We shall fight like savages with our arrows."

The first fighting centered in the air and along the road connecting U.N. headquarters with Elisabethville Airport. The U.N. air force of 15 jets (6 Swedish Saabs, 5 Indian Canberras, and 4 Ethiopian Sabres) took off from Luluabourg and swept south over Katanga. The jets attacked bridges, cannoned the railway between Jadotville and Elisabethville, strafed trucks, and, by destroying four Kantangan planes on the ground at Kolwezi, quickly established U.N. air superiority in the skies over Katanga. If this did not insure the U.N. of victory, it at least made its defeat impossible, since control of the skies meant that it could move and reinforce its troops at will, while Tshombe could not.

At the northwestern end of the highway linking U.N. headquarters and the airport, 29 Seventh-day Adventist missionaries (including 19 women and children), most of them Americans, found themselves pinned down by gunfire in their mission buildings, which lay between the opposing lines. They managed to flee to safety only after Seventh-day Adventist World Secretary-General Chester Torrey, an American, had been wounded. There was heavy fighting at the old airport (proposed site of Elisabethville University), near the traffic circle where the initial clash had taken place. Elsewhere, firing was sporadic but indiscriminate enough for Georges Olivet, Swiss International Red Cross representative in Elisabethville, to cable an appeal to his Geneva office to call on the U.N. to stop firing on Red Cross vehicles. Meanwhile, in New York, U Thant authorized George Ivan Smith to take counteraction on the ground and in the air against the Katangan gendarmes.

Having smashed the threat of the Katangan Air Force, Brigadier K. A. S. Raja began to build up his forces to sufficient strength to enable him to take the offensive. Washington put U.S. Air Force Globemasters at the U.N.'s disposal (one was damaged by Katangan ground fire as it came in for a landing at Elisabethville) and these giant planes (a total of 27 U.S. aircraft was employed) began bringing in troops, artillery, and armored cars. This resulted in the Katangan authorities placing Lewis Hoffacker under house arrest. Anti-American feeling spread throughout the city. Meanwhile, heavy fighting broke out around the railway underpass connecting the industrial section with the center of the city. Swedish troops, who initially had occupied the underpass, were forced out again after an attack by an all-white Katangan unit.

Tshombe quickly returned by air from Paris to Ndola, stopping at Brazzaville for a hasty conference with his ally, President Fulbert Youlou. From Ndola, escorted by a small body of gendarmes and accompanied by Joseph Lambroschini, the French Consul in Elisabethville, he drove by car to his embattled capital. In the north, heavy fighting between gendarmes and U.N. troops broke out at the tin-mining center of Manono.

As the U.N. jets stepped up their air attacks on December 7, and U.N. armored cars hammered gendarmes dug in on the fringes of Elisabethville's northern residential sector, the Rhodesian Railways dispatched a 10-car mercy train to Elisabethville to evacuate white women and children.

The situation was becoming increasingly unpleasant. Fifty U.N. mortar shells rained down on the Prince Leopold Hospital one night as African patients crawled screaming into the corridors. A terrified African woman about to give birth jumped from the operating table and disappeared into the night. The U.N. at first denied mortaring the hospital but later admitted it, stating that the hospital adjoined Camp Massart, the gendarme headquarters. It was, in fact, more than 800 yards from Camp Massart. This was the first of many incidents that led one to believe that the U.N. had both unskilled gunners and less than candid spokesmen.

On the same day, Union Miniere described as unfounded and entirely untrue accusations by U Thant that the company had built armored cars and bombs for the Katangan gendarmerie and shielded mercenaries with cover jobs. Union Miniere suggested that the U.N. was making these accusations to justify attacking Union Miniere's installations, an eventually that came to pass a few days later.

The U.N. jets next turned their attention to the center of the city. Screaming in at treetop level while excited gendarmes and white civilians popped away at them with anything from .22 pistols to submachine guns, they blasted the post office and the radio station, severing Katanga's communications with the outside world. It is difficult to see how this had any connection with insuring the safety of the U.N.'s lines of communications and the security of its personnel, the avowed purposes of the U.N. attack. One came to the conclusion that the U.N.'s action was intended to make it more difficult for correspondents to let the world know what was going on in Katanga, since the only way press dispatches could be filed was to drive them 150 miles to Northern Rhodesia over a road studded with tribal roadblocks and subject to U.N. air attack. This did not always work to the U.N.'s advantage, however, since the U.N. command in Elisabethville had direct communications with Léopoldville and New York; there was at least one occasion when it denied atrocity charges before these had appeared in the press. Meanwhile, the U.S. airlift of troops and war materials into Elisabethville continued.

On December 10, General McKeown, speaking in Léopoldville, asserted that if the U.N. had fired on cars with Red Cross markings, it was because these vehicles were carrying mercenaries (nobody thought to ask McKeown if a white civilian doctor serving with the Katangan forces was considered a mercenary by the U.N.). The General stated that the Red Cross had only 10 vehicles in Elizabethville but 50 had been spotted with Red Cross markings. There is a possibility that mercenaries did use cars marked with red crosses for reconnaissance. It is also true, however, that many civilians placed their cars at the disposal of the Katangan Government for use as ambulances, which explains the presence of more Red Cross vehicles than those officially registered.

U.N. air attacks continued with strikes against Union Minière's Kolwezi fuel dump which set 750,000 gallons of diesel oil afire. Two hundred youths of the Conakat Jeunesse stoned and partially looted the American Consulate in protest against the U.S. airlift. The Association of Enterprises of Katanga (chamber of commerce), a grouping of 80 companies giving work to 60,000 Katangans and supporting 240,000 others, filed a protest to "the civilized countries of the world" against "the systematic and willful destruction of the economic potential of Katanga." Late on the 10th, the first refugees train bringing 360 white women and children to safety reached Northern Rhodesia

On December 11, Youlou cabled Kennedy beseeching him "in the name of peace and humanity, to intervene in Katanga to arrange a cease-fire." On the following day, U Thant denied that the purpose of the U.N.'s Elisabethville operation was "to force a political solution of the Katanga problem by smashing the military strength of the present political leadership, and also the political leadership itself." He said that the goal was to "regain and assure our freedom of movement, to restore law and order, and to insure that for the future U.N. forces and officials in Katanga are not subjected to attacks."

One of the worst atrocities of the war occurred on December 12. Indian-piloted Canberra jets, safe in the knowledge that the daylight skies were theirs (the Katangan Air Force's few remaining propeller-driven light planes were able to make night attacks only), roared in over Shinkolobwe and shot up the former uranium mine's hospital, leaving two children and two men dead. Four pregnant women were wounded, as were 44 other Africans. The hospital was clearly marked with a huge red cross on its roof and was more than 1,500 yards from the nearest building. The previous day, while U Thant was still talking, U.N. jets had attacked the Le Marinel hospital, without, however, causing any casualties. Shinkolobwe was known to be an important Katangan military base. Putting the best possible interpretation on this tragic incident, one can only surmise that the Indian pilots did not see the red cross on the roof and thought they were attacking a military camp. However, far too many hospitals, churches, and other civilian installations were hit by U.N. air and ground fire to accept this as plausible. Even granting that, as the U.N. charged, Katangan gendarmes often fired from the shadows of churches or hospitals, the U.N. record in this respect left much to be desired. By December 12, the end of the first 8 days of fighting, Katangan losses amounted to about 100 killed and 179 wounded (75 gendarmes and the rest civilians of both races). An estimated 1,500 whites were homeless. The U.N. set its own losses at 10 dead, 34 wounded, and 13 missing.

Later in the day, U.N. jets attacked the Jadotville railway, strafed the Mulungwishi post office, cannoned an ore train in Kolwezi railway station, damaged a processing factory at Luilu, knocked out an electric generator at Luena, and destroyed a locomotive north of Elisabethville. It is not clear what bearing these attacks had on the reestablishment of the U.N.'s communications or the safeguarding of its personnel. The whole operation was beginning to look very much like an old-fashioned imperialistic punitive expedition. All that was missing was the gunboat.

By December 12, Raja had nearly 6,000 troops at his disposal to attack 3,000 Katangan gendarmes reinforced by 250 (at the very most—some estimates ran as low as 50) white mercenaries and perhaps 100 local white volunteers. Mortar shells hailed down on the center of the city as the softening-up process began. Again, the gunnery was either disgracefully amateur or totally indiscriminate. Among the military objectives hit: a beauty shop, the apartment of the French Consul, Sabena Airways office, the Roman Catholic cathedral, Elisabethville's museum. A car pulled up in front of the Grand Hotel Leopold II, where all of us were staying. "Look at the work of the American criminals," sobbed the Belgian driver. "Take a picture and send it to Kennedy." In the backseat, his eyes glazed with shock, sat a wounded African man cradling in his arms the body of his 10-year-old son. The child's face and belly had been smashed to jelly by mortar fragments. The war—and life—were over for him. His mother, also wounded, sat wordlessly beside her husband.

On the same day that this child died, Britain, France, Greece, the Malagasy Republic, and the former French Congo were all pressing for a cease-fire. But U Thant did not want one, the 18-nation Congo Advisory Committee did not want one, the United States did not want one. Or rather they did not want one until Tshombe had been taught a lesson and was prepared to accept conqueror's terms from Adoula.

There was never much doubt about the U.N.'s ability to storm Elisabethville. It had absolute control of the air, numerical superiority in men, and better equipment (the U.N. had Ferret armored cars, heavy mortars and 108-millimeter guns; the biggest gun the Katangans had was 75-millimeter and they were equipped only with light mortars). The only real questions were how much human misery the U.N. was going to inflict before capturing the city and whether, once its troops jumped off, they would complete their offensive quickly enough to prevent large-scale looting by the city's African civilian population.

The attack on the city continued as U.N. jets blasted the Lido Hotel near the zoo in the northwestern part of the city, traversed the city with mortar barrages, set aflame a large fuel dump, and captured the tallest building in the city, the so-called "new hospital," which contained no medical equipment, patients, or medical personnel and was being used by the Katangans as an observation post. The U.N. was far from being alone in being less than candid about the conduct of the war.

The propaganda battle continued as Union Miniere asserted that "it is evident that the objective pursued by the U.N. troops is the complete destruction of the economic potential of Katanga, a policy aggravated by total disregard for human life." U Thant countered this by publishing the names of 200 mercenaries serving in Katanga, although this would seem to have little to do with the moral right of the international organization to kill innocent Africans (Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak later revealed that of these 200, 1 was dead, 5 were not Belgians and 48 had not been in the Katangan service for "several months"). In Elisabethville, George Ivan Smith flatly denied that the U.N. had hit any industrial installations. This was obviously untrue. He could have read his statement by the flickering light of the burning railway fuel dump.

On December 13, the U.S. Globemaster flew a battalion of 700 Ethiopian troops and large quantities of war material into Elisabethville. U.N. jets destroyed a small Katangan transport plane on the ground at Ngule, 125 miles from Elisabethville, and knocked out two armored cars. In Elisabethville, U.N. ground forces lobbed more than 200 mortar shells into the center of the city, blowing up two fuel dumps, jets blasted gendarmes dug in at the Lido Hotel near the American Consulate and hit targets of opportunity in the center of the city. The Katangan Government announced late in the day that Olivet, the Red Cross representative, had disappeared while on a mercy mission to U.N. headquarters to arrange for the evacuation of civilians from the part of the city subjected to the heaviest fire. Ten days later, Olivet's wrecked ambulance was found in the combat area. The vehicle apparently had been hit by a U.N. bazooka. A shallow grave nearby contained Olivet's body, that of a Dutch Red Cross representative, and that of a Belgian woman ambulance driver.

Tshombe, meanwhile, had appealed to Pope John and to President Kennedy ("as a freeman and a Christian") to arrange a cease fire. To his people he said: "Whatever happens, all Katangans, black and white, will fight to defend their country. Resistance will be total and not 1 inch of ground will be yielded without a fierce fight to the last man, to the last drop of blood." While Tshombe was awaiting a reply from the American President, the U.N. long-awaited offensive got underway. On the 14th, the air and mortar attacks were intensified. Gendarmes with quart bottles of beer strapped into the baggy pockets of their combat fatigues fired back at the planes from the streets and hurried forward to reinforce the Katangan positions. Later the same day, Tshombe repeated his willingness to negotiate with Adoula anywhere on neutral ground. He suggested the Malagasy Republic as a suitable site for such a meeting, or some other point in former French Africa and called on his African brothers to assist in arranging such a meeting. Tshombe also directed a public appeal to "the free and civilized world to end this barbarous and useless carnage." In an obvious reference to the United States, Tshombe charged that "a great power that itself prizes liberty" was encouraging and financing the United Nations intervention in Katanga. On December 15, there was heavy fighting around the railway underpass and the mortar barrage continued to rain down on the center of the city. At 10:30 that night, fresh Ethiopian troops waded across Kiboko ("Whip") Creek and attacked in strength Katangan troops entrenched on the golf course to the northwest of the city, in an attempting to slash Elisabethville's communications with Kipushi on the Rhodesian border. To the east, Swedish and Irish troops moved up to the railway line and began their assault on Camp Massart, which guarded the other route to Rhodesia. In the north, Gurkha troops supported by armored cars blasted their way to within five blocks of the heart of the city. G. C. Senn, the International Red Cross replacement for Olivet, accused Swedish troops of firing on two of his ambulances.

Everybody had been expecting a frontal assault from the north, if only because the U.N. fire had been concentrated there and it obviously had the strength to storm the center of the city. Raja's pincer attack would have been a brilliant move, had he made it in sufficient strength to seal off the city quickly. Had he done this, he would have seized Tshombe and Munongo, captured most of the mercenaries, and destroyed or captured half the gendarmerie in the city. This would have ended Katanga's secession forever.

As it was, the Swedes and the Irish moved so cautiously and so unskillfully that their intention soon became obvious. The Ethiopians, although they attacked with great courage, found themselves opposed by gendarmes and white volunteers possessed of an equal bravery and tenacity. Three times the white-led gendarmes counterattacked and threw the Ethiopians off the golf course. Eventually, the U.N. seized the course. But it had taken them 8 hours to do so. By then, Tshombe and his government had withdrawn to Kipushi on the Rhodesian border behind a shield of mercenaries and gendarmes. Most of the gendarmes had been withdrawn from the center of the city and were busy digging in to protect the road junction to the south of the city. There was still a gap several thousand yards wide through which General Moke (or Major René Faulques, if you prefer—this thin, ascetic Frenchman, winner of the Legion of Honor and veteran of Indochina and Algeria, was the mercenary who commanded and was responsible for most of the gendarmerie's staff work) could evacuate his somewhat battered and depressed by largely intact army.

During those last days of the fighting, the atmosphere in Elisabethville had a dreamlike quality of unreality. The streets were filled with rubble and lined with blasted palm trees and shattered cars, their tires flat and their windows broken. Four trainloads of white women and children—about 1,100 people all together—had been evacuated to northern Rhodesia. Perhaps another 100 had made the risky road trip to safety. This left Elisabethville, which before independence had had a white population of 14,000, with about 3,000 white males and perhaps 1,000 women. Many of these—nearly a quarter—had been driven from their homes by the fighting. Perhaps 200 were huddled in the Grand Hotel Leopold II, sleeping 8 to a room and on mattresses in the lobby and in the corridors. During the fighting, the Leo Deux had been fairly gay. There was whisky but no beer or soda. The restaurant always managed to produce something in the way of food. This and Michel's were the only places in town where you could get anything to eat. At the latter it was still possible to munch a chateau-briand bernaise and enjoy a modest bottle of beaujolais by candlelight, while machineguns chattered in the darkened streets and mortar shells whistled overhead. Both places were hangouts for gendarmes and Les Affreux ("the Terrible Ones"), the mercenaries, who ate in their camouflaged battledress with their floppy jungle hats on their heads and their rifles slung over their shoulders. We got to know some of the mercenaries pretty well.

All of us will remember Luigi, who in many ways was a typical mercenary. Luigi, despite his nickname (many mercenaries, for obvious reasons, preferred to use a nom de guerre), was a Pole. Like most Poles, he was a Catholic. Like almost every Pole outside Warsaw's orbit, he nurtured an abiding hatred of communism which, as is natural, he associated with Russia, his country's ancient foe and present conqueror. The Poles, because of their geographical position on the eastern marches of Western European civilization, have had to develop certain martial qualities. They've had to fight to preserve their national identity since the days when Genghis Khan swept over the treeless steppes from Central Asia. When they haven't had a nation of their own to fight for (and this has been the rule rather than the exception down through history), they've been perfectly willing to fight for other people, as long as the cause seemed just. Kosciusko, for instance, served as a "mercenary" in another separatist movement—that of the Thirteen American Colonies. Luigi had been a part of this great martial tradition. He'd fought with the Polish Legion against the Italians and Germans in the Western Desert and at Monte Cassino. When he was wounded in Italy, nobody thought to call him a "mercenary." Then he was a patriot, as were those American "mercenaries" who served in the RAF before America entered the war against fascism. After the war, Luigi, deprived of a homeland, wandered around from continent to continent performing, like most men, a series of not very interesting jobs that furnished him with food for his belly but gave him little satisfaction. His most recent job had been as chef to a high British official in a nearby African territory. Then Luigi's wife ran off with a man he described as "a glamorous person." Luigi, always restless, decided he would become "a glamorous person." At the time Katanga was under attack from anti-Western Congolese elements and troops from a bunch of nations which, Luigi noted, had done nothing to help Poland when it was assaulted simultaneously by Russia and Nazi Germany.

The pay was good (when it came—the mercenaries were often unpaid for as long as 3 months at a time), and Luigi settled for a captain's commission. However, to describe him as a mercenary is to ignore Luigi's religious faith, his political convictions, his character, Poland's national history, and his people's "soldier of fortune" tradition. Luigi was a mercenary only in the sense that he was paid for his services, as was every U.N. soldier in Katanga. But was Luigi, after all, more a mercenary than the Swedish soldier who had no real interest in Katanga, religious or otherwise, yet who received double pay for fighting the local inhabitants of the region? And what of the Gurkhas of the Indian Army in Katanga? Nepal had no U.N. contingent in Katanga, yet these were Nepalese. The Gurkhas, mercenaries in the purest sense, had served first imperial Britain and now republican India with equal impartiality, ferocity, and skill. Finally, since the most vicious assaults on the motives and characters of the whites serving Katanga comes from the left, let us ask this question: Whatever one may think of their politics, were those Americans who served in the International Brigade during the Spanish Civil War "mercenaries?" Of course they were not, and to suggest that they were is to dishonor the dead. The same holds true for the majority of the whites who fought for Katanga. Some were nothing more or less than paid killers. Many others were emotional cripples of one sort or another. But the majority of them fought for a variety of reasons, only one of which was money.

Luigi was always a jaunty figure around the Leo Deux or Michel's in his camouflaged battledress festooned Ridgway-style, with hand grenades, Bren gun slung over his shoulder, a red silk scarf at his throat, and a helmet on his head. He was very Polish in appearance, short and barrel chested with sandy hair, high cheekbones, and gray eyes that glittered with splinters of light when he laughed. He laughed a lot. Sometimes it would be an old joke from the last war, or something about the railway underpass (which he commanded)—how his mixed force of whites and Katangans had thrown back an Irish attack or how he'd taken a pratfall when surprised by an exploding mortar shell. He was only solemn when the talk drifted around to Poland, the native land he knew he'd never see again.

The U.N. badly wanted Luigi's tunnel because it provided direct and covered entry into the center of the city for their Ferret armored cars. So they gave it considerable attention. In the daytime, Saabs or Canberras would come hedgehopping in at rooftop level to blast Luigi's boys with cannons and machineguns, and the Irish would lob mortar shells at the tunnel. At night, there would be more mortar barrages and probing attacks. We used to squat on the balconies of the Leo Deux with all lights extinguished, listening to the dull roar of explosions and the chattering of machineguns from the tunnel while tracer bullets burned across the night sky. Somebody would say "Luigi's catching hell tonight" or "Luigi'll have a thirst tomorrow." We never talked about the tunnel except in terms of Luigi. It was his personal real estate, his own small slice of Poland. Luigi had neither wife, nor home, nor nation of his own but the tunnel was his. In the tunnel with the ricochets whining like angry bees and the ground shaking from exploding mortar shells, Luigi was somebody. He was Kosciusko. He was the Polish barons standing up against the Huns and the Mongols. The tunnel made Luigi real and gave him meaning and he loved it as only a Pole could love his mistress. He was definitely "a glamorous person." Without the tunnel, Luigi was just a squat little man who used to cook other people's meals, a fellow who couldn't keep his wife in line. I often wished the errant lady could have seen him in all his glory.

We almost lost Luigi on the 13th. When he came into the bar the next day, there was a bloody bandage wrapped around his head where a shell fragment had taken a hunk out of his skull. He was dirty, unshaven, tired, and the going had obviously been pretty rough. But Luigi could still laugh, a great rumbling thunder of a laugh that began somewhere down by his belt buckle and gathered strength as it bounced up through his chest.

On Friday evening, Luigi did not come in for his usual pernod at the Leo Deux and we knew that things must be bad at the tunnel. There was heavy firing from that direction and from the north. Away off to the west we could hear muffled explosions and the angry stutter of automatic weapons from the Lido area, through which the Ethiopian conquerers of the golf course slowly were pressing. There were few mercenaries or gendarmes in the bar and most of those who were there were wounded. In the early days of the fighting, the bar had been packed with journalists, soldiers, and local white volunteers who spent their days in their normal civilian occupations and then went "moonlighting" with Tshombe's troops. These, again, could hardly be termed mercenaries. They were bitter men whose friends or relatives had been killed or wounded by U.N. fire, whose homes had been smashed into rubble, whose businesses had been ruined. They had an odd assortment of weapons and even odder attempts at uniforms. Nobody paid them. They fought because Katanga was their country and they hated the U.N.

Now there were few of them around the hotel. There were plenty of civilians but none with arms. The Katanga police came through checking the identity cards of the Africans in the hotel, a bad sign because it meant things were falling apart and the authorities were looking for deserters and traitors.

The night of the 15th was bad. U.N. mortar shells rained down on the center of the city all night long, bracketing the hotel and sending fragments humming into the rooms and rattling off the walls. At first I'd had to content myself with two chair cushions on the floor as a bed. But as the U.N. edged closer and the shelling became more intense, one of my more fortunate colleagues had vacated his bed and gone back to Rhodesia. So I had a place to sleep. The other bed was occupied by a former British mercenary. Things were not so good for him. If (or rather when) the U.N. captured the city, he stood a good chance of being turned over to the Léopoldville Government. If he tried to get out of Katanga, the gendarmes might well shoot him as a deserter. As the night wore on, we became quite skillful at rolling off our beds onto the floor in the split second given one between the time one heard the whistle of an incoming mortar shell and the explosion. Finally, we gave up and dragged our mattresses onto the floor and slept there. All night long the mortars came down and fragments rattled off the roof like acorns falling in the autumn.

In the morning there was no food, water, or electricity in the hotel. The lobby was jammed with taut-faced Belgians talking quietly in little knots. Mortars peppered the streets outside and the acrid smoke poured into the hotel. Dogs ran about barking crazily. Wounded gendarmes, sullen and tired, streamed south toward the one remaining gap in the U.N.'s pincers. One hard-looking mercenary in battledress with his Bren gun slung over his shoulder and a suitcase incongruously in one hand came into the hotel and disappeared upstairs. Minutes later he reappeared unarmed and in civilian clothes. There were still a few gendarme mortar crews in the area and one went into action in front of the hotel, which indicated that the U.N. was no more than a few hundred yards away. There were no more white mercenaries in evidence except for a single French officer who careened around the streets in a jeep on which a heavy machinegun was mounted. The tunnel was ominously quiet and it was rumored that it had fallen. When fire began to come into the city from the tunnel, we knew that this was the case. Luigi was gone, probably dead or captured, although there was always a chance that he'd pulled out and headed for Kipushi. I was sorry that I had not had a chance to say goodby but glad that he had had his red scarf, his few months of recapturing the brittle gaiety of World War II, of being a glamorous person.

We knew the end was near. The Katangan Information Office, which had had its headquarters in the Leo Deux and had supplied us with much propaganda and, occasionally, a bit of news, had pulled out before dawn for Kipushi, where Tshombe was with his government. These officials most ungallantly had neglected either to inform or to provide transportation for a South African woman colleague of theirs. She awoke on the morning of December 16, to find her employers gone and U.N. Indian troops within 4 blocks of the hotel.

Incredibly enough, Elisabethville did not fall on the 16th. This was less the result of the tenacity of the Katangan gendarmes than the extreme cautiousness of Raja. In the center, or northern front, his Gurkhas, Dogras (Indians), and Ethiopians had taken the Victory Stadium and pushed forward to the Avenue de Ruwe. There they were held up by scattered pockets of resistance. In a military sense, this was no front at all. Five or six gendarmes with a machinegun would barricade themselves into a house. There would be snipers scattered on the rooftops and in the gardens. Here and there an occasional civilian armed with a shotgun or a sporting rifle would fire a round or two. The U.N. soldiers would edge up slowly, clearing a street house by house. When their pressure became too great, a flying squad of gendarmes or mercenaries equipped with bazookas or recoilless rifles would roar up, establish a base of fire, and force the U.N. troops to halt. Then the flying squad would pull out and rush to some other threatened point. The Katangan mortar batteries operated in the same fashion. Both to avoid counterbattery fire and to create the impression of having far more guns than they did, they shifted their positions constantly. During all this, there would be a steady flow of refugees streaming out of the embattled area. All this fighting was in the white section of town. The native quarters to the south of the city were hit by U.N. mortars and air strikes but there was no ground fighting there until the very end. Most of the whites had fled but there were always a few who had stayed because they had no place else to go. With them were a few African servants. As the U.N. moved up, these scurried down the street in the pouring rain carrying a few belongings with them. Always there was the crazy barking of the dogs.

It was the flanks upon which Raja, attempting to complete his encircling movement, was placing the most pressure. In the west, his Ethiopians fought their way across the golf course against heavy resistance from gendarmes and mercenaries. They cleared the Les Roches district (machinegunning to death Guillaume Derricks, an advisory director of Union Miniere, his 86-year-old mother, and their African servant), recaptured the Lido Hotel, and skirmished through the wooded dells surrounding the zoo. The Ethiopian right flank reached Karavia Creek, interdicting by fire one of the two routes to Kipushi. From their positions they began to fire on the Union Miniere compound. On the western front, the Irish and Swedes had cleared the industrial area and seized Luigi's tunnel, occupied the main railway station, and were fighting their way into Camp Massart (called Camp Tshombe by the Katangans), which was only lightly held by a rearguard of gendarmes. The Katuba and Kenya native quarters to the south were a scene of chaos. War drums were throbbing, people were rushing about aimlessly, long straggling columns of gendarmes were pulling out to the south. White civilians trying to escape by this route were arrested or turned back by the gendarmes. About the only ones able to get out were journalists, all of whom had permits from the Katangan government. But even these often failed to satisfy the excited soldiery, although bribery usually worked.

The U.N. mortar attack on the center of the city continued on the 18th, again in a pouring rain that was a blessing because it furnished the battered city with drinking water. In the center, the Gurkhas continued their slow, methodical advance. To the west, the Ethiopians were unable to move forward because of stiff resistance in front of them. The U.N. then launched a heavy air attack against the Union Miniere works, claiming (after first denying the attack) that heavy firing had been directed on their troops at the Lido from the mining company's compound. A U.N. spokesman also claimed that Indian soldiers had discovered a map showing that Union Miniere's telecommunications center was the headquarters for the entire Katangan resistance. Union Miniere denied the allegation as "false and ludicrous," stating that only mining company employees were sheltered in its offices and mill. Both sides were wrong and both right in this case. Union Miniere's telecommunications had been used by the Katangan government, but not, to my knowledge, for military purposes. Katangan gendarmes and mercenaries certainly were firing from the mining company's property but again, to my knowledge, not from its buildings.

On the west, the Swedes had captured Camp Massart, as we discovered when they fired on a car carrying three civilians out of Elisabethville. The driver of the car, Jean-Claude Cornaz, a Swiss employee of the Katangan Ministry of Economics, was killed. His two passengers, Rhodesian Federal Broadcasting Corporation newsman James Biddulph and New York Herald Tribune correspondent Sanche de Gramont (a Harvard-educated Frenchman), were seriously wounded. A Swedish lieutenant said his men fired on the car with a machinegun when it failed to halt at a roadblock. There was no roadblock, however. The Swedes were simply dug in on one side of the road, the Katangans on the other, a fact of which the travelers were unaware. And the battered state of the vehicle indicated that it had been hit with either a bazooka or a 20-millimeter cannon, not a machinegun. The facts of the incident that matter are that U.N. troops fired with a highly lethal weapon on an ordinary passenger car with Rhodesian license plates in which three unarmed civilians were heading away from the combat zone. In a similar incident, the U.N. machinegunned Katangan Health Minister Jean Mwema's car, killing his wife. These incidents were typical of the type of total war waged by the United Nations, an organization dedicated to peace, in a city jammed with civilians.

While armored cars and mortars dueled in the smoke-filled streets, word came from the north that the U.N. was facilitating the advance of 1,800 Congolese troops on Kongolo, who were being resisted by the Katangan garrison. It was these Congolese troops who 2 weeks later were to slaughter the Kongolo missionaries. U.N. losses were unofficially put at 20 dead in Elisabethville and about 50 wounded. Katangan sources said that 20 gendarmes had been killed and 117 wounded in the last week of fighting. The city's hospitals, one of which now found itself between the opposing lines and the other exposed to Swedish fire, reported 8 white civilians dead and 35 wounded, 15 African civilians dead, and 121 wounded. The U.N., which declined to call its action a general offensive, reported that 12 Baluba refugees had been killed and 119 wounded in their camps by Katangan mortar fire.

Meanwhile, on the 17th, U Thant, meeting with his Congo Advisory Committee in New York, stated that he was willing to consider "reasonable" proposals for a cease-fire. This was, in effect, a denial of the five-nation plea for an unconditional cease-fire. U Thant told the committee: 'For us to stop short of our objectives at the present stage would be a serious setback for the U.N." The committee agreed. There was no cease-fire.

But other negotiations were underway. Kennedy (with U Thant's approval) had agreed that U.S. Ambassador to Léopoldville Edmund Gullion should act as conciliator and arrange for talks between Adoula and Tshombe, provided the latter agreed not to rule out the reintegration of Katanga into the Congo. On the 17th, Tshombe cabled Kennedy:

"I wait your Ambassador in Elisabethville. I am ready to hold discussions with Mr. Cyrille Adoula. Please arrange an immediate end to hostilities. Thanks to your intervention, we believe calm will be restored in the former Belgian Congo before Christmas."

It is not known whether Kennedy's overtures to Tshombe contained the promise that, if he did come to terms with Adoula, Gizenga would be dealt with by the Central Government. This may well have been the case. That other secessionist and fair-weather friend of Tshombe's, "King" Albert Kalonji of the "Mining State," was also arrested in late December. At any rate, in Léopoldville, Ralph Bunche, Linner, and Ghana's able Robert Gardiner (who was to succeed Linner as chief of the U.N.'s Congo operation) parleyed with Adoula to get him to agree to negotiate with Tshombe.

Finally, late on the 18th, Tshombe and Kibwe drove to the Northern Rhodesian town of Kitwe, where they were met by Gullion. The next day, a "suspension of fire" took effect in Elisabethville as Gullion and the Katangan delegation flew off in the American Presidential Constellation *Columbine* to the U.N.-held military base of Kitona at the mouth of the Congo River to negotiate with Adoula. Katanga's red, white, and green flag still flew over Elisabethville. The December war was over.

X. KITONA AND ITS AFTERMATH

"The President of the Province of Katanga recognizes the indivisible unity of the Republic of the Congo." (Article II of the Kitona agreement signed by Tshombe on December 21, 1961.)

"The word 'Congolese' is a Belgian invention. First, I am always Katangais." (Albert Nyembo, Katangan Minister of Information, addressing the Congolese National Assembly on December 30, 1961.)

On his departure from Léopoldville to meet Tshombe at Kitona, Adoula stated that "reconciliation is possible only if Mr. Tshombe accepts his responsibilities under the loi fondamentale" and ends his "rebellion" against the Central Congolese Government. In short, Adoula was going to Kitona not to negotiate but to accept the unconditional surrender of Katangan sovereignty. The only concession Adoula made to Tshombe then or later was to agree to meet him at Kitona rather than at Léopoldville. Tshombe had, of course, frequently stated his willingness to negotiate with Adoula on neutral ground, since his arrest at Coquilhatville had made it impossible for him to put much faith in a Congolese guarantee of safe conduct. Adoula, for his part, had been unwilling to meet Tshombe on neutral territory because he regarded him as only a provincial leader. Adoula was able to accept Kitona because it was in Central Government territory. Tshombe agreed to go there only because the base was under control of U.N. forces and because he had U.S. and U.N. safe-conduct guarantees.

This statement by Adoula greatly reduced the chances of any permanent settlement emerging from Kitona. Adoula had a fair legal case in demanding that Tshombe adhere to the loi fondamentale since this instrument had been created at the Brussels conference which Tshombe had attended and the Katangan leader had then accepted it. The fact remained, however, that the loi fondamentale was only a provisional constitution which had never been ratified. But far more important than the legal question was the actual political and military situation. Katanga had been independent in fact if not in law for nearly a year and a half. Although the Katangan gendarmerie had been mauled in the December fighting, it was still an effective fighting machine. While the U.N. at the time of the suspension of fire had almost encircled Elisabethville and certainly could have captured the city within a few days, the great majority of the gendarmerie and the remaining mercenaries had extricated themselves from the city and were resting and regrouping at Kipushi. The important centers of Kolwezi and Jadotville were still firmly in Katangan hands. Even had these been lost, the gendarmerie had the strength to carry on the war from the bush for months.

To expect Tshombe to surrender abjectly under these conditions was unrealistic. Even if the Katangan President had been willing to accept such terms, Tshombe knew (and Adoula, Kennedy, and U Thant must have known, unless they were woefully misinformed by their agents on the spot) that the hard core of Conakat, led by Munongo, would never agree to such an unconditional capitulation. Nevertheless, Adoula made his statement and flew to Kitona accompanied by Ralph Bunche, Mahmoud Khiari, and Robert Gardiner of the U.N., and by three of his ministers, Foreign Minister Justin Bomboko (an old enemy of Tshombe's), the Gizengist Interior Minister Christophe Gbenye (whom Adoula appointed Deputy Prime Minister on February 14, replacing him as Interior Minister with Cleophas Kamitatu, President of Léopoldville Province), and Justice Minister Remy Mwamba.

Tshombe, looking tired and drawn, had arrived at Kitona an hour and a half before Adoula's plane landed. With him were Gullion, Finance Minister Jean Baptiste Kibwe, and Odilon Mwanda, Katangan delegate to Brussels.

It was the first meeting between Tshombe and Adoula since the latter's rise to power in August. The talks between the two leaders on December 19, held in a hospital waiting room, were informal and friendly. The big stick was very much in evidence, however, for on the same day Ethiopian U.N. troops in Elisabethville occupied the entire Union Miniere compound. Both sides remained edgy, their troops still dug in facing each other.

The Congolese and Katangan delegations closeted themselves in the hospital waiting room for formal talks on the 20th, while the U.N. officials and Gullion hovered anxiously outside in the corridors. Whisky and sandwiches flowed into the room and angry voices flowed out of it. On several occasions, both Adoula and Tshombe appeared ready to break off the talks. Each time, Bunche, Gullion, Khiari, or Gardiner soothed their ruffled feathers and shephered them back into the conference room.

Finally, in the early morning hours of December 21, after 17 hours of almost continuous discussions, Tshombe signed an eight-point agreement officially ending Katanga's secession, although he stipulated that his action would have to be ratified by his cabinet and by the Katangan legislature. The Kitona agreement reads as follows:

"The President of the Province of Katanga—

"I. Accepts the application of the loi fondamentale of May 19, 1960.

"II. Recognizes the indivisible unity of the Republic of the Congo.

"III. Recognizes President Kasavubu as chief of state.

"IV. Recognizes the authority of the Central Government over all parts of the Republic.

"V. Agrees to the participation of representatives of the Province of Katanga in a government commission to prepare a new constitution.

"VI. Agrees to take all measures to permit senators and deputies of Katanga Province to exercise the national functions (that is, to sit in the national legislature).

"VII. Agrees that the gendarmerie of Katanga shall be placed under the authority of the President of the Republic.

"VIII. Agrees to see that the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council and General Assembly are respected and to facilitate their execution."

After signing the agreement, Tshombe flew back to Elisabethville and Adoula to Léopoldville. The Kitona document, which Gullion termed a "statesmanlike agreement" and not "punitive in any way," was not the fruit of negotiation but an unconditional surrender. On his arrival home, Tshombe shrugged when asked if he was satisfied with it. Kibwe murmured "not so good, not so good." Why did Tshombe sign such an agreement? There are two possibilities. The first is that Adoula gave him a secret oral assurance to the effect that the commission agreed to under article V of the agreement would rewrite the Congolese constitution to provide for a federal form of government with considerable local autonomy. Adoula may also have promised Tshombe substantial Conakat representation in his cabinet. Nothing has taken place in the months since the meeting, however, to indicate that this was the case.

The second possibility is more likely—that Tshombe signed under duress and never intended to implement the Kitona agreement This duress could have taken two forms: fear for his personal safety at Kitona or the threat that the U.N., if he did not sign, would immediately end the suspension of fire, launch a new offensive, and carry through its operations until Katanga's secession was ended and Tshombe handed over to Léopoldville for punishment.

It is unlikely that the United States or the U.N. would have allowed its safe conduct guarantee to be violated to the extent of handing Tshombe over to the Congolese at Kitona. It is quite likely, however, that the U.N. and U.S. representatives did warn Tshombe he would be overthrown by force if he did not accept Adoula's terms. The U.N. was on record by the Security Council resolution of November 24 as rejecting the claim that Katanga is a sovereign independent nation. Illegal as this resolution may have been under the terms of the U.N.'s own charter, it gave the international organization the power and the authority to overthrow Tshombe's government by force if necessary. There can be little doubt that this was exactly what it planned to do.

Had Tshombe been less wise and more honorable, he would have refused to sign the Kitona agreement and flown back to Elisabethville to face a renewed United Nations offensive. He is, however, just as shrewd, tough, and unprincipled as the men with whom he has to deal. Tshombe was well aware that world public opinion was by no means solidly behind the United States and the U.N. He was well aware of the fact that the U.N. was deeply in the red over its Congo operation and that many member states wanted the operation ended as quickly as possible. He was aware that his gendarmerie, although still capable of putting up a fight, badly needed a rest. Under the circumstances, it was to his advantage to play for time, as he had frequently done before. Hence, he signed the Kitona agreement, in my opinion, with no intention whatsoever of implementing it in any real sense.

Tshombe can be charged with duplicity on this count and the charge rings true. But was it wise of Adoula and his U.N. and U.S. advisers to insist upon an unconditional surrender which they must have known Tshombe would not and could not accept? It can be argued that Adoula's government was so weak that anything less than insistence on Katanga's complete surrender would have caused its fall. But in the long run Adoula's position could only be weakened by bringing home an agreement that could never be implemented. If the purpose of the Kitona agreement was to give Adoula's government a short-term boost or to provide the U.N. with a future propaganda weapon to hold over Tshombe's head, then the meeting at the mouth of the Congo was a success. If its purpose was to provide a reasonable and workable means of reconciliation which both Léopoldville and Elisabethville could accept with honor, then it was a miserable failure. The Kitona agreement was not worth the paper it was written on because it failed to take into account the fundamental structure of power in Katanga and the Congo.

It was fairly clear that the U.N. understood this. No sooner had Tshombe left Kitona than the international organization began to apply heavy pressure on him to implement the agreement at once. The U.N. immediately rejected Tshombe's contention that the agreement would have to be ratified by the Katangan cabinet and legislature, asserting that "as far as we are concerned, it is signed, sealed, and delivered; there is no question of ratification."

On the 21st, U.N. vehicles patrolled into the heart of Elisabethville to establish their right of free movements. This failed, however, to properly police the areas already under their control. Behind the U.N. lines, white residents were placed in the position of having to defend their property as best they could against rampaging Balubas who had broken out of their U.N. refugee camps and were after revenge, food, and loot. The U.N. had failed to keep the Balubas, whom they had invited into the camps, supplied with food, or to maintain any discipline. An estimated 15 to 20 people were being killed each day within the camps in faction fights, and some of these were being eaten. It was calculated that about 4,000 Balubas had moved into homes abandoned by whites in the Bel Aire section alone. Most of the city continued without electricity or water.

When Tshombe reiterated that he was "only the spokesman of my people and it is up to them to decide" as to the validity of the Kitona agreement, Adoula warned that the Central Government would use force against Tshombe again to end Katanga's secession if the Kitona agreement was not implemented. On December 22, the Katangan cabinet decided that it was not competent to rule on the Kitona agreement and passed the matter on to the legislature for a ruling.

The atmosphere continued tense in Elisabethville as Gurkha troops arrested 53 gendarmes and the U.N. admitted that the Baluba refugees were "widening their arc of pillage and loot" around their camps. The U.N. finally agreed to investigate two cases of rape against Ethiopian troops and several of pillaging by the same soldiers.

On the day after Christmas, U.N. spokesman Norman Ho made a statement in Léopoldville that sent a thrill of horror up the spines of all Katangans, black and white: 90 Congolese soldiers, the first of a force of 900, would join the U.N. forces in Kamina. The Congolese troops would wear the blue helmet of the U.N., serve with Indian, Swedish, and Norwegian troops at Kamina on an equal footing, and come under U.N. command. Such a move was certainly legal under the Kitona agreement. But was it wise? Had Linner already forgotten the 13 Italians murdered at Kindu? If he had, he was soon to be reminded of them by an even more horrible massacre. In fact, the movement of the Congolese to Kamina never took place (the Congolese troops showed that they disliked the U.N. as much as the Katangans did when they refused to wear the blue helmets). But the fact that the U.N. command even considered using Congolese troops showed how little it understood the situation in Katanga, how little it cared for the welfare of the territory's white population, and what little respect it had for Tshombe's pride.

The following day, the first group of Katangan representatives flew from Elisabethville to Léopoldville in U.N. planes to take part in the meeting of the Congolese Legislature in accordance with the Kitona Agreement. Diplomatic relations between Belgium and the Congo were reestablished on the same day, after a break that had lasted 17 months. The first group of three senators and an equal number of deputies was led by the Katangan Information Minister, Albert Nyembo. On December 28, a second group of nine Katangan representatives arrived in Léopoldville. Tshombe made it quite clear, however, that his representatives had gone to Léopoldville to bargain for a change in the loi fondamentale, not to participate in the National Assembly. In Paris, Kimba, the Katangan Foreign Minister, said that Katanga was prepared to make concessions, but on the condition that "such concessions were not unilateral." Actually, the Katangan delegates did take their seats, but only after Nyembo had emphasized that they would expect concessions in return when a new constitution was framed.

The situation in Elisabethville had not improved much. On December 28, Tshombe charged that U.N. troops were preparing a new offensive against Katanga. Tshombe said it was his understanding that the U.N. would jump off if the Katanga legislature did not meet on January 3 to ratify the Kitona agreement. Tshombe added that U.N. troops had ringed the town and were preventing gendarmes from entering the African townships. Urquhart, now senior U.N. civilian official in Katanga (the Frenchman Georges Dumontet, perhaps the ablest of the long succession of U.N. officials to serve in Elisabethville, now became Urquhart's assistant), said the townships had been sealed off to prevent looted goods from white areas reaching them and to stop looting within the townships themselves. In an incident in one of the townships, two Katangan gendarmes were killed by a Swedish patrol. Katangan Justice Minister Valentin Ilunga was arrested by U.N. troops but later released.

On the following day, Tshombe charged that central government troops with the support of U.N. forces had unleashed a new attack against northern Katanga. A U.N. spokesman in New York denied that U.N. forces were supporting such an attack (they were correct in this) and admitted that they had received reports of minor skirmishing in the area in recent days. Tshombe asserted that the main attack, launched by nearly three battalions of Congolese, was aimed at Kongolo, 40 miles south of the Katanga-Kivu border. Tshombe added that other Congolese troops were attacking Kapona, southwest of Baudouinville. On New Year's Day, Tshombe repeated his charge that Congolese troops were killing and burning in the Kongolo district and added that he had been forced to order his gendarmes to evacuate the town. The tin-mining town of Manono had also fallen to Baluba irregulars. At Kapona, he said, gendarmes had repulsed the Congolese attacks.

Now it was too much to expect that the U.N. would make any attempt to send troops to Kongolo to separate the Congolese and Katangan troops in accordance with their mandate to prevent civil war. The U.N. had already made it quite clear that a Congolese attack on Katangans was to be considered as a police action and hence not a matter for the U.N. to concern itself with. One might have thought, however, that the U.N. could have sent a small body of troops to maintain the safety of local civilians, dispatched a few observers, or at least made an aerial reconnaissance. It took none of these steps, despite the fact that it was well aware (or should have been) that these 1,800 troops were Colonel Pakassa's rabble that had murdered the Italians at Kindu. One comes to the conclusion that the U.N., if it did not welcome any diminution of Tshombe's authority in northern Katanga, at least did not care what happened in the area. Twice it had been quick enough to kill white and black civilians alike in an effort to impose a political solution on Katanga; seldom had it been willing to go out of its way to maintain law and order in remote and dangerous areas.

The first reports of the Kongolo massacre were not released until January 16, more than 2 weeks after Tshombe's charge that the district was being devastated and his troops were withdrawing. An African seminarian staggered into Bukavu in Kivu Province after a journey of hundreds of miles through the bush to report that 19 Roman Catholic missionaries (most of them Belgians) at Kongolo had been beaten with bicycle chains, shot, and dismembered by the invading Congolese. Parts of the bodies were eaten. Many civilians, the seminarian said, had also died in the massacre. The blood bath had taken place, he said, on New Year's Eve at the Mission of the Holy Spirit.

What was the response of the U.N. to this terrible tale? Urquhart said he had no information. The U.N. in Leopoldville admitted that it had no troops within 150 miles of the area and bleated about the "almost insuperable difficulties" in investigating the massacre (yet it had always been able to find the troops to attack Tshombe). The best the U.N. was able to do was to offer every possible assistance to the Central Congolese Government in finding the riotous troops and in preventing further incidents. In effect, all the U.N. did was to send jets swooping over the area at a safe height. These confirmed a Red Cross report from Elisabethville (the Red Cross intelligence apparently was better than Urquhart's) that the murderers of Kongolo were preparing to attack a mission run by White Fathers and Franciscan Sisters at Sola, just north of Kongolo. Pilots of the U.N. jets reported Congolese soldiers at Sola, huts in the village afire, and little sign of life around the mission. The idea of bringing U.N. troops into Kongolo by helicopter was rejected as extremely hazardous.

It was not until January 23, more than 3 weeks after Tshombe's warning and a week after the announcement of the massacre, that a 37-year-old British major named Richard Lawson, a man of great courage, demonstrated that the difficulties of getting into Kongolo were not as insuperable as the U.N. had led the world to believe.

Lawson, armed only with a swagger stick, jumped with a Congolese major from a light U.N. aircraft is it touched down at Kongolo, rolled across the field and took off again without stopping. The Congolese major promptly ran away into the bush and has not been seen since. Lawson, a blond and boyish former tank officer serving with a Nigerian battalion, was left alone to face the skin- and feather-clad savages of the Balubakat Jeunesse. Although one of these patriots stabbed him in the back with an arrow (and drew a punch in the nose for his pains), Lawson was able to make an assessment of the situation in Kongolo and to rescue the one survivor of the massacre, a Belgian, Father Jules Darmont, who flew out with him when his aircraft returned. Lawson established that 22 missionaries had been murdered at Kongolo by 5 doped-up and drunken Congolese soldiers, that half the town had been burned and the rest looted so thoroughly that "there was nothing left to pillage." Most of the population had fled into the bush to avoid Jeunesse cannibals but 3 Congolese priests and 30 Congolese nuns had remained at the Holy Spirit Mission.

Lawson made a second trip into Kongolo, accompanied by a Nigerian officer, Maj. Conrad Nwawo. From there they drove 30 miles to Mbulula where they found three nuns and eight priests. The missionaries were part of a group of seven nuns and nine priests who had fled through the bush from Sola to find refuge with a small unit of the Katangan gendarmerie. Four nuns and one priest had already been flown out to Baudouinville by the Katangan Air Force. Lawson and Nwawo were beaten by the villagers of Mbulula whom, since the pair were U.N. officers, they associated with the murderers of Kindu and Kongolo. Lawson and Nwawo, rescued by the Katangan gendarmes, offered to arrange for the evacuation of the remaining nuns and priests. But these, fearing that they would be killed if they associated themselves with the U.N., refused to go. They were later evacuated to Baudouinville on Tshombe's orders. U Thant said that the U.N. was unable to give protection to the 33 Congolese priests and nuns remaining in Kongolo. So ended this tragic and disgraceful episode.

In Washington, the State Department asserted that it was deeply distressed by these atrocities. Well might it have been, since they were the direct result of a U.N. policy to which the United States gave its full support. By waging war against Tshombe in the south, the U.N. had made it impossible for northern Katanga to be properly policed. The U.N. had compounded the error by airlifting savage Congolese troops to the area. It then refused to undertake any sort of police operation in these zones which it had left open to barbarism. When the inevitable atrocities occurred, it refused to move troops in by helicopter because that would be extremely hazardous. Lawson and Nwawo had shown that even a small group of U.N. soldiers possessed of moral and physical courage could have done a great deal to safeguard the local civilians. There were either too few such men among the U.N. forces or their political leaders were too timorous to permit them to do what most of them must have recognized as their duty—to protect lives and preserve law and order.

Meanwhile, the diplomatic pressure on Tshombe intensified. On December 30, Kasavubu called on the Katangan Legislature to meet at Kamina on January 3, a move which Tshombe rejected as a grave violation of constitutional law. The legislature, Tshombe asserted, would meet in Elisabethville on the 3d. Kasavubu's proposal apparently was designed to encourage the anti-Tshombe Balubas to attend (many were afraid to come to Elisabethville) so that Tshombe's lack of support in northern Katanga could be exposed.

U.N. spokesmen had repeatedly accused the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland of supplying Tshombe with mercenaries and war materials, an allegation Federal Prime Minister Sir Roy Welensky had frequently and heatedly denied. Both sides were right and both wrong in this instance. One is inclined to accept Welensky's assertion that his Government had at no time given Tshombe military assistance of any sort. On the other hand, white volunteers for Tshombe's forces repeatedly had passed through Rhodesia on their way from Europe to Katanga. As transit passengers, only a few of specified nationalities required visas. A few Rhodesians had volunteered as private citizens to serve Tshombe. In addition, paramilitary commodities such as gasoline, lubricants, and vehicles had legally been exported to Katanga by Rhodesia. Unquestionably, some arms and ammunition had been smuggled across Rhodesia's 1,200-mile-long border with Katanga, which was guarded by only five customs posts.

U Thant now sought to stop this by requesting that U.N. observers be posted at Rhodesian airports and roads leading into Katanga. A similar request was made to Portugal in respect to areas of Angola bordering on Katanga. Neither Portugal nor Rhodesia have any reason to love the U.N. The request to Portgual was particularly ironic, since that same month the Security Council had refused to take any action in a clear case of Indian aggression (recognized even by the U.S. Government) against Portuguese Goa. Portugal and Rhodesia rejected the requests, although Rhodesia agreed to strengthen its border posts and invited U Thant to come to Salisbury for discussions on the question, an invitation he declined.

On January 3, the Katangan Legislature met for exactly 7 minutes before adjourning because there was no electricity and Tshombe had not arrived. On the following day, the assembly met again with 35 of its 60 members (a bare quorum) present. Absent were all the Balubakat deputies and several tribal representatives who had been unable to reach Elisabethville because of disturbed conditions in the north. Tshombe told his deputies: "I leave to you the task of determining how far our concessions can go and which articles of the (Kitona) agreement should be modified." He went on to accuse the Central Government of having several times violated the loi fondamentale that it requested Katanga to accept. Tshombe concluded: "Katanga must be unified with its brothers in the Congo but remain sufficiently free so that its fate will not be finally sealed on the day the shadow of communism spreads over this country." Obviously, Tshombe was intent on keeping considerable local autonomy for Katanga and had small faith in the future of the Congo.

While Nyembo was dickering with Adoula in Léopoldville and the Katangan Assembly was debating in Elisabethville, two top State Department officials launched a new attack against Katanga. Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams, speaking in Detroit, accused the Katangan Government of fabricating horrendous tales of indiscriminate mayhem by United Nations troops during the December war. Unquestionably, the Katangan Information Service had played up U.N. atrocities, real and imagined, for all they were worth. Williams might have been in a better position to judge, however, had he spent some time in Elisabethville's Leo Deux while the U.N. mortar shells rained down during those last days before Christmas. Every newsman there had seen civilians shelled with his own eyes. Each of us had seen Red Cross vehicles destroyed by U.N. fire. Or were all of us lying? Georges Olivet, the Swiss Red Cross representative, lay in his shallow grave in testimony that we were not. Sanche de Gramont of the New York Herald Tribune might well have sent Williams a few pieces of the shrapnel picked from his body after Swedish troops shot up the civilian car in which he was leaving Elisabethville.

On the same night that Williams made his speech, Carl T. Rowan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, made an even more vitriolic attack on Katanga in a Philadelphia speech. Rowan charged that Katanga was waging a "clever big-money campaign" to dispense "a string of myths" designed to gain American support. Rowan directed his attack primarily against Michel Struelens, a New York-based Belgian publicist who Rowan said had spent $140,000 in 15 months in an attempt to put Katanga's point of view across. Rowan also strongly implied that Union Miniere was behind the whole problem in its attempt to create "a safe little kingdom" for its financial interests. Rowan acted as if it was a crime for Union Miniere to make a profit and tried to smear American supporters of Tshombe by asserting that they numbered among them "arch conservatives, people who oppose the income tax, avowed defenders of racial segregation, opponents of fluoridation of water, those who want to destroy the Supreme Court."

The Washington Star, in an editorial on December 29, dismissed Williams' speech as "a rehash of the familiar State Department-U.N. line, with all of the distortions and omissions, plus a few characteristic Williams-ish embellishments." Rowan's address it saw as "filled with fascinating contradictions and McCarthy-like innuendoes." Finally, the Star concluded, if Struelens could get so much mileage out of $140,000, the State Department should hire him, since it achieved so much less at a cost so much greater. In the end, there were few who would agree that because one thought Tshombe had some merit to his case, one must, by definition, oppose the fluoridation of water. These two speeches could only be taken as an attempt by the administration to muzzle opposition to its Katanga policy by smearing those who supported Tshombe through guilt by association. It failed, perhaps because Americans had experienced quite enough of these tactics under Senator McCarthy.

Back in the Congo, Adoula moved against other secessionists. On December 29, the National Assembly voted to revoke "King" Albert Kalonji's parliamentary immunity. He was arrested and placed under detention in Léopoldville. On January 8, the Assembly ordered Gizenga to return from Stanleyville to face charges of secessionist activity. Gizenga, who had been holed up in Stanleyville since October, refused to return. He was arrested after a battle between his bodyguard and Lundula's troops in which 14 were killed, and later transferred to Léopoldville. Gizenga was censured by the National Assembly, dismissed from his post of Vice Premier, transferred to a new place of detention near the mouth of the Congo River, and legal proceedings were instituted against him.

On January 10, Linner charged in a report published by the U.N. in New York that a hard core of mercenaries was still at large in Katanga and responsible for the continued uncertainty of the military situation there. In addition, Linner charged that 35 French-speaking mercenaries 2 days before had reached Brazzaville en route to Elisabethville. Of these, 26 Frenchmen and a Spaniard were sent back to Europe by the Rhodesian immigration authorities because their visas were not in order. Five Belgians, an Italian, a Frenchman, a Spaniard, and a Briton, who had valid visas, were allowed to proceed to Katanga. Nearly 3 tons of camouflaged uniforms carried by their aircraft were returned to Europe.

The importance of the incident was that it clearly demonstrated that Tshombe had no intention of implementing the Kitona agreement. He might send deputies to sit in the Congolese National Assembly, he might negotiate about a constitution, he might recognize Kasavubu until he was blue in the face; but Katanga was in fact if not in law independent and he intended to keep it that way. While the Katangan Legislature approved seven points of the Kitona agreement but haggled over the one calling for it to respect and facilitate the execution of the Security Council's resolutions, Tshombe fortified Kipushi and built up his army. Said U Thant: "It is our hope that he (Tshombe) will keep his promise; I must add, however, that our plans and preparations for further operations to achieve total elimination of mercenaries are going forward without delay."

Finally, on January 12, the U.N. agreed to an International Red Cross request for an investigation into Olivet's murder. The Katangan Government had been conducting an investigation but had not been allowed to extend this to territory under U.N. control, which included the spot where Olivet's ambulance was shot up. The U.N. lamely stated that it had not instituted its own investigation because it did not possess "adequate legal or technical resources." Or was the international organization in fact afraid that such an investigation, despite "Soapy" Williams, might well reveal that its troops had been guilty of atrocities?

On January 24, Tshombe met with Urquhart, Jose Rolz-Bennett, a Guatemalan who has since replaced Urquhart as chief U.N. representative in Katanga, and Dumontet to discuss the question of mercenaries. Tshombe gave Urquhart a list of French officers who, he said, "have just been paid off with thanks." Tshombe asserted that no foreign officer held any post of command in the Katangan gendarmery. This may well be the case. However, there is little doubt that white officers still serve as instructors and tactical advisers. On the same day, Lundula sent 160 Congolese troops to Kongolo in an attempt to apprehend the murderers of the missionaries.

After another meeting with the U.N. representatives Tshombe announced on January 27 that he was "resolutely determined to put an end to the problem of mercenaries." With this in mind, he added, he had demanded a month to seek out "those individuals who could be suspected of being mercenaries." At the end of this month, he suggested the establishment of a joint U.N.-Katangan commission to supervise the removal of mercenaries. Tshombe also stated that the gendarmerie was commanded by Katangans and must remain so, adding that "in no case would Katangan soldiers accept being under the command of European officers of any nation." It was obvious that Tshombe had no intention of handing over his gendarmerie to either Congolese or U.N. officers for retraining.

Several days before this, Tshombe had written to American Consul Lewis Hoffacker, asking for a visa to enable him to visit the United States in March, where he had been invited by his American supporters to address several public meetings. Hoffacker referred the request to Washington. Washington's reply was to ask Tshombe to file a formal application for a visa, to give details about his passport, and to state the length and purpose of his visit. Eventually, Tshombe was denied a visa on grounds that he did not have a valid (i.e., Congolese) passport. Said State Department spokesman Joseph Reap on February 15: "We believe that a visit to the United States by Mr. Tshombe at this time would interrupt and jeopardize progress towards common objectives; this is also the view of the Central

Government of the Congo." The State Department's position, while technically correct, obviously was yet another infringement of the right of the American people to hear Tshombe's side of the situation. While the United States could not admit the legality of a Katangan passport since Washington recognized the Léopoldville Government and not that of Elisabethville, there are many ways around such a situation. For instance, political refugees fleeing from South Africa have traveled on laissez-passers issued by the Indian Government. If the United States had wanted to avoid the embarrassment caused by allowing Tshombe to enter America on a Katangan passport and yet wanted to be fair in allowing him to state his case, it had only to suggest that the Katangan President apply for a laissez-passer from one of his allies, such as ex-French Congo or Malagasy. It did not, however. It simply turned down his visa application.

Meanwhile, a Union Miniere team from Elisabethville was negotiating with the Central Government in Léopoldville on how its operations could be reintegrated into the Congo's fiscal plans. Adoula had warned the mining company that he would appropriate it unless it stopped making payments to the Katangan Government. On February 14, the Congolese Prime Minister stated that legally Union Miniere owed the Central Government back taxes to August 1960. He added: "We are going to recover the money by all means at our disposal; it is up to us to decide whether to demand retroactivity." It was not until February 20 that the Ethiopian troops which had occupied the mining company's Elisabethville plant shortly before Christmas evacuated the works and allowed production to resume after a stoppage of nearly 2 months.

On January 30, the U.N. announced that eight Congolese soldiers responsible for the Kongolo massacre had been arrested by Lundula's troops and flown to Stanleyville, presumably for court-martial proceedings. On the same day, Linner since replaced as chief U.N. representative in the Congo by Ghana's Robert Gardiner) announced that he had rejected the 1-month delay suggested by Tshombe to enable him to expel the re-remaining mercenaries from Katanga. The Swede said he had ordered Tshombe to expel his remaining mercenaries immediately and added that if the Katangan authorities did not "take urgent steps to eliminate the mercenaries, the U.N. will not hesitate to take all necessary measures to do so." It all sounded familiarly like the propaganda barrage necessary before the U.N. could launch another offensive to topple Tshombe by force.

On February 2, Adoula flew to New York where he called on the U.N. General Assembly to provide greater military assistance to end Katanga's secession. "From the beginning," Adoula said, "my government announced its absolute will to do away with the Katanga secession." He added: "We are not carrying out a war against Katanga. It is our responsibility to defend our unity and our integrity against separatist maneuvers who take their orders from abroad. Our victory over the mercenaries will be a victory of all of civilization over barbarism." Again, it appeared likely that a new U.N. attack was in the wind.

On February 5, Adoula lunched with Kennedy in Washington and was promised that the United States would continue to provide his government with all necessary assistance.

On February 15, the Katangan Assembly finally approved with a considerable number of conditions and reservations the eight-point Kitona agreement. While the assembly toned down the original statement submitted by its Foreign Affairs and Political Committee—which demanded the repeal of the loi fondamentale, a radical decentralization of power in the Congo, and the guarantee of ministerial posts for Katanga in the Central Government—it stipulated that it accepted the Kitona agreement only "as being able to serve as a base" for discussion between the Congo and Katanga. In its motion, the assembly called on the Katangan Government to solve disputes between it and Leopoldville through negotiations. Tshombe, addressing the Assembly, made a new appeal to Adoula. "The two of us, without any foreign interference—which was not the case, alas, at Kitona—will apply an African program, reserved to Africans and decided by Africans. The result will be peace for our people and peace for Africa," he said. Five days later, 75 tribal chiefs from all parts of Katanga published a communique in which they "disapproved of the conduct of the United Nations toward the Katangan people" and alleged that the U.N. was in the Congo to help the United States appropriate for itself Katanga's copper and south Kasai's diamonds. In late February, the gendarmerie retook Kongolo and Kabalo and fanned out against Baluba terrorist gangs in the north.

By March, 1962, although the last nine mercenaries had officially left Katanga 3 weeks before, it was clear that the Kitona agreement was a dead letter. Adoula had made no concessions to Tshombe and the Katangan leader was still too strong to accept an unconditional surrender. While the arrests of Gizenga and Kalonji unquestionably strengthened the central government, these moves gave Tshombe pause: What was to prevent Adoula, once Katanga had been reintegrated into the Congo, from arresting him?

Despite his fears, Tshombe, accompanied by Kibwe and Public Works Minister Gabriel Kitenge, flew to Léopoldville on March 15, after first obtaining ironclad safe-conduct guarantees from the U.N. Tshombe told reporters that the purpose of his visit was not to capitulate but to try by means of frank and sincere discussions to save a country that has suffered for almost 20 months. Reconciliation between the Congo and Katanga, he said, was necessary "both for ourselves and for the whole of Africa."

Adoula, in a deliberate snub to Tshombe, flew to Coquilhatville for discussions with the Congo's other five provincial leaders, before talks between the two began on March 18. After a week of secret discussions, during which the tightest security precautions were observed, the talks were suspended when Tshombe asserted, as he had at Kitona, that no new agreement could be binding until approved by the Katanga Assembly.

Said Adoula: "The Katanga crisis has never been more serious." The Congolese Prime Minister asserted that while Tshombe was stalling for time, his colleagues in Elisabethville were buying arms and hiring mercenaries. Calling the talks a comedy, Adoula said his government would use "all the means in our power" to end Katanga's secession. He added that he was linking his government's life to the question.

On March 27, U Thant took the occasion of the appointment of Lt. Gen. Kebede Gebre, Ethiopian Chief of Staff, to replace McKeown as U.N. military commander in the Congo to assert that the U.N. had plans "for the next stages" if the talks broke down. He denied, however, that the use of force was contemplated.

The talks between Tshombe and Adoula were reopened in Léopoldville, where they dragged on into April without making noticeable progress.

The United States and the U.N. were by now more firmly than ever committed to intervention in the Congo and the crushing of the secessionist movement in Katanga. The only factors delaying such a move appeared to be financial considerations and some political pressure from Britain, France, and Belgium, all of which had grave doubts about the U.N.-U.S. policy in the Congo. Union Miniere, anticipating a third and perhaps final U.N. attack on Katanga, was dickering for terms with Adoula.

Tshombe, meanwhile, was reorganizing and building up his forces for a third test of strength with the U.N. The financial problems of the international organization appeared to be playing a major role in delaying U.N. action against Tshombe. Should the American Government agree, as Kennedy proposed it should, to buy half of the $200 million U.N. bond issue, and should at least a portion of the rest be subscribed to by other nations, it appears likely that the U.N. will again attack Tshombe.

Since Kitona, Tshombe has acted on the assumption that the U.N. will run out of funds and withdraw from the Congo before it has ended Katanga's secession. With this in mind, he has done everything in his power to play for time, to prevent a clash between his forces and the U.N., to persuade Adoula that he intends to reintegrate Katanga with the Congo.

It remains to be seen who will win this waiting game.

EPILOGUE: MYTH AND REALITY

"To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war * * * to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights * * * of nations large and small. (From the Charter of the United Nations.)

"The United Nations died in Katanga." (Moise Tshombe, Dec. 16, 1961.)

Only a fool would deny the desirability of union between the Congo and Katanga. The arguments for this are both political and economic. Union is desirable politically because the African states want it and because both the United States and the United Nations have staked their prestige on the establishment of such links. If Katanga is not reunited with the Congo, both the U.N. and the United States will suffer crushing psychological defeats. This, of course, is the fault of the U.N. and the United States, not of Katanga. The international organization and the Kennedy administration have placed themselves in this position because they have followed a policy of expediency that is both shortsighted and unethical. More of this later.

There is more substance to the economic argument. We have seen that Katanga is the richest of the six provinces that once constituted the Belgian Congo. We have seen that its fabulously wealthy mines once supported the colonial budget to the extent of more than 30 percent of its total. Apologists for U.S. and U.N. policy maintain that the Congo without Katanga will never become solvent. They may be right. But even a superficial examination of the country's economy reveals that the Congo will be in deep financial trouble even if Katanga's secession is crushed.

During the first 6 months of last year, the revenues and expenditures of the Congolese Central Government and of the six provincial governments including Katanga were as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Revenue	Expenditure	Deficit
Central Government	27.0	40.8	13.8
Léopoldville Province	8.4	28.8	20.4
Orientale Province	.18	24.0	23.82
Equateur Province	.42	7.8	7.38
Kivu Province	--------	2.4	2.4
Kasai Province	--------	4.2	4.2
Katanga Province	42.0	42.0	--------

These statistics, provided by Belgium's Center for Socio-Political Research and Information, indicate that the integration of Katanga with the Congo would not solve the latter's financial problems. They also go a long way toward showing why, in an economic sense, Katanga has no desire to be affiliated with the Congo. For the first 6 months of 1961, the Central Government and the five Provinces ostensibly under its control had a combined income of $36 million and combined expenditures of $108 million, a total deficit of $72 million.

Nor, of course, could the Congo extract all of Katanga's revenues from her even if she were integrated with the Congo, since Léopoldville would then become responsible for the administration of Katanga. Under the colonial regime, half of Katanga's contribution to the Central Government was returned to her. Even if this proportion were halved again—and Katanga could not possibly be administered for anything less than this—Elisabethville's subsidy to the Central Government and the other five Provinces over the 6-month period in question would amount to only $31.5 million. This would still leave a combined deficit of $40.5 million. In short, Katanga would be impoverished and the rest of the Congo not significantly enriched.

Even this rather unpromising situation would not come about unless Katanga's industrial complex was captured intact. It is unlikely that this would be the case. The U.N.'s military action in December caused considerable damage to Katanga's economy. Any further attempt to forcibly reintegrate Katanga into the Congo could only result in the implementation of the scorched earth policy that the Katanga Government has threatened. In addition, further fighting in Katanga, particularly any attempt to introduce Central Government troops, would result in the almost total exodus of Katanga's whites. The U.N. and the U.S. may be able to wash the Kindu and Kongolo massacres out of their memories. But Katanga's whites, reduced in number from 35,000 to about 8,000 by the U.N.'s policies, have not forgotten. They are the ones who would have to live under the unstable conditions created by the U.N. The vast majority of them would leave if Central Government troops were brought in. Their departure would delay the reactivation of Katanga's economy if not irreparably damage it.

Thus it is clear that the Congo's economic health depends less upon the reintegration of Katanga than upon the reestablishment of order and productivity in the other five Provinces and the adoption of a policy of fiscal responsibility by the Central Government. Under the Security Council's resolution of August 9, 1960, the U.N. certainly had the authority to assist the Central Government in doing this. Although it did its best in this regard, it failed miserably.

The excuse used by the U.N., the United States, and the Central Government to cover this failure has always been that it was impossible to accomplish these ends before terminating Katanga's secession. This simply does not hold water, as events have proved. The United States has always underlined the point that Léopoldville could not smash Kalonji and Gizenga until it had dealt with Tshombe. The falseness of this claim was demonstrated by the ease with which each of these leaders was taken into custody at a time when Katanga's secession was just as real in fact if not in name as it was a year before. Gizenga was always a paper tiger with whom the State Department was fond of conjuring. Lumumba's heir never had a real base of power in Stanleyville because it was not his tribal homeland. As the Central Government discovered when it finally moved against him, his support was limited to a personal guard of less than 200 troops backed by a few hundred members of the Lumumbist Youth Movement. His arrest and imprisonment cost exactly 14 deaths. Linked to this question was the U.N.'s and the State Department's fear that if action was taken against Gizenga, Russia would intervene unilaterally in the Congo and central Africa would become another Korea. A small knowledge of logistics and a cursory glance at the history of direct Communist military intervention elsewhere in the world would have taught these nervous gentlemen that this was nonsense.

Where has direct Communist military intervention taken place? In Korea, East Germany, Indochina, Hungary, and Tibet. Each of these countries is contiguous to a Communist-controlled land mass. Khrushchev would no more have launched massive military intervention in the Congo than he did in Egypt during Suez or in Lebanon during the American landing there. The logistics of the Congo's geographical position are such that he would have taken a severe beating had he done so. He, if not the United States, obviously realized this. Khrushchev let Gizenga go without a murmur. So much for the paper tiger Gizenga and the threat of Russian intervention. Kalonji in fact was a far more formidable opponent because his regime in South Kasai is based on his own Baluba tribe. This problem was solved by arresting him while he was in Léopoldville, far out of the reach of his supporters.

The fact remains, however, that it would be desirable for Katanga to be a part of the Congo. There are many things that are desirable but are not possible. To confuse the two is to prepare the ground for serious psychological defeats. We have already explored the factors in the Katangan situation—historical, linguistic, tribal, geographic, economic, and political—that militate against such unity. A return of Katanga to the Congo immediately after its secession could only have been possible (and then not probable) had some sort of order and stability been reestablished in the Congo. Paradoxically, the U.N., which was unable to accomplish this task itself, prevented the one group who might have done so from returning to the Congo: the Belgians.

The Congo was Belgium's creature. It had neither ethnic nor geographical meaning. It was one territory only because the Belgians carved it out of Africa's heart 77 years ago. The Belgians provided the essential link that gave all the parts of the territory at least the semblance if not the reality of unity. Most of them fled from the Congo during the unhappy events of the mutiny. As the situation quieted, many of them wanted to return. The U.N. in general and Dayal in particular opposed this. The Belgian Government itself, under the terms of the treaty of friendship, assistance, and cooperation attached to the loi fondamentale, had both the right and the obligation to supply the Congo with the technicians and advisers necessary to keep the new nation orderly and productive. Many of the Congolese themselves favored the return of these Belgian civil servants who had forgotten more about the Congo than the most brilliant U.N. civil servant will ever know. The U.N. was unable to provide the Congo with doctors, teachers, technicians, or administrators in anything like the number or the quality necessary. Yet the international organization adopted a hostile attitude toward a member nation that had been instrumental in the creation of the United Nations and erected every obstacle against the return of Belgians as either private citizens or as government employees. By so doing, the U.N. made a difficult job almost impossible and delayed perhaps by years the recovery of the Congo. Both New York and Washington must bear a heavy responsibility for this.

The U.N. having destroyed the Belgians as a possible factor in the reintegration of Katanga into the Congo, then proceeded to place obstacles in the path of reconciliation between the various Congolese leaders. Tshombe's secession was never absolute. The Katangan constitution stipulates that "The State of Katanga adheres to the principle of association with the other countries of the ex-Belgian Congo on condition that they are themselves politically organized in an atmosphere of law and order." Secession took place only because Tshombe and other federalists were unable to obtain a realistic constitution. From start to finish, he has asserted his willingness to negotiate on the subject. He played a leading role at the Tananarive Conference that laid the first foundations for a reconstituted Congo. He showed his good faith by attending the Coquilhatville Conference, where he was arrested after U.N. representatives had made it clear to the Central Government that they could get a better deal by working through the international organization. The Congo envisaged at Tananarive had many weaknesses. The U.N. and the United States didn't like it because it didn't happen to fit doctrinaire theories of political science. But it had two great advantages: It was a Congolese solution to a Congolese problem and it recognized the fact that political power in the Congo now and for the foreseeable future rests not in Léopoldville but in the Provinces. In any case, Tananarive was only a beginning. Had it been properly nurtured, a more unified and stable Congo might have grown from it. But the U.N. was never able to face the fact that if a solution to the Katanga problem was difficult with Tshombe, it was impossible without him.

The U.N.'s plan, despite frequent disclaimers, has been and is to forcibly compel the reintegration of Katanga into the Congo. This was shown by O'Brien's statement in September, when he said Katanga's secession was ended. It was shown when the U.N. flew Bochely-Davidson, the Central Government's gauleiter, into Elisabethville a few hours later. It was demonstrated again in the Security Council resolution of November 24, 1961, which rejected Katanga's secession. This plan was and is unworkable, for the simple reason that the U.N. lacks the military forces necessary to implement it. The present U.N. force in Katanga of 9,000 men is barely large enough to secure Elisabethville. But Jadotville and Kolwezi, the country's two most important cities, are still firmly in Katangan hands. Even if the U.N. were to receive sufficient reinforcements to enable it to capture the principal cities and towns, the war would be far from over. What the U.N. and the United States have never been able to understand is that when you make war on Tshombe, you make war not on a government or on a political party but on the Lunda, one of the largest tribes in central Africa. In addition, each of Tshombe's cabinet ministers has the support of his own tribe. Even if the U.N. troops had the skill and the stomach to pursue the gendarmerie into the bush and destroy it, they would still have the problem of dealing with the rebellious tribes. In any event, a political solution created by force would not survive the departure of the bayonets that imposed it. The U.N., already deeply in the red on its Congo operation, cannot keep troops in Katanga forever. Some time this year, they will have to be withdrawn. Once they are gone, Katanga will rebel again. The Central Government probably could not keep Katanga within the Congo by force. If it did succeed in doing so, the bloodshed and misery caused in the process would be immense.

Chief U.S. Delegate to the U.N. Adlai Stevenson expressed his shock at the Security Council's decision when he said that "we have witnessed tonight an effort to rewrite the (United Nations) charter to sanction the use of force in international relations when it suits one's own purposes. This approach can only lead to chaos and to the disintegration of the United Nations." In an emotion-charged speech, Stevenson pointed out that "the League of Nations died, I remind you, when its members no longer resisted the use of aggressive force." Yet it was the Security Council's reliance on the use of force in Katanga which made possible if not certain the decision on Goa. By its actions in Katanga, the U.N. invalidated international law and substituted for it the theorem that it is better to be popular than to be just. If that is the sort of world which we—meaning the United States and the U.N., for the latter still has a role to play—are building, then we are going back to the jungle. Dutch New Guinea may provide the final test. If the United States fails to stand up for the rights of the Papuans, a small and unimportant people, then there is no hope either for us or for the world, and we might as well start digging.

Loyal Americans and supporters of the United Nations are doing neither their Government nor the International Organization any favor if they support them when they are wrong. It was right for the United States and the U.N. to condemn British and French aggression at Suez. It was equally wrong, both morally and legally, for the U.N. and the United States to intervene aggressively in Katanga.

The story of Katanga is a doleful tale bristling with false morality and injustice. It is still an unfinished story. Let us hope that it is a story that will not be repeated in other times and other places.

In addition, Katanga should be compelled under the terms of the secession agreement to remit $40 million per year (roughly its contribution under the Belgians) to the treasury of the central government for a term of 10 years. Other powers which do a considerable trade with Katanga, such as Britain, Belgium, and the United States, should be signatory to such an agreement to make sure that these funds are paid over and to guarantee the borders of both Katanga and the Congo. A customs union should be established between the two countries and a nonaggression treaty signed. For a stipulated period of perhaps 5 years, provision should be made for regular discussions between the Congo and Katanga in an effort to recreate unity. To allay fears that Katanga might become an outpost of white supremacy allied with the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Katanga should waive her right to amalgamate with any nation other than the Congo, and immigration of whites into Katanga should be strictly controlled. A small U.N. observer force on the Katanga-Congo border might be desirable to reduce the probability of a clash between the two countries. Such a solution would be far from ideal. No compromise is ever perfect. But it would at least recognize the reality that the Congo is unable to prevent Katanga's secession by force. At least it would be better than the state of hatred, illegality, and near chaos that exists today.

The implications of what the U.N. has done go far beyond Katanga. By breaking its own charter, the U.N. has not only compromised its usefulness but placed in question its very future existence in an explosive world that needs its potential power for peace. The first fruits of this evil seed flowered in December, while firing was still going on in Elisabethville, when India invaded Goa and the Security Council turned down a Western bid for a cease-fire.

As far as the situation in Katanga itself is concerned neither the United Nations nor the United States is capable of playing a constructive role as long as they follow their present policies. The blue helmet and armband of the United Nations have become symbols not of hope but of oppression. The sight of an American plane produces not cheers but fists shaken in rage. It takes a big man, nation, or organization to admit it has been wrong. But to continue to follow a wrong policy rather than admitting to error is only to compound a wrong.

It is easy enough, especially in a case where ethics have been so flagrantly violated and the practical aspects of the problem so completely ignored, to show where the United Nations and the United States have gone wrong. What can be done to make the situation right, to deal justly with Katanga and at the same time reestablish the reputations of the United Nations and the United States? The U.N. must first recognize that it acted illegally (through the Security Council resolution of November 24, 1961) by "completely rejecting" Katanga's declaration of independence. The right of Katanga to self-determination—after nearly 2 years of autonomy—must be recognized. It is, after all, larger, more populous, wealthier, and just as stable as a good proportion of the members of the United Nations. Having done this, the U.N. should make every effort possible to demonstrate to both Adoula and Tshombe the advantages to both of a Congo federation or confederation. The Kitona agreement cannot be the starting point of such an agreement. Adoula must be made to realize that concessions are necessary to bring Katanga into the Congo. After every possible avenue of negotiation has been exhausted and a reasonable period of time has elapsed (say, 6 months or a year), if Tshombe does not then agree to bring Katanga back into the Congo, a plebiscite should be held on the matter in Katanga. Such a plebiscite should be supervised by the United Nations, preferably by a commission made up of French Africans. During the balloting, both the U.N. force and the Kantangan gendarmery should be confined to their barracks. Such a plebiscite should be conducted on the basis of Katanga's eight Provinces, the only condition being that no Province should be allowed to secede unless it is contiguous to the other secessionist Provinces. Such an arrangement would give the Balubas of Grands Lacs, Luvua, and Tanganyika Provinces the opportunity to rejoin the Congo if they so desired.

This unfruitful conversation ended quickly. If it was representative of official American thinking—as it appeared to be—there was little profit in further talk. Nor can there be much of a future for America when its Government would rather be popular than just. It is obvious that the United States hopes its position on the Katanga question will generate enough support among the Afro-Asian nations to forestall Russian moves to establish a troika system in place of the office of the U.N. Secretary-General and to delay Red China's admission to the International Organization. Yet the Afro-Asian nations following the Communist line have given no indication that they intend to alter their position on these questions. Nor is there anything to indicate that the conservative African nations (such as the ex-French republics) had any intention of shifting to the left in this regard. In point of fact, the United States has alienated two of these, ex-French Congo and the Malagasy Republic, who are supporters of Katanga.

United States and U.N. intervention in Katanga might have been justified—if one assumes, as the Communists do, that the end justifies the means—had it produced reunion with the Congo on a workable basis. This it has not done. By allowing Adoula to impose unacceptable terms amounting to unconditional surrender, the U.N. and the United States have only made it certain that Katanga will revolt again. The U.N., deeply in the red on its Congo operation, cannot stay in Katanga forever. Tshombe's policy now appears to be to attempt to comply with the form but not the substance of the Kitona Agreement, to send delegates to Leopoldville, to expel most of his white mercenaries, and to pay lip service to Kasavubu, the loi fondamentale, and the unity of the Congo. But as surely as night follows day, when the U.N. withdraws from Katanga, Tshombe will recall his deputies, new mercenaries will fly in, and the standard of revolt will be raised again. Had the U.N. and the United States convinced Adoula of the necessity of granting Tshombe liberal terms, it might have been possible to reunite Katanga and the Congo. This opportunity was missed. Consequently, the U.N.-United States Katanga policy is doomed to failure. It is unethical and it won't work. The Congo's chaos will be prolonged and differences between America and her allies exacerbated. Nobody wins by this except the Communists.

The United States clearly adopted its strong and illegal position regarding Katanga's secession in the hope of pleasing the Afro-Asian nations. In December, when flying to Katanga, I found myself in the company of a high, Washington-based State Department official with considerable responsibility for making American policy (he was not going to Katanga, but continuing on to Salisbury). Our conversation went something like this:

Question. "Why are we as a Nation supporting the suppression of Katanga?"

Answer. "The President has questioned almost every African leader who has visited Washington as to his views on Tshombe; all of them regard him as a stooge."

Question. "Have any of them ever visited Katanga or met Tshombe? Do any of them have any real knowledge of the situation?"

Answer. "Most of them don't know much about the situation, but they feel strongly about it."

Question. "What you're saying is that it's better for America to be popular than to act either morally or intelligently?"

Answer. "I wouldn't put it that way. We just feel that America should be in the mainstream on questions such as this."

Question. "But surely Washington must realize that there is no alternative to Tshombe in Katanga, that if you remove him and allow Leopoldville to set up a Baluba regime under Sendwe or to install a gauleiter, thousands will die?"

Answer. "Maybe. But that would be Africans killing Africans."

Question. "And that's desirable, is it?"

Answer. "It's better than white mercenaries killing Africans."

The role and responsibility of the United States in the situation is clear and heavy. The United States gave the U.N. its full diplomatic and financial support and it intervened in a military sense by providing air transport to bring U.N. soldiers from Léopoldville to Elisabethville during the fighting. It is customary for U.S. Government spokesmen to disavow responsibility for the U.N.'s acts in Katanga, to say that it does not make U.N. policy but loyally tries to carry it out. Yet during the December fighting, the United States made it quite clear under what terms a cease-fire could take place in Katanga. When Tshombe complied with those terms, he was flown to Kitona in an American plane and accompanied by an American diplomat. Obviously, the United States was calling a good percentage of the shots.

Why was the United States so eager to involve herself in the military suppression of Katanga, an act it must have known was illegal under international law? We have already mentioned the spurious fear of Gizenga and Russian intervention. It is worthwhile to ask why, if Katanga's independence so strengthened the Red puppet Gizenga and threatened a pro-Western Léopoldville government, Russia not only did not veto Security Council resolutions aimed at Katanga but vociferously supported them? The answer to this would seem to be that Russia realized from the start that a Red Congo was neither possible nor desirable. Marxist theory and Congolese realities do not coincide. As the London Times once put it, "the Russian debut in Léopoldville was unhappy, and the exile in Stanleyville little better." What was both possible and desirable was chaos in the Congo, preferably prolonged for as long as possible. By refusing to pay for the U.N.'s Congo operation while encouraging the attack on Katanga, Russia was placed in the pleasant position of seeing the most stable and pro-Western portion of the Congo blasted by the U.N. at a cost of $51 million a year to the United States and at none to herself. From the Russian point of view, this policy was infinitely successful in a larger sense in that it drove a wedge between the United States and the other 14 NATO powers, which, with the exception of Canada and Norway, either entertained serious reservations about America's Congo policy or were frankly antagonistic to it. This is not to imply, of course, that America's foreign policy should be dictated by its European allies. However, particularly in questions relating to Africa, an area where they have had so much more experience than we, virtually unanimous NATO disapproval of U.S. policy should have given Washington pause for serious thought.

Should Hammarskjold have insisted on the entry of U.N. forces into Katanga? Legally it appears that he should not have done so. The United Nations was invited into the Congo by the Léopoldville Government. Tshombe repeatedly stated that he did not want the United Nations in Katanga, which by then had seceded from the Congo. To bring U.N. troops into Katanga on the basis of an invitation from the Congo was a clear violation of international law since it constituted intervention in recognizing that Katanga was part of the Congo. If it was necessary for reasons of world politics to break international law, then the United Nations should have established only a nominal presence in Katanga in the form of a small military force and a few advisers. In fact, the United Nations poured its military forces into Katanga, the only peaceful portion of the Congo, with the obvious intention of either overthrowing the lawfully elected regime or of imposing a political solution by force. The Security Council resolution of November 24, 1961, which rejected the independence of Katanga, was both a violation of the United Nations own charter and illegal under international law. In addition, U.N. representatives in Léopoldville and Elisabethville stretched even these mandates to the breaking point in their attacks on Katanga.

The September attack, badly managed and made in bad faith, was particularly indefensible. If the object was to arrest mercenaries, what purpose could be served by attacking and killing Katangan troops defending public buildings? Why were U.N. troops sent to arrest Katangan cabinet ministers, who could hardly be described as white mercenaries? As has been mentioned earlier, Linner apparently had no knowledge of the United Nations plan to attack, and it appears likely to O'Brien that Hammarskjold did not. Why then did Khiari order the offensive? Since the United States pays about a third of the United Nations running costs (in 1961, $22.3 million of $64 million), finances half of the Congo operation ($77.5 million paid or pledged so far; in contrast, only 88 of 104 members of the United Nations have paid their assessed share of the cost of the Congo operation), and is considering the purchase of $100 million worth of U.N bonds, the American people have a right to know the answer to this question. The United Nations, assuming that it had exhausted all avenues of negotiation, had more justification for attacking in December than in September since the freedom of movement of its forces was severely threatened by Katangan roadblocks. But once these roadblocks were cleared and freedom of movement between its various strong points reestablished, why did it feel compelled to launch air and mortar attacks on the center of a city crammed with civilians and to attack industrial targets? Obviously, the only intention was to punish Tshombe and to force Katanga's political reintegration into the Congo, a goal achieved on paper at Kitona.

Yet last year a U.N. spokesman said the U.N. force had acted to end Katanga's secession on the request of the Central Government. On several occasions, the U.N.'s legal position was reaffirmed and explained to Tshombe by various U.N. representatives, including Ralph Bunche, who told Tshombe, in July 1960, that the U.N. force "has received strict instructions not to intervene in the internal policies of the country." Had Tshombe not trusted the sacrosanct nature of the Security Council's resolution and the statements of the international organization's representatives, he unquestionably never would have allowed the U.N. to enter Katanga.

The U.N. was right, both morally and legally, to come into the Congo. It had a great task to perform there, the successful completion of which would have reflected great credit on the organization. This was, first, to restore order, second, to secure the withdrawal of the Belgian forces from their Congolese bases (since their presence there, although legal, was no longer politically possible), third, to encourage the return of Belgian technicians and to replace those who would not return, and, fourth, to see that the economy and the social services continued to function. The U.N. was totally successful in the second instance and partially so in the first. It accomplished little in either the third or the fourth instances.

The U.N. recognized Katanga's position under international law in the Security Council's resolution of August 9, 1960. This asserted that the United Nations "reaffirms that the United Nations forces in the Congo will not be a party to or in any way intervene in or be used to influence the outcome of any internal conflict, constitutional or otherwise." The resolution of February 21, 1961, authorizing the "use of force, if necessary, in the last resort" to prevent civil war, does not and cannot affect this fundamental principle. Thus an action taken to secure the expulsion of white mercenaries cannot legally be used to impose a political solution on Katanga.

This was undeniably Hammarskjold's interpretation of the situation. In a 4,000-word summary of the situation leading up to the entry of U.N. troops into Katanga in August, 1960, Hammarskjold had this to say about Katanga's secession: "This is an internal political problem to which the United Nations as an organization obviously cannot be a party. Nor would the entry of the United Nations force in Katanga mean any taking of sides in the conflict to which I have just referred. Nor should it be permitted to shift the weight between personalities or groups or schools of thought in a way which would prejudice the solution of the internal political problem. I believe all this can be avoided if the United Nations maintains firmly its aim and acts with clarity and tact."

Unfortunately, the U.N. did not maintain its aim. It acted with neither clarity, nor tact, nor honesty.

On August 12, 1960, Hammarskjold made an even more explicit statement when he said that the United Nations could "not be used on behalf of the Central Government to force the provincial government of Mr. Moise Tshombe to a specific line of action."

How is it that a couple of hundred ill-trained and loud-mouthed soldiers of fortune of a dozen nationalities have been able to achieve so much more than thousands of American "mercenaries" have been able to accomplish in Laos?

In any case, the presence of mercenaries, military advisers, or whatever you choose to call them, does not, in international law, constitute inspiration or support of rebellion by external powers. International law is quite clear on one point: When foreign assistance (in this case, United Nations troops) is obtained for the purpose of imposing a political solution by force that could not be reached by normal democratic means (elections or a plebiscite), such intervention is illegal. There can be little doubt in any competent observer's mind that a plebiscite in the portion of Katanga under Tshombe's control would overwhelmingly confirm secession. This does not mean that a feeling of Katangan nationality is widespread. Most Katangans, like most Congolese, still think of themselves primarily as members of a tribe. But there has been a growth of Katangan nationalism in recent months. Paradoxically, it is the U.N.—in seeking to destroy this—which has largely created it. The fighting in September and December of 1961 did more to create a Katangan nation in the minds of those simple tribesmen than a hundred Tshombes. Katangans—black and white—have fought and died in defense of their homes against the white and brown soldiers of the United Nations. Out of this suffering and blood and passion has been born a Katangan nation. It is ironic to think that if Tshombe is the father of Katanga, Conor O'Brien, Ivan Smith, and U Thant have been its midwives.

International law, which we claim is the foundation of our society and the only hope for a peaceful world, is quite clear on the question. It establishes that once rebels or secessionists have established themselves firmly in a definite portion of territory and have acquired a reasonably stable government of their own, a duty of nonintervention arises in their favor. These rights are not dependent on diplomatic recognition. Once the proscribed situation exists, the rights exist.

There is one important exceptioh to this canon of international law. This is that the central government of a nation may request and receive assistance from other nations against its rebels if it can prove that the rebellion itself has been inspired or is being supported by external powers. This was the reason invoked by the U.N. when it went to the assistance of South Korea when it was invaded by North Korea in 1950. Eight years later, the United States again invoked this clause to move into Lebanon.

Although the U.N. has never formally stated that its intervention in Katanga is based on the supposition that Tshombe's rebellion is inspired from abroad, it has strongly implied this by the issue it has made of the presence of foreign mercenaries. Tshombe unquestionably made an important political mistake in recruiting mercenaries from South Africa and the colonial powers. This act damned him in the eyes of most African nationalists and gave substance to the allegation that he was no more than a white man's puppet. More recently, he has been equally unfortunate in the support given him by farout reactionaries and neofascists in Africa, America, and England. The U.S. Government, in particular, has used this fact to tar all those opposed to the U.N.'s actions in Katanga with the same brush. But Tshombe had no alternative to the former and he has no control over the latter. In August 1960, having dismissed the mutinous Force Publique, Katanga needed to create a new army. Had the U.N. not exerted immediate pressure on him to end Katanga's secession, the regular Belgian army officers on duty in Katanga would have been sufficient to train his gendarmerie. As it was, Tshombe was faced with the task of defending himself almost immediately. As a rebel, he was fighting not only for his own life but for his nation's existence. For this, he needed a trained force of men. So he hired mercenaries. Under the circumstances, he had to take them where he could get them. As a result, he ended up with an army composed at least partially of white supremacists and neo-fascists. The fact that Tshombe's need for an effective military force coincided with the hatred of these men for the U.N. should not conceal the fact that Tshombe's support in Katanga, particularly the southern half of the country, is immense. He is, after all, the lawfully and popularly elected leader of Katanga. Had his regime been propped up only by the mining interests and a group of mercenaries which never even in the wildest dreams of the U.N. exceeded 500 and seldom in actuality amounted to more than a fifth of that figure, surely it would have toppled of its own weight under assault by U.N. troops in September and December of 1961.

As well as being unworkable, a solution imposed by force is unethical. Tshombe's government is far from an ideal one. But it does rule. It has maintained reasonable order, created a workable multiracial society, and kept the wheels of economic and social progress turning. In the 2 years of its existence, it has acquired most of the characteristics of a nation as understood by international law. The mere fact that Katanga seceded from the Congo gave the U.N. no right to crush it. The unity of the Congo was never more than a myth created and maintained by the Belgians. The loi fondamentale, setting forth the unity of the Congo, was only a provisional constitution that has yet to be ratified by the Congolese National Assembly. Most of its other clauses have been violated by the Congolese themselves, so it seems strange that the U.N. should insist that the clause referring to the unity of the Congo is sacrosaner.

In addition, the secession of any one of a nation's parts from the whole is recognized by international law as the internal affair of the nation involved. Had the U.N. existed two centuries ago, would it have been right for it to prevent the secession of the Thirteen American Colonies from Britain or that of the South American nations from Spain and Portugal? More recently, would it have been right to prevent Norway's secession from Sweden and the excision of Northern Ireland from Eire? What about the division of Imperial India into Pakistan and the Indian Union? Was Syria wrong to secede from Egypt? Were France and the Indochinese wrong to split Indochina into four nations? In Africa itself, were France and the Africans wrong in 1958 to divide two great territories, French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa, into 12 separate and independent nations? Was Senegal wrong to secede from the Mali Federation in 1960? Should U.N. troops have been used in each of these instances to impose an unwanted and impossible unity? The answers to these questions must be in the negative. Were the U.N.'s actions in Kantanga just and logical? Were they calculated to promote the establishment of law and order locally or to preserve world peace? Equally certainly, the answer to these questions must be in the negative.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, during this week, the 187th anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski will be observed throughout the Nation. It is fit and proper that this day be noted in the Senate of the United States which owes so much to the devotion, self-sacrifice, and idealism of that great Polish patriot in the American Revolutionary War.

It is not without significance that the Pulaski family gained its first fame as revolutionaries against the Russian oppressors of Poland. Initially successful in his uprising against Russian brutality, Pulaski eventually was defeated; he was stripped of his position, wealth, and future. Looking about the world for other places where the fight for liberty could be taken up again, he saw the American Revolution. He came to America where he offered his services to General Washington.

He was substantially responsible for the formation of the first cavalry units during the Revolutionary War, commanding the cavalry during the winter of 1777 at Trenton and later at Flemington. Acting in unison with Gen. Anthony Wayne, he scouted for supplies to feed the starving troops at Valley Forge.

Pulaski's exploits in the field were not always successful. Often deprived of victory by betrayal, insuperable difficulties, and unforeseen circumstances, he yet made an invaluable contribution to the cause of American independence.

Pulaski gave his life for our country when he was killed while leading a charge of cavalry against enemy lines during the siege of Savannah.

There is no record to show where he was buried; some reports say that he was interred beneath the oaks of St. Helena's Island; others claim that he was buried in Greenwich, Ga., or at sea, from the cruiser *Wasp* where he had been carried after he was wounded.

In the perspective of history, it does not matter where his body lies, for his memory is firmly enshrined in the hearts of all who love freedom. To those Americans who are of Polish ancestry, Casimir Pulaski will always be a symbol of Polish and American gallantry and patriotism; to those whose ancestors came here from other countries, Pulaski is a reminder that once men came from the Old World to the aid of the New, to help establish the greatest of all democracies and the hope of all mankind.

COLUMBUS DAY OBSERVANCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, since the 400th anniversary of the arrival of Columbus was celebrated in America 70 years ago today, the custom of observing Columbus Day has spread to an increasing number of our States; indeed, Columbus Day is observed not only in the United States, but also in many of the Latin American Republics, and in a number of cities and towns in Italy and Spain which can claim some historical association with the great discoverer.

The observance of Columbus Day on October 12, of course, is more than the mere commemoration of the arrival of Columbus on the shores of the New World. In a larger sense, Columbus Day reminds us of the arrival of Western civilization on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, of the continuation of Europe in the New World, rejuvenated and infused with new ideas of justice and liberty which found receptive ground in the virgin soil of America.

Those Americans who are of Italian ancestry will, of course, take special pride in Columbus, because he brought much of what was best in Europe to these shores. Yet it is important to remember that his dreams of an eldorado encompassed all mankind; that his visions of a great adventure were justified by the centuries.

For in the 470 years that have elapsed since Columbus set foot on this continent, America has been a great adventure for all who came here. Liberty is an adventure; democracy is an adventure; hard work to build a future is an adventure.

Today, our way of life, our experiment in the art of peaceful cooperation between men and nations, face the challenge of a new tyranny, more powerful and more dangerous than the tyrannies of old. Thus the seeds of liberty which were brought to these shores must be returned to the Old World, to take root, to bloom once more where the great adventure of democracy has been abandoned.

It is in this sense that we observe Columbus Day this year. Let us hope that the plant of liberty which so well flourishes here may in God's own time thrive wherever men of good will live on this earth.

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President I commend to the attention of my colleagues and of the American people a book that has recently been published under the title "The Forgotten People."

The book tells the story of the hundred million people in Central and Eastern Europe who have been enslaved by Soviet imperialism since the close of World War II. It is written by Seymour Freidin, executive editor for foreign news at the New York Herald Tribune, who reported on Eastern Europe for nearly 20 years for his newspaper and who was an eyewitness to the Soviet takeover in these countries and to the total destruction of human freedom under the Soviet quisling regimes.

Mr. Freidin has been called "one of the most honest and perceptive of all foreign correspondents"—a description, in my opinion, which he has amply merited.

It is appropriate that we should read this book because it was largely because of the blundering politics of the great Western Powers that the peoples of Eastern Europe are today in thrall to Soviet despotism.

It is imperative that we restudy this tragic period in history and learn the lessons of the past, because only in this way will we be able to avoid repetition of the blunders that led to the enslavement of the Central European peoples.

This is not a pleasant book to read. It is a book made up of many tragedies, in each of which our folly and guilt loom large. But it is not a pessimistic book. It tells the story of the unrelenting fight for freedom that still goes on behind the Iron Curtain, the story of the unconquerable spirit of man. It makes the point that the forgotten peoples of Central Europe are our stanchest allies and the most effective deterrent to Soviet aggression.

And, it holds forth the hope that, with proper support from the West, the flags of freedom will again be unfolded in the lands of Central and Eastern Europe.

A NATIONAL STANDARD FOR EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement prepared by himself, presenting for printing in the Record an address entitled "A National Standard for Education" delivered by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, USN, at the 28th annual meeting of the Southern Governors' Conference, at Hollywood, Fla., on October 3, 1962.

There being no objection, the statement by Senator Smathers and the address by Admiral Rickover were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Smathers

The 28th annual meeting of the Southern Governors Conference held in Hollywood, Fla., was privileged to hear an address delivered by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, USN, entitled, "A National Standard for Education."

Admiral Rickover, as we all know, is recognized for the invaluable contribution that he has made in the field of nuclear physics and is one of the outstanding scientists in the country today. He has expressed deep concern over the quality and standard of our educational system.

Admiral Rickover's remarks, dealing with the inadequacy of our educational system today to meet the needs of tomorrow, make a valuable and thought-provoking contribution that merits the attention of all of us.

A National Standard for Education

(Address by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover, USN, at the 28th annual meeting of the Southern Governors' Conference, Hollywood, Fla., Wednesday, Oct. 3, 1962)

May I express to you, Governor Bryant, my sincere appreciation for inviting me to address this distinguished audience. It is an honor and indeed a great pleasure to be here.

I presume you are as deeply concerned, as am I, with American education and as desirous that it be the best that can be devised. There is overwhelming evidence that our children do not receive a good, still less the best possible, education. So the question arises: "Why not?" There are many reasons and I have spoken elsewhere at length about them.

We have a philosophy of education that simply does not work, an educational establishment that has too many administrators and researchers who boss the teachers, and teachers whose educational and professional qualifications are inadequate: these are but a few of the causes of low academic achievement. Underlying all of them, accentuating and perpetuating them, is our lack of a national scholastic standard. This renders our schools highly susceptible to the strong pressure toward mediocrity that is present in any system of mass education. It also makes reform difficult and, if accomplished at all, likely to come about in a piecemeal fashion that will increase the already very great geographic inequalities that characterize American education.

It is to this defect and the urgent need to remedy it that I would like to address my remarks.

American schools and diplomas have always been qualitatively of the most amazing diversity. This was probably unavoidable in earlier times when Americans were still engaged in subduing a wilderness. Different parts of the country were then at different stages of development. And, of course, education reflects the state of culture. High culture comes when the material necessities of life have been provided for. Education was bound to be better in the long-settled communities along the Atlantic seaboard than in pioneer country.

Today 70 percent of us live in urban communities, and technology has brought culture to the remotest farm. A child's educational needs are now the same whether he goes to school in Florida or California, in Wisconsin or Connecticut. Every American youngster must have knowledge of the basic subjects: of language, mathematics and science, of government, geography and history—all up to the highest level he is capable of achieving. Every child has the same need for development of his intellectual capacities so he will be able to reason logically and understand the complex world in which he lives and the public issues on which as a democratic citizen he is called to express independent and rational opinions. All our children need a good basic education to qualify them for the kind of jobs a highly technical society provides. Less and less will there be rewarding work in this country for the uneducated, no matter where they may live.

Is not the need for this knowledge and this skill the very reason why we have a public school system? We support it with our taxes because parents have neither the time nor—with rare exception—the competence to develop their children's mental capacities and guide them to intellectual maturity. As I have often stressed, schools that have our children in their care for but one-sixth of their waking hours—no more than the average child spends sitting before the TV screen—such schools cannot perform this task properly if they dissipate their energies on matters that can be done elsewhere. Education directed to the mind cannot be obtained anywhere else except in schools, colleges, and universities. These must therefore be judged by the competence with which they perform this all-important task.

I readily admit that as places for fun and games American educational institutions are unsurpassed in the world. But what concerns me is their performance in the intellectual field; what I call the school's technical task. It is just here that American education fails to live up to the needs of our society. It is here that there is too much scholastic inequality within our country. It is here that our competitive positions vis-a-vis other advanced countries is unsatisfactory.

How is this possible when we pour so much money into education; when we offer it so generously to so many of our children? For over a century we have been committed to the ideal that no American child should be denied an education because his parents were too poor to pay school fees. We set ourselves this ideal early in our history when we had no illusions of superiority; when we knew we were educationally backward. In many continental countries free universal and compulsory elementary education had long since been established. We did not attain even this until just after World War I, 200 years later than parts of Europe. But we were not content with merely catching up; we wanted to go Europe one better. We wanted secondary and even college education to be tuition free so our children should meet no financial bar in their climb to the very top of the educational ladder. This is what we then meant by "democratic" education, and that is what it really is.

Alas, our splendid ideal has foundered on the shoals of educational misconceptions about "democracy" and "education." Adherents of the progressive theory of education, in particular, have confounded "ability to pay" with "ability to learn," as when one eminent educator declared that we were unalterably committed to undifferentiated, comprehensive common schooling which, said he, "will unite in one cultural pattern the future carpenter, factory worker, bishop, lawyer, doctor, sales manager, professor, and garage mechanic." Indeed you can keep children of widely varying mental capacities, motivations, and educational objectives together in a common core program, but this is not education.

A child's—or his parent's—inability to pay for schooling is a removable bar to education; the child's inability to learn is an irremovable bar. Many a poor child is gifted, many a rich child is stupid; either child may be industrious or lazy. It is the giftedness or stupidity, the industriousness or laziness that ought alone to determine the educational levels a child may attain. When you eliminate "ability to pay" you get educational democracy; when you eliminate "ability to learn" you get noneducation.

In the past, when the "common school" of America served simple rural communities, we could tolerate keeping children of varying aptitudes in one schoolroom. The school did not extend beyond the primary years during which the subjects taught were elementary. These elementary subjects can be mastered by every normal child, though at greatly differing rates of speed.

In the small red schoolhouse a skilled teacher could manage things so that the fast learner progressed fast, the slow learner progressed slowly, without seriously interfering with one another. But as soon as you move beyond the elementary level, differences in aptitude create a situation where what the bright can and should study becomes incomprehensible to the average student. Each year the gap widens between children with varying intellectual capacities.

Between the two extremes of intelligence in a representative group of children, the gap in mental age will be almost 6.5 years in the sixth grade; even if the top and bottom 2 percent of the intelligence range is eliminated, the gap will still be over 3 years. Worse still, the gap in achievement levels is even greater; by age 11 children it may be 8 years.

Pleasantly democratic as comprehensive schooling may seem, when continued into secondary education it does justice neither to the fast nor to the slow learner. Nor is there anything democratic about automatic promotion and the handing out of unmerited diplomas. If a child is promoted before he has mastered a prescribed grade course, he will only seem to be moving up the educational ladder. In reality he will be standing still on the same rung, but this is camouflaged by educational terminology.

A child that is handed a high school diploma when he cannot yet read and write with ease and dexterity, has not really received a secondary education. True, he has been kept at school more years and his school has a different name but he has not mastered more than an elementary program. He hasn't even mastered that well. As for the high school diploma he carries away, this has necessarily shrunk in value so that in many cases it represents no more today than did grammar school graduation half a century ago.

Even as we have made higher education available to more children by eliminating fees, so we have taken away with one hand what we have given with the other. By not requiring so-called higher education and its diplomas to meet a fixed national standard, we have brought them down to what Dr. Robert B. Davis, of Syracuse University, so aptly terms "creeping lowest denominatorism." In the absence of a standard, our diplomas and degrees have inevitably suffered the fate of paper money that is not backed by gold bullion. As indicators of a student's educational accomplishment, the degrees "aren't worth a continental." You have to look up the institution that issued them and the course for which they were granted in order to evaluate their academic worth.

In this they are as different as can be from diplomas and degrees abroad which must conform to a national standard, and this whether they are issued in countries with a centralized or with a decentralized system of education. The irony is that our educational ideal has been adopted abroad where it is now being rapidly realized and realized better than here. For there scholastic standards have been retained. The "higher" education now attainable by children in Europe, either at no cost, or on scholarship, or for very small fees, is as good or as "high"—academically speaking—as it ever was. This important point is always overlooked when quantitative comparisons are made between American and European education. We go by labels and we do not inquire what the labels stand for.

Naturally we have more children with college degrees, since we hand these out for intellectual work that nowhere else in the world is held to be of "academic standard." What other country grants master degrees for trailer park management, bachelor degrees for domestic science, or doctorates for thesis work on "Field Hockey in American Education With Special Emphasis on the Colleges of the Northwestern United States"? It is as if we had decided to print enough money to give every child a million dollars upon graduation from high school and then declared proudly that we had become a nation of millionaires.

Apologists often argue that in as populous a nation as ours you cannot have a national scholastic standard. But size has little to do with this. There is greater degree equivalence among the advanced countries of the Continent than exists within our country, yet they are politically divided and we are not. Taken together they are as heterogeneous and as populous as we. However, no country abroad wants to fall behind, so each informs itself on what goes on educationally in neighboring countries and makes certain its national standard is up to par. I should like to see a similar thing happen among the several States of the American Union. This kind of competition is altogether good, and the beauty is that it does not cost more to have good education than mediocre life-adjustment training. The latter, in fact, requires more expensive equipment. For the money we spend on some of our educational palaces with their swimming pools, model kitchens, workshops, athletic fields, etc., we could get first-rate teachers and put them to work in simple buildings, and you would be surprised at the results.

As a practical man I judge educational enterprises by their products. Thousands of these products pass through my hands and those of my leading scientists and engineers when we interview young people who apply for positions as designers and builders of nuclear reactors, or as officers and men to operate our nuclear ships. I find the percentage so qualified to be deplorably small. Even the best have lacunae in their education that you would not find abroad among persons of comparable intellectual stature. We run schools for reactor technology where we have to teach many basic subjects which in other advanced nations already have been taught at school.

A new engineering project, such as development of nuclear power, is a good touchstone for a modern educational system. It calls for mental qualities that are in wide demand in all parts of a highly developed industrial society. Flexibility and toughness of mind, in particular; the ability to emancipate oneself from routine, and to pioneer new ideas; the capacity to think "professionally," as I call it, that is to view problems in a scientific spirit that disregards personal predilections. This latter quality has become scarce since the schools went over to life-adjustment training, with its emphasis on conforming to one's "peer" group. We badly need people who in their fields of special competence will stick to principle; people who will not compromise technical or professional judgment in order to "get along" with administrative superiors or to gain popularity.

To sum up: the overall level of general and specialized education in this country is far too low for our needs, both as individuals and as an industrial democracy.

We are plagued with serious deficiencies in virtually every class of occupation that makes demands upon a person's general and specialized education, whether it be at the level of the "learned" professional, the semiprofessional, the skilled craftsman, or the technician. Despite our enormous and costly educational establishment, this country has more functional illiterates than most other industrially advanced nations. We have more people who do not possess minimum knowledge of the elements of language, mathematics, history, and geography that are considered part of elementary education in advanced European countries and which every normal person there appears to absorb at school. Recently, the Army published the fact that 25 percent of draftees were unqualified to be modern soldiers—25 percent of a cross section of young America. In most cases the deficiencies were mental. In Switzerland, where every male does military service, the rejection rate is about 7 percent. Swiss standards for draftees are certainly no more lenient than U.S. Army standards. I refuse to accept this appalling difference between rejection rates of 7 percent and 25 percent as reflecting on the intelligence and educability of American youth. I blame American schools for this.

Compared to other advanced countries, American education is extremely inefficient. It wastes an inordinate amount of time and costs the taxpayer tremendous sums of money. For lack of an accepted standard, there is poor articulation between one grade and the next, between one school and the next higher. Repetition is inevitable when promotion is automatic. Teachers cannot at the start of the school year count on children in the new class having completed a prescribed course of study in the preceding grade. And so our schools cannot have the orderly sequence of carefully planned curriculums that makes European education so efficient; where each year builds on what has been learned before and there is no needless rehashing of the same subjects nor any gap in knowledge that might hinder orderly and rapid educational progress.

We have a fantastic stretchout in education. It takes average American children 12 years to reach achievement levels their counterparts on the Continent attain in a little over 8. The American bachelor degree comes at the end of 16 years of schooling, the continental degree at the end of 12 to 13. At that, continental holders of the baccalaureate are better educated than the majority of American college graduates.

The slow pace of American education harms all our children. The less able get discouraged and drop out before they have ever acquired what abroad would be considered an elementary education. As late as 1958 a quarter of our youth quit school at the end of the 10th grade or earlier, and 10 percent quit at the end of the 5th grade. Only half our children obtained a high school diploma. A decade earlier the situation was worse. Well over half dropped out with less than 10 years schooling; one quarter with no more than 5 years; and only a third completed high school. Those who did not stay on through high school received less basic schooling than has long been required of all continental children, whose attendance during the compulsory period is virtually 100 percent. In consequence we still have 8 million "functional illiterates" while parts of Europe have been wholly literate for a century, in some cases for a century and a half.

Educational inefficiency wastes the best learning years of our talented youth and contributes mightily to shortages of "professionals," men and women with fine minds and high educational qualifications without whom no modern nation can function properly. As you all know, we have a chronic teacher shortage we seem unable to overcome. It is aggravated by the educational stretchout for, since it takes American schools longer than necessary to attain a given scholastic level, we need proportionately more teachers. We have a serious shortage in medical personnel. Currently, we are trying to lure nurses from Canada. We import almost a quarter of our physicians from all parts of the world since each year we graduate only three-quarters of the number we require. Despite all our efforts to encourage more young people to enter engineering, our deficit grows year by year. We need 72,000 new engineers annually but graduate only 45,000. The Russians graduate three times that many and their engineers are competent. Former Secretary Ribicoff warned that we were coming dangerously close to a point where the balance of brainpower in this important area may tip decisively against us.

Observe how the stretchout contributes to our doctor shortage. Because of it Americans must put in three or four extra years before they graduate medical school. Mind you, these are not years added to their professional education; they will not make them better doctors. These years are the result of educational inefficiency, pure and simple. They are required because it takes that much longer to reach the bachelor degree in this country. You can figure for yourselves how much these needless years add to the expense of becoming a physician. Since in this country 80 percent of the cost of a medical education must be borne by the student, the school stretchout will inexorably bring us to a point where only children of the rich can afford to become physicians. Even today families with incomes under $5,000 supply only 14 percent of our medical students, yet these families make up 50 percent of the population. As a result, the number of applicants to our medical schools is currently decreasing, yet with a soaring population we need more doctors.

The same shortages plague us in skilled labor. We have too few skilled and too many unskilled workers; exactly the reverse of the situation that exists in Europe where many countries are scouting as far as the Near East to find unskilled laborers. Switzerland has to import virtually all she needs in this category—she produces almost no unskilled workers herself. England's working force is 50 percent skilled, 12 percent semiskilled. Russia has a tremendous training program for technicians. Her technicums annually graduate 250,000 engineering technicians alone; we graduate 16,000.

Educational inefficiency hurts our children and it hurts the Nation. It also makes ours the most expensive school system in the world. We spend more money to carry a child to a given level of scholarship than any other country. This is a serious matter, given our very rapid population growth—almost three times more rapid than in most European countries. In the last 10 years State taxes have doubled, I believe, with education accounting for most of the increase. Can we just go on that way? According to the 1960 U.S. Statistical Abstract, the average cost per pupil in 1900 was $16.67; in 1956 it was $294.22; it has risen much higher since then. Some States now invest over $500 per pupil each year. Even making allowance for the shrunken value of the dollar the educational results are hardly commensurate with this enormous increase in cost.

There is a limit in free societies, no matter how relatively affluent they are, beyond which people cannot be made to sacrifice, especially when those who proportionately pay most quite often get the smallest personal benefit. Some school districts are approaching the point where no more taxes can be wrung from the populace. It is becoming increasingly evident to thinking Americans that the problem of oncoming enrollment increases cannot be met merely by raising school taxes ad infinitum; we must also make a major effort to obtain a greater yield in genuine education for our tax dollars.

What, then, is to be done to improve American education? Well, local communities and State governments have the power to increase the amount of classroom instruction per school year. We have the shortest school day and school year among leading nations. They could eliminate from curriculums everything that can be learned elsewhere. We are the only advanced country where precious school hours are wasted teaching children how to make fudge, twirl batons, drive cars, budget income, handle the telephone, catch fish, and become "likable, lovable, and datable." They could improve teacher qualifications, bringing them up to the level existing abroad, and they could then put the educational enterprise under the supervision of our best teachers, giving them the necessary clerical and administrative assistance. Abroad, where teaching is an honored profession, no one would dream of putting nonteacher administrators in charge of schools. We are the only country where teachers are bossed by educational administrators who often as not can lay no claim to scholarship, superior intelligence, or higher education, and who may not have had experience in classroom teaching. Ex-athletic coaches are often made school principals, incredible as this may seem.

These suggested steps indicate the direction in which we must move. A few communities alert to the problem have begun to act, but progress is still extremely spotty. Of course, it is encouraging that Caltech now gets highly qualified students but its freshman class numbers only 182. The raising of admission standards in the Ivy League colleges has had a most salutary effect on bright high school students who all of a sudden realize that a good education requires exertion. But the Ivy League colleges enroll fewer than 1 percent of all our college freshmen. One can easily be fooled by enthusiastic press reports about this or that innovation which supposedly will at one stroke raise education sky high. "From kindergarten to college in 5 years," the advertisement for one mechanical gadget promises. I do not think our deep-seated educational deficiencies can be overcome that easily; on the contrary, quite extraordinary effort on the part of the public, of parents and of public officials will be needed.

Specifically, I am convinced we cannot put through a really effective reform program unless we set up a national scholastic standard—a permissive standard, of course—but nevertheless potentially a great influence for good. Many countries have, at one time or another, discovered their educational systems to be unsatisfactory. I know of none that has been able to carry out speedy reform without making use of some such standard. Indeed we are the only advanced nation without a national scholastic standard.

Now the word "standard" has many connotations. I use it in the sense that comes first to mind: a specific requirement or level of excellence deemed worthy of esteem or reward. Not a law enforceable in the courts; falling below standard does not put one in jail. Nor a conventional rule imposed by society; failure to meet the standard does not get one socially ostracized. No one has to live up to the standard. It is simply an optional criterion for determining the value of an act or accomplishment. For those who accept the standard it becomes the yardstick by which the worth of these acts or accomplishments is determined.

I do not share the pride our educationists take in the fact that we are the only leading nation with a school system that does not challenge its children to meet a national scholastic standard in order to receive academic rewards. I do not agree with them that children must not be "judged"; that each child has a right to "equal education and equal status"; hence that, as one superintendent of schools put it, "straight thinking and democratically minded school administrators" will hand out the same diploma, "regardless of the variation of high school courses and the range of scholastic achievement that are presented by the graduates as evidence of accomplishment." I think this educator misreads the whole purpose of academic certificates when he notes with approval that: "No longer does the diploma in its wording discriminate among the graduates, as was once the case when it carried the name of the course in which the student went through school, consequently implying that the accomplishments of the youth who did not take the highly academic lane were less worthy."

Nor do I share educationist concern that children who do not measure up to a standard will suffer pain and lose face. I suggest we set up a standard for different levels of aptitude, but in each case representing not the "average" accomplishment but the "highest" level children of this ability can with effort achieve.

All of life is a series of tests. Young people will be better able to take these tests in their stride if at an early age they begin to learn that everything worthwhile requires great effort but that the satisfaction derived from attaining a standard makes effort worth while. Given the wide differences of aptitude with which we are born and which we do not know how to alter, is it not good for young children to discover that some goals are beyond their capacities; that they cannot win all the tests? It is better to know one's limitations, as well as one's capacities, than to live in delusion which life sooner or later will rudely shatter.

Every American wants the best for the children of our country. In education the best we can give them is the chance to stretch their minds and reach the highest goal their intellect can encompass. "Democracy," wrote the late Dorothy Thompson, "is not to be conceived of as an invitation to share a common mediocrity, but a system that allows each to express and live up to the special excellence that is in him."

Last May, in testimony on English education before the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman CLARENCE CANNON asked me by what means I thought Congress might help to speed educational progress. I suggested that a National Standards Committee be created. This would be a small committee composed of men of national stature and eminence—trustworthy, intelligent, scholarly, and devoted to the ideal of an American education second to none. The committee would have two tasks:

The first would be purely informational, it would act as an educational watchtower announcing danger when it saw it approaching. The members would keep under continuous scrutiny, and periodically report on the state of American education. Does it meet the needs of our times? Is it competitive with education in countries at similar levels of culture and technology with whom we compete economically, politically, or militarily? How do American children compare in academic knowledge with children in Europe or Russia, say at age 12, or 16, or 18; taking, of course, into consideration different ability levels?

The committee's second task would be to formulate a national scholastic standard on the basis of its findings; a standard which would make us internationally competitive and would also respond to our specific domestic needs. The committee would do this by means of examinations set at different ability levels. No one would have to take them, but those who passed would receive national accreditation. The committee would in no way interfere with established institutions now granting diplomas or degrees. It would simply set up a higher standard, offer it to anyone who wished to meet it, and certify those who had successfully done so.

Neither the committee's informational nor its standard-setting function would represent a radical departure from established practice. Many Federal agencies collect and distribute information. We need a disinterested agency to tell us the unvarnished truth about the true state of American education. The committee would help prevent complacency and illusions of superiority and thus save us from the kind of painful shocks that sputnik and other evidence of Russian scientific proficiency have given us in the past few years. There is precedent, too, for the committee's setting of permissive national standards. We have something very like it in last year's amendment to the 1956 Water Pollution Act.

This amendment authorizes the Federal Government—if so requested by a State—to research and develop new methods of pollution control and to award grants-in-aid to localities and States wishing to use these federally established methods. In principle, you have here a national standard very much like the scholastic standard of the proposed committee, in that it is not imposed but merely offered as a service on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

In both cases, we face a problem that cannot be solved by local and State authorities alone but requires some assistance from the Federal Government. Population growth threatens us with a severe water shortage unless we devise better means to preserve the quality of our water resources so that they may be used over and over again. Pollution abatement has therefore become a national problem and we accept a new kind of Federal aid. I believe improvement of the quality of American education is at least as pressing as the need for an assured supply of clean water. "Education," says the Ford Foundation report for 1959, "is now the indispensable medium for survival and progress." Education is so basic to the quality of our national life that by steering it in the right direction we can change America's future; we can make it secure. To steer it right, I believe we need a new kind of Federal aid—the kind of aid that the proposed National Standards Committee would offer.

I hope I may convince you that it would be entirely proper and extremely useful for us to have such an agency. Let me make it crystal clear that nothing in my proposal would violate the constitutional separation of power between Federal and State Governments, nor go counter to our tradition of control of schools by the local community. I envisage the rendering of a service, not regulation in any way, shape, or manner. The proposed committee would not usurp the functions of any existing institution.

Its job would be to draw up national examinations going deeply into a candidate's true knowledge and intellectual caliber—not IBM graded multiple-choice tests. I suggested to the Appropriations Committee that we might well model them on the English national examinations which come at three levels and which offer many subject tests. Students choose the number of subjects and the level at which they wish to be examined. This is marked on their certificate which will list their so-called "passes."

Our committee might provide one set of examinations at the level appropriate for a high school graduate who aspires to enter a first-rate college; another set of examinations at the level of students who may wish to prepare for a semiprofessional or technician's job not requiring a bachelor degree but still requiring a good high school education. Still another for graduates of various types of colleges, especially those bound for the teaching profession. I stress again that no one would need to take these examinations; but those who did pass them successfully would obtain national certification; perhaps the notation "NS"—national scholar—stamped on their regular diplomas or degrees. The seal would clearly indicate what the holder had achieved. There are many occasions when admissions officers of higher educational institutions or prospective employers have a valid reason for wanting to know what an applicant's scholastic qualifications actually are. Think how much time and money would be saved if the diploma were clearly to indicate this. Everywhere abroad it is taken for granted that academic degrees conform to a specific standard—a standard known to everyone. Setting the standard is not regarded as government intrusion or tyranny but as a welcome service to students, their parents and the taxpayers who pay for public education.

Everyone benefits when there is a standard. At one stroke it does away with misleading educational labels so that any layman has the means to judge whether a school or college is doing its job properly. By offering the reward of a certified diploma to our children many who now drift through school would be encouraged to aspire to higher academic goals. You can't expect children to study hard subjects such as mathematics, science, and languages when next door others are effortlessly accumulating equal credits by easy life-adjustment courses in "family life." It surely isn't "undemocratic" to reward those who exert themselves with a diploma that takes note of their accomplishments. This is what certification by a National Standards Committee would do.

There is no question in my mind that a large sector of the American people wants better education. Public interest has grown tremendously. In the recent primaries for election of a superintendent of the Los Angeles schools there was almost as great a voter turnout as in the primaries for Governor of California. The news media now give much more space to educational matters than was the case but a few years ago. Every time I speak or write on education I receive a tremendous number of letters.

What strikes me in these letters is the sense of individual helplessness they reflect. Individually, my correspondents have long known that education must be drastically reformed but they don't know how to induce government to act. The very size of our Nation alienates government from the individual and accounts for much of the apathy for which the people are frequently castigated. Yet so often they can find no one in government to supply the leadership that is needed to carry out their wishes. Especially when this requires tackling so powerful a lobby, on the local and on the national level, as our educational establishment. People like myself can try to bring the truth to the public so that it may be able to reach a consensus—and this I believe has now been accomplished. Enough people want school reform to warrant government action. Now it is to men like yourselves who have been elected to positions carrying the power to act that the ball must be handed. I think this country has reached a stage where public education calls for a partnership of local, State and Federal authorities, each having its particular service to offer. Any determined reform effort—be it at the local or State level—would in my opinion be greatly helped if we had a National Standards Committee. The permissive character of the committee's activities would introduce into public education a needed element of choice. It would leave untouched the status quo for those who are content with it. At the same time it would provide facilities for people who prefer to set themselves a scholastic standard well above current achievement levels.

The Spanish philosopher, Artega y Gasset once wrote a book around the thesis—to quote him—that "there is no doubt the most radical division it is possible to make of humanity is that which splits it into two classes of creatures: those who make great demands on themselves, piling up difficulties and duties; and those who demand nothing special of themselves, but for whom to live is to be every moment what they already are." I read this as a young man and it impressed me deeply. And all my life I have unconsciously judged people and institutions by whether or not they set themselves a standard; whether they measure themselves against a criterion that requires effort because they deem it worthy of effort.

Let us in education as in everything else heed Jefferson's advice, to "dream of an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity."

IMPROVEMENT OF LAND TENURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him regarding Public Law 87-798, dealing with improvement of land tenure in the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARTKE

On October 11, 1962, President Kennedy signed into law S. 3387—legislation which strikes a solid blow in favor of improved land tenure in the United States. It is now Public Law 87-798. I am delighted to have been able to join with my good friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], in support of this legislation, now a reality.

This law, besides improving land tenure, also alleviates some of the pressing credit problems faced by many of our farmers.

Public Law 87-798 increases from $150 million to $200 million, the amount of farm loans insured by the Farmers Home Administration each year. These insured loans are made for farm ownership and water development and soil conservation purposes.

The insured loan program like those of the other credit services provided by Farmers Home Administration helps farm people earn a better living and live a better life. Past experience clearly shows that this agency has helped many family farmers pull themselves up by their bootstraps, helped them recover from economic reverses, helped them successfully fight the relentless battle of the price-cost squeeze, helped them adopt modern farming practices, helped them to become owners of a place of their own. Through Farmers Home Administration help, these family farmers have been able to earn enough income to properly feed, clothe and house their families and educate their children. In all of this agency's programs the focal point of its activity is the welfare of the people it serves.

Insured farm ownership loans are made to eligible farmers to enlarge, develop and buy farms not larger than family farms, and to refinance debts. Tenant farmers and sharecroppers may obtain these loans to buy farms of their own. Owners of small farms may purchase additional land to broaden their farm resource base and to increase the volume of their operations. Owners of family farms may use the loans to develop their farmland and improve their homes and other buildings.

Insured soil and water loans are made to eligible individual farm owners and tenants and to groups of farmers and rural residents to develop water supply systems for irrigation, household and livestock use, to drain farmland and to carry out soil conservation measures. Borrowers may obtain these loans to drill wells, purchase irrigation equipment, acquire a water supply or water right, build ponds and canals for irrigation, and to dig ditches and install tile to drain farmland. They may also receive these loans to carry out basic land treatment practices, expand forestry practices, establish permanent pastures and to carry out erosion control measures.

Groups of farmers and rural residents, operating on a nonprofit basis, may obtain insured soil and water loans to install or improve rural water supply and distribution systems that furnish water for home use and fire protection. Many of these loans are now being made to farmers and residents who, because of low rainful or the type of land formation in their area, are unable to use individual wells to provide adequate supplies of sanitary water. Their only solution lies in grouping together and installing a community type of water system with water reservoir and treating facilities. In my State of Indiana alone, $1,232,500 in these water association loans were made in the past fiscal year.

Through the insured loan program private investors provide the funds to help eligible farmers and the Government guarantees repayment with interest. Insured farm loans are made and serviced by the Farmers Home Administration. The investor may furnish the funds either at the time a particular loan is closed or he may purchase insured notes on loans previously made by the Farmers Home Administration out of a special fund.

Each loan is scheduled for repayment in accordance with the borrower's ability to repay, over a period not exceeding 40 years. The Farmers Home Administration collects the principal and interest payments when due and forwards the receipts to the lender after retaining one-half of 1 percent for insurance. The interest rate charged the borrower varies from 4½ to 5 percent depending on the type of loan. Insured farm ownership and soil and water loans to individual farmers may not exceed $60,000. Insured soil and water loans to groups for community water systems and other uses may not exceed $1 million.

Administration of this program is quite simple. Mortgages for insured loans run to the Government. The lender holds only the insured note. He agrees to hold it for at least 3 years but may easily assign it to another investor at any time.

These loans do not compete with credit provided by other lenders. Only farm families unable to meet their credit needs through conventional sources of credit in their community are eligible for insured loans.

Lenders located right in the borrower's own community furnish a substantial amount of the funds for insured loans. Principal investors include banks, pension funds, insurance companies and trust funds.

Since the insured loan program was started in 1947—just 15 years ago—more than $461 million has been loaned to nearly 40,000 individual farm families and soil and water associations. These borrowers have repaid more than $112 million in principal and

$49,356,000 in interest. Losses on insured loans amount to less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

There are many good things about the insured loan program. Aspiring farm tenants are able to acquire a stake in the land. Established farmers who have exhausted their equities or fallen behind in their mortgage payments through no fault of their own are able to secure some refinancing aid plus additional funds to strengthen their operations. Rural communities benefit not only from the improvements in local farming operations but also from the increased trade generated by the expenditure of loan funds. The Government benefits because the use of insured funds rather than appropriated funds leaves the borrower obtaining his credit from private sources and lessens the strain on the U.S. Treasury.

Existing legislation prior to October 11 limited the amount of insured loans made by Farmers Home Administration to $150 million per year. This amount was sufficient to meet the agency's demand for loans until last year when by congressional action, we broadened and improved FHA's loan program. Desirable changes brought about by the legislation now enable Farmers Home Administration to meet the credit needs of the full range of family farmers. The changes also streamlined the insured loan authorizations, making these investments more attractive to private lenders. A greater demand for insured loans resulted.

During the 1962 fiscal year, Farmers Home Administration obligated the authorized $150 million in insured loans in just 6 months' time and then had to cease operations for these kinds of loans. Obligations started out again during this 1963 fiscal year at a high rate and the agency will reach the $150 million ceiling by early December. Applicants after that date will have to be turned away. Yet, adequate private capital is available for insured loans. At the present time, Farmers Home Administration has on hand from private lenders, commitments to buy more than $75 million in insured loan paper. In my State of Indiana alone, commitments for $6,941,022 are on hand from private investors.

S. 3387 is and was a sound piece of legislation. There is a great need for additional farm credit, and we should take prompt action on this worthy measure. In Indiana, there is a sharp demand for all of these insured loans. Now on hand are 331 applications for farm ownership loans, several applications for individual soil and water loans and 11 applications for soil and water association loans, all financed with insured loan funds. These loans when obligated would total approximately $10 million. It is readily apparent that when this kind of a strong demand for loans in Indiana is multiplied by the demand in the other 49 States, $150 million falls far short of meeting the total needs. To prevent a termination of this fine program in Indiana and other States, I strongly endorsed the senior Senator of Minnesota's [Mr. HUMPHREY] bill.

Our farm families deserve to have sources of adequate credit available for the financing of sound successful farming programs. And from the Government's standpoint, it's just not sound business to be operating a lending program that is out of funds for half a year or more. Delaying action on this measure until the next Congress would have continued the undesirable situation of last year when those farm families most in need, had to go for several months without financial assistance from the agency that is their court of last resort.

On behalf of the farm families of Indiana, and of America, I salute the senior Senator from Minnesota on the introduction of this bill, and thank deeply the President of the United States for signing the passed measure into public law.

SENATOR HARTKE OFFERS CONGRATULATIONS TO MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO RELATIONSHIP OF GOVERNMENT TO THE ARTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by himself, dealing with culture in the Nation's Capital; also an article entitled "District of Columbia Capital Culture," published in Show magazine for January 1962, on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARTKE

From time to time, many things are written and said about our Nation's Capital. One such article has been written, which I should like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues. Its title is "District of Columbia Capital Culture." It was published in Show magazine.

Further, since this is the first anniversary of this publication devoted to the arts, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the magazine upon its first anniversary issue. Mr. Huntington Hartford, president, and Mr. Frank Gibney, publisher, have rendered the Nation a great service in bringing this magazine of culture and the arts into being and in publishing it with such a degree of understanding. Moreover, it has focused attention upon Washington with its perceptive articles about culture in the Nation's Capital and the relationship of government to the arts.

It is hoped that this publication can continue many more successful years of publication and because of this one article, which I previously mentioned, that I feel worthwhile reading for my colleagues.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CAPITAL CULTURE

The city of Washington, not ancient enough to be blase and too old to remain innocent, is enjoying a modest cultural boom. Let us stress the word "modest"; some even dare to hope that through the most strenuous efforts, and with a little luck, our Nation's Capital will soon be abreast, in cultural development, of Tiflis, U.S.S.R., a provincial metropolis 1,000 miles from Moscow.

More about that later. First let us also stress the handicaps that beset the arts in Washington. Whether you talk about the performing arts or about performing politics, whether you talk about what Jackie Kennedy is doing to Washington or what Washington is doing to Jackie Kennedy, the first thing to bear in mind about the Capital is that it is a restive colonial area. It is as much dominated by alien rulers as Bombay and Delhi were during the days of the British raj.

The invaders follow the venerable pattern. They take the best jobs, from the White House on down. They occupy the choicest neighborhoods—sometimes, as in Georgetown, evacuating the local population. In their favor, it can be said that they have been relatively benign about improving the native standard of living.

Philanthropists, beginning with the Britisher, James Smithson, and culminating magnificently in Andrew Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, and Duncan Phillips, have lavished their benefactions on the populace. Other settlers have encouraged the theater, the opera, the ballet, the symphony, and chamber music, while, at a lower level, colons from Greenwich Village have brought their coffeehouses, sandal shops, and sexual aberrations. And Harvard University, besides running the White House, has its special cultural outpost on the New Frontier—Dumbarton Oaks, with its stately gardens and Byzantine study center.

Washington, in short, is becoming civilized, or at least relatively so. The massive injections of foreign aid have begun to take effect; perhaps there is hope for the Gabon Republic, too.

That there is a modest amount of progress is borne out by the history of the Arena Stage, Washington's competent repertory theater, which began on an investment of $14,000 and has now become a million-dollar (though nonprofit) enterprise. Before the Arena, the only professional theater consisted of road shows and tryouts, the crumbs which Broadway tolerantly let drop from its table.

The Arena had its start as a theater-in-the-round in the old Hippodrome, a dilapidated movie house which seated 247 souls. It was founded in 1950 by Zelda Fichandler, a young protege of Prof. Edward Magnum, of George Washington University, who was convinced that there were enough colonists to support a resident company which offered both offbeat drama and the staples of commercial theater. Her judgment was triumphantly vindicated.

In 1956, the Arena moved its stage to a converted brewery located in Foggy Bottom, a silk hat's toss from the State Department. Seating capacity was doubled, and by the 1960 season there were 100,000 paid admissions for a bill which included "The Cherry Orchard," "Ring Round the Moon," "The Iceman Cometh," and "The Disenchanted." The troupe was comprised of young New York actors who were paid the equity minimum.

Due to the caprices of urban overdevelopment, the Arena's theater-in-the-vat was condemned to make way for the stanchions of a new bridge. This fall, the Arena was reborn again in fancy new quarters seating 750 people and costing more than $800,000. The fact that Mrs. Fichandler was able to finance the move is the best measure of the success of a company which began a decade ago in a shabby theater now devoted to showing nudist films.

The Arena's prosperity reflects the changes that have occurred in Washington since the Capital was a sleepy southern town in which livestock grazed on the White House lawn. The first big wave of invaders came with the New Deal; the wartime influx confirmed the city's new status as a major world capital. In the process, Washington became a white-collar town with the highest educational level of any major city in the country: 25 percent of the adult white population in the metropolitan area has completed 4 or more years of college (the figure for San Francisco-Oakland, the runnerup area, is 12 percent). The 2 million in the five-county metropolitan region are not only literate, but also prosperous: the area ranks first in the Nation in effective buying income per household. Additionally the Capital is now host to a steadily expanding international community. So, although the Capital is a single-industry town, its inhabitants offer a market for loftier cultural enterprise as well as for politics. Yet, by and large, Washington remains a lamentably underdeveloped area in the arts.

A notable exception is in the field of painting and the plastic arts. Taken together, the four great galleries in Washington rival the collections in London and Leningrad, not to speak of New York. Concerning music, the verdict is mixed. Attending an opera opening in Washington is an experience that has an inescapable note of the bouffe, because ours is the only major world capital without an opera house. When the Metropolitan comes (it makes an appearance only every few years), it plays at the Capitol Theater. The big, black Rolls-Royces with diplomatic plates pull up in front of the marquee, and official Washington makes its appearance in appropriate finery in the movie lobby—like Colonial Office worthies trying to Keep Up Standards in Sierra Leone.

Or, if the Washington Opera Society is offering one of its four or so annual programs, the identical tableau is enacted at Lisner Auditorium on the George Washington University campus. The auditorium has its virtues, but unfortunately the orchestra pit is best fitted for chamber music. It has been necessary, at times, to expand the pit in order to accommodate the orchestra.

Despite the handicaps, the Opera Society has made a reputation for itself in 5 years. The company draws on local talent as well as professional imports, and the quality of performance has surprised out-of-town critics. The only grumbling concerns the inclusion of such weary old mares as "Carmen" in a repertory that has until lately been aristocratically thoroughbred.

The city does have a symphony which for 5 years has been playing a 32-week season, but the orchestra—well, that is a matter for debate. Partisans of Conductor Howard Mitchell insist that Washington has in the National Symphony Orchestra an ensemble that need cause no blushing. Detractors reply that local pride colors this judgment, and that the Symphony, despite improvements, cannot be considered a major orchestra.

Whatever the correct estimate, it is clear that Mr. Mitchell labors under formidable difficulties. The bulk of his concerts take place in Constitution Hall, which has the acoustics of a dirigible hangar and the architecture one might expect in a building constructed for the springtime rites of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Equally discouraging, the National Symphony is the only major orchestra that has no summer season, which means that it cannot employ its talent year-round. In the summer, the Marine Band plays at the pleasant Watergate on the Potomac; and at Carter Barron Amphitheater you have a choice of crooners, comics, and antique Broadway musicals. It is odd that the Government, which owns Carter Barron, one of the country's finest outdoor amphitheaters, cannot make some provision for the orphan symphony.

Otherwise, the musical calendar is full. You can sample baroque concertos at the National Gallery of Art, chamber recitals at the Phillips Gallery, massive choral works at the National Cathedral; and, on occasion, the Natural History Museum offers concerts using ancient instruments from its collection. If all this palls, there is a recently formed Washington Ballet, which has had modest success; there is the usual parade of visiting recitalists; there are four good music stations (WGMS, WAMU, WASH, and WMAL); and there are the concerts at the Library of Congress. The last deserve special mention, because the Budapest String Quartet performances are surely the best musical bargain in Washington. At no cost to the concertgoer, it is possible to hear them play Beethoven on the Stradivarius instruments donated by Gertrude Clarke Whittall, a good angel who has helped to make the Library of Congress a place where a sonata can be heard as well as read.

If a coda is required for this discussion of music, it ought to be a reiteration of the problem of primitive facilities. Although the Government has many auditoriums, it has happened, on at least one occasion, that a stage could not hold the weight of a grand piano. Nadia Boulanger arrived for a concert at the Interior Department auditorium to find the piano sitting in the aisle.

If the capital's musical facilities are poor, its theatrical plant is pathetic. There is only one adequate legitimate playhouse for the 2 million people of Washington—the venerable National. What is more astonishing is the profligate fashion in which Washington has squandered its theatrical resources. The old Shubert provided a faded but usable second theater until it was gutted by fire a few years ago. Rather than restore an essentially sound structure, the proprietors cleared the site to make way for a more profitable parking lot. A third theater, the Belasco, is located on Lafayette Square, in full view of the White House, as choice a location as the city affords. It has been used to store Treasury records, and is soon to be razed to provide space for a monster Federal courthouse, where more prosaic drama will take place.

As a result of its monopoly, the National Theater was solidly booked last July for the current season. Most of the plays will be Broadway standbys now on tour. By virtue of its quality audience, Washington is regarded as a desirable tryout town, but the opportunity to attend openings has become increasingly rare at the very time that the audience for drama has increased.

Washington would be starved for theater if it were not for the supplementary diet provided by the smaller companies. Besides the Arena Stage, there is the University Theater of the Catholic University Speech and Drama Department, a superior college company, and there are well-intentioned amateur groups, including Theater Lobby and the Washington Theater Club; during the summer, players from Catholic University form the nucleus of a stock company in Olney, Md., and sometimes they are worth the trip.

In recent months, members of Congress have taken a tardy but laudable interest in culture, and for the first time there is a remote possibility that the Government may do something to end America's distinction of being the only civilized country that provides virtually no official encouragement to art, at least at home.

Paradoxically, foreigners have already benefited from the U.S. assistance to the arts in programs that are applauded by some of the same politicians who would be shocked if tax money were used in the same way to benefit the American people. It was considered perfectly proper to provide foreign-aid funds to help European cities rebuild their theaters. Few are shocked when the Government spends money for cultural exhibits at world's fairs and exhibitions. The Voice of America regularly broadcasts music of a quality unavailable in vast tracts of the United States. There were no strenuous denunciations when President Eisenhower began a cultural exchange program through which more than 150 attractions have been sent overseas, varying from Dizzy Gillespie to "The Glass Menagerie," starring Helen Hayes.

Until recently, the idea of letting the American people in on the fun has been regarded as downright seditious. Slight winds of change can now be detected. In one campaign statement, Mr. Kennedy was most explicit: "When so many other countries officially recognize and support the performing arts as part of their national cultural heritage, it seems to me unfortunate that the United States has been so slow in coming to a similar recognition." But the fact that politicians see some potential gain in discussing aid for the arts suggests that possibly—just possibly—something may be done.

As far as Washington itself is concerned, there are two possibilities. First, there is the proposed $80 million National Cultural Center, which could provide the facilities for the performing arts worthy of a major capital. Although Congress has donated land for the Center, the construction funds are supposed to be privately raised; gloomy realists doubt that the plans drawn up by architect Edward Stone can be implemented without public assistance.

On a more modest level, there is the suggestion that the city of Washington ought to do a good deal more to assist cultural enterprise. A Library of Congress study made recently found that Washington spends less on cultural activities than any of 38 other cities surveyed. The local budget for the fine arts is $16,000—compared with $2,600,000 for New York City, $824,000 for Philadelphia, and $446,000 for Baltimore. Tiny Hagerstown, Md., located in the heart of an economically afflicted area near Washington, spends only $3,500 less than the Capital of the United States spends out of a budget of more than $200 million.

It is, of course, true that the Federal Government contributes to the great national museums, but in view of the demonstrable local need, the parsimony of the city budget is difficult to understand. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who never runs short of ideas, has proposed that 1 mill out of each dollar of tax revenue be set aside in a special fund to be used for cultural purposes. Besides helping the symphony meet its deficit, the money could also be well spent in acquiring a theater. One movie house, RKO Keith's, has already been suggested as a possible municipal stage. Since the National Cultural Center seems light-years away, the locals would gladly settle for something more immediately usable, something which could develop along the lines of New York's City Center.

In the end, the fate of these proposals may well hinge on what President Kennedy does. When the President returned from his European tour, he was reportedly shocked to rediscover the relative cultural poverty of Washington in comparison with Paris and Vienna. The comparison is, of course, unfair, because both cities are more than political capitals; they are great centers of commerce, education, and culture. Yet Howard Taubman, drama critic of the New York Times, scored a telling point when he contrasted Washington with Tiflis, a city that has an opera house, a ballet, four professional theaters, several children's theaters, and a vigorous cultural tradition.

Mr. Kennedy obviously cannot improve the cultural tone of Washington merely by signing an executive order. But by pressing for some of the proposals already described, he can do a great deal. By example, too, the President is in a position to give more ceremonial importance to the arts, as he did, for instance, by inviting Robert Frost to participate in the inaugural and by placing something besides westerns on his personal bookshelf.

When they are confronted with the possibility that Washington could become more than a political capital, outsiders—particularly New Yorkers—adopt an attitude of amiable condescension. Washington, as Howard Taubman puts it, is a hick town, and he argues that, even if the Capital were to build a National Cultural Center, there wouldn't be much to perform in it.

Too often, the rejoinder in Washington consists of dismissing the criticism as a canard, as the ululation of envious provincials. The indictment is overdrawn, but it could be argued that this underdeveloped area has reached what Prof. Walt Whitman Rostow, the White House authority on such matters, calls the "takeoff" stage.

An increasingly cosmopolitan settler colony is now hungry for the sweetmeats of culture, and there are a dozen indications of its eagerness. For example, Washington is one of the few cities—Boston is said to be another—where the number of classical records sold is greater than the number of popular disks.

There is also the postwar boom in foreign film houses. Not so long ago, it would have seemed hopelessly utopian to expect to find a Bergman film at more than one theater, but recently three of the city's six art houses were featuring the works of the distraught Swede. Last year, a Washington Film Society, roughly comparable to New York's Cinema 16, was organized, and is off to a vigorous start.

No less striking is the success of the Institute of Contemporary Arts, which in less than a decade has established a cultural cartel in the poetry-reading field. the ICA offers a subscription series of readings, concerts, and esoteric films; despite the high cost ($20 per person for a season), it counts its members in four figures.

But, as in all underdeveloped areas groping into the 20th century, the cultural development of Washington has been uneven, thrusting forward on some fronts, conducting holding operations in others, and retreating miserably in at least a few areas. The literary life is Washington's single most humiliating failure—there is virtually none—while television is a close second.

There is no need to belabor the arid banality that characterizes much of the city's television programing. The surfeit of westerns, fossilized movies, and bloody private-eye shows follows the same pattern that prevails in most cities. But it is cause for special pain that, in the Capital, political events are sometimes inadequately covered. For example, during the celebrated September meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in 1960, New Yorkers could see Nehru and Castro, Khrushchev and Sukarno, in unexpurgated and undigested form. There was less television coverage available in Washington. It should, however, be noted that Washington finally acquired an educational TV channel this autumn, channel 26, operated by GWETA (the Greater Washington Education Television Association). The chief problem, of course, is that GWETA's outlet is an ultra-high-frequency channel requiring a special adapter for most sets.

Thus, Washington remains, in Dickens' phrase, a "city of magnificent intentions." The musk of power pervades the city, but as yet the scent of poetry is only intermittently encountered. If the administration makes an effort to practice the politics of art, there is a local constituency that would respond eagerly. Their slogan, it can be reported on good authority, is "Tiflis, here we come."

AN AMERICAN'S CHALLENGE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on October 9, 1962, at the American Legion national convention in Las Vegas, Nev., the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, delivered an excellent address, entitled "An American's Challenge," which should be called to the attention of all Americans.

On behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN'S CHALLENGE

At this critical hour in the life of our Republic, it is indeed a high honor to serve as keynote speaker for this great national convention. It is a great privilege to be thus honored by men and women who have demonstrated their patriotism and their courage in defending our beloved Nation.

Today, the American Legion is more vigorous than ever in inspiring national loyalty and promoting national preparedness. You have never faltered in your dedication to, and promotion of American ideals.

In 1946, when I spoke to you at San Francisco, the world was just emerging from a long and devastating war—a war which claimed the lives of over 400,000 of our fellow countrymen. We looked hopefully for the end of hostilities and an era of peace—peace with dignity, peace with honor, peace with international trust and understanding. We were aware, however, that a brand of tyranny and fascism—Red fascism—far more treacherous than that of Hitler and Mussolini, was emerging as a powerful threat on the international scene. By 1957, when I was honored to speak at your Atlantic City convention, the virus of communism had spread in epidemic proportions, infecting vast areas of Europe and Asia. The stench of death from the brutal slaughter of Hungarian freedom fighters by Soviet hordes, paralleling the carnage of Genghis Khan, the Mongol conqueror of the 13th century, hung heavy in the world atmosphere.

Two years ago, in 1960, it was my duty to urgently warn your delegates at Miami that communism had gained already a strategic beachhead in nearby Cuba; that Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, and Castro were dictators of the same order, driven by the same atheistic urge to dominate men and nations.

I referred also to the devastating encroachments of crime and corruption—avowed enemies of the very ideals upon which our Republic was founded. The poisonous effect of these enemies on the social, economic, and political life of America is keenly felt.

Today, we stand at the same crossroads and are faced with threats identical to those which confronted us 16 years ago. These threats are accepted in some quarters as the normal climate of life, to be met with appeasement or accommodation. The heavy inroads of international Communist aggression continue with a terrible ruthlessness.

Peoples everywhere must be prepared today to stand up and be counted—either for or against freedom.

We are an idealistic nation—a nation ruled by laws, not by men. Yet, each year shows new record peaks of crime and lawlessness.

Nearly 200 years ago, Edmund Burke warned, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." How meaningful these words are today.

We have failed to meet the postwar goals which America has established for herself because the "good men" to whom Burke referred—the forces for decency in our country—have failed in many respects to live up to their duties and responsibilities.

What has happened to the time-honored precepts of hard work and fair play which influenced the American scene during the all-important formative years of this great Republic? Where is the faith in God which fortified us through our past trials? Have our national pride, our moral conscience, our sensitivity to filth and degradation, grown so weak that they no longer react to assaults upon our proud heritage of freedom?

Crime and subversion are formidable problems in the United States today because, and only because, there is a dangerous flaw in our Nation's moral armor. Self-indulgence—the principle of pleasure before duty—is practiced across the length and breadth of the land. It is undermining those attributes of personal responsibility and self-discipline which are essential to our national survival. It is creating citizens who reach maturity with a warped sense of values and an undeveloped conscience.

Crime is a parasite, feeding upon public disinterest and moral lethargy. This day, more than 5,200 felonies—4 serious crimes every minute—will be committed across the United States. They will include 430 crimes of violence—murders, forcible rapes, and assaults to kill. At least 250 robberies, 10 an hour, will be recorded, as will 4,500 burglaries, major larcenies, and automobile thefts.

Since 1946, our national crime totals have more than doubled. Over the past 5 years, since 1957, these crimes have risen 5 times as fast as our growing population.

Nowhere has this increase been more pronounced than among America's youth. Last year, persons under 18 years of age were involved in 43 percent of all arrests for serious crimes. They accounted for 22 percent of the robbery arrests, nearly one-half of the burglaries and larcenies, and well over half of the automobile thefts throughout the United States.

There is a moral breakdown among young people in the United States. The crime rate is outdistancing the population increase; pornography is flourishing; and there is a quest for status at the expense of morality.

The heavy toll of crime, both juvenile and adult, is a direct product of self-indulgence and irresponsibility. There is a pattern of flight from responsibility.

It is utterly tragic that many otherwise intelligent people develop a blind spot with regard to the conduct of their own children. Until there comes about a greater degree of parental understanding—real interest, affection, and concern—we will witness a continued upsurge in juvenile crime.

There must be a moral reawakening in every home of our country. Disrespect for law and order is a tragic moral illness.

As Benjamin Franklin said, "Nothing is of more importance for the public weal, than to * * * train * * * youth in wisdom and virtue. Wise and good men are, in my opinion, the strength of a state; much more so than riches or arms."

Our city streets are jungles of terror. The viciousness of the rapists, murderers, and muggers who attack women and young girls seems to know no bounds. This senseless sadism can be stopped only by a concerted, realistic action on the part of everyone connected with law enforcement and our judicial processes. We must adopt stiffer laws and a more stern policy toward these perverted individuals.

Too often, the interests of justice and consideration for the welfare of society are buried under an avalanche of court decisions which give violators of the law rights and privileges that destroy respect for the law and public safety.

Too often, technicalities have been permitted to exist in our penal codes which have been employed solely and exclusively for the benefit of that small minority of lawyers-criminal who use any tactic, no matter how unethical, to defeat the interests of justice.

More and more the judicial-legal system of this country is being revised to benefit the criminal—to the disadvantage of the innocent. More judges should speak out against this legalized perversion of justice.

Too often, our parole boards are being influenced by impractical theorists—conference from "experts" who are without experience in the arena of action against crime.

Too often, a cloak of special privilege is thrown around the enemies of society, vicious young muggers, robbers, rapists and murderers, by poorly conceived and maladministered programs intended to promote their rehabilitation.

Mercy tempers justice in the American judicial system, but leniency was never intended to become a weapon for repeating offenders. Mercy can be hazardous and sympathy morbid when they are wasted on those who exploit them.

Responsibility for the wave of lawlessness now sweeping the Nation and the continued existence of conditions in which crime and corruption flourish, rests directly with the American people. The public, by its submissive attitude and its lethargic acceptance of infractions of the law, has helped create an atmosphere conducive to the insidious growth of underworld activity.

Crime is a community as well as a national problem. It will not be abolished by ignoring it. Perhaps it is sometimes oversensationalized; its gory details undoubtedly are distasteful to many people. But if the public is to be aroused to take needed action against what appears to be an epidemic of criminal activity, even sensationalism perhaps may be justified.

We are paying dearly and in cold cash for these indulgences. Crime now costs the

American people more than $60 million a day. But this figure does not take into account the human factors—the personal grief, the broken homes, the physical and mental suffering. Nor can a price be placed on the loss of American prestige in the community of nations, or the eroding influence upon our heritage, which are byproducts of the continuing growth of underworld activity.

Crime has a sinister partner in promoting the breakdown of our moral standards. This partner is international communism—an aggressive and atheistic force which today controls one-third of the world's population and one-fourth of her land surface. The barbaric Communist empire now stretches from the wall of Berlin to the China Sea, from Asia's Mekong River to the Escambray Mountains of Cuba.

In our country, this international conspiracy is represented by a bold and defiant Communist Party—fanatically dedicated to the destruction of our form of free government.

The Communist Party, U.S.A., is an alien force, an agency of a foreign power—the Soviet Russian Government. Today, it is engaged in an intensive campaign to openly defy the law and destroy public confidence in our entire system of justice.

Throughout the past year, the party has deliberately and flagrantly refused to comply with a U.S. Supreme Court ruling which requires it to register with the Attorney General as an agent of the Soviet Union.

In furtherance of this campaign, front groups have been formed, propaganda leaflets circulated, agitational meetings held—all for the purpose of attacking American laws and undermining faith in our democratic institutions. We must be aware of these tactics to sabotage our basic heritage of freedom.

The Communists, their myriad fronts and collaborationists do not fade away. The Communist Party today may be smaller in the United States, but it is a hard-core group of fanatics operating a massive and impressive propaganda machine. The danger and wiles of communism cannot be measured solely by shrunken rolls of actual party membership in this country.

Communists continue with impunity to breathe out hate, particularly against the United States.

There is not an avenue to the heart and mind of Americans that is not used to implant their false ideology.

The Communists are experts in the practice of treachery and deceit. They have used this program of blatant defiance as an offensive weapon to rally the support of misguided, ill-informed, and naive individuals.

Foremost among their targets have been America's young people, for the aim of communism is world youth and the capture and corruption of that youth.

We have but to look at the shameful riots in San Francisco in 1960 when college youth in that area, encouraged by Communists, acted like common hoodlums in demonstrating against a committee of the U.S. Congress engaged in public business.

We have but to look at the Communists' success in stimulating the interest and participation of some of America's young people in the Communist-inspired and Communist-dominated World Youth Festival which was held at Helsinki last summer.

We have but to look at the party's campus speech program which has seen Communist functionaries appear before student groups at colleges and universities from New York to California. On 1 campus alone, a crowd of nearly 12,000 turned out to hear the party's general secretary, ex-convict Gus Hall, declare that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is a legitimate political organization on the American scene and deny its subservience to Moscow, from which it has been established that it actually receives orders and financial support.

The success of these and other programs which the Communists have directed against American young people can be measured by the enthusiasm of top party officials who predicted several weeks ago that 1,000 youths could be recruited as party members before the end of the year.

Colleges should bear in mind that Communist speakers are not bound by any obligation to tell the truth.

The fact is that the party in this country functions as a valuable auxiliary of the Soviet-bloc espionage network. From their areas of influence, American Communists have produced a Julius Rosenberg, a Morton Sobell, and others both willing and able to betray vital secrets to the Soviet Union.

Today, there are 925 Soviet and satellite official personnel in the United States. The vast majority of them represent a cunning and dangerous espionage threat.

From the immunity of their diplomatic assignments, representatives of Communist-bloc nations have directed intelligence networks within the United States. From 1950 through 1960, 21 officials of the Soviet Union alone were declared persona non grata or otherwise asked to leave the United States because of flagrant activities detrimental to this country.

One Soviet defector, a former intelligence officer, has estimated that between 70 and 80 percent of the Soviet officials in the United States have espionage assignments. Years of personal experience qualify this man to speak with authority concerning the duplicity, the deception, and the deceit which are inherent in every phase of the international Communist conspiracy.

During the last 30 years, the United States has participated in hundreds of meetings with the Communists—Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. These meetings led to many agreements, almost all of which have been broken by Soviet Russia.

We are at war with this sinister conspiracy. Every Communist today must be considered as enemy, wherever he may be, at home or abroad.

A soft approach toward the menace of communism can lead only to national disaster.

Much has been done by the Government's internal security programs; by investigation, arrest, and prosecution of party functionaries; and by widespread intelligent public opposition of the Marxist philosophy to thwart the Communist Party's efforts in this country.

However, communism remains an intense subversive threat. Our Nation's efforts to deal effectively with this menace are not enhanced by those of the extreme right who tend to affix the Communist label without intelligent analysis, or by those of the extreme left who endeavor to minimize the real danger of communism.

This latter group includes grossly irresponsible elements, a shocking number of whom have depended for their very existence, upon tax-exempt funds. We have heard them shout "sententious poppycock" at well-founded and documented warnings against the capacity of the Communists to pervert our thinking and destroy the spiritual supports which form the foundation of our freedom. Inane statements such as these add nothing to the American people's understanding of the true menace of communism at home and abroad. They are a rank disservice to the cause of freedom.

I repeat, a soft attitude toward communism can destroy us. We should unite as a people around an intelligent, rational, sensible, but very hard attitude against communism everywhere.

In the battle against communism, as in all previous encounters with godless tyranny, the United States must win and we will win. Let Khrushchev, Castro, and Mao Tse-tung recognize there is no force more powerful than the determination of a free and righteous people.

Let us not forget that whenever we have stood firm, communism has retreated.

From the moment the American Republic was conceived, our country has achieved its proudest moments in the face of adversity. Valley Forge; Belleau Wood; Guadalcanal; Pusan, Korea—these are proud names in the Nation's history, places where our fighting men have risen to heroic heights to overcome deadly enemies. Challenge, not compromise; victory, not defeat—these are words which have real meaning for true Americans.

We must assemble our strength—the moral strength endowed upon us by our Creator, the Author of Liberty. We must reaffirm our determination—the God-inspired determination to protect our freedoms and safeguard our democratic heritage at all costs.

In the heat of an all-out struggle with an alien godless ideology, this Nation needs all the prayers it can get. Prayer and devotion to our Creator are basic to American strength and courage.

There is a vast difference between Americanism and communism. One teaches morality; the other, expediency. One follows the law of God; the other, no law. One is founded upon spiritual values; the other is complete secularism. One is characterized by deep religious conviction; the other, by ruthless, atheistic materialism. The Communist world is a world of walls, searchlights, and guards—a prison for the heart, mind and soul.

The United States is second to no nation in material wealth. From our free economy has emerged a standard of living beyond the reach of any Communist-controlled people in the world. But in luxury there is the danger of physical weakening and moral softness. Self-indulgence can prove fatal. It can accomplish from within what our most deadly enemies have been unable to do from without.

We cannot defeat communism with socialism, nor with secularism, nor with pacificism, nor with appeasement or accommodation. We can only defeat communism with true Americanism.

The fight against crime and communism can be won, and it will be won with, but only with, the help of every decent American citizen. No individual in this great land of ours should underestimate the importance of his or her role.

Let us all work that there may be a rebirth of freedom under God in our Nation.

As Astronaut John H. Glenn, Jr., said, "Freedom, devotion to God and country are not things of the past. They will never become old fashioned."

Every strong nation in history has lived by an ideal and has died when its ideals were dissipated. We can be destroyed only by our own gullibility. If we are ready, we shall neither be dead nor Red.

It is what a nation has in its heart, rather than what it has in its hand, that makes it strong. The nation which honors God is protected and strengthened by Him.

To foster the cause of liberty and justice—this is the goal of America and the goal of every Legionnaire. This goal has been challenged by communism and crime. America has accepted the challenge and we must and will meet it successfully.

We are a God-loving people. This is our greatest strength. Let our national motto always be "In God We Trust."

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. METCALF in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87-586, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MATTHEWS, of Florida, and Mr. CRAMER, of Florida, as members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2555) for the relief of Fong Yee Hin.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 7932. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1948, so as to repeal portions thereof relating to residual rights in certain land on Santa Rosa Island, Fla.; and

H.R. 12820. An act to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 489) to provide protection for the golden eagle.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11586) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, lest hopes be raised too high, the purpose of resuming the session is to give certain Senators an opportunity to make remarks which they have prepared and which I think it would be well to dispose of at the moment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to inform my colleagues that I shall probably take a half hour, with a rather large number of miscellaneous matters. If any Senator has something more brief, I shall be glad to yield.

FAILURE OF CONGRESS TO PROVIDE AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first I should like to make some observations on what I consider to be a real national tragedy—the failure of any bill on higher education whatever to get through this Congress. I was a conferee on the higher education bill passed by this body, which was based largely upon construction loans and scholarships, and an effort was made to reconcile that with the bill which passed the other body, which provided grants and loans but no scholarships. The conferees arrived at what I considered to be a meeting of the minds, but the bill was returned by the other body to the conference.

No aid-to-higher-education bill has been passed. Not only was the major bill for aid not passed, but there was not passed even a bill to increase student loan funds from the present authorized $90 million to $125 million, which passed the Senate without a voice being raised against it, and which we had every expectation would pass in the other body. We come to the end of this session on this critically important matter with dust in our mouths.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is probably one of the most signal failures of the present session. The American people will want to assess the responsibility for it. I hasten to add that I found in the chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the greatest anxiety to bring about agreement. Therefore, I wish to make very clear, in discussing the question, that I do not find fault with my colleague who headed the conference. But I do think that what happened here was that the majority party itself, the Democratic Party, was at war within itself and that there was no leadership when it might have counted for the most in terms of bringing about consummation of what the majority here had voted. The disputes which wrecked the hope for any higher education bill were the aid to private colleges and universities and the fight over scholarships. I am confident that they could have been and should have been reconciled and that the exercise of strong leadership would have brought about such a compromise. But I found it very sadly lacking in the whole situation, only to see all our hopes dashed by the adverse vote in the other body.

In my opinion it is really a disgrace that neither the college academic facilities bill or even the bill to increase the funds for student loans from $90 million to $125 million authorization per annum got anywhere. I have now introduced a new bill, which is in essence the conference report upon which the Senate and House agreed. It is hard to believe that neither the Senate nor the House, both of which passed bills for aid to higher education, so urgently needed by our colleges and universities, and which is absolutely indispensable in a cold war against the Communists, should have gotten anywhere in this very, very critically important field. It seems to me that the failure was a failure of political courage on the leadership side. Especially is that true when our security and progress as a Nation here are so heavily dependent upon our progress in education generally, and particularly in higher education.

Let us remember, too, that the bills thus passed in the Senate and in the House were only a minimum effort, and in view of the urgent need it will take an even greater effort than was incorporated in those bills, which roughly sought $1.25 billion in aid, as well as the increase in the college loan fund to help our colleges and universities meet their responsibilities.

I am very proud to have been the sponsor of the major compromise on scholarships through the suggestion that there be a loan program with substantial forgiveness for those students in the upper 25 percent of their classes.

I notice that the Senator from Oregon is present in the Chamber. I do not know whether he was here when I began. I paid special tribute to him. Certainly no one in the world could say that he did not try in every way that he could to bring about agreement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from New York for his comments. I would be less than appreciative of the teamwork that the Senator from New York extended to me throughout the past 2 years that we worked together on various education bills if I did not rise now to thank him for that assistance. He and I can never tell what the vicissitudes of politics will bring to Senators. I fully expect and look forward to working with the Senator from New York in this body next January. I hope that in the next session of Congress we will be more successful in getting adopted by both Houses of Congress an elementary and secondary school bill, a higher education bill, and several pieces of so-called proposed education legislation that I think the Nation is crying out to have passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think that all of us feel a great sense of responsibility in this matter and would not wish to speak except with some purpose even at a time when we are not doing much else in the Senate. The purpose of my speaking is, first, to express my great sorrow over what has occurred. This failure is a disgraceful thing for our Nation, considering the need.

Second, notwithstanding the rush of adjournment and the press of other news, I hope that somehow or other the realization may get out to the people of the country that here is something that can be made the subject of discussion in the course of the present campaign. We are all approached by groups of every kind and character for pledges and for assurances on policy and program. I really think that if the colleges and the universities of the country went to their own communities and laid before them the critical blow to America's future which has been struck—even if it is only a delay, which is now bound to be a year or perhaps 2 years—and the critical urgency to demand from their Representatives in Congress, whatever may be their party, or the candidates for the Senate, a statement of their position on the bill to provide Federal aid to higher education, would they allow what I consider to be in all respect to those who entertain it—but I must give honestly the inside of my conscience—the narrow and parochial view of our responsibilities in refusing to see any aid move to private or sectarian colleges after the most careful way in which we had directed it.

We had headed it without entertaining doctrinaire ideas about scholarships, knowing full well that 70,000 high school graduates in the top 30 percent of their classes have failed in this very year to go to college because of lack of funds. We are deprived of an indispensable natural resource as a result, especially in the face of an extremely practical provision, providing not for scholarships, but for loans, with an element of foregiveness if the student really showed high academic merit in his college studies.

It seems to me that there is a very substantial opportunity for the colleges and universities of our land, public and private alike, to arouse the people in their communities so that a significant body of support may be available when we return here. Perhaps I shall return; perhaps I shall not. Whether I do or not is not nearly as important as that this should be done. It is in that sense that I speak in great sorrow in deprecating in the national interest what we have failed to do.

Mr. President, there is a serious shortage of qualified teachers at all levels of education. The physical plants of so many of our colleges are not only overtaxed at present but must be expanded within the next 10 years to handle a college population that will be 2 million more than the enrollment at present.

By 1970 we will have 6 million students. We have four million students today.

Mr. President, I have not spoken about elementary and secondary education in the great detail that the subject deserves because for some reason it was almost tacitly accepted here, though I deprecate that attitude very much, too, that that kind of bill could not pass. But we had high hopes for the aid to higher education bill which have been completely dashed. That is the reason I speak so feelingly about the matter.

Our higher education picture is not good; there are expanding registrations, overcrowded classrooms, inadequate teaching staffs, wornout or old-fashioned equipment. Our higher education system in this space age should be of the very best quality of which we are capable, but we do not have it and we are not doing very much so far to get it. Unless we take the steps needed to approach at least the optimum goals for higher education, we will go on wasting talent and the energy of thousands of Americans like the 70,000 high school graduates who have been deprived of a college education, in my opinion, directly in the face of and contrary to the national interest.

I can think of few failures in our Nation in the last year quite as damaging as that one.

For myself, whether or not I return to the Senate next year, I shall continue to carry on the fight for Federal aid to our educational system and to sound the alarm over the widening educational gap and the serious shortage of skilled manpower which is a direct consequence of our failure to enact the essential legislation. Every young American who has the desire and the capacity to obtain a college degree should be given the opportunity to do so. And we shall not have met the great challenges of our age until we have made that opportunity a reality.

IN DEFENSE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 2, 1962, on the floor of the Senate the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. EASTLAND] delivered a scathing attack on the U.S. Supreme Court, and the Justices who have sat on that Court for the past 20 years. After charging that the Supreme Court has "infringed, invaded, and usurped the powers vested by the Constitution" in the executive and legislative branches of the Government, Senator EASTLAND presented charts that allegedly demonstrated that all members of the Court have, for many years, been delivering pro-Communist votes that "threaten fundamentally the basic security of our country from the onslaught of the Communist conspiracy from without and within"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 6, pages 7599–7605.

At that time, on the Senate floor, I requested of Senator EASTLAND the "specific criterion" for his statements and charges, and who had set the criterion. Senator EASTLAND said that the criterion had been set by his staff, but that "any lawyer with any sense at all could do that." He said that the test was, "if the decision of the individual judge was in favor of the position advocated by the Communist Party or the Communist sympathizer involved in the particular case, it was scored as a pro, meaning pro-Communist. If the judge's decision was contrary to this position, it was scored as a con, or contrary position"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 6, page 7604.

I was not satisfied to let the matter stand in this posture, with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing only the attack on the Supreme Court, a body that is in no position under the Constitution to defend itself. Accordingly, I stated that I would have a response prepared, in legal and constitutional terms, to the charges which, particularly made from such a source, were most serious.

The response was prepared at my request by Associate Professor Norman Dorsen of the New York University School of Law. At one time Professor Dorsen served as law clerk to Justice John Marshall Harlan and is presently the director of the Civil Liberties Center, which was established at the New York University Law School in honor of the late Arthur Garfield Hays. It is in my view a very excellent analysis which I believe deserves to be brought to the attention of my colleagues, the bar and the public.

I fully agree with the thoroughly documented conclusion of this analysis that the charges against the Court "are completely unrelated to legal doctrine or historical context," and that these are the only valid standards for criticism of the complex work of the Supreme Court. When the cases cited in the attack are matched against legal doctrine and historical context, it is found "(a) that many were decided on the basis of precedent—stare decisis—and therefore obviously did not represent a break with the past, and (b) that doctrines employed by the Court in cases involving national security—communism—are also employed in other types of cases." The attack wholly ignores the complex factual and legal issues in these cases and instead focuses entirely on the outcome. This "result-oriented" approach, as the analysis cogently demonstrates, produces absurd results if applied to other kinds of cases and has very serious implications for our constitutional democracy. Such an approach "depreciates the constitutional protections that all Americans enjoy" and undermines the very rule of law which is the basis of our system as contrasted with communism.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR EASTLAND'S ATTACK ON THE U.S. SUPREME COURT—AN ANALYSIS AND RESPONSE

I

Several years ago, one of this country's greatest jurists, the late Learned Hand, counseled us wisely on the subject of criticism of the judges of the Supreme Court and other courts, whether Federal or State. Judge Hand said:

"While it is proper that people should find fault when their judges fail, it is only reasonable that they should recognize the difficulties. Perhaps it is also fair to ask that before the judges are blamed they shall be given the credit of having tried to do their best. Let them be severely brought to book, when they go wrong, but by those who will take the trouble to understand." (Hand, "How Far Is a Judge Free in Rendering a Decision," in "The Spirit of Liberty," 103, 110 (3d ed. 1960).)

The valid technique for evaluating the work of the Supreme Court is scrupulous legal analysis of the decisions themselves in light of their historical antecedents. Senator EASTLAND's charges against the members of the Supreme Court are completely unrelated to legal doctrine or historical context. Instead, he focuses solely on the results of cases, and measures these results by a distorting and oversimplified standard. A subsequent section of this memorandum contains comment on certain unfortunate consequences of Senator EASTLAND's method of criticism. This section will concentrate on legal analysis of the Supreme Court cases referred to by Senator EASTLAND in his attack on the Court.

As Judge Learned Hand indicated, it is not a simple matter to evaluate the work of the Supreme Court. The complexities of law and fact make treacherous any but the most comprehensive analysis. Nevertheless, inspection of a certain number of decisions may be helpful in demonstrating that the members of the Supreme Court, in the cases singled out by Senator EASTLAND, used well-established legal doctrines in reaching their conclusions. That individual Justices can differ as to the applicability of a legal doctrine in a particular case is merely further proof of the difficulty of the judicial task assigned the Supreme Court.

In view of limitations on space, only two methods of analyses will be employed. These show (a) that many of the cases cited by Senator EASTLAND were decided on the basis of precedent (stare decisis) and therefore obviously did not represent a break with the past, and (b) that doctrines employed by the Court in cases involving national security (communism) are also employed in other types of cases.

A. Legal precedent

1. In *Curcio* v. *United States,* 354 U.S. 118 (1957), the question was whether the petitioner's personal privilege against self-incrimination under the fifth amendment attached to questions relating to the whereabouts of certain union books and records which he declined to produce pursuant to a grand jury subpena. The Court unanimously held that it did.

It was well established by prior cases that custodians of the documents of associations, whether incorporated or unincorporated, had no privilege with respect to such records. e.g., *Hale* v. *Henkel,* 201 U.S. 43 (1906); *United States* v. *White,* 322 U.S. 694 (1944).) It was equally well established that the custodian had a constitutional privilege to decline to answer questions about the whereabouts of such records when they no longer were in his possession. Thus, in *Wilson* v. *United States,* 221 U.S. 361, 385 (1911), Justice (later Chief Justice) Hughes said: "They (the custodians of records) may decline to utter upon the witness stand a single self-incriminating word. They may demand that any accusation against them be established without the aid of their oral testimony." And in *Shapiro* v. *United States,* 335 U.S. 1, 27 (1948), the Court said, "Of course all oral testimony by individuals can properly be compelled only by exchange of immunity for waiver of privilege." In view of these precedents, it is clear that the decision of the unanimous Court in the Curcio case was solidly grounded.

2. In the area of the fair administration of justice, *Gold* v. *United States,* 352 U.S. 985 (1957), is squarely based on *Remmer* v. *United States,* 350 U.S. 377 (1956); 347 U.S. 227 (1954), which involved income tax fraud. Gold had been convicted of filing a false non-Communist affidavit and the District Court judgment has been affirmed by an equally divided Court of Appeals. One of the issues was whether Gold had been deprived of a fair trial because "an FBI agent, investigating another case in which falsity of a non-Communist affidavit was also charged," had asked 3 members of the jury whether they had received propaganda literature, and also because other members of the jury had heard of the FBI contacts.

In a 6 to 3 per curiam decision, the Supreme Court held that a new trial should be granted, "because of official intrusion into the privacy of the jury." It is true, as the dissenters stated in Gold, that the Remmer opinion had said that tampering with a juror was only "presumptively prejudicial." However, the Supreme Court in its second opinion in the Remmer case ruled that the presumption could not be deemed rebutted and indicated that intrusion on a jury could be deemed nonprejudicial only in the rarest instances. 3. A series of cases illustrating both the principle of stare decisis and the fact that it is often difficult of application are *Galvan* v. *Press,* 347 U.S. 522 (1954), *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto,* 355 U.S. 115 (1957), and *Niukkanen* v. *McAlexander,* 362 U.S. 390 (1960).

In *Galvan* v. *Press,* it was held that an alien was properly ordered deported under section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950, two Justices dissenting on the ground that the provision was unconstitutional. In the Rowoldt case, after a careful review of the legislative history of the 1951 amendments to the Internal Security Act, a majority of the Court concluded that Congress did not intend the deportation of former members of the Communist Party unless their association was "meaningful" and had "political implications." The majority concluded that the 1-year membership of the petitioner in the party during which he "didn't get a penny" nor betrayed any ideological identification with the party's unlawful aims was insufficient to warrant deportation. The dissenting Justices disagreed that the 1951 amendments required a "meaningful association" with the Communist Party, and thought that mere membership (which was conceded) was sufficient.

In the third case, *Niukkenan* v. *McAlexander,* the petitioner was an alien who had been brought to this country when less than a year old and who lived here for over 50 years. Although he was briefly a member of the party in the late 1930's, the testimony showed that he never was an officeholder, never was employed by the party, and never represented the party on any occasion. There was also testimony, as in the Rowoldt case, that the petitioner's sole interest in joining during the depression was in "bread and butter" and the "sufferings of the people." A majority of the Court held that because the trial examiner disbelieved certain testimony of the petitioner, the Rowoldt rule did not aply. Four Justices disagreed on the ground that undisputed evidence put the case squarely within the "meaningful association" rule of *Rowoldt* v. *Perfetto.*

Ignoring the complex factual and legal issues in these cases, Senator EASTLAND simply counts as "pro-Communist" the votes of the dissenters in the Galvan and Niukkenan cases, and the majority in the Rowoldt case.

B. Application of legal doctrine to non-Communist cases

Some of the cases discussed immediately above had precedents not involving national security. Many other cases referred to by Senator EASTLAND involve doctrines that have been applied across the board, irrespective of the nature of the party before the Court.

1. *Sacher* v. *United States,* 343 U.S. 1 (1952), involved a contempt citation of defense counsel for 11 Communist leaders who were convicted of violating the Smith Act after a turbulent 9-month trial. During the Smith Act trial the judge repeatedly warned counsel that their conduct was contemptuous. Immediately upon receiving the jury's verdict of guilty, the judge, without further notice or hearing, found counsel guilty of criminal contempt and sentenced them to prison. On appeal, a majority of the Supreme Court affirmed the contempt conviction. The dissenting Justices contended that the citation for contempt should have been tried before a jury; that it should not in any event have been tried before the same judge who conducted the Smith Act trial; and that a full hearing was essential to due process of law. Senator EASTLAND has characterized the dissenters' votes as "pro-Communist," presumably because the defense counsel had been representing Communists on trial under the Smith Act.

But procedural protections have been jealously guarded in all kinds of contempt cases having nothing remotely to do with national security. Just last term, the Supreme Court reversed the conviction of an attorney held in contempt for his conduct during a civil antitrust suit (re *McConnell,* 370 U.S. 230 (1962)). Also last term, the Court held that the summary contempt power could not be used to punish out-of-court statements of a sheriff attacking as "agitation" and "intimidation" a grand jury investigation into alleged block voting by Negroes (*Wood* v. *Georgia,* 370 U.S. 375 (1962)).

There are many other decisions in favor of individuals on trial under the summary contempt power. In none of them could it fairly be said that the Court, or the individual Justices, were doing more than their duty to oversee the judiciary's awesome contempt power. Likewise, there is no basis for the conclusion that any sympathy existed for the cause of the defendant, or with his conduct. As Justice Frankfurter said in dissent in the Sacher case itself (343 U.S. at 27–28):

"I would not remotely minimize the gravity of the conduct of which the petitioners have been found guilty, let alone condone it. But their intrinsic guilt is not relevant to the issue before us. This Court brought the case here in order to consider whether the trial court followed the proper procedure in determining that the misconduct of the petitioners subjected them to punishment. Time out of mind this Court has reversed convictions for the most heinous offenses, even though no doubt about the guilt of the defendants was entertained. It reversed because the mode by which guilt was established disregarded those standards of procedure which are so precious and so important for our society."

2. Many of the cases cited by Senator EASTLAND involve freedom of expression. In all of them the votes in favor of the individual's right to speak or publish are regarded as "pro-Communist." (E.g., *Dennis* v. *United States,* 341 U.S. 494 (1951); *Barenblatt* v. *United States,* 360 U.S. 109 (1959); *Scales* v. *United States,* 367 U.S. 203 (1961).)

Many of the same constitutional arguments urged by the dissenting Justices in the above cases, in all of which a majority ruled that no first amendment violation occurred, were equally pressed in cases not involving communism.

Thus, in *Beauharnais* v. *Illinois,* 343 U.S. 250 (1952), a majority of the Court upheld a conviction under a State criminal libel law against a speaker who was exposing Negroes to "contempt, derision, and obloquy." The dissenting Justices claimed that the conviction was unconstitutional as invading the defendant's right to freedom of speech. In *Terminiello* v. *Chicago,* 337 U.S. 1 (1949), a majority of the Court reversed a conviction for breach of the peace based on the defendant's speech attacking Jews, Catholics, and Negroes. The majority held that the defendant had a constitutional right to express his views, no matter how unpopular and how odious.

It makes as much sense to say that the votes selected by Senator EASTLAND were "pro-Communist" as to say that the Justices voting in favor of the first amendment in the Beauharnais and Terminiello cases were anti-Negro, anti-Jewish, and anti-Catholic.

3. Many of the cases referred to by Senator Eastland involve questions of statutory interpretation. He characterizes as "pro-Communist" certain votes in those cases without regard to their validity under established canons of interpretation.

(a) Construction of statutes to avoid constitutional issues: It is well established that courts will attempt to interpret statutes so as not to require a judicial ruling on constitutional questions. In the words of Chief Justice Taft, "It is our duty in the interpretation of Federal statutes to reach a conclusion that will avoid serious doubt of their constitutionality." (*Richmond Screw Anchor Co.* v. *United States,* 275 U.S. 331 (1928).) Again, as Chief Justice (then Justice) Stone wrote, what Congress has written "must be construed with an eye to possible constitutional limitations so as to avoid doubts as to its validity." (*Lucas* v. *Alexander,* 279 U.S. 573 (1929).)

In *United States* v. *Rumely,* 345 U.S. 41 (1953), the Court narrowly construed a congressional resolution authorizing an investigation of "lobbying activities" so as to include only "representations made directly to the Congress, its Members, or its committees" and not all activities intending "to influence, encourage, promote or retard legislation." As a result, a contempt conviction of a purveyor of literature of a conservative persuasion was overturned.

In *United States* v. *Witkovich,* 353 U.S. 194 (1957), the Court interpreted section 242(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to deny authorities the power to require an alien under a final order of deportation to furnish information except with respect to his availability for deportation. A majority of the Court believed that serious constitutional questions under the first amendment would be presented by a contrary interpretation. Since the language of section 242(d) could fairly be construed to limit the authority to request information, it did so.

Senator EASTLAND counts the votes in favor of a narrow interpretation of the statute in Witkovich as pro-Communist, presumably because many of the questions asked by immigration officials related to Witkovich's possible membership in the Communist Party and activities on behalf of the party. Such a conclusion ignores the rule of statutory construction, as illustrated by the cases discussed above, that was in fact the basis for the decision.

(b) Strict construction of penal laws: A longstanding maxim of statutory interpretation cautions judges to interpret criminal statutes strictly in order to be sure, before a person is convicted and perhaps imprisoned, that defendants are punished only for violations that they could have avoided. As Chief Justice Marshall said over a century ago, in *United States* v. *Wiltberger*, 5 Wheat. 76, 95 (1820):

"The rule that penal laws are to be construed strictly, is perhaps not much less old than construction itself. It is founded on the tenderness of the law for the rights of individuals; and on the plain principle that the power of punishment is vested in the legislative, not in the judicial department. It is the legislature, not the Court, which is to define a crime, and ordain its punishment."

More recently, in *United States* v. *Universal C.I.T. Credit Corp.*, 344 U.S. 218 (1952), involving a prosecution for violation of minimum wage, overtime, and recordkeeping provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Court reversed a conviction by applying this doctrine. The Court said (344 U.S. at 222–23):

"Very early Chief Justice Marshall told us, 'Where the mind labors to discover the design of the legislature, it seizes every thing from which aid can be derived * * *.' (*United States* v. *Fisher*, 2 Cranch 358, 386.) Particularly is this so when we construe statutes defining conduct which entail stigma and penalties and prison. Not that penal statutes are not subject to the basic consideration that legislation like all other writings should be given, insofar as the language permits, a commonsensical meaning. But when choice has to be made between two readings of what conduct Congress has made a crime, it is appropriate, before we choose the harsher alternative, to require that Congress should have spoken in language that is clear and definite. We should not derive criminal outlawry from some ambiguous implication."

Senator EASTLAND lists among the votes labeled "pro-Communist" cases in which certain Justices employed the canon of strictly construing penal statutes. (E.g., *Yates* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 298 (1957); *United States* v. *Fleischman*, 339 U.S. 349 (1950).) Whether or not they were correct in doing so, is a difficult question of law in each case. What is not difficult is to see that the doctrine is a confirmed part of the law of legislative interpretation; that its use is common in the Supreme Court in a wide variety of contexts; and that to brand Justices who use it in a case that happens to involve national security as voting "pro-Communist" is totally unjustified.

II

As already has been mentioned, the proper basis for criticism of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court is a rigorous legal and historical analysis of the cases themselves. But because Senator EASTLAND did not content himself with making charges based on such a standard, it is necessary to go beyond the decisions and show the weakness of his allegations in other respects.

In the course of his remarks, despite certain intimations in the language employed, Senator EASTLAND at no point charged that individual members of the Supreme Court, or the Court as an institution, ever had the motive of advancing the Communist cause or weakening this country's ability to preserve its democratic form of government.

This is not surprising. To impute such motives to the men sitting on the Supreme Court would be ridiculous—tantamount to the assertion, in a wide variety of other cases, that a vote in favor of a particular result necessarily coincided with sympathy on the part of the individual Justice for the party for whom he cast his vote. Thus, to suggest a "pro-Communist" purpose to the Justices of the Court would be to make a similar charge in the following cases, among many others.

1. That the votes of Justices Black, Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge in *Adamson* v. *California*, 332 U.S. 46 (1947), indicate their sympathy for murderers because they voted in favor of the position advocated by counsel for accused murderers. The real question in that case was whether the due process clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution prohibited a State prosecutor from commenting on the fact that a criminal defendant did not take the stand to testify on his own behalf.

2. That the votes of Justices Frankfurter, Black, Reed, Douglas, Jackson, Burton, Vinson, and Clark in *Rochin* v. *California*, 342 U.S. 46 (1947), indicate their sympathy for narcotics peddlers because they voted in favor of the position advocated by counsel for alleged narcotics peddlers. The real question was whether the due process clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution permitted police to obtain evidence of a narcotics violation by forcing an emetic solution through a tube inserted in a man's stomach.

3. That the votes of Justices Clark, Black, Frankfurter, Douglas, Jackson, Burton, Vinson, and Minton in *Hoffman* v. *United States*, 341 U.S. 479 (1951), indicate their sympathy for racketeers because they voted in favor of a position advocated by counsel for alleged racketeers. The real question was whether an individual properly declined to answer questions during a grand jury investigation on the ground that the privilege against self-incrimination of the fifth amendment to the Constitution justified the refusal.

4. That the votes of Justices Black, Douglas, Reed, and Jackson in *Beauharnais* v. *Illinois*, 343 U.S. 250 (1952), indicate their sympathy with racists because they voted in favor of a position taken by certain avowed racists. The real question was whether the liberty of speech and of the press guaranteed as against the States by the due process clause of the 14th amendment to the Constitution prohibited a conviction for portraying "depravity, criminality, unchastity, or lack of virtue of citizens of the Negro race."

5. That the votes of Justices Douglas, Black, Reed, Burton, and Vinson in *Terminiello* v. *Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1 (1949), indicate their sympathy with Nazis because they voted in favor of a position taken by a Nazi sympathizer. The real question again involved the scope of the protection offered, even to words calculated to invite sharp dispute and anger, by the free speech guarantees of the Constitution.

6. That the votes of Justices Douglas and Black in *Hannah* v. *Larche*, 363 U.S. 420 (1960), indicate their sympathy with segregationists because they voted in favor of a position restricting investigative rights of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The real question was whether rules of procedure of the Commission which denied to persons against whom complaints have been filed the right of cross-examination of witnesses are consistent with the protection offered by the due process clause of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

It is no more bizarre to suggest that the present and past Justices of the Supreme Court sympathized with the causes of the parties in the above cases than to make the same suggestion in cases involving national security. Accordingly, it should be no surprise that Senator EASTLAND refrained from charging that members of the Court were purposefully advancing the cause of communism by their votes in the cases he selected.

III

If Senator EASTLAND did not mean to accuse the Supreme Court of lending conscious aid to enemies of the United States, then he meant that the effect of the Court decisions and the votes of individual Justices aided communism. This must be taken as the heart of the Senator's charges, and it is this that deserves response and refutation.

This position, when analyzed, discloses a particular attitude toward two distinct and important matters of government: (1) the function of the Supreme Court of the United States, including the proper basis for criticism of its rulings, and (2) the nature of the constitutional democracy known as the United States of America. On both issues the view expressed by Senator EASTLAND is subject to severe criticism.

A. The Supreme Court

At the outset, let it be made clear that the Supreme Court should no more be immune from criticism that any other governmental organization in a functioning democracy. Such criticism is vital if institutions are to reflect the general will of the people. But not all criticism stands on an equal footing, and the charges leveled by Senator EASTLAND neither fairly assess the work of the Court nor make any contribution to its improvement.

Senator EASTLAND evaluates decisions of the Supreme Court according to their result and in so doing considers only one criterion—whether the decision is "pro-Communist" or "anti-Communist." Prof. Robert Girard has said that such epithets, like the label "pro-Communist," "signify nothing more than that their author either agrees or does not agree with a particular decision or group of decisions by the Court. If he thinks the Court should not have interfered as it did, then you have 'judicial legislation' or, even worse, 'judicial usurpation,' depending upon the intensity of the author's conviction. If the Court should have stepped in when it did not, the result is 'judicial abnegation.' On the other hand, if the Court's response meets his fancy, then you are blessed with 'judicial restraint' or 'judicial statesmanship.'" (Girard, Book Review, 11 Stan. L. Rev. 800, 804 (1959).)

Prof. Henry M. Hart has pungently parodied the kind of result-oriented criticism that Senator EASTLAND has engaged in, "One up (or one down) for subversion," "one up (or one down) for civil liberties." (Hart, foreword: "The Time Chart of the Justices," 73 Harv. L. Rev. 84, 125 (1959).)

This kind of criticism, like the accusations of Senator EASTLAND, is known as "result-oriented" to students of the Supreme Court. It is unfair and narrow. It ignores the law governing a particular legal or constitutional issue, or the reasoning by which a particular result is reached.

But before a ruling of the Supreme Court can be properly evaluated, it is necessary to know more than which side won. It is necessary to study the facts and the law governing a particular controversy, including the arguments prepared by counsel versed in the case. A proper respect for the Court requires such candid recognition of the competing legal claims and constitutional values. Proper criticism takes account of this, and judges the Court according to professional standards appropriate to its work.

Once again, it must be repeated, the Supreme Court does not and should not stand above criticism. But the criticism must be intelligent and discriminating, fitting to the high function of our highest Court. Perhaps the true standard for critics of the Court should be the same as that to which we expect the Justices themselves to adhere. In the words of Dean Griswold of Harvard Law School:

"It is a process requiring great intellectual power, an open and inquiring and resourceful mind, and often courage, especially intellectual courage, and the power to rise above oneself. Even more than intellectual acumen, it requires intellectual detachment and disinterestedness, rare qualities approached only through constant awareness of their elusiveness, and constant striving to attain them." (Griswold, foreword: "Of Time and Attitudes," 74 Harv. L. Rev. 81, 94 (1960).)

Senator Eastland's criticism surely does not measure up to this exacting and high standard.

B. Constitutional philosophy

As already mentioned, the sole guide to Supreme Court decisions, according to Senator Eastland, is whether the ruling is or is not "pro-Communist." The fallaciousness of this standard as a means of judging the work of the Supreme Court has already been discussed. This portion of the memorandum will deal with some implications of this standard for our constitutional democracy.

In almost every case cited by Senator Eastland, an individual, several individuals, or an organization was asserting a claim under the Constitution of the United States. In some of these cases the claim was accepted by the Court, on other occasions it was rejected. Senator Eastland's view is that when the claim was recognized by a Justice, his vote was "pro-Communist." This is an incorrect and dangerous attitude in terms of the high purposes of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Why should not a vote in favor of a constitutional claim be counted "pro-American" rather than "pro-Communist"? Do not such votes serve to extend the liberties protected by the Constitution? Why could it not be said, with fervor at least equal to that of Senator Eastland's, that when a vote is cast in favor of freedom of speech or of the press or of religion, or to protect individuals against unwarranted searches of their homes or person, or to assure criminal defendants a fair trial, or to invalidate governmental action that discriminates on the basis of race, creed, or color, that the Justice is fulfilling the high trust imposed upon him by his oath to "uphold the Constitution of the United States"?

The precedent for this view, contrary to Senator Eastland's, is long and weighty. The principal architect of the Constitution, James Madison, said in the very first Congress that "independent tribunals of justice will consider themselves in a peculiar manner the guardians of these rights." (1 Annals of Congress 439 (1789).) Madison was speaking of rights guaranteed to the people by the Bill of Rights.

The decisive importance to this country of the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights can be illustrated by taking two brief excerpts from talks recently delivered by members of the Harvard Law School faculty to audiences abroad in which they described the essence of the American system. Senator Eastland's chart includes different types of cases involving the Bill of Rights; a high proportion of them dealt with freedom of speech and the rights of those accused of crime. Prof. Livingston Hall had this to say about the rights of the accused:

"* * * Our traditional and cultural heritage of due process of law has greatly inspired and influenced the lives and activities of the millions of individuals, living and dead, who have made up Anglo-American society. Rules of criminal procedure which treat human beings as individuals, and hold each one individually responsible only for his own acts, leave them free to go about their business, secure in the knowledge that they will not be unjustly punished by the State. This has had a great effect in releasing their energy for productive and imaginative ends." (Talks on American Law, 68–69 (Berman ed. 1961).)

And, in discussing the pivotal right of free expression, Prof. Roger Fisher said:

"Fundamental among the purposes of the first amendment is the role of free expression in the democratic process. Free expression is a means of developing public opinion. Free expression is an aid to an intelligent choice. And free expression provides an opportunity to make a choice. New and better ideas are most likely to be developed in a community which allows free discussion of any ideas. Without discussion who can be sure which ideas are right and which ideas are wrong? Finally, freedom of expression serves as an outlet for resentments and hostilities that otherwise might find more dangerous expression." (Talks on American Law, 88–89 (Berman ed. 1961).)

A particularly moving statement of the enduring value of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution has been made by Prof. Charles Black of the Yale Law School. It capsulizes the reasons for believing that decisions of the Supreme Court and votes by individual Justices in favor of enforcing the provisions of the Bill of Rights are patriotic in the most meaningful sense. "Consider the place of these phrases 'equal protection,' 'freedom of speech,' and the rest in the moral life of our Nation. They state our highest aspirations. They are our political reason for being; they are the things we talk about when we would persuade ourselves or others that our country deserves well of history, deserves to be rallied to in its present struggle with a system in which 'freedom of speech' is freedom to say what is welcome to authority, and 'equal protection' is the equality of the cemetery. Surely such words, standing where they do and serving such a function, are to be construed with the utmost breadth." (Black, "Old and New Ways in Judicial Review," Bowdoin College Bulletin No. 328, p. 11 (1958).)

As wholeheartedly as one may subscribe to the above views, it is well to recall that they do not decide concrete cases. To decide properly, as has been emphasized above, one must study and reflect upon the law, the facts, and the contentions of the parties.

The point here is different, but no less important. It is that Senator Eastland's methodology depreciates the constitutional protections that all Americans enjoy. It is impossible to accept the facile label "pro-Communist" without recognizing that the Senator includes within that definition Supreme Court decisions and votes of individual Justices that enforce the Bill of Rights—decisions and votes that do not seem alien to our heritage, but, on the contrary, are in the finest American tradition.

The attack by Senator Eastland on the Supreme Court and its members has now been analyzed from several points of view. It has been shown that there is no basis for any possible claim that in their rulings the Justices were motivated by sympathy for communism. It has also been shown that the criterion employed by Senator Eastland in evaluating the work of the Supreme Court ("pro-Communist" or "anti-Communist" decisions) has no validity in terms of the Court's complex constitutional role. Finally, examination of a sample of cases indicates that the Court's rulings rest on solid ground. Accordingly, it must be concluded that Senator Eastland's charges totally lack foundation.

Mr. JAVITS. I may add that I called to the attention of the office of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] the fact that I would make these remarks on the floor, and undoubtedly they will have the Senator's attention.

INTRODUCTION OF URBAN RENEWAL RELOCATION BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to increase the maximum amount of relocation payments made to commercial tenants displaced by urban renewal projects. I hope that the agencies involved will begin their study and evaluation of this proposal before the beginning of the next Congress. The bill deals with a major problem in urban renewal which has remained unresolved since its inception; compensation for the loss of good will built up by small businessmen over years in one location. Under the bill, payment would be equal to one-half the average annual net taxable income realized from the operation of the business during 3 years prior to the date of displacement. Two limitations are imposed upon such payments: First, the business concern must have been continuously located in the urban renewal area for 3 consecutive years prior to being displaced; and, second, no payment may exceed $7,500.

Relocation assistance has been a part of the urban renewal program since 1956 in a form which compensates business tenants for such costs as moving expenses and fixtures which are lost. My amendment to the 1961 Housing Act resulted in removing the maximum limitation of $3,000 upon such costs, which was too low. I am most gratified that as of yesterday, as a provision of the Highway Act of 1962, a comparable provision for tenant relocation for both individual and commercial tenants, the result of a long campaign on my part, was accepted by both Houses of Congress.

However, a vital problem remains for many small businesses, particularly retail establishments, whose moving expenses may be very low but whose very continued existence is dependent on reestablishing good will which the long conduct of business in one place builds up. Hence my bill. During the past year the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times both discussed this problem very effectively. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Record in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 1, 1962]

Displaced Business—Many Firms Evicted by Federal Projects Face Relocation Woes—Urban Renewal, New Roads Hit Small Stores Hardest; What's Good Will Worth?—Case of the Chicken "Flicker"

(By Stanley W. Penn)

New York.—In a small pastry shop on Manhattan's West 96th Street, two saleswomen cheerfully wait on a handful of customers. But in a dimly lit room in the rear, Elemer V. Vadasz, the Czech-born, 59-year-old proprietor, sits near a writing table, shaking his head gloomily. "I've been in this location for over 9 years," he says. "My wife and I worked like horses 12 to 14 hours a day to make something out of this place. Now they come and kick us out."

Mr. Vadasz' shop, Andre's Fine Pastries, is smack on the spot of a proposed 22-story apartment building, a part of an urban renewal project covering a hunk of Manhattan's West Side between 87th and 97th Streets. An estimated 360 groceries, clothing stores, drugstores and other small businesses will be forced out of the neighborhood to make way for the new buildings.

The plight of Mr. Vadasz and businessmen like him points up one of the little-realized side effects of the Federal Government's huge urban renewal program. More broadly, the cases focus attention on the laws regulating government acquisition of private property. These laws are touching an increasing number of businesses these days as the federally aided urban renewal and interstate highway programs, among others, grow in size and scope.

DISLOCATIONS MOUNT

From 1949 until last year, an average of 1,600 small businesses a year were forced to relocate because of the urban renewal program alone. For 1961 the figure is believed to have reached 4,000 and it is expected to continue to mount as the volume of urban renewal projects rises. No figures are available on business dislocations caused by right-of-way acquisitions for the Inter-State Highway System, but property purchases account for an important share of the $12 billion spent and $29 billion more scheduled to be spent on the program.

There is no doubt about Government's right to take over private property for public use or purpose, even against the wishes of the owners, if it gives just compensation. This right is known as the power of eminent domain. The right resides in both State and Federal Governments, which may delegate it, as they often do, to municipalities.

In practice, however, this power is raising a number of questions of social and economic significance. Among them: Are displaced businesses adequately compensated for their property losses? Should they be compensated for goodwill, an intangible but vital ingredient in nearly all commercial undertakings? Can evicted small businesses, with limited human and financial resources, make successful transitions to new quarters? Is it an unavoidable result of urban renewal that a certain percentage of small, family-run stores—often called momma-poppa shops—are bound to bow to competitive stresses and pass out of existence?

One Federal Government urban renewal source estimates that between 15 and 20 percent of the small businesses displaced by redevelopment projects never reopen their doors. Concedes one city planner: "The marginal shops are lost, unfortunately. These are mostly elderly people—the small tailor, the pawnbroker, dealer in secondhand clothes, and the like."

MORE PROJECTS, MORE MONEY

The Urban Renewal Administration, a branch of the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, says 913 redevelopment programs in 509 localities currently are planned or in execution. This compares wtih 650 projects in 389 places planned or in execution at this time 2 years ago. The urban renewal agency last year won from Congress a $2 billion appropriation which it may spend as fast as it wishes—a striking contrast to the $2 billion the Agency received through all of the past 12 years.

Title 1 of the Federal Housing Act of 1949 provides that the Agency may dispense these funds to municipalities to get rid of substandard buildings, both residential and nonresidential, and to rehabilitate existing buildings. The cities may purchase the property to be redeveloped from the private owners, then resell it to redevelopers at a lower price. Uncle Sam makes up two-thirds to three-fourths of the cities' losses; the cities bear the remaining costs, sometimes with State help.

So far most urban renewal projects have been in blighted residential areas and the businesses displaced largely have been corner groceries, candy stores and similar small enterprises. But down-at-the-heels business districts are expected to come in for increasing redevelopment. The Urban Renewal Administration was empowered by Congress last year to spend up to 30 percent of its money to redevelop residential and business slums for predominantly industrial and commercial use. Previously, the maximum was 20 percent. "This means more opportunity to do redevelopment work in downtown areas," an Urban Renewal official says.

Besides the money an owner receives in payment when his property is taken by a government, the occupants of the premises are reimbursed for their moving expenses. But many displaced businessmen still complain that moving imposes a financial hardship on them.

The 56-year-old proprietor of a small meat shop near Yale University in New Haven, Conn., puts it this way: "I've been here 30 years and now they tell me they need my place to put up a park. Where can I go? I pay $75 a month rent here. I can't get that sort of rent elsewhere. I'll probably have to go to work for a meat chain—if I can get a job."

Retailers, restaurateurs and others who would like to remain in their neighborhood after it has been redeveloped face an extremely difficult problem: How to survive the 2 to 5 years it usually takes from the time they must vacate their quarters until new structures have been put up.

The proprietors of Manhattan's Eldorado Pharmacy, which was forced by an urban renewal project to vacate its building at West 91st Street and Columbus Avenue, originally planned to hang on in this neighborhood. "We had a good business there and we thought we'd move across the street to a temporary location, then find a permanent spot after the area was redeveloped," recalls Mrs. Sylvia Wollan, whose husband runs the store.

But the Wollans had to change plans. "The tenants around us moved out and it became a ghost area," says Mrs. Wollan. "We were robbed twice and our insurance was canceled. One of our display windows was broken and it cost $125 to replace it. It wasn't safe to stay in the store any longer." So the Wollans moved their business to Broadway and West 100th Street. "I don't think we'll get back half our old business," Mrs. Wollan asserts.

NOTHING FOR GOODWILL

The shopkeepers and other small businessmen hit hardest by urban renewal are those who rent or lease their quarters and do not share in payment for the property. Forced to get out, they receive moving expenses but often must leave behind fixtures that they have had installed. Federal law provides some compensation for this property loss, but specifies that if a displaced business claims both moving expenses and property losses, the total claim cannot exceed $3,000. Thus, if a business' moving expenses alone total more than $3,000, it must bear any property loss itself. In addition, the displaced businesses lose their goodwill. One retailer threatened with eviction grumbles that his "goodwill" should be worth something. Says he: "I have to find a new location, and it means new customers. In other words, I have to start all over again."

An official of one city redevelopment agency tells about a woman who runs a rooming house in a site designated for urban renewal. "The woman rents the house," this official says, "but she had to pay $5,000 for the business. Now we are coming along and acquiring the property. The woman is wiped out unless she can get something out of the owner. The law says we can pay only for real property."

Many observers believe the loss of small neighborhood shops is unfortunate from the social as well as personal view. "These people work long hours," comments James H. Scheuer, president of Renewal & Development Corp., a New York-based developer of urban renewal projects. "Maybe they make $5,000 to $6,000 a year, but it is a way of life to them. They get a feeling of satisfaction in running their own businesses. These people are a vital part of the neighborhood. When the corner druggist stays open late, for instance, he's a sort of informal policeman in the area. When you only have these big buildings, without little focal points such as drugstores or coffee shops, you create a sterile neighborhood."

Dislocation can have a good side, contends Robert B. Pease, executive director of the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh. "Some of these momma and poppa stores are just hanging on. In some cases, we've rescued these people from hopelessness by buying their properties."

CASE OF THE CHICKEN "FLICKER"

Mr. Pease tells of a chicken "flicker," who ran machines for taking feathers off chickens. "His business was falling off and he couldn't afford to keep the building he owned," Mr. Pease recalls. "We bought the building and he went off to Florida to sell candy. I'm sure he is better off. The building wasn't even sanitary."

One of the inconsistencies—inequities, some businessmen call them—in the laws governing public acquisition of private property centers on an important difference between the Federal highway and housing programs. Businesses forced by highway right-of-way acquisitions to find another site are not entitled to the moving expenses received by shops dislocated by urban renewal projects.

This difference has led to several bizarre situations. One such case: When Providence, R.I., turned a rundown section of the city into an airy industrial park not long ago, the small businesses evicted from the redeveloped area were compensated at least in part for their moving costs. At about the same time, the State of Rhode Island purchased some nearby land for an expressway planned as a link in the interstate highway system. But the small enterprises forced out by this project received nothing for moving. In some instances, only a few hundred yards separated those who were paid from those who weren't.

AWARENESS OF PROBLEM

The House Committee on Public Works set up a subcommittee on real property acquisition last year to study this problem. At least one State, Maryland, has acted on its own to require payment of moving expenses to a business forced out by State or city acquisition of private property. The State makes the payments.

City planners and redevelopment authorities have been showing greater awareness lately of the problems of dislocated small businesses.

Robert J. Bliss, executive director of the Hartford, Conn., redevelopment agency, says "we'd rather go slow" in relocating firms "and not have any bad public relations." Mayor Leo P. Carlin of Newark set up a Committee on Small Business Relocation Needs early last year. One of the committee's first jobs has been to help businesses being forced out of parts of the central business district in Newark.

New Haven is one city which already has aided businesses in this way. Harry Sviridoff, business relocation officer for the New Haven Redevelopment Agency, has helped nine businessmen displaced by the city's Church Street urban renewal project relocate temporarily in a one-story building in the downtown area. The building was put up with $25,000 of city money and $28,000 of the businessmen's money. The businessmen pay only for maintenance and insurance; when they move to permanent quarters in the redeveloped Church Street area, the city will take over the building.

Owners of properties taken by a government often must endure considerable delays before they receive their payments. In New York, for instance, the amounts paid for private property often are decided by the courts. This is becaues the city and property owners rarely can get together on a price. "In Manhattan, claims are so high," one source in the city government says, "we just proceed to trail in practically everything."

New York City is authorized to pay 75 percent of the assessed value of the property immediately after its acquisition. But even this often takes time. Both sides obtain appraisers and frequently there are major discrepancies in the appraisers' findings. The city must pay 4 percent interest on the difference, if any, between what it pays immediately after a property's acquisition and what it ends up paying after negotiation or litigation. However, one automotive supplier forced out of Manhattan's Lincoln Square area several years ago, complains that this interest rate is unrealistic.

"We had to put up a new and bigger building at our new site," this supplier says. "We had to borrow money to do it. We were borrowing at 5 and 6 percent interest while the city was paying us only 4 percent." This executive says it took a year and a half from the time the city acquired his property to the time it made the first payment. "And we still haven't been paid in full," he adds glumly.

Not all businessmen touched by urban renewal are unhappy over their experience, however. In New Haven's Oak Street Title I project, five displaced property owners joined forces, raised $210,000 and built a building. They then formed a corporation, called College Plaza, to serve as landlord for the building, and, along with five "outside" businesses, rented space in the new structure. Charles J. Brown, president of the landlord corporation as well as owner of James Brown & Son, one of the tenants, says the five owner-tenants are highly pleased with the move. "Our own business, a wallpaper and paint shop, has improved continually since we moved into the new building," Mr. Brown comments.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1962]

Projects Plague Small Merchant—Problem of Compensation for Relocation Has Not Yet Been Resolved

(By Martin Arnold)

What two small businessmen in two different sections of New York have to say points up one of the most serious relocation problems in the city's housing and redevelopment programs.

One says:

"I cater to people in my area. I cannot go, say, to Forest Hills with the articles I sell to East Harlem laborers."

The other says:

'Nobody is thinking about me. I'll go on home relief when they throw me out of this store. I haven't the capital to start again."

Last year a total of 1,528 commercial tenants had to be relocated from public improvement areas in the city, according to the department of real estate.

Since 1954, when the department started to keep count, 13,907 such tenants have had to move.

The vast majority of these are small merchants—delicatessen owners, grocers, drugstore owners, drycleaners and tavern keepers.

NATURAL ATTRITION

In addition, the Housing and Redevelopment Board estimates that natural attrition, such as the death or retirement of a shopkeeper, kills 2,000 to 2,500 more small businesses annually.

Individual cases of relocation illustrate the problem.

Michael Gimino, 45 years old, and his brother, Louis, operate a grocery at 749 Columbus Avenue, near 97th Street.

They have been in the same spot for 15 years. A butcher in the store shares the $160 monthly rent.

It was Michael Gimino who threatened last week, not too seriously, to go on relief with his wife and two children when the West Side urban renewal program forced him out of the store.

"I've lived on this street all my life," he said. "I know everybody here and they know me. I give credit and service. The supermarkets wouldn't do this. I haven't the money to start again in a new section, and I wouldn't be able to afford the rents when this one is rebuilt."

CO-OP POSES PROBLEM

Stanley Unger, who own an Army-Navy store at the corner of 107th Street and Third Avenue, is a member of the executive board of the East Harlem Merchants Association and is a director of Franklin Plaza, a city-built middle-income cooperative across the street from his shop.

Mr. Unger said that "about 200 merchants have been driven out of East Harlem by Franklin Plaza." He estimated that other projects in the East Harlem area had forced more than 2,000 such merchants to close.

"Ninety percent of them don't come back," he noted. "The problem for a shopkeeper who wants to return to the neighborhood is to survive until he can get back."

Of the 31 store sites in Franklin Plaza, the board of education has agreed to rent 7 for a kindergarten through second-grade school; the Union Dime Savings Bank has agreed to rent 6 stores and several supermarket chains are bidding for a site. Only 5 merchants of the 2,000 relocated from East Harlem are planning to come back.

RENTS ARE HIGHER

Merchants in the area generally pay rents of $40 a month to $200 a month, depending on the store size. But, Mr. Unger said, "Franklin Plaza rents start at $200 and go up to $500." He says these rents are too high.

For a long time, the displaced small merchant received no compensation.

But now there is a standard city compensation formula for commercial tenants moved from all city public improvement projects and a different one for tenants moved from Federal urban renewal projects.

The city's latest "commercial move-out allowance" is equal to six times the monthly rent paid, with a minimum of $250 and a maximum of $3,000.

In addition, the commercial tenant is allowed "fixture awards," which are agreed upon by the tenant and the city or set by a Supreme Court ruling.

The formula applies to all city improvement projects, such as housing developments, school sites, and port authority relocations. The city is totally reimbursed by the Federal Government.

On Federal urban renewal sites the situation is different. The Federal Housing Act of 1961 sets no maximum for certified, actual moving expenses.

However, if a commercial tenant claims direct loss of property or a combination of such loss and moving expenses in a Federal program, the maximum remains at $3,000.

But nowhere is there compensation for a commercial tenant's goodwill.

"If I moved my store a few blocks away, where I didn't know the people in the area," Mr. Unger said, "I couldn't give credit to customers. My business might be ruined. This would come under goodwill. But I wouldn't be paid for that."

MOVING THE MERCHANDISE

He added:

"Nor are small businessmen paid for their merchandise. I might have $30,000 worth of stuff in my store. It will sell where I am located.

"If the city were to make me move I could move the merchandise so I wouldn't be paid for it. But could I sell it, say, in Forest Hills? No. I would have to buy different items.

"This has happened to merchants forced out of East Harlem and other areas."

Herman Badillo, deputy commissioner of the real estate department, said that he simply did not know how legislation compensating for goodwill could be drawn up.

"It would have to cover every type of business," he said. "Should a man be compensated if he moves four blocks from his present site but not two? These would be the problems."

FACED BY RUIN

Yet nearly every official concerned agrees that in a small marginal business a man can be financially ruined by being forced to move only several blocks.

Store space in or near housing developments is offered first to former site tenants, but they seldom can afford the increased rents.

Or, if they can afford the increase and do want to return to the area, they have the problem of surviving the year or two while the new development is under construction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3808) to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949, to increase the maximum amount of relocation payments to be made to a business concern displaced by an urban renewal project and to provide a method for ascertaining the amount of such payments, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A COMMISSION FOR THE REVISION OF FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL LAWS AND PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a Commission for the Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs. Of course, I am aware that nothing can be done toward the enactment of this proposal during this session of the Congress. However, I believe that its official printing at this time may engender study and discussion of the implications of such a Commission to prepare the way for speedy consideration by the next Congress.

Current agricultural programs are costing the U.S. taxpayers an annual average of $6 billion a year. Ironically, we are asking our fellow citizens to shoulder this tremendous burden without even being able to show some hope for its future diminution and without being able to claim that it represents anything but a year-by-year holding operation. I believe that there is no other program undertaken by the U.S. Government which meets both of these negative criteria:

First. No hope for probable termination in the future, and

Second. No current effective accomplishment except holding the line.

Mr. President, it is for this reason that we must look to a thorough reevaluation of laws and policies in this field. I do not think that the Department of Agriculture, involved as it is with political policy made by the administration and day-to-day administration of the agricultural program, can do this job. It certainly will lend its expertise to such an effort as recommended by my joint resolution.

Mr. President, in other nations there are lay commissions to do this job. We too have our precedent for special study commissions such as the Hoover Commission. We have no better means in this Nation for working toward the total national interest than the synthesis of ideas among our legislators, administrators, and those from the private economic sector. Such a synthesis is the overriding need, if we are to solve the growing problems of agriculture in the interest of national policy. I very much hope that my proposal will serve as a basis for study before the next Congress and for action next year.

ARMORY SHOW OF 1913—COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMPS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the original "Armory Show of 1913" held in New York City.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3809) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the original "Armory Show of 1913" of New York City, N.Y., introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CUBA—THE PERIL OF THE ANTILLES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Communist presence in Cuba, carrying with it increasing threats to the tranquillity of the Western Hemisphere, poses for the United States problems for which ready solutions do not appear at hand. It is vital that, if we are to act with the intelligence and forthrightness required in this crisis, Americans must be informed both as to the facts and as to solutions offered. In the October 5 issue of Life magazine, Clare Boothe Luce, distinguished former U.S. Ambassador to Italy and formerly a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, presents her exposition of the Cuban situation and offers solutions for our dilemma there. Her article is, as is characteristic of Mrs. Luce, provocative and strong, it merits reading and consideration by all who seek to be informed on the difficulties which beset us in the Caribbean today. Mrs. Luce's article is appended hereto.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA AND THE UNFACED TRUTH—OUR GLOBAL DOUBLE BIND

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

During a nationally televised press conference a few weeks ago President Kennedy said, "I would like to * * * set [the Cuban situation] in perspective." This is precisely what he has failed to do. By resting the case against intervention on a shockingly erroneous estimate of our Cuban dilemma, the President has evaded a desperately urgent task—to alert the people of this Nation to the grave dangers we face.

What are the facts?

"The President feels that Cuba is a bone in his throat." So spoke one of President Kennedy's aids soon after the abortive invasion of the Bay of Pigs. Since then the obstruction in the Presidential gullet has become a large bone of national and international contention. How did it get stuck there in the first place? How big and how dangerous is it? Can it be dislodged short of war?

The President naturally wants to keep these awkward questions out of this fall's congressional elections. But the failure to ask them and to answer them is fraught with danger to the Nation.

Castro began as a bone in the throat of the Eisenhower administration 4 years ago. Two years later, Candidate Kennedy did his eloquent best to get Mr. Nixon to "strangle" on it. Picking the decline of American safety and prestige as his theme, Kennedy pointed to the rise of Castro as prime evidence that "our security and leadership are both slipping away." His Cuban policy was to "let the Cuban people know our determination that they will someday again be free," to "let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere," and especially to "end the harassment * * * of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. Thus far," Candidate Kennedy said, "these fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our Government. Hopefully," he said, "events may once again bring us an opportunity to [act] on behalf of the cause of freedom in Cuba."

Hopefully, events did bring the newly elected President this opportunity. In April 1961 President Kennedy authorized the Cuban invasion. But at the last and fateful hour he ordered the withdrawal of decisive U.S. air support, abandoning 1,400 "liberty-loving anti-Castro fighters for freedom" to Castro's tanks, jails and firing squads. His profile in courage turned into a profile of indecision.

In 1960, addressing himself to the military aspect of the Cuban situation, Senator Kennedy said, "I think Castro is a source of maximum danger. * * * A Communist menace * * * has been permitted to arise under our very noses, only 90 miles from our shores. * * * [Castro's] transformation of Cuba into a Communist base of operations * * * by jetplane, missile or submarine * * * is an incredibly dangerous development." Thus, he warned, "the whole Western Hemisphere security system is drastically threatened."

Today President Kennedy says, "Rash talk is cheap, particularly on the part of those who do not have the responsibility [for decision]." Referring to Soviet shipments to Cuba, the President now says that these "do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of this hemisphere." He strongly denies that the Communist buildup is such as "to endanger or interfere with our security," or that Cuba is "an offensive military base of significant capacity."

Why is President Kennedy so relatively calm today?

The President and his advisers have constantly failed to understand that the same ideological, political and military necessities which make it essential for the United States to maintain Berlin as a "showcase of democracy" on Russia's border are operating today from Moscow, to maintain Cuba as a "showcase of communism" on our shores.

Castro's Cuba, still only 90 miles off our shores, has the second strongest ground army in our hemisphere. Estimated at 400,000 men, including militia, it has received, since the failure of the invasion, over $175 million in military aid and supplies from Communist-bloc countries. Communist-made jeeps, jets, tanks, radar, and electronic equipment are almost daily arrivals in Cuban harbors. According to the State Department and intelligence reports, 4,500 Russian soldiers, sailors, and technicians are in Cuba helping Castro. They are training new pilots, ground crews, and artillery men. Just last week Castro announced construction of a 12-million-peso fishing port on the Cuban coast for use by the Russians. Sites for guided missiles and rockets and bases for submarines and submarine detection are possible. Cuba will be capable of inflicting great damage on the U.S. naval installation at Guantanamo. And behind these beefed-up forces stands the U.S.S.R., openly pledged to support them, with its atomic power if necessary.

The bitter truth is that Cuba today is a far more effective base of Communist activity than it was 2 years ago. It is now a bustling, well-organized jumping-off point into all its neighboring countries for Spanish-speaking spies, provocateurs, propagandists, and secret military agents. (Many of them, according to intelligence sources, have been operating among Cuban refugees and Puerto Rican citizens here in the United States.)

Mr. Kennedy indicates that his hopes of a peaceful solution of the Castro problem lie partially in the deterioration of the Cuban political and economic situation. Dangling the prospect of a convenient collapse before this Nation's eyes, he says, "Castro [is] in trouble. * * * His own followers are beginning to see that their revolution has been betrayed."

What are the chances of a successful rebellion by Castro's disillusioned people? His unpopularity with a great section of his populace can no longer be questioned. But the unjailed remnants of the Cuban underground today no longer have the means or the will to challenge Castro's Soviet-armed firing squads. Like the Hungarians before them, the Cuban people have learned the bitter lesson of resistance: that Soviet Russia will spring to the aid of Soviet dictators wherever they may be, but the United States will not always go to the aid of men fighting for their freedom.

Meanwhile, the rising generation in Cuba is being vigorously indoctrinated with antidemocratic, anti-United States and pro-Russian ideas. It is being taught to think of itself as the vanguard of the Communist liberation in the Western Hemisphere.

Radio Cuba broadcasts around the clock to all the Latin American nations. Their underprivileged masses are told that their economic and political freedom depends on booting out all pro-U.S. politicians, and elevating public officials who stand ready to join the dynamic ranks of Communist republics, which now, because of Castro, can truthfully be said to girdle the globe.

The United States, Radio Cuba claims, is lending billions of economic aid to its southern neighbors for one reason only: fear of Khrushchev and Castro. American aid, it warns, will die on the vine the day Castro is defeated. The argument is a powerful one. Probably all Latin American governments view Castro and communism at least in part as a dollar-generating program. It would explain why even pro-U.S. leaders are reluctant to take action against him or their own domestic Communists.

President Kennedy has said that "monumental economic mismanagement, supplemented by our refusal to trade with [Castro] has crumbled" the Cuban economy. This seems to suggest the hope that the regime will collapse of its own weight and thereby discredit communism.

How justified is that hope?

There is no question that in the last few years living standards under Castro have deteriorated appallingly—as they have under Walter Ulbricht in East Berlin and Janos Kadar in Hungary. In 1959, Cuban exports were $675 million and imports $740 million; today, exports are $320 million, imports $350 million. Roughly, Cuba has lost one-half of her world trade. Castro would indeed be ousted by his own people by now—except for one all-important fact: Kremlin support. When Castro came to power in 1959, 80 percent of Cuba's trade was with the United States. Today, 85 percent is with the Communist-bloc countries.

Today Castro and his country are in total hock to Moscow. If Castro should balk at this, or in any other way become a liability or nuisance, the Kremlin will quickly dispose of him.

President Eisenhower is quoted as having said recently that he had heard the term "peaceful blockade" but he didn't know what the term meant. A naval blockade, if it is to succeed, must be continuously maintained and enforced on vessels of all flags. Allied and neutral, no less than "enemy," vessels must be intercepted and cargoes dumped or returned to home ports. International law defines such a blockade as "an act of war carried out by the warships of a belligerent detailed to prevent access or departure from a defined part of the enemy's coast."

Americans will remember that Kaiser Bill's harassment of American shipping in 1917 was construed by Woodrow Wilson as an act of war on the part of Germany against the "neutral" United States. A naval blockade led directly to our entrance into World War I. Consequently, the establishment of a formal U.S. naval blockade against Cuba could be construed as an act of war by any nation whose vessel is so intercepted. It is, of course, reasonable to assume that however much a naval blockade against our allies would gum up our relations with them, they would not war against America for turning back their Cuba-bound trade vessels. What is certain is that Cuba would declare a naval blockade to be an act of war, and that the U.S.S.R. would endorse that declaration.

Thus, putting the Cuban situation in its true perspective would require the President to make an excruciatingly painful admission: That the failure to carry through the Cuban invasion in April 1961 has already had dangerous, and perhaps disastrous, consequences for American global policies. No peaceful action that the United States can presently take can be counted on to end the Soviet buildup in Cuba.

Whatever usefulness or validity the historic Monroe Doctrine may have had before the invasion, the failure of that invasion and subsequent events would seem to have destroyed them. The doctrine, proclaimed by President James Monroe on December 2, 1823, warned the European powers that "we should consider any attempt * * * to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." (It is an irony of history that what inspired this doctrine was the attempt of Imperial Russia to penetrate "peacefully" into the American Northwest.)

By April of 1961, Castro was openly under the Soviet wing. Mr. Kennedy gave the invasion go-light even though OAS approval had not been secured. But when he withdrew U.S. air support at the last moment, one reason apparently was his consideration for the multilateral concept of the Monroe Doctrine.

Despite such lipservice to the Monroe Doctrine, the President (currently using the voice of Senator Hubert Humphrey) now wishes to supplant it with the "Kennedy doctrine." What is the Kennedy doctrine?

An analysis of the President's hard-core position on Cuba shows it to be this: The United States will not initiate any military action against a peaceful extension of Soviet power in our hemisphere, or a defensive Soviet military buildup in Cuba, but it will consider an offensive buildup to be dangerous to our safety. And, in the event of an armed attack by satellite Cuba against the United States or any of its neighbors, the United States is determined not to wait for other OAS nations to take action—it will unilaterally counterattack the attackers.

Upon even closer examination, this Kennedy doctrine looks quite familiar. And so it is. The Kennedy doctrine proves to be the 15-year-old Truman-Eisenhower doctrine, designed to contain Soviet Russia in areas outside the American hemisphere. The essential feature of that doctrine is, and always has been, nonaggression while maintaining the military capacity to retaliate in kind against Communist military initiatives. It incorporates the military tit-for-tat or retaliation principle—the ultimate tit-for-tat being, of course, massive retaliation. The rationale behind the doctrine of containment was the realistic acceptance of the European satellite states as legitimate zones of Russian concern and influence. Stripped of its double-talk, the Kennedy doctrine plunks for the application of this old Truman-Eisenhowever containment doctrine to our own hemisphere. Apparently so long as the U.S.S.R. does not use Cuba as an offensive base, it is now to be considered as a legitimate zone of Russian power.

So, the United States has now been placed in a global double bind. If the United States should intervene in Cuba, it must do so at the risk of exposing all its military bases and positions in Europe, the Near East, and Asia to the threat of Russian or Communist flanking attacks. But, if it does not intervene and should serious trouble—short of ultimate nuclear war—begin in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Laos, Vietnam, Formosa, or Korea, the United States now risks exposing the Western Hemisphere not only to constant Soviet reconnaissance but also to flanking attacks from Cuba.

The United States is now faced with two dismaying alternatives: to challenge Russian power in our hemisphere now, at the risk of war breaking out on other global fronts and (unless diplomatic concessions are made quickly there) escalating into world war III; or to sit and wait while Soviet military power is consolidated in our hemisphere, with the very real possibility that communism will take over large areas of Latin America.

It is in this grim global perspective that the people of this Nation must now debate the question of whether or not intervention is "required or justified" in Cuba. In concealing the extent of our dilemma, the President is denying the citizens of this Nation the right of a free people to debate crucial national issues with all the relevant facts before them. Short-range political astuteness may indicate the need to play down the size of the present crisis. But long-range statesmanship solemnly demands that the truth be told.

What is now at stake in the decision for intervention or nonintervention in Cuba is the question not only of American prestige but of American survival. If the decision is not to intervene, then that means the United States accepts the existence of Soviet military and political power in the Western Hemisphere. Postponing the decision to intervene will not make it any easier. The same arguments which are used against intervention today could and would be used when Russia has control of half a dozen hemisphere countries. If the United States deems that Russian military power in this hemisphere is intolerable, it would be the part of wisdom to say so clearly now, and to act accordingly. The vast majority of the American people, including most of the President's critics and opponents, will support the President when he takes action.

THE TIME IS NOW

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are quite used to the war correspondents of the great dailies and wire services traveling to the world's trouble spots to cover a story. The Negro community of New York had the opportunity of receiving such on-the-spot coverage when one of its own, Mr. James L. Hicks, executive editor of the New York Amsterdam News went to Oxford, Miss., to report on the recent unfortunate developments there.

Subsequent to his return Mr. Hicks has written a challenging editorial which merits, I feel, general attention. His challenge is constructive, a plea for understanding, and indicative of his mature philosophy that the solution for wrongs is to right them, not to compound them with further acrimony. The editorial is appended hereto.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Time Is Now

Student bodies of universities all over the world are generally in the forefront of the most forward-looking steps taken in any nation.

Wherever we have had great reform in industry we have had student bodies, the illegentsia, if you please, in the forefront of such movements.

And in thinking of this we can't help but note what a great opportunity the students at Mississippi University had to launch, initiate or join in a southwide movement that could quickly bring about the end of such bigotry and foolishness as we have seen recently evidenced in the James H. Meredith case.

What a golden opportunity for the president of the Student Council at the University of Mississippi to be able to start a movement on his own campus that would bring about the complete acceptance of James H. Meredith as a "black rebel" student, the first in the 114 year history of Ole Miss.

Such acceptance of Meredith's admission at Ole Miss is as certain to eventually follow as the day follows the night. It's only a matter of time.

But how wonderful it would be—what great stature the student body of Ole Miss could rise to if the students themselves would today take the situation by the horns, dash silly tradition and say to themselves that time must be "now."

VOTING PROCEDURE IN UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have received from the Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of United Nations Affairs Harlan Cleveland, a pertinent letter which clarifies a point made by me in debate, in which I said that a nation which, following decisions of the International Court of Justice, fails to pay its current U.N. assessment for 2 years will not automatically lose its right to vote in the General Assembly, but that that right must be denied to it by a vote of the General Assembly.

The Department of State takes the view that that is not so; that delinquent states automatically lose their right to vote if they are more than 2 years in arrears, and that this point may be made on a simple point of order to the President of the General Assembly.

I think this statement is so important that, with the permission of the Department of State, I ask unanimous consent that the letter dated September 28, 1962, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1962.

We are taking the position in the General Assembly that the denial of the right to vote is automatic whenever a country is more than 2 years in arrears.

Article 19 simply says that: "A member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years."

The U.S. view, which we have been promoting with other countries, is that this language is fully automatic. As a matter of fact, no country has ever been in the condition described in the sentence I have just quoted from article 19—but several countries paid up part of their arrears shortly before the current General Assembly, to avoid being the guinea pigs under this article. But when and if the conditions do arise, we believe the President of the General Assembly would simply declare that the country in question would not be made a part of the next rollcall or would skip the country's name in calling the roll. (There is precedent for this in other international organizations that have similar "loss of vote" articles.)

That ruling could no doubt be challenged and, if so, would go to a general vote of the General Assembly. Moreover, article 19 also provides that the General Assembly may "permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member."

Both the appeal from a ruling by the Chair or an appeal to be excused from the sanction in article 19 on grounds of hardship would require affirmative action by the General Assembly. But the denial of the vote, as such, should be fully automatic.

I mention this because I think it is important that other nations not derive the impression that there is argument in this country among supporters of the United Nations as to whether article 19 would be automatically applied or not. I'm sure you will appreciate the importance of this in the context of the discussions to be held—by Ambassador Klutznick and one of your colleagues, Senator ALLOTT—in the Fifth Committee of the 17th General Assembly this fall.

Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

HARLAN CLEVELAND,
Assistant Secretary.

THE WORLD GROWS UP—AND SO DO WE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the New York Times of this morning there is a news story which can give us at least a little hope that the tragic events in Mississippi have added to the sum total of human understanding. As Mr. Meredith was reported to have said after his registration at the university, it was "not a happy occasion." Yet it was an occasion at which principle, law, and, above all, morality prevailed in the face of an enemy—man's blind fear and hatred of some of his fellows—who has throughout human history compiled a deplorable record of victories.

The news story to which I refer deals with the reaction of those countries to the events in Mississippi, which have an overriding interest in our Nation's policies with respect to its own nonwhite citizens. Those countries with a nonwhite citizenry of their own are not unaware of the problems they themselves must solve—but in seeking guidance to the solution of these problems they look with great care on the actions of those who are leaders in the world. I believe that our national implementation of the law, in upholding the right of a qualified citizen to an opportunity to receive an education, was vital proof of the sincerity of our public protestations.

Mr. President, I believe also that the favorable reaction cited in this story gives proof of how close to disaster, in terms of our moral standing and our self-respect, we stood last week—and that it gives proof that our cherished way of life can only survive if it lives up to its own standards. I ask unanimous consent to have the news story printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. RACIAL ACTION PRAISED IN AFRICA—FIRM HANDLING OF MISSISSIPPI CRISIS SAID TO HAVE MADE A FAVORABLE IMPRESSION

(By David Binder)

WASHINGTON, October 11.—The Federal Government's firm handling of the Mississippi crisis has made favorable impression in Africa, according to information available here.

At the height of the crisis, when U.S. troops and Federal marshals were dispatched to the University of Mississippi to back the registration of a Negro student, James H. Meredith, the President of Mali, Modibo Keita, cabled President Kennedy his congratulations for acting decisively.

Mr. Keita's government has developed strong ties to the Soviet bloc in recent months, so the cable, dated October 1, was viewed here with surprise and pleasure.

REACTION A SURPRISE

Mr. Kennedy wired his thanks to the Mali leader last October 3.

At the same time, it was reported that Guinean political leaders reacted with similar approval of the Federal actions in Mississippi.

Rather than deplore the segregationist attitudes of some southerners, which the Guineans knew existed, they are quoted as saying, in effect: "What country in the world would mobilize a whole army to get a Negro student into college?"

These impressions contrast with the expectations of some observers here, who thought that the Mississippi crisis would be regarded as new evidence of racism in the United States.

Qualified observers in Washington declare they are quite pleased with this country's performance in African nations as compared with that of the Soviet bloc.

In Guinea, for example, official doors that were once closed to Americans and open to Russians are now said to be somewhat more ajar for U.S. diplomats.

The prime cause for this change is said to be the so-called Communist plot uncovered in Conakry last December that led to the ouster of the Russian Ambassador.

RUSSIAN FAUX PAS

But U.S. sources contend that the poor performance of Soviet aid and development programs, as well as the uningratiating behavior of Russian technicians, contributed to the wave of Communist influence in Guinea.

American sources contend the Russians committed several faux pas. Once they backslapped Guinean mining officials, calling them "comrade" and using the familiar "tu" (you) in French, rather than the more formal "vous."

The Guineans, it was asserted, resented this familiarity. Soviet officials are said to have shunned contacts with ordinary Guineans. Some natives, it was said, suspect them of snobbery and racist sentiments.

On the other hand, the Americans assert, G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, who is a backslapper with the best of them, immediately achieved rapport with Guinean leaders, including President Sekou Toure, during a recent visit.

The difference, according to observers, was that Mr. Williams knew his "tu" from his "vous" and demonstrated appreciation for Guinean sophistication in political affairs.

The list of recent American gains and Russian setbacks in Guinea, attested to by U.S. sources, is a long one.

It includes such items as the ouster of about 60 French Communist teachers along with the Russian Ambassador; the padlocking of a Communist book store that had been distributing propaganda; enactment of a law guaranteeing foreign investments; the joining of the International Monetary Fund; an invitation to the Peace Corps; and votes against the Soviet bloc in the United Nations.

YOUTH OF ALL NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from Miss Eugenia Barton, a young lady in her senior year at Cornell University, telling me of the organization, Youth of All Nations, Inc., YOAN for short. YOAN has established a correspondence exchange between young people throughout the world to introduce individual citizens of the United States to those of other countries. Each participant in the program makes a formal application to YOAN, which includes pertinent background information about his hobbies, education, and language abilities.

Miss Barton has described to me the value which 4 years of such corresponding with young people in other countries has meant to her. I wish to call this to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate, because I believe that it is through such programs which facilitate the frank exchange of ideas by our youth that the people of this world may eventually find a wider and deeper understanding to help us to live together and work together.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Barton's letter be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am studying international relations at Cornell University, where I am a senior. This summer I have been working as a guide at the United Nations. (Incidentally, because I speak Russian fluently, I have been assigned to guide some visiting Russians, too.)

This letter concerns an organization to which I have belonged for 4 years—Youth of All Nations, Inc., YOAN for short, located at 16 St. Luke's Place, New York, N.Y. YOAN's purpose is to acquaint young people all over the world with each other through carefully arranged personal correspondence. However, it is not a simple addresses exchange, but prospective members must first answer questions about their schooling, ambitions, hobbies, knowledge of foreign languages, etc. Then, they are introduced to someone in another country with similar interests. The program is primarily aimed at college age students and more serious teenagers rather than young children.

Members of YOAN also receive the organization's magazine, called Mirror for Youth, to which they contribute their experiences and ideas, and share their letters; for, of course, no one member can possibly correspond with all countries.

I cannot express how much membership in YOAN has benefited me. Not only has my international understanding increased, but now I have good friends in Italy and Sweden, and I am just beginning correspondence with members in Spain and South Vietnam. We exchange viewpoints, political ideas, local news, experiences, etc. I am also learning why our culture and politics are sometimes criticized, and why certain misunderstandings about Americans might arise.

My friends who belong to YOAN also think very highly of it. The organization is nonprofit, nonsectarian, and nonpartisan, and is headed by Miss Clara Leiser, its founder. Its work should be made more widely known and it should also be better supported, because it has been doing an excellent job in increasing international understanding. The young people who belong to YOAN are usually the more articulate elements of their societies and in a few years they will be the leaders. If they can be helped to understand the same generation in other areas of the world, then much is being done to help peace.

Do you think it would be possible for you to include something about YOAN in your reports to your constituents? in print or by radio-TV? If you will do this, please ask interested persons aged 14 to 24 to send a self-addressed, stamped envelope, and 10 cents (for handling costs) to Youth of All Nations, 16 St. Luke's Place, New York 14, N.Y. If you wish more information, please contact Miss Leiser or me. The YOAN telephone number is Watkins 4–1368.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,

Eugenia Barton.

SARATOGA BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL PARK AND CEMETERY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution I have received from the board of supervisors of Schenectady County, N.Y., with reference to the need for a third battlefield cemetery in that area.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution 141

Resolution on Saratoga Battlefield National Park National Cemetery urged

Whereas Federal authorities have determined there is a need for an additional national cemetery in New York State to meet the growing demands for burial space for our honored veterans; and

Whereas the two existing national cemeteries are located at Elmira and Farmingdale—both approximately 200 miles from Schenectady County; and

Whereas it would seem logical to establish a third national cemetery in the immediate area; and

Whereas facilities and space are now available at the Saratoga Battlefield National Park as a memorial site that would lend dignity and prestige to such a cemetery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Schenectady County Board of Supervisors give its full support and approval of efforts now being made by the Schenectady County Committee of the American Legion to establish a national cemetery at Saratoga Battlefield National Park; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to our congressional representatives in Washington and the Schenectady County American Legion.

PROPOSED FEDERAL CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEET

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a longtime supporter of a Federal capital budget I was delighted to read in a recent column by the former administration's Bureau of the Budget chief, Maurice Stans, a suggestion that the Federal budget provide a consolidated balance sheet listing the Government's assets and liabilities, in addition to the customary cash-in and cash-out statement.

Mr. Stans correctly points out that the taxpayer would like to know how much the Government has invested in "loans, stockpiles, securities, farm products, foreign currencies, working funds, public buildings, Government-owned corporations, and so on."

If such a balance sheet were prepared, it would indicate the extent of Federal investment in the Federal power program, together with the handsome return which the U.S. Treasury is earning on this investment. In fact, such a balance sheet might prevent Mr. Stans and the private power companies from parroting endlessly the line about how much the Federal power program allegedly costs the taxpayers.

Mr. Stans, in another column published in the Washington Post on September 30, carried this unsupported charge, and others, to ridiculous lengths. He contended that if only the private power companies did not have to pay taxes, they could reduce rates by 25 percent and thus remove the only advantage of "federalized power" which he equates with "industrial socialism and higher taxes." I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Stans' column of that date printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Who Pays for Federal Power?

(By Maurice H. Stans)

The investor-owned electric utilities in the United States last year paid $1.312 billion in Federal income taxes and $1.104 billion in State and local taxes. Would you be willing to eliminate all these taxes in the future, and make the electric companies tax free?

Before you answer, think it over. A saving of $2.416 billion in this way to the utilities would make it possible for them to cut all their electricity rates by about one-fourth. This would be quite a saving for everyone. This is what happens in areas where Federal power systems operate, like TVA and others. They do have low electricity rates.

So far it sounds good.

But then comes the inevitable question. Who would make up the loss in revenues to the Federal and local governments?

The answer is that you and other property holders and income earners in the country would have to pay nearly $2½ billion more in taxes—of one kind or another—for the governments to operate.

This circle illustrates a major distinction between Federal power and private power. Federal power is cheaper only because it shifts a burden of Government upkeep on to others.

To clarify this, let's look at the various costs involved in your electric bill:

Rather obviously such items as fuel, material, equipment, and supplies presumably can be bought at similar prices by private enterprise or Government. Labor rates should be roughly comparable also, or else the labor unions should look into the matter. So this leaves one other major item:

Taxes currently are taking around 24 cents out of every $1 billed to customers by private enterprise utilities. But Federal power enterprises pay no Federal taxes and out of each revenue dollar may pay little or nothing to local and State governments.

Sometimes there is a further difference. Utilities must borrow large sums of money to build their plants and distribution networks. The Federal Government can borrow a little cheaper than private companies. Local tax-exempt bodies can borrow still cheaper. And one Federal program, the Rural Electrification Administration, borrows from the Federal Treasury at 2 percent although the Government has to pay around 4 percent for the long-term funds it lends the REA. Again the taxpayer makes it up.

So if the price paid for Federal power is lower than that for private enterprise power, you can credit these two cost breaks for which every taxpayer is paying extra to make up the difference.

At the present time one-eighth of the installed generating capacity in the United States is Federal power. The pressures for more spreading of this deceptive bargain grow regularly.

REA asked for a record appropriation of nearly half a billion dollars this year (although 98 percent of the farmers now have central station electricity). A proposal to build a Federal power unit at an atomic site at Hanford, Wash., was barely defeated in Congress a short time ago. And now Government planners are advocating construction of a Federal national power grid, although private power companies have a nationwide system of interconnections and are building more each year.

The arguments of Federal power proponents don't hold water:

1. There is no need for Federal power where private companies are willing and able to do the job, and this is almost everywhere. The capacity of the industry has doubled about every 10 years.

2. Private utilities have the means and the finances. They already have invested $46 billion in power facilities and have been spending $3.2 billion a year on new plant and equipment. They will have $88 billion invested by 1970.

3. Federal power costs in actuality are not cheaper. Federal power rates are lower only because of Federal subsidy through tax-exemption and cheap money. Indeed, the added tax burden of existing federalized power currently exceeds the supposed savings from its cheap power.

Nor can the argument be used that private utilities are gouging the public. Private utility returns are regulated rigidly by Government public utilities commissions which ordinarily allow between 5 and 7 percent on invested capital—hardly a get-rich-quick return.

The real issue in Federal power, then, is not efficiency or economy of operation. The real issue is whether we want growing Government and ultimate socialization of the power industry. There is no need for any increase in Federal power if private industry does the job as it has and can. The trend ought to be the other way, if we believe in free enterprise and in tax equity. The Government ought to give private companies the opportunity to take over the Federal power operations upon a demonstration of their ability to do so.

Unless the trend of recent years is stopped, the cost of Federal power to us taxpayers can be expected to go up.

Matched against any standard, the investor-owned electric power industry has demonstrated an amazing record of competence, progress and service. Rates today are about one-third of what they were 50 years ago. America has more power capacity than the next five countries in the world combined—three times that of the Soviet Union. The American home uses nearly eight times the electricity of the Russian home.

The electric industry is today one of the outstanding examples of successful free enterprise. Should we allow it to be slowly destroyed at the price of industrial socialism and higher taxes?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, demonstrating once again the vast ignorance of the Nation's resource development program which characterized the thinking of the no-new-starters in the Eisenhower administration, Mr. Stans proceeded in his September 30 column to trot out all of the old cliches of the power company propagandists. I have taken a few of the most flagrant distortions and prepared a point-by-point rebuttal, for the illumination of Senators who may have read the column, or who have seen recent advertisements of the electric companies' advertising program.

CONSUMERS PAY TAXES OF PRIVATE UTILITIES

Mr. Stans says that the private power companies paid $2.4 billion in Federal, State, and local taxes last year, and that if they did not have to pay these taxes they could reduce electric rates by about one fourth.

This is what happens in areas where Federal power systems operate, like TVA and others—

Mr. Stans said.

They do have low electricity rates.

Supposing we did relieve the power companies of the obligation to pay taxes—which they do not really "pay" at all, but merely tack onto the consumer's electric bill. Could we expect them to pass these savings along to consumers?

The power companies have been enjoying spectacular tax benefits in recent years, yet the Federal Power Commission's annual report on residential electric bills indicates that electric rates continue to go up. By the end of 1962, private power companies will have piled up an estimated $1.7 billion in tax savings from the fast tax writeoff and liberalized depreciation provisions of the 1954 tax laws.

That was one of the Republican administration's greatest giveaways to the vested interests of this country. It is to be expected that one of the key men in that administration would present such false propaganda to the American people in the column to which I have referred.

In a few States, the regulatory commissions have required these savings to be passed along to consumers, but in many, the electric companies collect these "phantom taxes" from their ratepayers and then use the proceeds to invest in plant or to pay out as tax-free "return of capital" to stockholders. More than $100 million of this tax saving already has gone to stockholders as tax-free dividends.

The Federal Power Commission has ruled that the companies do not need to give consumers the benefit of liberalized depreciation, but I am happy to note that this matter is now being restudied by the Commission.

A new tax subsidy was handed the private utilities just last month: Under the investment incentive of the new tax laws, regulated utilities may deduct for tax purposes 3 percent of the cost of new facilities—an estimated 9 percent of their total tax bill, or about $100 million a year.

The Kennedy administration is just as wrong as the Eisenhower administration was in regard to this kind of giveaway. But to the everlasting credit of the President of the United States, I point out that it was not a part of his proposal. Instead, it was done by a coalition of reactionaries. An overwhelming majority of Republicans, assisted by Democrats in both Houses of Congress, have imposed this giveaway on the taxpayers of the Nation.

So far as I am concerned, Republicans and Democrats, alike, who voted for that nefarious so-called reform bill—although the word "reform" should be struck from it—will be held to an accounting on November 6, as they should be. On November 6, the taxpayers should hold them to a strict accounting for this and other great mistakes which these Members of Congress have made—for the so-called tax reform bill is but one of the great congressional mistakes for which I hope the voters will demand an accounting on November 6.

TAX WRITEOFF SAVINGS NOT PASSED ON TO CONSUMERS

No one knows whether this saving will be passed on to consumers. The history of fast tax writeoffs indicates that in most States it will not be. A September 27, 1962, decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals, in the case of Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. versus Federal Power Commission, if allowed to stand, will permit a regulated utility not only to invest these tax savings in new plant, but also to earn its normal rate of return for stockholders on this unintentional investment by the ratepayers.

Senators will recall the shocking tax writeoff which the Idaho Power Co. tried to get by with in the days when the fight was being made on the floor of the Senate to save for the American people the greatest remaining damsite for hydroelectric power in the Nation—the Hells Canyon Dam. The great Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] led the way on the issue in regard to the tax writeoff scandal involving the Idaho Power Co.; and the two Senators from Oregon assisted the Senator from Tennessee. When the Senate came to understand that shocking giveaway by the Republican administration to the private utilities, that turned the tide in the Senate on the Hells Canyon Dam bill, and the Senate passed the bill. A combination of reactionaries—again an overwhelming majority of the Republicans, assisted by reactionary Democrats, who should be sitting on the Republican side of the aisle in both Houses of Congress—then joined in killing the Hells Canyon Dam bill in the House committee.

The fight to protect the people's interest in the waters of the Nation that are owned by the people—not by the private utilities—is one which the liberals have waged for years on the floor of this historic Chamber. Hiram Johnson, McNary, Borah, La Follette, Couzens, Brookhart, Murray, and many others of the liberals who preceded us in this body sought for decades to warn the American people about what the private utilities were up to in regard to the matter of hydroelectric power. But the utilities would have the American people forget that the navigable streams of the Nation are owned by the people of the Nation, not by private utilities. They would have the people of the Nation forget that whatever private utility advantages are given in connection with any stream in the Nation are matters of privilege, not of right, and that the rights to these waters vest in the American people.

It required a McNary from my State and a Franklin Delano Roosevelt—a great Republican and a great Democrat—to stop the private utilities from scuttling the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, for in regard to the Grand Coulee Dam, they attempted the same shell game on the American taxpayers. The utilities were successful in getting by with it a few decades later at Hells Canyon Dam. When Franklin Delano Roosevelt realized that the private utilities were attempting to follow a course of action which would have prevented the construction of the great multiple-purpose dam at Grand Coulee, he joined with McNary in seeing to it that that "steal" on the part of the private utilities was scotched.

We must constantly be on guard in protecting the interests of the taxpayers in hydroelectric power. Propagandists such as Stans are used by the private utilities in their attempts to deceive the American people about the facts in connection with this power issue.

That is why I take the time in the closing hours of this session of Congress—at least, Mr. President, I hope they are the closing hours—once again to warn the American people, as I have done many times from this desk in the Senate, about what the private utilities are up to, in their attempts to steal from the taxpayers the precious economic rights to the streams of the Nation which belong to all the American people. That is why I take the time tonight to warn the people of the Nation about the misleading propaganda that Stans and the private utilities he speaks for are disseminating in advertisements and articles throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I would have the American people remember that the accumulated tax savings came originally from the ratepayers, to pay the utility taxes that would have been paid except for a gimmick in the tax law. Regardless of whether this gravy is paid to the stockholders as tax-free dividends, or is invested in plant, and thus earns more money for the stockholders, the stockholders—not the ratepaying public—will be the ones who will benefit.

PUBLIC POWER IS NOT TAX FREE

Mr. Stans says public power is cheap because it is tax free. But neither Federal nor local public power is tax free. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the Tennessee Valley Authority paid $6,740,153, in the form of in-lieu-of-tax payments, to 7 States and 130 counties in which it operates, while the municipal and rural electric cooperative distributors of TVA power paid about $12 million. These State and local in-lieu-of-tax payments are geared to the taxes which would have been paid by profitmaking power companies. In addition, TVA turned over the remainder of its net earnings—a 100-percent tax—to the Federal Treasury.

The municipalities and utility districts distributing Bonneville power pay either taxes or make in-lieu-of-tax payments to their local governments and States, in addition to making very substantial contributions in the form of reduced rates for schools, municipal buildings, and street lighting.

The net revenues of these systems are used to pay off bonds or to improve the systems, thus increasing the equity of all citizens of the community, in effect an additional in-lieu-of-tax payment.

Why does not Mr. Stans tell that? Why is he not journalistically truthful enough to tell the facts to the American people about the taxes which are paid and the income that these great public institutions pour into the Treasury of the United States and into the tax coffers of States, municipalities, and counties?

I will tell Senators why, Mr. President—because for years the private utilities have been carrying on a "big lie" technique in this democracy of ours, seeking to deceive the American people in regard to the great earnings that these great powerplants pay back to the consumers and the taxpayers of this country. It is not pleasant to have to call this misrepresentation of the private utilities to the attention of the people, but this program of misrepresentation by the private utilities of America, through its many mouthpieces, is an example of the brainwashing technique in America. We must have politicians with the courage and "guts" to stand up in the parliamentary halls of America and take on these deceivers of the public.

This kind of misrepresentation to the American people must be answered every time it is tried. Of course, Mr. Stans said nothing in his column about the income that the people, through their government, get from public power, nor the income that local governmental units get by way of taxes paid and payments in lieu of taxes, because if he told the whole truth, his case would fall to the ground.

TAXES, OTHER PUBLIC BENEFITS RECEIVED FROM PUBLIC POWER

As I said, the net revenues of these systems are used to pay off bonds or to improve the systems, thus increasing the equity of all citizens of the community, in effect an additional in-lieu-of-tax payment.

As an example, Seattle City Light had $38.1 million in gross revenues in 1960, of which $3.4 million was paid in direct taxes and $6.6 million was used to increase citizen equity in the system—for a total of $9.9 million, or 25.9 percent of the municipal utility's gross income. The system provided $470,516 in free street lighting service as well. In addition to these benefits, consumers of electricity in Seattle saved $12 million on their electric bills as compared to the rates of the nearest private utility. Total benefits to Seattle ratepayers and taxpayers, who are essentially the same people, totaled $23 million, out of gross revenues of $38 million.

But not a whisper from the propagandists of the private utilities about those facts, not a syllable in the article by Mr. Stans about those facts, because those facts cannot be reconciled with the propaganda technique of the private utilities, for which Mr. Stans is obviously a spokesman.

But we ought to expect that, coming as it does from someone out of the former Eisenhower administration. We were confronted then with an administration that was against all new starts for the development of great multipurpose dams which belong to the people of this country. We were confronted with an administration that sought to foist upon the people of this country the catch-slogan program called partnership in the field of power development.

As my late colleague Dick Neuberger said in describing the partnership program, it was the program of the Eisenhower administration by which the taxpayers would buy the cow and the private utilities would milk her. Under the partnership scheme, the private utilities would get the profits from the dams and the American people would pay for the so-called nonreimbursable costs of the dams. They would pay for flood control, navigation improvements, bank protection, recreational facilities, and recreational costs; and the private utilities would take the profits. That was the Republican administration's program.

Therefore, we should not be surprised that the man who ran its budget office, who is now writing for the private utilities, would write such a column as this. It is in line with the Eisenhower program of taking from the many for the benefit of the few.

Thank God, we have an administration now under a President dedicated to benefiting the many, recognizing that in a democracy as the many are benefited, every segment of the economy is also benefited, including reactionary business segments of the economy that almost invariably oppose any legislation aimed at benefiting the general welfare of the American people.

NEW DAMS STARTED OVER REPUBLICAN OPPOSITION

I shall always be proud of the Congress of the United States during the Republican administration. Under the leadership furnished by the Senate, when that administration submitted to us a budget containing not a single cent for the development of a multipurpose dam and tried to limit new construction, the phony partnership dams, such as Cougar, Green Peter, John Day, and others in my State, some of us in the Senate made it equally clear that we did not propose to give away the rights of this generation and future generations of Americans to the private utilities of this country. We offered amendment after amendment, year after year, under the 8 years of the Republican "no new start" program, and year after year we added funds to the appropriation bills in an effort to protect the public interest. The result was John Day, Cougar, and Green Peter rising to their economic majesty as people's dams, not private utility dams.

Some weeks ago I had the thrilling experience of attending the dedication of Hill's Creek Dam in my State; but if Eisenhower had had his way, we never would have dedicated a multipurpose dam belonging to the people of this country. We would have dedicated a partnership dam, with the power facilities being skimmed off for the selfish profits of the private utilities.

There must be constant, eternal vigilance exercised in the Congress against such selfish interests as the private utilities, who always seek to take every advantage that comes their way to take away from the American people the economic rights that belong to them.

PUBLIC POWER TAXES

Public utility districts in Oregon pay the same property taxes which the private utilities pay, and also are subject to the State's corporate excise tax, which amounts to roughly 7 percent of their net income. All of the municipal electric systems in Oregon of which I have any knowledge make substantial in-lieu-of-tax payments to their municipal governments.

One can read not only the Stans propaganda column but also the private utility advertisements in vain to find any such facts as I have just given to the Senate of the United States as to what the public utilities pay as to taxes or payments in lieu of taxes.

Nationwide, a survey by the American Public Power Association indicates that the local public power systems pay an average of 13 percent of gross revenues to local governments in the form of taxes, in-lieu-of-tax payments and free or under-priced services, compared with 10 percent paid in State and local taxes by the private power companies.

The figures prove that the public power utilities pay more by way of money and services into the treasuries of the local government units than do the private utilities.

FINANCING COSTS DIFFERENT

Mr. Stans contends that public power systems can raise capital more cheaply than can the private power companies, and that this is another reason for their rate disadvantage.

While tax-free municipal bonds undoubtedly command a lower interest rate on the average than utility bonds, the interest rates also depend heavily upon the financial strength of the utility.

However, differences in bond financing costs are a very small part of the financing picture.

The big spread in costs comes from private utility stock financing, which returns to investors as much as 9.3 percent annually—Montana Power Co.'s average rate of return, 1958 through 1960—and virtually always costs the utility 6 percent or more.

A study by Gus Norwood, executive secretary of Northwest Public Power Association, shows that if private utilities used bond rather than stock financing, the interest savings would be about 20 percent of gross revenues. Mr. Norwood's study, incidentally, shows that private power companies pay just under 20 percent of their total earnings for taxes of all kinds. I ask unanimous consent to have this study printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Stans implies in his column that they pay 25 percent in Federal taxes alone. When he states that taxes "currently are taking around 24 cents out of every $1 billed to customers by private enterprise utilities," we should remember that only a part of the taxes billed to consumers ever get to the Federal Treasury, thanks to tax gimmicks. Mr. Stans declares that Federal power is not necessary, it is subsidized by taxpayers generally, and is "industrial socialism."

MULTIPLE BENEFITS FROM PUBLIC DAMS

Mr. President, I point out that a good many public power utilities involve power taken from the great multiple-purpose dams of America, such as Grand Coulee, McNary, The Dalles, and many other multiple-purpose dams for the construction of which we have battled our hearts out for many years.

Those dams perform many public purposes other than the development of public power. They provide water for irrigation. They provide great reclamation projects. They provide lakes for recreation, calling for maintenance costs. They provide great aids to fisheries; as well as many other nonreimbursable costs. These are known as the nonreimbursable costs of the great power dams which, however, perform very valuable public services.

Therefore, when we look at the value of public power to the American consumer and taxpayer, we must also look at the many other benefits which the American consumer and taxpayer get out of these great hydroelectric dams which generate this public power.

The Federal power program is usually a byproduct of the multipurpose development of water resources. To build a dam for flood control, navigation, or irrigation and to permit the energy released by the falling water to go to waste would be sheer extravagance, as Congress has recognized for more than 50 years. The powerplant frequently is the only revenue-producing feature of a multipurpose dam, and it helps to pay for the entire project.

Where a Federal multipurpose project contains power facilities, they are financed on a businesslike basis with strict legal requirement that the cost of these facilities must be repaid with interest over the life of the project from proceeds of power sales.

I shall always be proud of the fact that the first bill which was ever passed by Congress on this subject matter was the bill I introduced several years ago. It was known as the Crooked River reclamation project. It is a project built on Crooked River in southeastern Oregon, as a reclamation project. Much of the cost was to be paid for from the power resources of The Dalles Dam, several hundred miles away.

However, we took the position that the development of the reclamation needs of the Pacific Northwest was also a need that the Federal Government should assist in paying for; not totally, because the ranchers themselves made their contributions under the reclamation projects.

There was quite a controversy in the Senate about that pilot bill. It finally passed in the Senate by a substantial majority, but it became logjammed in the House.

I well remember how the then majority leader, now the Vice President of the United States, went with me one afternoon to the office of the Speaker of the House, the incomparable Sam Rayburn, to whom I explained how important it was that we establish this legislative precedent, because it represented a sound conservation program. I pointed out that, as we move into the future with more and more needs for river basin development in connection with reclamation, range development, and power development, it will be necessary to have a legislative principle established which would make it possible to pay for the so-called nonreimbursable costs, in part, at least, out of the power resources belonging to all the taxpayers, which are collected from the multiple-purpose hydroelectric dams.

The late Speaker of the House had great fun with me in my presentation of my case for releasing for action in the House the Crooked River project bill. With his wonderful sense of humor, he said, "WAYNE, do you think you could get the name of that project changed? I would have much more chance of getting it released if you could call it something besides the Crooked River project."

I pointed out to the Speaker that I could not change the Crooked River in Oregon, but that I would be willing to go with him to any House Member who thought that the name caused any reflection on the substance of my bill.

To make the long story short, the Speaker had the bill released, and the House passed it. It has served as a precedent. Another precedent was the supplying of irrigation water to try to stop the dropping of the water table in the area of The Dalles, Oreg., which, if it had not been stopped, would have destroyed many hundreds of acres of valuable orchards. The same principle is applied now to obtaining water and paying for a part of its cost out of the power proceeds of The Dalles Dam.

When we talk about public power, and when we listen to the misleading propaganda of the private utilities, I advise the American people to be on guard against their deception. Readers will not find in their articles, such as the Stans article, to which I am replying this evening, or in the advertisements of the private utilities, the facts about the contributions that these great public power multiple-purpose dams make to other economic needs of the American people in connection with navigation costs and irrigation costs, and in connection with the cost of range rehabilitation, which is a part of a river basin development program.

Therefore, I believe it is extremely important for us to keep in mind that the public utilities not only pay taxes, or make payments in lieu of taxes, but that they also provide revenues for the Treasury, which make it possible for the Federal Government to contribute through just such projects as the two I have mentioned, the legislative precedent for which was established in the Morse bill known as the Crooked River reclamation project.

Thus the users of Federal electricity pay back every penny invested in the powerplant, and at many projects they are paying part of the cost of the dam and subsidizing irrigation as well. It could be argued that, far from taking subsidies from the taxpayers generally, the users of Federal power actually are subsidizing other public benefits.

FEDERAL POWER PAYS FOR ITSELF

Do Federal power projects actually pay for themselves? Emphatically, yes. From the beginning of operations in 1933 through fiscal year 1961, TVA's power revenues amounted to $2.4 billion. Net revenues, after deduction of operating expenses including straight-line depreciation, but before interest, totaled $628 million. Retained earnings, after interest expense and payments as return on the appropriations investment, totaled $581 million. These power earnings have been reinvested in the TVA power system either through direct investment in new construction or through payments to the Treasury. So, at the end of the 1961 fiscal year, the Federal Government was sole proprietor of an electric system with a net worth of $1.8 billion, well over half a billion more than the $1.2 billion Treasury investment in the system. At present, TVA is financing plant additions by revenue bonds sold in the private money market and without any kind of cost to taxpayers.

The Bonneville power system, like all Federal power systems, is required by law to be self-liquidating. At the end of 1960, the Bonneville system was $53 million ahead on its scheduled repayments to the Federal Treasury, having repaid $287,800,000, all coming from the pockets of the power users. Because Bonneville's power revenues currently are not running high enough to meet scheduled amortization payments, it is evident that unless this financial picture improves, and once the prepayments have been exhausted, higher power rates will have to be instituted to comply with the law.

PRIVATE COMPANIES REALLY OPPOSE COMPETITION, NOT SOCIALISM

Mr. Stans repeats the old "socialism" charge, a favorite of the power companies in their high-priced national advertising program.

A survey conducted in 1950 for the electric companies advertising program showed that while 63 percent of the American people approved of TVA, 69 percent of the same people opposed socialism. In its comment on these statistics, ECAP laid down the line which its propaganda has followed ever since:

> From the preceding charts, it is apparent that to link our fight to the TVA question would run us into a lot of opposition, most of it based on lack of knowledge. But to link our fight to socialism is something else again. The people do not want socialism.

Mr. Stans is trying to play both tunes at the same time.

Far from suffering from the Federal power program, the private power companies in many areas are eager buyers of Federal power and, nationwide, are in better condition than ever before. They produce about 77 percent of the Nation's power, receive about 84 percent of total power revenue, and have obtained something like 550 rate increases since 1946. The Federal power system provides only 13 percent of the Nation's power capacity and about half of this is used by the Government itself, primarily for defense purposes.

Mr. President, are the private utilities really "free enterprise?" Just try to find a competitor who can serve you with electricity if you do not like the service you are getting. The power industry is essentially a public industry, since it provides an essential service under monopoly conditions. If a community grants a franchise to a corporation to provide this service, exclusively, to its citizens, the result is not very private and certainly not enterprising. The company is obliged to serve all citizens, it is guaranteed a fair return, and it need not worry about competition—except when its consumers begin to wonder why rates are lower in a neighboring town.

In such a case, a private power company can sharpen up its operation, lower its rates, and find—as the utilities on the periphery of TVA found—that lower rates bring greater usage and lower unit costs, not to mention better earnings. Or it can follow the path trod by Mr. Stans and try to destroy this competition by maligning it. I hope that the majority will choose the former route.

Let us not forget that in area after area, for decade after decade, it was not possible to induce a private utility to stretch a powerline, because the utility knew that to do so would not be profitable; there were not enough customers. The rancher far out in the foothills had to milk with the aid of a kerosene lamp or lantern. His house was lighted by kerosene lamps. He churned by hand with an old barrel churn. He could not hire the farmer's most valuable hired man—electricity.

If he and a few of his remote neighbors, hat in hand, so to speak, riding in a buckboard behind a team, drove to town to call on the private utility owners, sometimes they could get electricity if they were willing to pay the cost of installation, which was exorbitant, and which they could not afford to pay. The sad fact is that the private utilities invariably put the selfish profit dollar ahead of the social interest.

But then the Federal Government proceeded with a public program by leaps and bounds, under the leadership of that great President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who will go down in history as a President having a great social conscience. He was aided on a bipartisan basis by such great Republican Senators as Charles McNary, of my State, Hiram Johnson, of California, William Borah, of Idaho, Robert LaFollette, of Wisconsin, and the great George Norris, of Nebraska, who gave support to the REA, which permitted Federal financing and development of a rural electrification program. Then the employment of the farmer's most effective hired man became a possibility, for mile after mile of electric wire, strung on REA transmission poles, was taken to the farmers of America. The kerosene lamp and lantern became an antique of a bygone day.

But if the American farmers had waited for the private power utilities of this country to take their lines to the farmers, the farmers would still be waiting. Yet we have the misrepresenting private utility propagandists using the "big-lie" technique to deceive the American people with respect to public power, seeking an opportunity to spring upon the public interest and destroy it in the field of electric power.

My confidence in the American people is such that I have news for the private utilities of the Nation. They cannot deceive the American people. I have battled on this issue in three hotly contested campaigns for the U.S. Senate, and I am about to go home to carry on the battle. I say once again to the private utilities: "I am ready to take you on again, if you try once more to deceive the people of the State of Oregon about the great value of their investment in the public power resources of Oregon and the Northwest."

EXHIBIT 1

ANSWERING UTILITY TAX PROPAGANDA

(By Gus Norwood, executive secretary, Northwest Public Power Association; address to the accounting and finance workshop of the Northwest Public Power Association, at Eugene, Oreg., Sept. 13, 1962)

One of the day-to-day operating problems of the public and cooperative electric systems is how to answer the propaganda barrage directed against us by the private electric utility corporations.

Taxes constitute the major theme of this continuing, relentless propaganda attack.

Many of our consumer-owned systems have urged that we do research on utility taxes.

Considering the millions of dollars spent by private utilities on tax propaganda, it is sobering to reflect that no authoritative study or investigation is available on this subject. Such a study is long overdue and should be made.

My remarks today are intended as a working paper to outline some of the facts and ideas for the more extensive study needed.

I want to express appreciation for this opportunity to submit this working paper to you in your role as utility controllers, auditors and accountants.

Certainly for me it has been rewarding and encouraging to find in the course of this analysis that in terms of electricity taxes and other public benefits the merits lie very favorably with the public and cooperative electric systems.

My remarks are organized and directed to answering seven basic questions:

First, If our systems do a good job, can propaganda hurt us?

Second, What organizations and outlets issue the utility propaganda?

Third, What are the propaganda charges being made against us?

Fourth, What is the record of our taxes and benefits for public purposes?

Fifth, What is the record of private utility profits and taxes?

Sixth, How do consumer owned systems compare with private utilities?

Seventh, How can private utilities reduce their high electric rates?

Before taking up these seven questions, it might be in order to mention a few basic premises and facts.

Certainly it is well recognized that the furnishing of electric service is by law a public utility function. It is a public function and often is carried on under public auspices. On the other hand this function may be delegated to private companies but only through the granting of public licenses, permits, franchises, use of public right-of-way and other public authority.

From the start of electric utility service around 1880 both public and private approaches were used. As early as 1882, four cities operated electric systems.

One study shows that 76 percent of all U.S. municipal electric systems originated because no private companies were available or willing to serve those communities.

Virtually all of the rural electric cooperatives came into being because private utilities were unable or refused to extend service into the rural areas.

As of December 31, 1960, the public and cooperative electric systems were serving 21.1 percent of the population while private utilities served 78.9 percent.

The electric revenues of the entire electric utility industry in 1960 reached $11.51 billion, divided $2.08 billion to the nonprofit systems and $9.43 billion to private utilities.

By including nonelectrical revenues the private utilities alone in 1960 just reached $12 billion or $1 billion per month.

The electric utility industry receives over 2 percent of gross national product and this proportion continues to increase. Investments now exceed $50 billion, approaching $150,000 per employee.

Perhaps not so well known is the fact that no utility whether public, cooperative or private, pays any taxes. Only consumers pay taxes. The utility merely serves as tax collector or pipeline for tax collection. No utility pays any taxes.

It goes without saying that electricity is a necessity of modern life, that good electric service at low cost is essential in the public interest.

But let's get on with the questions.

1. IF OUR SYSTEMS DO A GOOD JOB, CAN PROPAGANDA HURT US?

Yes; propaganda can hurt us.

Witness the effect of the attacks on municipal electric systems in 1921 to 1932 which resulted in 1,666 city owned electric systems going out of business in 12 years.

Under the leadership of Samuel Insull, the National Electric Light Association from 1920 to 1932 carried on a huge propaganda campaign against municipal ownership of electric plants.

Newspaper advertising alone came to $9 million per year.

Over 5 million copies each were distributed of such pamphlets as, "All in Favor of Paying More Taxes Say Aye," "Muscle Shoals," and "Why Did 860 Municipal Plants Close?" In all, NELA from 1920 to 1932 issued 200 different books, pamphlets, and folders in quantities from 1,500 each to 5,200,000. The large amount of taxes paid was often mentioned as an advantage from private utilities.

Mr. J. B. Sheridan reported at the 1925 NELA convention that the State publicity committees have served as "shock troops that carried out the attack upon the enemy" and he added "in a period of 4 or 5 short years they have just about changed the entire trend of economic and political thought in the United States."

And, brother, he spoke the truth.

In 1922 an alltime record of 213 municipal electric systems came into being and 32 systems were sold out leaving 3,032 systems in business.

In 1923 there were 123 added and 72 subtracted to reach the alltime high of 3,083 city systems. But the trend had already started against them.

In 1926 there were 48 added and an alltime astonishing record of 315 sold out. In 1929 only 5 were added and 170 sold out. Not until 1933 was this adverse trend reversed.

Taking the 12 years, 1921 to 1932 inclusive, there were 2,746 at the beginning of the period, then there were 777 added, 1,666 subtracted for a remainder of 1,860 city owned electric systems.

The creation of new plants per year decreased from 213 in 1922 to a mere 5 in 1929. The sellouts were increased from 32 in 1922 to 315 in 1926.

The tremendous accomplishment in buying out 1,666 city-owned electric systems in 12 years becomes more apparent when one realizes that in the 79 years from 1882 through 1961 there were at one time or another 4,321 city systems (actual peak was 3,083 in 1923) and at the end of 1961 only 1,972 remained in business.

Subtracting 1,972 from 4,321 means 2,349 cities went out of business in 79 years or 30 per year.

But in the 12-year 1921–32 period, 1,666 went down the drain or 139 per year. Over two-thirds of the city systems were sold out in 12 years.

The other 683 were sold out over 67 years or 10 per year. Thus the contrast in the rate of sellouts was 14 to 1 for the 12-year period as compared to the other 67 years.

How many of the 1,666 sellouts were the result of the propaganda drive? Undoubtedly, there were other technical, engineering and economic factors operating against the smaller city electric systems.

After all, the record shows that the number of U.S. consumers served by public systems increased from 1.6 million in 1922 to 2.3 million in 1932 or about a 50-percent growth while private utility customers almost doubled. This means that larger and fast-growing city systems generally survived and prospered.

My conclusion from analyzing the 1921 to 1932 period is that the propaganda was effective. It paid off handsomely. The lesson this era teaches is that propaganda, false or not, can kill off many more consumer-owned systems in the future.

Yes, propaganda can hurt us.

Municipal electric systems in the United States

At end of year	Total number in existence	Cumulative total since 1882	Originated during period	Discontinued during period
1961	1,972	4,321	4	8
1933	1,875	3,932	17	2
1932	1,860	3,915	39	52
1931	1,873	3,876	26	80
1930	1,927	3,850	17	115
1929	2,025	3,883	5	170
1928	2,190	3,828	6	182
1927	2,366	3,822	26	314
1926	2,654	3,796	48	315
1925	2,921	3,748	61	186
1924	3,046	3,687	69	106
1923	3,083	3,618	123	72
1922	3,032	3,495	213	32
1921	2,851	3,282	144	42
1920	2,749	3,138	203	42
1900	728	754	112	7
1882	4	4	4	0

2. WHAT ORGANIZATIONS AND OUTLETS ISSUE THE UTILITY PROPAGANDA?

In 1924 Martin Insull, chairman of NELA's public policy committee, and brother of Samuel Insull, reported:

"We are no longer a local industry but one great national industry, coordinated through this National Electric Light Association."

However, by 1932, the private utilities had overplayed their hand. The unsavory Insull scandal shook the public confidence.

The 1927–35 utility holding company investigation by the Federal Trade Commission by 1930 had produced 26 volumes of documented evidence just on propaganda, corruption and lobbying, and this in turn was summarized in books like Ernest Gruening's "The Public Pays," Thompson's "Confessions of the Power Trust," Ramsey's "Pyramids of Power," Levin's "Power Ethics," and innumerable articles.

Because NELA had become subject to criticism, a change of policy was launched in 1932. The complete change of face was expressed by Floyd L. Carlisle of Niagara Hudson Corp. in his 1932 NELA address: "This association has gone back to first principles. We have become, by the changes in our constitution and by the clear expression of our membership, a pure trade association. There is a great work that we can perform which will be truly for the public welfare. This is the proper forum for the exchange of the most exact and scientific knowledge concerning our business. Our statistics, compiled from no other standpoint than the exact truth, can be helpful to governments, to industries, to banks, and to investors, as well as to ourselves. Any taint of propaganda, of lobbying, of trying to color facts, or to influence anyone except with facts is definitely, and I hope permanently ended in this association."

Then to complete the change, NELA was dissolved in January 1933 with the explanation that NELA has been "* * * stamped, rightly or wrongly, with the reputation of a great propaganda organization and that it was best to end the association and start afresh."

In the place of NELA in 1933 appeared the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) as a fact-compiling association with a rigid code of business principles.

However, by 1962 the high-minded resolutions of 1933 are forgotten. The monthly EEI bulletin seldom lacks for at least one tax propaganda article. The annual EEI conventions feature many attacks on public power. EEI today is a propaganda organization, and openly so.

Three other national organizations subsequently came into being.

The National Association of Electric Companies (NAEC) was formed in 1945 to perform lobbying, headed originally by Purcell L. Smith at a $65,000 annual salary, and with a budget which in 1953 amounted to $534,000.

Formed in 1941 was the electric companies advertising program (ECAP), handled by N. W. Ayer & Sons with budgets running from $1.5 to $2 million per year.

Finally, in 1949, the public information program (PIP) was formed using the firm of Bozell & Jacobs with a budget of about a million dollars per year. PIP furnishes the shock troops trained to descend on a community to ring doorbells and get election results.

There are, of course, many allied propaganda outlets, notably the National Tax Equality Association (NTEA), E. Hofer & Sons, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Taxpayers' Association, Tax Foundation, and many others.

In the interest of simplicity, and since ECAP is the designated private utility advertising program and since a good file of ECAP ads is available, our analysis will concentrate on the ad contents of the electric companies advertising program.

3. WHAT ARE THE PROPAGANDA CHARGES BEING MADE AGAINST US?

Early in 1957 the Saturday Evening Post proudly issued a book reprinting the 169 full-page ads which had been run in the Post during the 15-year period, 1941–56, by ECAP, the Electric Companies Advertising Program. The Post claimed that these ads, together with its supporting editorials, had changed public opinion against Government ownership and in favor of business ownership of electric utilities.

Before analyzing these 169 ECAP ads, it may be helpful to note what ECAP says about itself. In January 1953 ECAP issued an inch-thick book covering its program 1941–52, containing testimonial letters from utility presidents, ad reprints, radio shorts, mats, survey results, cost data, participants, etc.

Participating companies rose from 42 in 1941 to 180 in 1946 and down to 129 in 1952. Expenditures rose from $375,000 in 1942 to $1.64 million in 1952. Magazine ad costs ran $2.45 to $3.03 per 1,000 magazines, with 35.7 million pages printed in 1948. In 1952 ECAP used 19 magazines for 2 to 13 insertions, with a page in Life costing $19,200 and Saturday Evening Post $14,670.

ECAP says the ads center on reputation: (1) to add to the reputation of the companies, (2) to detract from the reputation of Government power.

Another ECAP book, "Fact Finder," 1958 claims that public opinion which ran against the companies 5 to 4 in 1943 has been reversed 8 to 5 in favor of the companies in 1957. A 1957 ECAP survey especially concentrated on tax discrimination, claiming that the vote was 7 to 1 that cities should pay the same Federal tax that companies pay.

Turning to the 169 ECAP ads which appeared in the Post from 1941 through 1956, the theme of taxes gets emphasis in two ways, first in the signature and then in the ad copy content.

The August 7, 1943, ad introduced the taxpaying phrase in the signature: "This page sponsored by a group of 118 electric light and power companies—self-supporting, taxpaying businesses." The June 8, 1946, ad changed to "America's business-managed taxpaying electric light and power companies." The August 16, 1952, ad dropped the tax signature.

During the 9 years 1943 to 1952 the tax signature appeared in 102 Post ads. Since no other industry finds it necessary to refer to itself as taxpaying, this signature on the part of electric utilities is not only unique but purposeful. The innuendo clearly is that they are the taxpaying sector of the electric utility industry in contrast to the nontaxpaying sector.

That innuendo is false and deceptive.

Reviewing the content of the 169 ECAP ads shows taxes mentioned in 57, aside from signature. The frequency of tax ads rose with crescendo from one or two per year to eight in 1954 through 1956 or two-thirds of the ads for those years.

The 57 tax ads begin mildly, five restating the signature, three saying companies pay taxes, and seven say companies do their job without tax subsidy.

The July 6, 1946, ad says "Government operations pay little or no taxes. Electric companies pay plenty." The ad continues by opposing Government running an electric business because, "Didn't we just fight a war against that very principle?" The November 2, 1946, ad wonders who makes up the tax loss when Government goes into the electric business.

The umpire is featured as pitcher November 22, 1947, and complains about government electric systems: "They receive subsidies, pay little or no interest on money they borrow, pay no Federal taxes." Ad repeated July 17, 1948. The football referee running with the ball came October 9, 1948, and was rerun October 8, 1949, and complains of Government power competition with the taxpayer footing the bill.

"Pay this bill for me, will you?" appeared April 16, 1949, claiming * * * "you do help pay a lot of other people's electric bills every month * * * the Federal Government is in the electric business in some parts of the country. It sells electric service to some people and to certain industries—below the real cost. Who makes up the difference? You do—the Government uses some of your taxes for that purpose."

The most vicious ad is the February 21, 1953; six poses of the outraged baby who is alleged to have inherited $6 billion of debt for Federal dams on which the American taxpayer must pay $150 million interest.

The antisocialism ads ran very heavily starting with the picture of the boy, Bible, ballot, key, and pencil; November 12, 1949, running about 30 ads by 1955.

The Niagara honeymoon, tax dollars in Hells Canyon, subsidy, favoritism, preference, special privilege, unfair, waste of tax dollars, increase public debt are among the themes and phrases in the tax ads.

"Are you an April fool victim every day of the year?" appeared March 31, 1956, and charges: "Take this matter of 'cheap' Federal Government power. It's 'cheap' for the people who get it only because you and other taxpayers pay part of their electric bills. First, your taxes help pay for the Government powerplants that serve the folks in this privileged class. And, second, the taxes you pay in your electric bill have to be higher because those people don't pay a fair share of taxes in theirs. So when you hear about 'cheap' Federal power, think of the trick that's behind it. Remember—one of the victims of that trick is you."

Answer: False. Federal power investment must be repaid into the U.S. Treasury with interest. Debt incurred for Federal dams is self-liquidating and is not a burden on any taxpayer. The reason for much of the Federal income tax burden in electric bills of private power consumers is the large profits made by utilities. If they operate on a nonprofit basis, there is no Federal corporate income tax liability. That tax is not on electricity, it is on profits.

In short the accusations in the propaganda ads are quite simple. They attack the Federal power programs. Having found that the socialism tag did not take, the utilities hope to turn the public mind by means of the tax-dodger charge.

One of the most amazing ads, December 5, 1953, "Here's one that hasn't cost you a cent in taxes." features Washington Water Power Co.'s Cabinet Gorge Dam which was built only when the Government granted a huge accelerated amortization or fast tax write-off certificate. It is one of the most heavily subsidized of all private utility dams, as NWPPA testimony has repeatedly shown.

Another series of ads boasts of the job being done by private utilities in the atomic field, again with no mention of the huge Federal subsidies they get.

Before leaving the subject of propaganda ads, it should be emphasized that both the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Power Commission have declared them to be propaganda and have disallowed the cost from being deducted as utility expense. In Opinion 323 issued by FPC July 15, 1959, nine of the 1957 ECAP ads are reproduced and are found "to involve the presentation of argument in matters of political controversy, or have as their primary purpose the influencing of public opinion as to proposed legislation or the repeal of existing laws, and have a direct relationship to political matters."

4. WHAT IS THE RECORD OF OUR TAXES AND BENEFITS FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES?

The 1960 FPC statistics cover 271 public systems with 4.7 million customers or 61 percent of the public sector of the industry.

Three benefits are readily identifiable in the report. Out of the $820 million gross revenues, taxes came to $29.7 million, or 3.6 percent. The net income, which for public systems is plowed back into new plant or debt retirement, came to $190.4 million, or 23.2 percent of gross. The two items together amount to $219.7 million, or 26.8 percent of gross revenues.

The third benefit is the savings to the public due to lower electric rates. For residential use the average private and public rates were 2.62 and 1.58 cents per kilowatt-hour, respectively, or a difference of 1.04 cents, which when applied to the 20.422 billion kilowatt-hour residential sales of the public power systems comes to a saving of $212,388,800. Likewise the respective average rates for commercial and industrial sales for private and public systems are 1.49 and 1.22 cents per kilowatt-hour, or a savings of 0.27 which applied to 29.822 billion kilowatt-hours amounts to a further saving of $80,519,400. Further savings exist in the sales for public uses.

Much of the same is true of the rural electric systems. Turning to the 1960 REA report one finds $594.7 million gross revenue, $17.9 million taxes, and $81 million margins or $98.9 million of benefits or 16.65 percent of gross. Estimating benefits from lower rural electric rates is difficult, but if it amounts to 1 cent per kilowatt-hour on 27.2 billion kilowatt-hours, the amount is $272 million.

The utility serving my home, Clark County PUD, in 1960 had $5.26 million gross revenues and paid $325,318 in taxes and plowed back $1,050,685 in net earnings, the two together amounting to 26.2 percent of gross. In that year Clark County PUD electric rates were almost exactly 2 mills per kilowatt-hour below the rates of highly competitive Portland General Electric Co. across the Columbia River. When applied to the PUD sales, this 2-mill edge saves electric consumers $1,218,922 compared to the nearest private utility system. Actually this is distorted because the PUD has had a salutary effect upon PGE rates.

Seattle had $38.14 million gross revenues, $3.357 million taxes and $6.55 million net for a total of $9.9 million benefits or 25.9 percent of gross. Seattle's 4.057 billion kilowatt-hours sales were made at 0.927 cent per kilowatt-hour compared to the nearest private utility, P.S.P. & L.'s 1.24 cents for a difference of 0.313 cent which multiplies out to a saving of $12,700,000. In Seattle's case an additional benefit is the $470,516 in free street lighting service in 1960.

A case study on tax and other benefits can be prepared for every public and cooperative system.

A survey by Klickitat County PUD showed that the construction of its rural electric lines increased rural real estate values and tax base by more than the worth of the entire electric system. Similar reports have been made by many rural electric cooperatives. The effect of rural electrification upon farm productivity, farm income, and increased tax base for all taxes is well known.

The Washington PUD Association issued an excellent study where eight PUD's recomputed their 1959 bills to schools, cities, counties, and other tax-supported public bodies by using the rates of the nearest private utility. The private utility rates would have resulted in charges of $1,463,000 as against $1,002,500 from the PUD's. This amounted to a direct saving to the taxpayers of $460,500. Since 15 to 20 percent of all electricity used in the United States is purchased with tax dollars, the lower rates of the public and cooperative systems makes for Government economy and saves the taxpayer's money.

Other case studies can be prepared on the effect of low cost power in attracting industry. The 1945 tax study by BPA and the recent Flathead County analysis illustrate the method. Low cost power for irrigation pumping has opened new lands in the Pacific Northwest. Virtually every area and utility is a unique case study.

Of course, the target of the private utility tax propaganda is the Federal Government and the Federal power program of dams, transmission lines and REA loans. At first the utilities directed their propaganda against TVA, then socialism and in recent years on taxes. Clearly while taxation is the theme, the object remains to get the Federal Government out of the power business.

The record of benefits of the Federal power program can be measured both in national and local terms. The Nation has benefited from the multiple purpose water resources projects, where the power features made possible the flood control, navigation, irrigation, recreation, and other benefits. Without the prospect of power revenues most dams would not be feasible.

After the disastrous private utility power shortages of World War I, it is significant that Federal projects in the TVA, BPA, and other areas proved urgently necessary for national defense in World War II.

The Treasury benefits from the great increase in revenues as low cost power makes possible new industrial development, the opening of new lands and other economic growth. The record is clear that both TVA and BPA areas are now paying about twice the percentage of internal revenue collections as compared to 1933. Much of this improvement is the result of the Federal power program and the distribution of power by consumer-owned electric systems. It is a record of proud accomplishments.

5. WHAT IS THE RECORD OF PRIVATE UTILITY PROFITS AND TAXES?

The Federal Power Commission statistics for 1960 cover 270 class A and B private electric companies which comprise over 98 percent of the private sector.

Total utility earnings will be the basis of this analysis because the FPC data generally is on a consolidated basis. Total utility earnings in 1960 came to $12.002 billion, of which electric revenues were $10.116 billion.

Against the $12.002 billion earnings FPC shows $5.778 billion operating expense, $1.182 billion depreciation, and $1.154 billion in other taxes (other than Federal income taxes), or a total of $8.114 billion in deductions. These costs would have been incurred if the private utilities had operated on a debt-free, nonprofiting basis. These costs amount to 67.5 percent of total utility earnings.

The remaining $3.888 billion went for $1.783 billion net income, $693 million net interest cost, $215 million for deferred income tax, and $1.195 billion for actual Federal income tax. The latter figure for Federal income tax is shown by FPC as $1.218 billion, less $23 million income tax deferral for prior years.

The actual Federal income taxes came to 10 percent and other taxes 10 percent of all utility earnings.

The net income of $1.783 billion came to 14.87 percent of total utility earnings, whereas net interest cost was only $693 million or 5.78 percent of earnings.

By and large the private utilities pay almost 20 percent of their total earnings for taxes.

The Achilles heel of the private power picture lies in the division of the $3.888 billion. The companies have $21 billion of bond and $19 billion of stock financing. On the $21 billion bonds the net interest cost is $693 million. The remaining $3.195 billion of cost is incurred on account of the $19 billion of stock. The dividends and Federal income taxes thereon constitute the big cost. If the companies used bonds in lieu of stock, the interest cost would be about $622 million and would substitute for the $3.195 billion for a saving of about $2.5 billion or 20 percent of gross revenues.

6. HOW DO CONSUMER-OWNED SYSTEMS COMPARE WITH PRIVATE UTILITIES?

Comparisons require considerable caution. The hundreds of variables and changes in variables introduce hazards which prohibit precise comparisons.

However, the contrast between the private sector and consumer-owned sector of the electric utility industry requires no precision to get the point. Accordingly a broad brush approach will suffice.

The 1960 Edison Electric Institute Statistical Yearbook provides the basic data for revenue and rate comparison.

The table comparing electric rates shows that average residential price of electricity for the industry in 1960 was 2.47 cents per kilowatt-hour, being 2.62 for private utilities and 2.06 cents for consumer-owned systems, both cooperative and public. Compared to the private utility average residential price, the consumer-owned systems saved $287,500,000 for their consumers.

If the private utilities had sold power to their consumers at 2.06 cents per kilowatt-hour, their consumers would have saved $769,500,000. The total residential contrast is $1,057 million.

This understates the contrast since consumer-owned systems serve considerable rural loads.

Turning to the second half of the table on the total sales, the average industry selling price was 1.69 cents per kilowatt-hour, being 1.82 cents for private utilities and 1.268 cents for consumer-owned systems. Compared to the private utility price, the consumer-owned systems saved $896 million for their consumers.

If the private utilities had sold power to their consumers at 1.268 cents per kilowatt-hour, their consumers would have saved $2,851 million. The contrast for all sales is $3,747 million.

This contrast probably overstates the case because of the inclusion of direct industrial sales of the Federal power systems. Another distortion would result from the inclusion of large blocks of low-cost Federal hydro in contrast to private utility steam generation.

The actual combined electric revenues of private utilities and consumer-owned system was $11.516 billion, divided $9.432 and $2.084 billion. Had the low and high prices been used throughout, the resulting revenues would have been $8.665 and $12.412 billion respectively.

Whatever distortions may be contained in these figures, the fact remains that they merely reflect the actual operations of 1960.

Looking behind the low prices of the consumer-owned systems one cannot but be impressed by the fact that these prices more than cover the costs.

Setting aside the sharp contrasts in electric rates, the remainder of the comparison needs to be made by considering taxes and in the case of consumer-owned systems the dedication of net income to public use.

The public power systems listed in the FPC report contribute 26.8 percent for taxes and dedication of net income. The REA borrowers contribute 16.65 percent in taxes and dedication of net income.

Apparently the chief bone of contention between the comparisons as made by private utilities and as made by consumer-owned systems is in connection with the treatment of the net income of consumer-owned systems.

The net income of consumer-owned systems is not paid out to stockholders. It is generally used for new electric plant additions or for debt retirement. In either case the net income becomes part of the public equity owned by the people. This equity is a dedication of net income to public purposes. It is like a tax and constitutes a contribution in lieu of taxes.

On balance I must conclude that tax payments and contributions of net income for public use finds the consumer-owned systems at least on a par with private utilities, except that for consumer-owned systems most benefits remain in the community.

The real difference between the two approaches in the electric utility industry is in rates charged the electric consumer.

The accumulated results of the debt retirement policy of the consumer-owned systems appears in the official reports. The REA patronage capital credits by the end of 1960 amounted to $325 million.

FPC 1960 report for public power systems shows an accumulated net income or public equity of $1,968,321,604.

The policy of debt retirement by consumer-owned systems results in a gradual lowering of interest charges until the particular system becomes debt free and thereafter has no further interest charges.

In summary, the private utilities charge higher electric rates and operate for profit and they pay Federal income taxes on their profits.

The consumer-owned systems provide service at lower rates, operate on a nonprofit basis, and additionally plow back their net income to retire debt and thus establish an equity on behalf of their consumer-owners.

Comparison of electric sales, 1960, private utilities and consumer-owned utilities

[Dollars in billions]

	Private utilities	Consumer-owned systems	Total industry
Residential sales, (billion kilowatt-hours)	138.252	51.659	189.911
Price per kilowatt-hour, (cents)	2.62	2.06	2.47
Residential revenues	$3.6195	$1.0665	$4.6860
Revenue repriced at 2.06 cents	$2.85	$1.0665	$3.9165
Revenue repriced at 2.62 cents	$3.6195	$1.354	$4.9735
Savings between 2.62 and 2.06 cents	$0.7695	$0.2875	$1.0570
Total sales (billion kilowatt-hours)	518.811	164.388	683.199
Price per kilowatt-hour (cents)	1.82	1.268	1.69
Total revenues	$9.432	$2.084	$11.516
Revenue repriced at 1.268 cents	$6.581	$2.084	$8.665
Revenue repriced at 1.82 cents	$9.432	$2.980	$12.412
Savings between 1.82 and 1.268 cents	$2.851	$0.896	$3.747

NOTE.—Based on EEI Statistical Year Book for 1960, including Alaska and Hawaii.

7. HOW CAN PRIVATE UTILITIES REDUCE THEIR HIGH ELECTRIC RATES?

In 1948 Prof. James C. Bonbright, of Columbia University, and former chairman, New York Power Authority, served on the power committee which guided the research staff of the Twentieth Century Fund in preparing the monumental study "Electric Power and Government Policy." At that time he submitted this comment on electric utility taxes:

"The fact that electrical utilities operate, to a large extent, under conditions of decreasing costs for increasing quantities of service, adds weight to the argument that they should be given especially favorable treatment by the tax laws. The favorable treatment, however, should be made to redound to the full benefit of the ratepayers—an objective which is hardly attainable under our present ineffective methods of rate regulation. Utility tax reform must go hand in hand with reform in utility rate control."

More recently in addressing the Great Lakes Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, Labor Economist Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Union of America, made some specific suggestions for overhauling utility regulation. Particularly he urged elimination of common stocks in the financial structure of private utility enterprises. Excerpts from his address follow:

"The American people are on the threshold of demanding a complete review of our system of public utility regulation. * * * Probably the single most important reason for this concern is the dissatisfaction with rising service rates. The public has grown cynical of the degree to which their interests are protected and prices reasonably restrained. * * * Capital is rented no matter whether it be invested in the form of bonds, preferred or common stocks. The difference in the risks do not justify this classification. Why should not this fact be recognized in the entire system of regulation? * * *

"Many fundamental questions of economic import have to be raised in the public utility field. First is the propriety of the distinction between bonds, preferred and common stocks in this field. The existence of equity shares in the form of common stock distorts the nature of the public utility. It not only invites speculation but also encourages accounting practices designed to inflate the capital value of the enterprise with the resulting possibilities of forcing rate increases. Fundamentally, the differences in classes of equities should be eliminated. All financing of public utilities should be done through dividend-limited securities, such as bonds or preferred stock."

Private utility executives are not unaware of the possibilities of eliminating or drastically reducing the proportion of stock financing. In two cases they have been driven by necessity to adopt the idea.

Electric Energy, Inc., was formed in Kentucky as a syndicate of five companies to compete against TVA for the right to serve the AEC Paducah plant. A $182 million steam plant of 1,041,000 kilowatt capacity was financed by means of 95 percent bonds and 5 percent common stock. For example, at the end of 1960 there was outstanding $6.2 million in common and $150.9 million bonds. The 1960 operating statement shows $30.6 million gross revenue against which there was charged only $348,000 in Federal income taxes and $638,438 in other taxes or a total tax bill of less than $1 million or about 3 percent of the revenues. Interest on bonds came to $5.3 million leaving $295,000 net income as a modest 4.75 percent rate of return on the common stock.

Ohio Valley Electric Corp. was similarly formed by 15 companies to serve an AEC load. At the end of 1960 there was outstanding $310 million in bonds and $10 million in stock. Out of $71.5 million gross revenues the Federal income tax came to a modest $885,416 and other taxes $1,581,419 or a total tax of only 3.5 percent of revenues. The $800,000 net income came to 8 percent on the common.

These two systems achieved an average financing cost of about 3.5 percent and are thus operating examples of how to achieve low-cost power on the order of 4.5 mills per kilowatt-hour by steam generation. The key is the maximum use of bond financing so as to cut to the bone the twin burdens of common stock dividends and Federal income taxes

For the private electric utility executives these two cases illustrate a lesson that the public will hear about sooner or later: Where there is a will, there is a way. But first there must be a will.

The pattern established by Electric Energy, Inc., and Ohio Valley Electric Corp. happens to be appropriate to the special situation created by the backup of a long-term AEC power purchase contract.

However, it is interesting to note that the Pacific Northwest Power Co., a syndicate of four companies which proposed to build the Pleasant Valley and Low Mountain Sheep Dams on the Snake River some years ago, proposed to use 85 percent bond financing and only 15 percent common stock. The will was provided in this case by the competitive situation.

From this "thin common equity" approach it is but a short step to 100-percent bond financing, with or without a nominal common stock which does not participate financially but is used merely for voting control. The use of 100-percent bond financing would for all legal and Federal corporate income tax purposes create a nonprofit operation which would be excused from both common stock earnings and Federal corporate income tax thereon.

The magnitude and impact if the private electric corporation executives could find the will to operate on this kind of a "nonprofit" basis would be tremendous.

Legal problems would require legislation perhaps at both State and Federal levels to permit building up reserves or equity on behalf of the consumer, so that in the long term the consumers would own the enterprise. One way is to set up an amortization charge, like the 40-year payout plan of the Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario, as an operating expense, and having done that, then require electric rates to be set, using a rate stabilization reserve, so as to insure zero net income or nonprofit operation. Another way would be to commit all net income to a trust on behalf of the consumers similar to pension and other employee benefit trusts.

Setting aside the questions of control and trusteeship, the purpose here is to outline the huge impact possible on electric rates and utility ownership.

The 1960 FPC statistics for private electric utilities shows roughly $12 billion gross income of which $3.9 goes for interest, income tax, deferred income tax, and earnings accrued to stock. If bonds are substituted for stocks and only interest is paid, the companies would save $2.4 billions or 20 percent on their $12 billion gross income.

If rates were not reduced, but instead the $2.4 billion in annual savings plus subsequent interest savings were applied to debt reduction, the companies would be debt-free in 14 years, aside from new debt incurred for expansion, which however, would likewise amortize itself in 14 years at the present electric rate levels.

If the institution of nonprofit operation were done on the basis of splitting the 20 percent per year savings with electric consumers by reducing rates 10 percent, then the remaining 10 percent would amortize the $41 billion debt in about 23 years.

The latter approach is more typical of that used in the amortization policies of public power systems.

Such nonprofit operation will raise the cry that the loss of Federal corporate income tax must be made up in some other way. The answer generally is that the release of capital as electric property is amortized, makes those funds available for use in other capital opportunity markets. Also the cut in electric rates leaves more money in the pockets of consumers for spending in some other way or for investment. In any event the broad scope of the Federal income tax mechanism will insure that most of the income tax loss will be rebuilt through other channels.

Summarizing this portion of the analysis, it is apparent that the traditional pattern of financing private utilities can be drastically overhauled by taking the common stock monkey off the backs of the utility companies. Common stocks do not furnish risk capital any longer, but on the contrary are a form of self-created, unnecessary risk.

The companies have about $40 billion in debt outstanding. They pay $693 million net interest on $21 billion in bonds. Then they record $1,783 million in earnings on behalf of $19 billion in stocks. If the stocks were replaced with bonds at the same interest rate, the annual interest would have been $622 million on those bonds instead of having to show $1,783 million. Here is a direct savings of $1,161 million.

This billion dollar cost is a billion dollar monkey on the backs of electric consumers for services not received.

Additionally, this billion dollars of unwarranted burden is the reason for the Federal corporate income tax burden of $1,218 million even after the fast-tax-write-off allowance of an additional $215 million. All of these cost problems can be solved by adopting a 100-percent bond financing approach for private electric utility enterprises. OVEC and EE, Inc., have shown the way for the most part.

8. CONCLUSION

The private electric utility corporation officers are not being candid with the American public.

They are devoting millions of dollars annually for advertising and other propaganda smokescreens.

Private utilities are stuck with obsolete financing patterns which should be reviewed, and then for the most part junked. The use of common and preferred stocks can generally be discontinued.

Elimination of stock financing would greatly benefit the electric consumer in the form of rate reductions and in enabling consumers ultimately to own the electric systems. In the long haul the initial loss of corporate income taxes to the U.S. Treasury would be rebuilt through other channels.

The matter is in the hands of the private utilities. They can answer the questions and issues which they raise in their own tax propaganda.

The private utilities at one time were both private and enterprising. Today the utility business is so clearly a public function and is so clearly established, that it no longer warrants common stocks financing.

The departure of private utility stocks from the market would release more funds for genuine private free enterprise. And I for one believe in and want to support genuine private free enterprise, just as I also believe in supporting, where appropriate, genuine public free enterprise.

DR. FELIX NABOR SABATES

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's remarks,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives on S. 3453.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3453) for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates, which was, after line 6, insert:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mehmet Vechi Kalaycioglu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 1, 1957, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ali Khosrowkhah shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 29, 1946.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy. This expedites some business.

Mr. MORSE. I say to my good friend that I have postponed my speech as a matter of accommodation to the leadership, so that it could take place at this time while the Senate still is waiting for its conferees to report on a couple of important conferences. My friend from California is waiting for me to finish so that he can extend the same courtesy to the leadership.

Mr. ENGLE. But not with a speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The speech is a very good one.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a good speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further, so that the Senator from California may submit a conference report?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield with the understanding that the interruption will appear elsewhere in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 502 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11586) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to advise the Senate that the conferees on H.R. 11586 which is companion bill to S. 2800, the ship construction bill, have, with very minor exceptions, agreed to the Senate amendments.

The Senate voted to remove the 6-percent west coast differential. The conference accepted this. With respect to the repeal of the 6-percent differential, the bill would not repeal the differential as far as bids opened prior to the effective date of the new act were concerned. This was also a Senate amendment.

With respect to allocations, existing law requires a periodical survey of private shipyards by the Secretary of Commerce in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, to determine whether such yards are adequate to provide a mobilization base for national defense or emergency, and to remedy an existing inadequacy, if one is found. The Secretary may, with the approval of the President, allocate ship construction or reconstruction to any such yard to maintain its position and ability in the mobilization base.

As was stated in the House committee report on H.R. 1159 to repeal the 6-percent west coast differential, Congress has consistently recognized the need for having adequate, readily available shipbuilding facilities on all coasts for emergency use. It was urged then, and we do so here, that the allocation authority of section 502(f) be used wherever, and whenever, needed to keep the national shipbuilding mobilization base in balance.

The amendments were approved by the conferees. They will require the survey and report thereon be made at least once each year; change the phrase "existing inadequacy" to "existing or impending inadequacy," so that it is clear that a yard need not be completely down before allocation can be made; and remove the requirement of approval by the President. With the exception of "impending inadequacy" these were all Senate amendments.

Shipment of lumber from anywhere in the United States to Puerto Rico by foreign flag vessel would be allowed for an experimental basis for 1 year if the Secretary of Commerce found that no domestic vessel was reasonably available for the service. The Secretary could also terminate such an exemption from existing law whenever he found domestic vessels were available. With the exception of this 1-year limitation, this was the Senate amendment. The conferees added a permissive public hearing, with a cutoff from delaying court proceedings.

With respect to the 55-percent construction differential, the Senate voted a 1-year extension. The House voted 3 years, and also included a 60-percent differential for reconstruction or reconditioning.

The House conferees stood firm. We were successful in cutting the 3-year extension to 2 years, but to save the bill, agreed to the remainder of the House language.

Mr. President, these are the principal points in this legislation.

I urge the Senate to adopt the conference report.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. On behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I have been requested to ask some questions to clarify some of the problems which have arisen in respect to the bill, and to make some legislative history.

My first question is this: Is it the understanding of the chairman of the Senate conferees that the term "reasonably available" may be defined as available at "a rate and quality of service competitive to shipping available to lumber producers in comparable foreign ports," such as Vancouver, British Columbia?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am glad to respond to the question propounded by the Senator from Montana on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon.

The language "reasonably available" means the Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to all the facts and circumstances surrounding the lumber movements from and to the ports applied for. It is not proper to go into specifics and prejudge any decision by the Secretary of Commerce. But if it is the Senator's understanding that the language includes rates as well as service, then the Senator's understanding is the same as mine. The whole amendment must be read in the context of the problems of the lumber industry in getting access to domestic markets. Whether the problem—in an individual case—involves rates or service or Canada or Mexico is something the Secretary will have to take into consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Montana finished with this point?

Mr. METCALF. I have finished with this point. I desire to ask another question along the same line.

Mr. MORSE. I have talked to the junior Senator from Oregon in respect to this matter. When the Senator completes his questioning, I should like to make sure that the legislative history is clarified as to what I believe to be the understanding of the junior Senator from Oregon, because what I believe to be her understanding is exactly the understanding of the senior Senator from Oregon. I think we ought to make the legislative history very clear, because unless we do there will be those who will contend that the language in the conference report provides the Secretary of Commerce with some escape hatch in regard to what he can or cannot do in respect to authorizing the use of foreign bottoms. Unless we can get that cleared up, I am not so sure that this is an acceptable conference report.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I say to the senior Senator from Oregon that the second question I wish to propound to the chairman of the Senate conferees will further clarify this point and further make legislative history on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon.

We have clarified and explained the term "reasonably available."

Is it the understanding of the chairman of the Senate conferees that, immediately upon signing of this bill, a shipper could apply to the Secretary of Commerce for a Jones Act suspension with respect to given ports; that such suspension would be granted, after due notice and opportunity for hearing upon a finding that no carrier was reasonably available; and that such suspension would continue to apply unless and until the Secretary made an affirmative finding, again after due notice and opportunity for hearing, that domestic flag shipping had become reasonably available?

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator is correct. As I read the amendment, the Secretary of Commerce is not required to make a determination on a ship-by-ship basis or on a cargo-by-cargo basis. In other words, he does not determine it for a cargo at a time or even for a ship at a time, but rather on the basis of a port or terminal area at a time. The determination will initially be made, after application by a shipper, as between the originating and the terminating port or terminal areas that are applied for. If changed circumstances prompt a petition for withdrawal of the suspension, the Secretary will make a new determination with the same procedures that are required for the original determination.

Mr. METCALF. On a port-by-port basis.

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I have been delighted to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from California helped to clarify the situation somewhat. But as a supporter of the amendment of the junior Senator from Oregon, I wish to make very clear the understanding of the senior Senator from Oregon as to its intent, for our problem is merely as follows: We are in competition in the Pacific Northwest and all along the west coast—it applies to the State of the Senator from California as well—with Canadian mills, who by and large frequently have a great advantage over American mills, since they are allowed to ship in foreign bottoms at a great saving, if the American mill must pay the rates that most American ships require.

I wish to state a hypothetical case involving either the port of Coos Bay, Oreg., or the port of Portland serving lumber mills shipping to Puerto Rico, or lumber mills that could ship to Puerto Rico if they could compete with Canadian mills.

One of the reasons such mills cannot ship to Puerto Rico is that the Canadian mills have a great advantage in cost of transportation. That situation locks Oregon mills out of Puerto Rico because that is what has been happening. We have not been shipping American lumber to Puerto Rico. The primary reason the mill operators give to us is that they cannot ship as cheaply. Therefore, they cannot offer the lumber price that the Canadian mills can offer.

On the basis of the answer that the Senator from California has given, suppose those lumber mills in Coos Bay or in Portland or the port authority of either port should say to the Secretary of Commerce, "We have a lot of orders to ship lumber to Puerto Rico that we could fill if we could meet the Canadian competition, and we could meet the Canadian competition if we could ship in foreign bottoms."

Suppose further that the reply would be, "We think that X or Y American Steamship Co. has ships available."

The bill operators might say, "They have ships available but at transportation rates that we cannot afford to pay."

Under the facts stated, would the Secretary of Commerce be in a position to authorize the Coos Bay mills and the Portland port mills to ship in foreign bottoms unless the American shipping companies would say, "We will meet that competition and send the lumber in our bottoms at a competitive rate?" Yes or no.

Mr. ENGLE. Other than perhaps the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Oregon is probably better qualified than anyone else to interpret the amendment, because the junior Senator from Oregon, in consultation, I assume, with the senior Senator from Oregon, wrote the language of the amendment.

The amendment provides in effect that "the Secretary determines that there is no domestic vessel reasonably available to serve between such ports or terminal areas for the transportation of such lumber."

In answer to the question asked by the Senator from Montana, I said that, as I construed the amendment, it would apply to and include rates as well as service.

So to make it perfectly clear what we are talking about, I am advised we are not sending any lumber now from American ports via American-flag lines, for the very reason mentioned by the Senator from Oregon, namely, that we are priced out of the market in relation to transportation costs.

So as a consequence, I assume—and I believe it is also the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon, as well as the author of the amendment, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]—that it is the intention to take into consideration the competitive situation as well as the problems of service.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that before the last explanation by my friend from California, the senior Senator from Oregon would have been very happy to accept this delegation of authority from the Senator in charge of the bill to make the legislative history on the floor of the Senate. But then the Senator from California went on to make exactly the legislative history that the senior Senator from Oregon would make. I want the RECORD to show that I completely agree with the legislative history that that Senator from California has made, because, in my judgment, that legislative history stated only one interpretation, and that is rates, as well as other factors, can be taken into account by the Secretary of Commerce in determining whether American ships are reasonably available.

Mr. ENGLE. We wish to make that perfectly clear, because otherwise a ship could be bootlegged into a port and a statement made that it is available for service, but actually, from a practical standpoint, it would be of no use at all, because competitively we would be out of the market.

Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Oregon for yielding this time to me for this purpose.

I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to highly commend the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] for the very fine way in which he has represented the Senate and rendered an outstanding service to the Nation as chairman of the conference committee on this bill. He showed a splendid knowledge of the subject matter of the bill, complicated as it is, as well as the amendments thereto. Furthermore, he applied himself rigidly to the long and difficult task and showed in many ways that he is a skillful and valuable legislator in reaching agreements that make sound legislation. I commend him highly for this valuable service, and as one who was interested in the legislation and was in contact with him in his work, I am pleased to call his accomplishments to the special attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The report was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AT ANNUAL GEORGE C. MARSHALL MEMORIAL DINNER

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, October 10, 1962, our very able Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, was the principal speaker at the annual George C. Marshall memorial dinner of the Association of the U.S. Army, here in Washington.

In a brilliant address, Secretary McNamara gave a broad review of our defense responsibilities and capabilities, with special emphasis upon the role of the modern army.

Those of us who knew and admired General Marshall will appreciate the high and deserved tribute which the Secretary of Defense paid that great American. The Secretary's speech will make notable reading for all of us who are interested in the defense of the entire free world. Therefore, I ask that the speech be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. McNAMARA AT THE ANNUAL GEORGE CATLETT MARSHALL MEMORIAL DINNER, ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 10, 1962

It is a double privilege to be here with you this evening. By this occasion we honor two great soldiers. They served together in a war to defend human freedom against the greatest threat it had ever faced. When that war was won, they worked together to build the defenses of the free world against an even greater threat. In a sense they are both here in this hall, one quite vividly in spirit, and the other in person.

I never knew General Marshall. But no one who served under him, even in a very junior capacity, as I did, could help but absorb some appreciation of his extraordinary qualities. His contributions to the Army, to our country, and to the human race suggest the breadth of his concern—and the foolishness of trying to pigeonhole something called "the military mind."

Through the first peacetime Selective Service Act, he gave the Army the manpower it needed in a time of crisis. As a military adviser to the President, he was the principal architect of the strategy that gave us victory. As the author of the plan that bears his name, he gave the free world an idea that helped to bring Europe back from the ashes, and that is now being applied in our own hemisphere through the "Alianza para Progresso." One of General Marshall's wisest choices, demonstrating again his remarkable powers of judgment, was his selection of Dwight D. Eisenhower for early high command, leading to the career for which we are honoring General Eisenhower this evening.

General Marshall himself received many well-deserved tributes during his career. The highest tribute that I know of was paid to him by Henry Stimson, when Mr. Stimson was Secretary of War. Those of you who attended this dinner last year heard these words from Robert Lovett. I think they are worth repeating. Speaking on V-E day to a small gathering of War Department leader, Mr. Stimson turned to General Marshall and said:

"I want to acknowledge my great personal debt to you, sir, in common with the whole country. No one who is thinking of himself can rise to true heights. You have, never thought of yourself. Seldom can a man put aside such a thing as being the commanding general of the greatest field army in our history. This decision was made by you for wholly unselfish reasons. But you have made your position as Chief of Staff a greater one. I have never seen a task of such magnitude performed by man.

"It is rare, late in life, to make new friends; at my age it is a slow process, but there is no one for whom I have such deep respect and, I think, greater affection.

"I have seen a great many soldiers in my lifetime, but you, sir, are the finest soldier I have ever known."

What I want to talk with you about this evening are the responsibilities and the challenges that confront today's soldiers, and today's Army.

My thesis is a paradox—actually, a paradox within a paradox.

The first paradox, which I will only mention, is this: As the United States strives to maintain the great and increasing military might required to protect our vital interests and the vital interests of the free world, we must at the same time strive for disarmament arrangements that will reduce the danger of war. General Eisenhower personifies that paradox. He is distinguished not only for leading the greatest military expeditionary force in history, but also for breaking new ground in the field of disarmament. There is, of course, no inconsistency in pursuing worldwide disarmament while pursuing free world strength: We seek disarmament, but not unilateral disarmament. The disarmament we seek, like the strength we have, is intended to preserve our real security.

The second paradox—the one I want to discuss more fully this evening—relates to the role of the Army: As weapons of mass destruction grow more powerful, numerous, and widely proliferated among the nations of the world, the role of the Army, and even the role of the individual combat soldier, becomes not less but more important.

The continuing growth of the Soviet nuclear force is the fundamental fact influencing all our military planning. Our first responsibility to ourselves, to our allies, and to the free world is to preserve the vital interests of the free world while avoiding nuclear war. We deter the Soviets from using their growing nuclear force by maintaining a nuclear force strong enough and survivable enough to ride out any conceivable nuclear attack, and to survive with sufficient power to cause unacceptable damage to the attacker.

We have such a force today, and we have increased the budget to assure that we shall have such a force in the future.

The Polaris submarines deployed around the world, our bombers on 15-minute ground alert, our intercontinental missiles, increasingly hardened and dispersed in a great arc across the western plains provide the required deterrence. We have no reason to fear the Soviet rocket rattlers. Mr. Khrushchev himself has recognized the dangers of nuclear war in his much-quoted speech of January 6, 1961, when he said, "the problem of preventing a global thermonuclear war is the most burning and vital problem for mankind."

But Mr. Khrushchev remains an enthusiastic advocate of other kinds of wars, which he calls "wars of national liberation," and which we identify as subversion or covert aggression. He favors these wars because he believes they are below the threshold of nuclear deterrence; and recent history tends to support his judgment. The U.S. nuclear superiority did not deter the Communist invasion of Korea nor the Communist drive for domination in southeast Asia. Today the threshold of nuclear deterrence is still quite low. But as the Communist nuclear strength increases over the years, that threshold is bound to rise, whatever our margin of nuclear superiority. Therefore, we require increasing capability to deter forms of political and military aggression against which the application of nuclear weapons may not be a credible response.

It is essential in order to protect our own national security, as well as to meet our responsibilities as the leader of the free world, that we develop and maintain the forces to deter Communist aggression across the entire spectrum of military and paramilitary aggression—and, if deterrence should be unsuccessful, to stop that aggression dead in its tracks.

Mr. Khrushchev also likes to talk about "peaceful coexistence." To the extent that his peaceful coexistence means competition in advancing the well-being of peoples in the developing nations, or in the peaceful arts and sciences, or, in the race to the moon, we welcome the Communist challenge. As President Kennedy has said, "* * * if freedom and communism were to compete for man's allegiance in a world of peace, I would look to the future with ever-increasing confidence."

But the Soviets are not limiting themselves to such competition. So-called peaceful coexistence encompasses many levels of conflict from agitation to assassination, from trade fights to shooting fights. That is why countering Communist aggression requires the organized efforts not only of all of the four military services but of all the agencies of Government. This effort is making new demands on each of the military departments. The Army in particular must expand diversify and modernize itself to deal with a wide range of counterinsurgency and limited-war situations.

I must emphasize that these new requirements do not imply any shift in our stated policy on the use of nuclear weapons. The President has declared that "the defense of Europe and the defense of North America are indivisible," and he has expressed "the hope that no aggressor will mistake our determination to respond instantly with whatever force is appropriate." The appropriate response, whether it be nuclear or nonnuclear, whichever best supports our objective, will be made promptly and forcefully.

The U.S. Army has risen to many challenges in its 187-year history. The 145 battle streamers on the Army flag represent past threats to America extending from the Revolution to the Korean conflict. Rapid changes is no new experience for a service that in World War II expanded from a small peacetime force of some 270,000 to a modern Army of over 8 million—that in 1950 changed from garrison duty in Japan one day to combat in Korea the next—a service that knows that today it may be in training one hour and in combat the next in any part of the globe.

It has been an impressive and inspiring experience for me to observe the Army responding to the challenges of the sixties. You all know that the number of combat-ready Army divisions has increased by 45 percent in the past 14 months.

All of you may not be aware that both the 1962 and the 1963 budgets included over $21½ billion for Army procurement of weapons and equipment—65 percent more than appropriated for fiscal year 1961.

Equally important for the Army is the fact that 1963 procurement funds for airlift aircraft are double the amount for 1961 and that twice as many tactical fighters are being procured for the Air Force in fiscal year 1963 as in fiscal year 1961.

Together with these substantial increases in Army combat effectiveness, a greatly intensified effort is being made to assist our friends and allies in meeting the threat of Communist-supported insurgent movements. The Army's Special Forces have now been built up to almost four times their strength at the beginning of 1961. In addition these forces are contributing to a development to which I attach extreme importance. Augmented by special units, they are demonstrating the ability of our Armed Forces to play a vigorously constructive role in support of the economic and social development of less developed areas within our defense perimeter. We know how importantly economic and political reforms contribute to defense against subversion. We recognize the fact that it is this kind of progress, building on whatever can be achieved through military or paramilitary means, that provides the long-term solution to defense against subversion. The Army has a particularly challenging role to play here, and it is making encouraging progress in meeting that challenge.

Incidentally, the cost to the taxpayer of all these developments would be considerably higher but for our overall program to increase the efficiency and reduce the cost of our logistics operations. We have initiated actions since 1961 that will cut the costs of such operations by more than $1 billion in fiscal year 1963 and by at least $3 billion per year within 3 years. The Army's share in this cost-reduction program for 1963 is $377 million.

At the same time that the Army has been absorbing these large increases of men and equipment and innovations in doctrine, it has been going through a major reorganization involving combat arms and technical services that date back almost two centuries to the time of our first Commander in Chief. This reorganization, which has been planned by the Army staff to bring the Army structure into line with its new obligations and new operations, has been the most comprehensive since Secretary Root created the general staff system in 1903. It has required thousands of man-hours of studies and thousands of pages of planning documents.

But all of these plans and programs would have come to nothing without the dedicated efforts of men and women whose job it is to carry out the plans at every level of responsibility—from the division commander to the last private—from a special forces team in Vietnam to the infantry squad in Berlin—from the immediate office of the Secretary to the records rooms in the subbasement in the Pentagon.

There is no more important concern in the management of the Department of Defense than the welfare and morale of these men and women. I should like to list for you some of the major steps that are being taken to improve their welfare and maintain their morale:

1. The first increase in quarters allowance for military personnel since 1952, will go into effect 90 days from now—an average increase of 18 percent.

2. The Congress has just approved a 50-percent increase in the military housing program for the current fiscal year over the previous year.

3. The per diem allowance for both military and civilian personnel has been increased to meet higher costs of living.

4. At our request, the President has appointed a Special Committee on Equality of Opportunity in the Armed Services to consider particularly ways to alleviate the problems of off-base discrimination in housing, in education, in transportation, and in recreation, that makes life more difficult for soldiers and their dependents not only in some oversea areas, but also in some parts of our own country.

5. A comprehensive study of military compensation is being completed, looking toward legislation in the next Congress that should bring a long-overdue increase in military pay scales and incidentally reduce the drain of skilled manpower trained at Government expense away from the services to private industry.

These improvements in the circumstances of military service are the least that we owe to our service people. But these are surely not the attractions that draw men and women to the services, or that sustain them through the rigors of military life. They march to the music of a more distant drum.

In Germany 2 weeks ago, and earlier in Vietnam, I had an opportunity to observe and talk with some of the officers and men who are occupying our most forward positions under extremely difficult circumstances. I can only report that their readiness, their determination, and their sense of humor, measure up to the highest standards of the U.S. Army.

I had a rare insight into the motivations for military leadership the other day when President Kennedy shared with me a letter that he received from Maj. Gen. William F. Train in response to the President's letter of condolence about General Train's son, Lt. William F. Train III, who was killed in Vietnam.

General Train wrote:

"After graduation from West Point in 1959 and completion of the Infantry School, followed by airborne and ranger training, our son chose Korea as a demanding first assignment. He was completely dedicated to 'duty, honor, and country' and the life of a soldier. While there, in addition to his military duties, he actively sought to make friends with the Koreans, learn their language, and acquaint himself with this life and culture. He thus exemplified the qualities of leadership, diplomacy, and civic-mindedness so urgently advocated by you in your speech to the graduating cadets at West Point on June 6. Upon his return to the United States, he served at Fort Myer, Va., for almost a year, and then volunteered for the new challenge of Vietnam. He believed that his success with the Koreans, together with his facility in French, would be of especial value to his country there.

"His dedication and achievement in his work are fortunately memorialized in the words of a man who served under his command; a sergeant, who wrote: 'His fierce devotion to duty and his tremendous talent for taking care of small details, as well as large ones, endeared him to his men. We knew him as one officer who "always had time." Even when he didn't have time, he took time. We always got the impression that we were second only in importance to the mission to be accomplished. This is what enlisted men look for in officers and this is also what causes men to follow such a leader with an unquestioning attitude.'"

General Train continued:

"We send you this letter to thank you for your condolences and to tell you about our son. We are anxious that our Nation remember him not just as another casualty of the cold war, nor even only as our son, but rather as a loss to the Army and to the Nation, of one of its promising, courageous young officers. We buried him at West Point on July 9 in the hallowed ground of the Military Academy whose motto of 'Duty, Honor, and Country' he lived during his brief life."

It would be presumptuous of me to follow General Train's words with any words of my own. Instead, let me conclude by reading to you a few sentences spoken by General Marshall at Trinity College in June 1941, on one of the few occasions when he unburdened himself of his inmost feelings.

"The soldier's heart, the soldier's spirit, the soldier's soul, are everything. Unless the soldier's soul sustains him he cannot be relied on and will fail himself and his commander and his country in the end.

It is morale that wins the victory.

"It is more than a word—more than any one word, or several words, can measure.

"Morale is a state of mind. It is steadfastness and courage and hope. It is confidence and zeal and loyalty. It is elan, esprit de corps, and determination.

"It is staying power, the spirit which endures to the end—the will to win.

"With it all things are possible, without it everything else, planning, preparation, production, count for naught.

"We are building that morale—not on supreme confidence in our ability to conquer and subdue other peoples; not in reliance on things of steel and the superexcellence of guns and planes and bombsights.

"We are building it on things infinitely more potent. We are building it on belief for it is what men believe that makes them invincible. We have sought for something more than enthusiasm, something not merely of the intellect or the emotions, but rather something in the spirit of the man, something encompassed only by the soul."

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of nominations was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Six postmaster nominations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMENDATION OF NICHOLAS deB. KATZENBACH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to take this occasion to express my congratulations to the distinguished Deputy Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach. It was his responsibility to represent the Government of the United States during the crucially delicate and unfortunately critical days of tension at the University of Mississippi, in connection with the Meredith case. He acted with great distinction and honor. His address before the law students at the university, appealing to the deep sense of honor that has always been characteristic of the South, received for him a standing ovation, and also the applause of millions of Americans who were not present on that occasion.

These have been sad days. The President of the United States faced a trying problem with understanding, courage, and decisiveness. We all pray that this chapter in our history will quickly assume its proper perspective as America continues to strengthen its democratic institutions as it demonstrates to the world that although the path to freedom is strewn with many obstacles, it is the surest road toward the fulfillment of aspirations.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR TEXTBOOKS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the conference on District of Columbia appropriations has approved an additional $135,400 above the normal amount, to replace obsolete and worn-out textbooks in District of Columbia schools.

I am sure Senators recall that earlier this year I brought to the Senate Chamber a number of exhibits of textbooks used in the schools of the District of Columbia, books 25, 30, or 35 years old, totally out of date, having no relevancy whatever to the world in which we live—for example, science textbooks which refer to airplanes which, with at least one stop for refueling, might without too much difficulty be able to cross the United States, from New York to Los Angeles, in anywhere from 12 hours to 24 hours. I was of the opinion that such textbooks, particularly science textbooks, were so obsolete that they should be replaced; and I made a fight to obtain new textbooks for the District of Columbia schools. In my opinion the schools in the city of Washington, D.C., should set a standard for the rest of the Nation; they should not be lagging behind the schools in other parts of the country.

In a Federal budget which deals routinely with billions of dollars, $135,400 may seem relatively small and distinctly modest. But to me—and to thousands of boys and girls who are studying in Washington's schools—it is extremely important. I consider the approval of this appropriation by Congress a big victory.

I am very much indebted to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for his cooperation and helpfulness in obtaining this appropriation. I am sure Senators will recall that my interest in this subject was aroused when a delegation of students from the District of Columbia schools came to my office on a Saturday afternoon and pleaded with me to do something about their textbook situation. When young people will take the time to come to a Senator's office and ask for better books in their schools, that is a good sign, and is a call to action.

As a result of that visit, we did take action; and now the District of Columbia schools will at least have additional funds for the purchase of textbooks, and that will help considerably in relieving the obsolescence of these schools in that respect.

As I have said, earlier this year I spoke in the Senate of the shocking condition of textbooks in District of Columbia schools. We learned that in many Washington schools, students in some classes did not even have books that they could take home for study. We learned that some subjects were taught with textbooks as much as 30 years old, or textbooks so tattered and worn that rubber bands were used to keep pages together. We learned that courses of modern physics, for example, were utilizing books published long before any reference to nuclear physics could be included, and proclaimed such wonders as refrigerator boxes being kept chilled by "melting ice."

I was shocked at such a disgraceful blemish on education in Washington, and I vowed that Congress would not adjourn this year without appropriating funds to bring supplies of up-to-date textbooks to the local schools.

Superintendent of Schools Carl Hansen ordered a "crash" survey of textbook needs; the Senate Appropriations Committee acted favorably on his recommendations, with the help of the chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]; and this week the Senate and the House conferees completed the approval of the additional funds.

I am confident that this sum will enable the District of Columbia school officials to place modern textbooks in the hands of the children in the District, and that as a result the education and the intellectual development of these children will be given a huge boost.

But let me add that we must never face such a disgraceful situation again.

I urge that the District school officials conduct a thorough and detailed survey of the textbook needs every year, and that those needs be made known to the District of Columbia officials and to the Congress.

I pledge also that, as long as I am a Member of the U.S. Senate, and as long as the U.S. Congress holds authority and responsibility for District of Columbia schools, I will work to see that the disgrace of obsolete, tattered, inadequate, and insufficient textbooks does not recur in Washington schools.

Somewhere in the foreseeable future Congress may find that it has more important things to do than to serve as a city council. I once served as mayor of a city. While I respect such service and know what a thrill it is to serve in local government, it seems peculiar to have Senators from 50 States acting as a board of aldermen. If anyone can justify not having home rule on the basis of that sound government practice, I am here to learn a lesson on the validity of such a justification. The truth is that the District of Columbia needs home rule. The truth is that, until it gets home rule, we are going to have to be piddling around year after year, spending many hours of needed time, arguing, for example, about whether there ought to be new grammar books in the schools of the District of Columbia. Most city boards do not have to do even that. They have school boards that make such decisions. The school boards have authority to do it. Somehow or other, we insist on having a certain degree of colonialism, even though I thought we had repudiated it back in 1776. So we keep the Federal Government busy deciding such questions as whether one may stand at a bar or whether he must sit in order to be served a drink. That is a function of local government. What amazes me about this question is that those who are the greatest proponents of States' rights are among the strongest opponents of local government for the District of Columbia.

I hope I shall live long enough to see local government come to the District of Columbia. I hope sometime a Senator can return to his constituency and say, "I had as much time for you as I did for District of Columbia affairs." The way it is now, we spend many hours trying to act as a board of aldermen for the District of Columbia.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I fully agree with what the Senator from Minnesota has said. In addition to the substance of the remarks he was just making, I also agree with the hope that we may sometime return to our constituents—period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is a very hopeful man. I have canceled so many appointments back home that I do not know if I dare go there. I thought we might as well use this evening while we were awaiting important business of the day, such as supplemental appropriations and conference reports. But the Senator is right. Were it not that we had had to indulge ourselves in being local government officials, we might have cut a couple of weeks off the length of the session of Congress.

Our effort to secure necessary funds for school textbooks was successful. But another—and equally important effort—will have to be repeated.

I warn my colleagues that I shall be back on the same old stand next year, asking for sufficient money for the schools of the District of Columbia.

I speak of the need for adequate library facilities, personnel, and books in District of Columbia schools.

On the basis of Superintendent Hansen's survey and report, we urged an appropriation of $40,800 to hire 10 school librarians and $25,000 for library books for 10 elementary schools which now have the space for libraries.

This was a modest request. It was little more than a start to correct a situation in which District school libraries are shockingly inadequate.

Unfortunately, the District appropriations conferees did not approve these modest sums for school library books and personnel.

On May 23 of this year, I said in the Senate that Washington, D.C., has the worst school library system in the Nation compared to cities of its size.

Today and next year it will still have the worst system.

No Senator would tolerate such a situation in his own State. He would be ashamed to come to Washington lest some person might ask, "What is your library situation back home?" But in Washington, the Capital City of the Nation, where there are millions of visitors from the States and thousands of visitors from countries throughout the world, there is one of the most inadequate school library systems—in fact, the most inadequate school library system. We will try to straighten out that situation next year. Batten down the hatches—the storm is coming. We must have money for school libraries. Unless we do, we shall continue to have a bad library system.

The facts are clear. The national standard for school libraries is an expenditure of $3 a year per child.

In the vernacular, in Washington, D.C., that means three martinis or three tickets to a show per child per year. I think any city of this size can afford $3 per child per year for books.

Washington, in comparison, spends 58 cents for each junior high school student, 76 cents for each high school student, and nothing—zero—for each elementary school child.

So I serve notice, while I am in the full bloom of fatigue after a long session, that I will resume the crusade for libraries for Washington next year. I worked for such objectives while I was mayor of a city—good libraries, better textbooks, higher teachers' salaries. I am of the opinion that such things pay for themselves.

I cannot be satisfied that we in the Congress have fulfilled our responsibilities until the children of this city have a reasonable chance for full education through the vital tool of school libraries.

Again, I am grateful that with an additional appropriation of $135,400, District school officials will be able to provide adequate supplies of modern textbooks.

I suppose half a loaf is better than none. After one has been in Congress a while, he learns that if he can get the crust, much less half a loaf, he begins to think he has been fortunate.

But the other half—library books and facilities—is just as vital. I will not rest until the children of this city are given the full intellectual nourishment they want and need—through both textbooks and library books.

There is one way my colleagues can stop me from doing this, and that is to give this city self-government. I will quit talking about libraries and schools and will not harass my colleagues then. But, as long as I am an alderman for the District of Columbia and that is a part of my job, I am going to be an active alderman. I am going to do everything I can to get the resources that are needed. A great Capital City ought to be without slums. It ought to have the finest school buildings in the world. This city should be a model for the whole world. It should be a shining example of local government.

The only way I know of to obtain these things is by having the Congress relinquish the controls it now exercises over the city of Washington and permit the people to govern themselves, elect their own mayor, their own alderman, their own commissioners or council—call them what you will, Mr. President—and permit Washington, D.C., to have local government, like every other major city in the United States. Then we would not have to be asking, in this Chamber or in the other House, for money for libraries, textbooks, paper clips, rubber bands, and everything else that is needed to operate a school system.

I express my thanks for what was done and what Congress did authorize and appropriate. Secondly, I want my colleagues to know that when they return next year the same old record will be played, only this time the other side will be played—the librarian side—and we will still have to consider the need for adequate textbooks.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up certain nominations of postmasters reported today.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations of postmasters reported today will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hazel W. Lawson to be postmaster of Avondale Estates, Ga.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ILLINOIS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald E. Howe to be postmaster of Warrensburg, Ill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NEW JERSEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mabel P. Wood to be postmaster of Barnegat Light; M. Josephine Hulmes to be postmaster of Lebanon; Margaret L. Wetzel to be postmaster of Leonardo; and Henry P. Hofstetter to be postmaster of Pine Beach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President may be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. I wish to pay brief tributes to two colleagues who will not be with us next year, if the Senator will yield for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator, but I wish to hold the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota yields to the Senator from Idaho without losing his right to the floor.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR OREN E. LONG, OF HAWAII

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, all of us have noted with sorrow that the distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] will be leaving this Chamber on the adjournment of this session of the Congress and returning to his beloved State of Hawaii. I wish to add a few words to those my colleagues have spoken in tribute to Senator LONG.

I first came to know him many years ago when I was still a college student and went to Hawaii on a debate team, on the invitation of the students at the University of Hawaii, to debate the cause of Hawaiian statehood. That was the 40th anniversary of the university. The only stipulation in the invitation was that we were to take the negative side. At that time the passion for statehood had reached the level that no student at the university wanted to publicly debate against statehood for the Territory.

Of course, we went along, happy to have the opportunity to visit Hawaii. We were received with great hospitality by all the students at the university and by the faculty as well. I remember the occasion particularly because the Governor of the Territory at that time was OREN LONG. He not only opened the doors of his office wide and greeted us, but he also extended himself to make certain that our welcome to Hawaii was all we had hoped for and more besides. OREN LONG always has had a very special interest in young people.

His career, which has been a long and distinguished one, is particularly noteworthy in the field of public education. It was there he first made his mark, and for many years rendered exceptional service. Later, as Governor of the Territory of Hawaii and finally as a Member of the U.S. Senate, he capped off that career of service in public education with service to the public at large.

I cannot imagine how the people of Hawaii could have selected a man more deserving of the honor of being one of Hawaii's first Senators, after the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State, than the distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii, OREN LONG.

So I join with my colleagues in wishing him well on his departure. I hope that his retirement will be a long and happy one. Knowing him and liking him as I do, having a profound respect for him, I hope that our paths will often cross in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we shall also miss another colleague, BEN SMITH, the junior Senator from Massachusetts. He came here to fill the seat of the man who had gone on to become President of the United States. That is hardly an enviable position. Yet BEN SMITH has done more than merely hold down the seat of the Senator who became President. He has been a working and effective Senator for Massachusetts. If he had some handicap to begin with, he quickly overcame it, and he demonstrated by his seriousness of purpose, by his obvious intelligence, by his effervescent good nature that he was a man of uncommon talents.

Few men have come to this Chamber with the ability to win so many friends so quickly as BEN SMITH, of Massachusetts. Now that he is leaving the Senate I know I express the hope of many of his colleagues that his service here is but the start of a long career of public service in the Government of the United States, that he will find inspiration to serve in some other branch of government in an office commensurate with his ability, and that his years ahead will be years of accomplishment and fulfillment.

BEN SMITH is a remarkable individual. We all have learned to love him in the brief time he has been in the Senate, and I join with all his other colleagues in wishing him well.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much for his generosity in extending me this time. It is typical of the gracious way he treats all his colleagues in the Senate.

U.S. GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAM FOR ARTS: A MILESTONE IN AMERICAN CULTURAL HISTORY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in supporting S. 741, as revised, Calendar No. 2222, for the establishment of a U.S. National Arts Foundation and for a grant-in-aid program to the States.

It is particularly gratifying, of course, that the bill incorporates provisions of what has come to be known as the Clark-Humphrey bill, S. 785, to provide such grants for assistance to State art activities.

(At this point Mr. CHURCH assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

THE INTERESTING LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I find myself in a very interesting parliamentary situation.

The number of this bill, S. 741, is the same as the number of the original bill which I personally introduced for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

However, my original bill has been replaced in entirety by a substitute. This substitute, in turn, includes provisions, as I have indicated, of another bill which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] together with other Senators and myself.

The subcommittee of the Commitee on Labor and Public Welfare headed by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], actually reported the Humphrey bill, S. 741, for an Advisory Council, to the full committee. It included an amendment, which I personally had offered. This amendment would have established the Advisory Council within the Executive Office of the President, rather than within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The bill which is on the calendar omits the Advisory Council. I mention this now because I am sure the Senate will consider the proposed legislation next year. At least, the bill will be reintroduced, and undoubtedly it will be reported favorably by the committee.

Yet, the bill does significantly combine the principal features of S. 785, to establish a program of grants to the States, which I had cosponsored, and S. 1250, to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation, introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

So far as I am concerned, S. 741 in its revised form represents an excellent contribution to the cultural life of this Nation.

I take the time tonight, Mr. President, to comment on this proposed legislation because I am convinced that there is a great need for a broader participation by the Federal Government, and indeed by the State governments, as to the development of the arts and the promotion of the arts.

The bill which was reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was designed to encourage participation by both the Federal Government and the State governments in expanding the arts and in particular in providing for Federal assistance.

PRESIDENT CAN STILL APPOINT A COUNCIL

I am still hoping that a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts can be appointed.

I would like to see legislation adopted to establish such a Council and within the Executive Office of the President.

In the absence of such legislation, however, our Chief Executive does have more than sufficient power to appoint such a Federal Advisory Council on his own initiative and on an administrative basis.

GRANTS IN 2D YEAR OF $10 MILLION

Meanwhile, under the committee bill we have the essence of the Clark-Humphrey bill—to provide matching grants to the States in support of projects and programs which are making a significant public contribution in one or more of the performing or visual arts.

In addition, assistance is provided to the States to develop programs and projects in those arts in a manner which will, in conjunction with existing programs and facilities, provide adequate artistic service for all the people and communities in each State.

For this purpose, a sum in the current fiscal year not exceeding $5 million and in succeeding years $10 million would be provided.

Drawing upon the bill S. 1250, the pending bill would also establish a U.S. National Art Foundation as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government. The Foundation would serve under the general supervision of a Board of Trustees, consisting of the Director of the Foundation and 12 members, appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate.

HOUSE WILL NOT ACT AT THIS LATE HOUR

We all recognize that the hour is late in the 87th Congress. It will not be possible, unfortunately, for the House of Representatives to take up this important measure, even if it were passed in the Senate. The record ought to be clear that the only reason we did not call up the bill this week is that it was impossible to obtain a rule in the House to enable the House to consider the proposed legislation. I thought that rather than insist upon action in the Senate on a bill that would go no further than this body, particularly, a bill that might require reworking and revision in the next session, it would be better if the Senate did not proceed to take affirmative action.

But Senate committee approval of the bill is not, however, a token gesture. It is a step in the long march upward on the part of the people of the United States toward attainment of what Mr. August Heckscher, the President's special consultant on the arts, has termed the "public happiness."

Senate committee support of this bill will serve as the advance stage from which the 88th Congress can begin in order to make further progress.

TESTIMONY BEFORE PELL SUBCOMMITTEE

It had been my pleasure to appear before the subcommittee of which the Senator from Rhode Island is the chairman. My testimony on the bill will be found beginning on page 262 of the hearings.

CULTURAL RENAISSANCE UNDER PRESIDENT KENNEDY

I need hardly elaborate by reminding the Senate that within the last 19 months, under the leadership of the President of the United States and the First Lady, there has literally been a cultural renaissance in this land.

Without attempting to go into detail, it can be stated, without dispute, that the United States has emerged as a great power which is nationally dedicated to great art thanks to the President's leadership.

The unparalleled artistic events in the White House; the President's strong support of the National Cultural Center; the participation in public events from the inaugural onward by the magnificent poet, Robert Frost—these and a hundred other signs demonstrate that art has come into its own in our national life.

CULTURE NO LUXURY IN TODAY'S ARMED WORLD

To some it may appear as a luxury to be concerned with cultural activities in an age where we are battling for our very survival amidst a cold war and the hot fighting in South Vietnam.

We are racing to the moon; we are spending one-ninth of our national budget for scientific research; we are girding ourselves for new challenges in Berlin, Cuba, Laos, the Formosa Straits, elsewhere in south Asia, Africa, and South America.

To some, it may appear that we should have "no time and no expenditures" for anything more than this.

My own view is precisely to the contrary. It is because we are engaged in so many epic struggles throughout the world for the liberty of man that we need to fulfill the highest impulses in the soul of man here at home.

We do not propose to be brutalized by the process of dealing with a brutal power. The Soviet Union may be interested in a machineman who lives like a robot. But we are interested in human man—whole man.

And the fact of the matter is that we can be better fighters for the cause of freedom by uplifting the human personality.

Some of the greatest soldiers and statesmen in American history have been those with the deepest interests in man's effort to achieve beauty in many forms of art.

STUDY BY SENATE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

I should like to point out that the comments which I have offered on this subject of the United States and culture are based on many years of my prior efforts in this field. As Senate Report No. 2260, 87th Congress, indicates, I have offered legislation on this topic in Congress after Congress ever since my service began here in 1949.

In addition, I have had the privilege of studying this issue as chairman of the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee which is responsible for examination of issues of interagency coordination, pursuant to Senate Resolution 276, 87th Congress.

During the Congress recess this year, it is my intention to have the subcommittee issue, as a committee print, a comprehensive volume which will bring together information as to the total Government-wide effort in the arts today.

TOTAL COVERAGE OF ALL ART ACTIVITY

For the first time, this publication will cite:

First. All the laws on the statute books relating to Federal activity in the arts.

Second. All of the appropriations which are expended each year in this connection.

Third. All of the advisory councils which assist Federal agencies in the discharge of their obligations.

Fourth. All of the bills which the Congress has reported in recent years relating to this topic, whether or not the bills have been enacted.

The subcommittee will not attempt to present conclusions as to legislation. That is the task of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which does consider cultural legislation.

But it is the task of our Reorganization Subcommittee to consider the adequacy of Federal organization in attaining the objectives of the laws on the statute books. And it is our task to give a complete financial "picture" as to how much the U.S. Government is actually already spending.

In this process, we have been assisted by the splendid efforts of Mr. August Heckscher's office and the excellent cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget.

The U.S. Government is fortunate to have Mr. Heckscher serving in this post. His selection is a tribute to President Kennedy's judgment.

IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Finally, I should like to state the following with regard to what our own American citizens can do in this field.

Earlier, I have referred to the support of the National Cultural Center. Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Mrs. John F. Kennedy are, of course, national cochairmen. They symbolize the nonpartisanship of support of this great project and its continuity of support from the past administration through the present administration.

I mention this Center now because, on November 29, the people of this Nation are going to have a great opportunity to show their own feeling toward the arts and toward a national center.

A giant closed circuit telecast will be held, as a fundraising effort. This telecast will be absolutely unique in American history. It will feature some of the greatest artists in the land. A few of these artists include Leonard Bernstein, Marian Anderson, Danny Kaye, Dorothy Kirsten, Richard Tucker, Robert Frost, Harry Belafonte, Gene Kelly, and Jason Robards.

The importance of the success of the telecast cannot be overestimated. It is precedent making in terms of its fundraising role. What may not be realized is that the telecast will raise funds, however, not only for the National Center here in Washington but for local cultural efforts throughout the Nation. There will be a 50–50 division of the proceeds after, and I emphasize after, local costs have been met. In effect, local cultural activities will be receiving a tremendous financial lift by means of the telecast.

What must be borne in mind is that in enacting the legislation for the National

Cultural Center the Congress, for the first time, authorized a national voluntary fundraising effort for a great cultural enterprise.

Now, it is the American people's task and opportunity to respond. I have every faith that they will respond admirably.

Here in our Nation's Capital, Mrs. Hugh Auchincloss is chairman, and I am sure there will be a tremendous turnout here, in my own State of Minnesota, and throughout the 49 other States.

Mr. President, I would also like to take a moment to mention a statement by Adelyn D. Breeskin, Director of the Washington Gallery of Modern Art, given before the Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mrs. Breeskin has been noted throughout the art world for her outstanding work as director of the Baltimore Museum. Washington is indeed fortunate that she has decided to become a resident of this city and has accepted the responsibility of acting as Director of the new Washington Gallery of Modern Art. The gallery is located at 1503 21st Street NW., and the opening is scheduled for the end of October.

In her statement Mrs. Breeskin comments on the project of artmobiles that has already been undertaken in Virginia and New York. By means of a large motor van, art exhibitions are circulated throughout the State, thus affording an opportunity for works of art to reach every small village and community. This is a fine idea and suggests the type of State projects that would be assisted through the grant-in-aid program as provided for in S. 741, as amended, which we had hoped might become the law of the land by action in both Houses of Congress. It is regrettable that action was not completed on the proposed legislation. This will be one of the items on which I shall renew my efforts in the 88th Congress. I am hopeful that there will be committee action early in the session and that there will be congressional action in both Houses of Congress in the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

THE WASHINGTON GALLERY OF MODERN ART

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before Congress adjourns I must direct the attention of my colleagues and the Nation to the opening of the new Washington Gallery of Modern Art scheduled for October 30, 1962.

This event gives every indication of being a historic and artistic achievement of first magnitude. Museum directors and art officials from this country and from Europe will attend the opening which will feature the first major retrospective exhibition of Franz Kline, the late abstract expressionist painter.

The moving spirit behind this new gallery of modern art in Washington is my dear friend, Adelyn D. Breeskin. Mrs. Breeskin has served as director of the Baltimore Museum and has established the highest reputation among her colleagues in the art field. She is an unusually talented person and Washington is most fortunate to have her creative energies at work here.

A number of Members of the Senate were privileged to meet Mrs. Breeskin and to visit with her with respect to the projects that she has in mind for this city in the field of modern art, at a luncheon given for her only a short time ago.

The Washington Gallery of Modern Art under her outstanding direction will be recognized as one of the finest creative outlets for contemporary art. I am sure my colleagues join in giving Mrs. Breeskin and the Washington Gallery of Modern Art a solid vote of confidence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in last Sunday's Washington Post describing the activities of the Washington Gallery of Modern Art be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWEST GALLERY SEEKING SUPPORT

(By Leslie Judd Ahlander)

The most eagerly awaited art event this month is the opening of the new Washington Gallery of Modern Art October 30. The newly renovated building at 1503 21st Street NW., will have as its inaugural show the first major retrospective exhibition of Franz Kline, the late abstract expressionist painter.

Museum directors and art officials from all over the country will come here for the formal opening, and visitors are even expected from Europe. There are two reasons for this international interest in the new gallery and its opening show.

For one thing, Franz Kline, who, though a leader of the modern movement, never had an important one-man show or a definitive monograph written about his work, will at last be recognized with both an exhibit and a catalog with text by Elaine de Kooning, artist and personal friend as well as a perceptive chronicler of contemporary art trends.

Another factor is the high respect and affection in which the new gallery's director, Adelyn Breeskin, is held in the art field. Without her assured position, not nearly so many important Kline paintings would have been released for a Washington showing.

Following the Kline exhibit, a one-man show of the sculptor Reuben Nakian will run from January 8 to February 16. A show being assembled by Dore Ashton for the American Federation of Arts, entitled "Lyricism in Abstract Art," will run from February 19 to March 10.

The big Arshile Gorky retrospective which was seen at the Venice biennial last summer will come in March (only the Museum of Modern Art in New York and the Washington Gallery here will have this important show), followed by an exhibit tentatively called "Adventures in Modern Art," which will be "way-out and fun," according to Mrs. Breeskin.

From June 15 through August, the trustees of the gallery will display works from their own collections in a show that should surprise Washington by its variety and quality.

In order to be completely independent in its judgments, the new Washington Gallery of Modern Art has refused all Government help in financing its programs. This leaves its continuation squarely in the hands of interested Washingtonians.

The gallery has just started a major membership drive in categories that run from $10 to $5,000, with the memberships including not only invitations to exhibition openings but also an art rental gallery, a library, movies, lectures, and recitals. Over 300 originating members have already subscribed at $100 each.

In addition, works for the permanent collection have been coming in from many sources. Newest acquisitions are two pieces of sculpture, "Figure" by Hoflehner, the gift of David Greeger, and "Mystic Leaves" by Michael Guino, the gift of Mr. and Mrs. Alan Wurtzburger. The number of acquisitions was up to 19 at the last count.

Washington needs a gallery of modern art and this one promises the very best from the point of view of quality. Interested people are asked to phone FEderal 3–4027 or to write the gallery for membership forms.

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to express my congratulations and satisfaction on the appointment of William C. Doherty as first U.S. Ambassador to the new nation of Jamaica. Bill Doherty will be one of the first representatives of organized labor to serve his Nation abroad as Ambassador. But I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join with me in rejoicing at the complete appropriateness, the high personal qualifications of this man for such a post.

Bill Doherty has through the years made an outstanding reputation for himself as a labor leader of vigor, ability, and personal integrity. Not only in the United States but throughout Latin America and in Europe he is renowned for his tireless and determined opposition to dictatorship, whether it be on the right or the left. More than once he has stood up for the rights of the individual, the individual workingman and the individual citizen. In Jamaica organized labor is a strong and vital political force. Bill Doherty is the best man I know to comprehend and cope with the problems he will face in representing the United States of America to the people of Jamaica.

Furthermore, Mr. President, for the past 17 years in his work with the American Federation of Labor and then with the amalgamated AFL–CIO, Bill Doherty has worked to alert union members at home and abroad to the bitter menace of the Communist movement.

It is a measure of his ability and his contributions that Gen. Lucius Clay invited Doherty to Germany in 1945 to help reestablish a free trade union movement and to oust Communist elements which had infiltrated many unions. It is a measure of his skill and diplomacy in this critical area of international relations that he has already been appointed by two Presidents for important international missions. President Eisenhower named him an official U.S. delegate at the inauguration of Brazilian President Kubitschek. Last year, President Kennedy invited him to attend the important Punta del Este Conference in Uruguay as a special representative. He also attended Jamaica's Independence Day ceremonies last August as the President's special ambassador.

Mr. President, Bill Doherty with all the charm and verve of his magnetic personality will, I am positive, be a highly effective ambassador for the American way of life and for our free enterprise system. He will also be one of the most effective enemies of the Communist conspiracy which tries so hard to undermine free labor movements throughout the world.

In his important new post, Bill Doherty carries the hopes and best wishes of millions of Americans. We can be confident he will bring to his new position the same human warmth and dynamic enterprise which has been so conspicuous throughout his career of dedication and service to the cause of freedom.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon, at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 11 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled on being called to order by Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 12, 1962.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1663. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;

H.R. 7781. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad;

H.R. 8563. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit certain policies to be issued to members of duly organized national veterans' organizations;

H.R. 9045. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended;

H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;

H.R. 12135. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12217. An act for the relief of George Edward Leonard;

H.R. 12434. An act to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12708. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 13, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 12, 1962:

POSTMASTERS

OHIO

Harold B. Swan, Beach City.
John D. McCray, Greenfield.

GEORGIA

Hazel W. Lawson, Avondale Estates.

ILLINOIS

Donald E. Howe, Warrensburg.

NEW JERSEY

Mabel P. Wood, Barnegat Light.
M. Josephine Hulmes, Lebanon.
Margaret L. Wetzel, Leonardo.
Henry P. Hofstetter, Pine Beach.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The last words from the Bible, Revelation 22: 21: *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.*

Almighty God, whose divine pity and power are continually ministering to the pathos and poverty of human life, may we now pour out our hearts unto Thee in penitence and praise.

Grant that in these days, when disquieting moods and disturbing misgivings frequently assail our souls, inspire us to turn eagerly unto Thee to be quickened and fortified with a sense of the magnitude and majesty of Thy grace.

Though our "little systems have their day and cease to be" may we not be afraid to aspire and go forward with a devout and determined faith, trusting ourselves humbly and heroically to the leading of Thy Holy Spirit.

Now unto Him who is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1663. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;

H.R. 8269. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg; and

H.R. 8563. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit certain policies to be issued to members of duly organized national veterans' organizations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7932. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1946, so as to repeal portions thereof relating to residual rights in certain land on Santa Rosa Island, Florida.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13290. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12648) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 2, 51, and 53 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments to the bill (H.R. 9669) entitled "An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13290) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; if consent is given to this unanimous-consent request the House will have been bypassed at this time so far as knowing anything about what has happened with respect to the action on the Senate floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will my able and distinguished friend from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I am in sympathy with his point of view. The conferees whom the Speaker will appoint will go into this matter carefully, I assure the gentleman. To refresh our memories now, let me review what we did in the House. There were about 58 items considered by the House. The House struck out some 22 of them.

The budget estimate was around $640 or $650 million. We cut out of it $244 million. We cut out in the neighborhood of a third of it.

It is my understanding the other body has added about 27 new items and restored 3 old items that we took out here. The total added is around $145 million. I think what they restored was perhaps $10 million, so it really is not as big as it looks. The big item the other body put in there was the contribution to the civil service retirement fund for our retired Federal employees, to the tune of about $30 million, as well as I recall.

I assure my friend all of our conferees of the House, if it goes to conference, will get busy immediately. We will go into each one of these items with a lot of care.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says the other body has added 27 amendments to this bill. I have no way of knowing the dollar amounts contained in those amendments, no way of knowing what language is in the bill as inserted by the Senate. Neither has any other Member of the House except perhaps a limited few on the Appropriations Committee. I would like to suggest this——

Mr. THOMAS. We welcome the gentleman's suggestions.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to suggest that the unanimous-consent request be withheld for an hour or such time until the Appropriations Committee can provide a reasonable presentation of what has happened to this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I think I can do that reasonably well now, although not too well.

Mr. GROSS. It would take considerable time now and I fear it would not be adequate. I reiterate that I have no desire to prolong this session of Congress but I have every desire and every right to know what is in this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. We are going to protect the gentleman's right. We are going to work with him.

Mr. GROSS. I shall have to object, Mr. Speaker. I hope the gentleman will see to it that his committee provides those who may be interested with information as to what has transpired in connection with this bill. I am perfectly willing at a later time this afternoon if information is provided in a general way with respect to each of these amendments, to withdraw my objection. It is my purpose to cooperate. Then it may well be proper to let the bill go to conference.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my friend the printed copy is now available. That is very little consolation, I know that, because it takes time to go into this, but I offer it to him now.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I shall have to object.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask my distinguished friend from Iowa to withhold his objection momentarily?

Mr. GROSS. I withhold it.

Mr. THOMAS. Is there any specific item in there on which I could throw any light? I would be glad to try to. Let us discuss it now. Go ahead.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for providing me with this copy of the bill as amended by the other body, but I must have time to look at it to ascertain what these 27 Senate amendments mean. I cannot ask the gentleman questions about them when I do not know anything about them, and I cannot ferret them out in the bill and carry on this discussion.

Mr. THOMAS. May I suggest this to my friend, if the gentleman wants to exercise his right, and we will not fuss about it, let us and the committee sit down with whomever the gentleman wants to have with him and come back here in 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I would not like to put a time limit on it as to 30 or 35 minutes. The gentleman from Iowa proposes to be as reasonable as possible about this. I should like to say this at this time: We are doing nothing today, and have not been doing anything for many days, that could not have been done back in July or August.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my friend, if there is no objection, and, of course, we cannot remove the gentleman's objection, and I am not trying to, we will be back in about 30 minutes and we will be prepared at that time to answer any questions our able friend wants to ask.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my very able friend from Iowa, who is very well acquainted with these matters.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure every Member of the House realizes this most difficult job that the Members on this committee and the other committees on appropriations have had to deal with during this session of the Congress. We have reduced the President's budget in the House by over $4 billion. Now we have this supplemental bill which, of course, is always a controversial bill and it has been more controversial this year than ever before. That is in part also due to the fact that so many of these bills have been held up so long and here we are in the dying days of the session with this large supplemental bill before the Congress. All we can do as members of the House committee is to go to conference and try our very best to bring back a bill as close to the House figure as we possibly can. This is no small job. I appreciate the feeling of every Member when they object to this kind of legislative procedure, facts are that even the members of this committee have not known until right now what projects the other body added to this bill. So I am not at all adverse to having all the House Members who are still here to take a look at this bill before the bill goes to conferees. This is one of those things which is most obnoxious to me, and I am sure it is to every Member of the House, to be stalemated here at this late hour with a bill that has become a catchall appropriation bill. I hope that such a procedure will be stopped in the next Congress. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has struggled with this bill for many months. We had quite long hearings on all these items that we put in the House bill. We struck out $244 million for items that the budget had requested. So, as I said before, this is no small chore for the members of this committee, to face the Senate conferees in an attempt to bring about some kind of order out of chaos. But we shall do our very best, with a difficult problem.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for his fine contribution, which he always makes in our work both in committee and on the floor of the House. I also want to thank the able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. Speaker, at this time I withdraw the unanimous-consent request and we will be back in 30 minutes, and we hope we will be able to answer any questions that anybody wants to know about.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] withdraws his unanimous-consent request at this time.

VALIDATE THE COVERAGE OF CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12820) to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 218(p) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting 'Maine' after 'Kansas,'."

Page 2, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph 1518(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'when bleached, 50 percentum ad valorem;', and

"(2) by striking out 'or other material above mentioned, shall be subject to the rate of duty provided in this paragraph for such materials' and inserting in lieu thereof 'or other material above mentioned, or wholly or in chief value of any bleached natural grasses, grains, leaves, plants, shrubs, herbs, trees, or parts thereof provided for in paragraph 1722, shall be subject to the rate of duty provided for such materials'.

"(b) Paragraph 1722 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is amended by striking out 'and' before 'seaweeds', and by inserting before the period at the end of such paragraph the following: '; and natural grasses, grains, leaves, plants, shrubs, herbs, trees, and parts thereof, not specially provided for, not further advanced than bleached.' "

Page 2, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 4. The amendments made by section 3 of this Act shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes".

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order that the chairman may give us a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as unanimously passed by the House on August 30, 1962, the purpose of H.R. 12820 was to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act.

The amendments of the other body do not affect the provisions of the House-passed bill, but added sections incorporating the provisions of two other House-passed bills. The first amendment contains the language of the bill H.R. 8853, which was passed by the House on October 5, 1962. The purpose of this amendment is to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen. The original House bill containing this provision was also passed unanimously by the House.

The second amendment of the other body incorporates the substance of H.R. 12109, which passed the House unanimously on October 4, 1962, and would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit certain natural grasses and other natural materials to be imported free of duty.

I urge that the House concur in these amendments of the other body.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman that they have all been passed by the House.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. So it is simply a matter of combining two bills that were sent over to the Senate separately into one bill. Here we are agreeing to the consolidation that took place in the Senate.

Mr. MILLS. Yes. Two identical bills passed the House by unanimous consent. One of the bills was offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] and the other by the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. The bills, as I said, passed the House by unanimous consent. Rather than passing them as Senate items the Senate added the amendments to this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], and other members of the Ways and Means Committee. These are small bills, but of importance to some of my people who are intensely interested. I thank the gentlemen for the consideration that has been given them.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER], and I may have permission to extend our remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 12820, contains an amendment incorporating the provisions of H.R. 8853, a bill I introduced to allow Maine firemen and policemen to receive retirement and other benefits under social security, if they so desire, in addition to their regular retirement systems. My bill, H.R. 8853, passed the House under unanimous consent on Friday, October 5, 1962.

The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has been most considerate and cooperative in helping to give these dedicated public safety officials in my State of Maine the opportunity to increase retirement income and afford the survivors additional protection.

This legislation will make public safety positions more attractive in my State of Maine.

MAXIMUM LIMITATIONS ON MEDICAL, ETC., EXPENSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, and so forth, expenses, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2555)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 7, and 8.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 and agree to the same.

WILBUR D. MILLS,
CECIL R. KING,
HALE BOGGS,
NOAH M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
ROBT. S. KERR,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Senate amendment No. 1 adds a new section 2 to the House bill. The proposed section 2 contains the substance of H.R. 10117, as passed by the House. The amendment would allow a pension or annuity plan, qualified under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide for the payment of benefits for sickness, accident, hospitalization, and medical expenses of retired employees and their spouses and dependents, if such benefits are subordinate to the retirement benefits provided by the plan. It would make it possible for an employer, where he chooses to do so, to provide these benefits through a qualified pension or annuity plan, rather than being required to do so separately, as under existing law. Under the proposed section 2, this feature would apply to plans funded through insurance, as well as to trusteed plans.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: Under regulations recognized and approved by the Congress in House Concurrent Resolution 50, 79th Congress, and under section 39.23(m)-16 of regulations 118, a taxpayer had an option to charge certain intangible drilling and development costs in connection with oil and gas properties to capital, or to expense such costs. After the taxpayer has exercised this option, he is bound thereby with respect to all optional expenditures covered by the regulation, whenever made, in connection with oil and gas properties.

Senate amendment No. 2 would give a taxpayer who has exercised such an option to capitalize intangible drilling and development costs (rather than deducting such costs as expenses) a new option to deduct such costs as expenses. The new option is granted for the first taxable year ending on or after the date of enactment of the bill, and shall be exercised at the time of filing the return for that year, but otherwise is treated for all purposes as an option exercised under, and subject to, section 263(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells) and the regulations prescribed thereunder.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: Under existing law (sec. 5121 of the 1954 code) each State and local government retail liquor store as well as each privately owned retail liquor store is required to pay an annual special occupational tax of $54. Senate amendment No. 3 amends section 5123(b) of such code (which relates to dealers conducting their liquor business in more than one location) so as to provide that a State or political subdivision operating retail liquor stores will be required to pay only one such tax each year instead of paying the tax separately for each store location, and makes additional changes of a purely technical and conforming nature.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: Existing section 1341(a) of the 1954 code provides alternative methods of computing the tax where the taxpayer restores a substantial amount held under claim of right. Senate amendment No. 4 adds two new paragraphs to section 1341(b) to specify rules relating to (1) the treatment of net operating loss carryovers loss carryovers and capital loss carryovers for purposes of determining which of the alternative methods of computation will be used, and (2) the treatment of net operating loss carryovers and capial loss carryovers for taxable years after the year of restoration after the determination has been made as to which of the alternative methods of computation will be used.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: Existing section 7608 of the 1954 code provides that internal revenue officers who are charged with the duty of enforcing subtitle E of the code or other Federal laws pertaining to liquor, tobacco, and firearms shall have certain specified powers (including the power to carry firearms, to serve warrants, subpenas, and summonses, and to make certain arrests and seizures in the performance of their duty). Senate amendment No. 5 adds to section 7608 a new subsection (b) which would provide that criminal investigators of the Intelligence Division or Internal Security Division of the Internal Revenue Service who are charged with the duty of enforcing any of the criminal provisions of the internal revenue laws (or other criminal provisions relating to internal revenue) shall have power to execute and serve search and arrest warrants and serve Federal subpenas and summonses, to make arrests without warrants for offenses involving the internal revenue laws, and to seize property subject to forfeiture under such laws.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: Section 4521 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides for the imposition of an import tax on certain petroleum products. Senate amendment No. 6 added a new section 4522 to the code to provide that no tax is to be imposed under section 4521 on any article sold for use as fuel on vessels of the United States employed as common carriers on the high seas or the Great Lakes pursuant to certification by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Section 824(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as contained in sec. 8 of the Revenue Act of 1962) provides that in determining the statutory underwriting income or loss of certain mutual casualty insurance companies for the taxable year there is to be allowed a special deduction in the case of any company having a concentrated windstorm, etc., premium percentage, of more than 40 percent. In determining this percentage, the computation may be made on the basis of an area consisting of one State, or an area within 200 miles of any fixed point selected by the taxpayer.

Senate amendment No. 7 added a third alternative area as a basis for the computation; namely, an area within 400 miles of any fixed point selected by the taxpayer. However, if the taxpayer elected this third alternative, his special deduction was reduced by one-half.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 8: This amendment amended section 543(c)(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which deals with an exception from the definition of "personal holding company" for certain small business investment companies. It also amended section 1243 of the code, which deals with the loss of a small business investment company on certain securities acquired pursuant to section 304 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

The Senate recedes.

Wilbur D. Mills,
Cecil R. King,
Hale Boggs,
Noah M. Mason,
John W. Byrnes,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS (interrupting the reading.) Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, perhaps some little explanation would be in order.

Mr. Speaker, the first amendment that the House conferees accepted to the bill is the language of H.R. 10117 that had previously passed the House by unanimous consent with an amendment.

The second amendment has to do with what I think is more or less a procedural correction of the law with respect to the allocation of the deduction of intangible and development expenses.

The third amendment has to do with liquor stores operated by the State in lieu of an individual, the State being permitted to operate under one Federal stamp rather than one for each store. A bill of this sort passed the House by unanimous consent after having been amended by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Green].

Mr. Speaker, another amendment put in by the other body deals with amounts that a taxpayer previously received and properly included in his income under claim of right in a situation in which such taxpayer is required to restore such amounts in a later year.

In the 1954 code we provided a method of either doing this within the taxable year of payment or spread over the taxable years in which the incident arose, but we did not provide for any carryover or carryback of any net operating losses. This amendment merely provides for the carryover or carryback of any loss that may accrue as a result of that.

Mr. Speaker, the next amendment is entirely a procedural or administrative amendment. It would extend to criminal investigators of the Intelligence and Internal Security Divisions of the Internal Revenue Service the same authority under present law for Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division employees relating to the power to execute and serve search and arrest warrants.

Mr. Speaker, there were some amendments that the other body added that were not accepted by the conferees, and unless there are some questions I will not discuss those that were deleted.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. First may I say I concur fully with the gentleman's explanation of the results of the conference. It should be pointed out, however, in view of the colloquy yesterday between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, that this bill comes back from conference in complete accord with the understanding which the conferees had when they went to conference with the Senate. We sustained the position that the chairman at that time announced we would attempt to sustain, and I can tell every Member of the House that we were completely successful in the position that we assured the Members we would try to uphold when we went to conference.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the addition of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes]. He is always very helpful, and certainly I concur in his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses, and for other purposes.

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as passed by the House, the bill H.R. 10620 liberalized the dollar limitations on the maximum deductions permitted under present law for medical expenses. The other body made no change in the basic bill as passed by the House.

The other body did, however, make a number of substantive amendments to the basic bill which I shall briefly describe.

MEDICAL, ETC., BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES, THEIR SPOUSES AND DEPENDENTS

Mr. Speaker, the first amendment made by the other body adopted the substance of the bill H.R. 10117, which was unanimously approved by the House a few weeks ago. The Members of the House will recall that this bill permitted qualified employees' pension plans to provide sickness, accident and health, hospital and medical expense benefits for retired employees, their spouses and dependents. The other body added a provision to make clear that these benefits may also be provided under nontrusteed employee plans which are funded through insurance contracts as well as under trusteed plans. This amendment was accepted.

NEW ELECTION TO DEDUCT INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT EXPENSES

Mr. Speaker, under present law, the election to deduct intangible drilling and development expenses must be made for the first year for which they are incurred, and such election is binding for all subsequent years. If this election is not for such first year, these expenses must be capitalized and no further opportunity exists under present law for taxpayers to make an election to deduct them.

This Senate amendment would give taxpayers, who initially failed to make a timely election to deduct these expenses, a new option to deduct them for the first taxable year ending on or after enactment. Such new option is to be exercised at the time of filing the income tax return for such first taxable year and would be binding for all future years.

Under the conference agreement, this amendment was retained.

LIQUOR STORES OPERATED BY STATES, POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS, ETC.

The other body also amended the provisions of the bill as passed by the House by the addition of an amendment providing that States and political subdivisions that operate retail liquor stores would be required to purchase only one $54 occupational tax stamp rather than one such stamp for each store location, as is the case under present law. This amendment incorporates the text of the bill, H.R. 2016, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable William J. Green, and which was recently passed by the House. Under the conference agreement this amendment is retained.

RESTORATION OF AMOUNTS HELD UNDER A CLAIM OF RIGHT

Mr. Speaker, another amendment made by the other body deals with amounts that a taxpayer previously received and properly included in his income under a claim of right in a situation in which such taxpayer is required to restore such amounts in a later year. Under present law, the amount so restored may either be deducted in the year of restoration or, if a lower tax results, the taxes for prior years may be recomputed by excluding this amount from income in those years. If the deduction of such amount causes a loss in the year of restoration no carryover or carryback is allowed.

The amendment made by the other body provides that for the purpose of determining which of these alternative computations will result in a lower tax, if the deduction in the year of restoration results in a net operating loss, such loss may be carried back the permissible 3-year period but it may not be carried over. If, however, the alternative exclusion of the amounts restored during the taxable year from the income of prior years results in a net operating loss of a net capital loss in those taxable years, such losses may be carried back and carried over but not beyond the taxable year.

The amendment by the other body also provides that any such net operating or capital loss that is not absorbed prior to the taxable year may be carried over to years after the taxable year to the same extent as any other net operating or capital loss occurring in such years. Under the conference agreement this amendment is retained.

ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO INTERNAL REVENUE

The other body added an amendment which would, except for the authority to carry firearms, extend to criminal investigators of the Intelligence and Internal Securities Division of the Internal Revenue Service the same authority provided under present law for Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division employees relating to the power to execute and serve search and arrest warrants; to make arrests without warrants under certain circumstances; and, to seize property that is subject to forfeiture under the Internal Revenue laws. The Treasury Department urged the adoption of this amendment and under the conference agreement this amendment is retained.

EXEMPTION FOR BUNKER FUEL

Mr. Speaker, the other body also amended the bill to exempt from the import tax on petroleum products any article which is sold for use as fuel on vessels of the United States which are employed as common carriers on the high seas or on the Great Lakes pursuant to a certificate by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Under the conference agreement this amendment was rejected.

MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES UNDERWRITING CONCENTRATED RISKS

Another amendment made by the other body would have provided, on an elective basis, an expanded geographical area within which the risks underwritten by a mutual insurance company could be concentrated, thereby entitling such company to the special treatment accorded concentrated risk companies under the Revenue Act of 1962. Under the conference agreement this amendment was rejected.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. Speaker, another amendment added by the other body dealt with the exemption of small business investment companies from the personal holding company provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and the treatment of losses sustained by small business investment companies on their equity investments.

Under the conference agreement, this amendment was deleted.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin and I may extend our remarks in further explanation of the conference report, and that other Members who desire to do so may also have the privilege of extending their remarks in the Record on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING PROTECTION FOR THE GOLDEN EAGLE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 489, to provide protection for the golden eagle, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

> Page 2, line 8, after "egg" insert "thereof".
>
> Page 3, line 4, after "That" insert "on request of the Governor of any State, the Secretary of the Interior shall authorize the taking of golden eagles for the purpose of seasonally protecting domesticated flocks and herds in such State, in accordance with regulations established under the provisions of this section, in such part or parts of such State and for such periods as the Secretary determines to be necessary to protect such interests: *Provided further*, That".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I merely ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Goodling] may have permission to extend his remarks in the Record on this measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, conservationists everywhere won a notable victory today with the passage of House Resolution 489. Designed primarily to protect the golden eagle, it will serve a dual purpose. Counts show an alarming decline in the number of both species of eagle, the bald and golden.

Quite aside from the necessity of protecting the golden eagle for its own sake, the resemblance of the young golden eagle to the bald eagle has contributed heavily to the elimination of the latter through wrong identification by hunters. This legislation will arrest the decline of our national bird by prohibiting the taking of either variety.

While the hearings did not show a single instance where the golden eagle exhibited any predatory characteristics, nevertheless there is a considerable body of opinion that it is or may be a predator, for which reason the bill distinguishes between the absolute protection enjoyed by the bald eagle since 1940, and the somewhat qualified protection extended to the golden eagle. With respect to the latter, the Secretary of the Interior is given authority to permit control measures on a showing that the bird is exhibiting predatory tendencies in a particular area.

Protection of these majestic birds represents an important milestone on the road to preserve our fast dwindling wildlife. It would indeed be a sad commentary if the symbol of our national emblem were to go the way of the American bison, the carrier pigeon, and several other species of wildlife.

This proposal had the endorsement of many individuals interested in preserving some of our heritage for posterity. It was endorsed by, and its passage insured by, the notable assistance of the National Audubon Society, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, the Izaak Walton League of America, Fraternal Order of Eagles, many State conservation commissions and others.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, in order to add to the legislative history, the RECORD should show that many livestock growers and game conservationists have expressed serious misgivings about this bill. As the hearings will show, the golden eagle migrates to the Southwest in the winter seasons each year and there they live chiefly on young lambs, goat kids, fawn, and wild turkey. Because of this fact this bird has replaced the bobcat, the coyote, and the mountain lion as the number one predator in that affected area.

Therefore, it is important that any legislation enacted designed to protect the golden eagle, protect the right of those adversely affected to defend themselves by taking the eagle when it becomes necessary.

There are approximately 20 counties in Texas that are visited by this bird during the winter seasons. Those counties are in the very heart of the area where vast numbers of lambs are raised, and also many goats and wild game.

This menace is recognized by the Department of the Interior, and the need for adequate provision to protect the people against this predator is also recognized. In that connection, we are now given positive assurance that under the terms of the pending bill permits will be readily granted for the eagles to be destroyed in all areas where they are proven to be predators of domesticated animals and wild game.

Mr. Speaker, I have received from the Under Secretary of the Interior, James K. Carr, a letter, dated October 11, 1962, recognizing the problem and giving assurances that if enacted this law will be so administered as to allow the taking of the golden eagle when and where it may be necessary, including the 20-county area I have referred to. I wish to include a copy of that letter at this point:

> U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
> OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
> *Washington, D.C., October 11, 1962.*
>
> Hon. O. C. FISHER,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. FISHER: We appreciate your concern as to whether House Joint Resolution 489 will permit adequate protection of livestock from golden eagle depredations in southwest Texas.
>
> Through your efforts a very complete legislative history has been developed on this resolution. If the bill is enacted, the Secretary's regulations concerning taking of golden eagles will be governed by the views of the Senate Commerce Committee set forth on page 2 of Senate Report No. 1986. The committee report makes it clear that golden eagles can be taken on an areawide basis rather than under individual permits as you recommended. We agree that the 20-county area in southwest Texas as presented in your testimony on page 21 of the Senate hearings of June 26, 1962, on this bill, is the area of the most serious golden eagle depredations. The Secretary's regulations will provide for recognition of this area by not requiring that individual permits will be required to control golden eagles that are damaging livestock.
>
> The period of the year when golden eagles can be controlled will not present any problems under the terms of the proposed resolution. The lambing and kidding season in southwest Texas will soon be here and we shall do everything possible to prepare for it if House Joint Resolution 489 is enacted.
>
> We are confident that we can work cooperatively with you and the State of Texas in the successful administration of this House joint resolution, and we sincerely appreciate the efforts you have made to make us more aware of the special problems you have in your district.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> JAMES K. CARR,
> *Under Secretary of the Interior.*

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in these closing moments of this session of the Congress I am opposed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 489. This is a very complicated matter and one in which more time and study should have been given. Surely, this legislation need not be acted upon at this late hour in the session because many Members are occupied with major pieces of legislation and this legislation can be better considered when the Congress reconvenes in January and every Member of the Congress will have sufficient time to study all of the implications of this measure.

I for one, would be hopeful that this bill could be deferred until a later date because I am opposed to it and for the further reason that I believe the membership has not been fully informed of all its consequences.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLA.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7392) to amend the act of July 2, 1948, so as to repeal portions thereof relating to residual rights in certain land on Santa Rosa Island, Fla., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

> Page 2, line 10, after "the" where it appears the second time, insert "current".
>
> Page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out ", as of May 22, 1950".

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my understanding is that this bill has been cleared with the minority members, including the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it has been cleared by everyone on the committee, including the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. Speaker, on July 23, 1961, the House passed H.R. 7932 which would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to Okaloosa County, Fla., all the residual interest of the United States in a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla. Except for this residual interest, the remainder of the title to the land had been conveyed to the county, pursuant to an act of Congress, on May 22, 1950.

H.R. 7932, as passed by the House, would have authorized the conveyance of this residual interest of the U.S. Government at the fair market value as of the date of the original transaction, May 22, 1950.

Yesterday, October 11, the Senate passed the bill with an amendment. The amendment provides that the consideration for the conveying of the residual interest of the United States to Okaloosa County will be the current fair market value of that interest rather than the fair market value of the interest in May of 1950. The Senate amendment obviously gives no less protection to the Federal interest than the bill as passed by the House and may, in fact, provide a greater protection. Therefore, it is in the Federal interest to agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FONG YEE HIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2555) for the relief of Fong Yee Hin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman if this matter has been discussed with my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, it has been discussed. This is a bill that would permit an engineer employed by the New York City Transit Authority to have his immigrant status adjusted so as to make him eligible for citizenship. He is 31 years old and has been a resident of the United States for 22 years. He is the father of two American-born children.

Mr. POFF. Do I further understand that the gentleman from West Virginia agrees that this bill should be considered at this time?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; the gentleman from West Virginia not only agrees, but the gentleman thinks this will be the entering wedge for complete agreement with the other body on several other private bills.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this bill is confined strictly to this one case—this one immigration case?

Mr. WALTER. If the gentleman will yield, this applies to one person, an engineer who is now employed by the New York City Transit Authority.

Mr. GROSS. And it deals with no other subject?

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fong Yee Hin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 25, 1940, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIVERSION OF MAJOR DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to read in today's New York Times a statement by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's special assistant for science and technology, to the effect that the Federal Government was diverting major defense contracts away from the Midwest because there is an "intellectual vacuum" in the Midwest. The fact of the matter is that the colleges, universities, and research centers of the Midwest are producing more than their share of the so-called intellectuals involved in Government research and development. The Far West and the Far East are siphoning these people off as fast as we can produce them. The Government, on the other hand, is paying very little attention to a proper distribution of their research and development contracts and is operating on the fallacious assumption that the mere location of a research and development facility means that all the brains originate from that area. It would pay them to examine the records of their personnel and see where they had their training. The Government itself seems to deliberately avoid the Midwest with its inhouse research and development facilities. It is my own considered opinion that Weisner and people like him should stop being critical and start being realistic and helpful by using the great potential of the Midwest.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable J. Edward Roush.

The President's special assistant for science and technology, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, should be censured in his charge that major defense contracts are being diverted away from the Midwest because of the existence there of an "intellectual vacuum."

There is no question that defense contracts have been diverted from the Midwest to California and the Gulf States. However, the record will disclose that this diversion is more the result of political pressure rather than the result of any intellectual vacuum.

A great majority of the scientists who now dwell in California and Texas were born in the Midwest and educated in its schools and colleges. It was the defense research contracts which lured them from the Midwest to their new homes. The postwar research contracts were first directed to the west coast and the Gulf States because they had unutilized defense production facilities which were readily available. After that, contract followed contract. Our Midwest scientists were induced to leave the Midwest to the land of "cost-plus and name your own terms." More scientists brought more contracts—more contracts brought more scientists. If the Midwest has been depleted of its scientists, it was because of the "scorched earth" policies of the west coast contractors who had unleashed hands in the Federal till.

Those charged with the handling of defense contracts for research and production cannot ignore the economic impact of $52.6 billion in defense spending. This is big business. Some pattern of apportionment must be developed in this immense program of defense spending. The patriotism of the Midwest is already strained to pay the tremendous tax burden to support economic impact in other places. This could develop into an organized effort to cut military spending and weaken national support for the defense program. In following current policies which discriminate against the Midwest, the Defense Department may be "penny wise and pound foolish." The Defense Department cannot afford to lose the tax support and goodwill of the Midwest.

A DIRTY TRICK

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn that the military has claimed for itself the right to requisition or commandeer private property for use in peacetime, and particularly for a nonmilitary use. It seems the requisition was made for claimed "troop movement."

Five weeks ago, the Conroe (Tex.) High School entered into a charter agreement with the bus company serving Conroe for five buses to carry the high school football team, band, and fans to Austin, Tex., for a Friday, October 5, game with an Austin high school. On Thursday afternoon, October 4, the bus company was forced to cancel the charter on four of the five buses, because the U.S. Air Force requisitioned all available buses in the area for "troop movement."

And what was the troop movement? It was troops from San Antonio to Dallas to watch the football game between Southern Methodist University and Air Force Academy on October 6.

We have recent evidence that an unarmed and peace-loving citizenship cannot prevail against the naked power of the Armed Forces of the United States, but this arbitrary setting aside of a private contract long before entered into is an unreasonable exercise of military might. Several days ago I inquired of the Air Force about this.

It is a matter that would bear investigation by the Committee on Armed Services of the House.

In connection with this I read into the Record an editorial carried in the Conroe (Tex.) Courier, of date October 7, 1962:

A Dirty Trick

> School officials, the members of the Touchdown Club and the general public are still mad at the "dirty trick" pulled off by the U.S. Air Force and the Trailways Bus System serving Conroe.

Thursday afternoon four of the five chartered buses, which had been chartered for the Conroe Tiger-Austin Lanier football game were canceled by the bus officials with the statement "the U.S. Air Force has requisitioned all available buses in this area for troop movement."

The troop movement the Air Force spoke of was the moving of soldiers from San Antonio to Dallas to watch the SMU-Air Force Academy football game Saturday.

We say this is a dirty trick for the New Frontier to pull off * * * depriving over 100 band students of Conroe High School from attending the game and giving the Tigers moral support at the tilt. It also kept home 50 or more members of the Touchdown Club who always attend the out-of-town games to boost the Tigers.

Conroe High School has chartered buses for many years and if the Air Force says they have priority on all chartered buses for the purpose of furnishing transportation to a football game for the enlisted men or officers, they are liars.

Charles Sheffield, a civilian coordinator for the Air Force with bus companies, said Thursday that they had requisitioned the buses first chartered by Conroe some 5 weeks ago.

G. A. Bolton of Houston, an official of the bus company told a reporter Thursday night that the Air Force had chartered the buses for troop movement, and it was necessary to cancel Conroe's buses as he understood the military had first priority.

When the Air Force stoops to the very, very low of using the words "troop movements" in order to force bus companies to cancel chartered trips already contracted for by high schools, so that enlisted soldiers may go to a football game, then our country is in a sad state of affairs.

School officials were "burned up" here, the band members were steaming, the press over the State said it was a "dirty deal" and a member of the Armed Forces told this reporter contacted Friday, who is in the position to know the rules of the Armed Forces, said that the Air Force lied when they stated they had priority over chartered buses and that they tossed a "curve ball" at Conroe in using the words "troop movement" to the bus company in order that they could obtain buses already chartered for a trip planned at the last moment for the soldiers at San Antonio.

The Courier suggests that our Congressmen at Washington check into this sad affair here in Texas concerning such tricks as the above being used by the Air Force.

SMALL WINNINGS IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, there is much fear through the land, sparked by the use of naked force to usurp and abuse the rights of American citizens. If this abuse should continue and progress, those who follow us will not be privileged to enjoy the liberties and guarantees which we have enjoyed and Khrushchev's promise that our grandchildren will live under socialism will surely come to pass. Posterity, in its grief, will ask of today's generation, "Did none of you realize what was happening?"

For them, should that disastrous day come to pass, I am placing here a few of the many newspaper editorials across our great Nation, which will answer, "Yes, some of us knew".

The editorials speak for themselves. I can only add that when the editorialists of the Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press, the Washington Star and the Washington Post all agree that the fundamental constitutionally guaranteed rights of American citizens have been violated by their Government, then there can be no doubt in any reasonable mind but that such violations occurred.

[From the Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press, Oct. 1, 1962]

SMALL WINNINGS IN MISSISSIPPI

Now that the Federal Government has won the battle of Oxford, Miss., it is appropriate for Americans everywhere to ask a few questions about racial rights and racial wrongs and the direction in which the majority of Americans want this country to head.

Certainly there can be no comfort to any logically inclined American in the fact that several people died and more were painfully injured in the rioting that followed the forced entry of a Negro student to the campus of the University of Mississippi. There can be no admiration for students who took part in these riots.

But neither can there be any admiration for the Negro who insisted on his court-ordered right to attend the university, knowing that violence was the certain outcome of his insistence.

There can be no admiration for a Governor of Mississippi, who carried his State to a confrontation that it obviously couldn't win.

But there can be no admiration either for a brash young Attorney General and his brother, the President of the United States, who on their part failed to steer away from this shameful showdown.

This was not an exercise of justice but a test of wills.

Let us suppose that the matter had been handled in a different, and saner, way. Suppose that, after the Federal court ordered the University of Mississippi to accept the Negro student, the Governor of Mississippi had held a conference with the prospective student, and law enforcement officers and officials of the university. At such a conference all of the problems involved could have been gone over, and it is very possible that some solution might have been found that would have avoided violence.

Or suppose that the Attorney General of the United States, instead of sending Federal marshals and Federal airplanes to force the Negro's acceptance by the University of Mississippi, had counseled patience and good will to all concerned.

Suppose that the NAACP, that great guardian of the right to agitation, had turned good American and said peace and the welfare of all Americans is vital to all people of all races and that any individual should forego his own desires in order to protect American unity.

This country is tearing itself apart over a politically inspired division in race hatred.

One Negro has won his way into one institution, at a cost of many lives through at least a generation of bitterness.

One Attorney General has had his way, and one President has upheld Federal authority over the States.

The winnings are pretty small when compared with the wrecking effect this affair has had on national unity, at a time when we should be training troops to move into Cuba instead of training them, as we have been training them, to put down riots in our own country.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1962]

LAW AND ORDER

Three days have passed since violence erupted in Oxford, Miss., on Sunday evening and made necessary the intervention of Federal troops. At least a sullen semblance of order has been restored. But the situation is undoubtedly still tense and ugly, with dangerous undercurrents that could produce new outbreaks of lawlessness. Perhaps it would have been wise to declare martial law in Oxford in order to enable military authorities lawfully to search for weapons and take other summary measures to maintain order. Perhaps a declaration of martial law would still be desirable. It is disquieting, in any case, to learn that, without any declaration of martial law, soldiers are in some instances acting without regard to procedures established by law.

The Army was sent into Mississippi expressly to reestablish respect for the Constitution. Its mission can only be corrupted if it behaves in unconstitutional ways. Roadblocks, searches and seizures, and other emergency measures may be necessary; if so, let the emergency be recognized and military rule be proclaimed. In this connection, it seems in order to ask if all the protection of due process are being accorded Edwin A. Walker. For all the malevolence of his part in the Oxfod violence, he ought not to be denied reasonable release on bail and he ought not be committed to a mental institution even for examination without the precautions customary in the case of such a commitment.

It was to uphold the law as well as to maintain order that the Army was sent into Mississippi. Let it manifest, therefore, the most conscientious respect for law consonant with the immensely difficult and delicate task entrusted to it.

[From the Evening Star, Oct. 4, 1962]

POLITICAL PRISONER?

There is nothing in the record, as we view it, to support the contention that former Major General Walker is a "political prisoner." There is strong support, however, for the belief that his legal rights have been violated by the Government.

General Walker was arrested about noon on Monday and charged with rebellion, insurrection, and seditious conspiracy in connection with riot at the University of Mississippi. These are grave charges. If they can be proved he should be convicted and severely punished. But until found guilty by a jury, he is presumed to be innocent.

Two hours after his arrest a hearing was held before a Federal judge in Mississippi. General Walker, according to Representative Alger, of Texas, was not represented by counsel. The judge allegedly on the basis of statements made by a psychiatrist who had not even seen, much less examined, General Walker, ordered the latter committed to a Federal mental institution in Missouri, and fixed bail at $100,000.

His friends and family have raised this excessive amount. But the U.S. attorney in the Missouri district involved says General Walker will not become eligible for bail until after completion of a mental examination, which usually takes from 60 to 90 days. All of this, of course, is being done over the vigorous protests of General Walker's attorneys. But it is being done nonetheless, and if the Government can do this to General Walker it can do the same thing to any citizen.

When a riot is underway and people are being killed and wounded it doubtless may become necessary to act without too much concern for the niceties of the law. But the riot started and ended Sunday night. Four days later, however, General Walker sits in a prison hospital under circumstances which point to a denial of his constitutional rights. And certainly there is a basis for Mr. ALGER's assertion that the troops in Mississippi, who are still searching cars and individuals without a declaration of martial law, are violating the fourth amendment.

When the riot started the Government was forced to act. But continued illegal action and physical abuse of arrested suspects is inexcusable.

[From the Sunday Star, Oct. 7, 1962]

GENERAL WALKER INSANE?

The Department of Justice insists it has adhered faithfully to the law in confining former Major General Walker to a mental institution. Maybe so. But if this is correct, the law affords no visible protection to an individual in General Walker's situation.

He was arrested last Monday on serious charges in connection with the riot at the University of Mississippi. Taken before a U.S. commissioner, he was advised of his legal rights. General Walker waived his right to counsel and to a preliminary hearing. He was assured that he would be tried in Mississippi on the charges against him, and bail was set at $100,000. With that, he was flown to a Federal prison hospital in Springfield, Mo., with every reason to believe that he would be eligible for release on bail when he got there.

General Walker didn't know that the Department of Justice on the following day would bring mental commitment proceedings against him in Mississippi which would result in his being denied release on bail in Missouri. In fact, it is not clear when the decision to seek commitment was made. But it must have been made not later than about noon on Tuesday. An hour earlier, according to Representative ALGER, of Texas, he was being assured by the Attorney General personally that General Walker's transfer to Springfield "had no connection with the fact that there is a mental hospital connected with that prison." He was also assured, Mr. ALGER told the House, that there would be no barrier to General Walker's release if he posted the bail fixed by the court.

Meanwhile, the wheels were turning swiftly in Washington. Someone decided that the general should be committed for mental observation at Springfield. The Chief Psychiatrist of the Federal Prison Bureau prepared an affidavit for submission to a Federal judge in Mississippi—not in Missouri, where General Walker was.

This affidavit is an interesting document. Its essential conclusion is that General Walker's recent behavior "may be indicative of an underlying mental disturbance." The basis for his conclusion, the psychiatrist said, was a reading of newspaper stories, unspecified "indications" in an unidentified "medical history," and "other information" of an undisclosed nature "available to me."

Armed with this flimsy weapon, the U.S. attorney in Mississippi, doubtless on instructions from Washington, appeared before Federal Judge Claude Clayton, sitting in Oxford. The attorney told the judge that on the basis of the information from the psychiatrist, he had "reasonable cause" to believe that General Walker may be presently insane or so mentally incompetent as to be unable to understand the nature of the proceedings against him or to properly assist in his own defense. With this, the judge signed the commitment papers, and the U.S. attorney in Springfield thereupon said that General Walker would be held for from 60 to 90 days for mental examination and that he could not be released on bail.

It is important to note, we think, that the sole question is whether the general, who certainly has offered no defense of insanity, is able to understand the nature of the proceedings against him and to assist in his own defense. Without in any way condoning his behavior, we have seen nothing which indicates that he lacks this degree of mental capacity. And we do not think that this inference is overcome by an undocumented conclusion that he "may be" suffering from "an underlying mental disturbance"—whatever that means.

This is a question, however, which must be decided in the courts. And, thanks to the availability of the writ of habeas corpus, the Department of Justice must show cause in Springfield on Tuesday why General Walker should not be released on bond. Beyond that, the Department has been ordered by a Springfield Federal court to certify the "true cause" of General Walker's detention. The full story of the Walker case should be developed in the course of these proceedings.

Meanwhile, there is ample reason, we think, to be concerned over a procedure under which an accused man can reasonably believe on one day that he will be released on bail, only to discover 24 hours later that he has been committed to a mental institution, without right of bail, on the statement of a psychiatrist who had never examined him and by a judge who had never seen him.

[From the Palestine (Tex.) Herald-Press, Oct. 7, 1962]

BEHIND THE EMOTIONAL ISSUE

Did you ever expect to be able to draw a parallel between the seizure of power in Germany by Adolf Hitler and events in the United States?

It's a thousand to one such a thought has never crossed your mind. Yet—

The first act of Hitler on his climb to dictatorship was to create an emotional crisis, behind which he could hide while making moves to seize personal power. This crisis was centered on stirring the existing German prejudice against Jews.

It is entirely possible that at the first Hitler had no intention of doing more than put the Jews in their place. Certainly the German people, at the outset of Hitler's campaign against the Jews, would not have countenanced brutalities that were to follow.

Nevertheless, behind the screen of an emotional issue, Hitler and his lieutenants dropped off one after another of the human rights written into the constitution of the German Republic. The people, mesmerized by the emotional issue, left their rights go without protest, and usually without noticing what was going on.

Today, at the tail end of a national emotional binge over happenings at the University of Mississippi, Americans of all political learnings suddenly are waking up to the fact that American rights of the most fundamental importance have been flouted and destroyed by Federal actions taken in the name of civil rights, much in the manner of Adolf Hitler.

Liberal newspapers in the East at long last have seen what a great many people in Southern States have seen all along—that the unconstitutional use of raw military power against a State, without even going through the motions of legality, constitutes a far greater threat to all Americans than any possible move by the University of Mississippi or the State of Mississippi.

Federal marshals, followed by 12,000 bayonet-carrying Federal troops, moved into Oxford, Miss., on the order of the President, without a declaration of martial law, a clear violation of States rights under the Constitution.

Federal marshals brutally beat and otherwise mishandled students after these students were under arrest as riot suspects, a violation of the most fundamental of human rights.

The scheduled football game of the University of Mississippi was ordered moved away from Oxford by Federal marshals who feared rioting. Yet the same sort of preventive measure, against the threat of rioting, has been denied the States in every argument over civil rights.

Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, arrested on serious charges, has been denied his civil rights by being taken to a mental institution without due process of law, and denied bail in clear violation of the Constitution.

Thus the emotional issue regarding the entry of a Negro into the University of Mississippi has shrouded acts which, if permitted to go unchallenged, wipe out fundamental rights of all Americans. We are glad to see that newspapers across the country, and presumably people across the country, are waking up to the fact.

PAUL "THE WAITER" RICCA AND THE WALTER-McCARRAN ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post there appeared a lengthy article concerning one Paul "the Waiter" Ricca, a protege of Al Capone, who was ordered deported. This man is not only a gang leader and an extortionist. He is a murderer. He committed two murders in Italy, his homeland. According to the article he "lamented happily today that the United States can't boot him out because he's a man without another country."

I would like to call attention of the authorities to section 243(g) of the Walter-McCarran Act in which it is provided that if a country does not comply with our request to accept one of its nationals who was ordered deported under the laws of the United States, all immigration to the United States from that country shall end. Under the law, it is the duty of the Secretary of State to notify the several consular officers stationed in the noncooperating country not to accept any more applications for immigrant visas.

The Attorney General has written a letter to the Secretary of State asking him to try to prevail upon the Italian Government to reconsider its refusal to accept this man.

The Attorney General's letter reads as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1962.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is to request that appropriate steps be taken by the State Department to prevail upon the Italian Government to reconsider its refusal to issue travel documents to enable this Government to execute the deportation order outstanding against Felice De Lucia, also known as Paul De Lucia and Paul "the Waiter" Ricca.

De Lucia, who was born in Naples on November 14, 1897, has been a leader in the Chicago underworld since the days of Al Capone. He entered the United States illegally in August 1920 under the name "Paul

Maglio." Previously, on May 18, 1917, he had been convicted at Naples of voluntary homicide under the name "Felice De Lucia," and he was a fugitive on a second Italian homicide charge when he arrived in this country in 1920. He filed a petition for naturalization in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois in April 1928 in Maglio's name, and he was admitted to U.S. citizenship some 5 months later. The naturalization was revoked in June 1957 on the ground that it was obtained by willful misrepresentation and concealment of material facts. The revocation decree was affirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, 256 F. 2d 487, and the Supreme Court denied certiorari, 358 U.S. 836.

Thereafter, on January 26, 1959, a special inquiry officer ordered De Lucia deported on the ground that, at the time of his 1920 entry, he was excludable on the grounds that he did not present a valid passport and that he had been convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude. An appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals was dismissed by the Board on August 25, 1959; the deportation order was sustained in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois and the Seventh Circuit, 297 F. 2d 58; and the Supreme Court declined to review the deportation order, 369 U.S. 837.

I assume that the prior refusal of the Italian Government to issue travel documentation for De Lucia was under a general policy of that Government not to issue such documentation for an Italian native naturalized in this country, even though the naturalization was subsequently canceled. In view of De Lucia's fugitive status at the time of his arrival in this country and his subsequent conviction in absentia of the homicide charge which he was seeking to evade when he originally came to this country, I think this Government has special reason to request reconsideration. By like token, the Italian Government should be receptive to reconsideration since De Lucia had an established criminal record, had an Italian conviction on a serious charge, and had absconded to avoid prosecution on another serious charge before his admission to this country.

I shall personally appreciate whatever steps you may take in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

It would be a great lift up to get rid of this fellow. He is certainly among the very worst.

R.F.K.

Mr. Speaker, this correspondence is entirely unnecessary. It is up to the Attorney General simply to notify the Secretary of State to stop receiving any immigrants at all from Italy until the law is complied with.

Under leave granted me I am including the article from the Washington Post:

"THE WAITER" UNWANTED IN 60 LANDS

(By Robert T. Loughran)

CHICAGO, October 11.—Paul "the Waiter" Ricca, elder statesman of the Chicago underworld, lamented happily today that the United States can't boot him out because he's a man without another country.

Ricca, onetime protege of Al Capone, told U.S. Immigration officials who are trying to deport him as an undesirable alien that no other country in the world would have him.

He supplied letters of regret from the consulates of 60 nations, including his native Italy, to prove it.

Only one nation, Ricca told District Immigration Director John W. Lehmann, would agree to let him inside its borders—but only as a visitor, not as a permanent guest. That hospitality was offered by Monaco, the 64-year-old patriarch of the underworld said.

Lehmann said Ricca's failure to find another country meant that the Government would have to put the dapper little white-haired man, who looks more like a banker than a "retired" gang leader, on parole until some place is found that will take him.

Ricca was stripped of his citizenship in 1957 because he entered this country under a false name and concealed two murders in his homeland. A deportation order became final last April when the U.S. Supreme Court refused to consider his case.

Ricca, who recently said any man would be "out of his mind" to want to leave the United States, insisted that he diligently tried to find another land.

He wrote letters to officials of 60 nations. With each letter of inquiry, he sent along newspaper clips that gave revealing glimpses into his past.

Ricca was first indicted on charges of extorting nearly $2 million from major Hollywood film studios after gaining control of stage employees' and motion picture operators' unions. He was sentenced to 10 years in prison, served 3 years and was paroled in 1947.

Ricca became the rumored heir to the Capone throne but started slipping. He was sent back to prison in 1959 on an income tax evasion conviction.

REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I note with intense interest that the President is now desirous of a reduction in the number of Federal personnel.

This disclosure was made in connection with the Federal pay-postal rate bill signing ceremonies yesterday.

In view of the 160,000 increase in the number of Federal employees since Mr. Kennedy took office, I congratulate him on his newly found interest in this matter.

I note particularly that the President has called for additional reports to and by the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget on employment plans and manpower utilization.

If this is a move to place responsibility on a specific agency of Government to police manpower utilization, it is in line with a long-standing bipartisan recommendation of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

For the sake of the American taxpayer, I wish the President every success in his new crusade to whittle the bureaucracy down to size.

I sincerely trust that it is not merely a matter of 3-weeks-before-election virtue.

I have one suggestion which I respectfully offer to the President of the United States in this matter. It is going to require something besides additional reports to accomplish any manpower savings.

It is going to take some iron-fisted orders from the Chief Executive.

The President needs no legislation to issue those orders.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am naive or I would not have been shocked to read the statement which has been attributed to Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology. In a speech before the National Electronics Conference he stated that the Federal Government was diverting major defense contracts away from the Midwest because of an intellectual vacuum. He reportedly went on to say that the Midwest was late in getting started in research and development because it was comfortable and highly competent in consumer production during the postwar period. He further is quoted as saying that the contracts were being given to companies on the east and west coasts because they were more capable in research and development.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] inserted some figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing that West Virginia which had ranked 46th in the Nation in per capita amount of military prime contracts in 1960 now ranks 30th in the Nation under the Kennedy administration. According to the figures supplied by the gentleman from West Virginia for the fiscal year 1960, the total amount of prime military contracts awarded by the Department of Defense amounted to $36,098,000 while the figures for the fiscal year 1962 showed awards of $133,782,000.

The gentleman from West Virginia concluded and I quote, "that West Virginia is no longer being shortchanged and that President Kennedy fulfilled his campaign pledges to West Virginia."

I am not aware of any great new colleges or universities or other institutions of higher learning devoted to the physical or natural sciences that have opened their doors in West Virginia since 1960.

As a Representative to this Congress from the great Middle West, I resent as being completely unfounded and without fact the charge that has been made by the President's top adviser on science that the Middle West is an intellectual vacuum. For it is in the Middle West that we have some of the truly great universities and institutions of higher learning in the entire country. Their faculties are noted for the contributions that they have made in all fields of scientific endeavor, and they include Nobel Prize winners as well as the winners of various other high awards. Perhaps the true nature of the difficulty lies in the fact that in the last election the Middle West resoundingly rejected Mr. Kennedy's bid for the Presidency. Perhaps, indeed, it has now become the fashion to regard military contracts as a means of discharging political debts and obligations. Perhaps, indeed, the charge can truly be made that this administration is playing politics with the defense of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the charge that has been made by the President's scientific adviser is absolutely baseless and groundless and cannot be regarded in any other light than as a calculated insult to one of the great and productive regions of our country. The very kindest thing that you could say about Dr. Wiesner's remark is that it constitutes the very flimsiest kind of excuse for favoritism by this administration in the awarding of defense contracts.

During the debate a few weeks ago on the resolution to increase the national debt limit to $308 billion, it was brought out that the Department of Defense, obviously at the orders of the administration, had resorted to unprecedented blackmail and pressure on defense contractors in order to get Representatives from the Middle West to vote for this increase in the debt limit. This is, of course, further documentation for the fact that this administration apparently looks upon defense contractors as a means of achieving both its legislative and political aims.

EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAW

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, there is no wishing away the concern of our citizens when equal protection of the law is denied to anyone who is put away in a mental institution without a court order, particularly when the individual concerned does not have his day in court. Two cases have come to light, the Agriculture Department employee and General Walker.

As evidence of the concern of some of our people I here insert a letter and some material received from residents of California. I do not know these people, nor do I know the validity of all their statements. I do, however, know what I have seen transpire in the case of General Walker. I am therefore determined to do what I can to direct public attention to our mental health problems, the legislation surrounding them, and the proper administration of such law. No man or woman in these United States should be denied equal protection of the law at any time, and this includes alleged mental health cases.

The following articles make an interesting combined study. First, there is the letter to me from Mrs. Connie C. Chandler, president of the Liberty League, with a description of the Liberty League; second, a statement directed to the California Legislature on the subject of "The Bill of Rights for Mental Freedom," specifying prohibitions on incarceration in a mental institution; third, an outline of the dangers of present mental health laws; fourth, an article entitled "Communist Brainwashing for Americans," quoting Hon. Usher Burdick on an address by Communist Beria; fifth, excerpts from "Masters of Deceit," by J. Edgar Hoover; sixth, an editorial by the Wall Street Journal entitled "Whose Civil Rights."

The articles follow:

THE LIBERTY LEAGUE INC.,
El Modeno, Calif., October 10, 1962.

Re the incarceration of former Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker to a mental institution.

Representative BRUCE ALGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We allege that certain persons in the administration of the Federal Government are guilty of genocide against the American people. They are using the power and authority of their office to annihilate patriotic Americans who are trying to expose those who are subtly, and unsuspectingly, engaged in overthrowing the constitutional government of the United States.

The Federal Government of the United States created the mental health conspiracy, in that the United Nations was created by the Federal Government of the United States, and the mental health laws were designated to the World Health Organization, a specialized agency of the United Nations, for administration.

We have cases and records in our files of persons who have been used as guinea pigs for experimentation in mental institutions, have been incapacitated from shock treatments, and who are now in their grave as a result of the mental health laws.

Therefore, we request, and demand, as sovereign citizens of the United States, that the Congress of the United States investigate at once the mental health laws under the administration of the United Nations, and that the incarceration of Major General Walker in a mental institution be prosecuted, immediately.

Please convey our request to Members of Congress.

Yours truly,
MRS. CONNIE CHANDLER,
President.

THE LIBERTY LEAGUE, INC., EL MODENO, CALIF.

The Liberty League is dedicated to the principles upon which the Constitution of the United States was founded: a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

The principles upon which this organization is founded are set forth in the following preamble to the constitution of the Liberty League, Inc.:

"Having recognized that our rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are given to us by God, and that we are dependent upon the U.S. Constitution to protect these God-given rights, we shall actively oppose all attempts to substitute atheism, alien ideologies, or anti-Christian traditions in place of our Christian concepts.

"The authors of our Constitution had unusually shrewd comprehension of the dangers of concentration of governmental authority. They sought to insure, for all time, that the Federal Government could not attain a position of dominance over American citizens, but that it would ever remain an instrument for the preservation of law and order, and that it would be subservient to the people.

"Under this Constitution, unique in all history, the United States developed from a weak nation into a leader among nations.

"For 150 years the Constitution was upheld by our representatives in Government. But during the past 30 years we have witnessed evasion, selective enforcement and total revision of our Constitution via the back door of court interpretation, treaties, and executive agreements. As a result, government by men is being craftily substituted for government by law; powers not delegated to the Federal Government are being grossly usurped; countless unauthorized functions are being undertaken by the Federal bureaucracy, and we are rapidly trending toward the very dictatorship which our Constitution was specifically designed to prevent.

"The world is now heavily engaged in a 'cold war' between the principles of dominant government under which people are pawns in the control of their leaders and the principles of restrained, limited government under which peoples are sovereign citizens, as conceived by our Founding Fathers and exemplified in the U.S. Constitution.

"The United States is currently abdicating its position as a champion of its own constitutional principle of limited government, and is increasingly adopting the concept of omnipotent government.

"Therefore it is necessary that we now take action to regain the rights usurped by the Federal bureaucracy and demand that they be returned to the States and to the people as provided in our Bill of Rights."

The Liberty League appeals to all citizens who wish to be currently informed regarding legislation, and who wish to take action through this organization in the submission of petitions requesting investigation and/or other remedial action against subversive activities, Communist infiltration, and violations of the Constitution of the United States.

A post card sent to the Liberty League at the above address will put your name on our mailing list.

THE LIBERTY LEAGUE, INC.—PETITION

We, the undersigned, petition the members of the Legislature of the State of California to oppose S.B. 120 and support S.C.A. No. 3, introduced by Senator Nelson Dilworth, cited as "The Bill of Rights for Mental Freedom," for the following reasons:

All mental health legislation stems from the program of the World Health Organization, a specialized agency of the United Nations, with the exception of course. of remedial legislation such as Senator Dilworth's "Bill of Rights for Mental Freedom." The United Nations has been described in Government reports as being headquarters for enemy spies and saboteurs.

Gen. Mark Clark testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee August 10, 1954: "I believe to permit the Soviet Union to have its large number of spies and saboteurs over here spawning in our country is wrong, and I think the thing ought to be organized as a United Nations against the Soviet Union. * * * There is no question in my mind that they certainly are using it, and it is a very valuable asset to them to have their people over here who are able to run around our country and to get the views of our people."

Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond testified before the same subcommittee on November 23, 1954: "I think the U.N. provides a listening post in the midst of our country, which has been utilized to the fullest."

General Almond was asked by Senator Welker, "In other words, you agree with Gen. Mark Clark that the U.N. is now and has been a nest and a haven for spies, saboteurs, and people who can come over here and get vital information that might seriously affect the future of our Republic?"

General Almond replied: "I have no doubt of it, sir."

Congressman Usher L. Burdick asks in his speech "The Great Conspiracy to Destroy the United States," "Who wrote the (U.N.) charter? The answer is * * * the Russian Communists and Alger Hiss, a representative of our State Department * * * who was convicted for perjury when he denied sending secret material to the Soviet Union representatives. * * * World peace was not the object of this scheme at all. The real purpose was to build a world government, controlled by the Communists and their dupes in the United States. * * * Can anyone doubt that the United Nations was purposely set up to do to this country what could not be done by force of arms, but through the blandishments of Communists, fellow travelers, and dupes, get us to surrender our liberty without firing a shot?"

Many of the 128 mental health bills introduced at the 1957 legislative session in Sacramento were so destructive of American freedom they could have been written only by men dedicated to the destruction of that freedom and destructive of the minds of those dedicated to freedom.

S.B. 120, which the undersigned oppose, states: "Whenever * * * there is no judge of the superior court * * * to sign an order of detention * * * the superintendent or physician * * * may care for and treat the person for a period not to exceed 24 hours (following the signing of an emergency order by any judge of a municipal or justice court in the county)."

According to testimony by Dr. E. L. Kropa, a chemical known as LSD–25, or lysergic acid, produces temporary madness by destroying the individual's will to think and communicate. Within 6 hours' time, according to Dr. Kropa, the people can be "reduced to so many babbling idiots." In far less than the 24 hours during which S.B. 120 would allow a person to be held, he could be reduced to the state of which he has been accused.

Quotations taken from A.B. 401: Please write your legislators, State Capitol, Sacramento, and oppose this bill and all mental health bills:

"Any superior court to which application is made as hereinafter provided may appoint a guardian for the person and estate, or person, or estate, of an insane or an incompetent person, who is a resident of this State. As used in this revision of this code, the phrase 'incompetent person,' 'incompetent,' or 'mentally incompetent' shall be construed to mean or refer to any person, whether insane or not, who by reason of old age, disease, weakness of mind, or other cause, is unable, unassisted, properly to manage and take care of himself or his property, and by reason thereof is likely to be deceived or imposed upon by artful or designing persons.

"Any relative, friend, or person interested in his estate in expectancy or otherwise, may file a verified petition alleging that a person is insane or incompetent, and setting forth the names and residences, so far as they are known to the petitioner, or the relatives of the alleged insane or incompetent person."

PETITION SUPPORTING S.C.A. NO. 3 AND OPPOSING S.B. 120

Senator Nelson Dilworth's S.C.A. No. 3 proposes a senate constitutional amendment to the constitution of the State of California by adding to article 1 thereof a new section to be numbered 26, relating to the "Bill of Rights for Mental Freedom":

"Sec. 26. (b) No person shall be committed to or confined in a mental institution unless he is afforded the right to a speedy public trial; to a trial by jury; to counsel of his own choosing. * * *

"(d) No person shall be committed to or confined in a mental institution because of his religious or political beliefs.

"(e) No person shall be committed to or confined in a mental institution to prevent him from exercising his right of freedom of speech, including his right to express his political views and to criticize the government, any public official, or any law.

"(f) No person shall be committed to or confined in a mental institution to prevent him from exercising his right to assemble with his fellow citizens; to petition the government for the redress of his grievances; to lawfully possess arms; to resist unlawful searches and seizures; to engage in political activity; to resist the taking of his property; or to take appropriate action in his own defense or in defense of his children, parents, or spouse. * * *

"(l) No United States citizen shall be transported out of this State on charges of mental illness or mental deficiency of any kind unless it be to the State of his legal residence.

"Enumeration of the foregoing rights shall not deprive a person accused of mental illness or mental deficiency of any other rights that he may have at law or in equity."

Accordingly, we oppose S.B. 120 and support S.C.A. No. 3.

These Mental Health Laws, Now in Effect, Threaten Your Freedom

Because you may be arrested without a warrant, confined and treated in a county or State hospital without a court order, transferred to any State in the Union. Why? Because it may be to someone's advantage personally, politically, or financially to dispose of you.

Do you know a peace officer or health officer may arrest you without a warrant and take you from your home, apply for your admittance in a State or county hospital where you may be detained and treated, even though no warrant has been issued and there is no proceeding pending for your commitment?

Do you know if you are taken into custody by any peace officer or health officer for a mental examination, he is not required to give the name of his informant?

Do you know any doctor or other person signing a petition requesting that you be committed to a mental institution cannot be held liable, either civilly or criminally, for signing such a petition in good faith?

Do you know if the superintendent or person in charge of a psychopathic hospital feels that in his judgment you are a suitable person for emergency care and treatment, he may treat you for 72 hours without a court order?

Do you know after you have been delivered to the hospital you may be forcibly detained and treated for 90 days? These treatments may include shock treatments, injections, or drugs.

Do you know according to the testimony of Dr. E. L. Kropa, a chemical known as lysergic acid, produces a temporary madness by destroying the individual's will to think and communicate, and could within a few hours reduce a person to the state of which he is accused?

Do you know these laws might be used by relatives or others to bring false charges of mental illness against you for personal, political, or financial reasons?

Do you know that the mental health conspiracy had its creation, and beginning, in the United Nations Charter, which was the work of Stalin, Molotov, Nelson Rockefeller, and Alger Hiss? (Hiss was a Communist employed by our State Department.)

Do you know that one of Stalin's plans to "take over the United States without firing a shot" is the control of legislation setting up a police state under which the American people can be legally executed?

Help us oppose this diabolical plan to reduce to robots and slaves those whom the Communists cannot control. Circulate the petition, then mail to the Dilworth Committee, State capitol, Sacramento, Calif.

Communist Brainwashing for Americans

(Extension of remarks of Hon. Usher L. Burdick, daily Congressional Record, June 13, 1957)

Mr. Burdick. Mr. Speaker, to appraise the people of this country just what the Communist practice was, and probably still is, in regard to the treatment of the so-called mentally sick persons, I have decided to reprint the entire speech made by Communist Beria to a class of American students at Lenin University.

This is the same Beria who was at the head of the police system in Russia and who caused the execution of millions of Russians and who finally was executed by the Malenkov dictatorship:

"ADDRESS BY BERIA

"American students at the Lenin University, I welcome your attendance at these classes on psychopolitics.

"Psychopolitics is an important if less known division of geopolitics. It is less known because it must necessarily deal with highly educated personnel, the very top strata of 'mental healing.'

"By psychopolitics our chief goals are effectively carried forward. To produce a maximum of chaos in the culture of the enemy is our first most important step. Our fruits are grown in chaos, distrust, economic depression, and scientific turmoil. At least a weary populace can seek peace only in our offered Communist state, at last only communism can resolve the problems of the masses.

"A psychopolitician must work hard to produce the maximum chaos in the fields of mental healing. He must recruit and use all the agencies and facilities of mental healing. He must labor to increase the personnel and facilities of mental healing until at last the entire field of mental science is entirely dominated by Communist principles and desires.

"To achieve these goals the psychopolitician must crush every home-grown variety of mental healing in America. Actual teachings of James, Eddy, and Pentecostal Bible faith healers amongst your misguided people must be swept aside. They must be discredited, defamed, arrested, stamped upon even by their own Government until there is no credit in them, and only Communist-oriented healing remains. You must work until every teacher of psychology unknowingly or knowingly teaches only Communist doctrine under the guise of psychology. You must labor until every doctor and psychiatrist is either a psychopolitician or an unwitting assistant to our aims.

"You must labor until we have dominion over the minds and bodies of every important person in your Nation. You must achieve such disrepute for the state of insanity and such authority over its pronouncement that not one statesman so labeled could again be given credence by his people. You must work until suicide arising from mental imbalance is common and calls forth no general investigation or remark.

"With the institutions for the insane you have in your country prisons which can hold a million persons and can hold them without civil rights or any hope of freedom; and upon these people can be practiced shock and surgery so that never again will they draw a sane breath. You must make these treatments common and accepted. And you must sweep aside any treatment or any group or persons seeking to treat by effective means.

"You must dominate as respected men the fields of psychiatry and psychology. You must dominate the hospitals and universities. You must carry forward the myth that only a European doctor is competent in the field of insanity and thus excuse amongst you the high incidence of foreign birth and training. If and when we seize Vienna you shall have then a common ground of meeting and can come and take your instructions as worshipers of Freud along with other psychiatrists.

"Psychopolitics is a solemn charge. With it you can erase our enemies as insects. You can cripple the efficiency of leaders by striking insanity into their families through the use of drugs. You can wipe them away with testimony as to their insanity. By our technologies you can even bring about insanity itself when they seem too resistive.

"You can change their loyalties by psychopolitics. Given a short time with a psychopolitician you can alter forever the loyalty of a soldier in our hands or a statesman or a leader in his own country, or you can destroy his mind.

"However, you labor under certain dangers. It may happen that remedies for our treatment may be discovered. It may occur that a public hue and cry may arise against mental healing. It may thus occur that all mental healing might be placed in the hands of ministers and be taken out of the hands of our psychologists and psychiatrists. But the capitalistic thirst for control, capitalistic inhumanity, and a general public terror of insanity can be brought to guard against these things. But should they occur, should independent researchers actually discover means to undo psychopolitical procedures, you must not rest, you must not eat or sleep, you must not stint one tiniest bit of available money to campaign against it, discredit it, strike it down and render it void. For by an effective means all our actions and researches could be undone.

"In a capitalistic state you are aided on all sides by the corruption of the philosophy of man and the times. You will discover that everything will aid you in your campaign to seize, control, and use all mental healing to spread our doctrine and rid us of our enemies within their own borders.

"Use the courts, use the judges, use the constitution of the country, use its medical societies and its laws to further our ends. Do not stint in your labor in this direction. And when you have succeeded you will discover that you can now effect your own legislation at will and you can, by careful organization of healing societies, by constant campaign about the terrors of society, by pretense as to your effectiveness, make your capitalist himself, by his own appropriations, finance a large portion of the quiet Communist conquest of the nation.

"By psychopolitics create chaos. Leave a nation leaderless. Kill our enemies. And bring to earth, through communism, the greatest peace man has ever known."

The following, quoted from J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit," bears out the information contained in Beria's speech:

"Russian control, moreover, was implemented through the operation of another institution, the Lenin School in Moscow. * * * Founded in the 1920's the Lenin School had for its purpose the training of an international corps of Communist leaders. * * * The students were taught how to erect stout barricades, conduct guerrilla warfare, and handle firearms. The Soviets wanted rough-and-ready revolutionists, men who would kill, murder, blow up trains, and start revolutions.

"Many of the top leaders in Communist parties around the world are graduates of the Lenin School. The national committee of the Communist Party in the United States today include such graduates of the Lenin School as Eugene Dennis, Claude Lightfoot, Carl Winter, Simon W. Gerson, William Weinstone, Nat Ganley, Steve Nelson, and others. Former Lenin School graduates also include such well-known Communists as Betty Gannett, Gus Hall, Albert Lannon, Phil Bart, Rose Wortis, Loretta Stack, Henry Winston, and numerous others. The Lenin School became so notorious that it, like the Comintern, was discontinued. After all, it had turned out thousands of graduates, and the Communists probably thought it had fulfilled its usefulness."

EXCERPTS FROM "MASTERS OF DECEIT"

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

Under communism, a tiny minority, perhaps 10 to 20 men, would rule the United States. * * * National as well as State and local governments would be eliminated. "Soviets" (meaning councils) would be formed throughout the Nation. These would consist of local Communist Party henchmen who would depose and probably liquidate your mayor, chief of police, clergymen, and leading citizens.

The Constitution, and all our laws, would be abolished. * * * All property used in production would be confiscated. * * * This confiscation would include your home, business, bank deposits, and related personal possessions. These would belong to everybody. You have no right to own them under the Communist scheme.

The revolution would affect every man, woman, and child in America. Communists do not propose to remodel our Government or retain any part of it. They would tear it to the ground, destroy all opposition, and then create a new government. * * * Their recipe for action? The 1917 revolution, tailored to modern conditions. The Communists themselves have made the claim:

"The principles upon which a Soviet America would be organized would be the same, in every respect, as those which guided the Soviet Union."

All industry would be nationalized and farms taken away from their owners. A small businessman is just as guilty as a large businessman; both must be liquidated. * * * Countless occupations, termed by the Communists as useless and parasitic, would be ended. Here is a part of their list: wholesalers, jobbers, real estate men and stockbrokers, advertising specialists, traveling salesmen, lawyers, whole rafts of government bureaucrats, police, clericals, and sundry capitalist quacks, fakers and grafters. The Communists have a special disdain for lawyers. Perhaps it is because there will be no need for lawyers when there are no rights to defend. At any rate, William Z. Foster (long-time head of the Communist movement in our country) has said, "The pest of lawyers will be abolished."

Action would be drastic, immediate, and without appeal. An armed "Red guard" would enforce the orders of party henchmen. * * * The workingman in the mines, factories, and mills would be told to work certain hours for certain wages. Labor unions, as we know them, would be obliterated. * * *

The press would be muzzled, free speech forbidden. * * * If you expressed an opinion contrary to the party line, you should have known better and your disappearance would serve as a lesson for others. * * * Movies, radio, and television would be taken over by the government. * * * Churches would probably not be closed immediately, but they would be heavily taxed, their property seized by the state, and religious schools liquidated. * * * Children would be placed in nurseries and special indoctrination schools. Women, boast the Communists, would be relieved of housework. How? Huge factory and apartment-house kitchens would be set up, so that women would be free to work in factories and mines along with the men.

This picture of a Communist America is not overdrawn. Here are the words of William Z. Foster:

"Under the dictatorship all the capitalist parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated, the Communist party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses. Likewise, will be dissolved all other organizations that are political props of the bourgeois rule, including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, rotary clubs, American Legion, Y.M.C.A., and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, etc."

Communists want to control everything: where you live, where you work, what you are paid, what you think * * * how your children are educated, what you may not and must read and write. * * *

These statements are confirmed, day after day, by documented reports from areas where Communists have already taken over: Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Red China, and other areas.

When you read such reports, do not think of them as something happening in a far-off land. Remember, always, that it could happen here and that there are thousands of people in this country now working in secret to make it happen here.

But also, thank God, there are millions of Americans who oppose them. If we open our eyes, inform ourselves, and work together, we can keep our country free.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

WHOSE CIVIL RIGHTS?

Former General Walker and new heavyweight champion Sonny Liston don't have too much in common, but each of them ought to have a little sympathy for the other. Both of them have recently been the victims of some strange encounters with Federal police authorities.

To be sure, the Federal tax authorities had reasonable grounds for suspicion that the Government might not get its due share of the receipts from the Liston-Patterson fight unless it stepped in and grabbed them first. Fight managers and promoters are not noted for the scrupulous accounting or for being pillars of society, and the IRS has had trouble before with the fight's promoters.

Nonetheless, the new champion is not involved in this past dispute. Moreover, the Internal Revenue agents didn't pause long enough to give anybody a chance to make an accounting in good faith. Nor did they content themselves with putting a tab on some reasonable proportion of the fight take. They moved almost as fast as Sonny Liston moved on Patterson, and just as thoroughly. They seized the money first and talked about it afterwards.

Possibly also General Walker's speeches contributed to the riots in Mississippi; that is a matter for the courts to decide. But when he was arrested some of the niceties of civil rights got lost in the rush.

He was arraigned without benefit of counsel, and then without even going through the motions of a proper hearing the authorities had him hustled off for psychiatric examination. His bail was set at the unusually large figure of $100,000, the same figure used for the late Dr. Soblen, a man duly convicted in open court of having spied for the enemies of his country.

We'll leave the lawyers to debate the legal points in these two cases, as they are now doing. Subsequently General Walker's bail was cut in half and he is now out of jail. Doubtless in the end Sonny Liston will receive his proper share of the fight proceeds. But there is something more disturbing here than legal technicalities.

One of these cases puts aside the concept that a man is punished only for crimes committed; here is punishment for tax evasion—certainly seizing all a man's pay is punishment—merely on the policeman's suspicion that taxes might be evaded. The other puts aside the doctrine that a man charged with a crime is entitled to the protection of certain ancient processes of the law, including the right to counsel.

The reply of the policeman in each case is that haste was necessary. If the revenue agents hadn't acted then it might have been too late. The Justice Department had to move swiftly against General Walker to teach a lesson to other people.

Perhaps so; yet it's an argument become all too familiar. A Justice of the Supreme Court makes a ruling, as Justice Black did in the Mississippi school case, by concluding from conversations what the full Court might decide—because everybody was too impatient to wait a few weeks. A corporation angers the Attorney General, as United States Steel did by trying to raise prices, and the next day its offices are crawling with Government agents, hustling to find evidence for an indictment not yet drawn.

It may be hard to drum up much sympathy for General Walker or Sonny Liston. But if we are going to set aside all the due process of law every time the policeman is in a hurry, then no man can be safe from the scowl of the tax collector or the Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, all history shows the danger of government trampling individual rights. I call on all Americans to review their dedication to the preservation of all civil rights.

KNOWLES DAM PROJECT

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear that I am being fair with all of my constituents whether they are for or against the Knowles project which is the subject of some discussion before the Committee on Public Works in the House and between the conferees of the House and Senate on the omnibus public works bill.

The question of inundated lands is that clearly not more than 8,600 acres are tillable, and the remainder of some 50,000 acres of land are mountain and hillside which are not tillable. The land that would come under irrigation in the Knowles project is discussed on page 321 of the Senate hearings, and I quote the witness:

> Mr. PALMER. I will be pleased to summarize the information we have here and to make some generalizations that might be helpful to the committee.
>
> There are sites adjacent to the reservoir that could be reached with pumping, some up to a lift of 250 feet, that would bring in, that could bring in, approximately 21,000 acres of land. And there would be some 8,600 acres of bottom land that would be inundated.
>
> So the net effect would be that, if it is in the best interests of the country, that the acreage inundated can be fully replaced and additional potential for irrigation would be available. One other consideration that is important is that pumping energy, energy available for irrigation pumping on either side of the mountain in Montana, would be available and also further on down the river.

Now, then, concerning the popularity of the project, there have been many polls.

During July of last year, I mailed 90,000 questionnaires to the householders and rural boxholders in my district. One of the questions was as follows:

> The U.S. Corps of Engineers has recommended a dam at Paradise Knowles at Clarks Fork River, in Montana, for cheap electric power, flood control, irrigation, and recreation. Do you vote "yes" or "no"?

The answers received from almost 15 percent of the people queried were: yes, 54 percent; no, 39 percent; undecided, 7 percent.

In other polls taken among the people affected, the results have been ascertained as follows: The results of the Plainsman, published at Plains, by Don Coe; the Sentinel, published at Hot Springs, by Dick Shirley; and the Sanders County Ledger, published at Thompson Falls, by K. A. Eggensperger, showed 2 to 1 support for Paradise Dam.

In May of 1962, radio station KOFI, an independently owned and operated enterprise ran a public opinion poll on the Knowles Dam question. KOFI is a 5,000-watt station and has the greatest coverage of any station operating in the Flathead Valley near the Knowles damsite.

The question asked was simply, "What is your opinion of Knowles Dam?" This poll was run on a Sunday.

In reading the results on the air, the announcer stated that he was disappointed that more people did not put down their reasons for supporting or opposing Knowles Dam. A total of 102 people wrote into the station; 95 were for the dam, 7 against. None of the letters read over the air in support of the dam, contained requests to withhold the author's name, and three out of four of those whose letters opposed the dam, asked that their names not be read on the air.

I have received a great deal of correspondence and the fact of this correspondence has been brought to the attention of the Senate committee by Senator METCALF. Had there been a hearing before the House committee I would have presented it there fully and completely.

I think it is important that the people of Montana, in the area affected, desire the project as a requisite to its approval. Therefore, I insist on full disclosure of public interest.

The telegrams which I entered a few days ago are the result of no solicitation whatsoever to my knowledge. Rather, they are spontaneous to the news reports of Knowles' status in the Congress, as related in the news media in Montana. To summarize, since the publicity of last week, I have received 370 telegrams for, and 55 against the Knowles project. The remainder of the telegrams in this count I now tender to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks:

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 12, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Highly approve your stand on Knowles Dam. Please fight for it.

Sincerely,

WALTER and DOROTHY BROWN.

BILLINGS, MONT.,
October 9, 1962.

Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles storage key to Montana's future. Knowles means more power at less cost for Montana people and Montana industry. With Knowles Dam Montana water would be stored in Montana for the benefit of Montana people and Montana industry. This, together with downstream benefits, makes Knowles Dam a must. Members of this cooperative urge construction of Knowles Dam.

MAX MATHEWS.

MALTA, MONT.,
October 11, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana needs Knowles Dam for its economy. We are for it.

W. A. DORN.

RAYNESFORD, MONT.,
October 9, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Please vote for the Knowles Dam bill.

GEORGE GROSSKOFF.

HAMILTON, MONT.,
October 9, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to fight for the inclusion of Knowles in conference report. Appreciate efforts.

RAVALLI COUNTY FARMERS UNION.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
October 10, 1962.

ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We want Knowles Dam passed at this session. Need Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. O. V. NEUMAN.

BUTTE, MONT.,
October 9, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to make every effort to see Knowles Dam appropriation included in House conference committee report.

MARY MCNELIS.

BILLINGS, MONT.,
October 10, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Stand pat my friend and I support your Knowles position.

Sincerely,

RALPH E. MCKELVIE.

BOZEMAN, MONT.,
October 10, 1962.

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support Burns Creek and Knowles Dam for Idaho and Montana.

OLIVER and EVELYN DAHL.

REXFORD, MONT.,
October 8, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

People this area we visited around Polson all generally seem to be for Knowles Dam.

LEO COLLAR.

Bozeman, Mont.,
October 10, 1962.
Representative Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Knowles Dam is important to Montana's economy. You have my full support.

Geo. J. Stublar.

Bozeman, Mont.,
October 10, 1962.
Representative Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Your support of Knowles and Burns Creek Dam for Idaho and Montana will be appreciated.

Joseph Kanta.

Bozeman, Mont.,
October 10, 1962.
Representative Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana needs Knowles Dam for more employment, cheaper power, and more industry. Please support.

Einar Lindvig.

Bozeman, Mont.,
October 10, 1962.
Representative Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in favor of passage of Knowles and Burns Creeks Dams by present Congress.

Inez M. Dusenberry.

Kalispell, Mont.,
October 10, 1962.
Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We urge your support for Knowles Dam. Also in favorable conference report construction will help boost Montana's depressed economy.

Mr. and Mrs. Henry Siderius.

Charlo, Mont., *October 8, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

As I am elevator worker and polled farmers, majority are in favor of Knowles Dam.

Henry Therriault.

Plains, Mont., *October 8, 1962.*
Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I am greatly in favor of Knowles Dam.

Douglas Cummings.

Chester, Mont., *October 9, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge House approval Knowles Dam to develop Montana resources and strengthen Montana economy.

Gordon R. Twedt.

Dixon, Mont., *October 8, 1962.*
Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge continuation of your firm stand in favor of Knowles Dam.

Mr. and Mrs. H. E. Taplin.

Rexford, Mont., *October 8, 1962.*
Hon. Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

People this area we visited around Polson all generally seem to be for Knowles Dam.

Mary Holder.

Missoula, Mont., *October 5, 1962.*
Hon. Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

Montana needs Knowles Dam. Urge your utmost support.

—— ——.

Troy, Mont., *October 8, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We need Knowles Dam. We want Knowles. We support your position of this important project.

Minnie O. Anderson.

Troy, Mont., *October 8, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Encourage your continued support of Knowles Dam, a multipurpose dam, at Knowles site of the upper reaches of the Columbia drainage.

Agnes L. Haffermin.

Troy, Mont., *October 8, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This telegram to reaffirm sincere desire to see Knowles Dam project go through to final passage. Multipurpose dam a must for conservation of water resources in this area. This also represents general opinion locally.

Oliver Coburn.

Troy, Mont., *October 8, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

100 percent behind you and your position on Knowles Dam. We have confidence that your knowledge of the project supports your opinion.

William F. Haffermin.

Rexford, Mont., *October 8, 1962.*
Hon. Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

People this area we visited around Polson all generally seem to be for Knowles Dam.

Leo Collar.

Missoula, Mont., *October 9, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are opposed to construction of Knowles Dam.

Lawrence and Bertha Smith.

Missoula, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold L. Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our group with 2,400 members joins with Montana Wildlife Federation, United Sportsmens Association of Montana, and many others in opposition to Knowles Dam. In a 1960 questionnaire you stated you opposed high dams where proof of need is furnished solely by Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation. You appear now to have run under false colors. Save our natural resources and prevent this unnecessary drain on the Treasury.

Dr. M. D. Laine,
President, Western Montana
Fish and Game Association.

Missoula, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold L. Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your claim Knowles Dam is favored by those affected is untrue. After deliberation and study Missoula Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution opposing Knowles as unnecessary and undesirable both as to expense and purpose. We urge you to place western Montana ahead of party politics and withdraw your support.

Jeremy G. Thane,
President, Missoula Chamber of Commerce.

Ronan, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Oppose Knowles Dam as unnecessary wasteful expenditure of public money.

Gerald F. Perry.

Plains, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative Arnold Olsen,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose Knowles Dam because it is unneeded and unwanted wasteful spending.

C. H. Rittenhour.

Polson, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Be advised we are unqualifiedly opposed to your position on Knowles Dam.

J. H. Hanson,
President, Security State Bank.

Kalispell, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I strenuously oppose Knowles Dam and know many people who do likewise.

Mrs. Selma Dodge.

Kalispell, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I join with the majority of the people in western Montana in opposing Knowles Dam.

Frank Wieferich.

Creston, Mont.

Plains, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We violently oppose Knowles Dam. It is wasteful, impractical, and unnecessary.

Inez Nelson,
President, Paradise Home Demonstration Club.

Ronan, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the Knowles Dam.

Cordelia Francis.

Moiese, Mont.

Ronan, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative Arnold Olsen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am opposed to Knowles Dam.

Ralph Hough.

Moiese, Mont.

Kalispell, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives
Washington D.C.:

I solicit your opposition to Knowles Dam. It is not popular in Montana.

C. S. Robinson.

Kalispell, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative Arnold Olsen,
Member of Congress
Washington, D.C.:

I wish to urge your opposition to Knowles Dam.

A. K. Sample, Jr.

Missoula, Mont., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative Arnold Olsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We are opposed to Knowles Dam.

Grace E. Smith.

Moiese, Mont.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We are opposed to Knowles Dam.

L. O. SMITH.

MOIESE, MONT.

PARADISE, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are opposed to Knowles Dam as too expensive and unnecessary.

Mr. and Mrs. E. O. WILLISATT.

PLAINS, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We would like to go on record as opposing construction of Knowles Dam.

DIEHL LUMBER CO.

PARADISE, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We are opposed to the Knowles Dam project.

Mr. and Mrs. E. L. SEARS.

PLAINS, MONT.

PARADISE, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We are opposed to Knowles Dam; wasteful spending of taxpayers' money.

PARADISE VALLEY LODGE NO. 652,
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY CLERKS.

PARADISE, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

We oppose Knowles Dam project. It is not needed.

L. PETERSEN,
Chairman, Board of Trustees, School District No. 8.

RONAN, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We are definitely opposed to Knowles Dam project.

A. D. AKERS.

RONAN, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Representing city and city council, I strongly oppose Knowles Dam.

Mayor O. H. GRANLEY.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Even a preliminary expenditure for Knowles is unwarranted. How long must this extravangance be pushed?

CARL DRAGSTEDT.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I oppose Knowles Dam as unnecessary and extravagant use of taxpayers money.

TED CRISWELL.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Register our protest to Knowles Dam. We oppose it as waste by bureacracy.

NORMAN C. ROBB,
EVELYN M. ROBB.

PARADISE, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization opposed to wasteful unneeded Knowles Dam.

NELLIE PETERSON,
President, Paradise PTA.

POLSON, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We are opposed to your stand in favor of Knowles Dam.

OLE BELLAND,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce.

RONAN, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Let's stop foolish Government spending such as Knowles Dam.

FLOYD C. LOCKWOOD.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Knowles is not the answer for flood control. Make work projects continue damaging long after they cease any beneficial effect.

E. W. THOMAS.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Sportsmen, businessmen, taxpayers, and voters individually and in groups in western Montana oppose Knowles Dam.

ROBERT C. RUNKE.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Request you protect western Montana's interests and resources above Corps of Engineers make-work project. Oppose Knowles.

MILLS FOLSOM.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Register our protest against Knowles Dam.

JAMES R. CLARK.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Count me as opposed, repeat, opposed to Knowles Dam. Stop wasting money on political monuments.

R. J. MCCALL.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We don't need Knowles Dam urge you reconsider your position.

TONY CRISWELL.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Let's be American and continue free enterprise, oppose Knowles Dam.

JACK DOBBINS.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Free enterprise is the American way. Keep free-spending Government agencies out of western Montana, quit pushing Knowles Dam.

JOHN AILPORT.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Let western Montana remain unspoiled, forget Knowles Dam.

L. T. DELANEY.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Register me as against the bureaucrat power grab. Knowles is extravagant waste and will create major problems which will far outweigh any present claimed justification.

S. I. STEVENS.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 11, 1962.
Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your opposition to Knowles Dam.

EUGENE GILLETTE.

CHARLO, MONT.,
October 11, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

My land is as good as any in the Flathead Valley. I'm opposed to Knowles Dam.

WAY E. BURRELL.

MOIESE, MONT.,
October 11, 1962.
ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Opposed to Knowles Dam. Please vote to have killed from public works bill.

Mr. and Mrs. W. C. THORP.

RONAN, MONT.,
October 11, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I wish to voice opposition to Knowles Dam.

ALFRED J. SKOGEN.

MOIESE, MONT.,
October 11, 1962.
ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Opposed to Knowles Dam. Please vote to have killed from public works bill.

Mr. and Mrs. DON THORP.

RONAN, MONT.,
October 11, 1962.
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please express my continued opposition to Knowles Dam proposal as unwarranted, unneeded expense.

RAY M. LOMAN.

KALISPELL, MONT.,
October 11, 1962.
Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The majority of the people of western Montana oppose Knowles Dam, as your survey shows. Urge you join the majority.

JAMES E. MURPHY.

PLAINS, MONT., *Oct. 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Plains Grange No. 101 along with 64 other organizations and hundreds of individual voters opposing Paradise Knowles Dam. Respectively request you consider our position which to date we have not received.

ROBERT STEPHENS.

PARADISE, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
Washington, D.C.:

Committee representing over 150,000 acres in area affected unanimously oppose Knowles Dam.

D. A. MCMICHAEL.

RONAN, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Representative ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

I happen to be a Democrat opposed enthusiastically to Knowles Dam representing many votes.

R. D. LUCHAU.

POLSON, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

This to register my personal objections to Knowles Dam. As publisher editor, individual, I believe majority of local people oppose Knowles favor private enterprise development whether by MPC or Indians. There's place for public power in Montana, but this is not it. Your consideration appreciated.

PAUL FULGEBERG.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

With the majority of Montana citizens, I strongly oppose Knowles Dam as contrary to the best interests of Montana people. The forestry industry and most Montana farm, conservation, civic and industry groups join in such opposition.

HORACE H. KOSSLER.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Missoula Bonner Hoo-Hoo Club, Fraternal Order of Lumbermen, representing the forest products industries of western Montana continue to be firmly opposed to construction of Knowles Dam.

M. J. SULLIVAN.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Most of the people we know are opposed to Knowles. Why aren't you?

PAUL CHUMRAU.
FRANK GRADY.
RANDY JACOBS.
JAMES CARRAS.
HOGAN KRAABLE.
J. D. BURCHETTE.
JOHN RUFFATO.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Knowles can only be justified on political basis. Please record my disapproval. Original OLSEN copy BATTIN.

DOUGH HANSEN.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 12, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request you to think of western Montana ahead of partisan politics. Protect our natural resources. Oppose Knowles. Original OLSEN copy BATTIN.

PAT WILCOX.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I agree with John Bonner. I oppose Knowles Dam. Original OLSEN copy BATTIN.

RALPH DICKSON.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 11, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Add my name to former Governor Bonner and Governor Babcock against Knowles waste. Original OLSEN copy BATTIN.

JEREMY G. THAN.

MISSOULA, MONT., *October 12, 1962.*
Congressman ARNOLD L. OLSEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request you to think of western Montana ahead of partisan politics. Protect our natural resources. Oppose Knowles. Original OLSEN copy BATTIN.

PATT WWII (bust this).

APPROPRIATION NECESSARY FOR ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days, and we hope the closing hours of this session, we still have not come out with the appropriation for the accelerated public works program. Since this bill was passed, I am more than ever convinced of the need for it. In my district, which is a redevelopment area, we have several projects on the shelf which are desperately needed. I would certainly urge this Congress not to adjourn without providing at least the initial appropriation for this accelerated public works program.

A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF UNION COUNTY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I think our colleagues would agree that the 87th Congress has been a memorable and significant one—as much for its failures as for its achievements.

In this, my summary report to the people of Union County, N.J., on the record of this Congress, I shall continue a practice I have followed each year of my service in the House—to keep the people I represent informed of the record of Congress and of the activities of their Representative. This is, I believe, a fundamental responsibility of an elected representative in a democracy, and I am pleased to note that a great many Members on both sides of the aisle share my conviction in this regard.

As I prepare this report, Congress is about to adjourn one of the longest sessions in peacetime history—and, certainly, one of the most needlessly prolonged on record. The length of this second session makes it more imperative than ever that Congress reform its own procedures to assure better scheduling of legislation and guarantee more orderly and adequate consideration of the hundreds of important bills that come before us each year. The spectacle of long midsession delays and a frenzied rush to catch up at session's end does not do justice to "the world's greatest legislative body."

The most important accomplishment of the entire Congress, by general agreement, was approval this year of the Trade Expansion Act, which renewed and broadened the President's power to carry on tariff negotiations with other countries, especially the nations of the European Common Market. How well and wisely this new authority is administered will strongly influence American industry's ability to compete for foreign markets and thereby will affect, for good or ill, American jobs, our present favorable balance of exports over imports, our unfavorable balance of international payments, and the whole future of economic and political cooperation in the free world.

On this bill, which I supported, and on every other issue that came before us, I endeavored to exercise independent and informed judgment, in the conviction that the people of Union County do not want a yes-man or a no-man, but a Representative who will cast his "aye" vote or his "nay" vote with only one consideration in mind—the welfare of his country and his constituents.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

In other areas of foreign policy, Congress expanded the very successful Peace Corps, and authorized loans up to $100 million to the United Nations, contingent upon matching grants by other member countries and subject to other restrictions, to allow the world organization to put itself on a sound financial basis. Congress also continued the foreign aid program but reduced the administration budget request by over $1 billion in an effort to force the administration to prevent waste and redefine the program in a more rational and effective fashion. Already, it appears, our efforts are bearing fruit and I hope the administration will be successful in its present attempt to rethink the objectives of foreign aid, establish priorities, and make foreign aid a more useful servant of American foreign policy.

In two very significant resolutions, Congress expressed its determination that U.S. rights in Berlin be defended against Soviet violation and that the threat to American security posed by the Communist military buildup in Cuba be prevented "by whatever means may be necessary."

Congress demonstrated its seriousness of purpose to back up American foreign policy and defend the security of our country by increasing defense expenditures, authorizing the President to call up Reserve Forces if necessary and by greatly enlarging our space program which has tremendous implications for both military and peaceful purposes.

In the area of national affairs—although it is becoming more and more difficult to separate national from international affairs, since our ability to defend our security and protect freedom depends primarily on our own social and economic well-being—Congress acted as follows:

Authorized a 3-year program to retrain unemployed workers and help develop the new skills required by new technological developments.

Authorized creation of a new corporation, jointly owned by the public and the private communications industry, to set up and operate a communications satellite system to exploit the progress symbolized by the successful Telstar program, to which, incidentally, Union County industry and workers have made a significant contribution.

Repealed the 10-percent excise tax on railroad and bus fares and reduced to 5 percent the tax on airline passenger tickets, effective November 15, a move I have publicly urged for some time and one which should benefit both passengers and the hard-pressed transportation industry.

Continued the vital program of improving the Nation's highway system.

Provided for more effective control of the quality and distribution of new drugs.

Expanded the highly desirable program of loans to encourage the construction of housing for elderly persons.

REFORM OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Reformed the multibillion-dollar public assistance program by placing more emphasis on rehabilitation of needy persons, thereby reducing relief rolls, and by providing modest increases in assistance for the aged, the blind, and the disabled and for child welfare services.

Increased the protection afforded both workers and management under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Encouraged self-employed persons to establish pension plans for themselves and their employees.

Continued assistance to State and local governments for research to control air pollution.

Increased the amounts of medical and dental expenses allowable for income tax deduction and raised from $1,200 to $1,524 the amount of retirement income not subject to personal income tax to conform with last year's amendment to the social security laws allowing for a small increase in annual earnings of retired persons.

Strengthened Federal conflict-of-interest laws and laws relating to graft and bribery, and made more effective the prohibition against the transportation of gambling devices across State lines.

Increased the rates of compensation paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities.

All of these actions, I believe, were constructive efforts to strengthen our country and its determination to preserve peace, protect freedom, prevent the expansion of communism, improve the well-being of our people, strengthen the national economy, and make our governmental system of Federal, State, and local cooperation serve us more effectively. As such, all of this legislation received substantial support from Members of Congress of both political parties. Indeed, in some cases, without Republican votes worthwhile legislation would not have been passed in spite of the sizable margins by which the majority party controlled Congress.

FAILURES, TOO

Unfortunately, however, Congress' accomplishments were matched by its failures. For example, no significant education legislation was enacted into law, despite the fact that the urgently needed program to help colleges build classrooms and improve facilities had passed both House and Senate by substantial bipartisan majorities. The mass transportation bill, which I cosponsored and which is essential to the improvement of commuter service in metropolitan areas like our own, also failed to pass, although it, too, enjoyed considerable bipartisan support. In spite of the many recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, the only civil rights legislation to be approved was the proposed constitutional amendment to outlaw the poll tax as a requirement for voting purposes—the least effective and most time-consuming means to this laudable end.

Election year politics, among other reasons, prevented the finding of a workable formula for providing health care for older persons. The equal-pay-for-women bill, which I have sponsored from the beginning of my service in Congress, almost made it, only to be blocked by a last-minute technicality which could and should have been overcome. The President's proposal to create a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs out of the existing agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Administration, was defeated in the House. No action was taken on badly needed legislation to control the distribution of barbiturates and amphetamines, the so-called goofball drugs—legislation, by the way, to which I shall give special emphasis in the 88th Congress.

In the face of overwhelming evidence of the shortage of doctors and nurses, nothing was done to encourage the expansion of facilities for their training.

A special category of failure should be reserved for Congress' record on Government spending. Although approximately $4.6 billion was trimmed from the administration's budget requests, spending in the current fiscal year will, for the first time since World War II, exceed $100 billion.

Congress missed many opportunities to reduce appropriations for programs and projects which by no stretch of the imagination could be classified as essential or even important, one of the most flagrant examples of which was the $10 million fish aquarium for the District of Columbia. As a result, Congress increased the authorized national debt, although only temporarily, from $298 to $308 billion. In my judgment, this increase in the debt ceiling could easily have been avoided by a little judicious restraint. While the difficulties are all too apparent, I am still convinced it is possible to exercise fiscal responsibility and at the same time do everything necessary to advance the Nation's security and welfare. In fact, the two are logically inseparable, and I shall continue to do everything possible to see that both objectives are realized.

THE SOFT ECONOMY

In any analysis of the record of the 87th Congress, major attention must be given to the failure to take meaningful action to stimulate the economy. Tax revision, including necessary incentives to increase production and consumption, and therefore jobs, is of the first importance. Yet, this year's tax bill was notable chiefly for its investment tax credit of approximately $1.2 billion—which, while intended to be an incentive credit, covered expenditures made long before the bill was passed.

Businessmen themselves were less than enthusiastic about the value of the tax credit. Fortunately, however, Congress eliminated from the tax bill the unnecessary and discriminatory proposal to begin withholding of income from interest and dividends, a provision I strongly opposed.

The Area Redevelopment Act, which could have been a useful way of helping areas of heavy long-term unemployment, became instead, a highly political program which emphasizes rural areas as opposed to urban areas, where unemployment is greater, and which dissipates available resources among too many small and relatively ineffective projects.

The public works acceleration bill, which was cut from $900 to $400 million, will only substitute Federal dollars for State and local funds without holding out much hope of increasing employment, since eligible projects, by their definition in the law, would probably be constructed without this special Federal assistance.

Our economy has never really recovered from the last recession. Unemployment is close to 6 percent of the labor force nationally. While many key economic indicators are encouraging, others indicate a continuing instability. Unless effective measures are taken by private industry, the administration, and the next Congress to inject new vigor into the economy—through tax revisions, including tax cuts, efforts to create greater mutual confidence between Government and business, and more creative use of monetary policy, that is the adjustment of interest rates to regulate the supply of money—then we shall find the next economic dip a much more painful one. Our national and international responsibilities make it imperative that we do a better job of making our economy a stronger, more expansive and more dependable one than it is today, as soon as possible.

NEEDED: A GOOD FARM BILL

Other failures of the 87th Congress include the farm bill. All that can be said for the measure that squeezed past a hostile Congress is that it will be, hopefully, a temporary one.

It was makeshift, discriminatory, and certain to bring an increase in the price of the food we buy. The agricultural economy is composed of so many different commodity groups, special programs, and conflicting interests—all of them represented in Congress—that a coherent, balanced and rational farm program seems impossible of accomplishment through the normal legislative processes.

I do not minimize the difficulties, but sometime soon Congress is going to have to insist that farmers, processors, distributors, consumers—and taxpayers—get together and devise a program that will meet the country's need for abundance without waste, adequate income which farmers can depend on, and reasonable consumer prices. Logically, these should not be opposing objectives. Practically, Congress has not yet found the formula for harmonizing them.

This reference to agriculture leads me to the Billie Sol Estes case, the biggest, most time-consuming project in which either of my two committees engaged this year. Space obviously does not permit detailed discussion of this complex affair, so let me summarize it this way. The Estes investigation is not yet complete. As one who first insisted on my Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee's responsibility to investigate, I want to see the job done fully and fairly.

As it stands today, Mr. Estes is under multiple indictments. Several of his colleagues have been convicted on related charges. Evidence taken by our House and Senate committees establishes clearly that Estes was a wheeler-dealer on a grand scale. By means of frequent gifts, innumerable contacts, favors, and political contributions, he sought to ingratiate himself with Government officials, especially in the Department of Agriculture. As a result, he was allowed to keep millions of dollars worth of cotton allotments which he obtained in clear violation of law and regulations, until his nefarious operations became public. And, at a particularly critical point, he persuaded Department officials to retreat from a decision to raise his grain storage bond, a decision which, if carried through, would have revealed his bankrupt condition long before the Estes

Even though the investigation is incomplete, we have already achieved substantial results. Faced with overwhelming evidence of poor communications, inadequate supervision and generally loose administrative procedures, the Agriculture Department has been persuaded to undertake a number of important reforms—which, after all, is the primary objective of the investigation.

IMPROVING HEALTH

In other fields, the subcommittee made far-reaching recommendations which will greatly improve administration of the many health research programs of the National Institutes of Health. We also continued two important studies: To find ways of improving various consumer protection activities of Federal, State, and local governments; and to assure that the Food and Drug Administration's job of protecting the American people against unsafe food, drugs, and cosmetics is done with the utmost care and efficiency, a matter of literal life-and-death importance.

In the Banking and Currency Committee, mass transportation and housing for the elderly legislation were two of our principal occupations this year. We also reported bills to extend the Defense Production Act and the Export Control Act, strengthened the International Monetary Fund which stabilizes world currencies, increased the lending authority of the Small Business Administration for business and disaster loans, and improved laws governing the Federal Reserve Board, national banks and savings and loan associations.

Overlapping both my committees, and involving the work of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—of which I am one of three members representing the House—I introduced a series of bills which would provide more systematic scrutiny of Federal grant programs and improve coordination of such programs, especially as they affect urban areas, at all levels of government. Although no final action was taken on this legislation, I am glad to report that national organizations of Governors, mayors, and county officials have endorsed several of them, and I am hopeful we can pass them in the next Congress.

Legislation, no matter how significant, is only one of the responsibilities of Congressmen, and political scientists assign equal importance to the obligations of Members to serve the districts they represent. This aspect of my job in Washington has always been one of the most satisfying and rewarding, and I welcome every opportunity to be of service.

This year, as in the past, my staff and I have been privileged to help thousands of Union County residents on a wide variety of problems involving the Federal Government—uniting families; unraveling Government redtape; obtaining information for businessmen, housewives, students, and working people; protecting the rights of servicemen, veterans, and retired people; cooperating with public officials on community and county projects of many kinds; and welcoming visitors to our Nation's Capitol, to mention only the major categories.

KEEPING IN TOUCH

You, the people I represent, and I have continued to keep in close touch. Correspondence has been heavier than ever. Your interest in receiving my regular "Report to the People" accounted for a large increase in distribution. Your response to our congressional questionnaire was the greatest in the 5 years I have used this means of obtaining your views on important issues. And, while I remained on the job here whenever the House was in session, I used every possible occasion to return to the district on weekends and during recesses to talk with you personally and learn how I could represent you more effectively.

For all of this, and for the confidence you have placed in my ability to serve you, I thank you. This is your congressional office, and I hope you will always remember that there is nothing we like better than to try to be helpful.

I should like to conclude this report by mentioning several areas in which legislation I introduced or supported has benefited Union County directly. Urban renewal, housing for the elderly, and open space projects are underway in several of our communities. A number of new post offices have recently been completed. Assistance for hospital construction and sewage disposal has been received, and Congress has approved my request for funds to complete the flood control survey of the Elizabeth River.

Congress also passed a bill I cosponsored authorizing the sale of the General Aniline & Film Corp., a move which should contribute greatly to both labor and management at the company's big Linden plant. Approval of my bill to provide for maintenance of the channels to Port Elizabeth was a big step ahead in the development of this great new international port facility, a project which will provide employment for an estimated 8,000 to 9,000 persons in our area with annual payrolls of between $40 and $50 million. Congress, too, voted funds to continue work on a number of navigation and channel improvement projects in the New Jersey-New York port area—work that is vital in maintaining our area's preeminent position in world trade.

Finally, I am especially pleased to report that prospects look better than ever for New York State to raise its minimum drinking age from 18 to 21—a campaign I have carried on since 1955 and one in which a great many of you have actively participated. Earlier this year, 25 of my colleagues in the House and Senate joined me in petitioning the New York Legislature to take this action. On their behalf, I testified before the legislative committee studying the teenage problem. The indication of congressional concern was unique, and I believe it was helpful in emphasizing the seriousness of the situation.

All in all, therefore, this was a year of feat, a not untypical session of Congress. progress and delay, of victory and de- But we have much to do and time is short.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have coming over some documents to which I want to refer. I did not realize that the special orders would be called this early.

One document that I am going to discuss is the latest piece of campaign literature put out by Aime Forand's National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc. in regard to the issue of health care for the aged for this coming election. It is a very interesting point that this pamphlet clearly shows that the National Council of Senior Citizens Inc. has abandoned the King-Anderson bill as a proposed piece of legislation. It is also quite clear that President Kennedy has abandoned the King-Anderson bill as proposed legislation in this area. I might also state that former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr.

Ribicoff, now running for Senator in the State of Connecticut has abandoned the King-Anderson bill. President Kennedy said he wanted to make an issue this fall of the King-Anderson bill; yet with less than a month to go for these elections, this basic position has been abandoned by the administration. I think it is important for people on all sides of the aisle who are running for reelection to know, particularly those who were not in favor of the King-Anderson bill that this is not an election issue and that the administration has abandoned it.

As to those who might have been saying that they were for it, it is equally important for them, too, to realize that this is no longer a basic plank in the Democratic platform.

In essence, as near as I can figure out, the new proposal of the Kennedy administration is along the lines of what was done over in the Senate through a discussion of several proposals, one by Senator JAVITS, the Rockefeller approach, and the adoption of many amendments none of them studied by any committee nor open to hearings for the public to register its views. But, essentially, what we Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means have been pointing out for a number of years ever since the Forand bill was first presented was its failure to cover old people not on social security insurance. The gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman BYRNES, has a bill in now to cover those people who are not presently covered under social security insurance which the administration opposed and still opposes, I suppose. In other words, as we dug into the proposals of the Forand bill and the King-Anderson bill, we found out it applied only to people who are covered under social security insurance, leaving out some 3 to 4 million people who probably as a group need the help more than any single group because they were the ones who were not on social security and who only get old-age assistance. Let me point out that Congressman BYRNES' bill says, now that we have reached this point, let us cover all people under social security who are passed the age of 72 and were born too soon to have their occupations or their spouses' occupation covered.

One thing that we were pointing out in error in the King-Anderson bill is that any proposal ought to be applying to this 3 to 4 million old people. The Kerr-Mills Act does.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think it should be pointed out that in this group over 72 who are not now covered by social security, that over half of them are on public assistance, a demonstration of their need; and over half of them are widows. If there is any group we should start giving our attention to it is this group that has been completely neglected because, as we said before, they were either born too soon, or Congress acted too late as far as covering them under social security is concerned.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman is right.

The Forand senior citizen literature has this in it; it says:

> And all people whether they are now beneficiaries of the social security or not.

This is literature that is being spread around for the fall campaign.

Also in the same literature is this statement:

> The President has promised that he will have introduced in the next Congress—

January, whenever we meet—

> legislation designed along this line.

I guess it will be referred to now as the Kennedy bill. As I point out, he is abandoning the King-Anderson approach.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I commend the gentleman from Missouri for bringing this to the attention of the House. The gentleman will recall that several months ago I checked this material that came from the Forand committee. They peddled it around to public employees in my district. I did some checking. The literature went out with no name, without any credit. The publication could not be identified. But we checked it back to the bulk mailing permit in Washington. It was mailed under Permit No. 310, Washington, D.C., which is held by the Democratic National Committee. I was shocked that this material should be so anonymously circulated in Federal agencies. I have one in my office from a local extension office of the Department of Agriculture.

I did not receive any satisfactory answer. I do not know how extensive these mailings are, but I think we should deplore the fact that private groups are sending out literature to Federal employees on Federal mailing plates.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to commend the gentleman. The points he makes are accurate. This literature I have bears the name of the Senior Citizens group, Mr. Forand's group. I think what I am saying here is amply brought home. President Kennedy in good conscience ought to commend the Congress of the United States for having the wisdom and the patience to look into the issues involved in this serious matter of health care for the aged, commend the Congress for having been careful. Now the President himself is recognizing obviously, that the proposals that they had made were not well suited to meet the problems.

I might say that I do not know what else will be in the proposals of the Kennedy bill in January, but I certainly am hopeful that attention will be paid to these other basic criticisms that we have been directing against this kind of legislation.

One other thing, I hope the Kennedy administration and the President himself will dispel the misinformation that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is permitting to be spread around the country about the Kerr-Mills Act. The doctrine that has been spread is that the Kerr-Mills Act requires a pauper's oath. This is false, and those who are spreading that doctrine know it is false. Many of our social security workers, and Ph. D.'s in social work, have spread this false information.

What does the Kerr-Mills Act say? It recognizes that we have old age assistance, it recognizes that there is a means test in OAA. It says, "We do know there are people over 65 who are doing all right and are not on relief. They own their own little home. They have their pensions. We do not want them to have to go on relief."

Yet, if they are hit with a major medical bill they might be forced to. So the Kerr-Mills bill says, "You can tell these older people that we can help you to take care of your medical costs," not just 25 percent, as the King-Anderson bill would provide, but all of it, and you do not have to go on relief. You can go back and live in your little home and keep your little pension, just the reverse of what these enemies of our great American system would have people believe.

The dissemination of this false propaganda is one reason why States like my own, the State of Missouri, where the Democrat Party controls the legislature by 3 to 1, and has a Democrat Governor, have not implemented the Kerr-Mills Act. It is largely because of this false information. Disseminated by people in high authority.

I now have this document before me, to which I referred before. This is put out by the National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc., 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

In the center part it reads:

> President Kennedy's medicare program will, in fact, provide a paid-up noncancellable health insurance policy for all Americans, in full force at age 65, whether they qualify for social security cash benefits or not.

That is not the King-Anderson bill, and everyone knows it is not. This is a new proposal and one I might say that the Republicans on the Committee on Ways and Means called attention to.

One other item:

> President Kennedy has promised to introduce this medicare program to the U.S. Congress next January. It will become law only if enough Senators and Congressmen are prepared to vote for it.

The pamphlet does not spell out in any other detail what this new medicare proposal will be. We can only guess. Certainly this matter cannot become the subject of a campaign issue if left in this hazy and general manner.

One thing alone is certain; President Kennedy and his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have abandoned the King-Anderson bill as ill advised and poor legislation.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks I wish to set out a history of proposed legislation in the area of health care:

The campaign for a compulsory health care plan to be administered by the Federal Government first got underway with the appearance in Congress of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill in 1943—19 years ago.

Compulsory health care was not a new idea then. An offspring of 19th century socialism in Europe, it had been a subject of debate in the United States for decades. But it had made no headway in this country.

Although advocated by various groups during the 1930's, it made no progress during the regime of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, when the Social Security Act and other welfare proposals were enacted by Congress.

WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL BILL

When the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill made its appearance, its foremost backers were powerful labor leaders, although a well-known labor leader of earlier days—Samuel Gompers, one-time chief of the AFL—opposed compulsory health care.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill was like the compulsory health care plan now being pushed by the administration and labor leaders, except that it was much more far reaching. It provided for a nationwide compulsory health care system covering the overwhelming majority of the American people.

This bill has appeared, with some modifications, in every Congress since 1943. It is now before the Eighty-Seventh Congress in a bill (H.R. 4413) introduced by Representative DINGELL of Michigan, son of the Congressman Dingell of 1943.

Although labor leaders who campaigned for this proposal in the 1940's are not pushing it now, their recent testimony before congressional committees shows clearly that they have not abandoned their drive for a broad-gaged, compulsory health care program—that they are backing the limited administration proposal now before Congress in the hope that it can be passed, and expanded later.

After World War II, President Truman threw his support behind the Wagner-Murray-Dingell proposal. In November 1945, he submitted to Congress a special message in which he recommended a nationwide compulsory health care plan.

President Truman insisted that his plan would not be "socialized medicine," just as sponsors of the present limited version contend that it should not bear that label. Mr. Truman contended that physicians and hospitals would have "the same professional freedom" as before. However, he said:

> I am in favor of the broadest possible coverage for this insurance system. I believe that all persons who work for a living and their dependents should be covered.

He said such a program would require a levy of about 4 percent of all earnings up to $3,600 a year, but he left it to Congress to decide how much of the financing should come from a specific levy and how much from general revenues.

Lengthy hearings were held by committees of Congress in the latter 1940's on the Wagner-Murray-Dingell legislation. But no action was taken in either House of Congress.

An outspoken opponent of the plan was the late Senator Taft, Republican, of Ohio. Chief proponents included the AFL and the CIO, now merged into the AFL–CIO. A leading advocate was Representative Andrew J. Biemiller, Democrat, of Wisconsin, now legislative director of the AFL–CIO. Representative Biemiller testified in favor of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, and introduced a bill of his own.

In supporting the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill before the Senate Education and Labor Committee in 1946, Representative Biemiller said:

> I believe that action by the Federal Government is absolutely necessary if there is to be any solution to the problem of adequately financing the distribution of medical care for the people of this country. Workers face four great hazards in our industrial world—industrial accidents, old age, unemployment, and sickness. This bill (the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill) proposes that the principles of social insurance shall be applied in removing from the lives of our people the fourth great hazard—sickness.

FORAND BILL

The failure of the proponents to continue their campaign for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill was doubtless due in large measure to the rapid growth of voluntary health insurance since World War II. This rapid growth removed one of the main arguments advanced for the bill—namely, that voluntary plans would never be adequate, and that only a nationwide compulsory health care system could accomplish the desired objective.

But the campaign for compulsory health care has persisted. The proposal appeared in recent years in a modified form in a bill offered in the House by former Representative Forand, Democrat of Rhode Island.

Pressure for the Forand bill began to build up in 1959. This bill provided for free hospitalization, nursing home and surgical services, within specified limitations, for social security beneficiaries, including surviving widows and children.

The House Ways and Means Committee held 1 week of hearings on the bill during the 1959 session, and thereafter shelved the measure for the session.

Leading advocates of the Forand bill included labor leaders who had worked to pass the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill in earlier years.

Early in the 1960 session, a high-pressure campaign was started to force the Forand bill through Congress. As the House Ways and Means Committee prepared to consider the bill in closed session, the AFL–CIO called for an intensive letter-writing campaign.

After a hard battle behind closed doors, the Ways and Means Committee rejected the Forand bill by the one-sided vote of 17 to 8, with nearly half the Democrats on the committee joining a solid rank of Republicans in opposing it.

Union leaders then turned their attention to the Senate with a stepped-up drive to force passage of the legislation. Leaders in the fight included Walter Reuther, president of the Auto Workers, and James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical Workers.

The campaign was featured by a labor-sponsored rally in Madison Square Garden in New York in support of the Forand bill. A top-ranking AFL–CIO official threatened a political blacklist of all Members of Congress refusing to support the measure, saying they would be "manifestly unworthy of the support of American workers."

In the Senate, Senator Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, who by that time had won the Democratic presidential nomination, led the fight for a compromise Forand-type proposal offered by Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico. The Senate rejected the proposal by a rollcall vote of 51 to 44. Senator Kennedy said he would take his fight for the proposal to the voters.

In rejecting the Forand measure, Congress passed the Kerr-Mills bill providing for a special plan of Federal grants to States to pay the hospital and medical bills of indigent persons and others 65 and over who could not pay their health-care bills.

The Kerr-Mills plan still is in process of being implemented. Thus far, more than half the States have set up programs to take advantage of the plan.

THE KING-ANDERSON BILL

The campaign of the Kennedy administration for a compulsory health plan under social security started off with a task force report recommending such a plan. President Kennedy followed this up with a special message to Congress soon after he was inaugurated.

Representative KING, Democrat of California, introduced the administration bill in the House, H.R. 4222. Senator ANDERSON, Democrat of New Mexico, offered a companion bill in the Senate, S. 909.

The administration bill differs in certain respects from the Forand measure.

Those eligible for benefits are persons 65 and over who either are receiving or are entitled to social security old age payments, even though their earnings are too high to permit them to draw such payments. Surviving widows and children, who would have been covered under the Forand bill, are excluded.

Unlike the Forand bill, no payments are provided in the administration bill for physicians' bills.

Beneficiaries would be entitled to hospital care for up to 90 days during an illness, for nursing home care up to 180 days, for outpatient diagnostic services and for home health services. But the patient would have to pay the first $90 of his hospital bill if he remained in a hospital for 9 days or more, and the first $20 of the bill for each outpatient diagnostic study.

The administration bill provides for a payroll tax of one-half of 1 percent—one-fourth each on employer and employee—to support the program. This is one-eighth of the 4-percent levy which former President Truman said would be necessary to support the Wagner-Dingell nationwide plan.

Despite the fight which President Kennedy, as Senator, waged to secure passage of the Anderson-Forand-type proposal in 1960, the administration made no attempt to force its own plan through Congress in the 1961 session.

The House Ways and Means Committee held 2 weeks of hearings on H.R. 4222 in July and August 1961, and then postponed action on the measure until the 1962 session. Just as the Forand bill was held over for an attempt at passage in the 1960 election year, so has the administration bill been held over for a similar effort in the 1962 election year.

ESTABLISH THE PRINCIPLE

During the Ways and Means Committee hearings, President Walter Reuther of the Auto Workers and AFL–CIO President George Meany testified in support of the administration proposal.

Although he insisted that he no longer is trying to blanket everybody under compulsory health care, Mr. Reuther said:

> Obviously, it is a matter of commonsense that those who share my point of view that the present proposal (the administration bill) is not adequate in certain areas would want to continue their efforts to get amendments in the future to make it more adequate. Nothing is static. Nothing is fixed.
>
> Therefore, if we could get the principle established, we want to build on that principle, just as we built on the social security principle.

During the 1962 session of Congress, pressure has built up to force H.R. 4222 out of the Ways and Means Committee. As happened in 1960, a rally was staged in Madison Square Garden in New York City. President Kennedy himself made the keynote speech.

On Sunday, May 20, the Nation was subjected to an unprecedented "blitz" of pressure for passage of the King-Anderson compulsory health care bill, H.R. 4222, S. 909, backed by the administration.

The apparent purpose of this massive, high-pressure effort was to build up a wave of emotional demand of such proportions as to force passage by Congress of the King-Anderson bill by overwhelming all opposition, all question, and all dissent.

The top feature of this effort was a circus-type, mass rally in Madison Square Garden in New York City, at which the President was the principal performer.

The President's speech was carried into homes throughout the Nation by all major television networks, and to simultaneous rallies in more than 30 other cities by an elaborate and highly expensive television hookup.

In addition, many Cabinet officers and other top Government officials attended these rallies, and joined in the effort to create a clamor for passage of the King-Anderson bill.

ONE-DAY "BLITZ"

Like the President, each White House spokesman was able to exploit the months of careful preparation for the rallies reportedly coordinated by White House staff and the Washington office of a recently formed organization called the National Council of Senior Citizens. The head of this organization, Aime Forand, a former Congressman and the author of the Forand medical-care bill considered in the last session of Congress, introduced the President to the Madison Square Garden Rally and the television audience.

White House spokesman at the rallies were able to capitalize, too, on the spadework done by both local and national labor union leaders.

Despite this unprecedented pressure "blitz," the Senate subsequently rejected, by a roll call vote of 52 to 48, a compromise compulsory health care bill offered by Senator ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, as a rider to a bill making changes in Government welfare programs. Nearly one-third of the Democratic Senators joined Republicans in voting down the compromise proposal.

Following Senate defeat of the compromise bill, the House Ways and Means Committee debated H.R. 4222 for some time behind closed doors, but took no action. Significantly, a bipartisan majority of this group of Congressmen who were best informed about this legislative proposal remained vigorously opposed to passage of it.

Administration supporters stressed their plans to make a major issue of the compulsory health care proposal in the campaign preceding the November elections, and to mount another intensive campaign to force passage of the legislation in 1963.

Major proponents of bills before Congress in 1962 made little attempt to conceal the fact that these proposals were merely initial objectives that would "establish the principle" on which an expanded compulsory health care program could be built.

This, I believe, is the basic objective of the new 1963 proposal that was revealed in the campaign literature of the National Council of Senior Citizens to have a compulsory system controlled by the Federal Government by requiring the Department of HEW to set the prices to be charged and the services to be rendered by our hospitals and other health institutions.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman is doing a great job and I like it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would always yield for such kind remarks.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, until the very last, I had hoped that Congress would not pass up its fine opportunity to help meet one of the most serious problems—the shortage of doctors and dentists and public health specialists. Before the last gavel falls, all of us had hoped that there would be a chance for passage of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. Even on one of the very last days of this session it is still not too late to provide critically needed assistance to the schools that train our doctors, dentists, and public health specialists.

The bill on our side of the Congress is numbered H.R. 4999 and several months ago it cleared the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by a vote of 33 to 6, but for a long while, at least for many months, that stern director of legislative traffic, the Rules Committee, kept the measure from the House itself. We don't know why the Rules Committee held it. One Washington editorial said it was for purposes of ransom to make sure that the educational bills displeasing to the chairman were not enacted. Well, the College Academic Facilities Act was defeated so that should make a few of its enemies happy.

But now, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has granted a rule on this bill and Congress should act favorably and immediately so that Americans may continue in the years ahead to receive the quality of medical care of which we as a nation are so rightfully proud.

The need for Federal assistance in this area has long been recognized and is long overdue. The previous administration in a health message several years ago noted:

> There are serious shortages in such specialized fields as psychiatry, pediatrics, physical medicine and rehabilitation. Relative to population the number of dentists and nurses are diminishing. The aging of our population and the increase in chronic diseases, the anticipated continued growth of health insurance plans and the general expansion of our economy * * * all well tend to increase the demand for health services.

The present administration, through President Kennedy, a year ago in a statement to Congress noted:

> We have now 92 medical and dental schools. These graduate barely 7,500 physicians and 3,200 dentists each year. During the last 10 years capacity of our medical schools increased 50 percent and our dental schools by 100 percent. The output will still be only such as to maintain the present ratio of physicians and dentists to the population.

H.R. 4999 provided for three things:

First. Seventy-five million dollars annually for 10 years for the construction of teaching facilities to permit increased enrollment at medical and dental schools.

Second. A 5-year program of generous loans to students of dentistry, medicine, and osteopathy.

Third. Extended for 3 additional years the matching grant program for construction of health research facilities.

This bill should enjoy bipartisan support because both the Democratic and Republican platforms in 1960 pledged such a program.

At the present time we are a debtor nation in regard to our supply of young physicians in that we are relying more and more upon foreign-trained doctors to staff our hospitals and provide medical service to our communities throughout the country. The truth of the matter is that the United States is the wealthiest country in the world and the most advanced in science and technology and should be in a position to export medical people rather than import in order that we could make a net contribution to the international community.

There may be many shades of opinion and different views as to the best sort or type of legislation for the health care for our senior citizens. But these differences will be resolved and there will undoubtedly be a plan devised in the future which will be acceptable to the great majority of our people. It will be passed by the Congress, if not in the next session, then the following or the session following that. It is my prediction there will be a compromise enacted which will be workable and which will certainly not in any way be subject to the charge of socialized medicine. Whether that plan be administered by the Federal Government or with Federal funds administered by the States, there will be a need for a greater number of doctors because medical science is making it possible for all of us to live longer and longer. Population grows because of the excess of births over deaths and death is being cheated by the constant advance of medical science.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Health Provisions Educational Assistance Act is urgently needed by the country. It was pledged in the platform of both parties. It is time for all of us to redeem these pledges and take immediate action to meet our health manpower needs.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 502 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

Mr. BONNER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 11586) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2556)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11586), to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill insert the following: "That section 502(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152(b)), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

" '(b) The amount of the reduction in selling price which is herein termed "construction differential subsidy" may equal, but not exceed, the excess of the bid of the shipbuilder constructing the proposed vessel (excluding the cost of any features incorporated in the vessel for national defense uses, which shall be paid by the Secretary in addition to the subsidy), over the fair and reasonable estimate of cost, as determined by the Secretary, of the construction of the proposed vessel if it were constructed under similar plans and specifications (excluding national defense features as above provided) in a foreign shipbuilding center which is deemed by the Secretary to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of vessels of the type proposed to be constructed. The construction differential approved and paid by the Secretary shall not exceed 55 per centum of the construction cost of the vessel, except that in the case of reconstruction or reconditioning of a passenger vessel having the tonnage, speed, passenger accommodations and other characteristics set forth in section 503 of this Act, the construction differential approved and paid shall not exceed 60 per centum of the reconstruction or reconditioning cost (excluding the cost of national defense features as above provided): *Provided, however,* That after June 30, 1964, the construction differential approved by the Secretary shall not exceed in the case of the construction, reconstruction or reconditioning of any vessel, 50 per centum of such cost. When the Secretary finds that the construction differential in any case exceeds the foregoing applicable percentage of such cost, the Secretary may negotiate and contract on behalf of the applicant to construct, reconstruct, or recondition such vessel in a domestic shipyard at a cost which will reduce the construction differential to such applicable percentage or less. In the event that the Secretary has reason to believe that the bidding in any instance is collusive, he shall report all of the evidence on which he acted (1) to the Attorney General of the United States, and (2) to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives if the Congress shall in session or if the Congress shall not be in session, then to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House, respectively.'

"SEC. 2. (a) The Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (49 Stat. 1985), is amended by striking out subsection (d) of section 502: *Provided, however,* That the repeal of subsection (d) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, shall not be effective with respect to contracts for new ship construction under title V of said Act awarded on the basis of bids opened prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(b) Section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1159), is amended by striking out ': *And provided,* That in case a vessel is to be constructed under this section for an applicant who has as his principal place of business a place on the Pacific coast of the United States' and all that follows in that section down through and including 'maintains his principal place of business at any place on the Pacific coast.' and insert in lieu thereof a period.

"(c) Section 213 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1123), is amended by striking out 'a report' and inserting in lieu thereof 'reports' and by striking out 'as soon as practicable'.

"(d) Paragraph (c) of said section 213 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and adding the following '; reports under this paragraph shall be made annually on the first day of July of each year.'.

"(e) The first sentence of subsection (f) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152), is amended by striking out 'periodically' and inserting in lieu thereof 'at least once each year'.

"(f) The second sentence of subsection (f) of section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1152), is amended (1) by striking out the words ', with the approval of the President,' and (2) by striking out 'existing inadequacy' and inserting in lieu thereof 'existing or impending inadequacy'.

"SEC. 3. The Act entitled 'An Act to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to change the limitation of the construction differential subsidy under such title, and for other purposes', approved July 7, 1960 (74 Stat. 362), is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 4. No official or employee of the United States Government nor any member of their immediate families may accept directly or indirectly free or at a reduced rate passenger travel or carriage of personal property on any ship sailing under a flag other than that of the United States. This restriction shall not apply to persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons, and persons rescued at sea, and this restriction shall not apply to persons referred to in section 405(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1145(b)), relating to steamship companies carrying the mails of the United States. Any person who knowingly violates this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000 at the discretion of the courts for each such violation.'

"SEC. 4. (a) During the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883) shall be suspended with respect to the transportation of lumber to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico from any ports or terminal areas in the United States whenever the Secretary of Commerce, after notice and opportunity for hearing, determines that there is no domestic vessel reasonably available to serve between such ports or terminal areas for the transportation of such lumber. Such determination shall be made within 45 days after application for suspension and shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such determination. Upon making the determination provided for in this section, the Secretary of Commerce shall establish such terms, conditions, and regulations with respect to operations under such suspension as he determines to be in the national interest.

"(b) Any suspension under the provisions of this Act shall terminate whenever the Secretary of Commerce determines that conditions required in the subsection (a) of this section for such suspension no longer exist, or upon the expiration of the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever first occurs.

"(c) No Federal laws shall apply to any water carrier because of operations under a suspension provided for in this Act if such laws did not apply to such carrier prior to such suspension.

"SEC. 5. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be effective only with respect to contracts entered into with respect to (a) the construction of a vessel the keel of which was laid after June 30, 1959, or (b) the reconstruction or reconditioning of a vessel the shipyard contract for which was entered into after June 30, 1959, and the Secretary may, with the consent of the parties thereto, modify any such contract entered into prior to the date of the enactment of this Act to the extent authorized by the amendment made by this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes."

HERBERT C. BONNER,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
BOB CASEY,
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLAIR ENGLE,
E. L. BARTLETT,
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on tha amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11586) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The conference substitute contains all of the features which were originally contained in the House bill, and all of the features contained in the Senate amendment, except as noted below.

The first section of the House bill amended section 502(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, so as to provide that construction differential approved and paid by the Secretary of Commerce under the act shall not exceed 55 percent of the construction cost of a vessel except that in the case of reconstruction or reconditioning of a passenger vessel the construction differential approved and paid shall not exceed 60 percent of such cost. The House bill further provided that after July 7, 1965, the construction differential should not exceed 50 percent of the cost of construction, reconstruction or reconditioning of any vessel. The conference substitute retains the entire text of the House bill except (a) to change the date from July 7, 1965, to June 30, 1964, appearing in section 1 thereof; (b) to delete section 2 of the House bill to conform with other provisions of the conference substitute; and (c) other minor technical conforming amendments.

Section 2 of the conference substitute contains all the features of H.R. 1159, which passed the House on April 12, 1962. This section, which was added to the bill by the Senate amendment, would—

(a) repeal the present 6 percent preferential differential enjoyed by Pacific coast shipbuilders in bidding for ship construction except as to contracts for new ship construction under title V of the Merchant Marine Act awarded on the basis of bids opened prior to the date of enactment of this act;

(b) conform section 509 of the act with the effect of the repeal of section 502(d);

(c) and (d) amend section 213 of the Merchant Marine Act so as to require that studies made under that section with reference to shipbuilding costs and other matters shall be reported annually to Congress on the first day of July of each year;

(e) amend section 502(f) relative to allocation of shipbuilding contracts to other than low bidders when required by the national interest by providing for annual surveys of private shipyard capability in lieu of present requirements that such surveys be made periodically;

(f) further amend section 502(f) by (1) eliminating the existing requirement that allocations under the section must be made with the approval of the President, and (2) authorizing allocations under appropriate circumstances when it is found that inadequacies in the mobilization base are impending, as well as in cases where such inadequacies are existing.

Section 3 of the conference substitute, which was added by the Senate amendment, amends the act of July 7, 1960 (74 Stat. 362), so as to forbid officials or employees of the U.S. Government or members of their families from accepting free or reduced rate passenger travel or carriage of personal property on any ship sailing under a flag other than that of the United States.

Section 4 of the conference substitute, which was added by the Senate amendment, authorizes the suspension of the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 during 1 year after the enactment of the bill so as to permit foreign-flag vessels to transport lumber to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico from ports or terminal areas in the United States when the Secretary of Commerce, after notice and opportunity for hearing, determines that domestic vessels are not reasonably available for transportation between such points. Said section 4 also provides that such determination shall be made within 45 days after application for suspension and shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such determination.

Section 5 of the conference substitute conforms in substance to section 3 of the bill as passed the House, which simply provided that the ceilings on the construction differential contained therein would be applicable with respect to both new construction and reconstruction and reconditioning contracts, in all cases where keels were laid or contracts signed subsequent to June 30, 1959.

In connection with section 2 of the conference substitute which repeals the existing 6-percent differential enjoyed by Pacific coast shipbuilders and strengthens provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 authorizing allocation of construction contracts when needed in the national interest, Congress has consistently recognized the need for having adequate, readily available shipbuilding facilities on all coasts for emergency use. This was emphasized in House committee report on H.R. 1159, to repeal the Pacific coast differential, and in the debate on the floor when the House considered that measure. It was urged then, and we do so now, that the allocation authority of section 502(f) be used wherever, and whenever, needed to keep the national shipbuilding mobilization base in balance.

With regard to sections 3 and 4 of the conference substitute, the managers on the part of the House wish the record to show that agreement was arrived at reluctantly and primarily in the interest of bringing about enactment of those provisions applicable to the ceiling on construction differential and to the elimination of the above mentioned special west coast differential. The managers on the part of the House call attention to the fact that there has been no opportunity to hold hearings and make a thorough study of the matters covered by said sections 3 and 4. The principles involved are of such importance that early consideration of both of these matters should be given by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the first session of the next Congress.

In view of the problem involved in section 4 of the conference substitute relative to suspending the coastwise laws to permit foreign-flag vessels to transport lumber to Puerto Rico, as well as to other problems involving domestic shipping which have arisen during this Congress, it appears urgent that the next Congress make a thorough study and investigation of our entire domestic shipping policy.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
THOMAS N. DOWNING,
BOB CASEY,
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,
THOMAS M. PELLY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11586) to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to propound two or three questions to the chairman of the Committee on Merehant Marine and Fisheries.

The chief controversy involved in this conference was a provision to eliminate the ship construction differential which existed in favor of the west coast shipyards; is that so?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. In other words, one of the provisions of the conference agreement will eliminate section 502(d) of the Merchant Marine Act?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman understands that both the Senate and House have passed bills that contained these provisions. The House passed the bill H.R. 1159 in April. The Senate took no action on that bill. Now, the Senate added the provisions of that bill to this bill, H.R. 11586, providing for construction differential subsidy ceilings on new contruction and reconstruction of vessels. There is also added thereto two additional amendments.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I understand that. As I understand the facts, the conferees have now come to full agreement as to the matters in difference. But I wanted to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee another question, and that is this:

There still remains in the Merchant Marine Act section 502(f) which is commonly known as the allocation section under which the Secretary of the Department of Commerce is authorized to allocate ship construction to any shipyard in the United States should he feel, after a survey, it is in the interest of the national defense to do so; is that correct?

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is correct. That is pointed out in the conference report. Allocation shall now be made under the authority of section 502(f), instead of the former section 502(d) which provided for the 6-percent differential between the coasts.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. In other words, it was the opinion of the conferees that the Maritime Administrator should fully comply now with the provisions of section 502(f), and should no longer make any award under section 502(d)?

Mr. BONNER. That is correct. It further provides that a report shall be made to the Congress each year as to the condition of the existing shipyards for the national defense, which matter is taken into consideration in allocating vessels to shipyards in any part of the country.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for working out a very difficult situation. I also want to compliment all Members who were members of the conference.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object——

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Washington yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to this conference report, of course, but I have some interest in this. I simply wish to direct a question to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], because of his knowledge and interest in this matter: Does the gentleman understand that the provisions of section 502(f) will, as the gentleman interprets it and as I understand it to be interpreted by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, give to the west coast shipyard and others who will be concerned with this some assurance that the Secretary will have the authority to go ahead and do the things that are necessary in order to maintain the shipbuilding industry in our area, regardless of other situations which may exist as to cost, and so on?

Is that generally correct, or is this statement in error that I have made?

Mr. PELLY. Speaking as one of the conferees, I think I can assure the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] that the program would be such that all yards, regardless of what coast they were located on, would have consideration in order to maintain a mobilization base and balance, and to receive work under section 502(f).

Mr. Speaker, I can only say to the gentleman, as coming from the west coast, and as one who has had an interest in the 6-percent differential, and as one who has tried to preserve it in the past, I feel the result of the conference report is such as to strengthen our entire mobilization base and that it is in the national interest that we on the coast who have yards should, and will, receive consideration should we not have adequate work in order to preserve the necessary facilities and pool of skilled labor in our various yards.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Washington, and to commend the gentleman on the gentleman's statement. This, I think, is of vital importance. As the gentleman says, it is of vital importance not only to the west coast but to the shipbuilding industry and to our shipyards which are located on all coasts.

As I understand the gentleman's position, this does assure that we will remain in a proper position for mobilization and that the industry as such in the various areas of the country will be protected under the authority which the Secretary of Commerce will have under this section 502(f).

Mr. PELLY. I want to say and add that this has been a very controversial matter. It has been a very difficult matter to resolve. I would like to pay tribute to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and to all the other conferees and to those who have been interested in this in resolving this matter in such fashion as to be, in my opnion, truly in the national interest.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, of course, would like to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. I realize that this was a controversial situation. I do want to say that throughout the controversy that occurred on this matter, he has been very considerate of the position that some of us had on the west coast of the United States. So I want to express my appreciation, too, to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. May I join in the expressions of appreciation of the action of our distinguished chairman and of his fairness in handling an extremely difficult matter over a period of a great many years. Although personally I was reluctant to see it solved in this particular manner—I thought we could have done something that would have suited us better—I think we will all be happy to have it behind us, because it has been very troublesome.

Mr. Speaker, I signed this conference report with great reluctance, and only on account of the vital importance to the U.S. merchant marine of the extension of the temporary ceiling of 55 percent on the construction differential subsidy. I would also like to point out that it seems to me this is another example of what the gentleman from Missouri and others have been talking about for a number of days, the regrettable habit of the other body attaching unrelated riders to House bills. Each of the Senate amendments which we have been compelled to accept with very little modification should have been subjects of separate bills and should have had hearings and action on their individual merits.

I have strong personal objections to all three of the major amendments, but under the circumstances there seems to be nothing else to do but to bring back this particular conference report.

First. Repeal of the 6 percent differential is not justified by the facts as reported by the Maritime Administration. Modification to 4.2 percent is indicated and we so advocated. We would have accepted 3 percent. We received 0 percent. The only saving grace is the amendment to section 502(f) of the Merchant Marine Act which ought to be considered a mandate by the Secretary of Commerce to invoke this allocation procedure when defense considerations indicate it. We must keep a strong shipbuilding industry on all coasts.

Second. Permitting foreign-flag vessels to carry domestic trade even under these severe restrictions is a precedent-creating crack in the cabotage laws which should have received far more careful scrutiny. There were no House hearings. If we are to make special exceptions to the Jones Act we will eventually destroy completely our domestic U.S. flag maritime service.

Third. This prohibition against Federal employees and their families accepting reduced rate passage on foreign-flag vessels is highly discriminatory since it makes it illegal for them to do what any other citizen may do with no opprobrium whatsoever. This is a companion to the sa-called Williams amendment regarding U.S.-flag vessels; both are bad and highly unfair measures.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, may I say further, that with respect to contracts pending now, the terms will be carried out notwithstanding the elimination which has been referred to under that provision.

On other matters in this bill, in the conference report, there is a time for hearings so that all parties can come in and be heard with respect to one of the amendments.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to congratulate the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], for finally and successfully bringing to a conclusion this highly controversial matter of the 6-percent differential subsidy accorded the west coast shipbuilders over the shipbuilding industry of the rest of the country. Its repeal has long been overdue since there is absolutely no justification for its continuation under existing circumstances.

That portion of the bill repealing the 6-percent subsidy is something for which a number of us have been laboring for several years. As a matter of fact, my bill was reported out of committee more than 2 years ago but due to the lateness of the session we were unable to have it passed.

Our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], and his associates on the committee have done a remarkable job in overcoming many obstacles. As chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is entitled to much credit therefor. While many others are also entitled to credit for the final passage of the bill, I cannot miss the opportunity to pay my personal tribute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING] who has worked most diligently and faithfully toward the repeal. In fact, I am confident that had it not been for his energetic and able cooperation with the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman BONNER, we would not have succeeded.

I am very much in hope that the Senate today will also adopt the conference report with alacrity and thus bring to an end this long fight for equal treatment of the shipbuilding industry in all sections of our great common country.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] for the outstanding job he has done on this very vital piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13290) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations objects.

DUKE STEAMPLANT

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the hard fought question whether Duke will be permitted to construct the gigantic steamplant in the Savannah River in my district, is now being decided by the conferees. I want this House to know that I am grateful for the encouragement, support, and understanding of the membership on both sides of the aisle. Mr. Speaker, this House has supported me magnificently. The Georgia delegation has been particularly understanding. My distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, BOB STEPHENS, though fighting for Trotters Shoals as well as Duke, nevertheless fought fairly, openly, and with determination. I hold for the gentleman of Georgia the highest esteem and regardless of the outcome of the conference report, he will always have my admiration, affection, and respect.

INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY AND LEAGUE FOR INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY: SOCIALIST PROGENITORS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the often repeated questions I hear is "How did we ever get to such a state in America where socialism is disguised as progressive or liberal?" There are never any simple answers to such difficult questions but, as a student of political philosophy, it seems to me that a study of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society—ISS—and the League for Industrial Democracy—LID—will shed a great deal of light on the true goals of liberalism in America today. There was a time when Socialists were unabashed. One of the facts of life today is that there are very few people who publicly call themselves Socialist. Prof. Arthur Schlesinger's utterances and writings would certainly classify him as such but I imagine he would say that he is a liberal and not a Socialist.

In the words of the ISS and the LID leaders themselves, a meeting of 10 people was called on September 12, 1905, "for the purpose of promoting an intelligent interest in socialism among college men and women, graduate and undergraduate, through the formation of study clubs in the colleges and universities, and the encouraging of all legitimate endeavors to awaken an interest in socialism among the educated men and women of the country."

Men like Clarence S. Darrow, Jack London, and Upton Sinclair were in this original group. They freely referred to Norman Thomas, Socialist leader in America until the liberals took over his program, as our coworker. Some semantics were employed to say that their goal was to create students of socialism and not necessarily Socialists but viewed from any angle, it was a Socialist organization. They called their periodical the Intercollegiate Socialist.

Walter Lippmann, nationally known columnist, was first president of the Harvard Socialist Club, 1909–10, and proudly declared:

> The only evil we really fear is blind ignorance. In a general way our object was to make reactionaries, standpatters; standpatters, conservative liberals; conservative liberals and liberals, radicals; and radicals, Socialists. In other words, we tried to move everyone up a peg.

We will all have to admit that this is basically what has happened. The ISS and the LID are the forerunners of the modern day Americans for Democratic Action—ADA—and have been the vanguard of American Socialist thought and energy.

In 1921, the organization changed its name to the League for Industrial Democracy. The Bolshevik revolution had made the word "Socialist" less respectable and the leaders of the movement took a new approach. They were still socialistic and their new motto was "Production for Use, Not for Profit." They veiled their socialistic intent by high-sounding phrases such as these:

> The LID tries to bring into the field of thought and discussion all phases of the movement, conscious and unconscious, toward a social order which acknowledges the supremacy of human need rather than private profit as its organizing principle.

This was the birth of modern welfare statism and the start of the trend toward centralization and deficit spending. The depression was later to provide the impetus and Keynesian economics the tools which started the New Deal on a course which has been so successful, from their point of view, that we no longer have any vocal Socialist Party in the United States.

Further tie to the Socialist Party was shown when Norman Thomas joined Dr. Harry Laidler as a coexecutive director of the league in 1922. Paul Blanshard became field secretary and Robert Morss Lovett became the league's first president.

Many prominent people who have currently been billed as liberals were at the front of the activities of this Socialist organization. Walter P. Reuther was the organizer and president of the Wayne University chapter of the league. Andrew Biemiller, top labor lobbyist, was secretary of the University of Pennsylvania and Philadelphia chapters of the LID, 1928–32. Roger Baldwin, long associated with the American Civil Liberties Union, was on the board of directors of the LID, 1920–23. Prof. Alvin Hansen, sometimes called the architect of the New Frontier, assisted LID at Harvard.

The LID undoubtedly produced many sincere liberals. It also produced a host of leftist leaders such as Stuart Chase, Thorstein Veblen, Scott Nearing. Pro-Soviet Americans such as Corliss Lamont, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, and Owen Lattimore were active in the LID.

The ISS always had a close tie with the Fabian Society in England and a great amount of the success of that organization was the fact that while it was socialistic to the core it masqueraded as liberal, progressive, humanitarian and—you name the adjectives yourself. Like the Fabian Society, the ISS and its successor, the LID, pushed Socialist policies not Socialist organization. In their News Bulletin, the official organ of the LID, January 1923, they boasted:

> What the Fabian Society and the Guild Socialist League have done in England, what Clarté is doing on the Continent—this, making due allowance for American conditions and American needs, the LID seeks to accomplish in the United States.

That makes it about as clear as anyone can. This again is a telltale feature of the modern Socialists.

The report of the Joint Legislative Committee Investigating Seditious Activities, Senate of the State of New York, April 24, 1920, at page 1087 shows the tactics of these people very well in an advisory letter which Roger Baldwin wrote. He said:

> Do steer away from making it look like a Socialist enterprise. We want also to look patriots in everything we do. We want to

get a good lot of flags, talk a good deal about the Constitution and what our forefathers wanted to make of this country, and to show that we are really the folks that really stand for the spirit of our institutions.

It is fair to point out that neither the ISS or LID was officially associated with the Socialist Party although their memberships were in many cases filled with the same people. Their goals were clearly of the same ilk.

The "Handbook of the Student League for Industrial Democracy," gives many more telltale clues to their activities. Commenting on the transfer of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society to the League for Industrial Democracy, the handbook proclaimed:

> The war ended and the chapters began to revive. But students wanted a more inclusive name than Socialist, because they believed there were several alternative approaches to a cooperative commonwealth.

The handbook also told of the strife within the organization and reported:

> A movement of dissatisfaction set in within the LID which expressed itself in two ways. Attempts by loyal students from Columbia, Syracuse, the University of Chicago, and Wisconsin to change the structure of the LID; and the splitting away of Communist students who attributed the defeats of the LID to its Socialist leadership.

As was usual at the time, these organizations looked with favor upon the experiment in Russia and the handbook comments:

> The Soviet Union, on the other hand [being compared to Germany] is being built upon the solidarity of those who work with those who are growing up amid the struggles to build the first workers state.

Students were exhorted to give their all for the new social order and were warned:

> At times it means defiance of power and authority, when governmental force is thrown into the balance against labor in the class conflict. But it means still more. It implies participation in and active work to further the purposes of the movement dedicated to the building of a new social order. The student LID is part of the socialist movement in America. It aims to draw students into critical thought and radical action and to make of them workers for the cooperative commonwealth. Socialism in America is our primary goal.

Mr. Speaker, in 1955 the League for Industrial Democracy published a booklet which traces the history of this Socialist organization. I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

THE LID: 50 YEARS OF DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION—1905–55

(To Dr. Harry W. Laidler for a lifetime of dedicated service in behalf of the LID and its democratic ideals)

(By Mina Weisenberg)

INTRODUCTION

John Dewey, former president of the League for Industrial Democracy, speaking at the 35th anniversary of the society, reminded his hearers that "democracy above all else in an educational enterprise; that it rests upon faith in public opinion, and upon faith that the democratic process will result in the growth of a public opinion which is capable, enlightened and honest."

It was with a view of playing a role in this educational process that the Intercollegiate Socialist Society was formed in 1905, and has continued functioning as the LID since 1921. For 50 years the society has drawn to it men and women of great intellectual power, imbued with humane and ethical impulses. These have steadfastly engaged in research, in teaching and lecturing, in the writing of books and pamphlets. They have clarified obscure problems, helped to form social opinion, and to lead the forces of progress under the banner of the LID.

Liberals are incurably intellectuals. Thoughts and ideas, they believe, have an efficacy in achieving results. If you present people with sound arguments, they will be capable of achieving sound conclusions, leading to moral judgments. Their democratic political institutions will translate these judgments into action, according to the will of the people. "Light, more light"; "education"; "freedom of discussion"; seeing to it that all ideas have substantially an equal chance to be heard—that was the basis for the publications, the lectures, all the activities of the ISS–LID.

George Bernard Shaw once said of an acquaintance, "Good old ——. His heart is with us. I wish we had his head as well." The society has been waging battles to gain the heads, as well as the hearts, of the Nation's future leaders.

During the years when forward-looking men and women were torn apart by numerous schisms, it is amazing that the LID should have maintained its character and clear, purposeful action. This happy result may be credited to the wisdom and the integrity of its leaders, and, more especially, to the tireless stimulation and scholarly capabilities of its director, Dr. Harry W. Laidler.

The history of the LID might be written by listing the thousands of names of leaders in every field of American life—economic, political, legal, scientific, educational, social and literary—who received their initial introduction to the problems confronting a democratic society in college chapters of the organization. Or it may be written by listing the books and the pamphlets published under LID auspices—works on housing, transportation, social security, public utilities, labor, international affairs, monopolies, etc.—or by mentioning the numerous lectures, meetings, conferences, addressed by outstanding speakers, greatly influencing public opinion during the past half century. And, of course, in any story of the league, no historian can ignore the continuous and enthusiastic support and encouragement given to the executive director throughout the years by his devoted and talented wife, Agnes A. Laidler, in all of his LID activities and the efficient and dedicated service of his secretary for the last generation, Sara Kaplan Lowe.

An aphorism often quoted is that "History provides the lamp of experience for guidance in the present." A study of the past 50 years of the LID will throw a clear light on the problems facing Americans today. The LID has met periods of conservatism and of liberalism, of reaction and of reform, of economic prosperity and of depression, of war and of peace.

THE BIRTH OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The early 1900's witnessed the inception of revolts against the abuses of laissez-faire, against the "lawlessness of corporate wealth," against slums and child and sweated labor, and against waste of public resources. Social workers—Jacob Riis, Jane Addams, Robert Hunter, and others—were stirring thoughtful Americans with tragic tales of how the other half lived.

The labor movement during these days was going through a period of great expansion and for the first time in the history of our Nation the President, Theodore Roosevelt, helped effect a compromise in a labor impasse in the anthracite coal mine dispute by calling President John Mitchell of the miners to a conference at the White House, along with mine owners. The conference was followed by the signing of a union contract with the entire anthracite coal industry.

Teachers and philosophers left their ivory towers during these days to help extirpate pain and poverty. It was the age of the muckrakers, of militant protest literature. Ida Tarbell was writing "The History of the Standard Oil Co." Lincoln Steffens was publishing "The Shame of the Cities." Charles Edward Russell was attacking the trusts and Upton Sinclair was at work on "The Jungle."

The Socialist movement, of growing importance in many parts of the world, in the United States, under the leadership of the dynamism of Eugene Victor Debs and the brilliantly keen intellect of Morris Hillquit, Socialist theoretician, was furnishing a political outlet for workers and liberals dissatisfied with the conservatism of the major political parties. The young party was growing fast. In 1904 Debs received 400,000 votes as presidential candidate of the Socialist Party. (By 1912 the vote had increased to 900,000.)

It was in this atmosphere of protest that the Intercollegiate Socialist Society (the ISS) was born. As Dr. Harry W. Laidler said, "the time was propitious for the organization of the Society."

Pictures of Harry Laidler, still an undergraduate at Wesleyan College in 1905, show a slim, a bright-eyed, idealistic youngster. We can envisage him mounting the stairs to the top floor of Peck's Restaurant in New York on September 12 of that year, to attend the meeting called by 10 prominent persons for the purpose of promoting an intelligent interest in socialism among college men and women, graduate and undergraduate, through the formation of study clubs in the colleges and universities, and the encouraging of all legitimate endeavors to awaken an interest in socialism among the educated men and women of the country.

The signers of this call were: Oscar Lovell Triggs, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Clarence S. Darrow, William English Walling, J. G. Phelps Stokes, B. O. Flower, Leonard O. Abbott, Jack London, and Upton Sinclair.

Upton Sinclair, who presided at that organization meeting, told how he had passed through college without receiving from his professor an understanding of the labor movement and the fundamental social problems of the day and declared, "I decided that since the professors would not educate the students, it was up to the students to educate the professors."

So the ISS was created in 1905. With the election of the young collegian as student member of the executive committee, there began a career for Harry W. Laidler that is so closely associated with that organization (since 1921 known as the LID) as to lead his coworker, Norman Thomas, to declare, "It is truer of the LID than it is of most institutions that it's the length and shadow of a man and that the man is Harry Laidler." For 30 of these years his secretary, Sara Kaplan, has ably abetted his work.

The first 10 years of the ISS—1905–15

The first president of the ISS was the novelist, Jack London, described in a Yale periodical, in 1906, as a ruddy, stocky figure in a white flannel shirt and rolling flannel collar. In 1906, he traveled from one college to another on behalf of the society. This tour initiated a new method for educational purposes—a method the ISS–LID perfected for years, and one later frequently imitated by other organizations.

Discussing the college atmosphere with the students during that trip, Jack London declared, "I did not find the university alive. Fight for us, or fight against us. Raise your voices one way or the other; be alive. That is the idea upon which we are working." He urged the indifferent to "cease sitting quietly in their cool libraries, and turning the pages of lifeless books," and to take their part in the fight against poverty, against corruption, against unemployment, and against the other social evils of the day.

Criticisms of the new society soon appeared in the country's press. Answering an attack, written in Collier's Weekly, Thomas Wentworth Higginson said, "The primary aim of the society was to create students of socialism, not to produce Socialists, and those who criticized this object must be classed with those medieval grammarians who wrote, 'May God confound thee for thy theory of irregular verbs.' "

Reporting a "dollar dinner" of the ISS in 1908 in the New York Sun, the writer satirically comments, "From what went on after the dinner had been stowed away, it was gathered that it was the aim of the society to swat wage slavery with diplomas or smother it with degrees or something." He evinced sorrow at the absence of Vice President Sinclair, "who would have told of the millionaire with a solid gold fountain in his park."

The first college chapters were formed by Harry W. Laidler at Wesleyan, and by William M. Feigenbaum at Columbia. Within 10 years, over 60 college chapters were organized, and the ISS had increased its expenditures from $200 annually to $10,000. In 1910 Dr. Laidler became secretary and organizer of the ISS. In a large proportion of the colleges visited during the first years of the society, Dr. Laidler was the first speaker from outside the college community to have addressed college assemblies and economic and sociology classes on the labor, Socialist, and social reform movements of the day. In one of the small Virginia colleges, a minister passing through the college town, who had been asked to deliver the prayer before Dr. Laidler addressed the student body, was so disturbed about the message which he thought the speaker was about to bring to the students that he prayed the Lord "to deliver the students from the heretical doctrines which are constantly being presented before them, and prayed especially at this time because of the imminence of such doctrines." But in hundreds of colleges, the informative, scholarly addresses of the league's organizer and other ISS speakers were received with deep interest among the thoughtful students in the college bodies.

Chapters at Princeton, Harvard, and other colleges soon followed. At Princeton, when the ISS organizer appeared to address a scheduled meeting, the students organized one of their famous Princeton "peerades." Organizer Merrick was taken to the lecture hall at the front of the parade on the backs of the students and, following the conclusion of his address, delivered in the midst of firecrackers flung into the open windows, was given an ovation for pursuing his lecture to the bitter end under these trying conditions.

During this early period, a quarterly Bulletin was issued, developing later into the Intercollegiate Socialist, a magazine to which many leading figures of the day contributed, including, among others, Beatrice and Sidney Webb, Keir Hardie, Morris Hillquit, Paul H. Douglas, Norman Angell, and J. Ramsay MacDonald.

The correspondence files of the early years of the ISS give illuminating sidelights on the history and activities of the organization, and reveal how widespread its influence had become. The following examples will illustrate this:

Prof. Vida D. Scudder, of Wellesley, closely associated with the society from its early years and until her recent death, wrote in 1906 requesting the officers to send lecturers to the college, "if you have good speakers—people who can hold their own with an audience at once clever, critical, and densely ignorant."

Contributions and membership applications came from lawyers, dentists, librarians, ministers, advertising writers, the president of a mining company, justices of the peace, members of the American Press Writers' Association, and numerous businessmen.

A youthful exuberant from Leland Stanford University wrote to Upton Sinclair "assuring you of my earnest desire for the reform of the rottenness of modern society. I will go to Seattle, which is the most corrupt town on the Pacific coast, and study the lower side there."

Numerous requests appear for a definition or description of socialism. An amusing playlet, written by Jesse Lynch Williams in the Nassau Monthly of Princeton University, shows the confused notions by prominent graduates as to what socialism is. The scientist in the skit ended the discussion of the meaning of socialism in this way: "Well, that explains it all. No wonder intellectually courageous students are peeping into socialism on their own hook. You make a dull subject so fascinating. Bombs and brotherhood, the Christian ideal and its destruction, free love and no love, no law and yet too much." When one prominent graduate asked, "Well, then, what does it mean?" The scientist replied, "I don't know. You see I'm a college graduate myself." From Princeton, however, be it said, a few years before in 1905, had graduated with a magna cum laude a student—Norman Thomas—who did in after years work of colossal proportions in clarifying the meaning of socialism among millions of his fellow men.

From Cambridge, Mass., in 1906 comes a note, "Yesterday I received from the ISS the little sheet, 'Political Decay' by Prof. E. A. Ross, and it was so good that I sent it to one of the instructors here who has a very clear head and good heart about such matters."

Edwin Fairley, a teacher, wrote that a certain professor, "is reported to have boasted that a Socialist has never graduated from Amherst since he has held his present chair. Now I got my start in political economy at Amherst, and I don't want the old college to be a back number. I have a pet student at Amherst who is a Socialist, but I guess a vox clamantis in deserto." It should be noted that a few years later Amherst contained one of the strongest and most distinguished chapters of the ISS in the history of the society.

One of our active members, Abraham Epstein, a leading pioneer and advocate of social security until his untimely death, was instrumental in organizing a chapter in the University of Pittsburgh.

Not all communications were favorable. Possibly, Mr. William Lloyd Garrison, Jr., was before his time in thinking of the type of totalitarian society which the Soviet falsely terms socialism, when he wrote, "I hold with Herbert Spencer that socialism is the coming slavery, and I believe that the world languishes because of too much government and too little liberty. Of course, I recognize the altruistic spirit of many who call themselves Socialists, and respect their aims."

Gov. Chase S. Osborn, of Michigan, in 1912 warmly applauded the University of Michigan's Socialist society. He told them, "The right way of the future is to be discovered by those who are making earnest search for the truth, and I believe that you are doing that above all other considerations, and before you take any thought of political profit. The truth is what we should all desire, and, if it can come through the work of educated socialism, it will be none the less welcomed."

In the 1912 ISS Bulletin, Prof. V. Karapetoff, of Cornell University, reports, "College administrations have shown great wisdom in not interfering with the formation and peaceful activities of the ISS chapters. That which is not permitted in open will exist in secret, with all the degrading features of an illegal activity. It is a well established policy of ISS chapter to invite speakers opposed to socialism. From an educational point of view this is an excellent training for analysis and debate." (Our too fearful anti-Communist politicians, who fear to permit college students to debate the pros and cons of recognizing Communist China, please take note.) In fact, the ISS voted to membership all students, whatever their economic or political viewpoints—Socialist, non-Socialist, anti-Socialist—who were desirous of understanding the meaning of the social requirements of the day.

In 1910 a petition of 300 students in Harvard for a course on socialism bore fruit. This amazing group of collegians had as members of its Harvard chapter Kenneth R. Macgowan, Nicholas Kelley, Heywood Broun, and Lee Simonson. Their president, Walter Lippmann, proudly declares, "The only evil we realy fear is blind ignorance. In a general way our object was to make reactionaries, standpatters; standpatters, conservative liberals; conservative liberals and liberals, radicals, and radicals, Socialists. In other words we tried to move everyone up a peg. We preferred to have the whole mass move a little, to having a few move altogether out of sight."

1912 and 1913 were great years for the ISS. The New York Dental College, hoping to make its chapter the banner group among professional institutions, published an excellent monthly, the Progressive Dentist, the revenue from which was to be used to establish a dental clinic. The work was done under the leadership of Dr. Maurice S. Calman, later a Socialist alderman responsible for establishing dental clinics in New York schools. Dr. Calman, now an eminent dentist, is still an active member of the LID. In this year the Intercollegiate Socialist, a new quarterly, edited by Dr. Laidler, began publication.

A number of colleges adopted plans at this time similar to Barnard's, where Freda Kirchwey reported, "Many of the members felt last year that the club followed no definite course of action, had engaged to a great extent in desultory discussion. This fall, therefore, one of the shorter courses of study, suggested in the pamphlet on study courses, was adopted as the basis for the year's work."

"Light, more light," became the ISS slogan. To shed that light many meetings were held in New York and throughout the country. Charles Beard and Fred C. Howe discussed the trust problem. Lincoln Steffens spoke to 500 Yale students on "Graft—Its Cause and Cure." John Haynes Holmes and Meyer London spoke on the "Roads That Lead to Socialism." Harry W. Laidler was continuously in the field, from Maine to California, quoting figures on wages and child labor, and pointing to economic waste and to the industrial, political, social, and intellectual monopoly control in the United States. Chapters were set up following his work.

The influence of the society was spreading even abroad. The famous antiwar German, Karl Liebknecht, said that the only American publication with which he was familiar was "The Intercollegiate Socialist."

The society could fill Carnegie Hall in 1912 and 1913. Several mass meetings were successfully held there. At one, on "Industrial Unionism," a New York sheriff, with his deputy sheriffs, came to forestall the advocacy of sabotage, which which he declared, "I don't know what sabotage is, but if anyone advocates it I will arrest him immediately." It is said that at the end of the meeting the sheriff and his officers contributed to the collection.

A debate between Samuel Untermeyer, corporation lawyer, and Morris Hillquit brought tremendous crowds and publicity. For newly elected Congressman Victor Berger, of Milwaukee, and for visiting British Labor leader, Keir Hardie, there were successful Carnegie Hall meetings.

Then came the First World War. The first period of ISS history had ended.

The war and the postwar years, 1915–21

The ISS consistently reiterated that "to study socialism commits the students to nothing whatever. They may reject it in theory and combat it in practice." Dr. Laidler explained to them that "the society has never in its history committed its members to any creed or line of tactics." The organization emphasized its educational nature; its aim to acquaint collegians not only with Socialist doctrines, writings, and theories, but also to influence college-bred men and women, rapidly assuming a growing part in the weightiest affairs of the Nation, toward an understanding of the economic, political, and social problems of the day. Nevertheless, the history of the Socialist Party during World War I had important repercussions upon the organization.

From the vantage point of the 1950's it is difficult for us to appreciate the simple faith of some of the early Socialists who held the naive belief that once the major industries were nationalized, and wealth more equitably distributed, most of the serious social and economic problems would be solved. Some likewise sincerely expected Socialists in the various countries to put international labor above all considerations of nationalism.

These Socialists were to bear two severe blows. The first was the European Socialists' failure to act as internationalists when the First World War began. Especially were many American Socialists shocked at the nationalistic spirit of the German Social Democrats, one of the leading parties of that country. The second blow was the realization, with the development of the totalitarian evils in Soviet Russia, that nationalization of industry alone would not bring the millennium.

The leaders of the ISS for the most part had no such illusions. They were constantly emphasizing the fact that nationalization under a dictatorial state could constitute a great menace to society and that only as public industry was democratically administered in a democratic state did it give promise of solving the great social evils of the day. Democracy was the end, and public ownership and democratic management of the key industries, only a means to this end.

Most of the ISS leaders likewise had become acquainted with the failure before World War I of European Socialists at their international conferences to decide upon any common line of action once war broke out, and knew something of the powerful pressures that governments at war could exert upon the activities of their respective citizens.

In the United States, after the outbreak of World War I, the socialist movement was rent by schisms. Members of the Socialist Party had been traditionally antiwar. An emergency convention of the party in 1916 approved the famous St. Louis resolution declaring its opposition to the United States entrance into the European war, an action followed by the resignation of many prominent party members.

After the Russian revolution in 1917, further factional differences developed between the right and left wings. The ISS, though an educational discussion organization consisting of men and women of various shades of economic and social thought, could not be immune from these crosscurrents of opinion. Some of the leaders were against America's entrance into war, some contending that if the country remained out it would be in a better position, in case of stalemate, to help in mediating a democratic peace. Others, J. G. Phelps Stokes among them, felt that the organization should issue a public statement declaring that it stood "unequivocally by the President of the United States in the unparalleled crisis that confronts the country as well as the rest of the world."

The majority of the board insisted that the ISS, as such, should not take an official position on this question. The result was a few resignations among the officers though the membership remained, for the most part, intact.

During the months of America's involvement, the discussion of controversial social and international problems of the causes and cure of war of proposed terms of peace and of reconstruction after war was discouraged in many cities and on many campuses. Numbers of colleges were virtually turned into ROTC encampments where the majority of students gave their primary thought to preparedness for military service.

Under these conditions, many college chapters failed to continue their activities, and lecture and organizing work became restricted.

As secretary of the society, Dr. Harry W. Laidler felt, with Paul U. Kellogg of the survey, that, despite the obstacles encountered, "it was up to the society to try to keep the embers of a watch-fire glowing to light new torches for a younger generation." He predicted a drive on democracy with the war's end. He urged that the activities of the society and its college chapters be maintained to prevent a disastrous loss of league prestige, as well as a loss to democratic society.

The ISS during these days continued to hold its annual conventions at which labor and world problems were debated. In New York, one of the freest forums in the country was held throughout the war—the Saturday Camaraderies under the auspices of the New York chapter and the able leadership of Louise Adams Floyd. Weekend conferences on burning questions of the day were held at Whittier's Old Homestead in New Hampshire, at William F. Cochran's beautiful camp, Sherwood Forest, in Maryland, and at the home of Katherine and Darwin Meserole in Long Island. In the closing days of the war, Dr. Laidler went to Washington to survey the scope and achievements of war-collectivism, while Ordway Tead, for a while research director, began a study of reconstruction programs in Great Britain.

In 1919, the society began the publication of a monthly, the Socialist Review, which replaced the quarterly and lasted for 18 months. The purpose of the Review was to serve as a record and survey of the labor and socialist movement, and not as a propaganda organ, and to tell of the experiments, achievements, thoughts and significant events in industrial and political struggles here and abroad.

Many well-known foreign leaders, both literary and political, contributed to the new monthly, as well as leaders in the American field. Social Democrats of Hungary wrote an appeal to the workers of the world against the Red terror. In the same period articles appeared opposing the boycott of Russia. Numerous contributions in the field of labor and unionism were publicized.

The LID in the twenties

The reorganization of the ISS as the League for Industrial Democracy in 1921 was a recognition of the need for a new orientation. Membership in the society was opened to noncollegians, and a broader scope was envisaged. The new motto was "Production for Use, Not for Profit." An organizing pamphlet states the LID's aims as follows: "The LID tries to bring into the field of thought and discussion all phases of the movement, conscious and unconscious, toward a social order which acknowledges the supremacy of human need rather than private profit as its organizing principle. But it is trying to deal with that generalization in a scientific spirit, attempting to test it by the facts, to substitute knowledge for assertion, and reasoned conviction for blind acceptance of popular slogans."

Norman Thomas joined Dr. Laidler as a coexecutive director the following year, and shortly thereafter Paul Blanshard became field secretary. Robert Morss Lovett became the league's first president, with the electrical wizard, Charles P. Steinmetz, its vice president. Florence Kelley, eminent social worker and crusader against child labor, and Arthur Gleason still remained active league members.

Speaking of Thomas and of Blanshard, Dr. Laidler reported, "From then through part of the thirties, these two magnetic speakers carried the message of industrial democracy to student and civic groups in all parts of the country, and proved towers of strength to the progressive movement." He continued, "During many of these years, Paul R. Porter (later assistant administrator, ECA); George Edwards (later Detroit judge); Monroe Sweetland (editor of the Oregon Democrat); Joel Seidman, labor economist (now professor at the University of Chicago); LeRoy Bowman, adult educator (now teaching at Brooklyn College); and others organized and lectured, with significant results, reaching hundreds of thousands of the youth of our land." Their work, and Harry Laidler's, succeeded in establishing over 100 student chapters in the colleges by the end of the twenties.

The addition of Mr. Thomas and Mr. Blanshard to the LID staff gave Dr. Laidler more time for his research and writing. His books, "Social Economic Movements," "Concentration of Control in American Industry," and "A Program for Modern America" have been considered a "must" reading for all serious students of social studies, and have established Dr. Laidler as one of the leading scholars and authorities on the subjects he treated in the United States. In 1926, the league secretary, the committee and its secretary, throughout their scholarly surveys, public hearings, news releases, magazine articles and books and pamphlets on public control of coal and electric power, did much to influence the public power developments of the next decade. Following Mr. Raushenbush, Dr. F. L. Bird ably led this committee.

Mary Fox, graduate of Vassar and progressive educator, joined the staff as executive secretary in the late twenties. For 10 years her imaginative planning and promotional activities helped powerfully to stimulate and expand the work of the league.

During this period an excellent series of leaflets, by well-known authors, published by the LID, were effectively used. In leaflet No. 3, "More Power to You," Evelyn Preston wrote of Electric Power and the Good Life.

George Bernard Shaw's article in the bulletin of the LID in 1927 repeated his advice to young people, "All who achieve real distinction in life begin as revolutionists. The most distinguished persons become more revolutionary as they grow older. Any person under the age of 30 who, having any knowledge of the existing social order, is not a revolutionary, is an inferior." He writes that inherited wealth and absentee financial control seem to him "unsportsmanlike, as if an old college grad should try to pass on his college credits to his son."

This was an age when idealistic collegians were not afraid to be labeled liberal and radical. The First World War, with its losing battle to create a world safe for democracy, had made many young people deeply pacifist. Throughout the country the Oxford movement was gaining momentum. In 1925, Felix Cohen, son of Morris Cohen, the famous philosopher, later, until his unfortunately premature death in 1953, to become well known as a fighter for the rights of American Indians, led a widely publicized battle against ROTC at City College. College students throughout the country sent 100,000 petitions to Washington against military training. A united youth conference called by the LID and other groups was attended by 600 delegates who supported the Oxford resolution.

The manner in which students were being trained in league circles to thoughtful weighing of the issues in controversial matters is evidenced in a small pamphlet issued in New Haven by LID chapter members at Yale. George Brooks, Fred C. Hyde, and J. B. Whitelaw called their paper "Is This Fair Play?—An Investigation of the Neckwear Workers' Strike." The young investigators report: (1) The case for employers; (2) the case for the union; (3) civil liberties involved; (4) the newspaper situation in New Haven. "The reason we are compelled to print this leaflet," the collegians declare, "is that the ordinary channels of public information have been closed to the union by the silence of the New Haven press."

The Harvard Socialist Club printed in its periodical an arraignment of the university president, Lowell, for his part in the executions of Sacco-Vanzetti.

New York University LID'ers helped picket in the strike of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

The meetings and conferences of the league during the twenties reflected the changing conditions and ideologies of the times. Here were discussed the European revolutions; the Harding corruption and post-war slump; the so-called American plan for the destruction of trade unions; the Palmer raids; the Sacco and Vanzetti case; the Plumb plan for the railroads; the La-Follette Progressives; the budding labor bank development; the new developments in cooperation; the struggle for public power and against monopoly controls; the meaning of the "new capitalism," and the forces back of the Wall Street crash.

The depression years, 1930–38

In the late twenties, when many economists and businessmen were predicting that the "new capitalism" had found the key to an era of permanent prosperity, many a collegian felt that his future was secure, and that most of the social problems raised by the league were on the way to immediate solution.

Hardly, however, had they arrived at this conclusion than the United States found itself in the midst of the greatest depression in the history of the country, a situation which led to the increasing discussion throughout the country of whether the capitalistic order would survive; what type of cooperative order might be possible and desirable; and, more immediately, the need for social insurance, public works, collective bargaining and other New Deal measures to put an end to the depression.

Ways and means of developing trade and industrial union organization among the great corporations of the country also came in for much discussion. Tens of thousands of college men and women and members of the professions found themselves facing long periods of unemployment or semiemployment, and college interest in the message of the league greatly increased.

Walter P. Reuther, organizer and president of the Wayne University chapter of the league, in 1932 declared, "One of my first activities in the LID was to lead one SLID chapter of which I was chairman in the picket lines of the Briggs' strike of 1932."

The problem of the rising fascism of the thirties was likewise a serious concern to both student and city chapters, and the student LID prepared a pamphlet in 1935 on "Italian Intellectuals Under Fascism." At that early time it recognized that a fascist regime spelt the near death of intellectual life. Columbia students during that period also challenged the reception of 350 Italian students sent to the United States by Mussolini.

In the depression years of this decade, the LID engaged in a number of new projects. Under the leadership of Mary Fox, the league issued a pictorial magazine, the Unemployed, which sold hundreds of thousands of copies. It investigated the unemployed relief situation, and organized committees in New York, Chicago and elsewhere with a view of making that relief more adequate. It pioneered in urging a concentrated Federal attack upon the social evils of that period, and pleaded for a program of social security which later materialized in some of the measures of the New Deal.

In two series of broadcasts from coast to coast on the problems of the New Deal, under the auspices of the LID, Thurman Arnold, Roger Baldwin, John Dewey, Morris Ernst, Harry W. Laidler, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Wesley C. Mitchell, Reinhold Niebuhr, Norman Thomas, Rexford G. Tugwell, and many others critically evaluated the Government's program.

During the early 1930's, Mary Fox and Mary Hillyer, among others, organized an LID lecture series in from 40 to 50 cities in the East, South, and Middle West, in each of which 6 to 8 distinguished speakers addressed in an integrated program audiences from 200 to 800. Discussion outlines were used to make the course more valuable to those attending.

The league's challenging and valuable pamphlet program was continued. A 6-week summer school for training young college people for organizing and other union work was initiated. For many years following, students attended LID summer schools. Many young men and women trained in this fashion became active leaders in civic, labor, and cooperative movements. An Emergency Committee for Strikers' Relief was organized under the chairmanship of Norman Thomas and the secretaryship of Reinhold Niebuhr, with John Herling as able assistant.

The LID helped to mobilize public opinion against the attacks on civil liberties, as involved in the Tampa, Herndon, and Scottsboro cases. By published pamphlets and by meetings, the league fought to improve the conditions of southern sharecroppers. "The Plight of the Sharecroppers" by Norman Thomas had an excellent sale.

The doctrine of economics of abundance versus the scarcity theories of the classicists was likewise being discussed in LID lectures, books, and pamphlets. "The LID dares to believe that industrial civilization can be made to provide an abundant life for all. Only, we must develop a social control equal to the highly complex and interdependent technical structure we have built."

Stuart Chase, in his inimitable style, in the pamphlet, "Poor Old Competition," published in 1932, declared, "The doctrine of free competition is about in the condition of the enterprising young man:

"There was a young man who said, 'Why
Can't I look in my ear with my eye?
If I put my mind to it,
I'm sure I can do it.
You never can tell till you try!' "

Free competition, Chase said, "sets up an ideal which never has worked, never can work, and is utterly contrary to human behavior."

The developed consciousness of the evils inherent in totalitarianism, as envisaged in Italy's fascism, in Germany's nazism, and in Russia's communism, as we maintained, resulted in much soul searching by LID authors. Norman Thomas and Joel Seidman wrote a meaty and scholarly pamphlet on "Russia—Democracy or Dictatorship?" Prof. Morris R. Cohen in an article, "The Intellectual Basis of Individualism," writes, "How to combine the principles of collectivism with the principles of individualism is a problem which varies in different situations, at different times and places. Collectivism and individualism have been fighting faiths. We must have principles in order to have programs, and to follow a given direction rather than get lost, and wander aimlessly, but we must not follow a principle to destruction—that is the essence of fanaticism."

In his pamphlet "Public Ownership Here and Abroad," Harry W. Laidler discussed the question of managerial efficiency and democratic control. "The best friend of public ownership," declared Laidler, "is not he who shuts his eyes to present defects, but he who, with a profound faith in industrial democracy, takes up one by one these administrative questions, and gives his best contribution to their solution." He felt that this clear, wise thinking might create a public ownership that held out to humanity the elimination of competitive wastes, fairer distribution of wealth, democratic controls, the strengthening of nonprofit incentives, and the expansion of the use of commodities and services most conducive to human welfare.

The LID, 1940, 1955

The June 1940 conference of the league had as its topic, "Rethinking the Problems of Social Change." A report issued in connection with this conference voiced the belief that, if democracy was to be preserved under a cooperative order, "workers, technical, and administrative staffs and consumers should be adequately and democratically represented in the management of publicly owned industry; that voluntary cooperative industry and private ownership should be retained under a collectivist order; that public industries should be decentralized as much as is compatible with social efficiency; that consumers' choice should be free, and that people should be continually made to realize that not mere productivity, or the glory and the power of the rulers of the state, but the maximum of development of the great mass of individuals living in the community should be the primary social good."

In 1943 the constitution of the league was modified to express the purpose of the organization as "education for increasing democracy in our economic, political, and cultural life." Economic democracy became the dominant note. Dr. Laidler presided at a roundtable discussion on "Postwar Planning and Full Employment" at the Summer Institute of Social Progress at Wellesley. A New York conference thoroughly explored the question of "The Third Freedom—Freedom From Want." "Free Enterprise and Full Employment" was the topic of the 1945 spring conference. The more recent conferences have discussed such challenging questions as "Needed: A Moral Awakening in America"; "The Crisis in American and World Resources"; "How Free Is Free Enterprise?" and "The Next 50 Years."

LID members have had opportunities to hear the most thoughtful leaders of liberal forces, both foreign and American, during these years. Among those from abroad were

Mr. M. J. Coldwell of the CCF of Canada; Walter Nash, New Zealand deputy premier; Minister Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the U.N.; Dr. Jan Masaryk of Czechoslovakia; and members of the British Parliament: Margaret Bondfield, Sir Stafford Cripps, Jennie Lee, Margaret Cole, Arthur Creech Jones, Bertrand Russell, and Donald Chapman. Labor leaders of the United States who addressed the league included William Green, George B. Meany, Walter Reuther, and David Dubinsky, Julius Hochman, James B. Carey, A. J. Hayes, and Mark Starr. Wallace J. Campbell, Jerry Voorhis, and others reported on consumer cooperatives, one of the many facets of LID interests. An alertness course for New York teachers, organized by Mina Weisenberg, had as lecturers Lewis Corey, Harry Elmer Barnes, Paul U. Kellogg, Arthur Feller, James G. McDonald, Bruce, Bliven, Harold Rugg, Abraham Epstein, and Peter Drucker, among others.

Research and education through lecture series and pamphlets have continued. Concise, authoritative material has been widely influential in opening new frontiers in thought. Among the topics of research have been housing, social security, transportation, labor relations, power, medical care, cooperation, race problems, economic planning, and the role of progressives in an atomic age.

Katrina McCormick Barnes has been a tireless, inspirational pamphlet secretary.

The pamphlet literature of the last few years has been excellent and well received. Dr. Laidler's "A Brief History of Socialism in the United States" has been used in numerous colleges. Over 90,000 copies of "The Forward March of American Labor" by Joseph Glazer and Theresa Wolfson have been ordered by trade unions and schools. The pamphlet by Seymour E. Harris on "National Health Insurance and Alternate Plans for Financing Health" is a unique, pioneering job of acquainting Americans with this serious problem. Robert J. Alexander's treatise, "World Labor Today," presents encyclopedic information on trade union movements of many lands. The "Taft-Hartley Act in Action" has been an extremely influential work in collegiate and union circles. Norman Thomas' "Democratic Socialism: A New Appraisal" has been widely circulated. The 1954 LID pamphlet "How Free Is Free Enterprise?" sums up the findings of a recent conference.

Cooperation with other organizations have extended LID influence. The league frequently sends reprsentatives to attend meetings called by associations for some specific purpose, in reference to housing, civil liberties, social security, education, etc. Mrs. Isabelle B. Friedman, as LID delegate to the AAUN (American Association for the United Nations) and to the NGO (Non-Governmental Organization of the U.N.) has worked zealously to educate the public to the importance of the United Nations if a world of peace and security is ever to be attained. Mina Weisenberg represents the LID in the Coordinating Committee of the Public Education Association.

The league has had chapters in many cities, but the most active one has been that in New York. Among those serving as presidents of this chapter have been Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Rev. John Paul Jones, Prof. LeRoy Bowman, Carl Rachlin, Benjamin Naumoff, and Isabelle B. Friedman. During the past few years the New York chapter organized interesting field trips, such as the visit to the Wiltwyck School, where Dr. Ernst Papanek acted as host, followed by a reception by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt at Hyde Park. Many meetings on timely topics have been held at the home of Adelaide Schulkind and Walter Frank. New York chapter citations have been bestowed upon Charles Abrams for his work on housing; upon Prof. George S. Counts and Dr. Abraham Lefkowitz for outstanding services in education; and on Norman Thomas, onetime coexecutive director of the league, in honor of his 70th birthday and for his 50-year career as a tireless, courageous worker for peace, democracy, and human brotherhood.

In recent years the LID has made a practice of granting annual awards for outstanding services to the Nation. Among the recipients of the awards have been Trygve Lie, then U.N. Secretary General; Senators Hubert H. Humphrey, Herbert H. Lehman, and Wayne Morse; David Dubinsky, president of the ILGWU; William Green and George Meany, presidents of the A.F. of L.; Philip Murray, president of the CIO; Ralph J. Bunche; Oscar L. Chapman; and Eleanor Roosevelt. It is fitting that the 1955 award was given to Dr. Harry W. Laidler.

John Dewey awards to former LID student leaders have honored Walter P. Reuther, CIO president; Senator Paul H. Douglas; Dr. Selman A. Waksman; Leland Olds; Prof. Sidney Hook; Paul R. Porter; Clarence Senior; Felix Cohen (posthumous); and Prof. Theresa Wolfson.

The student LID, 1930–55

Unfortunately, the continuity of college organization was interrupted in the thirties. Over a hundred chapters had been vigorously active under the leadership of Joseph Lash, Monroe Sweetland, George Edwards, and others. The student LID had published a magazine, "Revolt," later called "The Student Outlook," with contributions by Sidney Hook, Herman Wolf, Arnold Beichman, and many others. Work for peace, for aiding underground activities in Fascist countries, for preserving civil rights, for strike aid—all these were of interest to the young collegians. But the young people could not resist the increased pressure and clamor for unity resulting from the Communist Party's popular front line. With great reluctance and against the advice of the general organization, the autonomous student LID gave up its identity and its connection with the LID, and merged with other youth groups to form in 1935 the American Student Union.

The college men and women were soon to learn the lesson that many other sad liberals had learned previously—that you can cooperate with Communists only by accepting their line and leadership. After 5 years of contention, a final blow, the Soviet invasion of Finland, caused a split which broke up the ASU.

Summer institutes for college students were organized by the LID in the forties, and Dr. Joel Seidman and Dr. LeRoy Bowman, as has been mentioned, were sent as lecturers to universities throughout the country, but it was not until the postwar period that LID chapters were again established, with Jesse Cavalier, James Farmer, Harold Lewack, and James E. Youngdahl as members of SLID staffs.

The 1947 constitution of the SLID effectively stopped all further cooperation with Communists. It reads: "Membership in the SLID is confined to young people who believe in education for economic, political, and cultural democracy, who believe in the democratic way of life as a means and a social goal. By virtue of the democratic aims of the league, advocates of dictatorship and totalitarianism, and of any political system that fails to provide for freedom of speech, of press, of religion, of assembly, and of political, economic, and cultural organizations; or of any system that would deny civil rights to any person because of race, color, creed, or national origin are not eligible for membership. Nor are those eligible whose political policies are wholly or largely determined by the policies laid down by the leaders of a foreign government."

The college chapters have reflected many of the problems dividing liberals during the last 10 years, making it difficult to organize and to maintain them at times. However, a number of vigorous, active groups have been functioning. At present James Farmer, a graduate of Wiley College and of Howard University and formerly the national chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality, is doing an outstanding lecturing job as student field secretary aided by a student executive committee, of which Jerome Breslaw was the 1954–55 chairman. In 1955, the Yale chapter, the John Dewey Society, under the leadership of Andre Shifrin, constituted the SLID's banner chapter.

Harold Lewack has written a well-documented "Brief History of the SLID." In the last section, which he calls "Operation Bootstrap" he declares, "The efforts of certain legislators to cancel the social gains of the thirties and forties, and the activities of Senator McCarthy, have aroused many students on the campus, and have led to an increased interest in the educational program of the SLID."

The LID has had distinguished presidents. The first president, Robert Morss Lovett, was succeeded in 1940 by the great American philosopher, John Dewey. Successively, Elizabeth Gilman, leader in race relations organizations; Dr. Bjarne Braatoy, author and at one time professor of government at Haverford College, and Mark Starr, educational director of the ILGWU, have headed the organization. Since 1948, Nathaniel M. Minkoff, secretary treasurer of the joint board of the ILGWU, A.F. of L., has been league president. Under his leadership, great strides have been made in LID-labor union cooperation.

Some educational achievements

For 50 years the LID has emphasized the need for democratic values in the field of economics as well as in politics.

Of the league's educational work in the college field in the past, Prof. George S. Counts has the following to say:

"Since its founding in 1905, the League for Industrial Democracy, in my opinion, has done more than any other organization in arousing the social conscience and advancing the political understanding of students in our colleges and universities. From the beginning it has opposed all forms of bigotry, obscurantism, and totalitarianism and remained true to the inscription on its masthead, 'Education for increasing democracy in our economic, political, and cultural life.' It is dedicated without reservation to that sublime faith in the human mind which is the foundation of foundations of free society in all ages."

The league has developed closely integrated relations with the labor and the cooperative movements. The value of the scholarly research and the publications of the league, and their influence on public understanding, attitudes, and legislation have been monumental.

A good friend of the league, David Dubinsky, president of the ILGWU, warmly commends the work of the LID. He says:

"The unions need the men and women of education. We need their skills, as writers, economists, educators, researchers, engineers, lawyers. I also see the liberal intellectual as a sort of a vital unifying force through which labor can convey its aspirations to other sections of the population: teachers, preachers, artists, authors, philosophers."

It is a wondrous thing to realize how many of the early pioneer members of the ISS–LID, have materialized into practical, accepted policies and activities of American society during these years. Who could have anticipated that the labor legislation, social security, public housing, pleading for which the league felt at times like a voice crying out in the wilderness, would now be commonplace public policies? Increased public health, educational and employment services have greatly improved the amenities of industrial living. There has been a healthy, continuous growth in trade-union membership.

For 50 years the LID, under the capable leadership of Harry W. Laidler and others, has preached, taught, analyzed, and fought to make the American dream a reality. It has organized thousands of meetings, published, and distributed millions of copies of its books and pamphlets, addressed countless numbers of people directly and through radio and television. To what extent the LID is responsible for the social gains already realized cannot be measured. That the society was one of the responsible, effective agencies that initiated actions and created public opinion for achieving these results cannot be denied.

The work of the ISS–LID in stirring youth to keen thinking, idealistic hopes and courageous, constructive actions has had its effect in all fields of American life. The roster of the past college chapter leaders and members who have become renowned in their own fields is long and honorable. Who can weigh the impact of an educational organization on an individual? All the LID can say is: We in the LID proudly point to these leaders—they have listened to our lectures, read our pamphlets, heard our arguments for social betterment, been moved by the impassioned pleading, stimulated by the keen analyses of LID organizers, and have joined with us to work for a better world.

THE NEXT 50 YEARS

What is the role of the LID in the years ahead?

As in the past, the LID must forthrightly protest Communist colonialism. The league must study aids to dependent peoples everywhere to achieve freedom and democracy, and, to quote an address of President George Meany of the AFL, at the 49th annual conference, must seek "to increase the productivity and purchasing power of millions of people in the nontotalitarian world, and to eliminate the obstacles to trade in this free area."

The fear of international communism, which has engendered a fear of being different, has created a problem for LID college leaders and student organizers. They must stand in the forefront in the struggle to impress upon youth the need to seek the truth with integrity, to oppose bigotry, to join courageously in the struggle against ruthless, arbitrary attacks against personal liberties.

The free enterprise economy of the past century has ceased to exist and with it the laissez-faire policies of the past eras lie buried. What has emerged in America may be termed a mixed economy, characterized by big corporations, powerful trade unions and regulatory government controls that are more or less effective. The league, as in the past, will study the industrial situation and formulate programs for the maintenance of a stable prosperity and full employment.

We cannot foresee all the social and economic consequences of an atomic age. But we must be prepared to study and to meet these problems as they arise.

There have been breathtaking changes in industry in the last few years. The public mind must be educated to the significance of automation and cybernetics. More and more laborers are becoming engineers or junior engineers. Service workers are rapidly increasing in number in comparison with oldtime skilled and unskilled labor. Unions are reorienting their administrative machinery for future effectiveness. New democratic techniques must be developed to assure efficiency without bureaucracy.

The phenomenal growth of labor unionism and labor power in 50 years has been a source of profound satisfaction to the LID. As in the past the league must call upon its skilled researchers, analysts, and writers to cooperate with the trade unions in formulating programs for dealing not only with the problem of automation with which mature powerful unions are concerned, but with many other problems as well.

How should unions handle their vast health and welfare funds so as to provide social betterment for their members and the community? How can large unions function democratically so as to preserve the rights of individuals? How can a guaranteed annual wage be gained, while at the same time avoiding untoward economic consequences? What are the human relations problems of workers in an age of cybernetics—trainings for early retirements, cooperation with community civil and political activities, etc.? How can trade-union collective bargaining rights be gained and used by the increasing mass of government employees? All these questions and others must be a matter of study for scholarly economists.

"Democracy," in the words of Dr. Laidler, "faces still other unfinished tasks. Vast economic power is still concentrated in the few. Powerful lobbies are at work seeking to alienate from the people a vast public domain; to undermine our labor and social legislation; to destroy our public power, atomic energy, and housing programs; to curtail needed educational and health services, and to deny equal rights to minority groups.

"Our unemployment problem is still far from solved. Our Bill of Rights is under constant attack. Freedom of inquiry and teaching is still restricted in many educational institutions. Political corruption still persists in city, State, and Nation. Smear and innuendo still serve as a substitute for facts, reason, and understanding in a host of political arenas. Isolationism and extreme nationalism still weaken and confuse our leadership in world affairs. And we have still seriously to plan for the full democratic use of our material and human resources for the common good."

In these fields the 50-year record of the LID inspires confidence for future achievements. The LID has the know-how for systematic study, for research, and for thoughtful recommendations for practical solutions of social and economic problems.

The League for Industrial Democracy must continue its honorable career as an educational force. It must create increasing understanding of the new powers, economic, political, and cultural, in the world today. It must continue to impress upon the American people the eternal values of democracy in all phases of our common life.

SOME LEAGUE COOPERATORS (1905–55)

Among the leaders of ISS–LID college chapters:

Harry W. Laidler, founder, 1905, Wesleyan ISS; board of directors of LID since 1905; executive officer ISS–LID since 1910; author, economist, lecturer.

Walter R. Agard, president, Amherst ISS, 1914–15; professor of classics, University of Wisconsin; president, American Classical League.

James W. Alexander, former president, Princeton ISS; executive committee and treasurer, ISS, 1920–21; noted mathematician.

Devere Allen, former president, Oberlin ISS; board of directors, LID, 1939–44; director and editor, Worldover Press.

Harold Arnold, Wesleyan ISS; late director of research, Bell Telephone Laboratories (deceased).

Gregory Bardacke, former student leader, Syracuse University, LID; board of directors, LID (1955–); director, American Trade Union Committee for Histadrut.

Murray Baron, member, Brooklyn Law School SLID; board of directors, LID, 1940—; public relations consultant; chairman, Manhattan Liberal Party.

Thomas S. Behre, secretary, Harvard ISS; New Orleans businessman, active in liberal movements (deceased).

Daniel Bell, member SLID; board of directors, LID, 1948—; labor editor, Fortune magazine; author, economist.

John K. Benedict, member Union Theological Seminary SLID; formerly field secretary, LID.

Walter Bergman, formerly of Michigan ISS; director of research, Detroit Public Schools.

Otto S. Beyer, former president, University of Illinois ISS, 1917; labor arbitrator and consultant; former Chairman, National Mediation Board (deceased).

Andrew J. Biemiller, former secretary University of Pennsylvania and Philadelphia chapters, LID, 1928–32; Congressman, 1944–56; legislative committee, A.F. of L.

Carroll Binder, president, 1916, Harvard ISS; editorial editor, Minneapolis Tribune.

George H. Bishop, officer, University of Michigan ISS, 1911; faculty, Washington University (St. Louis).

Hillman M. Bishop, former president, Columbia SLID; associate professor of government, CCNY.

Julius S. Bixler, former secretary, Amherst ISS; president, Colby College.

Bruce Bliven, president, Stanford ISS, 1910–12; editorial director, New Republic.

Hyman H. Bookbinder, former student leader, SLID; former New York executive committee, LID; political researcher, CIO.

Randolph Bourne, former Columbia ISS; essayist (deceased).

Leroy E. Bowman, board of directors, LID, 1940—; field secretary, 1940–41; associate professor of sociology, Brooklyn College.

Robert A. Brady, former University of California SLID; economist.

Jerome Breslaw, NYU chapter, SLID; chairman, SLID (1954–55).

Paul F. Brissenden, University of California ISS; board of directors, LID, 1923; professor of economics, Columbia University.

Thomas Brooks, Harvard SLID; research staff, TWUA.

Heywood Broun, a founder, Harvard Socialist Club, 1906; board of directors, LID, 1933–34; columnist; author (deceased).

George Cadbury, University of Pennsylvania SLID; board of directors, LID, 1953—; economic consultant.

Maurice S. Calman, organizer of ISS chapter, New York School of Dentistry (1911) and NYU School of Law; former Socialist alderman, New York City; past president Harlem Dental Society.

Wallace J. Campbell, former president, University of Oregon SLID; board of directors LID, 1940, 1945–48; national council since 1948; Washington representative, Cooperative League of U.S.A.

Jesse Cavileer, former president, Syracuse University SLID; student secretary, SLID; board of directors, 1947–49; National Council LID, 1949—; Unitarian minister, Cleveland, Ohio.

E. Ralph Cheyney, president, University of Pennsylvania ISS; poet (deceased).

Alice Cheyney, formerly president, Vassar ISS; labor economist.

Evans Clark, president, Amherst ISS, 1910; president and vice president, ISS and LID, 1918–23; director, Twentieth Century Fund, 1928–53; editorial writer.

Everett R. Clinchy, member, Wesleyan SLID; president, National Council of Christians and Jews.

Ramon P. Coffman, formerly Yale SLID; founder of Uncle Ray Syndicate.

Felix S. Cohen, president, CCNY LID, 1925–26; former Assistant Solicitor, Department of the Interior, in charge of Indian Affairs; author; teacher; lawyer (deceased); lecturer in philosophy of law, CCNY, Yale; recipient of LID, John Dewey Award, posthumous, 1954.

Cara Cook, Mount Holyoke SLID; board of directors, LID, 1950—; executive secretary, New York Ethical Culture Society.

Elmer Cope, Ohio Wesleyan SLID; labor economist.

Babette Deutch, member, Barnard ISS, 1917; poet.

Leonard W. Doob, member, Dartmouth College SLID; professor of psychology, Yale.

Paul H. Douglas, president, Columbia ISS, 1915; executive commissioner ISS, 1915–16; economist; U.S. Senator.

Tilford Dudley, Wesleyan SLID; assistant to president, PAC–CIO.

Evelyn Dubrow, formerly New Jersey College for Women SLID; secretary, New York ADA.

George Edwards, formerly president, Harvard SLID; former field secretary, SLID; judge of court of domestic relations, Detroit.

Ethan E. Edloff, formerly University of Michigan ISS and Detroit LID; educator.

Gustav Egloff, president, Cornell ISS, 1910–12; leading American chemist.

Samuel A. Eliot, Jr., former Harvard ISS, 1912; professor of English, Smith College.

Herbert L. Elvin, Yale SLID; director, Department of Education, UNESCO.

Boris Emmet, officer, University of Wisconsin ISS, 1911; labor statistician.

Abraham Epstein, former president University of Pittsburgh ISS; board of directors, LID, 1940–41; founder and former secretary, American Association for Social Security; authority on social insurance (deceased).

Harold U. Faulkner, Wesleyan ISS, 1913; national council, LID; professor of history, Smith College; authority on economic history.

William M. Feigenbaum, founder, 1906, of Columbia University ISS; newspaperman (deceased).

Samuel H. Fine, active in New York University SLID; former chairman, SLID; board of directors, 1952–54; accountant, ILGWU.

Osmond Fraenkel, president, Columbia ISS (1910); New York attorney; counsel, ACLU.

Anna Caples Frank, Vassar SLID; former membership secretary, LID; public relations counselor.

Isabelle B. Friedman, Hunter College ISS; board of directors, LID, 1951—; president, New York chapter, 1954–55; representative of LID at NGO of U.N.

Samuel H. Friedman, formerly leader CCNY ISS chapter; former president, New York chapter, LID; board of directors, LID, 1953—; president, Community and Social Agency Employees Union; Socialist leader.

Roland Gibson, formerly with Dartmouth College SLID; formerly board of directors, LID; political scientist, University of Illinois.

Louis Gollumb, leader, CCNY ISS, 1912; writer.

William Gomberg, CCNY SLID chapter; director, Management Engineering Department, ILGWU.

John Temple Graves, officer, Princeton ISS, 1911; author, columnist, lecturer.

Robert Halpern, president, CCNY chapter, LID; New York attorney.

William Haber, University of Wisconsin SLID; professor of economics, University of Michigan.

Elizabeth Healey, formerly Connecticut College; student secretary, SLID, 1947–49; social worker.

James Henle, vice president, Columbia ISS; president, Vanguard Press, 1928–52.

John Herling, formerly Harvard SLID; formerly active in Emergency Committee for Strikers Relief and in LID radio activities; editor, John Herling's Labor Letter.

Sidney Hertzberg, Wisconsin SLID; board of directors, LID, 1945—; writer; foreign correspondent.

Rene E. Hoguet, former Harvard chapter ISS; former president New York chapter, businessman.

Arthur N. Holcombe, Harvard chapter, ISS, 1906; professor of government, Harvard; president, American Political Science Association, 1936.

Carroll Hollister, Amherst College, SLID; pianist.

Sidney Hook, president, City College of New York chapter, SLID, 1922–23; receiver, LID John Dewey Award, 1953; chairman, department of philosophy, New York University; author.

Harold Hutcheson, Yale SLID; professor of English, Lake Forest College.

Eugenia Ingerman, secretary, Barnard ISS, 1910; physician.

Morris Iushewitz, Milwaukee State Teachers College, SLID; board of directors, LID, 1951—; secretary-treasurer, New York City CIO Industrial Council.

Nicholas Kelley, charter member, Harvard ISS; board of directors, LID, 1912–33; vice president and general counsel, Chrysler Corp.

Murray Kempton, member LID summer school, 1938; board of directors and national council, LID, since 1951; columnist.

Freda Kirchwey, secretary and president, Barnard ISS, 1912–15; former board of directors, LID; publisher, the Nation.

William Klare, officer, University of Michigan ISS, 1911; former vice president, Statler Corp.

Maynard Krueger, University of Pennsylvania and Philadelphia chapters, LID, 1928–32; professor of economics, University of Chicago.

William Sargent Ladd, Amherst ISS; former dean, Cornell Medical (deceased).

Joseph P. Lash, former secretary, SLID; U.N. correspondent, New York Post.

John P. Lassoe, Jr., Yale SLID; director of adult education, A.A.U.N.

William L. Leiserson, president, University of Wisconsin ISS, 1907–8; economist, former chairman, National Mediation Board.

Daniel Lerner, former New York University SLID; author; authority on psychology of propaganda.

Max Lerner, Brookings Institution SLID at Washington University (St. Louis); columnist; teacher; writer.

Aaron Levenstein, member, SLID; national council, LID; Research Institute of America; author.

Grace Mendelsohn Levy, former Brooklyn College SLID, and secretary, SLID; staff, New York City Housing Authority.

Harold J. Lewack, officer, New York University LID; national president, SLID, 1954; labor educator.

John L. Lewine, Yale SLID; executive committee, New York chapter; teacher; secretary, American Institute of France.

John F. Lewis, Jr., former University of Pennsylvania ISS; Philadelphia lawyer and civic reformer.

Marx Lewis, New York University SLID; board of directors, LID, 1945—; secretary-treasurer, United Hat, Cap & Millinery Workers Union.

Walter Lippmann, president, Harvard Socialist Club, 1909–10; executive committee, ISS, 1911–12; columnist; author.

Karl N. Llewellyn, former Yale SLID; professor of law, University of Chicago; author.

Charlotte Tuttle Lloyd, former president, Vassar SLID; former attorney, Department of the Interior.

Roger S. Loomis, formerly University of Illinois ISS; professor of English literature, Columbia University.

Jay Lovestone, president, City College of New York ISS; director, international relations, ILGWU.

Isador Lubin, former president, Clark and University of Missouri ISS; labor statistician; industrial commissioner, New York State.

Jerome Lubin, Brooklyn College SLID; former chairman, SLID; city planner.

Charles Luckman, secretary, Kansas City Junior College SLID; former president, Lever Brothers; architect.

Kenneth MacGowan, president, Harvard ISS, 1910–11; professor of theater arts, UCLA; dramatic critic; movie producer.

Charles A. Madison, president, University of Michigan ISS; publisher; author.

Anita Marburg, Vassar ISS; educator.

Otto C. Marckwardt, adviser, University of Michigan ISS for many years; English department, University of Michigan.

Will Maslow, active in SLID; director, Commission on Law and Social Action, American Jewish Congress.

Ralph McCallister, member SLID; director, program and education, Chautauqua.

Arthur McDowell, University of Pittsburgh; staff, Upholsterers International Union of North America.

Daniel Mebane, former president, University of Indiana ISS; former treasurer and publisher, New Republic.

Kenneth Meiklejohn, former Swarthmore SLID; specialist in labor law.

Inez Milholland, president, Vassar ISS; lawyer (deceased).

Spencer Miller, Jr., Amherst ISS; former secretary, Workers Education Bureau and Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Hiram K. Moderwell, secretary, Harvard ISS, 1911; foreign correspondent; dramatic critic (deceased).

Emanuel Muravchik, member, SLID; board of directors, LID; field secretary, Jewish Labor Committee.

Margaret J. Naumberg, president, Barnard ISS, 1910; educator.

Leland Olds, formerly Amherst ISS; receiver of John Dewey Award, LID, 1953; former Chairman, Federal Power Commission.

Samuel Orr, New York University, ISS; executive commissioner, New York chapter, 1954–; former judge; labor lawyer.

Gus Papanek, formerly Cornell SLID; chairman, SLID, 1952; agricultural consultant, Pakistan.

Talcott Parsons, secretary, Amherst SLID, 1923–24; professor of sociology, Harvard; author.

Selig Perlman, University of Wisconsin ISS, 1909–10; professor of economics, University of Wisconsin; author.

Irving Phillips, formerly Harvard SLID; former field secretary, SLID; staff, ILGWU.

Richard Poethig, formerly Wooster SLID; former secretary, SLID; minister.

Justine Wise Polier, formerly Barnard SLID; justice, Court of Domestic Relations, New York City.

Paul R. Porter, formerly Kansas University SLID; former field secretary, LID; former Deputy Administrator, ECA, Europe; president, Porter International Corp.

Dorothy Psathas, Connecticut College SLID; secretary, SLID, 1951–52; public service.

Carl Raushenbush, Amherst ISS; former board of directors, LID; national council; labor economist.

H. S. Raushenbush, Amherst ISS, 1916–17; secretary, LID, committee on coal and power, 1926–29; author; researcher, Public Affairs Institute.

Paul Raushenbush, former Amherst ISS; economist.

Victor G. Reuther, formerly Wayne University SLID; board of directors, LID, 1950–; assistant to president, CIO.

Walter P. Reuther, founder and president, Wayne University SLID, 1932; receiver of league's John Dewey Award, 1950; president, CIO; president, UAW–CIO.

John P. Roche, formerly Cornell SLID; vice president, SLID; board of directors, 1948; associate professor of government, Haverford College.

Will Rogers, Jr., formerly Stanford University SLID, 1934–35; editor; actor.

Lawrence Rogin, formerly Columbia University SLID; educational director, TWUA.

Leonore Cohen Rosenfeld, formerly Mount Holyoke SLID; housewife.

Henry Rosner, formerly College of the City of New York, SLID; director, Division of Finance and Statistics, Welfare Department, New York City.

Harry Rubin, New York University SLID; board of directors, 1948–52.

Morris H. Rubin, Wisconsin University SLID; editor, Progressive magazine.

Raymond Rubinow, University of Pennsylvania SLID; consultant on international relations.

David J. Saposs, president-secretary, Wisconsin University ISS, 1910; labor economist; author.

Emil Sschlesinger, former president, College of the City of New York SLID, labor attorney.

Laurence Seelye, Amherst ISS; former president, St. Lawrence University.

Clarence Senior, University of Kansas SLID; board of directors, LID; receiver of John Dewey Award, 1953; sociologist; authority on Latin America.

Andre Shifrin, Yale Chapter, 1954–55; executive commissioner, SLID.

William Shirer, formerly secretary, Coe College SLID; author; correspondent.

David Sinclair, Wisconsin University SLID; formerly New York executive commissioner; physicist.

Albert J. Smallheiser, former secretary, Columbia ISS, 1911–12; social science teacher and active spirit in New York Teachers Guild.

Tucker Smith, New York University ISS; economist.

Boris Stern, University of Wisconsin ISS; staff, U.S. Department of Labor.

Irving Stone, formerly officer, University of Southern California, SLID; novelist.

Ordway Tead, president, Amherst ISS, 1911–12; research director, LID, 1914–15, teacher; publisher; author; former chairman, Board of Higher Education, New York City.

Lazar Teper, Johns Hopkins SLID; research director, ILGWU.

Monroe Sweetland, formerly Syracuse University, SLID; former field secretary, SLID; national council; editor, Oregon Democrat.

Frank Trager, Johns Hopkins University LID; board of directors, LID, 1951—; former Director, MSA, Burma, professor of research, New York University.

Gus Tyler, City College of New York-SLID; political director, ILGWU.

Jerry Voorhis, formerly Yale LID; secretary, Cooperative League of United States of America.

Selman A. Waksman, secretary, Rutgers University chapter, 1914–15; receiver of John Dewey award, LID, 1953; codiscoverer of streptomycin.

James Wechsler, Columbia SLID; editor, New York Post.

Ray B. Westerfeld, secretary, Yale ISS; economist, banker.

Mina Weisenberg, Hunter College ISS; board of directors, 1954–55; secretary, New York chapter LID; treasurer, New York teachers guild, AFL; teacher of social studies.

Nathaniel Weyl, Columbia SLID; writer, economist.

Alvin G. Whitney, president, Yale ISS, 1910–11; forester.

Elsie Gibson Whitney, Middlebury College ISS, 1914; publicist.

Simon W. Whitney, formerly Yale SLID; economist.

Paul Willen, founder, Oberlin College SLID; writer.

Chester Williams, University of California, Los Angeles-SLID; writer, lecturer on international relations.

David Williams, president, Marietta College, ISS, 1909–10; Unitarian minister.

Frank Winn, formerly University of Michigan, SLID; editor, UAW–CIO magazine.

Theresa Wolfson, former president, Adelphi College ISS; board of directors, LID, 1944—; receiver of LID John Dewey award, 1945; professor of economics, Brooklyn College; author.

James Youngdahl, Washington University SLID; field secretary, SLID, southwestern organizer, ACWA.

Gertrude Folks Zimand, president, Vasser ISS, 1917; secretary, National Child Labor Committee.

Milton Zatinsky, former member, SLID; labor economist.

A FEW OTHER COOPERATORS—PAST AND PRESENT

Leonard D. Abbott, signer of call to ISS; editor, writer (deceased).

Charles Abrams, board of directors, LID, 1954–55; housing expert; New York State administrator of rent control, 1955.

Luigi Antonini, board of directors, LID since 1951; first vice president, ILGWU.

Jesse Ashley, executive committee, ISS, 1912–13; 1917–18; New York attorney; professor of law; feminist (deceased).

George E. Axtelle, board of directors, LID, 1954–55; professor of education, NYU.

Fern Babcock, board of directors, LID, 1946–55; program coordinator, national council, YWCA.

George Backer, board of directors, LID since 1953; businessman; editor; former president, ORT.

Hope S. Bagger executive committee, New York chapter, LID; author.

Emily G. Balch, executive committee, ISS, 1919–20; winner of Nobel Peace Prize (1946).

Roger Baldwin, board of directors, LID, 1920–23; director, ACLU, 1917–52; chairman of board, International League for the Rights of Man.

Angela Bambace, national council, LID; staff, Baltimore ILGWU.

Solomon Barkin, board of directors, LID since 1953; director of research, TWUA.

Benjamin W. Barkas, former chairman, Philadelphia chapter, LID; labor educator.

Katrina McCormick Barnes, board of directors, LID since 1953; pamphlet secretary since 1953; see ACLU.

Jack Barbash, board of directors, LID, 1947–52; national council since 1952; labor economist; author of "Taft-Hartley Act in Action," etc.

John Bauer, board of directors, LID, 1938–42; economist; writer; authority on public utilities; author, "America's Struggle for Electric Power," etc.

Charles A. Beard, faculty sponsor, ISS; historian.

Helen Marston Beardsley, national council, LID; housewife, active in peace movements.

Arnold Beichman, board of directors, LID, 1950–54; national council since 1954; press representative, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Robert Bendiner, board of directors, LID, 1948–52; writer.

Nelson Bengston, board of directors, LID since 1948; investment counselor.

John C. Bennett, vice president, LID, 1954—; dean, Union Theological Seminary; author.

Victor L. Berger, guest of honor at league's Carnegie Hall meeting, 1911; Congressman; Socialist leader (deceased).

Jacob Billikoff, formerly national council, LID; labor arbitrator (deceased).

Alfred M. Bingham, cooperator, LID; writer; legislator.

Frederick C. Bird, former secretary LID, Committee on Coal and Power; director, department of municipal research, Dun & Bradstreet.

Helen Blankenhorn, board of directors, LID, 1923–24; writer.

Brand Blanshard, National Council, LID; professor of philosophy, Yale.

Paul Blanshard, field secretary and lecturer, LID, 1923–33; commissioner of investigation, New York City, 1933–37; writer, lecturer.

Harriet Stanton Blatch, former executive committee, ISS; suffrage leader.

Anita C. Block, board of directors, LID, 1923–33; lecturer, dramatic critic.

Frank Bohn, frequent lecturer for LID; writer, lecturer.

William E. Bohn, formerly active in University of Michigan ISS; formerly staff, Socialist Review, editor, new leader.

Karl Borders, former secretary, Chicago Chapter, LID; former Chief Administrator, U.N. International Children's Fund (deceased).

Louis B. Boudin, executive committee, ISS, 1917–21; attorney; authority on socialism and labor and constitutional problems (deceased).

Bjarne, Braatoy, president, LID, 1940–44; board of directors, LID 1940–48; national council since 1948; author; teacher, technical consultant, German Social Democratic Party.

Phillips Bradley, board of directors, LID, since 1940; professor of government, Syracuse University.

Rae Brandstein, executive committee, N.Y. Chapter, LID, since 1954; executive secretary, National Committee for Rural Schools.

May Vladeck Bromberg, board of directors, LID, 1940–42; social service.

Robert W. Bruehre, executive committee, ISS, 1908–10; writer; labor mediator, and arbitrator.

Rosemary Bull, board of directors, LID, since 1954; publicist.

Ralph J. Bunche, receiver of LID award, 1951; winner of Nobel Peace Prize.

Elizabeth B. Butler, executive committee, ISS, 1907–8; writer on labor (deceased).

James B. Carey, national council, LID; president IUE–CIO; secretary-treasurer, CIO.

Jennie D. Carliph, former executive committee, New York chapter; active in work for Civil Liberties.

J. Henry Carpenter, board of directors, LID, 1945–54; former executive secretary, Brooklyn division, Protestant Council (deceased).

Edmund B. Chaffee, former board of directors, LID; former director, Labor Temple, New York (deceased).

Oscar L. Chapman, receiver of LID award, 1953; former U.S. Secretary of the Interior.

Stuart Chase, treasurer, LID in the twenties; lecturer; author of "Waste and the Machine Age," etc.

John L. Childs, board of directors, LID, since 1948; professor emeritus of philosophy of education, Teachers College, Columbia; author; former chairman, Liberal Party.

Gordon R. Clapp, board of directors, LID, since 1955; former chairman, TVA; deputy administrator, New York City.

Ethel Clyde, board of directors, LID, during thirties; active in many social movements.

William F. Cochran, host of ISS at summer conference in 1916; former member national council (deceased).

Fannia M. Cohn, long member of ISS and LID; former New York executive committee, LID; secretary, education department, ILGWU.

M. J. Coldwell, vice president, LID; member, Canadian Parliament; leader of CCP of Canada.

McAlister Coleman, LID lecturer; writer; labor editor; author (deceased).

George Willis Cooke, executive committee, ISS, 1905–8; minister; writer.

Albert Sprague Coolidge, board of directors, LID; department of chemistry, Harvard; active in American Federation of Teachers and other organizations.

Jessica G. Cosgrave, executive committee, ISS, 1911–13; vice president, 1911–12; former president, Finch School (deceased).

George S. Counts, board of directors, LID, since 1954; professor of philosophy of education, Teachers College, Columbia; former chairman, Liberal Party; author.

Grace L. Coyle, national council, LID, professor, School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University; president, National Conference of Social Work (1940).

George F. Cranmore, board of directors, LID, 1944–50; assistant regional director, UAW–CIO (deceased).

Frank R. Crosswaith, frequent league lecturer; secretary, Negro labor committee; member, New York City Housing Authority.

Max Danish, former board of directors, LID; former editor, "Justice."

Clarence Darrow, signer of Call for Formation of League; labor and Civil Liberties attorney (deceased).

Maurice P. Davidson, board of directors, LID, 1946–54; national council since 1954; New York attorney; former commissioner, New York State Power Authority.

Jerome Davis, former board of directors, LID, 1936–41; author; lecturer, teacher.

Eugene V. Debs, frequent league lecturer; socialist leader (deceased).

Jerome de Hunt, former board of directors, LID; trade union and labor political leader.

Solon de Leon, former board of directors, LID; economic researcher.

Max Delson, board of directors, LID, since 1950; chairman, finance committee, since 1952; labor and Civil Liberties attorney.

Albert de Silver, executive committee, ISS and board of directors, LID, 1919–34; treasurer, 1919–20; lawyer; former director, ACLU (deceased).

John Dewey, president, LID, 1939–40; honorary president 1940–53; leading American educator and philosopher; professor of philosophy, Columbia University (deceased).

Samuel de Witt, board of directors, LID, since 1945; businessman; poet; dramatist; lecturer.

Frank C. Doan, executive committee, ISS, 1912–14; professor, Meadville Theological Seminary; writer (deceased).

T. C. Douglas, receiver of award, 1953; Premier of Saskatchewan, Canada.

David Dubinsky, receiver of LID award, 1949; president, ILGWU.

Elizabeth Dutcher, executive committee, ISS 1907–10; social worker.

Kermit Eby, board of directors, LID, 1950–54; national council, since 1954; associate professor of social sciences, University of Chicago.

Sherwood Eddy, frequent lecturer for LID; author; writer; religious leader.

John Lovejoy Elliott, former board of directors, LID; head of Hudson Guild; leader, New York Ethical Culture Society (deceased).

Henrietta Epstein, executive committee, New York chapter, 1954–55; social insurance expert.

Morris Ernst, board of directors, LID, 1923–24; lawyer; writer, attorney, ACLU.

Samuel B. Eubanks, board of directors, LID, 1949–54; National Council since 1954; former vice president, National Newspaper Guild.

James Farmer, student field secretary, LID, since 1950; lecturer, writer.

James T. Farrell, National Council, LID; novelist.

Israel Feinberg, board of directors, LID, 1950–54; former manager New York Joint Board, Cloakmakers' Union (deceased).

Louis Fischer, board of directors, LID, since 1950; writer, lecturer; author of "Life of Gandhi," etc.

Harry F. Fleischman, executive committee, New York chapter, since 1954; director, National Labor Service, American Jewish Congress.

Louise Adams Floyd, executive committee, ISS, and president, New York chapter, 1919 to early twenties (deceased).

Walter Frank, frequent host LID meetings; New York attorney; leader in civic and social movements.

Ephraim Frisch, board of directors, LID, since 1945; rabbi; former chairman, Commission of Justice and Peace, Central Conference of Jewish Rabbis.

Walter G. Fuller, board of directors, LID 1921–22; writer; editor (deceased).

A. Garrick Fullerton, executive committee, New York chapter, since 1954; economic researcher.

Zona Gale, vice president, LID, 1923–25; novelist (deceased).

Lewis S. Gannett, board of directors, LID, 1920–24; literary editor, New York Herald Tribune.

Benjamin Gebiner, board of directors, LID, since 1950; assistant secretary, Workmen's Circle.

Martin Gerber, board of directors, LID, since 1953; director, Region 9, UAW–CIO.

W. J. Ghent, secretary, ISS, 1907–10; author; editor; educator.

Charlotte Perkins Gilman, signer of Organization Call, ISS; author; feminist.

Elisabeth Gilman, president, LID, 1940–41; secretary, Christian Social Justice Fund (deceased).

Arthur Gleason, executive committee, ISS and board of directors, LID, 1918–23; president, ISS, 1920–21; vice president, LID, 1921–23; writer (deceased).

Louis P. Goldberg, board of directors, LID, since 1945; national chairman, Social Democratic Federation; New York attorney.

Maurice Goldbloom, formerly New York executive committee; writer on international and intercultural affairs.

Clara G. Goldman, National Council, LID; housewife; active in peace movements.

J. King Gordon, board of directors, LID, 1945–52; former managing editor, the Nations; on staff of U.N.

Frances A Grant, executive committee, New York chapter, LID, since 1954; secretary, U.S. Committee of Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom.

Elmer E. Graham, former chairman, Detroit chapter; staff, UAW–CIO.

John H. Gray, National Council, LID; former president, American Economic Association (deceased).

Felix Gredon, former executive committee, ISS; Shavian authority; teacher.

Murray Gross, board of directors, LID, since 1950; assistant manager, New York joint board, Dressmakers' Unions.

Charles Grossman, board of directors, LID, since 1950; businessman; chairman, Reunion of Old Timers.

Harold M. Groves, national council, LID; professor of economics, University of Wisconsin.

Cameron P. Hall, board of directors, LID, 1947–49; executive secretary, Department of Church and Economic Life, National Council of Churches.

M. V. Halushka, Chicago chapter; teacher.

Meyer Halushka, Chicago chapter; educator.

Rose Laddon Hanna, former executive secretary, ISS; writer; lecturer.

Donald Harrington, national council, LID; minister, Community Church, New York City.

A. J. Hayes, vice president, LID, since 1954; President International Association of Machinists.

Ellen Hayes, executive committee, ISS, 1916–17; author; Professor of Mathematics, Wellesley College (deceased).

Paul R. Hayes, board of directors, and national council, LID, since 1951; Professor of Law, Columbia University.

Timothy Healy, board of directors, LID, 1925; trade union leader.

Eduard Heimann, national council, LID; Professor of Economics, New School; author.

Adolph Held, board of directors, LID, since 1945; director, Welfare and Health Benefits, ILGWU; chairman, Jewish Labor Committee.

Albert H. Herling, board of directors, LID, 1952–53; staff, City of Hope; author.

Mary Fox Herling, executive secretary, LID, 1929–40; national council since 1940; active in public and cooperative housing.

Hubert C. Herring, board of directors, LID, 1933–38; executive director, Committee on Cultural Relations With Latin America; author.

Thomas Wentworth Higginson, signer of call to organization, 1905; author; literary critic.

Morris Hillquit, treasurer, ISS, 1908–15; New York labor attorney; Socialist leader; author (deceased).

Mary W. Hillyer (Blanshard), board of directors, LID, 1940–49; director, LID. Lecture series in thirties; staff, Planned Parenthood Association.

Julius Hochman, board of directors, LID, 1936–38; manager, New York Joint Board, Dressmaker Union.

John Haynes Holmes, vice president, LID, since 1938; minister emeritus, New York Community Church.

Darlington Hoopes, LID cooperator; Socialist leader and former legislator.

Bryn J. Hovde, vice president, LID, 1948–54; housing authority; former president, New School (deceased).

Don Howard, board of directors, LID, 1941–42; social worker; dean, School of Social Welfare, University of California.

Frederic C. Howe, board of directors, LID, 1923–1925; author; social reformer (deceased).

Quincy Howe, board of directors, LID, 1939–41; radio and television commentator; writer; teacher.

Jessie Wallace Hughan, executive committee, ISS and board of directors, LID, 1907–50; vice president, 1920–21; teacher; author; economist (deceased).

Hubert H. Humphrey, receiver of LID and Reunion of Old Timers 1948 Award.

Robert Hunter, executive committee, ISS, 1905–11; author; social worker (deceased).

Alex Irvine, former lecturer for ISS; author; minister; lecturer (deceased).

James Weldon Johnson, former board of directors, LID; author; poet; diplomat; secretary, NAACP (deceased).

Mercer Green Johnston, national council, LID; minister; social reformer.

John Paul Jones, board of directors, LID, since 1945; former president New York chapter; minister, Union Church, Brooklyn.

Paul Jones, former board of directors, LID; bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church (deceased).

Horace M. Kallen, executive committee, ISS, 1919–20; educator; philosopher; author.

Leonard S. Kandell, board of directors, LID, since 1951; president Digby Management Co.

Vladimir Karapetoff, vice president, LID, in twenties; Professor of Engineering, Cornell University; musician; inventor (deceased).

Florence Kelley, executive committee ISS, 1911–21; board of directors, LID, 1921–23; vice president, 1912–18, 1921–23; president, 1918–20; secretary, National Consumers League; author; social reformer (deceased).

W. H. Kelley, executive committee, ISS, 1907–08; social worker.

Edmond Kelly, executive committee, ISS, 1908–10; lawyer; author; former counsel for American Embassy, Paris.

Paul Kennaday, executive committee, ISS, 1907–18; treasurer, 1907–08; writer; social worker.

A. M. Kidd, national council, LID; Professor Emeritus of Economics, University of California.

William H. Kilpatrick, board of directors, LID, since 1953; vice president since 1954; leading American educator.

Clifford Kirkpatrick, national council, LID; Professor of Sociology, University of Indiana.

George R. Kirkpatrick, organizer, ISS, 1908; author; lecturer (deceased).

Cornelius Kruse, national council, LID; Professor of Philosophy, Wesleyan University.

Alice Kuebler, executive secretary, ISS, 1919–20 (deceased).

Winthrop D. Lane, executive committee, ISS, 1918–31; writer.

Loula Lasker, board of directors, LID, since 1948; leader in public housing movement.

Bruno Lasker, board of directors, LID, 1921–22; writer; sociologist.

W. Jett Lauck, former board of directors, LID; labor economist (deceased).

Algernon Lee, executive committee, ISS, 1910–16; secretary, 1910–11; late president, Rand School; author (deceased).

Abraham Lefkowitz, board of directors, LID, since 1945; principal, Samuel Tilden High School.

Herbert H. Lehman, receiver of LID award, 1950; U.S. Senator from New York.

William M. Leiserson, Columbia ISS; former chairman, National Mediation Board; labor economist.

Alfred Baker Lewis, board of directors, LID, 1940–54; chairman of board, 1945; president, Union Casualty Co.

Trygve Lie, receiver of LID award, 1947; former Secretary-General, U.N.

Henry R. Linville, formerly board of directors, LID; teacher; former president, New York Teachers Guild (deceased).

Ben E. Lippincott, national council, LID; professor of economics, University of Minnesota; author.

Jack London, president, ISS, 1905–07; novelist (deceased).

Cedric Long, board of directors, LID, 1923–25; active in cooperative movement (deceased).

Harry Lopatin, executive committee, New York chapter; managing editor, Workmen's Circle Call; staff, City of Hope.

Lewis Lorwin, executive committee, ISS, 1920–21; author; authority on labor.

Owen R. Lovejoy, executive committee, and treasurer, ISS, 1905–06; former secretary, National Child Labor Committee.

Robert Morss Lovet, president, LID, 1921–38; vice president, 1938–49; former professor of English literature, University of Chicago; former editor, New Republic.

Sara Kaplan Lowe, secretary to Dr. Laidler since 1925; office manager.

John Lyon, executive committee, New York chapter LID; public relations counselor.

Marcia J. Lyttle, national council, LID; active in peace movements.

Bertha Mailly, former board of directors, LID; former executive secretary, Rand School.

Julius Manson, board of directors, LID, 1955; staff, New York State Board of Mediation.

Edwin Markham, frequent lecturer, ISS; poet.

Jan Masaryk, former honorary member, LID; former foreign secretary Czechoslovakia (deceased).

James H. Maurer, vice president, LID, 1923–44; former president, Pennsylvania Federation of Labor; former socialist legislator (deceased).

Francis J. McConnell, vice president, LID, 1939–49; late Bishop, Methodist Church and former president, Federal Council of Churches (deceased).

George Meany, receiver of LID award, 1954; president, AFL.

Alexander Meiklejohn, vice president, LID, since 1938; former president, Amherst; author; lecturer.

Darwin J. Meserole, executive committee, ISS, 1918–21; attorney; active in fight against unemployment (deceased).

Etta Meyer, vice president, New York chapter, LID; social worker.

Edna St. Vincent Millay, former Vassar SLID; poetess (deceased).

Abraham Miller, board of directors, LID, since 1945; secretary, New York joint board, ACWA.

Nathaniel M. Minkoff, board of directors, LID since 1952; chairman of board, 1946–48; president since 1948; secretary-treasurer, New York joint board, Dressmakers' Unions, ILGWU.

Broadus Mitchell, Johns Hopkins ISS, 1917–18; board of directors, LID, 1945–52; professor of economics, Rutgers University; author.

Hiram K. Moderwell, secretary, Harvard, ISS; writer; dramatic critic (deceased).

William P. Montague, executive committee, ISS, 1917–18; board of directors, 1920–23; late professor of philosophy, Columbia (deceased).

Therese H. Moore, executive committee, New York chapter; housewife.

Wayne Morse, receiver of LID award 1954; U.S. Senator from Oregon.

Amicus Most, executive committee, New York chapter, LID since 1954; former chief of Industrial Department, ECA, Germany; contractor.

Lewis Mumford, former member, New York chapter executive committee, LID; author; city planner.

A. J. Muste, board of directors, LID, 1921–22; secretary emeritus, FOR.

Isidore Nagler, board of directors, LID, 1953—; manager, New York joint board, Cloakmakers Unions, ILGWU.

George Nasmyth, executive committee, ISS, 1918–20; student of international affairs (deceased).

Benjamin B. Naumoff, board of directors, LID, 1950—; president, New York chapter, 1952–54; Chief Field Examiner, NLRB, New York region.

Nellie Seeds Nearing, board of directors, LID, 1923; author; educator (deceased).

S. L. Newman, board of directors, LID, 1945–52; former vice president, International Association of Machinists.

Reinhold Niebuhr, former president, New York chapter, LID, former board of director and treasurer; author; vice president, Union Theological Seminary.

Morris S. Novik, board of directors, LID, 1950—; radio consultant.

Katherine Maltby Meserole, member first executive committee, ISS; educator.

Harry A. Overstreet, national council; author; lecturer; educator.

Mary W. Ovington, executive committee, ISS, 1914–15; a founder, NAACP.

Jacob Panken, board of directors, LID since 1948; former justice, court of Domestic Relations, New York City.

Ernst Papanek, board of directors, LID, 1955—; director, Wiltwyck School.

Herbert W. Payne, board of directors, LID, 1946–52; treasurer 1943–52; late vice president, Textile Workers Union of America (deceased).

Dorothy Pearson, executive committee, New York chapter, LID; active in liberal movements.

Orlie Pell, board of directors, LID; education and research associate, American Labor Education Services.

Elsie Cole Phillips, executive committee, ISS, 1910–14; vice president, 1910–11.

William Pickens, board of directors, LID, 1923–42; author; former field secretary, NAACP (deceased).

Ernest Poole, executive committee, ISS, 1908–18; vice president, 1912–18; novelist; winner, Pulitzer Prize (deceased).

J. S. Potofsky, board of directors, LID, 1925–26; president, ACWA.

Eliot D. Pratt, board of directors, LID, 1948–52; national council; chairman, board of trustees, Goddard College.

Sherman D. Pratt, national council, LID; publicist.

Paul W. Preisler, national council, LID, teacher; attorney.

Carl Rachlin, board of directors, LID since 1950; former president New York chapter; labor and civil liberties attorney.

Walter Rautenstrauch, former board of directors, LID; professor of industrial engineering, Columbia (deceased).

Cleveland Rodgers, board of directors, LID, in forties; formerly editor, Brooklyn Eagle, and member New York City Planning Commission.

George E. Roewer, formerly Boston chapter; legal consultant; labor lawyer.

Eleanor Roosevelt, recipient of LID award, 1953; "First Woman of the World."

George Ross, board of directors, LID since 1948; businessman; secretary, People's Educational Camp Society.

I. M. Rubinow, executive committee, ISS, 1913–17; authority on social insurance.

Charles Edward Russell, frequent lecturer for league; author; writer.

Stanley Ruttenberg, board of directors, LID, 1950–52; director of research and education, CIO.

Helen Sahler, former secretary, New York chapter; sculptor; painter (deceased).

Mary R. Sanford, executive committee, ISS, 1907–38; treasurer, 1916–19; vice president, LID, 1938–48; publicist.

Joseph Schlossberg, board of directors, LID, 1940—; treasurer, 1945—; secretary-treasurer, emeritus, ACWA; member, Board of Higher Education, New York City.

Karl Scholz, national council, LID; professor of economics, University of Pennsylvania.

Adelaide Schulkind, vice president, New York chapter, 1954—; secretary, League for Mutual Aid.

Leroy Scott, secretary, ISS, 1910–17; writer; novelist.

Vida D. Scudder, executive committee, ISS, 1912–16; vice president, LID, 1921–54; late professor of English literature, Wellesley (deceased).

H. D. Sedgwick, executive committee, ISS, 1912–17; educator; writer (deceased).

Bert Seidman, former chairman, Washington chapter; research department, AFL.

Toni Sender, frequent league lecturer; representative of International Confederation of Trade Unions at U.N.

Boris Shishkin, board of directors, LID; economist, AFL.

Upton Sinclair, founder; vice president, ISS, 1905–17; novelist.

Winifred Smith, national council, LID; former professor of English, Vassar.

George Soule, board of directors, LID; author; economist; professor of economics, Bennington College.

John Spargo, executive committee, ISS, 1916–19; writer.

Sterling Spero, board of directors, LID; professor of public administration, New York University.

Sidney Stark, Jr., national council, LID; businessman.

Sidney Stark, long LID cooperator; businessman.

Lincoln Steffens, frequent lecturer, LID; writer (deceased).

Charles P. Steinmetz, vice president, LID, 1921–24; inventor, "electric wizard" (deceased).

Helen Phelps Stokes, executive committee, ISS, 1907–21; board of directors, 1921–40; vice president, 1940 (deceased).

J. G. Phelps Stokes, executive committee, ISS, 1905–18; president, 1907–18; publicist.

Benjamin Stolberg, former board of directors, LID; writer (deceased).

George Streator, national council, LID; former board of directors; labor editor.

Caro Lloyd Strobell, executive committee, ISS, 1913–21; writer.

Louis Stulberg, board of directors, LID; manager Local 66, ILGWU.

Norman Thomas, executive committee, ISS, 1918–21; board of directors, LID since

1921; executive committee, 1922–36; Socialist leader; author; lecturer; chairman, Post War World Council.

John Thurber, former chairman, Washington chapter, LID; labor statistician and historian.

Richard C. Tolman, University of Illinois, ISS; physicist (deceased).

Ashley L. Totten, board of directors, LID, 1951—; secretary-treasurer, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Oswald Garrison Villard, board of directors, LID, 1933–34; former editor and publisher, the Nation (deceased).

B. Charney Vladeck, board of directors, LID in thirties; business manager, Jewish Daily Forward; former New York City Councilman (deceased).

Stephen Vladeck, board of directors, LID, 1955—; labor attorney.

William C. Vladeck, board of directors, 1953–55; architect.

Thorstein Veblen, National Council, 1925–29; sociologist (deceased).

Anna Strunsky Walling, active member since 1905.

L. Metcalfe Walling, board of directors, LID, 1948–52; former administrator, Fair Labor Practices; attorney.

William English Walling, executive committee, ISS, 1912–18; author; social scientist (deceased).

Agnes A. Warbasse, board of directors, 1925–26; leading cooperator (deceased).

Arthur Warner, board of directors, LID, 1921–23; writer, editor (deceased).

Adolph Warshow, formerly board of directors, LID; businessman (deceased).

Morris Weisz, national council, LID; labor economist.

Mildred Perlman Westover, secretary, SLID, 1952–53; board of directors, 1953–55.

Bertha Poole Weyl, board of director, LID, 1922–45; vice president since 1945; housewife.

Bouck White, executive committee, ISS, 1912–15; author (deceased).

Samuel S. White, national council; labor-management relations.

Pearl Willen, Board of directors, LID, since 1952; lecturer; social service.

Norman Williams, Jr., board of directors, LID; legal department, New York City Planning Commission.

William Withers, national council, LID; professor of economics, Queens College.

Herman Wolf, board of director, 1953–55; public relations.

Helen Sumner Woodbury, executive committee, ISS, and director, 1917–24; labor economist (deceased).

Louis Yagoda, executive committee, New York chapter; New York State Board of Mediation.

Phil Ziegler, national council, LID; editor, Railway Clerk.

Savel Zimand, board of directors, LID; 1921–24; writer; health educator.

Charles Zimmerman, board of directors, LID; vice president, ILGWU; manager, local 22.

Charles Zueblin, executive committee, ISS, 1916–21; author, lecturer (deceased).

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3453. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11586) entitled "An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended."

PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (REPT. No. 2557)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

"SEC. 101. That the following works of improvement of rivers and harbors and other waterways for navigation, flood control, and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the respective reports hereinafter designated: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 1 of the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law Numbered 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this title; and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto, shall apply as if herein set forth in full:

Navigation

"Narraguagus River, Maine: House Document Numbered 530, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $500,000;

"Carvers Harbor, Vinalhaven, Maine: Senate Document Numbered 118, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $205,000;

"Searsport Harbor, Maine: House Document Numbered 500, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $700,000;

"Portland Harbor, Maine: House Document Numbered 216, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,340,000;

"Kennebunk River, Maine: House Document Numbered 459, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $270,000;

"Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 482, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,500,000;

"Gloucester Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 341, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,100,000;

"Marblehead Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 516, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,752,000;

"Chelsea Harbor, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 350, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,843,000;

"Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Massachusetts: Senate Document Numbered 126, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,050,000;

"Plymouth Harbor, Massachusetts: Senate Document Numbered 124, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,200,000;

"Pawtuxet Cove, Rhode Island: House Document Numbered 236, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $210,000;

"Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway, New York: River and Harbor Committee Document Numbered 20, Seventy-third Congress, for the further partial accomplishment of the approved plan there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to sums previously authorized, $1,000,000;

"Little Neck Bay, New York: House Document Numbered 510, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,185,000;

"Flushing Bay and Creek, New York: House Document Numbered 551, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,695,000;

"Buttermilk Channel, New York: House Document Numbered 483, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,226,000;

"Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, New Jersey (channels to Port Elizabeth): Modification of the existing navigation project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954 (Public Law 780, Eighty-third Congress), House Document Numbered 252, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers, subject to the approval of such plans by the Secretary of the Army and the President;

"Raritan River, New Jersey: House Document Numbered 455, Eighty-sixth Congress, maintenance;

"Lynnhaven Inlet, Bay, and connecting waters, Virginia: House Document Numbered 580, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,068,000: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing reimbursement to local interests for the Long Creek-Broad Bay Canal Bridge;

"James River, Virginia: House Document Numbered 586, Eighty-seventh Congress at an estimated cost of $39,000,000: *Provided,* That this authorization shall expire after a period of five years from the date of approval of this Act unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time: *And provided further,* That prior to construction, there will be submitted to the Congress a feasibility report which takes account of possible adverse effects of the project on seed oyster production;

"Rollinson Channel and channel from Hatteras Inlet to Hatteras, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 457, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $652,000;

"Wilmington Harbor, North Carolina: Senate Document Numbered 114, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,370,000;

"Savannah Harbor, Georgia: Senate Document Numbered 115, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $605,000;

"Canaveral Harbor, Florida: Senate Document Numbered 140, Eighty-seventh Congress, at the estimated cost of $5,076,000;

"Key West Harbor, Florida: Senate Document Numbered 106, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $820,000;

"Tampa Harbor, Port Sutton and Ybor Channels, Florida: House Document Num-

bered 529, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $997,000;

"Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama: Senate Document Numbered 109, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $500,000;

"Pensacola Harbor, Florida: House Document Numbered 528, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $424,000;

"Holt lock and dam, Alabama: The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause an immediate study to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers with a view to providing hydroelectric power generating facilities in said dam, and his report on such study shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army within the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Eighty-eighth Congress;

"Pascagoula Harbor, Mississippi: House Document Numbered 560, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,870,000;

"Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico, Louisiana: Senate Document Numbered 36, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $357,000;

"The project, Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico, barge channel through Devils Swamp, Louisiana (Baton Rouge Harbor), authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1946, in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 321, Eightieth Congress, as amended by the Flood Control Act of 1948, is hereby further amended to provide for the provision as required, of suitable dikes and other retaining structures at a Federal cost of $299,500, for the construction and future maintenance of the project, in order to provide additional industrial sites with water frontage which are now needed to permit the normal development and expansion of the industrial and commercial activities of the locality: *Provided,* That local interests contribute the sum of $100,500 toward the cost of the work;

"Bayous Terrebonne, Petit Caillou, Grand Caillou, Du Large, and connecting channels, Louisiana, and Atchafalaya River, Morgan City to Gulf of Mexico: House Document Numbered 583, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $45,000;

"Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana and Texas: House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $25,540,000: *Provided,* That the authority to make such modifications as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, as set forth in House Document Numbered 556, Eighty-seventh Congress, shall be interpreted to apply to, but not limited to, the improvement of the existing channels at proposed channel relocation sites in lieu of such relocations;

"Calcasieu River salt water barrier, Louisiana: House Document Numbered 582, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,310,000: *Provided,* That the Corps of Engineers is directed to study the question of cost sharing taking into account that measures for mitigation of damages from navigation improvements will be a Federal responsibility and enhancement effects will be shared on the basis of a 50 per centum Federal and 50 per centum non-Federal; such cost sharing is hereby authorized as determined to be feasible and justified by the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army within the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the report is submitted to it unless such report is disapproved by the Congress;

"Mississippi River at Clarksville, Missouri; House Document Numbered 552, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $103,300;

"Sandy Slough, Lincoln County, Missouri; House Document Numbered 419, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $195,000;

"Sabine-Neches Waterway, Texas: House Document Numbered 553, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,830,000;

"Trinity River, Wallisville Reservoir, Texas: House Document Numbered 215, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,162,000: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir;

"Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Palacios, Texas: House Document Numbered 504, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $818,000;

"Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Victoria, Texas: House Document Numbered 288, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,590,000;

"Illinois Waterway, Illinois and Indiana: House Document Numbered 31, Eighty-sixth Congress, is approved and there is hereby authorized the sum of $40,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project;

"Kaskaskia River, Illinois: Senate Document Numbered 44, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $58,200,000;

"Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minnesota: House Document Numbered 513, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,205,000;

"Ontonagon Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 287, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,741,000;

"Muskegon Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 474, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $609,000;

"Leland Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 413, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $485,000;

"Little Bay De Noc, Gladstone Harbor and Kipling, Michigan: House Document Numbered 480, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $350,000;

"Green Bay Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 470, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,270,000;

"Kenosha Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 496, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $673,000;

"Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 479, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $719,000;

"Milwaukee Harbor, Wisconsin: House Document Numbered 134, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,029,000;

"Chicago Harbor, Illinois: House Document Numbered 485, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,505,000;

"Calumet Harbor and River, Illinois and Indiana: House Document Numbered 581, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $11,464,000;

"New Buffalo Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 481, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $667,000;

"Caseville Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered 64, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $327,000;

"Saginaw River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 544, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,780,000;

"Rouge River, Michigan: House Document Numbered 509, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $257,000;

"Huron Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 165, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,557,000;

"Cleveland Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 527, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $888,000;

"Conneaut Harbor, Ohio: House Document Numbered 415, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,179,000;

"Erie Harbor, Pennsylvania: House Document Numbered 340, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $671,000;

"Buffalo Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 451, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,797,000;

"Great Sodus Bay Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 138, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $765,000;

"Oswego Harbor, New York: House Document Numbered 471, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,180,000;

"Dana Point Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 532, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,730,000;

"Santa Barbara Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 518, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,000,000;

"Oakland Harbor, California, Fruitvale Avenue Bridge: Senate Document Numbered 75, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,750,000;

"Oakland Harbor, California: House Document Numbered 353, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,775,000;

"Noyo River and Harbor, California: Senate Document Numbered 121, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,231,000;

"Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oregon and Washington: House Document Numbered 203, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $493,000;

"Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Washington, and Portland, Oregon: House Document Numbered 452, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,100,000;

"Tacoma Harbor, Port Industrial and Hylebos Waterways, Washington: Senate Document Numbered 104, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,460,000;

"Kingston Harbor, Washington: House Document Numbered 417, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $428,000;

"Swinomish Channel, Washington: House Document Numbered 499, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $887,000;

"Kaunakakai Harbor, Molokai, Hawaii: House Document Numbered 484, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,919,000;

"The project for Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, authorized by Public Law 645, Eighty-sixth Congress, is hereby modified to provide for adjustment of the cash contribution required of local interest in accordance with recommendations by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the President, such adjustment to be made at the earliest practicable date.

"Beach erosion

"State of New Hampshire: House Document Numbered 416, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $88,000;

"Fire Island Inlet and shore westerly to Jones Inlet, Long Island, New York: Modification of the existing beach erosion control project authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (Public Law 500, Eighty-fifth Congress), House Document Numbered 411, Eighty-fifth Congress, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans, which will include a sand bypassing system at Fire Island Inlet, being prepared by the Chief of Engineers, subject to the approval of such plans by the Secretary of the Army and the President;

"Clark Point, New Bedford, Massachusetts: House Document Numbered 584, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $60,000;

"Virginia Beach, Virginia: House Document Numbered 382, Eighty-seventh Congress, periodic nourishment;

"Fort Macon, Atlantic Beach and vicinity, North Carolina: House Document Numbered 555, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $194,000;

"Palm Beach County from Martin County line to Lake Worth Inlet and from South Lake Worth Inlet to Broward County line, Florida: House Document Numbered 164,

Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $128,800;

"Virginia Key and Key Biscayne, Florida: House Document Numbered 561, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $220,000;

"San Juan and vicinity, Puerto Rico: House Document Numbered 575, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $65,400;

"Lake Erie shoreline from the Michigan-Ohio State line to Marblehead, Ohio: House Document Numbered 63, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $658,500;

"Sheffield Lake community park, Sheffield Lake Village, Ohio: House Document Numbered 414, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $100,300;

"Ventura-Pierpont area, California: House Document Numbered 458, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $515,000.

"Orange County, California: House Document Numbered 602, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,845,000.

"Sec. 102. That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for such work done by them on the beach erosion projects authorized in section 101, and in other sections of this Act, subsequent to the initiation of the cooperative studies which form the basis for the projects: *Provided*, That the work which may have been done on these projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the projects herein adopted: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

"Sec. 103. (a) The Act approved August 13, 1946, as amended by the Act approved July 28, 1956 (33 U.S.C. 426e–h), pertaining to shore protection, is hereby further amended as follows:

"(1) the word 'one-third' in section 1(b) is deleted and the word 'one-half' is substituted therefor;

"(2) the following is added after the word 'located' in section 1(b): ', except that the costs allocated to the restoration and protection of Federal property shall be borne fully by the Federal Government, and, further, that Federal participation in the cost of a project for restoration and protection of State, county, and other publicly owned shore parks and conservation areas may be, in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, not more than 70 per centum of the total cost exclusive of land costs, when such areas: Include a zone which excludes permanent human habitation; include but are not limited to recreational beaches; satisfy adequate criteria for conservation and development of the natural resources of the environment; extend landward a sufficient distance to include, where appropriate, protective dunes, bluffs, or other natural features which serve to protect the uplands from damage; and provide essentially full park facilities for appropriate public use, all of which shall meet with the approval of the Chief of Engineers';

"(3) the following is added after the word 'supplemented' in section 1(e): ', or, in the case of a small project under section 3 of this Act, unless the plan therefor has been approved by the Chief of Engineers'; and

"(4) sections 2 and 3 are amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to reimburse local interests for work done by them, after initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for the project, on authorized projects which individually do not exceed $1,000,000 in total cost: *Provided*, That the work which may have been done on the projects is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the authorized projects: *Provided further*, That such reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority for improvements.

"'Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to undertake construction of small shore and beach restoration and protection projects not specifically authorized by Congress, which otherwise comply with section 1 of this Act, when he finds that such work is advisable, and he is further authorized to allot from any appropriations hereafter made for civil works, not to exceed $3,000,000 for any one fiscal year for the Federal share of the costs of construction of such projects: *Provided*, That not more than $400,000 shall be allotted for this purpose for any single project and the total amount allotted shall be sufficient to complete the Federal participation in the project under this section including periodic nourishment as provided for under section 1(c) of this Act: *Provided further*, That the provisions of local cooperation specified in section 1 of this Act shall apply: *And provided further*, That the work shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation, except for participation in periodic beach nourishment in accordance with section 1(c) of this Act, and as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of survey reports.'

"(b) All provisions of existing law relating to surveys of rivers and harbors shall apply to surveys relating to shore protection and section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended (33 U.S.C. 426), is modified to the extent inconsistent herewith.

"(c) The cost-sharing provisions of this Act shall apply in determining the amounts of Federal participation in or payments toward the costs of authorized projects which have not been substantially completed prior to the date of approval of this Act, and the Chief of Engineers, through the Beach Erosion Board, is authorized and directed to recompute the amounts of Federal contribution toward the costs of such projects accordingly.

"Sec. 104. The project for aquatic plant control authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297, 300) is hereby modified to provide that research costs and planning costs prior to construction shall be borne fully by the United States and shall not be included in the cost to be shared by local interests.

"Sec. 105. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey 17.94 acres of land located at old lock and dam numbered 7, Ohio River, to the city of Midland, Pennsylvania, after November 1, 1962, for public park and recreation purposes, without monetary consideration but subject to reversion to the United States if not utilized for public park and recreation purposes and further subject to such flowage rights as may be necessary in the operation of the New Cumberland lock and dam, Ohio River.

"Sec. 106. Section 110(f) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 297) is amended by changing the period to a comma and adding the following: 'and upon completion of transfer to the said State of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canal in accordance with the agreement executed December 14, 1960, between the Chief of Engineers and the representatives of said State, the additional sum of $800,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to be expended by the Corps of Engineers, or by said State, for the repair and modification of any canal properties and appurtenances, notwithstanding the provisions of section 110(b) hereof.'

"Sec. 107. The Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to prepare and transmit to Congress, at the earliest practicable date, a compilation of survey and review reports on river and harbor and flood control improvements, similar to that prepared in accordance with the Act of March 4, 1913, revised in accordance with the Acts of July 3, 1930, August 30, 1935, and May 17, 1950, and printed in House Document Numbered 214, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

"Sec. 108. The Chief of Engineers is authorized to perform such work as may be necessary to provide for the repair and restoration of lock and dam numbered 3 on the Big Sandy River: *Provided*, That the work authorized herein shall have no effect on the condition that local interests shall operate and maintain the structure and related properties as required by the Act of Congress approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1062): *And provided further*, That there is hereby authorized to be expended from appropriations hereafter made for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, such funds as may be necessary for the repair and restoration of lock and dam numbered 3 on the Big Sandy River, not to exceed $200,000.

"Sec. 109. The body of water designated as the Redondo Beach Harbor, California, shall be known and designated hereafter as the Redondo Beach King Harbor, California. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such body of water is referred to shall be held to refer to it as the Redondo Beach King Harbor, California.

"Sec. 110. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys to be made at the following named localities and subject to all applicable provisions of section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1950:

"Falmouth Harbor, Maine.

"Channel between Point Shirley and Deer Island, Massachusetts.

"Little Egg Inlet, New Jersey.

"Brigantine Inlet, New Jersey.

"Corsons Inlet, New Jersey.

"Kings Bay Deepwater Channel, Georgia.

"Auglaize River at Wapakoneta, Ohio.

"Surveys of the coastal areas of the United States and its possessions, including the shores of the Great Lakes, in the interest of beach erosion control, hurricane protection and related purposes: *Provided*, That surveys of particular areas shall be authorized by appropriate resolutions of either the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate or the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives.

"Sec. 111. Title I of this Act may be cited as the 'River and Harbor Act of 1962'.

"TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

"Sec. 201. Section 3 of the Act approved June 22, 1936 (Public Law Numbered 738, Seventy-fourth Congress), as amended by section 2 of the Act approved June 28, 1938 (Public Law Numbered 761, Seventy-fifth Congress), shall apply to all works authorized in this title except that for any channel improvement or channel rectification project, provisions (a), (b), and (c) of section 3 of said Act of June 22, 1936, shall apply thereto, and except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided*, That the authorization for any flood control project herein adopted requiring local cooperation shall expire five years from the date on which local interests are notified in writing by the Department of the Army of the requirements of local cooperation, unless said interests shall within said time furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that the required cooperation will be furnished.

"Sec. 202. The provisions of section 1 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law Numbered 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session), shall govern with respect to projects authorized in this Act, and the procedures therein set forth with respect to plans, proposals, or reports for works of improvement for navigation or flood control and for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto shall apply as if herein set forth in full.

"SEC. 203. The following works of improvement for the benefit of navigation and the control of destructive floodwaters and other purposes are hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That the necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work may be prosecuted on any project authorized in this title with funds from appropriations hereafter made for flood control so as to be ready for rapid inauguration of a construction program: *Provided further*, That the projects authorized herein shall be initiated as expeditiously and prosecuted as vigorously as may be consistent with budgetary requirements: *And provided further*, That penstocks and other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam authorized in this Act for construction by the Department of the Army when approved by the Secretary of the Army on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

"New England-Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Wareham-Marion, Massachusetts, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 548, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,811,500.

"The project for navigation and hurricane-flood protection at Point Judith, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 521, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,414,000.

"The project for navigation and hurricane-flood control protection at Narragansett Pier, Rhode Island, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 195, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,152,000.

"Long Island Sound area

"The project for hurricane-flood control protection at New London, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 478, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,401,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Westport, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 412, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $217,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Mystic, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 411, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,490,000.

"Housatonic River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Naugatuck River at Ansonia-Derby, Connecticut, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 437, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,620,000.

"Hudson River Basin

"The project for flood protection on Rondout Creek and Wallkill River and their tributaries, New York and New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 113, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,111,000.

"New Jersey-Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control on Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook Bay, New Jersey, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 464, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,097,000.

"Susquehanna River Basin

"The project for construction of the Fall Brook and Ayleworth Creek Reservoirs, and local flood protection works on the Lackawanna River at Scranton, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, in Senate Document Numbered 141, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,596,000.

"The project for the Juniata River and tributaries, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 565, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $32,150,000: *Provided*, That installation of the power generating facilities shall not be made until the Chief of Engineers shall submit a reexamination report to the Congress for authorization.

"Delaware River Basin

"The project for the comprehensive development of the Delaware River Basin, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 522, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $192,400,000.

"Potomac River Basin

"The project for the North Branch of the Potomac River, Maryland and West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in House Document Numbered 469, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $50,965,000.

"Middle Atlantic coastal area

"The project for hurricance-flood protection at Norfolk, Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 354, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,537,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 511, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $345,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Carolina Beach and vicinity, North Carolina, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 418, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $739,000.

"Apalachicola River Basin, Georgia

"The project for the West Point Reservoir, Chattahoochee River, Georgia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 570, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $52,900,000.

"Central and southern Florida

"The comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the Act of June 30, 1948, and subsequent Acts of Congress, is hereby modified to include the following items:

"The project for flood protection of West Palm Beach Canal is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 146, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,220,000.

"The project for flood protection on Boggy Creek, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 125, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,176,000.

"The project for South Dade County, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 138, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,388,000.

"The project for Shingle Creek, Florida, between Clear Lake and Lake Tohopekaliga, for flood control and major drainage is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 139, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,250,000: *Provided*, That no obligation shall be incurred for development of the Reedy Creek Swamp as a wildlife management area unless the State or one or more other non-Federal entities shall have entered into an agreement in advance to assume at least 50 per centum of the cost associated with that feature of the project.

"The project for flood protection in the Cutler drain area, Florida, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 123, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,063,000: *Provided*, That local interests shall receive credit in the Contributed Fund Account of the project for moneys shown to have been spent after March 1, 1960, for construction of units of the authorized plan for Cutler Drain: *Provided further*, That such completed work must be inspected and accepted by the Chief of Engineers as constituting useful parts of the authorized plan: *And provided further*, That the credit established shall be in accordance with cost sharing arrangements for the central and southern Florida flood control project in an amount not to exceed $124,000.

"Green Swamp region, Florida

"The project for the Four River Basin, Florida, namely the Hillsborough, Oklawaha, Withlacoochee, and Peace Rivers, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 585, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $57,760,000: *Provided*, That the cost sharing shall be as recommended by the Secretary of the Army in House Document Numbered 585, Eighty-seventh Congress: *And provided further*, That planning and construction on the Lowery-Mattie Conservation Area and its appurtenant works is deferred until additional studies are made thereon, and a further report submitted to the Congress.

"Pascagoula River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Chunky Creek, Chickasawhay and Pascagoula Rivers, Mississippi, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 549, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,740,000.

"Lower Mississippi River Basin

"The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended by subsequent Acts, is hereby modified and expanded to include the following item:

"(a) Monetary authorizations heretofore and hereafter made available to the project or any portion thereof shall be combined into a single sum and be available for application to any portion of the project.

"The project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River, adopted by the Act of May 15, 1928, as amended, is hereby modified and expanded to include construction of certain improvements in Gin and Muddy Bayous, Yazoo River Basin, Mississippi, substantially in accordance with plans on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, subject to the approval of such plans by the Secretary of the Army and the President, at an estimated cost of $150,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection on the Mississippi River Delta at and below New Orleans, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 550, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,502,000.

"The project for flood protection on Red River in Natchitoches and Red River Parishes, Louisiana, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 476, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,293,000.

"The lower auxiliary channel, Yazoo River Basin, Mississippi, a unit in the Mississippi River and tributaries project, shall hereafter be known and designated as the Will M. Whittington Auxiliary Channel in honor of the late Member of the House of Representatives from the Third District of Mississippi, and former chairman of the House Public Works Committee. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, is hereby authorized and directed to erect appropriate markers along the auxiliary channel designating the project 'The Will M. Whittington Auxiliary Channel'. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such project is designated or referred to under the name of lower auxiliary channel, Yazoo River Basin, Mississippi, shall be held and considered to refer to such project by the name of 'Will M. Whittington Auxiliary Channel'.

"Buffalo Bayou

"The project for flood protection on Vince and Little Vince Bayous, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 441, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,224,000.

"Gulf of Mexico

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Port Arthur and vicinity, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 505, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $23,380,000.

"The project for hurricane-flood protection at Freeport and vicinity, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 495, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,780,000.

"Trinity River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the East Fork of the Trinity River, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 554, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $23,760,000.

"The project for extension of the Fort Worth Floodway, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 454, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,148,000.

"Brazos River Basin

"The project for the San Gabriel River, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 591, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $20,250,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Clear Fork of the Brazos River at and in the vicinity of Abilene, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 506, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $31,200,000.

"Tularosa Basin

"The project for flood protection at Alamogordo, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 473, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,040,000.

"Rio Grande Basin

"The project for flood protection at Las Cruces, New Mexico, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 117, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,350,000.

"Arkansas River Basin

"The Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas River, Arkansas, is hereby modified to provide for construction of a sewage outfall system for the city of Russellville, Arkansas, substantially in accordance with plans of said city, approved by the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of $1,400,000.

"The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause an immediate study to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers of bank erosion on the Arkansas River between about river mile 455, near Muskogee, Oklahoma, and about river mile 495, near Coweta, Oklahoma. Such project or projects, because of its or their emergency nature, are hereby authorized as determined to be feasible and justified by the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army with the approval of the President unless within the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after the date on which the report is submitted to it such report is disapproved by the Congress: *Provided*, That the requirements for cooperation shall include provisions that local interests shall furnish all lands, easements, and rights-of-way; hold and save the United States free from damages; maintain and operate after completion; and make a cash contribution in recognition of any special benefits: *And provided further*, That with respect to any work found justified in the vicinity of Wybark, Oklahoma, local interests shall meet the requirements as stated and shall make a cash contribution of not less than $150,000 which shall include the value of all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required to be furnished, and the value of goods and services provided for purposes of project installation on a basis acceptable to the Chief of Engineers: *Provided*, That the cost to the Federal Government shall not exceed $2,000,000.

"The project for improvement of the Verdigris River and tributaries, Oklahoma and Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 563, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $62,400,000.

"The project for flood protection on Big Hill Creek, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 577, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,785,000.

"The project for the Kaw Reservoir, Arkansas River, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 143, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $83,230,000: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir.

"The project for flood protection on Cow Creek, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,560,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Arkansas River at Dodge City, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 498, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,133,000.

"White River Basin

"The flood protection project for Village Creek, Jackson and Lawrence Counties, Arkansas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 352, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,968,000.

"The project for flood protection on Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts, Arkansas is hereby modified to provide for construction of a pumping plant, substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 577, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated additional cost of $1,018,000.

"Red River Basin

"That the general plan for flood control and other purposes on Red River below Denison Dam is hereby modified to authorize the Chief of Engineers to adjust the local cooperation requirements of the McKinney Bayou, Arkansas and Texas, Maniece Bayou, Arkansas, and East Point, Louisiana, projects so as to bring such requirements in accord with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and approval of the President, such adjustment to be made at the earliest practicable date.

"The project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of $16,100,000, subject to the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and approval of the President.

"The project for Lake Kemp, Wichita River, Texas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 144, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $6,410,000.

"The modification of the Broken Bow Reservoir, Mountain Fork River, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 137, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $23,800,000.

"The project for the Clayton and Tuskahome Reservoirs, Kiamichi River, Oklahoma, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 145, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $29,748,000.

"The project providing for the construction of two experimental water quality study projects in the Arkansas-Red River Basins, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 105, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $300,000.

"Missouri River Basin

"(a) The Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, Osage River, Missouri, is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 578, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated additional cost of $43,245,000: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir.

"(b) The project for the Kansas River, Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 122, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $88,070,000: *Provided,* That the authorization for the Woodbine Reservoir on Lyons Creek is deferred at this time, subject to submission of a new feasibility report to the Eighty-eighth Congress, which shall take into account the water and related land resource development plans of the Soil Conservation Service, the Kansas Water Resources Board, and Lyons Creek Watershed Joint District Numbered 41, and preparation of said report is hereby authorized.

"The project for flood protection on White Clay Creek at Atchison, Kansas, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 151, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $3,495,000.

"The project for flood protection on Papillion Creek and tributaries, Nebraska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 475, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,122,000.

"The project for flood protection on Indian Creek, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 438, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,270,000.

"The project for Grand River and tributaries, North and South Dakota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 574, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,670,000: *Provided*, That the project shall be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of the Army.

"The requirements of local cooperation on the project for flood control on the Floyd River, Iowa, authorized by Public Law 85–500, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 417, Eighty-fourth Congress, is hereby modified to read as follows: '*Provided,* That responsible local interests give assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will (a) furnish without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project; (b) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; (c) make without cost to the United States all necessary road, highway, highway bridges other than those required to carry Interstate Highway 29 over the relocated Floyd River, and utility alterations and additions; (d) contribute in cash 0.84 per centum of the estimated first cost of the work for which the United States would be responsible, a contribution presently estimated at $65,000; (e) upon authorization of the project, to take all possible action under Iowa law, short of actual purchase, to prevent additional developments within the right-of-way that might increase the overall cost of the project; and (f) maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.'

"Ohio River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Kokosing River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 220, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,438,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Wabash River at and in the vicinity of Mount Carmel, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 573, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,417,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Mad River above Huffman Dam, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 439, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,930,000.

"The project for the Kentucky River, Kentucky, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 423, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $26,020,000.

"The project for Twelvepole Creek, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 520, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $11,000,000.

"The project for the Guyandot River and tributaries, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 569, Eighty-seventh Congress, second session, at an estimated cost of $60,477,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Buckhannon River, West Virginia, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 43, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,206,000.

"The project for flood protection on Crab Creek at Youngstown, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 440, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,268,000.

"The project for the Scioto River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 587, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $55,307,000: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a wildlife refuge in this project.

"The project for flood protection on the Allegheny River at Salamanca, New York, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 166, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,390,000.

"The project for French Creek, Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 95, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $23,102,000.

"The project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–500) is hereby modified to authorize the Chief of Engineers to adjust the cash contribution required of local interests to such amount as is recommended by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the President, such adjustment to be made at the earliest practicable date.

"Upper Mississippi River Basin

"The project for the Illinois River and tributaries, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Indiana, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 472, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $71,465,000.

"The project for Rend Lake, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 541, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $35,500,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River at and in the vicinity of Guttenberg, Iowa, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 286, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $729,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Mississippi River between Sainte Genevieve and Saint Marys, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 519, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,500,000.

"The project for the Harrisonville and Ivy Landing Drainage and Levee District Numbered 2, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 542, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,112,000.

"The project for the Columbia Drainage and Levee District Numbered 3, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 543, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $986,000.

"The project for the Prairie DuPont Levee and Sanitary District, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 540, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $921,000.

"The project for flood protection on Richland Creek, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 571, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,995,000.

"The project for the Joanna Reservoir, Salt River, Missouri, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 507, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $63,300,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Pecatonica River, Illinois and Wisconsin, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 539, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $850,000.

"The project for flood protection on Rock River at Rockford, Illinois, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 142, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,228,000.

"The project for the Mississippi River urban areas from Hampton, Illinois, to mile 300, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 564, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,289,000.

"The project for the Mississippi River urban areas from Hampton, Illinois, to Cassville, Wisconsin, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 450, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,350,000.

"The project for the Kickapoo River, Wisconsin, is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 557, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $15,570,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Warroad River and Bull Dog Creek, Minnesota, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 449, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $972,000.

"Great Lakes Basin

"The project for flood protection on the River Rouge, Michigan, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 148, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $8,659,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Sandusky River, Ohio, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 136, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $4,300,000.

"Gila River Basin

"The project for the Camelsback Reservoir, Gila River, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 127, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $9,770,000.

"The project for flood protection on the Gila River below Painted Rock Reservoir, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 116, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $18,255,000.

"The project for flood protection on Pinal Creek, Arizona, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 512, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,300,000.

"Truckee River Basin

"The project for flood protection on the Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 435, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,385,000.

"San Francisco Bay area

"The project for flood protection on Alameda Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 128, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,680,000.

"The project for Corte Madera Creek, Marin County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 545, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $5,534,000: *Provided*, That local interests shall contribute in cash 3 per centum of the Federal construction of the Rose Valley unit with a contribution presently estimated at $158,000.

"San Joaquin River Basin

"The New Melones project, Stanislaus River, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), is hereby modified substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 453, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $113,717,000: *Provided*, That upon completion of construction of the dam and powerplant by the Corps of Engineers, the project shall become an integral part of the Central Valley project and be operated and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws, except that the flood control operation of the project shall be in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That the Stanislaus River Channel, from Goodwin Dam to the San Joaquin River, shall be maintained by the Secretary of the Army to a capacity of at least eight thousand cubic feet per second subject to the condition that responsible local interests agree to maintain private levees and to prevent encroachment on the existing channel and floodway between the levees: *Provided further*, That before initiating any diversion of water from the Stanislaus River Basin in connection with the operation of the Central Valley project, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine the quantity of water required to satisfy all existing and anticipated future needs within that basin and the diversions shall at all times be subordinate to the quantities so determined: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army adopt appropriate measures to insure the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife in the New Melones project and shall allocate to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, as provided in the Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), an appropriate share of the cost of constructing the Stanislaus River division and of operating and maintaining the same: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army, in connection with the New Melones project, construct basic public recreation facilities, acquire land necessary for that purpose, the cost of constructing such facilities and acquiring such lands to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable: *Provided further*, That contracts for the sale and delivery of the additional electric energy available from the Central Valley project power system as a result of the construction of the plants herein authorized and their integration with that system shall be made in accordance with preferences expressed in the Federal reclamation laws except that a first preference, to the extent as needed and as fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, but not to exceed 25 per centum of such additional energy, shall be given, under reclamation law, to preference customers in Tuolumne and Calaveras Counties, California, for use in that county, who are ready, able, and willing, within twelve months after notice of availability by the Secretary of the Interior, to enter into contracts for the energy and that Tuolumne and Calaveras County preference customers may exercise their option in the same date in each successive fifth year providing written notice of their intention to use the energy is given to the Secretary not less than eighteen months prior to said dates: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Army give consideration during the preconstruction planning for the New Melones project to the advisability of including storage for the regulation of streamflow for the purpose of downstream water quality control.

"The Hidden Reservoir, Fresno River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 37, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $14,338,000.

"The Buchanan Reservoir, Chowchilla River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document Numbered 98, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $13,585,000.

"The project for flood protection on Mormon Slough, Calaveras River, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 576, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $1,960,000.

"Russian River Basin

"The project for Russian River, Dry Creek, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 547, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $42,400,000.

"Redwood Creek Basin

"The project for flood protection on Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 497, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $2,580,000.

"Los Angeles River Basin

"In addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $3,700,000 for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Los Angeles River Basin approved in the Act of August 18, 1941, as amended and supplemented by subsequent Acts of Congress.

"Rogue River Basin

"The project for the Rogue River, Oregon and California, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 566, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $106,700,000, subject to the conditions of local cooperation specified in said report: *Provided*, That the project is to be located, constructed, and operated to accomplish the benefits as set forth and described in the report and appendixes: *And provided further*, That in the years of short water supply all water users will share the available water in the same proportions that they would share the total full supply when it is available, and that no further water-use allocations will be made from the authorized storage so as to retain the maximum possible benefits to authorized uses during the periods of adversity when storage shortages occur.

"Columbia River Basin

"The projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and subsequent Acts of Congress, including the Flood Control Acts of May 17, 1950, September 3, 1954, July 3, 1958, and July 14, 1960, are hereby modified to include the projects listed below for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin (including the Willamette River Basin) substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 403, Eighty-seventh Congress: *Provided*, That the depth and width of the authorized channel in the Columbia-Snake River barge navigation project shall be established as fourteen feet and two hundred and fifty feet, respectively, at minimum regulated flow.

"Asotin Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Washington;

"Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir, North Fork, Clearwater River, Idaho;

"Strube Reregulating Dam and Reservoir, South Fork, McKenzie River, Oregon;

"Gate Creek Dam and Reservoir, Gate Creek, Oregon;

"Fern Ridge Dam and Reservoir modification, Long Tom River, Oregon;

"Cascadia Dam and Reservoir, South Santiam River, Oregon.

"The project for the Ririe Dam and Reservoir, Willow Creek, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 562, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $7,027,000.

"The project for the Blackfoot Dam and Reservoir, Blackfoot River, Idaho, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 568, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $829,000.

"Wynoochee River

"The project for the Wynoochee River, Washington, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 601, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $40,211,000: *Provided*, That the installation of the power-generating facilities shall not be made until the Chief of Engineers shall submit a reexamination report to the Congress for authorization.

"Cook Inlet, Alaska

"The project for Bradley Lake, Cook Inlet, Alaska, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document Numbered 455, Eighty-seventh Congress, at an estimated cost of $45,750,000.

"Sec. 204. (a) For the purpose of developing hydroelectric power and to encourage and promote the economic development of and to foster the establishment of essential industries in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to construct and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to operate and maintain the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project near Juneau, Alaska. The works of the division shall consist of pressure tunnels, surge tanks, penstocks, a powerplant, transmission facilities, and related facilities, all at an estimated cost of $41,634,000.

"(b) Electric power and energy generated at the division except that portion required in the operation of the division, shall be disposed of by the Secretary of the Interior in such a manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery of the costs of producing and transmitting the power and energy, including the amortization of the capital investment over a reasonable period of years, with interest at the average rate (which rate shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury) paid by the United States on its marketable long-term securities outstanding on the date of this Act and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum. In the sale of such power and energy, preference shall be given to Federal agencies, public bodies, and cooperatives. It shall be a condition of every contract made under this Act for the sale of power and energy that the purchaser, if it be a purchaser for resale, will deliver power and energy to Federal agencies or facilities thereof within its transmission area at a reasonable charge for the use of its transmission facilities. All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy generated at said division shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

"(c) The appropriate Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and enter into such agreements as may be appropriate for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this Act into full force and effect, including the acquisition of rights and property, and the Secretary of the Army, when an appropriation shall have been made for the commencement of construction or the Secretary of the Interior in the case of operation and maintenance of said division, may, in connection with the construction or operation and maintenance of such division, enter into contracts for miscellaneous services for materials and supplies, as well as for construction, which may cover such periods of time as the appropriate Secretary may consider necessary but in which the liability of the United States shall be contingent upon appropriations being made therefor.

"Sec. 205. Section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended (33 U.S.C. 701s), is amended (a) by striking out '$10,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$25,000,000', (b) by striking out the term 'small flood control projects' and inserting in lieu thereof the term 'small projects for flood control and related purposes', and (c) by striking out '*Provided*, That not more than $400,000 shall be allotted for this purpose at any single locality from the appropriations for any one fiscal year' and inserting in lieu thereof '*Provided*, That not more than $1,000,000 shall be allotted under this section for a project at any single locality and the amount allotted shall be sufficient to complete Federal participation in the project'.

"Sec. 206. The first sentence of section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended (33 U.S.C. 701n), is hereby further amended to read as follows: 'That there is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of $15,000,000 to be expended in flood emergency preparation, in flood fighting and rescue operations, or in the repair or restoration of any flood control work threatened or destroyed by flood, including the strengthening, rising, extending, or other modification thereof as may be necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate functioning of the work for flood control; in the emergency protection of federally authorized hurricane or shore protection being threatened when in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers such protection is warranted to protect against imminent and substantial loss to life and property; in the repair and restoration of any federally authorized hurricane or shore protective structure damaged or destroyed by wind, wave, or water action of other than an ordinary nature when in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers such repair and restoration is warranted for the adequate functioning of the structure for hurricane or shore protection.

"Sec. 207. Section 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes', approved December 22, 1944, as amended by section 4 of the Flood Control Act of July 24, 1946, and by section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1954, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 4. The Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate public park and recreational facilities at water resource development projects under the control of the Department of the Army, to permit the construction of such facilities by local interests (particularly those to be operated and maintained by such interests), and to permit the maintenance and operation of such facilities by local interests. The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, at water resource development projects for such periods, and upon such terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organizations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a project area for any public purpose, when the Secretary of the Army determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, and other natural resources, the licensee or lessee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance, and utilization of such lands. Any balance of proceeds not so utilized shall be paid to the United States at such time or times as the Secretary of the Army may determine appropriate. The water areas of all such projects shall be open to public use generally, without charge, for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing, and other recreational purposes, and ready access to and exit from such areas along the shores of such projects shall be maintained for general public use, when such use is determined by the Secretary of the Army not to be contrary to the public interest, all under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Army may deem necessary. No use of any area to which this section applies shall be permitted which is inconsistent with the laws for the protection of fish and game of the State in which such area is situated. All moneys received by the United States for leases or privileges shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.'

"Sec. 208. Section 207 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 501) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 207. (a) When used in, this section—

"'(1) The term "Agency" means the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, or the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Department of the Interior, whichever has jurisdiction over the project concerned.

"'(2) The term "head of the Agency concerned" means the Chief of Engineers or the Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, or their respective designees.

"'(3) The term "water resources projects to be constructed in the future" includes all projects not yet actually under construction, and, to the extent of work remaining to be completed, includes projects presently under construction where road relocations or identifiable components thereof are not complete as of the date of this section.

"'(4) The term "time of the taking" is the date of the relocation agreement, the date of the filing of a condemnation proceeding, or a date agreed upon between the parties as the date of taking.

"'(b) Whenever, in connection with the construction of any authorized flood control, navigation, irrigation, or multiple-purpose project for the development of water resources, the head of the Agency concerned determines it to be in the public interest to utilize existing public roads as a means of providing access to such projects during construction, such Agency may improve, reconstruct, and maintain such roads and may contract with the local authority having jurisdiction over the roads to accomplish the necessary work. The accomplishment of such work of improvement may be carried out with or without obtaining any interest in the land on which the road is located in accordance with mutual agreement between the parties: *Provided*, (1) That the head of the Agency concerned determines that such work would result in a saving in Federal cost as opposed to the cost of providing a new access road at Federal expense, (2) that, at the completion of construction, the head of the Agency concerned will, if necessary, restore the road to at least as good condition as prior to the beginning of utilization for access during construction, and (3) that, at the completion of construction, the responsibility of the Agency for improvement, reconstruction, and maintenance shall cease.

"'(c) For water resources projects to be constructed in the future, when the taking by the Federal Government of an existing public road necessitates replacement, the substitute provided will, as nearly as practicable, serve in the same manner and reasonably as well as the existing road. The head of the Agency concerned is authorized to construct such substitute roads to design standards comparable to those of the State, or, where applicable State standards do not exist, those of the owning political division in which the road is located, for roads of the same classification as the road being replaced. The traffic existing at the time of the taking shall be used in the determination of the classification. In any case where a State or political subdivision thereof requests that such a substitute road be constructed to a higher standard than that provided in the preceding provisions of this subsection, and pays, prior to commencement of such construction, the additional costs involved due to such higher standard, such Agency head is authorized to construct such road to such higher standard. Federal costs under the provisions of this subsection shall be part of the nonreimbursable project costs.'

"SEC. 209. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to cause surveys for flood control and allied purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

"Valenciana River, Puerto Rico.

"Waccasassa River (Levy County and Gilchrist County), Florida.

"Lake Pontchartrain, North Shore, Louisiana.

"Peytons Creek and tributaries, Texas.

"Clear Creek, Texas.

"San Bernard River, Texas.

"Arkansas River Basin, with reference to the effect of the Eufaula and Keystone Reservoirs, Oklahoma, on the water supply facilities of the cities of McAlester and Yale, respectively, with a view to determining the extent, if any, of Federal participation in the replacement of the cities' water supply facilities in equity without regard to limitation contained in existing Corps of Engineers protective and relocation plans.

"Cumberland River, Kentucky and Tennessee, with reference to the effect of the Barkley Dam project, on the water supply and sewage treatment facilities of the cities of Cadiz, Kuttawa, and Eddyville, Kentucky, and the State penitentiary at Eddyville, Kentucky, respectively, with a view to determining the extent, if any, of Federal participation in the replacement of their water supply and sewage treatment facilities in equity without regard to limitation contained in existing Corps of Engineers protective and relocation plans.

"Missouri River Basin, with reference to the effect of Oahe and Garrison Reservoirs, North Dakota and South Dakota, on the sewage treatment facilities of the cities of Bismarck and Mandan, North Dakota, respectively, with a view to determining the extent, if any, of Federal participation in the sewage treatment facilities in equity without regard to limitation contained in existing Corps of Engineers protective and relocation plans.

"All streams in Santa Barbara County, California, draining the Santa Ynez Mountains, except Santa Ynez River and tributaries.

"Sacramento River Basin and streams in northern California draining into the Pacific Ocean for the purposes of developing, where feasible, multiple-purpose water resource projects, particularly those which would be eligible under the provisions of title III of Public Law 85-500.

"Battle Creek, Sacramento River, California.

"Kaskaskia River levees, Illinois; review of requirements of local cooperation.

"Puget Sound, Washington, and adjacent waters, including tributaries, in the interest of flood control, navigation, and other water uses and related land resources.

"Harbors and rivers in Hawaii, with a view to determining the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power development, water supply, and other beneficial water uses, and related land resources.

"Waimea River, Kokee Area, Kauai, Hawaii, for multiple purposes.

"Waipio River, Kohala-Hamakua coast, Island of Hawaii, for multiple purpose development.

"Iao River, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.

"SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Army acting through the Corps of Engineers is hereby authorized to replace with adequate floodway capacity the bridge over Boeuf River, Chicot County, Arkansas, approximately three miles north of the county line, and the bridge over Big Bayou, Chicot County, Arkansas, approximately two miles upstream from its confluence with the Boeuf River which were altered as part of the project for Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, authorized by the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, and which were recently destroyed by floods, at an estimated cost of $115,000.

"SEC. 211. The Wilkesboro Reservoir flood control project, Yadkin River, North Carolina, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1946, shall hereafter be known and designated as the W. Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir, in honor of the late Senator W. Kerr Scott of North Carolina. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such project is designated or referred to shall be held and considered to refer to such project by the name of the W. Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir.

"SEC. 212. Title II of this Act may be cited as the 'Flood Control Act of 1962'."

And the Senate agree to same.

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT S. KERR,
PAT MCNAMARA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
HIRAM L. FONG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the Senate amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

TITLE I—RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Senate amendment did not delete any of the projects for navigation contained in the House bill. The Senate amendment did modify certain of these projects and it also authorized projects not contained in the House bill.

(1) The Senate amendment authorized further partial accomplishment of the project for the Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway, N.Y., at an estimated cost of $1,000,000 additional.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(2) The project for Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N.J., contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment to require approval of the plans of the Chief of Engineers by both the Secretary of the Army and the President.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(3) The Senate amendment authorized the project for the James River, Va., at an estimated cost of $39,000,000, with the condition that the authorization expire after 5 years unless the Governor of Virginia has endorsed the project within that time and a further requirement that there be submitted to Congress a feasible report which takes account of possible adverse effects of the project on seed oyster production.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(4) The Senate amendment authorized the project for Canaveral Harbor, Fla., at an estimated cost of $5,076,000.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(5) The project for Holt lock and dam, Alabama, as authorized in the House bill, required a report of the Chief of Engineers to be submitted to Congress within the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the 88th Congress. The Senate amendment extended this period to 90 days.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

(6) The Senate amendment authorized the modification of the Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to Gulf of Mexico Barge Channel through Devils Swamp, Louisiana, for dikes and retaining structures, at a Federal cost of $299,500, with local interests to contribute $100,500.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(7) The Senate amendment authorized the project for Bayous Terrebonne, Petit Caillou, Grand Caillou, Du Large, and connecting channels, Louisiana, and Atchafalaya River, Morgan City to Gulf of Mexico, at an estimated cost of $45,000.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(8) The project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Louisiana and Texas, contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment to provide that the authority to make such modifications as the Chief of Engineers deems desirable, as set forth in House Document No. 556, 87th Congress, shall be construed to apply to, but not be limited to, the improvement of the existing channels at proposed channel relocation sites in lieu of such relocations.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(9) The project for the Calcasieu River salt water barrier, Louisiana, contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment through the inclusion of a proviso requiring a study by the Corps of Engineers of the question of cost sharing and authorizing such cost sharing as is determined feasible and justified by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army within the first period of 60 calendar days of Congress after the date on which the report on cost sharing is submitted to the Congress, unless Congress disapproves such report.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(10) The project for Trinity River, Wallisville Reservoir, Tex., as contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment through the addition of a proviso that nothing in the act shall be construed as authorization for the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(11) The project for the Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind., was authorized in the House bill at an estimated cost of $114,652,000. The Senate amendment reduced that figure to $40,000,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(12) The Senate amendment modified the project for Hilo Harbor, Hawaii, to provide for adjustment of the cash contribution required of local interests in accordance with the recommendations by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the President.

The House bill did not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the adjustment is required to be made at the earliest practicable date.

Beach erosion

The Senate amendment did not delete any of the beach erosion projects which were contained in the House bill.

The Senate amendment did modify certain of these projects, and it also authorized projects not contained in the House bill.

(1) The project for Fire Island Inlet to Jones Inlet, Long Island, N.Y., contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment by requiring that the plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers be approved by the Secretary of the Army and the President.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(2) The Senate amendment authorized a project for Clark Point, New Bedford, Mass., at an estimated cost of $60,000.

This project is not in the House bill.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(3) The Senate amendment authorized a project for Palm Beach County from Martin County line to Lake Worth Inlet and from South Lake Worth Inlet to Broward County line, Florida, at an estimated cost of $128,800.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(4) The Senate amendment authorized a project for San Juan and vicinity, Puerto Rico, at an estimated cost of $65,400.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

(5) The Senate amendment authorized a project for Orange County, Calif., at an estimated cost of $2,845,000.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Shore protection modifications

Section 103 of the Senate amendment amended the act of August 13, 1946, which relates to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property by increasing the Federal contribution from one-third to one-half, by requiring that when the property is Federal property all of the cost will be borne by the Federal Government and by requiring that up to 70 percent of the cost exclusive of land costs shall be borne by the Federal Government when it is a project for restoration of State, county, and other publicly owned shore parks and other conservation areas under certain circumstances. It further authorizes the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done by them on authorized projects which individually do not exceed $1,000,000 in total cost after initiation of the survey studies which form the basis for the project, if the work is approved by the Chief of Engineers as being in accordance with the project; however, the reimbursement shall be subject to appropriations applicable thereto or funds available therefor and shall not take precedence over other pending projects of higher priority. It further authorizes the Chief of Engineers to undertake small shore and beach restoration and protection projects not specifically authorized by Congress if he finds it advisable and permits him to spend not to exceed $3,000,000 in any one fiscal year for such projects, except that not more than $400,000 shall be allocated to any one project and the total amount allotted shall be enough to complete Federal participation in the project. Local cooperation is required and the work on the small project must be complete in itself and not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation.

Subsection (b) of section 103 of the Senate amendment provides that all existing law relating to surveys of rivers and harbors shall apply to surveys related to shore protection.

Subsection (c) of section 103 of the Senate amendment provides that the cost sharing provisions of this act shall apply to authorized projects not substantially completed before the date of enactment of this act and directs the Chief of Engineers to recompute Federal contributions to such projects accordingly.

The bill as passed by the House contained no comparable provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Aquatic plant control

Section 104 of the Senate amendment modifies the project for aquatic plant control authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to make research costs and planning costs prior to construction entirely borne by the United States.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Illinois and Mississippi Canal

Section 106 of the Senate amendment amends section 110(f) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to authorize the appropriation of an additional sum of $800,000 to be expended by the Chief of Engineers or by the State of Illinois for the repair and modification of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal, notwithstanding subsection (b) of such section 110, upon transfer to the State of Illinois of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canal in accordance with an agreement of December 14, 1960.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Compilation

Section 107 of the Senate amendment directed the Secretary of the Army to prepare and transmit to Congress as soon as practicable a compilation of survey and review reports on river and harbor and flood control improvements similar to compilations which have been prepared in the past.

The House bill did not contain this requirement.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Surveys

In addition to the surveys authorized in the House bill the Senate amendment authorized the following surveys to be made: Falmouth Harbor, Maine, Little Egg Inlet, N.J., Brigantine Inlet, N.J., and Corsons Inlet, N.J.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment provided general authorization for surveys of the coastal areas of the United States and its possessions including the shores of the Great Lakes in the interest of beach erosion, hurricane protection, and related purposes with a requirement that surveys of particular areas shall be authorized by resolutions of either the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or of the House.

The House bill contained no such general authorization.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

The Senate amendment contained all of the projects for flood control contained in the House bill. It modified certain of these projects as passed by the House and added certain others. The following projects were either modified or added by the Senate and are contained in the proposed conference substitute:

Susquehanna River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized an additional $5,000,000 for the project for the West Branch of the Susquehanna River Basin.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for the Fall Brook and Ayleworth Creek Reservoirs on the Lackawanna River at Scranton, Pa., at an estimated cost of $3,596,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The project for the Juniata River and tributaries, Pennsylvania, contained in the House bill specifically exempted the power features of such project from authorization and permitted the Chief of Engineers to submit a reexamination report on those features if he deems it desirable.

The Senate amendment did not specifically exempt the power features of the project from authorization but did provide that their installation shall not be made until the Chief of Engineers shall have submitted a reexamination report to Congress.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Delaware River Basin

The project for the Delaware River Basin, N.Y., N.J., Pa., and Del., were authorized in the House bill at an estimated cost of $224,000,000.

The Senate amendment reduced the authorization to $192,400,000.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Middle Atlantic coastal area

The Senate amendment authorized a project for hurricane-flood protection and beach erosion control at Wrightsville Beach, N.C., at an estimated cost of $345,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Cape Fear River Basin

The Senate amendment contained a project for Cape Fear River Basin, N.C., at an estimated cost of $25,143,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

Apalachicola River Basin, Ga.

The House bill authorized a project for the West Point Reservoir, Chattahoochee River, Ga., in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, at an estimated cost of $52,900,000.

The Senate amendment deleted the "Secretary of the Army and the".

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for Flint River, Ga., at an estimated cost of $151,820,000, with the proviso that this authorization is without prejudice to consideration by the Federal Power Commission of non-Federal development of power.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

Central and southern Florida

The Senate amendment provided an additional $30,000,000 basin authorization for central and southern Florida.

The House bill did not contain this authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

West Palm Beach Canal

The Senate amendment authorized a project for flood protection of West Palm Beach Canal, at an estimated cost of $3,220,000.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Boggy Creek, Fla.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for flood protection on Boggy Creek, Fla., at an estimated cost of $1,176,000.

The House bill did not contain this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Shingle Creek, Fla.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for Shingle Creek, Fla., at an estimated cost of $3,250,000, with the proviso that no obligation shall be incurred for the development of the Reedy Creek Swamp as a wildlife management area unless the State or another non-Federal entity agrees in advance to pay at least half the cost of that feature of the project.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Cutler drain area, Florida

The project for the Cutler drain area, Florida, contained in the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment through the inclusion of a proviso that local interests shall receive credit for moneys spent after March 1, 1960, for construction of units of the authorized plan for Cutler drain if that work is acceptable to the Chief of Engineers and if that credit does not exceed $124,000.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, with a clerical amendment.

Green Swamp region, Florida

The project for the Four River Basins, Fla., authorized by the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment by a proviso that cost sharing shall be as recommended by the Secretary of the Army in House Document No. 585, 87th Congress. The Senate amendment also deferred the planning and construction on the Lowery-Mattie conservation area until a further report is made to Congress.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Lower Mississippi River Basin

The Senate amendment modified the project for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River adopted by the act of May 15, 1928, and subsequent acts to provide that monetary authorizations heretofore and hereafter made available to the projects shall be combined into a single sum and shall be available for application to any portion of the project.

The House bill contained no such modification.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Gin and Muddy Bayous, Yazoo River Basin, Miss.

The authorization contained in the House bill for improvements in Gin and Muddy Bayous, Yazoo River Basin, Miss., were modified by the Senate amendment to provide that the plans for such improvements be subject to approval by the Secretary of the Army and the President.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Brazos River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized an additional $21,000,000 for the Brazos River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

Arkansas River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized an additional $182,000,000 for the Arkansas River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

Arkansas River between Muskogee, Okla., and Coweta, Okla.

The Senate amendment authorized and directed the Secretary of the Army to make a study of bank erosion on the Arkansas River between Muskogee, Okla., and Coweta, Okla., and authorized such projects as the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary of the Army, and the President approved, unless within 60 days after the submission of the report thereon to the Congress such report is disapproved by Congress.

It provided the usual requirements for cooperation by local interests, except that with respect to any work found justified within the vicinity of Wybark, Okla., local interests shall make a cash contribution of not less than $150,000 which shall include the value of all lands, easements, and rights-of-way required to be furnished, and the value of goods and services provided for purposes of project installation on a basis acceptable to the Chief of Engineers.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the language has been modified to make it clear that the advance authorization of the bank erosion projects has been adopted because of their emergency nature. The conference substitute also limits to $2,000,000 the Federal costs under this authorization.

Big Hill Creek, Kans.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for flood protection on Big Hill Creek, Kans., at an estimated cost of $3,785,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Kaw Reservoir, Arkansas River, Okla.

The project for the Kaw Reservoir, Arkansas River, Oklahoma, authorized by the House bill, was modified by the Senate amendment to include a proviso that nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a national wildlife refuge at the reservoir.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

White River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized an additional $11,000,000 for the White River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

Red River Basin

The Senate amendment modified the general plan for flood control on the Red River below Denison Dam to permit the Chief of Engineers to adjust local cooperation requirements of the McKinney Bayou, Ark., and Tex., Maniece Bayou, Ark., and East Point, La., projects to bring them into accord with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the approval of the President.

The House bill contained no such modification.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment except that the adjustment is required to be made at the earliest practicable date.

The Senate amendment authorized a project for Sanders, Big Pine, and Collier Creeks, Tex., at an estimated cost of $16,100,000, subject to the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army, and approval by the President.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Missouri River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized an additional $140,000,000 for the Missouri River Basin.

The House bill contained no such additional authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for flood protection on White Clay Creek, Atchison, Kans., at an estimated cost of $3,495,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for Grand River and tributaries, North and South Dakota, at an estimated cost of $2,670,000, with the requirement that the project be constructed, operated and maintained by the Chief of Engineers under the direction of the Secretary of the Army.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment modified the requirements of local cooperation on the project for flood control on the Floyd River, Iowa, to require that local interests (1) furnish without cost to the United States all necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way, (2) hold the United States free from damages due to construction, (3) make without cost to the United States all necessary road, highway, highway bridges (other than those required to carry Interstate Highway 29) over the relocated Floyd River, and utility, alterations and additions, (4) contribute in cash 0.84 percent of the estimated first cost of the work (approximately $65,000), (5) take all possible action to prevent increase of the overall cost of the project, and (6) maintain and operate the completed work in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of the Army.

The House bill did not modify these requirements of local cooperation on this project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Ohio River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized an additional $120,000,000 for the Ohio River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

The Senate amendment authorized the project on the Wabash River near Mount Carmel, Ill., at an estimated cost of $1,417,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky., and Tenn., at an estimated cost of $151,000,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

Scioto River, Ohio

The House bill authorized the project for the Scioto River, Ohio, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $55,847,000.

The Senate amendment authorized this project in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of $55,307,000 with a proviso that nothing in the act shall be construed to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the establishment of a wildlife refuge in this project.

The proposed conference substitute follows the House bill with respect to the authorization, follows the Senate amendment limiting the cost to $55,307,000, and adopts the proviso in the Senate amendment.

Saline River, Ill.

The House bill modified the project for the Saline River and tributaries, Illinois, to eliminate the requirement that there be a cash contribution by local interests and to provide that other items of local cooperation heretofore recommended by the Chief of Engineers still be applicable.

The Senate amendment modified that project to authorize the Chief of Engineers to adjust the cash contributions required of local interests to such amount as is recommended by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the President.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that the adjustment is required to be made at the earliest practicable date.

Upper Mississippi River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized an additional $31,000,000 for the upper Mississippi River Basin.

The House bill contained no such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

The Senate amendment authorized a project on the Rock River at Rockford, Ill., at an estimated cost of $7,228,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment authorized the project for the Mississippi River urban areas from Hampton, Ill., to mile 300 at an estimated cost of $9,289,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Gila River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized the project for the Camelsback Reservoir, Gila River, Ariz., at an estimated cost of $9,770,000. It also authorized the project on the Gila River below Painted Rock Reservoir, Ariz., at an estimated cost of $18,255,000. It further authorized the project on Pinal Creek, Ariz., at an estimated cost of $1,300,000.

The House bill contained none of these projects.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

San Francisco Bay area

The authorization of the project Corte Madera Creek, Marin County, Calif., contained by the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment by the addition of a requirement that local interests contribute in cash 3 percent of the Federal construction of the Rose Valley unit (approximately $158,000).

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

San Joaquin River Basin

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment authorized a modification of the New Melones project, Stanislaus River, Calif., at an estimated cost of $113,717,000. In addition, the House bill contained certain requirements with respect to this project which were eliminated by the Senate amendment. These requirements were as follows:

1. Upon completion, the project would become a part of the Central Valley project and be operated and maintained by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with reclamation laws, except flood control operations.

2. The Stanislaus River channel from Goodwin Dam to the San Joaquin River would be maintained by the Secretary of the Army to a capacity of at least 8,000 cubic feet per second, subject to local interests maintaining private levees.

3. Before diverting any water from the Stanislaus River Basin in connection with the operation of the Central Valley project, the Secretary of the Interior would determine water requirements to meet all present and future needs in that basin and subordinate diversions to the quantities so determined.

4. The Secretary of the Army would take necessary action to insure preservation of fish and wildlife on the project and allocate to that project an appropriate share of the construction costs which would be nonreimbursable.

5. The Secretary of the Army would construct basic public recreation facilities including necessary land acquisition, and the cost thereof would be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

6. Contracts for the sale and delivery of electric energy available from the Central Valley power system as a result of the plants authorized by this section and their integration with the Central Valley system would be made in accordance with preferences set forth in the Federal reclamation laws, except that a first preference of up to 25 percent of the additional energy would be given under the reclamation laws to preferred customers in Tuolumne and Calaveras Counties, Calif., for use in those counties if such customers are ready, able, and willing within 1 year of notice of availability by the Secretary to enter into contracts for such energy, and such preference customers may exercise their option on the same date in each successive fifth year if written notice of such intention to so use the energy is given to the Secretary at least 18 months before such date.

7. The Secretary of the Army would give consideration during preconstruction planning of the project to the advisability of including storage for the regulation of streamflow for the purposes of downstream water control.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill except that requirement No. 4 relating to costs of fish and wildlife preservation is revised to eliminate the nonreimbursable provision and requirement No. 6 relating to preferential sales of electric energy is revised to provide that such first preference shall be given to the extent needed and fixed by the Secretary of the Interior but not to exceed 25 percent of such energy shall be given first preference.

The Senate amendment authorized a project on Mormon Slough, Calaveras River, Calif., at an estimated cost of $1,960,000.

The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Los Angeles River Basin

The House bill authorized an additional $3,700,000 for the Los Angeles River Basin.

The Senate amendment provided an authorization for the Los Angeles River Basin of $38,000,000.

The proposed conference substitute follows the House version.

Rogue River Basin

The project for the Rogue River, Oregon and California, authorized by the House bill was modified by the Senate amendment (1) to the conditions of local cooperation specified in the report of the Chief of Engineers published as House Document Numbered 566, 87th Congress, and (2) by the elimination of the requirement in the House bill that water for all purposes shall be released in the quantities and qualities at the points described in the district engineer's report and its appendixes.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Columbia River Basin

The Senate amendment provided an additional authorization of $226,000,000 for the projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin and modified those projects and plans to include the following listed projects:

Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Montana;

China Gardens Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Oregon;

Asotin Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Washington;

Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir, North Fork, Clearwater River, Idaho;

Strube Reregulating Dam and Reservoir, South Fork, McKenzie River, Oregon;

Gate Creek Dam and Reservoir, Gate Creek, Oregon;

Fern Ridge Dam and Reservoir modification, Long Tom River, Oregon;

Cascadia Dam and Reservoir, South Santiam River, Oregon.

The Senate amendment also provided that the depth and width of the Columbia-Snake River barge navigation project channel be established as 14 feet and 250 feet, respectively, at minimum regulated flow.

It further provided that Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont., be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation and authorizes $50,000,000 for partial accomplishment of that project.

The House bill authorized the project for the Asotin Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, at an estimated cost of $99,818,000 and the project for the China Gardens Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, at an estimated cost of $74,777,000. These projects were within the larger group authorized by the Senate amendment.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment except (1) the additional authorization of $226,000,000 for projects and plans for the Columbia River Basin is omitted; and (2) the following listed projects contained in the Senate amendment are deleted:

Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; and

China Gardens Dam, Snake River, Idaho and Oreg.

In taking its action authorizing Bruces Eddy Dam and Reservoir, North Fork, Clear Water River, Idaho, the conferees were aware of the objections that have been made to this project by numerous groups interested in fish and wildlife conservation. It is the intention of the conferees that the Secretary of the Army shall adopt appropriate measures to insure the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife affected by this project, and shall allocate to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, as provided in the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), an appropriate share of the cost of constructing this project and of operating and maintaining the same.

The Senate amendment authorizes the project for Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho, at an estimated cost of $52,000,000.

The House bill did not authorize this project.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

Wynoochee River

The Senate amendment authorized the project for the Wynoochee River, Wash., at an estimated cost of $40,211,000 with the requirement that the power generating facilities shall not be installed until a reexamination report has been submitted to Congress. The House bill contained no such project.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Cook Inlet, Alaska

The House bill authorizes a project for Bradley Lake, Cook Inlet, Alaska, at a cost of $45,750,000.

The Senate amendment modified this authorization to require that the operation and maintenance of the project shall be through the Secretary of the Interior.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

Snettisham project

The House bill did not contain an authorization for the Snettisham project.

Subsection (a) of section 204 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to construct, and the Secretary of the Interior to operate and maintain, the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project near Juneau, Alaska, at an estimated cost of $41,634,000.

Subsection (b) of section 204 of the Senate amendment directs the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of electric power and energy so as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. It requires rate schedules to be so drawn as to have due regard to the recovery of costs of producing and transmitting the energy, including amortization of capital with interest. Preference in the sale of power and energy is to be given Federal agencies, public bodies, and cooperatives, and it is to be a condition of every contract of sale to a purchaser for resale that such purchaser will deliver power and energy to Federal agencies within its transmission area at a reasonable charge for the use of its transmission facilities. All receipts are to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Subsection (c) of such section 204 authorizes the appropriate Secretary to make necessary rules, regulations, and agreements, and otherwise do such things as may be necessary, to carry out the purposes of the provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Waurika project

The House bill did not contain any provision authorizing the Waurika reclamation project.

Section 205 of the Senate amendment authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; provided for allocation of the cost of this project among a number of purposes; authorized transfer to a water users' organization the care, operation, and maintenance of certain works; authorized construction of certain recreational facilities; and authorized an appropriation of $25,019,500 for construction, and a continuing authorization for operation and maintenance.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this provision.

Small projects

The House bill amended section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 to increase the scope of application of that provision of law. The House bill, among other things, increased from $400,000 to $2,000,000 the ceiling upon the amount authorized to be allocated to a project in any one locality and provided that no construction should be undertaken under this section on a project with a Federal cost in excess of $1,000,000, unless that project had been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committees on Public Works of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively.

The Senate amendment reduced to $1,000,000 the amount which can be allocated to a project for any one locality and eliminated completely the provisions relating to approval by resolutions of the committees of the Congress.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Emergency fund

Section 207 of the Senate amendment amends section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, to extend the application of the emergency fund authorized in that section to emergency conditions relating to federally authorized hurricane or shore protection necessary to protect against imminent and substantial loss of life and property, and for the repair and restoration of any federally authorized hurricane or shore protective structure damaged or destroyed by wind, wave, or water action of other than an ordinary nature when necessary in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers for the adequate functioning of the structure for hurricane or shore protection.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Park and recreational facilities

Section 208 of the Senate amendment amends section 4 of the act of December 22, 1944, as amended, to revise existing law relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Army to construct, maintain, and operate public parks and recreational facilities.

This revision is essentially the same as existing law, except that—

1. Existing law is expanded to include recreational facilities not only in reservoir areas but also in any water resource development project under the control of the Army.

2. The construction, maintenance, and operation of recreational facilities is authorized to be carried out by local interests (particularly those to be operated and maintained by such interests).

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Improvement, reconstruction, and maintenance of public roads

Section 209 of the Senate amendment amends section 207 of the Flood Control Act of 1960 to substitute a revision of existing law relating to utilization, construction, and relocation of public roads in connection with the construction of flood control, navigation, or multiple-purpose projects for the development of water resources.

This revision is essentially the same as existing law except that it has been expanded to include irrigation projects constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation and a provision has been added that whenever a substitute road is to be constructed, if a State or political subdivision thereof requires that it be constructed to a higher standard than would otherwise be applicable and the requesting State or political subdivision pays before the beginning of construction the additional necessary costs, then such road is authorized to be constructed at the requested higher standard. Federal costs under section 207(c) of the Flood Control Act of 1960 are to be part of the nonreimbursable project costs.

The House bill contains no provision on this subject.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Savannah River

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment grant to Duke Power Co. authority to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Savannah River between Anderson County, S.C., and Elbert County, Ga.

The proposed conference substitute deletes this authorization.

Trotters Shoal Reservoir

Section 210(b) of the Senate amendment authorized the project for Trotters Shoal Reservoir on the Savannah River at an estimated cost of $78,700,000 subject to the approval of the President.

The House bill contained no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this provision.

Flood control surveys

Section 211 of the Senate amendment authorized the same surveys for flood control as were contained in the House bill, and added other surveys.

Arkansas River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for flood control of the Arkansas River Basin, with reference to the effect of Eufaula and Keystone Reservoirs, Okla., on the water supply facilities of the cities of McAlester and Yale, respectively, to determine the extent of Federal participation in the replacement of such facilities in equity without regard to other limitations.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, but changes the phrase "the extent of Federal participation" to read "the extent, if any, of Federal participation" in order to make it clear that this legislation does not constitute a commitment that there will necessarily be any such Federal participation.

Cumberland River

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for flood control of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn., with reference to the effect of the Barkley Dam project, on the water supply and sewage treatment facilities of Cadiz, Kuttawa, and Eddyville, Ky., and the State penitentiary at Eddyville, Ky., with a view to determining the extent of Federal participation in replacement of such facilities in equity without regard to existing limitations.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, but changes the phrase "the extent of Federal participation" to read "the extent, if any, of Federal participation" in order to make it clear that this legislation does not constitute a commitment that there will necessarily be any such Federal participation.

Missouri River Basin

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for flood control of the Missouri River Basin, with reference to the effect of Oahe and Garrison Reservoirs, North and South Dakota, on the sewage treatment facilities of Bismarck and Mandan, N. Dak., respectively, with a view to determining the extent of Federal participation in the sewage treatment facilities without regard to existing limitations.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, but changes the phrase "the extent of Federal participation" to read "the extent, if any, of Federal participation" in order to make it clear that this legislation does not constitute a commitment that there will necessarily be any such Federal participation.

Kaskaskia River levees

The Senate amendment authorized with respect to the Kaskaskia River levees, Illinois, a review of requirements of local cooperation.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Puget Sound, Wash.

The Senate amendment authorized a survey of Puget Sound, Wash., in the interest of flood control, navigation, and other water uses and related land resources.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Harbors and rivers in Hawaii

The Senate amendment authorized a survey of harbors and rivers in Hawaii.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Waimea River, Kokee Area, Kauai, Hawaii

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for multiple purposes of Waimea River, Kokee Area, Kauai, Hawaii.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Waipio River, Island of Hawaii

The Senate amendment authorized a survey for multiple-purpose development of Waipio River, Kohala-Hamakua Coast, Island of Hawaii.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Iao River, Hawaii

The Senate amendment authorized a survey of Iao River, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.

The House bill did not authorize this survey.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Missouri River Basin

Section 212 of the Senate amendment authorizes an additional $100,000,000 for continuing the works in the Missouri River Basin to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior under the comprehensive plan adopted by section 9(a) of the act approved December 22, 1944.

The House bill did not contain such authorization.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this authorization.

Chicot County bridges

Section 213 of the Senate amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Army to replace the bridge over Boeuf River, Chicot County, Ark., approximately 3 miles north of the county line, and the bridge over Big Bayou, Chicot County, Ark., approximately 2 miles upstream from its confluence with the Boeuf River which were destroyed recently by floods at an estimated cost of $115,000.

The House bill did not authorize these bridges.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

Wilkesboro Reservoir

Section 214 of the Senate amendment designates the Wilkesboro Reservoir as the W. Kerr Scott Dam and Reservoir in honor of the late Senator Scott of North Carolina.

The House bill did not contain this provision.

The proposed conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment.

TITLE III—WABASH BASIN INTERAGENCY WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION

The Senate amendment contained a title III which establishes the Commission to be known as the Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission.

Subsection (a) of section 302 recites the necessity for a full and complete investigation and study and survey of land and water resources within the Wabash River basin consisting of the watershed of the entire Wabash River and its tributaries, located within the States of Indiana and Illinois.

Subsection (b) of section 302 provides the Commission will be the principal agency for coordinaton of Federal, State, and local plans for this basin; will prepare and keep up to date the comprehensive integrated joint plan for such basin; will recommend a long-range schedule of priorities for collection and analysis of basic data, for investigation and project planning, and for construction of projects in the basin; and will foster and undertake studies of water resources problems in the basin.

Section 303 provides for the composition and appointment of the Commission.

Section 304 provides for the organization and administration of the Commission.

Section 305 provides the functions and duties of the Commission. These are as follows: (1) to engage in such activities, and make such studies and investigations necessary or desirable to carry out section 302, (2) to submit annually to the President, Congress, and other interested agencies a report on its work, and (3) to submit, after proper clearance with interested agencies, to the President, a comprehensive integrated joint plan for water and related resources development in the Wabash basin.

Subsection (b) of section 305 provides for periodic reports by individual members of the Commission to the agencies or States or other commissions from which he was appointed.

Section 306 provides the necessary authority to hold hearings, take testimony, print and distribute proceedings and reports, acquire space, and other necessary authority to carry out the provisions of this title, including the appointment of personnel.

Section 307 provides that members of the Commission appointed from agencies of the Federal Government shall receive no additional compensation and that certain other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $75 per day but not more than $7,500 in any one year.

The House bill contains no such provision.

The proposed conference substitute does not contain this title.

Early hearings

The managers on the part of the House made a commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings as soon as practicable after the next Congress convenes on the following projects which were considered by the conferees and which are not included in this conference report: Cape Fear River basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; the South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho; Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; Savannah River—Duke Power Co., South Carolina and Georgia, and Trotter's Shoal Reservoir, Savannah River.

CLIFFORD DAVIS,
JOHN A. BLATNIK,
ROBERT E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H.R. 13273, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill has been a matter of considerable controversy. The membership of the House are not informed as to what is in it. From all I can hear about it, I believe they have arrived at a rather satisfactory report, but I do not think we should pass this matter without a little consideration. I do sort of hope the conferees, since we have to wait around here, anyway, would defer that at least for half an hour, and let us take a look at it.

I do not want to be insistent about it, I do not want to be contrary about it, but I have a considerable interest in it, as the gentleman knows. He and I worked together on it satisfactorily. I would like to know, for instance, if any new projects have been put into it in conference. I would like to know if any matters have been taken out of the bill that were agreed to by both houses.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say that, like the gentleman from Virginia, I have followed the actions of this conference very carefully. I would say without any reflection on the Members of the other side of the Capitol that our conferees in my opinion have done a very good job. There was one item in the bill as it passed the House that has been taken out by conference action. For that I am sorry. But beyond that, in my opinion, this conference action has pretty substantially supported the House position.

Mr. Speaker, I might say in addition to that I can see no reason why with the adoption of this conference report and another conference report having to do with appropriations that we cannot have a sine die adjournment resolution and adjourn tonight.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is an end very much desired by all of us, I am sure. But does the gentleman not think everybody would be happier if we did have a half hour or so.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I am sure the conferees on the other side would be glad to discuss the final report of the conference committee, which was unanimous. But I really cannot see that there is any disagreement on the conference report after the long and laborious work on the part of the conferees, and I should be delighted to take a few minutes and explain to the gentleman from Virginia some of the things that we took out and to explain the amount of money by which we reduced the bill which, in fact, I think this House will be delighted to hear. We went into the conference to sustain the position of the House and we came out, I might say to the gentleman from Virginia, with that position of the House sustained, and I am delighted to report our action to this House and that is what we promised the membership.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me say I have conferred with the gentleman from Tennessee on numerous occasions about this bill. He has stood firm with reference to the position of the House as far as it was humanly possible to do so, and I doubt if very many Members of the House would have been able to sustain the position of the House as the gentleman from Tennessee has done. Personally, I want to thank him for his aggressive work and to thank him for, perhaps, his obstinacy, if you want to call it that—I do not think he can be rated with a certain group referred to yesterday by one of the gentlemen from the other body. But, certainly, he has maintained his position with great force and effectiveness and I want to pay my compliments to him for the work that he has done. In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the gentleman's request but I do hope he will give us a fairly complete explanation of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (during the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here, in the annals of some, for quite a long while. I am now beginning the 23d year of my service. I have been on the Committee on Public Works for a long while and I have participated in the drafting and the presentation of a great number of public works omnibus bills. In all of the years in which I have participated this has been quite the most laborious task that I have ever undertaken.

There are many reasons for this. When we brought this bill to the House it carried a money value—and I am speaking in round figures—of $2,300 million. The other body raised this figure by $1,495 million. Some seem to think it is a little more, but all of those who have added up the figures admit that it was at least $1,495 million.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I hope my good friend will withdraw that because it will take me but a few minutes to conclude my statement.

Does my dear friend from Michigan insist on the point of order? It will take me but a few minutes to finish the statement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have long known my distinguished friend and colleague from Michigan, I know of his long devotion to our late friend, Paul Shafer, of Michigan, who was one of my dearest and warmest friends. I just felt my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen], would not further delay the proceedings of this House. I just knew he would not, and I am grateful.

Mr. Speaker, this was a tedious job. We brought out a bill carrying a price tag, if I may use the expression, of $2,300 million. As the chairman of the Flood Control Committee, I gave assurances to the chairman and the members of the Rules Committee that to the very best of our ability we would sustain the position of the House.

It will be recalled that when we came to the House I gave assurances to the House that we would sustain so far as possible the position of the House.

It will be recalled further I asked at that time, in a spirit of cooperation, that if we promised full and complete hearings early next year on the projects in controversy, I pled with the Members of the House that they not offer a single amendment suggesting the addition of a single project to this bill. Many of my colleagues were rather amazed because, you will recall, in a spirit of absolute honesty, in a spirit of absolute fairplay, and I shall never forget this the longest day I live, the Members of this House took me, speaking for my committee as a whole, at my word, and not a single amendment was offered to add a single project to this bill.

So, then, we debated the bill. On one project we did not prevail. That was defeated on a recommittal motion. On three others we did prevail. So, then, when objection was lodged, it was necessary to go before the Rules Committee to get a rule, and again I made assurances on the part of the committee in the House that we would do our best to sustain the position of the House.

So I am delighted, humbly, to tell you that after long, hard, laborious, and tedious conferences, we come back to you with a unanimous conference report, and I am more than delighted, humbly, to tell you that in that unanimous report we have come back with about $2,300 million, or almost exactly the money value of the bill as it left the House. In that as long as we live we will feel that we have absolutely kept our word to the Rules Committee and to the House to bring that bill back to you, and we bring it back to you just as we passed it and as you passed it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the House consideration of this matter, but I think it should be said that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] has performed a legislative miracle. He has sustained the position of the House. He has accomplished his job against very difficult odds in a minimum amount of time. He and his conferees deserve the commendation of us all, including those of us who were hopeful other projects might have been included in the conference report, such as the Waurika project in Oklahoma.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the commendation of the distinguished majority whip and to add that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] also brought back a very difficult assignment. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Blatnik] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones], who assisted him, are also to be commended. He also had the able assistance of his minority Members, headed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Tennessee and those members of the conference committee who have brought back this conference report.

However, there is one project that meant a great deal to many of us which was contained in the House bill when it passed the House. It was also in the Senate bill when it passed the Senate. I refer to the Savannah River project—the Duke Power project—which would have used a great deal of coal, and that coal would have been mined in the distressed areas of our great coal fields in this country, not only in my own State of Virginia, but in West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and others.

I remind my colleagues that this project, which would involve no Federal funds whatsoever, would open new employment opportunities to miners, railroaders, and workers in affiliated industries. When completed, the installation would burn 9,500 tons of bituminous coal per day.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the coal industry is already hard hit by imports of residual oil and other market inequities. Here is an opportunity to help.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that that project was not left in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the gentleman from Tennessee would comment as to the possibilities of this project which would mean so much to my area?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the House, I should like to state this:

We recognize that the basin authorizations must be taken up early next year. With the consideration of the basin authorizations we are going to take up the Duke Power project, the Trotty Shoals project, along with, if I may say, the Devil's Jump project, the Knowles project, the Flint River project, the Cape Fear project, the Burns Creek project, and the Waurika project, along with the basins. We have promised and reduced it to writing in the conference report that early in January we will have further hearings in order to bring them out to the floor in advance of any consideration that the Appropriations Committee will give to these projects in the late spring or early summer.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I certainly yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the majority whip has spoken of the fine work performed by our conferees, and in that statement I join. As the minority leader, I am sure the gentleman would agree with me that the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] have performed admirably as representatives of the House of Representatives in this conference.

Mr. Speaker, I too am sorry that the Duke Power project is not included in the bill. Having followed this matter, I know of the situation that developed and to retain it in the bill apparently became pretty much of an impossibility. Certainly, as far as I am concerned, I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I shall do as much as I can in the early days of the next session—that is, assuming I am back, about which there is a little dispute now, but I guess I will make it if we finally adjourn so I can get home and see my people—but in any event I shall do what I can in behalf of that project.

Mr. Speaker, while we in Indiana have been interested in a project which is not in this bill and which was not in the bill as it passed the House, I venture to express the hope that before we come back in January the Bureau of the Budget and the administration will have seen fit to approve the Burns Waterway Harbor in northern Indiana in my district, and I trust that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] then would give it the sympathetic consideration that I just know he will.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, based upon what the gentleman from Tennessee has said, we can understand that there will be another public works bill next year containing these projects, plus other projects reported by the Army Engineers on projects they are now studying?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, many of the basin authorizations have to be changed, and while I cannot guarantee what the full committee will do about specific projects, I say that early in January we will have hearings.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my distinguished and beloved friend from Tennessee, the chairman of the House conferees, that he did an outstanding job. Also I want to thank the members of the minority who stood by the House of Representatives on the Duke project, even though it passed through this House in a breeze, with no opposition. It was also adopted in the other body. But I still want the gentleman to know that I am grateful to the conferees; I am grateful to the distinguished Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the chairman of the Rules Committee, and all the Members of this House who stood by the House position. I lost this round. The next round will come up in January.

I do want to say this to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee as a reminder to the House, that this would have been the largest steamplant on the face of the earth, a $300 million plant, in line with the President's program to get the economy moving; $26 million worth of coal annually from the distinguished gentleman's State and the States of West Virginia and Pennsylvania; 9,500 tons daily over the Seaboard, the Southern, and the Atlantic Coast Line.

I am happy that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee is able to assure me that this project, next January, will receive the earnest and careful consideration of this House. I extend my thanks to him, to the Speaker, the majority leader, the chairman of the Rules Committee, and all of them.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding. I just wanted to make this comment, following the remarks of my friend from South Carolina who recounted the vast amount of money that would be involved in this project and the tremendous benefits and advantages that would accrue to so many people, to point out in addition to that, that all of this money would be provided by the Duke Power Co. without involvement of the Federal Government or taxpayers' money. I certainly regret that the conference committee saw fit to knock this project out of the bill. In my judgment it was the best project in the bill. I realize that the gentleman had his obligations, and I am expressing only one man's opinion; but it does seem to me that this is a project we should have authorized since it would not have cost the taxpayers a single dime.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my commendation to the others that have been offered to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the House committees, and the other members of the House conferees. Naturally, I wish that the Flint River project were included in the conference report. I have every belief that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee will confirm his previous statement that it will be brought up and will receive the support of his committee in January of 1963.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the most grateful man in the Congress today is Carroll Kearns because, I say to the gentleman, you took care of my area in a flood control district. I want to commend you now.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman so much. I think I can say to both sides of the aisle that we are going to miss you greatly in the next session.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman for saying that Waurika project will be considered in January. This does not preclude the consideration of other projects which were not considered in this bill, does it?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct.

If you will give me just 2 minutes more, because I think on a bill of this magnitude we have certainly transgressed on the time of the House but mildly, may I say that we have come back sustaining the position of the House almost to the dollar. This has not been an easy task, but I want you to know that never in all of the 22 years I have been here have I had such cooperation on the part of two of my grand friends and colleagues, Bob Jones, of Alabama, and John Blatnik, of Minnesota, two of the ablest men in this whole House of Representatives. They both came back from their districts to see this through in the last 24 hours.

May I say further that in all of my experience I have never had more delightful dealings with two more able, intelligent, and dedicated men on the minority side, Bill Cramer, of Florida, and John Baldwin, of California. Those two men are as earnest men as I have ever known in my life. All of us worked together faithfully today and finally signed the report. You do not have this too often on a bill of magnitude, but, if I may have your attention a moment or two longer, may I say that I shall forever cherish the fine fellowship of these two men along with Bob Jones and John Blatnik.

I want to say another thing. We have been privileged to have with us over the years Dick Sullivan, of New York, and Joe Brennan, our professional consultant, who has the respect of all of us on both sides of the aisle.

We also had with us Joseph F. Van Vladricken—we always called him "Van"—chief administrative assistant in the Projects Development Branch of the Civil Works Division, Office of the Chief of Engineers, who is so capable and so efficient. We passed the bill and the Senate passed it. These men worked over the weekend, on the Sabbath Day, and came in on Monday with a complete analysis of this bill so we could look at it.

Then we are indebted to Robert L. Mowson, who is the assistant legislative counsel. These men, along with Cliff Enfield, the minority counsel, an able lawyer, were of great assistance to us.

So I come to you tonight with a heart full of gratitude that we had competent, able, dedicated conferees, with an able staff, so that we were able to maintain the position of the House on a bill of this magnitude.

So, with appreciation to the Speaker of the House, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], and the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], and all who helped us as we were seeking to help you adjourn the House of Representatives tonight, we have come in with this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, with a heart full of gratitude I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman, my friend, one of the ablest Members of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, passage today—on what could be the last day of the 87th Congress—of the omnibus rivers and harbors public works bill would mean the fulfillment of a dream long held by the people in my congressional district. In a sense, it would not mean the actual fulfillment of that dream, but it would mean the dream's fulfillment in due course of time.

Contained in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is authorization for a dam and reservoir at the Oakley site on the Sangamon River, a part of the Illinois rivers and tributaries project. Oakley Dam and Reservoir, when completed and in operation, will prevent much of the costly annual flooding in the area which washes away rich, fertile topsoil from farms in one of the best, most productive farming areas in the entire United States. This topsoil, lost to posterity, becomes a nuisance at present in that it is carried down the Sangamon to Lake Decatur, clogging that body of water and reducing the water supply of the city of Decatur. Moreover, Oakley Dam and Reservoir will furnish to the city of Decatur an additional supply of water, desperately needed right now. It will also supply water to Decatur in sufficient quantity for Decatur's foreseeable future needs. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Decatur is ready, willing, and able to pay the costs of Oakley attributable to water supply—some $4,500,000.

It will be at this time, when Oakley Dam and Reservoir are operational, that Decatur's dream will come true.

It has been 8 long, hard years, from the time I was first contacted in 1954 in regard to the possibility of building a dam at Oakley, until now when the Congress is about to give its authorization for the dam's construction. These 8 years have had their high points, and they have had their lows. There was a time, in 1958, when it appeared that all systems were "go" on Oakley. But the Corps of Engineers' price tag on the Illinois rivers and tributaries project was $330 million, which the Bureau of the Budget said was too high in relation to the benefits to be derived. So a resurvey was ordered, a survey which further delayed Oakley 3 agonizing years. I know that I watched with a sense of frustration—as did the citizens of my district—the rumblings of the wheels of governmental process which, at times, seemed to have ground to a complete halt.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I am not complaining about the Corps of Army Engineers. They would have been remiss in their duties had they changed their survey and report to a point where they were careless in their findings of fact. And we, in the Congress, would have been remiss in our duties to all of the people of the United States had we accepted and acted upon such a report.

Finally, in February, the Engineers released their report recommending construction of Oakley Dam and Reservoir. Knowing the report was on its way, on the 1st day of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, I introduced a bill to authorize its construction. From that day until today, it seems that hardly a week has passed without something being done on Oakley—starting with a letter to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Buckley], chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, requesting reports on my bill from the interested agencies and departments.

Then came almost endless contacts with the departments, including a personal contact with my good friend and our former colleague, the Honorable Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior. Through the departments, through the Bureau of the Budget, back to Engineers, and then back to the Committee on Public Works, I have closely followed every step as Oakley slowly progressed through all the channels which have brought it to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to thank all those who have helped me so greatly in getting Oakley to the floor for vote—members of the Committee on Public Works, staff members of the committee, and all of the various persons in the departments who have been so helpful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the omnibus public works bill—and Oakley Dam.

Mr. CRAMER. This may not be pertinent at this hour and under these circumstances, but somebody said a minute ago, perhaps, you would like to have us tell you what is in the bill. So now for a few minutes I would like to do that.

To my distinguished colleague, and very able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] I would like to say it is always a privilege to work with him and with the Committee on Public Works. I am delighted again as in a number of instances in the past that we come to you with a bill which I think in good conscience each and every one of us can support.

I am glad to see this conference report in the shape that it is because it has been my consistent position that we, in this highest legislative body in the world, the Congress of the United States, must acknowledge certain responsibilities to the people of this country and to the taxpayers. Nobody can say that this is a pork-barrel bill. The pork is out of it. Nobody can say that those who are entitled to the right to be heard are being denied that right because these projects that are controversial have been eliminated and will be heard next year. This is in the true democratic tradition—and that is spelled with a little "d" I guess.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say we have before us what I would call a clean bill that I can wholeheartedly support, and that I think every Member of this House can support. I think it is monumental that the Members of the House were able to cut from this bill, that is, the amounts contained in the bill as recommended by the other body—$1,434 million. As a matter of fact, I think that is historic. I know of no similar precedent, and I am proud to have had a part in effectuating that cut. Nine hundred million dollars was cut from the basin authorizations to be considered next year.

Waurika was cut out of the bill, $25 million.

Flynt River, $151 million.
Cape Fear, $25 million.
Devil's Jump, $151 million.
Burns Creek, $52 million.
Knowles Dam, $50 million.
Trotter's Shoal, $78 million.

Of course, Duke Power along with Trotter's Shoal had to be deferred for consideration until next year since it was essential to do that in order to get a bill. So both projects are being deferred.

Let me say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Jennings] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dorn], and to those who have inquired, and properly so, so far as I am concerned I would have preferred to have had the Duke Power project retained because it was noncontroversial and in both bills. There was no controversy about it so far as I am concerned. It was in both bills and I feel that it should have been retained in the final bill. Trotter's Shoal proved to be controversial and, obviously, had to be removed from the bill in keeping with the basic criteria of having noncontroversial projects included. Therefore, in order to get a bill it was essential to remove both projects.

I am glad to report to the House that China Gardens was removed, as you recall, from the House bill. As you recall, we had it up on the floor of the House, and we had a vote. It was a close vote. I understand the examiner for the Federal Power Commission has recommended on the Mountain Sheep $260-and-some-odd-million project—as a private enterprise development. China Gardens is an integral part of that total project so it seemed a logical thing to me that likewise the Federal Power Commission should have the opportunity of considering the China Gardens project. I think that, too, is a tremendous accomplishment.

One concession was made to the other body of a rather substantial nature in that the Bruces Eddy project, an Idaho project on the Columbia River, was included. I think it is significant that one concession in this instance was made to the other body and eight concessions were made to this body. I think it is salutary. I think we have a sound bill. I think we have a bill that everyone can support. It is a bill that I can wholeheartedly support.

The basic question left is, Are there any projects in this bill that have not cleared the department involved? There are a few that have not cleared the Bureau of the Budget, but in every instance the committee has written into the bill that clearance is essential before the project can be authorized. So I can wholeheartedly support the bill as meeting basic and necessary criteria.

In closing, let me say that the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin] has been of invaluable service to the House and in conference in bringing back this report deserving of our support.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on this side. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin] wants 2 minutes, and these 2 minutes will conclude the debate. I want the House to know that, and I want to thank especially the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin], a valiant conferee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Members of the House that the chairman of the House conferees, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis], was absolutely a Rock of Gibralter in this conference in defending the position of the House. I would like to commend him and I would like to say it was a privilege and an honor to serve with him on this conference committee.

It was our objective, we had announced it to the Rules Committee and we had announced it to the House that all projects added by the other body where House Members wanted the opportunity to be heard and had not had the opportunity to be heard because the House committee had not held any hearings on the subject, or projects added by the other body on which outside witnesses had a legitimate right to be heard but had not been given the opportunity before the House committee, that these projects would be removed from the bill and hearings held on them next year. This is the position we took. We were successful in maintaining that position. We were therefore successful in maintaining the integrity of the House and maintaining the right of interested House Members to have the right to be heard before any action is taken involving projects that may affect their district or their State in which they have a vital interest.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW ORLEANS SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87–759, the Chair appoints as members of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Hébert, Mr. Colmer, Mr. Abernethy, Mr. Chelf, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Everett, Mr. Baker, and Mr. Siler.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE FOURTH MISSOURI DISTRICT ON THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, in a short time the gavel will fall, bringing to a close the 2d session of the 87th Congress. This summary is prepared that the people of the Fourth Missouri District may know how well their Representative has fulfilled the responsibility they entrusted to him. Under our system of representative democracy, it is important that all citizens be informed on matters of significance to our area and to the Nation.

Whether this will be known as a great Congress, it will certainly go down as a good Congress. We believe the acts of this Congress accurately reflected the wishes of most of our citizens and was responsive to the needs of our people in both domestic and foreign affairs. This was a Congrèss which contrasted with the previous Congress. There was somewhat a change of attitude. The 1960 recession was over and employment and profits were both up. The Congress was in a more cautious mood than the 86th Congress.

While legislation provides a record to rate each Congressman, a large part of the work of each Member is done behind the scenes. I refer to work by the committees. Your Representative is a member of the House Space Committee—Science and Astronautics—and also a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. The Space Committee took the major portion of our time because this year it had a budget second only in size to the Department of Defense. For months and months we were engaged in subcommittee hearings having to do with the subject of space sciences, trying to evaluate the merit or need or to weed out the unnecessary in the requests by NASA.

The physical operation of this session of Congress started at a fast pace with committee meetings and early consideration of several matters on the floor. By March, the Congress had considered 12 major bills and 10 more in April, but in May the legislative machine seemed to run out of steam, or drive, and slowed down almost to a snail's pace. Only five record votes were held in the entire month of May and about then the columnists were saying, "What is wrong with Congress?" It took the Congress until about midsummer to get moving at a fast clip, and those pundits who in late spring and summer had labeled it a "do nothing" Congress were forced to admit before adjournment it had, in fact, done many worthwhile things.

Many Congressmen felt they were not here simply to say "yes" to everything the President proposed or to vote "no" simply because the President was in opposition. The fact is that in the last 2 years the President has asked the Congress for a huge program of legislation. Let us compare it with Mr. Eisenhower, who in his first 2 years asked for approximately 65 major pieces of legislation whereas President Kennedy asked for about 110, or almost double that amount. President Eisenhower got 30 of his 65 while President Kennedy got 65 of his 110, or just about the same percentage as his predecessor.

We understand this Congress has remained in continuous session longer than any other peacetime Congress. As it draws to a close, we can say it has been two most interesting and important years. The cold war is still upon us, but a shooting war is no closer than it was 2 years ago. While Cuba is an acute problem, on the other hand, the Communist world is in serious trouble. Indian and Red China troops are killing each other in border clashes. Russia is having so much trouble with Red China that three consulates have been closed. Famine and food shortages exist in both China and Russia. In contrast we now enjoy a growing and much strengthened military force.

On the domestic side, we approach the year 1963 with our economy in better shape than it was in 1961, with fewer unemployed and higher corporate profits. The present administration inherited the problem of 6 million unemployed which has been reduced to 3.5 million today. Since 1.1 million new workers have been added to the work force there are 3.6 million more people at work than there were in January 1961.

We submit below a checklist of major legislation enacted to dramatize the record of accomplishment of the 87th Congress. In the area of national defense and foreign policy the following was accomplished:

IMPROVED DEFENSE POSTURE

We have strengthened our defense posture at home and throughout the free world. We inherited a foreign policy replete with crises in southeast Asia, Cuba, and Berlin, but we set about immediately to strengthen our Military Establishment and provide the weapons, manpower, and equipment to meet the global challenge of the Communist bloc. Military expenditures were increased by some $9 billion over the level maintained by the previous administration. On two occasions when the cold war threatened to explode into a hot or shooting war over Berlin, the President asked the Congress and received permission to call up Reserve forces for active duty. This U.S. troop buildup is generally credited with causing the Russians to back down on their demands for Berlin.

Specifically, the Polaris submarine program was doubled. Missile development production was sharply increased; but equally important and perhaps most important of all, we increased our capacity to wage conventional and guerrilla-type warfare.

Closely akin to the military—because space has many military implications—is our exciting new program of space exploration. Its announced objective was to place a man on the moon by the end of this decade as well as extensive planetary exploration but the side effects or fallout of this program have been of such great military value that these expenditures can be classed as military. The space race is one which we cannot afford to withdraw from because of military reasons.

THE PEACE CORPS

The Peace Corps has helped people of other nations by teaching and demonstrating needed skills. The Corps confronted the original critics and has proved to be most useful in underdeveloped countries and a powerful force in spreading good will around the globe. What a contrast with the attitude toward the Peace Corps in 1961 which was a very controversial issue but it did so well in the ensuing year and has proved itself so well that the vote in 1962 to continue the Peace Corps was 317 to 70. These "crusaders for democracy" now have 1,050 volunteers overseas in 17 countries and many other countries have requested volunteers. The most dramatic endorsement of the Corps is the fact that its members do not go to any country that does not request or invite them. We now have future commitments to go to 34 countries or exactly double the 17 where our corpsmen now are.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

The Alliance for Progress has helped to bring about social and economic reform in South American countries. However, the Congress did cut about $600 million from the appropriation when the State Department could not present sound plans to justify the requested expenditure or to show the Latin American countries themselves were making an effort to put their own house in order.

FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

Revitalization and expansion of the food-for-peace program put American farm surpluses to work feeding the hungry of the world—agricultural products which would otherwise have to be stored at Government expense or sold for foreign currencies or on credit terms. The profits of these sales will be used to finance American embassies abroad and as loans—not grants—for such projects as schools, hospitals, and dams.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

Undoubtedly the most important piece of legislation passed by the 87th Congress was the President's Trade Expansion Act. This dynamic new program will help to expand our foreign trade opportunities in the EEC and around the world. This will empower the President to cut all tariffs on most foreign imported goods by 50 percent over a 5-year period and to eliminate entirely tariffs on goods coming from the EEC which account for at least 80 percent of our world trade, but bear in mind this authority to make these concessions is given only in return for favorable treatment of American exports by other countries. In the same bill, there is a provision for loans and tax relief for businesses hit by lower tariff barriers and payments up to 65 percent of wages to unemployed workers who may lose their jobs but who are also provided with assistance in retraining to new skills. It is said one of our great needs is to create 5 million new jobs each year for the next several years. Growth and trade through this act will provide a significant number of these new jobs but it was more than simply passing a trade bill. With us, it was a case of "trade or fade." We simply had to be ready to deal with these new world markets of Europe and Japan or be shut out, but equally significant is the fact that this Trade Expansion Act may be the first step toward a great trading bloc of free nations that will use their combined strength to frustrate, and let us hope, to finally defeat world communism.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Congress enacted a realistic flexible long-range foreign assistance program to strengthen the free nations of the world against Communist domination. We believe our foreign aid program has reinforced the security and prestige of the United States abroad and strengthened the forces of freedom throughout the world. These bills were called by the name the Foreign Assistance Acts of 1961 and 1962. Your Member worked toward cuts in foreign aid spending and final appropriation was reduced $585 million for 1962 alone.

AID—Agency for International Development—was formed from all the numerous agencies that went their separate ways in other years on foreign assistance. This coordination was a great improvement, and for the first time, AID has cooperated with foreign American charity organizations such as CARE and church missions. In the last 2 years the emphasis on foreign aid has been shifting away from outright gifts to loans that must be repaid and more importantly, this aid is being tied to a stipulation of self-help and social reform.

U.N. BONDS

We supported the $100 million loan for the purchase of U.N. bonds when we were convinced this legislation contained safeguards which provided that the sums we lend must be matched by other nations. The Communist bloc will still be liable for its dues and assessment and if they do not pay them in 2 years they will lose their right to vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

CUBA AND BERLIN RESOLUTIONS

Before the Congress adjourned, it enacted resolutions restating the congressional sentiment against Communist China on its possible admission to the United Nations and outlining our determination in the Cuba and Berlin crisis. We created a means of arms control through the Disarmament Agency which was the first deliberate move by any Congress to solve the problems and threat of nuclear disaster which hangs over the earth as well as the immense sums of money spent by nations on armaments. It may be that not too much can be accomplished real soon but this is the first full-time agency to work at the problem. Finally, it can be said the cost of national defense is high but we must face up to the cost to preserve our way of life on this planet. There is no price tag on such a thing as freedom.

In the area of domestic legislation the following was accomplished:

MINIMUM WAGE

The 87th Congress increased the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 and extended the coverage to 3.6 million people.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

The Area Redevelopment Administration was created as a measure to provide help in the long-range rebuilding of local economies suffering from chronic unemployment. This applied to generally depressed industrial and rural areas. The act authorized $394 million in loans and grants and $10 million for payments to unemployed workers taking part in training programs for new jobs.

HOUSING ACT

The Congress enacted the most comprehensive Housing Act in many years, expanding urban renewal, slum clearance, and housing for colleges. Then only this year we enacted the Senior Citizens Housing Act providing low interest rates for construction of rental and cooperative housing for persons over 62 years of age in urban areas.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

The 87th Congress made extentive liberalizing amendments to the Social Security Act to benefit over 4 million senior citizens. The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 increased the Federal share to old-age assistance, to the blind and disabled, effective October 1. There were major improvements in the operation of Federal-local welfare programs. Most of these were aimed at rehabilitating relief recipients and eliminating abuses. One specifically would curb abuses on money intended for needy children—aid to dependent children—where it was being used for all types of unjustified—even illegal—purposes.

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

The Public Works Acceleration Act permitted the immediate commitment of $600 million to stimulate capital investment programs in communities that are designated for ARA or that have had more than 6 percent unemployment for over a year.

MANPOWER RETRAINING

A manpower retraining program was enacted. Pockets of unemployment made it imperative that we do something to make use or utilization of skills of the unemployed in these areas. The bill empowers the Secretary of Labor to retrain these people whose jobs have been eliminated through automation or technological changes. It is a 3-year $435 million program providing on-the-job and vocational training for between 500,000 and 750,000 workers.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

One of the first acts of the new Congress in 1961 was to provide for temporary extension of unemployment insurance benefits to workers who had exhausted their benefits and aid to dependent children of these needy unemployed whose unemployment benefits had been exhausted.

AMENDED HIGHWAY ACT

This Congress enacted legislation to keep the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System on schedule and to shift a greater portion of the cost to the users and finally this year required the States to provide relocation advisory assistance to families displaced by highway acquisitions.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

We strengthened and expanded the grant program for the construction of sewage treatment plants for water pollution control and tightened up the enforcement of the law. This set up a 5-year program with a doubling of Federal assistance to local communities.

EXTENDED IMPACTED SCHOOL AID

We established a community health facilities program to broaden local public health services and construction of needed nursing homes; extended the Federal impacted school aid law—Public Law 874 and Public Law 815—and also extended the National Defense Education Act.

STRENGTHENED WELFARE-PENSION PLAN

The Congress strengthened the enforcement of the welfare-pension plan now in effect and applicable to many labor organizations, acting to safeguard all of the beneficiaries of these pension programs.

SALINE WATER PROGRAM

We expanded the saline water conversion program, established three new national parks and authorized several public works projects; established a pioneer program which could be said to be the first Federal program ever enacted to combat juvenile delinquency.

AEC PLUTONIUM REACTOR

As a Congress we authorized the largest nuclear-powered plant in the world to utilize waste steam from the AEC plutonium reactor at Hanford, Wash. This was without cost to the Government.

ELIMINATION OF POLL TAXES

In the field of civil rights, the Congress enacted a proposed constitutional amendment which must be ratified by three-fourths of the States to bar poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections. The Civil Rights Commission was extended and we established a program to promote equal employment opportunities for all citizens.

REDUCED EXCISE TAX

The Federal excise tax was reduced on airline travel, and we completely eliminated excise tax on rail, bus, and water travel.

TAX REVISION

The so-called tax bill of 1962 encouraged plant modernization by an investment incentive allowance and provided for closing some loopholes in the tax laws.

TELSTAR

Telstar was the subject of long and bitter debate, but the result was the creation of a commercial satellite system and provision for the corporate structure to administer this new program, ushering in an era of international television.

Legislation was enacted to combat the hijacking of airplanes.

NEW FARM LAW

We finally after two or three tries passed a new farm law which includes some of the first steps toward a realistic supply-management program to reduce cost of surpluses, improve farm income, and yet one to hold consumer prices stable.

NEW DRUG CONTROLS

Before adjournment this Congress did not forget the consumer, for late in the session we passed a bill to protect the consumer from the harmful effects of experimental drugs. In amending the Food and Drug Act, we required that advertisement of drugs list the active ingredients and the side effects of the drug and required the advertisement to give a brief description of the merits and advantages. It was provided that a brief summary of the cautions, side effects, and related information or possible adverse effects of the drug be spelled out.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASE

Near the end we adjusted postal rates to reduce the Post Office Department's deficit and correspondingly increased the salary of postal and Government employees in an effort to bring these more in line with those in private industry. This bill granted a pay raise for 1.6 million Federal employees in two steps: the first to be effective around October 15, 1962, and the second on January 1, 1964. Included in the same bill was an increase of 5 percent in the benefits received by 600,000 civil service retirees and their survivors. This annuity increase will become effective January 1, 1963.

VETERANS LEGISLATION

In the field of veterans legislation we made numerous liberalizing changes, most important of which was a cost-of-living increase for service-connected disabled payments to almost 2 million such veterans. We opened national service life insurance for 1 year to those who had let this insurance lapse, but unfortunately limited it to those with service-connected disabilities.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There is much unfinished business remaining for the next Congress. The reason is that much of the legislative program was blocked by minority obstructionism, or I should say by most of those in the Congress who make up the party in opposition to the administration. Had they simply disagreed that would have been quite understandable or had they offered rational substitutes for legislation with which they disagreed that could have been understood but they opposed solely for the sake of political gain. Constructive opposition is welcome but it proposes alternatives, not resistance, and no party has the right to oppose destructively what is good for the country. These obstructionists go about calling the 87th Congress, "do nothing." Their actions have been negative and only aimed to defeat legislation proposed by the majority party. Their opposition could best be described as blind and obstructive, but what did these negativists offer in place of a positive program? The answer is "nothing."

Remaining unfinished includes a bill to aid the mass transportation of those who live in urban and suburban areas. It was proposed that grants of about $500 million operate for 3 years, with the Federal Government furnishing not to exceed two-thirds of the cost to improve mass transit, the remaining one-third to be contributed in cash by the community.

Another unfinished item was the Youth Employment Opportunities Act which failed of consideration. It provided for a Youth Conservation Corps of 12,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 22, a sort of domestic peace corps.

The College Academic Facilities Act was defeated; it would have provided matching grants for 5 years in the improvement and extension of badly needed college facilities.

The establishment of a national wilderness preservation system failed to be considered.

Aid to elementary and secondary schools failed again.

Without going into the controversial medical care question, we believe if medical school construction assistance had been provided for, it would have been most helpful and gone a long way to relieve the shortage of doctors. This bill was known as the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, but it never reached the floor. It provided a 10-year program in grants for the construction of medical, dental, and public health teaching facilities and for the rehabilitation of existing facilities.

I believe it is a true statement to say that this Congress was run by the moderates and that the moderates examined each proposal on its merit and proceeded to vote according to their own best judgment as to whether the proposed law would be good for their own district and the Nation. One Member aptly said, "Our eyes were on the stars but our feet were on the ground."

I have sincerely worked for what I believe to be the best interest of our district and our great country, and while I cannot expect everyone to be pleased

with every vote, I hope that this accounting will meet with overall or general approval.

I deeply appreciate the honor to represent the Fourth Missouri District in Washington during the past 4 years, and I have tried to show this appreciation by devoting all of my time to the job of serving my constituents to the very best of my ability.

A GLOSSARY OF SPACE TERMS

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Space Committee—Science and Astronautics—we are frequently asked by constituents for a glossary of space terms and if there is available a table which would classify the different projects according to mission or purpose and according to launch vehicle. We have also been asked to indicate whether the particular space activity is under the guidance of some branch of the Department of Defense or the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We recognize it is exceedingly difficult to take such complex subject matter and succeed in any effort to clearly classify the many unmanned or scientific space exploration projects in any arrangement that can be condensed into one or two pages. We have included a table of space applications to communication, weather, and navigation.

We earnestly hope that this presentation of space terminology may be of some value to the many students who have made inquiry and also our adult constituents who have expressed their interest in a classification of space exploration projects.

A glossary of space terms follows:

Space terminology

Launch vehicles	Mission	Payload weights	
		300-mile orbit	Deep-space probes
Vanguard	Scientific satellites	25	
Redstone (Jupiter C)	Scientific satellites (Redstone-Mercury)	30	
Juno II	Scientific satellites, moon shots	100	15
Scout	Scientific satellites, military tests	150	
Thor-Able	Reentry test satellites, moon shots	200	40
Thor-Able-Star	Military satellites	500	65
Thor-Delta	Scientific satellites	500	60
Thor-Agena A	Military test satellites	1,250	250
Thor-Agena B	do	1,600	
Atlas-Able	Moon shots (unmanned)	2,000	375
Atlas-Mercury	Manned orbital flight	2,000	
Atlas-Agena A	Midas and Samos, reconnaissance satellites	3,000	750
Atlas-Agena B	Midas, Samos, and Ranger, reconnaissance satellites	5,000	
Atlas-Centaur	Surveyor, Advent, and Mariner projects	8,500	2,300
Saturn C–1	Prospector, Dynasoar, Voyager, and Apollo	20,000	2,400
Saturn C–5	Apollo	200,000	80,000
Nova	do	290,000	100,000

SPACE EXPLORATION (MANNED)

Suborbital, one passenger

Mercury (Redstone)—NASA

MR–1, December 1960, capsule test.

MR–2, January 1961, chimpanzee "Ham."

MR–3, May 1961, Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

MR–4, August 1961, Capt. Virgil I. Grissom.

Three orbits, one passenger

Mercury (Atlas)—NASA

MA–1, July 1960, Atlas destroyed.

MA–2, February 1961, maximum reentry heat test.

MA–3, April 1961, Atlas destroyed.

MA–4, September 1961, instrument test.

MA–5, November 1961, chimp test "Enos."

MA–6, February 1962, Col. John Glenn.

MA–7, May 1962, Comdr. M. Scott Carpenter.

MA–8, October 1962, Comdr. Walter Schirra (6 orbits).

Gemini (Titan II) NASA sustained orbit, two-man, 1964–65

Apollo:

NASA sustained orbit, three-man; to use Saturn C–1 or C–5.

NASA circumlunar, three-man; to use Saturn C–5.

NASA lunar landing, three-man; to use Advanced Saturn.

Dyna-Soar: Air Force gliding reentry; to use Titan II, Titan III, Saturn; first flight scheduled in 1965.

ASP: Air Force, NASA, aerospace plane (proposed).

SPACE EXPLORATION (UNMANNED)

Vanguard, U.S. Navy, scientific satellite, later given to NASA.

Explorer, U.S. Army, scientific satellites, later given to NASA. NASA scientific satellites, launched by Air Force and NASA.

Discoverer, U.S. Air Force, scientific and engineering satellite (Thor Agena).

Mariner, NASA, probes of Venus.

Arents, ARPA, to investigate space environment (proposed).

Reconnaissance and detection satellites

Samos, Air Force reconnaissance satellite.

Midas, Air Force infrared missile detection and alarm system.

Caleb, proposed Navy air-launched satellite formerly called Yo-Yo.

Vela Hotel, space detection of nuclear blasts in space and underground.

Bambi, ARPA, satellite capable of intercepting enemy missiles in boost phase.

Anna, Army-Navy, NASA-Air Force geodetic satellite.

SCIENTIFIC DATA GATHERING SATELLITES

OAO, NASA, 3,500-pound orbiting astronomical observatory.

OGO, NASA, 1,000-pound satellites with geophysical measurements, Atlas Agena B, Thor Agena B, Centaur Boosters, 1963 (orbiting geophysical observatory).

OSO, NASA, orbiting solar laboratory.

SERT, NASA, satellite for environmental tests, last quarter, 1963.

Pioneer, ARPA Moon project, later NASA, Deep Space Probes.

Ranger, NASA, hard landing on moon.

Surveyor, NASA, soft landing on moon.

Mariner, NASA, intended flyby of Venus.

OTHER PROJECTS BY PURPOSE

Communications satellites

Score, U.S. Army delayed repeater.

Courier, U.S. Army delayed repeater.

Beacon, NASA passive reflector.

Echo, NASA passive reflector.

Echo II, NASA passive reflector.

Rebound, NASA passive reflector.

Relay, NASA active repeater.

Advent, developmental Air Force communications satellite.

Csar, proposed Air Force communications satellite.

Westford, Air Force developmental version of passive reflectors (copper needles).

Haystack, Air Force operational version of passive reflectors.

Telstar, research version of commercial active communications satellite.

Syncom, satellite in synchronous orbit at 22,300 miles altitude.

Weather satellites

Tiros, NASA experimental weather satellite—six out of six launches successful.

Nimbus, NASA experimental weather satellite, first scheduled flight, late 1962, attitude controlled.

Aeros, NASA advanced model weather satellite.

Navigation satellite

Transit, Navy navigation satellite.

(Alphabetic abbreviations above are NASA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; ARPA, Advanced Research Projects Agency (Department of Defense).)

COLUMBUS DAY, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, to me, Columbus Day is no ordinary anniversary. Although it may be a platitude to say that the world tends to forget the significance of its holidays, it seems to me that we are particularly prone to overlook the tremendous import for all future generations of the voyage of Christopher Columbus.

To the man himself we must first pay homage. His achievement was the result of indomitable faith in an idea. His was a triumph of courage in the face of all odds. Mutiny and the complete discouragement of those about him he met with the same brave persistence which steered him across the shoreless seas, day after day, with no goal to beckon him, no single voice raised to stimulate his lonely hope, to support his solitary faith in his own vision.

The Columbus of our own day, the astronaut, has at least a voice of encouragement to accompany him, a contact with those who share his dream, a connection, tenuous though it is, with the world behind him. Not so Columbus himself.

But though he had no touch with the Old World as he sailed his maiden voyage, it was Columbus who brought the Old World to the New. It was he who commenced that tremendous trek of succeeding generations, of succeeding centuries, which brought to the Western Hemisphere the civilization of Europe and all that went before. Not only did the people come themselves, with their imports, their energies, and their talents; they brought with them their heritage, which was to make the New World what it is.

Now we in the 20th century have begun to repay that vast debt of generations. We are reaching back to the Eastern Hemisphere in countless helpful ways. We are sharing our wealth of well-being, our faith, and our hope, internationally, binationally, country to country, people to people and now, little people to little people, for even the youngsters have begun a program of contacts with which they aim to convince the world that we in the West are sincere in our hope for peace and the welfare of all men.

This "little people to little people" movement started, I am proud to say, with my young son Peter. At the age of 10 he said one morning that perhaps Khrushchev and the Communists did not believe that the ordinary people in America really meant it when we said we wanted him to stop testing atom bombs. Perhaps, if he and a lot of children were to write to Mr. Khrushchev they might persuade him that we really did mean it.

That was the beginning of what has developed into a modern children's crusade. Thousands of children, prompted by Boy Scouts, encouraged by teachers, ministers, parent-teacher associations, and their own colleagues are now writing letters, not just about atom bombs but conveying a sincere desire for peace and understanding among the people of the world. The young generation is sailing forth on its own. Unchartered seas are no barriers to them. They are destined, like Columbus, to reach new and rewarding shores.

Thirty years from now, the world will be celebrating the 500th anniversary of the voyage of Christopher Columbus. Thirty years from now the world will be in the hands of this younger generation. In the early start that they have made in communicating, in learning, in teaching the philosophy of the Western World there lies much hope and much promise. If all the world knows that the West is sincerely striving for a breaking of barriers, for the promotion of peace, there will be much progress toward the accomplishment of these ends.

Columbus in his faith, his courage, his endurance, and his vision led the way across unknown seas to the New World of today. The Columbuses of today are launched upon the uncertain seas of progress toward the New World of tomorrow—the world of the spirit of understanding that may stretch around the whole world to the benefit of all mankind.

ENTRY OF ALIEN SKILLED SPECIALISTS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is in the bill?

Mr. WALTER. This is a conference report on one section of a bill which passed the House last week authorizing the adjustment of immigration status of certain aliens in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. And the bill is confined strictly to this adjustment of the status of aliens?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly. As I said, the conference report relates to one section of the bill where the House did not agree to the method of adjustment embodied in the Senate bill. Now, we largely restore title 3 of the Smith Act of 1940, which had expired, as the guide for the purpose of making a determination of eligibility and obtaining the approval of the Congress for the ruling of the Attorney General.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand from the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the other body will also consider House bills that we may have passed?

Mr. WALTER. I am sure the gentleman knows the position we have taken. Today we succeeded in connection with two private bills. I am sure we will be more successful in the future because we know now how to do it.

Mr. BOW. I would like to clarify the situation. If the House considers bills from the other body, will the other body also consider bills from the House of Representatives? Can the gentleman tell me about that?

Mr. WALTER. I cannot give the gentleman any guarantee. I will say that we will be able to determine what the attitude is going to be when at the next session we report bills that pass the House and go to the Senate. We will be in a position at that time to discuss what we will do with Senate bills.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am not particularly interested in the next session of Congress. I am speaking about bills from the other body that they are interested in having considered in this session of Congress. It seems to me that bills of the House of Representatives should also be considered by the other body, and I am wondering whether the gentleman can give us assurances if we consider bills that come over here from the other body they also will consider bills sent to them?

Mr. WALTER. Of course I am very glad to inform the gentleman that this afternoon the Senate passed two bills of the House providing for the adjustment of status of two physicians, one introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and the other by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. Those bills were approved by the Senate this afternoon. As to this bill I wish to add a few words of explanation.

Basic principles of a sound immigration policy and our continuous concern to preserve the integrity of the very important international educational exchange program caused the conferees to exclude from the benefits of this legislation those aliens who enter the United States as crewmen or exchange visitors. Similar exclusion, with specified exceptions applies to natives of countries and islands contiguous or adjacent to the United States.

If any alien in these classes becomes subject to deportation proceedings, maximum relief which could be accorded him would be discretionary action by the Attorney General who may permit such alien to leave the United States without prejudice to his future, lawful entry, provided that he or she leaves the United States promptly when ordered by the Attorney General to do so.

The inclusion in the benefits of this legislation of aliens who served honorably for a stated period of time in the Armed Forces of the United States represents the incorporation into a permanent statute of a policy traditionally adhered to by the Congress in the enactment of private relief bills for the alien servicemen or ex-servicemen. Aliens serving in the Navy or the Coast Guard under a special arrangement with the Government of the Philippine Republic and aliens enlisted or inducted outside of the United States, are not subject to the relief provisions of this legislation.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to compliment the gentleman on the excellent job he has done with this bill. He is entitled to the commendation and congratulations of the whole House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2552)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of United States citizens, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same with the following amendment:

In lieu of the language proposed to be stricken by the amendment of the House, insert the following:

"Sec. 4. Section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254) is hereby amended to read:

"'Sec. 244. (a) As hereinafter prescribed in this section, the Attorney General may, in his discretion, suspend deportation and adjust the status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, in the case of an alien who applies to the Attorney General for suspension of deportation and—

"'(1) is deportable under any law of the United States except the provisions specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection; has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than seven years immediately preceding the date of such application, and proves that during all of such period he was and is a person of good moral character; and is a person whose deportation would, in the opinion of the Attorney General, result in extreme hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child, who is a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or

"'(2) is deportable under paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), or (18) of section 241(a); has been physically present in the United States for a continuous period of not less than ten years immediately following the commission of an act, or the assumption of a status, constituting a ground for deportation, and proves that during all of such period he has been and is a person of good moral character; and is a person whose deportation would, in the opinion of the Attorney General, result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child, who is a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

"'(b) The requirement of continuous physical presence in the United States specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall not be applicable to an alien who (A) has served for a minimum period of twenty-four months in an active-duty status in the armed forces of the United States and, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, and (B) at the time of his enlistment or induction was in the United States.

"'(c) (1) Upon application by any alien who is found by the Attorney General to meet the requirements of subsection (a) of this section the Attorney General may in his discretion suspend deportation of such alien. If the deportation of any alien is suspended under the provisions of this subsection, a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case shall be reported to the Congress with the reasons for such suspension. Such reports shall be submitted on the first day of each calendar month in which Congress is in session.

"'(2) In the case of an alien specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section—

if during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien or authorize the alien's voluntary departure at his own expense under the order of deportation in the manner provided by law. If, within the time above specified, neither the Senate nor the House of Representatives shall pass such a resolution, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings.

"'(3) In the case of an alien specified in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section—

if during the session of the Congress at which a case is reported, or prior to the close of the session of the Congress next following the session at which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it favors the suspension of such deportation, the Attorney General shall cancel deportation proceedings. If within the time above specified the Congress does not pass such a concurrent resolution, or if either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the suspension of the deportation of such alien, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law.

"'(d) Upon the cancellation of deportation in the case of any alien under this section, the Attorney General shall record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date the cancellation of deportation of such alien is made, and the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of entry and was not charged to the appropriate quota, reduce by one the quota of the quota to which the alien is chargeable under section 202 for the fiscal year then current at the time of cancellation or the next following year in which a quota is available. No quota shall be so reduced by more than 50 per centum in any fiscal year.

"'(e) The Attorney General may, in his discretion, permit any alien under deportation proceedings, other than an alien within the provisions of paragraph (4), (5), (6), (7), (11), (12), (14), (15), (16), (17), or (18) of section 241(a), (and also any alien within the purview of such paragraphs if he is also within the provisions of paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section), to depart voluntarily from the United States at his own expense in lieu of deportation if such alien shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he is, and has been, a person of good moral character for at least five years immediately preceding his application for voluntary departure under this subsection.

"'(f) No provision of this section shall be applicable to an alien who (1) entered the United States as a crewman; or (2) was admitted to the United States pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(J) or has acquired such status after admission to the United States; or (3) is a native of any country contiguous to the United States or of any adjacent island named in section 101(b)(5): *Provided*, That the Attorney General may in his discretion agree to the granting of suspension of deportation to an alien specified in clause (3) of this subsection if such alien establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he is ineligible to obtain a nonquota immigrant visa.'"

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its amendment numbered 2.

Francis E. Walter,
Michael A. Feighan,
Frank Chelf,
Managers on the Part of the House.
James O. Eastland,
Olin D. Johnston,
John L. McClellan,
Roman L. Hruska,
Kenneth B. Keating,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The agreement reached by the committee of conference with regard to House amendment No. 1 amends the language of section 4 of the Senate bill. The now proposed language is designed to achieve the purpose envisaged by the Senate in a modified manner. As intended by the Senate, relief would be granted to certain aliens physically present in the United States; but under the language agreed to by the committee of conference, the granting of relief will be subject to congressional review and it will be predicated on the showing of specified type and degree of personal hardship which might occur in the absence of such relief. The amended language also provides relief for aliens who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States, but it specifically excludes the granting of relief (1) to alien crewmen (seamen and airmen), (2) to persons who entered the United States under educational exchange programs, and (3) to natives of countries contiguous to the United States or of islands adjacent to the United States with certain specified exceptions.

Francis E. Walter,
Michael A. Feighan,
Frank Chelf,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the final version of the general immigration bill as agreed to by the House after a conference with the Senate, contains the following provisions:

First. An approximate number of 7,000 highly skilled immigrants whose entry was requested by American industrial enterprises, defense contractors, institutions of learning, hospitals, laboratories, and so forth, will be permitted to enter the United States, or remain in this country if they are already here, by being granted immigrant status not subject to quota limitations. The members of the skilled specialist's immediate family, namely, spouses and minor children, are included.

Second. Beneficiaries of fourth preference petitions filed by U.S. citizens who are the brothers or sisters, or parents, of the prospective immigrant, will be permitted to enter this country regardless of quota limitations, provided that they have registered for immigration at an American consulate abroad before March 31, 1954. The best approximation which the Department of State was able to furnish as to the number of those who will benefit from this provision of the bill is 16,000. The largest numbers of those relatives of U.S. citizens will be coming from Italy, Greece, Portugal, and some from Spain.

Third. In order to assist the Congress in developing a uniform policy in the important matter of admitting highly skilled immigrants, the new bill places upon the Attorney General the obligation to report to the Congress on each petition which he approves authorizing the entry of a preferential immigrant. In his reports to the Congress the Attorney General will have to state the basis for his approval of the preferential petition including an outline of the immigrant's professional qualifications and reasons why urgent need for his services exists.

Fourth. A provision of the bill worked out in conference between the House and the Senate provides for congressional approval or disapproval of every order of the Attorney General's under which an alien—in an unlawful status in the United States—may have his deportation suspended if he shows that the deportation would cause hardship to the members of his immediate family, such as children, spouses, or parents. However, hardship will be recognized only in the event that the relatives of the alien who is to be deported are either citizens of the United States or are in this country in a lawful immigrant status as permanent residents.

Suspension of deportation will not be available to alien crewmen and to persons who come to the United States under international educational exchange programs and are under obligation to return to their native countries for at least two years to give their countrymen the benefit of their American education and experience. Similarly excluded from the benefits of suspension of deportation are natives of countries and islands contiguous or adjacent to the United States. Aliens who served honorably for a minimum of 24 months in the Armed Forces of the United States are included in the new relief legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DOWDY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARBSTEIN.

Mr. PUCINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BOLAND.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1663. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;

H.R. 7781. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad;

H.R. 8563. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit certain policies to be issued to members of duly organized national veterans' organizations;

H.R. 9045. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended;

H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;

H.R. 12135. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12217. An act for the relief of George Edward Leonard;

H.R. 12434. An act to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12708. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 555. An act for the relief of Elmore County, Ala.;

H.R. 1691. An act for the relief of Elaine Veronica Brathwaite and Jessie Bamer;

H.R. 3131. An act for the relief of Richard C. Collins;

H.R. 5260. An act to continue for an additional 3-year period the existing suspensions of the tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations, or mixtures thereof;

H.R. 5700. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise;

H.R. 6190. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the repair or replacement for veterans of certain prosthetic or other appliances damaged or destroyed as a result of certain accidents;

H.R. 6691. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6836. An act to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act;

H.R. 7791. An act to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for the collection and publication of foreign commerce and trade statistics, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8140. An act to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8355. An act to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8874. An act to authorize certain banks to invest in corporations whose purpose is to provide clerical services for them, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8952. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes and relating to the taxation of life insurance companies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9285. An act for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson;

H.R. 9777. An act to amend Private Law 87–197;

H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of civilian employees of the New York Naval Shipyard and the San Francisco Naval Shipyard erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to a misrepresentation of a Navy civilian personnel instruction;

H.R. 10026. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power;

H.R. 10129. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees;

H.R. 10199. An act for the relief of Lester A. Kocher;

H.R. 10423. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy H. Johnson;

H.R. 10541. An act to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs designed to protect their populations, particularly all preschool children, against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus;

H.R. 10605. An act for the relief of Joan Rosa Orr;

H.R. 10708. An act to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity;

H.R. 10936. An act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11058. An act for the relief of Carl Adams;

H.R. 11578. An act for the relief of Don C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner;

H.R. 11899. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund;

H.R. 12313. An act for the relief of Jane Froman, Gypsy Markoff, and Jean Rosen;

H.R. 12402. An act for the relief of Concetta Maria, Rosetta, and Tomasino Mangiaracina;

H.R. 12513. An act to provide for public notice of settlements in patent interferences, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12599. An act relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 13175. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2531)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, and 16.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 9, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,870,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$73,504,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,010,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$158,218,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$107,808,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$104,576,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,872,224,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$262,745,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$400,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 4, 13, and 18.

CLARENCE CANNON
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
BEN F. JENSEN (I reserve on title IV),
JOHN TABER (I reserve on title IV and the $400,000,000),
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
LISTER HILL,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ROBERT S. KERR,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE 1—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Corps of Engineers—Civil

General Investigations

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $17,870,300 instead of $16,561,900 as proposed by the House and $19,192,300 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

Item	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963	Conference allowance
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
1. Surveys:		
(a) Navigation studies	$1,600,000	$2,051,600
(b) Flood control studies	4,600,000	5,428,700
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies	250,000	250,000
(d) Special studies:		
San Francisco Bay survey	200,000	200,000
Ohio River Basin review	600,000	500,000
Potomac River review	75,000	75,000
Colorado River, Tex	228,000	228,000
Great Lakes water levels	85,000	110,000
Rampart Canyon, Alaska	315,000	315,000
Arkansas-Red River pollution study	177,000	227,000
Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal	220,000	220,000
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway	200,000	200,000
Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y	200,000	200,000
Susquehanna River Basin	300,000	300,000
Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J	150,000	150,000
Red River, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex	250,000	300,000
Meramac River Basin, Mo	215,000	215,000
Pascagoula River Basin, Miss	100,000	100,000
Willamette River Basin, Oreg	100,000	100,000
Grand River Basin, Mich	100,000	100,000
Connecticut River Basin	100,000	100,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	200,000	200,000
White River Basin, Ark. and Mo	100,000	100,000
Brazos River Basin, Tex	100,000	140,000
Hurricane studies	945,000	945,000
Coordination studies with other agencies	300,000	300,000
Basin planning	400,000	----------
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued		
1. Surveys:—Continued		
(d) Special studies—Continued		
Kanawha River Basin, W. Va	----------	$200,000
Subtotal, surveys	$12,110,000	13,255,300
2. Collection and study of basic data:		
(a) Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	250,000	250,000
(b) Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	380,000	380,000
(c) Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	100,000	100,000
(d) International water studies	85,000	85,000
(e) Flood plain studies	700,000	700,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	1,515,000	1,515,000
3. Research and development:		
(a) Beach erosion development studies	400,000	400,000
(b) Hydrologic studies	175,000	175,000
(c) Civil works investigations	1,550,000	1,300,000
(d) Mississippi Basin model:		
(1) Construction	650,000	650,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study	200,000	200,000
(e) Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction	665,000	500,000
Subtotal, research and development	3,640,000	3,225,000
Other reductions and slippages	----------	−125,000
Total, general investigations	17,265,000	17,870,300

Navigation studies: The increase above the House figure includes $233,000 for surveys added by the Senate. None of the funds provided are to be used for the Great Salt Lake, Garfield, Utah, navigation study.

Flood control studies: The increase of $503,200 above the House figure is for studies added by the Senate including $60,000 for the Missouri River, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Nebr., navigation study. None of the funds provided are to be used for the Sac River and Butte Basin, Calif., study.

Other reductions and slippages: The reduction of $125,000 under this heading agreed upon by the conferees is to be applied to the budgeted general investigations program for the north central division.

Construction General

Amendment No. 2—Reported in disagreement: The managers on the part of the House will move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment substituting the amount of $791,580,500 instead of $762,361,000 as proposed by the House and $807,962,500 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are not in agreement as to the $205,000 budgeted for the Cross Florida Barge Canal. The motion to be made by the managers on the part of the House will exclude this amount.

The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

	Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Alabama:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Claiborne lock and dam		$210,000		$210,000
(N)	Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	$2,254,000		$2,179,000	
(N)	Holt lock and dam	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam		150,000		150,000
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Mobile Harbor			600,000	
(FC)	Paint Rock River	350,000		350,000	
	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi. (See Mississippi.)				
(MP)	Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	8,138,000		8,073,000	
	Alaska:				
(MP)	Bradley Lake		†100,000		
(FC)	Fairbanks		60,000		60,000
(N)	Juneau Harbor	760,000		760,000	
	Arizona:				
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir			500,000	
(FC)	Gila and Salt Rivers		90,000		90,000
(FC)	Gila River and tributaries—downstream from Painted Rock		†100,000		100,000
(FC)	Tucson	400,000		400,000	
	Arkansas:				
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:				
	(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	18,000,000		18,000,000	
	(b) Navigation locks and dams		2,000,000	300,000	2,000,000
(MP)	Beaver Reservoir	14,000,000		14,000,000	
(MP)	Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo., additions of units Nos. 7 and 8	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(MP)	Dardanelle lock and dam	16,000,000		16,000,000	
(FC)	De Queen Reservoir		50,000		50,000
(MP)	DeGray Reservoir	950,000		1,550,000	
(FC)	Dierks Reservoir				30,000
(FC)	Garland City, Red River	150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Gillham Reservoir		99,000	350,000	99,000
(MP)	Greers Ferry Reservoir	4,900,000		4,832,000	
(FC)	Millwood Reservoir	9,500,000		9,500,000	
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La		235,000	165,000	235,000
(N)	Ozark lock and dam		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	300,000		300,000	
	California:				
(FC)	Alameda Creek		†100,000		100,000
(FC)	Bear Creek	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Black Butte Reservoir	3,529,000		3,529,000	
(FC)	Camanche Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(R)	Crescent City Harbor (breakwater)	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Drycreek Reservoir channel improvement		†100,000		
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir		†75,000		
(BE)	Imperial Beach, San Diego County (reimbursement)	20,000		20,000	
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	15,000,000		15,000,000	
(N)	Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors (1960 act)			1,705,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,700,000		1,700,000	
(N)	Monterey Harbor		90,000		90,000
(R)	Morro Bay (breakwater)	800,000		800,000	
(FC)	New Hogan Reservoir	4,140,000		4,140,000	
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor Mooring Basin				26,000
(BE)	Oceanside (reimbursement)	672,000		672,000	
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	15,000,000		14,000,000	
(FC)	Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection		50,000	150,000	50,000
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Sacramento River deep water ship channel	5,910,000		5,910,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River flood control project	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(BE)	Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	70,000		70,000	
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor	1,520,000		1,520,000	
(FC)	Stewart Canyon debris basin	522,000		522,000	
(FC)	Tahchevah Creek		110,000		110,000
(FC)	Walnut Creek		225,000		225,000
(FC)	West Fork Reservoir		100,000		100,000
	Colorado:				
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir		155,000		155,000
	Connecticut:				
(FC)	Ansonia-Derby		†100,000		
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir				50,000
(N)	Bridgeport Harbor, Black Rock Harbor		26,000		26,000
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(FC)	East Branch Reservoir	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Hancock Brook Reservoir	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Mad River Reservoir	1,826,000		1,826,000	
(FC)	Northfield Brook Reservoir			400,000	
(FC)	Stamford		250,000		250,000
(FC)	West Thompson Reservoir		142,000	342,000	
	Delaware:				
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages at Reedy Point, Deepwater Point, and enlarging Marcus Hook and Mantau Creek anchorages, Delaware and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)				
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (main dikes), Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)				
(R)	Indian River Inlet (bulkheads)	750,000		750,000	
(N)	Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake & Delaware Canal), part II, Delaware and Maryland.	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(BE)	Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)	110,000		110,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Florida:				
(N)	Apalachicola River	$500,000		$500,000	
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Bakers Haulover Inlet		$15,000	25,000	$15,000
(N)	Canaveral Harbor		†80,000		80,000
(FC)	Central and Southern Florida	13,500,000		13,500,000	
(N)	Cross Florida Barge Canal		205,000		
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway:				
	(a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	900,000		900,000	
	(b) Jacksonville to Miami	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Miami Harbor (1960 act)	400,000		400,000	
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	15,000		15,000	
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)	677,000		677,000	
(N)	St. Marks River	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	St. Petersburg Harbor (deferred)		10,000		10,000
	Georgia:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(MP)	Carters Dam	2,500,000		2,500,000	
	Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
(MP)	Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C	3,700,000		3,649,500	
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
(MP)	West Point Dam		†100,000		100,000
	Hawaii:				
(N)	Hilo Harbor		600,000		600,000
(FC)	Wailoa Stream	200,000		200,000	
	Idaho:				
(MP)	Bruces Eddy Reservoir			2,000,000	
(FC)	Columbia River local protection:				
	Boise Valley		21,000		21,000
(FC)	Ririe Dam		†75,000		75,000
	Illinois:				
(FC)	Beardstown	900,000		900,000	
(N)	Calumet Harbor and River, Ind. and Ill		†110,000		
(R)	Calumet Harbor and River (breakwater), Ill. and Ind	600,000		600,000	
(N)	Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.:				
	29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor, and 27-foot entrance	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(BA)	Calumet River bridge alterations	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	6,400,000		6,400,000	
(R)	Chicago Harbor (breakwater)		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	70,000		70,000	
(FC)	Clear Lake Special Drainage District				40,000
(N)	Dam 27, Mississippi River between St. Louis and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri	858,000		858,000	
(FC)	Drury Drainage District	435,000		435,000	
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	Freeport				50,000
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 1		32,000		32,000
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 2		38,000		38,000
(FC)	Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	150,000		150,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag Channel, Part I, Illinois and Indiana	9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC)	Indian Grave Drainage District	50,000		50,000	
(N)	Kaskaskia River		†100,000		
(N)	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:				
	(a) Regulating works	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	(b) Chain of Rocks	50,000		50,000	
(FC)	Mount Carmel		†75,000		75,000
(FC)	New Athens		73,000		73,000
(FC)	Oakley Reservoir		†125,000		125,000
(FC)	Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	326,000		326,000	
(FC)	Sny Island Levee Drainage District		100,000		100,000
(FC)	South Quincy Drainage and Levee District		27,000		27,000
(FC)	Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	The Sny Basin	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Tri Pond levee		48,000		48,000
	Indiana:				
(FC)	Brookville Reservoir				75,000
	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
(N)	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	2,750,000		2,750,000	
(FC)	Evansville	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Greenfield Bayou levee (deferred)		10,000		10,000
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir			1,000,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
(N)	Indiana Harbor, 1960 act	510,000		510,000	
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	250,000		350,000	
	Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
(FC)	Mason J. Niblack levee	700,000		700,000	
	McAlpine locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)				
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir	1,690,000		1,690,000	
(FC)	Monroe Reservoir	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Newburg lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky				150,000
(FC)	Salamonie Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		200,000		200,000
(FC)	West Terre Haute	332,000		332,000	
	Iowa:				
(FC)	Chariton River, Iowa and Missouri				50,000
(FC)	Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge		40,000		40,000
(FC)	Des Moines		40,000		40,000
(FC)	Floyd River and tributaries	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Indian Creek		†50,000		50,000
(FC)	Iowa River—Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Little Sioux River	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska (active units)	2,300,000		3,000,000	
(N)	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:				
	(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	6,000,000		6,000,000	
	(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,400,000		2,400,000	
	(c) Kansas City to the mouth	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13	150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Rathbun Reservoir		159,000		159,000
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	9,800,000		9,800,000	
	Kansas:				
(FC)	Cedar Point Reservoir (deferred)		25,000		25,000
(FC)	Council Grove Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Dodge City		†50,000		50,000
(FC)	Elk City Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000	
(N)	Fort Leavenworth Bridge	430,000		430,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Kansas—Continued				
(FC)	Fort Scott Reservoir (deferred)		$30,000		$30,000
(FC)	Frankfort	$825,000		$825,000	
(FC)	John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo.	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	Lawrence		78,000		78,000
(FC)	Manhattan	1,050,000		1,050,000	
(FC)	Marion Reservoir		71,000		71,000
(FC)	Melvern Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Milford Reservoir	11,600,000		11,600,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Osawatomie		40,000		40,000
(F)	Perry Reservoir			750,000	
(FC)	Pomona Reservoir	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	Topeka	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	Tuttle Creek Reservoir	2,632,000		2,632,000	
(FC)	Wilson Reservoir	4,400,000		4,400,000	
	Kentucky:				
(MP)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn.	31,200,000		31,147,000	
(FC)	Barren River Reservoir	10,110,000		10,110,000	
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(N)	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	10,200,000		10,172,000	
(FC)	Cave Run Reservoir		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Corbin	200,000		400,000	
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	6,700,000		6,700,000	
(FC)	Frankfort (deferred)				25,000
(FC)	Grayson Reservoir		371,000		371,000
(FC)	Green River Reservoir			1,000,000	
(MP)	Laurel River Reservoir		653,000		653,000
(N)	Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	7,977,000		7,785,000	
(N)	McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky	3,500,000		3,500,000	
	Newburgh lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Nolin Reservoir	2,536,000		2,447,500	
	Uniontown lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
	Louisiana:				
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	940,000		940,000	
(N)	Bayou LaFourche and LaFourche Jump Waterway	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Bayou Le Carpe			[1] (45,000)	
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass (1960 act)	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River salt water barrier				56,000
(FC)	Campti Clarence levee				50,000
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	600,000		600,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico	2,569,000		2,569,000	
(N)	Mississippi River gulf outlet	8,000,000		8,000,000	
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice, La., Hurricane Protection		†265,000		265,000
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)				
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)				
	Maine:				
(N)	Bass Harbor			[1] (183,000)	
(N)	Kennebunk River				17,000
(N)	Portland Harbor, deepen to 45 ft			550,000	
	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, N.H., and Maine. (See New Hampshire.)				
(N)	Searsport Harbor				10,000
	Maryland:				
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and channels (1958 act)	4,100,000		4,100,000	
(FC)	Bloomington Reservoir		†100,000		
	Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake & Delaware Canal), part II, Delaware and Maryland. (See Delaware.)				
(N)	Pocomoke River	300,000		300,000	
	Massachusetts:				
(R)	Cape Cod Canal-Bourne Bridge		38,000		38,000
(FC)	Chicopee Falls	350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Conant Brook Reservoir		160,000		160,000
(FC)	Littleville Reservoir	1,900,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet barriers	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Provincetown Harbor		15,000		15,000
(FC)	Three Rivers		50,000	350,000	
(FC)	Wareham-Marion		†73,000		73,000
(BE)	Wessagussett Beach (reimbursement)	23,000		23,000	
(FC)	Westfield		120,000		120,000
	Michigan:				
(N)	Detroit River channel north of Belle Isle			[1] (380,000)	
(N)	Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(N)	Gladstone Harbor Little Bay DeNoc			[1] (350,000)	
(R)	Grand Haven Harbor (piers and revetment)	830,000		830,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	3,200,000		3,200,000	
(N)	Hammond Bay Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(R)	Holland Harbor (piers, revetment, and breakwater)	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Little Lake Harbor	610,000		610,000	
(R)	Ludington Harbor (piers, revetments, and breakwater)		40,000		40,000
(N)	Manistee Harbor	900,000		900,000	
(R)	Manistee Harbor (piers, revetment, and breakwater)		45,000		45,000
(R)	Manistique Harbor (breakwaters)	300,000		300,000	
(R)	Marquette Harbor (minor rehabilitation)	(300,000)		(300,000)	
(R)	Menominee Harbor (piers), Michigan and Wisconsin	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Presque Isle Harbor (minor rehabilitation)	(140,000)		(140,000)	
(FC)	River Rouge		†50,000		50,000
(N)	Saginaw River	1,666,000		1,666,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River	300,000		300,000	
(R)	St. Joseph Harbor (piers and revetments)	81,000		81,000	
(N)	St. Marys River, New Poe lock	750,000		750,000	
(R)	South Haven Harbor (piers and revetments)	570,000		570,000	
	Minnesota:				
(N)	Duluth-Superior Harbor:				
	(a) Inner Harbor 27-foot and 23-foot channels	300,000		300,000	
	(b) Outer Harbor 32-foot to 27-foot channel	2,580,000		2,580,000	
(FC)	Marshall, Redwood River	750,000		750,000	
(R)	Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River (Winnibigoshish Dam)		30,000		30,000
(N)	St. Anthony Falls extension	4,430,000		4,430,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	1,700,000		1,700,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Mississippi:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Jackson and East Jackson		$123,000	$500,000	
(FC)	Okatibbee Creek Reservoir				$150,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor			1,500,000	
(FC)	Tombigbee River and tributaries		106,000		106,000
	Missouri.				
	Bull Shoals Reservoir, units 7 and 8, Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Canton	$200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Cape Girardeau and vicinity	200,000		200,000	
	Chariton River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Iowa.)				
	Dam 27, Mississippi River between St. Louis and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Gregory Drainage District				50,000
(FC)	Hannibal		†50,000		50,000
(MP)	Joanna Reservoir				100,000
	Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)				
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir (with power)		267,000		267,000
(FC)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill., and Mo., regulating works. (See Illinois.)				
	MissouriRiver agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	180,000		180,000	
(FC)	St. Louis	8,800,000		8,800,000	
(FC)	South River Drainage District			100,000	
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	900,000		900,000	
(FC)	Union Township Drainage District				40,000
	Montana:				
(MP)	Libby Reservoir		2,600,000		2,600,000
	Nebraska:				
(FC)	Little Papillion Creek		†50,000		50,000
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Norfolk				80,000
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Waterloo			[1] (100,000)	
	Nevada:				
(FC)	Humboldt River (deferred)		15,000		15,000
(FC)	Las Vegas Wash		100,000		100,000
	New Hampshire:				
(FC)	Claremont Reservoir (deferred)		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Hopkinton-Everett Reservoi	2,587,000		2,567,000	
(N)	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, N.H. and Maine				100,000
	New Jersey:				
(BE)	Atlantic City (reimbursement)	129,000		129,000	
(BE)	Barnegat Light (reimbursement)	62,000		62,000	
(R)	Cold Spring Inlet (breakwater)		15,000		15,000
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton, Pennsylvania and New Jersey	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages at Reedy Point, Deepwater Point, and enlarging Marcus Hook and Mantua Creek anchorages			300,000	
(R)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (main dikes) New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware	750,000		750,000	
(BE)	Long Beach Island (reimbursement)	42,000		42,000	
(R)	Manasquan Inlet (bulkheads)		10,000		10,000
(R)	New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway (jetties)		12,000		12,000
(BE)	Ocean City (reimbursement)	158,000		158,000	
(BE)	Raritan Bay-Sandy Hook Bay			500,000	
(MP)	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J		†200,000		
	New Mexico:				
(FC)	Alamagordo Diversion Channel				50,000
(FC)	Cochiti Reservoir		350,000		350,000
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Las Cruces		†50,000		
(FC)	Socorro	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Two Rivers Reservoir	1,911,000		1,911,000	
	New York:				
(FC)	Allegany (deferred)		7,000		7,000
	Allegheny River Reservoir, N.Y. and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(N)	Buffalo Harbor:				
	(a) Deepen north entrance, Buffalo River entrance, Buffalo River, Buffalo Ship canal	450,000		450,000	
	(b) South entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channel (1960 act)	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point		250,000	750,000	250,000
(N)	Flushing Bay and Creek			1,500,000	
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	400,000		400,000	
(R)	Great Sodus Bay (piers)	473,000		473,000	
(FC)	Herkimer	880,000		880,000	
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany	5,300,000		5,300,000	
(FC)	Ithaca (Cayuga Inlet)		112,000		112,000
(FC)	Lackawanna		78,000		78,000
(FC)	Lake Chatauqua and Chadakoin River		35,000		35,000
(N)	New York Harbor, 35-foot channel from ocean to bayside	1,537,000		1,537,000	
(N)	Rochester Harbor	900,000		900,000	
(BE)	Selkirk Shores State Park (reimbursement)	40,000		40,000	
(FC)	South Amsterdam	300,000		300,000	
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (see New Jersey).				
	North Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	New Hope Reservoir		†100,000		100,000
(FC)	Wilkesboro Reservoir	800,000		779,000	
	North Dakota:				
(FC)	Bowman-Haley Reservoir				180,000
(MP)	Garrison Reservoir	600,000		600,000	
	Oahe Reservoir, N. Dak. and S. Dak. (See South Dakota.)				
	Ohio:				
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor (1960 act)	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Big Darby Creek Reservoir				250,000
(FC)	Buck Creek Reservoir				75,000
	Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
(N)	Cleveland Harbor:				
	(a) Bridge replacements widening, Cuyahoga and Old River and deepening channel in east basin and outer harbor (1958 act)	300,000		300,000	
	(b) 28-foot approach channel, 27-foot entrance channel, 27-foot river channel, 28 feet in west basin (1960 act)	1,000,000		1,000,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Ohio—Continued				
(R)	Cleveland Harbor (breakwater)	$253,000		$253,000	
(R)	Conneaut Harbor (breakwater)	265,000		265,000	
(FC)	Deer Creek Reservoir				$250,000
(N)	Fairport Harbor	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		$100,000		100,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor (1960 act)	3,000,000		3,000,000	
	Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
(FC)	Paint Creek Reservoir				250,000
(N)	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	12,400,000		12,348,250	
(N)	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		395,000		395,000
(N)	Sandusky Harbor (1960 act)	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(R)	Sandusky Harbor (east jetty)	200,000		200,000	
	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(N)	Toledo Harbor (1950, 1958, and 1960 acts)	4,700,000		4,700,000	
(FC)	West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	2,400,000		2,400,000	
	Oklahoma:				
	Arkansas-Red Rivers salinity control (initial phase), Oklahoma and Texas. (See Texas.)				
	Arkansas River and tributaries bank stabilization and channel rectification, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
	Arkansas River and tributaries navigation locks and dam, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Birch Reservoir				20,000
(FC)	Broken Bow Reservoir	3,400,000		3,400,000	
(MP)	Eufaula Reservoir	31,300,000		31,265,000	
(FC)	Kaw Reservoir		†75,000		75,000
(FC)	Keystone Reservoir	21,000,000		20,990,000	
(FC)	Optima Reservoir				50,000
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir	600,000		600,000	
(MP)	Short Mountain lock and dam		531,000		531,000
(FC)	Skiatook Reservoir		†40,000		
(N)	Webbers Falls lock and dam		325,000		325,000
	Oregon:				
(N)	Columbia and Lower Willamette River below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.:				
	(a) 40-foot channel		†100,000		
	(b) 35 feet from mouth of Willamette River to Vancouver				
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		130,000		130,000
(R)	Columbia River at the mouth (jetties), Oregon and Washington	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Columbia River local protection:				
	John Day River		20,000		20,000
(N)	Coos and Millicoma Rivers				23,000
(R)	Coos Bay (south jetty)	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(MP)	Cougar Reservoir	9,100,000		9,079,000	
(FC)	Fall Creek Reservoir	1,900,000		1,900,000	
(MP)	Green Peter Reservoir	6,100,000		6,100,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	43,000,000		43,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:				
	Beaver Drainage District	516,000		516,000	
(R)	Siuslaw River (south jetty)	720,000		720,000	
(R)	Tillamook Bay and Harbor (north jetty)	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Umpqua River (south jetty)	2,160,000		2,160,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	600,000		600,000	
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor		100,000		100,000
(R)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor (jetties)		30,000		30,000
	Pennsylvania:				
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	24,800,000		24,800,000	
(FC)	Beltzville Reservoir		†100,000		100,000
(FC)	Bethlehem	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Blanchard Reservoir		350,000		350,000
(FC)	Butler	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Curwensville Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(N)	Dam 4, Monongahela River	500,000		500,000	
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (main dikes) Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)				
	Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton. (See New Jersey.)				
(N)	Erie Harbor (1960 act)	1,220,000		1,220,000	
(FC)	Latrobe		75,000		75,000
(N)	Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	7,800,000		7,748,250	
(BE)	Presque Isle Peninsula (reimbursement)	186,000		186,000	
(FC)	Ridgway	241,000		241,000	
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.	7,600,000		7,600,000	
(FC)	Tioga-Hammond Reservoir		100,000		
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Turtle Creek	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Union City Reservoir		†50,000		50,000
	Puerto Rico:				
(N)	San Juan Harbor	4,500,000		4,500,000	
	Rhode Island:				
(FC)	Fox Point barrier	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Woonsocket	300,000		300,000	
(R)	Point Judith Harbor (breakwater)	810,000		810,000	
	South Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Charleston Harbor (1945 act)	824,000		824,000	
	Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C. (See Georgia.)				
	South Dakota:				
(MP)	Big Bend Reservoir	26,000,000		26,000,000	
(FC)	Cottonwood Springs Reservoirs (deferred)		15,000		15,000
(MP)	Fort Randall Reservoir	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	20,000,000		20,000,000	
	Tennessee:				
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)				
(MP)	Cordell Hull Dam		309,000	1,000,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir		404,000	1,000,000	
	Texas:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Arkansas-Red Rivers salinity control (initial phase), Oklahoma and Texas			300,000	
(N)	Barbour Cut, La Porte			(58,500)	
(FC)	Bardwell Reservoir	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Big Fossil Creek		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Blieders Creek Reservoir, New Braunfels		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	4,800,000		4,800,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Texas—Continued				
(FC)	Canyon Reservoir	$3,200,000		$3,200,000	
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway (Clear Fork)		†$75,000		$75,000
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway upstream extension		70,000		70,000
(R)	Galveston Harbor (jetties)	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:				
	Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	450,000		450,000	
(R)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor (Dikes)		25,000		25,000
(N)	Houston ship channel:				
	(a) Bend easing and widening to 36-foot depth only	3,500,000		3,500,000	
	(b) Deepening to 40 feet (phase II)	948,000		948,000	
(N)	Matagorda ship channel, 38- and 36-foot channels	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(MP)	McGee Bend Dam	10,200,000		10,200,000	
(FC)	Navarro Mills Reservoir	2,080,000		2,080,000	
(N)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway:				
	(a) Channel to Viola, 36-foot depth, phase I	450,000		450,000	
	(b) Deepening existing project to 40 and 42 feet			500,000	
(FC)	Port Arthur—Hurricane protection		†115,000		115,000
(FC)	Proctor Reservoir	4,600,000		4,600,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Somerville Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	1,700,000		1,700,000	
(FC)	Texas City	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(R)	Texas City Channel (dike)		40,000		40,000
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayou		†50,000		
(FC)	Waco Reservoir	15,000,000		15,000,000	
	Utah:				
(FC)	Weber River	250,000		250,000	
	Vermont:				
(R)	Burlington Harbor (breakwater)	800,000		800,000	
	Virginia:				
(FC)	Gathright Reservoir and Falling Springs reregulating dam (deferred)		40,000		40,000
(FC)	John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Norfolk		†87,000		87,000
(FC)	North Fork of Pound Reservoir	500,000		500,000	
	Washington:				
(FC)	Colfax	1,200,000		1,200,000	
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington—jetties. (See Oregon.)				
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(N)	Everett Harbor and Snohomish River	1,208,000		1,208,000	
(FC)	Howard A. Hanson (Eagle Gorge) Reservoir	200,000		200,000	
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	1,600,000		1,600,000	
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:				
	Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Lower Columbia River levees at new locations:				
	Kalama River, south area				10,000
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam		500,000		500,000
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	18,500,000		18,500,000	
(FC)	Pullman		25,000		25,000
(FC)	Sammamish River	1,060,000		1,060,000	
	West Virginia:				
	Bellville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Buckhannon		†30,000		30,000
(FC)	Burnsville Reservoir (deferred)		35,000		65,000
(FC)	East Lynn Reservoir		100,000		100,000
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(N)	Opekiska lock and dam	6,000,000		6,000,000	
	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Summersville Reservoir	9,750,000		9,750,000	
	Wisconsin:				
(N)	Ashland Harbor	340,000		340,000	
	Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin. (See Minnesota.)				
(FC)	Eau Galle River	340,000		340,000	
(N)	Green Bay Harbor			200,000	
(N)	Kenosha Harbor				15,000
	Menominee Harbor (piers), Michigan and Wisconsin. (See Michigan.)				
(R)	Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		360,000	
(R)	Sheboygan Harbor (pier and breakwater)	320,000		320,000	
(R)	Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan ship canal (revetments)	360,000		360,000	
	Wyoming:				
(FC)	Jackson Hole	430,000		430,000	
(FC)	Sheridan	600,000		600,000	
	Miscellaneous:				
(FC)	Emergency bank protection	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation	3,000,000		4,000,000	
(N)	Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation (costing up to $200,000)	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Snagging and clearing	200,000		200,000	
	Projects deferred for restudy		(217,000)		(272,000)
	Recreation facilities, completed projects	4,000,000		4,150,000	
	Small authorized projects	1,500,000		3,000,000	
	Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	600,000		600,000	
(R)	Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000)	2,500,000		2,500,000	
	Employees compensation	22,000		22,000	
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−60,000,000		−70,000,000	
	Grand total, construction, general	761,045,000	19,600,000	772,086,500	19,494,000
		(780,645,000)		(791,580,500)	

---

†Submitted in S. Doc. No. 135.

[1] Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.

[2] Eligible for selection under small navigation program not requiring specific legislation.

Missouri River Agricultural Levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska (active units): The increase above the budget includes funds for initiating construction on units L-601, L-594, R-345-330 and L-351, and planning for unit L-15.

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $73,504,000 instead of $70,500,000 as proposed by the House and $75,954,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows.

Projects	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
1. General investigations:				
(a) Examinations and surveys	$42,500		$62,500	
(b) Collection and study of basic data	82,500		82,500	
Subtotal, general investigations	125,000		145,000	
2. Construction and planning:				
Mississippi River levees	$2,200,000		$2,600,000	
Channel improvement	25,500,000		26,500,000	
Memphis Harbor	800,000		800,000	
Greenville Harbor	1,530,000		1,530,000	
Old River control	4,200,000		4,174,000	
St. Francis Basin	3,900,000		3,900,000	$60,000
Lower White River	850,000		850,000	
Cache Basin		$100,000		100,000
West Tennessee tributaries	600,000		600,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	100,000		100,000	
Lower Arkansas	500,000		550,000	
Tensas Basin:				
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	1,740,000		1,740,000	
Red River backwater	$35,000		$35,000	
Yazoo Basin:				
Sardis Reservoir	30,000		30,000	
Enid Reservoir	53,000		53,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	30,000		30,000	
Grenada Reservoir	37,000		37,000	
Greenwood	700,000		700,000	
Main stem	2,050,000		2,050,000	
Tributaries	660,000		660,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc	1,200,000		1,200,000	
Yazoo backwater	900,000		900,000	
Atchafalaya Basin	4,900,000		4,900,000	
Lake Pontchartrain	760,000		760,000	
Subtotal, construction and planning	53,275,000	$100,000	54,699,000	$160,000
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−1,500,000		−1,500,000	
Total, construction and planning	51,775,000	100,000	53,199,000	160,000
3. Maintenance	18,500,000		20,000,000	
Grand total	70,500,000		73,504,000	

Amendment No. 4: Reported in disagreement. The managers will move to recede and concur with language inserted in the bill by the Senate concerning the use of funds provided for the Cache River, Ark.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

General Investigations

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6: Appropriate $8,400,000 instead of $7,100,000 as proposed by the House and $9,420,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that $7,010,000 of the amount shall be derived from the Reclamation Fund instead of $5,610,000 as proposed by the House and $8,030,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes funds for: central Arizona, $500,000; Passamaquoddy, $200,000; Maxwell, Ariz., $60,000; Ouray unit, central Utah, $30,000; delivery of Colorado water to Mexico, $285,000; and up to $100,000 for weather modification research. No funds have been provided for the Pendleton, Oreg., project, and the Senate increase proposed for the Sonora-Keystone, Calif., project has been disallowed.

Construction and Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $158,218,000 instead of $153,077,000 as proposed by the House and $160,361,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided under this heading are to be distributed as follows:

Project	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Advance planning	$1,705,000	$1,030,000
Gila project, Arizona	3,000,000	2,000,000
Colorado River front work and levee system, Arizona-California	250,000	550,000
Central Valley project, California	47,401,000	47,401,000
Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake pipe rehabilitation, Idaho	519,000	519,000
Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas	7,100,000	7,100,000
Washoe project, Nevada-California	198,315	198,315
Rio Grande project, New Mexico		80,000
Norman project, Oklahoma	7,500,000	7,500,000
Rogue River Basin, Talent division, Oregon	439,000	439,000
The Dalles project, Western division, Oregon	1,025,000	1,025,000
Vale project, Bully Creek extension, Oregon	1,765,000	1,765,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California	515,000	515,000
Canadian River project, Texas	10,000,000	10,000,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas	1,500,000	1,500,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas	1,940,000	1,940,000
San Angelo project, Texas	2,770,000	2,690,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	10,538,000	10,538,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington	2,136,000	2,136,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	4,569,000	4,569,000
Drainage and minor construction	3,956,054	3,956,054
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	5,346,000	5,346,000
Subtotal	114,172,369	112,797,369

Project	Budget estimate	Conference allowance
Missouri River Basin project:		
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska	$5,800,000	$5,800,000
Almena unit, Kansas	4,826,000	4,826,000
Cedar Bluff unit, Kansas	906,000	906,000
East Bench unit, Montana	5,620,000	5,620,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska	6,800,000	6,800,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	1,714,000	1,714,000
Glen Elder unit, Kansas	750,000	750,000
Oahe unit, James section, South Dakota	220,000	220,000
Transmission division	14,449,000	14,379,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	12,150,000	12,150,000
Drainage and minor construction	1,705,631	1,820,631
Investigations	1,488,000	1,143,000
Advance planning	1,284,000	1,284,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project	57,802,631	57,412,631
Other Department of the Interior agencies	3,240,000	3,008,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	61,042,631	60,420,631
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	175,215,000	173,218,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−13,515,000	−15,000,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	161,700,000	158,218,000

Advance planning: The increase above the House figure includes funds for: Fryingpan-Arkansas, $500,000; Arbuckle, Okla., $350,000; and Washoe, Nev., $50,000.

Missouri River Basin project, transmission division: The conferees on the part of both Houses are in agreement that the Bureau shall proceed immediately with the budget program for Federal construction of the Creston, Iowa—Fairport, Mo., transmission line.

Missouri River Basin project, investigations: The amount provided includes funds for: Turner and Clay Counties, S. Dak., $20,000; Cannonball division, Montana, $20,000; and Musselshell River, Mont., $25,000. The conferees are in agreement on the Senate reduction of $77,000 in the funds for the northeast Montana division.

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $36,444,600 as proposed. by the Senate instead of $38,150,000 as proposed by the House.

Loan Program

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $12,517,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,173,000 as proposed by the House.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

Amendments Nos. 10, 11, and 12: Appropriate $107,808,000 instead of $106,508,000 as proposed by the House and $109,576,000 as proposed by the Senate, provide that $104,576,000 instead of $103,276,000 as proposed by the House and $105,576,000 as proposed by the Senate shall be available for the Upper Colorado River Basin fund, and provide that $3,232,000 as proposed by the House instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities.

The increase above the House figure includes $550,000 for San Juan-Chama and restoration of $750,000 of the House reduction for slippage. Of the funds available for the Seedskadee, Wyo., project, $95,000 shall be available for the Lincoln County, Wyo., road between U.S. Highway 189 and the Bureau of Reclamation community at Fontenelle.

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Atomic Energy Commission

Operating Expenses

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $2,872,224,000 instead of $2,860,974,000 as proposed

by the House and $2,885,391,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The increase above the House figure includes the following: $3,000,000 for the cooperative power reactor demonstration program; $2,000,000 for the advanced space power system portion of the satellite and small power sources program; $5,000,000 for the physical research program; $500,000 for the food irradiation programs; and $750,000 for program direction and administration.

Plant Acquisition and Construction

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Appropriate $262,745,000 instead of $261,845,000 as proposed by the House and $267,895,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that $4,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate be used for improvement on U.S. Highway 95, Nevada.

The increase above the House figure includes $250,000 for the Argonne National Laboratory cafeteria, and $650,000 for food irradiators.

The conferees direct that $4,500,000 of funds available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads for construction of U.S. Highway 95, Nevada.

St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

Amendment No. 17: Limits administrative expenses to $414,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $425,000 as proposed by the House.

U.S. Study Commission—Southeast River Basins—Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, making funds under this heading available until December 31, 1963, instead of December 31, 1962.

TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Public works acceleration

Amendment No. 19: Inserts heading and language as proposed by the Senate and appropriates $400,000,000 instead of $500,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers on the part of the House endorse the Senate report statements on the accelerated public works program.

In addition the conferees on the part of both Houses direct that emphasis be placed on community facilities projects requiring local matching funds such as water and sewer systems, public buildings and hospitals, streets and sidewalks.

The conferees on the part of both Houses direct also that no funds are to be made available for all-Federal research laboratories of the type normally requiring separate item review and approval of the Congress in the regular appropriation processes, or for all-Federal projects of any other type costing more than $400,000.

These conditions are being applied pending a budgetary presentation identifying specific projects for the remainder of the program.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 20: Changes title number.

Amendments Nos. 21 through 27: Change section numbers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
BEN F. JENSEN (I reserve on title IV),
JOHN TABER (I reserve on title IV and the $400,000,000 appropriation),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the budget estimates on this bill aggregated $5,651,751,000. As it passed the Senate, there was a total of $4,613,807,900. We bring it to the House of Representatives after conference as $5,067,869,400. That figure is below the budget estimate by $583,881,600. It is above the House bill by $454,061,500. It is below the Senate figure in the sum of $143,402,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes back to the House in the form of a conference report which has been agreed to by all the Members of the Senate and the House conference, with the exception of one item on which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I disagreed on, and that was the $400 million for the President's public works total request of $900 million, known as the accelerated public works program, as I recall.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is too much to say about this. I am sure that if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] or I would offer an amendment to strike the $400 million, it would not prevail in the House of Representatives tonight. Therefore, I can only hope that the House will accept the conference figures which the House reduced by many millions of dollars below the Senate figure for these many public works projects. Most of them are good projects and will bring great revenue back to the Federal Treasury in due time. Of course, there are some of these projects which are not reimbursable. But in almost every instance where flood control projects are supported with Federal funds the local municipalities, the various areas and counties and regions do contribute a considerable sum in participation.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that the House will approve the conference report because I feel that it is completely justified; and also because we did reduce the budget considerably in the first instance and have reduced the other body's request by many millions of dollars.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I notice on page 22 of the report, funds appropriated to the President under title IV are $400 million. That is the accelerated public works program about which the gentleman spoke, is it not?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. This is what has been of concern to me on this accelerated program. I think it is fully documented in the hearings. This is a $400 million blank check to the executive branch of the Government to spend, not particularly on anything they want, in the form of anything that local authorities could build; they do not even know what the projects are. I refer to page 7 of the hearings in which Senator YOUNG had this to say when he was advised by Mr. Gudeman representing the Department, that they could not provide him with a list of the projects:

> Senator YOUNG. This is a completely new departure from the procedures of Congress. I do not see how Congress could go along with this kind of absurd proposal. We appropriate $900 million and know nothing about the various projects that are going to be embarked upon; is this what you are proposing?

Then we get into what these projects are. I know a lot of people laugh when we discuss this thing on the floor of the House with reference to the type of projects that might be involved. They are listed here in the hearings. For instance, on page 94, in New Jersey, a city hall in Long Branch; a bus terminal in Passaic; a reformatory in Bordentown; an incinerator in Newburgh; a swimming pool in Grants Pass.

This is all being paid for by 50 percent Federal money and if the State cannot match it, it is being paid for 75 percent by Federal money.

Let me call your attention to this. This is a fairground expansion in Allegheny County, Pa.; a swimming pool in Clearfield; a subway extension in Philadelphia; a stadium in Pittsburgh; a zoological garden in Pittsburgh; a public market in Arecibo; a coliseum in San Juan, the last two in Puerto Rico; and so forth. There is a hydroelectric project in here.

This is what is happening to this boondoggle program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, just let me say this. The reason Mr. TABER and I reserved on the $400 million item for this accelerated public works program was for the very reason the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has just read into the RECORD.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Here is a horse and foot trail in Minnesota; irrigation power in Arizona.

These are examples of what this money is going to be spent for, just to get the money out and to get it spent. I say that this shows what a poor program it is. I think the gentlemen should be congratulated for reserving on it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 2: Page 4, line 12, strike out "$762,361,000" and insert "$807,962,500".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: $791,580,500.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. SIKES. I want to be heard.

Mr. CANNON. The hour is late. Many Members have their tickets and reservations. They are in no mood to listen to oratory, so I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield time to any Member?

Mr. CANNON. No. I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present and ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present or ask for the yeas and nays?

Does the gentleman object to the vote?

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present and ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present and objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The Chair will count.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 84, nays 120, not voting 230, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

YEAS—84

Abbitt
Ashbrook
Ayres
Bates
Beermann
Betts
Boland
Bolton
Broomfield
Broyhill
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Chenoweth
Church
Clancy
Colmer
Cooley
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Dole
Feighan
Ford
Fountain
Gary
Gathings
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Horan
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kitchin
Knox
Kunkel
Lane
Latta
Lesinski
Mahon
Mailliard
Mathias
May
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Morse
Mosher
Natcher
Patman
Pillion
Poff
Ray
Reece
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Rooney
Roudebush
Rutherford
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Schweiker
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Taber
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Van Pelt
Walter
Whitten
Winstead

NAYS—120

Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Baldwin
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brooks, Tex.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Casey
Chelf
Coad
Cohelan
Cook
Corbett
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Everett
Fallon
Fisher
Flynt
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gilbert
Granahan
Gray
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen
Harsha
Healey
Hechler
Herlong
Holland
Huddleston
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Karsten
Kearns
Kilgore
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lankford
Libonati
McFall
Madden
Matthews
Mills
Moorhead, Pa.
Morris
Murphy
Murray
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
Perkins
Pfost
Pike
Pilcher
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.
Rosenthal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
Selden
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Miss.
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Waggonner
Westland
Wharton
Wickersham
Willis
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—230

Adair
Alexander
Alford
Alger
Andersen, Minn.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baker
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blitch
Bolling
Boykin
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chiperfield
Clark
Collier
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Downing
Doyle
Durno
Elliott
Ellsworth
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Fenton
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Garmatz
Gavin
Giaimo
Glenn
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Haley
Hall
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Inouye
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McMillan
McSween
McVey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mack
Magnuson
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Michel
Miller, George P.
Moeller
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Peterson
Philbin
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Quie
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rousselot
Santangelo
Saund
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Spence
Stafford
Staggers
Stratton
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Tupper
Ullman
Utt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weis
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

(After completion of first call of the roll:)

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr AVERY. What motion is the House presently voting on?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the parliamentary inquiry is very pertinent. The Chair will state in response that the House is voting on a motion which was made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to recede and concur in a Senate amendment, with an amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, my motion was for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The House is voting on a motion made by the gentleman from Missouri to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

That is the motion pending at the present time.

The Clerk will proceed to call the roll of those Members who failed to answer on the first rollcall.

(The Clerk resumed calling the roll.)

Mr. CRAMER (interrupting call of the roll). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the parliamentary situation to be that the motion now being voted upon is a motion to recede and concur in a Senate amendment with an amendment, and a vote "no" is a vote for $205,000 for the Florida Cross-State Barge Canal planning, and a vote of "aye" is against it?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already stated that the parliamentary inquiry is correct in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY]. The Chair is confident that the Members know what they are voting upon.

(The Clerk resumed calling the roll.)

Mr. HARDY, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. GARY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BOW, and Mr. AVERY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GROSS (interrupting the rollcall). Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is proceeding.

Mr. GROSS (interrupting the rollcall). Mr. Speaker, I demand the well be cleared.

The SPEAKER. Members will take their places out of the well.

Mr. GROSS (interrupting the rollcall). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, how many times must a Member check how he has voted?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. EDMONDSON (interrupting the rollcall). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to have a recapitulation of the votes that have been cast in advance of the announced vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that there has been no vote announced as yet. Therefore, at this point it is not possible to request a recapitulation.

(The Clerk resumed calling the roll.)

Mr. COLMER (interrupting the rollcall). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in the event that a quorum is shown not to be present, what procedure is then left to the House?

The SPEAKER. The House can wait until a quorum arrives, or a motion to adjourn would be in order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, is a quorum present?

The SPEAKER. The rollcall has not as yet been completed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of a quorum only one motion is in order, and that is to adjourn. I move that the House now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not announced the fact that a quorum is not present as yet. At this point that motion is not in order.

(The Clerk resumed calling the roll.)

Mr. EDMONDSON (interrupting the rollcall). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. May a recess be declared in advance of the completion of the vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the present situation the Chair may not declare a recess with a rollcall in process.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Chair announce the vote.

The SPEAKER. On this vote, there were 84 yeas and 120 nays.

So a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 13, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2627. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the second semiannual report on activities of the U.S. Travel Service, pursuant to section 5 of the International Travel Act of 1961, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee of conference. H.R. 11586. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of July 7, 1960, as amended, to continue the 55-percent limit on construction-differential subsidy for construction, reconstruction, and reconditioning of ships for 3 additional years; without amendment (Rept. No. 2556). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee of conference. H.R. 13273. A bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2557). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 13410. A bill to amend title III of the act of March 3, 1933, commonly referred to as the "Buy American Act," as it relates to the acquisition of steel, steel products, and steel materials for public use; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 13411. A bill to provide a simple alternative to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to tax the broadest tax base—national income—at the lowest rate that will balance the budget and stabilize prices, and thereby raise net personal incomes and promote economic growth; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 13412. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, Calif., to the county of Kern, State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 13413. A bill to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 905. Joint resolution to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to provide that such building shall be designated the President James Madison Memorial Library, thus making totally unnecessary the destruction of scores of fine residences and saving at least $39 million by combining the plan for a memorial to James Madison with the plan for a third building for the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.J. Res. 906. Joint resolution to authorize and require the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO to submit an annual report concerning its activities, programs, and proceedings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 13414. A bill for the relief of Luther B. Stull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 13415. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Vlasios Manaves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13416. A bill for the relief of George Hatzopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 13417. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yellamaty Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 13418. A bill for the relief of Najiba Antone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the annals of our American history, no date is more readily recalled, no date more easily remembered, than October 12, 1492.

This date has a unique significance for me because it is also the birthday of my small son. As he grows older, I hope he will acquire a realization of the great adventures which are so much a part of our American history; a history which begins with the monumental achievement of the greatest visionary of the 15th century.

It has been 470 years to the day since Christopher Columbus and the handful of men who sailed with him from Spain beached their frail landing craft on the sands of the New World. Their battles against hunger, disease, superstition, and the prejudice of centuries are familiar to all of us. We have read and reread these chronicles since childhood, for they are among the noblest and most exciting in our history.

It is appropriate that Italy, which brought Europe out of the Dark Ages and produced a resurgence of art, literature, and science should have produced the man of vision who was so eager to explore the unchartered depths beyond the horizon.

The perseverance and devotion to an ideal which characterized Columbus' voyage gave us the perfect foundation on which to base our national goals. He was our first pioneer, if—after these 470 years—we can now claim him for our own. He faced an unknown more terrifying than any of the gallant explorers who followed him, and he met and was equal to the challenge.

The Americans of Italian descent who have come to this Nation since that time have inherited and transmitted this undaunted spirit of Christopher Columbus. Their history of bravery in battle, their musical and cultural accomplishments which have brought renown to all of us, their leadership in Government and participation in community affairs have helped America to expand until it is truly a representative government composed of individuals of divergent backgrounds, all of whom have contributed immeasurably to the fabric which constitutes our American way of life.

And, as I wish a happy birthday to my son on this October 12, I also feel a debt of gratitude to the kind providence which shared with him a day of such rewarding adventure and such promise.

My only regret, as we observe this anniversary today, is that because of my official duties here in Washington while Congress remains in session, I could not participate personally in the huge parade which was held in Chicago this forenoon. This impressive tribute to Columbus staged in Chicago by the Italian-American community, in cooperation with all the people of Chicago, manifests once again the high regard we Americans hold for Christopher Columbus.

Commendation of Senator Church, of Idaho, by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has received a letter from the Attorney General, Robert F. Kennedy, complimenting him on his help to the Department of Justice by his work for anticrime legislation.

I think this is a fine accolade for Senator CHURCH, who has represented my neighboring State of Idaho in the Senate of the United States for 6 years. The activities of Senator CHURCH, praised by the Attorney General, have been beneficial to both Idaho and Montana and have contributed to law enforcement everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that Attorney General Kennedy's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 10, 1962.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: With the Senate ending I just wanted to express a personal word of appreciation to you for your help to the Department of Justice. Specifically, as you know, Congress passed more anticrime legislation in this session than at any time since 1934. I just wanted to tell you that in this effort your help and support has been just indispensable.

Your record in the Senate of exposing racketeering and gangsterism, and of sponsoring legislation to bar the shipment of gambling devices in interstate commerce, warrants special commendation.

When you were a member of the McClellan committee investigationg racketeering in labor and management, and I was counsel for the committee, I came to admire the relentless way you sought to expose improper practices, without ever favoring in the slightest degree either labor or management. The whole investigative staff shared my feeling that your appointment to the committee added new life and zest to the hard task we faced in exposing crime and corruption to public view. Your contribution in this effort helped immensely in bringing about the enactment of corrective legislation in the Congress.

Particular note should be taken of your sponsorship in 1959 of S. 2107, to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce. Since each State, under the Constitution, has the right to make its own laws respecting gambling, the power of the Federal Government to deal with gambling is confined to interstate commerce. Your bill led the way to the enactment of tighter restrictions on the movement of gambling devices from State to State, as called for by the Justice Department.

You may be sure that whenever we have further recommendations to make in improving the Federal antigambling laws, we shall be in touch with you. We know, from your past record in this field, that we can count on your effective support in the Senate.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Columbus Day Observation by United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today as we approach the sine die adjournment of the 87th Congress, Columbus Day is being joyously observed in communities all over the United States. One of the most colorful of these parades is held in my home city of Springfield, Mass., sponsored by the United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield. I had accepted an invitation to participate in this great event, but regretfully could not attend this afternoon because of wind up of this session of Congress. I do hope to be able to arrive in Springfield by tomorrow night to attend the Columbus Day banquet sponsored by the United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield, presided over by Dr. Alfred H. Cola, at the municipal auditorium.

Mr. Speaker, 470 years ago Christopher Columbus, with his few sailors in three ships, broke down the barrier of ignorance and fear that separated the New World from the Old. Until the fear was braved and beaten back, until the ignorance was dispelled by experiment, no one, not even Columbus himself, knew that a territory as vast as the then known world lay waiting for exploration, for colonization, for exploitation or cultivation, and for the Christianizing and civilizing of the natives. Out of Columbus' bold imagination and brave deed have come the centuries of agony and triumph, of conflict and construction, of the constant effort to reconcile liberty with law, that have marked the progress of our hemisphere.

If we have built something good out of the nations of the New World; if we have contributed to man's material comfort and his mastery of his natural surroundings; if we have helped men learn to work together in freedom, in the service of God and for the common good; if we of the New World have accomplished anything of value, it is fitting that we pay tribute, on this day, to the one man whose courage and vision lie behind all that we are, behind all that we have done or can do. May we be heirs worthy of the heritage we have received from this bold spirit.

The Pornography Racket in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1962

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News each took editorial snipes at the U.S. Congress for its efforts to put effective controls on the lucrative business of pornography in the District of Columbia by almost unanimously passing H.R. 4670.

The Daily News editorialist could not have read the bill before writing his editorial. He may have relied on the ranting statement of the Washington branch of the Civil Liberties Union, which consistently opposes all efforts to put bridles on obscenity, lewdness, and indecency. The Post editorial makes its usual attack on moral integrity, ignoring the fact that the widespread distribution of pornographic material promotes juvenile delinquency which is already out of hand in the District of Columbia.

I have written replies to each of the editors, hoping a factual presentation of the bills as well as the moral aspects of this problem may be presented to the readers of the two papers. The letters are necessarily lengthy. In the event either is too long for publication in its entirety, or not published at all, I want the Members of the House to know of the replies.

I hope to have your indulgence while I read them into the RECORD:

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your October 5 editorial, "Imprisoning the Press," one wonders just what your firm is printing which you consider to be "obscene, lewd, and indecent." Reasonable men have no difficulty in knowing what is meant by obscenity, lewdness and indecency. No one can tell me that our morals have fallen so low that the distinction can no longer be made.

The annual $2 billion pornography racket is attacking the integrity, as well as the moral and spiritual welfare of the people of the United States. Can the Post editorialist be blind to this insidious influence which is as corrupting as atheistic communism? Is the filth purveyor's profit all that precious?

I do not mind your castigation of my efforts in sponsoring H.R. 4670, to smother the widespread pornography business in the District of Columbia. To say the least, the "provincial morals" which you attribute to me are high above the gutter which spawns the filth that my bill will ban.

J. Edgar Hoover stated that "sex-mad magazines are creating criminals faster than jails can be built." A former Detroit police inspector has declared, "There has not been a sex murder in the history of our department in which the killer was not an avid reader of lewd magazines." Does your editorialist honestly believe that all the bloated profits of the mendacious merchants of smut would recompense for the life of even one little girl—let alone others uncounted?

Most people in Washington wish the Post would show the same devotion to the moral welfare of the American family and to the rights of the law abiding as it does to the coddling of yokers, rapists, murderers and worse. Children of tender age are exposed to large quantities of morally repulsvie publications and pictures, as well as to molestation by those perverted thereby. I would remove this evil from our midst—is that what the Post calls "provincial morality"? Morality doesn't change with the times, nor with locality.

The editorialist must recall the passage from St. Matthew: "But whoso shall offend one of these my little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea"—or does the editorialist feel that has been overruled as being unconstitutional? Our children must be protected; admittedly, this is a duty of the local police, but it is no less a duty of all the wholesome interests of the community. The Post policy should be to join with the responsible communications media in support of healthy laws to suppress this vicious vice.

Surely your paper's profits do not greatly depend on income from that kind of business. The continued degradation of sex, with the accompanying degradation of manhood, womanhood and childhood, is not worth the price.

Wouldn't you like to be on the right side just once? Perhaps this thought will help. I believe there is a connected ownership involving the Post and a radio station. In title 18, United States Code, is a provision that "whoever utters any obscene, indecent or profane language by means of radio communication shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both". Furthermore, there would be the possible added penalty of losing the station's license. Has the Post had any difficulty understanding the meaning of the descriptive words in that statute?

The Post has not editorialized for the repeal of that statute, nor complained of its penalties, and presumably approves of them. My bill which passed the House by a vote of 270 to 18 provides a less stringent penalty; not more than $500 fine, or not more than 1 year in jail. The House vote of 15 to 1 in favor of my bill indicates that very few Members were impressed with the Post contention. Indeed, it might be said that the Post's campaign against our efforts to control the merchants of filth and immorality has made almost no converts—and support for this bill is just as strong outside Congress as it is within.

My bill leaves the decisions up to the courts. Perhaps the Post does not trust the courts, but your editor has not suggested a better tribunal, taking only a totally "negative," "do nothing" attitude about this problem.

Perhaps it is fair to say that the Post is out of touch with the real concerns of the fathers and mothers and the religious community of the Nation's Capital. The people and the Congress have spoken and acted; it is now only up to the President to sign H.R. 4670 into law, to make possible the steps necessary to effectively combat this vicious business. It cannot be done with fine speeches about the rising crime rate and the mounting tide of juvenile delinquency. This bill, when it becomes law, will remove the profit from obscenity, and provide penalties essential to the control of filth, just as penalties are essential to the control of other crimes, and criminals.

Sincerely,

JOHN DOWDY,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

EDITOR,
The Washington Daily News,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This refers to your May 6 editorial entitled, "Dangerous Bill." It deals with my bill, H.R. 4670, which passed the House on October 4, by a splendid margin, 270 to 18, which is exactly 15 to 1.

Do you think it quite fair to editorialize against the bill without reading it? You have been misled by the smut peddlers, who realize this bill would cut heavily into their lush profits.

Your editorialist states that if a household owned a copy of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales," which a son took to school to his English class, "the District could seize the household furniture, car, lawnmower, icebox, television set, the family clothes, and every other possession, and padlock your house for a year." This is not true, and wholly misleading.

In the first place, the courts have defined the phrase, "obscene, lewd or indecent," and "Canterbury Tales" does not fall within that class. Reasonable men have no difficulty in understanding what is meant by "obscenity, lewdness and indecency." Our morals have not yet fallen too low to make the distinction. I believe your writer is the first I have heard to condemn "Canterbury Tales" as indecent.

Now let's examine the editor's allegation about what could be seized. The bill quite plainly says that the only things subject to seizure are those things "used or to be used" in violating the law. Now re-read the editorial recitation, set out above, and decide whether the editor read the bill.

Then the editorialist stated your residence could be padlocked for a year because you let your son carry "Canterbury Tales" to school. My bill provides "any house—to which the public commonly resorts or congregates for business or pleasure" where publications, pictures, etc., forbidden by law are exhibited, etc., or to which persons resort for observing same, may be enjoined as a common nuisance, and if such use is proven to be habitual, suit may be instituted asking the Court to padlock the building for 1 year, subject to being used and occupied by posting proper bond that same will not be issued in violation of the act.

It is obvious that a family residence would not come within the definition "a house to which the public commonly resorts." Other buildings that are habitually used to violate the law are not reserving of great solicitude, especially in view of all the safeguards to protect property rights which are written into the bill, and which have been construed by the courts in other similar legislation.

The editor expresses fear for radio and television stations. Much stricter laws already on the books put limits on their abuse of decency. In addition to loss of license, the United States Code provides that "whoever utters any obscene, indecent or profane language by means of radio communications shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both." I have not heard of any of the District of Columbia stations having trouble understanding the meaning of "obscene or indecent" as used in that statute.

I hope the editor will read H.R. 4670, and correct the erroneous editorial of October 7. Police files everywhere, including FBI, reveal that obscene and lewd exhibitions and publications promote sex offenses. Surely the News will not set itself up in opposition to this partial advance toward clearing the jungle spirit from the streets of Washington, so that decent women and chaildren can again walk without fear of attack and molestation. I believe an overwhelming majority of the people, just as expressed by the 270-to-18 vote of the Members of the House, support this hope that the News will join us.

Sincerely,

JOHN DOWDY,
Member of Congress.

The WEN Corp. Wins the Coveted "E" Award for Export Initiative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1962

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to a significant ceremony which recently took place in my district.

On October 9, WEN Products, Inc., a dynamic and expanding industry in the 11th District of Illinois, received the coveted "E for Export" flag from the Department of Commerce in national recognition of the tremendous forward-looking strides taken by this company in contributing to our national export program.

I might add with no small degree of pride that WEN Products is one of the first industrial firms in Chicago to receive this highly coveted award.

In ceremonies attended by dignitaries from the Federal Government, the State government and local officials of Chicago, the main plant at 5810 Northwest Highway raised the blue and white "E" flag beside the Stars and Stripes.

These "E" flags are awarded for exceptional progress and success in helping to promote U.S. trade throughout the world. The award grants to the recipient manufacturer the exclusive privilege of flying the symbolic pennant with the large "E" on it and the wearing of "E" flag lapel pins. During World War II, as some of my colleagues will remember, the "E" award was granted to various individual firms for excellence in defense production.

I am happy to say that President Kennedy, with his great concern for expanding world trade and his interest in seeking new markets for American products abroad, reactivated this program for the Government's national export expansion program.

WEN Products is a large manufacturer of electric portable tools for the home craftsman and the professional. Undoubtedly, many of my colleagues here today are familiar with this trade name and with its reputation for quality and integrity. The tools consist of a large number of items: all-purpose and freehand operating saws, soldering guns, sanders, shavers, two-speed drills, saber saws, and accessories. WEN Products are used in the electronic, automotive, homebuilding, hardware, woodworking, and industrial fields.

The citation from the Department of Commerce, after consultation with the Labor Department, the Interior and Agriculture Departments, and the Small Business Administration, stated that WEN had more than doubled its exports of electric portable tools and rotary shavers. In addition, the firm has participated readily and with ingenuity in various trade fairs and tool exhibitions sponsored by the Department of Commerce throughout the world.

Earlier in this Congress, I sponsored legislation which would provide for a mobile trade fair on a moving fleet of merchant ships which would actively and aggressively seek out new world markets for American products. I sponsored this legislation with small companies such as WEN Products in mind. These industries have repeatedly demonstrated that they can compete on a global scale, given the opportunity to bring their products to the attention of buyers in other countries.

Unfortunately, the costs of transporting exhibits of products of smaller manufacturers to these world markets have often been prohibitive. Under the provisions of my proposal, these financial problems would largely be solved.

The House and Senate have approved this program of mobile trade fairs and I am confident we will see a very marked resurgence of America's ability to compete with products in other countries. We have the talent, the resources, the ingenuity, and now the opportunity to compete abroad.

This presentation of an "E" flag to WEN Products heralds a new era of American trade expansion and development. I am proud to represent a company which has so willingly accepted the challenge of the 1960's. American trade expansion in world markets means more job opportunities for all Americans.

My heartfelt congratulations to the men and women of WEN Products, Inc. It is talent and teamwork, such as they have demonstrated, which have made our American industrial complex the mighty competitive giant that it is.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 12, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, no more appropriate tribute may be paid to the discoverer of this continent than to express briefly the admiration, respect, and affection that we all feel for his Italian-American countrymen in the United States. As the last century ended there were about 484,000 of them here seeking a better life than the one they had known in the disrupted agricultural economy of the Italian peninsula. By 1910 they numbered over 1,343,000.

In the beginning most of them performed back-breaking labor in construction or heavy industry. But it was not long before their children became doctors, teachers, lawyers, judges, legislators, and businessmen. In their achievements they are second to no other group in the United States. It has been estimated that some 845,000 men of Italian descent served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Second World War. I have the honor of serving with able, hard-working, and patriotic Italian-Americans in this House.

Perhaps on this occasion others will extoll the contributions of Italian-Americans to the arts and the sciences. I wish to praise them as a group which in difficult times, under severe handicaps, and in a remarkably short number of years has come to take its place in the leadership of the free American society. That one of their number, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze, was appointed to an executive department of the Federal Government whose responsibilities are of crucial importance to our entire population is characteristic of the magnitude of their achievement as political and administrative leaders. Columbus discovered America, and Italian-Americans help lead it and preserve its freedom.

The Malaxa Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 12, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, recently there has been considerable discussion in the Congress and in the press about the case of Nicolae Malaxa and the relationship of former Vice President Richard M. Nixon to Malaxa. In this connection, I may add that I think the manner in which this has come about is most unfortunate. Mr. Nixon chose to inject the issue of dealing with communism into the Governor's race in California, by charging that Gov. Pat Brown's administration had been soft on communism. In response to this, some have pointed to Mr. Nixon's connections with this Nicolae Malaxa, a resident alien who is alleged to have had both Nazi and Communist connections in his homeland of Rumania.

The Washington Star of Wednesday, October 10, quoted Malaxa's attorney as saying that the immigration hearings held in Malaxa's case had fully cleared Malaxa of these charges. I want to set the public record straight in this respect. I reviewed the Malaxa case closely, some months ago, and concluded that the proceedings involving him had been most irregular, and were such that the charges against him had not been fully explored. For one thing, when the charges were being considered, he refused to answer questions about his past. He claimed that because of procedural technicalities, he did not have to answer such questions.

On review, Attorney General Rogers later held that Malaxa should have answered the questions, but, nonetheless, upheld a decision in Malaxa's favor, even though Malaxa's unlawful silence had prevented a full inquiry into his past associations. This is set forth in some detail in a letter I wrote to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy on April 11, 1962, in which I reviewed the Malaxa case and urged the Attorney General to reconsider it. I pointed out in this letter the procedural irregularities in the previous proceedings and the fact that Nazi war documents published by the State Department in 1960 now present new evidence against Malaxa. I referred specifically to a secret telegram sent in 1941 by the German Minister in Rumania to the German Foreign Ministry, in which the Minister referred to Malaxa as "the financial mainstay" of the Iron Guard, which was the Rumanian Nazi Party. Mr. Malaxa's attorney now states that this document was declassified in 1955 and was presented against Malaxa in the immigration hearings. I have not yet had time to confirm this contention. The reported decisions in the Malaxa case deal in detail with the evidence against him, and make no reference to this document, thus indicating to me that it was not considered at the hearings. In any event, the evidence against Malaxa, coupled with the peculiar procedure which operated in his favor before, indicates to me that there is clearly room for doubt that his past Nazi and Communist associations were fully explored; and certainly it cannot be claimed that he refuted the charges against him when he refused to answer questions concerning his past Iron Guard, Nazi, and Communist associations.

On April 19, the Attorney General wrote to me, in response to my letter, that the Department of Justice would look into the matter at the first opportunity and would advise me further.

Since writing the Attorney General, I have had a number of conferences with Mr. Nicholas Katzenbach, the Deputy Attorney General. He told me he thought the record showed Mr. Malaxa to be an improper person for admission to the United States, and that he should have been excluded. He said he thought a strong case of previous improper conduct had been made before the hearing examiner, and fully justified such a holding against Malaxa; but Mr. Katzenbach advised that since the Board of Immigration Appeals, by a split decision, had reversed the hearing examiner, and Attorney General Rogers had affirmed the decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals, he felt it was not good public policy for one Attorney General to reverse the decision of a previous one, unless there was substantial and convincing evidence which had not been brought out in previous hearings.

With this administrative policy I agree, but I have some question as to its applicability in this case.

Mr. Katzenbach has advised that he is keeping the matter under consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of my letter of April 11, 1962, to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 11, 1962.

The Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

Re: Nicolae Malaxa.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Nicolae Malaxa is a Rumanian alien now residing in New York City. I have received information which leads me to believe that the lawfulness and desirability of his continued presence in this country should be reconsidered.

Malaxa first came to this country in 1946 for a temporary visit as a member of the Rumanian economic delegation. He never returned to Rumania but he later claimed to have become an unwanted capitalist there—despite his appointment to this trade mission and despite the fact that the Communists paid him $2,500,000 in compensation for factories seized by the Russians and allowed him to transfer his funds to the United States.

In 1948, he began steps to gain permanent residence under the Displaced Persons Act. After hearings, the Immigration Service made a favorable recommendation on his application on September 26, 1951, in an opinion by Mr. A. C. Devaney of the Adjudications Division. Malaxa's self-serving, and at times farfetched, testimony was believed and the contrary testimony of many disinterested persons was rejected in instance after instance. The recommendation failed to receive necessary congressional approval and died. An attempt in Congress to adjust his status by joint resolution was then unsuccessful also.

Malaxa next moved under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. He was sole owner of Western Tube Corp., which ostensibly planned to build a seamless tubing plant in Whittier, Calif. His corporation filed a petition seeking a first preference quota for Malaxa on the grounds that the corporation urgently needed his services for building the California plant. The petition was approved and Malaxa was admitted from Canada as a permanent resident on September 26, 1953. Western Tube Corp. soon became inactive. It never got beyond the organizational stages and the California plant was not built. Apparently, the only objective which it achieved was to obtain permanent residence in the United States for its owner.

The apparent sham of the Western Tube operation led the Service to attempt to exclude Malaxa when he reentered the country in December 1955, after a stay in Argentina of almost a year. In addition to alleged fraud in the Western Tube application, charges were made involving Malaxa's connections with the Rumanian Iron Guard and the German Nazis prior to and during World War II and dealings with the Communists after World War II.

The special inquiry officer found against Malaxa on all points and ordered him deported. His findings were based partly upon refusals to answer questions asked by the examining officer concerning Malaxa's past Iron Guard, Nazi, and Communist associations. Malaxa contended that an examining officer was not authorized for the hearing and that he could only be required to submit to questioning by the special inquiry officer. The special inquiry officer ruled that Malaxa should answer the examining officer's questions and chose to draw adverse inferences from Malaxa's silence rather than to propound the questions himself. As a result of this procedural dispute, Malaxa's past was not fully explored.

The Board of Immigration Appeals reversed the special inquiry officer in a split decision, holding that the inquiry officer could not draw inferences from Malaxa's silence and that he should have questioned Malaxa instead of relying on the examining officer. The board expressly decided (from a record which was obviously incomplete because of Malaxa's silence) that Malaxa was never affiliated with the Iron Guard, Nazis, or Communists.

Attorney General Rogers then reviewed the case. He agreed with the inquiry officer that Malaxa should have responded to the examining officer's questions and that adverse inferences properly could be drawn from his refusal. Despite this, he affirmed the Board's order admitting Malaxa to permanent residence. Malaxa thus profited from his wrongful refusal to answer questions about his past, because the only consequence was that his past activities were not fully explored for the record. It is hard to see why a final decision was reached favorably to Malaxa on factual issues which he prevented from being fully heard. In the courts, a comparable case would have been remanded for a new hearing in which Malaxa would have responded to questions by the examining officer so that the case could be decided from all relevant evidence.

I realize something can be said for terminating such a case once it is concluded even if the decision was wrong, but new evidence has been revealed which also appears to justify reopening the Malaxa case.

Malaxa has always denied alleged affiliations with the German Nazis, the Rumanian Iron Guard and the Rumanian Communists. There has always been strong evidence against him but I will not attempt to review it here except to mention a few of the incriminating facts concerning his connections with the terrorist Nazi Iron Guard. In the 1951 proceedings, the testimony of several prominent Rumanians linked Malaxa to the Iron Guard at the time of its January 1941 uprising when it was finally suppressed by General Antonescu. Marion Novotny told of seeing iron guardists enter Malaxa's home to obtain arms reportedly stored there for use in the revolt. Alexander Cretzinu, who was then serving in the Rumanian foreign office, testified that during the uprising General Antonescu told him of learning from his secret service and German officers that Malaxa was the financial backer of the Iron Guard. Max Ausnit, a leading Rumanian industrialist, identified Malaxa as the Iron Guard's financial backer at the time. This and similar testimony was simply denied by Malaxa and his word was accepted, as it apparently again was by the Board of Immigration Appeals and Attorney General Rogers in 1958.

Now it appears that official German war documents published by the State Department in 1960 refute Malaxa's testimony and confirms the testimony against him. At page 1050 of the documents on German foreign policy appears Document 623, a secret telegram dated January 8, 1941, to the German Foreign Ministry from Fabricius, the German Minister in Rumania. Fabricius referred to Malaxa as "Carol's former friend and the present financial mainstay of the Legionnaires." He added that the Legionnaires (Iron Guard) "let this clever big industrialist finance them. He has in his plants the leader of the Legionnaire labor organization, Gana, and there the green flags of Sima flutter everywhere." Of General Antonescu's distrust of Malaxa, Fabricius reported: "The general * * * would like best to send Malaxa and his family off to Germany in order to get rid of them for a while. In reply to a question from him, I told him that, if he wished it, we would be glad to oblige him by taking Malaxa in, since German industry had always been on the best of terms with him. The general considers this his only chance of getting rid of this troublesome schemer."

This telegram is dated only 2 weeks before the Iron Guard revolt which resulted in Malaxa's arrest and imprisonment by Antonescu.

I believe the prior handling of Malaxa's case and the persuasive evidence contained in the German war documents justifies reconsideration. These documents may not meet tests of legal admissibility in judicial proceedings, but a principal reason that the rules of evidence do not apply to immigration matters is that the issues involved are often incapable of such proof. This reason particularly applies in evaluating Malaxa's connection with the Iron Guard which reputedly slaughtered 7,000 Rumanian Jews in 1940–41.

Taken with the other evidence against Malaxa, the German documents appear to be extremely incriminating. I urge you to reconsider the case in this light.

Sincerely yours,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
U.S. Senator.

SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast sustained our lives to see yet another day which Thou hast made, we look to Thee for wisdom and strength to do that which is pleasing in Thy sight this day.

As Thy servants in this Chamber confront the massive responsibilities placed upon them by Thy providence and the will of the people, grant that they may have a lively sense of their accountability to Thee, as well as to the people.

Through long and laborious months, Thou hast given them strength for their many and demanding duties. Add Thy blessing, we pray, to all that has been accomplished through their efforts for the good of the Nation and the welfare of all kinds and conditions of men.

Grant that the citizens of this land of liberty may understand that they, themselves, are truly in authority here, each one accountable to Thee for moral integrity, for devotion to justice, and for a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

May the decisions registered this day beneath the great white dome of this citadel of freedom encourage and empower all responsible men of good will throughout the earth, to the end that righteousness and peace may prevail, and Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 12, 1962, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 13, 1962, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 1663. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;

H.R. 7781. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad;

H.R. 8563. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit certain policies to be issued to members of duly organized national veterans' organizations;

H.R. 9045. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended;

H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;

H.R. 12135. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12217. An act for the relief of George Edward Leonard;

H.R. 12434. An act to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12708. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

RESOLUTIONS

ORIGINATION OF BILLS APPROPRIATING MONEY FOR SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 414) asserting the power of the Senate to originate bills appropriating money for the support of the Government, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Russell, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESEARCH PROGRAM TO DISCOVER NEW USES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. Talmadge) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 415) favoring a program of research to discover new uses for agricultural products, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Russell, which appears under a separate heading.)

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF THE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 416) appointing a committee to notify the President concerning the proposed adjournment of the session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 417) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the Vice President for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 418) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 419) authorizing the President of the Senate to make certain appointments after the sine die adjournment of the Congress, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolutions printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appear under separate headings.)

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL DEPLORES FLAGRANT LOGROLLING IN GLEN ELDER PROJECT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I spoke at some length against a reclamation project in Kansas that would eventually cost $60 million. This project was not only unjustified on every score, but I received petitions from 90 percent of the farmers who allegedly would benefit from the project; they vehemently oppose it.

The Milwaukee Journal has summed up the arguments against this waste in an editorial entitled "Some More 'Logrolling'," and has done so in what I regard as an extremely effective and persuasive way. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Some More Logrolling

Senator Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, lost his fight against a $750,000 appropriation for preliminary work on the $60 million Glen Elder Dam and irrigation project in Kansas. His one-man filibuster was ignored and the Senate voted, 57 to 17, to leave the item in the $5.2 billion emergency public works bill which was later passed.

Perhaps his effort to draw attention to what he called fantastic waste in Federal irrigation and flood control projects was not all wasted, however. He made a powerful case.

The Glen Elder project was first authorized by a single line in a 1944 bill that listed 325 other projects. It was to cost only $17 million.

Examined in light of today's situation a $60 million outlay makes almost no sense. Water would be provided for 60 new farms, but 80 or more farms would be flooded out. Cost per acre of the irrigated land would be around $1,800, of which owners would pay back only $191 an acre.

One of the main benefits expected is in increased feed grain production on 13,000 of 21,000 acres to be irrigated. And the Federal Government is frantically trying to reduce the feed grain surplus. Some 90 percent of farmers involved are said to oppose the Glen Elder development.

The dam would provide a municipal water supply for the little city of Beloit, Kans. (population 3,800). At the same time it would so reduce streamflow that health authorities at Topeka, Kans. (population 120,000), are worried about pollution and a supply of enough clean water to meet domestic and industrial requirements there.

With all this evidence before them, why didn't the Senators take heed? If the $750,000 appropriation wasn't enough to arouse their concern, why weren't they moved to hold up starting a project that has so little justification? Why did only 17 seem to share Senator Proxmire's dismay over colossal waste on western water projects?

Surely it wasn't because more than half the Senate thought Senator Proxmire was wrong. Most of them knew he was right. The explanation unquestionably is found in congressional "log rolling."

Many of the votes for Glen Elder were cast by Senators who expected, in return, to win support for other Federal projects in their own States—some, no doubt, just as questionable. As the U.S. News & World Report said recently, "Candidates for the Senate and House seek votes on the basis of what they have done and can do for the home folks. It is from Washington that more and more of the good things of life seem to flow. Politicians tend to be rated on their success or lack of success in getting a share of these good things."

In the case of Glen Elder Dam, it is indeed doubtful that it deserves to be rated as good.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Metcalf in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

KIM CHUNG SHIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1969, House bill 11866.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 11866) for the relief of Kim Chung Shin (Mary Rathbun).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action is contemplated on this bill. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

Address delivered by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER to the Republican State Convention, Hartford, Conn., June 4, 1962.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR OREN E. LONG, OF HAWAII

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, before this session closes I wish to pay a short tribute to my friend from Hawaii, Senator OREN LONG, who has elected not to return for another session.

During my service in the Senate I do not know of any Senator who has more favorably impressed his colleagues in the Senate in the years he has served than has the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG]. I did not serve on a committee with him, but I was associated with him in several ways, and I was impressed by his fine principles of character and honor that never faltered or failed, but were the basic and controlling factors in all his relations with his fellow Senators, as well as on public questions.

He is a man of fine intelligence, quick to perceive. He has an innate modesty which is personally attractive. Moreover, he is always a great humanitarian in his approach to various problems and in making his decisions.

He is also a man of great spiritual capacity and appreciates greatly the spiritual values not merely in a theoretical way, but in a practical manner in his everyday living.

These are his controlling factors in regard to conclusions and decisions and official acts as a Senator. He has made a distinct contribution in the Senate, which is a climax to a distinguished career as an educator and in other avenues of public service. I know he has made a contribution to the Nation and to the Senate.

I for one will be sorry to see him go, and I wish for him unbounded satisfaction of life that will continue throughout rich years which will bring him fine reward.

OREGON AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, among the many steps taken by the administration to restimulate the economy of our Nation was one which led to the creation of the Area Redevelopment Administration, which functions under the Department of Commerce. Much interest in the program and the projects being undertaken through the authorities entrusted to that agency, has been voiced to me by Oregonians in every corner of the State.

As a result of this expression of interest, I requested from the Area Redevelopment Administration a status report upon each of the ARA projects which involve my State. I have just received this report and because of its interest to Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Oregon summary sheet

Population:	
1962 estimate	----------
1960 census	1,768,687
Total number of counties	36
Designated counties:	
Areas	8
Population	164,185
Indian reservations	1
Projects authorized (1):	
Total cost	$1,306,500
ARA funds requested	$812,000
Pending project proposals (5):	
Total cost	$2,142,368
ARA funds requested	$1,428,973
Projects being planned for filing:	
Total cost (estimate)	$8,049,400
ARA funds requested (estimate)	$5,064,060
New jobs created (estimate)	792
Technical training programs:	
Proposed and pending	6
Overall economic development programs (OEDP)	
Approved (6):	
Counties	5
Indian reservations	1

Overall economic development program approved

CLATSOP COUNTY 5(b)5 AREA

Projects being planned for submission to ARA:

1. Port of Astoria—Grant to rehabilitate dock facilities and add loft crane and trackage:	
Section 8 grant:	
Total cost	$3,800,000
ARA funds requested	$2,200,000
New jobs created	Will save 170 jobs
Status: Application being revised.	
2. Port of Astoria—to rehabilitate small boat basin:	
Section 7 loan:	
Total cost	$150,000
ARA funds requested	$15,000
New jobs created	Not determined
Status: Under study and discussion.	
3. Convention center—To construct and equip a convention center at Seaside, Oregon:	
Section 7 loan:	
Total cost	$700,000
ARA funds requested	$700,000
Status: Under study and discussion.	
4. Expansion and addition to a sawmill:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	$180,000
ARA funds requested	$117,000
New jobs created	30
Status: Being developed.	

Overall economic development program approved—Continued

COLUMBIA COUNTY 5(b) 5 AREA

Projects being planned: Construction of a steel mill using local low-grade iron ore and deep water site on the Columbia. This project will largely depend on the outcome of a feasibility study which will be requested soon. (None approved.)

JOSEPHINE COUNTY 5(b)5 AREA

1. Josephine Plywood Corp.—West Coast Plywood Co. (formerly). Purchase and modernization of a layup plant and green veneer plant:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	$1,306,500
ARA funds requested	$812,000
New jobs created	250
Projects pending:	
1. Manufacturing project—To expand existing business:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	$109,700
ARA funds requested	$71,305
New jobs created	83
Status: Awaiting additional information.	
Projects being planned:	
1. Electronic manufacturing:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	$177,000
ARA fund requested	$155,000
New jobs created	77
Status: Expect to submit application in January 1963.	
2. Warehousing and box manufacturing:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	$90,000
ARA funds requested	$41,000
New jobs created	16
Status: Preparing information.	
3. A hardwood plant:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	$262,400
ARA funds requested	$170,560
New jobs created	40
4. A plywood plant:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	$140,000
ARA funds requested	$91,000
New jobs created	No estimate
Status: Application being prepared.	

LINCOLN COUNTY 5(b) 3 AND 5

Projects pending:	
1. A hardwood manufacturing plant:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	$190,000
ARA funds requested	$65,000
New jobs created	15
Status: A revised application is being submitted.	
2. Newport Commission—Construction of adequate port facilities:	
Sections 7 and 8 loan and grant:	
Total cost	$171,018
ARA funds requested	$171,018
Status: Sent to Community Facilities Administration for processing.	
3. Oregon State University—Development of an Oceanography Laboratory at Newport:	
Section 8 grant:	
Total cost	$1,286,650
ARA funds requested	$921,650
Status: Sent to Community Facilities Administration for processing.	

Overall economic development program approved—Continued

Projects being planned:

1. Resort and marina:

Section 6 loan:

Total cost	$750,000
ARA funds requested	$487,000
New jobs created	100

Status: Information being prepared.

2. City of Newport sewage disposal system—Improvement and expansion:

Sections 7 and 8 loan and grant:

Total cost	$575,000
ARA funds requested	$432,000

3. City of Newport water system—Improvement and expansion:

Sections 7 and 8 loan and grant:

Total cost	$200,000 to $700,000
ARA funds requested	$200,000 up

Status: Sewage and water project — Consultation made by the city of Newport to study and prepare economic justification for the Area Redevelopment Administration in city and surrounding areas including oceanography laboratory—Eventide, agate beach development, industrial park, etc.

HOOD RIVER COUNTY 5(b)5 AREA

Projects pending:

1. Port of Hood River—Construction of industrial site:

Section 6 loan:

Total cost	$385,000
ARA funds requested	$200,000
New jobs created	20

Status: Sent to the Small Business Administration for processing.

Projects being planned: A group is actively working on a project proposal for the development of a ski area development.

WASCO AND SHERMAN COUNTIES 5(b)5 AREA

Projects being planned:

1. Wood products plant (Wasco County):

Section 6 loan:

Total cost	$200,000
ARA funds requested	$130,000
New jobs created	80

Status: Application material to be prepared.

2. Manufacturing company—Expansion (Wasco):

Section 6 loan:

Total cost	$25,000
ARA funds requested	$15,000
New jobs created	9

YAMHILL COUNTY 5(b)5 AREA

Organizational underway, with some work completed on provisional OEDP. (None approved.)

WARM SPRINGS INDIAN RESERVATION

Projects being planned:

1. Development of the Kahnuta Hot Springs resort:

Section 6 loan:

Total cost	$1,350,000
ARA funds requested	$85,000
New jobs created	75

Status: Feasibility study being done with ARA grant. This project if approved, will necessitate a training program for guides for pack and riding trips.

MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS INVOLVING OREGON AND PACIFIC NORTHWEST

1. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: A study of the needs of fishery cooperation in the Pacific Northwest, $25,000 (under review).

2. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: A study of the Pacific Northwest Trawl Fishery, $60,000 (under review).

3. Oregon Department of Planning and Development: Evaluation of existing and proposed small craft harbors along the Oregon coast and navigable river, $60,000 (under review).

4. Bureau of Indian Affairs: Primarily a resort development study for the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, $10,000 (grant approved).

5. Oregon Department of Planning and Development: A study of Oregon hardwoods, $50,990 (under review).

6. Livestock company: Automated feedlot study, $8,500 (approved).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I feel sure that in the months ahead many projects which are now under study will materialize into jobs and payrolls for Oregonians in the designated counties. I assure the ARA that I shall do everything in my power to assist the program personnel in their job of translating the President's ideals into living reality.

AMA READIES BIG POLITICAL DRIVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in yesterday morning's Washington Post and Times-Herald there was published a very interesting column written by Drew Pearson entitled "AMA Readies Big Political Drive." The article points out what the American Medical Association purportedly is planning to do by way of its political blitzkrieg in the closing days of the campaign. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMA Readies Big Political Drive

(By Drew Pearson)

Many doctors, busy caring for people's health, don't know that their trade union has now prepared one of the most elaborate and careful political campaigns in recent years.

That union, the American Medical Association and its subsidiaries, has drafted letters to be signed by thousands of doctors and nurses and sent out just a few days before election day against Congressmen who lean toward medical-care assistance for the elderly. The letters will brand the Congressmen as favoring socialism.

This letter-writing strategy has been kept very hush-hush, and the following instructions have been sent with the letters: "The doctors and their nurses are not to release one single copy of this letter in order to prevent the opposition from obtaining a copy."

However, this column has obtained a complete set of both the letter and the instructions for mailing it. Though the letter is not supposed to be mailed until Nov. 3 or 5, it may be a good idea to let the voting public know in advance what the doctors' trade union is up to.

One letter in the doctors' barrage pins the socialism label on Representative Walter Moeller, a middle-of-the-road Democrat, of Lancaster, Ohio, who has not even taken a formal stand either for or against medicare, though he has indicated that some means should be found to help older people with their medical bills.

DOCTORS' TARGET

Moeller is a modest, moderate, hard-working Congressman.

But here is the instruction which the AMA has sent out to doctors and nurses in Moeller's 10th Ohio District:

"1. Secretaries and doctors should address their envelopes and sign the letters now and hold them for mailing until the week before election.

"2. Each doctor should personally underline Mr. Abele's name with ink before signing. (This refers to Homer E. Abele, the Republican candidate against Representative Moeller.)

"3. Add a postscript in ink to make the letter more personal.

"4. Mr. Moeller's name has been removed from the letter and if any name is to be used in the postscript, it should be Mr. Abele's spelled out. If the doctor wishes to say something about Moeller he should use the words 'the present Congressman.' The frequency of name repetition, whether good or bad, is impressed upon the mind and the name remembered most is apt to be voted for.

"5. The doctors and their nurses are not to release one single copy of this letter in order to prevent the opposition obtaining a copy.

"6. Letters should not be mailed until Thursday, November 1, so as to reach the individual on Saturday or Monday, November 3 or 5.

"7. A categorical list of Mr. Moeller's voting record will be available for each doctor to use in his postscript comments."

HOW TO VOTE

Enclosed with these careful instructions to each doctor is the following letter branding Representative Moeller as an enemy of private enterprise and an advocate of socialism.

At the top of the letter is marked in three places "copy." Then follows this further instruction:

"This is a copy of a letter which is to be circulated in Fairfield County, Ohio, and, perhaps, also in other counties of the 10th Congressional District. It is to go out over the signature of a physician."

The letter itself, to be copied by the doctor on his own stationery and mailed just as the voters are about to go to the polls and too late for the Congressman to answer, reads:

"Dear ————: As a physician I am happy to participate in the campaign against polio and help other community activities which promote your welfare. Current governmental policies necessitate physicians' participation also in politics.

"I do not object to a man as a Republican or a Democrat, but I do object to any public official with liberal socialistic ideas that promote governmental control of your life and mine.

"I believe sincerely that the present Congressman is a liberal with socialistic tendencies, who is trying to destroy private enterprise, our freedom and our security.

"Vote for Homer E. Abele, a conservative candidate, to help stop the spread of socialism and to preserve our freedom. Sincerely."

Note: One thing the drafters didn't figure on was the risk of libel for the doctors signing these letters. Though the courts have not taken as clear cut a position on branding a man a Socialist as they have on branding him a Communist, the two are so closely allied in some people's minds that the courts are beginning to get tougher with this type of name calling. To call a man a Communist is libel per se.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the AMA politicians are not going to fool the American people in this campaign, for the American people recognize that medical care for the aged is a moral obligation and the responsibility of all the people of this country, acting through their Government.

Apparently the AMA is oblivious to the fact that many thousands of young people—particularly young married couples—are beginning to recognize the great social, economic, and medical problem which has arisen in this country. It has arisen because of the failure of the United States to provide care for our elderly citizens comparable to the care for the elderly provided in other free nations of the world. The Scandinavian countries, for example, put us to shame when programs of medical care for our people are compared.

I am preparing a speech which summarizes the position the senior Senator from Oregon has taken on medical issues during many years in the Senate. I had hoped I might have had it finished by today. Much of the time I planned to devote to this in the past week, however, has been necessarily taken up in giving careful consideration to a good many other economic issues which involve the welfare of the people of my State.

I thus have had to postpone completion of my speech on medical problems. I intend to set forth my reasons for complete support of President Kennedy's medical care program for the aged, which would provide for medical care on a sound principle under social security. I am sure the voters of my State would like to have for ready reference a summary of my views in support of President Kennedy's medical care program.

It is my understanding that the Congressional Record will be kept open for some days after Congress adjourns sine die—when it does—and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the speech I am preparing on medical care, giving my reasons for supporting unequivocally the President's program——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I ask that my speech be printed in an issue of the Congressional Record to be published after adjournment. It is my understanding that usually there is a period of 10 days to 2 weeks in which to have printed in the Congressional Record material that we are unable to have ready on adjournment day. Am I correct in that understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if some other Senator wishes the floor, I yield. There is another morning hour subject upon which I wish to speak.

THE RUNAWAY WAGON OF THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this is my 16th year as a Member of the U.S. Senate. During that period I have served with some of the country's most respected men and under some of the Senate's most able leaders; however, for the past 2 years I have had the privilege of serving with a majority leader who stands second to none.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] is one of the ablest, most dedicated, fairest, and most respected men who have held that position, and it has been a privilege to work with him in his official capacity.

This point should be emphasized as we discuss the present dilemma in which the Congress now finds itself.

But let us face it—the administration is in trouble. Last year they obtained control of the Congress and got it started, but they do not know how to stop it. A small group of prima donnas in an open revolt against the Senate leaders have grabbed the bit in their teeth and are running away with the frontier wagon, scattering the administration's legislative plans all over the New Frontier. Someone has got to come to their rescue.

My patience has ended. I am thoroughly disgusted—and I am sure I am not alone in that sentiment—at the disgraceful spectacle of a Congress stalling along, unable to reach an adjournment.

Now we are told that an agreement cannot be reached on some public works projects, or on what is better described as the "pork barrel." Some congressional Members under threats of filibusters, others through special deals, threats of quorum calls, or delays of adjournment are attempting to bludgeon the Congress into accepting their pet multi-million-dollar projects—projects many of which have never been approved, some of which have never been authorized, and certainly in many instances projects which cannot be justified.

This public works bill presently in dispute was delayed for consideration by the Congress until the closing days of the session with the strong suspicion that by so delaying, it was figured the Members in their anxiety to go home would accept anything. The absence of a quorum makes it easy for one to carry out a threat, should his pet project be eliminated.

I am of the opinion that with less than 3 months to go before the new Congress convenes it would be better to adjourn sine die without approving any bill at all. Certainly as a new Congress convenes next January it could more intelligently reappraise the merits of the respective projects.

However, if the Congress wishes to stay here a few more days or weeks or until January to debate these issues I, as one Member of the Senate, will cooperate and rearrange my plans to be present.

To avoid any misunderstanding or possible embarrassment either to the leadership or to the administration, however, I am suggesting now that, should it be decided to continue the Congress over into next week, they would be well advised to take appropriate steps in advance to notify the Members of the Senate that a quorum will be expected to be present prior to the consideration of any business on each day that Congress remains in session after midnight October 13, 1962.

As long as the Senate or the House tries to act without a quorum it is at the mercy of any individual Member.

I understand that today there are fewer than 25 Senators in Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Crisis of Congress," by Roscoe Drummond, published in today's issue of the Washington Post, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CRISIS OF CONGRESS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The greatest national need today is not to get a man on the moon nor to build an aquarium in the District of Columbia.

These things are all right and they are going to be done. But I submit that the frantic scramble of Congress to pass vital bills and appropriate vast sums of money in the last weary, out-of-breath hours of the tail end of the session reveals that the greatest need today is not for Congress to do something about others but to do something about itself.

Congress is perilously near to losing its capacity to transact the public business.

It has already lost the capacity to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently.

Congress is losing power. It is losing prestige. It risks losing the confidence of the country.

This isn't just bad for Congress. It is bad for the country. It means that our very system of government—a government of balanced and coequal powers—is being altered by default.

With all the earnestness and conviction of a death-bed confession, Republican Senate floor leader Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska shortly before his passing some 10 years ago, pleaded with his colleagues in these words:

"The creaking machinery of Congress is so appallingly inadequate for modern times that free representative government is endangered."

But Congress has been too busy to attend to itself.

It not only has not given "continuous attention" to the problem. It has not given it any attention—in 16 years.

Since then a few things have happened—like the cold war, $90 billion budgets, an exploding population, the race into outer space, a Soviet satellite state planted in the Western Hemisphere—which make the careful, responsible, efficient transaction of the public business by Congress a matter of national survival.

Congress simply isn't doing its job. It is doing it less well every year. This can't go on much longer.

Fortunately, two of the most influential Members of the House—Representatives Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, and Chet Holifield, of California—have been working on a bipartisan project which can lead to wide-ranging reorganization of congressional procedures, practices, and rules. They have already identified many of the areas crying for reform.

Senator Joseph Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania has sponsored a resolution with bipartisan backers in both Houses to create a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress. There is obviously gathering support for some kind of congressional reorganization.

Congress should certainly pick the scholars to do this study, but it seems to be that at least a half dozen of the big foundations would want to volunteer to contribute the funds to make it possible.

FEED GRAIN PROBLEM IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since the first of August, the congressional delegations from the Pacific Northwest have been actively, and continually, urging the Department of Agriculture to explore and, on the basis of the facts which we believe substantiate the position of Northwest agriculture, to modify present departmental policies with respect to the feed grains.

It is our contention that our area is not a feed-grain deficit area. We believe that this contention is well sustained by careful studies made by the economists at Oregon State and Washington State universities.

We further believe that the adverse price differential situation with respect to corn produced in the Middle West is, in part, the responsibility of the Federal Government, since the figures clearly show the differential has been seriously aggravated by Government programs and policies respecting agriculture.

I have today received from Mr. James Hill, chairman of the Pacific Northwest Feed & Livestock Council, a copy of a letter dated October 10, addressed to Secretary Freeman, which clearly, succinctly, and in my judgment irrefutably sets forth the case for our livestock, turkey, and poultry producers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred, together with the attachments thereto, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I enjoyed the opportunity to visit with you in Portland last week and to discuss the seriousness of grain price relationships to our Pacific Northwest livestock feeding industry.

We have enclosed a copy of the Marion Thomas letter with figures, and comments on the chart you gave me charting "average farm price differentials between Nebraska corn and Oregon barley by months for 1950–54, 1955–59, 1960, 1961, and through June 1962."

We are of the opinion that your chart and our information shows and substantiates the following:

(a) 1950–54 PNW feed grain, barley, was within a livable economic price spread as compared to Nebraska corn. During this period our feeders had 4 to 5 months each crop year to cover feed needs at prices not to exceed $3 per ton over Nebraska corn. Even at the worst periods of the crop year (PNW barley advancing—Nebraska corn declining) our spread did not exceed $9 per ton. Major feeders covered season's needs when the spread was 0 to $3.

(b) 1955–59 PNW barley prices began to reflect larger spreads after grain production adjustment and Public Law 480 programs began to operate. But even during this period our feeders would have 2 to 3 months each crop year when they could cover their year's feed barley needs at less than $6 per ton spread over Nebraska corn.

(c) In the last few months of 1960 spreads between PNW barley and Nebraska corn advanced to as high as $18 per ton. Since that time these spreads have been against our livestock economy by $10 to $16 a ton consistently. Even at harvesttime our feeders have not been able to cover feed needs at less than $10 adverse spread. Our livestock feeders, especially hog, broiler, and turkey industries cannot long continue under these adverse feed grain price relationships which have now been with us 2 years.

This condition, although not solely created by your administration, has been accentuated and prolonged by administrative actions under the emergency feed grain legislation of 1961–62. Unless corrective action is soon taken, we fear these conditions could actually be perpetuated.

In the fall of 1961 your department partially recognized the inequity of our livestock feeders position and instituted a temporary milo release program. Although spreads for the first 6 months of 1962 are in the highest in over 20 years, we have not had any indication of current corrective action. Thus we become greatly concerned when we read in the October 8, 1962, Wall Street Journal that—

"The Agriculture Department announced it will begin selling Government-owned corn at market prices, but not below levels which prevailed generally at harvesttime in 1960 and 1961. The Government already is selling grain sorghums under the same formula. From July 1 to September 28, 44 million bushels of sorghums were sold."

Here again this indicated sell-back target period of 1960 and 1961 represents a period when our PNW prices (non-sell-back area) were at most substantial difference above Midwest prices (sell-back area). Our feeders cannot continue such adverse competitive costs for their feed grains and must not be frozen into this uneconomic position any longer.

Therefore, we respectfully refer you to our well documented "Action Memorandum" of August 1, 1962, supported by studies of Oregon State University and Washington State University and presented personally to you by a group from our congressional delegation.

The vital significance and uncertainty of Government action make it most difficult for our people to decide wisely about future use of their resources. Time is of the essence. Therefore, we urge Government action now to reasonably correct this inequitable position.

Sincerely,

JAMES HILL, Jr.,
Chairman, Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
State of Oregon, October 6, 1962.

Mr. JAMES HILL, Jr.,
Chairman, Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council, Pendleton, Oreg.

DEAR JIM: We are enclosing herewith the chart showing farm price differentials between Nebraska corn and Oregon barley, which Secretary Freeman gave you earlier this week.

As requested, we have checked the chart and find that through May 1962 it is essentially in agreement with published USDA mid-month farm price data, after the indicated calculations have been made.

Starting with June 1962, the lines on the chart depart significantly from published USDA data. We find that the differential in June 1962 was $14.78 a ton instead of the $13 to $13.50. Likewise, the differential in July, $11.79 instead of approximately $10 shown. In August the difference was $11.47 instead of $9. The correct points for the 3 months are shown in red on the chart.

Incidentally, we find the chart shows the August 1960 differential about $1 higher than it actually was. In other words, the differential in August 1960 was only 15 cents higher than in 1961, according to our calculations shown in the attached tables.

While we believe there are better measures of the price differentials, in summary we would say that the chart, when corrected, shows the situation as you have been describing it; that is, differentials between Northwest barley prices and Midwest feed grain prices started increasing significantly in the 1955–59 period after grain production and adjustments and Public Law 480 programs began to operate. These spreads reached new highs in 1962 and remained above all other years charted at least until mid-August.

I hope this will help you eliminate doubts about the situation and obtain action that will substantially reduce this obstacle to continued economic development of the area.

Very truly yours,

MARION D. THOMAS,
Extension Agricultural Economist.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FEED, GRAIN & LIVESTOCK COUNCIL,
Pendleton, Oreg.

To All Council Members, Associates, Pacific Northwest Congressional Delegations:

On August 2, 1962, council representatives with a group of our Senators and Congressmen personally presented our action memorandum to Secretary Freeman. This memorandum extremely well supported and documented by Oregon State University and Washington State University studies pointed out the following highlights:

(a) Administration of Federal feed grain programs has developed distorted feed grain price relationships which will force Pacific Northwest livestock and poultry producers out of business unless these disadvantages are corrected.

(b) Our livestock and poultry people have been paying $12 to $16 per ton more for their feed grains than feeders in other major grain producing areas of the Nation.

(c) This is the greatest disadvantage for the Pacific Northwest livestock industry in 25 years. Though unintentional, the effect of Government action has been to benefit livestock feeders, related industries, and the people of other areas at the expense of like interests in the Pacific Northwest.

(d) Recent developments indicate that a feed-grain-cost squeeze on Pacific Northwest livestock feeders and poultrymen is going to remain severe in the 1962–63 feeding period unless administrative action is taken to restore reasonable patterns and price relationships.

Our action memorandum requested that immediate action be taken to establish and implement policies which will restore reasonable and equitable feed grain price relationships to the Pacific Northwest.

We recommended that for the short-term immediate (until the new form legislation could get our area back into balance) that the Secretary ship CCC-owned milo, corn or both to the Pacific Northwest and sell them into our markets at the same percentage below support levels in the Midwest. In other words, apply his sell-back program equally and fairly in all major grain producing market structures.

We also pointed out that a fair price relationship from our studies would be no more than $3 per ton higher price for Portland, Oreg., feed grain as compared to Kansas City feed grain.

Since August 2, the Secretary and his staff have been considering our case. We hardly expected an answer during the heat of the Billie Sol Estes case and the strains of getting farm legislation through this Congress. Now those hurdles are passed and we are getting down to the wire.

The Department economists have taken issue as to whether we are actually a feed grain surplus producing area. The point is, the Department should not make sell back prices available in every feed deficit area and should not be put in the position of making postage stamp rates for feed grains all over the Nation. Of course, the plain simple fact is that the Pacific Northwest is a grain surplus producing area. Over 70 percent of the grains we produce are dependent solely on an export market or Government storage.

We can thank Orville Freeman and the administration for battling through our farm legislation which for the first time officially recognizes wheat as a part of the total feed grain picture. Proper administration of this new legislation can ultimately solve our economic problem of feed grain price relationships.

But, "Meanwhile Back at the Ranch" we are temporarily frozen and locked into a most uneconomic position—unless the Secretary takes short-term emergency action to free us.

Actions to be taken: It is important that each of us continue our educational work with our friends, organizations, and with the city business leaders. When the big city businessman, banker, or industrialist finds out what adverse feed grain price relationships are doing to the economy of this Pacific Northwest he gets interested (see pp. 5, 6, and 7, "Meanwhile Back at the Ranch"). Keep in touch with your Congressman and Senator. Let them know the facts as they affect you—as you see them—do not forget Secretary Freeman.

Budget: Most of you responded quickly to our first request. Our sincere thanks. If you haven't acted, please let us hear from you one way or "tother."

Organizational meetings: It is the time of year when all of our commodity and livestock groups start holding annual meetings. It is very important that each group be aware of our program. Wherever possible it is important to have the delegate body pass a resolution favoring (1) participating in the council affairs and (2) authorizing the officers to support the council program so long as there is no direct conflict with the organization's policy.

Once again your directors deeply appreciate the very fine response from our membership and our associations. Our university people at Oregon State University and Washington State University have been indispensable.

Sincerely,

JAMES HILL, Jr.,
Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council.

OREGON WHEAT COMMISSION,
Pendleton, Oreg., October 1, 1962.

Mr. JAMES HILL, Jr.,
Chairman, Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council, Pendleton, Oreg.

DEAR JIM: Attached is a check for $100, authorized by the Oregon Wheat Commission on September 25, to help defray the expenses of the council.

The commission also endorsed the activities of the council and restated its own policy of urging the USDA to correct present regional feed grain price relationships.

During the past 4 years the commission has contributed over $12,000 in ways calculated to enhance the growth of livestock feeding in Oregon, believing that the Pacific Northwest should produce grain for Pacific Northwest livestock and poultry to supply Pacific Northwest markets for meat. As you know, Oregon wheat growers have long advocated a two-price system for wheat as the most practical way to accomplish this.

Under the 1963 wheat program a version of the two-price plan will be the subject of a grower referendum for the wheat program in 1964. We hope the Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council will join Oregon wheat growers in their efforts to get an acceptable, workable certificate plan, including the substitution clause allowing wheat to be grown on feed grain acres at prices or supports competitive with coarse grains.

Sincerely yours,

OREGON WHEAT COMMISSION,
By WINN TUTTLE, *Administrator.*

"MEANWHILE BACK AT THE RANCH," A TALK ON AGRICULTURE BY JAMES HILL, JR., BEFORE THE CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND, OREG., SEPTEMBER 28, 1962

Agriculture is of major importance to our Nation, to its people, to you. To accentuate this statement let's take a quick look at USDA leaflet No. 491—"Background on Our Nation's Agriculture"—it is the yellow folder—and follow me while I quote portions.

What is modern farming? Modern farming is the Nation's biggest industry. Farming employs 7.1 million workers—more than the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, the steel industry, and the automobile industry. Pretty good so far.

Investment in agriculture is nearly $200 billion, equal to three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

Agriculture, this biggest of the Nation's industries, is composed of 3.7 million independent producers.

Agriculture is a good customer. The farmers spend $25 to $26 billion a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock; another $15 billion a year for the same things that city people buy—food, clothing, drugs, furniture, appliances, and other products and services.

Each year the farmers' purchases include: $2.5 to $3 billion in new farm tractors and other motor vehicles, machinery, and equipment; $3.5 billion for fuel, lubricants, and maintenance of machinery and motor vehicles; farming uses more petroleum than any other single industry; total inventory of farm machinery alone is greater than the assets of the steel industry and five times that of the automobile industry.

Our Nation's agriculture is creator of employment. Four out of every ten jobs in private employment are related to agriculture.

Farming is an efficient, progressive industry. Productivity of the American farmworker in the 1950's increased by 6½ percent a year. Output per man-hour in nonagricultural industry increased by about 2 percent a year. We will have something to say on productivity later.

Our agriculture is food supplier to the world. We are the world's largest exporter of agricultural products; $4.8 billion in farm products were exported in 1960. This American agricultural abundance is a powerful force for world peace.

But in looking at the farmer's income from his labor and capital we find farm people in 1960 received 82 cents an hour income for farmwork. By contrast, 1 hour's work in a factory averaged $2.29, and hourly earnings in food marketing averaged $2.14.

These facts from the USDA leaflet surely point out the importance of our Nation's agriculture and also indicate some of our basic problems.

Let's look at Oregon's agriculture. Oregon State University's extension circular 683—the white one—gives us this information:

More than 40,000 families call Oregon farms home. Altogether these farms contain 21 million acres, a third of our State's total area.

Oregon's agriculture is the second largest primary industry in the State, generating more than a half billion dollars in buying power each year; employing more than 77,000 workers—more than employed in the wood products industry, or the contract construction industry, or transportation, communications, and public utilities.

Oregon's farming industry involves farm investments totaling $2.5 billion. This figure is equal to the total assets of all Oregon's banks or two-thirds of the annual income received by all Oregonians.

Oregon's farm investments average $32,000 for each Oregon farmworker, equaling twice the investment for each U.S. factory worker.

Oregon produces many agricultural products that enter into export trade. Farm products account for 4 out of every 5 tons exported at Portland, Oreg.

So it goes without question—agriculture and agricultural growth is of vital importance to every citizen in Oregon. A healthy, profitable agriculture is of vital necessity to the economic stability and growth of our Nation.

Peter Drucker, well-known management consultant, and economist, as quoted in the Oregon School of Business Administration publication, "Business Developments, 1961," in a talk given right here in Portland, Oreg., stated:

"The recession and the international deficit in our balance of payments are caused by the failure of our economy to improve its productivity during the last decade. There has been, of course, considerable productivity increase—but it has been confined to one segment, farming. If we deduct the fast rise in farm productivity from the total figures, we find practically no increase in productivity at all. Output has grown with the labor force—productivity simply has not grown at all. We do not utilize our resources, other than farmland any better than we did 10 years ago."

V. E. Rossiter, Sr., writing in the Banker, February 1962 issue, writes:

"By 1960 farmers were producing and marketing nearly 30 percent more physical production than had been produced and marketed in the 1947–49 period. In this same period of time—some 11 to 13 years—it cost the farmer 50 percent more to produce his products, his gross income increased only 13 percent and his net profit declined 22 percent for the period."

How do these things affect us? One important way is the cost of living. Let's look at the cost of living around the world for a minute:

Cost-of-living climb in the last 10 years, by selected nations

	Percent
France	42
Britain	29
Japan	28
Italy	22
Germany	18
United States	13

We all know wages increased greatly in this country the past 10 years—industrial goods and services increased substantially in price. Peter Drucker says productivity didn't increase; then, how did the United States end up with the lowest increase in the cost of living? The answer is the tremendous productivity increase in agriculture and the attendant drastic decline in food prices at the farm level have largely been responsible in recent years for keeping our economy relatively stable.

But, meanwhile back at the ranch, the better job our farmers did the past 10 years, the poorer they came out economically—they have produced themselves into depression conditions. Another way of saying this is—the farmer today has to trade the product of approximately 3 hours of his labor for the product of 1 hour of labor in manufacturing industries. This imbalance of price and profit opportunity between agriculture and industry of this Nation must be corrected before we can hope to enjoy balanced opportunity for all of us. Now this gets down to you and me, doesn't it?

Well, what to do about it all? I am not sure anyone knows for positive, but we have a lot of people and interests putting forth statements and opinions including myself. Briefly I will mention two of these.

The Committee for Economic Development—a business group composed of top level industry leaders—has recently completed an independent and searching study of the farm problem, entitled "An Adaptive Program for Agriculture." This Committee for Economic Development report correctly diagnosed the basic farm problem as imbalance between production and demand caused mainly by excess resources in agriculture. The Committee for Economic Development proposal is designed to raise income from farming without extensive Government control or subsidy. They would do this in a transitional 5-year period by relocating some 2 million farmers into the cities and doing away with all controls, subsidies, and supports during the transition period.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives says the proposal will not be effective for at least three main reasons. I agree. Here they are:

1. It fails to recognize that the free market in agriculture will not reduce total production or adequately adjust total production in relation to demand.

2. It fails to recognize the influence of economic organization and structure of agriculture and output.

3. It fails to recognize the importance of many resources other than labor which influence output.

We haven't time to explore these reasons in detail. Suffice to say that they are fundamental, deep seated, and realistic.

The second source, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, spearheaded by Orville Freeman, in its "Food and Agriculture—A Program for the 1960's" points out that there are four distinct but related goals that warrant most serious consideration. These are abundance—to expand food consumption, both domestic and foreign; balance—to adjust the production of commodities now in serious oversupply; conservation—to achieve better land use; and development—to upgrade economic opportunity for rural people.

This is a humane program. It is practical and workable. It is a program that faces facts squarely. Here are some of those facts:

Fact: The technological revolution in agriculture is real and nonreversible.

Fact: Agriculture can produce more than the market can take and will continue to do so—as far ahead as we can see.

Fact: Agriculture—made up as it is of many individual units—is not able by itself to make desired adjustments to excess supply or reduced demand. Generally, lower farm prices do not assure lower total farm output, unless the price declines are extreme and substained. Farmers are linked to the land by a long heritage, not simply dollars and cents. They often increase their output despite lower prices in a lonely effort to stay in business.

Fact: Large budget expenditures cannot be made indefinitely to acquire stocks of commodities that we do not need.

Fact: Farmer income has been at unsatisfactory levels relative to incomes of nonfarm people.

Facts: The economies of smalltown and rural America are dependent upon a prosperous agriculture.

Fact: If agriculture were to be returned to a free market situation, farmers would experience a searing farm depression. In such an event farm prices and incomes would fall to disaster levels and stay there a long time.

Programs planned and based on such facts can be made to work. If this be so, then why haven't we got the job done? So long as agriculture is to be the playing field for a political football game and subject to pressures political, we will have difficulty arriving at a sensible solution.

The most interesting suggestion we have heard is the one to create a Federal Farm Board somewhat in the image of the Federal Reserve Board and thereby ultimately remove the uncertainty and unpredictable outcomes of the political football contests from year to year.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch—so let's get down to business. Agriculture in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest is a leading industry and an economic spearhead of our regional economy. This will be true for many years to come. The large areas of cropland—rangeland combined with our God-given resources of water, rainfall, and growing climate dictate that the best economic use of these resources is agriculture—will be agriculture. Generally, in the early years of developing natural resources the emphasis of the developer is on turning the resource into the simplest form of cash. Certainly a worthy objective. Two good examples of this historical economic tendency is our timber industry and agriculture. The timber industry, for nearly a hundred years has cut and sold logs and sawed lumber for cash. Only recently has the complete utilization and further manufacturing operators come into the Pacific Northwest field. Today the cash sawmill operator and lumber seller is in a status quo if not declining position.

The agriculture industry of our Pacific Northwest has for nearly 100 years placed emphasis on growing cash crops. The vast dryland grain areas produce grain to be sold for cash. The hay man produces hay for cash. The main proportion of our agricultural land area has been utilized to produce the most effective immediate cash crops. There are signs that "immediate cash crop" economics is not adequate to sustain a growing agriculture in the Pacific Northwest. This is particularly true of our dryland grain areas of the Pacific Northwest. Only so much grain can be sold in the form of cereal-bread food products. The export market has been using vast quantities of our grain exported by Government subsidy. World markets for grain are totally controlled by state of governments. There is no such thing as a world free market. Each nation is aggressively encouraging their own farmers to produce—the technological revolution is just starting in these foreign countries, many of which have been paying out dollars for our cash crops.

So, meanwhile back at the ranch, I sit owning (through no astuteness on my part—I just had a good father and mother who worked like the devil and successfully gambled a lifetime on farming)—so I sit owning 1,000 acres of real good dryland grain area. I get a crop of grain off this land every other year. The property tax takes approximately $8,000 out of each crop. This is all right if I can expect a reasonable opportunity for (1) a ready market for my grain produced and (2) a market which will pay me a price that represents reasonable parity with the wage levels demanded by labor and prices charged by industry in the United States. In order to meet these requirements it seems obvious—almost elementary, dear Watson—that we must change some of our agricultural production and marketing concepts. The basis of America's meat rich diet is grain. We, here in the Pacific Northwest, must wake up and get busy converting our grain, grass, and fiber into meat animals as a means of keeping a balanced, healthy, and growing agricultural economy for our area. The following statements, facts, and figures illustrate the basic economics involved:

1. The farmer and his community get more of the consumer's retail food dollar when the farmer and his community produce, fatten, and market meat animals as compared to producing and selling cash crops.

2. Livestock can convert and concentrate about 7 pounds of dry matter feed (grain, grass, hay silage, concentrates) into 1 pound of highly nutritious animal foods. Thus, each meat animal is a small local factory capable of using the local products of our soil and converting these to a product our people want, need, and use.

3. In the United States the per capita consumption of cereal grain products as a food has been declining for over 40 years. The flour-food milling industry of the Pacific Northwest today uses less than 10 million bushels per annum of Pacific Northwest produced wheat. One county, our Umatilla County, can produce this amount of wheat.

4. Seventy percent of the cereal grains produced in the Pacific Northwest are now dependent on foreign export market use—or Government storage.

5. The total poultry and livestock activity of the Pacific Northwest has not materially changed in over 30 years. Yet the population of the area has increased tremendously in those 30 years.

6. The Pacific slope States import approximately 80 percent of the pork consumed by their populations. The State of Washington ships in from other areas about 20 percent of the beef consumed in the State of Washington.

Since the war years, our major agricultural industry in the Pacific Northwest—grain production—the best and often only economic resource use of vast dry land areas awakened to find that: (a) it had lost ground in the cereal food market; (b) had missed its share of the growing meat animal markets in the area; (c) was almost solely dependent on Government price and export programs; (d) had no future plan or program (independent of Government action) for changing the picture.

Our people started looking for answers. There is a logical, sound, economic solution to this Pacific Northwest area production and marketing problem. The Pacific Northwest is well located and endowed with all the basic resources necessary to competitively produce meat. The present area populations of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho provide a substantial market at our back door. The future growth of this area's population can provide a growing market for the products of our land through meat animals.

Let's take a quick look at the economics of this area market. The annual per capita consumption of flour and cereal products in this Nation is only about 145 pounds per person and declining. The per capita consumption of meat is about 190 pounds per year and going strong. When I eat 190 pounds of meat a year—which I like—I am consuming roughly 755 pounds of grain—more than I will ever eat in the form of flour or cereal products. The following illustrates the point:

Annual per capita meat consumption converted to pounds of grain

	Annual per capita meat consumption (dressed weights, pounds)	Pounds of grain
Beef	85	340
Pork	65	334
Chicken	28	57
Turkey	7	20
Lamb and mutton	5	4
Total	190	755

This 755 pounds of grain which you and I eat annually in the form of meat animals is equal to about 14 bushels of grain per person.

Now let us apply this average (14 bushels) figure to populations of the States of Oregon, Washington, and California and see how many bushels of grain are now being consumed in these States annually in the form of meat animal products:

State	Population	Bushel factor	Grain consumed (bushels)
Oregon	1, 768, 687	14	24, 761, 618
Washington	2, 863, 214	14	39, 994, 996
California	15, 717, 204	14	220, 040, 856
Total			284, 747, 470

Most of us are astounded when we see the size of annual grain consumption via meat products. After surprise, we become nonplussed to learn that our Pacific Northwest agriculture or California's agriculture is not deriving the main benefits from this economic activity. No, we are exporting our dollars to buy meat products to be shipped in to us. As we import these meat products from other areas we are buying their grass, their hay, their grain, their fiber, their processing, their labor, their services—and letting our economic opportunities go hang. It has been estimated that the importation of meat animals and finished meat products into the States of Oregon, Washington, and California presently amount to an annual wholesale processed value of some $500 to $600 million a year. The Pacific Northwest farmer, businessman, professional man, and laboring man cannot afford to ignore these sound, simple economics if we wish to have a balanced, growing, profitable area economy.

Why isn't someone doing something about all this? Someone is. For the past 8 to 10 years there has been a well sustained growth and interest in livestock enterprises. Substantial investments have been made by individuals and companies. For example cash farm marketings from animal products in 5 years (1955–61) doubled in Umatilla County, going from $6 million to $12 million. Cattle feeding mushroomed, the turkey industry took new hope, and people started back into the hog business. Things went along well until some 15 months ago the emergency feed grain legislation and the attendant farm program legislative squabbles resulted in our Pacific Northwest feed grain prices being consistently $10 to $16 per ton higher than feed grain prices in other major feed grain livestock areas. These differences which are the result of the administration of Government programs and policies are inequitable and unfair to our area feeders. Our livestock feeders cannot exist and consistently pay $10 to $16 per ton more for their raw product—feed grain—than their competitors in the Midwest.

We took this serious problem to Secretary Freeman a year ago and his department recognized the problem and instituted a temporary milo release program last fall which enabled our feeders to exist last year. However, the problem is back with us again—like a biting sow.

Oregon State University and Washington State University have prepared complete economic studies documenting the seriousness of our position. The congressional delegations of the three Pacific Northwest States have functioned as a group. We have had fine assistance from our Oregon group with MORSE, NEUBERGER, GREEN, and ULLMAN taking special interest. We have tied many of the agricultural grain, livestock, and poultry interests together in a Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council. On August 2, representatives of this council along with Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, and Congressmen ULLMAN and MAY personally presented our documented case to Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture. We are now waiting for the Secretary to make his administrative decision on what will be done, if anything, to correct our inequitable situation. In the meantime, our Pacific Northwest turkey, broiler, and hog industries are precariously hanging on the verge of liquidation. This must not be allowed to happen.

This is another major example like the lumber industry problem, and the Hanford project where the logical production and marketing economics of an area get hamstrung under the political and administrative procedures of Federal legislation and programs.

The answer is obvious that the people and interests of the Pacific Northwest must develop awareness, then we must unite, and finally stand up and fight.

I would like to summarize what I have said today. Agriculture is the Nation's biggest industry. Its productivity has exceeded that of labor and industry. For this ability to produce its reward has been lower prices at the farm and lower profits for the farmer. Declining prices in food products at the farm level has materially offset rising prices in other segments of our economy. This largest industry must become profitable if we expect our national economy to remain healthy.

Removing people from the farm and placing agriculture in a totally free production and marketing economy will not result in a healthy, profitable agriculture. Government direction, action, and control in some degree is necessary.

Agricultural policy in this Nation must be removed from the political football field so that Government direction, action, and necessary controls can be based upon sound economic reasoning to arrive at what is good for agriculture, our people, and our Nation. Commodity problems and concepts must be considered. Area production and marketing concepts must be fairly evaluated.

Agriculture in the Pacific Northwest is and always will be one of our major industries. There is no other way to better use our large areas of crop and range lands. Our agriculture cannot grow unless we can market what we produce profitably. The Pacific Northwest agriculture cannot continue to depend so heavily on shipping primary raw products out of the area.

In every way possible we must upgrade these products by processing within the area. We need those jobs—we need those markets.

Conversion of Pacific Northwest grain, grass, hay, and fiber into meat animals to become the chief meat-producing region of the west coast offers tremendous economic opportunities for all of us.

We must base our position on logic and sound economic reasoning. We must be prepared and able to make our position known and respected. So much will depend on the attitudes and actions of our leadership of the various segments of the Pacific Northwest area. Now is the time for all good leaders to come to the aid of our great Pacific Northwest in the full development and use of our God-given natural resources.

Meanwhile back at the ranch, we are like sitting ducks on "Lake Federal" waiting for the decision on adverse feed grain price relationships which have largely been created by Government action and hence have to be corrected by Government action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will follow where the facts lead and will recognize through positive action on the part of the Department the fairness and equity of our case.

In any event, I strongly urge that before final action is taken by the Department that the Secretary will give most careful consideration to this latest brief from a very responsible spokesman for the livestock industry of the Pacific Northwest.

The very least, it would seem to me, that the Department should do would be to indicate to our poultry and livestock producers what price relationship between barley and corn must obtain before the Government will take action.

It may be argued that feed grain prices have broken slightly in the past month or weeks. It is my understanding that this is a normal drop for this time of year. The important point, however, is that our turkey, poultry, hog, and livestock producers must know with reasonable certainty what the Government plans to do so that they can plan their own operations. I gravely fear that, unless departmental policies are changed, far too many will be forced out of business.

Northwest feeders must have an equal opportunity to purchase feed grains at prices which are not higher than the normal price differentials of Midwest corn and milo.

The result of the feed grain program during the past 2 years has been near disastrous for Northwest feeders. It will become a major disaster if nonnormal price relationships continue.

I feel, and so do our farmers, that until the underlying inequity is corrected it will not be possible to place our livestock, turkey, and poultry industries upon a sound basis. The dollar of farm income, as I have often said, rings in the cash registers of Main Street throughout our region, as elsewhere. We should not continue to place, by Government action, an inequitable burden upon our Pacific Northwest farm people, who, after all, are trying to bring our towns and cities nourishing food at reasonable prices. An equitable feed grain policy for the Pacific Northwest can be a strong economic tool to achieve this desirable end.

Mr. President, at the heart of the controversy which has arisen over the feed grain problem is a very delicate subject. It is a subject which in my judgment must be discussed in the open. It is a subject which may place me in conflict, but I hope not in controversy, with the Department of Agriculture. I speak not alone. I speak for other Senators and for Representatives from the Pacific Northwest.

I wish the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman, to take note of what I say on the floor of the Senate today. We in the Pacific Northwest do not feel that we are receiving fair, adequate, and proper consideration of the feed grain program in the Pacific Northwest as it affects the livestock and the poultry feeders of our country.

I have listened to the Secretary's staff members express their rationalizations up to now on the Department's do-nothing policy with regard to this subject. However, the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants cannot change the law of mathematics. They cannot make two and two equal anything but four; nor can they change the fact that adding nothing to nothing still ends with nothing.

The delicate problem to which I refer is that the policy of the Department of Agriculture with regard to the feed grain discrimination against the Pacific Northwest results in nothing but favoritism to the storage interests of the Middle West, to the detriment of the feeders of the Pacific Northwest.

It is news to me that the surplus commodity program of the United States encompasses any plan to enrich the storage interests of America. I had always thought that our aim so far as the surplus commodity program in this country is concerned, was to get it used. Our object was not to store at great cost to the taxpayers of the United States.

When the Department of Agriculture does not give us the relief we need in the Pacific Northwest to end the unfair discrimination from which our feeders are suffering, in comparison with the advantages given to feeders in the Middle West, it must be charged, as I now charge the Department of Agriculture, with a program which, in effect, favors the storage people of the country.

The senior Senator from Oregon is taking the position, in speaking for the congressional delegations of the Pacific Northwest, that we must get milo out of storage. We want to get this milo into the feed troughs of the Pacific Northwest so that our feeders can, at the least, compete on an equal footing with Kansas City, Chicago, Des Moines, and other great feedlot centers of this country.

We are confronted with an unfair discrimination of from $7 per ton up of discrimination favoring the Middle West feed lots. In recent times, as reported by Mr. Hill, this has risen to $18 per ton and has been consistently at a $10 to $16 a ton level.

So I say once again to the Secretary of Agriculture: "Take a look at the facts and follow where they lead. I am well aware of all the pressures that come from the Midwest. I am well aware of the powerful lobby of the storage houses of America, which are making millions of dollars from storing surplus grains. I am aware that they like to get the grain stored in order to collect from the American taxpayers what amounts to a huge waste of taxpayer dollars.

"However, Mr. Secretary, you cannot justify continuing this discrimination against the feed lot operators of the Pacific Northwest. We are entitled to have some of the surplus milo and other feed grains shipped to the Pacific Northwest to be made available at fair prices to our feed lot producers. We should not be everlastingly told that we must continue to compete against Kansas City, Chicago, Des Moines, and other feed lot centers of this country, with a handicap of well over a $7 per ton, plus, adverse differential because of the policies of the Department of Agriculture."

Our feed lot producers have submitted the evidence which supports the choice that I recommend. As between keeping the grain in storage and putting it into livestock and poultry, the choice is a clear one. We should use it to feed our livestock in order to provide a better diet for our people.

When we put the milo or other grain into our feed lots, we are putting it into great private enterprise institutions. It will come as a surprise, I am sure, to the American people generally—and I am not so sure, although we tried to make it clear, that this will not come also as a surprise to some people in the Department of Agriculture—that the States of Washington and Oregon do not produce all of their own meat supply. A large percentage of the meat supply of the Pacific Northwest is shipped into the Pacific Northwest as finished product.

"But," people say, "Mr. Senator, I thought Oregon was a great cattle raising State. I thought that Washington also raised much cattle."

Both States, are, but we still both remain economic colonies of the East and of the Middle West. We are still great raw material States, not finished product States. We still suffer great economic discrimination. We have fought for years, for example, to bring to an end the freight differential of the Pacific Northwest, which puts us at an economic disadvantage with many other parts of the country.

What happens? Our feeder cattle, our young stock, is shipped from Washington and Oregon into the feed lots of the Middle West.

After slaughter in the packinghouses of the Middle West, the finished carcasses are shipped back across the country. They come back to Oregon and to Washington, thus supplying us with a large share of our meat requirements.

I am waiting for agricultural economists in the Department of Agriculture to justify this economic waste. I maintain that it cannot be justified. We could feed our own feeders and finish our own meat supply if we were to receive some help on this problem.

The Department of Agriculture has a responsibility to see to it that this kind of economic discrimination is brought to an end. We ought to have the right, and the opportunity, on an equal, competitive basis, to finish our own livestock in our own feed lots. We ought not to have our thousands and thousands of heads of feeders shipped for fattening into the Kansas City, Chicago, Des Moines, and other Midwest feed lot areas, only to be shipped back to us as finished carcasses.

We are asking only for an equal and a fair break on the feed grain problem. It can be done. It has happened on a couple of rare occasions in certain emergencies. It happened once when a few thousand tons of milo were shipped to the Pacific Northwest. I told the Secretary of Agriculture, when it happened more than a year ago, that this action was of great benefit to us. I recall one other occasion when some milo was shipped to the southeastern part of the United States. It was a sound program then; it would be a sound program if renewed now.

As I enter this caveat today, I say to the administration that there, in my judgment, is an opportunity to do something about the cost of storage of surplus grain. Here is a way to do something to stimulate the private enterprise system by seeing to it that the surplus grain program of the Government does not work an economic injustice to every feed lot operator and every turkey and poultry producer in the Pacific Northwest.

I am sorry I have found it necessary to come to the floor of the senate to make so strong a statement as I have made this morning. I have tried to avoid doing so, because for many weeks we have tried to have the problem settled in the Department of Agriculture on a negotiated basis.

It is not the fault of the Secretary of Agriculture; he is very much concerned with many other matters. But I say, most respectfully, that we feel it is the fault of the staff in lower echelons of the Department of Agriculture. I want them to know that the senior Senator from Oregon does not know what it means to accept a brush-off. I say to the Secretary of Agriculture that I do not intend to accept a brush-off on this issue. I intend to take the issue to the country in the weeks immediately ahead. I shall continue to ask the Department: When will you start to give common justice to the feedlot operators, the hog, poultry, and turkey producers of the Pacific Northwest?

STORM DAMAGE TO OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, beginning yesterday afternoon and continuing much of last night, a storm of hurricane proportions, possibly unequaled in the history of my State, ravaged not only Oregon but other parts of the Pacific Northwest. Exceptionally heavy damage was done in my State. It is not yet known what the total amount of damage is or what the total loss of life or number of casualties will be, although I have been greatly relieved to receive, in the last long-distance telephone call, the information that the estimated loss of life is less than 25. Long-distance telephone calls have been received from Oregon for many hours, so we pray and hope that the estimate is correct. There is no way of knowing yet the number of persons who have been injured.

I was told in the latest message that all the telephones are "out" in the southern part of Oregon. I have been trying to reach my hometown to learn the extent of the damage there, but telephonic communications with that area have not yet been established. However, according to reports which have been relayed from that area to Portland, the damage apparently has been pretty much limited to the loss of buildings. In some areas, such as Junction City, major fires have occurred. Several lumber mills in my county have burned down. There has been a severe loss to the power utilities and a great loss by way of damage to automobiles, personal property, and trees. This morning the Governor declared that part of the State to be a disaster area.

I express my appreciation to the administration for the cooperation I have received this morning, for I presented this problem early this morning to the White House, where it received the attention of Mr. Ralph Dungan. I asked that he proceed to initiate whatever Federal procedures are necessary to determine what, if any, Federal assistance can be given to the disaster area in my State. I am sure that upon a determination of the facts, the Federal Government will in this instance, as it has been in the case of any other disaster or tragedy which has struck our country, be of every assistance as the law allows. I have given that assurance to the people of my State. However, I wished to make a statement on the floor of the Senate at this time, so that there would be public knowledge of the fact that we are all working together in an endeavor to provide such assistance as is possible.

My counsel has just handed me a newsticker dispatch which corrects a figure given me in the latest long-distance telephone call. I am sorry to have to report that, according to this dispatch, the estimated loss of life has been increased. The Associated Press dispatch from Portland, Oreg., reads, as follows:

> PORTLAND, OREG.—A howling storm with wind gusting to more than 100 miles per hour left at least 26 persons dead and a broad band of devastation along the west coast today.
>
> That made a 2-day toll of 35 killed by successive storms, with 13 dead in Oregon, 11 in California, 8 in Washington, and 3 in British Columbia.
>
> National Guard units and all available police were on duty in the Portland area to curb looting, which began after the wind smashed hundreds of store windows yesterday.
>
> The fury of the storm was felt as far as 125 miles inland, where it was finally blunted by the Cascade Mountains.
>
> At one time three trains were reported missing between Seattle and Portland. It turned out they were delayed by trees and debris on the tracks, but with all communications out, it took hours to locate them.

A storm of this kind in my section of the country is really unheard of. In my years in Oregon, I do not recall a storm having winds which reached a velocity of more than 100 miles an hour. I mention this item on the floor of the Senate today on behalf of the people of my State, the Governor of my State, and other Government officials. I wish to express appreciation to the Federal Government for the cooperation which is being extended to us and for whatever assistance can be given to us to alleviate the suffering and the losses which the people of my State are undergoing in this tragedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FACILITATION OF ENTRY OF CERTAIN ALIENS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 12, 1962, pp. 23421–23422, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as passed by the Senate, S. 3361 provided for the admission in a nonquota status of certain skilled aliens whose services are urgently needed in the United States and of certain close relatives of U.S. citizens, and also provided authority for the Attorney General to create a record of lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States in the cases of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1962.

Sections 1, 2, and 3, as agreed on by the conferees, are identical to both the Senate version and the House version of the bill.

Section 4 of the bill, as agreed on by the conferees, is in the nature of a substitute for the provisions contained in the Senate version of the bill which would have permitted the Attorney General to create a record of lawful admission for permanent residence in the cases of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952. Section 4 now provides a procedure within the framework of the suspension of deportation procedures presently contained in section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The aliens affected will be granted substantially the same relief that they would have received under the provisions of section 4 of the Senate version of the bill, with a requirement that the action of the Attorney General in suspending deportation be reported to the Congress for approval.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, since the distinguished majority leader has already outlined this measure, I shall take only a few minutes of the Senate's time to discuss it.

I must express my regret that the measure is not more comprehensive. It serves to emphasize the great importance of having, early in the next session, a thorough consideration of our immigration statutes, in order to remove from them certain discriminatory features and in order to help unite families which today are separated because of some of their harsh provisions.

Under the bill now before us, it is my judgment, Mr. President, based on reliable estimates, that a total of 7,000 aliens in the first preference or skilled specialist category, will be permitted to enter the United States freed of quota restrictions; or, if they are already in the United States on a temporary basis, they will be eligible to have their status adjusted to that of permanent residents.

In the fourth preference group, some have said that approximately 16,000 alien relatives of American citizens will be able to come to this country. Mr. President, I would just like to stress that this 16,000 estimate is based on the number of fourth preference aliens who are on consular waiting lists with a registration date prior to March 31, 1954. The mere fact of their registration on the list, plus their eligibility under this bill, will not necessarily mean that the full estimated number of 16,000 will actually come to America. Among the names registered so long ago on consular lists are those who have since died, moved, or, for one reason or another, simply changed their mind about emigrating to the United States. In my considered opinion, not more than 10,000 to 12,000 of those eligible under this bill will actually derive its benefits. I stress this, not by any means to belittle this bill, which I think is much needed, but to show how, relatively speaking, we are dealing with a mere trickle of immigration in passing stopgap measures as this.

Mr. President, as this bill passed the Senate 8 days ago, section 4 of the bill amended present section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by changing from 1940 to 1952 the cutoff date of entry for persons eligible for certain administrative relief. In the other body, an amendment was offered and agreed to, striking this section 4.

In its stead, the other body agreed to a second amendment inserting a new section 4 in the bill relating to the present Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the State Department.

I am happy to say, however, that the conferees in behalf of the other body were persuaded to recede from this amendment, and their reasonableness in this regard is to be commended. I am confident that when the House amendment treating the organization of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs comes before the appropriate Senate committee in the due course of orderly legislative process, it will receive fair consideration and will stand or fall on its own true merits.

The conferees of both bodies also believed it desirable to restore to this bill a section permitting adjustment of status for certain aliens illegally in the United States. Instead of the amendment to section 249 which was contained in section 4 of this bill as it was passed by this body, the conferees agreed upon an amendment to the present section 244 of the act. No person who would have been eligible for administrative relief under section 249 as the Senate proposed and amended it, would be excluded from consideration for relief under section 244 as the conference report now proposes to amend it. Section 244 as amended would permit aliens who have been physically present in the United States for 7 years, or, in more serious cases, for 10 years, to apply to the Attorney General for a suspension of deportation as under present section 244. The alien would have to show a specified degree of hardship to either himself or his spouse and children if he were to be deported as required by law. Should the Attorney General believe the application meritorious, he would recommend suspension of deportation to the Congress as under present law, and the Congress by resolution could approve the recommendation, suspend the alien's deportation, and adjust his status to that of permanent residence.

Mr. President, I would have personally preferred a suspension of deportation provision which would have made available to those eligible a completely administrative remedy, rather than bringing the Congress itself into the process. I do not see any reason for the Congress, when enacting legislation of a general nature in the immigration field, to inject itself into its administration on a case-by-case basis. Such a procedure simply makes for unnecessary labor within the respective committees of the Congress—almost as much labor, indeed, as would be involved if the problem were to be handled through private bills, which presumably the general legislation is designed to curb or eliminate.

The conference amendment to section 244 does have at least one advantage over the earlier Senate-passed amendment to section 249. Section 249, as the Senate proposed to amend it, would have applied only to aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952. The conference version of section 244, on the other hand, has continuing future applicability to any alien who can satisfy either the 7- or the 10-year physical presence requirement in addition to the other criteria for suspension of deportation. On balance, this continuing applicability of section 244 persuades me that the conference proposal is certainly not so objectionable that it should stand in the way of approval of this conference report.

I believe all those whc worked to obtain enactment of this measure in these last days of the Congress deserve commendation. There was every likelihood until very late in the session, that no immigration bill would be considered by the Congress before adjournment. This would have been most unfortunate and I am very pleased that at least this measure has been approved. It does not begin to resolve all of the inequities in the present law, but there is no doubt that it will provide relief in many worthy cases.

I therefore urge approval of the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New York in his statement in regard to this measure. As one who joined in the introduction of a number of immigration bills, particularly for the purpose of making it easier to modernize the quotas which were established in the period from 1920 to 1960, I believe Congress has done very little to make it more possible for the relatives of American citizens to enter this country. The other day I spoke on this matter.

I take this occasion to join the Senator from New York in hoping that the 1st session of the 88th Congress will concern itself with making the necessary improvements in our immigration laws.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE STORY OF CHAVEZ RAVINE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD "The Story of the Chavez Ravine" in the city of Los Angeles, Calif. It was originated in 1830 by Julian Chavez, a 27-year-old New Mexican, who went to the Pueblo of Los Angeles that year.

There being no objection the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STORY OF CHAVEZ RAVINE

Chavez Ravine in Los Angeles takes its name from Julian Chavez, a young New Mexican who came to the Pueblo of Los Angeles in the 1830's.

Chavez probably arrived late in 1835—as indicated by the old city archives—the year Mexico honored the pueblo by making it a city (ciudad) and the capital of Alta California. The 1836 census listed Julian Chavez, gave his age as 27, and his occupation as laborer.

In Chavez' time, to get a lot or a small farm, a man went to the city council—then called the ayuntamiento—and asked for a specific piece of vacant land. Los Angeles, having been founded in 1781 as a Spanish pueblo, was by law the owner of four square leagues of land centering at its plaza. The city, accordingly, was the chief source of land for the townsmen. Councilmen spent most of their time hearing petitions from the land-hungry or passing on reports from its land committee to which most of these petitions were referred.

Young Chavez was ambitious. On arriving in town he tried to get land for agricultural purposes. His first request was turned down though soon afterward in 1836 he got a town building lot. He was not discouraged and kept on with his agricultural petitions. He worked hard to get the council of the 1830's to say "yes," for the name of Julian Chavez was well sprinkled through the pages of the old archives devoted to the doings of the council in Mexican days.

Finally he got his land, which ultimately became known as Chavez Ravine. At first the people called it "Corralitos" because of the small corrals for his cattle and horses, which he installed there—following a New Mexican custom little known to Californians.

At this time Los Angeles was the hub of the ranches, the trading and social center of the southern California cattle country. To its plaza all roads led, bringing in fast-galloping horsemen and slow-moving, ox-drawn carretas filled with women shoppers from the ranches which ringed the pueblo. From Chavez Ravine it was a short horseback ride on Eternity Street to get to the plaza, the shops, and the fandangos.

As the years went by, Julian Chavez acquired many friends and held several small offices, such as substitute auxiliary alcalde and judge of the waters. Finally, in 1846, he became a regidor, that is, a councilman. Now he could help pass on land applications himself. So important a man as Chavez could even get a rancho, too, and, with a friend named Leonardo Cota, high up in government circles, he was given a 6-league grant, the Rio de las Animas. Gov. Pio Pico was the donor, on behalf of the Mexican action—though, alas, the claim was later rejected by the United States.

The great excitement of 1846, however, one that caused the council to adjourn for over 6 months, was the raising of the American flag over Monterey on July 7 by Commodore Sloat of the U.S. Navy. This signaled the end of Mexican rule in California. Under the military government that was set up by the United States, local government was encouraged to continue as it had been doing. So, the Los Angeles Ayuntamiento (city council) took heart and resumed the normal activities of assigning land and settling all of the town's troubles and disputes.

It was in 1849, during the period of military rule, that the councilmen, somewhat Americanized, decided to sell their land instead of giving it to the settlers. Also, their treasury was empty. Under the rules laid down by the military, however, Los Angeles couldn't go into the real estate business and sell any of its unappropriated 4 square league area without reference to a map. The town had no map and no man capable of making one. Lt. E. O. C. Ord, of the U.S. Army, was assigned to the surveying job. He came up with the town's first map. It covered the heart of the 4 square leagues. It showed blocks, lots, vineyards, cornfields, and such streets as the Street of the Grasshoppers, Bull Street, Short Street, the Street of the Virginia, and Eternity Street. The last named highway led from the plaza to the pueblo's old cemetery and passed the entrance to Chavez Ravine. The ravine itself got into Ord's picture and was included in the hilly area of the map's upper right corner.

In April of 1850 the American form of government in Los Angeles County was organized. Later, municipal government was reformed along American lines, with mayor and council taking the place of alcalde and ayuntamiento. In the same year, too, California became a State in the Union. When the Federal census of the city of Los Angeles was taken that year, Julian Chavez was listed as a farmer, with a household of 13. His real estate—Chavez Ravine—was valued at $800.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], containing a message from Mr. Herman H. Pevler, president of the Wabash Railroad, to its employees, dealing with the responsibilities of citizenship.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

The strength of our country lies in its business leadership as well as in public life. An example of the type of leadership which this country needs if our representative form of government is to continue is Mr. Herman H. Pevler, president of the Wabash Railroad. In the Banner, a publication sent by the Wabash to its employees, Mr. Pevler's message to his fellow employees is:

"We are again approaching general elections, at which time Americans everywhere will exercise one of their most sacred prerogatives—the right to choose their representatives in local, State, and Federal Government.

"However, in years past, the record shows that off-year elections have inevitably resulted in an extremely light voter turnout, perhaps because the glamour and dynamics of a presidential choice were not present. This to me is tragic since the men we select to represent us at these levels of government strongly influence the day-to-day operations of our great country.

"No citizen should make the error that his or her vote won't be missed; the sum total of those 'won't be missed' votes can turn the tide in any election.

"In addition to casting a ballot, all Americans should become active in the political party of their choice and work diligently in support of the candidates they feel are best qualified for public office. Too often the selection of legislators and public servants is left in the hands of a few precinct politicians. This invariably results in unhealthy political alliances.

"It is a great privilege to be an American, but with this privilege goes certain responsibilities we can't afford to ignore. Putting men of merit in public office is one. I urge all Wabash employees to fulfill their responsibility by going to the polls and voting for the candidates they feel are best qualified to serve."

CRITICISM OF BRITISH POLICY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday, in an address delivered at Llandudno, Wales, British Foreign Minister Lord Home spoke in words disturbingly reminiscent of Neville Chamberlain's ill-fated phrase "I have brought home peace with honor." Incredible as it may seem, Lord Home emphasized with pride Britain's role in the unsatisfactory Lao settlement, which, even as he spoke, was being further undermined by the complete refusal of the Communist forces to heed its terms. We have kept our agreement in regard to Laos; but the Communists—as was to be expected—have completely ignored their commitments. To consider this Lao agreement anything more than a face-saving gesture, an umbrella against a hurricane, another Munich pact in Asia, is to mistake the wish for the reality.

Furthermore, Mr. President, at the same time that Lord Home was taking credit for the futile Allied gestures in Laos, the British Government was asking the U.S. Government to protect British shipping in the Caribbean, so that British magnates can continue reaping the profits of trade with Castro. Whereas, other NATO allies on the whole have been understanding of the need to curtail Castro's source of supply, the British and some of their Commonwealth associates have persistently put their own dollars-and-cents advantage above any other consideration. Just as there were British merchants who did not hesitate to sell arms and equipment to Hitler in the thirties, just as the British last year did not hesitate to sell Viscounts to Red China, and just as the British have consistently transgressed or weakened the COCOM restrictions on strategic trade with the Communists, so, too, in the Cuban trade situation, short-run gain is apparently put before long-range international objectives.

According to reports in the press, Lord Home gratuitously insulted the United States by telling a story about a young boy who was coming up an escalator the wrong way. According to Lord Home, he told the boy, "You cannot do that," to which the boy replied, "But I am an American." Lord Home then told his audience, saying he drew no moral, "I turned him round and I put him back on the right and proper road."

I am afraid it is the British, who in my judgment, have been traveling the wrong road. We would be in serious trouble, indeed, if we followed the suggestions of Lord Home about the proper road to travel.

I was incensed when I read this report of Lord Home's speech. I am still angry about it. But I want to make one thing clear. As one who fought in two World Wars side by side with British men and officers, I know there are no more courageous, determined, or resourceful fighters than the British. And if I had to choose anyone with whom to stand with my back against the wall in a last-ditch struggle for survival, I would not hesitate to make that stand with a Britisher. When the chips are down, they are always superb.

But my point is this, Mr. President, the American people would prefer to meet and defeat communism without first placing our backs to the wall and throwing our chips to the ground. There is no reason why at this point we should continue to negotiate ourselves into a dead-end alley where the only alternative is complete surrender or all-out war. There are many other courses we can take today with regard to Cuba, Asia, trade with the Communists, Berlin, and other points of conflict with the Communists which will strengthen our hand and, in my judgment, make all-out conflict less, not more, likely. But such a policy demands more than mere negotiation and wishful thinking. It requires allied cooperation, and even economic sacrifice.

Mr. President, we are not playing tiddlywinks with the Communists. We are involved in a serious and dangerous cold war struggle. We cannot afford to lose, and the kind of hesitation, gentleman's agreement, and timid diplomacy which played such a large part in bringing on World War II is even more out of date today than it was a quarter of a century ago. In facing the Communists, we must fight fire with fire and give up the dangerous habit of confusing the form and appearance of international agreement with the real substance of international security which we have so far been unable to achieve through diplomatic method.

SOVIET OIL OFFENSIVE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the severity of the threat posed to the security of this country by the Soviet oil offensive was graphically emphasized this week with the release of a report by the National Petroleum Council. This group is an advisory body to the Federal Government, and its membership includes 80 men who are leaders in the field of petroleum production, transport, and sale. Eighteen months ago, the council was asked by the Department of the Interior to make a factual study of the effects on the free world of the exports of oil from the Soviet bloc. A working committee, headed by George T. Piercy, of Standard Oil, and Robert Ebel, of the Department of the Interior, has produced a voluminous, well-documented report which can only be described as startling.

The committee found that the Soviet Union is the repository of vast untapped oil reserves, and that crude oil production is increasing rapidly and far exceeding all official Soviet plans. Furthermore, the Russians are stepping up their ability to export petroleum by building a major pipeline system which they would not have been able to complete thus far without obtaining materials from the free world. West Germany, Italy, and Sweden alone will supply 40 percent of the entire requirements of the Soviet 7-year plan for 40-inch pipeline.

Our allies are also cooperating in this expansion by building Russian deep sea oil tankers in Western countries. The Soviet tanker fleet will be practically self-sufficient by 1965, and two-thirds of the new tonnage will have been supplied by the free world. It is indeed surprising that the Russians seem to be surpassing even their own production estimates in this field, and distressing that the nations of the free world have formulated no coordinated plan to meet the offensive.

Soviet bloc exports to Western Europe have grown, and in the estimation of the committee which has just produced this important report, Soviet bloc exports will continue to grow. This politically motivated trade offensive has three serious consequences:

First. It reduces the revenues of the oil producing nations of the West.

Second. It enables the Communists to obtain strategic goods and technology in return for oil, from the industrialized nations.

Third. It enables the Soviets to exert political pressure on underdeveloped countries which become dependent upon receiving Soviet oil.

In recent months, I have spoken out many times in an effort to alert the country to this very real danger. It is gratifying that this long-awaited report was finally released, and I commend the National Petroleum Council, and the members of the committee for their excellent presentation. Perhaps this report will serve to awaken the public and government officials to the harsh facts.

On October 26, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will meet in New York to hear testimony relating to trade with the Soviet bloc. It is my hope that the witnesses at the hearing will be able to give us additional information on this oil problem in particular. With this objective in mind, the subcommittee staff is preparing to receive testimony from some of the men who compiled this excellent report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair. At 2 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1962.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 13, and 18 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 6371. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income, and with respect to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks;

H.R. 8269. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg;

H.R. 8517. An act to grant emergency officer's retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929; and

H.R. 10501. An act for the relief of Kenyon B. Zahner.

PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 12, 1962, pp. 23400–23408, Congressional Record.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the report was agreed to by all the conferees, and is signed by all members of the conference committee.

The conferees carried on extensive and intensive deliberations, and reached an agreement which will make it possible to carry forward projects which are extremely vital to the improvement and strengthening of our economy.

There were a number of projects on which hearings had not been held on the House side, and on which the House conferees could not agree. The Senate receded very reluctantly on these projects; but we have received a commitment from the managers on the part of the House that the Committee on Public Works of the House will hold public hearings as soon as practicable after the next Congress convenes, on the following projects which were considered by the conferees, and are not included in this conference report. They are Cape Fear River basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; the South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky., and Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho; Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; Savannah River-Duke Power Co., South Carolina and Georgia; and Trotter's Shoal Reservoir, Savannah River.

Mr. President, I refer to page 48 of the conference report as presented to the House by Mr. Davis of Tennessee, a copy of which is on the desks of Senators, for the statement of the managers on the part of the House, as follows:

EARLY HEARINGS

The managers on the part of the House made a commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings as soon as practicable after the next Congress convenes on the following projects which were considered by the conferees and which are not included in this conference report: Cape Fear River basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; the South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho; Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; Savannah River-Duke Power Co., South Carolina and Georgia, and Trotter's Shoal Reservoir, Savannah River.

There will also need to be a consideration with respect to basin authorizations, and perhaps other projects will be available for consideration by that time—early in 1963.

In that regard, the total cost of the projects contained in the bill as passed by the Senate was $3,692,200,800. With the reductions made, the conference report provides for a total monetary authorization of $2,260,220,000, and would authorize some 207 projects.

The largest item taken out of the bill in the conference was the sum of $900,300,000 from basin authorizations. However, with the exception of the Los Angeles River basin, in California, there is enough remaining authorization from the Flood Control Act of 1960 to cover the appropriations made in the civil functions appropriation bill, 1962, for the fiscal year 1963.

With reference to the Los Angeles River basin, the appropriation in the current civil functions bill exceeded the existing authorizations by $3,700,000. Therefore, the only basin authorization contained in this bill is the $3,700,000 for the authorization required to cover the appropriations in the current appropriation bill for the Los Angeles River basin.

The situation now is that before the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for 1963 can be considered and enacted, to provide the necessary funds for the orderly continuation of the projects in the several basins, additional authorizations will have to be made. It was the belief of the Senate committee—and it was approved by the Senate—that since it was so late in 1962, it would be the part of wisdom to include in this bill additional basin authorizations; and that was done to the extent of approximately $900 million. That was one of the items—and the largest one—taken out of this bill in conference. It does not mean that the authorizations will not be passed. They will have to be passed next year, ahead of next year's civil functions appropriation bill.

However, the House conferees insisted that those basin authorizations be deleted from this bill; and that was when they gave the assurance that early in 1963 they would hold hearings and would initiate proceedings, early in the session of Congress next year, for the passage of legislation including not only the additional basin authorizations which were taken out of this bill, and which will be required next year, but also they agreed, as I have stated, to hold hearings on these additional projects which were deleted from this bill.

Therefore, it is quite apparent that, while the conference committee reduced the amount provided in the bill from $3,692,200,800 to $2,260,220,000, the net result is that the difference between the two amounts will, of necessity, and in accordance with the commitment of the members of the House Public Works Committee, be before the Congress for its consideration next year.

With that explanation, I ask for approval of the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Oklahoma referred to the agreement made by the House conferees that hearings would be held early next year upon various projects, including Devils Jump, which were not included in the bill reported by the conference. It was agreed also that these separate projects will be considered early next year in connection with the river basin projects, and if approved will be included in an omnibus bill, which will be acted upon by the Congress in 1963.

Mr. KERR. In the same bill that would provide additional river basin authorizations; that is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I note that river basin projects are not referred to in the paragraph on page 48 captioned "Early hearings." I am sure it was an oversight.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma does not regard it as an oversight. I think it was by reason of the fact that the managers on the part of the House took it for granted that Senators and Members of the House of Representatives both knew existing authorizations were about exhausted, and that of necessity legislation would be required early next year for additional basin authorizations. I think they had in mind to make clear and a matter of record their assurance that there would be hearings on the projects which were eliminated from the bill but which had been listed.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that the Senator's description of the situation is correct. The projects listed in the statement of the House managers, and not included in the bill reported by the conference, if they should be approved by the House or Senate Public Works Committee, would become part of the omnibus bill which will have to be considered next year.

Mr. KERR. As the Senator from Kentucky is so well aware, because he spent so many days in the hearings of the committee, the projects which have been set forth in detail and which were deleted from the bill were all fully justified and shown to be worthy and meritorious by the reports of the various Government agencies—the Chief of Engineers, the Rivers and Harbors Board of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of the Budget; and certainly they will be just as meritorious and worthy next year.

It will be the purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors, along with other members of the subcommittee, including the Senator from Kentucky, who is the ranking Republican member, to hold hearings when the bill comes to be considered, and to include such projects in whatever authorization act we have next year.

Mr. COOPER. Let me say, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], that we are very grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for his leadership—and to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]—as well as to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], for their valiant labors during the conferences with the House to uphold to the very end the Senate version of the bill. They did all it was possible for them to do to secure its adoption, and we thank them.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. While we were very much disappointed that we did not get the Cape Fear project in the bill, I am very grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma for the fine work he and his colleagues did in obtaining an agreement with the House conferees to hold hearings on the project next year, so it may be included in another bill. I want to thank every one of the Senators for the fine service they rendered. I know what they were up against. Nobody could have done more than they did. I am deeply grateful to every member of the conference committee on the Senate side, and I have no quarrel with Members of the House who were in the conference, because they were under orders and they did all they could do.

I appreciate the courtesy extended to me in letting me come into the conference and explain the project I was interested in, with the hope that I might be of help. It was not very helpful, but I thank Senators for their courtesy. With the agreement that has been made, we have assurance that this project will be considered next year, when the hearings will be held, and it can be passed on then. It is a fine project.

I appreciate the fine work done by the Senator from Oklahoma, as well as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. KERR. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. It was with the deepest regret that the Senate conferees receded on the Cape Fear River basin project in North Carolina.

It had been approved by every Member of the North Carolina delegation in the House of Representatives except one. It had been vigorously fought for by the two great Members in the Senate from North Carolina. It had been approved by the Governor of North Carolina. It had been approved by the Chief of Engineers, the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget. It had a cost-benefit ratio of 2.5 to 1.

It developed that there was a road block in the form of a commitment in the Public Works Committee of the House to one member of the delegation in the House of Representatives from North Carolina that the project would not be accepted until further hearings had been held by the House Public Works Committee. The Senate conferees, not only with reference to this project, but with reference to the others that were deleted from the bill, were confronted with the simple proposition of accepting the position of the House and deleting those projects or not having a bill this year. So it was impossible to keep those projects in the bill. When we received assurances of the managers of the bill on the part of the House of Representatives, being the majority of the members of the subcommittee of the House committee handling rivers and harbors, that hearings would be held on these projects early next year, the Senate conferees reluctantly receded in order that there might be a bill to bring to this Chamber.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, we, the citizens of South Carolina, are disappointed that the Duke project dam on the Savannah River, which had the approval of all the necessary Government agencies, which had been included in the House passed bill, and which also was included in the Senate passed bill, was deleted from the bill in conference.

I thank the distinguished Senator for the assurances he has given that early hearings will be held on this subject in January, or as soon thereafter as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the report by the chairman of the conference committee on the part of the Senate, which the Senator has made, the news release on this matter that I issued, dated October 12, 1962.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ON RIVERS AND HARBORS AUTHORIZATION BILL, OCTOBER 12, 1962

I am disappointed that the conferees threw out the Duke Power project approval. It would cost the Government nothing. In fact, it would greatly benefit South Carolina and Georgia in both construction jobs and permanent employment. This $280 million project by private enterprise would be the largest steam power generating plant in the world and would pay annual national taxes of approximately $10 million, approximately $7 million to the State and approximately $1 million to Anderson County.

The conferees did give some indication that we might be able to win approval of the Duke project early next year. I will certainly work toward accomplishing this goal.

I was pleased that the conferees eliminated from the bill the Trotter's Shoal project. It has been estimated that the cost would be $78.8 million, but as usual with power projects, the final cost could run to more than $100 million. It would help create a desert for industrial development in the upper western part of South Carolina by eliminating many fine industrial sites. In fact, former Senator Charles E. Daniel says that at present this area provides some of the best industrial sites in this country.

While the Duke project had the approval of all necessary Government agencies, the Trotter's Shoal project did not have such an approval.

In addition to all this, the Trotter's Shoal project would block the construction of a $50 to $80 million paper plant operation near Calhoun Falls. In addition to the many jobs this plant would provide, its operations would result in greatly increasing the price of pulpwood in this area of

South Carolina and Georgia where tree farming is the principal farming pursuit.

Mr. THURMOND. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. W. B. McGuire, president of Duke Power Co., before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives in August 1962.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF W. B. MCGUIRE, PRESIDENT OF DUKE POWER CO., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 1962, H.R. 6789

My name is W. B. McGuire. I live in Charlotte, N.C., and am president of Duke Power Co. Personally, and on behalf of my company, I wish to thank the committee for the opportunity of presenting some facts which I hope will assist the committee in its deliberations upon H.R. 6789 which is presently before you.

PURPOSE OF APPEARANCE

Duke Power Co. proposes to construct a steam-electric generating plant on the Savannah River, in the area of Middleton Shoals, between the Clark Hill and Hartwell Federal hydroelectric projects. In connection with this plant it will be necessary to build a diversion dam across the Savannah River, for which congressional approval must be obtained. It is through H.R. 6789, introduced by Congressman DORN, of South Carolina, in whose district the project would be built, that we seek this authorization. Our diversion dam across the river would be partly in Georgia in the district of Congressman STEPHENS, and we have kept him fully advised of our plans.

DUKE POWER CO.'S PROPOSED STEAMPLANT

Duke Power Co.'s proposed steamplant would be located on the northeast bank of the Savannah River in Anderson County, S.C., at river mile 296.7, about 8 miles below Hartwell Dam, and immediately upstream from the Sanders Ferry Bridge. The initial installation will contain two steam-electric generating units, each of at least 350,000 kilowatt capacity, but the site will be developed for the ultimate installed generating capacity of some 2 million kilowatts.

While there may be plants of this size in existence at the time of ultimate completion of Duke Power Co.'s plant, it is Duke's understanding that, today, a steam-electric generating plant of this capacity does not exist in the world. The following statistics with respect to this plant may be of interest:

	2,000,000-kilowatt steamplant	700,000-kilowatt initial 2 units
Construction costs	$280,000,000	$91,000,000
Annual cost of operation and maintenance, including payroll but less fuel	$2,500,000	$1,150,000
Annual cost of fuel, including local railroad delivery	$26,000,000	$9,100,000
Annual local and State taxes, estimated on FPC basis	$7,450,000	$2,420,000
Annual Federal income taxes estimated on FPC basis	$9,240,000	$3,000,000
Installed capacity (kilowatts)	2,000,000	700,000
Annual production (kilowatt-hours)	10,000,000,000	3,500,000,000
Annual coal use (tons)	3,500,000	1,220,000
Daily coal use (tons)	9,500	3,300

While mentioning the economics of our plant, I would note for the committee, that the entire South Carolina congressional delegation—both Senate and House Members—support this legislation. The South Carolina General Assembly on February 8, 1962, adopted a concurrent resolution strongly supporting this project and memorializing the Congress to authorize its construction as soon as possible. In addition, the Governor of South Carolina and the South Carolina Development Board strongly support this bill.

NECESSITY FOR AND FUNCTION OF DAM

Steam-electric generating plants require large quantities of water for condensing steam. In connection with Duke Power's proposed plant, a diversion dam across the Savannah River is necessary to provide sufficient storage to reregulate the nonuniform flows to be discharged from Hartwell hydroplant. Our dam will be a relatively low structure. It is a retaining wall only and will not be used to generate hydroelectric power. The pond created by this diversion dam will have a surface area of only 1,500 acres.

To condense the steam, river water will be drawn from the pond created by the diversion dam and will be returned to the river downstream from the dam. In passing through the condensers, the water's temperature will be raised some 13° to 18° F., depending upon operating conditions. After discharge from the powerhouse, the warmer water will, under the most adverse weather conditions, be cooled by natural processes to normal temperature by the time it travels a relatively short distance downstream from the steamplant.

In addition, the diversion dam will act as a thermal barrier to separate the intake and discharge points of the plant's cooling water system. Without this barrier, if a Government hydroelectric project is built in this stretch of the river, warm water discharged from the condensers would recirculate to the intake, be drawn into the plant, and reduce the plant's efficiency.

COMPARABILITY OF DUKE POWER'S PLANT WITH GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT

Several plans have been proposed for development of the stretch of the Savannah River between the Clark Hill and Hartwell projects. In 1959 the Army Engineers considered the construction of two projects, Carters Island and Goat Island. After restudy, the Army district engineer on February 9, 1962, recommended that a single project, Trotters Shoals, be built to impound the entire reach of the river between Clark Hill and Hartwell.

Duke has kept the Army Engineers advised of its plans for the Savannah River plant as they have developed, and has had numerous conferences with both the district engineer in Savannah and the division engineer in Atlanta.

If no Federal dam is built, Duke's proposed steam plant requires only a diversion dam with a crest at elevation 466 above mean sea level. However, in order to make its plant and the proposed Carters Island and Goat Island projects compatible, Duke advised the Army Engineers of its willingness to construct its diversion dam to elevation 475.

When Trotters Shoals was proposed, Duke again met with the Army Engineers and reiterated its agreement to construct its dam to elevation 475, which is the elevation recommended by the Army Engineers for Trotters Shoals. Although this additional height on the Duke Dam is not needed for its project, Duke will assume this additional cost to achieve compatibility between its plant and Trotters Shoals, should Congress authorize the construction of Trotters Shoals.

TIME SCHEDULE OF CONSTRUCTION

Duke Power Co.'s construction program calls for initial operation of the first unit of 350,000 kilowatts of the Savannah River plant about July 1, 1967, with the second unit to commence operation about 1 year later. Further units will be added as needed to meet system requirements up to a maximum plant capacity of about 2 million kilowatts.

To begin operation on July 1, 1967, construction of the dam and steamplant must begin approximately 3 years earlier, about July 1, 1964. Before construction of the dam and plant can proceed, a railroad must be built to the site to bring in the necessary construction materials. This plant site can be served by more than one railroad. Construction of the railroad must begin on either March 1, 1963, or January 1, 1964, depending upon what railroad connection shall be built.

ARMY ENGINEERS HAVE NO OBJECTION TO BILL

H.R. 6789 is patterned after Public Law 68, enacted by the 80th Congress, 1st session, May 16, 1947, authorizing Duke Power Co. to construct a diversion dam across the Dan River in Rockingham County, N.C. H.R. 6789 was submitted to the Chief of Engineers in Washington, D.C., and contains the only suggestion made by the Chief of Engineers, which was the insertion in line 21, page 2, of the words "or downstream."

By letter of August 24, 1961, the Department of the Army advised the House Committee on Public Works that it had no objection to the passage of this bill, saying in part:

"It is considered that the proposed Duke Power Co. dam would not materially affect future development of the water resources of the stream as planned. In any event, the interests of the United States are protected by the provision in the bill requiring approval of plans by the Chief of Engineers, and Secretary of the Army with such conditions as they deem necessary and the provision releasing the United States from all claims for damages by reason of any Federal project upstream or downstream from the proposed dam.

"The Department of the Army interposes no objection to the enactment of H.R. 6789."

The bill grants Duke authority to construct its plant on condition that its plans are approved by the Army Engineers and prohibits variance from the plans so approved except with approval of the Army Engineers.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR VIEWS ON BILL

By letter of April 27, 1962, the Department of the Interior presented to the committee its views on H.R. 6789. The Department of the Interior has made what seems to us to be a very unusual request. It is that they be given authority to approve plans for our structure. Historically the approval of plans for structures in navigable streams of the United States has always rested with the Army Engineers. We have checked this matter through the office of Congressman DORN who introduced this bill. He advises us that he knows of no instance in which the Congress has granted to the Department of the Interior veto power over project plans. Congressman DORN further advises us that he made inquiry of the counsel to this committee and your counsel knew of no such grant of authority.

We respectfully point out that were we to be required to obtain approval of our plans from both the Army Engineers and the Department of the Interior, we would be placed in a most difficult position. Such dual approval would be quite time consuming and our time schedule is a tight one. But a much more serious problems stems from the fact that the Army Engineers and the Department of the Interior may be in disagreement as to the type of structure we should build. The Army Engineers' report on the proposed Trotters Shoals Government dam calls for that project to be built to elevation 475 feet above mean sea level with no provision for pumped storage at Hartwell Dam. The Department of the Interior wants Trotters Shoals at 480 feet above mean sea level, with provision for pumped storage at Hartwell. These different views not only call for different heights for our structure, but a different design altogether. So long as this difference exists between the two agencies, if both must approve our plans, we are placed in an impossible situation. We respectfully urge this committee to leave the approval of plans for our project with the Army Engineers where this authority has heretofore resided.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION VIEWS ON BILL

By letter of May 18, 1962, the Federal Power Commission commented upon H.R. 6789 to the committee. H.R. 6789, as pending before the committee, contains a provision indemnifying the United States against damages to our structure by reason of any Federal development on the Savannah. This is the same form of indemnity clause enacted by the Congress in Public Law 68, 80th Congress, authorizing us to construct a similar dam for our Dan River plant in 1947. The Federal Power Commission, however, suggests an amendment which would give the Federal Power Commission or other authorized agencies power to require Duke Power Co. to remove its dam if it should ever interfere with any Federal development on the river. This to us seems a very harsh provision, especially when it is remembered that the Army Engineers have full control over the plans for our dam. To our knowledge, no such language has ever been enacted in an enabling act of the type we seek. The Federal Power Commission did not suggest such an amendment when it commented to the Congress upon our Dan River bill.

The Federal Power Commission's report to this committee cited legislation (61 Stat. 675) authorizing Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to build a dam in the Susquehanna River as authority for the proposed FPC amendment to H.R. 6789. But that legislation was not authority for the proposed amendment because it did not require the removal of the Pennsylvania Power & Light dam.

It is doubtful that Duke Power Co. could borrow the millions of dollars we will need for our steamplant were the FPC amendment adopted. The bondholder's mortgage would be of little value against a steamplant which could be rendered useless by having its essential cooling-water dam destroyed.

It is no answer to say, as the FPC amendment suggests, that Duke Power Co. could utilize the reservoir which caused Duke's dam to be destroyed. We are sure that the committee can understand our fear of having a $280 million plant located upon a reservoir over which we had absolutely no control. Such a reservoir might be drained for work on its dam or power facilities, leaving our steamplant without cooling water and, therefore, useless. In addition, the location of Duke's plant on the slack water of a reservoir after removal of Duke's dam would permit recirculation of the warm water discharged from the plant's condensers. This would substantially reduce both the efficiency and the capacity of Duke's steamplant.

When these factors are considered, we believe the committee will understand why we cannot undertake this project if the condition contained in the FPC amendment is imposed.

We would like to leave with the committee a memorandum covering the requested Federal Power Commission amendment. We urge the committee to conclude that this is a burdensome and unnecessary amendment, and that the indemnity clause contained in H.R. 6789, and previously enacted by the Congress in 1947 for our Dan River plant, is satisfactory.

WHY A DUKE POWERPLANT ON THE SAVANNAH RIVER?

Duke Power Co. has for many years planned the eventual location of one or more major generating plants on the Savannah River, and long ago purchased substantial areas of land on the river for this purpose. Over 2,200 acres of the company's land was condemned for the Clark Hill Federal project, and over 3,600 acres for the Hartwell project. On land remaining which it owns on the Savannah, the company now proposes constructing the above-mentioned steamplant We own substantially all of the land necessary for our steamplant and its cooling water reservoir.

Duke's entire area is served by an integrated system of high-voltage transmission lines. The company is now in the process of completing a 230,000-volt trunk transmission line system throughout the area. Generation at any one point on the system is fed into this interconnecting transmission network and becomes a part of the combined total production which is used to supply the area. Generation by Duke on the Savannah River would be fed into this interconnected transmission system. In addition, it should be noted that our system will be interconnected with that of Georgia Power Co., and the generation from our Savannah River plant will also be a valuable backup to that company.

The southwestern part of the company's service area which is bounded by the Savannah River has been undergoing rapid industrial and population growth. This area includes Anderson and Greenville, S.C. Present annual energy requirements within the area are about 5.1 billion kilowatt-hours, and it is expected that by 1970 the requirement of the area will have doubled. Obviously, it is desirable that additional generating facilities be provided in this vicinity.

There is no other river in the southwestern portion of the Duke area having a streamflow sufficient to provide cooling water for the 2 million kilowatt steamplant Duke proposes for this area.

SUMMARY

In summary, Duke Power Co. calls special attention to the following aspects of its proposed plant:

1. The projected growth of the company's service area demands the location of a large steamplant in the lower end of its system, and the Savannah River is the only stream capable of providing cooling water adequate for the size of the plant required in this portion of Duke's service area.

2. The proposed plant will be of tremendous economic benefit to the area, both in construction and operation. It will provide jobs for many during construction and a large annual payroll for operation; it will consume approximately 3.5 million tons of coal per year; it will produce a substantial volume of taxes for both Federal and local governments; and it will generate the large quantities of firm electric power which will be needed for the industrial development of the region. (This plant will support the system of Georgia Power Co., as well as Duke Power Co., through interconnections between the two companies.)

3. The proposed plant will not prevent the construction of the Trotters Shoals project presently proposed by the Army Engineers, should Congress decide to authorize it. For the purpose of avoiding conflict between the two projects, Duke Power Co., will be spending substantially more than its project would otherwise cost.

4. The entire South Carolina congressional delegation supports Duke's plant and H.R. 6789.

5. The plans for our plant must be approved in detail by the Army Engineers, who have traditionally controlled structures in navigable streams. The granting of similar approval authority to the Department of the Interior is not necessary and would seriously delay, if not prevent, construction of Duke's plant.

6. The Federal Power Commission's suggested amendment requiring Duke to remove its dam under certain conditions is not necessary, has not been enacted heretofore, and would prevent construction of this plant.

We urge the committee to give H.R. 6789 a favorable report in its present form which has been approved by the Army Engineers.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for the record it should be said that the chairman [Mr. Kerr] of the conference committee on the part of the Senate has indicated that there was an agreement by the managers on the part of the House that the hearings on the eight projects which have been spelled out here today would be held early next year, possibly beginning in January. I think it is important to indicate that the Senator from Oklahoma requested this action on the part of the Public Works Committee in the House. That was not initiated by the managers on the part of the House, but came from the Senate request.

I believe it is factual to state to Senators who have an intense interest in certain projects that this was the desire and determination expressed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Kerr], the chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate. Others of us were privileged to work with him, to insist that the House hearings be held early next year. That was the agreement entered into after the initiative was taken by the Senator from Oklahoma.

There were 13 days of hearings in the Senate Subcommittee on Flood Control-Rivers and Harbors and approximately 100 hours of testimony was heard. Thorough consideration was given to these projects representing all sections of the country. There are 17 members of the Committee on Public Works chaired by the experienced and effective Senator Chavez. Our subcommittee consisted of the following: Robert S. Kerr, chairman; Pat McNamara, Jennings Randolph, Stephen M. Young, Edmund S. Muskie, Frank E. Moss, Oren E. Long, Benjamin A. Smith II, Lee Metcalf, John Sherman Cooper, Hiram L. Fong, J. Caleb Boggs, Jack R. Miller, Maurice J. Murphy, Jr., and James B. Pearson.

Several of these men presided over hearings lasting 8 hours or longer. They were patient and helpful in moving the projects ahead, with the assistance of the committee staff, and witnesses.

It is timely also to stress that often, and mistakenly, such projects—almost 200 involved in this legislation—are referred to as "pork barrel" items. That is a misnomer. The citizens of our country should realize rather than pork barrel projects, that these are projects definitely in the public interest. They contribute to the national wealth, and strengthen the economic base of the country. They are dividend producing projects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the conference report. I know something of the task involved in bringing about the settlement.

I have no interest individually in those projects which have been left out. I mean that they do not affect my State. I am interested, of course, as a citizen and as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

There is something which I think is a little ominous contained in the statement that the House conferees would not accept the projects because the House had not been able to hold hearings on the projects, and that therefore they were eliminated. It is true that we have been given a promise of early hearings next year.

My question is, are we moving gradually but surely into a position in which the Senate cannot initiate portions of legislation, based upon hearings the Senate holds? For instance, my understanding is that with respect to many of these projects, and perhaps all of them, the budget estimates were sent to Capitol Hill after the bill had passed the House, that those were before the Senate, and that the projects had been cleared.

Is the Senate to be barred from any initiative in legislative matters? Goodness knows, an apparent effort has been made to bar the Senate on appropriation matters from adding new items, and from taking an initiative on its own part. Is that to be extended to the legislative field? If so, I am concerned.

I know that often, in the legislative committees of which I am a member, new matters are considered by the committees. Sometimes the Senate committees initiate and the Senate passes legislation which goes to the other body, and the committee in the other body adds new material to the proposed legislation after hearings held there. Does that mean we have a right to object to that process, because the Senate has not held hearings?

My answer to the question, of course, is in the negative. By the same token, I do not believe that the House of Representatives has the right to say that the Senate cannot add projects to legislation already passed by the House simply because the House has not held hearings on those particular projects.

I wish to lodge one protest against any such understanding as that, and I think the RECORD ought to show clearly that it is not our intention that that should become a precedent which would rule in the future.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, for which I am grateful, because they call to mind a matter about which considerable has been said and much more thought, I wish to say that the Senate added to the bill about 44 projects or items relating to projects. There were some three projects added in the action by the Senate. Of these thus added by the Senate, about 37 were kept in conference. Therefore, I say to my good friend that the Senate had a good deal to say about what went into the bill.

In addition, we added provisions in the bill concerning a new method of approach on beach erosion. We added a new method of approach on implementation of recreation. A very significant provision was added by the Senate Committee on Public Works in connection with the handling by the Bureau of Reclamation of the replacement of highways in multiple-purpose projects or water resources projects.

The distinguished Senator will remember that in 1960, the Senate added provisions to the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill which allows a new formula for the Corps of Engineers as to the replacement of highways in multiple-purpose projects and water retention reservoirs. Under previous procedures, which was more administrative than legislative, the Corps of Engineers, in the replacement of highway facilities, would allow only enough money to replace the existing highway facility in kind; that is, to the same specifications as the existing roads.

We all know that these reservoirs are built in areas where sometimes the highways are 10, 15, 20, 30, and 40 years old. When these roads were built, they were built in accordance with the standards of those days and more adequate to accommodate traffic of those days. But in 1960 we provided that the Corps of Engineers could pay the cost of their building of the new highways so that they would be of standards adequate to accommodate present day traffic needs. Through an oversight we did not make that rule applicable to the roads replaced by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with reclamation projects. That situation was corrected in the bill, and the same provision added for that Bureau. There were additional provisions which related to emergency flood control work small flood control projects and measures which will be of great help in developing our water resources projects. I wish to pay special tribute to our great chairman, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who provided so much leadership in the development of the proposed legislation, and the wonderful staff of the committee, which spent many weeks preparing for hearings and assisting in the 13 days of hearings that the Public Works Committee had on the proposed legislation.

I pay special tribute to the members of the committee who worked, in the busiest time of the present session, long hours of the day, including Saturdays, to get the bill ready to bring to the Senate; and to Senators who served on the conference with the Senator from Oklahoma, including the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. Their service was faithful, devoted, and of great help and benefit.

In connection with the hearings, the present Presiding Officer [Mr. METCALF in the chair] spent many days in conducting the hearings, as did also the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the House Rules Committee—a very great, honorable, and highly respected gentleman.

The proposed legislation passed the House and then the Senate very late in the session, with certain differences. The measure went back to the House. It was apparent that if we were to accommodate our differences and have a bill, a conference would be necessary.

The Senator from Oklahoma made the statement about the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee and about the Senator from Oklahoma that they were a couple of tough and rugged characters. They were stubborn and of very positive convictions and thinking. But I respect stubbornness. I respect positive convictions. The distinguished Representative from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, is one of the great public servants of this period in our history. I hope he lives long and continues in the service of his country.

I do not agree with him on a number of things. By the same token, he does not agree with me on a number of things.

Such differences do not reduce my respect—indeed, my esteem and affection—for him. But I wish to remind Senators that due to the amount of influence or the position that the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has, he could have, for a considerable number of days, either prevented a rule being given that could result in a conference or certainly create delay. But he agreed to the Rules Committee giving a rule and, as Senators know, after that was done he could have put it in his pocket for 10 days if he had wanted to. Determined as he was to bring about certain results, he still recognized the propriety and the wisdom of permitting the legislative process to have its way and in having a conference.

The Senator from Oklahoma does not blame him for having called the House conferees in before he gave that rule and asked them if they would stand firm in reference to certain projects in the bill. If the Senator from Oklahoma had had the positive convictions that the chairman of the Rules Committee did about these things, he probably would have tried in some way—which perhaps would not have been as apparent or as highly publicized—to have gained his objective. But if the Senator from Oklahoma had felt positive enough about it and had arrived at the conclusion that the only way to accomplish his objective was the way in which the distinguished Representative from Virginia did it, he might have done the same thing.

But I wish to say to his credit that he made it possible this week for us to have a conference, which ended yesterday.

I see by my calendar that yesterday was Friday, October 12, which was an historic day, Mr. President. It was the anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus. That was a more important event than a successful determination of the conference. But I wish to say that the conference termination and accomplishment was of great significance and enhanced Columbus Day. It certainly did nothing to cast any eclipse or darkness upon it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am deeply indebted, as I believe the Senate is, to the chairman of the committee, the members of the staff, the House conferees, the leadership of the House and the Senate, and to the great Representative from Virginia, Judge HOWARD SMITH.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 12, 1962, p. 23424, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as everyone knows, the bill was handled in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I present the report due to the fact that the Senator from Louisiana is necessarily absent today. The conference report was signed by all the conferees of the Senate who participated in the conference.

At the conclusion of the conference, our chairman, the Senator from Louisiana, stated that he felt that, considering the bill as a whole, the Senate had fared very well in our conference with the House. With respect to general investigations, the conference figure of $17,870,300 is $1,308,400 over the amount approved by the House, and $1,322,000 under the Senate figure. I believe, with one or two exceptions that were taken care of this afternoon in the other body, the Senate conferees did very well in maintaining a large number of the projects which the Senate provided for during the consideration of the bill.

The Senate added 21 new starts under "Construction, general." In the floor action in the other body, to which I referred a moment ago, two additional new construction starts, previously approved by the Senate, were restored to the bill. The bill, therefore, provides for 18 out of the 21 new starts added by the Senate.

It is unnecessary to say that the Senate conferees, especially our distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would personally have liked to have seen all of the Senate amendments saved in the conference.

I might say that our chairman and the members of the conference committee—but particularly the chairman, who has more familiarity with the bill than any other individual in Congress—waged a very valiant fight in conference to save these projects.

Generally speaking, the House sent us a good bill this year. As you will recall, for the past few years the House has inserted some new unbudgeted construction projects. This year's projects, on examination by the Senate committee, proved to be desirable, and the committee approved their inclusion, as we have done with similar projects in years past.

In a few minutes I intend to move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. 2. Senators will recall that when the supplemental appropriation bill was before the Senate, certain items were inserted in the bill which had not been agreed to in the conference report on the bill.

One item under "Construction, general," was in actual disagreement. That is the item which pertains to a budgeted item of $205,000 for the completion of planning on the Cross Florida Barge Canal. The House did not approve the item originally. It had a budget estimate and was inserted in the bill by the Senate.

The chairman of the House conferees moved that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2, and agree to the same. That amendment would have made the general construction figure $791,585,000.

That motion was defeated by a rollcall vote in the House. A substitute motion, which was next in order under the Rules of the House, was then made by Representative SIKES, of Florida, to provide $792,845,500. This would include all the funds contemplated in the motion offered by the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, plus the following items:

The item in disagreement, which was the Cross Florida Barge Canal, for which the budgeted amount is $205,000, to complete the planning for the project. The next item was Calumet Harbor and River development in Indiana and Illinois, $110,000. Kaskaskia River, in Illinois, $100,000. Then the Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., $100,000. The Blue River Reservoir, Oreg. $500,000. The Yaquina Bay and Harbor project, Oregon, $200,000. Also $50,000 to initiate planning on the Port Arthur Bridge over the Sabine Neches Waterway, Tex.

The total amount involved in the so-called Sikes motion was an increase of $1,265,000. This amount was agreed to by a voice vote. The total construction item was, therefore, increased by that amount. That means that the amount, as it comes before us now, is $792,845,500.

Therefore, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report. That will leave in disagreement the amendment to which I have referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the supplemental appropriation bill there is contained an item of $1,450,000 for the Navajo Reservation Irrigation District. What happened to that project?

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume that that item is still in the supplemental appropriation bill. Objection was made to laying down the bill before the other body, and the House has not considered the request of the Senate for a conference on that bill. The item is included in the supplemental bill. The other body, however, so far has not permitted the bill to go to conference. As the Senator knows, the Senate Committee on Appropriations approved that project.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that it has not been laid down in the other body, but that is a matter which is wholly beyond the control of this humble servant.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, let me give just one example of the effect of not acting on the supplemental appropriation bill. Contained in the supplemental appropriation bill is a provision for payment of $30 million to the civil service retirement and disability fund to finance the annuity benefits and increases provided for in the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act. This is one of the measures the President frequently refers to in listing the achievements of this Congress. Yet unless this $30 million payment is made, this provision of the act will be completely ineffective. It will be a hoax and anyone expecting an increase will be bitterly disappointed. This is a performance that can only be called shameful.

The argument will be made that the funds can be appropriated next year. But what guarantee is there that the same squabbling which has prevented action now would not pervent action next year? And if this increase is justified, why should the beneficiaries have to wait months before it is paid? There are no satisfactory answers to these questions. We will simply be breaking faith with those who thought that starting in January 1963, they would be getting the increase they were promised and deserve under this legislation.

We must take steps early in the next Congress to reform the procedures of the House and Senate. The appropriation process we are now following has broken down. There are simply too many opportunities for obstruction under the present system, and these opportunities have been fully exploited. The wasted motion, the duplication, the attitude of rule or ruin, has made it impossible for Congress to act on the fiscal problems of our Nation in any orderly or sensible way. This is causing tremendous difficulties in the operations of the Government. It produces results which are very unfair to individual members and States. It sounds silly to talk about inefficiency in the executive branch of the Government when we consider the dismal failure of our own procedures for dealing with appropriations.

It is incredible to realize that all of these appropriations will have to be considered again when we reconvene in January. The same hassles and, bickering will resume with hardly any interruption in just over 2 months. The mere prospect of a repeat performance of what we have been through this session is painful to contemplate.

I hope it will not be considered presumptious to make some proposals for reform in appropriation procedures. One is that we have 2-year appropriations so that Congress can spend some of its valuable time on other than fiscal issues. Many State legislatures do this and the result would certainly be to save money as well as time.

Another is for the appropriation committees to begin their work before Congress convenes so that we do not waste months at the beginning of every session waiting for bills to come out of committee. Another is to combine Senate and House appropriation hearings and staffs, still reserving to each body the power of independent decision.

We should have an appropriation's timetable for Congress and make the consideration of appropriation bills automatic so that they are not imperiled by procedural objections of individual members and a veto power by the Rules Committee of the other body.

These are commonsense procedures which it would seem any objective observer would favor. The prerogatives and privileges of a few Members cannot be allowed to stand in the way of their consideration if the Congress is to do its work in a manner deserving of public support.

Rules reform must be a matter of the highest priority in the next session of Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12900, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
October 13, 1962.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 13, and 18 to the bill (H.R. 12900) entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$792,845,500".

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary and other tables showing how the money is distributed among the various titles of the bill be placed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. 2, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$792,845,500" and insert "$793,060,000".

This is a total of $215,000 more than the House figure. It includes $115,000 for the deepwater harbor project at Kaunakakai, Hawaii, which was included in the Senate version of the public works appropriation bill. Authorization for this project was approved by both the House and the Senate in the omnibus public works bill to which conferees have agreed. Earlier today the House approved the conference report and the Senate has just given its approval. The remaining $100,000 provided in my amendment is for a flood control project at Ansonia-Derby, Conn. This project, too, was contained in the public works appropriation bill as passed by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a description of the two projects, the one in Hawaii, and the other in Connecticut, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KAUNAKAKAI HARBOR, MOLOKAI, HAWAII

The island of Molokai is about 40 miles from this principal island of Oahu, where Honolulu is located and where more than 500,000 of Hawaii's 690,000 population live. The harbor of Kaunakakai is about 60 miles from Honolulu Harbor.

The main industry on Molokai is agriculture, chiefly a cash crop, pineapple. At present, the fresh pineapples are transported by barge to Honolulu where the fruit is processed in Oahu canneries. Until now, agricultural growth on Molokai has been severely hampered by lack of water in central and western Molokai. Underway, however, is a small reclamation project which will render arable 14,600 acres on Molokai, thereby greatly increasing pineapple production.

The early completion of the irrigation project and the imminent construction of pineapple canneries require that the Kaunakakai deepwater harbor project get underway as soon as possible. Then export commodities can be directly shipped from Molokai in large vessels, avoiding the costs of transshipment in Honolulu. This will be more practical, efficient, and economical than shipping Molokai commodities by barge or small ship to Oahu and then unloading and reloading cargoes for export.

The project has the approval of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. The House has approved its authorization. The Senate has approved its authorization. There is no controversy over its authorization. It has an excellent benefit-cost ratio—4.4 to 1.

NAUGATUCK RIVER, ANSONIA-DERBY, CONN.—JUSTIFICATION

(H. Doc. No. 437, 87th Cong.)

Location: The city of Ansonia and the town of Derby are adjoining communities located in southern Connecticut on the Naugatuck River about 12 miles above Long Island Sound.

Authority: A resolution of the Public Works Committee of the U.S. Senate adopted September 14, 1955, and similar resolutions of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States adopted June 13 and 23, 1956, respectively.

Existing project: Federal flood-control improvements in the basin affecting Ansonia-Derby consist of seven reservoirs for flood control, authorized by Congress. One reservoir, Thomaston, is located at mile 30 on the main stream and has been in operation for flood control since September 1960. None of the other reservoirs are under construction.

Flood problem: Flooding of the Naugatuck River causes damages to residential, commercial, industrial, and other properties located in Ansonia-Derby, and creates health, safety, and economic problems which adversely affect the welfare of the cities.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for approximately 12,470 linear feet of levee and floodwall, with appurtenant works, for the protection of approximately 232 acres of industrial, commercial, and residential areas in Ansonia-Derby.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1960)

Federal	$5,620,000
Non-Federal	380,000
Total	6,000,000

Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal [1]	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization	$208,900	$15,200	$224,100
Maintenance and operation	0	10,700	10,700
Net loss of productivity	0	2,300	2,300
Total	208,900	28,200	237,100

Annual benefits

Damages prevented	$206,000
Enhancement from reduction of flood hazard	84,000
Total	290,000

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.2.

Local cooperation: (a) Contribute in cash because of the more costly plan desired by local interests for the River Street area, 1.4 percent of the construction cost, presently estimated at $80,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to start of construction or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final contribution to be determined after actual costs are known; (b) provide without cost to the United States all land easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, including changes to highway bridges and roads, railroad track, sewers, and other utilities; (c) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; (d) maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and (e) prevent encroachment on the improved channels or on the ponding areas, and if capacities are impaired, provide equivalent effective storage or pumping capacity without cost to the United States. Local interests are willing to furnish the items of local cooperation.

Comments of the State and Federal agencies:

Department of the Interior: Favorable.
Department of Commerce: Favorable.
Department of Agriculture: Favorable.
State of Connecticut: Favorable.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget: No objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am somewhat familiar with the details of the projects that are included in this item, although I did not have primary responsibility in connection with the conference report. I certainly hope that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will carefully consider the possible consequences of amending the Senate amendment at this late date. I am sure the majority leader would like to make a statement, because Members on both sides have worked incessantly in trying to bring this measure to this stage. It would be unfortunate if we lost it after all this work had been done on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join in the statement just made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] and to add my request to his; namely, that in view of the difficult circumstances in which we find ourselves at present, the Senator from Massachusetts will not press his amendment, which is a good amendment, and had been offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Bush] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and which, I believe, was approved unanimously by this body.

I assure the Senator from Massachusetts that one of the first orders of business next January will be the consideration of these proposals and one other which had been approved by the Senate. I hope that with that assurance the acting minority leader will reconsider the offering of the amendment which is now pending and will withdraw it on the basis of the promise being made by the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was authorized by the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], who handled the supplemental appropriation bill, to state for him that next year he will be glad to see to it that these items are given the most sympathetic attention in the first supplemental appropriation bill to be considered by Congress, and that if he has anything to do with that bill, he will include these projects.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the statements of the two distinguished leaders on the other side of the aisle. The subject was discussed at considerable length in a private conference. I realize the problem in relation to the House with respect to these specific situations, especially the supplemental appropriation bill for this year.

The Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Hawaii are unavoidably detained at this hour because of official business. At their request, I agreed to offer the amendments.

I discussed the two amendments with the majority leader and the Senator from Georgia, and they assured me that they would discuss the matter on the floor. On the basis of the character, integrity, and leadership of these two distinguished Senators, and on my own assurance as a member of the Committee on Appropriations that we will do everything we can to include these items in the first supplemental appropriation bill of the 88th Congress, I therefore withdraw the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, one of the items deleted from this appropriation bill by the House-Senate conference was an appropriation of $100,000 for advance engineering and design of the Booneville Reservoir in the Kentucky River Basin. It was added in the Senate upon my motion and that of my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. Morton].

In 1954, former Senator Clements and I submitted a resolution asking for a survey of the Kentucky River Valley Basin and all its tributaries. I believe the records of the Corps of Engineers show that for more than 100 years the Kentucky River Valley extending from Virginia to the Ohio River has been swept and ravaged by floods. After the tragic flooding of the Kentucky in 1957, I introduced a resolution in the Public Works Committee, asking that the Corps of Engineers expedite its survey, and this was done.

In 1960, the Corps of Engineers, after years of intensive work presented its plan for the comprehensive flood protection of the Kentucky River Valley. The plan called for the construction of four reservoirs—Booneville, Carrs Fork, Eagle Creek, and Red River—and local protection at Frankfort, the capital of Kentucky, which is flooded almost every year. The annual flood damage in the valley has reached to almost $10 million in several years. As Carrs Fork, Eagle Creek, and Red River reservoirs were not authorized until today—only Booneville—authorized in 1944—was eligible for appropriations.

The proposal which I offered with Senator Morton was a request for an initial appropriation for advance engineering and design, preparatory to actual construction.

This item is one of three which was stricken from the bill. I have spoken to the majority leader about this appropriation and I now address myself to my friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the member of the Committee on Appropriations who is in charge of the bill. I express the hope that next year the Committee on Appropriations will provide funds for Booneville Reservoir in an early supplemental appropriation bill, or the regular works appropriation bill. I know that if that is done, the Senate conferees will make every effort to insist that it be maintained in conference with the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that the assurance which I gave on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] and at his express suggestion, included the project about which the Senator from Kentucky has just spoken. I thought I so stated at the time I made my statement with respect to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall]. The Senator from Florida said he would be happy to undertake to promote this planning project in the first supplemental appropriation bill to be brought before the Senate in 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I fully corroborate the statement just made by the Senator from Georgia. I make the same promise to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I accept without any reservation whatever the statements of the majority leader, and the assurance the Senator from Georgia has given for the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with respect to two Oregon projects which were included in the supplemental appropriation bill, but were not included in the final public works bill report now offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell].

The first is with respect to the Mason Dam project, at Baker, Oreg., calling for $145,000 of planning money. The other is for a $20,000 project at Pendleton, Oreg. Both are reclamation projects.

I attended the conference of Senate managers of this bill to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] just referred; at that conference we discussed all phases of the parliamentary problems which confronts us with respect to the conference report on public works items. At that conference, it was pointed out that these two Oregon reclamation projects could have been made subject to points of order by the House. Therefore, there could have been no assurance whatsoever that they could be obtained at this session no matter how long we stayed here. But we also recognized at that conference that, come January, the senior Senator from Oregon would be in a position to press for the consideration of these projects in connection with a supplemental appropriation bill. The senior Senator from Oregon was given the assurance of his colleagues that they would do what they could to assist in presenting the requests for those two projects to the Senate, so that the projects could be included in the supplemental appropriation bill to be considered by the Senate in January. Therefore, the Record should show that although I think it is unfortunate that these very much needed projects in eastern Oregon will have to wait for a few months, nevertheless the rules of the House after all, were applicable to them, and I reluctantly went along with that arrangement.

I express my sincere appreciation for the cooperation of Senators who are in charge of the bill and also for the cooperation I received from Members of the House, from whom I received a large number of messages in the past 2 days in reference to the Oregon items. The three which were included are job-producing projects in my State in which a serious employment depression now exists. By including them in this final conference report a great many things were accomplished, not the least of which was the clear and salutary demonstration by both Houses of Congress that there would be a maintenance of the purity of the legislative process in the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as the Senator from Oregon has just stated, the two projects he has described are in the same unfortunate position as the Navajo project, advocated by the Senator from New Mexico. But in this report there was no item to which these projects could have been appended; and it would have made the whole report subject to a point of order if the reclamation projects had been added to a river and harbor item.

In view of the multiplicity of difficulties the bill has encountered in the past few days, I think the Senate has done quite well to have salvaged this much of the items which were included in the supplemental bill.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the action it has taken on that amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXHIBIT 1

Summary table

	Estimates, 1963	Amount allowed by the House	Amount allowed by the Senate	Conference allowance
TITLE I				
CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
Quartermaster Corps, cemeterial expenses	$10,276,000	$10,276,000	$10,276,000	$10,276,000
Corps of Engineers:				
General investigations	[1] 17,265,000	16,561,900	19,192,300	17,870,300
Construction	[2] 780,645,000	762,361,000	807,962,500	792,845,500
Operation and maintenance	143,539,000	143,539,000	143,539,000	143,539,000
General expenses	13,600,000	13,580,000	13,580,000	13,580,000
Mississippi River and tributaries	70,500,000	70,500,000	75,954,000	73,504,000
St. Lawrence Joint Board of Engineers	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
International Navigational Congresses				
Total, Corps of Engineers	1,025,569,000	1,006,561,900	1,060,247,800	1,041,358,800
Panama Canal:				
Canal Zone Government:				
Operating expenses	[3] 22,772,000	22,772,000	22,772,000	22,772,000
Capital outlay	3,120,000	3,120,000	3,120,000	3,120,000
General and administrative expenses	*(8,113,000)*	*(8,113,000)*	*(8,113,000)*	*(8,113,000)*
Total, Canal Zone Government	25,892,000	25,892,000	25,892,000	25,892,000
Total, title I	1,061,737,000	1,042,729,900	1,096,415,800	1,077,526,800
TITLE II				
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Bureau of Reclamation:				
General investigations	8,400,000	7,100,000	9,420,000	8,400,000
General investigations (special foreign currency program)	2,500,000			
Construction and rehabilitation	[4] 161,700,000	153,077,000	160,361,000	158,218,000
Operation and maintenance	38,250,000	38,150,000	36,444,600	36,444,600
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	*(3,543,000)*	*(3,543,000)*	*(3,543,000)*	*(3,543,000)*
Loan program	[5] 12,517,000	10,173,000	12,517,000	12,517,000
Emergency fund	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Upper Colorado River Basin fund	[6] 110,326,000	106,508,000	109,576,000	107,808,000
General administrative expenses	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	343,993,000	325,308,000	238,618,600	333,687,600
Bonneville Power Administration:				
Construction	[7] 31,900,000	29,800,000	29,800,000	29,800,000
Operation and maintenance	12,750,000	12,713,000	12,713,000	12,713,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	44,650,000	42,513,000	42,513,000	42,513,000
Office of the Secretary, Southeastern Power Administration, operation and maintenance	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Southwestern Power Administration:				
Construction	7,210,000	7,210,000	7,210,000	7,210,000
Operation and maintenance	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
Continuing fund	*(5,000,000)*	*(5,000,000)*	*(5,000,000)*	*(5,000,000)*
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	8,660,000	8,660,000	8,660,000	8,660,000
Total, definite appropriations	398,103,000	377,281,000	390,591,600	385,660,600
Total, indefinite appropriations	8,543,000	8,543,000	8,543,000	8,543,000
Total, title II	406,646,000	385,824,000	399,134,600	394,203,600
TITLE III				
INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
Atomic Energy Commission:				
Operating expenses	[8] 2,888,588,000	2,860,974,000	2,885,391,000	2,872,224,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts [2]	*(26,700,000)*	*(26,700,000)*	*(26,700,000)*	*(26,700,000)*
Plant acquisition and construction	[9] 332,345,000	261,845,000	267,895,000	262,745,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	3,220,933,000	3,122,819,000	3,153,286,000	3,134,969,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation limitation on administrative expenses	(425,000)	(425,000)	(414,000)	(414,000)
Tennessee Valley Authority	35,071,000	35,071,000	35,071,000	35,071,000
Delaware River Basin Commission, salaries and expenses	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission	[10] 80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	112,000	112,000	112,000	112,000
River Basin Study Commission for South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, salaries and expenses	552,000	552,000	552,000	552,000
River Basin Study Commission for Texas, salaries and expenses	[11]	[11]	[11]	[11]
Total, definite appropriations	3,256,668,000	3,158,554,000	3,189,021,000	3,170,704,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	26,700,000	26,700,000	26,700,000	26,700,000
Total, title III	3,283,368,000	3,185,254,000	3,215,721,000	3,197,404,000

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT 1—Continued

Summary table—Continued

	Estimates, 1963	Amount allowed by the House	Amount allowed by the Senate	Conference allowance
TITLE IV				
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
Public works acceleration	[12] $900,000,000	-------	$500,000,000	$400,000,000
Total, title IV	900,000,000	-------	500,000,000	400,000,000
Grand totals:				
Total, definite appropriations	5,616,508,000	$4,578,564,900	5,176,028,400	5,033,891,400
Total, indefinite appropriations	35,243,000	35,243,000	35,243,000	35,243,000
Grand total, all titles	5,651,751,000	4,613,807,900	5,211,271,400	5,069,134,400

[1] Includes increase of $665,000 in H. Doc. No. 379.

[2] Reflects decrease of $930,000 in H. Doc. No. 379, and an increase of $2,869,000 in H. Doc. No. 477, and an increase of $3,000,000 in S. Doc. No. 135.

[3] Includes increase of $198,000 in H. Doc. No. 486.

[4] Includes increase of $750,000 in H. Doc. No. 422, and $1,075,000 in H. Doc. No.

[5] Includes budget amendment increases as follows: H. Doc. No. 388, $600,000; H. Doc. No. 422, $4,023,000; H. Doc. No. 431, $750,000; and $2,344,000 in S. Doc. No. 134.

[6] Reflects decrease of $6,884,000 in H. Doc. No. 422, and an increase of $550,000 in H. Doc. No. 477.

[7] Reflects decrease of $3,000,000 in H. Doc. No. 388.

[8] Reflects increase of $164,500,000 in H. Doc. No. 409 and an increase of $23,300,000 in H. Doc. No. 467.

[9] Reflects increase of $46,300,000 in H. Doc. No. 409.

[10] Submitted in H. Doc. No. 393.

[11] H. Doc. No. 393 and bill provide continuing availability of 1962 appropriation until Aug. 31, 1962.

[12] In S. Doc. No. 129.

General investigations, Corp of Engineers

Item (1)	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
1. Surveys:				
(a) Navigation studies	$1,600,000	$1,818,600	$2,265,400	$2,051,600
(b) Flood control studies	4,600,000	4,925,500	5,896,900	5,428,700
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(d) Special studies:				
(1) San Francisco Bay survey	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(2) Ohio River Basin review	600,000	500,000	600,000	500,000
(3) Potomac River review	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
(4) Colorado River, Tex	228,000	228,000	228,000	228,000
(5) Great Lakes water levels	85,000	85,000	110,000	110,000
(6) Rampart Canyon, Alaska	315,000	315,000	415,000	315,000
(7) Arkansas-Red River pollution study	177,000	177,000	227,000	227,000
(8) Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000
(9) Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(10) Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway. N.Y	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(11) Susquehanna River Basin	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(12) Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
(13) Red River, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex	250,000	250,000	300,000	300,000
(14) Meramac River Basin, Mo	215,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
(15) Pascagoula River Basin, Miss	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(16) Willamette River Basin, Oreg	100,000	100,000	200,000	100,000
(17) Grand River Basin, Mich	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(18) Connecticut River Basin	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(19) Upper Mississippi River Basin	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(20) White River Basin, Ark. and Mo	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(21) Brazos River Basin, Tex	100,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
(22) Great Lakes Harbors survey	-------	-------	-------	-------
(23) Hudson River siltation study	-------	-------	-------	-------
(24) Trinity River, Tex	-------	-------	-------	-------
(25) Hurricane studies	945,000	945,000	945,000	945,000
(26) Coordination studies with other agencies	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(27) Basin planning	400,000	-------	-------	-------
(28) Kanawha River Basin, W. Va	-------	-------	200,000	200,000
(29) Lake Champlain Waterway, N.Y. and Vt	-------	-------	50,000	-------
Subtotal, surveys	12,110,000	12,104,100	14,287,300	13,255,300
2. Collection and study of basic data:				
(a) Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(b) Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	380,000	380,000	380,000	380,000
(c) Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(d) International water studies	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
(e) Flood plain studies	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	1,515,000	1,515,000	1,515,000	1,515,000
3. Research and development:				
(a) Beach erosion development studies	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(b) Hydrologic studies	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
(c) Civil works investigations	1,550,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(d) Mississippi Basin model:				
(1) Construction	650,000	650,000	650,000	650,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(e) Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction	665,000	400,000	665,000	500,000
Subtotal, research and development	3,640,000	3,125,000	3,390,000	3,225,000
Other reductions and slippages [1]	-------	−272,200	-------	−125,000
Total, general investigations	17,265,000	16,561,900	19,192,800	17,870,300

[1] House cut in north-central division program.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1963

Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alabama:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) Claiborne lock and dam		$210,000		$210,000		$210,000		$210,000
(N) Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	$2,254,000		$2,254,000		$2,179,000		$2,179,000	
(N) Holt lock and dam	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(MP) Jones Bluff lock and dam		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(MP) Millers Ferry lock and dam	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N) Mobile Harbor					600,000		600,000	
(FC) Paint Rock River	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(N) Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi					500,000	225,000		
Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi. (See Mississippi.)								
(MP) Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	8,138,000		8,138,000		8,073,000		8,073,000	
Alaska:								
(MP) Bradley Lake (not authorized)		†100,000				100,000		
(FC) Fairbanks		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(N) Juneau Harbor	760,000		760,000		760,000		760,000	
Arizona:								
(FC) Alamo Reservoir					500,000		500,000	
(FC) Gila and Salt Rivers		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
(FC) Gila River and tributaries—downstream from Painted Rock (not authorized).		†100,000				100,000		100,000
(FC) Tucson	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Arkansas:								
(N) Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:								
(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000	
(b) Navigation locks and dams		2,000,000		2,000,000	600,000	2,000,000	300,000	2,000,000
(MP) Beaver Reservoir	14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000	
(MP) Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo., additions of units Nos. 7 and 8	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(MP) Dardanelle lock and dam	16,000,000		16,000,000		16,000,000		16,000,000	
(FC) De Queen Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(MP) DeGray Reservoir	950,000		1,550,000		1,550,000		1,550,000	
(FC) Dierks Reservoir						30,000		30,000
(FC) Garland City, Red River	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(FC) Gillham Reservoir		99,000		99,000	350,000	99,000	350,000	99,000
(MP) Greers Ferry Reservoir	4,900,000		4,900,000		4,832,000		4,832,000	
(FC) Millwood Reservoir	9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
(N) Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.		235,000		235,000	165,000	235,000	165,000	235,000
(N) Ozark lock and dam		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC) Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex.	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
California:								
(FC) Alameda Creek (not authorized)		†100,000				100,000		100,000
(FC) Bear Creek	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Black Butte Reservoir	3,529,000		3,529,000		3,529,000		3,529,000	
(FC) Comanche Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(R) Crescent City Harbor (breakwater)	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC) Drycreek Reservoir channel improvement not authorized)		†100,000				100,000		
(FC) Hidden Reservoir (not authorized)		†75,000				75,000		
(BE) Imperial Beach, San Diego County (reimbursement)	20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000	
(FC) Los Angeles County drainage area	15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000	
(N) Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors (1960 act)					1,705,000		1,705,000	
(FC) Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
(N) Monterey Harbor		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
(R) Morro Bay (breakwater)	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC) New Hogan Reservoir	4,140,000		4,140,000		4,140,000		4,140,000	
(N) Noyo River and Harbor Mooring Basin						26,000		26,000
(BE) Oceanside (reimbursement)	672,000		672,000		672,000		672,000	
(FC) Oroville Reservoir	15,000,000		14,000,000		15,000,000		14,000,000	
(FC) Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Sacramento River bank protection		50,000		50,000	150,000	50,000	150,000	50,000
(FC) Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(N) Sacramento River deep water ship channel	5,910,000		5,910,000		5,910,000		5,910,000	
(FC) Sacramento River flood control project	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(BE) Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000	
(N) Santa Cruz Harbor	1,520,000		1,520,000		1,520,000		1,520,000	
(FC) Stewart Canyon debris basin	522,000		522,000		522,000		522,000	
(FC) Tahchevah Creek		110,000		110,000		110,000		110,000
(FC) Walnut Creek		225,000		225,000		225,000		225,000
(FC) West Fork Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Colorado:								
(FC) Trinidad Reservoir		155,000		155,000		155,000		155,000
Connecticut:								
(FC) Ansonia-Derby (not authorized)		†100,000				100,000		
(FC) Black Rock Reservoir						50,000		50,000
(N) Bridgeport Harbor, Black Rock Harbor		26,000				26,000		26,000
(FC) Colebrook River Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC) East Branch Reservoir	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC) Hancock Brook Reservoir	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Hop Brook Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC) Mad River Reservoir	1,826,000		1,826,000		1,826,000		1,826,000	
(FC) Northfield Brook Reservoir			400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Stamford		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC) West Thompson Reservoir		142,000	342,000		342,000		342,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Delaware:								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages at Reedy Point, Deepwater Point, and enlarging Marcus Hook and Mantau Creek anchorages, Delaware and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)								
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (main dikes), Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)								
(R) Indian River Inlet (bulkheads)	$750,000		$750,000		$750,000		$750,000	
(N) Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal), pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
(BE) Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)	110,000		110,000		110,000		110,000	
Florida:								
(N) Apalachicola River	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) Bakers Haulover Inlet		$15,000		$15,000	25,000	$15,000	25,000	$15,000
(N) Canaveral Harbor (not authorized)		†80,000				80,000		80,000
(FC) Central and southern Florida	13,500,000		13,500,000		13,500,000		13,500,000	
(N) Cross-Florida Barge Canal		205,000				205,000		205,000
(FC) Four Rivers Basin (not authorized)						150,000		
(N) Intracoastal Waterway:								
(a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
(b) Jacksonville to Miami	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N) Miami Harbor (1960 act)	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(BE) Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000	
(N) Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)	677,000		677,000		677,000		677,000	
(N) St. Marks River	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N) St. Petersburg Harbor (deferred)		10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
Georgia:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(MP) Carters Dam	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
(MP) Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C	3,700,000		3,700,000		3,640,500		3,640,500	
Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
(MP) West Point Dam (not authorized)		†100,000				100,000		100,000
Hawaii:								
(N) Hilo Harbor		600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000
(N) Kaunakakai Harbor (not authorized)						115,000		
(FC) Wailoa Stream	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Idaho:								
(MP) Bruces Eddy Reservoir (construction not yet authorized)					2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC) Columbia River local protection:								
Boise Valley		21,000		21,000		21,000		21,000
(FC) Ririe Dam (not authorized)		†75,000				75,000		75,000
Illinois:								
(FC) Beardstown	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
(N) Calumet Harbor and River, Ind. and Ill. (not authorized)		†110,000				110,000		110,000
R) Calumet Harbor and River (breakwater), Ill. and Ind	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(N) Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.:								
(a) 25-foot depth in river channels, Cargill docks to Torrence Ave								
(b) 20-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor, and 27-foot entrance	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(BA) Calumet River bridge alterations	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC) Carlyle Reservoir	6,400,000		6,400,000		6,400,000		6,400,000	
(R) Chicago Harbor (breakwater)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC) Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000	
(FC) Clear Lake Special Drainage District (not authorized)						40,000		40,000
(N) Dam 27, Mississippi River between St. Louis and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri	858,000		858,000		858,000		858,000	
(FC) Drury Drainage District	435,000		435,000		435,000		435,000	
(FC) East St. Louis and vicinity	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC) Freeport				50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC) Henderson County Drainage District No. 1		32,000		32,000		32,000		32,000
(FC) Henderson County Drainage District No. 2		38,000		38,000		38,000		38,000
(FC) Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(N) Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag Channel, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC) Indian Grave Drainage District		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(N) Kaskaskia River (not authorized)		†100,000				100,000		100,000
(N) Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:								
(a) Regulating works	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(b) Chain of Rocks	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
(FC) Mount Carmel (not authorized)		†75,000				75,000		75,000
(FC) New Athens		73,000		73,000		73,000		73,000
(FC) Oakley Reservoir (not authorized)		†125,000				125,000		125,000
(FC) Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC) Shelbyville Reservoir	326,000		326,000		326,000		326,000	
(FC) Sny Island Levee Drainage District		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC) South Quincy Drainage and Levee District		27,000		27,000		27,000		27,000
(FC) Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC) The Sny Basin	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC) Tri Pond levee		48,000		48,000		48,000		48,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
(1)	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Indiana:								
(FC) Brookville Reservoir				$75,000		$75,000		$75,000
Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
(N) Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	$2,750,000		$2,750,000		$2,750,000		$2,750,000	
(FC) Evansville	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC) Greenfield Bayou levee (deferred)		$10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
(FC) Huntington Reservoir					1,000,000		1,000,000	
Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
(N) Indiana Harbor, 1960 act	510,000		510,000		510,000		510,000	
(FC) Levee unit 5, Wabash River	250,000		250,000		350,000		350,000	
Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC) Mason J. Niblack levee	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
McAlpine locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC) Mississinewa Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000		2,000,000		1,600,000	
(FC) Monroe Reservoir	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N) Newburg lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky				150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC) Salamonie Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(N) Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) West Terre Haute	332,000		332,000		332,000		332,000	
Iowa:								
(FC) Chariton River, Iowa and Mo.				50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC) Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC) Des Moines		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC) Floyd River and tributaries	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC) Indian Creek (not authorized)		†50,000				50,000		50,000
(FC) Iowa River—Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC) Little Sioux River	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC) Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska (active units).	2,300,000		2,350,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(N) Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:								
(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000	
(c) Kansas City to the mouth	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13.	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(FC) Rathbun Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC) Red Rock Reservoir	9,800,000		9,800,000		9,800,000		9,800,000	
Kansas:								
(FC) Cedar Point Reservoir (deferred)		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC) Council Grove Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Dodge City (not authorized)		†50,000				50,000		50,000
(FC) Elk City Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
(N) Fort Leavenworth Bridge	430,000		430,000		430,000		430,000	
(FC) Fort Scott Reservoir (deferred)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC) Frankfort	825,000		825,000		825,000		825,000	
(FC) John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC) Kansas City, Kans. and Mo.	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC) Lawrence		78,000		78,000		78,000		78,000
(FC) Manhattan	1,050,000		1,050,000		1,050,000		1,050,000	
(FC) Marion Reservoir		71,000		71,000		71,000		71,000
(FC) Melvern Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) Milford Reservoir	11,600,000		11,600,000		11,600,000		11,600,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) Osawatomie		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC) Perry Reservoir					750,000		750,000	
(FC) Pomona Reservoir	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC) Topeka	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC) Tuttle Creek Reservoir	2,632,000		2,632,000		2,632,000		2,632,000	
(FC) Wilson Reservoir	4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000	
Kentucky:								
(MP) Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn.	31,200,000		31,200,000		31,147,000		31,147,000	
(FC) Barren River Reservoir	10,110,000		10,110,000		10,110,000		10,110,000	
(MP) Booneville Reservoir						100,000		
Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(N) Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	10,200,000		10,200,000		10,172,000		10,172,000	
(FC) Cave Run Reservoir		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(FC) Corbin	200,000		200,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Fishtrap Reservoir	6,700,000		6,700,000		6,700,000		6,700,000	
(FC) Frankfort (deferred)				25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC) Grayson Reservoir		371,000		371,000		371,000		371,000
(FC) Green River Reservoir			1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP) Laurel River Reservoir		653,000		653,000		653,000		653,000
(N) Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	7,977,000		7,977,000		7,785,000		7,785,000	
(N) McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
Newburgh lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(FC) Nolin Reservoir	2,536,000		2,536,000		2,447,500		2,447,500	
Uniontown lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project (1)	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
	Louisiana:								
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	$940,000		$940,000		$940,000		$940,000	
(N)	Bayou LaFourche and LaFourche Jump Waterway	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Bayou Le Carpe (not authorized)					[1] (45,000)		[1] (45,000)	
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass (1960 act)	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River salt water barrier (not authorized)						$56,000		$56,000
(FC)	Campti Clarence levee (not authorized)						50,000		50,000
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico	2,569,000		2,569,000		2,569,000		2,569,000	
(N)	Mississippi River gulf outlet	8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice, La., Hurricane Protection (not authorized)		†$265,000				265,000		265,000
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)								
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)								
	Maine:								
(N)	Bass Harbor					[2] (183,000)		[2] (183,000)	
(N)	Kennebunk River (not authorized)						17,000		17,000
(N)	Portland Harbor, deepen to 45 ft. (not authorized)					550,000		550,000	
	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, N.H., and Maine (not authorized). (See New Hampshire.)								
(N)	Searsport Harbor (not authorized)						10,000		10,000
	Maryland:								
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and channels (1958 act)	4,100,000		4,100,000		4,100,000		4,100,000	
(FC)	Bloomington Reservoir (not authorized)		†100,000				100,000		
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) Part II, Delaware and Maryland. (See Delaware.)								
(N)	Pocomoke River	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
	Massachusetts:								
(R)	Cape Cod Canal-Bourne Bridge		38,000		$38,000		38,000		38,000
(N)	Chelsea River (not authorized)						15,000		
(FC)	Chicopee Falls	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Conant Brook Reservior		160,000		160,000		160,000		160,000
(FC)	Littleville Reservoir	1,900,000		2,200,000		1,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC)	New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet barriers	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Provincetown Harbor		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(FC)	Three Rivers		50,000	350,000		350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Wareham-Marion (not authorized)		†73,000				73,000		73,000
(BE)	Wessagussett Beach (reimbursement)	23,000		23,000		23,000		23,000	
(FC)	Westfield		120,000		120,000		120,000		120,000
	Michigan:								
(N)	Detroit River Channel north of Belle Isle					[1] (380,000)		(380,000)	
(N)	Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(N)	Gladstone Harbor Little Bay DeNoc (not authorized)					[1] (350,000)		[1] (350,000)	
(R)	Grand Haven Harbor (piers and revetment)	830,000		830,000		830,000		830,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(N)	Hammond Bay Harbor	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(R)	Holland Harbor (piers, revetment, and breakwater)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	Little Lake Harbor	610,000		610,000		610,000		610,000	
(R)	Ludington Harbor (piers, revetments, and breakwater)		40,000		400,000		40,000		40,000
(N)	Manistee Harbor	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
(R)	Manistee Harbor (piers, revetment, and breakwater)		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(R)	Manistique Harbor (breakwaters)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R)	Marquette Harbor (minor rehabilitation)	(300,000)		(300,000)		(300,000)		(300,000)	
(R)	Menominee Harbor (piers), Michigan and Wisconsin	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Muskegon Harbor (not authorized)						18,000		
(R)	Presque Isle Harbor (minor rehabilitation)	(140,000)		(140,000)		(140,000)		(140,000)	
(FC)	River Rouge (not authorized)		†50,000				50,000		50,000
(N)	Saginaw River	1,666,000		1,666,000		1,666,000		1,666,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R)	St. Joseph Harbor (piers and revetments)	81,000		81,000		81,000		81,000	
(N)	St. Marys River, New Poe lock	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(R)	South Haven Harbor (piers and revetments)	570,000		570,000		570,000		570,000	
	Minnesota:								
(N)	Duluth-Superior Harbor:								
	(a) Inner harbor 27-foot and 23-foot channels	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
	(b) Outer harbor 32-foot to 27-foot channel	2,580,000		2,580,000		2,580,000		2,580,000	
(FC)	Marshall, Redwood River	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(R)	Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River (Winnibigoshish Dam)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(N)	St. Anthony Falls extension	4,430,000		4,000,000		4,430,000		4,430,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,760,000	
	Mississippi:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Jackson and East Jackson		123,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Okatibbee Creek Reservoir (not authorized)						150,000		150,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor (not authorized)					1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)								
(FC)	Tombigbee River and tributaries		106,000		106,000		106,000		106,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Missouri:								
	Bull Shoals Reservoir, units 7 and 8, Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Canton	$200,000		$200,000		$200,000		$200,000	
(FC)	Cape Girardeau and vicinity	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
	Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Iowa.)								
	Dam 27, Mississippi River between St. Louis and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri. (See Illinois.).								
(FC)	Gregory Drainage District (not authorized)						$50,000		$50,000
(FC)	Hannibal (not authorized)		†$50,000				50,000		50,000
(MP)	Joanna Reservoir (not authorized)				$100,000		100,000		100,000
	Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir (with power)		267,000		267,000		267,000		267,000
(FC)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo., regulating works. (See Illinois.)								
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	180,000		180,000		180,000		180,000	
(FC)	St. Louis	8,800,000		8,800,000		8,800,000		8,800,000	
(FC)	South River Drainage District			100,000		100,000		100,000	
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
(FC)	Union Township Drainage District (not authorized)						40,000		40,000
	Montana:								
(MP)	Libby Reservoir		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000
	Nebraska:								
(FC)	Little Papillion Creek (not authorized)		†50,000				50,000		50,000
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Norfolk						80,000		80,000
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Waterloo					[1] (100,000)		(100,000)	
	Nevada:								
(FC)	Humboldt River (deferred)		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(FC)	Las Vegas Wash		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
	New Hampshire:								
(FC)	Claremont Reservoir (deferred)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir	2,587,000		2,587,000		2,567,000		2,567,000	
(N)	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, N.H., and Maine (not authorized)						100,000		100,000
	New Jersey:								
(BE)	Atlantic City (reimbursement)	129,000		129,000		129,000		129,000	
(BE)	Barnegat Light (reimbursement)	62,000		62,000		62,000		62,000	
(R)	Cold Spring Inlet (breakwater)		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton, Pennsylvania and New Jersey	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages at Reedy Point, Deepwater Point, and enlarging Marcus Hook and Mantua Creek anchorages			300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (main dikes) New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(BE)	Long Beach Island (reimbursement)	42,000		42,000		42,000		42,000	
(R)	Manasquan Inlet (bulkheads)		10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
(R)	New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway (jetties)		12,000		12,000		12,000		12,000
(BE)	Ocean City (reimbursement)	158,000		158,000		158,000		158,000	
(BE)	Raritan Bay-Sandy Hook Bay (not authorized)					500,000		500,000	
(MP)	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (not authorized)		†200,000				200,000		
	New Mexico:								
(FC)	Alamagordo diversion channel (not authorized)						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Cochiti Reservoir		350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Las Cruces (not authorized)		†50,000				50,000		
(FC)	Socorro	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Two Rivers Reservoir	1,911,000		1,911,000		1,911,000		1,911,000	
	New York:								
(FC)	Allegany (deferred)		7,000		7,000		7,000		7,000
	Allegheny River Reservoir, N.Y. and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	Buffalo Harbor:								
	(a) Deepen north entrance, Buffalo River entrance, Buffalo River, Buffalo Ship canal	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
	(b) South entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channel (1960 act)	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Fire Island to Montauk Point		250,000		250,000	750,000	250,000	750,000	250,000
(N)	Flushing Bay and Creek (not authorized)			1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(R)	Great Sodus Bay (piers)	473,000		473,000		473,000		473,000	
(FC)	Herkimer	880,000		880,000		880,000		880,000	
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany	5,300,000		5,300,000		5,300,000		5,300,000	
(FC)	Ithaca (Cayuga Inlet)		112,000		112,000		112,000		112,000
(FC)	Lackawanna		78,000		78,000		78,000		78,000
(FC)	Lake Chatauqua and Chadakoin River		35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000
(N)	New York Harbor, 35-foot channel from ocean to bayside	1,537,000		1,537,000		1,537,000		1,537,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
(1)								
New York—Continued								
(N) Rochester Harbor	$900,000		$900,000		$900,000		$900,000	
(BE) Selkirk Shores State Park (reimbursement)	40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000	
(FC) South Amsterdam	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (not authorized) (see New Jersey).								
North Carolina:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC) New Hope Reservoir (not authorized)		†$100,000				$100,000		$100,000
(FC) Wilkesboro Reservoir	800,000		800,000		779,000		779,000	
(N) Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (not authorized)						135,000		
North Dakota:								
(FC) Bowman-Haley Reservoir (not authorized)						180,000		180,000
(MP) Garrison Reservoir	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Oahe Reservoir, N. Dak. and S. Dak. (See South Dakota.)								
Ohio:								
(N) Ashtabula Harbor (1960 act)	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N) Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC) Big Darby Creek Reservoir				$250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC) Buck Creek Reservoir (not authorized)						75,000		75,000
Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N) Cleveland Harbor:								
(a) Bridge replacements widening, Cuyahoga and Old River and deepening channel in east basin and outer harbor (1958 act)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(b) 28-foot approach channel, 27-foot entrance channel, 27-foot river channel, 28 feet in west basin (1960 act)	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(R) Cleveland Harbor (breakwater)	253,000		253,000		253,000		253,000	
(R) Conneaut Harbor (breakwater)	265,000		265,000		265,000		265,000	
(FC) Deer Creek Reservoir				250,000		250,000		250,000
(N) Fairport Harbor	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(N) Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N) Lorain Harbor (1960 act)	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC) Paint Creek Reservoir				250,000		250,000		250,000
(N) Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	12,400,000		12,400,000		12,348,250		12,348,250	
(N) Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		395,000		395,000	350,000	395,000		395,000
(N) Sandusky Harbor (1960 act)	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(R) Sandusky Harbor (east jetty)	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N) Toledo Harbor (1950, 1958, and 1960 acts)	4,700,000	--	4,700,000		4,700,000		4,700,000	
(FC) West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000	
Oklahoma:								
Arkansas-Red Rivers salinity control (initial phase), Oklahoma and Texas (not authorized). (See Texas.)								
Arkansas River and tributaries bank stabilization and channel rectification, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
Arkansas River and tributaries navigation locks and dam, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC) Birch Reservoir (not authorized)						20,000		20,000
(FC) Broken Bow Reservoir	3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000	
(MP) Eufaula Reservoir	31,300,000		31,300,000		31,265,000		31,265,000	
(FC) Kaw Reservoir (not authorized)		†75,000				75,000		75,000
(FC) Keystone Reservoir	21,000,000		21,000,000		20,990,000		20,990,000	
(FC) Optima Reservoir (deferred)						50,000		50,000
(FC) Pine Creek Reservoir	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(MP) Short Mountain lock and dam		531,000		531,000		531,000		531,000
(FC) Skiatook Reservoir (not authorized)		†40,000				40,000		
(N) Webbers Falls lock and dam		325,000		325,000		325,000		325,000
Oregon:								
(FC) Blue River Reservoir					500,000		500,000	
(N) Columbia and Lower Willamette River below Vancouver, Wash. and Portland, Oreg. (not authorized):								
(a) 40-foot channel								100,000
(b) 35 feet from mouth of Willamette River to Vancouver		†100,000				†100,000		
(N) Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000
(R) Columbia River at the mouth (jetties), Oregon and Washington	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC) Columbia River local protection:								
John Day River		20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000
(N) Coos and Millicoma Rivers				23,000		23,000		23,000
(R) Coos Bay (south jetty)	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
(MP) Cougar Reservoir	9,100,000		9,100,000		9,079,000		9,079,000	
(FC) Fall Creek Reservoir	1,900,000		1,900,000		1,900,000		1,900,000	
(MP) Green Peter Reservoir	6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000	
(MP) John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	43,000,000		43,000,000		43,000,000		43,000,000	
(FC) Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:								
(a) Beaver Drainage District	516,000		516,000		516,000		516,000	
(R) Siuslaw River (south jetty)	720,000		720,000		720,000		720,000	
(R) Tillamook Bay and Harbor (north jetty)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R) Umpqua River (south jetty)	2,160,000		2,160,000		2,160,000		2,160,000	
(FC) Willamette River Basin bank protection	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(N) Yaquina Bay and Harbor		100,000		100,000	200,000	100,000	200,000	100,000
(R) Yaquina Bay and Harbor (jetties)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	(1)	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
	Pennsylvania:								
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	$24,800,000		$24,800,000		$24,800,000		$24,800,000	
(FC)	Beltzville Reservoir (not authorized)		†$100,000				$100,000		$100,000
(FC)	Bethlehem	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Blanchard Reservoir		350,000		$350,000		350,000		350,000
(FC)	Butler	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Curwensville Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
(N)	Dam 4, Monongahela River	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (main dikes), Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)								
	Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton. (See New Jersey.)								
(N)	Erie Harbor (1960 act)	1,220,000		1,220,000		1,220,000		1,220,000	
(FC)	Latrobe		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(N)	Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	7,800,000		7,800,000		7,748,250		7,748,250	
(BE)	Presque Isle Peninsula (reimbursement)	186,000		186,000		186,000		186,000	
(FC)	Ridgway	241,000		241,000		241,000		241,000	
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.	7,600,000		7,600,000		7,600,000		7,600,000	
(FC)	Tioga-Hammond Reservoir		100,000				100,000		
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (not authorized). (See New Jersey.)								
(FC)	Turtle Creek	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Union City Reservoir (not authorized)		†50,000				50,000		50,000
	Puerto Rico:								
(N)	San Juan Harbor	4,500,000		2,400,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
	Rhode Island:								
(FC)	Fox Point barrier	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Woonsocket	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
R)	Point Judith Harbor (breakwater)	810,000		810,000		810,000		810,000	
	South Carolina:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Charleston Harbor (1945 act)	824,000		824,000		824,000		824,000	
	Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C. (See Georgia.)								
	South Dakota:								
(MP)	Big Bend Reservoir	26,000,000		26,000,000		26,000,000		26,000,000	
(FC)	Cottonwood Springs Reservoirs (deferred)		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(MP)	Fort Randall Reservoir	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000	
	Tennessee:								
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)								
(MP)	Cordell Hull Dam		309,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir		404,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Texas:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Arkansas-Red Rivers salinity control (initial phase), (Oklahoma and Texas not authorized)					300,000		300,000	
(N)	Barbour Cut, La Porte			(58,500)		(58,500)		(58,500)	
(FC)	Bardwell Reservoir	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Big Fossil Creek		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Blieders Creek Reservoir, New Braunfels		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor (1960 act)					500,000			
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	4,800,000		4,800,000		4,800,000		4,800,000	
(FC)	Canyon Reservoir	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway (Clear Fork) (not authorized)		†75,000				75,000		75,000
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway upstream extension		70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
(R)	Galveston Harbor (jetties)	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:								
	Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
(R)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor (dikes)		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(N)	Houston ship channel:								
	(a) Bend easing and widening to 36-foot depth only	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
	(b) Deepening to 40 feet (phase II)	948,000		948,000		948,000		948,000	
(N)	Matagorda ship channel, 38- and 36-foot channels	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
(MP)	McGee Bend Dam	10,200,000		10,200,000		10,200,000		10,200,000	
(FC)	Navarro Mills Reservoir	2,080,000		2,080,000		2,005,000		2,005,000	
(N)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway:								
	(a) Channel to Viola, 36-foot depth, phase I	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
	(b) Deepening existing project to 40 and 42 feet			500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Port Arthur—hurricane protection (not authorized)		†115,000				115,000		115,000
(FC)	Proctor Reservoir	4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.).								
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Port Arthur Bridge								50,000
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Somerville Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
(FC)	Texas City	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(R)	Texas City Channel (dike)		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayou (not authorized)		†50,000				50,000		
(FC)	Waco Reservoir	15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000	
	Utah:								
(FC)	Weber River	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
	Vermont:								
(R)	Burlington Harbor (breakwater)	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
	Virginia:								
(FC)	Gathright Reservoir and Falling Springs reregulating dam (deferred)		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC)	John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,584,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Norfolk (not authorized)		†87,000				87,000		87,000
(FC)	North Fork of Pound Reservoir	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	

See footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 Construction (2)	Planning (3)	House allowance Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Senate allowance Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Conference allowance Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Washington:								
(FC) Colfax	$1,200,000		$1,200,000		$1,200,000		$1,200,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington—jetties. (See Oregon.)								
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(N) Everett Harbor and Snohomish River	1,208,000		1,208,000		1,208,000		1,208,000	
(FC) Howard A. Hanson (Eagle Gorge) Reservoir	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(MP) Little Goose lock and dam	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(FC) Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:								
Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2		$50,000		$50,000		$50,000		$50,000
(FC) Lower Columbia River levees at new locations:								
Kalama River, south area						10,000		10,000
(MP) Lower Granite lock and dam		500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000
(MP) Lower Monumental lock and dam	18,500,000		18,500,000		18,500,000		18,500,000	
(FC) Pullman		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC) Sammamish River	1,060,000		1,060,000		1,000,000		1,060,000	
West Virginia:								
Bellville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC) Buckhannon (not authorized		†30,000				30,000		30,000
(FC) Burnsville Reservioir (deferred)		35,000		65,000		65,000		65,000
(FC) East Lynn Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC) Justice Reservoir (not authorized)						150,000		
Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(N) Opekiska lock and dam	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC) Summersville Reservoir	9,750,000		9,750,000		9,750,000		9,750,000	
Wisconsin:								
(N) Ashland Harbor	340,000		340,000		340,000		340,000	
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin. (See Minnesota.)								
(FC) Eau Galle River	340,000		340,000		340,000		340,000	
(N) Green Bay Harbor			260,000		260,000		260,000	
(N) Kenosha Harbor (not authorized)						15,000		15,000
Menominee Harbor (piers), Michigan and Wisconsin. (See Michigan.)								
(R) Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R) Sheboygan Harbor (pier and breakwater)	320,000		320,000		320,000		320,000	
(R) Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan ship canal (revetments)	360,000		360,000		360,000		360,000	
Wyoming:								
(FC) Jackson Hole	430,000		430,000		430,000		430,000	
(FC) Sheridan	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Miscellaneous:								
(FC) Emergency bank protection	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC) Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation	3,000,000		3,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation (costing up to $200,000)	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Snagging and clearing	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Projects deferred for restudy		(217,000)		(272,000)		(272,000)		(272,000)
Recreation facilities, completed projects	4,000,000		4,150,000		4,150,000		4,150,000	
Small authorized projects	1,500,000		1,500,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(R) Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000)	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
Employees compensation	22,000		22,000		22,000		22,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−60,000,000		−80,000,000		−60,000,000		−70,000,000	
Grand total, construction, general	761,045,000	19,600,000	745,867,000	16,494,000	786,130,500	21,832,000	772,786,500	20,059,000
	780,645,000		762,361,000		807,962,500		792,845,500	

---

† Submitted in S. Doc. 135.

[1] Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.

[2] Eligible for selection under small navigation program not requiring specific legislation.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1963

Projects (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 Construction (2)	Planning (3)	House allowance Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Senate allowance Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Conference allowance Construction (8)	Planning (9)
1. General investigations:								
(a) Examinations and surveys	$42,500		$42,500		$62,500		$62,500	
(b) Collection and study of basic data	82,500		82,500		82,500		82,500	
Subtotal, general investigations	125,000		125,000		145,000		145,000	
2. Construction and planning:								
Mississippi River levees	$2,200,000		$2,200,000		$3,000,000		$2,600,000	
Channel improvement	25,500,000		25,500,000		27,500,000		26,500,000	
Memphis Harbor	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
Greenville Harbor [1]	1,530,000		1,530,000		1,530,000		1,530,000	

See footnote at end of table.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1963—**Continued**

Projects (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 Construction (2)	 Planning (3)	House allowance Construction (4)	 Planning (5)	Senate allowance Construction (6)	 Planning (7)	Conference allowance Construction (8)	 Planning (9)
2. Construction and planning—Continued								
Old River control	$4,200,000		$4,200,000		$4,174,000		$4,174,000	
St. Francis Basin	3,900,000		3,900,000		3,900,000	$60,000	3,900,000	$60,000
Lower White River	850,000		850,000		850,000		850,000	
Cache Basin		$100,000		$100,000		100,000		100,000
West Tennessee tributaries	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
Lower Arkansas	500,000		500,000		600,000		550,000	
Tensas Basin:								
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	1,740,000		1,740,000		1,740,000		1,740,000	
Red River backwater [1]	35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000	
Yazoo Basin:								
Sardis Reservoir	30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000	
Enid Reservoir	53,000		53,000		53,000		53,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000	
Grenada Reservoir	37,000		37,000		37,000		37,000	
Greenwood	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
Main stem	2,050,000		2,050,000		2,050,000		2,050,000	
Tributaries	660,000		660,000		660,000		660,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
Yazoo backwater	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
Atchafalaya Basin	4,900,000		4,900,000		4,900,000		4,900,000	
Lake Pontchartrain	760,000		760,000		760,000		760,000	
Subtotal, construction and planning	53,275,000	100,000	53,275,000	100,000	56,149,000	160,000	54,699,000	160,000
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−1,500,000		−1,500,000		−1,500,000		−1,500,000	
Total, construction and planning	51,775,000	100,000	51,775,000	100,000	54,649,000	160,000	53,199,000	160,000
3. Maintenance	18,500,000		18,500,000		21,000,000		20,000,000	
Grand total	70,500,000		70,500,000		75,954,000		73,504,000	

[1] Completed with amount in approved budget.

Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation

Project (1)	Budget estimate (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
Advance planning	$1,705,000	$130,000	$1,400,000	$1,030,000
Gila project, Arizona	3,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Colorado River front work and levee system, Arizona-California	250,000	250,000	550,000	550,000
Central Valley project, California	47,401,000	47,401,000	47,401,000	47,401,000
Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake pipe rehabilitation, Idaho	519,000	519,000	519,000	519,000
Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
Washoe project, Nevada-California	198,315	198,315	198,315	198,315
Rio Grande project, New Mexico			80,000	80,000
Norman project, Oklahoma	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
Rogue River Basin, Talent division, Oregon	439,000	439,000	439,000	439,000
The Dalles project, western division, Oregon	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000
Vale project, Bully Creek extension, Oregon	1,765,000	1,765,000	1,765,000	1,765,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California	515,000	515,000	515,000	515,000
Canadian River project, Texas	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas	1,940,000	1,940,000	1,940,000	1,940,000
San Angelo project, Texas	2,770,000	2,770,000	2,690,000	2,690,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	10,538,000	10,538,000	10,538,000	10,538,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington	2,136,000	2,136,000	2,136,000	2,136,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	4,569,000	4,569,000	4,569,000	4,569,000
Drainage and minor construction	3,956,054	3,956,054	3,956,054	3,956,054
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	5,346,000	5,346,000	5,346,000	5,346,000
Subtotal	114,172,360	111,507,369	113,167,369	112,797,369
Missouri River Basin project:				
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
Almena unit, Kansas	4,826,000	4,826,000	4,826,000	4,826,000
Cedar Bluff unit, Kansas	906,000	906,000	906,000	906,000
East Bench unit, Montana	5,620,000	5,620,000	5,620,000	5,620,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	1,714,000	1,714,000	1,714,000	1,714,000
Glen Elder unit, Kansas	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Oahe unit, James section, South Dakota	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000
Transmission division	14,449,000	14,229,000	14,379,000	14,379,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	12,150,000	12,150,000	12,150,000	12,150,000
Drainage and minor construction	1,795,631	1,795,631	1,820,631	1,820,631
Investigations	1,488,000	1,000,000	1,431,000	1,143,000
Advance planning	1,284,000	1,284,000	1,284,000	1,284,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project	57,802,631	57,094,631	57,700,631	57,412,631
Other Department of the Interior agencies	3,240,000	2,900,000	3,008,000	3,008,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	61,042,631	59,994,631	60,708,631	60,420,631
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	175,215,000	171,502,000	173,876,000	173,218,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	13,515,000	18,515,000	13,515,000	15,000,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	161,700,000	153,077,000	160,361,000	158,218,000

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87–759 the Speaker had appointed Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. COLMER, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. CHELF, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. SILER as members of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3215) for the relief of Kim Chong Koo.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10539. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 88th Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 584. Concurrent resolution fixing the date for the sine die adjournment of the 2d session of the 87th Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 585. Concurrent resolution authorizing the officers of the House and Senate to sign enrolled bills notwithstanding the sine die adjournment.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 835) to appoint two Members of the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10539) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ASSERTION OF THE POWER OF THE SENATE TO ORIGINATE BILLS APPROPRIATING MONEY FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk a privileged resolution, for which I request immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 414) submitted by Mr. RUSSELL was read, as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives has adopted House Resolution 831 alleging that Senate Joint Resolution 234, a resolution continuing the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, to be in contravention of the first clause of the seventh section of the Constitution and an infringement of the privileges of the House; and

Whereas this clause of the Constitution provides only that "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives," and does not in anywise limit or restrict the privileges and power of the Senate with respect to any other legislation; and

Whereas the acquiesence of the Senate in permitting the House to first consider appropriation bills cannot change the clear language of the Constitution nor affect the Senate's coequal power to originate any bill not expressly "raising revenue"; and

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, pursuant to a directive of the House of Representatives, reported to the House in 1885 that the power to originate bills appropriating money from the Treasury did not reside exclusively in the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate respectfully asserts its power to originate bills appropriating money for the support of the Government and declares its willingness to submit the issue either for declaratory judgment by an appropriate appellate court of the United States or to an appropriate commission of outstanding educators specializing in the study of the English language to be chosen in equal numbers by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this resolution is just as self-explanatory, I believe, as the clause of the Constitution which is involved. I see no necessity for laboring it.

I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Georgia believe it would help to have a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution, in order to show the unanimity of the Senate in regard to it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure the Senate is unanimously in support of this proposition; and I do not think it would be worthwhile to call our associates into the Chamber, from the matters which now engage them, in order to have a yea-and-nay vote taken.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. I merely wanted to express my strong support of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from New York. I am sure the resolution will be unanimously agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

RESEARCH PROGRAM TO DISCOVER NEW USES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk, and for which I request immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 415) submitted by Mr. RUSSELL, was read, as follows:

Whereas the vast accumulation of surplus agricultural commodities by the Government of the United States, at the expense of the American taxpayer, presents this Nation one of its most serious domestic problems involving the expenditure of billions of dollars for storage, handling and transportation alone; and

Whereas this condition makes it not only desirable but necessary that appropriate steps be taken to decrease the enormous expenditures and wastage involved in the accumulation, handling and storage of said surpluses; and

Whereas the United States has neglected adequate research in finding new means to utilize these vast surpluses for the benefit of the American people who have contributed almost $27,000,000,000 to the farm program since 1952: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby respectfully requests the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to the Director of the Budget and to the Congress in time to be considered in connection with the first supplemental appropriation bills before the Congress in the 88th Congress the most effective program available for research to discover new uses for agricultural commodities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be requested to limit this program to items costing not in excess of $35,000,000 per annum above current allowances for 1963 for utilization research to discover new uses for agricultural commodities.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the resolution merely sets forth, in essence, the position of the Senate, as expressed by the 77 to 0 vote on the floor of the Senate. It requests that the Secretary of Agriculture define the program, so that the fact that it has not previously been defined and spelled out in detail could not be used as an ostensible objection to the program. The resolution does not involve the expenditure of a dime of money; it merely requests the Secretary of Agriculture to submit this program to the Congress, for its consideration.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the Senator from Georgia.

The resolution was agreed to.

FISCAL POLICY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there appears in today's issue of the Washington Daily News an editorial on fiscal policy, as written by former President Harry Truman. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"HOOEY" SAYS HARRY

Today we let Harry Truman write our editorial on fiscal policy:

"It is all a bunch of hooey to talk about cutting taxes when you are trying to give Government workers a pay raise and when we face the costly defense situation we do."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has asked me to request unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him be printed in the body of the RECORD. I so request, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

I wish to register my strong protest against the highly arbitrary action of the other body in adamantly refusing to pass the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 13290, because of a dispute over a few items, in another set of bills, regarding public works. The country should be made aware of the price which the other body is exacting for the willfulness of some, and the record should show clearly just where the responsibility lies.

The supplemental appropriations bill contains additional funds which are essential to the continued effectiveness of many Government agencies for the remainder of the year. I am advised that some of these agencies and their programs can get along on some sort of stretching basis until the opening of the 88th Congress next January when, we are told, another bill can be pushed through. But many agencies will be hard hit, and it is the Nation which will bear the brunt of their diminished effectiveness.

Extremely unfair is the case of the school lunch program which will be deprived of vitally needed funds for the next few school months. Similarly, Federal public welfare grants to the States under the new expanded program, especially aid for dependent children, will be stalled, as will the new educational television program and the U.S. Information Agency; perhaps most cruelly, the recently passed and much needed increase in annuities to civil service retirees will be held up along with many items for salaries of employees of several departments and agencies.

We should not ask these agencies and these employees to scrape along on a basis of expediency at a time when the Nation demands so much of them. I believe the other body is bypassing its responsibilities shamefully and the Nation should know it. It is small consolation at this late date, but at least the Congress must now reaffirm its solemn obligation to pay those sums at the earliest opportunity in the next Congress.

BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS OF ALL APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a table which shows the budget estimates, the amounts in the House and the Senate versions of the bills, and the final amounts agreed to in conference for every appropriation bill approved during the 87th Congres, 2d session.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of appropriation bills, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include any back-door appropriation bills. Also excludes permanent appropriations]

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed Senate	Final action: Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to Senate
	1962 SUPPLEMENTALS						
H.J. Res. 612	Veterans' Administration	$151,200,000	$55,000,000	$151,200,000	$55,000,000	$55,000,000	−$96,200,000
H.R. 11038	2d supplemental	[1] 503,265,000	447,514,000	[1] 522,231,929	560,008,344	373,550,689	[2] −148,681,240
H.J. Res. 745	Supplemental [3]		(133,259,929)		(277,222,429,		
	Total, 1962 supplementals	654,465,000	502,514,000	673,431,929	615,008,344	428,550,689	−244,881,240
	1963 APPROPRIATIONS						
H.R. 10526	Treasury-Post Office	5,575,386,000	5,461,671,000	5,575,386,000	5,526,558,000	5,489,781,000	−85,605,000
H.R. 10802	Interior [4]	930,674,000	868,595,000	932,674,000	922,560,820	885,362,000	−47,312,000
H.R. 10904	Labor-HEW	5,284,831,000	5,170,788,000	5,386,363,100	5,380,958,000	5,334,609,500	−51,753,600
H.R. 11151	Legislative	114,078,425	113,733,890	[8] 146,913,210	146,690,690	146,477,270	−435,940
H.R. 11289	Defense	47,907,000,000	[6] 47,839,491,000	47,907,000,000	[6] 48,429,221,000	[6] 48,136,247,000	+229,247,000
H.R. 12276	District of Columbia	(299,134,478)	(290,059,000)	(300,161,478)	(289,253,300)	(288,986,350)	(−11,175,128)
	Federal payment	35,199,000	33,199,000	35,199,000	33,199,000	33,199,000	−2,000,000
	Loan authorizations	(26,042,000)	(26,042,000)	(26,042,000)	(26,042,000)	(26,042,000)	
H.R. 12580	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	[7] 2,004,178,000	1,901,215,700	[7] 2,123,248,000	2,086,908,700	2,025,895,700	−97,352,300
H.R. 12648	Agriculture	6,354,783,000	5,475,842,500	6,354,783,000	4,774,983,000	5,487,029,500	−867,753,500
	Loan authorizations	(805,000,000)	(805,000,000)	(805,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
H.R. 12711	Independent offices [5]	12,560,063,500	11,501,141,000	12,580,269,500	11,801,590,000	11,631,792,100	−948,477,400
H.R. 12870	Military construction	1,594,729,500	1,369,741,000	1,594,729,500	1,350,501,000	1,319,114,500	−275,615,000
H.R. 12900	Public works	4,745,332,000	4,613,807,900	5,651,751,000	5,211,271,400	5,069,134,400	−582,616,600
H.R. 13175	Foreign assistance	7,335,029,000	5,956,852,000	7,335,029,000	6,781,402,000	6,278,962,000	−1,056,067,000
H.R. 13290	Supplemental	543,728,980	404,747,880	631,785,376	550,668,376		−631,785,376
	Total, 1963 appropriations	94,985,012,405	90,710,825,870	96,255,130,686	92,946,411,986	91,837,603,970	−4,417,526,716
	Total, all appropriations	[9] 95,639,477,405	91,213,339,870	[9] 96,928,562,615	93,561,420,330	[9] 92,266,154,659	−4,662,407,956
	Total, loan authorizations	(831,042,000)	(831,042,000)	(831,042,000)	(846,042,000)	(846,042,000)	(+15,000,000)

[1] Adjusted to reflect rescission of $44,637,000 for Civil Service Commission proposed in H. Doc. No. 333 but not acted upon by Congress.

[2] Of this amount, $117,457,000 which was originally provided for fiscal year 1962 costs eliminated by H. Con. Res. 505 as no longer required.

[3] Included primarily deficiency items contained in 2d supplemental, 1962 (H.R. 11038) considered necessary to enable certain agencies to finish out fiscal year. Not sent to conference or enacted into law.

[4] Includes borrowing authority as follows: Budget estimate, $20,000,000; House reported and passed, $6,000,000; Senate reported and passed, $20,000,000.

[5] Consists largely of Senate items not included in estimates to House.

[6] Includes $514,500,000 in new obligational authority in lieu of utilizing the sum of $514,500,000 appropriated for the current year for the procurement of long-range bombers, as proposed in the President's budget.

[7] Includes comparability adjustment of $115,480,000 for borrowing authority replaced by appropriation.

[8] Includes comparability adjustments of $34,427,500 for contract authorization and borrowing authority replaced by appropriations.

[9] In addition, permanent appropriations (interest on the debt is by far the largest item) recurring under basic law, and therefore not requiring annual action by Congress, were tentatively estimated, for fiscal year 1963, at $9,996,000,000 in the January budget. Precise amount is subject to some revision—perhaps slightly upward.

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations in the bills are included in this table.

NOTIFICATION OF PRESIDENT RELATING TO ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk, and for which I request immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 416) submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the resolution; and, without objection, it is agreed to.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m., the Senate reconvened, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MORSE in the chair).

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the committee appointed to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses are ready to adjourn unless he had further communications to make to us, I report that the committee has performed its duty, having previously communicated with the President, and that the President informs us that he has no further communications to make to the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps it would not be amiss to repeat his words, that if it were all right by us, it was all right by him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, there are three resolutions at the desk. I ask that they be called up and considered.

DATE OF ASSEMBLY OF 88TH CONGRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 907) fixing the time of the assembly of the 88th Congress, which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Eighty-eighth Congress shall assemble at noon on Wednesday, January 9, 1963.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 584), fixing the date for the sine die adjournment of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 13, 1962, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 585), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 417), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 418), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 419), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF APPRECIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it would be hard to imagine a more ingratiating Senator, or a more accommodating one, than the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Our relationship has been a source of strength to me. We have dealt with each other almost daily since January 20, 1961, working out the schedule of the Senate, and attempting to mold a legislative program that would be worthy of the greatest parliamentary body in the world. Where there appeared to be almost insuperable obstacles to that program, the Senator from Illinois threw his immense powers of persuasion into the resolution of those obstacles. I do not mean to say he gave up his beliefs or his colorful partisanship; he did not. But he has prevented partisanship from itself becoming an insuperable obstacle to the performance of our legislative responsibilities. For that I honor him, and I pay him these respects as a friend and admirer. Whatever our profound disagreements on many policy matters, we have not permitted these to disrupt our steady friendship.

The very agreeable minority whip, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], has carried many responsibilities, both dramatic and dreary. He has been a steadfast floor leader of his party in the absence of the Senator from Illinois, and a wise counselor at all times. No more likable man exists in the Congress.

I find it hard to improve on the words of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], when he spoke of the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] last Tuesday:

> I challenge anyone to be associated with this wonderful man for any length of time and not increase greatly his admiration and affection for him.

HUBERT HUMPHREY and I were friends before we assumed duties of leadership in this Chamber. I can honestly state that this friendship has been absolutely invaluable to me during the 87th Congress. A servant of the State of Minnesota, of the Democratic Party, and of the highest progressive traditions of American political life, Senator HUMPHREY has earned the lasting gratitude of all those who have worked with him in the U.S. Senate.

The tribute paid the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] might appropriately be made about its author. Senator SMATHERS has been an independent, hard-working, and highly productive member of the Senate Democratic leadership. Easygoing as he seems, he has been unstinting in his service to the Senate, and by that service has earned the respect, as well as the fond regard, of his colleagues.

Mr. President, I pay my additional respects to the committee staffs, who have labored through an unusually long and productive Congress, and whose efforts are completely essential to any sound record of accomplishment in the Senate; to the staff of the Senate itself, especially to our beloved friend, Secretary Felton Johnston, now recovering from an eye operation and soon to return to his post in good health; to Joe Duke, our unfailingly helpful Sergeant at Arms; to Bobby Baker, for many years the indispensable right arm of Senate leadership; to Mark Trice, Bill Brownrigg, and Rein Vander Zee, who have, with efficiency and with agreeable spirits, kept the machinery of the Senate running; to the clerks at the desk, the official reporters, the young men who serve in the cloakrooms and as pages and those who serve both press and Senate—I shall not detain the Senate with a complete listing of those without whom we could not operate this huge institution. It must suffice that I offer the thanks of the elected Members of this body to the unelected members.

Let me pay a last overdue debt of thanks to Senators LEE METCALF, JOE HICKEY, CLAIBORNE PELL, QUENTIN BURDICK, and MAURINE NEUBERGER. These freshmen Senators served the Senate in one of the most grueling tasks it befalls a Senator to perform—presiding over the long, long sessions we frequently endure. They did it without complaint, and with courtesy, dignity, and authority.

Mr. President, I would be remiss in my obligation if I did not mention the cooperation, understanding and tolerance shown by the leadership of the other body in the person of the Speaker, Mr. MCCORMACK, the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, of Oklahoma; the majority whip, Mr. BOGGS, of Louisiana; the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana; and the minority whip, Mr. ARENDS, of Illinois. They were very cooperative. Collectively they have performed a great service in the House of Representatives. I commend and congratulate them for what they have been able to do over the past 2 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and all the Republican Senators, I thank the majority leader for the very thoughtful, considerate, patient, and understanding manner in which he has led the Senate through this long and difficult session.

As he has said, he has had the cooperation and understanding of the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. When he congratulates Mr. DIRKSEN, he congratulates all the members of the Republican Party in the Senate, who have followed Mr. DIRKSEN and who have great respect for his leadership. We thank the majority leader for his work in conducting this long and arduous session, in which we have all worked hard, but in which he has worked harder than any of us.

As acting minority leader today, I pay this tribute to him in the closing hour of the session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his kind words. I assure him that I deeply appreciate them.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, it is with regret and resignation and relief that I move that the Senate stand adjourned sine die.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). It is with great pleasure that the Chair puts the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), Saturday, October 13, 1962, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 584, the Senate adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 585, agreed to October 13, 1962, the President pro tempore, on October 16, 1962, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1447. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund;

S. 1961. An act for the relief of Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Fong Yee Hin;

S. 3124. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

S. 3215. An act for the relief of Kim Chong Koo;

S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes;

S. 3451. An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes;

S. 3453. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates;

S. 3705. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7932. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1948, so as to repeal portions thereof relating to residual rights in certain land on Santa Rosa Island, Fla.;

H.R. 10620. An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11586. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12276. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12648. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12820. An act to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas, under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12900. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13273. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to establish a commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide protection for the golden eagle; and

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution that the 88th Congress shall assemble at noon on Wednesday, January 9, 1963.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate, on October 17, 1962, presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1447. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund;

S. 1961. An act for the relief of Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Fong Yee Hin;

S. 3124. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

S. 3215. An act for the relief of Kim Chong Koo;

S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes;

S. 3451. An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes;

S. 3453. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates;

S. 3705. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that on the following dates he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

On October 9, 1962:

S. 455. An act to amend the act of July 14, 1955, relating to air pollution control, to authorize appropriations for an additional 2-year period, and for other purposes;

S. 1060. An act to authorize the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 3120. An act to amend section 6 of the act of May 29, 1884;

S. 3156. An act to amend section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with regard to furnishing court quarters and accommodations at places where regular terms of court are authorized to be held, and for other purposes;

S. 3408. An act to establish in the Library of Congress a library of musical scores and other instructional materials to further educational, vocational, and cultural opportunities in the field of music for blind persons;

S. 3431. An act to consent to the amendment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact and to the participation of certain additional States in such compact in accordance with the terms of such amendment;

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to establish the sesquicentennial commission for the celebration of the Battle of New Orleans, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property within Chalmette National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National School Lunch Week; and

S.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

On October 10, 1962:

S. 136. An act for the relief of Dinko Dorcic;

S. 453. An act for the relief of Robert J. Scanlan;

S. 689. An act for the relief of Karl Heinz Agar;

S. 1552. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, effectiveness, and reliability of drugs, authorize standardization of drug names, and clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority, and for other purposes;

S. 1999. An act for the relief of Anna Marie Erdelyi;

S. 2667. An act for the relief of Sabastiana Santoro;

S. 2777. An act for the relief of Arild Ericksen Sandli;

S. 2836. An act for the relief of Carmelo Rafala;

S. 2902. An act for the relief of Sumiko Takahashi;

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Raymond Chester Hendon;

S. 3089. An act to amend the act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada in order to extend for 5 years the time for selecting such lands;

S. 3275. An act for the relief of Anna Sciamanna Misticoni;

S. 3295. An act for the relief of Mathew Lengyel (also known as Brother Paul, S.V.D.);

S. 3336. An act for the relief of Lazaro Loyola Arinque, Jr.; and

S. 3396. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds.

On October 11, 1962:

S. 1651. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to delegate the function of approving contracts not exceeding $50,000;

S. 2690. An act for the relief of Mona McIsaac Downey;

S. 2711. An act for the relief of Tasia Demetropoulon (Dimitropoulos);

S. 2908. An act for the relief of Rosa Fumarola Balice;

S. 2992. An act for the relief of Michelangelo Comito (Nati);

S. 3152. An act to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary packaging of rice prior to its distribution under certain Federal programs, including the national school lunch program;

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Ma Chin-Ying;

S. 3279. An act for the relief of Yet Gee Moy (Tsze Woo Lai) and Mee Sen Moy (Sau Ming Lai);

S. 3452. An act for the relief of Dr. Hassan M. Nouri; and

S. 3600. An act for the relief of Chao Hua-Hsin.

On October 15, 1962:

S. 320. An act to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicles may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State;

S. 507. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe;

S. 914. An act to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia, to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes;

S. 962. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Marie Margaret Arvanetes;

S. 1288. An act to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make Indian tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 2568. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1950, to extend the regulatory authority of the Federal and State agencies concerned under the terms of the Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, signed at Washington May 31, 1949, and for other purposes;

S. 2687. An act for the relief of Robert D. Barbee;

S. 2697. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide an extension of the period within which certain educational programs must be begun and completed in the case of persons called to active duty during the Berlin crisis, and for other purposes;

S. 2753. An act for the relief of Duk Man Lee and Soon Mal Lee;

S. 2938. An act for the relief of Seymour K. Owens;

S. 2950. An act for the relief of Dwijendra Kumar Misra;

S. 2953. An act relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America;

S. 3085. An act for the relief of Paul Huygelen and Luba A. Huygelen;

S. 3177. An act for the relief of Michael (Mike) Bessler;

S. 3265. An act for the relief of Despina Anastos (Psyhopeda);

S. 3267. An act for the relief of Gunter Heinz Hillebrand;

S. 3338. An act to incorporate the American Symphony Orchestra League;

S. 3390. An act for the relief of Naife Kahl;

S. 3504. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Conservation Act;

S. 3557. An act for the relief of Betty Sandra Fagann;

S. 3631. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of reports filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis;

S.J. Res. 214. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period from November 26, 1962, through December 2, 1962, as National Cultural Center Week; and

S.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

On October 16, 1962:

S. 2795. An act to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencise of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that any such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia.

On October 18, 1962:

S. 1563. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Ga.-S.C., to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes;

S. 1658. An act to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 2450. An act for the relief of Major C. Todd, Jr., and the estate of Ira T. Todd, Sr.;

S. 3451. An act for the relief of G. W. Todd and the estate of Lloyd Parks;

S. 3389. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

S. 3394. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William A. Carter, U.S. Air Force; and

S. 3679. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to hold a World Food Congress in the United States in 1963.

On October 23, 1962:

S. 1961. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Fong Yee Hin;

S. 3124. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

S. 3215. An act for the relief of Kim Chong Koo;

S. 3451. An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes; and

S. 3453. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates.

On October 24, 1962:

S. 1447. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund;

S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes;

S. 3705. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes.

OCEANOGRAPHY PROGRAM—POCKET VETO

The President of the United States notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had allowed the bill (S. 901) to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes, to expire at midnight of October 17, 1962, without his approval.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 4: 3: *Endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.*

God of infinite grace and goodness, from whom cometh our help and our hope, Thou knowest how weak we are in faith and how hesitatingly we often enter upon a new day.

Gird us with a capacity to see all our tasks in their right perspective and with courage to discharge them faithfully and without fear.

Grant that when we leave this Chamber we may commend and commit one another to Thy love and care, beseeching Thee that the benediction of Thy praise and peace may rest upon our President, our Speaker, our chosen Representatives, and all who, in this 87th Congress, have had the sacred privilege of serving our beloved country.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; may the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; may the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$791,580,500".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 93, nays 143, not voting 199, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

YEAS—93

Abbitt
Andersen, Minn.
Ashbrook
Bates
Beermann
Betts
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Broomfield
Broyhill
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Chenoweth
Clancy
Colmer
Cooley
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Daddario
Dole
Feighan
Fenton
Fogarty
Ford
Fountian
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harrison, Wyo.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Henderson
Horan
Ichord, Mo.
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kitchin
Knox
Kunkel
Lane
Latta
Lesinski
Lindsay
Mahon
Mailliard
Mathias
May
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Morse
Mosher
Natcher
Pillion
Poff
Reece
Rhodes Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Rooney
Roudebush
Rutherford
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Schweiker
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Taber
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Van Pelt
Walter
Wharton
Whitten
Winstead

NAYS—143

Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Battin
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Boggs
Boykin
Brademas
Bray
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Buckley
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Coad
Cohelan
Cook
Corbett
Cramer
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Dingell
Dowdy
Dulski
Edmondson
Everett
Fallon
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Forrester
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Garmatz
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Granahan
Gray
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hansen
Harris
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Herlong
Holland
Huddleston
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Karsten
Kearns
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Lankford
Libonati
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
McVey
Madden
Matthews
Mills
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
Olsen
O'Neill
Osmers
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Pike
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rosenthal
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Germain
Selden
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Udall, Morris K.
Vanik
Waggonner
Westland
Wickersham
Willis
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—199

Adair
Alexander
Alford
Alger
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baker
Baring
Barry
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Bolling
Breeding
Bromwell
Brown
Burke, Ky.
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Collier
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Daniels
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Dorn
Downing
Doyle
Durno
Dwyer
Elliott
Ellsworth
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Gavin
Glenn
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Haley
Hall
Harding
Harrison, Va.
Harvey, Mich.
Hébert
Hemphill
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Inouye
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
McSween
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mack
Magnuson
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Meader
Merrow
Michel
Miller, George P.
Moore
Moorehead, Ohio
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Peterson
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Quie
Rains
Ray
Reifel
Reuss
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Rousselot
Santangelo
Saund
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Çalif.
Stafford
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Tupper
Ullman
Utt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weis
Whalley
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Younger
Zelenko

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Haley with Mr. Ray.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Garland.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Curtin.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Berry of South Dakota.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Ostertag.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Alger.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Inouye with Mr. Nelsen.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Schadeberg.

Mr. Scott with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Mack with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Hiestand.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Scranton.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Brown.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Breeding with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. McDonough.

Mr. John W. Davis with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Loser with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Nygaard.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Bromwell.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Taylor with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Ullman with Mrs. Church.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Whitener with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Teague of California.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Devine.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Harding with Mr. Rousselot.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Durno.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Belcher.

Mrs. Riley with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Schneebeli.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Langen.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Wallhauser.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Alford with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Andrews with Mr. Baker.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. James C. Davis with Mrs. Weis.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky, with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Schriver.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Frazier with Mr. Short.

Mr. Grant with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Peterson with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Quie.

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mrs. Kee with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Downing of Virginia with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Marshall with Mr. Mason.

Mr. McSween with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. BECKWORTH and **Mr. GONZALEZ** changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and **Mr. RIVERS** of South Carolina changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sikes moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: in lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$792,845,500".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Missouri for the purpose of offering a substitute?

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman from Florida does not yield, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida declines to yield to the gentleman from Missouri to offer a substitute.

The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I take this time to impress upon the Members of the House the importance of remaining available for quorum calls. There will be other legislative business which might involve a call of the House, including the adjournment sine die resolution. Without a quorum perhaps some of this business cannot be transacted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority, I likewise take this opportunity to urge that Members hold themselves in readiness to be here and do whatever may be necessary in order that we may adjourn sine die today.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to find myself in disagreement with the chairman of my committee. I have the highest respect for him. He is one of the great men of the Congress, and he has built up here a record which is one of the most significant in the history of this great deliberative body.

But I feel I am right in asking that the House accept the amendment which I have proposed, which would add $1,265,000 to the amount now in the bill. That amount includes:

Blue River Reservoir in Oregon	$500,000
Yaquina Bay and Harbor project, Oregon	200,000
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg	100,000
Cross Florida Barge Canal	205,000
Bascule bridge on the Sabine-Neches Waterway at Port Arthur, Tex	50,000
Calumet Harbor, Ill	110,000
Kaskaskia River, Ill	100,000
Total	1,265,000

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking directly for a budget item of $205,000 for advanced engineering and design of the Florida Cross State Canal. We are told that this will complete all preconstruction design. Then we can take another look to decide whether actual construction should begin. We have spent $1½ million. But unless we spend this item of $205,000 for planning we shall have wasted a large part of the money heretofore spent in engineering and design. Starts and stops in any program are costly. We want to finish what we have begun.

This project has been authorized for years. There is no rhyme or reason in suggesting that we go back to the Public Works Committee for another authorization. The engineers have periodically checked this project and they have found that the benefit ratio is steadily improving. Any talk of a new authorization is purely a device to kill the project.

The project now has economic justification of approximately 1.2. It is important not only to Florida, but the U.S. engineers have stated it will have direct economic benefit to 36 States. It closes a gap between the Atlantic and gulf coastal waterway systems. And let me emphasize here and now, there is no problem in connection with the use by barge traffic of the stretch of open gulf between the western terminus of the canal and the eastern terminus of the gulf intercoastal canal at St. Marks. This is sheltered water which barges and other craft now traverse every day without difficulty. The use of the Florida Cross State Barge Canal is not tied to the completion of a canal from St. Marks to the Atlantic.

THE CANAL IS 12 FEET DEEP

Now, here is something that deserves your special consideration. Henceforth, most of the missiles to be fired at Cape Canaveral will be so big they must go there by water. Those that go from the gulf coast to Cape Canaveral will save 500 miles if the cross State barge canal is available.

The Caribbean is no longer a placid American lake. The Panama Canal is no longer a certain, safe artery for American and world commerce. Castro and Khrushchev have changed all this.

In World War II the United States lost to enemy submarines 77 tankers and 88 dry cargo ships operating in the gulf and off the Atlantic coast of Florida. The loss of these 165 ships, their cargoes, many of their crew members, resulted in a cost many times as much as the entire Cross State Barge Canal. Anyone who heard the cries of men on those torpedoed and burning ships, or saw the wrecks of men who came ashore, some of them more dead than alive, will not want that experience repeated.

But Hitler had no base of operations in Cuba or in the Caribbean. He had only a handful of submarines. Khrushchev has a naval base in Cuba. Khrushchev has many times the number of submarines that Hitler had and much better subs. They are missile-carrying subs which endanger the whole eastern seaboard—as well as shipping. The Reds can create havoc along our coasts any day they wish.

So the canal is a defense measure, too. It will free ships. It will save crews. It will free railroads for coast-to-coast shipping. It will save shipping costs in peace and in war.

For $205,000—a budget item—we can be ready to go ahead with construction when the time is right. We will have a completed preconstruction package. We will not have spent without avail the $1½ million which already has gone into this preconstruction package. We will be penny wise and pound foolish to reject this low-cost item at this late and dangerous date in the security of America.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, because much has been said but still much misunderstanding persists about the Cross-Florida Barge Canal I submit the following report indicating the project is feasible and discussing its need:

CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL—CHIEF OF ENGINEERS' EVALUATION

1. Authorization of project: The Cross-Florida Barge Canal was authorized by Public Law 675, 77th Congress, dated July 23, 1942. The report on which authorization is based is printed in House Document No. 109, 79th Congress, 1st session.

2. Plan of improvement: The Cross-Florida Barge Canal project provides for a canal suitable for barge traffic 107 miles long, extending from the St. Johns River near Palatka, Fla., near the Atlantic coast to the Gulf of Mexico near the mouth of the Withlacoochee River, about 40 miles north of Tampa. Access to the Atlantic coast will be via St. Johns River. The project consists of five locks and dams and dredged channels. The navigable channels of the waterway would have minimum dimensions 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide. The five locks would be 84 feet wide and 600 feet long.

3. Local cooperation: Local interests are required to provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the canal; hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and take over, maintain, and operate all new public highways built in connection with the project. The Florida State legislature in 1961 established a canal authority under the cabinet. This authority is empowered to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

4. Authority for and scope of evaluation: In accordance with requests of the House and conference committees in connection with the Public Works Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1962 for an up-to-date evaluation of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, a reanalysis was made of the project cost, prospective commerce, unit transportation savings, other navigation benefits, and collateral benefits, based upon conditions prevailing at this time and anticipated during a 50-year period of analysis from 1970 to 2020. The following reports and data were analyzed in making this evaluation:

(a) "Economic Restudy Report," January 10, 1958, by the district engineer, Jacksonville district, and the division engineer, South Atlantic division.

(b) "Economic Evaluation Report," March 13, 1962, by the district engineer, Jacksonville district, and the division engineer, South Atlantic division.

(c) "Potential Traffic and Transportation Cost Saving of Cross-Florida Barge Canal," March 1962, by Arthur D. Little, Inc.

(d) The background data, work sheets, and detailed analysis sheets that support the findings of these reports.

In addition, the services of a recognized rate consultant were retained to provide an independent check of current transportation rates and charges.

5. Cost estimates:

(a) District and division engineers' estimates: the district and division engineers' current estimate of project cost, as given below, is based on contract drawings, plans, and specifications prepared in 1945, with certain modifications to adapt to current standards and criteria as listed in inclosure 3 to the district engineer's economic evaluation report, March 13, 1962.

First cost

Federal:	
Corps of Engineers	$134,300,000
Coast Guard (for navigation aids)	200,000
Subtotal	134,500,000
Non-Federal	12,400,000
Total	146,900,000

(b) In contrast to estimates made in 1958 and subsequent years by escalation of previous figures, the current district and division engineers' estimate is based on current construction costs and methods.

(c) Chief of Engineers' estimate: The standards, criteria, construction practices and unit prices on which the district and division engineers' estimate is based are considered proper, with the exception that provision for minimum horizontal bridge clearance of 150 feet as previously planned in the interest of safe and economical navigation, and additional clearing in the project pools, are desirable. With these modifications the current estimates of first and average annual project costs are as follows:

First cost

Federal:	
Corps of Engineers	$145,300,000
Coast Guard	200,000
Subtotal	145,500,000
Non-Federal	12,400,000
Total	157,900,000

Annual charges

Federal:	
Interest and amortization	$5,710,000
Maintenance, operation, and replacements	680,000
Total Federal annual charges	6,390,000

Annual charges—Continued

Non-Federal:	
Interest and amortization	$486,000
Maintenance, operation, and replacements	118,000
Loss of taxes on lands transferred to Federal ownership	45,000
Total non-Federal annual charges	649,000
Total	7,039,000

6. Tributary area: The Cross-Florida Waterway would serve as a connection between the gulf and Atlantic Intracoastal Waterways and would provide a new mode of transportation to the immediate tributary area. The latter includes the following 10 Florida counties: Alachua, Citrus, Clay, Duval, Flagler, Levy, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, and St. Johns. For certain commodities the trade area tributary to the canal is the entire State of Florida or the southeastern region of the United States.

7. Traffic analysis: The basic data and background material used in determining prospective average annual traffic and transportation savings shown in the referenced reports were thoroughly reviewed as a basis for the Chief of Engineers current evaluation. Each prospective commodity movement was examined to eliminate duplications in traffic and tonnages. A determination was made that traffic considered as currently prospective canal traffic was actually moving in 1962 via some existing mode of transport and routing. In this regard, considerable reliance was placed upon data developed in the consultant's 1962 field investigation and his contacts with established shippers and receivers. This information served to validate many of the traffic items previously accepted in the Corps of Engineers 1958 analysis. Adjustments were made for traffic previously accepted which is no longer moving in the same amount, manner, or direction, due to changes in competitive relationships and alinements, company operations, origins, destinations, etc. The consultant's investigation also disclosed a number of prospective movements which have developed subsequent to the 1958 study.

8. Currently prospective traffic: A total of 2,555,200 tons of reasonably prospective current traffic was subjected to a detailed comparative analysis of transportation rates and charges between existing routings and modes of transport, and estimated through transportation charges via the proposed waterway. A complete recheck of transportation rates and charges used in both the Corps of Engineers' 1958 study and the consultant's 1962 study was obtained by contract with a recognized traffic consultant in Jacksonville, Fla. The rates used in the current evaluation are those in effect as of May 15, 1962, or proposed rates due to become effective within 60 days thereafter. Barge transportation charges used in this review are based on the latest available data on water-carrier operating costs as developed for use in corps-wide navigation studies currently in progress. All appropriate accessorial charges associated with the through point-to-point movement of specific commodities have been included in the rate computations. Based upon this complete reevaluation, a total of 1,575,200 tons of the reasonably prospective current waterway traffic were eliminated because of insufficient or no prospective savings. Table 1, inclosed, presents a detailed summary of the Chief of Engineers' analysis of currently prospective traffic, amounting to 980,000 tons.

9. Prospective 1962 traffic and savings: The recheck of transportation rates revealed that many selective rail rate reductions have been put into effect since the 1958 study was made. These adjustments have reduced the unit savings applicable to many of the commodity movements accepted for this analysis. Prospective 1962 traffic and the unit and total savings applicable thereto are presented in the following tabulation. For purposes of comparison similar data from the 1958 report are included.

Estimated base year traffic and savings

Commodity	Corps of Engineers 1958 report			Chief of Engineers analysis		
	Traffic, net tons	Unit savings	Total savings	Traffic, net tons	Unit savings	Total savings
Products of forests	49,700	$2.58	$128,200	11,000	$2.10	$23,100
Products of mines	40,000	4.39	175,600	35,000	1.79	62,700
Petroleum	120,000	1.08	129,600	130,000	1.08	140,400
Fertilizer and fertilizer materials	137,000	4.02	550,600	152,000	2.31	351,300
Industrial chemicals	142,300	6.10	869,100	189,000	4.72	892,100
Paper and paper products	287,650	4.53	1,305,500	330,000	3.13	1,031,700
Animal feeds				60,000	0.95	57,000
Manufactures and miscellaneous	84,000	3.81	319,800	73,000	4.34	317,700
Total	860,650	4.04	3,478,400	980,000	2.93	2,876,000

10. Reconciliation of estimates: The estimates of base year commercial freight traffic and savings developed in the Corps of Engineers' 1958 report and in this analysis are presented in the preceding paragraph. The consultant's 1962 study indicates that 3,313,850 tons and $14,002,196 savings would be potentially prospective to the waterway by 1970. Some of the commodity movements included in the latter estimate were not included in the Chief of Engineers' evaluation on the basis of review of prospective savings. The basis for the major exclusions is as follows:

(a) Coal: The consultant's prediction of 1,500,000 tons of coal traffic in 1970 is premised on future thermal electric generating capacity being located in the canal service area. It is agreed that future thermal capacity will use coal and that there will be a significant increase in coal imports in Florida. However, in previous studies of the prospective movement of coal from Alabama mines to Florida and Georgia coastal areas, it was found that rail freight rates were less than estimated barge charges via the proposed waterway. Reanalysis of existing rail freight rates for coal movements from eastern Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama mines to Florida and Georgia destinations compared with current estimates of barge transportation charges confirms the previous finding that little or no savings would accrue to barge movements of coal. This is, of course, based on the assumption that these rail rates would continue in the future. However, in view of the large quantity involved, a small change in the relationship between rail rates and barge charges could result in waterborne shipments of coal on the proposed canal.

(b) Sand and clay: The consultant's study considered 369,000 tons of sand and clay as prospective 1970 traffic, based on operations which have developed since the time of the earlier study. This traffic might utilize the Federal project on the St. John's River, a presently available water route, for shipments to east coast destinations. Although conveniently located in relation to the existing waterway, none presently moves by barge. Subsequent investigation revealed that most of the existing sand and clay traffic moves in rail carload quantities which could not readily utilize barge transportation. In view of these findings and uncertainties concerning direction of movement and specific destinations, none of the sand and clay traffic was accepted as prospective for the canal at this time.

(c) Crude petroleum: The consultant's estimate of 118,000 tons of crude oil traffic is based on the assumption that an asphalt refinery would be located on the canal in the Ocala area by 1970. Subsequent investigation revealed that the prospective shipper does not have firm plans at this time for construction of a refinery. Accordingly, this item was not included in the Chief of Engineers' estimate of currently prospective traffic.

(d) Pulpwood and stumpwood: A total of 60,000 tons of prospective pulpwood and stumpwood traffic included in the consultant's estimate were not included in the Chief of Engineers' evaluation because the location of sources of timber supply in relation to the proposed waterway generally would require overland movement by truck and transfer to barge, resulting in overall transportation charges in excess of present rail rates.

(e) Feed grain: The consultant's analysis considered a large tonnage of feed grains as prospective traffic. This analysis disclosed that the area wherein such grains could be delivered via the canal at a savings over other routes and modes of transportation would be more restricted than that considered by the consultant. Accordingly, the tonnage used in this analysis is less than that estimated by the consultant.

11. Alternate route via Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss.: This authorized, but not constructed barge navigation project has recently been restudied to determine its present economic status. In the current analysis of prospective traffic for the Cross-Florida Canal, consideration was given to prospective movements with and without the Tennessee-Tombigbee project in operation. All the prospective traffic and transportation savings credited to the cross-Florida improvement have been developed independently and are, therefore, not contingent on provision of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. With both projects in operation, however, additional transportation savings would be realized, part of which would be creditable to the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

12. Projection of commerce and savings: The study made for the 1958 report was reviewed in the light of more recent data, particularly the 1960 Census of Population and the consultant's report. It was found that the 1958 study tends to understate the growth trends applicable to base year traffic. New projection factors were developed applicable to prospective through and local traffic. Traffic which would terminate in Florida is considered local. Through traffic is that traffic which either would move through the length of the canal or originate in Florida and terminate outside the State.

13. Indexes of growth: For the purposes of estimating prospective traffic over the 50-year period of analysis from 1970 through 2020, growth trends for population, value added by manufacture, per-capita consumption, and fertilizer consumption were developed. Each of the commodity movements, except crates and boxes, is expected to increase in relation to one or more of these indexes. For example, the demand for consumer type commodities, such as petroleum products, newsprint, and sugar, is expected to change in response to the change in population and the change in per-capita consumption of such commodities. Manufactured products are expected to increase in relation to the expected growth in the manufacturing sector of the economy.

14. Population: Estimated U.S. population for the period ending 2010 is based on a study made by the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce in connection with the Delawara River Comprehensive Survey. For the period 2010–2020 it was assumed that the same rate of growth would continue as estimated for the period 1980–2010. In projecting the population of Florida and the immediate tributary area this study has related population growth in Florida to the Nation and growth in the immediate tributary area to growth in Florida. The projection of the State population checks very closely with the average of the four projections prepared for the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources by the Bureau of the Census. In estimating the future population of Levy and Marion Counties in connection with movement of petroleum products, a relationship was established with the 10-county tributary area. The population of Florida has been increasing faster than the Nation's population and it is expected that this trend will continue, though at a somewhat reduced rate. The following tabulation presents actual United States and Florida population 1900–1960 and estimated population 1970–2020. The State population as projected herein agrees very closely with the consultant's projection.

Year	United States	Florida	Percent of United States
	Millions	*Thousands*	
1900	76	530	0.7
1910	92	756	.8
1920	106	962	.9
1930	123	1,471	1.2
1940	132	1,915	1.4
1950	152	2,821	1.9
1960	181	5,000	2.8
1970	211	6,760	3.2
1980	248	8,600	3.5
1990	286	10,500	3.7
2000	326	12,400	3.8
2010	370	14,400	3.9
2020	420	16,800	4.0

The population of the 10-county and 2-county tributary areas has not increased as fast as the State's population and this trend appears likely to continue. The following tabulation shows actual population of the two tributary areas, 1900–60, and estimated population 1970–2020:

Year	10-county area	Percent of State	2-county area	Percent of 10-county area
	Thousands		*Thousands*	
1900	146	27.5	33	22.6
1910	196	25.9	37	18.9
1920	231	24.0	34	14.7
1930	293	19.9	42	14.3
1940	357	18.6	44	12.3
1950	495	17.9	49	9.9
1960	704	14.2	62	8.8
1970	880	13.0	73	8.3
1980	1,065	12.4	85	8.0
1990	1,260	12.0	97	7.7
2000	1,450	11.7	109	7.5
2010	1,640	11.4	121	7.4
2020	1,800	11.0	140	7.2

15. Per capita consumption: The prospective traffic includes some commodities; namely, petroleum products and newsprint, for which the per capita demand has been increasing. This study estimates that the per capita demand for petroleum products and newsprint will increase 80 and 60 percent, respectively, between 1960 and 2020. This is a somewhat lower rate of increase than has occurred in the past 30 years. There has been no noticeable increase in the per capita demand for sugar and lumber and none is assumed for the future. The demand for feed grains in Florida has increased faster than population in recent years; however, due to expected changes in land use, this study estimates that the demand for grains will increase at approximately the same rate as Florida's population in the future.

16. Value added by manufacture: For the purpose of projecting value added by manufacture in the United States a relationship was established with gross national product. Gross national product projections for the period ending 2010 are from the study by the Office of Business Economics previously mentioned, the estimate being converted to 1954 dollars. For the period 2010–20 it was assumed that the same rate of growth would continue as for the period 1980–2010. This study also estimates that because of the rising demand for services, manufacturing employment beyond 1980 will not increase as fast as total employment, and thus value added by manufacture is not expected to increase as fast as gross national product. The following tabulation shows gross national product and value added by manufacture for selected years 1929–58 and estimated 1960–2020:

[In billions of 1954 dollars]

Year	Gross national product	Value added by manufacturing	Percent of gross national product
1929	$182	$54	29.4
1931	153	40	25.9
1933	127	32	24.9
1935	153	38	25.0
1937	184	47	25.8
1939	189	48	25.5
1947	282	89	31.6
1949	293	85	29.1
1950	318	98	30.7
1954	363	117	32.2
1958	401	128	32.0
1960	441	141	32.0
1970	610	196	32.0
1980	840	269	32.0
1990	1,156	364	31.5
2000	1,550	480	31.0
2010	2,120	636	30.0
2020	2,900	841	29.0

Florida's share of the national manufacturing output has increased and this study estimates this trend will continue through 1990 from which time it is projected to grow at the national rate. Thus, value added by manufacture in Florida is estimated to increase at a rate of 3.5 percent per year, as compared with an expected national rate of increase of 3 percent per year, until 1990, and then at a rate of 3 percent per year to 2020. The following tabulation shows estimated value added by manufacture in Florida for the period 1960–2020:

Value added by manufacture

Florida:	*Million 1954 dollars*
1960	1,551
1970	2,188
1980	3,086
1990	4,354
2000	5,851
2010	7,863
2020	10,567

17. Consumption of fertilizers: In projecting the consumption of fertilizers this study has related the demand for fertilizers to estimated farm output. The index of farm output itself was estimated to increase at about the same rate as the U.S. population. This is generally consistent with other projections of farm output. The following tab-

ulation shows the index numbers of U.S. population, farm output, and the demand for fertilizers 1945–60 and estimates for 1970–2020:

Year	U.S. population	U.S. farm output [1]	U.S. demand for fertilizers
1945	78	74	58
1950	85	78	81
1955	92	88	91
1960	100	100	100
1970	117	117	122
1980	137	137	150
1990	158	158	181
2000	180	180	216
2010	204	204	256
2020	232	232	305

[1] Index, 1960=100.

In the period from 1929 to 1960 Florida increased its share of the Nation's consumption of fertilizers from 5.2 to 6.4 percent. Since agricultural output in Florida has been growing somewhat faster than for the United States and this trend is expected to continue, it is also expected that Florida's increasing share of U.S. fertilizer consumption will continue into the future. The following tabulation shows the consumption of fertilizers in Florida for designated years and estimated consumption, 1970–2020:

Year	Florida fertilizer consumption	Percent of United States
	1,000 tons	
1929	427	5.2
1930	489	5.8
1935	400	6.1
1940	533	6.2
1945	821	5.8
1950	925	4.7
1955	1,229	5.5
1960	1,559	6.4
1970	1,970	6.6
1980	2,540	6.9
1990	3,190	7.2
2000	3,970	7.5
2010	4,830	7.7
2020	5,850	7.9

18. Summary of projection factors: The projection factors used to estimate future traffic over the period of analysis for the waterway are summarized herein.

(a) Population index: All movements of commodities related to the population index are local and terminate within the State of Florida. Grain, sugar, and lumber traffic was estimated to increase in relation to Florida's population. Newsprint was also estimated to increase in relation to Florida's population as modified by an estimated increase in the per capita demand of 60 percent by 2020. Sewer pipe traffic was estimated to increase in relation to the population increase of the 10-county area. Petroleum traffic was estimated to increase in relation to the population increase of the two-county area as modified by an increasing per capita demand. The following tabulation shows the projection factors that were applied to 1962 base year traffic in commodities related to the population index:

Year	Grain, sugar, and lumber	Newsprint	Sewer pipe	Petroleum products
1962	100	100	100	100
1970	130	140	114	126
1980	165	195	133	166
1990	202	259	152	211
2000	236	328	170	260
2010	277	410	189	315
2020	325	510	219	394

(b) Manufacturing index: Through traffic in commodities related to the manufacturing index were projected on the basis of the estimates of value added by manufacture in the United States. Local traffic in commodities related to the manufacturing index were projected in relation to the estimated increase in value added by manufacture for the State of Florida. The following tabulation shows the projection factors that were applied to 1962 traffic in commodities related to manufacturing:

Year	Local traffic	Through traffic
1970	132	130
1980	186	179
1990	262	243
2000	352	320
2010	473	424
2020	636	561

(c) Fertilizer index: Through fertilizer traffic was projected on the basis of increased demand for fertilizers in the United States and local traffic was projected on the basis of estimated demand for fertilizers in Florida. The following tabulation shows the projection factors that were applied to 1962 traffic in commodities related to the fertilizer index:

Year	Local traffic	Through traffic
1970	120	118
1980	155	146
1990	195	176
2000	242	210
2010	295	249
2020	357	296

19. Application of growth factors: The following list shows the relationship between the above indexes and the commodities:

Population index: Grain; lumber; newsprint; petroleum; pipe, sewer; and sugar.

Manufacturing index: Acrylonitrile, caustic soda, chlorine, ilmenite ore, iron and steel products, methanol, paper products, polyvinyl chloride, pulpboard, salt, salt cake, tall oil, and woodpulp.

Fertilizer index: Ammonium nitrate, ammonium sulfate, aqua ammonia, nitrogen products, potash, and sewer sludge.

It was assumed that there would be no growth in the miscellaneous item for crates and boxes. In the case of several commodities indices were adjusted to compensate for anticipated changes in per capita use. As derived from the accepted 1962 traffic shown in table 1, 31 percent of this traffic was related to the population index, 53 percent to the manufacturing index, 15 percent to the fertilizer index and 1 percent to miscellaneous. The indices of growth applied are the aggregate of numerous factors reflecting the general level of economic and other activities locally and in the Nation and, therefore, their application does not mean that traffic in each individual commodity related to a particular index would necessarily grow at that specific index rate.

20. Estimated traffic and transportation savings, 1962–2020: Table 2 herewith shows the estimated traffic for local and through movements and table 3 shows transportation savings both for 1962–2020 by index groups. In addition, the latter shows the estimated transportation savings to local and through traffic to be 40 and 60 percent, respectively, for 1962. Transportation savings, for the project analysis period 1970–2020, were discounted at an interest rate of 2⅝ percent. The resulting annual transportation benefits to the project are estimated at $7,016,000.

21. Other navigation benefits:

(a) Many trips are made each year between the Atlantic and gulf coasts by commercial fishing vessels, contractors' floating construction plant, and new vessels being delivered from shipbuilders to customers. Some of these trips may be made via the Okeechobee Waterway route but many, because of the limitations of that waterway, must be made via the longer, more exposed route around the Florida Keys. For trips originating or terminating in the north, the Cross-Florida Barge Canal would reduce sailing distance by 356 miles compared with the Okeechobee Waterway route and 611 miles compared to the route via the Florida Keys. The District and Division Engineers estimate prospective savings due to these reductions at $210,000 annually. This estimate has been reviewed and with the addition of $5,000 additional savings for vessel deliveries has been used in the Chief of Engineers' evaluation.

(b) The Cross-Florida Barge Canal would enhance recreational boating in the area and extend the range of this activity. The District and Division Engineers' annual benefit estimate of $118,000 for improvement in recreational boating has been incorporated in the Chief of Engineers' evaluation.

22. Collateral benefits:

(a) Large areas along the canal route experience periodic flooding. Some 100 square miles are affected. Major floods occurred in 1945, 1953, 1958, 1959, and 1960. The navigation canal would serve as a flood channel affording substantial protection to these areas for floods having an average recurrence period of about 10 years and would facilitate removal of floodwaters arising from larger floods. The flood areas are well suited to development for agricultural purposes, principally citrus growing, vegetable production, and for improved dairy and beef pastures. Based on data and estimates furnished by agricultural experts in the area a projection of these developments has been made. On the basis of this projection it is anticipated that annual flood control benefits of about $257,000 will be realized.

(b) Construction of the project would create new waterfront land along much of the project length. It would create two pools of considerable areal extent having shorelines of 74 and 108 miles. Waterfront properties are in demand in the area and values are relatively high. The areas involved would be particularly attractive for summer and year-round residences. Assuming progressive development of the shorelines and based on values supplied by experienced realtors and appraisers it is estimated that the annual benefits due to enhancement of these properties will amount to $650,000.

23. Annual benefits, annual charges, and benefit-cost ratio: A summary of the annual benefits, annual charges, and benefit-cost ratio developed for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal in the Chief of Engineers evaluation is presented in the following tabulation. For purposes of comparison similar data for the Corps of Engineers 1958 report are also presented.

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	1958 report	Present study
Annual benefits:		
Navigation:		
Transportation savings	7,407	7,016
Commercial fishing benefits	49	70
Benefits to contractors floating plant	20	30
Benefits to new vessel deliveries	155	115
Benefits to recreational boating	127	118
Subtotal, navigation benefits	7,758	7,349
Collateral:		
Flood control benefits		257
Land enhancement benefits		650
Subtotal, collateral benefits		907
Total, annual benefits	7,758	8,256
Total, annual charges	7,365	7,039
Benefit-cost ratio	1.05	1.17

TABLE I.—*Summary of prospective 1962 freight traffic for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal*

[Traffic in net tons]

Commodity	Traffic considered		Eliminated by screening [3]	Accepted for reanalysis	Eliminated by reanalysis [4]	Prospective 1962 traffic
	Estimated traffic 1958 report [1]	Consultant's estimate [2]				
Products of forests:						
Pulpwood	--------	40,000	--------	40,000	40,000	--------
Stumpwood	--------	20,000	--------	20,000	20,000	--------
Lumber	36,000	11,000	--------	36,000	25,000	11,000
Logs	13,700	--------	--------	13,700	13,700	--------
Subtotal	49,700	71,000	--------	109,700	98,700	11,000
Products of mines:						
Ilmenite ore	40,000	65,000	30,000	35,000	--------	35,000
Coal	--------	1,500,000	700,000	800,000	800,000	--------
Clay	--------	134,000	--------	134,000	134,000	--------
Sand	--------	235,000	--------	235,000	235,000	--------
Subtotal	40,000	1,934,000	730,000	1,204,000	1,169,000	35,000
Petroleum:						
Crude oil	--------	118,000	118,000	--------	--------	--------
Petroleum products	120,000	39,000	29,000	130,000	--------	130,000
Subtotal	120,000	157,000	147,000	130,000	--------	130,000
Fertilizer and fertilizer materials:						
Ammonia	20,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	--------	10,000
Ammonium nitrate	18,800	23,750	--------	34,000	--------	34,000
Ammonium sulfate	22,000	8,000	2,000	22,000	--------	22,000
Nitrogen fertilizer solutions	31,000	10,000	--------	43,000	10,000	33,000
Potash	27,000	10,000	--------	28,000	--------	28,000
Sewage sludge	18,200	47,500	22,500	25,000	--------	25,000
Subtotal	137,000	109,250	34,500	162,000	10,000	152,000
Industrial chemicals:						
Acrylonitrile	20,000	20,000	--------	20,000	--------	20,000
Caustic soda	36,000	50,000	--------	55,000	--------	55,000
Chlorine	27,000	--------	2,000	25,000	--------	25,000
Industrial chemicals—Continued						
Methanol	--------	7,000	--------	7,000	--------	7,000
Polyvinyl chloride	12,500	24,000	--------	24,000	--------	24,000
Sulfur	5,000	--------	5,000	--------	--------	--------
Salt (industrial)	--------	7,500	--------	8,000	--------	8,000
Salt cake	41,800	58,000	1,800	68,000	18,000	50,000
Subtotal	142,300	166,500	8,800	207,000	18,000	189,000
Paper and paper products:						
Woodpulp	15,600	--------	--------	16,000	--------	16,000
Tall oil	35,500	59,000	1,000	48,000	--------	48,000
Pulpboard	218,050	67,200	600	243,500	139,500	104,000
Paperboard	--------	47,000	--------	47,000	--------	47,000
Newsprint	5,500	53,500	--------	60,000	--------	60,000
Miscellaneous paper products	13,000	162,600	--------	58,000	3,000	55,000
Subtotal	287,650	389,300	1,600	472,500	142,500	330,000
Animal feeds:						
Corn	--------	400,000	310,000	90,000	35,000	55,000
Soybean meal	--------	40,000	30,000	10,000	5,000	5,000
Subtotal	--------	440,000	340,000	100,000	40,000	60,000
Manufactures and miscellaneous:						
Iron and steel articles	49,600	--------	--------	50,000	27,000	23,000
Crates and boxes	9,400	6,800	--------	10,000	--------	10,000
Sugar (refined)	25,000	30,000	--------	30,000	--------	30,000
Sewer pipe	--------	10,000	--------	10,000	--------	10,000
Subtotal	84,000	46,800	--------	100,000	27,000	73,000
Total, all traffic	860,650	3,313,850	1,261,900	2,485,200	1,505,200	980,000

[1] As shown in table B-1, appendix B, economic restudy of Jan. 10, 1958, Jacksonville district.

[2] Estimated 1970 traffic.

[3] Eliminated because of unsubstantiated tonnage requirements; tonnage duplication; traffic not currently moving; location of shipper and/or receiver; and insufficient volume of individual small-lot shipments.

[4] Eliminated as prospective waterway traffic because of insufficient or no savings based on comparative analysis of existing or proposed transportation rates and charges via alternative modes of transport, i.e., rail, truck, barge, steamship, etc.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated traffic, 1962–2020, by index groups and local or through movements*

[Thousands of tons]

Index groups	1962	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020
Population index	301	390	513	650	795	957	1,170
Local	301	390	513	650	795	957	1,170
Through	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Manufacturing index	517	680	928	1,274	1,687	2,244	2,972
Local	105	138	195	274	369	497	667
Through	412	542	733	1,000	1,318	1,747	2,305
Fertilizer index	152	181	230	286	351	423	509
Local	96	115	148	188	233	284	343
Through	56	66	82	98	118	139	166
Miscellaneous	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Local	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Through	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Total	980	1,261	1,681	2,220	2,843	3,634	4,661
Local	502	643	856	1,112	1,397	1,738	2,180
Through	478	618	825	1,108	1,446	1,896	2,481

TABLE 3.—*Estimated transportation savings, 1962–2020, by index groups and local or through movements*

[Thousands of dollars]

Index groups	1962	1970	1980	1990	2000	2010	2020
Population index	537	693	907	1,140	1,385	1,660	2,001
Local	537	693	907	1,140	1,385	1,660	2,001
Through	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Manufacturing index	1,950	2,514	3,428	4,704	6,227	8,281	10,964
Local	358	471	665	934	1,258	1,695	2,274
Through	1,592	2,043	2,763	3,770	4,969	6,586	8,690
Fertilizer index	351	418	532	664	816	985	1,186
Local	241	289	371	472	585	713	861
Through	110	129	161	192	231	272	325
Miscellaneous	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
Local	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Through	37	37	37	37	37	37	37
Total savings	2,875	3,662	4,904	6,545	8,465	10,963	14,188
Local	1,136	1,453	1,943	2,546	3,228	4,068	5,136
Through	1,739	2,209	2,961	3,999	5,237	6,895	9,052

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that the most important single waterway project before the Congress of the United States is the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. My support of this project is primarily based upon its defense value. Four Presidents of the United States have had an important part to play in the recent history of this project, Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and even way back in the 19th century President Andrew Jackson vigorously supported this canal. After extended studies through many years of other various possible alternative routes the present route was selected and the project was authorized in 1942 by a bill, "to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipeline and a navigable barge channel across Florida." This authorization by Congress was not on the basis of any economic justification but solely on its national defense values. The canal, however, was not built at that time because of the necessity in time of war to apply to all manpower and equipment in other directions in the emergencies involved.

As soon as I was discharged from the U.S. Army in 1947, I ran for Congress on the platform of the construction of this canal and came to Congress in January of 1949. I had the active help of President Truman in the accumulation of material necessary for a full presentation to Congress, but was not able to make such a presentation until during the administration of President Eisenhower. Under President Eisenhower's leadership it was thought that it would be well to see if the project could be justified not only for its defense values but also for its economic justifications, and President Eisenhower took the leadership in making this a budget item, and the studies were conducted and they showed economic justification for the project during the Eisenhower administration. Additional surveys were made in the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and they resulted in an even greater economic justification, 5 times the original economic justification, or the final figure of 1.2 over 1.

During President Kennedy's campaign for the Presidency of the United States he had written and allowed me to publish during that campaign the following statement over his signature:

> I know of your persistent work for the early construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. If I am elected President, I will be glad to cooperate with you in making this project a reality. I regard it not only as important to Florida, but to the economy of our entire country, which must fully utilize all of our natural resources if we are to achieve necessary economic expansion.

President Kennedy has done everything he can to bring this to Congress for prompt action, having placed in the budget an item for $205,000 to complete the planning and bring the project down to the place where construction can actually be started if Congress so provides at some future date. The present item now under consideration is $205,000 for the final planning on this project. It does not bind the Congress to go ahead with the construction. The Senate has passed this item and has refused to agree with the House conferees, who have not approved the item since it was not included in the House bill. I sincerely hope that the House will approve these funds.

I would like to say something about the defense value of this project. On May 11 of 1962, the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman CARL VINSON, of the Armed Services Committee, wrote the gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of the Appropriations Committee, as follows:

> I am very hopeful that during this Congress your committee will see fit to appropriate sufficient funds to make a forward step in the construction of the Cross Florida Barge Canal which is to be a section of the Intracoastal Waterway.
>
> I am very much interested in this project because of its very important national defense aspects.

Chairman VINSON quoted the findings of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, August 30, 1946, in part, as follows:

> The Chief of Engineers has stated in his opinion (hearing before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Jan. 9, 1946) that the authorized canal will represent, in addition to its economic worth, a value in national security considerably greater than its cost.

On May 29, 1951, the Deputy Secretary of Defense in a letter to the President stated as follows:

> The Corps of Engineers expressed the views that "a barge canal will afford a short, economical, protected route across Florida for the movement of a large amount of long-haul traffic by barge and small freighters between gulf and Atlantic ports. Large tonnages of raw materials as well as manufactured products are susceptible to movement between those points via protected inland waters at great saving. Completion of the canal would also permit quick, safe, and economical transfer between the east and west coasts of Florida, of floating plant and construction equipment now required to move via the circuitous and dangerous Florida Keys route.
>
> During World War II, many cargo ships and tankers were lost off the coast of Florida due to enemy action. Many of the cargoes that were lost would and could have moved by barge or small freighter had the barge canal been in existence at that time. The saving in lives, ships, and valuable and critical cargoes would have been great. Similar and comparable savings would also accrue in future serious national emergencies if the canal is in operation.
>
> The Joint Chiefs of Staff find that either of these projects (i.e., the previously considered ship canal or the authorized barge canal) will provide an additional and shorter line of communication between the gulf coast and the east coast and would thus reduce exposure of shipping to submarine attack.

In the mentioned report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors they said to the Chief of Army Engineers:

> The economic analysis of a long-lived project could not be considered complete if it covered merely the interval of peacetime years and ignored the recurrent war periods. The insurance value of the avoidance of war losses is, therefore, distributable on an annual basis and can be at least roughly approximated in dollars and cents for measurement against the monetary annual charges of providing and maintaining the facilities.

The Board then goes on to compute the annual value of this wartime insurance afforded by the project as $3,600,000 based on price and replacement cost levels of 1946. In terms of today's price levels, this figure is above $10 million per year and more than doubles the total economic benefits currently reported by the Corps of Engineers in their interim report as to the peacetime economies to be yielded by the waterway.

The Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President, in the fall of last year, reviewed a memorandum on the national defense value of the project prepared by H. H. Buckman, engineer, and said as follows about it:

> We have reviewed the Buckman memorandum and appended papers and feel that its thesis is sound and its findings still essentially valid with respect to civil as well as military defense. The desirability of a shorter line of communications between the gulf and east coasts is recognized.

Engineer Buckman further points out the tremendous cost of lost shipping in World War II due to the necessity of using the gulf-Atlantic open sea lanes, and said:

> Over 1 million gross tons or 25 percent of all the shipping in these lanes was lost. The value was $987 million, and 167 ships went to the bottom.

From what I have pointed out to you the national defense value of this canal is outstanding and there should be no further delay in going forward with it.

The lone opposition to this canal has been from railroads, which have traditionally opposed canals all over the country. It should be pointed out, however, that the Florida East Coast Railway supports the canal and that many individuals in the railroad industry favor the canal. General Morris of the U.S. Army Engineers this year in the House hearings said with regard to railroad interests as follows:

> In a short time the canal will assume its proper place in the overall transportation network. Developments along and adjacent to the canal will be accelerated, particularly by industries utilizing and processing raw materials. When this condition develops it can be anticipated that the volume of traffic transported by rail and truck will also expand due to their natural advantages in the transportation of certain classes of commodities. While this trend can be anticipated from the statistical studies made for the economic restudy of the canal, it has been clearly shown in the growth pattern of transportation in other sections of the country under similar conditions. It is believed that the provision of cheap water transportation for bulky commodities to this section of the Southeastern States will create such developments that loss of traffic to competing rail and truck transportation systems will not be of lasting importance and the resulting improvement of regional economic conditions will ultimately add materially to their traffic.

Before closing this talk, I would like to say a few things about arguments which have been raised against the canal: One is that when the canal reaches the Gulf of Mexico it reaches open waters and the route is no longer well protected until it reaches the next dug canal to the north in the shoreline of Florida some miles away. This question is answered completely by the fact that barges now safely use this partially protected area of the Apalachee Bay just as they now use partially protected routes in the Chesapeake Bay and in the Mississippi Sound. The question was answered pointblank by the Chief of Engineers in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House under date of June 15, 1942, as follows:

> With reference to the use by Intracoastal Waterway traffic of the open gulf between the eastern terminus of the present Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Apalachee Bay and the gulf terminus of the above-mentioned barge canal, it may be stated that coastwise traffic now follows this route and that while some danger is connected therewith, I am informed that there is very little time lost in navigating this portion of the gulf. Accordingly, it would be possible to eliminate that section of the Intracoastal Waterway from the improvements proposed in H.R. 6999 and still move very large quantities of commerce by barge from terminals along the gulf coast to the eastern seaboard with the completion of the other improvements proposed in the bill.

Another argument that is made against this canal is that there is an existing canal running across the State of Florida in its southern portions, the Okeechobee Waterway. This southern route is 356 miles longer and is more expensive to construct and maintain even though it does exist in a very limited degree at the present time. Further, its utilization is much more limited than utilization of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal would be, according to authentic and careful studies that have been made over a period of many years. On this point there is a letter from the Office of Chief of Engineers dated May 17, 1962, which went into this question and stated as follows:

> The existing Okeechobee Waterway provides a channel 8 feet deep and 80 feet wide from the Intracoastal Waterway near St. Lucie Inlet to the Gulf of Mexico near Fort Myers Beach. This waterway includes three locks, 50 feet wide and 250 feet long. In 1958, preliminary cost estimates were made for enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway to the same design criteria established for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project. Those estimates showed that the cost of enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway would exceed $100 million. Traffic studies also showed that the volume of commerce that would use an enlarged Okeechobee Waterway, and the transportation savings therefrom, would be far from sufficient to justify the large cost of improvement of the existing waterway to the dimensions of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Finally, it is said by the railroad lobby that the economic justification of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is slight and that the benefits are primarily to Florida rather than to the Nation as a whole. As to the economic justification, I would like to point out that even on the most conservative figure presented by the Corps of Engineers, 1.2 over 1, this is an economic justification in excess of other projects which Congress has authorized, projects involving more money than this project, and we are spending money for such other developments right now in actual construction. As to the argument of the locality of the project, this is perhaps the most absurd argument which is raised against the Cross-Florida Barge Canal because it actually has more national significance than any waterway project ever undertaken by the U.S. Government. By a distortion of the facts and figures which were given to the committee an erroneous conclusion was drawn that on economic justification most of the transit would be within the State of Florida but an accurate reading of the information given to the committee shows that although about 80 percent of the traffic would either start or stop in Florida, only 16 percent of it would be of the within-the-State variety even when most conservative analysis is used as to its interstate utilization.

This compares very favorably with other projects. Moreover, it should finally be observed that this project was not authorized by Congress on the basis of economic justification, but was authorized on the basis of its defense value and that the defense value is certainly the paramount value of this project. Even if all of the economic justification of this project were thrown out the window, the project still should be built because of its defense values of which I have already spoken. I sincerely hope that the Congress will provide for the $205,000 budgeted Senate-passed appropriations for completing the final planning for this project.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the late Thomas Wolfe wrote a book entitled "You Can't Go Home Again." I am beginning to know how he must have felt, but of course not for the same reason.

I have had the privilege of being a Member of Congress now for 14 years. This is the first time I have ever taken the floor to ask you for an appropriation—an appropriation that is not just for me but is for you as well. Let me please impose on you for a minute to point out several things.

This project, the Florida Cross-State Barge Canal, is authorized. The request for funds for completing the planning was in the budget. It does not seem like sound economy to me to spend all of the money we have spent in studying and planning for this project and then stop just before we complete the plans.

This project has a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio—more favorable, I am told, than many projects which are actually under construction. None of the data used to develop the benefit-cost ratio on this project takes into consideration the military significance of the project. With the new Soviet naval base being constructed in the Havana Harbor, it is a sure thing that shipping that has to go around the Florida Keys will literally be sitting ducks.

The argument that has been made that once the project is completed barges will be in open water for a few miles on the west coast of Florida until they get back into the protected intercoastal waterway at St. Marks is not a valid objection. Barges use this route now; it is less hazardous than the present intercoastal routes that take barges down the Chesapeake Bay and across the Mississippi Sound. I have been over nearly every foot of the Gulf of Mexico on the route which the barges will have to take, the water is very shallow and rough water is dissipated by breakers before it reaches the route the barges will use.

I earnestly plead with you to at least, please, let us complete the planning on this project.

To paraphrase Thomas Wolfe, I may be able to go home again, although I do not know how welcome I will be; but whether I will come back here again may be another question.

Bear in mind, please, that what we are asking for is for you just as much as it is for us. It is, as I said, false economy to at least not finish the planning at this time and this planning will be completed with this appropriation.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I plead with the House to approve the Senate amendment of the conference report which would grant us $205,000 for advance planning and design on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. I feel that simple justice would be served if we were granted the $205,000. Let me emphasize that this amount was in the President's budget and that this project has gone through the tortuous procedure of authorization by the Public Works Committee, a Corps of Engineers evaluation, the approval by the Corps of Engineers, and the approval of President Kennedy.

I viewed with amazement the reasoning which the House Appropriations Committee used in disallowing this project, as contained on pages 38 and 39 of House Report No. 2223, dated August 14, 1962, and which accompanied H.R. 12900.

It should be noted that the committee quoted an opponent of the project in downgrading the economic justification; whereas in my opinion it would have been a more complete picture if, in addition to the testimony of the opponent they could have brought out that an independent firm gave the Cross-Florida Barge Canal a benefit-cost ratio of 4.6 to 1 for a project life of 50 years.

The House committee referred to the estimated total cost of this project as being $145,300,000 in 1962 as compared to only $44 million when it was authorized in 1942. Of course, if the project had been built when it was authorized, a savings of more than $100 million would have been effected, and the project would long since have paid for itself.

Let me emphasize that an independent firm of Arthur D. Little Co. engaged by the Corps of Engineers gave the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project a benefit-cost ratio of 4.6 to 1. The Corps of Engineers in their evaluation reduced the average annual tonnage and benefit estimates of the Little Co. by approximately 75 percent which appears to be unreasonably low to me, but this still provided a favorable benefit-cost ratio of 1.2 to 1. The House committee noted in its August report that a group opposed to the project contends that the benefit-cost ratio is only 0.13 to 1 and apparently gave this estimate the same weight as those made by the Little Co. and the Corps of Engineers which were based upon many years of experience and knowledge.

The main difference between the benefit-cost ratios suggested by the Little Co. and those of the Corps of Engineers is based upon the vast difference in the estimated freight tonnage between the two. The Little Co. estimates annual tonnage during the first 50 years of the project's life of 10,727,000 while the Corps of Engineers estimate is only 2,500,000. As previously stated, the Corps of Engineers estimate appears to be unreasonably low to me.

In the August 1962 issue of the Mississippi Valley Association's Newsletter, I read:

> A new record in barge traffic was established in 1961 on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Colonel Jennings said. He noted that a total of 58,866,964 tons of commerce passed over this major inland transportation artery which runs from Apalachicola Bay, Fla., to the Mexican border. This is a 3,918,305-ton increase over 1960 traffic.

The Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, which will feed the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, is already carrying nearly 59 million tons of commerce and is experiencing a single-year increase of almost 4 million tons in 1961. It appears inconceivable to me that the Cross-Florida Barge Canal will carry only 2½ million tons annually as estimated by the Corps of Army Engineers. The 10,727,000 tons estimated by the Little Co. appears to be a much more realistic appraisal of the situation, including their benefit-cost ratio of 4.6 to 1. The Gulf Intracoastal Canal currently shows a benefit-cost ratio of approximately 15 to 1.

The report of the House committee August 14 noted that—

> Testimony solicited by the committee during the course of the hearings indicates that 80 percent of the claimed total benefits in the movement of commodities on completion of this canal would revert to the State of Florida and that its national significance is limited to 20 percent of the benefits.

This erroneous conclusion was presumably based on a notation in the justification provided by the Corps of Engineers which the committee apparently misinterpreted. The Corps of Engineers statement says:

> About 20 percent of the barge canal prospective traffic could be classified as through traffic in that it would move through the length of the barge canal generally to and from points beyond Florida. The balance would be termed local traffic, 80 percent of which would be classed as interstate commerce in that it would either originate in Florida and move to another State, or originate in another State and move to Florida.

I believe a correct interpretation of this statement is that 20 percent of the total traffic will move through the entire length of the canal and have no direct connection with Florida. Of the remaining total traffic, 20 percent would be intrastate in nature and 80 percent would be interstate traffic. In other words, only 16 percent of the total traffic will be within Florida and 84 percent of the total traffic will be interstate traffic. Saying that 80 percent of the total traffic will benefit only Florida is like saying that New Orleans will get 80 percent of the benefits from the Mississippi River gulf outlet project or that Louisiana and Texas receive 80 percent of the benefits of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. The people of the United States benefit from the proper development of this Nation's water resources and the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is no exception.

Additionally, the division engineer stated in his testimony before the House committee that all the estimates of the Corps of Engineers on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal are based on the limits of the project. In other words, the estimates of traffic do not contemplate construction of the Intracoastal Waterway from St. Marks to Tampa, which is now under study by the Corps of Engineers. If this project is feasible, and I believe it will be, then total traffic, particularly through traffic, on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal should greatly exceed the corps present estimates.

For years the Cross-Florida Barge Canal has been called the missing link in our transportation system. The Cross-Florida Barge Canal, together with the St. Marks to Tampa Canal, would tie the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway system to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway system and would benefit the eastern two-thirds of our country, encompassing that area from Montana to New England and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. Certainly, Florida would benefit by the construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, but the major benefits would accrue to the citizens adjacent to all our inland waterways, including the Mississippi Valley, and it is for this reason that the Mississippi Valley Association has long been in the forefront of the proponents of the project.

It is an old axiom of the inland waterways that it costs as much to load and unload a bulk commodity from a barge as it does to transport the barge 600 miles. Since the economics of barge transportation are predicated on relatively long hauls, it seems apparent that construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal would have little, if any, adverse effect upon the economics of the existing Intracoastal Waterways on both coasts of Florida, as the House committee contended.

The report of the House committee dated August 14, concluded with the statement:

> Since the authorization of this project was 20 years ago and its feasibility and economics are in the committee's opinion questionable, it seems only appropriate that the legislative committees and Congress should reaffirm its authorization before it is again presented to the Appropriations Committee for funding.

In the opinion of the Mississippi Valley Association, and I may add in my opinion, this was a good project when it was authorized 20 years ago, and its feasibility and economics are even better now than they were at the time of the original authorization.

In fact, the project now has five times the economic justification that it had when it was first authorized. I believe this project is important to the welfare of the United States and that it should be built without further delay.

I know comparisons are sometimes odious and unfair, but I must say that even though the modest appropriation of the $205,000 in the President's budget for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal was denied, largely on the basis of the low benefit-cost ratio, the House Committee on Appropriations approved at least two items with a benefit-cost ratio less than that of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. In two instances, projects had a benefit-cost ratio of only 1.1 to 1, which is less than the benefit-cost ratio of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in pleading for the $205,000 for advance planning and design on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, may I emphasize two facts: First of all, this item was in the President's budget. It is my information that only one other item that was in the President's budget for planning for similar projects was deleted. In the second place, let me emphasize that we have an economic justification for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. When the project was first authorized over 20 years ago, it was on the basis of its military value. Since that time, the benefit-cost ratio has multiplied five times. In other words, 20 years ago there was not an economic justification for the project, but only a military justification. Now we have a favorable economic justification, and in addition, who could deny that if in 1942 the canal were needed for defense when the enemy was thousands of miles away, that the need is less today when the strident voices of communism—our unalterable foe—can be heard just a few miles from the mainland of our Republic. Surely with the loss of 165 ships in World War II in the gulf-Atlantic coastwise lanes, we can see the tremendous need for internally available supplies, internally produced and internally transported, based on the existence of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

I therefore plead again that the House grant us the $205,000 for advance planning and design on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, an item that was included in the President's budget.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, may I very briefly say that two of these projects which are in my congressional district in Oregon and which are included in this amendment are excellent projects.

With particular reference to Yaquina, I have been very definitely told by the Army Engineers that they could and should have the $200,000 to start construction.

With reference to the Columbia River project, this appropriation goes hand in hand with yesterday's action authorizing deepening of the channel from Portland to the sea at a cost of $21 million. The $100,000 here requested is simply to make the necessary surveys preparatory to that dredging work.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this bill and against the amendment to increase it.

I regret that the Ansonia-Derby project from my district has not been included in this bill even though it has not been formally authorized, since the omnibus authorization bill in which it is included has not been finally approved by the Senate or signed by the President.

It is encouraging, however, to have obtained the inclusion of this project in the supplemental appropriation bill. Apparently this bill will not be considered by the House prior to adjournment. However, I am pleased to have the assurance of the leadership and of the chairman of the subcommittee handling the supplemental appropriation bill that the appropriation for planning funds for this project will be considered as the first business of the Appropriations Committee in January.

Although I had considered making an attempt to amend this bill, in view of the delicate parliamentary situation and the effect upon adjournment sine die of any additional controversy, and relying upon the assurances of the leadership of consideration within a matter of weeks, I decided not to attempt to include these funds in the present bill.

I was reinforced in this decision by my belief that normal procedure should be followed and that appropriations should not be made for projects before they have been authorized.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: On page 6, line 10, insert: "; *Provided*, That funds herein appropriated for planning on Cache River, Arkansas, shall be used to the extent necessary to study the effect of the project on agricultural lands along the lower Cache River and along the White River downstream from the confluence to determine whether additional protection should be provided for these lands in connection with the Cache River project and for preparation and submission of a report thereon to the Appropriation Committees."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concur therein.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, objection has been made to sending to conference a supplementary appropriation bill carrying more than one-half billion dollars in needless appropriations. If there is any question as to its need, the chairman of the subcommittee which reported the bill advises that there is nothing in the bill of immediate emergency. Such items as may in the future require consideration can very well go over to the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as Thomas Jefferson said in an immortal document: "A just consideration for the opinion of mankind requires that we give reason for our action."

So, I give you here today the reason why this action is taken.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], one of the great men of the House of Representatives, is leaving his congressional service with the end of this session. If I had my way I would keep him here because I think he is needed. But he has more than earned the right to a vacation. He is entitled to the last and best years of his life for himself, for his family, his friends, and his books, and in order to catch up with his long neglected fishing.

At a dinner tendered him as a tribute to his distinguished service and as a token of the warm affection in which he is universally held, statistics were quoted of the national situation at the beginning and close of his service, as follows:

The year Mr. TABER came here the total annual public expenditure was $3 billion. The first year that he was here Congress spent $3 billion. We are spending this year $115 billion, the largest amount ever spent in a peacetime year in the history of the American Congress.

Gentlemen, when you go home you can attract special attention by saying, "I have just come from a $100 billion Congress." You are the first man ever to go back to your congressional district from a $100 billion Congress in all its history.

When Mr. TABER came here the number of employees of the Federal Government was 536,000. Today it is 2,514,000.

When he came here the public debt was $22 billion. Today it is $302 billion. It is now past the high water mark. It is the largest debt in the history of the United States. It is the largest debt ever owed by any nation in any country in the history of the world. And we are still busily adding to it as fast as we can and every year spending more than we take in.

That is why the purchasing power of the dollar is down to less than half. That is why the cost of living for every family of the United States is up. That is why our gold is dwindling at Fort Knox. We are spending at the rate of $115 billion a year—far above our revenues.

We are still taxing the people at wartime rates. In the past we have repealed war taxes levied to keep the troops in the field as soon as peace was declared. But not this time. We are today levying every tax dollar we can draw out of the American people. We are still exacting the same taxes we levied to keep our armies fighting in Europe. And with all that extra revenue we are spending more than we take in.

An instance is the item we just passed. Although congressional expenditures are already larger than ever before we have just added a program which will cost a fabulous sum before it is completed for a project rejected by every authority we consulted.

This must be added to the public debt already of recordbreaking proportions. From your vote it is evident that all you gentlemen favor increasing the public debt. When you go home tell your people you voted today to increase the public debt; that you believe the public debt is too small, that you believe we ought to owe more money; that you believe that the purchasing power of the dollar should be depreciated; that the American people are living too cheaply; that the cost of living ought to be higher, so you vote to raise it.

That is what you voted for just now.

The supplemental bill to which we are objecting will add more than half a billion dollars to the national debt. I know you high-cost-of-living gentlemen will be disappointed that you will not have an opportunity to add it to the bill you have just voted through. The name of every Congressman who voted for it is right here in this yea-and-nay vote. Why not send it back home to be posted in every voting poll in your district?

The chairman of the committee who reported it says it is not necessary. He says it will in no way discommode the Government if you fail to pass it this year. So we are adhering to the refusal to permit it to go to conference. We are adhering to the refusal to permit you to add further to the taxes of your already overburdened taxpayers. As you did in the vote just taken.

Surely, gentlemen, we ought to be satisfied with a debt of $302 billion. Why insist on owing more money? Why add to it? That is what you voted to do just now. And will you tell us what your people and your district get out of it? Nothing but more taxes.

There is many a taxpayer out on a small farm, a small businessman in the local town, a workman here who has a hard time paying even a few dollars of taxes. But when the Internal Revenue men bring it to Washington we spend it all; we spend it as you have spent it today. We send it down to Florida. Florida received everything, every project she asked except this one item. She received more proportionately than most any State in the Union. She received 10 projects. This was a particularly bad item. All the reports we got on it showed it was a bad item. But it is fine for the promoters. In one case down there they bought land for 5 cents an acre and got the Government to build some public works and sold it for $5,000 an acre.

Florida could not get this item in the bill when we wrote the bill in the subcommittee. They could not get it in the bill when it was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee. They could not get it in the bill when the full committee reported it to the House. They could not get it in the bill when the House conferees took it up with the Senate conferees. So they come in here today and buttonhole every man on the floor. "What is the U.S. Treasury between friends?"

Remember these boys are asking for something for themselves. The committee has no personal interest. The only thing the committee has to gain by this is ill will and unpopularity for being a "wet blanket." But surely somebody has to protect the taxpayers' money. The committee does not seem to have any friends here today. The taxpayers do not seem to have any friends here today. Everybody is the friend of these ingratiating gentlemen from Florida.

A woman wrote me yesterday that she took a dozen eggs to market and got 24 cents for them, and it was not enough to pay for postage stamps to write to each of her children. Yet you raised postage the other day. "Oh, the people are not paying enough. Sure, vote to make them pay more postage and more taxes."

Mr. Speaker, who is leading this raid upon the public Treasury today? The gentlemen from Florida—fine fellows, of course—I love every one of them. The great Sunshine State of Florida is taking population from every State of the Union. New York up here lost a Congressman. They put him down in Florida. And they have tax laws down there that pull New York money down there too. They are attracting population from all over. The reason they readjusted your districts this year is that Florida is such an enticing State. Yet they are so poverty stricken that they must come up to Washington and run over the Committee on Appropriations which has no interest whatever except to discharge the duties and serve the purpose for which appointed.

They are as redoubtable a gang of pirates as ever sailed the Spanish Main, and my State and your State are paying the bill in onerous taxes. Millions of dollars were plundered by Captain Kidd and Blue Beard, but the amount of money Kidd and Blue Beard took pales into insignificance compared to the money these highwaymen have taken from the U.S. Treasury here this morning. You cannot give them enough. No matter how much you give them, they want more. They come in here after being denied by an impartial committee and try their case here on the floor. Nobody except Florida insisted on trying their case on the floor. Why have a committee if you are going to support these rebels against legitimate authority like other Caribbean freebooters in Central and South American principalities?

Today, gentlemen, you have voted to increase the annual expenditures of the Nation although the Government is already spending the largest amount ever spent in one peacetime year in the history of any nation on earth.

You have today added to the number of Government employees when they are falling over each other in every department. Competent men tell us that if they only had one-third the number of employees in the Pentagon, they could do better work. That is true of every department of the Government. You have today voted to increase the national debt already so large that it staggers the imagination. I was in Germany after the war. At one time the German mark was an unassailable standard of value throughout Europe. Then Germany followed this primrose path until eventually the depositor had to carry his money to the bank in a basket. When he got to the bank, the bank did not count the money. It just distributed the bills by denomination and weighed it.

In 1936 when a housewife took a dollar downtown to the grocery store, she got $1.07 worth of groceries for that dollar. Nations all over the world were scrambling for that dollar. They wanted hard cash. But now they are not so keen about it. Today it is only worth 44 cents.

Many a man who must earn his living by the sweat of his brow is having a hard time buying school shoes for his children. He is having a hard time filling the plates on the breakfast table. But when we send the tax collector around, he has to ante up. Here today you are telling that man to let his children wear their shoes a little longer after they are already worn out. You are telling the parents of some of those children to send them to school without an egg for breakfast or without a slice of bacon so that they will have enough to pay the taxes you voted on them this morning for the golden Sunshine State of prosperous Florida.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection the motion is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 19, line 5, insert: "After September 30, 1962, the position of Commissioner of Reclamation shall have the annual rate of compensation as provided for positions listed in section 2205(a) of title 5, United States Code, so long as held by the present incumbent."

Mr. **CANNON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 13 and concur therein.

Mr. **TABER**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CANNON**. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. **TABER**. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 13 was inserted by the conferees after having been passed in the Senate version of the bill. In part it represents a policy that I cannot go along with. It provides for increase of salary for the Commissioner of Reclamation from $19,000 to $20,000 a year. I am opposed to the inclusion in appropriation bills of increases in salary. I think that ought to be taken care of by the appropriate legislative committee.

If we do not stop this idea of these civil servants running around to somebody who has an appropriation bill up, if we do not begin to stop that practice and stop the way we are doing business I can see no hope for the people of the United States. We heard what the chairman of the committee said in his statement as to the financial condition of the Government. That is the thing that worries me very much, and I do not believe we can continue long in the direction things are going at the present time. For my own part I am opposed to this motion and I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. **CANNON**. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 29, line 7, strike out "1962" and insert "1963".

Mr. **CANNON**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein.

Mr. **CANNON**. Mr. Speaker, the summer has waxed and waned; the birds have nested and flown; the leaves are falling in the autumn breeze, but Congress still stays on.

We should have been home long ago. There are more new districts in the United States this year than in any previous election. In some districts the change has been comparatively small. They have added one county or they have taken away one county. But there are more districts this time in the United States in which there is readjustment, in which there are new constituents, than in any previous election.

We should have had an opportunity to go home. These constituents want to see their new Congressman, they want to hear him; and I am certain the new Congressman wants to see his new constituents. But we have been kept here longer than at any time before, except in time of war. Do not ask me why. I do not know.

Someone is ready to comment that the last bill here this morning is an appropriation bill. It must be the Appropriations Committee. Why did you not hurry up?

I remind you that early in the session we reminded the leadership that we would not process appropriation bills until we had authorization. Happily, under the American Constitution, you cannot appropriate a dollar that is not authorized by law. The legislative committees hold the whip hand. The delay on the pending bill is due to the fact that we did not have authorizations. That has been true of most of our bills. We have been here from January to October, but the last authorization bill came in last night.

Before the change in the Constitution, we went home every other year on the 4th of March. Every bill had been passed, everything was done that needed to be done. There was never a year in which we failed to complete the legislative program in ample time to adjourn by March 4. Why did we not go home in March of this year, or at least in July, according to law? I am convinced, we would not have had votes like we had here this morning if we had been back home, rubbing shoulders with our constituents, if we had had an opportunity to see the hard conditions under which they live.

Back here in Washington we are in these lovely air-conditioned offices. We do not have to be bothered by constituents running in on us. But legislation suffers.

Congress ought to go home. Congressmen ought to stay in touch with the people and find out what they need, what they are talking about, what their sentiments are. If Members had kept in touch with the voters we would not have had the vote we had here just now. And, Mr. Speaker, we have not had any such outstanding generalship in the House this session.

We had a little controversy with the Senate some time ago in changing the obsolete, antiquated machinery in order to discourage the habit of the Senate of adding unwarranted sums to House appropriation bills.

The other body sought to take away a prerogative lodged in the House by the Founding Fathers who wisely provided that the strongest hold on the pursestrings of the Nation should be in the hands of the House of Representatives because it is closest to the people, and has to come before the people every 2 years.

It has been the prerogative of the House since 1789. In that battle we did not have the support of the leadership. Daily we were importuned by the Speaker to yield to the Senate, to surrender the prerogatives of the House, to agree on any terms.

The Committee on Appropriations, under heavy criticism, maintained its position but it was in spite of the leadership of the House when it should have been supporting us.

The leadership is supposed under ordinary circumstances to collaborate with the committees. After a committee has studied a bill, held hearings, processed a bill, and has spent months bringing in a report—other things being equal—the committees are entitled to the support of the leadership of the House. Last night my good friend Hale Boggs, after vigorously campaigning for Florida, brushed the Parliamentarian aside. He stood there like an avenging angel. I have never seen anything like it before. You could not get to the Speaker even if he had been willing to see you. My good friend from Oklahoma, Carl Albert, assiduously opposed every effort for economy by the committee in trying to maintain the bill it had unanimously reported.

The other day there was an insulting speech made in the Senate in which they charged Members of the House with moral obloquy and delinquencies because they used their frank as every Congressman from Washington's administration has done.

When the A's in the alphabet were called Mr. Albert voted against the committee, the unanimous report of the committee, and then at the last minute, after he had given the signal to the House, and everybody had voted, he changed his vote so that it would look a little better.

The majority leader of the House came to me last night, after the rollcall started and said, "If you will agree to let this half billion dollar bill go through"—the one they said we did not need—"we will turn and support you and give you this motion."

In other words, gentlemen, justice is for sale. No thought of principle. No thought of the obligation of office. It is a question of the highest bidder.

At the end of these long months, the longest peacetime session Congress has had—and with no visible reason—I honor the high office they hold but I cannot endorse the quality of leadership.

I have sat under 10 Speakers—but I have never seen such biased and inept leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the Record a summary tabulation on the bill and the usual list of additional surveys and studies agreed to in conference:

Public Works Appropriation Act, 1963

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Total, title I, civil functions, Department of the Army	$1,061,737,000	$1,042,729,900	$1,096,415,800	$1,077,526,800	+$15,789,800	+$34,796,900	−$18,889,000
Total, title II, Department of the Interior	406,646,000	385,824,000	399,134,600	394,203,600	−12,442,400	+8,379,600	−4,931,000
Total, title III, independent offices	3,283,368,000	3,185,254,000	3,215,721,000	3,197,404,000	−85,964,000	+12,150,000	−18,317,000
Total, title IV, public works acceleration	900,000,000	(1)	500,000,000	400,000,000	−500,000,000	+400,000,000	−100,000,000
Grand total, all titles	5,651,751,000	4,613,807,900	5,211,271,400	5,069,134,400	−582,616,600	+455,326,500	−142,137,000

[1] Not considered by House.

Corps of Engineers general investigations added in conference

NAVIGATION STUDIES

Alaska:	
Hoonah Harbor	$10,000
Kake Harbor	10,000
California: Russian River, Jenner	10,000
Florida:	
Carrabelle Harbor	6,000
Mulat Bayou via Red Fish to Escambia	10,000
Jupiter Inlet	10,000
Hawaii: Coast of Hawaiian Islands	+20,000
Illinois: Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek	+10,000
Louisiana:	
Calcasieu River	5,000
St. Charles-Jefferson Parish Line Canal	3,000
Maine:	
Calf Island	6,000
Owls Head	5,000
Massachusetts: Nantucket Harbor	10,000
Michigan: Les Cheneaux Channels	5,000
New York: Buffalo Harbor-Niagara River	10,000
Oklahoma:	
Arkansas and Red Rivers to Oklahoma City	+20,000
Arkansas River-Eufaula Reservoir	+18,000
Texas:	
Freeport Harbor	+5,000
Greens Bayou	18,000
Guadalupe and San Antonio River	17,500
Washington: Tacoma-Seattle Ship Channel	20,000

FLOOD CONTROL STUDIES

Alaska:	
Clarks Point	10,000
Seward	10,000
Arkansas:	
Lee Creek, Ark. and Okla	20,000
Little Rock Levee (east end district)	10,000
California:	
Isabella Reservoir	15,000
Jacks and Simmerly Sloughs	10,000

Corps of Engineers general investigations added in conference—Continued

FLOOD CONTROL STUDIES—Continued

Florida:	
Middle River-Canal 13	$12,000
Econlockhatchee River	20,000
Georgia: Appalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint Rivers, Columbus, Ga	25,000
Indiana: White River	+10,000
Iowa: West Fork, Little Sioux River	20,000
Louisiana:	
Mooringsport-Caddo Lake Dam	10,000
Tangipahoa River	5,000
Maine: St. Johns River	15,000
Michigan: St. Joseph River	5,000
Minnesota:	
Bassett Creek	10,000
Root River	10,000
Mississippi: Pearl River	25,000
Missouri: Excelsior Spring, Fishing River	15,000
Montana:	
Beaver Creek	10,000
Missouri River, between Garrison and Fort Peck Dams, N. Dak. and Mont	5,000
Nebraska: Big Blue River	15,000
New Mexico:	
Pecos River, Las Vegas	15,000
Santa Fe River, Santa Fe	15,000
North Dakota: Missouri River, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Nebr	60,000
Ohio: Moxhala and Jonathan Creeks	10,000
Oklahoma:	
Arkansas River, Wybark and Choska	20,000
Red River and tributaries (Sherwood Reservoir)	20,000
Tennessee: Tennessee River, Chickamauga	20,000
Texas: Highland Bayou and Hitchcock	20,000
Utah: Mill and Pack Creeks, Moab	15,000
West Virginia: West Fork River, Stonewall Jackson Reservoir	20,000

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly supported the Public Works Acceleration Act which was approved by the President last month, and I wish to record my support of the pending appropriation which will provide the funds for putting that act into effect.

This legislation will make it possible to hasten the construction both of Federal public works and of locally built, but federally aided, community facilities in areas which are suffering from a high level of unemployment.

The immediate purpose of the legislation is to relieve unemployment by creating additional jobs, but this by no means exhausts the benefits which the legislation will provide. The additional construction will contribute to the economic well-being of the localities as a whole since more jobs mean increased purchasing power and increased economic activity within the locality as a whole. Moreover, the facilities which will be constructed under the legislation will in each instance be useful and necessary capital improvements which will serve the local communities for many years to come.

In the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts—in the towns of Dracut, Lawrence, Lowell, and other localities—there have previously been planned with Federal aid several sewer and water projects, park reconstruction work, and sidewalk improvements, the estimated total cost of which will be about $2 million. These projects are eligible for Federal grants under the new accelerated public works program.

Perhaps some of them will not in fact be aided under that program, but then again other local projects have been planned or will be forthcoming which will also be eligible for grants under the new law.

There are seven projects in the fifth district of Massachusetts which have been completely planned under the federally aided public works planning program and which would be eligible for grants under the new accelerated public works program. These include two in Lowell, a fire alarm building estimated to cost $72,100 and sidewalks estimated to cost $107,500; four in Dracut, three of them sewer projects estimated to cost $387,000, $488,000 and $279,000, and a water project estimated to cost $432,000; and, in Lawrence, park reconstruction work estimated to cost $185,740.

These are certainly not the only projects in the fifth district for which plans have been completed but which have not been scheduled for construction. Neither is it certain that all of these projects will be aided under the accelerated public works program. However, these are examples of the kind of projects in the district which can be aided under that program.

The construction of projects of this type will not solve all the economic problems of my district but will certainly be extremely helpful in reducing those problems. Furthermore, the Public Works Acceleration Act is desirable legislation from the viewpoint of the Nation as a whole. The money which will be spent—in providing employment and useful public works in areas of unemployment—will also contribute to the economic well-being of the entire Nation because the persistence of centers of unemployment in many American communities is a drag on the national economy as a whole.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Public Works I am vitally interested in every item contained in the appropriations bill conference report on civil functions now before us and if time would permit I would mention several items in detail. However, it is vitally important that I discuss with Members of the House and you, Mr. Speaker, the $400 million item contained in the bill to implement the President's program of accelerated public works throughout the country. Although the $400 million allowed in the bill will be adequate to get the program moving until next year, I am very much disturbed about certain language slipped into the report accompanying this money bill. Mr. Speaker, I refer specifically to language in the report placing an arbitrary ceiling of $400,000 on any one all-Federal project. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the legislative committee that had the privilege of helping draft this new law, I resent this language very much. It is a sorry state of legislative affairs when a duly constituted committee passes out a piece of legislation, having it fully debated on the floor by all Members wanting to do so, then having Congress pass the legislation with the President's signature making it a law, and then have one or possibly a very few Members of the House and Senate write in language in a report tending to completely nullify the basic law. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will agree that this is legislating by a small minority and ignoring the recorded wishes of the majority.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has, on the floor today, criticized certain Members for offering an amendment to the conference report and, in fact, characterized these Members as "pirates." Yet, he has allowed some of his staff to write language into a report that does not at all correspond to the law or the intent of Congress. Mr. Speaker, southern Illinois and other areas of the country that are suffering from chronic unemployment are looking forward to jobs instead of relief handouts from this bill. Placing a $400,000 limitation will severely cut down on the amount of jobs that could be provided. Congress does not want the limitation, and has so voted; the President does not want the limitation I have been advised, and certainly the agencies and departments of Government charged with the responsibility of administering the program do not want the limitation. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am joined with a large number of Members who have given me permission to speak for them in urging that the language in the report be ignored. No one wants to take away the prerogatives of the important Committee on Appropriations but as we respect their prerogatives we of the legislative committee do expect the same consideration from them.

Mr. Speaker, another section of the report added in conference by the other body and concurred in by the House concerns language to the effect that if any community could raise their 50 percent through any existing agency or by selling bonds or negotiating a loan they would not be eligible to receive assistance under this act. Mr. Speaker, this too is an attempt to completely rewrite the basic legislation by committee report. Many communities may be able to raise funds by having a referendum and increasing local taxes but because of the difficulties involved have not done so in the past and will not do so in the future.

The results being that unemployed persons in those communities will remain on relief rolls and yes, Mr. Speaker, will be subsidized in great part by the Federal Government. The purpose of the act is to give a local community the needed incentive through matching grants to start a project immediately in order to provide jobs and make available a needed public works project in that community. Mr. Speaker, again I strongly urge all parties to ignore this language in the report because it does not speak for a majority of this Congress and is completely contrary to the basic legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier many of my colleagues on the Public Works Committee wanted to speak on this matter; however, due to our efforts to adjourn today they have asked me to speak for them. Many of my colleagues who are not on the Committee on Public Works have asked me certain questions about the legislation. For the record and to attempt to explain to the other Members this situation I am going to prepound certain questions asked of me by colleagues and then give an answer.

Question: I understand that several of the Members have found it somewhat difficult to grasp the full intent of the language in the Senate committee report concerning local sharing of costs in the public works acceleration program. I certainly hope that that language would not require an applicant community to exhaust all its financing capacity on a single project and then become incapable of financing part of any additional project under the program. Is there any ground for concern on this point?

Answer: No. The Federal agency under the statute—and I am sure that the committee report is not intended to negate the statute—is required to consider the aggregate increased employment made possible when Federal grants to some local projects enable the community to add other projects of equivalent size to the local capital improvement budget for the particular fiscal year. In fact, I believe the committee report itself talks of the capacity of the community to finance its—and I quote—"community facilities," rather than requiring the Federal agency to wear blinders while looking at a single project at a time.

Question: I call your attention to the statement in the conference report which adopts by reference the language of the Senate committee report concerning local cost sharing in the case of Federal grants under the Public Works Acceleration Act. Could you give me some idea of the kinds of requirements for cost sharing which the downtown agencies might impose to carry out the intent of this language?

Answer: That is a rather difficult question to answer because on the one hand we are dealing solely with distressed communities which find it difficult to contribute local funds, and yet it is important that the Federal dollar be stretched as far as is practical in order to obtain additional local public works which result in increased employment.

I should think that if the responsible agencies adopt several precautions, they will meet the intent of the language without wrecking the program in time-consuming redtape. There are several precautions which would be sufficient.

First, I would expect the agencies not to permit a locality to receive a grant where it has already applied for a loan for which it is eligible under an existing Federal loan program.

Second, non-revenue-producing projects should receive 50-percent grants, or higher grants in the special cases provided for by the law, if they meet the requirements with respect to essential public need, initiation or acceleration within a reasonably short time, significant increase in local employment, and so forth.

Third, in the case of revenue-producing projects, the 50-percent grant should be given in all cases where the particular project has been added to the local capital improvement program for the fiscal year, or another project involving equivalent local expenditures has been added to such capital improvement budget for the year.

Question: Is my understanding correct that it would be a truly exceptional case for any eligible local public works project under the Public Works Acceleration Act to receive more than a 50-percent Federal grant or less than a 50-percent Federal grant?

Answer: Yes. For a community to rereceive more than a 50-percent Federal grant, it must meet strict standards with respect to the fiscal and economic capacity of the locality. On the other hand, the act is based on the fact that eligible distressed areas cannot readily increase their capital improvement budget for any given fiscal year without a substantial measure of help.

Therefore the act provides at least a 50-percent grant for projects of a community which accelerate its aggregate local public works.

Question: I would like to ask what Federal contribution a community can expect under the act for an eligible project where the community makes no claim to the special 75 percent of cost based on its unusually bad economic and financial capacity. Can the community expect the 50 percent authorized in the law or do we have to have all of this reinvestigation of a distressed community's finances and bonded indebtedness and revenues and all the administrative redtape that goes with it in order to determine whether it gets 39 percent, 41 percent, or some other amount that some official finds in his crystal ball?

Answer: The community is entitled to 50 percent of cost. There has never been any intention in any language in the legislation or in any of the reports or other legislative history which would require any sort of further investigation and paring down of the 50-percent authorization.

Mr. Speaker, from the above questions and answers it is clear that the whole purpose of the measure is to spur activity in distressed areas. To add a batch of redtape will completely destroy the program, will not give the added incentive to proceed immediately with improvements and above all will deny jobs to hungry people. Therefore, in closing let me urge every agency and department to proceed to administrate this program as required under the law. If the agencies and departments limit all Federal projects to $400,000 and impose severe restrictions on non-Federal projects they are very clearly not carrying out the intent of Congress and the majority of Members thereof. I speak today for dozens of colleagues and urge that the appropriations committee members continue to work with the legislation committee as they have in the past but not do what they have done here. But doing this we will stop the millions in handouts we are giving to the States in welfare programs and instead provide much needed employment and a better America, because after all, Mr. Speaker, a chain is no stronger than its weakest link and unless we can eradicate the areas of high unemployment we will not have a healthy economy in America. I strongly urge all concerned to help move this program forward immediately with the $400 million provided and under provisions laid down by the law passed by Congress and not what is contained in a committee report.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the bill before us contains a compromise resulting in a cut of $100 million in funds appropriated to the President for public works acceleration. This is a legitimate cut, and quite within the rules.

However, in the statement of the managers, which constitutes a report of the conferees and is supposed to explain the effects of action agreed upon, there is a directive forbidding the use of funds for all Federal projects which cost more than $400,000.

This restriction is not part of the appropriation bill itself. It represents quasi-legislation which attempts to have the committee of conference speak with the voice of authority for a majority of the membership of both Houses. I realize that this parliamentary device has been in practice for some time, but I cannot let this occasion go by without raising my voice in protest.

Let me make it clear that the managers cannot speak for this House in their statement, and this directive can have no legal or binding effect. What it amounts to is a powerful admonition to the executive branch by other than the normal legislative process.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, questions have been raised concerning the possibility that funds appropriated for use as Federal grants under the Public Works Acceleration Act might be diverted to assist in providing local public works which do not result in a true increase in current local employment because the same volume of construction could just as well have been provided without the assistance of the new Federal grants. These are worthwhile questions because the basic purpose of the act is the alleviation of current unemployment through accelerated construction of public works.

Such a diversion of grant funds is barred by the plain meaning of the law, and I am pleased to note that precautions have already been taken downtown to prevent grant funds from being dissipated.

On September 7, in anticipation of the enactment of the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Community Facilities Commissioner telegraphed all Housing and Home Finance Agency regional offices that public facility projects which had previously been approved for loans under the public facility loans program would not be eligible for public works acceleration grants. The telegram also directed the field offices that all applications for Federal loans which are pending are to be processed to completion and, if the projects are found eligible for loan assistance, they would not be eligible for the new grants.

So far as new applications for Federal aid for local public works are concerned, section 4(a) of the Public Works Acceleration Act contains an express limitation which assures that the Federal grants will in fact result in additional local public works construction and in additional employment, during the fiscal year. That section states that no part of any grant allocation under the Public Works Acceleration Act "shall be made available during any fiscal year to any State or local government for any public works project, unless the proposed or planned total expenditure (exclusive of Federal funds) of such State or local government during such fiscal year for all its capital improvement projects is increased by an amount approximately equal to the non-Federal funds required to be made available for such public works project."

Under this language, Federal grants for public works acceleration may be made only if there is a resulting increase in the aggregate public works construction of the locality during the fiscal year. Some of the projects aided by Federal grants will be projects which are themselves not feasible without the grants. Others will be projects which could possibly have been started with just loan assistance, or without Federal aid, but which should be approved because the grants make it possible for the community to undertake aided and nonaided projects which, taken together, result in increased public works construction and local employment during the fiscal year. Section 4(a) of the Public Works Acceleration Act is thus designed to permit communities to select from a wide range of local projects those most capable of getting off to a quick start, thereby serving the basic purpose of the Acceleration Act. Also, under this language, an applicant locality would not be required to exhaust all its financing capacity on its first projects and then receive approval of Federal grants only for later projects when, as is possible, Federal grant funds will meanwhile have been exhausted.

Eligible projects in eligible communities would in most cases be assisted by 50 percent Federal grants. In addition, there would be some other projects eligible for Federal grants of between 50 and 75 percent of their cost. However, each of these projects would have to meet an additional test. That is, the locality in addition to being a redevelopment area or unemployment area, would have to show under section 3(c) of the Public Works Acceleration Act, that it does not have economic and financial capacity to assume all of the additional financial obligations required by the project without a Federal grant in excess of 50 percent of project cost.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE YEAR

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I shall insert at this point in the RECORD the usual summary by the Committee on Appropriations, reviewing the appropriations program of the year.

APPROPRIATIONS AND BUDGET RÉSUMÉ, 2D SESSION, 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, following the customary practice, for the information of Members and the country I am summarizing the appropriation record of the session and including sundry tabulations and data on the appropriations work of the 2d session of the 87th Congress with statements summarizing the fiscal condition of the Government.

A tabulation of the identified backdoor appropriation provisions in legislative bills of the session outside traditional appropriation channels is also included.

Comprehensive executive summary of all actions affecting the budget and the Treasury will not be available until a few weeks hence when they issue the usual budget review. That will include:

First. Effect of congressional action, or inaction, on new revenue recommendations in the budget.

Second. Effect of congressional action on new legislation having final impact.

Third. Revised estimates of revenue collections in light of current conditions.

Fourth. Revised estimates of expenditures from all sources—approximately one-third of annual budget disbursements are from prior years appropriations, and some from permanent appropriations, and therefore not directly affected by congressional actions on the current budget.

Fifth. Effect of back-door provisions.

Sixth. Summary and results of the net reductions made in the regular appropriation bills disclosed in the table below.

All these factors join to influence the final results and the original budget projection of a surplus of $463,000,000 for the current fiscal year 1963. The fiscal year 1962 closed last June 30 showing a deficit of $6,307,612,863. Every significant sign now points to another substantial deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the President's original budget, submitted in January, proposed total new obligating authority—annual appropriations, permanent appropriations, Treasury borrowing, contract authority, reappropriations—everything constituting an obligation against the Treasury—of $99,303,000,000 for fiscal year 1963 and $3,778,000,000 as supplements to fiscal year 1962—a total of $103,081,000,000 for the session, and the first time in peacetime history the asking price has exceeded $100,000,000,000.

Subsequent amendments from the President have raised the total request by an amount not immediately available, but substantial. There will be supplements to fiscal 1963 submitted early in the next Congress. The executive budget review will articulate the whole situation. But the principal portion of the spending side of the budget—that portion subject to annual congressional action—has been disposed of in the bills processed through the Committee on Appropriations. Not counting backdoor bills, 14 appropriation bills have been processed in this session—2 having to do primarily with fiscal year 1962 and 12 primarily with the current fiscal year 1963. The last supplemental passed both Houses but did not become law.

SUMMARY OF THE APPROPRIATION BILLS

As disclosed by the tabulations which follow, budget estimates of appropriations submitted to the House for action this session in bills from the Committee on Appropriations total $95,639,477,405. As noted, this does not include permanent appropriations—estimated tentatively in the January budget at $9,996,000,000—which recur automatically under previous law without annual action by the Congress; $9,300,000,000 was for annual interest on our rising national debt. These permanent items are subject to some revision—perhaps upward—in the forthcoming executive budget review.

The total of the bills sent to the House floor was $91,199,482,870, a reduction of $4,439,994,535. Every bill was reported below corresponding budget requests. The great bulk of the cut represents substantial savings.

From the debate presenting the rule creating the committee in March 1865:

> The proposed Committee on Appropriations have, under this amendment, the examination of the estimates of the departments, and exclusively the consideration of all appropriations. I need not dilate upon the importance of having hereafter one committee to investigate with nicest heed all matters connected with economy. The tendency of the time is to extravagance in private and in public. We require of this new committee their whole labor in the restraint of extravagant and illegal appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the original charter stands unchanged. The mandate is still there—and it is more urgent today than ever. The necessities of the times demand more fiscal restraint; that we stop this senseless spiral of an ever-increasing public debt, of living beyond income, most of it for nondefense purposes.

The House made only minor changes: Committee recommendations were raised by $13,857,000. As sent to the other body, the bills totaled $91,213,339,870; that is $4,426,137,535 below budget estimates considered by the House.

Budget estimates of appropriations considered in the other body total $96,928,562,615, or $1,289,085,210 above the total on which the House acted. This is customarily the situation in every session. The President sends supplements to the Senate after the bills have passed the House; the largest single item this year was the $900,000,000 for accelerated public works spending authorized in Public Law 87-658.

The other body adopted a total of $93,561,420,330, or $3,367,142,285 below the budget amounts considered by it and $2,348,080,460 above the House bills. Three bills were below the House amounts but debate discloses this to be almost entirely a deferral of appropriation rather than retrenchment of expenditure. Eleven of the bills exceeded the House allowances. One was unchanged from the House amount. Last year, the other body raised the total of every House bill.

I feel certain the country would be glad to see the other body cooperate more closely than in former years in holding to amounts not in excess of those in the House bills, and even constructively reducing them wherever possible—and there are many places it is possible, especially in the nondefense items.

> Franklin thought that the purse should be controlled by the House, because the Representatives were to be elected by direct vote of the people and for short terms; but Madison suggested that the power of amendment should be given to the Senate so that it might diminish an extravagant budget by the House.

The second session bills, listed in the table below, as finally enacted aggregate $92,266,154,659. That is $4,662,407,956 below the total budget estimates of $96,928,562,615. Every bill sent to the President with the single exception of the main defense bill is below the budget requests. By far the largest part of this reduction is hard savings below the budget proposals; there are in every session a handful of cuts in the nature of deferrals or adjustments.

As previously noted, permanent appropriations recurring automatically and chargeable to the General Treasury, estimated in the January budget at $9,996,000,000, would be in addition; subject to slight refinement of the latter figure, total appropriations would therefore approximate $102,000,000,000—the first peacetime year in history that general budget appropriations have gone that much above $100 billion.

The grand total is approximately $6 billion above corresponding appropriations in the session last year. And last year was some $12 billion above the year before.

The appropriation totals—not counting back-door amounts—for the two sessions of the 87th Congress are summarized below. The amounts for each bill in the current session follow that.

Summary of budget estimates and appropriations, 87th Cong. (both sessions)

[Not counting back-door bills]

Session	Budget estimates	Appropriations	Increase or decrease
1st sess.:			
Other than permanents	$91,507,488,053	$86,606,819,990	−$4,990,668,063
Permanents	[1] 9,588,126,620	[1] 9,588,126,620	
Total, 1st	101,185,614,673	96,194,946,610	−4,990,668,063
2d sess.:			
Other than permanents	96,928,562,615	92,266,154,659	−4,662,407,956
Permanents	[1] 9,996,000,000	[1] 9,996,000,000	
Total, 2d	106,924,562,615	102,262,154,659	−4,662,407,956
Total, 87th	208,110,177,288	198,457,101,269	−9,653,076,019

[1] Subject to some revision for actual results (but would not materially alter the totals).

NOTE.—Excludes back-door bills (their inclusion in 1st session totals would run that total well over $100,000,000,000).

Table of appropriation bills, 87th

[Does not include any back-door appropriation bills. Also excludes permanent

Bill No.	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
	1962 supplementals								
H.J. Res. 612	Veterans' Administration	$151,200,000	Jan. 31	$55,000,000	−$96,200,000	Jan. 31	$55,000,000	−$96,200,000	
H.R. 11038	2d supplemental	[1] 503,265,000	Mar. 30	431,807,000	−71,458,400	Apr. 4	447,514,000	−55,751,000	+$15,707,000
H.J. Res. 745	Supplemental [3]		June 14	(133,259,929)		June 14	(133,259,929)		
	Total, 1962 supplementals	654,465,000		486,807,000	−167,658,000		502,514,000	−151,951,000	+15,707,000
	1963 appropriations								
H.R. 10526	Treasury-Post Office	5,575,386,000	Mar. 1	5,461,671,000	−113,715,000	Mar. 6	5,461,671,000	−113,715,000	
H.R. 10802	Interior [4]	930,674,000	Mar. 16	868,595,000	−62,079,000	Mar. 20	868,595,000	−62,079,000	
H.R. 10904	Labor-HEW	5,284,831,000	Mar. 23	5,170,788,000	−114,043,000	Mar. 27	5,170,788,000	−114,043,000	
H.R. 11151	Legislative	114,078,425	Apr. 6	113,733,890	−344,535	Apr. 11	113,733,890	−344,535	
H.R. 11289	Defense	47,907,000,000	Apr. 13	47,839,491,000	−67,509,000	Apr. 18	47,839,491,000	−67,509,000	
H.R. 12276	District of Columbia	(299,134,478)	June 22	(290,059,000)	(−9,075,478)	June 26	(290,059,000)	(−9,075,478)	
	Federal payment	35,199,000		33,199,000	−2,000,000		33,199,000	−2,000,000	
	Loan authorizations	(26,042,000)		(26,042,000)			(26,042,000)		
H.R. 12580	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	[6] 2,004,178,000	July 17	1,902,065,700	−102,112,300	July 20	1,901,215,700	−102,962,300	−850,000
H.R. 12648	Agriculture	6,354,783,000	July 20	5,477,092,500	−877,690,500	July 25	5,475,842,500	−878,940,500	−1,250,000
	Loan authorizations	(805,000,000)		(805,000,000)			(805,000,000)		
H.R. 12711	Independent offices [7]	12,560,063,500	July 27	11,501,141,000	−1,058,922,500	July 31	11,501,141,000	−1,058,922,500	
H.R. 12870	Military construction	1,594,729,500	Aug. 10	1,369,741,000	−224,988,500	Aug. 14	1,369,741,000	−224,988,500	
H.R. 12900	Public works	4,745,332,000	Aug. 14	4,613,807,900	−131,524,100	Aug. 16	4,613,807,900	−131,524,100	
H.R. 13175	Foreign assistance	7,335,029,000	Sept. 18	5,956,852,000	−1,378,177,000	Sept. 20	5,956,852,000	−1,378,177,000	
H.R. 13290	Supplemental	543,728,980	Oct. 1	404,497,880	−139,231,100	Oct. 3	404,747,880	−138,981,100	+250,000
	Total, 1963 appropriations	94,985,012,405		90,712,675,870	−4,272,336,535		90,710,825,870	−4,274,186,535	−1,850,000
	Total, all appropriations	[9] 95,639,477,405		91,199,482,870	−4,439,994,535		91,213,339,870	−4,426,137,535	+13,857,000
	Total, loan authorizations	(831,042,000)		(831,042,000)			(831,042,000)		

[1] Adjusted to reflect rescission of $44,637,000 for Civil Service Commission proposed in H. Doc. 333 but not acted upon by Congress.

[2] Of this amount, $117,457,000 which was originally provided for fiscal year 1962 costs eliminated by H. Con. Res. 505 as no longer required.

[3] Included primarily deficiency items contained in 2d supplemental, 1962 (H.R. 11038) considered necessary to enable certain agencies to finish out fiscal year. Not sent to conference or enacted into law.

[4] Includes borrowing authority as follows: Budget estimate, $20,000,000; House reported and passed, $6,000,000; Senate reported and passed, $20,000,000.

[5] Includes $514,500,000 in new obligational authority in lieu of utilizing the sum of $514,500,000 appropriated for the current year for the procurement of long-range

DELAYS IN PROCESSING THE BILLS

Mr. Speaker, in every session the committee is charged by some with responsibility for the lateness of adjournment. Responsibility lies elsewhere. Except for the usual closing supplemental bill—always, and logically, last—the committee had virtually completed its hearings for the session before the July 1 beginning of the fiscal year. At that date, 6 of the 12 regular bills had passed the House; hearings were complete on 4 others and virtually complete on the other 2. A major delay in adjournment—but not the only one—is the lateness of the necessary legislative authorization bills. The House should not expect to receive the bills earlier if it persists, as it is increasingly doing, in indulging annually in reprocessing the authorizations for going programs. Only a few days ago the House passed a bill requiring, for the first time, annual authorization for Coast Guard procurement and construction in advance of reporting the appropriation.

For example, in the session just concluded:

Annually recurring legislative authorization bills for fiscal 1963

	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference report finally adopted	Signed in law
1. Military procurement, H.R. 9751	Mar. 21	Apr. 11	Apr. 12	Apr. 27
2. Military construction, H.R. 11131	Apr. 16	June 24	July 16	July 27
3. Foreign aid, S. 2996	July 12	June 7	July 24	Aug. 1
4. NASA, H.R. 11737	May 23	July 11	Aug. 1	Aug. 14
5. AEC, H.R. 11974	July 27	Aug. 1	Sept. 18	Sept. 16

These bills authorized appropriations totaling some $23,000,000,000.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the situation in this respect is no different from that of last year when none of the annual supply bills had been sent to the President by July 1 of last year. But there the similarity with last year abruptly stops.

OUR WORSENING FISCAL SITUATION

This year, we owe more money than we did last year—about $10,000,000,000 more. We are deeper in debt—deeper than we have ever been.

This year, on August 15, for the first time in history, the national debt crossed the $300,000,000,000 mark and is going higher.

This year, we took more taxes from the people than ever before—in time of war or peace—and still went deeper in debt.

This year, budget expenditures were higher than ever before, in war or peace, with the single exception of 1 year in World War II, and we are on the verge of passing even that high peak. We spent more in fiscal 1962 than ever before in any peacetime year.

This year, the deficit is larger than last year—63 percent larger—in fiscal 1962 than in 1961. And every sign points to a substantial recurrence in the current fiscal year 1963—a deficit in the order of $6,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 on the present basis.

This year, the regular appropriations for the first year in time of peace crossed the $100,000,000,000 mark—billions above last session and even more billions above the year before. The back-door bills are in addition.

This year, we added another year to the long string of years of living beyond national revenues—in 26 of the last 32 years we haven't balanced the budget. Not even in times of unprecedented national prosperity have we been willing to pay as we go along. We have yet to demonstrate any determination to do so.

> In case of war, our credit must be our chief resource * * * and this would be greatly impaired by having contracted a large debt in time of peace.

Cong., 2d sess., as of Oct. 13, 1962

appropriations tentatively estimated in January budget at $9,996,000,000 for fiscal 1963]

Senate							Final action			
Budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—		Date approved	Amount as approved	Public Law No.	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
					Budget estimates	House action				
$151,200,000	Feb. 1	$55,000,000	Feb. 2	$55,000,000	−$96,200,000	----------	Feb. 13	$55,000,000	87-404	−$96,200,000
[1] 522,231,929	Apr. 11	487,802,980	Apr. 16	560,008,344	+37,776,415	+$112,494,344	July 25	373,550,680	87-545	[3] −148,681,240
----------	June 22	(277,222,429)	June 23	(277,222,429)	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
673,431,929	----------	542,802,980	----------	615,008,344	−58,423,585	+112,494,344	----------	428,550,680	----------	−244,881,240
5,575,386,000	Mar. 16	5,526,558,000	Mar. 29	5,526,558,000	−48,828,000	+64,887,000	Aug. 6	5,489,781,000	87-575	−85,605,000
932,674,000	May 10	916,560,820	June 12	922,560,820	−10,113,180	+53,965,820	Aug. 9	885,362,000	87-578	[7] −47,312,000
5,386,363,100	June 29	5,333,084,000	July 20	5,380,958,000	−5,405,100	+210,170,000	Aug. 14	5,334,609,500	87-582	−51,753,600
146,913,210	July 31	146,690,690	Aug. 2	146,690,690	−222,520	[8] +32,966,800	Oct. 2	146,477,270	87-730	−435,940
47,907,000,000	June 8	48,429,221,000	June 13	48,429,221,000	[5] +522,221,000	+569,730,000	Aug. 9	48,136,247,000	87-577	+229,247,000
(300,161,478)	Sept. 27	(289,253,300)	Sept. 28	(289,253,300)	(−10,908,178)	(−805,700)	----------	(288,986,350)	----------	(−11,175,128)
35,199,000	----------	33,199,000	----------	33,199,000	−2,000,000	----------	----------	33,199,000	----------	−2,000,000
(26,042,000)	----------	(26,042,000)	----------	(26,042,000)	----------	----------	----------	(26,042,000)	----------	----------
[6] 2,123,248,000	Oct. 1	2,036,808,700	Oct. 3	2,036,808,700	−86,439,300	+135,593,000	----------	2,025,895,700	----------	−97,352,300
6,354,783,000	Aug. 22	4,774,983,000	Aug. 25	4,774,983,000	−1,579,800,000	−700,859,500	----------	5,487,029,500	----------	−867,753,500
(805,000,000)	----------	(820,000,000)	----------	(820,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	----------	(820,000,000)	----------	(+15,000,000)
12,580,269,500	Aug. 27	11,789,153,000	Aug. 31	11,801,590,000	−778,679,500	+300,449,000	Oct. 3	11,631,792,100	87-741	−948,477,400
1,594,729,500	Sept. 4	1,349,611,000	Sept. 7	1,350,501,000	−244,228,500	−19,240,000	Sept. 25	1,319,114,500	87-684	−275,615,000
5,651,751,000	Sept. 28	5,211,271,400	Oct. 1	5,211,271,400	−440,479,600	+597,463,500	----------	5,069,134,400	----------	−582,616,600
7,335,029,000	Sept. 28	6,781,402,000	Oct. 2	6,781,402,000	−553,627,000	+824,550,000	----------	6,278,962,000	----------	−1,056,067,000
631,785,376	Oct. 8	518,750,876	Oct. 10	550,668,376	−81,117,000	+145,920,496	----------	([10])	----------	−631,785,376
96,255,130,686	----------	92,847,293,486	----------	92,946,411,986	−3,308,718,700	+2,235,586,116	----------	91,837,603,970	----------	−4,417,526,716
[9] 96,928,562,615	----------	93,390,096,466	----------	93,561,420,330	−3,367,142,285	+2,348,080,460	----------	[9] 92,266,154,650	----------	−4,662,407,956
(831,042,000)	----------	(846,042,000)	----------	(846,042,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	----------	(846,042,000)	----------	(+15,000,000)

bombers, as proposed in the President's budget.

[6] Includes comparability adjustment of $115,480,000 for borrowing authority replaced by appropriation.

[7] Includes comparability adjustments of $34,427,500 for contract authorization and borrowing authority replaced by appropriations.

[8] Consists largely of Senate items not included in bill as passed House.

[9] In addition, permanent appropriations (interest on the debt is by far the largest item) recurring under basic law, and therefore not requiring annual action by Congress, were tentatively estimated, for fiscal year 1963, at $9,996,000,000 in the January budget. Precise amount is subject to some revision—perhaps slightly upward.

[10] Not sent to conference; not enacted.

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations in the bills are included in this table.

BACK-DOOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Speaker, subject to unnoticed last-minute action, identified back-door appropriation provisions dropped to a mere fraction of the past several years. Executive requests in 11 such bills last year totaled $28,670,000,000 plus; some $19,673,000,000 plus was enacted into law. In this session apparently, only 2 bills with back-door provisions were adopted, and these carrying $437,400,000 are both above the corresponding executive requests. And, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on adjournment night last year the Congress barred the back door on four new programs. This year, without known dissent, the back door remained closed.

It is the most significant sign of results from past efforts to alert the Congress and the country to this indefensible and irresponsible way of legislating the finances of the Government. It is to be especially hoped the House will not further indulge the practice. And that the next budget will make no such recommendations.

Its discontinuation would undeniably enhance the opportunities to legislate for the functions of Government in a more responsible and orderly manner within a framework of competitive priorities.

Back-door appropriating serves the purposes of special interests and pleaders who do not want to abide by the rule. The left hand does not know what the right hand is doing—and the back-door approach serves to keep it from knowing.

Moreover, as so well demonstrated, the practice flirts dangerously with the constitutional prerogatives and supremacy of the House in money matters. The other body has never been reluctant to attempt arrogation of the appropriating powers. It has indulged heavily in recent years in origination of back-door bills. And the precedents are heavy with the record of attempts to originate other appropriation bills. But the writings of the prominent drafters of the Constitution clearly show the design and the intent, and that has been reinforced by the practice from the beginning. The House, for all time, ought to plug the back-door loophole opened by default in the last few years.

For general information, I include the most authoritative tabulation available on back-door provisions of the session.

It stands in marked contrast to last year:

New authority to obligate the Government—Proposed by executive or carried in identified legislative bills (1st sess., 87th Cong.) (public debt borrowing, contract authority, note cancellations—all forms of back-door financing)

Bill and subject	Executive requests		House	Senate	Enacted	Enacted compared with revised executive request
	Original	Revised				
1. Subscription to International Monetary Fund (H.R. 10162; Public Law 87-490) (public debt)	$2,000,000,000	[1] ($2,000,000,000)	[1] ($2,000,000,000)	[1] ($2,000,000,000)	[1] ($2,000,000,000)	
2. Foreign investment guarantee fund (public debt borrowing) (S. 2996) (Public Law 87-565) (H.R. 13175)	100,000,000	[2] (180,000,000)	[2] (30,000,000)	[2] (100,000,000)	[2] (30,000,000)	(−$150,000,000)
3. Senior Citizens Housing Act (H.R. 12628—portion relating to farm housing for elderly; Public Law 87-723) (public debt)			50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000
4. Defense Production Act revolving fund (S. 3203, H.R. 11500; Public Law 87-505) (note cancellation, writeoff of accrued interest on borrowings, and exchange of notes)	(3)	(3)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(−?)
5. Public Works Acceleration and Standby Act (S. 2965, H.R. 10113; Public Law 87-658) (authority to use existing unobligated funds)	[5] (2,000,000,000)	[5] (2,000,000,000)	[5] (900,000,000)	[5] (1,500,000,000)	[5] (900,000,000)	(−2,000,000,000)
6. College academic facilities (H.R. 8900—portion dealing with loans) (public debt)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(6)	
7. Housing—additional open space land grants (contract authority)	50,000,000	50,000,000	(7)	(7)	(7)	−50,000,000
8. Mass transportation assistance (H.R. 11158; S. 3615)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(8)	
9. Highway Act of 1962 (H.R. 12135; Public Law —) (contract authority):[9]						
Chargeable to general funds	82,000,000	356,000,000	356,000,000	417,400,000	387,400,000	+31,400,000
Chargeable to highway trust fund	(1,900,000,000)	(1,900,000,000)	(1,925,000,000)	(1,900,000,000)	(1,925,000,000)	(+25,000,000)
Grand total	2,232,000,000	406,000,000	406,000,000	467,400,000	437,400,000	+31,400,000

[1] Proposed as public debt borrowing in January budget, but legislation carried usual form of appropriation authorization.

[2] Proposed as public debt borrowing in January budget, but subsequently requested to be changed to authorization for appropriation in Foreign Aid Authorization Act; $180,000,000 appropriation requested. Basic legislation also increased the investment guarantee issuing authority by $440,000,000, to a total of $1,540,000,000, which is in the nature of a contingent liability to extent used.

[3] Executive proposal, in all aspects, proposed to write off unpaid interest and cancel notes as of June 30, 1961, totaling $445,178,000. In addition, would have waived interest for fiscal 1962 estimated $70,900,000; fiscal 1963 estimated $72,500,000; and thereafter. Exact total "price tag" of the proposal not determinable, but future losses would be an added factor.

[4] Legislation omitted all the financial proposals mentioned in footnote 3; merely extended the DPA Act.

[5] While this is not added in totals of the table because technically the $2,000,000,000 proposition involved use of existing unobligated funds rather than $2,000,000,000, additional, it nevertheless involved changing the character of existing balances and would have permitted up to $2,000,000,000 expenditure without the usual form of appropriation. House and Senate substituted usual form of appropriation authorization.

[6] Executive proposed public debt borrowing of $300,000,000 a year (5 years, $1,500,000,000), but subject to availability as specified in appropriation acts. Reported to House on that basis, but at $120,000,000 a year (5 years, $600,000,000—with $180,000,000 a year for grants). Loan provision changed on House floor to usual authorization for appropriation. Senate bill followed executive proposal. Conference report, recommitted, followed House bill.

[7] No bills reported.

[8] Executive request for $500,000,000 for 3 years—usual form of appropriation authorization. Bills reported in both Houses—in the House as an appropriation authorization, in the Senate as contract authority. Not enacted.

[9] With minor exceptions, amounts are for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965. Amounts chargeable to highway trust fund are not included in totals since they are not included in budget totals generally, although the whole highway fund operation is essentially "back door" in nature.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, we cannot live indefinitely beyond our national revenues. Somewhere we must discontinue spending more than we take in. We have lived beyond income in 26 of the last 32 years and we are again in that unhappy situation for the current year. The House, the press, and the country are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that it is rising nondefense expenditures that have unbalanced the budgets and expanded the national debt and, in consequence, precipitated foreign holders of our once peerless dollar to demand gold. We lack the self-discipline to live within our income, to pay our way as we go. That is the genesis of our present tenuous fiscal situation.

In the 8 years, fiscal 1954 through 1961, the level of national defense expenditures remained virtually unchanged, but the nondefense budget in that time increased $13,470 million—and that does not include the highway program, erroneously labeled as a "trust" fund and therefore no longer counted in general "budget" totals.

Again when fiscal 1962 closed on June 30 last, budget expenditures had risen $6,153 million above 1961—$3,575 million for national defense and $2,578 million for nondefense.

Down-to-date estimates for fiscal 1963 will be issued by the executive branch in a few weeks, but merely on the basis of the original January Presidential budget estimates and proposals, the expenditure levels keep rising steadily. There seems to be no interest or effort in retrenchment or return to rational fiscal policies. In summary:

	National defense	Other than national defense	Total
1963 budget estimates (January 1962) of expenditures:			
1963 over fiscal 1961	+$5,196,000,000	+$5,826,000,000	+$11,022,000,000
1963 over fiscal 1954	+5,704,000,000	+19,296,000,000	+25,000,000,000

So, Mr. Speaker, for nondefense purposes we were faced with propositions to spend at a level 17 percent above 1961 and, incredible as it may seem, 94 percent above 1954. And this largely on borrowed money. The forthcoming executive revision of estimates may enlarge the percentages:

> Nothing is easier than the expenditure of public money. It does not appear to belong to anybody. The temptation is overwhelming to bestow it on somebody.

I include here the official figures:

Defense and nondefense—Net "budget" expenditures

[In millions]

Fiscal year	National defense functions		Other than national defense	Total net budget expenditures
	Defense, military	Total		
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year)	$43,610	$50,442	$23,678	$74,120
Fiscal 1954	40,336	46,986	20,551	67,537
Fiscal 1955	35,532	40,695	23,694	64,389

Defense and nondefense—Net "budget" expenditures—Continued

[In millions]

Fiscal year	National defense functions		Other than national defense	Total net budget expenditures
	Defense, military	Total		
Fiscal 1956	$35,791	$40,723	$25,501	$66,224
Fiscal 1957	38,439	43,360	25,606	68,966
Fiscal 1958	39,062	44,234	27,135	71,369
Fiscal 1959	41,233	46,491	33,851	80,342
Fiscal 1960	41,215	45,691	30,848	76,539
Fiscal 1961	43,227	47,494	34,021	81,515
Increase in level during the 8 years, 1954-61	+2,891	+508	[1] +13,470	+13,978
Fiscal 1962 (preliminary)	46,826	51,069	36,599	87,668
1962 compared to previous year 1961	+3,599	+3,575	+2,578	+6,153
1962 compared to 1954	+6,490	+4,083	[2] +16,048	+20,131
Fiscal 1963 (original budget estimate of January 1962)	48,300	52,690	39,847	92,537
1963 compared to previous year 1961	+5,073	+5,196	[3] +5,826	+11,022
1963 compared to 1954	+7,964	+5,704	[4] +19,296	+25,000

[1] Represents 65 percent increase, 1961 over 1954.
[2] Represents 78 percent increase, 1962 over 1954.
[3] Represents 17 percent increase, 1963 over 1961 (subject to revision).
[4] Represents 94 percent increase, 1963 over 1954 (subject to revision).

NOTE.—(a) Beginning with 1957, highway program shifted to "trust fund" classification and therefore omitted for that and subsequent years; (b) data in table correspond to classification used in 1963 budget; (c) "national defense" consists of defense military (including civil defense), military assistance, AEC, stockpiling strategic materials, expansion of defense production, and selective service.

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY

The final responsibility for these ever-increasing expenditures paid for in substantial degree with borrowed money rests in the Halls of Congress. Not a dollar can be removed from the Treasury for any purpose, at any time, by anyone without the prior obligating authority from Congress. They call it new obligational authority. Once you obligate, you have to spend to pay the obligation. Of course, the executive branch recommends, urges, pressures, promises, but only Congress can make the appropriations. Budgets of recent years have been recordbreakers. And they continue to be recordbreakers. Every year the budget asks for more, principally more for nondefense. And every year Congress appropriates more, including more for nondefense. And practically every year it has carried us deeper into debt. The spenders and special pleaders are on both sides of the aisle and in both administrations. The latest examples, and these figures are official and documented:

Request to Congress for new authority to obligate the Government

	Outgoing fiscal 1962 budget of President Eisenhower (Jan. 16, 1961)	Original fiscal 1963 budget of President Kennedy (Jan. 18, 1962)	Proposed increase in level
1. National defense (defense, military, military assistance, AEC, stockpiling and small related items)	$46,278,000,000	$54,745,000,000	+$8,467,000,000
2. Nondefense	34,589,000,000	44,558,000,000	+9,969,000,000
Total	[1] 80,867,000,000	[1] 99,203,000,000	+18,436,000,000

[1] From only $62,800,000,000 for fiscal 1954. The 1963 figure has been amended upward since January—it will exceed $100,000,000,000 when all the totals are assessed.

BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. Speaker, the following tabulation summarizes the steadily rising budgets of the last 10 years during which the budget was unbalanced by the total of $37,709,000,000.

Net budget receipts and net budget expenditures, 10 years, 1953–62

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Net budget receipts	Net budget expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)
1953 (Korean war year)	$64,671	$74,120	−$9,449
1954	64,420	67,537	−3,117
1955	60,209	64,389	−4,180
1956	67,850	66,224	+1,626
1957	70,562	68,966	+1,596
1958	$68,550	$71,369	−$2,819
1959	67,915	80,342	−12,427
1960	77,763	76,539	+1,224
1961	77,659	81,515	−3,856
8 years, 1954-61	554,928	576,881	−21,953
1962	81,360	87,667	−6,307
1963	[1] (?)	[1] (?)	[1] (?)
Total, 10 years, 1953-62	700,959	738,668	−37,709

[1] Dependent on executive midyear review to be released in the near future.

Source: Budget documents.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

I include official figures on the status and trend of the national debt. Every year, as we borrow more and more to meet the amount we spend beyond what the tax collector brings into the Treasury, the inescapable day of reckoning is that much closer. Fiscal chaos is just that much nearer.

For the first time in history, on August 15, the debt crossed the $300 billion mark. We again indulged in the annual formality of raising the debt ceiling "temporarily" to $308 billion—the 10th time it has had to be raised over the old $275 billion limit to cover our willingness to pay as we go—mostly for nondefense items we could get along without or at least could defer until willing to provide the money. We cling for a few years to a "temporary" ceiling and then blithely convert some of it to a permanent status—always higher than the last time. The latest ceiling epitomizes the performance—on April 1 next it drops from $308 billion to $305 billion; then on June 24 next it drops to $300 billion for 6 days. And then again the annual formality is repeated.

The restraining influence of the limitation has long since disappeared. It is too late to limit expenditures after they have been authorized and appropriated and the obligations incurred.

> For every one who is hacking at the roots there are a hundred hacking at the branches.

Just to carry the debt, the annual cost is tentatively estimated at $9,300 million. Last year it was $9,140 million. The whole Government operated on that sum 22 years ago. It now takes 10 cents of the budget dollar. Incredible as it may seem, the annual interest cost runs to some $17,690 every minute, every hour, of every day and night of the year.

The peak in World War I was $26,596,701,648.01.

The peak in World War II was $279,764,369,348.29. Most of the debt up to 1947 was unavoidably accumulated through unprecedented war expenditures.

The lowest postwar debt was $251,553,319,739.98 on April 30, 1949, although immediately we were making effort to pay off the war debt itself. But the national debt continues to accumulate.

In January 1953, the debt was $267,393,784,247.66. We had been in the Korean war.

Eight years later—January 1961—the debt had climbed to $290,174,764,757.12 as a result of spending beyond record national tax revenues, primarily for nondefense purposes. That is what happened—an increase of $22,780,980,509.46 in the 8 years, equal to the national debt accumulation in the first 130 years of the Republic.

As time goes by the debt goes up. This morning's Treasury statement: $302,313,788,895.25. The $308 billion ceiling was set on the assumption of a balanced budget. But we are, assuredly, going into a substantial deficit. What will the next figure be? When will the inevitable limit be reached?

Again, from the debate in March 1865:

> Have we not already, like other nations, instead of providing for the principal, provided only for the interest of these great debts? What follows? That money borrowed, being obtained without sweat or sacrifice, is spent lightly, without economy or care. A revenue raised at the expense of posterity is sure to be squandered wastefully. Waste begets want, and the sums raised by loans will commonly be large.

Pertinent tabular data follows:

Federal debt on significant dates

Date	Classification	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita[1]
	WORLD WAR I		
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1,282,044,346.28	$12.36
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26,596,701,648.01	250.18
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16,026,087,087.07	129.66
	WORLD WAR II		
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	[2] 48,496,601,692.96	[2] 367.48
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	61,363,867,932.26	[2] 458.47
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279,764,369,348.29	[2] 1,989.75
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269,898,484,032.56	[2] 1,911.14
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [3]	251,553,319,739.96	[2] 1,690.29
	SINCE KOREA		
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257,376,855,385.01	[2] 1,696.74
Dec. 31, 1952		267,445,125,544.96	[2] 1,687.90
Aug. 31, 1962	Highest debt [4]	302,311,771,606.78	[5] 1,615.64
Sept. 30, 1961	Debt a year ago	294,020,489,002.97	[2] 1,592.97
Aug. 31, 1962	Debt last month	302,311,771,606.78	[5] 1,615.64
Sept. 30, 1962	Debt this month	299,985,627,106.86	[5] 1,600.91

[1] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

[2] Revised.

[3] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury)	23,876,001.12
Total direct and guaranteed debt	251,269,765,060.14

[4] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was on Aug. 30, 1962, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$302,676,371,694.37
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury)	464,806,750.00
Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes $431,961,349.40 not subject to statutory limitation)	303,141,178,444.37

[5] Subject to revision.

OUR DWINDLING GOLD STOCKS

Mr. Speaker, our gold supply situation is not on this morning's front pages but it should be noted that it grows steadily worse. Our gold reserve dwindles sharply. We have lost $6,682,699,970 since the run on it started in 1958. Our persistent deficit in balance of international payments, now showing some improvement, laid the groundwork, but our ever-mounting public debt and the ever-declining value of the dollar continues to precipitate the draft on our gold. Foreign holders of our dollars are apprehensive. They are apprehensive about our unwillingness to live within the national income.

Notwithstanding this alarming situation we still refuse to exercise national self-discipline. We still refuse to live within our national revenues. We refuse to adopt elementary business routine and pay as we go. Instead, year after year, we continue to spend more and more money we do not have, much for nondefense items—and load part of the cost on generations not yet here to call us to account.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are others to perform that very essential duty and call us to account—and the clamor becomes more insistent. Unless we show more respect for the value of the dollar—already down to 45 cents—they will, beyond reasonable doubt, call in the notes and demand payment on the mortgage. Foreign nations are in position to haul us up short if we continue to ignore the lessons of history, the plain trend of the times. They hold the mortgage, callable on demand. Foreign claims against our diminished, and diminishing gold supply now exceed $20 billion. We have only $16 billion in gold and about $11,800 million of it is committed by law as a 25 percent backing of our money supply. We are hanging on the ragged edge.

It would, manifestly, be absurd to try to delude ourselves to think that foreign nations, holding claims against our gold, will sit idly by if we continue to cheapen our paper dollars and securities which they hold. Then what happens?

If anyone thinks that it cannot happen here, then these statements only last June by two of the highest Treasury officials should be noted.

Under Secretary Fowler:

> All our efforts to restore international stability will be undermined if we are unable to continue to maintain reasonable price stability. European bankers today are aware of this. They are not seriously concerned—

He did not say they were not concerned, only that they were not "seriously" concerned—

> about our fiscal policy provided it is disciplined and controlled and is not allowed to contribute to an inflationary surge. They do, however, have considerable concern over our capacity to maintain price stability, and what failure in this area could do to our payments position.

Foreign bankers—who hold these claims on our gold—have been most attentive to our Treasury statements.

They note how little our depreciated dollar buys—they are painfully aware that today its buying power has dropped to 45 cents.

And they have watched the Congress repeatedly boost appropriations beyond the national revenues—much of it for nondefense items.

On the same day, Under Secretary Roosa implied that if any tax cut—which would deepen the deficit—were accompanied by further spending beyond the $92.5 billion originally budgeted for fiscal 1963, European dollar holders might well demand gold in lieu. And he suggested they would much prefer a ceiling on Federal spending to a ceiling on the Federal debt.

They are watching us because vital interests are at stake. And it would be to the interest of every American if Congress—every Member of both Houses—watched the situation as closely and did more about it.

We also ought to look to the recent lesson from the north. In June, the press reported the distress of the Canadian dollar and the drastic measures taken by the Canadians. Only a few years ago their dollar was worth more than ours—about $1.05 to one U.S. dollar. Then they devalued the Canadian dollar until it corresponded to 92½ cents of the U.S. dollar. Like us, though for somewhat different reasons, their international accounts and their domestic budgets were at a deficit status. The headlines read: "Canada Tightens Belt To Bolster Its Dollar"; "Canada Acts in Growing Fiscal Crisis; Austerity Program"; "Cuts Spending."

They are evidently reading the signs and heeding the warnings which we persist in ignoring; instead we are busy adopting new and appealing ways to find rationalizations for bigger and more expensive budgets.

We are trying to delude ourselves with the statistic that the Federal spending does not today take a larger share of the national production than it did a few years ago—that the $300 billion plus Federal debt is less, per person, than it was a few years ago.

We are continuously and consistently spending more than we take in, much of it for nondefense purposes, and loading

it on our grandchildren and their children's children.

We are toying with the idea of changing from a budget theory that has never worked to one that might sweep the whole bothersome business of deficits under the rug and out of sight—at least for a while.

We are continuing to ignore the inescapable lesson of history that debasement of currency leads to fiscal chaos.

But though we may obscure, Mr. Speaker, we cannot escape the truth. We may delude ourselves a while longer, but we cannot mislead those who hold the claims on our gold. They will still know:

First. That the average American, today, owes more public debt on a per capita basis than he did 10 years and 20 years ago. The people who owe the Federal debt also owe the State and local public debt—we must include all three. The average American does not owe less—he owes more.

Second. That the official cost-of-living index is at an alltime high.

Third. That we have indicated no serious inclination to live within our income.

Fourth. And, perhaps most important of all, the buying power—the purchasing value—of the U.S. dollar is less than half what it was just prior to World War II.

I include tables of data in support:

Gold assets of the United States

Date or period	Assets	Change during the month or year
Dec. 31, 1957	$22,780,675,342	
Dec. 31, 1958	20,534,104,913	−$2,246,570,429
Dec. 31, 1959	19,456,135,794	−1,077,969,119
Dec. 31, 1960	17,766,797,708	−1,689,338,086
Dec. 31, 1961	16,888,905,838	−877,891,870
Decline in gold holdings in the 4 years, 1958–61		−5,891,769,504
Calendar year 1962:		
Jan. 31	16,815,039,807	−73,866,031
Feb. 28	16,789,541,641	−25,498,166
Mar. 30	16,609,145,013	−180,396,628
April 30	16,494,523,771	−114,621,242
May 31	16,434,718,854	−59,804,917
June 29	16,435,032,370	+313,516
July 31	16,147,765,859	−287,266,511
Aug. 31	[1] 16,097,975,372	−49,790,487
Decline in gold holdings, 8 months of calendar 1962		−790,930,466
Decline in holdings, Jan. 1, 1958 to Aug 31, 1962		−6,682,699,970

[1] It was $16,067,481,089 on Oct. 2, 1962.

Source: Daily Treasury statements.

Our touch-and-go position on gold

[In billions of dollars]

	U.S. gold stock	Gold stock (above required 25 percent backing for currency and deposits)	Possible foreign claims	Potential shortage of gold with present 25 percent backing provision
End of calendar year:				
1957	$22.9	$10.8	$14.9	$4.1
1958	20.6	8.5	15.6	7.1
1959	19.5	7.3	17.7	10.4
1960	17.8	6.1	18.8	12.7
1961	16.9	4.9	20.4	15.5
4-year change	−6.0	−5.9	+5.5	+11.4
1962:				
January	16.8	5.2	20.3	15.1
February	16.8	5.2	20.2	15.0
March	16.6	5.0	20.3	15.3
April	16.5	4.8	20.3	15.5
May	16.5	4.8	20.2	15.4
June	16.5	4.6	20.8	16.2
July	16.2	4.4	(1)	(1)
Change, January 1958 through June 1962	−6.4	−6.2	+5.9	+12.1

[1] Not yet available.

Source: Department of Commerce.

U.S. balance-of-payments data

[Millions of dollars]

Period	U.S. receipts (recorded)		U.S. payments (recorded)					Balance on recorded transactions [net payments (−) or receipts (+)]	Unrecorded transactions—errors and omissions (net receipts)	Increase in foreign gold and recorded liquid dollar assets through transactions with the United States
	Exports of goods and services	Foreign capital other than liquid dollar assets (net)	Imports of goods and services	U.S. grants and capital (net)						
				Total [1]	U.S. Government grants and capital	Private capital				
						Total	Direct			
1954	17,759	240	15,931	3,791	1,554	1,622	667	−1,723	173	1,550
1955	19,804	394	17,795	4,051	2,211	1,255	823	−1,648	503	1,145
1956	23,595	653	19,628	6,098	2,362	3,071	1,951	−1,478	543	935
1957	26,481	487	20,752	6,853	2,574	3,577	2,442	−637	1,157	−520
1958	23,067	22	20,861	6,245	2,587	2,936	1,181	−4,017	488	3,529
1959	23,476	863	23,342	[2] 5,152	[2] 1,986	2,375	1,372	−4,155	412	3,743
1960	27,013	335	23,188	7,493	2,760	3,882	1,694	−3,333	−592	3,925
1961	28,066	606	22,923	7,608	2,777	3,953	1,475	−1,859	−602	2,461
			Seasonally adjusted annual rates							
1961—1st quarter	28,276	792	21,792	8,436	3,316	4,236	1,828	−1,160	−116	1,276
2d quarter	27,312	1,006	22,040	4,200	−188	3,504	1,076	2,168	−1,464	[3] −704
3d quarter	27,564	28	23,708	8,296	4,052	3,380	1,716	−4,412	772	[4] 3,640
4th quarter	29,112	508	24,152	9,500	3,928	4,602	1,280	−4,032	−1,600	[5] 5,632
1962—1st quarter	29,004	1,120	24,180	8,716	3,640	4,204	1,324	−2,772	868	1,904
2d quarter [6]	29,888		25,024							976

[1] Includes remittances and pensions not shown separately.

[2] Excludes $1,375,000,000 increase in U.S. subscription to International Monetary Fund.

[3] Includes advance debt repayment and interest payments on U.S. Government loans of $774,000,000 ($3,100,000,000 at annual rate).

[4] Before adjustment for receipts of principal and interest on Government loans paid in the previous quarter.

[5] Includes over $400,000,000 ($1,700,000,000 at annual rate) of subscriptions to international organizations and other special capital outflows.

[6] Preliminary.

NOTE.—Data exclude goods and services transferred under military grants.

Source: Department of Commerce.

Federal, State, and local tax receipts, expenditures, and debt—On a per capita basis, selected fiscal years

Year	Per capita				Percentage distribution			
	Total	Federal	State	Local	Total	Federal	State	Local
1. Tax receipts:								
1940	$109	$43	$32	$34	100	39.2	29.2	31.6
1946	370	286	45	39	100	77.3	12.2	10.5
1950	369	255	60	54	100	69.1	16.3	14.6
1953	576	433	77	67	100	75.2	13.3	11.5
1960	715	499	114	102	100	70.1	15.5	14.4
2. Expenditures:								
1940	156	77	35	44	100	440.3	22.3	28.5
1946	602	502	47	53	100	83.5	7.7	8.8
1950	473	301	86	86	100	63.7	18.2	18.1
1953	707	514	90	103	100	72.7	12.8	14.5
1960	864	548	153	164	100	63.2	17.6	19.2
3. Gross debt:								
1940	483	328	27	128	100	67.9	5.7	26.4
1946	2,154	2,034	18	102	100	94.4	.8	4.8
1950	1,893	1,731	36	127	100	91.4	1.9	6.7
1953	1,925	1,708	50	167	100	88.7	2.6	8.7
1960	2,010	1,617	105	288	100	80.5	5.2	14.3

Source: Tax Foundation "Facts and Figures," 11th edition.

COST OF LIVING—VALUE OF THE DOLLAR

Every factory worker, every office worker, every farmer, every businessman, every family, feels the pinch of meeting their expenses with a dollar that buys less and less. The cost of living index keeps creeping up. And the value of the dollar keeps falling. In 5 of the first 7 months of calendar 1962, the index reached new high water marks. And the buying power of the dollar dropped further; it is now down to 45.9 cents—a new low.

Consumer price index and purchasing power of the dollar

	Consumer price index (1947–49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100 cents)
	All items	Foods	
Years:			
1939	59.4	47.1	100.0
1940	59.9	47.8	99.2
1941	62.9	52.2	94.4
1942	69.7	61.3	85.2
1943	74.0	68.3	80.3
1944	75.2	67.4	79.0
1945	76.9	68.9	77.2
1946	83.4	79.0	71.2
1947	95.5	95.9	62.2
1948	102.8	104.1	57.8
1949	101.8	100.0	58.3
1950	102.8	101.2	57.8
1951	111.0	112.6	53.5
1952	113.5	114.6	52.3
1953	114.4	112.8	51.9
1954	114.8	112.6	51.7
1955	114.5	110.9	51.9
1956	116.2	111.7	51.1
1957	120.2	115.4	49.4
1958	123.5	120.3	48.1
1959	124.6	118.3	47.7
1960	126.5	119.7	47.0
1961	127.8	121.0	46.5
Selected months:			
1946—June	79.8	72.1	74.4
1950—June	101.8	100.5	58.3
1952—December	114.1	113.8	52.1
1958—December	123.7	118.7	48.0
1959—December	125.5	117.8	47.3
1960—December	[2] 127.5	121.4	46.6
1961—June	[2] 127.6	120.9	46.6
July	[2] 128.1	122.0	46.4
August	128.0	121.2	46.4
September	[2] 128.3	121.1	46.3
October	[2] 128.4	120.9	46.3
November	128.3	120.3	46.3
December	128.2	120.4	46.3
1962—January	128.2	121.0	46.3
February	[2] 128.6	121.7	46.2
March	[2] 128.8	121.8	46.1
April	[2] 129.1	122.0	46.0
May	129.1	121.8	46.0
June	[2] 129.2	122.1	46.0
July	[2] 129.4	122.5	45.9

[1] As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.
[2] New record high.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Debt Analysis, Aug. 28, 1962.

THE BUDGET AND GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

Some years ago a new fiscal doctrine came into vogue in peacetime Federal budgets. Simply expressed, it was a policy to the effect that the Treasury's books ought to be balanced over a cycle of economic ups and downs; that it was acceptable to borrow money in order to spend more than we took in in times of recession provided we repaid it when the recession ended, and prosperity returned. Administrations embraced the policy and Congress as a whole did not reject it.

But the policy has not proved to be effective. It has failed. We have been receiving bigger and bigger expenditure recommendations from the executive branch throughout the ups and downs. And larger and larger appropriations in response. There has been no surplus left to pay what we borrowed to meet the higher expenditures when Treasury income was falling. So the policy has not been practiced and no longer serves to justify failure to live within our income—to pay as we go along.

There is now a growing tendency to explain, to justify ever-increasing budgets in statistical relationship to the gross national product—the national production of goods and services; growth of the product justifies growth of the budget. Similar comparison of the enlarged, and constantly enlarging Federal debt tends to obscure, to minimize the situation. Obviously, steady growth of population generates more demands, requires a larger volume of total public services, and boosts the national product. But it cannot justify living beyond our means or unwillingness to tax ourselves to pay the cost. And the official figures unerringly disclose that we have refused to accept the idea—through the last several economic cycles of ups and downs.

The tabulation included below shows that budget spending has kept pace with the rising national product—122 percent to 121 percent, using the tentative figure for 1962. But the Federal debt, on the same basis, rose $45.4 billion. And it is going up again in the current fiscal year. The policy did not work. And the cost of living has risen 27 percent in the same period. The buying power of the dollar—every paycheck, every savings account, every bond, every pension—dropped by 21 percent; just since 1949—the 1939 dollar is now worth less than 46 cents.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we fail to pay our way—when we live beyond income—when we pay for immediate necessities by borrowing from the distant future, as we have been doing and continue to do, then we find ourselves in difficulty. Khrushchev is waiting for us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy. No government can indefinitely spend more than it takes in without risking disaster.

Gross national product, budget expenditures, surplus or deficit, cost of living increase, and declining value of the dollar, 1949–62

[In billions of dollars where applicable]

Year (calendar or fiscal as noted)	GNP in then current prices (calendar year)	GNP in 1961 prices (calendar year)	Net budget expenditures (fiscal year)		Surplus or deficit (fiscal year)	Federal debt (end of fiscal year)	Consumer's price index (1947–49=100)	Purchasing power of dollar (1939=100 cents)
			Amount	As percent of GNP				
1949	$258.1	$337.6	$39.5	15.3	−$1.8	$252.8	101.8	58.3
1950	284.6	365.6	39.5	13.9	−3.1	257.4	102.8	57.8
1951	329.0	395.8	44.0	13.4	+3.5	255.2	111.0	53.5
1952	347.0	411.1	65.3	18.8	−4.0	259.1	113.5	52.3
1953	365.4	429.9	74.1	20.3	−9.4	266.1	114.4	51.9
1954	363.1	421.2	67.5	18.6	−3.1	271.3	114.8	51.7
1955	397.5	454.1	64.4	16.2	−4.2	274.4	114.5	51.9
1956	419.2	463.8	66.2	15.8	+1.6	272.8	116.2	51.1
1957	442.8	472.6	69.0	15.6	+1.6	270.5	120.2	49.4
1958	444.5	465.1	71.4	16.1	−2.8	276.3	123.5	48.1
1959	482.7	496.2	80.3	16.6	−12.4	284.7	124.6	47.7
1960	503.4	500.4	76.5	15.2	+1.2	286.3	126.5	47.0
1961	518.7	518.7	81.5	15.7	−3.9	289.0	127.8	46.5
1962	[1] 570.0	[2] 545.6	87.7	15.4	−6.3	298.2	[3] 129.4	[4] 45.9
Change	+121%	----------	+122%	----------	−43.1	+45.4	+27%	−21%

[1] From 1963 budget message—original fiscal 1963 budget revenue estimates are based on attaining this rate in calendar 1962. Second quarter rate was $552.0 billion.
[2] Second quarter rate.
[3] July 1962; new record high.
[4] July 1962; new record low.

Sources: Various official documents.

In the final analysis, the key question is, Do we owe more or do we owe less—regardless of the amount spent or for what spent? Here again, as some say, Federal debt, on a per person basis, has dropped since World War II. True, because the population has grown faster than the Federal debt. Simple arithmetic. But there is only one population; the same population also owes the State and local government debts; the same population has only one pocket, one paycheck from which to support all levels of government expense and all levels of public debt. And according to available published figures, on a per person basis and despite a rising population, the American people owed four times more total public debt in 1960 than they did in 1940; they owed more in 1960 than in 1950; and more in 1960 than in 1953.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as will be noted, and as a conclusive reminder of the results of our profligacy, and of our precarious and worsening financial situation, foreign holders of our dollars and claims on our gold have been calling for gold. They are apprehensive. We cannot expect them to maintain faith in our dollar when we ourselves so heedlessly and so consistently continue to depreciate it. It is our dollar; not theirs. If we will not respect its traditional value, neither will they.

The President's state of the Union address to Congress at the beginning of this session ranked inflation in the forefront of the enemies of freedom. He also submitted a budget in balance—precariously, tenuously, it is true, but nonetheless slightly in balance. And he urged the cooperation of the Congress to keep it in balance. Of course, like so many past budgets, its balance was prospectively arrived at; it rested on estimated uncertainties as to revenues. Like so many past budgets, it violated rules of prudence by failing to allow clear safety margins as a hedge against overoptimism. For months the financial writers and market analysts have been saying we would incur another deficit. It is now clear—and universally conceded—that we will close the fiscal year again deeply in the red. In the last 8 years, 1955–62, final results, for a variety of reasons, varied from original budget predictions and recommendations by over $28 billion—that much deeper than had been originally budgeted.

Jefferson's admonition is particularly applicable in this emergency:

> I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy.

Mr. Speaker, but for the indefatigable labor and sound business judgment of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber] and others who have stood with him during his 40 years of dedicated service to the reduction of the budgets, the national debt, frightening and dangerous as it is—the national debt would be even billions and billions higher today. When the gentleman from New York, John Taber, came to the House in 1923, the national debt was $22 billion. Today it is $302 billion—and going higher.

When John Taber came to the House in 1923, the annual expenditure of the Government was $3 billion. Today it is $115 billion—and going higher.

When John Taber came to the House in 1923, there were 536,000 Federal employees. Today there are 2,514,000—and there will be more.

The inescapable consequences in store for us if this trend continues indefinitely are unpredictable. In this situation we are not in position to further expand the Federal establishment or undertake additional obligations beyond those absolutely essential. On the contrary it is high time we took carefully considered measures to retrench expenditures, put in motion efforts to reduce surplus activities, reduce the cost of living, and adopt a program for methodical and periodical reduction of the public debt.

RETIRING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that we are now approaching the closing hours of the 87th Congress and certainly I do not want to delay the adjournment which I understand will be put into its initial stages very soon. But I want to take this opportunity to say that all of us, I am sure, are saddened by the thought that we are completing our last day in the House with many colleagues on both sides of the aisle who will not be with us when the 88th Congress convenes in January.

Included in this group are many, many close friends of mine—able, fine, and effective Members of the House—whose departure from these Halls is a sorrowing prospect. On our side of the aisle alone there are 23 Members who will not be with us next year. Most of them are leaving voluntarily after long and distinguished careers of service to the Nation. Some are aspiring to other offices. All will be greatly missed.

Mr. Speaker, I could reminisce at length about each and every one of them, but if I did so I am afraid, as some of us have feared, we would be here until the snow flies.

In the interests of time, therefore, I am simply going to call the roll of our departing Republican colleagues and their terms of distinguished service.

Leading the list is the venerable and beloved John Taber, of New York, former chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, with 40 years—or 20 terms—of very valuable service in this House of Representatives.

Next in line are the able Members, Clare Hoffman, of Michigan, with 14 terms and my old and dear friend, Noah Mason, of Illinois, with 13 terms.

The roll continues with—

Robert Chiperfield, of Illinois, and H. Carl Andersen, of Minnesota, with 12 terms. Both of them have served with distinction here.

James Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania, 11 terms.

Chester Merrow, of New Hampshire, 10 terms.

Carroll Kearns, of Pennsylvania, 8 terms.

Marguerite Church, of Illinois, and Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., of Connecticut, 6 terms.

Laurence Curtis, of Massachusetts, John Ray, of New York, and Gordon Scherer, of Ohio, 5 terms.

Perkins Bass, of New Hampshire, and Phil Weaver, of Nebraska, 4 terms.

Edwin Dooley, of New York, 3 terms.

Jessica Weis, of New York, 2 terms.

Peter Dominick, of Colorado, Edwin Durno, of Oregon, Peter Garland, of Maine, Walter McVey, of Kansas, Louise Reece, of Tennessee, and William Scranton, of Pennsylvania, 1 term.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak not only for myself but for all of my Republican colleagues, and I am quite sure our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, when I say to these friends of ours who will not be with us next time, "We'll miss you. Good luck and God bless you in the years ahead."

THE 2D SESSION OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished minority leader in his tribute to retiring Members. I want particularly to pay tribute to my Democratic colleagues who will not be with us next year. They are: Representative Burr P. Harrison, of Virginia; Representative Merwin Coad, of Iowa; Representative Morgan Moulder, of Missouri; Representative Daniel Brewster, of Maryland; Representative Sidney Yates, of Illinois; Representative Fred Marshall, of Minnesota; Representative Daniel Inouye, of Hawaii; Representative Brent Spence, of Kentucky; Representative Iris F. Blitch, of Georgia; Representative Catherine Norrell, of Arkansas; Representative Corinne Riley, of South Carolina; Representative Gracie Pfost, of Idaho; Representative Victor Anfuso, of New York; Representative Kathryn Granahan, of Pennsylvania; Representative Frank Boykin, of Alabama; Representative Frank Smith, of Mississippi; Representative Frank Kowalski, of Connecticut; Representative Harold McSween, of Louisiana; Representative Dale Alford, of Arkansas; Representative James Frazier, of Tennessee; Representative Herbert Zelenko, of New York; Representative James C. Davis, of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 87th Congress has been notable in many respects and in its waning hours I should like to comment very briefly and generally concerning those events and the great personalities which carried them forward. Although we have been constrained to spend more time in session than is usual, and at considerable sacrifice for many of our Members, I believe we can now lay down our burdens secure in the knowledge that we have met our legislative obligations to the best of our ability and that the record of this session bears the stamp of solid accomplishment in many vital areas, both domestic and foreign.

The House now concludes its first year of operation under the guidance of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker McCormack, whose leadership has been ably and adroitly executed during the past 10 months. His performance during this time of stress and unprecedented challenge has been outstanding. His reputation as one of the truly great Speakers of this House is sealed with the record of this session. I extend my personal thanks to the Speaker for the many, many considerations he has shown me. I believe my appreciation also expresses the sense of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

The Speaker loves and seeks to serve with fairness and dedication every Member of the House. As the devoted leader of his party he has given skilled effort and tireless attention to the great program of President Kennedy.

The leadership is deeply in the debt of its Democratic whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] and his assistant whips, for the truly magnificent work they have done during this session. They have been extremely accurate in their polls on legislative matters. For outstanding and devoted assistance on so many occasions, I personally am deeply indebted to my friend and coworker, the gentleman from Louisiana, Hale Boggs.

I can find no adequate words to give full expression to the gratitude I feel toward all the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, for the many kindnesses they have shown me. Members of my own party have given me support and help of a measure far greater than I could have hoped to receive.

My Republican friends have shown me innumerable courtesies. I extend my thanks to all of them and particularly to their distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck] and to the very able minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends]. They have been most kind and considerate to me in all personal matters and in all matters involving the efficient and orderly operation of the House. They are great Americans and I am happy to say they are my personal friends.

Without the cooperation and statesmanship of the minority leadership the course of this House would have been far less stable, and far less productive in the very vital areas of our national defense and foreign policy. For if we are divided by political ideology, we are united by mutual recognition of our common purpose to serve our people and our country above all else.

The Members of the House have given lavishly to this body and to the Nation, of the best of their talents, almost entirely of their time, and with superb determination to meet the myriad challenges and problems which have faced them constantly during this session.

The Members of the House, its officers, and employees, all have given tireless devotion and effort during this long and arduous session. Our Parliamentarian, Lew Deshler, whose workday and workload are exceeded only by his great talents and knowledge, was ill for a few days last week but we are fortunate now to have him back among us during the closing hours of this session. Lew Deschler has no peer in his field. His services are essential to the functioning of the House. He has been a bulwark of strength not only in his capacity as the leading parliamentarian of the world but as a wise and experienced servant of this House. He has through every hour of every session been the strong, indispensable right arm of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

I hope that the months ahead will bring opportunity for rest and relaxation for the Members and officers and employees, all of whom have worked hard and deserve a time away from their strenuous routines. Again I thank you for your friendship and your help. I wish for each and every one of you good health and good fortune, in the present and in the future.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 835

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some further communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members on the part of the House of the committee to notify the President the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck].

NATIONAL FISHERIES CENTER AND AQUARIUM ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(a), Public Law 87-758, the Chair appoints as members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen].

WORK PLANS RECOMMENDED UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

October 11, 1962.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Executive Communication No.	Committee approval
Alabama	Town Creek	2289	Oct. 2, 1962
Delaware and Pennsylvania	Brandywine Creek	2424	Do.
Georgia	Tobesofkee Creek (supplemental)	2535	Do.
Kansas	Twin Caney	2424	Do.
Oklahoma	Upper Blue River	2289	Do.
Do	Cottonwood Creek	2535	Do.
Do	Delaware Creek	2535	Do.
Pennsylvania	Sandy Creek	2424	Do.
South Carolina	Thicketty Creek	2280	Do.
Texas	Salado Creek	2424	Do.
Do	Valley Creek	2424	Do.
Wyoming	Boulder Lake	2572	Do.

Sincerely yours,

Charles A. Buckley,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

MATTER OF CONSCIENCE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the Cuban ransom blackmail deal, it is becoming more evident that the attempt to raise moneys, foodstuffs, and medicines to be turned over to Castro to help keep him in power, could properly be described as a "Kennedy Conscience Fund" for the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion. The following editorial from the Tampa Tribune in my district indicates that this is what that newspaper thinks, which is in support of what I have been saying:

Matter of Conscience

The more that leaks out about the proposed ransoming of the 1,113 Cuban invasion prisoners, the worse the deal looks for the United States.

All the signs suggest that the ransom is not only approved by President Kennedy but that most of the food, medicine, and money handed over to Fidel Castro will come from

American taxpayers. Nobody knows what the final agreement may call for but Castro originally demanded $62 million; if he knows that the President is behind the negotiations, he is not likely to settle for less.

And Castro can hardly fail to know.

The New York World-Telegram said yesterday that the American negotiator, New York lawyer James B. Donovan, was given the assignment last June by none other than Attorney General Robert Kennedy.

An earlier tipoff came in a column by Joseph Alsop, published on this page Tuesday. Alsop, who is close to the Kennedys, said in effect that the President had decided to ransom the prisoners as a matter of conscience, because he was responsible for the bungled invasion.

A further clue is the fact that the committee of Cuban exiles which for some months has been attempting to raise the ransom money by private donation has had little success. The only fairy godmother with the equivalent of $60 million to drop in the pot is the Federal Government. The money presumably could be taken from the funds of the Central Intelligence Agency, which makes no public accounting of its spending.

Now, we have deep sympathy for the 1,113 captives and all the thousands of less-publicized prisoners rotting in Castro's jails. We also can appreciate President Kennedy's lacerations of conscience, from the nagging knowledge that his denial of air support wrecked the invasion and caused the capture of most of the little army of freedom fighters.

But there are more than the welfare of prisoners and the mental comfort of the President to consider.

There are, for example, the national honor and the campaign to free Cuba from communism.

Our prestige suffered enough from the Bay of Pigs defeat, when the world's mightiest nation permitted itself to be humiliated by a Red dwarf. What will Latin America and the rest of the world think of our now buying back the prisoners—instead of rescuing them at gunpoint?

Even worse, perhaps, in the world's view will be the inconsistency of threatening to penalize Allied countries whose ships carry cargoes to Cuba at the very time our Government is preparing to ship to Castro invaluable supplies of food and medicine. Who can understand such a violent contradiction in declared policy?

We are reminded of President Kennedy's stirring words in announcing the failure of the invasion in April 1961. Speaking sternly of the necessity for resolute action to maintain freedom in this hemisphere, he said "the complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies will be swept away with the debris of history."

Ransoming the prisoners, we submit, is the course of softness. Unless the President begins to meet the Cuban problem with some of the promised toughness of spirit, more of free Latin America will become debris on the Red tide. And Mr. Kennedy then will have on his conscience not 1,113 prisoners but millions.

UNANIMOUS OPPOSITION EXPRESSED TO BLACKMAIL RANSOM PROPOSALS BY CASTRO TO FREE CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, with the negotiations of James Donovan with Castro for the payment of $62 million in foodstuffs and medicine to Castro, public indignation over these negotiations by a private citizen, apparently committing the United States, and certainly under authority of the U.S. Government, has resulted in expressions from all over the country of indignation.

This appeasement is to be compared to strong language over Cuba used in the 1960 campaign, which I set out hereafter:

J.F.K.'S BIG 1960 PROMISES ABOUT CUBA

In the light of developments of the past 20 months, there is a hollow sound to J.F.K.'s glowing promises about Cuba, made when he was seeking the Presidency in 1960. Why not write a "letter to the editor" using these quotations? Here are a few of them:

"I want people to wake up all over the world in the next years and wonder not what Mr. Khrushchev is doing or what Mr. Castro is doing. I want them to wonder what the United States is doing."—Candidate J.F.K., Queens, N.Y, October 27, 1960.

"Mr. Nixon hasn't mentioned Cuba very prominently in this campaign. He talks about standing firm in Berlin, standing firm in the Far East, standing up to Khrushchev, but he never mentions standing firm in Cuba—and if you can't stand up to Castro, how can you be expected to stand up to Khrushchev?"—Candidate J.F.K., Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960.

"We must let Mr. Castro know that we do not intend to be pushed around any longer and in particular do not intend to be pushed out of our naval base at Guantanamo or denied fair compensation for American property he has seized."—Candidate J.F.K., Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960.

"We must let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere."—Candidate J.F.K., Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960.

"I am not satisfied to have the hand of the Communists move 3,000 miles from East Berlin to our former good neighbor in Cuba, only 90 miles from the coast of Florida, only 8 minutes by jet."—Candidate J.F.K., Washington, D.C., September 20, 1960.

"If communism should obtain a permanent foothold in Latin America then the balance of power would move against us and peace would be even more insecure."—Candidate J.F.K., New York City, September 14, 1960.

I include some examples of the expressions of indignation for the RECORD in the hope that the administration will withdraw its support of this effort, the only result of which can be the support of communism and Castro—consistent with 1960 promises:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
October 11, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: Congratulations on your stand and belief regarding the Cuban prisoner exchange deal. I consider this about the lowest possible thing that I know of for our President to sanction and encourage this blackmail and bribery. Thanking you for your stand and please keep fighting.

Z. V. ROSSER.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

DEAR SIR: We agree with you in keeping the U.S. taxpayers money out of the Cuban ransom deal.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. GRAFTON COCHRAN, Jr.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR BILL: Just to let you know we are backing you in your efforts against negotiations being performed by Donovan.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS A. and DOROTHY B. KIRK.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We concur with your estimate of the Cuban prisoner exchange deal; we think it does, too, in other words. To have arranged the exchange of Abel for Powers is a poor recommendation for New York Attorney James B. Donovan; it's downright suspicious, in fact. What about the Cuban children who have been shipped to Russia, Red China, and other Communist countries? Is anybody trying to effect their release?

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. H. M. THOMPSON.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am backing you in your stand against negotiations being performed by Donovan, a private individual, trading with Cuba, an enemy country. This is contrary, I believe, to the Logan Act.

Sincerely,
HELEN M. BOSWORTH.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: What is all this talk about this James Donovan making deals with Castro for the prisoners held there? And who has authorized him to do so?

If I am not mistaken it was decided some time ago we would not be held up to pay ransom to that bearded butcher.

Has this matter of James Donovan making deals with Castro been discussed on Capitol Hill at this time—or is it none of the business of our Congressmen and Senators these days? Soon, at the rate we are going, we will not need our elected Members of Congress and Senators.

I would say the administration's leadership is talking out of both sides of their mouth and what is more in the act of blocking his country with one hand and handing him great quantities of food, medicine, and of all things money—taxpayers' money. How asinine.

Khrushchev will not have to bury us with such stupid leadership carrying out such deals. We are bankrupting our Nation and tearing it down morally with such lowbrow leadership these days.

With every good wish.

Very sincerely,
ELIZABETH DAVIS.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER: Have been reading about Donovan going to Cuba to offer food and drugs in exchange for the Cuban prisoners. Seems this would be a big help to the enemy who could so easily ship it to Russia, and the Cuban people would have no good of it. How mixed up can the State Department and others in Washington get?

We are certainly backing you in your stand against this, as well as other ways you are fighting communism.

Yours truly,
Mrs. MABEL KINSEY.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: We are backing you all the way regarding Donovan, a private individual, trading with Cuba. The Cuban situation is most alarming and we hope the most drastic measures possible will be taken to oust the Russians from our doorstep. It is better to risk and even have war now than later on when we are isolated.

Thank you for the fine job you always do as our Congressman.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT E. BAYLEY.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: I commend you highly on trying to bring out the hidden facts regarding the administration's role regarding its part in the release of Cuban prisoners. Food—medicine or money—what's the difference in blackmail? Let's keep America's image high—not lower it.

Very truly,

Mrs. RUSSELL G. LUDWIG.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Florida.

DEAR SIR: I am in full accord with your demand for a congressional investigation that the U.S. Government may pay part of the ransom for Cuban invasion prisoners, if we pay this ranson or "blackmail" to the Castro government this Nation will have to hang its head in shame forever. There is too much double talking about what we will do, but never do, as President Kennedy said, no one should doubt our resolution in Laos, but the picture is that Laos has gone to the Communists. So let's begin to say a few things we mean and back our words with action if necessary in any way that will bring results.

Yours respectfully,

HARRY M. HOBROCK.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM CRAMER,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: We wholeheartedly agree with your views on the Cuban prisoner deal. We admire you for having the intestinal fortitude to fight this disgraceful blackmail. It does one's heart good to know that we have one who is not afraid to fight for the rights of "The American citizen." We pray that you will succeed in your fight and wish you success in doing so.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. HENRY J. PLATE.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER: I have been reading with interest and concern about the proposed ransoming of the Bay of Pigs prisoners.

It would be a terrible mistake to give the enemy any succor. In the first place, people who feel strong enough about dictatorship and oppression to fight are the last to ask or approve any aid to the enemy. It is natural that relatives and loved ones, as well as our heart, ask that the prisoners be rescued but this is total war with communism.

Secondly, it doesn't make sense to give dollars and medicine with the right hand and then organize a blockade with the left.

Encourage the President to enforce a complete embargo on trade with Cuba but don't vote for or authorize one red cent, public or private, for Communist Castro's Cuba.

Respectfully offered,

FRED M. WHITAKER.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: May I extend my compliments upon your stand in connection with the Donovan deal.

I do not see how we can have a policy which asks the Greeks, the Swedes, the Norwegians and the British to withhold commerce from Cuba and, at the same time, even as ransom, permit the giving of more probably give (with taxpayer's money), $62 million worth of food and drugs.

All reports in the press and elsewhere indicate that our South American neighbors have lost respect for our policy, due to our wavering on the Cuba situation. If this deal is permitted to go through, surely it cannot help but further lower our prestige there, if, indeed, it has not sunk below any recognizable level.

Yours sincerely,

BLAKE MORE GODWIN.

Thank you Congressman CRAMER for probing the Donovan-King John infamy.

How do the people of Florida put up with this punk in the W.H.?

MARIE HANNON.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

DEAR BILL: I am with you 100 percent on the Cuba situation.

The people of Florida and the Nation will certainly be shocked should this Government allow itself to be blackmailed into contributing 1 penny toward the release of prisoners who by now have become thoroughly brainwashed.

What is wrong with our Government, especially our State Department?

Sincerely,

C. B. O'NEAL.

HOMESTEAD, FLA., *October 11, 1962.*

Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Even though my grandfather would turn in his grave and I will also before I recognize Republicanism, please continue to hold the Democrats feet to the fire on the Donovan intervention.

HARRY R. KNIGHT.

GAINESVILLE, FLA.,
October 11, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Millions for fish tanks, nothing for human lives.

E. M. SOLOMON.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
October 12, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your stand against Communist blackmail. Keep up the good fight against the appeasers who are selling out America and the Constitution.

JOHN MASSEY.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
October 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.:

Backing you to limit on your stand on Donovan exchange of prisoners.

FLORENCE M. CAMERON.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
October 10, 1962.

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Washington, D.C.:

I am backing you wholeheartedly on the Donovan issue.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. G. BRIDGES.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
October 10, 1962.

Congressman WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Backing you 100 percent on stand on Donovan as private individual trading with Cuba.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. LEE JEAN WELLS.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My friends and neighbors and all the members of the Women's Republican Club of St. Petersburg, Fla., are certainly backing you in the position you have taken regarding the supersecret negotiations being performed by James B. Donovan, a private citizen, in connection with the release of 1,113 invasion prisoners in Cuba—this contrary to the Logan Act.

We admire your fighting spirit in this respect—keep it up.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The 1,113 Cubans would not now be prisoners if you had met your commitment to provide air cover at the Bay of Pigs.

Now you are trying to remedy one small part of the results of your error by buying the release of the 1,113. What are you doing to liberate the other 6 million Cubans?

I object to the expenditure of taxpayers' money to pay blackmail.

I object to expedients such as this which will further make a laughingstock of this country.

I object to continued appeasement surrounded by noble talk.

Effective action is needed: and if you do something effective, the whole country will support you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. SALMON.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The 1,113 Cubans would not now be prisoners if you had met your commitment to provide air cover at the Bay of Pigs.

Now you are trying to remedy one small part of the results of your error by buying the release of the 1,113. What are you doing to liberate the other 6 million Cubans?

I object to the expenditure of taxpayers' money to pay blackmail.

I object to expedients such as this which will further make a laughingstock of this country.

I object to continued appeasement surrounded by noble talk.

Effective action is needed; and if you do something effective, the whole country will support you.

Very truly yours,

JOHN T. SALMON.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are backing you all the way in regard to the Donovan case—a private individual trading with Cuba.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. MARGARET T. BANTING.

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Representative of the State of Florida,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: With a full realization of time consumption of correspondence, I hesitate to write. However, there is a point that keeps coming to my mind, which is this: If our Congress is going to allow the Supreme Court (known sometimes as a school board) "to rewrite the Constitution to conform to the spirit of the times and to take into account sociological, if not ideological changes" (quote editorial—U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 1, 1962), I say again, If this is going to be, then also apply the spirit of times to the judges. The Supreme Court judges should be elected by the people. Again, I repeat, if they are going to write the laws (and be a school board), they should have to come before the people for election.

One other question, Does our Congress of the United States of America believe the 14th amendment changes the 10th amendment?

Stop Castro somehow.

It is with regret you will not be our Representative in 1963. We wish you well and keep plugging.

Very cordially yours,

J. E. BARBER.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is to advise you that my husband and I are against the negotiations being performed by James B. Donovan, a private individual trading with Cuba. We heartily approve of your stand in this matter. How can we expect cooperation of our allies by stopping trade with Cuba?

Good luck in your fight.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. WILLIAM E. FILES.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: I am backing you to the limit in your stand against the method being used for the release of the Cuban prisoners.

Sincerely,

MARY D. BROWN.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Your telegram to President Kennedy was a very apt and needful one in connection with the matter of ransoming the folks in Cuba. It is so strange why the administration goes about so many things in such half-cocked, blundering and ill-advised ways which, very obviously, will not pan out, or creates such bad impressions abroad and at home.

Respectfully,

OSCAR E. LANCASTER.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: My husband and I are backing you 100 percent in your opposition to the secretly arranged exchange (by Donovan) of surplus food and medicine for Cuban prisoners.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. R. B. LUTH.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

MR. CRAMER: Thank you for your courageous and forthright stand against this most recent "deal". I am constantly reminded of the old Americanism "Millions for Defense But Not One Cent for Tribute."

Your vigilance appreciated—and honored.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY COBB.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: I wholeheartedly support your views against the embarrassing situation in which our Government has become involved in the "money for prisoners deal" with Fidel Castro.

I deeply appreciate the position in which you have placed yourself politically by taking this stand and I want you to know that I am with you 100 percent, and if there is anything possible that I can do to help you in this coming campaign, do not hesitate to call on me.

Yours very truly,

W. A. BORDERS.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I, speaking for myself only, do feel you are so right on your stand against negotiations being made with Castro by Attorney James B. Donovan for release of 1,113 invasion prisoners. Seems to me that is not the duty of a private individual in our country, to negotiate with another country. Where are our elected officials? What deals, or concessions are being made?

Seems to me our President is taking every possible way to circumvent our legislative bodies on every issue in which he can't have his own way.

Best wishes to you in this fight.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: Supporting and backing you regarding Mr. Donovan exchange of surplus food and medicines for Cuban prisoners. Have written to President Kennedy protesting this action by Mr. Donovan.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY B. FOUTS.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
October 10, 1962.

Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Women's Republican Club of St. Petersburg, 1,970 members strong, back you to the limit in fight against private negotiations with Castro. Wires being sent to Dean Rusk and President Kennedy.

MRS. JOHN T. SALMON.

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: It is obvious that Fidel Castro, Ernesto Guevara and their associates in the Cuban Government are so firmly imbued with Communist doctrine that nothing short of force can cause them to change their position.

This being so, it is useless to hope for any improvement in relations with that government. They will continue to employ every means within their power to further the cause of communism and to set back the cause of the free world.

If the Castro government is to be dislodged, force must be employed. The U.S. Government has committed itself to refrain from using force in this matter. Rulers of the member nations of the Organization of American States are not eager to accept the social reforms implicit in all-out opposition to communism since they feel their position is stable so long as they have the support of the military, hence their support of the use of concerted force against the Castro government will be nominal, at best. The Cuban exiles are the ones who have lost the most from actions of the Castro government and who stand to gain the most from the dislodgement of the Castro Communist regime. Being intimately concerned, they will fight the hardest to restore Cuba to the free world.

It is therefore respectfully suggested that a Cuban government-in-exile be recognized as the logical and most effective means for the elimination of the Castro Communist tyranny and the restoration of civil rights to the oppressed peoples of Cuba.

Respectfully,

ROBERT O. WILKINSON, B.S.

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I thoroughly approve of Congressman CRAMER's opposition to the Cuban negotiations. I have bitterly opposed them from the start.

Since when do you negotiate with the enemy?

Since when do Christians negotiate with the Devil?

Is Florida to be a second Pearl Harbor? It was your kind who created the first, idiotic parties to raise money for the Kennedy gang; this is more important than protecting decent American citizens, isn't it?

How much do you care for our beloved men rotting in Red Chinese prisons? In North Korea too and even Russia's slave labor camps?

Donovan's wheeling and dealing is a vicious violation of the Logan Act, but perhaps you are like Fulbright, Schlesinger et al and think "the people are too dumb to know," Powers and Able should have stayed where they were. We are at war.

Why do you lie and claim this is a private deal when we know it is our own tax money the CIA will hand over?

PT–109 indeed:

"Know therefore that Jehovah thy God, He is God, the faithful God, who keepth covenant and loving kindness with them that love Him and keep His Commandments to a thousand generations."

——— ———.

Hon. WILLIAM CRAMER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: A goodly number of us are grateful to you for your strong position against our Government's paying blood-money to Communist Castro for his unfortunate captives.

I entreat you to continue in your effort to prevent such weak and cowardly action with every resource at your command, assured that the American people are prepared to provide you with moral, intellectual and emotional support.

The lives of those freedom fighters are too precious to be paid for in gold, and the United States of America must not do business in any case with unprincipled barbarians.

Yours truly,

MARY B. SNYDER.

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

Mr. WILLIAM CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. CRAMER: The writer wishes to congratulate you on the stand you have taken on sending a wire to our President to pick up the $60 million tab. This is the taxpayers' money and I, as one, do not see that our Government should give them (Commies) any food or drugs. What about our own boys in Russia and China that are suffering behind the Commies' curtains.

I think the American public should stand up and demand of our Government, who is paying this blackmail. At this time there is a lot of talk about the release of these prisoners, but there is nothing said about the $60 million Castro demands for their release.

From my understanding of our Government this issue should be brought before our Congress.

Thanks for reading this.

Sincerely,

V. J. HENKE.

TRI-CITY HARBOR, LAKE COUNTY, IND.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks we have heard considerable remarks on the House floor regarding the Burns Ditch Harbor on the south shore of Lake Michigan in Indiana.

We have also heard from the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman Ray J. Madden, regarding the practical advantages of the construction of the tricity port harbor adjacent to Hammond, East Chicago, and Whiting, Ind., in Lake County. The following letter from Mr. R. J. Smith, chairman, Rivers and Harbors Committee of the Hammond Chamber of Commerce contributes some solid information regarding the advantages of a harbor location in an area where three steel mills are already operating and several hundred more small industries could take advantage of the new harbor construction.

I am extending my remarks to include the following letters from the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the Hammond Chamber of Commerce:

October 10, 1962.

Editorial Page Editor,
Gary Post Tribune,
Gary, Ind.

Dear Sir: Your editorial of October 7 condemns the tricity port as a smokescreen attempt to defeat Burns Harbor and as impracticable. This is not only harsh but grossly inaccurate.

Professional opinion in behalf of the tricity port site is impressive. Prof. Harold Mayer, waterway and urban authority of the University of Chicago and author of an authoritative book on the St. Lawrence Seaway has endorsed this site as feasible. Morris N. Quade, consulting engineer and waterway expert of New York of the firm of Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Quade, and Douglas, has supported this Hammond, Whiting, East Chicago port in his professional capacity and as a member of a professional group that has made engineering studies of this site.

The proposed tricity harbor would be formed by connecting existing breakwaters at Indiana Harbor and at the Illinois-Indiana line with 4 miles of new breakwater. This would enclose a harbor area approximately 6 miles long and 2 miles wide which would allow 4,800 acres behind the breakwater for industrial and harbor development by fill methods. Engineering study shows that the 4,800 acres can be filled by low-cost methods that are economically compatible with its intended use.

The most important advantage of the tricity site is that it is the only site on any of the five Great Lakes that can act as a common terminal for the ocean vessels of the St. Lawrence Seaway and barges of the Mississippi-gulf barge system.

Congressman Ray Madden, of the Lake County congressional districts, the mayors of the four major cities of the county, the city councils of Hammond, Whiting, and East Chicago, the county commissioners of Lake County, Ind., major industries and labor unions in this county, including one of our largest steel mills and one of our largest unions, and the chambers of commerce of Hammond and East Chicago have all supported the tricity port study. This concerted effort led by Congressman Madden has been successful. Both House of the U.S. Congress have now passed an appropriation in the amount of $50,000 for the first year of a 3-year feasibility study by the Corps of Army Engineers of the tricity site. A tricity harbor and industrial development has enormous significance for Lake County to restore high employment.

Many industries have left Lake County in recent years. Between 1957 and 1962 manufacturing jobs in Hammond alone have suffered a 20-percent reduction. Layoffs of Lake County steelworkers reach 50 percent all too frequently. The Lake County steel district area is classified as a depressed area by the U.S. Bureau of Labor. Unemployment in Gary, Hammond, and East Chicago, is 7.3 percent, the highest for any of the seven major manufacturing districts in the State. By comparison, unemployment in the State is 4.8 percent; Indianapolis, 4.2 percent; and South Bend, 4.4 percent.

An economically depressed area in a county of 514,000 people is not only a local problem but a national one. Tricity port offers an unparalled industrial opportunity for Lake County and the State of Indiana.

What does the proposed Burns Harbor offer to the Nation and the State? To the one steel mill now there (and no other steel mill has committed itself to building) the proposed Burns Harbor would be an outright subsidy and that steel mill would gain over 90 percent of the benefits. New and automated steel mills produce the same amount of steel with a fraction of the manpower. The manpower requirement per ton in an automated mill is estimated to be one-fourth that of an older mill. A new automated steel center at Burns Harbor made possible through a Federal grant of $26 million and State revenue bond financing of $38 million would further depress employment in the Lake County industrial area, Hammond through Gary.

The one steel company now located at Burns Ditch can build its own slips and docks as did the Gary mills. By so doing, its present commitment would be protected and it would not gain an unfair competitive advantage over other local steel mills.

The proponents of the tricity port rest their case on the merits of that location subject to confirmation by the now assured feasibility survey by the Army Engineers. This culminates an effort that goes back almost 50 years. A smokescreen doesn't have that kind of endurance, however diverting it may be as a rhetorical symbol.

R. J. Smith.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON NARCOTIC AND DRUG ABUSE

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. The White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse has completed its conference—an official transcript of the conference is not available at this time. Dr. Lois L. Higgins, because of her specialized practical knowledge at all levels of this ugly subject received an invitation from the President, John Kennedy, to attend and participate in the discussions. The President realizes that there is no greater human problem confronting our Nation. Medical authority, sociologists, police experts, penologists, psychiatrists, and welfare authorities have studied this subject in all of its phases. Judges of the courts and enforcement officers and prosecutors have discussed and debated the various theories on what are the best procedures to deal with the addicts, pusher-users, and pushers of dope. Hospitalization facilities and related curative methods have been tested and experimented over the years.

We hope that the Conference through its open discussion of the various phases of this problem will make further contributions to control of narcotics both in the habit and suppression of the traffic. Ultimately a cure will be found—meantime the treatment of the victim as a diseased person or incarceration as a felon or law violator must be determined by Federal statutes. We are anxious to review the discussions and findings of the Conference in order as legislators to aid us in our determinations. We are proud of those in attendance at the Conference and applaud and praise their efforts in their dedication to solve this problem for the health and happiness of these unfortunates and the alleviation of the anxieties of their families. We are indebted to Dr. Lois Higgins' report and congratulate her in her great career herein:

Report on the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse

(By Lois L. Higgins)

On May 29, 1962, the Honorable John F. Kennedy issued a statement announcing that a White House Conference on Narcotics would be held in late summer. He said:

"The problems arising out of the use of narcotics and other habit-forming drugs are many and varied including those of law enforcement, the treatment to be accorded addicts, posttreatment procedures and perhaps most importantly an accurate and up-to-date assessment of the particular nature and magnitude of addiction in the United States. It is our intention to bring to the Conference national authorities and leaders, including those in Federal, State, and local governments, to better understand the facets of addiction and to formulate a course of action designed to cope more effectively with this national problem area.

"The Attorney General will serve as General Chairman of the Conference. I have discussed this proposal with Governor Brown, of California, and Mayor Wagner, of New York City, who represent two jurisdictions where drug addiction is especially prevalent and they agree that such a conference could be most helpful. Many other government officials including Members of the Congress from those two areas have also urged that a conference be held."

Invitations were received in mid-September and upon responding, delegates received preconference materials of general interest, along with delegate badges for admission to the State Department Auditorium where the 400 invitees were to meet. Registration began at 8:30 a.m. on the morning of September 27, 1962.

Television and radio communications had been set up in the auditorium and they continued throughout the 2-day meeting.

The press was well represented and it appeared that the talks were being translated into different languages—but this is merely a conjecture based on the operations in view. It is not confirmed.

The President of the United States was introduced by the Honorable Robert Kennedy, Chairman. He advised the 400 delegates that this Conference could be only windowdressing, or, it could produce concrete programs for action at Federal, State and local levels. He said that there is "no area where there is so much of mystery, misunderstanding and difference of opinion" as in the field of narcotic addiction. He stressed the need for elimination of illicit drug traffic and the need for greater emphasis on treatment of addicts. While the traffic in illegal drugs seems to have been lessened in recent years, he noted that there is growing abuse, especially among young people in the use of so-called nonnarcotic barbiturates and pep pills. He remarked with feeling "Society's gain will be illusory if we have reduced the incidence of one kind of drug addiction only to have new kinds of drugs substituted."

President Kennedy expressed hope that Congress would pass a bill he requested strengthening Federal powers to control manufacture and distribution of barbiturates and stimulant drugs.

He mentioned that he had just presented a special citation to Harry Anslinger, retired Commissioner of Narcotics (Treasury Department) for outstanding service in reducing illegal drug traffic. He noted that the American people are most indebted to him (Anslinger) for his 45 years of Federal service.

The President mentioned the discouragingly large number of relapses among addicts who leave our medical institutions (Lexington and Fort Worth) free of any physical dependence on drugs—and noted that this makes it clear that more must be done.

The loudspeaker was not working properly and it was difficult to hear the next few speakers. However, it can be noted that Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, under whom the Narcotics Bureau (Federal) operates said that Treasury is concerned with the human and social aspects of addiction as well as stopping illegal traffic.

The new Secretary of HEW the Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze told the delegates that "a program of civil commitment for addicts, coupled with a rehabilitative parole system would be an important forward step."

This statement reminded me that Attorney General Kennedy in opening the Conference stated "for all that is said, argued or believed about narcotics and drugs, the depressing truth is that we don't know very much about them. He referred to the working booklet 'Ad Hoc Panel' which delegates received prior to the Conference—noted that there is a very sharp drop in drug addiction after the age of 35 or 40, but that we can only guess at the reason." He went on "We can see that our job, therefore, is clear—it is to start finding out—to start building a reasonable and reliable body of information."

Governor Brown, of California, spoke of that State's fight against the problem and noted his own experience as former Attorney General. He said that California now has better laws and has been gaining in the fight since now there is the possibility of keeping parolees and probationers under supervision through the use of Nalline and the results of those tests. Governor Brown was an eloquent speaker and he could be heard by all. While great gains have been made there, he said, there is still a need for stricter laws and more adequate rehabilitation programs for addicts—in the local communities and at all levels. He also urged research.

Mayor Wagner addressed himself to the New York problem and stated that he too, favored strict penalties for peddlers and research into rehabilitation. He described the programs now in operation in New York City and expressed the hope that the Conference would be able to assist generally, in the entire area of narcotic and drug abuse problems.

In almost each speaker's text was reference to the new and growing problem of misuse of tranquilizers, barbiturates, pep pills, and other synthetic drugs. Statistics as to the increase in manufacture of these drugs was noted by almost every speaker.

Attached to this report is a copy of the entire program with speakers and subject matter information. It is impossible here to note the contribution of each, and it was indicated that the delegates will eventually receive copies of the texts.

With 1,200 miles of shoreline, with several ports of entry this poses a tremendous problem of keeping drugs out of country. He urged customs to have more personnel and continue their good work.

He urged:

1. Strict control on the manufacture of drugs.

2. Smuggling of drugs into United States be made a felony.

3. Creation of a Joint Mexico-United States Commission on Narcotics to include people on the firing line.

4. Mandatory removal of addicts from society until well.

5. Tougher penalties to include new drugs—synthetics too.

6. Expand treatment programs and hospital facilities and he also urged that addicts under 18 years of age be allowed in the institutions for treatment.

7. Continued research.

SYNANON

Let it be noted here that a group from Synanon (Santa Monica, Calif.) were in Washington, came to the auditorium but were not permitted badges to attend the conference.

They had headquarters in room 155, Old Senate Office Building, and the director (leader) is Charles Dederich. Arline Hepner, Jeanne Camano, Betty Coleman, Keith Kvammen, James Middleton and Nadine Portugal—with the public relations man (Mr. Kimball?) another ex-addict who lives at Synanon—invited me to visit them in their Washington headquarters. According to some present, Senator Dodd had arranged that they might stay there. They were very active, very vocal and received much space in the press and on several TV programs. (A rumor has it that 20th Century Fox is to make a picture using Synanon House as subject.)

Having visited Synanon myself, last February 21, I prefer at this time to make no comments on the program. It boasts of many successes and few relapses of addicts who have come there and remained through the three stages. It is patterned somewhat after Alcoholics Anonymous in format.

NOTES ON GOVENOR BROWN'S TALK, SEPTEMBER 27

1. In 1959, California pioneered the Nalline tests. (Note: Nalline is dropped into the eyes. If individual has been taking narcotics, he begins within a half hour to have withdrawal symptoms.) Parolees and probationers were thus kept under strict supervision.

2. In 1960, Commission on Narcotics was established. All members are law enforcement officers along with one defense attorney. They were charged with the problem of how to cut down traffic in narcotics.

New legislation with increased penalties was passed.

Drug addiction was defined as a contagious disease with danger of recontagion. Addicts were put under "quarantine" from periods of from 6 months to 5 years—supervision. After 3 years, they may win the right to return to the community. This has proven most successful according to Governor Brown.

Increased penalties (6 years to life now)—effective coordination at all levels of enforcement; vigorous enforcement caused marihuana peddling to level off. But he asked "Has this caused peddlers to turn to new merchandise?" They sell synthetics now instead—which are just as dangerous to the addict, but are less dangerous (less sentences) for the peddlers if caught.

Now California has increased penalties for these synthetics also.

In 1961 there were 1 million units of drugs sent from United States to Mexico * * * sold to Americans there and brought back. A real problem. More recently, there were 600,000 units shipped to Mexico in 3 days.

No records are kept for inspection on such manufacture. This must be rectified, things like seconal, demerol, jewelry, etc.

The lack in Federal laws includes the need for compulsory treatment of addicts.

He said that 75 percent of heroin in California comes from Mexico * * * that 100 percent of marihuana comes from Mexico.

I await with interest especially the text of Dr. Charles E. Smith, Medical Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, who had valuable information gleaned from the records of inmates over a number of years.

Mention must be made here of the valuable contribution from law enforcement to the Conference. Of special interest was the talk by Chief William Parker, of Los Angeles, Calif., as he stressed the very real problem inherent in community protection. He did not negate the hope for greater emphasis on rehabilitation of addicts, but he did express the hope that in seeking to help them, that law enforcement would not suffer another blow or have additional obstacles placed in its way, in trying to put distributors and peddlers in prison. It was apparent that Chief Parker was familiar with several aspects of this urgent national social evil.

The only controversy during the meeting was between the psychiatric viewpoint and law enforcement, but this was held to a minimum since the only questions asked were those directed by one panel member to another. The delegates in the audience were listeners and not participants.

Prior to the conference, information on the fact sheet stated that "some of the objectives of the conference will be to seek an up-to-date appraisal of the magnitude and nature of the problem, to examine the role of law enforcement activities in controlling the illicit supply and in apprehending those engaged in the sale and distribution of such drugs, and an examination of existing programs for the treatment and rehabilitation of addicts with a view to developing positive and more effective means of permanently restoring addicts to a proper and useful role in society.

The Conference's objective is not to arrive at specific solutions to the problem but rather to highlight the various aspects of the problem from the perspective of the various disciplines and experiences represented at the conference and to recommend guidelines designed to arrive at specific solutions.

Of particular interest to me as a delegate was the question asked by one panelist of two law enforcement representatives: Deputy Superintendent Joseph Morris of Chicago, and Edward Carey, deputy chief, New York City Police Department "What about teaching young people about narcotics?" Mr. Morris said he was against this since two cases he recalled indicated that the reason given by the young offenders was that they had "tried narcotics" after listening to a talk on the subject. Mr. Carey agreed. Since Illinois (and many other States) has a law that states young people must be taught the dangers of alcohol and narcotics—in a designated number of units a semester, this was somewhat confusing. A physician present disagreed and stated that education is an important weapon in fighting any problem and that he felt more of it should be done.

After the early hearings (in the fifties) before congressional subcommittees, recommendations were made that educational programs, if done by qualified people, were considered useful and necessary.

For years this has been an area of controversy. Doctors and nurses who apparently know more about the subject than any other profession are said to have the greatest number of addicts among them. Thus, the admonition not to teach the lay population. However, it has been pointed out many times that there are two factors here: (1) The availability of the drug and (2) the long and strenuous and tense hours put in by these people. The two factors together create a situation not present in many other groups.

It has been pointed out that sex education comes too late when a girl is pregnant * * * or the dangers of communism taught when a young person has become a Communist—is too late.

As one who has been in law enforcement since 1937, and in the Municipal Court Social Service prior to that, and as a probation officer of the Juvenile Court (now Family Court) of Cook County I want to go on record as saying that information must reach young people early if it is to act as insulation against adverse influences. It must be given properly and by qualified people, if it portrays the use of drugs as well as the abuse of drugs (the medical and dental profession) and at the same time tries to inspire young people (or anyone for that matter) with the idea that they are responsible for their own acts * * * that they must make decisions each day of their lives—and these must be predicated upon right thinking and right living. They must learn too, that even when they refuse to make decisions, they are indeed making decisions even then, and must take responsibility for remaining quiet when they should have spoken up.

It goes without saying that information can be given improperly and that this must be guarded against. We would hope that any educational programs for young or old would be under the guidance of those people trained in the psychological techniques of the teaching process.

We will await, now, the official transcript of the conference if and when it becomes available.

SUMMARY

Since there were to be no formal resolutions or recommendations emanating from the conference it is not possible, therefore, to list any. However, if a "meeting of the minds" could be counted as "trends" presently, I would say that the following seemed to be the items which received most agreement from all panelists and delegates (who expressed themselves during recesses):

1. Stricter penalties for peddlers and distributors. Stricter control of the manufacture of drugs, and systems of recordkeeping.
2. A method of treating addicts under civil commitment (patterned after New York and California laws) and possibly declaring addiction a contagious disease making it mandatory to remove them from society until "cured" and then only under supervision for a specified period of time.
3. Federal aid for the training of parole officers, hospitals, and personnel of halfway houses (also recommended).
4. More and greater effort to keep the illicit drugs out of the country.
5. Research at all levels and within all disciplines.

On September 28, Attorney General Robert Kennedy announced that a White House committee will be named to develop broad narcotics legislation for presentation at the next Congress.

This was the main result of the 2-day White House Conference on Narcotics and Drug Abuse, which brought together 400 diverse and articulate "experts" or "specialists," as they were referred to, from throughout the country. This committee is expected to consist of experts from Government departments concerned with narcotics and private workers in the field.

No doubt this committee will consider the above recommendations made informally by one or more of the panelists during the conference. The controversial subject—among others—will center around the civil commitments—now legal in New York and California.

Program

White House conference on narcotic and drug abuse: Registration 8:30 a.m., State Department, September 27.

Thursday morning, September 27:

Chairman: The Attorney General.

Speakers: The President of the United States; Secretary Dillon, Department of the Treasury; Secretary Celebrezze, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (10:45); Governor Brown, of California; Mayor Wagner, of New York.

Notices: Dean Markham, Conference planning director.

Thursday afternoon, September 27:

Panel 1: Law enforcement and controls.

Chairman: Herbert J. Miller, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Panelists: Harry J. Anslinger, U.S. member, Narcotics Drug Commission of the U.N.; Dr. Leo Bartemeier, Seton Psychiatric Institution, Baltimore, Md.; Dr. H. Stanley Bennett, dean, University of Chicago Division of Biological Sciences; Richard Bloomfield, officer in charge, Mexican Affairs, Department of State; Edward Carey, deputy chief, New York City Police Department; John C. Cross, Illinois Department of Public Safety; Chester A. Emerick, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Customs; Henry L. Giordano, Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics; John M. Kelly, legislative counsel, Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association; George P. Larrick, Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration; Joseph Morris, deputy superintendent of police, Chicago, Ill.; Stanley Mosk, attorney general of California; Robert V. Murray, Commissioner of Police, District of Columbia; William B. Parker, chief of police, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. Maurice H. Seevers, chairman, Department of Pharmacology, University of Michigan.

Panel 2: Current and experimental methods of treatment (1–3).

Chairman: Dr. Ray E. Trussell, commissioner of hospitals, New York City.

Panelists: Dr. Henry Brill, deputy commissioner of mental hygiene, State of New York; Dr. Murray A. Diamond, Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service; Meyer H. Diskind, New York State Division of Parole; Dr. Roger Egeberg, medical director, Department of Charities, Los Angeles; Dr. Robert Felix, Director, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda; Dr. Alfred M. Freedman, New York Medical College; Dr. David Goddard, provost, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Harris Isbell, Director, Addiction Research Center, Lexington; Richard H. Kuh, administrative assistant to the district attorney, New York City; Judge Morris Ploscowe, New York City; Dr. Herbert A. Raskin, department of psychiatry, Wayne State University; Dr. Edwin Schur, Tufts University; Roland Wood, superintendent, California Rehabilitation Center, Corona.

Panel 3: Research (3:15).

Chairman: Dr. Harris Isbell, Director, Addiction Research Center, Lexington, Ky.

Panelists: Dr. Isadore Chein, professor of psychology, New York University; Dr. Nathan B. Eddy, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council; William B. Eldridge, American Bar Foundation, Chicago; Dr. Harold Finestone, Illinois Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago; David Hackett, Director of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime; Dr. George Hager, dean, College of Pharmacy, University of Minnesota; Dr. George James, commissioner of health, New York; Dr. Keith Killam, associate professor of pharmacology, Stanford University; Dr. Charles E. Smith, Medical Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons; Dr. Abraham Wikler, Addiction Research Center, Lexington, Ky.; Dr. Charles Winick, American Social Health Association, New York.

Friday morning, September 28 (9–11:30).

Panel 4: Civil commitment and parole.

Chairman: Stanley Mosk, attorney general of California.

Panelists: Arthur Alarcon, executive secretary to the Governor, California; Rev. Norman Eddy, East Harlem Protestant Parish, New York; Paul Gernert, chairman, Pennsylvania Board of Parole; Edward Grout, executive director, Colorado Department of Health; Dr. George James, commissioner of health, New York; Congressman James Roosevelt; Richard H. Kuh, administrative assistant to the district attorney, New York City; Dr. Gardner Lindzey, professor of psychiatry, University of Minnesota; Dr. James F. Maddox, Medical Officer in Charge, U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Fort Worth; Judge John McIlvanie, Pittsburgh, Pa.; H. G. Moeller, Assistant Director, Bureau of Prisons; Arch E. Saylor, Chief Federal Probationary Officer, New York; Weldon Smith, Adult Authority, State of California.

Friday afternoon, September 28 (1):

The Attorney General: "Future Responsibilities."

Panel 5: Legislation.

Chairman: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey.

Panelists: James V. Bennett, Director, Bureau of Prisons; Richard A. Chappell, Chairman, Board of Parole, Washington, D.C.; Carol De Baggio, Chief Counsel, Narcotics Bureau; Senator Thomas J. Dodd; Dr. Roger Egeberg, medical director, Department of Charities, Los Angeles; Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice; Senator Kenneth Keating; Richard H. Kuh, administrative assistant to the district attorney, New York City; Robert Morgenthau, former U.S. District Attorney, New York City; Hon. Edwin J. Regan, State senator, California Pharmacology, University of Michigan; Judge William F. Smith, Federal Circuit Court, Newark.

(Closing remarks.)

HOST COMMITTEE

Hon. James A. Reed, chairman; Hon. Lee White, White House; Mr. Frank Bartimo, Department of Defense; Dr. Frank B. Berry, Department of Defense; Mr. Chester A. Emerick, Bureau of Customs; Mr. Henry L. Giordano, Commissioner of Narcotics; Mr. James P. Hendrick, Treasury Department; Mr. Forrest Holmes, Department of Defense; Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Mr. Edson W. Kempe, Treasury Department; Dr. James V. Lowry, Public Health Service; Mr. Otis E. Mulliken, State Department; Mr. Philip Nichols, Jr., Commissioner of Customs; Mr. Andrew F. Oehmann, Department of Justice; Mr. David P. Page, Secretary, Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics; Mr. Arnold Sagalyn, Treasury Department; Mr. James W. Symington, Department of Justice; Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, National Institute of Mental Health.

OFFICIAL DELEGATION

Senator Alan Bible, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Congressman Hale Boggs, Congressman Willard S. Curtin, Congressman James Roosevelt.

MAYOR WAGNER DEDICATES FIRST BUILDINGS IN WEST SIDE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech by the mayor of the city of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on October 9, 1962, the first completed apartments in the West Side urban renewal area were dedicated. The New York City Housing Authority took title to and rehabilitated 4 brownstones, creating 40 low-rent public housing units. I have long advocated the idea of "vest pocket" public housing. The first use of this technique was on 103d Street where the first such rehabilitated brownstones were opened last May. The Riverside Democrats and I fought to bring a neighborhood conservation program to that area and to condemn and rehabilitate the slum buildings. With the support and cooperation of Mr. Louis Horch and the Master Institute of United Arts, we were successful. I hope that other cities will adopt this technique initiated in the 20th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Robert F. Wagner outlined the hopes and promises of the West Side urban renewal plan in his remarks at the dedication of the new buildings on October 9. I include the mayor's speech at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT DEDICATION, FIRST REHABILITATED BROWNSTONE, WEST SIDE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

Today, with this dedication, we mark the real beginning of the West Side urban renewal program. Today we are really getting started on the most extensive program of neighborhood renewal ever undertaken in this city. I hope and trust that this one will show the way to others, and then to still others.

The West Side plan represents our new selective renewal plan, applied on a grand scale—to a 20-block area studded with blight—to a 20-block area of which this very block is a fair sample. This is the first job completed here. This block is to be considered as reflecting the condition "before" the plan really goes into operation. A little more than 2 years from now, we will see the "after" picture.

This very block contains a total of 50 buildings of which 30 are scheduled to be rehabilitated and 10 to be demolished. Only 10 buildings in this block are not scheduled for major change as part of the West Side renewal plan. And all this is going to take place in stage 1 of the project—which is planned for completion by the end of 1964.

This is not a pretty street right now. We didn't pick a pretty one. For our first job, we picked a street which presents very difficult problems—housing problems and social problems, problems which we want to help resolve, but which are not very easy to resolve because they include many human problems. But that did not stop us in our efforts, as it did not stop us from having this dedication here on 94th Street.

Well, we are determined to do our best to help everybody who wants to help himself and also those who cannot help themselves.

Yes, this block is going to have a basic facelifting. It is going to look a lot different than it does this morning. And in this block there will be low-cost public housing; there will be middle-income housing, and there will be some of the housing that now stands here. This block will be a proud block, as far as housing is concerned. It will contain the kind of sound, modern and healthful housing of which these rehabilitated apartments are an example.

At this point let me pay my tribute to Bill Reid and Ira Robbins and Francis Madigan of the New York City Housing Authority, and, of course, to their associates and subordinates for the kind of job they have done here. It is an exciting and impressive piece of work.

Of course, I also want to pay tribute to the entire complex of government planning and housing agencies which are involved directly or indirectly in the West Side urban renewal program—beginning with the city planning commission, the Housing and Redevelopment Board, the Department of Real Estate with its Bureau of Relocation soon to become a separate department under Commissioner Herman Badillo, the city rent and rehabilitation administration, and the executive committee of the housing policy board which now coordinates, subject to my direction, the entire housing operation in this city.

Here I also want to emphasize one of the most significant differences between the West Side urban renewal plan and some of our earlier slum clearance programs undertaken by the old slum clearance committee.

Our basic aim in the present program is to do everything possible to stop deterioration, remove spots of blight, and revitalize this entire area as a residential area for all the varied elements which now make up this teeming, multicultural and cosmopolitan neighborhood. But the bulldozer approach, or anything like it, is out.

This part of the West Side is going to look a lot different than it does now, but not radically different. You will still be able to recognize the buildings—and the people.

The objective of urban renewal on the West Side is not, and is not going to be, the transfer or relocation out of this area of the people who have come into it during the last couple of decades or less. These New Yorkers are now a part of the West Side community. They are going to remain a part of the West Side community, in an integrated, open-city pattern. That is my intention and determination as mayor of this city.

What we intend to do is to make the West Side a finer place to live in, both for those who already live here and also for those who will find a place in the new units which are going to be built.

At the same time, we want to eliminate the shame of that housing which has deteriorated to a point where it is beyond rehabilitation or where rehabilitation would be more costly and more time consuming than razing and reconstruction.

The entire West Side renewal program will result in the construction or rehabilitation of 8,500 units, sufficient to house about 40,000 people, spread over the 20-block area from 87th to 97th Streets between Central Park West and Amsterdam Avenue; 4,000 of these units of housing will be middle income housing; 2,500 will be low income units and 2,000 will be fully taxpaying units; 1,010 of the low income units will be in middle income buildings—which is something entirely new we are doing; 223 units of low income public housing will be built at 93d Street and Amsterdam Avenue, a stone's throw from here, at the site of PS 93; 280 units of low income public housing will be provided in rehabilitated brownstones, of which this one that we are dedicating today is an example—an exciting and inspiring example, I might say.

This is the statistical picture of the West Side urban renewal plan. But figures tell only a small part of the story. With this great construction program providing new housing for 40,000 or more people in this area, we will be completely changing the face of this 20-block square sector in the midst of which we stand this morning.

The entire West Side of Manhattan, so fortunate in its location, overlooking the beautiful Hudson River, cushioned on the one side by the Riverside Park and on the other by Central Park, will be given a new and richer lease on life.

The whole West Side can and should feel that it is in the beginning of a great renaissance—one of the most exciting prospects for change and improvement of all I know in this great city of ours.

A very special and central feature of this program is our relocation plan. Of course, there is going to be substantial relocation to achieve this, we are proceeding—as I mentioned a moment ago—to convert our relocation bureau into a relocation department headed by Herman Badillo, who will be the first Puerto Rican to head any major city department. The relocation offices are now working day and night in preparation for the relocation here on the West Side.

The families which are occupying the apartments in this rehabilitated building are families who are being relocated from within this 20-block area. All the low income housing we are building is being reserved for the people who are going to be forced to move as a result of rehabilitation and demolition, under the West Side urban renewal plan. Relocation will be geared to new construction, and the staging of the new construction will depend upon the progress being made in relocation. This is the way we have planned it. This is the way we are going to execute the plan. We look forward to having the help and cooperation of all the community organizations in this area to achieve this purpose.

In conclusion, let me say that we are determined to preserve the essential and underlying character of this neighborhood, but we are equally determined that its housing inventory shall be vastly upgraded and increased and that housing which was and is a festering sore of social infection, housing which cannot be rescued from the slum category, shall be eliminated for the good of the decent people living in these slum conditions, for the good of the West Side, and for the good of New York City.

THE CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the action just completed by the House on the Civil Functions Appropriations bill, H.R. 12900, makes this 13th day of October 1962, a day of lasting significance for both Oklahoma and the Nation.

With the passage of this measure the House reaffirms its determination to proceed with vigor and with initiative in the critically important field of water resources development.

We have taken another major step to assure that the ravages of flood are reduced across this land of ours, and we have made possible major new advances in navigation and water supply for future generations.

For Oklahoma, this bill is of tremendous importance in the provision of funds essential to the great project which is vital to our State's industrial future—navigation of the Arkansas River.

On behalf of all Oklahomans, I want to express deep appreciation to the Members of this House, and especially to the members of the great committees on Public Works and Appropriations, for their generous and statesmanlike consideration of the water development needs of our States.

In the words of Daniel Webster, you have indeed helped to "develop the resources of our land" and to "call forth its powers," in the finest sense of these great legislative purposes.

DUKE POWER PROJECT

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to learn that there is considerable official support for authorization of the Duke power project on the Savannah River. Unfortunately, this worthy project could not be included in the omnibus public works authorization bill, but we have been given assurances that this project will be high on the priority list when the hearings on the next public works authorization bill are commenced next January.

The Duke power project will mean a great deal to the coal industry, since the installation when completed will burn 9,500 tons of bituminous coal per day. This is a project which will mean a great deal to the State of West Virginia, and will also benefit, Virginia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and many other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to keep on fighting for this worthwhile project which will mean so much to the economy of our Nation. I certainly hope that early and favorable consideration may be given to the authorization of the Duke power project so that we may get it under way as soon as possible.

REIMBURSEMENT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as the first Member of Congress to introduce a measure to reimburse the city of New York for the unusual expenditures incurred in providing security during the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1960, I feel I must express my deep disappointment in the lack of final action of the 87th Congress on this critically important matter.

On Thursday an attempt was made on the floor of the other body to get favorable action on the measure which was passed by the House on April 5 of this year. But the attempt failed, and there was an agreement by the leadership to take another look at the legislation early in the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House only after extensive hearings at which I testified on the critical need to provide relief for the city of New York in this situation—a situation which was the direct result of the fact that the United Nations headquarters is located in that city. That session cost New York City an estimated $4,800,000.

After due consideration the Foreign Relations Committee favorably reported the bill to the other body on July 9, 1962. For the past 3 months it has been awaiting its turn on the agenda. When it finally came up under a motion to suspend the rules, it was held back for "an opportunity to consider the matter in a little greater detail."

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the matter has been considered in quite enough detail—and I do not think this Congress has any adequate excuse for failing to take action.

After all, the two bodies together have so far appropriated a total of at least $92 billion for this year alone.

It seems obvious that, since I introduced my bill on January 12, 1961, there has been plenty of time to consider in enough detail the authorization and appropriation of $3 million for the purpose I have stated.

This matter should not be allowed to die. I hope that it can be resurrected in the next Congress; and, if the people of my district return me to the House next year, I will reintroduce this legislation.

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, we of the Pennsylvania delegation are happy and proud that our colleague Kathryn E. Granahan has been appointed by the President to the high office of Treasurer of the United States.

Kathryn is eminently qualified to fill this important post. In 1956 Mrs. Granahan came to the House of Representatives, succeeding her late beloved husband, William T. Granahan, with whom it was my pleasure to work closely on many key legislative matters. Kathryn has proved an able successor to her distinguished husband and has demonstrated outstanding legislative ability in the discharge of her committee assignments and other important responsibilities. In all her work she has emulated the conscientious spirit of dedication to public service which won for Bill Granahan the respect and affection of his colleagues in the Congress.

My regret that Mrs. Granahan will not serve in the 88th Congress is tempered by the pleasure of knowing that she is entering high office in the executive branch and in her new post she will be in a position where her outstanding ability will continue to be devoted to the public service.

I join with her host of friends in Washington and in Pennsylvania in wishing Kathryn Granahan the best of happiness and success in her new career.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like the Record to show the reason why I did not answer the last rollcall, No. 293, was because of the fact I was en route from New Jersey. I was unable to get a plane to arrive here in time to respond to the call.

NEW GOALS FOR INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Thomas B. Curtis, of St. Louis County, Mo., has long been a strong defender of the free enterprise system and a conscientious student of our Nation's economy. In an interview with the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman Curtis, in the April 23 issue of Steel magazine, he discusses some of his ideas on unemployment, economic growth, and other important economic problems facing our country.

According to the gentleman from Missouri, Tom Curtis, economic growth is not gross national product. Real growth is seen in the shift in emphasis from manufacturing to services and distribution. And by this important standard, he maintains that we have a dynamic and rapidly advancing economy, rather than a stagnant one, as many administration theorists maintain.

The gentleman from Missouri, Congressman Curtis, also believes that automation is growth because it actually creates more jobs than it displaces. The problem lies in the advantageous use of automation and technological change. This, he believes, can be brought about through upgrading the skills of our labor force, matching the jobless man with the manless job. In his opinion, an updating of the "Directory of Skills" and basic, incentive-type changes in our unemployment insurance system are some of the steps which would contribute greatly to bringing the skills of our people into line with the new job needs of our growing economy.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri, Tom Curtis, is particularly well equipped to contribute to a solution of our economic problems because of his service as a ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee and as senior House Republican on the Joint Economic Committee, on which we serve together. Because of the timeliness and importance of his article, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Record at this point:

New Goals for Industrial Growth

"I don't think any crisis is facing this Nation in the way the word is used by the

Kennedy administration." That's Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, talking.

A profound defender of the free enterprise system, the Congressman does worry, however, that some of the methods advocated by President Kennedy for promoting the Nation's economic welfare may lead to serious trouble.

FULL EMPLOYMENT?

For example, he reflects on the meaning of the Employment Act: "Our Constitution doesn't provide the framework for interpreting the Employment Act as making the Government responsible for seeing that everyone has a job. Many call it the Full Employment Act, not realizing that the word 'full' is not used; the word is 'maximum' and the implication is that it is the maximum employment which can be obtained through the private enterprise system.

"Full employment involves the implication that the Government should make work for those who don't have it. Anyone who thinks that an economy can progress on a philosophy of make work is in error.

"We must use the Employment Act in terms of three goals: Maximum employment, maximum rate of growth, and maximum price stability. These three goals move in the same direction. If we pursue only one of them at a time, we can cause great damage to the private enterprise system and the economy."

MEASURING THE ECONOMY

The basic issue to most of the economic arguments of today is the matter of growth. The Congressman believes an even more fundamental issue is the means one chooses to measure growth.

"Growth is not gross national product. Gross national product should be but one series of statistics telling us where we are going. It reveals how much activity is going on, but can also measure mistakes. If a railroad substitutes 1 mile of track for 10 by finding a shortcut, there appears to be less activity. Actually, a mistake was being measured when the 10-mile route was being used.

"Gross national product gives undue emphasis to manufacturing. If you spend $1 million on school construction, rather than $1 million on teachers' salaries, it shows up stronger in gross national product because of the multiplier effect on manufacturing, whereas the money spent on salaries might be a better indication of growth.

"The phenomenon, which most strikes me: The shift in our economy from manufacturing to services and distribution. That shift is indicative of real growth. That is how a sophisticated economy grows.

"We have had such a concentration on mass production; we have forgotten it depends upon mass distribution and mass service.

"We need a capital account for the society (and it must be depreciated), so we know what we have and can compare it with the past to understand our growth. Really we should be talking in terms of trillions of dollars when measuring the economy, not billions.

"We also need to know our work force and its skills (knowing the mere number of workers is not enough), and we must measure what I call business organization—that which puts capital and labor together. Thus to correctly measure the economy, you would need some method of putting together six factors: Extractive industries, manufacturing, distribution, services, productivity, and the infrastructure of our society (transportation, communications, and power)."

In the present administration's marriage to gross national product as the proper tool for planning the economic growth of the Nation, Mr. Curtis sees a real lack of depth. "Their falure to analyze problems is tragic."

AUTOMATION IS GROWTH

He cites the White House's expressed fear of automation: Automation is a problem, say the President and the Secretary of Labor. "They don't know what growth is," counters the Missouri Representative. "Automation is growth."

"The penalty of growth is the obsolescence of skills, but automation creates more jobs than it displaces. The problem is that you can't identify the new jobs with the displaced persons. This country has always had a labor shortage—we still have one as brain comes to replace brawn. We can't meet our labor shortage today with immigrants, so we must upgrade our workers' skills to meet the challenge of technological advance."

While some unemployment does come from automation, Mr. Curtis wants you to remember that only the rate of innovation has quickened. We've always had change, he points out. When the horse and dray were replaced by the truck, the blacksmith disappeared. "What if the buggy whip manufacturers had been organized?" he wonders.

SOLVING UNEMPLOYMENT

"Our traditional labor shortage has been the incentive for much of our progress," says the Congressman. "Labor is costly so we have invented machines to replace workers."

He thinks the Government itself is doing much to impede solutions to the unemployment problem: For example, the Internal Revenue Service does not allow night school expenses to be deducted from income taxes. "A gradual raising of the skills of our workers is the only answer to unemployment. We must train cottonpickers to be automobile mechanics' helpers, and auto mechanics to step up to skilled jobs in highly automated industries," says the man who helped push the Manpower Training Act through Congress. He warns that we won't be able to train the unskilled to be highly skilled workers; we will have to push skills up all along the line.

Mr. Curtis reports a recent example of a Government impediment to the mobility of labor in his own district. "McDonnell Aircraft sent technicians on a per diem basis to Mercury space capsule work in New Mexico, but the Internal Revenue Service ruled the income was taxable. I know of another case where workers moved from Evansville, Ind., to St. Louis but were given no help on their returns even though they still maintained their residences in Evansville. A worker moving from Chicago to New York for a job should receive some sort of deduction for following what is the normal economic process in a free country."

Washington could help the situation more by establishing a directory of skills in the Labor Department to tell companies where needed workers are available, and help workers find companies with shortages of skills, adds Mr. Curtis. Also, companies could warn the Labor Department of impending layoffs.

"There are plenty of jobs going begging," he says, citing want ads in newspapers for skilled workers.

Mr. Curtis is particularly disturbed by the number of States that do not allow trainees to receive unemployment compensation: "They should be kicked off unemployment compensation if they don't retrain," he reasons. He suggests States could follow the lead of New York, which has compiled a list of the needs for electronics technicians through 1964. Then the Federal Government could combine all the State studies and begin encouraging labor mobility. "Retraining won't do any good, if there are not jobs available in the field you retrain people for."

Another possibility for solving the unemployment problem and making concrete contributions to the welfare of the Nation: Give firms who do their own retraining of displaced workers a special break on their unemployment insurance rate. "The cost of retraining might be met by savings in unemployment benefits."

THE UNIONS' ROLE

The Republican is highly critical of some practices of labor unions, but points out: "I tell union leaders, Republicans can be their best friends, because they believe in free enterprise and constitutional government. I fought for the Landrum-Griffin Act because it gives power back to the individual union man and strengthens the labor movement as a whole." The Congressman, who is endorsed by several unions in his district, worries that unions resist increasing the mobility of labor because they don't want to lose jurisdiction over their members. Labor's answer to unemployment sometimes is little more than featherbedding.

The biggest worry of all, however, is the monopoly of unions. "Labor should not have the advantage of a monopoly so it can pick off companies that don't equal the union in strength. Antitrust laws are needed for unions. There should be competition in the labor field. Eventually, if they don't choose to allow competition for personnel, the public will demand regulation of labor through commissions such as the Federal Government has established in the public utility field."

DEPRECIATION REFORM

Another step to industrial growth is to give a firm the right "to have its own depreciation schedules, so long as it doesn't try changing its practices from year to year. Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon is not up to date with automation. A firm may have to junk a machine 2 years old, because a new machine can do the job so much better. His concept of a 15-year life for machines is ridiculous."

The Congressman favors revising depreciation practices by congressional, not by administrative, action as the Treasury has promised for all industry. He doesn't feel the handling of the textile industry is right: "It is an error to bribe one segment of industry. Bulletin F should be changed so that all industries start together; all are competing in the market for capital." He frowns on the fact that sophisticated companies have been able to work out a useful lives concept with the Internal Revenue Service, whereas small firms have not. "A small business is a business which can't afford to send a representative to Washington," he quips.

Another phase of the problem: Encouraging industry to invest more in basic research. "Such research should be allowed as a business expense. Our tax laws now recognize only applied research."

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

While suggesting many ways in which Government can help industry grow, the Congressman warns that industry shouldn't ask for too much: "I would say to industry: 'Don't lose the right to fail.' Many small businessmen plead for a floor from which the Government guarantees they can operate at a profit. Other firms, large or small, are always coming to Washington to try to get the Government to help them and hurt their competitors. They risk Government regulation. That is always second best to the markeplace. The economy should only turn to Government when the marketplace fails to operate.

"Unwittingly we have hit on the laboratory system of economics in the United States. The marketplace is a laboratory which should have the same thrill for the businessman that a scientific laboratory has for a physicist. Some appear to have forgotten the thrill of the marketplace. Look at the way some of industry favors the tax credit. It is uneconomical, a bad law. When you grant concessions on taxes when rates are so high, you tend to manipulate the economy. Then you have government by men, not law.

"The only thing consistent about the present administration is the desire to centralize more power in the hands of the Federal Government. Industry must resist this.

"Consider the whole question of subsidies, which so many firms ask for in one way or another. If there is anything that will hurt the cause of free enterprise, it is to ask the Government to step in. Subsidies are dope. Companies get hooked on them.

"Governments allocate resources badly. The marketplace has its own discipline."

MISLEADING PRESS RELEASE ISSUED BY NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on a matter of concern not only to the people of the State of Massachusetts whom I represent but to every American taxpayer. This matter was broached in a very misleading press release issued by the National Coal Policy Conference on September 24, 1962.

In this statement Mr. Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, mentions the difficulties which the General Services Administration has had in obtaining residual fuel oil to be used for heating Government buildings in the Washington area—buildings which are only equipped to burn oil. Mr. Moody uses this situation to raise the specter of residual fuel oil imports being cut off during wartime.

It is apparent that Mr. Moody has missed the real impact of the GSA's problems. There is no shortage of residual fuel oil in the country at this time. This is the opinion of the Oil Imports Administration as expressed to the GSA. Even Mr. Moody agrees. Why then should the GSA encounter problems in having its requirements satisfied? And why should its supplier for the last 20 years be forced to enter a bid contingent on an increase in residual fuel oil import quotas? The answer lies in the artificial atmosphere created by restrictions on residual fuel oil imports. Supply is fixed by import quotas. The administrative procedures of the OIA determine in whose hands these supplies will be placed. A free market has been replaced by a rigid one. Some companies, like the GSA's supplier, find that their supplies are inadequate to meet their normal demand. The GSA has certainly been made aware of the disruption of the market which results from imposition of these inflexible restrictions.

The American taxpayer and particularly the East Coast consumer of residual fuel oil should be aware of the situation too because they are paying for these import restrictions in the form of a higher price tag on the oil which they buy. The response to the GSA's last bid invitation provides dramatic proof. Two bids were received for the entire volume—one provided the necessary import quota, the other did not. But the price with import quota, which the GSA has said it will accept, was 10 cents a barrel higher. It is crystal clear that the right to import residual fuel oil under quota restrictions has a very definite value—on this particular bid the American taxpayer will fork out an extra $143,000 solely because imports are restricted. And this is not the only case when the GSA and the American taxpayer have been forced to pay higher than world market prices. During the summer the GSA made several emergency purchases at a price 30 cents a barrel higher. All other East Coast consumers are in the same boat. In order to buy residual fuel oil, which they have freely chosen as the fuel they wish to burn, they are forced to pay prices which as you have seen are inflated by the effects of import restrictions—prices which reduce the ability of American industry to compete and grow. They are thus subsidizing the cost of a system which they do not want, which serves no valid purpose, and which exists today only through misguided pressures from the coal industry, including Mr. Joseph Moody and his National Coal Policy Conference.

While the problem he had raised bears no relationship to the dependability of residual fuel oil imports in wartime, it will not hurt to present the true facts about the contribution of foreign residual fuel oil even though this has been discussed time and time again. It is very clear that foreign residual fuel oil and the tanker fleet that carries it, far from being weak points in our defense, are crucial to it. During World War II foreign supplies provided over one-third of the allied military and ocean bunker demand as well as the entire essential foreign civilian demand. In addition, imports into the United States during the war years were higher than in the corresponding period just before the war.

These supplies would have been of no use during the war if during peacetime a tanker fleet had not also been developed to carry them. The role of tankers in wartime cannot be overvalued. On a tonnage basis over half the supplies shipped to our Armed Forces were petroleum products which could only be moved by tankers. The Interior Department in its "History of the Petroleum Administration for War, 1941–1945" states that—

> It was the luckiest good fortune that the economics of peacetime transportation had brought the east coast tanker fleet into existence. Without that fleet the military would have had an insurmountable supply problem overseas.

Importation of foreign oil during peacetime assures that such supplies and the tankers to carry them will be available in the event of any emergency.

It is unlikely that in the event of another war the continental United States would again be so fortunate as to escape considerable physical damage. In that event imports of foreign residual fuel oil are probably even less vulnerable in wartime than is domestic industry. Indeed, the coal industry itself recognizes this. A pamphlet put out by Consolidation Coal Co. in support of coal pipelines discusses Defense Department studies of the effect of an all-out assault on the United States and points out "that hundreds of railroad bridges would inevitably be destroyed" and that repairs would take several months, thus cutting off east coast coal supplies. From the standpoint of national security there is no reason in peacetime to deny the American consumer free choice in picking the fuel which best serves his needs.

In conclusion, let me say only what has been demonstrated before. Restrictions on residual fuel imports accomplish only one thing—to raise the price of oil to the taxpayer and consumer. Lifting of these controls would not jeopardize our national security and would not materially affect the output of coal. It is regrettable that the coal industry is spending so much time and money to preserve and tighten import restrictions which contribute so little to their own self interest. This time and this money could be used to better advantage in making coal more competitive in a free energy market.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MORRILL ACT

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as we have noted before in this session, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the Morrill Act under which some 68 land-grant universities and colleges were established in the United States. It is appropriate that I call to the attention of the House that this year also marks the celebration of the centennial of the founding of the University of Massachusetts, located in Amherst, First Congressional District of Massachusetts. This university was itself born of a gift received under the Morrill Act, and to this great university of Massachusetts I extend congratulations on behalf of myself and the Congress.

A proposal for the donation of public land to the States for the education of farmers and mechanics had been made by a Massachusetts born and educated professor as early as 1850. I refer to Jonathan Baldwin Turner, often called the father of the land-grant movement, who was then teaching at Illinois College. He had formulated his plans so well and argued for them so forcefully that his leadership moved the legislature of the State of Illinois in 1853 to petition the Congress of the United States for an amount of public land sufficient for the establishment of a university in each State of the Union.

Turner's work did not end with the passage of the Morrill Act, however. He lectured and wrote tirelessly on the subject until in 1867 the legislature of Illinois authorized the erection of the State University of Illinois. It was in this spirit of public dedication that the founders of the University of Massachusetts could find their inspiration.

The history of the University of Massachusetts is an interesting and a proud tale. When all heads were counted during its first term, the Massachusetts Agricultural College—as the university was then known—had an enrollment of 47 students and a faculty of 4 members. When the first commencement proceedings were held, 27 students received their diplomas.

Present at that first commencement was the man who had led the land-grant program through the Congress and to the approving signature of President Lincoln in 1862, Justin Smith Morrill. The purpose of the Morrill Act had been to promote the branches of learning in agriculture and the mechanic arts, and in so doing to "promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life." The land-grant schools have grown away from their early adherence to a limited curriculum in agriculture and the mechanic arts, until today their superior record in all fields is recognized.

The growth of the University of Massachusetts has matched this national trend. In 1962 its students will exceed 7,000; it offers a comprehensive program of instruction and research in all fields, and it is the Commonwealth's major resource of public higher education.

When the Massachusetts Agricultural College was founded there was a great deal of disapproval from a good many people. It was their contention that the proceeds of the Land-Grant Act should be made available to one of the already existing institutions. But the petitions of Harvard, Amherst, and Williams were refused; a new type of higher education was foreseen in the Morrill Act, and only a new college could make real the vision and goals of that act. The idea was stated at the first commencement of the college by an early supporter:

> We shall have among our yeomanry such farmers as the world never before witnessed, men who will honor their vocation and therefore be honored by society—the chiefs of our land, the bulwark of our Nation.

The ideal was realized. Its teachers and graduates became leaders in the field of agricultural science, and as early as 1876 its reputation was sufficiently established for the Imperial Government of Japan to express a desire to follow its lead. William S. Clark, the president of the college, went to Japan at the invitation of the Government and established the Sapporo Agricultural College. This college, like its model in Massachusetts, was to become a great institution, the Hokkaido University. A program of cooperative exchange with the Hokkaido University is still carried on by the University of Massachusetts.

The college developed quickly in other fields as well. In the summer of 1871 the college rowing team startled the regatta crowds on the Connecticut River by defeating both Harvard and Brown Universities by a good margin.

Unique in its time, the Massachusetts Agricultural College filled a real need of the Commonwealth, but as the years passed, that need changed and so did the college. By 1931 the college was becoming a liberalized institution as it reflected the broadening interests of its students. The General Court of Massachusetts recognized this development and the school became known as the Massachusetts State College. In 1947 the college received its present title, the University of Massachusetts.

It is interesting to note that though its original trustees and early leaders had heartily argued against tying the college to the already established schools, once the college was truly established and on its own, it readily associated and pooled its resources with other schools. From 1875 to 1911 the students in Boston University and Massachusetts Agricultural College enjoyed the benefits of a unique program which allowed students in either institution to earn the bachelor's degree from both. Today the university joins with its great academic neighbors—Amherst, Smith, and Mount Holyoke Colleges—in extending and enriching their collective educational programs.

Since its founding the university attempted to assure that capable students would not be turned away. In 1882 the tuition was waived to assist the hard-pressed students. Today, the tuition is still nominal.

Thus, in accordance with its traditions, the University of Massachusetts continues to provide for the Commonwealth an institution of higher learning, devoted to Massachusetts' needs, and offering to every capable young person an education of the highest level.

PROBLEMS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, as a strong believer in the interchange of ideas and opinions, I was delighted to see that the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers invited our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, Representative THOMAS CURTIS, to address their 10th constitutional convention at Cleveland, Ohio, on September 20, 1962. The gentleman from Missouri, Representative CURTIS, is one of the most outstanding and constructive Members of this body; the IUE is the vanguard of the dynamic forces in the American labor movement. But all too often Americans of differing viewpoints fail to share their thoughts and aspirations; too often they fail to carry on a meaningful dialog on the great problems of our age. Hence, there is compelling significance in the invitation to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] to address the IUE Convention.

Many of our colleagues know of TOM CURTIS' scholarly progressive leadership in combating the problem of unemployment. His widely acclaimed book, "87 Million Jobs," his able direction of the House Republican operation employment study and his important role in the drafting of the Manpower Training and Development Act, fully attest to his unstinting, always constructive efforts in this critical area.

The speech of the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CURTIS, to the IUE Convention is characteristic of his thoughtful approach to solving our Nation's economic problems. In pointing out the fundamental, but often overlooked fact that "we are the first society in history to emerge into an economic system based upon plenty, not upon scarcity," Representative CURTIS stressed the irony of widespread unemployment while there are jobs going begging. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] aptly asserts that the jobless man must be matched with the matchless job.

Although technological advance in opening up millions of new jobs, is causing severe dislocations in the labor market, Representative CURTIS said that these new jobs can be filled only if people seeking work can be informed as to where and what kind of employment opportunities are available, and be trained to fill new jobs as they are opened. This requires increased job retraining, dissemination of vital information on job availability, and the development of educational programs to help remedy this tragic paradox of our economic life.

Regretfully, the gentleman from Missouri, Representative CURTIS, was prevented from delivering his speech in person because of congressional business which made it impossible for him to be at the convention in time. This was a deep disappointment to him as he had labored weeks in preparing this address. The speech was delivered in Mr. CURTIS' place by Seth Taft, son of Charles Taft, one of the young progressive leaders of the Republican Party in Ohio, and an old friend of mine.

I hope that our distinguished colleague's speech will receive the widest possible circulation for it can serve as a clear example of the necessity of doing away with stereotypes and labels and as a model of how we can achieve meaningful exchanges of ideas on the vital questions of our day.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply value my association with Congressman TOM CURTIS, and I am proud to bring his notable address to the attention of my colleagues and of all Americans.

The text of this speech follows:

THE MANLESS JOB AND THE JOBLESS MAN—THE ECONOMIC PARADOX OF THE 1960'S

(By Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri)

I want to thank Jim Carey for giving me this opportunity to come here to talk with you today about some of the problems which deeply concern us all.

For a number of important reasons, I have always admired and respected the IUE. You care about your fellow men, as you have shown by your leadership in working for equal rights for all of our citizens, regardless of age, religion, color, sex, or national origin.

The men and women of the IUE are also courageous. I remember with deep satisfaction and gratitude your fight to rid a vital part of our trade union movement of Communist influences. Your success was a great victory for democratic unionism. It was a great victory for America.

The IUE has sometimes been criticized for being too militant. To me, militancy implies a sense of purpose, a sense of direction, a sense of dedication. You care deeply about the problems which face our country. I hope you never lose that quality. I admire you for it.

I, too, fight for what I believe in, and I have little doubt that sometimes we don't see eye to eye on the causes for which I work most militantly.

But the important thing in carrying on a meaningful and useful discussion of our common problems is that we do not question one another's motives or sincerity.

I am not a rich man. I have five children and I am concerned about them and their future, just as you are concerned about the future of your children. You and I share the same spirit and the same drive, which is to do our best to make America a better place in which to live and to leave a better America for the generations following us.

Today I do not want to stress just issues on which we disagree. Rather, as President Kennedy suggested in his inaugural address, I want to explore the issues which unite us as much as those which divide us.

Too often Americans of differing views fail to share their ideas, their hopes, and their aspirations with one another, and I think we are all the losers for it.

There will be no disagreement between us on what the big issue is today in the minds of America's working men and women. It is the issue of jobs, job creation, job security, better jobs.

I believe in the right to work—but not as set out in any right-to-work law I have ever seen. These I oppose, specifically as I did in my own State of Missouri even before I came to Congress in 1950. To me, right to work means that every man or woman able and willing to work should be able to find a job. The Government has the obligation to maintain the economic climate in which jobs may be created and to see that all who wish a job have the opportunity to fill a job for which they are qualified.

A tremendous amount of thought and energy has gone into that task in previous administrations, as well as in this one. I am impressed by the efforts. But at the same time, I am unimpressed by the results. Trying is not enough. We can be satisfied only with success. And thus far the record gives us no cause for complacency.

We have had four recessions in America since the end of World War II. At the end of each of those recessions, unemployment was higher than it was at the end of the previous one. Moreover, long-term unemployment—the kind that really hurts—has been increasing over the years. Today there are over a half million persons who have been unemployed more than 26 weeks and nearly a million who have been out of work more than 15 weeks.

With the current recovery apparently leveling off, we have a large pool of nearly 4 million jobless men and women. Unemployment is still 5.8 percent of the civilian labor force, or about 7 percent if we count all of the labor force time lost due to both unemployment and part-time employment for economic reasons.

Even worse in terms of human suffering and harmful social consequences is the concentration of much of our unemployment in certain areas of the country, in certain industries, in certain age groups and among our Negro citizens. This suffering and this waste of our precious manpower resources seems illogical and unnecessary in an economy where jobs are going begging. As one who deeply believes in our free enterprise system, I am convinced that its preservation requires that we be constantly on the alert to be sure it is functioning properly.

I do not agree with the administration that a 4-percent unemployment rate is acceptable. We have to remember that our labor force is growing. As it grows, a 4-percent unemployment rate, or any other fixed rate, means that more and more people are out of work.

For example, today a 4-percent unemployment rate would amount to about 2.9 million workers. But in 1970, it would represent nearly 3.5 million. Many of these 3.5 million workers would have families. If you add in these other family members, you get a clearer idea of the size of the problem.

However, a word of caution is in order here. The fact is that some of our unemployment—how much we do not know—involves little or no distress. Many unemployed Americans could be working today if they would upgrade their skills or take a job in a different line, even if it were not quite as good as the best job they at one time had. They may prefer to take unemployment compensation, draw down their savings, or live on the wages of another working member of the family. One writer has termed this discretionary unemployment, and it is a new factor which requires a good deal of study. To solve the unemployment problem, we need more information on who the unemployed are.

But, discretionary unemployment aside, there is no doubt that we still have a serious problem on our hands. We have jobs going begging and we have people unemployed who would like to work.

To solve the problem, we must first know its cause, just as the doctor diagnoses the illness before prescribing the medicine. Why have we been suffering higher and higher rates of unemployment after each post-war recovery? Why is the problem of persistent hard-core unemployment growing more serious? Yet why, at the same time, is economic progress being slowed because we lack the engineers, the technicians, and the many skills which we badly need today?

There are those who say that our economy is suffering from inadequate demand which, in turn, retards growth and leads to stagnancy. This ignores the realities around us.

It is true that in the past when economic activity fell off during a recession, a cutback in spending resulted in layoffs and unemployment. Your members have been particularly sensitive to this type of cyclical unemployment. Special measures, such as a strong and effective unemployment compensation system, are designed to meet this problem. While we must continue to improve our unemployment insurance system, there is no doubt that it is one of the greatest reforms ever made in our economic system.

But is inadequate demand our basic problem at the peak of the expansionary phase of the business cycle? I frankly do not think so. Consumers, Government, and business are spending today at record or near-record levels. Yet unemployment remains very high.

I also challenge the idea that our economy is stagnant. Quite the contrary, I think it is dynamic and vital. This is precisely what causes a large part of our problem. It is a problem of growth—not decline or stagnation. We are suffering—particularly in the form of unemployment—from growing pains. These growing pains are but symptoms of the swift and far-reaching basic growth that is changing the face of our economy.

Rapid technological advancement creates great obsolescence in skills. If this frictional unemployment remains untreated through a failure to retrain those with skills no longer in demand, it freezes into serious structural unemployment, such as we see in the coal mining areas of Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

We make a serious mistake when we judge our economic performance solely on how rapidly our gross national product is increasing. GNP was never intended to measure economic growth; it measures only the ups and downs of economic activity. Gross national product rises dramatically during a war, but would anyone calim that this represents real or sustainable economic growth?

Important components of meaningful growth, such as new and improved goods and services on the market, increased education, better health, more leisure time and research and development, are completely unstated or badly understated by the gross national production. And yet judging by any of these measuring sticks our society is making impressive advances. If we fail to recognize this, we may end up applying depression remedies to the problems of prosperity.

No, I do not believe that our hard-core unemployment is caused by inadequate demand. Nor is it the result of a stagnant economy. Perhaps its most important cause is the success of our economic system, its dynamism, its rapidly increasing ability to produce more goods, with fewer men. But increased production of goods requires increasing our efforts, and, therefore the number of jobs, in distributing and servicing the new goods. Using fewer men to produce more means more leisure time and, therefore, more jobs to be filled in such fields as education and recreation.

From 1953 to 1961 the decline in the number of production workers offset by the gain in white collar and technical employees resulted in a net reduction of 6 percent in manufacturing workers. Yet during the same period 24 percent more goods were being turned out. This technical revolution means that fuller utilization of our industrial capacity no longer guarantees a rising number of jobs in producing goods. But, upon analysis, it also means an increasing number of jobs to distribute and service the increased amount of goods.

Other factors also contribute to our hard-core unemployment, such as changing consumer tastes, changing patterns of resource use, as from coal to oil and gas, and the migration of industry. The problem of runaway shops is particularly serious to you. Congress has taken steps which are supposed to combat runaway shops by insisting that the area redevelopment and community facilities programs not contribute to the relocation of plants from one area to another. If you will pardon me for saying so, this is like untying the dog and telling it to stay in the yard. Unions can and are doing much. Your task is to organize the workers in substandard wage areas and to seek to have protection against runaway shops written into your contracts.

Of all of these problems, however, technological change, success and growth, has the heaviest impact. Its effects are felt throughout the entire economy. Of course, technological change has always been with us. But the rate of change is now so rapid in our dynamic economy, which the unseeing call tired and stagnant, that we have coined a new word—automation—to describe it. Consider for a moment the fact that technological advance consumes about 5,000 jobs a week and creates the need to fill 6,000 new jobs demanding higher and different skills at the same time, and you will understand why I consider it the major domestic challenge of our times. By not filling the new jobs automation creates, we slow our rate of progress; by creating unemployment, we intensify our human problems and cut back consumer purchasing power. Actually, however, the unemployed, the person with the displaced skill, becomes our greatest potential asset to fill the new jobs going begging.

History shows that we need not fear automation. But we must respect it. In both the short and the long run, automation leads to an increase in job opportunities, higher paying jobs, more leisure time, and an increased standard of living for all of us.

Who, for example, could have predicted in the horse and buggy days at the turn of the century that hundreds of thousands of men would be employed in the automobile and allied industries? Who could have foreseen the jobs that were to open up in the electronics and television industries? Yes, the newly created jobs are sometimes hard to see—they may be and frequently are in a field far removed from that where the unemployment was created by the new machine or new technique. The new job is frequently under the jurisdiction of another union, or, as often is the case, in a field so new that it is nonunion. This need not be so if the union is geared to the dynamic process. I point out that not one of the members of the Teamster Union is a teamster by trade. Who hauls by horses when trucks and highways abound?

New products and new techniques destroy old jobs, but at the same time they create new ones. With the unprecedented amounts we are spending for research and development, the trend is sure to accelerate in the future.

As our productivity increases so, too, does our income. We all receive a larger slice of a larger pie. Larger incomes lead to a greater demand for services. This is exactly what has been happening since the end of World War II. While manufacturing jobs have been declining, those in service and distributive industries have been increasing. There has also been a shift within manufacturing itself from production workers to nonproduction workers and to service-type jobs. And, above all, the jobs in education increase. Furthermore, larger incomes lead to better pensions, hence earlier retirement.

The process demands more education per person. Therefore, the age of entering the labor force has been increasing by leaps and bounds in recent years. Today we wonder why our labor statistics use the age 14 as the age of entry. The age actually is now over 19. All of this means that our work force does not increase in a dynamic economy in proportion to the population increase.

These changes are unsettling and often painful for the individual. Our challenge is to ease and facilitate the adjustment which technological change and invention bring. Yesterday a man who learned a skill could count upon it for his livelihood for a lifetime. Today training and retraining have become a necessary part of being sure of a job.

One thing is certain. Technological change will continue. Even if it were possible to stop it, the freezing of technology or any impairment of the flexibility of our economic system would bring disaster to our country.

However, there is more to the challenge than just filling the jobs we need to have filled as our increased standard of living facilitates earlier retirement and requires a later entry into the labor force. Our growing economy requires more workers of an increasing variety of specialties. Fortunately, during the 1960's we are facing the largest net increase in workers for any 10-year period in our history. By 1970 our labor force is expected to grow to 87 million persons—or 13 million more than today. By 1975, there should be 95 million persons in the labor force. A most sobering thought, however, is that the rate of increase in the labor force will be largest in those groups now suffering the highest rates and the longest duration of unemployment, the unskilled, the semiskilled, essentially the high school dropout—those who are not now qualified to fill the jobs going begging.

What can we do?

Sustained economic growth continually opens up new job opportunities. But economic growth will lag if these new job opportunities are not seized. Economic growth cannot smooth out serious dislocations in our labor market in fact, by its very nature it causes the dislocations. The people to fill the new jobs must be qualified to fill them. They must know what jobs are going begging and where to find them and contact must be made between the job-seeker and the employer.

Unfilled jobs—a problem in many sectors of our economy today—can hold back our economic growth more than any other single factor. The technique of matching idle workers with unfilled jobs is in its infancy. So, too, is our system for training and retraining Americans to fill the jobs that must be filled in the future if, as a nation, we are to realize our economic potential. I feel so strongly about this subject that I have written a book about it, entitled "87 Million Jobs," published by Duell, Sloan & Pearce which will appear September 28. I hope you will find it useful in thinking through this problem.

I think it is time that we devoted more attention to our job vacancies, both actual and latent. How can we get men and women to fill the jobs going begging as well as the hundreds of thousands of new jobs that would open up if trained and willing people were available to fill them? The help-wanted ads which appear in our newspapers tell only a part of the story. Many employers, knowing that the workers they seek are not available, do not even bother to advertise for them or to train them.

I have estimated that in the field of health alone, 900,000 more persons could be employed as doctors, dentists, nurses, nurses' aids, laboratory technicians, orderlies, physical therapists—if only qualified people were available.

To a large extent the same situation applies in the field of education. Many areas of the country are desperately short of teachers, teachers' aids, and other school personnel. Furthermore, it is almost impossible to find competent, fully qualified secretaries. There is also a severe shortage of automobile mechanics, tailors, sales clerks, shoe repairers, officeworkers, social and welfare workers, and scientific and technical subprofessional personnel, even newspaper reporters. The list could go on and on.

There is no magic cure-all to our employment problem. But I believe that to meet the challenge of technology, we must launch a vast program to upgrade the skills of our people so that they can fill the many new jobs being created in our highly developed and increasingly service-oriented society and leave their old jobs to be filled by others, possibly unemployed persons with lesser skills.

Training and retraining of workers in new skills and occupations requires close cooperation among individuals, corporations, labor unions, and Federal, State, and local governments. But the key to the success of any retraining program is the individual energetic and ambitious enough to try to improve his skills or education.

The greatest waste in our society is the person capable of doing a job requiring a higher skill who will not train himself to handle that skill but who, instead, lazes along in a job which is too easy for him. Such a person robs himself as well as the person who does not have the talent to fill the more demanding job but who could adequately handle the less demanding one. Furthermore, he lets down his society.

Our training and retraining effort must cover the entire spectrum of skills. People ask me how the unemployed laborer can be trained as an electronics computer technician. The answer is that he won't be. The possessor of the lowest skill will not be the one trained for the newly emerging job demanding the higher skill. The new job will be filled by a worker who already is highly skilled and who can easily upgrade his skill, and so on down the line.

Another question often asked is, Training for what? It is a key question. We shall defeat our purpose if we train men and women in outmoded skills and dying occupations. Our training must be done with an eye to the future.

One of the most efficient ways of developing the right skills is through inplant training within a corporation. Some of the most encouraging developments in company training are the farsighted programs which train employees to take jobs that do not yet exist while preparing to introduce new mechinery and techniques that will eliminate the old jobs.

But the problem cannot be solved by private effort if government does not help to maintain the proper economic climate, and, might I add, if our churches and character building institutions do not help to preserve the proper human attitudes. The Federal Government has a vital role to play. A slow start has been made. The recently enacted Manpower Training and Development Act can become a major Federal effort in this field. I am proud to say that this act is largely modeled along the lines of the program offered by Republicans in the House after conducting a study, which I had the privilege to organize and direct, into the problems of employment in our dynamic economy. That study, which the press called operation employment, was conducted by 50 House Republicans to which 25 university specialists contributed basic research papers. It was a highly useful study, and I hope we can go into the problem further next year. I have a few copies of the conclusions and recommendations we reached, which I would like to leave with you.

The manpower retraining program, when in full swing, will provide new skills for about 20 percent of those now unemployed. However, if it hits at frictional unemployment in a timely fashion, we will prevent it from freezing into structural unemployment ever again, as happened because of our inattention to the coal mining areas. The encouragement of private businesses to continue and to improve their training and retraining programs is a must. Furthermore, more remains to be done at the Federal level and at all levels of Government to encourage individuals to upgrade their skills. Let me cite a few examples of what the Federal Government can do, and in some instances stop doing, to create this climate or encouragement. I urge your support of these proposals.

I am convinced that men and women who want to increase their education or develop skills should be permitted to deduct such expenses from their income for Federal income tax purposes. At present, they can do so only if the training or education is required to hold their present job. A bill which I have introduced in the House, H.R. 9194, would permit such deductions when incurred in order to move into a new and better job. This is essential in encouraging the upgrading process.

Another area where action is needed is in those States which deny unemployment insurance to persons undergoing retraining. Here again, the law works directly contrary to the public interest. It discourages training when it should be encouraged. But some progress is being made. In 1960, only six States permitted an individual to receive unemployment compensation while undergoing training. Today 20 States permit it. All States should permit it, yes, even demand it of an unemployed person lacking a skill in demand.

The U.S. Department of Labor "Directory of Skills" must be brought up to date. This is a vital first step in preparing our growing work force for the jobs of tomorrow. Many skills in demand are so new we don't even have names for them.

The U.S. Employment Service must be strengthened so that it can be effective in assisting the States, local communities and private business in counseling, placing and relocating workers.

Furthermore, the Department of Labor must begin the formidable task of collecting information on job vacancies on a national scale, just as it regularly collects statistics on our unemployment. With job vacancy information at hand, the U.S. Employment Service could better perform its mission of bringing together the jobless man and the manless job.

The ultimate usefulness of our efforts to identify job vacancies and to upgrade the skills of our workers will be crippled if we fail to encourage greater voluntary mobility of the labor force. We must make it easier for people to move to areas where job opportunities exist.

The mobility of workers is reduced by a number of factors. For example, the nontransferability of pension, seniority and other job rights may tie a worker to a particular job. Cooperation between labor and management can help to remove some of these barriers to mobility.

There are some things that the Federal Government can do to encourage mobility. I have introduced a bill in the House which would make a worker's home for tax purposes his place of residence rather than his place of employment. This simple amendment to update our archaic tax law would remove the tax penalty which workers suffer when they leave their place of residence for a nonpermanent assignment, in another place, or when they follow their job to its new location and have difficulty selling their home and moving their family with them.

These proposals which I have put forward are some of the examples of the free enterprise approach to the problem. I think it is an approach which would serve us well if only we gave it a chance.

Another aspect of our unemployment problem deserves some special attention. Many of our young people, particularly the high school dropout, our Negro citizens, and workers over 45 suffer severely from discrimination as well as from the handicap of having only minimal skills. This discrimination against large numbers of our citizens is both economically and morally wrong.

The problem of the high school dropout has received more and more attention in recent years, and with good reason. Unless we take vigorous action to reduce the dropout rate among high school students, more than 30 percent of new workers entering the labor force in the 1960's—or roughly 7.5 million youngsters—will not have completed high school. Of these, over 2.5 million will not even have completed grade school. This is a staggering social problem with potentially explosive consequences.

Our first objective must be to motivate these youngsters to remain in school. But while in school, they must receive sound vocational guidance and training. Furthermore, State and local employment services must put special emphasis on the problem of finding jobs for these young people.

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must do a complete overhaul and updating job of Federal vocational education. HEW and the Department of Labor must start coordinating instead of competing in these two fields—vocational education and apprenticeship training. All of this should be be coordinated with the vocational education programs conducted by our military establishment. Today the military establishment is the largest operator of vocational education.

Many of the workers over 45 are jobless because employers are prejudiced against older workers for various reasons or because they believe they cannot be trained to the new skills. This belief is largely without foundation. Older workers learn more slowly, but once trained they outperform the younger men. The maturity and experience of our older workers is a precious national asset and must not be wasted.

The prejudice against rehabilitated or habilitated disabled workers must be overcome. Rehabilitation of a disabled person is the most human and economically sensible program we have in our society. The disabled person is a great potential for filling the new jobs that our society so badly needs to have filled.

The discrimination suffered by our Negro citizens is well known to this group. You know, as do I, that much remains to be done by certain unions, some companies and even the Government to eliminate the discrimination that bars Negroes from many of the better jobs. I hope your union will continue to fight vigorously against unfair discrimination in employment and keep those of us in Congress who are carrying on the battle there. In addition, Negro workers, by and large, are concentrated in the less skilled occupations. Census figures show that 75 percent of the Negroes are in five major unskilled and semiskilled occupational categories. Since these groups are most seriously affected by layoffs during recessions and by technological changes, Negroes are disproportionately represented among the unemployed.

Right now there is considerably more that the Federal Government can do to attack the problem of racial discrimination in employment. For example, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has asked the Department of Labor to withhold Federal funds from State employment services that discriminate against Negroes and to stop discrimination in the hiring of Negroes on construction work done for the Government by private contractors. Much remains to be done in eliminating racial exclusion from construction apprenticeship programs. I have worked with the NAACP to achieve this reform, a continuing fight. Many cities haven't even started reforming the apprenticeship program. Even in my own city of St. Louis, one of the first test cities, the battle has not yet been fully won, even though the Department of Labor is offering its assistance.

Recently, I have seen suggestions in the press that unless our chronic unemployment is solved soon, we will have to seek an answer in heavier and heavier doses of Federal spending. What a negative, unanalytical, tired and outworn approach that is. I say unless the crying need for trained people to man our schools, our laboratories, our health institutions, our service and distributive industries is filled we are going to eliminate economic growth. Then we will become a tired, stagnant economy going no place where a skill learned as a youth remains a skill still in demand at age 65.

I believe in the free enterprise market economy. With imagination and hard thought, I am certain we can get our people to fill the jobs going begging without relying on the crutch of Federal spending or new encroachments by the Central Government on the freedoms of individuals, businesses and unions. This approach will not solve the problem arising from long-term changes in the nature and location of jobs. In fact, by delaying the search for a genuine solution, it could well make the problem worse.

In complete honesty, we have to recognize that there are no easy or pat solutions to our employment problem. But I am certain of one thing—that the answers of the prewar depressions, if indeed they ever were true answers, are not sufficient for the questions which trouble us today. All of us must keep our minds open to new and workable ideas. We are the first society in history to emerge into an economic system based upon plenty, not upon scarcity. We cannot put this new wine into old bottles. Our challenge is one of the future, not of dead ghosts of the past.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in this second year of the Alliance for Progress, it has become apparent that the effectiveness of the Organization of American States will be an important factor in its success or failure. I want to take a moment to speak about that organization because of some severe criticism which has been directed at it lately.

There is no doubt that a vigorous, effective OAS could significantly contribute to speeding the economic and social development of the hemisphere. From the U.S. point of view, its potential value is inestimable. Even though we are sincerely devoted to the task of improving the social and economic conditions of the hemisphere, many of our neighbors of the south view our actions with great circumspection. The OAS, however, can speak to Latin America with true impartiality; the voice of the OAS is the voice of Latin America itself. It can say and do things which we in the United States cannot do except at a great disadvantage. Expert advice and prodding for reform, if it comes from a respected, effective OAS, will not arouse the irrational reactions and resentment as would similar advice from a U.S. Government agency. In short, some very practical and pragmatic reasons exist why the OAS can be a most instrumental tool if we wish to hasten the programs for the development of the hemisphere.

From all indications, reports in the leading newspapers in the country and reports which I have personally received at my desk, the OAS is faltering. I am not, at this time, addressing myself to the political role of the organization in the case of Cuba. That is another question. My concern in this case relates solely to the activities of the organization in the field of economic development and technical aid. This is, after all, the core of the task before us. I fully appreciate that the OAS has a long history in inter-American affairs, and that some of its problems result from those deep roots back to a period when it did not have very much to do and functioned accordingly. Today, however, with the unfolding of the Alliance for Progress, its machinery must be adapted to greatly demanding tasks. This calls for leadership and it appears that the administration has not provided that leadership.

There is a great need for the administration to make a strong effort to discover what troubles this organization and what can be done about it. We can not point a finger at the Latin American nations for the ineffectuality of the organization when we ourselves have been equally guilty in disregarding its potentiality. Our diplomatic representation to the Organization does not indicate that we place great importance in the role that it must play in the hemisphere. And it will certainly never assume that role in economic development and technical assistance unless we, who bear the greatest responsibilities, begin to pay closer attention to it.

In this respect, to date, the OAS has been largely ineffectual in its efforts. There is lack of coordination, costly duplication and delay; followthrough in its work is poor; studies into which great amounts of technical and expert effort have been poured are filed away or go unheeded; highly paid experts are unable to put all their talents to work because of the lack of imaginative leadership; competition and jockeying for personal advantage within the organization become more and more burdensome daily. Granted that all large organizations suffer a measure of these woes; but at least, in other organizations, a code of accomplishment exists along with all the personal politics and, when all is said and done, something is accomplished. In the OAS that code of accomplishment seems to have been lost.

This is all the more puzzling and disheartening when one looks at the potential of the men responsible for directing the Organization. It is true that Secretary General Mora has been tagged with some harsh criticism recently, and certainly his record has not been one to generate spontaneous praise. But the Secretary General and some of the people around him are men who have risen to exacting tasks before; their careers indicate a potential capability which, for some reason, is presently paralyzed. The question we must ask, and demand an answer, is what has happened? Why aren't these men living up to the needs of the Organization and the hemisphere? Why are no imaginative ideas coming forth out of the offices of the OAS? Why is not the Organization taking advantage of its well-established impartial role to assert leadership in many of the administrative needs of the Alliance and to press for technical reform?

I think we deserve some answers to these questions. I think we would do well to know why the administration does not make a more determined effort to eliminate the impediments to the effective functioning of this organization. After all, the people who staff the OAS are the same people with whom we must deal in the governments of the Latin American countries. If we cannot do the job here, with people who are right on our front doorstep, and convince them to undertake the vigorous action necessary, what hope is there that we will ever be able to do a similar job with their compatriots in the governments of the American States that are thousands of miles away?

More important, the Alliance, if it is to succeed, needs some organization that will not act as a focus to crystallize the energies of the peoples of the hemisphere and serve as a focal point for the aspirations of 200 million Latin Americans—one that will, in the words of Ambassador Roberto Campos, of Brazil, reprinted on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD only a few weeks ago, established a mystique or crusade atmosphere to the Alliance. No U.S. Government or citizen is able to do that. An organization manned and inspired by Latin Americans might.

Although some people argue for organizing a separate entity for this purpose, I am not at all sure that when one organization is not functioning adequately, creating a new one is any answer. We presently have an elaborate inter-American organization which could, if functioning properly, do the job. It is worth the try. If the U.S. Government cannot, with serious and intense efforts, forge the OAS into a vigorous, purposeful organization, I fear it does not augur well for the future of the Alliance for Progress as a dynamic force to counter the threat of communism in the hemisphere.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as it was necessary for me to be absent on official business on the following rollcalls, in order that the RECORD may show my position on these issues, I request permission to note that had I been present I would have voted as follows: Rollcall No. 276, "yea"; rollcall No. 287, "yea."

CLYDE T. ELLIS—THE ELECTRIC POWER INDUSTRY

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this morning there was delivered to me in my office a six-page telegram which was sent yesterday at 2:30 p.m. m.s.t. from Mr. Clyde T. Ellis in Denver, Colo. Mr. Ellis said he was distressed to learn that last Monday I had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three newspaper articles reporting a speech he made recently in Portland, Oreg. He further accused me of attacking him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for his reported statements that "the power companies were a bigger threat than the Communists." He further accused me of making a "disgraceful and slanderous statement" when I said that "Clyde Ellis envisions himself as the first national commissar of a Russianized electric power industry."

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Shakespeare, "Me thinks the gentleman protesteth too much." Perhaps Mr. Ellis is overly sensitive because I have hit too close to home and his secret dreams and ambitions have thus been exposed pointedly to public view.

It might be interesting to note also in passing that this telegram was sent from Denver at 2:30 p.m., m.s.t., which would be 5:30 p.m. our time here in Washington, yesterday, October 11. May I refer my colleagues to page 23201 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 11 where the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon inserted in the RECORD a letter from this same Mr. Ellis to the Portland Oregonian in which the latter claims to have been misquoted by that outstanding newspaper. The senior Senator from Oregon also referred to my statement of October 8, and indicated that Clyde Ellis had protested to me. It is difficult for me to understand how the senior Senator from Oregon could state on the floor of the Senate that such a communication had been addressed to me when it had not even yet been sent.

In accordance with the request of Clyde Ellis, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I insert his entire telegram in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point so that all may see the thinking of this man:

DENVER, COLO., *October 11, 1962.*

Representative JOHN SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I am distressed to learn that on Monday of this week, October 8, you attacked me personally in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and stated that in a speech in Portland, Oreg., I had said that the power companies were a bigger threat than the Communists. You made the disgraceful and slanderous statement that "Clyde Ellis envisions himself as the first national commissar of a Russianized electric power industry." This statement is completely false, ridiculous on its face and completely unworthy of utterance by any honorable man. As I have written to the Portland Oregonian, I did not make the statement as quoted in its October 3 edition. I have written the Oregonian on this matter as follows:

"EDITOR,
"THE OREGONIAN,
"Portland, Oreg.

"DEAR SIR: In a story on the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference, the October 3 edition of the Oregonian failed to fully and accurately reflect my views on the question of the threat of economic dictatorship by the commercial power companies. I am sure that this occurred through an inadvertent misquote of my extemporaneous remarks.

"I intended my remarks to reflect deep concern over the intensified effort of the power companies to take over and completely dominate every facet of the electric power industry, and to extend their control to the total economy and the Government.

"Due to their concentration of power, I feel that the commercial electric utilities are the No. 1 threat from within to our free enterprise system. They are more dangerous even than Communists who no longer are considered a substantial threat from within.

"Economic dictatorship of the type exhibited by the power companies is a threat and is something that can seriously weaken us in our battle to stop the spread of communism in the world.

"The private sector of the power industry is the largest American industry, doubling its sales every 10 years—far faster than any other major industry. I am convinced that those who control energy in the future will control the economy of the Nation.

"We all recognize the extremely dangerous threat of communism. That is the reason why we must guard against the excesses, the extremism and the scare tactics of groups such as the power companies which would use legitimate fears about security to turn American people against one another.

"In their national advertising, propaganda booklets and speeches, the power company spokesmen mouth the line that power development by anyone other than themselves is socialism or at best un-American. Such a vicious propaganda line is indicative of the extremes to which the power companies are willing to go to gain control of all power production and distribution in the United States.

"The so-called public service power companies are using almost unbelievable monopoly pressure tactics to kill all proposed Federal multipurpose river development projects so vital to the West. They used the same tactics to first kill the Government's efforts to generate power from the waste steam of its atomic energy plant at Hanford, Wash. They succeeded. Then they used the same tactics to prevent consumer-owned-utilities of Washington from doing it, even though consumer-owned systems would pay the Government up to $125 million for it and no Federal expenditures would be involved. They killed it once in the House, but Congress finally rebuffed them and passed it.

"The Idaho Power Co. last February made a tremendous drive to kill off the Raft River Electric Cooperative at Malta, Idaho, just as it had already killed two electric co-ops in Oregon and one in Idaho. Power company campaigns to kill off electric co-ops are now active in the courts and before State Commissions in California, Nevada, New Mexico, Colorado, Mississippi, Alabama, Indiana, and Illinois.

"I hope the Oregonian as well as the rest of the Nation's press will use their great services to expose the power company tactics. The American people, once aroused to the dangers, will demand reform in the commercial power industry.

"Sincerely,

"CLYDE T. ELLIS."

I am sorry you did not check the alleged statement with me before using it as a basis for slandering me before Congress. I ask you in fairness to place this telegram in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CLYDE T. ELLIS.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to note that Clyde Ellis claims the Oregonian misquoted him in his statement that the power companies were a bigger threat than the Communists. However, in his letter to the editor of that great newspaper, he really sticks his foot in his mouth. For it will be noted in the second paragraph of his letter, he states, and I quote exactly:

> I feel that the commercial electric utilities are the No. 1 threat from within to our free enterprise system. They are more dangerous even than Communists who no longer are considered a substantial threat from within.

How can one in honesty and in good conscience accuse a hardworking reporter of misquoting him when he turns right around and says the same thing publicly in a letter to the editor? I will leave it to the judgment of my colleagues in the House of Representatives as to whether Clyde Ellis should criticize the Portland Oregonian, the reporter, or me for exposing his views to the spotlight of public examination.

Mr. Speaker, the tenor of this telegram from Clyde Ellis would seem to infer that the Congressman from Johnstown, Pa., should apologize for exposing him. I say to you and to Clyde Ellis that he has the shoe on the wrong foot.

I call upon Clyde Ellis now to apologize publicly to the hundreds of conscientious taxpaying electric companies for the malicious and slanderous statements that he has made against them in his Portland speech and on many other occasions. I call upon him to apologize to the hundreds of thousands of employees of these companies who are dedicated to the service of their communities and to their Nation.

I call upon Clyde Ellis, furthermore, to apologize to the thousands of honest and sincere members of rural electric cooperatives who are hardworking, God-fearing Americans and who do not countenance such irresponsible acts and expressions.

And, lastly, I call upon Clyde Ellis to apologize to the mass of the American people who are satisfied that the great investor-owned electric utility industry, which has supplied the power to make us great, is the necessary backbone of our economy.

THE SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS TAX RETIREMENT ACT OF 1962

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, since the President signed H.R. 10—the legislation granting professional people and other self-employed individuals the right to establish retirement plans—my office has received many requests for copies of the law.

The subject, as you know, is most complicated and the language not easily interpreted. I am advised by the House Document Room the bill, now identified as Public Law 87-792, will be printed and available for public distribution on or about October 19.

Mr. Speaker, this act will enable more than 7 million self-employed individuals to be covered under qualified retirement plans. The present tax law has encouraged establishment of retirement plans for employees since 1942 and today there are nearly 22 million employees covered under approximately 66,000 qualified plans.

Legislation, as you know, has been pending in Congress for more than a decade to remove the statutory obstacles preventing self-employed persons from participating in qualified retirement plans. This proposal has been named after its authors, namely, as the Reed-Keogh, Jenkins-Keogh, Simpson-Keogh, or the Keogh-Smathers bill. Hearinegs were held on this legislation by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House in 1952, 1953, 1955, 1958, and 1959. The Committee on Finance of the Senate held hearings in 1959, 1960, and 1961. The House passed H.R. 10 three times over the years, 1958, 1959, and 1961, but it was not until this year—September 7, 1962—that the bill was brought to a vote in the Senate.

Under this new law, self-employed individuals are to be treated as employees for retirement plan purposes. They will now be permitted to be covered under qualified employees retirement plans. Rather rigid requirements are imposed upon the self-employed as to amounts which may be contributed, coverage for employees, vesting of benefits and time for payout of benefits.

Self-employed individuals under the new law may contribute under a qualified retirement plan up to 10 percent of their earned income or $2,500, whichever is lesser, but may deduct on their tax returns only one-half of the amount contributed. Thus, the maximum deductible amount is $1,250. Under certain contributory plans additional nondeductible contributions may be made by self-employed individuals. An exception to the 10-percent limitation permits self-employed individuals to purchase level premium retirement income contracts if the premium is based upon earned income for the 3-year period preceding the purchase of the annuity contract. The amount deductible, however, will depend upon earned income for the current year.

Earned income under the new law is defined as net earnings from self-employment, except that where both personal services and capital are material income-producing factors not more than 30 percent of the net profits of the trade or business may be earned income. This definition is designed to insure that contributions are made only with respect to income derived from personal services.

Under the new law, in order for a self-employed individual who has employees to participate under a retirement plan, he must include under the plan each of his employees who has more than 3 years service. Moreover, he must make contributions for those who are fully vested at the time they are made. The new law also requires the self-employed individual who desires to coordinate his retirement plan with social security to do so under new rules which in effect permit him, in determining the contributions he must make under the retirement plan, to take credit only for social security taxes he has actually paid with respect to his covered employees.

Self-employed individuals may not receive benefits under their qualified retirement plans prior to their attaining age 59½ except in the case of disability or death at an earlier age. Benefits must be payable, however, not later than the taxable year in which the self-employed individual reaches age 70½. These restrictions prevent retirement plans from being used for income averaging and prevent lifetime accumulations which might escape income tax altogether.

The new law permits retirement plans covering self-employed individuals to be funded in several ways. There may be a trust whose investments may be directed by the self-employed individual or another person. The trustee, generally, must be a bank. A bank trustee is not required if the trust assets are invested solely in annuity, endowment or life insurance contracts issued by a life insurance company. A custodian account in a bank in lieu of a trust is permitted if its investments are solely in stock of a regulated investment company or in annuity, endowment or life insurance contracts issued by a life insurance company. The retirement plan may be funded through the direct purchase of annuity contracts with an insurance company or it may invest in nontransferable face amount certificates. As an alternative form of investment, the new law permits establishment of qualified bond purchase plans. These plans will not require a trustee but will permit investment directly in a special issue of Federal bonds which may not be redeemed prior to age 59½ and which are nontransferable. Although these bonds may be purchased by anyone, their cost will be deductible only if they are purchased under a qualified retirement plan.

Regulations interpreting the new law will be issued by the Treasury Department and will aid self-employed individuals in applying H.R. 10 to their particular situations. As experience is gained under the new law, it may become desirable to further amend the statute to carry out the intent of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and other sponsors of this legislation have waited many years to see this proposal become law. The lawyers, doctors, dentists, and small businessmen have also been patient. I believe they will find it worth waiting for and hope it will help them in saving for their retirement years.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to notify the President is now ready to report.

Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

PROVISION FOR SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 584, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 584

Resolved, That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 13, 1962, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 585, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 585

Resolved, That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISED EDITION OF THE RULES AND MANUAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 836, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 836

Resolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Eighty-eighth Congress be printed as a House document, and that one thousand six hundred additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which seven hundred copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL TO BE PRINTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 837, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 837

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841 et seq.) shall be printed during such adjournment as House documents of the second session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, AND APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF REPORTS FILED BY INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 87th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBERS OF THESE COMMITTEES TO EXTEND REMARKS, ETC.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of all the standing committees and subcommittees of the House may extend their remarks up to and including the publication of the last RECORD and to include a summary of the work of their committees; also that the ranking minority member of such standing committee or any subcommittee may have the same permission to extend their remarks and to include a summary, if they desire, from their point of view, separately from that of the chairman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DATE OF CONVENING OF 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 907) fixing the time of assembly of the 88th Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 907

Resolved, That the Eighty-eighth Congress shall assemble at noon on Wednesday, January 9, 1963.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAUCRATIC SECRECY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, bureaucratic secrecy is a malady that deeply concerns every one of us. It unquestionably can be and is used to obscure corruption, waste, and inefficiency within the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, bureaucratic secrecy is a harsh term. Executive privilege is a nicer term and it is, in fact, the term that we most often hear when bureaucratic secrecy is being imposed.

Congress and the people of the United States must have the maximum amount of information on the operations of the Federal Government; otherwise, we will never be able to muster the broad wave of national support that must accompany our national decisions in the cold war.

Unfortunately, the trend recently has been away from providing the American people with the maximum amount of information on the operations of their Federal Government. More and more in the recent past, we have heard the term "executive privilege" raised like a curtain around information of great importance to our people. It is a trend that many of us in Congress deplore and we were pleased to learn of the publication of Clark Mollenhoff's book, "Washington Coverup." Mr. Mollenhoff's book is a nonpartisan exposition of virtually every facet of executive privilege and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Personally, I am doubly pleased with the publication of Mr. Mollenhoff's fine work, because, in addition to exposing the deleterious effect of bureaucratic secrecy, it pays one of my close friends and colleagues, PORTER HARDY, JR., of Norfolk, Va., a long overdo tribute for his courage in ferreting out and documenting the methodology used by bureaucrats to shield executive branch employees responsible for waste, fraud, and corruption.

Mr. Speaker, I was very deeply impressed by the outstanding manner in which Mr. Mollenhoff presented the material in his book. However, since I am not a member of the Government Operations Committee, I believe I should leave to others more experienced in this area the detailed discussion of the consequences that all of us can expect from the continued imposition of bureaucratic secrecy. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I rise primarily to praise PORTER HARDY.

If my colleague were the kind of man who sought publicity for his deeds, his actions would be well known, but for years he has quietly worked on and served as chairman of the Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, and has reported to the Congress on the findings of his subcommittee. His splendid efforts have been continuing since he first took his seat in the Congress in 1947.

His deeds during his first 10 or 12 years in the Congress in helping to preserve financial integrity and avoid the squandering of the taxpayers' funds are now history.

Many of his recent actions are more familiar to us. In 1958, he effectively investigated the ICA and its administration of major construction projects overseas, and he documented his findings of inadequacy, inefficiency and incompetency on the part of the agency.

He has, also with great difficulty as outlined so well by Mr. Mollenhoff, gone into the many programs of the International Cooperation Administration and its successor agency, the Agency for International Development. In spite of concealment efforts on the part of administrative personnel, he has opened up the record to the Congress and the American people.

Of course, some of PORTER HARDY's activities have made headlines, such as the technical assistance programs in Latin America; the aid operations in Iran, Laos, and Peru; the Cambodian Port Highway, and—just within the past month—two more reports on the contract operations of the aid programs.

In each case, whether under the present administration or previous ones, his major concern has been to see that deficiencies are corrected and that administrative action is taken by the agency to avoid recurrences.

So widespread has been PORTER HARDY's fight to provide the Congress and the people with information concerning foreign activities of Federal agencies that a questionnaire recently circulated among Members of Congress by one of the leading wire services included this question: "Do you favor the Hardy amendment which mandates Federal agencies to provide information to Congress about mutual security expenditures?" Significantly, the wire service thought explanation of the amendment unnecessary.

I know my colleagues will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the wire service was absolutely correct. Service of the kind long rendered to PORTER HARDY's district, and to his State and Nation, speaks for itself.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, as vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the RECORD, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

THREE-RING CIRCUS NO PLEASURE FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from the Seventh Virginia District, BURR HARRISON, is retiring at the end of this Congress. He is a comparatively young man to have accomplished so much and rendered such outstanding public service.

BURR and I began our service in the Congress at the same time. Those of us who have been privileged to know him intimately have recognized his unusual ability, enjoyed his keen sense of humor, and have found particularly rewarding the warmth of his friendship. I know that as he discontinues his service here, his vast energies will be applied constructively in other pursuits.

As I extend to him my best wishes for improved health and a high degree of satisfaction in whatever endeavors he undertakes, I want to call to the attention of the House some of BURR's typically brief and incisive comments. These appeared in a series of short articles by Luther A. Carter, the Washington staff writer of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot. Because I am sure that these comments will be of interest to my colleagues in the House, I am including the articles in their entirety.

Too Many Activities Destroy Efficiency—3-Ring Circus No Pleasure for Congressmen

(By Luther J. Carter)

Washington.—Congress operates in the 20th century with 19th-century procedures to the vexation of its Members, says Representative Burr P. Harrison, Democratic Congressman from Winchester.

Harrison, on advice from his physician, is retiring from Congress at the end of the present session.

TAXPAYERS' PURCHASE POORLY USED

For some time, he's been thinking about the faults of the institution in which he has served for the last 18 years.

"A major fault is an intolerably vexatious, inefficient management of the time of its Members, time purchased by the taxpayers," he says.

"The various activities of the Congress are in progress at the same time, like a three-ring circus. If one duty is to be done properly, it is likely another must be content with a lick and a promise.

"Committees sit as the floor debate proceeds and constituents wait in the office," he says. "A Member busy in committee will be summoned by the bells to vote on the floor on a measure as to the merits of which he knows little, if anything, and as to the controversial aspects of which he has heard no debate.

"A Member occupied on the floor or in his office will hurry to committee to propound a series of questions to a witness on points which the witness had discussed fully prior to his arrival," Harrison says.

Cynics always have suspected that much of Congress' activities are subterranean. Harrison confirms this view. "During the course of an average day, a Member will spend a great deal of time in the Capitol Hill tunnel system, moving from committee to floor to office," he says.

"Under such a method of operation," he adds, "the Members of Congress function without deliberation, without adequate information and in an atmosphere of stress and tension in which many are plucked at by recurring doubts as to the purpose or worth of their individual efforts."

The onerous burdens of office break down as follows:

Legislative: Attending committee sessions, hearing witnesses, drafting bills and participating in floor debate.

Attending to constituents and their representatives (lobbyists): This involves personal interviews and extensive correspondence. Aiding constituents in their dealings with the "frustrating complex of Federal agencies" has become a major function, contrary to what was contemplated under the Constitution.

(Harrison observes: "In many cases, a Member will receive more letters, telephone calls and personal visits from constituents relating to personal problems involving civil service, veterans claims, postal service, flood control, agricultural regulations, visas and immigration, family hardships of servicemen and a multiplicity of other dealings between individual citizens and the Federal octopus, than he will on pending legislation.")

Social demands. These arise from "the practice of annual congressional banquets held in Washington by business, agricultural, labor, veteran, fraternal and other groups.

"The absence of a Member often is resented, even though he may previously have accepted an invitation to a similar function for the same evening," Harrison says.

In the spring, invitations of this kind can account for three or four evenings a week, and "attendance at the functions becomes work." The almost invariable presence of one or more constituents makes it important work.

Mending the home fences. The Congressman keeps in touch with his district by attending community functions, accepting speaking invitations, and sampling public opinion by personal tours and correspondence generated by the legislator.

"For a House Member, faced with biennial campaigns, this activity makes a constant demand on his time," says Harrison.

To make matters worse, not only is the Congressman confronted with these conflicting and multifarious duties, but a mixed-up legislative schedule frustrates attempts to organize his time, Harrison says.

"In general, no one knows this week what Congress is going to do next week," he notes. "No one knows today what Congress is going to do tomorrow."

CLOCK CAN'T COMMAND ATTENTION

"No one knows at 4 o'clock this afternoon whether Congress is going to quit for the day in half an hour or continue its deliberations well into the evening. Even when announced, legislative programs often are not adhered to and cannot be relied on."

Congress Best in Crisis—Lobbyists Distort National Interests

(By Luther J. Carter)

Washington.—The national interest often tends to get overlooked because lobbyists apply a political leverage on the Congressman quite unmatched by that of the ordinary citizen, Representative Burr P. Harrison says.

Harrison, retiring from the House of Representatives after 16 years as Democratic Member from Virginia's Seventh District (Shenandoah Valley), suspects that Congress works best in time of crisis.

Then it can give the national interest its due, and sectional and private interests are properly left for secondary consideration.

Normally, however, minority interests are so politically persuasive that things hindmost often wind up in front, Harrison believes.

The "average citizen" has no right to be sanctimonious about this. Harrison places on him much of the responsibility for the situation, though he indicates it is perhaps inevitable.

"The activities of Congress have become so extensive that the average citizen has little information about his Congressman's record except to the extent it affects his individual interests," he says.

"This is often limited to the information given him by the Washington lobby that protects his interests.

"While these lobbies may represent substantial numbers of citizens, the individual groups represented comprise minorities of the total electorate and usually are being represented only with respect to certain issues," Harrison says.

"The citizens in these groups, however, often are furnished lists of 'friends' and 'enemies' in Congress and urged to vote for the friends and against the enemies," he goes on.

The Congressmen are labeled on the basis of certain positions they have taken affecting the minority interest, rather than on the basis of their overall record and the general welfare, Harrison says.

The citizen who belongs to no special-interest groups may be in an almost total void of information about his Congressman.

Indeed, this is likely to be the case, Harrison says, "except to the extent the Member of Congress may undertake his own mass distribution of speeches, news reports, questionnaires and voting summaries.

"Minority pressure groups, therefore, exert a power over the Congress far out of proportion to their size in the overall population," he says.

"They make their members Congress conscious and guide them in voting on a special-interest basis."

Tempers Too Hot in Summer—Recess Would Cool Congress—Congress Needs a Rest

(By Luther J. Carter)

Washington.—In nonelection years Congress should take a summer recess and not pick up its legislative duties again until tempers have cooled along with the weather.

This is the view of Representative Burr P. Harrison, Democratic Congressman from Winchester, who in previous articles has discussed various congressional shortcomings. Harrison is retiring after 16 years in Congress.

RELAXATION WHEN NEEDED

A summer recess, from July 1 until October 1, is one of the major improvements he believes are needed.

Such a recess would give Members of Congress a chance to plan time in their districts, enjoy their families while the children are home from school, and "relax their tempers during the period in which experience has shown this to be most needed," Harrison says.

"This would tend to reduce the present ill-tempered legislating of the Washington summers, conducted in a frantic tension-ridden 'When are we going to get away from here?' atmosphere," he adds.

Harrison suggests a way to keep a legislative logjam from piling up at the end of each session. The first part of the session should be devoted largely to committee business (hearings, marking up bills, etc.), and a deadline should be fixed after which no new legislation could be introduced.

Exceptions to observance of the deadline should be allowed only upon request of the President or by vote of the House, he says.

ORGANIZATION LACKS ORGANIZATION

Harrison complains of the lack of order and certainty in the Congressman's schedule, but he has a partial remedy for this, too.

"Divide the days of the week between those on which committees sit and the House meets," he says. This would keep Members from having to scurry back and forth through the tunnel between the Capitol and their office buildings. They could carry out their work without dispatching some duties with a lick and a promise.

He would also have the House adopt "the British system under which the floor leader announces well in advance the date and hour at which votes will be taken."

This would relieve a longstanding grievance where Harrison is concerned. He says no one knows today what Congress will do tomorrow. When legislative programs are announced they are not to be relied upon.

Perhaps his most radical suggestion is to allow Members to delegate to staff members the right to attend committee hearings in their stead. The staffman would question witnesses in the Member's behalf.

VARIED OPINIONS

This would call for a rare tact on the staffer's part, so as not to find himself embroiled in the squabbling that often goes on among committee members of varying political hues.

Not all is wrong with the Congress and Harrison takes up for one of its most oft-criticized features—the seniority rule that determines committee chairmanships.

"The difficulty is in selecting a better system," he says. "Prior to the inauguration of the seniority system, the power was in the Speaker and the party leadership who exercised it so arbitrarily and capriciously that seniority was substituted."

For all its faults, Harrison laments the fact that the people do not know the Congress better. The growth of the Nation has put congressional representation in a two-way stretch.

"The size of the House has grown so large it is unwieldy (435 Members)," he says. "On the other hand, population increases have required such increases in the population of congressional districts that contact is being lost between the people and their representative."

Harrison doesn't know whether he's returning to the anonymity of private life, or whether he's been anonymous all along. "What percent of the citizens can even give the name of their Congressman?" he asks.

A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my constituents are accustomed to receiving from me at the close of each Congress a message entitled "A Report to the People."

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Citizens have a right to know the views, the record, and the performance of their Representative in Congress. For that reason, I also make weekly radio reports and offer my services to appear before any and all groups to discuss any issue or answer questions.

Due to the merger of congressional districts, this report is also being sent to citizens in Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties.

There have been attempts to deny Representatives the opportunity of mailing these reports by taking away their congressional franking privilege. Behind this effort are interests that would deny citizens the right to know about their Congress and to hear from their elected representatives.

This would keep important information from the people which often is difficult, if not impossible, for them to receive otherwise.

I hope the day will never come when the people of this country do not demand an accounting of the activities of their Representatives, and I hope that day will never come when a Representative is so lacking in responsibility to the electors that he refuses to offer such a report.

I regret that this report will reach the people almost 2 months later than usual, because the Congress has been held in session long past the usual date of adjournment.

DECEPTIVE CHARGES

Wild charges have been made blaming congressional mail for the big postal deficit. Facts are that the total cost last year for franked mail for all Members of Congress was less than $4 million. It has nothing to do with the postal deficit as the cost of congressional mail is paid by direct appropriation from the Treasury. It is not included in the postal deficit.

The per capita cost for all mail sent out by all Members of Congress is less than 2 cents a year. By comparison it costs taxpayers three times this much for postal subsidies that go to just one big news monopoly. The below-cost mailing service, as an example, to Time, Life, and Fortune, and three other Luce publications costs U.S. taxpayers $12 million a year.

It is a violation of the sacred right to know to have citizens depend entirely on partisan monopoly news services for reports on their Congress.

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD

It is quite obvious that many persons do not realize how closely their welfare, their opportunities for jobs, for education, health services, old-age and disability pensions, and a decent livelihood are affected by action or inaction of the Congress.

It is important to know the fundamental differences between our two great political parties and their conflicting philosophies of government. To better understand the controversy over education, social security, area redevelopment, economic growth, hard money, recessions, and other such programs, it is essential to know and understand these differences. From them the sharp conflicts arise on social and economic questions.

Monetary and credit policies vitally affect the performance of the whole American economy. They affect the price level, the levels of production and employment, the rate of economic growth, and the standard of living.

They affect the degree of economic opportunity afforded to the small as well as the large, the weak as well as the strong. They affect not only the degree of economic stability and progress, but also the degree of economic justice or injustice.

CONFLICT OF ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHIES

Democratic Senator Russell Long put it in plain language in a Senate speech when he pointed to the deep cleavage between the Republican and Democratic Parties. Senator Long said:

> It reflects a difference of fundamental economic philosophy—a difference which has persisted throughout our history as a nation, and particularly during the current century.
>
> The difference is between those who believe in an economy of scarcity, and those who believe in an economy of abundance; between those who feel that we must stand still, have occasional recessions or depressions, and those who feel that we have the brains and the tools to move forward without substantial interruption. It is a difference between those who feel that social injustice is the price we must pay for economic progress, and those who feel that social justice and economic progress are one and inseparable.

Regardless of election campaign oratory, the decision at the polls in State and national legislative contests will determine which one of these two courses the Nation will follow to meet the challenge and problems of our time.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

The record of your 87th Congress is an impressive one. More has been done to fight recession and restore prosperity by this Congress than any other since the early New Deal years.

When President Kennedy took office in January of 1961, the Nation was in the midst of its third recession in 7 years. Unemployment was far above the tolerable 4-percent mark as over 5½ million Americans looked for jobs. Industries across the country were operating anywhere from 50 to 80 percent of capacity. Farm incomes were disastrously low.

To fight unemployment and get the economy moving again, President Kennedy stepped up the release of already authorized funds for Federal procurement and for the construction of highways and other public works.

ANTI-RECESSION PROGRAM

The President asked the Congress for a bold anti-recession program. As a result, the 1st session was devoted mainly to fighting recession and attempting to meet some of our urgent public needs. During 1961 the President recommended to Congress and secured the enactment of extended unemployment compensation; higher minimum wage and coverage for 3.6 million more people; area redevelopment; liberalized social security and a comprehensive housing program to provide homes and jobs and to wipe out slums, urban blight, and unemployment. Also approved were a new highway program; expanded airport construction; increased appropriations to combat the pollution of our rivers; program for economic conversions of salt water to fresh; civil rights legislation; new laws to combat organized crime, and a program for control of juvenile delinquency. The first major addition was made to our national park system in 14 years. A community health facilities program was approved to help senior citizens through nursing homes, diagnosis, and advisory centers, improved hospitals, and other community services.

Toward the end of last year, the Kennedy program was taking its effect. Unemployment dropped from 7 percent in 1961 to less than 5.7 percent in 1962. Industrial production was up 13 percent. Corporate profits increased $12 billion. Gross national product was up 8 percent. Wages and salaries up 7 percent.

SECOND SESSION

The work of the second session of the Congress was devoted to spurring on the recovery, wiping out unemployment in those areas of chronic and persistent unemployment, fighting the scourge of automation, and meeting human and public needs. Over the past 10 months, the following legislation was given favorable consideration by the Congress:

The manpower training and development program designed to help those unemployed through automation and the obsolescence of their skills find new hope and new jobs.

The first major public works bill since the great depression, designed to fight unemployment in the distressed areas and meet the need for new public facilities.

A revised welfare program emphasizing rehabilitation and self-help rather than relief and subsistence.

A revised Welfare Pension Plan Disclosure Act to protect the pension funds of America's working men and women.

Repeal of the 10-percent excise tax on bus and train passenger fares and a reduction of the tax from 10 to 5 percent on airline rates.

A responsible drug control bill to protect our people from false and misleading advertising, untested and unsafe drugs, and excessive drug prices.

UNMET PUBLIC AND HUMAN NEEDS

Despite excellent progress made in this Congress several major measures have not received favorable action.

It was unfortunate that the administration's aid to education proposals were killed by the conservative coalition in the House of Representatives. Last year's final move to consider even a modified general aid to education bill on the House floor was killed by almost solid Republican opposition with the help of conservative southern Democrats.

The administration's proposals would have meant an extra $28 million for the State of Pennsylvania to spend on education, to say nothing about the 1,000 or more scholarships to needy high school seniors and other programs to be expanded under the National Defense Education Act.

This year the coalition was successful in killing the administration's college aid bill which would have helped the Nation's colleges and universities in building needed classrooms, libraries, science halls, and other academic facilities. This program would also have made available more than $600 million in loans and grants for needy college students and high school seniors.

I feel that such scholarship and construction parts of this program were of vital importance to the new Sixth District. Albright College, now trying to gain enough funds to provide new facilities for growing enrollments would have benefited significantly from Federal grants and loans through the scholarship and loan provision. Needy students in Berks, Northumberland, and Schuylkill Counties would have been given new hope and new opportunities to receive a college education that is now beyond the means of many talented boys and girls.

BATTLE OF WORDS AND PHILOSOPHY

These are some of the programs that the GOP-Dixiecrat coalition in Congress have opposed with such arguments as wasteful and unnecessary spending, States rights, welfare statism and big government. Throughout our history, however, liberal programs such as offered by President Kennedy have always been opposed by ultra conservative interests.

There is, of course, this sharp conflict between the Republican philosophy which Democrats refer to as trickle-down and the Democratic belief that progress and prosperity depend upon the purchasing power of the people and their opportunities for jobs and expanding public service.

Republican leaders contend that the Nation cannot afford to do the things which the administration proposes, while Democrats insist that our country cannot afford to ignore them.

Like my Democratic colleagues, I am alarmed at the terrible waste in human and natural resources which goes on in the name of economy.

REAL WEALTH OF NATION

The real wealth of our Nation lies in these human and natural resources, the intelligence, health and know-how of our people, and the productive power of men and machines. Unemployment is waste. Failure to use the services of partially handicapped persons and many men over age 50, who are willing and able to work, is wasteful. To deny our youth educational opportunities is a waste to our Nation which needs to develop the best of its talent.

The waste in lost productivity and wealth due to economic curtailment, unemployment and recession during the last several years is too staggering to estimate, running into untold billions of dollars. President Kennedy has made every effort to reverse this trend with his progressive program. For the decade of the 1950's as a whole, the Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that the total loss of national production from underutilization of our resources exceeded $175 billion. This lost productivity and unemployment represents a waste of human and natural resources that the Nation cannot afford, a loss that is reflected in needless human suffering and distress, particularly in depressed coal region areas of Pennsylvania.

DEMOCRATIC WHIP

In this Congress I again served as whip and floor leader of the Pennsylvania Democratic delegation. As a party whip, I worked with House and Senate leaders, and with President Kennedy, in seeking enactment of his progressive program.

My attendance record was again one of the highest in the Congress.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have supported efforts to promote educational features on television and to eliminate fraud and deception and those evils which contribute to juvenile delinquency and crime.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety, I gave special attention to programs which seek to find the cause and cure of crippling and killing diseases. My bill to aid the graduate schools of public health in training doctors, nurses, technicians, and other specialists, was passed by the Congress as part of the overall community health facilities bill.

I am a member of the House Administration Committee, which approves appropriations for House committees. In this capacity I have worked closely with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman Francis E. Walter, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Only once in 14 years have I objected to the amount of money requested by this committee. That was 14 years ago after the unethical conduct by a former chairman who was later convicted and imprisoned on a corruption charge.

BILLS INTRODUCED

In this Congress, as in the past, I have introduced legislation in the House of Representatives which I believe to be in the public interest. As in previous Congresses, some of my proposals were enacted into law. Some were passed in amended form. Some died in committees. All proposals, however, stimulate discussion and interest and contribute to the enactment of sound legislation.

I sponsored legislation to raise income tax exemptions to $800 a year; increase minimum social security benefits to $50 a month; allow benefits to men who retire at age 62; women at 60; establish a Federal Agency for the Handicapped; grant a deduction for income tax purposes to handicapped persons for transportation expenses to and from work; and provided an additional tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting handicapped dependents unable to care for themselves.

Other bills I introduced were designed to provide a massive public works program to put jobless people back to work; provide a pension for World War I veterans; aid in the creation of a nationwide system of junior colleges; increase Federal authorization to assist schools of public health in training specialists for public health service and institutional work.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Twice vetoed by former President Eisenhower, the Area Redevelopment Act was passed in this Congress and signed by President Kennedy. It provides $394 million in Federal loans and grants to assist urban and rural areas suffering from excessively high rates of unemployment.

This important legislation had my active support. It is of vital importance to the new Sixth Congressional District, especially the anthracite areas in Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties where unemployment is intolerably high.

By September 1, over $500,000 worth of loans and grants were approved by the ARA for Northumberland and Schuylkill Counties. These projects under consideration are expected to create many new jobs.

Area redevelopment is a long-range program which will not have its full effects for several years. As part of an overall program to increase our rate of economic growth and provide job opportunities for the unemployed it can bring new hope, and new opportunities to the anthracite areas of Pennsylvania. It is unfortunate that a program which will do so much to help so many of our people was opposed by 75 percent of the Republican Members when it came before the House of Representatives.

IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY

As part of his antirecession program last year, President Kennedy proposed a liberalization of our social security program including medicare for the aged.

Minimum monthly benefits were raised from $33 to $40. Widows' benefits were increased. Men were given the option to retire at 62 years of age with slightly reduced benefits. The requirements for eligibility were liberalized to enable thousands more of our senior citizens to come under the social security program. Of all our welfare programs, social security is the one which Republican leaders have historically opposed. One of the leading objectives of the John Birch Society, a conservative front organization which includes many millionaires, is to repeal social security. Its influence was felt at the national convention of Young Republicans in Minneapolis, which called for the abolition of social security.

With many liberal Democratic colleagues, I feel that much still remains to be done to improve social security. Benefits generally are too low and coverage should be expanded to those old folks who are not covered.

HOUSING

To meet housing needs and to increase our rate of economic growth, Congress passed the most comprehensive housing program in congressional history.

This new law will help to give every American an opportunity to own his own home. To help our citizens in the lower income groups to buy their own homes, the law contained a low-interest, low-downpayment loan program.

This bill also included an expansion of urban renewal, public housing, housing for the elderly, and college housing. In addition, a program was established to obtain open spaces in urban renewal areas for children to enjoy fresh air and recreation.

Housing programs are extremely beneficial to the new Sixth Congressional District. As of March 31, 1962, more than $60 million in Federal funds had been available to meet housing needs in Berks, Northumberland, and Schuylkill Counties.

Housing programs make it possible for thousands of our citizens to purchase decent homes through FHA-insured mortgages. More than 53,000 people in the new district are now enjoying the benefits of more than $55 million in federally insured home mortgage and improvement loans. They provide loans for colleges to meet the needs of growing enrollments. Last year, Albright College in Reading, Pa., received $920,000 under this bill to build needed dormitory space.

More than $4,300,000 have come into our cities in the tricounty area through urban renewal programs. Rural areas have benefited to the amount of over $440,000 in planning advances from the Community Facilities Administration for public works projects like sewer and water facilities.

Reading was the first city in the Nation in providing decent public housing for our needy senior citizens. Hensler Homes in Reading is a project and a model of what can result from a healthy partnership of local initiative and Federal funds.

MANPOWER RETRAINING

To help the unemployed gain new skills and new hope, the Congress this year enacted the Clark-Holland Manpower Development and Training Act.

In the short time the program has been underway, over $300,000 in Federal funds has come into the Sixth District to retrain the unemployed.

PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

To help meet our Nation's need for new public facilities and fight unemployment, the Congress this year passed its first major public works program since the early New Deal years.

This legislation had my active support in the House of Representatives. It should go a long way in fighting unemployment in the coal region areas of the district and provide needed public facilities.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The President's proposal for financing hospital and nursing home care through the social security system to meet the needs of our senior citizens is also awaiting action by the next session of Congress.

Defeat for the President's medicare program in the U.S. Senate was a serious setback for the Nation's senior citizens. This program is essential to meet the health needs of the more than 17 million people who are now over age 65. At a time when their health needs are the greatest in their lives, our old folks are receiving the lowest incomes of their adult years. This President's program had my support in the House of Representatives.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S FUTURE

Every informed person knows that there needs to be a proper balance between Government spending and revenues. But there is a big difference between investments for public service, education, health, housing, and the big spending which benefits a favored and powerful few.

One road leads to a strong and prosperous economy. The other leads to unemployment and recession and the neglect of human needs and public service.

ABUNDANCE SHOULD BE USED WISELY

We are blessed in our country with abundance and with great human and natural resources. Yet there is unnecessary suffering and distress. There is no need to fear the future if we have faith, courage, and understanding, and if we dedicate ourselves to promoting the public welfare and the common interest we all share in a strong, united, and prosperous America.

As a Member of Congress this has been my objective. This is why I have supported legislation fór schools, jobs, old age security, and programs to meet the needs of our people and our country.

COOPERATION WITH INDUSTRY

Our business community has made steady recovery from the recession. All the important statistics point to a rising level of business activity, which will mean both greater employment and profitable enterprise.

Whenever I could properly be of assistance to business and industry in Berks County, I have cooperated in every possible way. I fully appreciate the importance of a successful and prosperous industry to our community. A healthy climate for business means jobs for working men and women, and prosperity for our city and county.

Politics never interferes with my responsibility to all of my constituents. I am sure that many Berks County business leaders will attest to this fact.

Pennsylvania's Democratic Senator JOSEPH CLARK has given me full cooperation in helping my congressional district.

Senator CLARK has a business and professional background. He is one of the most progressive and able Members of the Senate. He is a man of unimpeachable integrity, great ability, and political courage.

FOREIGN POLICY

In foreign affairs, the Kennedy administration has sought to mold a community of free world nations whose military, economic, social, and moral resources would be directed against the Communist menace. On taking office last year, President Kennedy faced the grimmest situation in foreign affairs that has ever confronted a new Chief of State.

A strong and united free Europe is our first line of defense against the Communist menace. Today, when the Berlin crisis is still with us, Europe and the United States are standing firm as a solid block against the irresponsible demands of the Communist countries.

WAR ON THE BREEDING PLACES OF COMMUNISM

As an effective means in fighting communism, President Kennedy has placed emphasis on eliminating conditions that breed communism. In his address announcing the new Alliance for Progress last year, the President announced our Nation's commitment to cooperate with the underdeveloped nations in ending the poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and unemployment upon which communism thrives.

Along with our assistance, the underdeveloped nations would be expected to make necessary internal reforms such as land redistribution and tax revision in order to make their governments more stable and to make a greater contribution to their own national development. The President has pledged to rid our foreign aid programs of waste and corruption, and to insure that our aid would help all the people and not just the favored few.

Many in Congress feel that economic assistance is a vital part of our defense effort. It will do little good to forge strong military alliances in the chain to contain world communism if our economic links are weak. Many of us agree with President Kennedy who declared that military pacts cannot help nations whose social injustice and economic chaos invite insurrection and chaos.

POLITICAL SPENDING

A congressional committee has reported that millions of dollars are being spent each year in national political campaigns. Yet influencing election contests involves much more than the expenditures which are cited in such reports. To get a more realistic picture of political spending, one should also include the cost of political efforts of syndicated columnists and political writers and the value of free space given by the big news monopolies to influence political thinking and voting trends.

Nearly all of the big high-salaried national columnists hold conservative views or reflect the interest and philosophy of those who own and control the big news syndicates.

It is this fact that causes a one-sided presentation of news and information and makes it difficult for a clear public understanding of the controversial and crucial issues which confront the people of the Nation.

Political spending reports are not complete unless they include all the organized efforts to influence public opinion and election results.

FARM BILL ISSUE

The farm bill which was enacted appears to be the best possible compromise that could be agreed upon in this 87th Congress. I am not in complete agreement with every part of this bill. But its defeat would have meant a reversion to the so-called Benson program which would reopen the floodgates for a new avalanche of surpluses in wheat, corn, and other feed grains, and cost our taxpayers additional billions of dollars.

I was pleased that measures restricting the amount of grain a farmer could grow for his livestock have been significantly eased in the final report. This question was of special concern to me as I know it was to Pennsylvania farmers.

The bill's purpose is to increase farm income, lower costs of farm programs to the taxpayer, and reduce vast Government surpluses.

SUPPORTED BY GRANGE

Opponents have made wild and deceptive charges that the bill contains a provision that would jail farmers who do not comply with the law. These statements are false and dishonest. The bill had the support of National and State Grange leaders Herschel Newsom and J. Collins McSparran. Endorsement by these respected and dedicated agricultural leaders indicates how irresponsible such charges really are. McSparran is well-known in rural Pennsylvania. He was a candidate for Governor this year in the Republican primary elections. Both Newsom and McSparran urged my support for the farm bill which was passed and for which I voted.

No question before this 87th Congress was more confusing than the controversy over the farm bill. The reason for this, however, is quite obvious.

Bad news about the farm problem is as Columnist Walter Lippmann pointed out:

> There are more farmers trying to make a living on the land than our modern scientific agriculture requires. Underneath the crop surpluses there is a surplus of farmers.
>
> There are nearly twice as many farmers as are needed for efficient production. And in the years to come, as more and more scientific means are applied to agriculture, the number of farmers that are needed will decline still more.
>
> This revolution cannot be stopped or turned back by any farm program that Congress could vote or that the Treasury could possibly afford.

Lippmann's statement outlines the basic farm problem. To soften the impact of the farm revolution, Congress, I believe, has an obligation to the farmers and to the Nation.

FARMERS DIFFER

Farmers themselves differ widely. In a recent farm newsletter I submitted statements by the Farmers Association (Farm Bureau), the National Grange, and that of Agriculture Secretary Freeman.

These statements reflect the conflicting views on farm legislation.

AMENDMENTS AID PENNSYLVANIA FARMERS

When the bill first came before the House I made efforts, with some success, to have the House committee agree to amendments to meet objections raised by farmers from my district. Amendments were adopted that eased restrictions on silage and soft wheat. Other changes were made to meet objections by some Eastern farmers. After the amendments were adopted, I supported the bill as a reasonable compromise. I feel sure that dire predictions made by opponents will prove to be wrong.

The highly respected Kiplinger Agricultural Letter, which was brought to the attention of Congress by House Agriculture Committee Chairman Harold D. Cooley several months ago, pointed out that there was nothing in the administration bill to regiment farmers and there was nothing in the bill asking Congress to abdicate. Yet these irresponsible charges were made in an effort to defeat the farm bill.

Involved—

The Kiplinger Report said—

> is basic idea conflict on role of Government in farming. You may agree that the farm economy can right its own wrongs and gain prosperity with less Government, or you may disagree on the basis that Government has a responsibility to assure strength in the economy. But no matter where you sit, it's important to know the facts.

Senate Leader Mike Mansfield has this to say:

> In my opinion a vote against the present conference report would bring about lower farm income. It would increase the cost to the taxpayer. It would increase surpluses and reverse the successes which the programs over the past 2 years have brought about in reducing surpluses.

H. R. Snider, a farmer whose remarks were inserted in the Congressional Record by Senator Gale McGee, criticized efforts to distort the farm issue through emotional outbursts, extreme exaggerations and profuse use of words and terms such as communism, regimentation, loss of freedoms, and so forth. Some speakers and writers, Snider said, are blocking a calm and reasonable approach to problems which should command our very best thinking and our best talents.

The pressing problems in American agriculture and their solutions are approached by some commentators, magazine articles and some groups in a completely negative manner.

It takes little or no mental effort to resort to labels or name calling whether the purpose is to condemn or espouse. It is a negative and irrational approach which cannot be condoned by the conscience-thinking citizen.

CHALLENGE OF AUTOMATION

Last July the Committee for Economic Development, a business-sponsored group, recommended that one-third of the Nation's farmers leave the farms for other work. With millions of jobless already in the cities, such a plan would lead to chaos without a comprehensive program. Automation, whether on the farm or in industry, presents a challenge that requires joint and cooperative effort of all segments of the economy affected by the technological revolution.

DISTRICT OFFICE SERVICE

Ever since my election to Congress I have maintained a full-time office in Reading where constituents can come with their problems or suggestions and receive prompt and courteous attention.

This, I believe, is the kind of service that should be available to constituents in every county to bring their Representative closer to the people.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY HERE FEAR SHIFT OF JOBS TO TEXAS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star yesterday there was a news story with a headline reading, "Seven Hundred and Fifty Here Fear Shift of Jobs to Texas." The story purported to recount the chagrin of certain Air Force employees who were advised that their work unit was to be transferred from Washington to Randolph Air Force Base at San Antonio, Tex., the district I represent.

This newspaper account recited some expressions of concern on the part of Negro employees who feared they might suffer indignities of racial segregation, have difficulty finding suitable housing or that their children would suffer educationally and culturally.

When I read this story I could appreciate the fact that here were a group of Government employees distressed at this uprooting and the changes it implied in their lives. Furthermore, it was apparent that the expressions of concern about San Antonio were prompted principally by a fear of the unknown. Their knowledge was based on what they knew from popular caricatures of the South or from the balderdash that makes Texas a good butt of popular jokes.

Neither the caricatures nor the "Texas jokes" necessarily apply to San Antonio. San Antonio is very much a part of Texas, but it was there before Texas. It has a history and development of its own, and, I venture, its recorded history predates that of the hometown of any member in this Chamber.

This fact has given San Antonio a uniqueness, and, as its Congressman, I felt obliged to advise the good reporter of the Evening Star that there was more to be said than he had reported. I am gratified that today's edition of this paper presented most of the letter I wrote on this last night. This is what I said in my letter:

> I have just read your story stating that some 750 Air Force employees are fearful

and displeased about the prospects of being transferred to San Antonio, Tex. I hasten to make two comments on this to you and the affected employees.

First, the employees can be sure of my support in the safeguarding of everyone of their rights and opportunities, for I know what personal and job problems can come from a move of this kind. I feel certain that with the help of their collective bargaining representatives, Air Force officials and all the rest of us, we can assure that this is handled with consideration for each individual.

Mainly, I want to tell the employees that they are wrong about San Antonio and I offer every facility of my office and our city to prove they are wrong. For one thing, San Antonio is considered a desirable place to live by tens of thousands of civil service and military personnel who have elected to retire there. Our city devotes itself to being a good host to over 35,000 Government workers who are now working there.

Those Negro employees who are fearful of discrimination against their rights are unduly concerned. We have problems, as does Washington, in this area, but if what they say they fear were true, I would not be Congressman from San Antonio.

When I was city councilman in 1956 we completely integrated every public facility in town including swimming pools—and we have swimming pools there. Our schools are integrated better than most in the District and all those in Maryland and Virginia. A few weeks ago I dedicated the opening of one our finest private housing developments of premium homes near Randolph Field. It is completely integrated and one can buy a lot more home for his money in San Antonio than he can here, and our year-round sunshine does most of the heating.

One incident should allay all these fears. When the Nation was torn over events in Mississippi last week, a Negro graduate of Howard University and the University of Texas Medical School was named chief resident of obstetrics and gynecology at our great county hospital. This does not sound like a city anyone need fear. Certainly it is more enlightened in these matters than many of those who guide the fortunes and administration of the District of Columbia.

We will welcome all those who care to come and they will find us good neighbors. Some years from now you can write another story telling how those who came in fear stayed to retire in peace beside our romantic river that for 250 years has been a spot where many cultures met and settled in peace.

Having started on this subject, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to find a point at which to terminate. So much more should be said. If a leading newspaper in our Nation's Capital was not sufficiently informed to feel compelled to present a balanced account on San Antonio, I wonder about the knowledge of my own colleagues in this House. It is my duty to represent my district before you, so I shall add to this account.

I have said that San Antonio is a place where many cultures met and settled in peace. This is true, but it has not always been true. We have had our struggles between conflicting interests, as has had the Nation. Most of these we have now buried along with other memories in the shrine of the Alamo.

Looking back over our history, San Antonio meets the modern eye as an ancient though modern city lying along the Balcones Escarpment where the San Antonio River literally bursts from the rocks in a thousand limestone springs. Not since Moses struck the rock to draw water have men seen such a sight. Little wonder that the men of Carlos V built their Kings Highway, El Camino Real, to this spot where they did dwell in peace with the Lipan Apache.

Here is where America had its first water reclamation project as the Franciscan Fathers taught the Indians to build elaborate aqueducts, irrigation ditches and mills. Here is where the Viceroy of Mexico brought Canary Islanders to live and where the Governor's palace was later erected. Over half a century before the cornerstone of this Capitol was laid the cornerstone of our San Fernando Cathedral was laid.

San Antonio became the meeting point of the Spanish-speaking and the English-speaking cultures on the American continents. It continues to have that distinction. But our city is not composed of only English and Spanish. To this city, which was built hundreds of miles beyond the then existing frontier of the United States, there came also the Germans, the French, and the Irish. And from La Villita of the Spanish, Germantown of the Germans, Military Plaza of the Americans, and the Irish flats of the Irish, there has truly been composed, in every sense of that tranquil word, a great and cosmopolitan city around which has grown the ninth most populated congressional district in the United States.

I speak here for San Antonio and the county of Bexar. I do it proudly. There is much for which to be proud that is not told in terms of history, but rather in those terms by which we take the measure of a city.

There is much I could tell you of our industries, our natural resources, our universities, our schools, our hospitals, our research foundations, our agricultural and livestock diversity, our rapidly growing population, our parks, our museums, our art centers, our multiplicity of tourist attractions, our recreational facilities, our trade and commerce and our ready access to Mexico and to the hills and plains of Texas.

Statistics on all these might burden you, for you have your own case to make for your own districts. However, the U.S. Congress has obviously thought well of San Antonio for many, many decades. If it were not so, the Congress would not have placed there so many facilities important to our Nation.

You have known of San Antonio as the home of many important defense installations: Fort Sam Houston, headquarters of the 4th Army, Brooke Army Medical Center, Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio Air Material Area, the Continental Division of the Military Air Transport Service, Lackland Air Force Base, Kelly Air Field, and others.

Past Congresses have known of San Antonio as a good place with good people—a place to which you can entrust the welfare of things important to the Nation and a place to which anyone can go to visit or to live with ease and appreciation.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, responding to the personal and urgent request of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I returned to Washington today to be present for the meeting of the House of Representatives.

I had hoped to be here when the call of the House was made at 12, but due to transportation difficulties I did not arrive in time to answer the rollcall.

Although I was not able to have my name recorded as present, I wish to have the RECORD show my presence soon thereafter.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, this morning early I received a message from our beloved Speaker of the House asking that I return to Washington for today's session.

I immediately made my plans to return but transportation difficulties delayed my arrival and I did not arrive in the Chamber until the rollcall had been completed. I regret this very much, but I do want the RECORD to show my presence here for the remainder of today's program.

THE MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to the very gracious remarks made by my distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. I have had in this second session of this Congress the responsibility of majority whip. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure and an honor to work with you and the majority leader of this body.

The name "whip," in my opinion, is a misnomer because what we are trying to do is work with the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, understand their problems and understand and recognize the fact that all of them represent great districts in this magnificent country of ours.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege for me to work with you, with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and my colleagues on the Republican side.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 293 today I was unavoidably detained. I should like the RECORD to show that had I been here I would have voted "yea."

REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the bill, H.R. 8754, introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable SAM FRIEDEL. This bill has passed the House but no action has been taken on it by the other body.

The problem involved has to do with the treatment of redeemable ground rents, a common arrangement in Maryland. The bill would treat the buyer of property subject to a redeemable ground rent, for tax purposes, as having bought the land. This would make him eligible for the interest deduction and it would treat the seller as having received the current value of the ground rent.

This is a problem that has been unsettled for several years. It is my hope that legislation similar to H.R. 8754 as it passed the House this year can be enacted by Congress early next year. If it can be enacted promptly we will be able to make its application to homeowners retroactive. The application to sellers would, of course, be prospective.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10539) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will explain the legislation. It is a very important piece of legislation, and I want the House to know that it has the support of many of us on our side of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think it is desirable legislation and ought to pass.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will correct an inequitable situation that has developed since enactment of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act in 1959—and which was not and could not be foreseen at that time—with regard to participation in the program by employee organizations.

In establishing the Federal employees health benefits program, the Congress gave recognition to the fact that a number of employee organizations had already arranged group health insurance plans for their members in the absence of a Federal program. Specific provisions were, therefore, made in the law for participation in the program by these organizations in order to avoid the hardships and inequities that might arise if membership in these organizations might be drained off into a separate Federal program. Among the requirements that had to be met by organizations' plans was that they had been in operation on July 1, 1959, and that they apply for approval as carriers before December 31, 1959.

The law, as written, did serve the purpose of affording protection to those employee organizations who already had health benefit plans and who were approved as carriers. There is no evidence that any of them have lost membership.

However, subsequent developments have tended to impose undue hardships on those employee organizations who had no plan of their own or who may not have sought approval as a carrier. There is evidence to the effect that these organizations are losing membership to the organizations who do have health benefit plans.

In testifying before our committee, the national president of the National Association of Post Office Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers, and Group Leaders reported that his organization is losing members in appreciable numbers, mainly because the organization has no health benefits plan. The local union of this organization in New York City has lost over 1,000 in the past 2 years. These employees are being attracted into other organizations which are able to offer a health benefit plan as a recruitment incentive.

The health benefits program was intended, as our committee's original report on the legislation indicated, to facilitate and strengthen the administration of the activities of the Government generally and to improve personnel administration in the Government. It was definitely not intended to be a recruitment aid or incentive for employee organization membership campaigns. It was certainly not the intent of Congress in enacting the legislation to place any employee organization in an unfair position in relation to any other organization.

The remedy for this situation lies in the enactment of H.R. 10539. It will, in effect, open up the program for a short period of time—to the end of this year—to any employee organization who may now wish to apply for approval as a carrier. It will eliminate the requirement that employee organization plans must have been in operation on July 1, 1959, and it will permit any organization to apply for approval up to December 31, 1962.

My committee is agreed that, regardless of other considerations, this is the only fair course that can be taken at this time. It further wishes to emphasize that this action should not set a precedent for similar action in the future. This so-called open season will exist for only this one short period of time and organizations desiring to apply for approval as carriers will only have this opportunity to do so.

It is expected that enactment of this legislation will entail only a nominal increase in certain administrative expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize again that this legislation seeks only to correct an inequity that has developed and which could not be foreseen when the Federal Employee Benefits Act was enacted. I sincerely urge the prompt enactment of H.R. 10539.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(1) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 710; 5 U.S.C. 3001(1)) is amended by striking out "1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "1962".

(b) Section 4(3) of such Act (73 Stat. 711; 5 U.S.C. 3003(3)) is amended by striking out ", and which on July 1, 1959, provided health benefits to members of the organization".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIM CHONG KOO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3215) for the relief of Kim Chong Koo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Chong Koo may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by the Reverend and Mrs. Kenneth J. Mitchell, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said Kim Chong Koo pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RANSOM OF CUBAN PRISONERS—OR AID TO CASTRO AND COMMUNISM—OR CASTRO'S BLACKMAIL ATTEMPT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, it appears we are adjourning barely before the frost is on the pumpkin, as a matter of fact, just barely before the frost is on the pumpkin in northern Florida. However, there is substantial unfinished business before this Congress.

One item to which this Congress should have given consideration was the series of resolutions opposing the Cuban ransom deal which I introduced which would have had the effect, first, House Concurrent Resolution 479, May 31, 1962, of reversing the ruling of the Internal Revenue Service which has finally come properly to light in the morning papers, which declares that the ransoming of prisoners is "a charitable purpose." The ransoming of Cuban prisoners is a charitable purpose, according to the Treasury Department. Under the internal revenue laws, therefore, anyone making contributions to the Cuban Prisoner Committee can get tax deductions, so by the back door the taxpayers, as the result of loss of revenue to the Treasury, are paying a part of the bill.

The second resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 322, May 1961, would have vetoed in the first instance the $20 million tractor-for-prisoner blackmail proposal and in the second instance House Concurrent Resolution 459, April 11, 1962, the $62 million for prisoners blackmail proposed by Fidel Castro. This proposal of ransom and of indemnity—I think to put the thing in proper focus it is important to point out that Fidel Castro from the beginning has been demanding indemnity, and he has been demanding that this country pay to his country for damages done by the abortive invasion in the Bay of Pigs that failed.

There has never been any doubt in his mind what the money would be for—indemnity or ransom.

I was utterly amazed and I might say shocked a few months ago when I received from the Internal Revenue Department when I inquired, which resulted from my introduction of House Concurrent Resolution 459 which would have abrogated the preliminary regulation that provides that money contributed to the Cuban Prisoner Committee would be tax deductible, that the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, in his letter to me in April based the decision of the Internal Revenue Service on this theory, and can you imagine such a theory:

> Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am very interested in what the gentleman is saying, and his interest in this whole matter. I hope the gentleman will expand on and explain a bit more the background of the quotation that he has just given to us.

Mr. CRAMER. I would be delighted to do so. Can you imagine that theory? I wrote the Secretary and challenged him to cite examples. Quoting from Secretary Dillon's letter on the theory as to why this redemption of prisoners or ransom of prisoners is considered to be a charitable activity, the Secretary said, and I read again:

> Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity.

And I will include the entire incredible letter at the end of my remarks.

Let us bring this thing in focus. That leads to the conclusion of providing $62 million to Fidel Castro whom the President himself called the enemy of the United States, by invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act effective February 7, 1962, which the President did to cut off the importation of Havana cigars coming in even through third friendly countries like Canada or the Canary Islands. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6342, April 11, 1962. The President by invoking the Trading With the Enemy Act through Presidential proclamation declared Fidel Castro, and properly so, as an enemy of free nations of the world and the United States in particular. Yet, with this Treasury ruling, we find the typical inconsistent position of the New Frontier—talk tough and use a powder puff—we find the New Frontier at this time permitting the collection of $62 million that is going to be used for what purpose? I am just as sympathetic to the prisoners as anybody else. I realize and so does everyone in the world how they got there. It was because they were not given the air coverage at the Bay of Pigs that they were entitled to and promised. But I want to free all the people in Cuba. I want to see the 6 million people who live in Cuba free. They are all prisoners of communism and Castro. If we free 1,113 who are now in prison, is Castro going to make another demand on the other 100,000 Cubans in prison in Cuba? If we set this precedent, what are we faced with in the future, the great powerful freedom-loving United States of America? We are faced with a precedent of paying money in ransom for prisoners. To whom? To the enemy. Of paying indemnity to the enemy.

I thought our historical answer to such demands has been—"Millions for defense—not one cent for tribute."

That should be our answer today.

What is going to be the result? What is Fidel Castro going to do with this money? That is the point. What is the Cuban Government, the Communists, going to do with this money, and drugs, and foodstuffs?

Fidel Castro is going to use them to keep himself and the Communists and the many Russian technicians, and Red Chinese in Cuba, to keep them in power and continue to subject the 6 million citizens of Cuba to virtual slavery. That is what we are contributing to.

That is why I am opposed to this abortive proposal and have been from its inception with the April 17 failure of the invasion of 1961. If you recall, I introduced a resolution opposing the tractors deal just a few weeks after it was made. So we have to keep our minds on what is going to happen by giving this ransom aid. It is going to permit Fidel Castro to stay in power, to permit the Communists to stay in power and to subjugate the 6 million people in Cuba, and at the same time challenge the freedoms of the rest of the Western Hemisphere, challenge it by exporting Communists to other countries of the hemisphere—even with arms.

I say this is wrong. And the gentleman from Illinois the other day said critically that I should be the general to lead the invasion forces. I would suggest that the gentleman from Illinois aid me, follow me, rather than criticize me—not necessarily as a general leading the invasion with words, as he said, but I am at least not guilty of being silent in opposing this abortive proposal that is against everything that we stand for, the dignity of America, the freedom of the hemisphere, and a strong position in opposition to atheistic communism.

Look where we are today. What position are we in? We find that Mr. Donovan, who just happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate in New York, we find he was designated many months ago to do this negotiating. He obviously was given permission to do so.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I will yield after I have finished.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman is making a fine statement. It should be taken seriously. What concerns me is that the administration is still making Berlin its first and only challenge by the Communists and fails to watch out for Cuba, and the direct threat of the large military buildup to the United States, the American people, and the free world. Possibly Berlin is a diversion, with only small forces involved at present, but a two-headed thrust, when Cuba is carefully considered. I cannot understand why the administration thinks a military base in Cuba could be "defensive." Why?

I believe that Cuba is equal to the challenge of communism that Berlin is. I know this from firsthand personal observation within the past 2 weeks.

On September 29 and 30, 1962, I went to the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba and was there for several days working hard to get firsthand information for our U.S. security. It was a serious trip. We were flown into Guantanamo escorted by two U.S. fighter jets, and we were flown out escorted by two U.S. fighter jets. That shows it is serious business.

When I was there I was shocked to find that there are 3,200 Cuban employees employed at the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba, and 2,400 of them go home in the Cuban territory in Oriente Province every evening. These are the people that run the shipyard, and include craftsmen, metalworkers, welders, drillers, carpenters, every kind of a trade that we have in oversupply in the United States. These are the workers in this greatest U.S. naval base and shipyard. Why not American workmen?

I am from the city of Pittsburgh, and we have a tremendous number of unemployed in heavy industry trained in this type of work, yet we cannot get the administration people to employ these people at the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba.

Why this discrimination against American citizens, trained U.S. workers, and U.S. jobless veterans?

Castro's government in Cuba could shut our naval base down overnight by blocking the entry of these workers and diverting them as a readymade task force to the new Soviet-financed base now building near Havana. Guantanamo is the largest U.S. Navy base we have anyplace in the world, and ship basic repairs for the whole U.S. Atlantic Fleet are made here. Castro could shut Guantanamo down overnight simply by preventing the 2,400 employees from going in on any particular morning.

Another trouble is this: Because of this Cuban payroll, between $6 and $8 million in U.S. cash is going into Castro's coffers to keep Communism going in Cuba. That is being supported and paid for by U.S. taxpayers through payments made to these Cuban employees.

One of the tragedies of the Cuban situation is that at Guantanamo Bay we have only 1,500 military servicemen stationed there. Navy ships come and go, but they are not shore based. There are 3,200 Cuban employees who are able to take the U.S. Guantanamo base over at any given moment, many of them just as well physically built and equipment trained as any of the U.S. servicemen we have there.

Another problem that struck me very seriously is the neglect of this administration in not having the planes parked on the base runways protected at any time. There are no embankments or concrete revetments. Those planes are there just awaiting another Pearl Harbor. We need action for defense at Guantanamo and the base needs construction quickly to modernize all installations. I am sure base personnel will heartily concur if asked.

Just 3 miles out of the base on one side, beyond Suicide Ridge, on one of the high hills beyond the Guantanamo Naval Base is a gun emplacement with large guns aimed right down into the naval base of the United States. In the other direction, about 5 miles away, there is another small mountain or high hill with more guns and artillery aiming down into the U.S. naval base. What are we doing about this?

At the base, we are yet unable to supply our own water, and have to depend on an outside Cuban water company. The source of supply is 4 or 5 miles outside the U.S. naval base. We have only a pipe coming out of there. There is no guard by the United States either on the reservoir or on the water system in the Cuban area. There is just one pipe, so that could be shut off at any time. We need salt water conversion equipment, and quick.

The administration should make clear we are putting standby carriers down there with an adequate reserve supply of water in case of a long siege, if necessary.

When I was there I learned about what was happening on the materials being shipped into Cuba at present.

The amount, description, and size of shipments is shocking.

Mr. Speaker, the point that struck me sc forcefully was the rate of shipping going into Cuban ports. These ships consisted of large-mast ships of new design, laden part way up the mast in many instances, and on other occasions you could see from photographs that they had gun mounts, plane parts, missile-carrying PT boats on the decks.

Mr. Speaker, these ships are not going in one or two at a time. For the week ending September 29, when I was there, there were over 200 ships which went into Cuban ports under full steam taking military and civilian supplies that Cuba so badly needs. That is at the rate of 10,000 ships a year going to Cuba, and over half of them are ships which come from our so-called friends and allies of the free world and the neutralist countries.

That means there are 100 ships a week from the Communist-bloc countries going into Cuba carrying ammunition and military supplies, which even this administration admits is at the rate of millions of dollars a year.

To me this is a major destructive threat to the whole of the State of Florida and to every State in the eastern part of the United States, and is a destructive threat to the security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that by only passing resolutions on Cuba and hitting with the powderpuff, and sending strong words to Khrushchev on Berlin, this administration is making a real mistake. We must be firm on Cuba.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I shall be glad to yield further when I have finished a few remarks that I have to make on this subject. Of course, the gentleman is eminently correct in many of his observations.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I have been advised that there are over 200 Mig planes now based in Cuba, and there has even been seen a Mig 21, their latest model. This is a tremendous threat to the United States, because with proper remodeling and change the Mig 19's and Mig 21's can carry 1,000-pound nuclear weapons which will endanger any American city up to about an 800-mile range. This is a real threat, in my opinion, and I think we need firm action on Cuba. The President should immediately meet with Prime Minister Khrushchev and make plain the U.S. position and our intended strong steps to protect ourselves, the Western Hemisphere, and the free world.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and his support of my position in bringing out some facts of tremendous importance. Of course, the gentleman's discussion of the buildup militarily in Cuba is the best evidence of the fact that we should not give to Castro any American dollars which are being collected by this ransom committee, or any foodstuffs or any medicine that Castro can use to trade to Red China and Russia and certainly not any taxpayer-supported funds or foodstuffs. As we all know, they need foodstuffs and medicines and they certainly would like to have American dollars to help build up their war materiel, their big machine—that the administration admits has imported at least $200 million worth of war materiel, making them the second military power in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse in the world for this, by direction, indirection, or regardless of the amount of compassion which we may have for the prisoners, and I have as much compassion as anyone else. I do not believe that we should help Castro stay in power. Castro admittedly, as all other Communist nations, has a serious food shortage, because the agrarian reforms which were pushed have not been successful, not only in Cuba, but anywhere in the Communist world. So, he needs foodstuffs badly. For what? To stay in power, to keep from losing control of Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, how humiliating a position do we find ourselves in with these negotiations? We find a gentleman by the name of Donovan, whom I say just happens to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate in New York, negotiating on behalf of whom? The prisoners' committee, supposedly. But, he could not be negotiating or he would be violating the Logan Act, unless he had "the authority of the United States" to do so. There is not any question about it. He must have the authority of the Government of the United States. He has been in and out of the Attorney General's office on a number of occasions. The State Department has conferred with him. I would venture to say that he is being conferred with right now in Miami, assuming he is still there, because the State Department has in Miami at this time a representative, Mr. James L. Greenfield, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Information, Bureau of Public Affairs, who is at Homestead, Fla., now, and has been for some time.

He is in charge of what the administration calls mysteriously—this whole thing has been mysterious—Project X. Project X is the preparation for the importation of the prisoners and the cooperation of the State Department to bring it about. So there is no doubt but what this not only has the condonation but the full backing of the administration and is contrary to the best interests of this country.

I have asked the question, Does not this administration have compassion for Americans who are in prison in Cuba? I provided for the RECORD this week a list of 10 Americans who are in prison. The New Frontier is letting American prisoners rot in prisons around the world, including 21 in Cuban jails, on trumped-up charges, while backing the Cuban prisoner ransom blackmail deal as indemnity to Communist Castro because of the abortive failure of the invasion at the Bay of Pigs.

I charge that some 21 prisoners are held in jail largely on bogus charges, and many of them are in ill health. They are being mistreated, many of them. They are underfed. But we hear little of efforts to get them out of prison, while every administration pressure that can be brought to bear is being used to get the release of the Cuban prisoners, including the making of the contributions to the Cuban Ransom Committee tax deductible, as I said before; sending Donovan to get on his knees in the name of the United States, to Castro, and influencing American pharmaceutical and food houses to make contributions to the Cuban Ransom Committee and even planning to put in U.S. funds if needed.

Compassion for Cuban prisoners? Si. Compassion for American prisoners? No. That seems to be the policy of the New Frontier apparently, because the whole philosophy of this blackmail deal that the administration is trying to sell to the American people is a deal that helps Castro and the Communists stay in power with medicines, foodstuffs, and drugs, and is to apologize for the invasion failure. Maybe this whole contribution program ought to be renamed. Maybe they ought to call it the Kennedy conscience fund, instead.

The State Department refuses to give me the names of the prisoners, the 21 prisoners in the Cuban jails; 4 being held against their will in Red China; 1 in Russia; 4 unaccounted for in North Korea. Where is our compassion for our own citizens who are being held by the Communists throughout the world, if ransom is to be the sorry, humiliating approach? It is obvious that ransom and indemnity have never been the approach of this great country in fighting for freedom.

Despite the refusal of the State Department to give me the names of the Cuban prisoners I have been able to acquire the names of 18 of them, and here they are as reported to me by the only source available to me: Raefael del Pino, of New York and Miami; Austin Young, of Miami; James Wellington King, of Miami; Donald Joe Green, of York, S.C.; Alfred E. Gibson, of Mount Gilbuss, N.C.; James G. Dean, of Franklinville, N.C.; Thomas Baker of Dothan, Ala.; Eustace Danbrent, of Baltimore, Md.; Daniel Carswell, of East Chester, N.Y.; and Edmond Taransky, of New York City.

Those names I published earlier in the week. These are the others: Miss Marilyn Menger, of Miami. I do not know where the rest of them are from, but here are the names: Dario Prohias Bello, Martha O'Neal, Robert John Gentile, Juana Pedro Koop, Peter Joe Lambton, Richard Allen Peconaro, Leonard L. Schmidt.

Where is our compassion for these American citizens rotting in Cuban jails? Our attitude about American prisoners seems to be that nothing can be done for them short of efforts to do exactly what we should do, not only for the Cuban prisoners, but to free all of Cuba from Castro and communism. But our attitude about Cuban prisoners is that we must give in to Castro's ransom and indemnity demands and provide him with much needed dollars, foodstuffs, and medicines, all of which he can trade off for more war materiel to be used against the United States of America and the freedom-loving countries of this hemisphere, and which he can use to build up communism in other countries in this hemisphere. That is what is wrong with this whole deal.

I hope that puts it in focus. Now, where are we? As of now we find Mr. Donovan back in Miami. Negotiations have been going on for months. I understand the ransom committee started in April and Donovan interceded in early August 1962.

The American people have not been told this. The American people are not told even now what the deal is. The American people have not been advised. The American people do not know what authority Mr. Donovan has to negotiate in regard to contributions by this Nation or its people to this ransom deal.

When I inquired of the State Department about it they admitted that they were doing "contingency planning." That is a good gobbledygook term, is it not? "Contingency planning" in the event that a request came from Mr. Donovan and the committee for contributions on the part of the United States.

I asked the State Department's Mr. Robert A. Hurwitch, Assistant Secretary of State, about this "contingency planning," "What authority do you have to spend 5 cents in paying ransom to an enemy, payment by the Government of the United States to Fidel Castro?" I have never knowingly and intentionally voted a nickel that could be used by the Government of the United States as payment to an enemy government, to Castro or communism.

He said in that respect that that, too, is part of the "contingency planning" to determine where moneys or foodstuffs or other matters of value are that could be made available to the committee. Is there any doubt that it is being given consideration?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. May I say to the gentleman from Florida in regard to the taxpayer's funds being used for a contingency of that kind that as a member of the subcommittee making appropriations for the State Department I would say there is no money that has been appropriated for that purpose. They never have submitted any request for money for that purpose.

As one member of the committee I shall inquire next year whether any has been used, and if it has, we will bring it to the attention of the House. But I would serve notice on the State Department now that there is no money that has been appropriated by our committee for that purpose. I would think they would be making a great mistake if they used funds appropriated for other purposes for any such purpose as the gentleman has now referred to.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I agree this should be the case. I think the gentleman is referring likewise to the Central Intelligence Agency. I am confident no one in this body has voted for those appropriations thinking they could be used for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for the campaign he has carried on in the last several days on this issue and say to him I thoroughly agree that not one dime of the American taxpayers should be spent for the liberation of the Cuban prisoners without the express authorization of Congress. This would be, it seems to me, the worst kind of tribute paid to Fidel Castro. I am sure the gentleman knows and every Member of the House knows that the money thus expended would be paid over eventually to the Russians.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. He put his finger exactly on the problem. I go further and say that dollars collected by the voluntary ransom committee likewise gives Castro just as much support and are of just as much value to him. That, too, should not be permitted.

I started to discuss briefly these negotiations. Look where the United States of America now is. We find that Mr. Donovan is back in Miami probably conferring with Mr. Greenfield, a representative of the State Department in Project X. All this mystery, with no information made available to the American public. We find Mr. Donovan suggesting that there is a hitch in the negotiations. I assume the hitch is, and my best information is that the hitch is that Mr. Castro, wanting to get as much advantage as he can out of this propagandawise—and do not think he is the only one behind this. Do not think Khrushchev is not giving him advice on how to get the most propaganda advantage out of this. They are going to drag it along a little while, let the whole world know that the United States of America is willing to get on its knees to Fidel Castro, the puppet of Red China and Russia in Cuba.

So they are upping the ante—dragging on the negotiations—ask for more of everything—more money, more foodstuffs, more medicine, additional guarantees, supply new lists that Castro wants filled, change the ground rules. How long is this humiliating experience going on? He must have gotten word from Khrushchev. He must have gotten word from Mao Tse-tung that he is making points in the world propagandawise. Keep it up, keep the United States of America on its knees, let the world know Mr. Donovan, who has authority to negotiate from the U.S. Government, is on his knees to Fidel Castro, Khrushchev and Mao must be saying. The asininity of this thing. How we ever got ourselves in such a position is hardly understandable to me.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I have been interested to know how Mr. Donovan gets into the picture and what interest he has in this business. Who is financing him? What authority has he been delegated by the U.S. Government? Why do we have highly paid diplomats by the score? Are they unable to carry on negotiations, if negotiations should be carried on? Is this administration saying it is necessary to find someone from outside of the Government to carry on these negotiations? I do not understand the situation at all.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman is asking many questions that, I am sure, are in the minds of the American people as well as people throughout the world. This man has no portfolio. This man has no Senate confirmation. This man has not put his credentials before the American people for examination. This man is a private citizen.

I always felt the Logan Act prevented a citizen of the United States from dealing with foreign countries, even a friendly country, let alone an enemy. So the only way that he could be negotiating without violating the law would be if he had "the authority of the United States" to do so. So we can only assume that he does have, but I hasten to add he should never have gotten that kind of permission from me. So we are being forced now to get down on our knees and crawl before Castro and the Communists and to accede to the indemnity demands resulting from this abortive invasion failure and to accede to the demands for ransom of a bearded, power-hungry madman, Fidel Castro, who is threatening the security of this entire hemisphere. That gives the Communists a beachhead in this hemisphere the likes of which they never had in the history of communism. Now they want us to crawl even more. It is time to put a stop to it.

I wrote for consideration of my resolution calling for an end to this humiliation and aid to Castro. This is some of the unresolved business of this session. The request follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am deeply disturbed by reports that the President, through Mr. Donovan, is negotiating to bargain away American dollars and/or foodstuffs to Communist Castro who recently, in a strong resolution passed by the House, was declared to be an enemy of the U.S. Government, and it appears from the latest news reports that there are proposals being made to pay him in dollars from CIA funds.

This is about the greatest abuse of Presidential discretion as I can remember in the history of this country because I, as a Member of Congress, have at no time, knowingly or intentionally, ever voted for any funds, CIA or in any other authorization or appropriation bill, that would permit the President to spend taxpayers' money to pay off ransom and indemnity demands, to give in to blackmail threats by an enemy government and, in particular, Fidel Castro.

As you know, I have pending House Concurrent Resolution 459, which provides: "That it is the sense of Congress that this Government oppose the trading of dollars for humans as proposed by the Communist government of Cuba and request the President to withhold any further Executive approval of such commerce or trade with the enemy, to refuse to permit the issuance of visas to visitors to Cuba for purposes of negotiation, to refuse to permit shipment or payment of such dollars to Cuba from the United States, and to refuse to permit gifts and contributions made for such a trade to be deducted for income tax purposes."

In view of the emergency nature of this situation, and the obvious public indignation against it, as evidenced in the tractor deal which was finally disallowed by the President, and this obviously being contrary to the basic policy established by Congress itself just a few weeks ago in the Cuban resolution, I am asking for immediate hearings by your committee to consider this entire matter and my resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 459.

The people are entitled to know all the facts and I am confident that the Congress of the United States does not want to be a party to the appropriation of money or foodstuffs to be turned over to Fidel Castro. America demands that Castro and communism in this hemisphere be defeated—not supported.

If the Congress does not stop this unwholesome, degrading, and humiliating blackmail deal, the prestige of the United States will be forever irreparably harmed. I am extremely sympathetic to the Bay of Pigs invasion forces held in prison but I call your attention to the fact that, according to the Department of State, American prisoners are being held in Cuba, as well as in North Korea and in Red China, and no effort is being made for their release because of our strong policy against the ransoming of prisoners. Likewise, all of Cuba is a prison under Castro, let alone the hundreds of thousands who are known to be in jail, and our efforts should be to help the Cuban refugees free their entire country rather than put that date off indefinitely by supporting Castro and his Communist regime to the tune of $60 million. This deal is an American surrender of principles and appeasement of communism.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1962.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in response to your letters of April 25, 1962, to the President and to me, about the deductibility of contributions to the Cuban Families Committee for the Liberation of Prisoners of War, Inc.

Our records show that the committee filed an application in August 1961, with the Internal Revenue Service requesting exemption from income tax as an organization described in section 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The committee also requested a determination that contributions made to it would be deductible by the donors in accordance with section 170 of the code.

Early in October, in amplification of its request, the committee informed the Internal Revenue Service that it hoped to negotiate the release of prisoners by the Castro regime in exchange for tractors. This related back to the earlier Castro demands, and at no time from the filing of the original application to the tentative granting of the exemption on December 6, was there prior knowledge, as your letter suggests, of any new Castro prisoner trade offer.

Section 501(c) (3) provides that corporations and foundations which are "organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific * * * (and) educational purposes" shall be exempt from taxation. Contributions to organizations which enjoy exempt status under section 501(c) (3) are deductible under the provisions of code section 170. The application and supplemental evidence submitted by the committee indicate that its primary purpose, on which its entitlement to exemption depends, is the liberation, relief and rehabilitation of the prisoners now being held in Cuba. Throughout history the redemption of prisoners has been regarded as a charitable activity. Similarly, it has frequently been recognized that the relief and rehabilitation of persons in distress is charitable.

Since the purposes for which the committee was formed fall within the exemption provisions of the code, the organization was tentatively granted exemption by the Service in a letter ruling dated December 6, 1961. The letter states that if the committee is operated in accordance with its stated purposes and in the manner indicated by the evidence submitted, it will be entitled to exemption from Federal income tax and contributions received by it will be tax deductible. Before the issuance of the December 6 ruling letter, we were advised by the Justice Department that the activities of the committee would not entail any violation of the Logan Act. Also, we were informed by the State Department that there were no objections to the issuance of a favorable ruling from a foreign policy point of view.

You have requested that the ruling issued to the committee be rescinded. However, we believe that under a proper construction of the applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and on the basis of the facts submitted to us, the committee is entitled to exempt status. Therefore, we can see no appropriate legal basis for the revocation of the tentative ruling issued to the organization.

Sincerely yours,
DOUGLAS DILLON.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. On October 6 the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] obtained unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes at the appropriate time on the last day of the session. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have just taken advantage of that leave and have introduced that material at the close of my remarks following the last bill.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to give the House a brief summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the 87th Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I will insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a later date a more detailed statement.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the work of this Congress will be applauded wherever freedom finds voice.

In both sessions of the historic Congress, 1961 and 1962, President Kennedy has seen enacted into law an unusually high percentage of his recommendations. This great body of forward-looking legislation sets the foundations for a new decade of peace, progress, and prosperity in the challenging 1960's.

Two illustrious names in American history have guided these sessions in the

House—the revered Sam Rayburn, of Texas, in the first session, and the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, in the second. We owe a public tribute to these great architects of effective self-government.

By building impregnable military security we have renewed and revitalized the constructive forces of growth and progress everywhere in the free world.

And our own internal security has been strengthened and buttressed by new legislation to punish espionage, subversion, and betrayal at home.

The world around, the whole structure of freedom commands new authority, dignity, and power.

America faces the future with unblinking confidence, for everywhere the evil powers of destruction and moral decay are in check before the awesome might of freedom under God.

Looking back 20 months to the opening days of the 87th Congress, in January 1961, the Nation now sees clearly that our legislative program has been successful on two fronts—a broad offense against Communist aggression and subversion around the world, and a daring new offensive against distress, disaster, unemployment, and economic dislocation at home.

No boast is hinted that all of our challenging problems of national development have been solved. But we have recorded an inspiring effort to advance the central aspirations of our times—world peace, national security, and solid economic growth in a beckoning climate of justice and human dignity.

Throughout these 2 years, we have hammered out on the anvil of free debate in the Halls of Congress virtually all of the great issues and problems of our day. As a result, American constitutional government emerges in new strength, vitality, and dedicated purpose.

Freedom is a way of life which only free men and women can maintain and defend.

And freedom prospers from year to year only as the Congress is alert and responsive to the demands of orderly constitutional government. The national will and purpose find effective expression in government only through the laws enacted by the Congress.

During these 2 years, Congress has been in session 18 months out of 24—a notable tribute to the dedication and devotion of the Members.

Our first session, under the leadership of our beloved late Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, of Texas, was notable for measures strengthening the national defense against world communism, and for legislation buttressing the domestic economy against our fourth postwar economic recession.

America today pays sincere tribute to the memory of Sam Rayburn for his heroic leadership in that great session of the Congress. All Members here present pause to honor his devoted patriotism and his wise and determined consecration to America's steady advance in security and peace.

In our second session, this year, we have all admired and honored the determined and inspired leadership of Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, a great and dedicated American truly in tune with the mood and temper of his time.

In these two great leaders the 87th Congress reflects the true dimensions of American statesmanship.

We salute also the high quality of leadership which our country has had in the U.S. Senate.

DEFENSE POSTURE STRENGTHENED

The 87th Congress has contributed substantially to modernizing and strengthening our U.S. military posture.

We now command a new and awesome ability to respond to aggression throughout the entire spectrum of military power. In every kind of defense—from brush-fire engagements to nuclear exchange—our security posture has been increased significantly.

Our new nuclear striking power provides a retaliatory force capable of survival even after a surprise attack. All our operational weapons systems now are hardened, dispersed, and concealed. The combat readiness of all our forces has been steadily improved. Our conquest of space during these last two years has been the most spectacular in the entire history of cosmic exploration.

MAJOR ENACTMENTS

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 marks a historic milestone in U.S. trade policy. It is one of the legislative landmarks of the 20th century. It not only adds a new dimension to the struggle between freedom and communism, it equips the American people with the tools to meet the challenge of a rising European Economic Community.

The Revenue Act of 1962 represents the first major revision of our tax laws since 1954. By this measure, we provided a tax incentive to modernization and growth, made more equitable both the taxation of income of savings institutions and the treatment of deductions for business expenses, and increased taxes on income earned by American subsidiaries abroad.

Our farm bills of 1961 and 1962 were landmark measures. The 1961 bill enabled us, and the 1962 bill strengthens these efforts, to reduce farm surpluses, maintain and even raise farm income, save tax dollars, and provide the American people with an abundance of basic agricultural commodities at low prices. We repealed the 1958 feed grain program, under which surpluses began to mount at an impossible cost to the American taxpayer. We eliminated an archaic wheat act which provided for an arbitrary national allotment of 55 million acres regardless of our domestic or foreign exports.

We authorized this country to loan up to $100 million to the United Nations.

The Communications Satellite Act will lead to the creation of a joint public and private corporation which will usher in the age of instantaneous worldwide space communications.

Our foreign aid program was completely revamped to emphasize long-term assistance and loans instead of grants. The Alliance for Progress is history's first dramatic assault on poverty in Latin America, and it represents a bold offensive against the seeds of communism in our hemisphere.

We made the first major revision since 1950 in our public welfare programs, stressing rehabilitation and training instead of continued dependency.

We amended the Social Security Act, reducing the male retirement age, increasing from $33 to $40 the minimum monthly Federal benefits, increasing by 10 percent the benefits for widows, and liberalizing eligibility and retirement requirements. Nearly 5 million persons are receiving new or increased benefits.

The Housing Act of 1961 represented the most comprehensive and far-reaching housing program in congressional history.

After 20 years of congressional effort, this session's legislation authorizing an amendment of the Constitution to prohibit poll taxes marks a great monument in the battle for civil rights.

LABOR WINS THE TOOLS OF FREEDOM

The Manpower Development and Training Act of March 15, 1962, marks a new frontier in Federal assistance to national development.

This act seeks to provide industry with the trained manpower necessary to meet the challenge of automation and technological change. It is a new and vigorous approach to full employment and continued business expansion. It is a new opportunity for several million American workers so long unemployed or underemployed because they lacked the skills demanded by technological progress.

The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 is a companion measure of the 87th Congress to advance the economic development of those areas which have for so many years suffered from persistent unemployment.

This is a broad program to stimulate new industrial development in every depressed area of the Nation. It is a bold attempt to focus the power and might of the Federal Government upon the basic need of the people—jobs at decent wages.

Every State, indeed, every factory in the land, will be benefited by the expanded on-the-job training program embodied in this progressive legislation.

Wages and hours have been protected further by the 1961 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. Minimum wages are fixed at $1.15 an hour for 2 years, and $1.25 an hour thereafter.

When this law was put on the books in 1938, the minimum wage was only 25 cents an hour.

Coverage of the act was extended by our 1961 amendments to 3,600,000 additional workers, bringing the total now covered to approximately 28 million. For the first time in history, the 1961 amendments extend this minimum-wage coverage to about 2,200,000 retail clerks.

We amended the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act and put teeth into Federal efforts to protect our laborers against mismanagement of their welfare and pension funds.

Other enactments of major interest to labor brighten the record of the 87th Congress—perhaps the most fruitful

Congress in 25 years in this area of legislation.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

No less than 30 new laws have been enacted in these 2 years for the benefit of our war veterans, increasing disability compensation, extending the home loan program, revamping procedures before the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and expanding the benefits of Government insurance.

OTHER MAJOR ENACTMENTS

Public works and military construction have been expanded and accelerated on every front—highways, housing, urban renewal, homes for the aged, education, and recreation. The $900 million Public Works Act of September 14, 1962, soon will provide 400,000 new jobs throughout the country.

Public health has been protected by a comprehensive new law to police both the production and distribution of prescription drugs. Experimental drugs which may endanger health are brought under Federal inspection and license for the first time in history.

Juvenile delinquency has been attacked on the national front, through enactment of Public Law 87-274, the first comprehensive measure in our history to mobilize the Nation's energies in behalf of young people unable to find constructive employment.

Already we have seen the establishment of 17 demonstration projects under this new program, plus 26 training grants for youth workshops in our great universities.

Development of our natural resources was significantly advanced by our creation of three national seashores and an authorization of nine new reclamation projects. We also made possible the world's largest atomic electric power plant by authorizing the use of the steam of the Hanford reactor for these purposes at no expense to the Government of the United States.

Educational television has been stimulated on a truly national scale, through an authorization of $32 million for construction grants to the States and colleges as well as by legislation requiring television sets manufactured in the future to receive ultrahigh frequencies.

Federal laws to fight air and water pollution have been extended and supported vigorously with appropriations commensurate with today's national needs.

Postal rates and Federal pay scales have been revised to promote national economic expansion and price stability.

Through a new agency of Government, the Peace Corps, established in 1961, we have added a vital new dimension to foreign aid. Today, the Peace Corps operates in 38 countries, and by July 1, 1963, will have some 10,000 volunteers engaged in educational development work overseas.

These are the highlights of the last 2 years. In addition, a tremendous volume of subsidiary legislation—more than 760 public laws in all—make the complete record of this historic 87th Congress.

Let this table of worthy accomplishments stand as a tribute to the faithful public service of all the Members of this House.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN—XVI

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, revise and extend his remarks, and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 22,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 16th report of my voting and attendance record. These 16 reports show how I voted on 2,045 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 94 percent.

87th Cong., 2d sess.

Rollcall No.	Date 1962	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 10	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 10	Election of Speaker. (McCormack 248, Halleck 166.)	Halleck.
3	Jan. 18	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 23	Quorum call	Present.
5	Jan. 24	Quorum call	Present.
6	Jan. 25	Quorum call	Present.
7	Jan. 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8900, authorizing Federal aid for construction of college academic facilities:	
8	Jan. 30	On passage. (Passed 319 to 80.)	Yea.
9	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
10	Feb. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 383, granting private company a right to mine under Grand Canyon National Park land for 25 years in exchange for certain private land:	
11	Feb. 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 202 to 136, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6360, authorizing an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce:	
12	Feb. 6	On passage. (Passed 231 to 169.)	Nay.
13	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Absent.
14	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Absent.
15	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Absent.
16	Feb. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 549, providing for consideration of H.R. 10050, providing for temporary increase in the public debt limit:	
17	Feb. 20	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 258 to 133.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10050, providing for an increase in the public debt limit:	
18	Feb. 20	On passage. (Passed 251 to 144.)	Yea.
19	Feb. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 530, disapproving the President's reorganization plan to create an Urban Affairs and Housing Department:	
20	Feb. 21	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 264 to 150.)	Yea.
21	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 6747, amending the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia:	
22	Feb. 26	On amendment providing 2 additional judges. (Adopted 221 to 143.)	Yea.
23	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
24	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
25	Feb. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8399, authorizing a 2-year program to train unemployed workers (Manpower Development and Training Act):	
26	Feb. 28	On passage. (Passed 354 to 62.)	Yea.
27	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
28	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
29	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 132, authorizing $25,520,000 for educational television by State agencies:	
30	Mar. 7	On passage. (Passed 339 to 68.)	Nay.
31	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

87th Cong., 2d sess.—**Continued**

Roll-call No.	Date 1962	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		S. 167, authorizing the Attorney General to issue a civil investigative demand compelling the production of business records for use in antitrust cases:	
34	Mar. 13	On passage. (Passed 339 to 58.)	Yea.
35	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8723, amending the 1958 Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act:	
37	Mar. 15	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to restore House amendment to remove conflict of interest by prohibiting affiliated union membership by the Labor Department's Welfare and Pension Division employees. (Rejected 182 to 218.)	Yea.
38	Mar. 15	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 284 to 108.)	Nay.
		H.R. 10606, extending and improving the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act (the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962):	
39	Mar. 15	On Byrnes' motion to recommit with instructions to delete a provision increasing the Federal contribution to States for old age assistance by $140,000,000 per year. (Rejected 155 to 233.)	Yea.
40	Mar. 15	On passage. (Passed 320 to 69.)	Nay.
41	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
42	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9751, authorizing procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in fiscal 1963:	
43	Mar. 21	On passage. (Passed 404 to 0.)	Yea.
44	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10904, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1963:	
45	Mar. 27	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 24 to 373.)	Nay.
46	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 576, providing for the consideration of H.R. 10650, the 1962 tax revisions bill:	
47	Mar. 28	On motion to prevent amendments. (Agreed to 224 to 185.)	Nay.
48	Mar. 28	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 234 to 172.)	Yea.
49	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
50	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10650, the 1962 tax revisions bill:	
51	Mar. 29	On Byrnes' motion to recommit with instructions to strike out the investment credit and withholding tax on dividend and interest. (Rejected 190 to 225.)	Yea.
52	Mar. 20	On passage. (Passed 219 to 196.)	Nay.
53	Apr. 2	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10162, authorizing standby authority for the United States to lend $2,000,000,000 to the International Monetary Fund:	
54	Apr. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 257 to 94.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10743, raising compensation payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities:	
55	Apr. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yea.
56	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10700, authorizing an increase in funds for the Peace Corps in fiscal 1963:	
57	Apr. 3	On passage. (Passed 317 to 70.)	Yea.
58	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11038, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1962:	
59	Apr. 4	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit U.S. contributions for the United Nations Congo operation to percentage of total payments made by assessed nations rather than percentage of total cost. (Rejected 153 to 235.)	Not voting.[1]
60	Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 4441, authorizing appropriation to New York City to help defray extraordinary expenses incurred during the 1960 15th General Assembly of the United Nations:	
61	Apr. 5	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 143 to 217.)	Not voting.[2]
62	Apr. 5	On passage. (Passed 207 to 153.)	Yea.
63	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
64	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 589, providing for the consideration of H.R. 10788, extending the President's authority over regulation of cotton and textile imports:	
65	Apr. 10	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 265 to 76.)	Nay.
66	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
67	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10788, extending the President's authority over regulation of cotton and textile imports:	
68	Apr. 11	On passage. (Passed 312 to 81.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11151, making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal 1963:	
69	Apr. 11	On motion to recommit with instructions to prohibit congressional franked mail addressed only to "Occupant." (Rejected 192 to 197.)	Yea.
70	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
71	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
72	Apr. 12	Quorum call	Present.
73	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
74	Apr. 17	Quorum call	Present.
75	Apr. 17	Quorum call	Present.
76	Apr. 18	Quorum call	Present.
77	Apr. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11289, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1963:	
78	Apr. 18	On passage. (Passed 388 to 0.)	Yea.
79	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8031, authorizing the FCC to require television set manufacturers to equip all sets to receive ultrahigh frequency channels:	
80	May 2	On passage. (Passed 279 to 90.)	Yea.
81	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11040, providing for the establishment of a private corporation to own, establish, and operate a commercial communications satellite system:	
82	May 3	On passage. (Passed 354 to 9.)	Yea.
83	May 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8617, authorizing $73,000,000 for unpaid balances of World War II damage awards under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946:	
84	May 9	On passage. (Rejected 171 to 201.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 625, a resolution to send to conference with Senate H.R. 8900, authorizing Federal aid for construction of college academic facilities:	
85	May 9	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 295 to 77.)	Yea.
86	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
87	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
89	May 16	Quorum call	Absent.
90	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
91	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
92	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
94	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11737, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
95	May 23	On passage. (Passed 343 to 0.)	Yea.
96	May 24	Quorum call	Absent.
97	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11665, revising the State allotment formula of the National School Lunch Act:	
99	June 6	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete provision giving Secretary of Agriculture broad authority to determine allotment to needy schools. (Rejected 160 to 220.)	Yea.
100	June 6	On passage. (Passed 370 to 11.)	Yea.
101	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 5532, bringing negotiated Defense Department procurement contracts under more rigid legislative control and encouraging use of advertised, competitive bidding:	
103	June 7	On passage. (Passed 362 to 0.)	Yea.
104	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
105	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
106	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
107	June 13	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

87th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1962	Measure, question, and result	Vote
108	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
109	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11990, increasing the public debt ceiling from $300,000,000,000 to $308,000,000,000:	
110	June 14	On Byrnes' motion to recommit with instructions to limit ceiling to $306,000,000,000. (Rejected 145 to 258.)	Yea.
111	June 14	On passage. (Passed 211 to 192.)	Nay.
112	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
113	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 691, providing for consideration of H.R. 12154, extending the Sugar Act of 1948:	
114	June 18	On the motion to consider resolution. (Adopted 262 to 32.)	Yea.
115	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
116	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12154, extending the Sugar Act of 1948:	
117	June 19	Motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate special payments of $22,755,153.67 to the Dominican Republic. (Rejected 174 to 222.)	Yea.
118	June 19	On passage. (Passed 319 to 72.)	Yea.
119	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
120	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
121	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
122	June 21	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 11222, the administration's farm bill embodying supply-management controls for wheat, corn, and other feed grains:	
123	June 21	On amendment permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to give farmers in feed deficit areas a special exemption from having to cut acreage below the 1959-60 level. (Adopted 267 to 151.)	Nay.
124	June 21	On motion to recommit. (Adopted 215 to 205.)	Yea.
125	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
126	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11500, extending the Defense Production Act:	
127	June 25	On passage. (Passed 329 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11309, extending the Export Control Act:	
128	June 25	On passage. (Passed 339 to 0.)	Yea.
129	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
130	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
131	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
132	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
133	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11970, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962:	
134	June 28	Motion to recommit with instructions to substitute a 1-year extension of the present Trade Agreements Act. (Rejected 171 to 253.)	Yea.
135	June 28	On passage. (Passed 298 to 125.)	Yea.
136	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1658, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce:	
137	June 29	On passage. (Passed 349 to 1.)	Yea.
		S. 1969, granting the Civil Aeronautics Board permanent authority to license and regulate supplemental airlines:	
138	June 29	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 337 to 0.)	Yea.
139	June 30	Quorum call	Absent.
140	June 30	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 12154, revising and extending the Sugar Act of 1948:	
141	June 30	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 248 to 31.)	Not voting.[1]
142	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
143	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11586, amending the Merchant Marine Act with respect to vessel construction subsidies:	
144	July 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 293 to 5.)	Yea.
		S. 2775, increasing authorized funds for administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands:	
145	July 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 281 to 14.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 714, expressing the sense of the House that an increase in the current 50-kilowatt power limit for clear channel AM radio stations be permitted:	
146	July 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 198 to 87.)	Yea.
147	July 9	Quorum call	Absent.
148	July 9	Quorum call	Absent.
149	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
150	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
151	July 11	Quorum call	Absent.
152	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11921, authorizing the foreign aid program:	
153	July 12	On passage. (Passed 250 to 164.)	Yea.
154	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
155	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
156	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 726, providing for House agreement to Senate amendment allocating subsidized sugar quotas to certain Western Hemisphere countries, added to H.R. 8050, relating to honey bee imports:	
157	July 16	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 196 to 142.)	Nay.
158	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
159	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11974, authorizing $250,000,000 in fiscal 1963 for Atomic Energy Commission construction projects:	
160	July 17	On amendment to prevent construction of power-generating plant in connection with the Hanford, Wash., atomic reactor. (Adopted 232 to 163.)	Yea.
161	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 167, authorizing Justice Department to compel the production of business records for use in antitrust cases:	
162	July 18	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to insist upon limiting bill to companies under investigation and confining use of documents obtained to Justice Department. (Agreed to 202 to 200.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12135, authorizing appropriations for fiscal 1964 and 1965 for highway construction (Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962):	
163	July 18	On amendment to require State highway departments to provide relocation advisory assistance to families displaced by right-of-way acquisitions. (Adopted 236 to 159.)	Yea.
164	July 19	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 10606, extending and improving the public assistance and child welfare services program of the Social Security Act (Public Welfare amendments of 1962):	
165	July 19	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 358 to 34.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 12391, farm bill, extending the 1962 special wheat and feed grains program for 1 year, etc.:	
166	July 19	On passage. (Passed 229 to 163.)	Not voting.[2]
167	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
168	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12580, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1963:	
169	July 20	On passage. (Passed 266 to 56.)	Not voting.[1]
170	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
171	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
172	July 24	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2996, authorizing the foreign aid program:	
173	July 24	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 221 to 162.)	Yea.
174	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12648, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1963:	
175	July 25	On passage. (Passed 346 to 41.)	Yea.
176	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
177	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 529, authorizing $3,490,000 to construct the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho:	
178	July 26	On passage. (Passed 190 to 162.)	Nay.
179	July 30	Quorum call	Absent.
180	July 30	Quorum call	Absent.
181	July 30	Quorum call	Absent.
182	July 31	Quorum call	Absent.
183	July 31	Quorum call	Absent.

See footnotes at end of table.

87th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1962	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 12711, making appropriations for sundry independent offices:	
184	Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed 369 to 12.)	Yea.
		H.R. 575, authorizing $6,168,000 to construct the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon:	
185	Aug. 1	On passage. (Passed 200 to 182.)	Nay.
		H.R. 10904, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1963:	
186	Aug. 1	On motion to recommit to conference with instructions to insist on House figure for the National Institutes of Health. (Rejected 173 to 214.)	Yea.
187	Aug. 1	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 350 to 35.)	Nay.
188	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
189	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
190	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
191	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 4055, authorizing award of up to $10,000 to each recipient of the National Medal of Science:	
192	Aug. 8	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 193 to 177, a ⅔ vote being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7283, authorizing compensation to U.S. citizens for certain World War II war claims:	
193	Aug. 8	On passage. (Passed 355 to 15.)	Yea.
194	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1005, increasing construction cost limit on Federal Reserve bank buildings from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000:	
196	Aug. 14	On passage. (Passed 314 to 60.)	Yea.
197	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
198	Aug. 27	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall 197. (Adopted 298 to 65.)	Yea.
199	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
200	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
201	Aug. 27	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall 200. (Adopted 312 to 62.)	Yea.
		S.J. Res. 29, constitutional amendment banning the poll tax:	
202	Aug. 27	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Adopted 295 to 86.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 769, agreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 11040, providing for establishment of a private corporation to own, establish, and operate a commercial communications satellite system:	
203	Aug. 27	On motion to suspend rules and agree to resolution. (Adopted 372 to 10.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12628, increasing the authorization for urban and rural housing loans for the elderly (Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962):	
204	Aug. 27	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Adopted 367 to 6.)	Yea.
205	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
206	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
207	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 10113, authorizing the President to spend $900,000,000 on public works projects in areas he chooses:	
208	Aug. 29	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 192 to 221.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11974, authorizing $250,000,000 for Atomic Energy Commission construction projects in fiscal 1963:	
209	Aug. 29	On motion to instruct conferees not to agree to Senate amendment authorizing Hanford power project. (Rejected 148 to 246.)	Yea.
210	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
211	Sept. 11	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 4, providing for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore:	
212	Sept. 13	On passage. (Passed 258 to 87.)	Yea.
213	Sept. 13	Quorum call	Present.
214	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2768, authorizing the purchase by the United States of $100,000,000 in United Nations bonds:	
215	Sept. 14	On motion to recommit with instructions to add Byrnes' amendment barring any U.S. loan until the United Nations General Assembly adopts the World Court advisory opinion on financial obligations of members. (Rejected 171 to 219.)	Yea.
216	Sept. 14	On passage. (Passed 256 to 134.)	Nay.
217	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11974, authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission:	
218	Sept. 14	On motion to recommit with instructions to insist that the Hanford power project not be allowed. (Rejected 150 to 186.)	Yea.
219	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Present.
220	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Present.
221	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Present.
222	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Present.
223	Sept. 18	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. Res. 777, providing for consideration of S. 2429, enlarging the boundaries of Virgin Islands National Park:	
224	Sept. 18	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 267 to 5.)	Yea.
225	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Present.
226	Sept. 19	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall 225. (Adopted 355 to 17.)	Yea.
227	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Present.
228	Sept. 19	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under rollcall 227. (Adopted 339 to 26.)	Yea.
229	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12082, strengthening personnel security in the National Security Agency:	
230	Sept. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Adopted 351 to 24.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11363, barring security risks in private employment from access to classified information and for hearings for those affected:	
231	Sept. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 247 to 132, a ¾ vote being required.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12648, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1963:	
232	Sept. 19	On motion to agree to Senate amendment to conference report, appropriating $1,600,000 for construction of peanut research laboratory in Georgia. (Rejected 143 to 221.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11151, making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal 1963:	
233	Sept. 19	On motion to disagree to Senate amendment barring congressional franked mail addressed only to "Occupant." (Rejected 125 to 247.)	Nay.
234	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12391, omnibus bill extending the emergency wheat and feed grain programs for 1 year and in 1964 establishing strict controls on wheat under a certificate plan and repealing 1958 corn and feed grain program (Food and Agriculture Act of 1962):	
235	Sept. 20	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 202 to 197.)	Nay.
236	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
237	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
238	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8900, authorizing Federal aid for construction of college academic facilities, with amendment authorizing loans and grants to students:	
239	Sept. 20	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to eliminate student loans and grants provisions. (Adopted 214 to 186.)	Yea.
240	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 13175, making appropriations for foreign aid for fiscal 1963:	
241	Sept. 20	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce economic aid appropriations by $100,000,000. (Rejected 190 to 203.)	Yea.
242	Sept. 20	On passage. (Passed 249 to 144.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12180, permitting duty-free entry of personal household goods brought into the United States under Government orders with Senate amendment extending the tax deduction privilege to life insurance companies that write individual accident and health policies:	
243	Sept. 21	On adoption of Senate amendment. (Adopted 324 to 8.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11732, authorizing foreign governments to operate radio facilities in the District of Columbia:	
244	Sept. 21	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 95 to 208.)	Yea.
245	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
246	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		S.J. Res. 224, granting President standby authority to order Ready Reserve to active duty for 12 months:	
247	Sept. 24	On passage. (Passed 342 to 13.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10, regulating taxes on pensions for self-employed persons:	
248	Sept. 25	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 361 to 0.)	Yea.
249	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
250	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
		S.J. Res. 230, expressing U.S. determination to prevent the spread of communism in Cuba:	
251	Sept. 26	On motion to recommit with instructions to add language reaffirming the Monroe Doctrine. (Rejected 140 to 251.)	Yea.
252	Sept. 26	On passage. (Passed 384 to 7.)	Yea.
253	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
254	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

87th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1962	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. Res. 818, providing for disagreement to Senate amendments to H.R. 7927, postal rate and Government salary adjustment bill, and requesting a conference with the Senate:	
255	Oct. 1	On motion to suspend rules and agree to resolution. (Agreed to 327 to 22.)	Yea.
256	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 5698, apportioning among the States temporary summertime employment with the Government in the District of Columbia area:	
257	Oct. 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 308 to 19.)	Yea.
258	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
259	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 13241, granting farmers planting under 15 acres of wheat an exemption from 1963 marketing quota penalties:	
260	Oct. 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 255 to 60.)	Nay.
261	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
262	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 822, agreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 8181, authorizing $10,000,000 for National Aquarium in District of Columbia:	
263	Oct. 2	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 245 to 104.)	Nay.
264	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
265	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
266	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 823, providing for consideration of H.R. 12373, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill:	
267	Oct. 3	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 344 to 4.)	Yea.
268	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12373, the omnibus rivers and harbors bill:	
269	Oct. 3	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete the $52,000,000 Burns Creek dam, Idaho. (Adopted 203 to 130.)	Yea.
270	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 11970, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962:	
271	Oct. 4	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 256 to 91.)	Yea.
		S. 1552, tightening controls over the manufacture and distribution of drugs:	
272	Oct. 4	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 347 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12648, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1963:	
273	Oct. 4	On House amendment to conference report, relating to funds for construction of research facilities and cutting back funds allowed by Senate. (Adopted 273 to 5.).	Yea.
		H. Res. 803, providing for consideration of S. 1123, extending certain provisions of the child labor law to agriculture:	
274	Oct. 4	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 257 to 81.)	Yea.
		S. 1123, extending certain provisions of the child labor law to agriculture:	
275	Oct. 4	On motion to strike enacting clause (kill the bill). (Rejected 137 to 193.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4670, strengthening laws in District of Columbia against indecent publications:	
276	Oct. 4	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 270 to 18.)	Yea.
277	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
278	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7927, postal rate and Government salary adjustment bill:	
279	Oct. 5	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 312 to 20.)	Yea.
280	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
281	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Con. Res. 570, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should protect, by whatever means necessary, its rights in Berlin:	
282	Oct. 5	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 311 to 0.)	Yea.
		S. 1447, increasing salaries of District of Columbia teachers:	
283	Oct. 5	On passage. (Passed 260 to 9.)	Yea.
284	Oct. 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 13175, making appropriations for foreign aid for fiscal 1963:	
285	Oct. 6	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 171 to 108.)	Yea.
286	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 831, returning to Senate S. J. Res. 234, making continuing appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1963 because it infringes upon the exclusive right of the House under the Constitution to originate appropriation bills:	
287	Oct. 10	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 245 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12580, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1963:	
288	Oct. 10	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 172 to 76.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8952, concerning use of the special constructive sale price rule for purposes of certain manufacturers' excise taxes:	
289	Oct. 10	On adoption o conference report. (Adopted 247 to 6.)	Yea.
		S. 3451, to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes:	
290	Oct. 11	On adoption of conference report extending relief beyond that provided in House bill. (Adopted 182 to 77.)	Not voting.[2]
291	Oct. 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 12900, civil functions appropriation bill:	
292	Oct. 12	On parliamentary motion having effect of striking out funds for Cross-Florida Barge Canal. (84 to 120, not a quorum, whereupon House adjourned.)	Yea.
		H.R. 12900, civil functions appropriation bill:	
293	Oct. 13	Continuation of unfinished business—motion striking out funds for Cross-Florida Barge Canal. (Rejected 93 to 142.)	Yea.

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent. If present, would have voted "nay."

THE HONORABLE FRANK KOWALSKI

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been said: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." The greatest evil that has confronted the world since the dawn of civilization is war. We have now reached the stage where men possessed with nuclear weapons can end civilization.

As this 87th Congress adjourns, it is appropriate to honor a man of great goodness and courage, a man who has labored long and hard for a lasting peace, our distinguished colleague and my friend, Congressman FRANK KOWALSKI.

First elected to Congress in 1958 as Representative at large from Connecticut, FRANK KOWALSKI brought with him the priceless experience in national defense which he gained during a brilliant 33-year career as an officer of the U.S. Army. His colleagues, recognizing his extraordinary abilities, selected him to serve on the House Armed Services Committee.

Out of his deep concern for the dignity of the individual and for the efficient use of our military manpower, FRANK KOWALSKI immediately launched a drive to halt the use of GI's as military servants. As part of this campaign he was instrumental in the establishment of the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization. His campaign contributed to an improved defense posture and resulted in the savings of millions of the taxpayers' dollars. Only a few weeks ago Secretary of Defense McNamara revealed that the Department of Defense has now identified and will transfer to military duties the "lost division" of 15,000 enlisted men engaged in nonessential jobs.

Devoted to the principles of democracy, FRANK KOWALSKI has been a strong advocate of strict civilian control of our Armed Forces. He has advocated the unification of our military services along functional lines.

FRANK's courage in speaking out strongly for patient moderation when others seemed clamoring for war has been an inspiration to many of us. His experience of the horror of nuclear war as Military Governor of Hiroshima taught him a lesson which is never out of his mind. He has repeatedly, often without much support, spoken out against nuclear testing for political, psychological, or aggressive purposes. He has been a crusader for international cooperation, disarmament, and a stronger United Nations as the best means for achieving world peace. His exciting tool bank proposal is typical of his intelligent and human approach to international understanding.

Knowing we cannot have a strong and free world without a strong and free America, Frank Kowalski has fought hard for progressive social legislation that would make it possible for every American to obtain his full civil rights, a decent home, a good education, and security in his old age. He has been a leader in the fight for a higher minimum wage, school desegregation, incentives for the small businessman, Federal aid to education, improved social security benefits, essential veterans benefits, and medical care for the aged.

One of his most notable contributions was to call to the attention of the Nation the inequities in our defense procurement policies which permit Government subsidies for extra costs incurred by firms with Government contracts when their workers go on strike.

Frank Kowalski's service has not gone unnoticed. In his first 2 action-packed years in the Congress he made a deep impression on the people of Connecticut and the Nation. In 1960, on the basis of his record of achievement, the people of his State gave him an overwhelming vote of confidence by returning him to office with the highest vote any Democrat has ever received in Connecticut. Spurred on by the strong support of the people of Connecticut, he redoubled his efforts in his second term. There has been no more vigorous and outspoken supporter of the administration's program than Frank Kowalski.

The fact that Frank Kowalski is not running for reelection is a severe loss to Connecticut, the Congress, and the Nation. As he retires from the Congress, I am sure he goes with the respect and best wishes of all of us. I know we all hope that Frank will be given the opportunity to continue in the service of his country, fighting for peace and guided by his deeply human philosophy: "Man is the most important concern of government."

NATIONAL DEBT SHOULD BE REDUCED

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Wallhauser] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope, as the 87th Congress adjourns, that we will all carry home with us two compelling thoughts that, in my judgment, will be for the benefit of this great country of ours. First, the legislative branch of our Government, as represented by the House of Representatives and the Senate, must continue to resist efforts of the executive branch to dilute our authority and powers granted to us under the Constitution.

Second, the stability of our monetary system is of such great importance that it should always be uppermost in the minds of those of us whose duty and responsibility it is to preserve it. Empires have fallen when the octopus of inflation has strangled them, and we who have built on a strong foundation stone of fiscal responsibility must never let this happen. Our debt, now at $300 billion, should be systematically reduced so that our children, and our children's children, will not be faced with the real danger of collapse of our free enterprise system, on which the greatness of our country has been built.

PROBLEMS IN CUBA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, since the Bay of Pigs fiasco in 1961, those who do not wish us well have used every stratagem in their arsenal in an attempt to pin the responsibility, and consequently the blame, for the incident on the American people, and especially on the administration.

To say that the American people are not concerned over the plight of enslaved Cubans would be a gross error; to say that they look on Castroism and all it implies with anything except horror and indignation would be worse than an error. But it must be denied emphatically that the American administration accepts any responsibility for an invasion in the Bay of Pigs case.

The invasion was hopeless from the start. Responsible Americans knew it. Cubans who had fled the island, many of them accepted in America, were brave enough and rash enough to undertake a hasty and poorly organized attack. Efforts on the part of more sober-minded advisers to restrain them until a more favorable condition could be created were futile. The attack was made, and failed. Some thousand or more unfortunate Cuban patriots were captured. They were jailed, and appear to exist now under daily threat of being executed. To ransom them and restore them to liberty in exile seems to many people to be a noble purpose. But let this be understood clearly. These unfortunate people are Cubans. They fought as Cubans, and lost. For America to pay tribute to Castro for their release would be to accept official responsibility for their attempt. It would admit that America had sent them to their fate, and now could make reparation only by submitting to blackmail for their release.

In many parts of the world American civilians and American military personnel sent out under the American flag to serve American purposes during the World War and the Korean war are still lying in jail somewhere, if they are not under the sod. There is no movement, official or unofficial, to ransom them. Should a different policy apply to Cuba?

In an effort to block further buildup of Communist force in Cuba, the administration, with the full concurrence of the Congress, has initiated measures to intercept shipping carrying arms to Cuba. Some of the ships involved actually are American owned, operating under foreign flags. Now a friendly nation, Great Britain, suggests that she will deem any interference with shipping which flies her flag an act of war. This is a responsibility which we should be prepared to accept.

Military buildup in Cuba is condemned by a number of Latin American nations, as well as by the United States. Such a buildup is a direct threat to our own national interests, and an almost equal threat to the survival of free governments everywhere. If we are going to be alone in defending democracy, we might as well know it now. If our allies refuse to accept their share of the burden, if they interpose their temporary economic interests between the real enemy and the prosecution of the great objective of the West, then we must reluctantly come to the conclusion that they are not unalterably on our side. In such a case, America can and will take up the challenge. We will protect our own national interests, as we see them.

WEST VIRGINIA FARM PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have carefully watched the development of farm programs in the Nation, particularly as they affected the farmers of West Virginia and my district. The recent passage of new farm legislation will place additional responsibility on the shoulders of the ASCS farmer-elected committees who administer most of the action farm programs. Enrollment for participation in the 1963 programs will open soon and once again these ASCS farmer-elected committees will be called on to spark the programs at the local level.

I commend these farmer committees for their exceptionally fine record of local farm program administration. This record extends back for nearly 30 years. I have had occasion to contact some of these committees in my district. I have always found them to be most cooperative and am especially proud of the work they have done to bring the programs to the farmers of my district to help them solve their conservation and other farm problems. There are many small farmers in West Virginia who grow wheat, tobacco, corn, and other cash crops and who manage dairy and beef herds; these small farm operators need and appreciate the help and assistance given them through our farm programs administered by their locally elected committeemen. Our farmers appreciate this "grass roots" approach to farm programs under the committee system. As in all other States, ASCS county and community committees in West Virginia are elected by farmers themselves. These committees function much like a "board of directors" and they help adapt Federal farm programs to local conditions.

The agricultural conservation program is one of the programs these committees administer at the local level. This program is very important to West Virginia where we have so many small farms and extensive woodland. Farmer committee guidance of this conservation program, under which the Government shares the cost with the farmer for carrying out approved soil conservation measures, means a great deal to my district. It has helped to solve many conservation problems. The fertility and productivity of the soil have been increased. It has helped reduce the problems of erosion and gullying. Across the country farmer committees work with many other programs including price support, production adjustment, soil bank, feed grain and other programs authorized by the Congress designed to help farmers in time of natural disaster.

At this time, I want to compliment all those who have served so well in the farmer committee system, both in West Virginia and throughout the land, and also our Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, for his untiring efforts in revitalizing and strengthening the committee system of administration of our action farm programs.

THE CHALLENGE OF SOVIET EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Giaimo] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable William Benton, distinguished former Senator from Connecticut and chairman of the board and publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica, has recently written a series of articles on the challenge Soviet education is making to our own educational system.

Senator Benton is an astute and extremely knowledgeable observer in this field, and I believe that his remarks should be carefully read by every American citizen.

Last year I was privileged to tour the Soviet Union to study the quality of higher education in that country. I echo many of the sentiments expressed by the Senator, and I would like to convey to him my appreciation of this perceptive and brilliant series.

Russia's Quiet Weapon: Education—Benton Sees Soviet Schools Outstripping Those of West—Ex-Senator Reports on Fourth Visit to U.S.S.R. in 7 Years

(First in a series of articles by former U.S. Senator William Benton, a recognized authority on the Soviet educational system)

The competition between the Soviet Union and the United States—between the Communist world and the free world—is likely to turn on which society makes the best use of its potential educational resources. The cold war struggle is one for intellectual power.

For some years, the Russian drive in this competition has been undergoing tremendous expansion on all fronts. It is now so intense that it threatens to surpass the United States and the West.

I make this statement, after my fourth visit to the U.S.S.R. in 7 years, on the basis of information and observation previously afforded no other American.

My latest visit, between June 21 and July 8 of this year, was both illuminating and sobering. I found Russian education at all levels bursting forth with new energy, new initiative, new inguenity.

I found remarkable gains over those reported after my first visit to the Soviet Union in 1955, when the disparity between Russian dedication to education and our own was so grave that I came home a deeply worried citizen.

Soviet education is, of course, not "education" as we understand it. Our U.S. objective is to train our young people for individual development and fulfillment—for the best use of their highest powers in the pursuit of a happy and useful life. The Soviet objective is simpler. It is an easier one. It is merely to train young people for maximum value to the State.

Toward this end the Soviet Union's most potent weapon may very well be her quietest weapon: education.

Having been in Government and education off and on for a quarter century, I was aware that the Russians were practicing wise propaganda as well as courtesy when, as their guest, they revealed their progress to me. I am sure they expected me to warn my fellow Americans that the Soviet competitive threat to our educational supremacy is very real—calculated, dedicated, and purposeful. As Vyacheslav Yelutin, Minister of Higher Education, said to me, "Better an education race than an arms race." We are, of course, faced with both.

Illiteracy is now a thing of the past except among the elderly. Education of all Russian youth not only is compulsory, but the primary-secondary school program now requiring a minimum of 8 years of schooling, will be expanded to 11 years for all by 1970. Further, the curriculum is much more demanding than our own.

Russian youngsters go to school 6 days a week, 10 months a year. Study hours are long. Discipline is strict. Examinations are frequent and searching, many of them oral and in the presence of outside observers. At all levels, Soviet students work much harder than do ours.

Since 1955, seven new universities have been established. On my 1955 visit, Minister Yelutin told me that 1.8 million students were enrolled in higher institutions. He placed the current figure at 2.6 million and told me that by 1980 it will reach 8 million. His budget, he said, was rising at a rate of 8 to 10 percent a year.

The Russians are now completing a giant "academic city" in the middle of Siberia consisting of a university and 15 modern research institutes, capable of accommodating 50,000 scientists and researchers. Further, they have drawn plans for more.

"The only limit in the number and quality of advanced institutions of learning is the economic resources of the country," I was told by E. K. Federov, chief learned secretary of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences. No top limit is admitted; Russia is determined to continue to expand the economic resources available for science and research. The living standard may not go up appreciably in any given year. The prices of butter and meat have just been upped 25 percent and 30 percent. But the new academic city has top priority in the budget.

Nor does the Soviet effort stop at what we might call conventional methods of education. Correspondence courses are being provided for those who cannot get to the classroom; classroom motion pictures are spreading; television and radio are being applied to educational techniques on an ever-broadening scale and a full-time television network is planned to train engineers and other professional students; and while Russian teaching machines may lag behind ours in their present development, I predict that they will pick up our ideas, develop them rapidly and in 5 years may be far ahead of us.

Moreover, the Russians are more energetic and resourceful in their use of the work-study plan than we in the United States. At least a year in the 11-year schools is applied to work. At the college and advanced study level, only the most brilliant students are admitted without an intervening period of work. And, after admission, about 1 year of the 5-year course is devoted to work in office, factory, farm, or laboratory.

Speaking of the work-study policy, Education Minister Yelutin told me in approved Communist style: "This is a concern not only of practical importance but of great social importance. Won't you agree that it is not right to split the population into two layers—the workers and the intellectuals?"

"Everything in life goes back to physical labor," he added. "People who have brought up their children and who have permitted them to avoid physical labor have often had many difficulties with them. Under our present system of work and study, the adjustment of the young people to life is fast—and it is much better."

While many young men and women in the United States must forgo a college education because of the cost, Soviet educators claim that they put higher education within the reach of all who can qualify. In the Soviet higher institutions, the state, rather than the individual, pays the tuition. In fact, students receive stipends, depending on the subject and their grades.

Full tuition is paid in full for full-time students. Evening and correspondence students are not paid because they are earning money at daytime jobs. However, they are given 1 month off each year at full pay while they prepare for their examinations—and 4 to 6 months off at full pay in their last year before final examinations. They get the same courses and the same diplomas as full-time students, but, of course, take longer.

As for admission requirements, Rector Ivan Petrovsky of Moscow University denied reports that children of the privileged class receive any preference. I do not wholly accept this. It may be true in wide areas, but it is perhaps only recently true—and only partially true. There have been scandals.

The rector stressed, however, that all applicants from within the U.S.S.R. are now given the same competitive exams. He pridefully pointed with pride to the fact that his own student body was drawn from the 60 nationalities of the U.S.S.R., plus another 70 nationalities from abroad. Indeed, there is a quota system to govern the admission of such students.

Since the Communist educational reforms of 1928, the U.S.S.R. has sought to apply to the new masses the educational goals of the old pre-World War I elite, the high standards of the czarist system which were based on the German.

The Soviet student is not merely permitted to develop his talent to the full. He is pushed, prodded—and virtually forced to develop it—especially if the talent is the kind the state particularly values.

Thus the wastage of potential manpower tolerated in the United States would be unthinkable in the U.S.S.R.

For every American student who enters college, there is another of equal ability who fails to enter. Even worse, of the top 20 percent of our high school population in academic ability, only about one-fourth finish college—this despite the fact that we have taken some steps to meet the Soviet challenge trumpeted at us by the first sputnik. We have passed a National Defense Educational Act. President Kennedy has called for the program of Federal scholarships which I proposed in 1956.

But the key question still remains unanswered: Can we take the further steps to gird ourselves to the educational challenge being hurled at us by the U.S.S.R.?

If the Russians goad us into doing a better educational job, then we shall do only what our own best traditions call for. But if we are complacent about our educational achievements, if we allow ourselves to fall behind, we may find ourselves outwitted, outmaneuvered, outthought, and outbuilt throughout the world.

SOVIETS DETERMINED TO GIVE SCHOOLING TOP PRIORITY—11 YEARS OF STUDY WILL BE REQUIRED BY 1970

(Second in a series by former U.S. Senator William Benton, a recognized authority on the Soviet educational system)

In 1955, after the first of my four visits to the Soviet Union, I wrote that Russia was not only trying to steal the American dream of providing every child an equal opportunity for an education but was actually walking off with it in broad daylight.

On the basis of my latest firsthand study of the Soviet educational system this June and July, I can only conclude that the Russions now are threatening to run off with that dream and create a nightmare for an America all too inclined to rest on its educational laurels.

This is true not only in elementary and secondary education—at the grade and high school levels—but in higher education as well.

Because the U.S.S.R., as a country, is not nearly as developed economically as the United States, it is easy for us to be naive and complacent in minimizing the progress Russia has made and its planning for the near future. In the thirties, the Nazis claimed they gave up butter for guns. The Soviets have been giving up milk and meat for education.

Starting this fall, compulsory school training for all Soviet children is being expanded from 7 to 8 years. (When I first visited the U.S.S.R. it was only 4 years in many rural areas.) The present 10-year program, which is almost universal in the cities, has been extended to 11 years.

The extra year in each case will be devoted to practical experience—on farms, in factories, in offices. This is said to be in line with the Marxist goal to eliminate the class difference between intellectual labor on the one hand and manual labor on the other. But it accelerates the productivity of labor. It helps prepare the labor force for the factories.

In an interview with Alexei Ivanovitch Markuchevitch, Deputy Minister of Public Education of the great Russian Republic, I learned that the 11-year school will be compulsory for every Russian youngster by 1970. Further, there will be no significant electives except in the choice of the foreign language which must be studied for 6 years. Every boy and girl, for example, must study trigonometry. Only 8 percent of ours now do. Thus all Russian youngsters will have the mathematics needed to move ahead into engineering or science—in contrast to only a small fraction of ours.

Vyacheslav Yelutin, Minister of Higher Education, told me that the present enrollment of 2.6 million in higher education will be increased to 8 million by 1980.

Markuchevitch, who visited American schools in 1958, remarked that the compulsory level in Chicago, as he remembered it, was 10 years. When I told him that I understood 50 percent of all Chicago high school students dropped out before finishing their 12-year elementary and high school courses, he insisted that Russian students will not be permitted to withdraw until after the 11-year minimum.

Further, a Russian school year is much longer than ours. It is 10 months—and 6 days a week. Compulsory studies in the 11-year schools are 4 years of physics, 4 of chemistry and biology—and plenty of Russian literature.

So intense is Russia's drive to make a complete education universal that the "tempo of growth of the students is faster than the tempo of growth of teachers," Markuchevitch stated.

"We must cut down on the time for training elementary teachers," he told me. (He said it now takes 5 years to train a teacher after graduation from the 11-year schools.) "We must seek new ways to improve the skills of teachers. We must adopt and study the new techniques of teaching. We must step up the numbers of students in our universities who are being trained as teachers."

He commented: "Your English system of measurement is greatly in the way of your children when they study mathematics or chemistry. The metric system (used in Russia) is far, far better. Your system places a heavy burden on your children."

I found that Markuchevitch felt he had acquired a rather keen insight into American students on a visit to our country in 1958. He contended that if the demands on them were greater, they could easily cope with them.

"The difference between your students and ours," he said, "is the difference between film which is moving at slow speed and film which is moving at regular speed."

When Markuchevitch, a specialist in theoretical mathematics, visited American schools, he sat through the classes and talked at length with students afterward.

He told me he met very capable young people, the kind who would have no difficulty with the subject matter of the Soviet schools if they had exposure and instruction and hours of work comparable with Russia's.

But he found that when he gave young Americans a problem of reasonable difficulty in mathematics—a problem he would expect Soviet students to handle—and he said this was true in Boston, Chicago and San Francisco—they could not solve it. American teachers, he suggested with no trace of belligerence, "use more standard methods of solving problems."

Markuchevitch told of visiting a school of 4,500 in Detroit and talking to a senior whom he assumed, because he was selected for him, must have been considered outstanding.

"What do you know about mathematics?" the Russian mathematician asked him.

"I intend to choose law and I have no use for mathematics," was the reply.

Markuchevitch was bothered and said, "You are recommended as a bright young student and you must be a reader, interested in belles-lettres. Won't you give be the names of some Russian writers?"

The boy couldn't name one.

Markuchevitch then asked, "What do you think of French writers of the 19th century?"

The boy flushed. "Such questions should be addressed to my sister," he said. "She is studying in Paris."

By contrast, Markuchevitch said, Soviet young people are curious. They are avid readers. "The Soviet children," he told me, "work much harder." We may question some of Markuchevitch's observations, but not this last one.

An interesting recent innovation in Russian elementary education is the establishment of so-called boarding schools. In the Republic of Uzbekistan I visited with the principal of such a school. In this Republic there are 100 such schools, each with an enrollment of 600 to 700. They are for local children and are counterparts to the regular public schools except that the children live in them except for weekends with their parents.

The Soviet factories want women and this system enables most of the mothers to work. I was told the children do better academically, with regular hours and controlled study. How they fare emotionally is not clear. A tuition fee is charged. The fee varies in line with the family income and number of children.

At the elementary level in the boarding school, there is only one teacher for the entire class. But, as the children progress, they are said to benefit from special teachers in foreign languages, music, physical culture and other areas. I was interested to learn that the teaching of foreign language starts in the second year in the boarding schools, as contrasted with the fifth year in the regular schools.

The likelihood is that many more of these schools will be set up in the U.S.S.R. They already run into the thousands.

The Russians put strong emphasis on teaching foreign languages. For example, there are 41,000 English teachers in the U.S.S.R. I learned from Education Minister Yelutin that 600 new high schools are to be started in which all teaching will be in a foreign language—English, French, German, and Spanish. The aim is to make the children bilinqual.

In short, the Russians are determined to expand and improve their educational facilities from the ground up. Lacking in America is the determination to do the same with ours.

INTELLECTUAL PHOENIX RISING IN HEART OF SIBERIA—SOVIET BUILDING A CENTER FOR TOP ACADEMIC TALENT

(Third in a series by former U.S. Senator William Benton, a recognized authority on the Soviet educational system)

Deep in the heart of Siberia, the Soviet Union in the last 4 years has established an awesome complex of buildings, equipment and human talent. It has been a closed city, forbidden to foreigners. It symbolizes, in the most dramatic terms, the educational and scientific challenge Russia is hurling at the West.

I speak of the academic city of Novosibirsk. Remember the name. It is designed as a pilot city for others yet to be built. Its fame and influence will be felt through all of the U.S.S.R., possibly the world. One of our top American physicists told me that he saw advantages in Novosibirsk over any present research center anywhere in the world.

In the company of my wife and son, I was the first American to see the academic city in its nearly complete skeleton form. Before my 2-day visit ended, my hosts, bursting with pride, asked me to extend an invitation to President Kennedy to visit the center if he should come to the U.S.S.R.

My hosts were some of Russia's most brilliant academicians.

Little in the secret city was kept from my view. However, not being trained as a scientist, I would not have been able to recognize a secret if my nose had been rubbed into it.

I toured the 15 advanced research institutes, all with brandnew laboratories said to be supplied with what the Russians probably describe as the latest scientific equipment. We have nothing like these institutes in the United States.

In the United States most advance research, or theoretical research, is centered in our universities. In the U.S.S.R. it is largely centered in so-called research institutes, where its is closely allied with what we call applied research. This is much as if the Harvard mathematics and physics departments were merged with the Bell Telephone Laboratories and General Electric.

I saw an impressive physics and chemistry center which represents the first building of the new Novosibirsk University, again replete with the most modern laboratories.

I saw the shiny new apartment houses which had been built for the construction workers and the comfortable, modern cottages for the top scientists and research directors—accommodations which rival those within the financial means of most of the professors at our leading American universities.

I learned that when the institutes and university are at peak operation 2 years hence, the present staff of 12,500 will have increased to 50,000.

I was told that the present enrollment of 1,000 at the new university will climb to 4,000 as other buildings are completed.

And I learned that, as impressive as Novosibirsk is, as enormous its potential, similar academic cities are already planned for Irkutsk, capital of east Siberia, and Kemerovo, a coal center some 100 miles from Novosibirsk. The construction workers will move right on. Khrushchev, who personally approved the academic city and against the advice of the president of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences—Khrushchev will push them on.

Obviously, the eyes of Russia's teachers and researchers are fixed on the future, and when I asked my hosts to speculate on what lies ahead, there was this dynamic prediction by Academician Sobolev, director of the new institute of mathematics, which now has a staff of 500, shortly to be increased to 1,000:

"All we know is that there will be more changes created by science in the next 50 years than have been created since the days of the Pharaohs." He thought a moment and then added, "Or in all the past history of the world put together."

Academician Lavrentiev, president of the Siberian Academy of Science and head of the academic city, set forth for me five principles which he feels will make his new city a unique keystone in Russia's expansion in the fields of education and scientific development:

1. Each of the 15 institutes has been allowed enough acreage for literally unlimited expansion of facilities back and ever backward into the forests. Thus they will not suffer from the problems of the big-city Soviet university—and the problems of the American universities which have lacked space for expansion in the center of big cities.

2. "To solve the great problems of science, it is necessary to have many specialists in many fields in proximity."

The institutes already are staffed with able researchers in geology and geophysics, mathematics, automation and electrical measuring techniques, genetics, experimental biology and medicine, hydrodynamics, kinetics and combustion, applied mechanics, physics of solid states, nuclear physics, organic chemistry, catalysis, inorganic chemistry and thermonuclear physics—to name those I was able to jot down as they were rattled off. The experts in many areas have much to contribute to other areas. Instead of being in laboratories as much as 50 miles apart, as around Moscow, the research institutes all adjoin one another on a long avenue proudly called the Avenue of the Institutes.

3. The all-important principle of leadership. The institutes are headed by scientists who are brilliant not only in their own right but who can train young men to follow in their footsteps. And the young man want to share in this great new scientific research venture. (The climate is terrible, far worse than Chicago's, but close by are good hunting, boating, swimming, and fishing.)

4. There are close ties between science and industry. Indeed, new scientific discoveries already are being applied to industries in the nearly million-population metropolis of Novosibirsk, an industrial center perhaps comparable to Cleveland.

(I watched two newly developed water cannon for mining provide startling evidence of this. One shattered a large block of bricks into tiny pieces; the other reduced a 2- by 3-foot slab of granite into a dozen fragments. I was told, too, that such cannon were under full trial in five coal mines; that they were capable of generating water pressure up to 30,000 atmosphere units, in contrast with only 2,000 units generated elsewhere in the world. I have not sought to verify this claim.)

Now consider this statement by the head of the Institute of Geology and Geophysics in terms of what geological research will mean to Soviet industrial might:

"Just prior to World War II, it was believed that Siberia was poor in iron and had no oil. Our research parties have now discovered that Siberia is very rich in iron ores. Further, we have big oil and gas deposits. The geologists are sure there are many new minerals. Indeed, there is every mineral deposit in Siberia that there is in the table of the elements. Our Novosibirsk Institute of Geology now has 94 missions of exploration throughout Siberia. Of course other institutes have their own missions as does the Institute of Geology."

5. A new university is being built in the academic city so that students can be integrated into the institutes. "You (in the United States) look to your universities to train your scientific personnal and to develop them thereafter," Lavrentiev told me. "In the U.S.S.R., it is in the institutes that many are trained and that most of our important research is centered."

"During the first 2 years," Vekhua, rector of the university, told me, "the students will devote themselves wholly to their academic studies at the university. But in the second term of the third year, they will begin to work with the institute in their field of specialization.

"They will spend about 2 days a week with the institute throughout their third and fourth years. In the fifth year, they will spend 5 out of every 6 days at the institute. They will work on team projects or be given individual assignments.

"This affiliation with the institute brings them step by step into research. We shall thus be able easily to spot the gifted students. We shall keep them in the institute. This will be their sure way to success." (There will be no drain on such students into the fields of business and finance, as in our own American universities.)

Rector Vekhua added with a smile, "It is better for a child to learn how to swim step by step, but there is also a second way of teaching a child to swim: thrown him right into the water. The second way cuts down on the period which formerly was obligatory before a man could launch himself on pure research."

In the realm of mathematics, I was given books developed by computers which I was told had deciphered scripts of the Mayan tribes of Mexico—scripts to which philologists previously devoted their lifetimes unsuccessfully.

It was Lavrentiev's jest that computers were producing other, greatly improved computers much faster than human beings were able to produce human beings. He smilingly defied Rector Vekhua—and the challenge obviously was intended for my benefit—to produce a child three times as good as himself. However, a young Soviet scientist conceded privately to me that the United States was well ahead in the development of computers.

I suggest that the implications of the Soviet Union's progress in higher education and research are incalculable. We see some of them as we read the headlines about the Soviet astronauts and as President Kennedy concedes that the U.S.S.R. is ahead of us in the space race.

Yet one conclusion is obvious: Each year the Soviet budget for higher education goes up 8 to 10 percent, and Russia is moving ahead in science and technology at an accelerating pace and has only begun to exploit its resources, both physical and human. New machines, new techniques, new theories, new talent—all are being thrown into the effort.

Can we in the United States say the same? What do we have to say? When shall we say it?

SOVIET TV AND RADIO HIGHLY GEARED TO LEARNING—U.S.S.R. LEADERS HOPE TO MOVE AHEAD OF UNITED STATES

(Fourth in a series by former Senator William Benton, a recognized authority on the Soviet educational system)

The Soviet Union seems about to move out ahead of the United States—and far ahead—in the application of television and radio to the fields of education and technical training. At least, so Russia's top TV and radio executives assured me during my recent visit to the U.S.S.R.

If a Russian is unabel to get to a classroom, the classroom will be brought to him by television or radio, or both. The young, energetic leaders entrusted with these two great media are determined to slake the Soviet citizen's thirst for learning. And where there is no thirst, one will be created.

These, in my opinion, are no idle Soviet boasts, although even partial realization is still a few years away.

While educational TV in the United States struggles against lack of money—and tides of complacency and inertia—the Government of the U.S.S.R. seems to be throwing its full support, financial and moral, behind the effort to supplement conventional education with learning by electronics.

This does not mean that the radio and television will cease to be major propaganda arms of the Soviet state. The music and opera will still be come-ons for the propaganda and the slanted news. But these are to be supplemented by vast educational and training programs. (The importance the Soviets attach to radio and TV may be indicated by the fact that the deputy to the cabinet minister in charge of them says that his minister outranks the Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko.)

The ambitious TV educational development project rests primarily with two men—Michael Khalarmov, chairman of the State Committee of Radio and Television of the Council of Ministers, and his deputy, Enver Mamedov, who is also in charge of 126 hours a day of radio propaganda broadcasts outside the Soviet Union.

Both are journalists, in their early forties (Is it not interesting that the powerful media of radio and television should be turned over to two young men with little radio or TV background?) They bubble with ideas and enthusiasm. They have been vested with enormous authority. They seem to have Khrushchev's full backing; indeed, Khalarmov was his press officer at international conferences. And the information I obtained from them in separate interviews contains implications for us in America which must be viewed as most challenging.

Among the statements they gave me were these:

There are now 116 TV centers in the Soviet Union. "Many more—even more than called for by the 7-year plan—will be in operation by the end of 1965, at which time a great new complex of buildings to be known as the Moscow Television Center is expected to be completed. Six TV channels are planned out of the Soviet capital.

Four satellites may be orbited to replace the present relay system and assure perfect transmission for all of the U.S.S.R. (This plan was revealed to me before the United States launched its Telstar communications satellite, indicating that the Russians seem to have made great strides in this realm, too.)

Should the technical hazards of the satellite plan prove too great, I was assured, the Soviet Government is prepared to spend the money for cables to hook up the stations.

One Sovietwide TV channel will be devoted exclusively to supporting correspondence courses at university and professional levels. (About one-half of the present 2,600,000 students in higher education are correspondence students and it is believed this same proportion will apply to the 8 million students planned for 1980.)

I was told that the U.S.S.R. already has a 2-year university course on radio which offers a diploma. Special courses will be introduced this Fall for an even broader audience.

Some 52,000 farmers in the Moscow area have been taking regular radio courses in agronomy, with monitors checking attendance, attentiveness, and homework. This is a pet project of Chairman Khrushchev's.

This program is to be extended to cover much of the country. It is designed to bolster the Soviet's ailing agricultural program. (It takes 43 percent of the Soviet population, on the farms, to provide food for the balance—in contrast to less than 15 percent of ours on the farms producing vast surpluses; indeed I told the Soviet officials that if we had as many as 20 percent of our people on the farms, we, like them, would have no unemployment.)

Khalarmov declared that, as extensive a role as television and radio already play in Soviet education, realization of their potential has only begun. Implicit in his stated goals, it seems to me, is an admission of grievous past failures.

He told me he was not going to permit broadcasting to be just a waste of time, that he was determined to "make our people know more, to educate them, to raise their esthetic level, to use these media to develop their respect for other people, to help the Russian people make themselves into fully developed human beings.

"We want our radio and television to be alive, interesting, and full of ideas. We want it to highlight the new world. Of one thing, I am absolutely sure: correspondence courses are a matter of great moment. These offer a very great opportunity. We are going to develop them energetically on radio and TV."

It is apparent from Khalarmov's attitude that the Soviet planners are concentrating their expansion of the two media on use in higher education, rather than at the elementary and secondary levels. When I pressed him for an explanation, he said:

"We think the most complicated problems in the Soviet Union are in higher education. Science is developing so rapidly. Our great need is for diplomas for engineers and scientists. Middle education is easier. There is no shortage of teachers. This isn't to say we won't get to middle education later, for we shall."

He also said: "The Soviet Union now has complete literacy. Shortly everybody will have a middle education." Khalarmov is referring to the goal of compulsory 11-year schools for all by 1970.

It was interesting to find that, in the U.S.S.R. as in the United States, commercials and competition between networks present problems.

Many readers may be surprised to learn that, in a monolithic state like the Soviet Union, the Russians are planning greater competition, rather than less, among TV and radio programing networks. On the other hand, there should be no surprise in Khalarmov's statement that commercials will not be permitted to interfere.

The various competing networks, a new concept introduced by Khalarmov, are to be urged to fight for the listener. All are to enjoy a certain amount of autonomy in planning their programs. But he added: "There will still be some central control. We can't let all of the stations put on talk programs at once."

Of commercials, he said: "We won't have any commercial advertising. How terrible it is to interrupt a motion picture or a program by advertising—to disturb and irritate the viewer."

On the other hand, he admitted that "some time should, of course, be allocated to this," because advertising can be "good and useful—let us say for a new appliance, a new product." This is a new concession by Soviet officials. Once all advertising was confined to party propaganda.

The two young Russian leaders of TV and radio think of these media not as avenues of escape, concentrating largely on entertainment, but as bright paths to culture and learning—as vehicles that will speed Soviet progress and, of course, above all as tools of the Soviet state in its propaganda offensives still to come.

The Soviet Union for some years now has been challenging us with its new emphasis and new techniques in the field of education. These are now to be expanded by their application to radio and television.

As I hope this series of articles has demonstrated, we Americans would be foolish not to recognize the educational challenge flung at us by the U.S.S.R.—and we shall be foolhardy if we fail to do more about meeting it.

HON. JOHN TABER

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, JOHN TABER'S first consideration during his long years of distinguished service here has been the national welfare. JOHN TABER is an American; courageous, forthright, honest, and loyal. The distinguished gentleman from New York has always reminded me of the Founding Fathers of this country—men who were not afraid to stand alone if necessary. JOHN, we are going to miss you here, but you have earned a rest. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for you every continued success in any undertaking.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair, the bells to be rung 15 minutes before the House reconvenes.

(Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

CUBA AND RUSSIAN BALLISTIC MISSILES

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I brought to the attention of Members of the House the fact that Russian missile submarines have been seen prowling off our coast and that these submarines were offensive type weapons.

Other very vital additional facts have come to my attention in the last few days.

These facts pertain to Russian missiles which have been observed in the Russian base in Cuba.

I have here in my hand a photograph of the Russian surface-to-air missile which is in Cuba.

We are told that this Russian missile can fire only 30 nautical miles and is a surface to air missile.

I wish to bring to the attention of Members that our second stage in development surface to air missile can fire much further and can be readily converted to a surface to surface missile in a matter of minutes.

Therefore we must assume the Russians possess the same capability.

In my considered judgment the voice of the Department of Defense should be heard by the American people on the precise capabilities of the Russian missile facilities established in Cuba and now under construction.

Information released by the Department of State on this issue has been very confusing and on the whole misleading.

This is no time for sugarcoated information.

The American people realize how serious is the situation in Cuba.

Our people will be better prepared to meet the Cuban crisis if the unvarnished truth is presented to them.

I also have here a second photograph of a Russian V-2 type missile supplied to me by the U.S. Army.

I have another photograph of a Russian ballistic missile which could be launched from Cuba and hit my native city of Cleveland.

The Russians have breached our inner line of defense, which brings into serious question the value of our DEW line defense system.

I have previously proposed a six-point program for action on Cuba.

We should move on this threat at once, because there is no doubt in my mind that the Russian-controlled bases which are secured even against the Cubans contain deadly missiles aimed at our heartland.

There is ample evidence that offensive type weapons manned by Russians are presently emplaced in Cuba.

President Kennedy has taken strong steps to impose economic sanctions against all shipping going to Cuba from all parts of the free world.

In addition, all shipping going to Cuba has been warned that they are subject to the possibility of attack from clandestine Cuban operations.

The United States assumes no responsibility for such actions and forewarning all ships destined for Cuba that they lay themselves open to the possibility of such attacks should be fair warning to all concerned.

But as strong as these measures are, I believe they will not be sufficient to deter the establishment of Russian missile capabilities in Cuba.

But these things remain to be done—call for a Cuban government in exile, all-out establishment of a Cuban freedom army in the free world, political action in the United Nations against Russian dictatorship in Cuba, and at the proper time the imposition of a complete sea and air blockade.

A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN SPENCE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my friend, the truly distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable Brent Spence, who after more than 30 years of outstanding service is retiring from this body.

I have had the privilege of serving under his chairmanship of the Banking and Currency Committee. What a wonderful, enlightening experience it has been. I have been tremendously impressed with his remarkable abilities as chairman of this committee, with his intimate knowledge of the legislative processes and his ability to apply this knowledge in the most effective manner.

I have admired his grasp of all issues which have come before the committee. I have marveled at his great dignity at all times, at his wisdom, his warmth, his patience, and his tremendous ability.

In his daily contacts with his associates, with employees, and with the public, he epitomizes all that is fine in service to democracy.

Congressman Spence is one of those rare individuals whose human qualities and deep understanding of the problems of others enriches the lives of the people with whom he comes in contact.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the 4 years I served as one of his colleagues and as a member of his committee have been among the most rewarding of my life, and I shall always cherish my association with this fine gentleman and great public servant.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment, a joint resolution and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 88th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 584. Concurrent resolution fixing the date for the sine die adjournment of the 2d session of the 87th Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 585. Concurrent resolution authorizing the officers of the House and Senate to sign enrolled bills notwithstanding the sine die adjournment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12900) entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 2 to the above entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13273) entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3361) entitled "An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

S. Res. 416

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

S. Res. 414

Whereas the House of Representatives has adopted H. Res. 831 alleging that S.J. Res. 234, a resolution continuing the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, to be in contravention of the first clause of the seventh section of the Constitution and an infringement of the privileges of the House; and

Whereas this clause of the Constitution provides only that "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives," and does not in any wise limit or restrict the privileges and power of the Senate with respect to any other legislation; and

Whereas the acquiescence of the Senate in permitting the House to first consider appropriation bills cannot change the clear language of the Constitution nor affect the Senate's coequal power to originate any bill not expressly raising revenue; and

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, upon request of the Committee on Appropriations, reported to the House in 1885 that the power to originate bills approprating money from the Treasury did not reside exclusively in the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate respectfully asserts its power to originate bills appropriating money for the support of the Government and declares its willingness to submit the issue either for declaratory judgment by an appropriate appellant court of the United States or to an appropriate commission of outstanding educators specializing in the study of the English language to be chosen in equal numbers by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] kindly assume the chair?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 838) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the words of this resolution which I offer speak very well for themselves, but I want to add just one word as the minority leader who has been privileged to serve under our great Speaker and our great friend, John W. McCormack.

I have been, in my years here, privileged to serve under a great many Speakers. Without exception, I have found them to be fair in all of their dealings with the Members of the House. In my time I have served here under Speakers of the Democratic Party and under Speakers of the Republican Party. As I say, they have all been fine, able, outstanding men.

Mr. Speaker, to be the Speaker of the House of Representatives is one of the greatest privileges, one of the greatest honors, and one of the greatest responsibilities within the power of the American people to bestow.

I just want to say to my dear personal friend, John McCormack—and may I say parenthetically once in a while I slip up and refer to him as John, since I have known him for so many years, and then he says, "Well, I would just as soon you would call me 'John' rather than 'Mr. Speaker'"—to John McCormack I want to say, and I want the whole country and the world to know, that he has done a magnificent job in his service here as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I would like to make this one further observation. It was my great honor to be the candidate of the people on my side of the aisle for the great office of Speaker of the House of Representatives. As I said at the time, it was one election I knew I was not going to win. But upon the election of Speaker McCormack, I said as I presented him to the House of Representatives that undoubtedly, as we moved along through the session of the Congress there would be differences among us in respect to matters here on the home front, and after all that is as it should be in a great two-party system such as we have, but I also said and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have demonstrated the truth and the good faith of what I said, that when the security of our country was threatened, we would prove once again that we are a united and a resolute people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask for action on the resolution I have presented which, I am sure, expresses what is in the heart and mind of everyone of us in respect of our great Speaker, John W. McCormack.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin). The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply touched by the action of the House and particularly by the friendly, generous, and eloquent remarks of my dear friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], the able, sincere and dedicated minority leader, and as well an able and sincere legislator and American.

This has been a long and arduous session of the Congress, but in the fields of legislative action both on the foreign and the domestic fronts, it has been a constructive session. This has been one of the most successful sessions of the Congress that I have experienced in my 34 years of service in this body. While there have been differences of opinion on domestic matters, as my dear friend from Indiana properly mentioned, the record of this Congress is an outstanding one. It must be remembered and is generally recognized that the recommendations of a President at the beginning of his term of office are not all intended to be, nor expected to be, enacted into law in the first 2 years of his administration. Some recommendations have long-range considerations and look forward to long-range action in the third year and in the fourth year of a President's term—and as in the case of President Kennedy, his first term. The comparatively few recommendations on the domestic level that have not been acted upon thus far will be considered and acted upon during the next 2 years.

In the field of national defense and in the field of foreign policy, this Congress has been notable for the bipartisan manner in which it has performed its duties, in cooperation with the President of the United States, President Kennedy, under the Constitution of our great country. This is a strong Congress, as the distinguished minority leader has referred to it in more eloquent language than I can. I repeat, this has been a strong Congress, of which I am proud whether in the field of national defense or in the performance of our duties in the field of foreign affairs.

In this period of the world's history—this very trying period that mankind is going through, the present Congress has been a tower of strength in cooperating with the President of the United States in combating international communism and to ultimately assure to mankind a future world at peace.

I repeat, we can be proud of it; not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans. As I so repeatedly have said, not only in the well of the House on the few occasions during this year that I have addressed the House and my colleagues, but outside, even when I am making a political speech, when I come to national defense or foreign affairs, I point with pride to the bipartisan cooperation, the bipartisan action, and the realization that no middle aisle separates us, but that when we come to questions of national defense and foreign policy, without regard to party affiliation we vote as Americans. I think the country realizes that and appreciates it. We face the world with a bulwark of strength when we have such a Congress that stands for a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy.

It is not my purpose to discuss specific legislation. My main reason for taking the well at this time is personal, to express my sincere thanks to all the Members for the many kindnesses and considerations they have extended to me. The position of Speaker, an important one, is at times arduous and trying, but by your cooperation, your tolerant and unselfish consideration, you have made this session more tolerable and more enjoyable.

I have zealously tried to protect the rights, prerogatives, and dignity of the House, and the right under the rules of the Members. To me this is a primary duty of any Speaker. I hope I have lived up to that trust.

To those Members who will not be back with us in the next Congress, I wish them and their loved ones in retirement countless years of future happiness and success.

To those who will be Members of the 88th Congress, I am looking forward to seeing you in January next and to a continuance of service together in this, the greatest legislative body in the world, and a body which I love.

I want particularly to pay my respects, my sincere appreciation, not only to all the Members but also to the minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], who is a great American and whose cooperation has been splendid; to the Republican whip, the gentleman from Illinois, Les Arends, to all of the Republican Members; to my dear friend, the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Carl Albert, whose loyalty to me has been outstanding, whose contributions have been marked, and whose patience with me enduring, if at times trying to him. He has made in this 1 year one of the great majority leaders of this body.

I also want to express my sincere thanks to my dear friend from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], majority whip, whose cooperation has been close and united with the majority leader and me, both of whom have been a bulwark of strength to me.

And through the majority whip I want to express my sincere thanks to the deputy whip, John Moss, of California, and all the members of the whip organization for the fine way they have cooperated with the Democratic leadership; and I know that my Republican friend, Charlie Halleck, feels the same way about his whip organization on the Republican side.

Also I want to express my sincere thanks to that great American, the No. 1 Parliamentarian of the world, Lewis Deschler, for his splendid cooperation and for the sound advice and suggestions I have received from him so many times this year. To his assistants, I also extend my sincere thanks.

I also want to express my sincere thanks to all the members of the House organization from the page boys up.

I am deeply touched by the many friends who have been so loyal to me during the past year. It has been a trying and arduous one. I extend my sincere thanks for a friendship I shall always remember and always treasure. To each and every one of you and your loved ones I extend my kindest regards and my very best wishes—I know between now and election day there will be little time, but particularly for a deserved rest after election day.

Again, my dear colleagues and friends, my profound thanks for the many kindnesses and the courtesies you have extended to me during this, one of the most constructive, and one of the most trying sessions of any Congress in my 34 years in the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Weaver (at the request of Mr. Halleck), on account of official business as delegate to the Interparliamentary Conference.

Mr. Williams, for today, on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Cramer, for 30 minutes today, following the legislative business, but before the first recess.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Wallhauser (at the request of Mr. Pirnie), for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Staggers (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 10 minutes, each on two subjects today; to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Giaimo (at the request of Mr. Boggs), today, for 30 minutes, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN in two instances to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STRATTON.

Mr. OLSEN in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mrs. PFOST.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT to include a more detailed statement with reference to the major legislative accomplishments of the 87th Congress.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PIRNIE and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WALLHAUSER.

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. SHORT.

Mr. WILSON of California.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. CELLER in four instances.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan.

Mrs. NORRELL.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6371. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income, and with respect to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks;

H.R. 7932. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1948, so as to repeal portions thereof relating to residual rights in certain land on Santa Rosa Island, Fla.;

H.R. 8269. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg;

H.R. 8517. An act to grant emergency officer's retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929;

H.R. 10501. An act for the relief of Kenyon B. Zahner;

H.R. 12820. An act to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide protection for the golden eagle.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 584, the Chair declares the 2d session of the 87th Congress adjourned sine die.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), Saturday, October 13, 1962, the House adjourned sine die.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on October 15, 1962, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10620. An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11586. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12276. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12648. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12900. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13273. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 88th Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 585, 87th Congress, he did on October 16, 1962, sign enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10620. An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11586. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12276. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12648. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12900. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13273. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 88th Congress.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 585, 87th Congress, he did on October 16, 1962, sign enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1447. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund;

S. 1961. An act for the relief of Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Fong Yee Hin;

S. 3124. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

S. 3215. An act for the relief of Kim Chong Koo;

S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes;

S. 3451. An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes;

S. 3453. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates;

S. 3705. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to establish a commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 15, 1962:

H.R. 1668. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;

H.R. 6371. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income, and with respect to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks;

H.R. 7781. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad;

H.R. 8269. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg;

H.R. 8517. An act to grant emergency officer's retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929;

H.R. 8563. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit certain policies to be issued to members of duly organized national veterans' organizations;

H.R. 9045. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended;

H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;

H.R. 10501. An act for the relief of Kenyon B. Zahner;

H.R. 12135. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code; and for other purposes;

H.R. 12217. An act for the relief of George Edward Leonard;

H.R. 12434. An act to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12708. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes.

On October 17, 1962:

H.R. 7932. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1948, so as to repeal portions thereof relating to residual rights in certain land on Santa Rosa Island, Fla.;

H.R. 10620. An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11586. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12276. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12648. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12820. An act to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12900. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13273. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide protection for the golden eagle; and

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution providing that the 88th Congress shall assemble at noon on Wednesday, January 9, 1963.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 3, 1962:

H.R. 5144. An act to provide for the acquisition of and the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social, and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5165. An act to provide for the acquisition of and the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social, and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5312. An act for the relief of certain additional claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N.C., on March 7, 1942;

H.R. 5320. An act for the relief of Robert Knobbe;

H.R. 6649. An act for the relief of C. W. Jones;

H.R. 6998. An act for the relief of Anthony Pirotta;

H.R. 6999. An act for the relief of Henry Massari;

H.R. 7704. An act for the relief of Chyung Sang Bak;

H.R. 8626. An act for the relief of Wilfrid M. Cheshire;

H.R. 8738. An act to amend sections 1 and 5b of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9472. An act for the relief of Janina Tekla Gruszkos;

H.R. 10678. An act for the relief of Angelo A. Russo;

H.R. 10720. An act for the relief of Rexford R. Cherryman, of Williamsburg, Va.;

H.R. 11266. An act to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to the townsite laws applicable in the State of Alaska;

H.R. 11728. An act to amend section 1208(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize investment of the war risk insurance fund in securities of, or guaranteed by, the United States;

H.R. 12711. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12818. An act to amend the act of July 13, 1946, to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of certain additional toll bridges over or across the Delaware River and Bay.

On October 4, 1962:

H.R. 10937. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands.

On October 5, 1962:

H.R. 218. An act to provide that individuals enlisted into the Armed Forces of the United States shall take an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States;

H.R. 1960. An act to amend chapter 85 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2952. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of California to the city of Needles;

H.R. 7708. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver and Sgt. and Mrs. Cecil P. Fisher;

H.R. 8134. An act to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands;

H.R. 9603. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Joseph P. Mannix;

H.R. 10022. An act to amend section 510 (a)(1), Merchant Marine Act, 1936;

H.R. 10566. An act to provide for the withdrawal and orderly disposition of mineral interests in certain public lands in Pima County, Ariz.;

H.R. 12529. An act to provide for the free entry of one nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer and one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of Illinois;

H.R. 12589. An act to amend the Smith-Lever Act of May 8, 1914, as amended; and

H.R. 13067. An act to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act with respect to the authority of the Federal Housing Commissioner to pay certain real property taxes and to make payments in lieu of real property taxes.

On October 9, 1962:

H.R. 310. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law;

H.R. 4333. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, as amended;

H.R. 6682. An act to provide for the exemption of fowling nets from duty, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7326. An act for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot Carpenter;

H.R. 7876. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of the joint pension plan for employees of local unions 645, 1507, and 1511, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 8181. An act to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia and to provide for its operation;

H.R. 8205. An act to provide tax relief to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America Local 863 pension fund and the contributors thereto;

H.R. 8824. An act to modify the application of the personal holding company tax in the care of consumer finance companies;

H.R. 9747. An act to amend section 514(1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended;

H.R. 10613. An act to eliminate the requirements for certain detailed estimates in the annual budgets;

H.R. 10652. An act to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another;

H.R. 11059. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of Bricklayers Local 45 (Buffalo, N.Y.) pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 11217. An act to amend section 6112 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 11551. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Maryland to the Holy Cross Lutheran Church, Greenbelt, Md., and for other purposes;

H.R. 11590. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Cherokee Nation or Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma;

H.R. 11793. An act to provide criminal penalties for trafficking in phonograph records bearing forged or counterfeit labels;

H.R. 11887. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex.;

H.R. 13044. An act to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 and the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; and

H.J. Res. 693. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress for the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia to amend the Washington Metropolitan area transit regulation compact, and for other purposes.

On October 10, 1962:

H.R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals;

H.R. 8113. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Southern Ute Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitation;

H.R. 10316. An act for the relief of Leopoldo Rocha Canas and Teofilo Caolle Servito;

H.R. 10881. An act for the relief of Major Singh Sunga;

H.R. 11378. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus personal property to schools for the mentally retarded, schools for the physically handicapped, radio and television stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission as educational radio or educational television stations, and public libraries;

H.R. 11594. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H.R. 12164. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort St. Marks National Historic Site;

H.R. 12180. An act to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12451. An act to authorize reimbursement to appropriations of the U.S. Secret Service of moneys expended for the purchase of counterfeits;

H.R. 12688. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying on a program of forestry research, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12887. An act for the relief of Benjamin Leach, Diogracias Leach, Rogelio Leach, and Maximo Leach; and

H.J. Res. 659. Joint resolution granting consent of the Congress to a compact entered into between the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia for the creation of the Potomac River compact of 1958.

On October 11, 1962:

H.R. 1362. An act for the relief of Calogera Virone Messina;

H.R. 1483. An act for the relief of Priscillo Jose Sisson and Evelyn Sisson;

H.R. 2836. An act for the relief of C. Edwin Alley;

H.R. 5423. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to take possession of the naval oil shale reserves, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5695. An act for the relief of Forrest L. Gibson;

H.R. 6987. An act for the relief of Maj. William R. Cook;

H.R. 7617. An act for the relief of John W. Schleiger;

H.R. 7927. An act to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8567. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to create trial boards for the U.S. Park Police, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8983. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in financing the construction of a bridge at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9469. An act for the relief of Charles L. Kays;

H.R. 9491. An act to provide for the removal of an encumbrance on the title of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the Board of Education of the Vallejo School District, Vallejo, Calif., by the U.S. Housing Corporation;

H.R. 9590. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward Hirsch;

H.R. 11543. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands adjacent to the Suitland Parkway in Prince Georges County, Md., to Suitland Lodge No. 1856, Loyal Order of Moose;

H.R. 11552. An act for the relief of Henry E. Keiser;

H.R. 11732. An act to amend section 305 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended:

H.R. 11970. An act to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and security of the United States through international trade agreements and through adjustment assistance to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12093. An act for the relief of Joseph Wolf, Jr.;

H.R. 12539. An act for the relief of Leslie O. Cox and other employees of the Federal Aviation Agency;

H.R. 12653. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such act; and

H.R. 13241. An act to amend section 300 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

On October 15, 1962:

H.R. 946. An act to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen;

H.R. 1598. An act for the relief of Michael Anthony Dedetsinas;

H.R. 1691. An act for the relief of Elaine Veronica Brathwaite and Jessie Bamer;

H.R. 2978. An act for the relief of Rosa and Rita Quattrocchi;

H.R. 4094. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources;

H.R. 4483. An act for the relief of Simon Karasick;

H.R. 6386. An act for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat;

H.R. 6691. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7099. An act to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas;

H.R. 7600. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the effective date provisions relating to awards, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7791. An act to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for the collection and publication of foreign commerce and trade statistics, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8662. An act for the relief of Jose Fuentes;

H.R. 8855. An act for the relief of Marie Silva Arruda;

H.R. 9342. An act to provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9737. An act to amend section 641 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that deductions shall not be made from Federal payments to a State home because of amounts collected from the estates of deceased veterans and used for recreational or other purposes not required by State laws, and to amend chapter 35 of such title in order to afford educational assistance in certain cases beyond the age limitations prescribed in such chapter;

H.R. 9894. An act for the relief of Loretta Shea, deceased, in full settlement of the claims of that estate;

H.R. 10129. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees;

H.R. 10415. An act for the relief of Earl T. Briley;

H.R. 10605. An act for the relief of Joan Rosa Orr;

H.R. 10617. An act providing that the U.S. district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain cases involving pollution of interstate river systems, and providing for the venue thereof;

H.R. 10697. An act for the relief of Joseph Hammond;

H.R. 11018. An act to amend the act concerning gifts to minors in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 11049. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920;

H.R. 11058. An act for the relief of Carl Adams;

H.R. 11334. An act for the relief of Mary J. Papworth;

H.R. 11665. An act to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11678. An act to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, eastern division, holding court at Akron, Ohio;

H.R. 12080. An act to permit domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors;

H.R. 12090. An act for the relief of James Comeau;

H.R. 12092. An act for the relief of Arthur H. Brackbill;

H.R. 12402. An act for the relief of Concetta Maria, Rosetta, and Tomasino Mangiaracina;

H.R. 12513. An act to provide for public notice of settlements in patent interferences, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12855. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 relating to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments.

On October 16, 1962:

H.R. 1660. An act for the relief of Margaret MacPherson, Angus MacPherson, Ruth MacPherson, and Marilyn MacPherson;

H.R. 4034. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. David V. Kyrklund;

H.R. 8556. An act to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to require certain additional information to be filed by an applicant for a scholarship or fellowship.

and to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with respect to certain requirements for payments or loans under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9199. An act for the relief of certain officers and enlisted personnel of the 1202d Civil Affairs Group (Reinf. Tng.), Fort Hamilton, Brooklyn, N.Y.;

H.R. 10650. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12936. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Fousse and others.

On October 17, 1962:

H.R. 11099. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Institute of Child Health and Human Development, to extend for 3 additional years the authorization for grants for the construction of facilities for research in the sciences related to health, and for other purposes.

On October 18, 1962:

H.R. 8321. An act for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews;

H.R. 9128. An act for the relief of Sgt. Ernest I. Aguilar;

H.R. 9804. An act for the relief of Cuyahoga County, Ohio;

H.R. 10931. An act to revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial.

On October 22, 1962:

H.R. 7283. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses.

On October 23, 1962:

H.R. 555. An act for the relief of Elmore County, Ala.;

H.R. 1663. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;

H.R. 5260. An act to continue for an additional 3-year period the existing suspensions of the tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations, or mixtures thereof;

H.R. 5700. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise;

H.R. 6190. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the repair or replacement for veterans of certain prosthetic or other appliances damaged or destroyed as a result of certain accidents;

H.R. 6836. An act to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act;

H.R. 7781. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad;

H.R. 7932. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1948, so as to repeal portions thereof relating to residual rights in certain land on Santa Rosa Island, Fla.;

H.R. 8140. An act to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8269. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg;

H.R. 8355. An act to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8563. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit certain policies to be issued to members of duly organized national veterans' organizations;

H.R. 8874. An act to authorize certain banks to invest in corporations whose purpose is to provide clerical services for them, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8952. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes and relating to the taxation of life insurance companies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9045. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended;

H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;

H.R. 9777. An act to amend Private Law 87–197;

H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of civilian employees of the New York Naval Shipyard and the San Francisco Naval Shipyard erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to a misinterpretation of a Navy civilian personnel instruction;

H.R. 10026. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power;

H.R. 10199. An act for the relief of Lester A. Kocher;

H.R. 10423. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy H. Johnson;

H.R. 10501. An act for the relief of Kenyon B. Zahner;

H.R. 10541. An act to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs designed to protect their populations,. particularly all preschool children, against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus;

H.R. 10620. An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10708. An act to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity;

H.R. 10936. An act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11578. An act for the relief of Don C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner;

H.R. 11899. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund;

H.R. 12135. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12217. An act for the relief of George Edward Leonard;

H.R. 12276. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12313. An act for the relief of Jane Froman, Gypsy Markoff, and Jean Rosen;

H.R. 12434. An act to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12599. An act relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12708. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13175. An act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13273. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 88th Congress.

On October 24, 1962:

H.R. 6371. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income, and with respect to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks;

H.R. 8517. An act to grant emergency officer's retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929;

H.R. 11586. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12648. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12820. An act to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12900. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporaton, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide protection for the golden eagle.

HOUSE BILLS DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the President had disapproved the following bills of the House on the dates indicated:

RICKERT & LAAN, INC.

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 1616, for relief of Rickert & Laan, Inc.

In 1959, the beneficiary company imported three shipments of nails from an Italian firm, having received assurances that such nails were of Italian origin and they were so marked upon arrival at the port of New Orleans. After the merchandise had cleared U.S. customs, it was discovered that the nails were, in fact, of Hungarian origin. The erroneous marking made the importing company liable for special marking duties, assessed at the rate of 10 percent of the value of the goods.

The original purpose of marking duties was to assure that labels as to country of origin could be relied upon by American consumers of imported goods. At present, these duties serve the additional purpose of helping to prevent mislabeling of products of the Communist bloc as products of free world countries in order to evade the higher duties placed on Communist goods and other restrictions on trade that would benefit our adversaries.

Under present law, marking duties are due on improperly marked merchandise whether or not there is evidence that the importer knew or had reason to know that the merchandise was mismarked. I believe that the policy behind this rule is sound. It should be the responsibility of the importer to assure proper marking, since he is in a position to insist on indemnification from the foreign seller if goods have been misrepresented. If, on the contrary, relief were granted to all importers with respect to mismarked merchandise whenever customs could not show that the importer was aware of the mismarking, this would be tantamount to making customs prove in each case of mismarking that the importer was at fault at considerable cost in time and effort. This would greatly change the impact of the marking law.

Since this would be the result of general legislation relieving importers of marking duties whenever mislabeling has resulted from the actions of others, I am constrained to withhold my approval from H.R. 1616 as a bill according relief which cannot be given to all other honest importers.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 16, 1962.*

AMENDING THE LAW RELATING TO INDECENT PUBLICATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I am withholding my approval of H.R. 4670, a bill "to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia."

Although I am in complete accord with the Congress that the people of the District of Columbia should adequately be protected against the dissemination of indecent and obscene publications and articles, there are grave constitutional and other considerations which have been called to my attention which compel me to withhold my approval of the legislation.

Among other things, my attention has been directed to the 1961 Supreme Court decision in *Marcus* v. *Search Warrant*, reported at page 717 of volume 367 of the U.S. Reports, which seems clearly to make the search and seizure provisions of this bill unconstitutional.

The 88th Congress will convene in less than 3 months and I am convinced it is desirable that the considerations which have been brought to my attention should be brought to its attention. Such a brief delay in the enactment of this legislation seems a small price to pay in order to obtain an enforcible law which will achieve the worthy objectives which prompted the bill before me.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1962.*

CATALINA PROPERTIES, INC.

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 12701, an act for the relief of Catalina Properties, Inc.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay $29,425.01 to Catalina Properties, Inc., representing the amount which the corporation was unable to collect as rentals from sublessees of the Catalina Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., for the period February 1 to March 15, 1953. The corporate claimant owned a 99-year leasehold interest in the hotel. During 1953, the Internal Revenue Service served a notice of levy and warrants for distraint on the sublessees of the hotel to pay accrued rentals to the district director. This levy resulted from a lawful attempt to collect income taxes fraudulently evaded by the corporation's principal shareholder, a bookmaker. The sublessees failed to pay these rentals either to the Government or to Catalina Properties, Inc., and the sublessees were evicted from the hotel in November 1953.

Catalina Properties, Inc., contends that the United States should pay to it the rentals which it could not collect from the sublessees on the ground that the levies caused the claimant's failure to collect the rentals. However, during 1953 the sublessees had no independent assets from which the rentals could have been collected from them, and the balance sheet accompanying their income tax returns for 1953 indicated that they were insolvent at that time.

The enactment of this bill would presuppose a duty on the part of the Government to collect from taxpayer's creditors, on whom levies are served, at the risk of the Government being held liable to the taxpayer if such collection is not effected. This is a risk which it is unfair to impose on the Government. Moreover, the primary beneficiary of this bill would be the corporation's principal stockholder whose fraudulent evasion of income taxes caused the levies.

Under the circumstances, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1962.*

PROVIDING A MORE DEFINITIVE TARIFF CLASSIFICATION DESCRIPTION FOR LIGHTWEIGHT BICYCLES

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 8938, "to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles."

The new tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles would include a description of the frame. By this means, it would double the import duties on certain types of bicycles being imported.

Bicycles are provided for in paragraph 371 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and were originally subject to duty at 30 percent ad valorem. A tariff concession on bicycles was first granted to the United Kingdom in a bilateral trade agreement effective January 1, 1939. Under that agreement the framework of the existing tariff classification based upon diameter of the wheel was established. That classification provided for separate categories of duties: bicycles with or without tires having wheels in diameter over 25 inches; over 19 but not over 25 inches; and not over 19 inches.

That classification and duty treatment were continued following a concession granted by the United States in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade effective January 1, 1948, with one exception. The exception provided that the rate of duty on bicycles with or without tires having wheels in diameter over 25 inches and weighing less than 36 pounds complete without accessories and not designed for use with tires having a cross sectional diameter exceeding 1⅝ inches was to be reduced to $1.25 each but not less than 7½ percent nor more than 15 percent ad valorem. All other classifications were dutiable at specific rates but not less than 15 percent nor more than 30 percent ad valorem.

The present duty on lightweight bicycles is the result of a renegotiation which took place in February 1961. This renegotiation, in effect, reestablished an escape clause rate increase which had been invalidated by a previous court decision.

The practical effect of this legislation would be to increase the duty on imported bicycles having a cantilever or curved frame, weighing less than 36 pounds from the present duty of $1.875 each, but not less than 11¼ percent nor more than 22½ percent ad valorem to a new rate of $3.75 each, but not less than 22½ percent nor more than 30 percent ad valorem. I am informed that approximately one-half of current imports of bicycles that are imported under the lightweight classification are those with cantilever or curved frames, and would be subject to this approximate 100-percent increase in duty.

The enactment of this legislation within a short time after the 1961 negotiations and following the opening of new opportunities for trade expansion under the recently approved Trade Expansion Act would hamper our efforts to improve the position of American industry in foreign markets.

Under the Trade Expansion Act, a wider variety of relief is available to assist American firms suffering from imports. Should the American bicycle industry demonstrate the need for this relief, it should be provided.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 22, 1962.*

RICHARD C. COLLINS

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 3131, a bill "for the relief of Richard C. Collins." The bill directs the Court of Claims to grant a rehearing to Mr. Collins, of Billerica, Mass., in connection with his contesting the action of the Department of the Treasury in demoting him to a lower grade.

The facts concerning this legislation are as follows. Mr. Collins was employed by the Internal Revenue Service. He was notified, on November 27, 1956, that his work was unsatisfactory and thereafter that he was separated for inefficiency. However, the district director decided, after further review of Mr. Collins' case, that a more compassionate step would be to demote him to a lower grade. After the civil service regional office at Boston and the Board of Appeals and Review of the Civil Service Commission in Washington held that the demotion was valid and warranted, Mr. Collins instituted suit in the Court of Claims in April 1958. The court thoroughly reviewed his case and held that his demotion complied with applicable regulations, procedures, and laws. The court subsequently denied a motion for reconsideration.

Mr. Collins, who appeared before the court in his own behalf, contends that because of improper Civil Service procedures and through his own lack of understanding of legal procedures, he failed to emphasize the most important aspects of his case. The Court of Claims, however, appears to have fully considered the applicable statutes and regulations and Mr. Collins had previously presented his views before the agency and before the Civil Service Commission in a lengthy hearing.

In summary, I do not believe that a constitutional court should be directed to hear particular matter once deposed of. Mr. Collins has had his day in court. If each dissatisfied litigant were to be permitted repeatedly to litigate his claim, there would scarcely ever be an end to litigation against the Government.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 23, 1962.*

MRS. HELENITA K. STEPHENSON

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 9285, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Helenita K. Stephenson. The bill would pay veterans' death benefits in a lump sum of $5,144.29 to Mrs. Stephenson for the period 1946 to 1955, during which she was remarried and ineligible for such benefits. The asserted basis for this payment is that her remarriage was annulled in 1955, because her husband had fraudulently misrepresented his wealth and health, and from a legal point of view, remarriage did not therefore exist during those years.

Mrs. Stephenson's entitlement to veterans' survivor benefits derived from the death of her husband in service in 1943. The monthly payments to her on this account were terminated in 1946, in accord with the law that remarriage is a bar to such benefits. Also in accord with longstanding regulations and practice, the payments were resumed in 1955 when her remarriage was annulled. Death benefits were paid all during the period of her remarriage on behalf of her children, continuing even after they were in college.

Mrs. Stephenson's situation appears to be no different from thousands of similar cases where individuals have not been given lump-sum settlements to cover the period of an invalid remarriage. While it may be, given the grounds of the annulment, that she did not receive adequate support during her remarriage, in view of all the circumstances this does not seem to be adequate reason for the retroactive payment proposed. Retroactive payments in this program are inherently objectionable because the program is based on the rule that death benefits are compensation toward support of the widow for current monetary loss resulting from the service death of a husband. A remarriage, even one subsequently annulled, must be assumed to replace that loss and to remove the Government's obligation to do so.

Approval of this bill would therefore seriously discriminate against similarly situated widows of veterans and it is important that we preserve the integrity and impartiality essential to the administration of programs involving hundreds of thousands of veterans and their dependents. This we cannot do if we grant special privilege or favored treatment as proposed by H.R. 9285.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 23, 1962.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

2628. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report entitled "Report on Borrowing Authority" for June 30, 1962, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 13419. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to regulate the manufacture, compounding, processing, and distribution of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, and of amphetamine and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 13420. A bill to amend section 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 252), to increase the basic allowance for quarters of members of the uniformed services, and to make living conditions more fair and pleasant for their families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 908. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Is Motto "In God We Trust" Being Left Off $1 Bills?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, together with the other Members of the House, I have been pleased to note the recent installation of the motto, "In God we trust," over the podium.

An assertion frequently held is that $1 bills currently being produced by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing do not contain this motto. As an example, I received, in the mail, this inquiry only last week:

> Since you are on the House Committee for Banking and Currency, I direct to you this inquiry concerning why the motto "In God we trust" has been eliminated from the $1 bill. As you know, on the side of the bill which has the pyramid and great seal of the United States the motto appeared above the word "one." Some of the more recent $1 bills have been printed without the motto. Can you tell me if this is something voted upon by the Congress or is left up to someone in the appropriate Government department?
>
> I will very much appreciate any information you can give on this query.

The answer, of course, is that since 1955 the law has required that the motto be placed on all U.S. currency and coins. My full answer to the above inquiry follows:

> I wish to acknowledge your letter of October 1 in which you inquire why the motto "In God we trust" has been eliminated from the $1 bill.
>
> I wish to advise you that this motto has not been eliminated from the $1 bill—that it is in fact required by law to be placed upon the currency and coins of the United States (31 U.S.C. 324(a) 69 Stat. 290). Section 324(a) of the code provides that "at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription 'In God we trust' and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins."
>
> The Bureau of Engraving and Printing has followed the provisions of law in this regard carefully. As the new process for the printing of currency has been adopted, new dies are prepared for the printing of the currency. This process has not been completed for all the various denominations of currency, but the new dies, rolls, and plates for the $1 silver certificate have been completed, and no $1 silver certificate is being printed today without the aforementioned inscription being printed thereon. You must remember that many thousands of the $1 silver certificates printed prior to the change in the printing process are still in active circulation. Until these are all recovered by the Treasury Department you will see some of such certificates without this most appropriate inscription being printed thereon.
>
> I appreciate your having brought this matter to my attention and I trust that within a reasonable time all of our coins and currency shall bear the inscription "In God we trust."

While the use of this motto in such places as on the wall of this Chamber above the podium and on our coins and currency may, upon first blush, seem of small moment, I submit that it is a matter of great importance.

The emblazoning of those Christian ideals which ever have been the hallmark of our Nation serves notice to the world that, unlike those existing under the rule of the forces of godless communism, we place our ultimate faith in our Divine Creator.

A Personal Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE D. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, the nearly 2 years of my service in the Congress have passed in record time, and shortly my tenure of office will be over. Due to the vagaries of fortune, our State is losing two seats in this body. Thus in the interest of retaining a delegation as strong as possible, though small in number, I did not seek reelection.

I came into the House as a freshman Congressman, but not as a newcomer to Washington. I believe that every Member of the House welcomed me and offered his assistance. My own State delegation, headed by Congressman Wilbur Mills, took me under its collective wing. Each member of the delegation—Congressman Mills, Congressman Gathings, Congressman Harris, Congressman Trimble, and Congressman Alford—has been a source of strength to me, and I am deeply grateful for their kindnesses.

The Speaker, with his usual cordiality, geniality, and fairness, has made a deep and lasting impression upon me. I have heard him say several times that he has a great affection for the State of Arkansas, and that his beloved wife, a former Metropolitan Opera singer, gave her farewell concert in Little Rock.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your many courtesies and friendship.

Congressman Carl Albert, our majority leader, is, in my opinion, one of the most capable men serving in the Congress. Carl is not only a close personal friend, but a mentor as well. I have gone to him with many problems, and he has always helped me in solving them. To Carl I give my sincere thanks.

And to Hale Boggs, our majority whip, I extend my thanks for his friendship and the help he has given me.

This has been the most challenging and interesting experience of my life. Never having expected to serve an elective office of any kind, I feel a deep sense of gratitude to the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Arkansas who elected me to serve this unexpired term.

Congressman Harris will be representing the new Fourth District, which will embrace 11 of the 13 counties now in the district which I represent. Congressman Mills will be representing the two remaining counties. I am sure they both know that my offer of assistance at any time is prompted by my desire to be of service to my State.

I expect to remain in Washington for the next few years. I am sure that a spirit of nostalgia will overwhelm me at times, and that I will want to come back to follow the proceedings of the House.

My heartfelt thanks to each Member of the House on both sides of the aisle for your friendship and courtesies.

The 43d Anniversary of Lieutenant Frank J. McConnell Post 229, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 7, 1962, in my congressional district, the Lieutenant Frank J. McConnell Post No. 229, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, celebrated its 43d anniversary. The present commander of this post, Mr. George Bauer, made the welcoming address while Past Commander William McCarthy was master of ceremonies for the program commemorating this anniversary.

In conjunction with this anniversary celebration, a plaque for dedicated service was presented to Hon. Eric J. Treulich, city councilman and vice chairman of the New York City Council, for his dedication and devotion to community service and duty.

As a part of the celebration of the 43d anniversary, there was dedicated a new Lieutenant Frank J. McConnell Veterans of Foreign Wars Park at Atlantic Avenue and Lefferts Boulevard, Richmond Hill, Queens, N.Y., within my congressional district.

It was my privilege and pleasure to be in attendance at this celebration and dedication. The park was dedicated to the standard bearer of said post, Lt. Frank J. McConnell, who was born on September 11, 1897, on 114th Street in Richmond Hill. He was a member of the Richmond Hill Baptist Church at 91st Avenue and 114th Street.

He attended Jamaica High School for 2 years and then attended Poly Prep in Brooklyn in order to take Greek. He was graduated from Poly Prep.

He attended Princeton University for 2 years and at the age of 20 he entered Plattsburg on a dispensation due to the fact he had not reached his 21st birthday.

At Plattsburg, McConnell was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Regular Army. Lieutenant McConnell was assigned to the 7th Field Artillery, of the 1st Division.

Lt. Frank J. McConnell was killed in action in France on the 26th day of July 1918 and his body lies in France.

Lieutenant McConnell was the first boy from Richmond Hill to be killed in action in World War I.

I take this opportunity to commend Hon. Eric J. Treulich for his service to the community and to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Lieutenant Frank J. McConnell Post, for memorializing our dearly departed standard bearer and for their continued work for the veterans and the community.

Basic Failures of the Kennedy Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on June 4, Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky made the keynote speech at the Republican State convention at Hartford, Conn. At this convention, our candidate for Governor, John Alsop, our candidates for State offices, our candidate for U.S. Senator, Horace Seely-Brown, and for Congressman at large, John Lupton, were nominated.

I ask that this speech by Senator Cooper be printed in the Congressional Record for many reasons. It was of importance because Senator Cooper declared in this speech, 4 months ago, the basic failures of the administration of President Kennedy, and pointed out the record and principles of the Republican Party. The speech has been widely and favorably commented on by newspapers throughout the country, and it has served as a basic and helpful document for many of our candidates. Its truths are applicable in any section of the Nation, and that is as it should be.

Senator Cooper is listened to with respect in the Senate and the country. He has had a long and varied experience in political life. A native of Somerset in the mountains of Kentucky—and Kentucky's one Republican congressional district, which has given Republican majorities since the Civil War—Senator Cooper entered politics in 1925. He served as precinct and county chairman, was elected when 25 years old to the Kentucky Legislature and later served as county judge, and circuit judge of his judicial district.

In 1942, at the age of 41, he enlisted as a private in the Army, and served in General Patton's 3d Army in his campaigns through France, Luxembourg, and Germany. He rose to the rank of captain and was awarded the Bronze Star. At the close of the war he was assigned to reorganize the judicial system of Bavaria.

Since 1946, he has been chosen by the Republican Party of Kentucky six times as its nominee for U.S. Senator. In 1946, 1952, and 1956 he was elected to fill unexpired terms. In 1960 he was elected for a 6-year term, receiving a majority of 200,000—the largest ever given to any candidate of either party in Kentucky.

He has served as a delegate at three sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations; as an adviser to the Secretary of State in the organization of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and in 1955 was appointed by President Eisenhower to be Ambassador to India and Nepal. In 1960 he was named the "ablest Republican in the Senate" by newspaper reporters who cover the Senate proceedings.

I mention these facts because Senator Cooper has joined in his life practical working experience in the Republican Party, service at the local and State levels, and experience in foreign affairs as well as in the U.S. Senate. His speech at Hartford nailed down as fundamental issues in this campaign the inability of the Administration to establish a fiscal policy, its never-ending grasp for power, and its indecision in both national and international affairs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Senator John Sherman Cooper to the Republican State Convention, Hartford, Conn., June 4, 1962

It is a great honor to address this convention. I was glad when Senator Bush asked if I could do so.

Senator Prescott Bush of Connecticut is the best informed Member of the U.S. Senate on fiscal and monetary matters—but he is more. Responsible in his speech and votes, humane and progressive, a man of conviction and integrity, he is one of the most influential Members of the Senate and is respected throughout the Nation. We will miss his leadership. We hold him in affection and respect, as we do his great wife, Dotty Bush. All of us, I know, are sad that he has decided to retire from the Senate, because he would have been reelected. But an element of his decision was that Connecticut has many Republicans capable of representing it ably and effectively. And I am sure that the candidate you select will succeed him.

I

The 1962 elections are of critical importance. For the American people—in choosing between the two parties—are called upon to determine the basic direction of our country's economic and foreign policies.

This statement may sound extravagant. But the record of contradictions and failures of the Kennedy administration bears out the truth of my statement. For its failure flows essentially from its inability to determine its economic philosophy. It flows also from its lack of faith in the private enterprise system, and from its lack of faith in the traditional processes of our Government.

The election this fall will be a turning point. The people are ready to reverse the trend of the Kennedy administration.

Here in Connecticut, and across the Nation, the Republican Party will lead the way. This is the year of victory for our party. We will win a Republican victory in Connecticut, we will elect a Republican House of Representatives, and gain Republican seats in the Senate.

II

Two years ago, the President promised the American people that a Democratic administration would lead our country to a new frontier of unparalleled economic growth, of confidence, prosperity, and leadership in the world.

The Kennedy administration has been favored by the continuing surge of growth and confidence fostered by the Eisenhower administration. The "box score" of bills pushed through by the Democratic majority appears impressive. I am always surprised that the President's advisers, and even some political pundits, think that a "box score" is more important than the substance of the bills. They are the bills he has contended were necessary "to get the country moving again"—to bring jobs, prosperity, and economic growth.

But as Senator Dirksen recently said, they have been the agents of "shrinkmanship" instead of "growthmanship."

Nearly 4 million people are still unemployed in our country.

Business failures have increased 11 percent.

Mortgage foreclosures are up 40 percent, the biggest 1-year increase since the depression of 1932.

Farmers' costs are at an alltime high, and the parity ratio is the lowest in over 20 years.

The cost of living is the highest in U.S. history.

And the outflow of American gold from our shores continues.

This is a state of affairs in which the Republican Party finds no pleasure. For we believe—as does the country—that the American economy is basically strong.

The slack in our economy flows from a lack of confidence in the Democratic administration's policy.

But it goes deeper. The root of the uncertainty, and the lack of confidence which plagues our country today lies, first, in the Administration's inability to determine its economic philosophy and, second, in its obsessive reach for power.

III

On the one hand, the President promises steady progress toward a balanced budget. He has spoken of extraordinary measures to stop the outflow of gold. He has made world trade a chief issue in his program.

But° in practice, the administration is enamored by the Keynesian policy of deficit spending. The Congress is asked day by day to commit itself to great programs of spending—without priorities—which make it impossible to balance the budget; which increase the outflow of gold; which discourage investment necessary for competitive world trade, and which strike at confidence. There is no evidence that the President and his administration are yet willing to obey the very injunction of sacrifice the President has asked of the American people.

The President has assured private enterprise that he respects it as the chief agent of economic growth and trade, and the source of jobs. But in practice, the doubt lingers whether his administration trusts the free economic system.

Both industry and labor have their compulsions for power. There is agreement that these compulsions must be regulated, and this the Congress has done since the days of Theodore Roosevelt. The President has the duty to speak out at times if he believes industry and labor contravene the national interest. I am not here to dispute the right of the President to speak up in the recent steel episode, but it is a fact that the raw display of compelling governmental power exercised at the time, raised disquiet in the ranks of industry and labor alike. They ask whether the Presidency will be used to coerce, or to appeal to public opinion.

Our private enterprise system has given this country unparalleled prosperity and power. Rightly used, it is an aspect of our free system of government. If it is to be successful, it must be trusted, encouraged, and strengthened by sound governmental policies.

The administration must make up its mind about its fiscal and monetary policies. It must decide whether it will trust and encourage our free enterprise system. The American people can influence this choice this fall. They must set the administration straight, and it is the task of the Republican Party to lead the way.

IV

The second source of uncertainty and lack of confidence which I mentioned earlier—the administration's obsessive drive for power—strikes at the very heart and nature of our governmental system.

One of the unique contributions which the founders of the Republic made to representative government is the division of power which our Constitution defines. They were political philosophers and they knew that the core of republican institutions was centered in the denial of arbitrary power to the executive—whether a King or President.

The Republican Party has listed 25 delegations of power sought by the President thus far. I cannot even read the long list. But among them are found the President's request to give to "experts" in the Department of Agriculture control over the agricultural economy; authority for the President to initiate a vast $2,600 million public works program to be financed by funds drawn from such agencies as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and even the World Bank—without approval by the Appropriations Committees. The worst features of this proposal were exposed and defeated by the Republicans in the Senate. The President has asked the Congress to transfer to him limited authority over the taxing power—the "power of the purse"—the very power which, centuries ago, our forebears determined must be held by the representatives of the people. And I cite his request to create a Department of Urban Affairs, even though it has support in many cities of our country. Stripped bare, the proposal is based upon the philosophy of the administration that it can decide what is best for the people better than the local officials whom the people elected, or the people themselves.

Who would exercise these powers taken from the Congress? I have no doubt that the plan was conceived by the academicians and theoreticians in the administration. We will not be anti-intellectual, for they have their place in government. But the country ought to reject the administration's quest for power, to be exercised by inexperienced men whose judgment is unknown, and reject their desire to arrogate to themselves the powers of the Congress, and to set their judgment above the people.

The transfers of power they seek would remove from congressional debate, and from the scrutiny of public opinion, a substantial part of the specifics of legislation.

It is a reactionary trend in representative government. It expresses a lack of confidence in the judgment of the Congress—and of the people.

In this election the people must reject this policy, which I judge the most fundamental issue they will be called upon to decide.

V

I have been speaking of the proper functions of our Government, and of domestic and economic policies. But economic policy cannot be separated from foreign policy. Our military strength, the strength of our allies, our very ability to defend this country, rest upon a strong and stable economy in which our people and the people of the world have confidence.

World crises and danger will continue to manifest themselves in different ways, but their essential cause remains. It is the unchanging and steely objective of the Soviet Union that communism shall triumph over our country, and over freedom itself. Our confrontation with the Soviet Union and the threat of nuclear war have prescribed imperatives of foreign policy upon which there has been general agreement by both parties.

The years since World War II have been darkened by danger, but 1961 and 1962 with the crises of Berlin, Laos, and Cuba have been particularly unhappy. I point out that during these crises the Republican Party acted responsibly. When the Cuban disaster of 1961 shook the confidence of our Nation and its allies, our party in the Congress rejected any temptation to use it for political capital. For we knew that the President must be supported and the country unified, when the security and prestige of the Nation are at stake.

But I must say, for the people should remember it, that the responsible conduct of the Republican Party stands out in sharp contrast to the behavior of many Democratic leaders following the U-2 affair in 1960, even when Chairman Khrushchev, attacking President Eisenhower, struck at the United States itself.

Here I want to make a suggestion which I think would be helpful in increasing the confidence of our own people, and of our allies, about our military capability to defend freedom and to deter war.

During the 1960 campaign, the President and other Democratic candidates downgraded the military strength of the Nation. The phrase "missile gap" was used again and again in the campaign to imply that the Soviet Union possessed greater power in missiles. Yet, shortly after the administration came to power, the Secretary of Defense and other officials declared that the United States possessed preponderant power, and that the "missile gap" was a myth. But, the uncertainty and lack of confidence in our military strength, which the 1960 campaign engendered, remains. I do not believe it will be wholly removed until the President expiates the wrong of 1960, and reveals to our people the strength which we possessed in 1960, as well as the strength we possess today. For it is a fact that our armed might, our missile strength, and our space program which now thrills the world, were initiated, planned, and largely developed under the administration of President Eisenhower.

VI

The record of the Democratic Party will bring Republican victory this year. But this election year is also a testing time for the Republican Party. It gives the opportunity to define and fight for broad objectives in harmony with the national interests, and to firmly establish our party's philosophy. This is the time to build not alone for victory this year, and for victory in States and local communities, but for the presidential victory which shall be ours in 1964.

We can strengthen the affirmative and humanitarian record which already is ours. We can prove again that ours is the party of responsibility.

(1) The Republican Party is the one party of fiscal responsibility. Since World War II, with the exception of 1951, when Korean war taxes swelled revenues, the only balanced budgets were provided by President Eisenhower and, before his administration, by the Republican Congresses of 1947 and 1948. The only major tax cuts since World War II were enacted by Republican Congresses in 1947 and 1954. And even as a minority party, it has been the Republican Members of Congress who have fought to restrain spending and to maintain order in fiscal and monetary policy, against the weight of the Democratic majority.

(2) While we Republicans give weight to fiscal responsibility, we shall not neglect human needs. Unemployment, education, decent housing, the health of our people—none of these can be neglected.

These are human problems with which we must be concerned, not as a matter of politics or votes, but as a matter of humanity and justice. Justice is the ultimate objective of free government. And the neglect of these needs will deny, as the great Republican Robert Taft contended, the equal opportunity which our free system promises to all its people.

(3) The Republican Party will continue its fight for full civil rights for all of our people. The Democratic record on civil rights is one of complete failure, for it will not risk offending the southern wing of its party. What was its record this year? It introduced one bill of doubtful constitutionality, and then abandoned it. In contrast, the Eisenhower administration fought to successful enactment the civil rights bills of 1957 and 1960.

As the party of Lincoln, born to assure freedom, we have the great opportunity to stand united, and to fight for equal rights and freedom for all our citizens, regardless of race, color, or religion.

(4) The Republican Party has demonstrated its responsibility in the field of foreign policy. We will maintain the military and economic strength on which our security depends. We will be faithful to our commitments throughout the world. But we must resist the arguments of extremists who dream of isolation, who believe that honest negotiation is appeasement, and who cannot understand that our support of the United Nations and our assistance to other countries contribute also to our security and leadership in the world. For the United States alone possesses, as Winston Churchill said, the decisive power to maintain freedom in the world.

VII

The President asks for the election of an overwhelming Democratic majority in the Congress, not to exercise its powers, but to rubberstamp the administration's proposals, and to assist in the transfer of congressional power to the Executive. He asks the election of Democratic State and local governments, which would be tied to the national government to stifle criticism, local independence and initiative. We do not need or want a rubberstamp Congress. What we need is a Congress—a Republican Congress—and State and local officials who have respect for their responsibilities; who will subject the proposals of the administration to public examination; who will support them when they are right, and reject them when they are wrong.

The central idea of our system of government is, as Lincoln said in 1856, "the equality of man." And his familiar words in his Gettysburg address that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth," spoke of his powerful sense of the mission of representative government at home and for the world.

Connecticut is one of the cradles of freedom and representative government. It has the great opportunity this year to lead the way to Republican victory. It has the opportunity to assert, as Lincoln did, the central idea and the mission of our party, and of free government itself.

Hail and Farewell to Representative Herbert Zelenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a distinguished member of the New York delegation who will not return to the House in the forthcoming Congress; Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, of the 21st District in New York City. As an unfortunate result of a Republican gerrymander, two Democratic Congressmen found themselves in the same district and the gentleman from New York, HERBERT ZELENKO, was pitted against one of his own Democratic colleagues in the primaries. Of two proven legislators, one had to lose—one had to win. The gentleman from New York, HERBERT ZELENKO, served the House throughout the 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. He served with diligence and great competence. His work on the House Committee on Education and Labor and on Merchant Marine and Fisheries commands the deep respect of his colleagues, and the gratitude of his constituents.

The gentleman from New York, HERBERT ZELENKO, is returning to his chosen profession of the practice of law. We who know him, know that he will be an ornament to that profession, as he has been to this House.

Service Beyond Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, many times a Member of Congress finds it necessary to call upon the various agencies of the Federal Government in order to be of maximum assistance to their constituents, and I know that the membership of this House will agree with me that the various agencies have always expressed a willingness and desire to assist wherever possible.

But I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the San Francisco office of the State Department's Passport Division and to the consul of the Philippine Government in San Francisco for what I consider service beyond the call of duty.

At a few minutes past midnight last night, I received a long-distance call from my good friend, Dr. Dayton Royse, of Weatherford, Okla. Dr. Royse was calling from the home of Mrs. James Moore, whose husband is a U.S. Air Force captain, whose life is hanging by a very thin thread in a hospital at Barksdale, in the Philippines.

Captain Moore, who is only 41 years old, contracted hepatitis while on official duty for this Government in Vietnam.

Mrs. Moore had been advised that her husband is not expected to recover, and the death is not far away. She wanted her husband either brought home or an opportunity to join him.

At about 1:30 this morning I called the Department of the Air Force and spoke to S. Sgt. Edward Norris, a native of the State of Florida. Following our conversation, the Air Force immediately went to work to render every possible assistance to Virginia Moore and her family.

I was advised this morning that Mrs. Moore will arrive in San Francisco, Calif., at 5:08 p.m., and will board a military aircraft to the Philippines at 10 p.m. Because Mrs. Moore will not arrive in San Francisco before normal duty hours are over; and because she does not have the necessary passport and visa, the Passport Division of our State Department in San Francisco and the Consul for the Philippine Government have volunteered to keep their offices open in order to issue the necessary papers for Mrs. Moore.

The American Government is big and often it is accused of being too big, but we must always remember that it is the Government that represents its people and has proven in the case of Mrs. Virginia Moore that it can pause and assist in individual emergencies.

I know that Mrs. Moore, her husband, and her children join with me in expressing deep appreciation to the Air Force, to the Passport Division of the State Department, and to the Philippine Government for their assistance, and to Dr. Royce.

Alert Citizens Can Prevent Abuse in Nonacademic School Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, my bill H.R. 10508, would be a meaningful way to prevent abuses in the nonacademic brainpicking tests which are currently being conducted in many of our schools throughout the country. Of course, it cannot do the full job. State laws are needed and, above all else, an alert citizenry at the local level.

During the past 2 years, I have worked extensively on this very significant area of education. I have received the help and advice of many hundreds of Americans throughout the United States. Without their information on the testing programs carried out in their schools at the local level, I would not have been in a position to present the information to the House which I had in my October 10 address.

If I am returned to the 88th Congress, I assure all of you that I will make every effort to press with vigor this legislation which will be reintroduced at that time. I believe we will win the next round. I have been amazed at the reception here in the House following the revelations of these sordid tests. Disbelief turns to shock as the Members I discussed this matter with read the tests which are being given. We will have a groundswell of support in the 88th Congress for this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage Americans in our 50 States to study the testing programs in their own local school districts. As I put it in the concluding paragraph of my October 10 address:

> By alerting American fathers and mothers to the dangers inherent in these nonacademic brainpicking tests we can encourage them to be ever vigilant lest their children be guinea pigs in some classroom. My bill H.R. 10508 would help plug this gap but in the final analysis it is going to be an alert and vigilant citizenry which will rectify this erroneous usurpation of the privileges and responsibilities of the home and church.

I hope we can spread this message throughout our entire Nation. I will be most appreciative of all of the information on local testing that can be sent to me in the next few months since I want to build up a good file which can be used to further demonstrate the need for this legislation and buttress our arguments when we begin once more our efforts in January.

Report on the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the 87th Congress has finally ground to a halt and I wish to express my sincere thanks to the citizens of the 12th District of New Jersey for affording me the high privilege of representing them in the U.S. Congress. As part of the responsibility to my office, I make this report to my constituents on some of our accomplishments and failures.

The first session adjourned on September 27, 1961, which made it the longest since 1951. But even this was topped by the second, just now completed. It must be remembered that for the first time since 1954, one party was placed in control of both the executive and legislative branches of the Government and one could reasonably suppose that any program advocated by the administration would have been enacted into law. But such did not prove to be the case.

The duties of a Representative—usually referred to as a Congressman—divided themselves into three major categories, the first of which is to legislate by exercising considered judgment to determine those bills that are for the best interests of his district and country. The second, to serve constituents who have particular problems, including matters pertaining to the military, immigration, social security, and others which are of vital personal importance to many residents. Third, and a very important one, is to receive the opinions and views from constituents on legislation and administrative matters as a guide to grassroots thinking.

I have kept my sights on the diligent effort to accept all three of these responsibilities and I am proud of the fact that my attendance record and participation in both committee meetings and House sessions has been extremely high and on a full-time basis.

In the third category, I have been favored by an abundance of thoughtful mail opinion on many subjects, and this has been very helpful.

Additionally, in this session I afforded my constituents the opportunity of expressing their views on 12 important subjects through a questionnaire mailed to them. There was a 19.4-percent return on the questionnaire, and this is a most impressive commentary on the interest in Government shown by those residing in my district.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

In relation to foreign policy, some of the important decisions that were made during the past Congress included the establishment of the Peace Corps, a new Arms Control Agency, and on two separate occasions authority for the President to call up Reserves, although one can wonder why we do not maintain Armed Forces at sufficient strength at all times, especially when one realizes the huge amounts that are spent for defense. The defense budget was given a substantial increase of $5.8 billion and the space funds were almost doubled in an effort to beat Mr. K to the moon. But little progress has been made in concluding the cold war and, as a matter of fact, it would appear that the trouble spots are increasing, with disturbing and almost critical situations facing us, with Russians in Cuba, Berlin, the Congo, South Vietnam, and some countries in Latin America.

Some of the major legislative measures relating to the domestic economy would include the minimum wage bill, which raised the wage floor for 25 million workers from $1 an hour to $1.25 an hour in two steps and extended it to approximately 1.3 million additional workers. Other measures enacted into law included:

The so-called depressed areas bill, which disappointed me because it is weighted heavily in favor of rural sections as against urban locales where the need is greater.

Other good enactments included bills improving coverage and increasing benefits under social security; the Manpower Retraining Act, which provides a 2-year program of vocational training and assistance in retraining workers with obsolete or insufficient skills; the temporary unemployment benefits bill to help the unemployed wage earner over a slack period which was passed in 1961; the Reciprocal Trade Act, which gives the President authority to reduce tariffs by 50 percent in an effort to meet likely trade challenges from the European Common Market, and a bill authorizing the purchase of United Nations bonds on a matching basis with the total of other countries up to $100 million.

One of the most important actions taken was the passage of the postal rate increase measure which provided a long-awaited and completely justified pay raise for Federal employees based on comparability with private industry.

Among those that fail to excite any enthusiasm at all would include the Freeman program farm bill, which I believe is a step in the wrong direction in meeting problems that have existed for more than 30 years. The bill will be costly to the consumer and the taxpayer. The piecemeal Tax Revision Act, which to my mind only delays the carrying out of a long-needed complete overhaul of our antiquated tax laws, also was signed into law.

Some of the failures of this Congress, in my opinion, would include the inability to settle the controversial issue between a true medical care for the aged program versus the administration-sponsored, limited hospital care bill and to have it considered in the legislative rather than in the political arena. It is indeed unfortunate that this issue has been dragged through the political mire.

Another major failure has been inaction on bills proposing assistance for urban and suburban areas with their serious mass transportation problems. What was proposed at this session was just a minimum, but it was important so that efforts to find a solution to this serious problem could be started. It is my belief that too much Federal concern is directed to the rural areas to the detriment of our cities, suburban and industrial sections.

Another glaring failure—and certainly a major one—was the lack of any civil rights legislation to put all of our citizens in the first-class category and promote equal opportunities for all.

Of very deep concern to me is the constantly rising national debt, now at $300 billion, an alltime high with the interest alone totaling $10 billion annually, an item for which our taxpayers get no return at all. Our debt now is greater than the combined debts of all the other countries of the free world.

COMMITTEE WORK

My committee assignments include the Government Operations Committee, which is the watchdog of all Government departments including executive departments and regulatory agencies, and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as well as a special investigative Federal Home Loan Bank Board Subcommittee.

The main thrust of my endeavors on the Government Operations Subcommittee, on which I serve, was to assist in ferreting out waste and inefficiency in the various governmental departments and regulatory agencies that come under our jurisdiction. We were, I believe, extremely successful in pinpointing many areas where improvements could be made with a result in savings to the taxpayer. I am sure that there is general agreement on the importance of keeping a close check on fiscal responsibility. This is essential and it is my hope that it will be pursued to completion at the earliest possible moment.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee devoted a great deal of its time and attention to postal rate increases and adjustment of Government employees' salaries to be more nearly comparable with those paid by private industry as well as providing the necessary and much needed increases in the annuities of retired, former Federal employees.

BILLS INTRODUCED

My interest in legislation, in addition to my voting record, can be illustrated by some of the important bills introduced by me. These include one to extend the presumptive period for service-connected multiple sclerosis, which was accepted by the Veterans' Affairs Committee as an amendment and incorporated in the general veterans compensation bill, a bill to award extreme hazardous pay for civilian employees, which was passed by the House, also a measure to provide convalescent and nursing home care in facilities provided at Veterans' Administration hospitals. I also introduced a bill to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted under the Social Security Act to $1,800, and I regret that no action was taken on this necessary legislation.

We have a great need for a U.S. Science Academy to develop scientific knowledge and achievement, and I introduced a bill to recommend necessary steps for its establishment. One of my keen regrets is that legislation to penalize those who mail obscene matters to minors and a resolution to create a select committee to investigate and study the problem of objectionable motion pictures introduced by me did not see the light of day.

WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

I was honored with appointment by the Speaker of the House to be one of two House Members to serve on the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission. The purpose of this Commission is to consider and formulate plans for the construction of a permanent memorial to Woodrow Wilson, former President of the United States and Governor of New Jersey. There are nine members, five of whom were appointed by the President to serve on this important Commission: The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Chairman — President Wilson's grandson — Chester (Chet) Huntley, Walter Lippmann, Arthur H. Sulzberger, Conrad L. Wirth, Senator Clifford P. Case, Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Congressman Cornelius Gallagher and myself.

My service in the House of Representatives has been a rich experience and I have conscientiously tried to evaluate and use my best judgment on the vital issues presented to us. I have at all times attempted to be available to my constituents and diligent in my assignments. I am truly grateful for the opportunity that has been given to me and the confidence that has been reposed in me to serve in the Congress.

It is my hope that my constituents will not hesitate to call upon me for any service of which I am capable.

Personal Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, responding to the personal and urgent request of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I returned to Washington Saturday, October 13, 1962, to be present for the meeting of the House of Representatives.

I had hoped to be here when the call of the House was made at 12, but due to the fact that my plane was late, I arrived in the House a few minutes after the rollcall vote. Had I been here I would have voted "nay."

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GRACIE PFOST

OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 87th Congress—the longest in recent peacetime history—has adjourned. This was not a rubberstamp Congress. It was a thoughtful, deliberative session with lengthy consideration of each issue. In the end, we wrote a constructive and forward-looking record. This is my report to you on what we did for the Nation and Idaho.

The length of the session proved most beneficial to the Gem State because it was in the closing days that we completed action on the greatest program of Federal water development for Idaho in our history. All of the measures involved came out of committees on which I served, and I was in the middle of the fight to "bring home the bacon," almost $300 million worth. That we were able to succeed was an immensely rewarding experience.

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND POWER

Public works projects mean jobs for the people of Idaho and economic progress for the State. Congress approved $293 million in such projects for our State, including Bruces Eddy, Ririe, and Asotin Dams and Reservoirs, and the raising of Blackfoot Dam. The $52 million Burns Creek project was lost in the final, bitter fight on the House floor, but Representative Clifford Davis, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the powerful House Flood Control Subcommittee, assured me the project will be the first order of business for his group when the 88th Congress convenes January 9. We from Idaho will never say die on this, for the project is needed to insure maximum resources development as part of the present Palisades Dam and Reservoir project.

Along with the House Public Works Committee, I also serve on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. The latter approved my bill to build the $3.4 million Mann Creek irrigation project, and the House passed it. This same committee also reported my bill authorizing $1.4 million in pipeline repairs in the Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake project, and the House passed the measure. It included an amendment which saved water users $183,000 in payments.

Senator Frank Church, Congressman Ralph Harding, and I are attempting to give further impetus to Idaho's economy by having the Bonneville Power Administration make a survey to determine whether all Idaho should be made eligible for the low-cost power produced at the federally built dams in the Pacific Northwest. Cheaper power would bring new industry and more jobs into our State. It would also cut in half the light bills of many of our citizens in southern Idaho.

NEW BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION

New construction also means new jobs. It was satisfying, therefore, to win some $1 million in funds for improvements to post offices at Payette, Caldwell, and Nampa; about $300,000 for six Idaho airports; more than $7 million in construction, matching funds and loans for 17 separate projects ranging from $123,000 for the border station at Porthill, to a $370,000 hospital at Emmett; a $3 million housing loan for the University of Idaho, plus a total of $141,049 in grants to 18 school districts for equipment and building improvements. All of these funds, and others not listed, have served to provide a boost to the economy of Idaho's First Congressional District.

FORESTS

Idaho will receive some $20 million in the next 3 years for forest roads and trails under the new highway bill, and forest research will be expanded. A modified wilderness bill was approved by the House Public Lands Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, and was reported to the floor, but died in the adjournment rush. I visited the White House with other Northwest Members to protest the imports of Canadian softwoods, and this is now under study. The State's national forests netted our schools and roads $1,063,435 from sale of timber, grazing, recreation, and other fees.

MINING

I joined the vigorous protest on artificial controls on silver—and since their removal prices have moved from 91½ cents an ounce to $1.20. Idaho leads the Nation in production of the white metal. Congress voted $4.5 million for stabilization payments to the small lead-zinc producers.

FARM

We have made a major breakthrough in the past 2 years in increasing farm income and reducing surpluses. Farm revenue is up $2 billion; and income of the average farmer is up from $2,960 to $3,360 a year. The farm bill we passed this year should make further improvements.

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN AID

Congress, keenly aware of the threat of world communism, voted a $48 billion defense budget, more than $2 billion over last year, and increased space expenditures 200 percent. The President was given the authority to call up the Reserves in an emergency, and to invoke economic sanction, or take any other action necessary, to contain Castroism in Cuba. Foreign aid was cut by $1 billion, but the Peace Corps was enlarged. Ten Idaho youths are now serving in this undertaking which even its former critics now praise.

GENERAL

Social security benefits to Idaho were increased by $3 million annually to a total of $42.3 million. A record $15.7 million was voted for health, education, and welfare activities in our State. The administration program to provide hospital insurance for the elderly was defeated in the Senate, but some type of health insurance for our senior citizens is a must next session.

The 10-percent tax on railroads was repealed; funds to complete the Lewis-Clark Highway were voted; compensation for veterans with service injuries was increased; and many other measures of merit were passed. I am proud of my part in building this record. My attendance tally for 10 years was 96 percent, one of the best in the House. I was glad to stand up and be counted on every issue.

With this report I conclude 10 years in the Congress. They have been wonderful and challenging years, and I am most grateful to the people of the First Congressional District for electing me—and reelecting me so many times.

I write this, therefore, with a deep feeling of appreciation and some nostalgia. As you know, I am relinquishing my seat in Congress to run for the U.S. Senate. I aspire to the 4-year term of the late Senator Henry Dworshak. It would be a privilege and a pleasure to serve all of the people of Idaho from this wider sphere.

Some Searching Questions About Venezuela and Betancourt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, during the current session of Congress, we have spent considerable time and effort endeavoring to determine what to do about Fidel Castro and Communist Cuba.

It is apparent that this problem will be with us for some time to come, and that it constitutes a grave peril to the security of the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere.

But, we must not let the urgency of the Cuba situation blind us to the seriousness of the Communist threat which exists throughout Latin America today.

It occurs to me that a more realistic approach to this problem on our part is mandatory if we are to forestall the Communist takeover of other Latin countries, one by one.

Just for once, I think we, the United States of America, should beat the Reds to the punch in their deadly game of Latin-Leninism.

We cannot ignore the fact that Castro was permitted to seize power in Cuba as the result of misleading our Government.

Nor can we ignore the fact that our State Department was misled as to Castro's Communist ties, apparently largely by his public disavowal of communism.

Because of the mistakes regarding Castro and Cuba and the dire consequences we now face because of them I urgently recommend that we take a close, hard look at our current policy toward Venezuela which appears on the verge of developing into another Cuba.

Like Castro, before he gained power, Venezuela's President Romulo Betancourt long ago disavowed his connection with international communism. But at the time of his disavowal, he made it perfectly clear to his comrades that he was taking this action solely to enable him to camouflage and introduce Marxism to Venezuela "with Vaseline."

So far the record shows, he has never publicly disavowed his devotion to the Marxist program.

Officials of his government confessed to former Vice President Richard Nixon, that Betancourt and his leftwing Accion Democratica Party seized power in Venezuela with the active support, collaboration, and assistance of the open Communist Party. This is in the record, period.

Whether Betancourt's disavowal of his Communist leanings is genuine or a false front calculated to deceive is entirely beside the point at this stage of the game.

What we must face is the inescapable fact that the Communist buildup in Venezuela has been permitted to reach its present alarming proportions without really effective opposition from the Betancourt government.

Lawlessness, Communist terrorism, and daylight thefts and assaults are rampant throughout Venezuela today, particularly in the major cities. The situation is described as "chaos" by many American newspapermen visiting that country.

The extent of the Communist penetration in all phases of Venezuelan life is readily apparent to our more knowledgeable and veteran Latin correspondent newsmen, such as Hal Hendrix of the Cox chain of newspapers.

In a recent article, Mr. Hendrix wrote, and I quote:

> Communists have infiltrated deeply into labor unions, the Nation's press, student organizations, almost every sector of commercial and industrial activity and the Government body, itself.
>
> Betancourt cracks down only occasionally.

The noted syndicated columnist and radio commentator, Fulton Lewis, Jr., reported after a recent visit to Venezuela, and again I quote:

> To all practical purposes, there is no law and order * * * and anarchy reigns. * * * There have been three attempted revolutions so far in 1962 * * * and this is what Mr. Kennedy calls the "show window of the Alliance for Progress."
>
> There is evidence to believe that Betancourt allows it to go on because he wants to continue the state of confusion and anarchy as long as possible.

Now we must ask ourselves: If the Betancourt government is incapable of controlling this criminal activity on the part of the Communists, how long will it be before the Communists take full and open control?

Today, the force of active Communists in Venezuela is placed at 50,000, including a number of their congressmen and senators and, at least 5 of the members of the Caracas City Council.

True, this is a small percentage in an overall population of 7 million. But anyone who quotes Communist Party membership or the party's low percentage of votes in national elections as a means of minimizing the Communist threat is blindly naive.

This is made crystal clear by the case in Cuba.

According to the Communist Party's own figures, it had no more than 27,000 active members in Cuba at the end of 1961, and yet, the Communists were in full command of Cuba at that time.

The total population of Cuba is about the same as that of Venezuela, 7 million.

If the Cuban situation does not prove my point, then consider the fact that there are as many active Communists in Venezuela today as there were in Russia at the time the Soviet Party gained control of that country.

I ask again, how long will it be before these dedicated Communists take full and open control in Venezuela?

Today, the congress of Venezuela, and most governmental departments already are dominated either by avowed Communists or members of satellite parties.

Many of the key men are old-time Communist comrades of Romulo Betancourt, from the days when he was an active leader of the Red operation in the Caribbean area and publicly admitted he proudly carried a Communist card. The roll of names from the old "open Red" days and close associates of today is long and more importantly, documented.

Among these old comrades are Raul Leoni and Ricardo Montilla, two of the three men to whom Betancourt wrote in 1932, outlining his "Vaseline plan" for introducing Marxism to Venezuela.

Montilla is now a presidential adviser and Leoni a senator and former president of the Venezuela congress.

The third man who received the "Vaseline plan" letter from Betancourt was Valmore Rodriguez, who died as a Communist in exile in Chile a few years ago.

When Mr. Betancourt became president of Venezuela, he spent more than $300,000 to have Rodriguez' ashes returned to his homeland where he was enshrined as a national hero.

Another old comrade from the 1930's, is Mr. Betancourt's Economic Adviser Carlos D'Ascoli, who was working for the Communists in Paris, France, 3 decades ago, and heartily endorsed Mr. Betancourt's "Vaseline plan" of introducing Marxism to Latin America.

I would like to point out further, that the man whom Mr. Betancourt selected as his ambassador to the United States, has a long history of Communist activity.

He attended a Communist training school in Moscow and was decorated by the Order of Lenin.

Like Fidel Castro and Romulo Betancourt, Ambassador Mayobre also has disavowed his Communist ties, and here he sits just a few blocks away at this very moment.

I, for one, am not going to cheer that type of personal history.

In view of the rapid rise of communism in Venezuela under the present regime, I cannot help but be alarmed over this situation, and the possibility that we may once again be playing the role of dupes.

We were hoodwinked by Castro, and today we must pay the piper for that colossal blunder.

Are we being similarly hoodwinked in Venezuela by such slick slogans as "showpiece of the Alliance for Progress?"

Are these slogans or shadows? Who built what in Venezuela? And what kind of progress actually has been made in that country with our millions of dollars in "alliance" money?

I am seriously concerned over the unmistakable indications that we are blundering in Venezuela the same as we did in Cuba and that the timetable for Venezuela's open conversion to communism appears perilously close at hand.

It is my firm conviction that the time has come when we must call a spade a spade, and base our policies throughout Latin America on realism rather than the idealist assumption that all is well that appears well on the surface.

To do otherwise is to court disaster far greater in consequence than that we now face in Communist Cuba.

Part II: Farmers and the New Frontier—A Report on the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 4, 1962, at page 22333 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who serves as the chairman of our House Committee on Agriculture, took issue with several statements which I had made on October 1, 1962, about the New Frontier farm program. I would like to take this opportunity to rebut a few of these criticisms.

COW QUOTAS

After several pages of praising Democrats, denouncing Republicans, and condemning "partisan politics" in agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] says:

> Cattlemen were told that Washington wanted to control the livestock industry. The Department of Agriculture did not propose nor would I support Government control programs for cattle and hogs.

If this is true, the American hog and cattle raiser is justified in asking why the administration recommended and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] introduced H.R. 6400, which contained this language in section 360 (a):

> PART VII—MARKETING QUOTAS FOR SPECIFIED AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES
>
> SEC. 360(a). This part covers any agricultural commodity including but not limited to the following: Hogs, cattle, lamb, chickens, turkeys.

If there were no intention to control hogs and cattle, why were marketing quotas proposed?

REGIMENTATION, RADICALISM, AND SURRENDER

Later the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] states that the 1961 recommendations of the administration were not radical, would not regiment farmers, and would not call for a legislative surrender by Congress. If they were not, why was not this bizarre scheme able to command a majority of votes in the House and Senate Agriculture Committees controlled overwhelmingly by the Democratic Party? The answer I suspect is that there were not enough "regimented radicals" in the Halls of Congress.

The fictitious role of farmers in the administration-sponsored surrender plan was exposed early. Here is what the General Counsel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture said about the role of the handpicked farm advisers:

> Title I of H.R. 6400 provides for industry advisory groups, but the Secretary is required only to consult and advise with such groups, and the Secretary has the authority to determine the details of the programs to be established pursuant to title I of H.R. 6400.

WHAT'S EXTRANEOUS?

In analyzing my earlier remarks on the makeup of the 1962 farm bill, the chairman states that the Public Law 480, REA, FHA, rural area development, and soil conservation provisions deserve better than the label "extraneous." In that regard, I must agree with my chairman. Each one of these provisions represents a significant change in existing law. Most of them were very meritorious and if considered separately would, I am sure, have received the overwhelming support of all Members of the Congress. It is just one of the unfortunate features of omnibus legislation that a lot of worthwhile and noncontroversial items are tied to undesirable and controversial bills.

It was unfortunate that the "rule or ruin" omnibus bill had to be burdened with some meritorious legislation. The 18 members of the Committee on Agriculture who sent the bill to the floor of the House made these provisions "extraneous"—not the 17 members who opposed it.

DAIRY CONTROLS—SCUTTLED OR TORPEDOED?

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] points out in his remarks that the dairy control plan was not scuttled in 1962. If it was not, what happened to it? There is nothing on dairying in the new law which President Kennedy signed last week. If it was not scuttled, perhaps it was torpedoed by the American dairy farmer who apparently wants no part of a chain gang agriculture.

My chairman also described the proposed penetentiary terms for dairy farmers as a "bogeyman" which I would like to use to "freighten farmers away from agricultural progress." He pointed out too that the "bill had barely been in Congress for 2 or 3 days before this part of the bill had been stricken out."

I would point out first that when a major piece of legislation affecting millions of our citizens is circulated among the leaders of our Nation in the important agencies of our Government and is reviewed by the White House before it is submitted to Congress and still contains a proposal calling for penetentiary terms for dairy farmers, it is more than a bogeyman. It is a real threat to the civil liberty of every citizen in this Nation.

As far as the deletion of this unsavory provision is concerned, let me say this: It was not Mr. Freeman who changed this bill. He is not a Member of Congress. H.R. 10010 was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] on January 31, 1962. Open hearings were held starting February 7. On March 26, the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee held its first executive session on the dairy provisions of the bill. On April 3, 1962, some 62 days after the bill was introduced, the full Committee on Agriculture held its first executive session on the bill. The dairy penitentiary provisions were deleted, not by Mr. Freeman in "2 or 3 days," but by the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture of the U.S. Congress which simply did not tolerate such an untoward proposal.

RULE OR RUIN—NOT IN DIXIE

My chairman next asks if I honestly believe that the 60 Members of the House from the great feed grain producing States—59 Democrats and 1 Republican—sold out their feed grain farmers in voting for the defeated "rule or ruin" bill. Let me say, Yes, I do. Why should a farmer in Iowa be forced to cut back from 20 to 25 percent on his feed grain production—without any compensation whatsoever after the third year—while a feed grain farmer in a so-called "feed deficit area," such as Florida, would not be required to cut his acreage at all? Why should 93 percent of the feed grain farmers in North Carolina be excused from taking a cut in acreage? And finally, why should every dairy farmer in the country be allowed to raise all the corn for silage that he wanted to while the Iowa hog farmer was required to cut back his corn production under strict controls?

The answer is clear to each of these questions. Any Member who represents the Corn Belt was not doing a very good job of it when he voted for the "rule or ruin" bill.

My friend from North Carolina expresses his southern point of view on this bill quite clearly when he says:

> It is in the self-interests of southern Members to support this position.

EIGHTY-CENT ORVILLE

In commenting about the 1964 feed grain program, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] says:

> Yes; it is true that feed grain supports would drop in 1964 if a new feed grain program is not enacted next year.

He goes on to state that he expects a feed grain program to be enacted next year.

Everybody realizes that Congress can change the new law next year. I surely hope we will. I most certainly will work to change it. That does not alter the fact, however, that the 1964 program as here and now presently written calls for 80-cent corn. Many Corn Belt farmers now describe our present Secretary of Agriculture as "80-cent Orville" because nowhere during the debate on the farm bill or afterward has any responsible administration spokesman, either within or outside Congress denied that the way the present law is written it will mean anything other than 80-cent corn in 1964.

POKING AT STRAWMEN

The gentleman from North Carolina says that the gentleman from Iowa "sets up a strawman to condemn the wheat certificate plan." In fact, two strawmen are created, he says. The first is 92-cent feed wheat in 1964, and the second is a "bread tax."

My chairman admits that if corn were 80 cents a bushel, feed wheat will be 92 cents a bushel. But he argues that feed wheat can be supported in relation to world prices and/or feed grain prices. He says that if there is 80-cent corn in 1964 the world price of wheat would prevail and noncertificate wheat would be set at $1.30 to $1.40 per bushel. We must remember that some 175 million bushels of wheat are supposed to move into feed channels. How will $1.30 wheat move competitively into feed channels with corn at 80 cents? Who in the world would feed wheat with a 50-cent difference? No one, obviously. Thus, the grandiose wheat plan begins to crumble. The so-called feed wheat would not be fed. It would be stored with Uncle Sam instead.

Another so-called strawman is the "bread tax." If every processor and exporter of wheat must pay from $1.08—based on 92-cent noncertificate wheat—to 70 cents—based on $1.30 noncertificate wheat—for the privilege of either changing that wheat into a food produce or selling it overseas, what better description of this assessment is there? Every consumer of bread will know it when the housewife goes to the grocery store.

My chairman also mentions another strawman in his remarks. The CED report was certainly in that category. No one on the Agriculture Committee or in the Congress took it seriously enough to have it transformed into legislative language, yet several weeks of shadow-boxing were spent on it. Certainly the House and Senate committees did not take the CED plan as seriously as the penetentiary terms for dairy farmers or the heavy criminal fines for wheat farmers that the administration asked for.

In reviewing the overall situation, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] rightfully points out some of the great accomplishments and achievements of American agriculture. Every one of us is justifiably proud of our farmers. I have no quarrel with such statements. Nor do I have any quarrel with increases in farm income. I have always done my best to increase farm income. That is why I have supported the voluntary feed grain program. My quarrel is with the way this administration proposes first to rigidly control our entire agricultural economy under the false colors of high price supports and then to label anyone who opposes this hoax as "an opponent of agriculture" or a "snipe hunter."

Nowhere in his remarks did the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] challenge my statement that the Democratic Party had repudiated 90 percent of parity on basic farm commodities.

In his final remarks, the gentleman from North Carolina asks what I mean about "back on the track under our free enterprise system." I am looking forward to answering that question in great detail during the 88th Congress, but a more appropriate and a more immediate answer could probably come from the farmers and ranchers of South Dakota who attended their State fair last year. They found an exhibit sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture showing a "free enterprise" train derailed and wrecked, while a "supply management" train rolled merrily along. After enough shocked and angry protests were registered, the Department officials put the free enterprise train back on the track. Let us hope that the American farmer will make the New Frontier do the same for American agriculture.

Report on 2d Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting, for inclusion in the RECORD, a brief summary of various of the legislative highlights of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, which it appears will be of interest to the 24th District of California which I represent.

The past session of Congress has been an unusual one in a number of ways. It was the longest continuous session since 1951 though you will have to go a long way in my opinion to find anyone who knows exactly why it lasted from the beginning of January until mid-October.

Early in the year, though the committees of Congress were busy holding hearings and preparing legislation to be brought up for debate and vote, months went by with little final action on legislation. Until June, only two major pieces of legislation were passed by the House.

In terms of what was accomplished, the session presented many questions and considerations on which it is difficult to give final assessment at this time. In terms of appropriations, the session has been the most expensive peacetime session in the history of the United States. The 87th Congress was one in which the basic philosophies and understandings as to what way our Government should move came into sharp focus on a number of occasions, producing plenty of legislative fireworks.

Legislation taken up covered a very broad spectrum of issues, problems, and proposals from relatively minor bills to major and far-reaching domestic and international measures.

Bills which brought into the picture the varying philosophies and ideas as to what direction our Government should go and what type of services it should perform for the people include many which you have all read about in the press from time to time. These include such items as medical care for the aged, Federal aid to education, urban affairs, tax revision, trade expansion, the farm program, public works, and others.

The medical care proposal probably presented this question as squarely as any to the Congress. In spite of the publicity given to this proposal, however, there is generally widespread misunderstanding as to just what action was taken on this measure by Congress.

In actuality, no medical care for the aged under social security bill was brought before either the House or Senate for debate and vote during the session in terms of the way legislation is generally handled.

In the House, the Ways and Means Committee did not report out a medical care bill. It therefore did not come up for debate and vote.

In the Senate an attempt was made to tack a medical care proposal on another bill when it came up for vote. This was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 52 to 48. It had not been the subject of hearings by any committee in the Senate and there was no report on the proposal. So in spite of all the comment, medicare legislation did not come up for vote before the Congress under the usual procedures of handling legislation.

The proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs was another highly publicized matter. A major issue here was the question of whether we should move toward expanded Federal Government and siphon away State and local authority. It was one on which the administration suffered a setback.

On this proposal, the House Rules Committee had refused to grant a rule on a measure to establish a Department of Urban Affairs so the means used by the President was to attempt to create one through an Executive reorganization plan. The President has certain standing authority to reorganize departments and agencies but the Congress can disagree. The reorganization plan was decisively killed in the House by a 264-150 vote.

Federal aid to education represented another area where the Congress refused to grant requests for massive assistance programs such as for school construction, subsidy for teachers' salaries, and scholarships.

Tax legislation is almost always a sure bet to bring about controversy because any bill, even the most minor measures, always has an effect which is keenly felt by someone. I often wish that people could get as concerned about expenditures as they can about taxes. Many do of course realize that they are essentially opposite sides of the same coin, but unfortunately, the significance of expenditures is often ignored.

Tax legislation was one of the major items taken up by the 87th Congress in the first major revision since 1954.

There is much to be done still in this field but the tax bill did affect a number of important matters.

It covered such items as investment credits to allow deductions from income tax of up to 7 percent of investments in new and used property. This is considered the major section of the bill. Also included are new regulations for business expense deductions, increased taxation of oversea personal and corporate income, cooperatives, thrift institutions, mutual fire and casualty insurance companies, and others.

The mail coming to the Congress on the proposal to withhold tax on interest and dividends, which was included in the tax bill when it passed the House, probably was heavier than any other single legislative item during the year. As is usual in tax legislation, this measure came up before the House under what is known as a closed rule under which amendments were severely limited. I did not agree with various items in the bill and voted against passage. The controversial features of the House-passed bill to withhold interest and dividends was dropped by the Senate and this action was accepted by the House. In its place was substituted a provision to require that interest and dividend payments of over $10 annually are to be reported to the recipient and to the Government.

Reciprocal trade was another big item which occupied much attention in the Congress, first in lengthy hearings and then in debate and vote.

Tariff legislation, as is the case in the field of taxation, is extremely complex. It has many ramifications and as far as the viewpoints of the citizens are concerned, it is somewhat like tax legislation in that many people are directly affected in one way or another by whatever action is taken in this area.

The bill passed by the Congress grants unprecedented authority to the President to cut tariffs, up to 50 percent over a 5-year period. On certain goods on which the United States and the European Common Market represent 80 percent of the supply, the President could eliminate tariffs altogether. Certain safeguards would be provided when tariff cuts hurt domestic interests but, of course, it remains to be seen how these safeguards will be administered by the Government.

A major aspect of this legislation, and the source of major controversy, was the request for authority to provide aid to industries hurt by tariff cuts. In addition to representing large potential public spending and the imposition of Federal controls over additional areas of our economy, this can be used as a convenient device to bail out or cover up inadequate negotiations. The minority members of the House Ways and Means Committee said about this part of the package deal on tariffs: "Adjustment assistance insures that the U.S. negotiators will do a poor job of negotiating."

This measure will undoubtedly affect many industries, the economy, and the consumers. Just how remains to be seen. This is probably the most far-reaching measure passed by the 87th Congress and you will want to be watching closely to see how the authority is exercised by the President.

The foreign-aid legislation again brought about considerable controversy, much of it centered around the question of aid to Communist nations. It was with regard to this point that an odd, ironic switch took place between the House and Senate positions on foreign aid.

To begin with it should be pointed out that there are each session of Congress two foreign aid bills. One is the authorization bill to authorize the President to conduct a foreign-aid program for another year. Later on in the session comes the foreign-aid appropriation bill which is to provide the actual funds to operate the program.

When the foreign aid authorization bill came up in the Senate, the Senate stipulated that no economic or military aid could be given to such nations known to be dominated by Marxism or communism. Immediately this touched off a flurry of administration activities, such as releasing to the press a cable from the Ambassador to Yugoslavia and even bringing him back here to support the administration position to be free to grant aid to Communist nations. When the measure came over to the House, the Senate-inserted prohibition was watered down considerably to allow the President discretion as to whether or not he wished to grant such aid.

On the foreign aid money bill, the procedure was just about reversed. The House, which acts first on all appropriations bills, inserted a prohibition against aid to any Communist nation. The Senate in turn voted to give the President discretionary authority to grant aid to Communist nations and to waive restriction on aid to nations aiding Cuba. What this boils down to is that each body had an opportunity to speak out loudly and boldly in favor of opposing aid to communism. Then each took a turn at drawing in its horns and nullifying in substantial part the effect of the other in prohibiting aid to Communists. Though in conference the absolute restriction on giving military aid to Communist nations or to those who ship military supplies to Cuba was retained, the President still has authority to grant economic aid to Communist nations and to nations who give Cuba so-called nonmilitary aid. So the Congress went through lots of motions on this subject, but we stand largely where we were before this question, for what is the difference if we do not send guns and ammunition to Communist nations if we send other things to help build up their economy to either manufacture or buy military items.

I firmly believe it is a serious mistake to grant any kind of aid to Communist nations. Many claims are made, for example, about so-called differences between Yugoslavia and Poland and the U.S.S.R. and the need to cultivate their friendship and promote their independence. I believe that is fallacious reasoning. Poland and Yugoslavia are linked with Moscow through their mutual Communist beliefs, and also militarily and economically. Any differences that may exist amounts to no more than an internal squabble among dedicated and confirmed members of the international Communist conspiracy and I do not believe we should be taken in by Communist deceit.

The House did make stick a sizable cut in the foreign aid bill. As it passed the House a reduction $1.378 billion was made to the request of the administration under the foreign aid bill, most of which was for the foreign aid program, though there were a few other smaller items contained in the measure such as appropriations under the Philippine rehabilitation legislation; $1.378 billion, by the way, is $1,378 million.

The Senate, as is the usual pattern, upped the House figure and the two bodies compromised at a reduction of $1.032 billion under the amount requested in the budget for the foreign aid program.

The United Nations bond purchase proposed is another bill that came up that was quite controversial and attracted much attention. I voted against passage. I firmly believe this will set a bad precedent for financing the United Nations in the future and on the other hand will really solve no financial problems it faces. The problem is more than one of financing. We have to take a hard look at the role the United Nations is carrying out, and what it is trying to carry out, and we must also recognize that the United Nations has done a poor job of managing its internal affairs. I do not believe we can continually keep bailing out the United Nations with U.S. tax money.

The communications satellite bill—the Telstar legislation—passed by the Congress provides for a corporation to own and operate a commercial communications satellite system. Its board of directors represent public shareholders, communications carriers, and some directors will be appointed by the President. Basically this corporation was set up to provide for a joint operation between the public and the Government in running this system.

The proposal did not generate an undue amount of attention when it was passed by the House. It did not explode, so to speak, until it got to the Senate when a determined effort was made to provide for Government ownership of the corporation through filibuster.

In other actions the Peace Corps was authorized to increase in size to 10,000 by next September, and the administration was voted authority for a $900 million standby public works program. A full-scale meeting already has been held in Washington attended by representatives of cities and areas across the Nation to discuss how these funds would be spent. According to reports, the administration goal on this program is to commit the $900 million as fast as possible.

During the year Congress raised the temporary ceiling on the debt limit to $308 billion and appropriated about $92 billion for the current fiscal year. I sincerely believe that we have no alternative but to take a hard look at our Federal spending practices to check the trend toward annual increases in expenditures. This is very important for all citizens, for with Federal spending invariably goes Federal control. We are in a period during which many determined efforts are being made toward centralization of Government in Washington. This is a problem we must all be aware of and I believe work firmly against to preserve freedom in America.

After many years, H.R. 10 finally passed the Congress. Many of you I am sure are familiar with this legislation and know that H.R. 10 is the measure which would allow establishment of pension plans for the self-employed similar in ways to pension plans that can be set up in industry.

I have been a cosponsor of this type legislation over a number of years. Though it had passed the House previously it never got through the Senate. This year it was approved by the Senate but not until several amendments were added, the major one of which would have disallowed capital gains treatment on distribution of pension plan funds. A huge flood of mail hit the Congress when this happened and this amendment and others were promptly eliminated from the bill when it went to conference between the House and Senate.

The day of the nickel beer and the nickel bus or subway ride is all but gone, if not completely so, but Congress showed it was willing to do something about providing an item you can buy for a nickel—it raised the 4-cent stamp to 5 cents. Other sections of the bill increase other rates such as the postcard to 4 cents, airmail to 8 cents, and other raises in second and third class and controlled circulation. To the same bill, which passed the House earlier by voice vote, the Senate tacked on a provision to raise salaries of Federal classified and postal workers.

Due to the king-sized boost from the thalidomide scare, a drug control bill to tighten controls on the manufacture and sale of drugs sailed through the Congress with scarcely any opposition.

It is a very rare occasion that a major bill passes, or a conference report is adopted by unanimous vote, but after the House and Senate passed very similar drug bills, the conference report was agreed to in the House by a vote of 347–0. Drug manufacturing controls, factory inspections, new requirements relating to drug-test bookkeeping and reports, and tighter requirements as to the evidence of effectiveness of drugs, clearance procedures, and with regard to advertising are among the major provisions in the measure.

It is encouraging to report that through the efforts of the Select Committee on Export Control, it was possible to achieve certain strengthening amendments to the Export Control Act, which controls exports flowing from the United States to other countries.

I have been interested in this problem for a number of years and introduced legislation to study the entire administration and enforcement of the Export Control Act. Finally last year the House Select Committee on Export Control was created. It is a five-man committee and I feel privileged to have been selected to membership on the committee. We held hearings last fall and again early this year and then recommended certain amendments to the act intended basically to cut down the flow of materials to the Soviet bloc. The amendments won handily in both the House and the Senate despite roadblocks thrown in the way by the State Department which sets the overall policy under which the Export Control Act is administered. I wish I could say that the flow of materials to the Soviet bloc is down to practically nothing but unfortunately that is not the case. There is apparently a determined effort in the executive department to maintain at some substantial level the trade flow with the Soviet bloc. As an example of the type of thinking we run into in this regard, in a task force report prepared under the direction of the present Assistant Secretary of State, George Ball, in the fall of 1960, it was recommended that export controls be virtually scrapped. From my observation it appears to me that there are many who hold this view. I simply do not see any sense in helping to build up the economy of the Soviet bloc through selling whole factories in such fields as chemicals, textiles, rubber products, and so forth and selling them advanced machine tools and other materials to build up their military and economic potential. We are in a basic struggle with the Communists. Let us face it squarely and decisively and hold the line.

The same goes with regard to the Cuba situation. The Congress can provide for an adequate defense program, as it has been doing for a number of years, and it can pass resolutions such as that taken up late in the session expressing our determination to prevent the Communist regime in Cuba from endangering our security. But in the last analysis we must have decisive, firm leadership and diplomacy if we are to succeed in eliminating malignant growths on freedom such as Castro's Cuba.

From all the way back to the incredible failure at the Bay of Pigs, which was the result of indecision and vacillation, down to the present we have seen that we in effect have no positive policy at all on Cuba, except merely to wait and see. Everyone realizes that this is a serious problem but the longer we do nothing, the worse it will get. Another Berlin wall is in effect being built. Regardless of what approach is taken, what we need first of all is a firm policy to eliminate the Castro menace and a strong conviction to carry out that policy.

Our situation today, then, at the end of the 87th Congress, is one which requires the close attention of all citizens.

Many of the items of legislation enacted can affect all of us vitally, such as the tariff legislation, the resolutions bearing on the Cuban situation, and the new or expanded programs which call for increased expenditures and increasing authority in the Federal Government.

The best advice that can be given is to follow with interest the operation of Government, how it is being administered, and how your security and welfare is being affected. This will pay dividends to yourself and your Nation. The strength of any nation is in the hands of its citizens. I cannot urge too strongly that everyone exercise the privilege that is his of participating in the operation of Government.

Changing Europe and United States Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on October 10, I had the privilege of delivering the Phillips Lecture of the Adult Education Council of Springfield, Mass., on the subject "Changing Europe and United States Policies." Now that the conflicts of the 87th Congress have drawn to a close, it seems to me an appropriate time to make this speech generally available for, I hope, dispassionate consideration. The views which are expressed, may I emphasize, are my own, the views of one Senator, a Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the lecture, previously referred to, be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING EUROPE AND UNITED STATES POLICIES

(By Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana)

First, let me say that in the remarks I will make tonight, I will be speaking in my capacity as a Senator of the United States and not as the majority leader of the U.S. Senate.

Although it will have taken an inordinate length of time to complete it, the record will show that the 87th Congress has disposed of a substantial amount of public business. For this work, it will be praised or blamed—at least until early November—depending in no small part, I should think, on one's political predilections. The Congress also failed to get through certain significant items of business. And for this, too, it will be praised or blamed, at least until early November.

In the closing days of the 87th Congress, however, two major measures were cleared. Praise or blame and political predilections notwithstanding, these measures are of immense importance to the Nation.

I refer, first, to the foreign aid appropriation. We may deplore this appropriation as a waste of money, as an invitation to foreign ingratitude or worse. We may praise it as an act of farsighted humanitarianism or enlightened self-interest.

However we may regard it, there is no escaping the fact that foreign aid is a critical gear in the intricate machinery of the Nation's foreign relations.

It has continued to turn, more or less adequately, for many years and through several administrations of both political parties. It is no overstatement to say that if the Congress had removed the gear or crippled it by denying an ample appropriation it would have risked bringing down the entire structure on which the peace and security of the Nation has rested for many years. Faced with that reality, more than a sufficient number of Senators and Representatives were inclined to the course of prudence with respect to this program. Members of both parties acted to sustain the security and peace of the United States.

This is not to say that misgivings were absent on the part of Members who voted for foreign aid. Many entertained serious doubts about one or more aspects of the aid program. May I say, in all frankness, that I personally share some of these doubts.

I do not believe, for example, that we can or should accept as satisfactory for the indefinite future a course of foreign policy which places great reliance on a continued outflow of dollar grants to other nations. Nor do I believe that we should accept by force of habit a course of sustaining the independence of nations elsewhere by maintaining aid-dependent governments in a style to which they may have become accustomed. Nor do I believe that the long-range interests of this Nation are served by casting aid for the economic development of emergent nations, a problem which has a rationale of its own, in the framework of a competitive struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union.

But the intelligent resolution of these and other doubts does not lie in the sudden smashing of the gear of foreign aid with all that that implies to the total machinery of foreign policy and, hence, to our peace and security. I believe, rather, that we must look for the resolution of the doubts in a continuing alertness to the changing realities of the international situation. We must look for it in constructive adjustments in the foreign policies by which we seek to deal with these realities. And we must look for it, finally, in a continuous reordering of both objective and administration in the aid program itself, as circumstances elsewhere and at home change. In these ways we may anticipate, with some realism, the day when the dependency of others on the more dubious and costly elements of the aid mechanism may come to an orderly end. Indeed, we may look forward to the day when the dependency of our own policies for peace and security on these same dubious elements may also come to an orderly end.

For this reason, among others, it seems to me that the President's new trade policy is the most important act of the recent session of the Congress. This first major revision of foreign trade policy since the enactment of the reciprocal trade program a quarter of a century ago places in the hands of the President authority to deal effectively with recent changes in the patterns of international trade. The program has great significance for the continued growth of our own domestic economy, for that growth is now interwoven with an expanding oversea trade. But even greater, perhaps, are the possibilities which are opened by the new trade program for placing our security and well-being on a more stable and equitable and, hopefully, a less costly basis than that which now prevails.

In this latter connection, the new trade law bears a direct relationship to the focus of tonight's discussion. It has particular relevance to Europe, to a changing Europe, and to our relations with that region.

I have already referred to the need for a continuing alertness to the evolving situation abroad. It is essential to effective foreign policy that we do not imprison ourselves in a self-fashioned cage of outworn facts and ritualistic slogans. Certainly, we ought not forget the experiences of the past. But, equally, we must be alert to the realities of the present and try our best to anticipate the needs of the future.

This alertness is most essential with respect to Europe. For Europe has long been at the core of our foreign policies, and Europe is changing rapidly. It is changing, moreover, in ways which are likely to require adjustments in policies on a scale more extensive than any we have known in the past decade.

We cannot yet define the adjustments which may be desirable, possible, or, indeed, inevitable in the years ahead. Our policies interact with the policies of other nations and the courses which they take will surely affect our own. But we will discern the lines of adjustment, and we shall have a better chance to formulate effective adjustments as we deepen our understanding of what is presently transpiring in Europe.

Those of you who have traveled from time to time on that Continent may have been struck by the obvious manifestations of change over the years. Indeed, a great change is readily evident in such simple matters as the progressive improvement in the dress of the people and the worsening of the traffic problems in the major European cities. It is evident in the copious availability of food and other consumer goods, in the general intensity of commercial and industrial activity.

The present look of Western Europe, to one who saw it 10 or 15 years ago, is that of a booming prosperity. And, indeed, the economic indicators sustain the apparent. Western Europe is prosperous, and it is dynamic. It is producing, investing, trading—internally and externally—and consuming at unprecedented levels.

There is a general belief that this dynamism is due to the Common Market. The fact is that much of the economic momentum was generated in the European countries on an essentially national but cooperative basis, even before the market arrangements began to go into effect. We may anticipate, therefore, that there is much more to come if the Common Market continues to live up to its initial promise and, if the cooperative concepts of the market are extended outward to other nations.

In any event, the atmosphere of Western Europe in 1962 makes it difficult to recall the Europe of 1945—the devastated Europe, stunned by long years of privation, by the incredible brutality and massive destructiveness of the war. It is difficult, even, to recall the Europe of 1950 or 1951—the Europe struggling to its feet with the help of the Marshall plan.

Difficult though it may be, it is essential that we recall these earlier Europes. For it was in those settings that our basic postwar comprehensions of the European situation were formed, comprehensions which persist to some extent even today although circumstances have changed greatly.

We saw Western Europe, then, as hurt almost beyond help, threatened by revolutionary upheaval from within and aggression from without. We saw Western Europe dependent on this Nation for its very subsistence, let alone the revival or survival of its freedom. And after the Berlin blockade, we saw Europe, as a whole, split beyond any expectation of healing between the monolithic oppressive Stalinist system in the East and the reviving free nations of the West. And we saw, in a divided Germany the wedge of a deepening division in a nation and a continent.

Throughout the early postwar years, our policies were reasonably attuned to the realities of the European situation. They were policies which could produce more and more vehement slogans of liberation, more and more speeches in the Congress on liberation, but, unfortunately, not the actuality of a liberation in Eastern Europe, as we saw with striking clarity at the time of the Hungarian uprising. But they were policies which, with less and less fanfare, were appropriate to the restoration of Western Germany, the recovery of Western Europe and to the protection of its renewed vitality and freedom.

Western Europe readily accepted our leadership in those years. Cynics might note that the Europeans had little choice. But I prefer to think that our leadership was accepted in major part because it was an understanding, effective, and responsible leadership. We pursued policies which Western Europeans recognized as serving their interests and policies which served our own interests, by safeguarding the security, the peace, the progress—the essential well-being—of the people of the United States at a realistic and bearable cost.

As I have noted, attitudes tend to persist even after the circumstances which give rise to them have changed. National policies and administration are subject at least to the same inertia. If we would deal effectively with the Europe of 1962, therefore, we must now grasp firmly the fact that we are no longer dealing with the Europe of 1945 or 1950. In Western Europe, we are no longer dealing—to be blunt—with the gaunt and shabby economic dependent, the shocked, tottering and willing dependent of the earlier years. On the contrary, Western Europe, today, is on its feet and has been for several years. More, it is running.

Indeed there are certain aspects of the change which has taken place which border on the ironic. European countries, for example, were once in little demand in the international financial markets. Some of these currencies are now in relatively greater demand than our own. Not so long ago we legislated inducements to encourage American enterprise to invest in Western Europe and found very few takers. Now we are concerned and properly so by the great outflow of American capital to that region, and we are seeking to stimulate Western European investment in this country as a partial counterbalance. Once we were badgered for loans by Western Europeans. In recent years we have been seeking a speedup in repayment of various obligations and what is more, the Europeans have been repaying in advance.

Once we placed abroad, as far as possible, orders for arms and munitions and other material for NATO. Now, we are pressing the European allies to make their military purchases in the United States as a means of obtaining foreign exchange to offset the dollar outflow involved in keeping our military forces in Europe.

I do not cite these examples in dismay or alarm. The recovery and prosperity of Western Europe were the ends which we sought because our national interests are interwoven with these ends. Moreover, the international financial position of the United States is one of great reserves and in the past year this position has apparently strengthened. I cite the unusual and ironic turnabouts, rather to indicate the extent to which economic circumstances have changed in Western Europe.

The transition has not been sudden. And as it has taken place, our policies—sooner or later—have generally adjusted to the changes. Some of the examples which I have just cited are representative of specific adjustments. But in more general terms, we might note that the policies of postwar relief to a stricken Europe, the postwar loans, the Marshall plan, have long since passed into history. With the exception of Spain, no economic aid of any kind has been extended to Western Europe for several years.

From one-sided economic aid, in short, we have progressed to a vastly expanded two-way trade—regular commercial trade. This trade has flourished, and it now encompasses one-third of our total trade, $6.3 billion in exports to Western Europe, and $4.7 billion in imports from Western Europe in 1961. Compare these figures with a prewar trade which, in 1938 stood at $1.2 billion in exports and $474 million in imports. Apart from its other virtues, the Marshall plan was a key factor in bringing about this immensely and mutually advantageous growth in trade.

It is doubtful, however, that we can coast indefinitely in this satisfactory situation even if we so desired. It is not likely that we shall be able to avoid difficulties in the period ahead in our relations with Western Europe. The basic question which is looming is whether a surge forward in Western cooperation, notably in trade, is now possible, indeed, necessary.

The major decisions in this connection cannot long be avoided. Indeed, Western Europe is moving toward them largely on a self-generated momentum. The Inner Six countries—Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxembourg—are impelled by the high initial effectiveness of the Common Market into a speedup in the removal of economic impediments as among themselves. As a group, moreover, they are at a point at which there will be a significant step forward in the freeing of trade with nations outside the Market or the heightening of restrictions on that trade. Moreover, the very success of the Common Market appears to be serving as a stimulus to integrated and quasi-independent European action on other matters, particularly on the part of the core nations of Western Germany and France. And the resolution of the Algerian question is likely to increase this stimulus.

Britain and other Western European nations linked in the free trade area commonly called the Outer Seven, are also carried toward major decisions largely by the significance of the Common Market to their trade. They are drawn by both the great promise and the uncertain propects with which the market confronts them. And finally, we are impelled toward major decisions not only by considerations of trade but because of the key position which all of Western Europe—and a changing Europe—occupies in the structure of policy upon which our peace and security depends.

We find ourselves, in short, in a period of major transition in Western Europe during which many questions, economic and more than economic, are appearing and demanding answers. We do not yet know all the questions, let alone the answers. For it does not rest with us alone to pose the one or to compose the other.

It is in this context that the action of the Congress in enacting into law the President's new trade program assumes great importance to the Nation. In a most responsible and nonpartisan achievement and by overwhelming vote the Congress has equipped the President to deal with the several possibilities which are emerging, all of which have great significance for the Nation's security, peace and well-being.

It is easy enough to visualize these possibilities in an optimistic light. One might look ahead, for example, to the entry of the United Kingdom and other European nations into the Common Market or, in other ways, the devising of satisfactory trade arrangements between the Inner Six and Outer Seven of Europe so that they will not find themselves at sixes and sevens. One might look ahead, too, to the immense possibilities of trade growth between this Nation and all of Western Europe, through the reciprocal removal of trade barriers, in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, under the General Agreement for Tariffs and Trade and in other ways.

Indeed these optimistic possibilities are now open. But in all realism we must recognize that they are not the only possibilities. In this connection, I would point to the difficulties which have arisen in the course of British negotiation for membership in the Common Market. It is understandable that there should be difficulties and cautions on both sides in these negotiations. But the hesitancies should not be dismissed by the glib assertion that it is just a matter of Britain "wanting the cake and eating it too." There is more involved—much more.

And much of what is involved is concerned with the Commonwealth. We will do well to remember that the Commonwealth, whatever its shortcomings, remains a significant factor for restraint and order and the evolution of freedom in a world which is never far from chaos and filled with tyranny. It is to be hoped, therefore, that arrangements will be devised which permit reconciliation of new British ties with Western Europe with the maintenance of the Commonwealth. For such a reconciliation may well decide whether present trends in Western Europe will turn inward or outward, toward seclusion or inclusion, in the direction of fragmentation or toward more effective cooperation among all the free nations in meeting the worldwide problems of freedom.

If the coming transition in Western Europe will require adjustments in our economic policies it is not unlikely that it will require adjustments in political and defense policies. Again, it is possible to view the possibilities in a most optimistic light.

We might assume, for example, that the great economic progress of Western Europe might produce a steady closing of political as well as economic ranks and the development of more effective common approaches toward Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and toward all the issues involved in a common advance of freedom throughout the world. One might also assume the continuation and deepening of military cooperation under NATO, with the Europeans bearing an increased share of its costs in manpower and materiel, commensurate with the improvement in their economic situation.

Yet, we would not see the present situation fully if we did not also note certain tendencies which suggest alternative possibilities. We must note, for example, that Western policies with regard to China and other parts of the Far East are by no means parallel policies, let alone common policies, and the gap which has existed for years shows no sign of closing. That may be understandable inasmuch as the Far East has become increasingly remote from the concern of Western Europe even as it has come closer to ours. But near at hand, we cannot ignore the fact that the profitable trade and shipping enticements which have existed since the breakdown in our relationships with Cuba have proved too much for some NATO members to resist. Again, I suppose one might rationalize this situation by noting that many of the NATO members are maritime nations and, as such, have traditional reluctances or legal restraints against introducing impediments to commerce on the seas, and further, that Cuba is somewhat remote from their immediate interests.

But even more directly, in the North Atlantic relationship itself, a relationship in which, presumably, the security and other interests of the European members are at least equally and probably more at stake, we cannot fail to notice certain anomalous tendencies.

There are obvious differences over nuclear strategy which far from being resolved, appear to be deepening. Further, it is years since NATO established a force goal of 30 divisions in Western Europe. At the present time, however, there are only 23 divisions in the region, and so far as I am aware, the only increments to its strength in the past half decade have come from the United States and West Germany which now supplies half of the European contingent. This is the case despite the fact that economic growth throughout Western Europe would appear to equip the nations of that region to increase their expenditures for the common defense and permit us to reduce ours.

In this instance, we are confronted with an almost inescapable conclusion that the Western European allies are either most lackadaisical about their security or they see the military threat to the North Atlantic region or at least to Western Europe in a far different perspective than do we.

This conclusion, moreover, is reinforced by another anomaly in the current situation. I allude to it by pointing out that much of the discussion of foreign policy in the last Congress, as in its predecessors, revealed a continued deep ideological hostility and security concern with respect to any and all relations with Eastern Europe. The congressional concern included Yugoslavia and Poland despite the fact the Presidents of both parties throughout the years have urged a somewhat different approach at least to these two Eastern European nations.

With this exception and despite occasional short-lived efforts to improve the tone of United States-Soviet relations—as for example during the Geneva Conference of 1955 and when the spirit of Camp David prevailed—our relations with Eastern Europe have, in fact, been extremely limited, involving minimal diplomatic and cultural contact and small-scale—in some instances—trivial trade. The closed-door situation in the East European Communist countries, of course, has been a factor in this situation. At the time the Marshall plan was proposed, for example, the Eastern European governments under Stalin's dictation isolated themselves almost completely from contact with the West. But it is also true that we imposed, as a matter of policy, our own quasi-quarantine on relations with that region and have retained it through the years. The principal motives, apparently, have been a belief that any other course would adversely affect the security of the West and the hope that quasi-quarantine would contribute to a liberation of the Eastern European people from oppressive Communist governments.

In any event, our policies with respect to Eastern Europe have involved stringent trade controls for many years. These controls have acted to keep our commerce with all of the Eastern European countries at a very low level. Exclusive of trade with Poland and Yugoslavia, it has amounted to under $100 million a year. And the great bulk of the $100 million consists of trade with the Soviet Union. By contrast, our commerce with Yugoslavia and Poland, unfolding under a somewhat eased policy, came to over $300 million in 1961.

It would be reasonable to assume that a parallel policy towards Eastern Europe would prevail among our NATO allies. They are closer to the source of danger, sharing the control of the Continent with the Communist governments. Their stake in the security of the West and the liberation of Eastern Europe would appear at least equal to our own.

But we look in vain, if we look for parallel policies. With the Soviet Union alone, for example, the trade of the NATO nations of Europe amounted to over $1.5 billion in 1961. And the trade of our NATO allies with Eastern European countries, exclusive of the Soviet Union, in the same year came to a total of over $2 billion.

Indeed, in the case of West Germany, trade with East Germany has been about $500 million a year for the past 5 years. West German trade with the Soviet Union alone amounted to $400 million in 1961, equal to our total trade with all of Eastern Europe, including Yugoslavia and Poland.

Moreover, the trade figures are a barebones indicator of the extent of increasing contact between West and East Europe. Add to it, a growing intra-European tourism. Add to it, the spread of commercial aviation networks until they embrace both parts of Europe and include principal European carriers. Add to it the direct rail service now available between Moscow and Rome, Paris and London. Add to it new credit agreements and seagoing shipping arrangements which facilitate the flow of trade between the two parts of Europe.

What begins to emerge from these and other indicators is a far different portrait of the all-European situation than that which prevailed a decade or more ago, the period in which our general comprehensions were formed and our basic political and defensive policies established. The contemporary portrait hardly suggests a Western Europe cowering with fear before the threat of imminent Soviet invasion, or subversion from Eastern Europe. It hardly suggests a Britain, Germany, France, or Italy which hold that the way to induce change in Eastern Europe is to isolate it. It hardly suggests Western Europe standing firm or even standing still, insofar as contact with Eastern Europe is concerned.

On the contrary, the current situation appears to be that of a Europe which while it may be separated on ideological lines is finding, through an extensive commerce and other contacts, a tolerable way to live with the division. This is a far different Europe than that which existed at the time our present policies of quasi-quarantine of Eastern Europe were devised. It is a far different Europe than that which is suggested by the situation in Berlin in which the United States and the Soviet Union confront each other in a continuous state of incipient conflict.

It is a Europe, in short, which appears to have changed markedly in a decade, except at Berlin. So much has it changed that it suggests the desirability of a critical examination of both our comprehensions of the situation and the policies which are derived from them to determine whether both may have fallen somewhat behind the times. We will not serve our own interests if we cloak the realities of the present situation in the facts and slogans of the past. Policies persisted in long after circumstances alter risk irrelevancy or worse.

Certainly, we ought never to approach changes in foreign policy lightly. Neither ought we to fear them. We must always be prepared to seek them if, in the light of altered situations, changes may be indicated in terms of our own security, peace, and well-being.

In the end, it is the President who has the awesome responsibility of decision in these matters. But I have long believed that any President gains from thoughtful public consideration of foreign policy. Nor is such consideration impossible in this country until after November, as Mr. Khrushchev appears to think. The questions involved in our relations with the rest of the world are not political; they are national. The people of this Nation have long since shown a capacity to separate the two and, in time, to deal with those in public life who fail to separate them. It is with continued confidence in that capacity, therefore, that I suggest to you some aspects of the European situation and our policies, which are in need of thorough and dispassionate public examination.

1. It does not seem to me unreasonable, for example, to anticipate that the impact of the economic transition in Western Europe is bound to be felt, not only in economic matters, but throughout the structure of Western cooperation. It seems to me, further, that our once preponderant position of responsibility must evolve into a greater sharing of responsibility in line with the diminishing differences between the basic capacities of the Europeans and ourselves as the effect of World War II on Europe recedes into history. There is no failure of leadership in adjustment to this reality. Rather, it is an essential of leadership. It would, indeed, be a failure if we were to cling to an excessive responsibility in Western affairs on a mistaken assumption that nothing has changed and the need for us is little different than it ever was and that special sacrifices on our part must continue. In that presumptive course lies not only unnecessary tension but unnecessary cost and unnecessary risk for the security of our own people.

More suitable to the present, it seems to me, is the course of a less ritualistic pursuit and, at the same time, a more realistic pursuit of interdependence among the Western nations on the basis of a more proximate equality of benefit and sacrifice in our relations. We may begin to find such a course through the new trade program and a great expansion of trade, not only with the Common Market but with all the Western European nations. Certainly, that is precisely what the policy is designed to permit, and I have no doubt that the President will pursue it with vigor. But we need to be prepared for some very hard and difficult bargaining in the days ahead. We must be prepared to look to our national needs with the same frank concern as do others. Unless we are so prepared we may well find ourselves continuing to carry more of the burdens of interdependence while enjoying less of its benefits. We will do well, too, to make certain that the trade interests of Latin America, Japan, and other nations with whom close and fortuitous relations are enjoyed, are not shunted aside in the effort to strengthen the ties across the Atlantic.

2. If the beginnings of the adjustments of our course are to be found in the new trade program, they are not likely to end with that program. For, I do not think that we can discount for much longer, the existence of Western European concepts of security needs which differ considerably from our own. Nor can we ignore the continued reluctance of Western European governments to increase their sacrifices for the common defense in the patterns which were determined some years ago.

May I say the Europeans have an equal right to their views as to what may presently be necessary to their defense, to the common NATO defense, and every consideration should be given to their views. But equally, we have a right and a responsibility to examine the extent of our commitment to the common defense, particularly in view of the failure to reach the NATO force goals, in view of the consistent balance-of-payments deficits which we have experienced for several years, in view of the expanded European capacity to bear a larger share of the common costs if they were so inclined, and in view of the enormous burden of assistance which we have carried and are carrying, largely alone, with respect to other areas of the world. It would appear to me that, at the least, the time is already past due when the remaining military aid programs to Western Europe should follow the economic aid programs into history. Nor is it unreasonable to consider a future reduction in our expensive ground force commitment to Europe—both in manpower and in dollars—if a reduction might be negotiated for a reciprocal withdrawal of Soviet forces from Eastern Europe. Any such reduction is, of course, inseparable from a satisfactory and enduring resolution of the Berlin question. Otherwise, we would be in the impossible situation of reducing forces in Europe one day only to have to increase them the next.

3. Prospects for any such course are also partially dependent on the situation in Eastern Europe. And it is difficult to speak of the present situation in that region with any precision. Our public sources of information are somewhat limited, to say the

least. Nevertheless, policies which still derive from an interpretation of that region as the Soviet monolith which it was in Stalin's day seem to me to be open to question.

Certainly, Eastern Europe remains an area of preponderant Soviet influence. Certainly, Communist nations of the region are linked in the Warsaw Pact. But it is hardly accurate to see the Soviet relationship with Finland and with Poland in the same perspective; nor is it valid to equate the Soviet relationship with East Germany and with Yugoslavia, nor the Soviet relationship with Poland and with Bulgaria, Rumania or Albania. Indeed, the latter country has actually severed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and sent its military mission packing.

What meaning, if any, these and other differences in Eastern Europe may have to the peace and welfare of the United States is an open question. But nothing is gained by closing our eyes to the fact that differences do exist or by regarding as sacrosanct policies which derive from earlier assumptions with regard to the region from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

On that basis alone, the policies which we have pursued more or less consistently with all of Eastern Europe except Finland and to a lesser extent with Yugoslavia and Poland for a decade and a half clearly require careful scrutiny. When we consider, further, that NATO trade with Eastern Europe has risen to a level of $3.5 billion and other East-West European relationships have greatly expanded, while we have continued to maintain a quasi-quarantine, the need for thoughtful review becomes even more evident.

I would reiterate that prospects for an orderly improvement of our policies with respect to Europe or, at least, a safe reduction in their burdens on the public, are likely to prove remote so long as there is a continuance of the present tension in Berlin.

It is the policy and, by this time, it should be clear to all that it is the policy of the United States neither to be provoked into unnecessary war nor to surrender Allied rights in Berlin to force. Whatever is necessary to assert that policy will be done. But let there be no mistake as to the cost of that situation to this Nation. The increase of several billions in the defense budget in the last 2 years was closely related to it. The callup of National Guardsmen and Reserve components last year was directly related to it. The grant of standby authority to the President to do the same this year is related to it.

I would point out, further, that the rights which we are seeking to safeguard in Berlin are Allied rights even though the principal responsibility and cost for upholding them has been borne by this Nation since 1948. It seems to me that, in the light of the altered situation in Europe, we may properly inquire whether the Berlin situation today is not at least as much a responsibility of the Germans and the Europeans as it is of the United States. We may properly inquire, whether or not in view of the catastrophic implications which this situation contains, it has not become, to some extent, a worldwide responsibility to share.

It would appear to me that we have every right to insist that those whose interests are at least as directly involved as ours bear more equitably the risks and costs which are involved. At the least, it would appear to me that they join in an effort to find a rational alternative to this dangerous and costly situation, by such honorable means as may be open, be it by diplomacy, be it through the United Nations or through conferences on Germany at which the European nations who may be prepared to contribute, as well as Germans, might be present. Indeed, it is not at all inappropriate that both the United States and the Soviet Union move further back in such negotiations while the Europeans themselves make a greater effort to find answers to the problems posed at Berlin by a divided Germany.

In any event, I do not believe that we should be dissuaded from seeking more rational answers to the Berlin dilemma and related questions by the raised eyebrows or the relatively cost-free reticences of others, so long as we continue to bear the preponderant burden of cost and responsibility.

To stand firm while circumstances move on is not to stand firm at all. It is to recede into irrelevance and a frustrating impotence from which the only escape may indeed be an ignominious retreat or a war of mutual annihilation. The President deserves to be sustained at home and by allies abroad as he engages in an unremitting search for a better answer to the dilemma. And the hour is indeed already very late in Berlin.

I have discussed these matters with you, tonight, notwithstanding the fact that the winds of October have already begun to kindle the political fires of November. I have felt free to do so because these questions of a changing Europe and our foreign policies will be with us all regardless of the outcome of the election.

With the President remains the awesome responsibility of decision. He will have to make the decisions—decisions on which hinge the security, the peace, and the well-being of generations. In all frankness, the decisions which are reached with regard to foreign policy are not likely to differ significantly whatever the political composition of the next Congress. In these national matters, I am confident that President Kennedy will continue to have the support of the preponderance of the Membership of Congress, as did his predecessor. And I am confident, too, that he will have the preponderant support of the people of the United States.

Show Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, when it was the custom for magazines to go out of business rather than to begin publication, Huntington Hartford founded Show magazine, the magazine of the performing arts. During the course of the first year, it became the magazine of all the arts and, with its first anniversary issue, incorporated into it U.S.A. 1, a magazine of politics and current history. It has essentially become the magazine of culture—theater, movies, television, music, dance, painting, sculpture, architecture, design, literature, history, and politics.

During its first year as a publication, it has not only dealt with the arts in Europe, the Far East and other parts of the world but also has devoted a great share of its space to matters related to Washington politics and culture. It has dealt with such varied subjects as the theater-going habits of Presidents, politics as a performing art—the Vice President's whistle-stop tour of the South in 1960, and invasion of Washington by the "Advise and Consent" army, Government and television, the showmanship at Cape Canaveral, and the relationship of Government to the arts.

Huntington Hartford and Frank Gibney, the publisher, are making a real contribution to a better cultural climate in the United States.

I wish to congratulate Show upon the occasion of its first anniversary.

Women's Role in Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1962, it was my pleasure to address the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. As my theme for the evening I chose to speak about the role women have played in veterans' affairs, which is tantamount to roles they have played in all walks of life. As they have fostered the development, growth, and progress of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is appropriate that they share in the commendation and recognition extended the parent organization. Under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following in the Record:

Madam Chairlady, our honored guest, Mrs. Eleanor M. Davids, my colleague, Congressman Cornelius E. Gallagher, distinguished guests, officers, members and friends of the Department of New Jersey Ladies Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is indeed a pleasure to be here this evening to attend the Department of New Jersey Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I have attended many dinners in this ballroom in past years but never have I seen it packed as it is this evening. This large audience speaks more eloquently than any words at my command of the affection, respect and high regard that you have for your honored guest, Mrs. Davids.

The Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has a great heritage. A ladies organization on a nationwide scale was a logical and needed adjunct to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. All through history women have given invaluable aid to our soldiers—in camp and in battle. But in time of peace their patriotism, fidelity, and fortitude have continued to be "a tide in the affairs of men."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States had its origin in an ideal of patriotic service. Its founders were men who had returned from active service in the Spanish-American War. They believed that American citizenship involved a responsibility of service in times of peace as well as in war. Banded together in an organization which would be a peacetime counterpart of the military organizations to which they had belonged, those men envisioned a future of continuous service to their country, their flag, and the comrades with whom they served.

No appraisal of the Veterans of Foreign Wars would be complete without giving full credit to the mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and granddaughters of oversea veterans who compose its ladies auxiliary. From the early days of the organization in 1899, the womenfolk of the members have proved themselves indispensable to the parent organization.

I have always marveled at the way the ladies of the auxiliary get things done.

The thoroughness with which you tackle a problem and carry it through to a successful conclusion is something that we men might well emulate. You barely complete one project before you begin planning another.

A study of your program reveals that thousands of hours and thousands of dollars are devoted to hospital work, cancer aid and research, the VFW national home, youth activities, rehabilitation, civil defense needs, Americanism, and an untold number of services to veterans and their families.

We must never let the passage of time obscure or minimize the Nation's debt of gratitude to our veterans and their families. Today the Government of the United States is able to deal with the problems of the world as a free Government because of the sacrifices of our veterans in time of national peril.

It is of more than passing interest to recall that America has always rendered a special kind of gratitude to veterans of military and naval conflict. Men who served under arms in America as far back as 1636 have been designated under certain prescribed and varying conditions to be eligible for public assistance. The Plymouth Colony specifically provided that any man sent forth as a soldier who returned maimed, should be maintained by the Colony from that time forward. From the early colonial authorities to the present time, formally constituted governments have enacted laws or adopted provisions making benefits available for veterans and their dependents.

But our job is more than "remembering." The crises of the present demand that we take a new grip on ourselves and look squarely at our national program in behalf of the more than 22.3 million veterans and their families.

Who knows, better than the women of our local communities, the real behind-the-scenes actual circumstances surrounding the hospital and rehabilitation programs administered by our Veterans' Administration. One of the auxiliary's basic programs is voluntary service in Veterans' Administration and community hospitals. I am told that in 1961 your membership worked over 1½ million hours, serving patients in nearly 500 Veterans' Administration and community hospitals. Your members spent 97,700 hours assisting VFW post officers in rehabilitation work for veterans and their families; 1,300 hours transporting people to hospitals, clinics and other facilities. Other rehabilitation services performed in local communities included nursing service, disaster relief, and aid to the handicapped.

Without the headlines of publicity, auxiliary members constantly devote their talents to the needs of veterans' families in distress; to the needs of disabled veterans who are forced to spend weary months in hospital beds; and to the welfare of widows and orphans unable to subsist on their meager incomes.

Rarely a day passes in any Veterans' Administration hospital without the presence of a representative of the Auxiliary of the VFW. To the patients of these hospitals, you bring friendly smiles, cheerful greetings, and an unending flow of gifts. The sum total of these activities give a lift to patient morale that no medicine can accomplish.

The job of rehabilitation is a continuous one. The extent of your assistance can perhaps best be told when we view, even briefly, the mission of the Veterans' Administration's medical program.

Since the establishment of the Veterans' Administration in 1930 there has been a tremendous expansion in the medical program for veterans. On June 30, 1931, there were 54 VA hospitals, 7 of which were opened that fiscal year, with a total capacity of slightly more than 26,000 beds. Three decades later the number of hospitals had been expanded to 170, with a capacity of more than 122,000 beds. The average daily patient load in fiscal year 1931 was 33,000 of which approximately 24,000 were in VA hospitals, and 9,000 in other Federal, national homes, State. and local government and private hospitals. In fiscal year 1961, this number had grown to more than 114,000 of which 111,000 were in VA hospitals and 3,000 in contract hospitals.

The Veterans' Administration voluntary service program—with which you are so closely connected—provides a dynamic partnership between the community and the Veterans' Administration medical program. This involves 42 national voluntary organizations and some 400 local organizations. During the fiscal year volunteer women workers provided more than 7 million hours of volunteer service. I have previously mentioned the 1½ million hours which your auxiliary has contributed. This is a gigantic undertaking and is a highly necessary portion of the program in behalf of our Nation's veterans.

Women's patriotic organizations can indeed become a power in aiding disabled veterans. Programs in aid of job development in local communities have been formulated by your individual auxiliary units. Together with the aid of employment officers of the posts of the VFW and representatives of placement services, such programs make a most realistic contribution.

After all, perhaps no one is better equipped to seek out job information than the women citizens of our local communities. To women—whether in the home or in business and the professions—there comes information of a direct and detailed nature dealing with job opportunity.

Who, better than you, the women of the Veterans of Foreign Wars auxiliary, can realistically understand the emotional and physical impact of experiences undergone by the veteran who has been wounded in the service of his country? Who, better than you, recognizes the trials, the tribulations, and the efforts involved in that uphill fight?

Who, better than you, can earnestly, sincerely, and wholeheartedly, enter into this ever-increasing challenge of launching our physically disabled war veterans in their final step in the rehabilitation program—the step that means finding a job which they are qualified to do and will be happy in doing?

It is my belief that the ladies of the auxiliary of the VFW can continue to contribute much in the crusade for (the right, the just, and the must in) finding employment for physically handicapped war veterans.

The VFW buddy poppy is an annual reminder of the Nation's debt of honor to its disabled veterans and war dead. Public and voluntary support of this worthy cause makes possible certain phases of your welfare work. When you sell buddy poppies, you perpetuate the VFW tradition of service and every auxiliary shares in maintaining that tradition by enlisting a record number of volunteer workers. Each buddy poppy offered for sale gives you, and the people of America, an opportunity to honor this Nation's war dead by wearing this symbol of service.

Major credit for the successful development of the VFW National Home for war orphans, at Eaton Rapids, Mich., belongs to the ladies auxiliary.

You and I know that patriotism is a living, dynamic force that causes men to die on their feet for liberty and freedom, rather than live on their knees for a tyrant. These words have been derived from a study of pages of our country's history. It is easy to be patriotic in times of war, yet remembering what Will Rogers once said to the effect that we have never lost a war and have never won a peace, we should be just as patriotic in times of peace—to win that peace and security for our children.

Inherent in the action of meeting this challenge of American citizenship are the women of America. Tomorrow's history is being written today. The circumstances that can help control or change the course of history remains within the power of the people themselves, if they will exercise their rights as citizens.

Women the world over have followed with deep interest the progress of American women. They are interested in the jobs women hold, in the pay they receive, in their efforts to improve our schools and communities. The world also knows that more and more American women are contributing to the life of the Nation, expressing themselves on the issues which face them as citizens, homemakers, and workers. In the final analysis, men and women everywhere have the same basic goals as those which motivate the women of the United States. They are dreaming of better lives. They desire in the years ahead opportunities for education—new ways of learning, working, and living.

Your auxiliary is approaching its 50th anniversary. Step by step, year by year, encampment by encampment, you have served our veterans. This service, in turn, has benefited the entire Nation. I am certain you are not looking only to the past, but you are working for the future preservation of our freedoms. It is a testimony to the vigor of the auxiliary that it is constantly preparing to meet new challenges with courage, energy, and skill that have been tried in the fires of long experience.

There is much an auxiliary can do. First, each individual member can resolve to carry on the struggle for freedom in her daily life by fully accepting the responsibilities that freedom entails—thus setting an example for others. Each auxiliary, in cooperation with its post, can assume community leadership in aiding to establish peace through its Americanism programs and other projects. Regardless of the project undertaken, it is important to remember that halfhearted measures are not enough today. There must be, in addition, a determination to be as devoted, selfless, and brave on behalf of our country and its causes as were those who gave their lives for freedom.

We have inherited a sacred trust to be passed on safely to those who come after us. If one generation fails in its duty, the chain will be broken. We must believe in our democratic heritage with a faith, not passive, but strong and confident. Then we must be willing to work for it.

I am certain that the VFW and its ladies auxiliary will never betray that trust.

Godspeed.

My Voting Record in the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom during the five terms I have served in Congress to compile and publish a record of my stand on important issues. I firmly believe the people of the Second District of Washington State, whom I represent, have an inherent right to this information.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the compilation I present in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will help eliminate any misconceptions concerning my voting record which might have been erroneously circulated within my district.

Of course, only a small percentage of the more than 19,000 pieces of legislation introduced during the 87th Congress was voted upon in the House of Representatives. Even so, more bills came to a vote than conveniently can be placed in this voting record. I am, therefore, confining my record to issues of national importance and those of particular concern to my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, to simplify my voting record, I have placed these measures into categories according to the general fields they encompass, although some are difficult to classify because they are broad in scope and may overlap. If there are questions concerning any of these issues or my stand on a particular issue, I will be happy to answer them when I return to my district following adjournment.

BILLS AFFECTING NATIONAL DEFENSE, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Voted for House Resolution 167 to provide funds for the House Un-American Activities Committee to carry out its functions.

Supported Senate Concurrent Resolution 34 expressing the sense of Congress as being opposed to recognition of Communist China and to seating Communist China in the United Nations.

Voted for H.R. 4469 to bar employment on waterfront facilities and U.S. merchant vessels persons who refuse to appear or to answer questions on Communist affiliations.

Voted for House Concurrent Resolution 226 which called for the taking of immediate steps to impose sanctions against the Castro regime in Cuba under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

Voted for H.R. 8465 prohibiting shipment in interstate and foreign commerce any article imported to the United States from Cuba.

Voted for H.R. 5000 authorizing construction at Army, Navy, and Air Force bases here and abroad.

Voted for H.R. 7851 appropriating $42.7 billion in fiscal 1962 and supported H.R. 11289 appropriating $47.8 billion in fiscal 1963 for the Defense Department so we can continue to maintain a defense system capable of deterring aggression.

Voted for H.R. 8302 and H.R. 12870 to provide appropriations for military construction, including programs at Paine Air Force Base, Whidbey Island Naval Air Station, and Blaine Air Force Station.

Opposed H.R. 5618 which appropriated $500 million for a wasteful and unworkable inter-American social and economic program.

Voted for S. 2311 and H.R. 9751 authorizing additional procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

Supported H.R. 9118 to establish an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Voted for H.R. 11974 authorizing projects for development of our atomic energy. This legislation included authorization for the Washington Power Supply System to construct a generating facility for generating electrical power from waste steam developed by the Hanford New Production Reactor.

Voted against H.R. 13175, the foreign aid bill which already has cost more than $100 billion.

Voted for S. 2768 which permits the United States to buy United Nations bonds in an amount paid in by other nations.

BILLS AFFECTING VETERANS' SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Voted for H.R. 6027 to amend the Social Security Act to permit optional retirement for men at age 62, increase benefits for widows who are 62 or older and to raise minimum monthly payments.

Voted for H.R. 10606 to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act.

Voted for H.R. 10 to encourage self-employed professionals to establish individual pension funds by granting income deductions for funds set aside up to $2,500 each year.

Supported S. 2393 which extended programs of Federal assistance to schools in federally impacted areas.

Voted for H.R. 8900 authorizing grants and loans to colleges for construction, rehabilitation, and equipping academic facilities.

Voted for S. 278 to extend program for grants and scholarships for training practical nurses under Vocational Education Act.

Voted for H.R. 10743 to increase rates of service-connected disability compensation for veterans.

Voted for H.R. 848 providing for permanent program of vocational rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disability serving between World War II and the Korean war.

Voted for H.R. 5439 authorizing special dividend payments to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance.

Voted for H.R. 5723 extending direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean veterans until February 1, 1975.

Voted for S. 1658 to tighten provisions of ban on shipment of gambling devices in interstate commerce.

Voted for H.R. 12628 authorizing additional money for revolving loan funds for building rental housing for senior citizens and liberalizing Farmers Home Administration loan program to be of more service to elderly borrowers.

Voted for S. 146 to extend the special milk program for schools and child care agencies, and to increase funds for program by $10 million.

BILLS AFFECTING LABOR AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Voted for H.R. 2935 to increase minimum wage from $1 an hour to $1.25 an hour.

Supported H.R. 8140 to strengthen Federal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflict of interest.

Voted for H.R. 7929 to increase pay of postal workers and other Federal employees.

Voted for H.R. 8723 to strengthen Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to protect individual union member.

Voted for H.R. 1258, increasing disability benefits under Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act.

BILLS AFFECTING FARMERS AND AGRICULTURE

Voted against H.R. 4510, the feed grains program which would have given the Secretary of Agriculture unprecedented powers to fix market prices and would have meant rigid Government controls.

Voted for H.R. 2010 to extend for 2 years the program of importing Mexican farm laborers to alleviate shortage of farmworkers on American farms.

Voted for S. 1643, the 1961 farm bill which denied the administration a stranglehold over American agriculture.

Supported H.R. 7176 to provide a national program to attempt to eradicate hog cholera.

Voted against H.R. 11222, the 1962 farm bill which would have established extreme, inequitable, and unworkable new controls on wheat and grain farmers, would have given the Secretary of Agriculture sweeping powers, and would have placed the dairy industry on a "licensed" basis.

Voted for H.R. 1027 to dispose of an additional $2 billion in surplus commodities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Voted for H.R. 1822 to increase from 10 percent to 25 percent the proportion of appropriated farm loan funds available for individual farms with debt of more than $10,000.

Voted for S. 2113 to permit harvesting of hay on conservation reserves under disaster conditions.

Voted for S. 1710 authorizing Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans.

Voted for S. 2197 to permit distribution of feed at reduced prices to livestock farmers suffering drought hardship.

BILLS AFFECTING ECONOMY, BUSINESS, AND TRADE

Voted to recommit H.R. 7446 with instructions to eliminate 10-percent tax on rail, bus, air, and water travel.

Voted for House Resolution 305, a resolution disapproving the President's rubberstamp reorganization plan for the Federal Trade Commission.

Voted against H.R. 10650, the President's proposal to withhold 20 percent on savings account earnings and dividends, and to eliminate the proposed tax credits for investments in newly purchased machinery and equipment.

Voted for H.R. 11041 to establish a commercial communications satellite system under private ownership.

Supported S. 902 raising the limit on amounts Small Business Administration may lend small business investment corporations and on latter's investments in individual enterprises.

Supported H.R. 8922 to increase amount available to Small Business Administration for regular business loans.

Voted for H.R. 8102 to extend construction aid under the Airport Act for 3 years.

Voted against H.R. 1159 which eliminated 6-percent differential allowed west coast shipbuilders.

Voted against H.R. 11970, the trade expansion bill, which would not give Pacific Northwest timber industry adequate tariff protection against timber imports from British Columbia.

Voted for H.R. 6413 to extend to fishermen same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimate of income taxes.

BILLS AFFECTING GOVERNMENT OPERATION

Voted for H.R. 5789 to establish the Cape Cod National Seashore as an addition to the National Park System.

Voted against H.R. 11990 to increase the national debt to $308 billion.

Voted for S. 1619, the old currency bill which saves taxpayers between $3 million and $4.5 million annually and improved the cash position of the Treasury by $98 million.

Voted for H.R. 8181 which would provide for a fisheries center and whose cost would be self-liquidating.

Voted for S. 1969 to grant permanent authority to the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate and license nonscheduled airlines.

Voted for House Resolution 530 to kill the administration's proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

Voted for H.R. 12900 appropriating funds for public works, including funds for the Sammamish River flood control project, Snohomish River navigation project, Point Roberts navigation survey, Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers flood control surveys, and Swinomish Channel and Stillaguamish River operation and maintenance.

Voting, Attendance, and Performance Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a letter from the Honorable Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, certifying to my voting and attendance record in the 87th Congress, and a letter from the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, the Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, referring to my performance in the 87th Congress, to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

I, Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, being charged with the preparation of the Journal of the United States House of Representatives and as the certifying officer of the House, do hereby certify that I have carefully examined all rollcalls of the 87th Congress, 1st and 2d sessions, and find that ARNOLD OLSEN, First District of Montana, has voted on each and every rollcall and answered each and every quorum call and therefore has a 100 percent voting and attendance record.

In witness whereof, I hereunto affix my name and the seal of the House of Representatives, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, this 13th day of October, anno Domini 1962.

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

OCTOBER 1, 1962.

Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
Helena, Mont.

DEAR ARNOLD: As the 87th Congress draws to a close I want to express to you my personal thanks for the great work that you have done as a Member of Congress. You have made an outstanding record and the people of your district are justified in feeling proud of you. You reflect great credit upon them.

You have performed your duties with outstanding ability, with courage, and supporting progressive legislation in the best interest of the people. You have been a bulwark of strength for legislation for greater appropriations for a strong national defense and you have supported the strong leadership that President Kennedy is giving us in the field of foreign affairs.

You richly deserve reelection. I sincerely hope and I respectfully urge that the people of your district reelect you, enabling you, with your seniority, to continue the great work that you are doing in their behalf and in behalf of our great country.

You are truly, "A People's Congressman."

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

A United Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the 87th Congress, with all its trials and moments of frustration has now come to a successful conclusion. The success of this Congress, which history will record, is attributed in a large measure to your excellent leadership and the determined efforts of all the Members of this body to pass just laws. In order that this might be accomplished, cooperation was required from Members on both sides of the aisle. And it is very apparent that in by far the majority of instances this cooperation was forthcoming. The esteemed minority leader, Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana, who is held in high respect by men on both sides of the aisle, stood by you and provided the inspiration of those of the Republican Party to join in these cooperative efforts. Truly, this was a united Congress at work in the interest of all the people of this Nation. As one not long in the field of politics, I have come to enjoy a profound respect for all the Members of this body.

On the outside there are many who feel that the lawmakers are not men of integrity and honor; often they are pictured as those seeking only personal gains and self-interests. This notion has long ago been dispelled from my mind. I have found here the most conscientious, the most dedicated, and truly the very epitome of genuine Americanism in these elected representatives of the people. It is for this reason that I resent the uncomplimentary attacks made on any Member. I resent attacks that may be made on the Speaker, the majority leader, or any man on my side of the aisle. But I equally resent attacks made upon the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK, or any Member on this side of the aisle. In these perilous days, it ill behooves any of us to find fault and condemn, when we ought to uphold and appreciate the efforts of our colleagues. These are days when all of America should be solidly united as one invincible army in following the leadership of our esteemed President and Vice President. It is a time when we need to look with appreciation upon the efforts of those in the highest court of the land, making up the third branch of our Government and find cause for rejoicing at their resolute determination that our Constitution be upheld in every respect.

This is also a time when every American citizen needs to reflect upon the great privilege of his citizenship in this the greatest Nation on earth. We dare never become proud or haughty; we must always acknowledge that what we have today and what we are as a people comes to us by divine benediction. It is truly a time when we must lean heavily upon spiritual resources to give us strength for the day. When the psalmist of old cried out, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it"—Psalm 127:1—we must with all vigor look to divine guidance to give us direction in these days of trial when our blessings and great institutions are threatened. Only with the help of God can we remain a mighty Nation, deserving of a position of world leadership. With this sentiment upon our hearts we return to our several homes to solicit the support of our fellow men to return here to continue in this service. May even our campaign efforts give demonstration of high ideals, of strong moral character, and of humble acknowledgment of the dependence of each of us upon divine providence. And with that, may God be with us until we meet again.

Retiring Members of the Committee on Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, eight members of the Committee on Public Works are retiring from the House, some to take other assignments and several to run for other offices. Representatives GRACIE FROST, of Idaho, and PERKINS BASS, of New Hampshire are candiates for the U.S. Senate. Representative FRANK SMITH, of Mississippi, has been named to the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority by President Kennedy. Representatives IRIS BLITCH, of Georgia, LOUISE REECE, of Tennessee, and GORDON SCHERER, of Ohio, did not run for reelection and Representatives EDWIN B. DOOLEY, of New York, and WALTER L. McVEY, of Kansas, will pursue other careers.

Mr. Speaker, I join the many friends and colleagues of these Members in extending to them the appreciation of us all for the service given in the past to the committee and to the Congress. We are especially sorry to lose all of our feminine members who have been an effective arm in consistently supporting legislation providing for harbor improvement, flood control, and water resource programs. I want to single out the activities of Representative SMITH of Mississippi, chairman of the Subcommitee on Watershed Development, and commend him for a job well done. The programs he has sponsored will provide benefits to communities all over the Nation. ED DOOLEY has many fine qualities and I consider him one of the most able and dedicated Members of the House. PERKINS BASS and WALTER MCVEY contributed their legal talents to the committee's work. GORDON SCHERER leaves Congress as something of an expert on highway matters.

If time and space permitted I could continue at great length with a listing of the many committee activities and programs which have been advanced due to the work of these retiring Members of the Congress. The tremendous success of the public works programs we have enacted into law speaks adequately for the way in which these committee members have met their responsibility. I have no doubt but that the same fine dedicated service will be rendered in any activities in which they may engage in the future.

Legislation Needed To Regulate Distribution of Habit-Forming Barbiturate and Amphetamine Drugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have today, the last day of the 87th Congress, introduced a bill, H.R. 13419, which I believe to be of special importance to the people of this country. I want to explain to our colleagues why I have waited until the last day of the session to introduce it and why I consider it of such significance.

I claim no ownership for this legislation. I did not draft it myself nor am I responsible for anything which has gone into it. Whatever credit there may be involves the recognition of a potentially effective weapon to be used in the fight against a grave national danger and the contribution now of an additional measure of support.

This bill is a companion bill to legislation, S. 3673, introduced in the Senate by the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD. It proposes to regulate the distribution of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs. In the language of our time, this could be called the antigoofball bill.

I have introduced this bill today for two reasons: First, to protest the failure of the 87th Congress to take affirmative action to meet what virtually everyone recognizes is a national scandal of frightening proportions, and second, to indicate my own strong personal support of this bill and my intention to continue the fight to enact this legislation in the 88th Congress.

As many of our colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, this bill grew out of extensive hearings by the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, under the chairmanship of Senator DODD. These hearings showed that both adult and juvenile use of amphetamines and barbiturates has increased strikingly in the recent past. Senator DODD describes these drugs as "deadly drugs." They are habit forming and they frequently lead to addiction to other, even more potent, drugs.

As might be suggested by the so-called goofball craze which has swept large areas of the country, the subcommittee found that more of these drugs were being sold illegally than were being distributed according to the law. The subcommittee also found that loopholes and other inadequacies in the law were a major reason for the easy availability of the drugs and the rapid growth in the number of new addicts.

Senator DODD designed his bill to attack the central problem in controlling illegal distribution of barbiturates and amphetamines—the difficulty for law enforcement officials to learn precisely the quantity in which these drugs are being produced, the origin of their manufacture, and the destinations to which drugs are being sent for resale or other distribution.

The bill would attack the problem in the following ways: It would require that manufacturers, compounders, and processors of barbiturates and amphetamines register their names and addresses with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would require manufacturers and distributors of the drugs to keep records of the quantities they handle and make these records available to food and drug inspectors. And it would provide broad authority to drug inspectors to inspect establishments, inventory stocks, vehicles, and other facilities in connection with proper and reasonable investigation of the disposal of these drugs.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, has been endorsed by the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, the President of the United States, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the International Juvenile Police Officers Association, the Association of Juvenile Court Judges, representatives of religious faiths, and so far as I know, by everyone else who has commented on the legislation. The bill also reflects the changes proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to an earlier version of the measure.

Yet, for 16 months the legislation has languished in another Senate committee—without hearings or other official action of any kind. In view of the critical nature of drug addiction, the potential effectiveness of the bill in controlling distribution of the drugs, and the overwhelming support the bill has received from Federal, State, and local government officials and private organizations and individuals, I am puzzled, to say the least, at the failure to act.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the bill at this time to give expression to this sense of puzzlement and great disappointment and to symbolize the support this extremely worthwhile piece of legislation deserves. I intend to reintroduce this bill at the beginning of the 88th Congress. I hope our colleagues will, in the meantime, investigate the seriousness of the goofball situation and acquaint themselves with the merits of this proposal as a means of dealing with one of our country's greatest problems. I urge them to support the legislation.

Report to the People of the 6th District of Oklahoma on the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, since my first term in Congress in 1941, it has been my practice to mail out, at the end of each session, an annual report. The 87th Congress has ended, and I am pleased to again send you this report.

During my 16 years in the House of Representatives, I have tried to represent the thinking and the best interests of the people in the district. In introducing bills, in speaking for or against any measure, or in voting on any legislation, the welfare of the people in the Sixth District, Oklahoma, and the Nation have always been my primary concern.

Looking back 20 months to the opening days of this 87th Congress, we see clearly that the legislative program has been successful on two fronts—a broad offense against Communist aggression and subversion, and a daring new offensive against distress, disaster, unemployment, and economic dislocation at home.

During these 2 years, Congress has been in session 18 months out of 24—a notable tribute to the dedication and devotion of all the Members of the Congress. Throughout these 2 years, we have hammered out in free debate all the great issues and problems of our day. And American constitutional government comes forth in new strength, vitality, and dedicated purpose.

The following are some of the important areas, which your Congressman participated in as your representative:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The 87th Congress, and the House Armed Services Committee, of which I have the pleasure to be a member, contributed substantially to modernizing and strengthening our military posture. We now have a new and awesome ability to respond to aggression throughout the world. In every kind of defense—brush fire engagement to nuclear exchange—our defense is prepared.

Our nuclear striking power provides a retaliatory force capable of survival even after a surprise attack. The 12 Atlas missiles in southwestern Oklahoma are ready for action.

MAJOR ENACTMENTS

The Revenue Act of 1962 represents the first major revision of our tax laws since 1954. This act provides a tax incentive to modernize and expand our present industries in order to take full advantage of the space age. This new act puts Oklahoma in the best possible position to lead this Nation in space-age industries.

The agriculture bills of 1961 and 1962 will enable us to produce the farm surpluses, and save over a billion dollars a year of the taxpayers' money in storage fees, and at the same time provide our people with an abundance of basic farm items at low cost, while raising the standard of living for Oklahoma family farms.

Our foreign aid program was completely revamped to emphasize long-term loans instead of outright grants.

We made the first major revision in our public welfare program since 1950, stressing rehabilitation and training instead of continued dependency.

Congress amended the Social Security Act, reducing the male retirement age, increasing the minimum monthly benefits, increasing the widow's benefits, and providing a more meaningful program for our elderly, our blind, and our dependent children.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 marks a historic milestone in U.S. trade policy. It equips the American people with the tools to meet the challenge of the European Common Market, as well as expanded trade from the Communist world.

The Communications Satellite Act will lead to the creation of a joint public and private corporation which will usher in the age of instant worldwide communications.

The Manpower Development and Training Act seeks to provide industry with the trained manpower necessary to meet the challenge of automation and technological change. It is a new approach to full employment and business expansion.

The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 is an act to advance the economic development of those areas which have for so many years suffered from heavy unemployment. Both Greer and Grady Counties in our district are now taking part in this program, with possible long-range benefits to all our counties.

Wages and hours have been protected further by the 1961 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

No less than 30 new laws have been enacted in these 2 years for the benefit of our war veterans.

Public works and military construction have been expanded and accelerated on every front—highways, homes for the aged, education and recreation facilities.

Public health has been protected by a comprehensive new law to police both the production and distribution of prescription drugs. Experimental drugs are brought under Federal inspection and license for the first time in history.

Juvenile delinquency has been attacked on the national front for the first time.

Through a new agency of the Government, the Peace Corps, we have added the dimension of education to our foreign aid program.

We also eliminated taxes on railroad and bus tickets and reduced the tax on airline tickets.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The economy is once more on the move, and we are taking steps forward instead of talking about recessions. Unemployment has been reduced by over 1 million; industrial production is up 15 percent; realized farm income is up $1 billion; and personal income is up 9 percent, or in other words, 9 cents more income on every dollar.

Congressional duties are not confined to legislation in my office, but also extend to giving personal assistance to constituents in their problems with the Federal Government. This often requires a great deal of time, and in every case involves personal investigation and discussions with the Federal agencies. I feel that this is my duty, and I am available to my constituents at all times. I have always said, "Just phone, wire, or write." I have always been as close to you as your telephone. I have a 95 percent attendance and voting record in Congress, but have spent as much time as possible with you in the district, while maintaining this record.

THE OKLAHOMA TEAM

The Oklahoma congressional delegation works as a team on all matters affecting our State and Nation. We have the strongest team of any State in the Union in the Congress. The progress we have made in the Sixth District is a result of a close, friendly, working relationship between our two outstanding U.S. Senators, BOB KERR and MIKE MONRONEY, and your Congressman.

Legislation and Federal Programs Affecting Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the 87th Congress a number of legislative proposals of great significance to the small business sector of our economy were enacted into law. Legislation was also introduced which, although not enacted during this session, will receive further consideration during the 88th Congress.

There have also been encouraging trends in the growth of small business investment companies, and in the greater share of Government procurement received by small business. The Small Business Administration has been a source of increasing assistance to small businessmen. More loans have been made to applicants than ever before, many under the new bank participation programs inaugurated by the present Administrator. The total amount loaned, as well as the number of loans, has risen sharply. Other forms of assistance have also been increased—counseling, advice and assistance in conjunction with international trade, and specialized assistance to small businesses in those areas participating in the Area Redevelopment Administration's program.

SMALL BUSINESS BILLS ENACTED BY 87TH CONGRESS

H.R. 10, Mr. KEOGH, Ways and Means: Allows self-employed individuals tax deduction for funds for retirement.

H.R. 3413, Mr. PATMAN, Banking and Currency: Amends Small Business Investment Act to give Small Business Administration permanent authority to make secured loans to State and local development companies for plant construction, conversion, or expansion.

H.R. 5120, Mr. MULTER, Banking and Currency: Small Business Act amendments—additional loan authority for Small Business Administration requires Secretary of Commerce to publish notice of defense procurement actions of $10,000 and above and civilian actions of $5,000 and above. Studies to be made by FTC or the Justice Department of effect of Government activity on small business and to determine factors which adversely affect small business through the lessening of competition.

H.R. 7577, Mr. ANDREWS, Appropriations: General Government matters, Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1962. Includes SBA appropriation for fiscal 1962.

H.R. 8762, Mr. SPENCE, Banking and Currency: Increases funds available for regular business under Small Business Act from $1 billion to $1.5 billion and also increases from $575 million to $725 million the maximum amount of the SBA revolving fund.

H.R. 9169, Mr. THOMAS, Appropriations: Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1962, including $160,363,500 for SBA.

H.R. 10620, Mr. BOGGS.

S. 3481, Mr. SPARKMAN, The provisions of this bill were added to the House bill by amendment in the Senate: This bill expands the so-called self-dealing limitation on the exclusion of SBIC's from definition of personal holding companies and allows a 20-percent reserve for loss. The bill also provides for certain other technical tax amendments.

H.R. 11038, Mr. THOMAS, Appropriations: Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1962, including an additional $40 million for SBA.

H.R. 10650, Mr. MILLS, Ways and Means: Allows up to 7 percent tax credit for funds invested in modernization of industry or business.

S. 902: H.R. 8870, Mr. SPARKMAN and others; Mr. PATMAN, Banking and Currency: Small Business Investment Act amendments to facilitate formation and growth of SBIC's. Increases amount of SBIC debentures that may be purchased by the SBA.

Identical or similar bills were introduced by the following: Mr. PATMAN, H.R. 6672; Mr. EVINS, H.R. 6696.

S. 1922, Mr. SPARKMAN, Banking and Currency: Housing, urban renewal and community facilities, including housing for moderate and low income families and financial assistance for displaced business concerns through loans from SBA.

Identical or similar bills were introduced by the following: Mr. JAVITS, S. 1543; Mr. HUMPHREY, S. 1803; Mr. MULTER, H.R. 824; Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, H.R. 3642; Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, H.R. 4532; and Mr. RYAN, H.R. 7418.

S. 2970, H.R. 12121: Messrs. ROBERTSON and SPARKMAN, by request; Mr. SPENCE, Banking and Currency: Amends Small Business Act to provide that interest and repayments of loans be paid into the revolving fund.

Identical or similar bills were introduced by the following: Mr. SPENCE, H.R. 11020; Mr. PATMAN, H.R. 11300; and Mr. WIDNALL, H.R. 11407.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BUT NOT ENACTED DURING THE 87TH CONGRESS

In addition to the above legislation, a great number of bills designed to assist small business were introduced during the 87th Congress. The Committee has available to Members, upon request, a complete list of these. Because of its great deal, this 40-page analysis is appropriate primarily as a resource document.

H.R. 116, Mr. MADDEN, Interstate and and Foreign Commerce: Quality stabilization bill.

Identical or similar bills were also introduced by 10 Senators and 7 Representatives.

H.R. 127, Mr. PATMAN, Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Prohibits selling of goods below cost. Designed to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by making it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to sell or offer goods in one location of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by him elsewhere, where such sales would include unreasonably low prices.

H.R. 3470, Mr. STEED, Ways and Means: Provides a program of special tax deductions for small business and for persons engaged in small business.

H.R. 8830, Mr. STEED, Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Authorizes Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease and desist orders.

H.R. 11906, Mr. PATMAN, Banking and Currency: Assists qualified small business concerns to obtain leases of commercial and industrial property in areas where unduly stringent credit requirements exist; authorizes the Small Business Administration to guarantee, directly or in cooperation with others, the payment of rentals under such leases. Establishes a revolving fund with an initial capital of $50 million for this purpose.

Identical or related bills were introduced by the following: Mr. ROOSEVELT, H.R. 11909.

H.R. 13189, Mr. PATMAN, Banking and Currency; S. 3737, Mr. SPARKMAN: Gives statutory approval to SBA "standby guarantees" of loans made by banks and expands SBA's lending power.

H.R. 13190, Mr. PATMAN, Ways and Means; S. 3736, Mr. SPARKMAN: Provides technical amendments to the Internal Revenue Code for small business investment companies. Allows setting up of reserve for losses, exempts SBIC's from the accumulated earnings tax, and other amendments.

MORE ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The President in the month of June 1961 created the White House Committee on Small Business, under the chairmanship of the Honorable John E. Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration. This Committee has been most active in looking into the problems of America's small business community and recently issued its first report, which incorporated a number of recommendations designed to improve the economic position of America's small business sector. Members may obtain copies of this report from the House Small Business Committee.

Small Business Administration loans to small businessmen are increasing. In fiscal 1962, 6,203 loans, totaling $360,762,000 were approved and disbursed. This compares with 4,989 loans for fiscal 1961 and 3,670 for fiscal 1960. The dollar amounts involved have more than doubled since 1960. It should be noted that SBA funds have been augmented with hundreds of millions of dollars loaned by banks through the various bank participation loan programs, which have been recently expanded by the agency.

Small business investment companies have increased in number until presently there are 642 of them. These companies have proved to be a potent stimulus for private investment in the small business sector. The total capital pool available for this purpose as of October 10, 1962, was $552,854,875. Of this amount, all but $84.6 million, which was supplied by the SBA, came from private investors. In other words, private funds in the program exceed Government funds by a ratio of 6.5 to 1.

During fiscal 1962, in response to a directive by the President, there was a 10-percent increase in the share of defense contracts awarded to small businesses. During the same period, $6.1 billion in contracts for overall Government procurement were awarded to small businesses, an increase of 27 percent over the preceding year.

The small business set-aside program, which reserves or sets aside certain contracts for exclusive bidding by small business has been most helpful. In conjunction with the set-aside program is what amounts to an appeals procedure. A small business which has been the low bidder for a Government contract but has been denied the award because of alleged incompetency, may request SBA to determine whether it is in fact competent to perform the contract. In those cases where the low bidder is found to be competent, he is awarded a certificate of competency and the agency letting the bid must award it to the small businessman in question. During fiscal 1962, the number of applications for certificates of competency received by SBA increased from 217 to 292, for contracts involving a total amount of $71,237,964 as opposed to $68,507,021 in fiscal 1961.

Recently, the House Small Business Committee, in conjunction with the Senate Small Business Committee, the Small Business Administration, and the White House Committee on Small Business, issued a hundred-page "Federal Handbook for Small Business." This is a survey of small business programs in Federal Government agencies. It describes for the benefit of the small businessman the various programs available to him, how he may apply for participation in these programs, whom to contact, what forms to use, and other similar useful information.

The Committee has recently sent a copy of this handbook to each Member of the House. Additional copies will be available shortly. Should any Member desire additional copies, we will supply them, upon request, as soon as they are received from the printer.

Hon. Herbert Zelenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, with adjournment approaching, our sense of accomplishment in the record of another productive Congress is tinged with regret in the knowledge that those of us who may be privileged to return here next year will not find precisely the same company of valued friends in which to renew rewarding associations.

One who will have moved on to other endeavors is that energetic and respected member of our New York Democratic delegation, Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO. His conscientious work in the 84th through 87th Congresses has produced significant results in legislation for the benefit of working people.

When this distinguished attorney joined us, he had earned a wide reputation in his profession for constructive analysis of the legal process. His record of civic service likewise was notable and known. It was not unexpected, therefore, that our colleague should have moved quickly into the mainstream of legislative deliberations.

Among his special interests have been the plight of migratory labor in the United States, mine safety, equal pay for men and women performing similar work, compensation adjustments for longshoremen and harbor workers and workers in the radiation industries, and an end to Federal payments to school districts refusing to honor the Supreme Court desegregation decision. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor of this House, and as chairman of its Select Subcommittee on

Labor, our colleague was able to advance progressive legislation, or contribute to administration policy, in all of these fields. He has worked diligently, too, in his important assignment on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

With all of this to occupy him, Mr. ZELENKO somehow has found time through the years to make notable contributions to the work of the Zionist Organization of America, B'nai B'rith, and the Jewish Memorial Hospital in New York City, and, as director of sports in Israel, has promoted closer ties between the United States and Israel through the development of sports programs.

His many friends in this House wish him well in his new endeavors.

Twenty-Five Years of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, because of the late adjournment of the Congress, it was not possible for me to fulfill an engagement to address the 22d annual conference of the Nebraska Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts at Valentine, Nebr., on October 1.

Mr. Everett Brown, of Valentine, director of region V of the association, was gracious enough to read to the conference the remarks I had prepared for delivery.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the statement read by Mr. Brown.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA TO 22D ANNUAL CONFERENCE, NEBRASKA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, VALENTINE, NEBR., OCTOBER 1, 1962

This year Nebraska looks back on a quarter of a century of organized soil conservation and ahead to the rapidly approaching day when we can put behind us the dread fear of drought and floods.

The record compiled since the 1937 legislature passed the enabling act is one familiar to you all. I recite it here out of pride.

Eighty-seven soil conservation districts, covering the entire State.

Technical assistance to more than 65,000 district cooperators in planning and applying soil and water conservation measures on more than 24 million acres.

Complete basic conservation plans on about 43,000 farms, totaling over 16 million acres.

This three-way partnership of Federal, State, and local governments working together to solve a common problem is an important demonstration of the fact that a task can best be done when such level of government performs the part of the job for which it is best fitted. There are all too many cases where the Federal Government is being asked to render a service which can be performed more efficiently and at less cost by a subordinate government.

Nebraska has been a pioneer in soil conservation and watershed development. We can take great pride in the fact that at the start of the Eisenhower administration, four of the first pilot watersheds were located here in our State, Brownell Creek, in Otoe County, the Upper Salt Creek, the Indian Creek in Gage County, and Dry Creek out in Red Willow and Frontier Counties.

All of us rejoiced in the naming this year of Brownell Creek as the "Watershed of the Year" by the National Watershed Congress. But in each locality, their own project is properly considered the watershed of the year. And there are 38 of these in Nebraska, of which 22 have been authorized for planning. And of these 22, 12 have been authorized for operations.

Under soil conservation laws passed through the years, the Department of Agriculture, working with farmers individually and in groups, has worked a minor miracle on the face of America's farmlands.

President Eisenhower told the Congress in 1953 that upstream watershed development "will require the maximum cooperation among the State and local communities, farmers, businessmen, and other private citizens and the Federal Government."

The soundness demonstrated by those early pilot programs, in Nebraska and elsewhere, accounts in large measure for the continuing success of the program. But the requirements on local initiative and enterprise are no less responsible. Because local agencies must acquire the land and rights-of-way, operate and maintain the works after completion and assume a portion of the cost, this program has retained its essentially local character with emphasis on local leadership.

Important progress is being made in the Great Plains conservation program, a plan tailored to fit the particular needs of this region of ours long troubled by land use problems related to soil and moisture and climatic conditions peculiar to the Plains States. The program is moving forward in accomplishing its basic purpose, with increasing support and wide interest. Plans in process of application now total over 9,100 on nearly 23 million acres and provide for 28 percent of the cropland to go into permanent grass.

Basic concepts of this program are receiving new attention in expanded programs now under consideration in soil and water conservation. This is reflected in the increase in appropriations this year, the first since the program was launched in 1957. The increase will make possible a stepped-up effort to assist the more than 270,000 farmers and ranchers eligible in the 10-State area, including the 4,000 unserviced applicants.

In Nebraska 58 counties have been designated eligible to receive assistance under the Great Plains conservation program. About 1,300 contracts, covering about 1½ million acres have been entered into, enabling farmers and ranchers to receive technical and financial assistance in planning and installing conservation systems.

The 87th Congress has provided new soil and water conservation tools. The Department of Agriculture was given additional authority to work with local people and their organizations, including soil conservation districts, in long-range programs for converting cropland into other profitable uses—for timber, grassland, and income-producing recreation, including water-based recreation in small watershed projects.

In small watershed projects the Department will now be able to cost-share on recreational developments, defer repayment by local organizations for municipal and industrial water capacity to meet anticipated needs, and to help pay for land, rights-of-way and easements for reservoir or other sites or areas dedicated to recreation in small watershed projects.

From the standpoint of appropriations, this year's increase over funds available for fiscal year 1962 includes $500,000 for assistance to new soil conservation districts, $400,000 for soil surveys, $94,500 for snow survey work, and $75,000 for plant material centers.

The bill passed by the Congress includes $60,585,000 for watershed protection, including $5,200,000 for planning of individual watersheds and $2,200,000 for river basin surveys.

For flood prevention, $25 million was appropriated and for the Great Plains conservation program, $12,250,000.

On the basis of these appropriations, the Soil Conservation Service has allocated $5,743,200 to Nebraska. This is broken down in the following manner: $2,885,000 for technical assistance to local districts, approximately the same level as last year; $1,423,300 for watershed protection, an increase of more than $400,000 from fiscal year 1962; $1,334,900 for the Great Plains program in Nebraska, up $182,000 from last year.

These funds, of course, are also used to operate the State soil conservation service office, the cartographic unit, and the soil mechanics laboratory in Lincoln.

In addition, $100,000 has been allocated for river basin studies in the Elkhorn and Big Blue Basins.

While these amounts are sizable and have increased generally throughout the past 25 years, they are still far short of meeting all the requests. The Congress must necessarily strike a balance, both in geographic and economic terms.

Perhaps more rapid progress could have been made with a crash program with large outlays of funds. Instead, we have had steady and sure growth through the years without sacrificing the important principles of fiscal responsibility. It is a record we can view with satisfaction.

In the past quarter century soil conservation districts have become a permanent part of American agriculture. They are an outstanding example of what makes this Nation what it is, what sets it apart from other countries. Districts are pure America with their emphasis on local initiative and control, and their willingness to assume responsibilities and to carry on work that benefits their neighbors, their community, their State, and their country.

We can find great satisfaction in our progress and even greater gratification for the real and valued heritage which we will be passing on to future generations.

Commendation is due the cooperation of those who have signed up for participation in this program, and congratulations are warmly extended to you community leaders, the officers, the supervisors, and others who have contributed their time and effort—and more than that, your leadership—to this worthwhile endeavor. I know how many miles you have traveled to meetings and how many midnights you have spent working on your plans.

To all of you, my heartiest congratulations for a commendable job.

The management of our soil and our water are inseparably bound up in each other. Working together, we shall become their masters and not their victims.

Report to Constituents in 22d District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the 87th Congress draws to a close, I wish to report to my constituents, in some detail, my voting record and my evaluation of the accomplishments of this Congress. Let me first, however, make an observation for both my colleagues and my constituents.

One cannot serve a term in this great legislative body without gaining renewed confidence in this Nation and our form of government. Representing the half million people in the San Fernando Valley has been an interesting, educational, sometimes frustrating, but, above all, inspiring experience.

I know that some of my constituents will differ with me on some votes, just as my colleagues may, from time to time, differ. But our system is great because we retain the right to differ and the responsibility to protect the views of the minority and the freedom and sovereignty of the individual.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Of all the challenges faced by this Congress, none was more important than safeguarding our Nation's security. The 87th Congress has unanimously supported the requests of the President in this area, giving additional emphasis to our conventional military and naval forces and broadening the base of our strategic strike power with the Polaris weapons system.

If there was any question about the wisdom of these moves, it was answered during the Berlin crisis last year, when our swift response to the Soviet threat resulted in a relaxation of tension at least for the moment.

With all our complex, sophisticated and overpowering weaponry, it is appropriate to note that the backbone of our Nation's defense is still the same as it was 186 years ago: the citizen soldier. Twice during the 87th Congress, President Kennedy was given authority to call up Reserves and National Guardsmen to meet threats of the cold war. California's 22d District and the Nation are properly grateful to guardsmen of the 146th Air Transport Wing, based in Van Nuys, for their contribution to maintaining freedom.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Every American hopes and believes that the final answer to the world's problems does not lie in the direction of an arms race and nuclear balance of terror. We all share, I believe, a conviction that war is not a solution to these problems. We all would welcome a shift from this emphasis in our cold war competition with the Soviet Union and its satellites to competition in the area of ideas and economic accomplishment.

The mutual security program, which was so effective in combating the spread of communism in Western Europe and Japan and the Philippines, has been reviewed and revised to more nearly fit the needs of developing nations. Additionally, we have turned greater attention to our Latin American neighbors in the framework of the Alliance for Progress—a new concept of social reform and self-help. Our own national interests and the cause of freedom in the world dictate that the scourge of communism in Cuba be isolated and eradicated. The Alliance for Progress is our greatest hope for accomplishing this goal without military action.

The Trade Expansion Act provides the format for stepped-up trade between ourselves and the other free nations of the world. Establishment of an Arms Control Agency, a Peace Corps, and renewed support for the United Nations are additional evidences of our desire to reach peaceful, not military, solutions to the complex problems which face us.

THE SPACE PROGRAM

It has been my privilege in this Congress to serve on the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House. This has afforded me an opportunity to review our space program close up, and to assess our objectives and progress so far. In my view, we have set ourselves important and realistic goals, and our progress to date has been satisfactory.

Candidly, we must note that the Russians have some capabilities in space we cannot match. Chiefly, these are in the size of the objects which they can orbit. Nevertheless, our superiority in a number of other important areas of space exploration is unchallenged. An example is the ability of our scientists to learn far more about space environment with more sophisticated, highly instrumented packages in space, and their ability to apply that knowledge.

We should not be panicked into a wasteful, hurry-up program in areas where the Russians now lead us. Rather, we should continue the program we now pursue to overcome this disadvantage. Such a program holds promise for a better life on this planet and the ability to explore other planets through technology. The technological revolution of our generation will raise living standards of all men as dramatically as the industrial revolution did a century ago.

CRIME AND COMMUNISM

This Congress also passed a number of important measures designed to improve the administration of justice and arm the Attorney General with better weapons to fight organized crime throughout the United States.

A total of 73 new Federal judges, 4 in California, were approved, to guarantee speedier, and thus fairer, dispensing of justice for everyone who comes before a U.S. court. Regulations in the National Security Agency were tightened. The Attorney General has an impressive record of convictions, aided in part by legislation of the 87th Congress.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Farm legislation is as important to the city taxpayer and consumer as it is to the farmer himself. The soil bank—or Benson plan—saddled the Nation with a very costly program which led to unbelievable surpluses. The key to this complex problem is, I believe, proper controls on overproduction. In its efforts to apply the brakes to this agricultural "Frankenstein," the administration and the leadership in the 87th Congress have been hampered by resistance from farm pressure groups who fought every reasonable restriction on unbridled production while holding out for continued high subsidy payments.

I opposed the 1961 farm bill because in my opinion, it did not go far enough to curb overproduction. I did support the 1961 feed grain and the 1962 farm bills because they improved existing laws. But they do not go far enough and much more attention must be given this problem in the 88th Congress.

Let me cite one solid achievement in this area, however. Today there are 700 million fewer bushels in Government storage bins than there were when this congressional session began. This year's farm bill should go a long way toward reducing the surpluses still stored at great cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

In the field of our natural resources and recreational areas, some progress has also been made in this Congress. Notable is the Point Reyes bill, establishing a Point Reyes National Seashore Park, north of San Francisco. We still need a comprehensive wilderness bill to more equitably balance the needs of commercial interests and the recreation-seeking public. Our national parks are inadequate for the needs of our growing population. It would be tragic if we failed to meet the challenge of tomorrow.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Responsible steps to assist veterans with service-connected disabilities, both in areas of rehabilitation and compensation rates, were taken in this session of Congress. I think we have failed, however, to give enough attention to the problems of Reservists called to active duty.

It is apparent that the cold war is far from over, and many men will be called to active duty from time to time. In my view, they are entitled to the same types of assistance to adjust their financial responsibilities as were extended to those of us who served in World War II and the Korean conflict.

GENERAL DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

In housing, in job retraining, in area redevelopment, the 87th Congress has a record of solid achievement. In other areas—notably education—this Congress has not carried out its mandate. To cite the accomplishments:

The 1962 Housing Act makes private ownership of homes more easily available for people of modest income. It also provides for accelerated housing programs for our senior citizens. The Area Redevelopment Act, the extension of unemployment compensation, expanded social security coverage, and the Manpower Retraining Act also represent marked progress in combating the recession and meeting the needs of our jobless and retired population. Objective of this legislation is to keep men on the job, off the dole.

The 1962 tax reform bill did not go as far as some would have liked. It did provide tax relief for small businessmen, and closed some of the more glaring tax-avoidance loopholes. Of major import to the movie industry was repeal of the "foreign residence" tax exemption which has caused such an impetus to "runaway" movie production. There will no longer be the "foreign residence" tax incentive which has hurt the local industry.

Most disappointing of all to me has been our failure to enact legislation in the field of higher education. In my opinion, our national interest demands that every American have the opportunity to develop his full potential under free public education. Anything less than this constitutes a waste of our greatest natural resource: individual Americans. It is imperative that the next Congress adopt legislation to enable the Federal Government to fill its proper role in this field.

BILLS WHICH I HAVE SPONSORED

I am pleased that some of the legislation that I personally sponsored received favorable action. My bill to make FHA home improvement loans available for street and sidewalk improvements received the endorsement of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and favorable comment from the Housing Subcommittee. It will very probably be included in the 1963 omnibus housing bill.

My amendment to both the National Science Foundation and the Defense Education Act scholarships, introduced separately in the House but combined in the Senate, substantially improves security regulations. Became law. It repeals the disclaimer affidavit and specifically excludes Communists from eligibility for scholarships.

Action on my bill, to provide a Federal building in the Valley Administrative Center in Van Nuys, has been pending for several months. Because of the delay, I sought the help of the President. I believe early financing of the project is imperative.

A number of private relief bills have been acted upon favorably by the House, and some have been enacted into law.

VOTING RECORD

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which lists major legislative decisions made in the 87th Congress and my position on each of them:

My vote	Issue	Outcome*
	ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE	
Supported	Creates 63 additional U.S. district court judgeships and 10 in circuit courts to meet increasing caseloads. (4 in California.).	Public Law 87-136.
Supported	Authorizes FBI to pursue across State lines any fugitive accused of an offense punishable by more than 1 year in prison	Public Law 87-368.
Supported	Prohibits and fixes penalty for interstate transmission of bets by wire communications	Public Law 87-216.
Supported	Prohibits and fixes penalty for interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia	Public Law 87-218.
Supported	Prohibits and fixes penalty for interstate and foreign travel, or use of the mails, for the purpose of unlawful activity	Public Law 87-228.
Supported	Strengthens Federal criminal law relating to bribery, graft, and conflict of interest	Became law.
Supported	Broadens definition of gambling devices, transportation of which is prohibited across State lines	Became law.
Supported	Stiffens penalties for spreading false bomb reports	Public Law 87-338.
Supported	Authorizes the Attorney General to compel the production of documents required as evidence in civil antitrust cases	Public Law 87-664.
Supported	Provides criminal penalties for trafficking in phonograph records bearing forged or counterfeit labels	Public Law 87-773.
	AGRICULTURE	
Opposed	1961 omnibus agriculture bill [1]	Public Law 87-128.
Supported	Provides for voluntary 1-year cut in acreage and crops of feed grains; increases price-support payments to participants for corn, grain sorghums, and other feed grains and soybeans.	Public Law 87-5.
Supported	Extends Sugar Act of 1948, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers, for 15 months to June 30, 1962; continues President's authority to exclude Cuban sugar imports and reallocate its quota.	Public Law 87-15.
Supported	Authorizes disposal of additional $2,000,000,000 in surplus commodities under provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.	Public Law 87-28.
Opposed	Extends present program of importation of Mexican farm labor to Dec. 31, 1963 [2]	Public Law 87-345.
Supported	Provides for assistance to States in programs of forestry research	Public Law 87-788.
Supported	Authorizes grants to provide health services for migratory workers	Public Law 87-692.
	CIVIL RIGHTS	
Supported	Extends life of the President's Civil Rights Commission for 2 years to Sept. 30, 1963	Public Law 87-264.
Supported	Authorizes an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor on problems of women in industry	Public Law 87-137.
Supported	Proposes constitutional amendment to prohibit poll taxes	Adopted.
Supported	Prohibits discrimination by requiring equal pay for men and women performing same services	Passed the House.
	GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION	
Supported	Reorganization Plan No. 3. Gives Civil Aeronautics Board authority to delegate functions to an individual Commissioner, a hearing examiner, or other employee, their findings subject to review by the Board as a whole.	Adopted.
Supported	Reorganization Plan No. 4. Same authority as above granted to Federal Trade Commission	Adopted.
Supported	Reorganization Plan No. 6. Transfers to the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board authority to appoint and remove personnel, assign operating functions, and have overall responsibility for management, all subject to Board review.	Adopted.
Supported	Reorganization Plan No. 7. Abolishes the Federal Maritime Board. Establishes a 5-man Federal Maritime Commission.	Adopted.
Supported	Amends Communications Act to expedite procedure in quasi-judicial functions of Federal Communications Commission	Public Law 87-192.
Opposed	Reorganization Plan No. 2, Federal Communications Commission	Failed.
Supported	Establishing a Department of Urban Affairs	Failed.
	INTERNAL SECURITY	
Supported	Provides funds for House Un-American Activities Committee, 1st session	Adopted.
Supported	Permits prosecution for acts of espionage committed against the United States outside its jurisdiction	Public Law 87-369.
Supported	Fixes penalty for malicious destruction of certain private communications facilities	Public Law 87-306.
Supported	Prohibits shipment of weapons in interstate commerce by or to any person convicted of a felony	Public Law 87-342.
Supported	Defines and clarifies the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act applying to Communists	Public Law 87-486.
Supported	Authorizes Postmaster General to notify recipients of Communist propaganda of the nature of such mail	Passed the House.
Supported	Provides for summary dismissal in certain security violation cases within the National Security Agency	Passed the House.
Opposed	Provides for summary dismissal in certain security violations in private industry	Failed.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Supported	Authorizes $4,200,000,000 1962 program of loans and grants for foreign economic aid, development, and military assistance	Public Law 87-195.
Opposed	Proposed amendment to favor labor surplus areas in procurement contracts	Failed.
Supported	Alliance for Progress program	Public Law 87-41.
Supported	Establishes U.S. Peace Corps as an independent agency subject to policy guidance of State Department	Public Law 87-293.
Supported	Establishes a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to operate under guidance of the President	Public Law 87-297.
Supported	Extends President's authority to use surplus farm products to aid the people of underdeveloped nations	Public Law 87-92.
Supported	Broadens programs of educational and cultural exchange of persons between the United States and other countries	Public Law 87-256.
Supported	Reduces from $500 to $100 value of goods returning Americans may bring back duty free from abroad [3]	Public Law 87-132.
Supported	Establishes a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to promote and encourage tourist travel from abroad [3]	Public Law 87-63.
Supported	Extends U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO to June 30, 1962	Public Law 87-116.
Supported	Guarantees U.S. exporters and importers against political and credit risks of loss in foreign countries	Public Law 87-311.
Supported	Enacts permanent authority for admission of alien orphans to the United States for purposes of adoption	Public Law 87-301.
Supported	Expresses the sense of Congress against seating of Communist China in the United Nations	Adopted.
Supported	Trade Expansion Act of 1962	Public Law 87-794.
Supported	Authorizes $4,600,000,000 foreign assistance program for 1963 for Latin America at $600,000,000 a year through 1966	Public Law 87-565.
Supported	Authorizes loans up to a total of $100,000,000 by the United States to the United Nations	Public Law 87-731.
Supported	Extends and expands Peace Corps, authorizes $63,700,000 for fiscal 1963	Public Law 87-442.
Supported	Extends for 3 years to June 30, 1965, authority of President to regulate and control exports of strategic and critical material.	Public Law 87-515.
Supported	Authorizes aid for resettlement of refugees from Iron Curtain countries abroad and those seeking asylum from Cuba	Public Law 87-510.
Supported	Prohibits shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of articles imported to the United States from Cuba	Passed the House.
Supported	Authorizes sale by Department of Justice of General Aniline & Film Corp	Passed the House.
Supported	Authorizes payment of $73,000,000 balance of war damage awards to the Philippine Republic	Public Law 87-616.
Supported	Expresses the sense of the Congress that the OAS re-evaluate the role of Cuba in inter-American affairs and take such steps as it deems necessary toward imposition of sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.	Passed the House.
Supported	Urges the President to provide a program of education for Cuban refugee university students	Passed the House.
Supported	Expresses the determination of Congress and gives full congressional support to the President's stand with respect to Cuba.	Public Law 87-733.
Supported	Authorizes $3,928,900,000 1963 program of loans and grants for foreign economic aid, development, and military assistance. Authorizes the President to permit nonmilitary aid to Iron Curtain countries when he deems it important to U.S. security.	Became law.

See footnotes at end of table.

My vote	Issue	Outcome*
	NATIONAL DEFENSE	
Supported	Authorizes the President to call up to 250,000 Reservists and National Guardsmen for active duty of not more than 1 year	Public Law 87-117.
Supported	Authorizes a 2d increase, in the amount of $958,000,000 for planes, ships, and missiles in fiscal 1962	Public Law 87-118.
Supported	Authorizes $12,500,000,000 additional for fiscal 1962 for construction of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels	Public Law 87-53.
Opposed	Proposed amendment to give preferential treatment to labor surplus areas	Failed.
Supported	Authorizes $893,900,000 for construction and improvement projects at military bases at home and abroad	Public Law 87-57.
Supported	Authorizes $12,970,000,000 for procurement of missiles, naval vessels and aircraft, including $491,000,000 for RS-70	Public Law 87-436.
Supported	Authorizes $1,450,000,000 for construction and improvement of Army, Navy, and Air Force bases at home and abroad	Public Law 87-554.
Supported	Authorizes President to call up 150,000 Reservists and National Guardsmen not called up under Public Law 87-117	Public Law 87-736.
Supported	Total defense appropriations for fiscal year 1962, $46,662,556,000; fiscal year 1963, $48,136,247,000	
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Supported	Authorizes temporary grants to States to finance inclusion of dependent children of unemployed	Public Law 87-31.
Supported	Increases $1 minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, extends coverage to 3,500,000 additional workers by gradual wage stepups	Public Law 87-30.
Supported	Establishes Area Redevelopment Administration in Department of Commerce	Public Law 87-27.
Supported	Authorizes additional $11,500,000,000 for completion of Interstate and Defense Highway System as scheduled by 1972	Public Law 87-61.
Opposed	Extends construction aid under the Airport Act for 3 years to June 30, 1964 [4]	Public Law 87-255.
Supported	Increases to 70 percent of deposits amount national banks may lend on real estate; extends maturity of construction loans.	Public Law 87-717.
Supported	Requires public disclosure of identical bids on Government contracts	Passed the House.
Supported	Amends Internal Revenue Code to: provide tax credit for investment in new equipment; tax savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks; reduce deductions for business expenses; increase taxes on income earned by American subsidiaries abroad; tax personal earnings of American citizens while residing abroad over $20,000 annual income.	Became law.
Supported	Increases postal rates and Federal employees salaries	Public Law 87-793.
Supported	Increases lending authority of Small Business Administration for business loans and disaster loans	Public Law 87-5 0.
Supported	Extends for 2 years to Dec. 31, 1964, the Renegotiation Act for recovery of excessive profits on defense contracts	Public Law 87-520.
Supported	Directs Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate adequacy of rules and regulations of stock exchanges	Public Law 87-196.
Supported	Authorizes $435,000,000, 3-year program of training of unemployed in vocational schools, or on-the-job retraining	Public Law 87-415.
Supported	Authorizes $900,000,000 to accelerate Federal public works and for matching grants for local projects	Public Law 87-658.
	NATURAL RESOURCES	
Supported	Provides for sale of excess steam to local power companies at Hanford, Wash., reactor plant. Federal Government to recoup $125,000,000 over 24 years.[5]	Public Law 87-701.
Supported	Extends for 6 years to July 1, 1967, the Department of the Interior program for saline water conversion; authorizes $75,000,000	Public Law 87-295.
Supported	Permits miners of clay and shale to include as a depletion allowance the process of manufacturing brick and tile	Public Law 87-312.
Supported	Authorizes 10-year comprehensive program of oceanographic research and surveys	Become law.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE	
Supported	Raises from $1,200 to $1,524 the amount of retirement income not subject to personal income tax	Became law.
Supported	Raises minimum monthly old-age insurance payments under Social Security Act from $33 to $40	Public Law 87-64.
Opposed	Extends aid to federally impacted school districts [6]	Public Law 87-344.
Supported	Authorizes 4- to 5-year $4,900,000,000 housing programs for low and moderate income families on liberalized terms	Public Law 87-70.
Supported	Extends for 4 years to June 30, 1965, $5,000,000 a year program for grants and scholarships for training of practical nurses	Public Law 87-22.
Supported	Authorizes a program of Federal grants of $10,000,000 a year for 3 years to combat juvenile delinquency [7]	Public Law 87-274.
Supported	Authorizes $1,500,000 a year for fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for grants for training teachers of deaf children	Public Law 87-276.
Supported	Amends Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 by providing Secretary of Labor with powers of enforcement	Public Law 87-420.
Supported	Amends Social Security Act, to reduce public assistance rolls by providing grants to States that establish work programs	Public Law 87-543.
Supported	Authorizes $2,600,000,000, 5-year program of: Loans to colleges and universities for construction and improvement of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries ($1,500,000,000); matching grants to States for building public junior and community colleges ($250,000,000); and scholarship aid for college students ($924,000,000).	Failed.
Supported	Provides for low- and moderate-cost housing for elderly in urban and rural areas; authorizes $200,000,000 for loan funds	Public Law 87-723.
Supported	Authorizes 3-year $36,000,000 program of grants to aid States and other communities in carrying out mass vaccination programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus.	Became law.
Supported	Provides for stricter regulation of drug industry and of distribution of new drugs	Public Law 87-781.
Supported	Authorizes matching Federal funds up to $1,000,000 for any State to purchase TV equipment for educational purposes	Public Law 87-447.
Supported	Extends to 1966 authorization for program of grants to State and local governments under the Air Pollution Control Act [8].	Became law.
Supported	Encourages self-employed professionals to establish individual pension plans by granting income-tax deduction for fund set aside up to $2,500 per year.	Public Law 87-792.
Supported	To prohibit use of children under 12 years of age as migrant farmworkers	Failed.
Opposed	To prohibit use of children under 12 years of age in motion picture, television, or any theatrical production	Failed.
	SPACE PROGRAM	
Supported	Makes the Vice President instead of the President, Chairman of the National Space Council	Public Law 87-26.
Supported	Increases number of scientific positions in Government	Public Law 87-367.
Supported	Reorganization Plan No. 2, 1962. Establishes Office of Science and Technology in Executive Office of the President	Adopted.
Supported	Makes certain communities where NASA installations are located eligible for assistance under public facilities loan program.	Public Law 87-634.
Supported	Clarifies responsibility of National Aeronautics and Space Administration for nonmilitary activities	Passed the House.
Supported	Authorizes an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology	Public Law 87-405.
Supported	Authorizes $1.7 billion for NASA for fiscal 1962; includes increases for manned moon-orbiting project	Public Law 87-98.
Supported	Authorizes $3,810,000,000 for NASA for fiscal 1963, including $263,000,000 for planetary and lunar exploration	Public Law 87-584.
Supported	Authorizes creation of a commercial corporation, owned 50-50 by the public and the communication industry, to establish and operate a communications satellite system under regulation of the FCC, in cooperation with NASA.	Public Law 87-624.
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Supported	Extends direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to Feb. 1, 1975; authorizes additional $1,200,000,000 for direct loan program through fiscal year 1967.	Public Law 87-84.
Supported	Authorizes payment of $60,000,000 special dividend to eligible policyholders of National Service Life Insurance	Public Law 87-223.
Supported	Amends and clarifies reemployment provisions of Universal Military Training and Service Act	Public Law 87-391.
Supported	Increases payments to veterans' widows	Public Law 87-268.
Supported	Requires Board of Veterans' Appeals in Veterans' Administration to make findings of fact and conclusions of law	Public Law 87-97.
Supported	Increases lump-sum readjustment payments to members of Reserve components involuntarily released from active duty	Public Law 87-509.
Supported	Permits members of Armed Forces to accept scholarships, fellowships and grants	Public Law 87-555.
Supported	Authorizes VA hospital and medical care for peacetime veterans with noncompensable service-connected disabilities	Public Law 87-583.
Supported	Extends period of vocational rehabilitation for blinded veterans	Public Law 87-591.
Supported	Permits for 1 year granting of National Life Insurance policy to veterans with service-connected disabilities [9]	Became law.
Supported	Increases by average of 9.4 percent rates of compensation for service-connected disability paid to 1,900,000 veterans	Public Law 87-645.
Supported	Increases basic allowance for living quarters for members of Armed Forces	Public Law 87-531.
Supported	Provides that retirement of members of Armed Forces shall be in the highest grade served satisfactorily	Passed the House.
Supported	Provides for a permanent program of vocational rehabilitation for veterans with service-connected disability serving between World War II and Korean conflict and thereafter.	Passed the House.
Supported	Increases compensation for blinded veterans	Public Law 87-610.

---

[1] In my opinion at the time of this vote, there were not sufficient production controls. However, it later developed that the cuts in wheat acreage reduced Government storage volumes. I am still of the view that we should have more stringent controls or an end to price supports.

[2] This bill provided no improvement in working or living conditions of Mexican nationals and failed to adequately protect domestic workers from use of Mexican nationals when domestic labor is available.

[3] Steps taken to reduce outflow of gold.

[4] I opposed the Federal aid to airports bill because a lack of long-term planning in the bill made it very difficult for use by the city of Los Angeles.

[5] This measure was defeated twice in the House; finally accepted as part of a conference report.

[6] I opposed the Federal aid to impacted school districts because the Los Angeles school districts are denied $5,000,000 annual entitlement; the bill is discriminatory against large districts.

[7] Los Angeles has already received $256,906 to implement this program.

[8] The 88th Congress should pass a more adequate bill to broaden the scope of our research and development of pollution control devices.

[9] I opposed the amendment which limited benefits of this bill to disabled veterans. The amendment carried and I supported the bill as amended.

*Public law indicates bill became law.

Bill Number	Bills which I sponsored	Status
H.R. 8556	Amends National Science Foundation scholarship security provisions to require applicants to disclose record of felony convictions or pending criminal prosecutions; prohibits application by members of Communist organizations; repeals disclaimer affidavit.	Public law will include H.R. 8556 and H.R. 10612.
H.R. 10612	Same provisions as H.R. 8556, applicable to National Defense Education Act	
H.R. 11262	Amends the National Housing Act to permit the insurance of a loan made to a homeowner for the purpose of paying the cost of public improvements for which he is legally liable.	Committee hearings completed.
H.R. 12732	Suspends until Jan. 1, 1964, certain provisions of the act forbidding the importation, exportation, or carriage in interstate commerce of falsely stamped articles of merchandise made of gold or silver or their alloys.	Pending in committee.
H.R. 11524	Federal Air Pollution Control Act: Broadens the scope of the Federal air pollution control program	Pending in committee.
H.R. 9352	Provides for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance	Companion bill passed.
H.R. 7926	Provides for the construction of a new Federal office building in Van Nuys, Calif.	Pending in committee.
H.R. 8518	Provides for planning the participation of the United States in the International Exposition for Southern California	Companion bill passed.
H.R. 5859	Provides for relief of H. A. Saley	Passed the House.
H.R. 2640	Provides for the adoption of Yoko Takayashiki	Private Law 87-282.

Health Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misunderstanding regarding the President's health care program under social security, and I wish to clarify the true purpose of the President's program.

Health is the business of a democratic country, for the fulfillment of the individual—impossible without health—is one of its highest goals. Yet many elderly citizens cannot afford and do not obtain the health care they need.

The principal aim of the President's program is to provide our older citizens with protection against the excessive costs of hospital care for prolonged illness which can wipe out the lifetime savings of an aged couple of moderate means, and often results in a major financial drain on their families, or forces them from independence to dependency.

The need is widely acknowledged, and the fact is beyond dispute that the greatest single threat to the economic security of older people is the unpredictable cost of illness. The President's program would make it possible for our people to build insurance protection in their working years against the high cost of illness in their later years—just as they now build protection under social security for themselves and their families against the loss of earnings because of old age, disability, or death.

Hospitalization represents the heaviest financial health care burden imposed on aged persons. The average hospital care cost per day in 1946 was $9.39; in 1950 it rose to $15.26; in 1955, to $23.12; in 1960, to $32.28; in 1961, to $34.98. In Montana, the approximate cost in 1961, $30.69.

Therefore, insurance against the cost of hospital care was deemed the proper area of coverage under a health insurance program, with a contribution rate within the means of our country's working force of approximately $1 per month. It is a very modest proposal designed to meet the most essential need; approximately 90 percent of the hospital bill would be paid by the plan—10 percent by the individual patient.

People 65 and over have health care costs twice as high as those of younger people. They are more likely to have serious and longlasting illnesses, yet their annual income, on the average, is only half as large. The majority have little or no money beyond what they need to meet their day-to-day expenses for housing, food, and clothing. Most younger persons readily recover from serious illnesses and regain both their health and economic well-being, whereas such an opportunity is rarely afforded those of advanced years.

In our social security system we have the instrument which can spread the cost of health services in old age over the working years effectively, and in a manner consistent with the dignity of the individual. For over 26 years the efficient administrative machinery of the social security system has been operating successfully, and extension of health care insurance can be logically added at a minimum cost for the benefit of those over age 65.

By using this proved system to provide health insurance protection, it will be possible for our older people to get the vital hospital services they need, not as a gift, but as a right earned and established during productive years, without exhausting their resources, mortgaging their homes, burdening their families, or being obliged to resort to public assistance. Paying for hospital costs under the social security system is the conservative and practical answer to the problem.

Only about half of our people 65 and over have hospitalization insurance, and many of the policies offered to older people provide but limited benefits under the restrictive conditions. It is well recognized that a policy that will provide even an approach to adequate care is beyond the financial ability of the great majority of retired persons.

The Kerr-Mills law, adopted by the Congress in 1960, provided medical assistance for those who could prove poverty. But now we must meet the needs of those millions of taxpayers who are staggered by the drain on their savings—or those of their children—caused by an extended hospital stay.

The President's program seeks to prevent ever-rising health care costs from bringing about poverty, rather than to extend care only after poverty occurs.

It is obvious the proposed health care program has no resemblance to socialized medicine. It is simply a national program to help older people prepay hospital and related health-care bills, not a means of providing these services. Nothing in the bill would in any way change existing practices of hospitals which require that patients be admitted only on the order of a physician.

There would be no interference in the doctor-patient relationship. Every patient would have free choice—of doctor, hospital, or nursing home. Hospitals and other services would be paid in much the same way that Blue Cross and other insurers now pay. The proposal states specifically that the Government would in no way control, regulate, or interfere with the practice of medicine or the administration of hospitals.

The aim and ideals embodied in the health insurance program will help social security do the job it was designed to do: provide a measure of independence with dignity for America's senior citizens during their golden years with an added measure of health and happiness. What greater bulwark against communism could there be than the contentment of a citizenry assured of a feeling of security they have earned.

Persons not covered by social security must have a method of participating. Those who are in poverty will participate in health care in the already passed Kerr-Mills law. Those who are not on public welfare and are not included under social security should be admitted by the payment of a reasonable fee commensurate with their financial background. But in no event should they be financially discouraged from participating.

Report on Activities of the House District Committee, 87th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House District Committee I take great pleasure in making the report of the activities of the House District Committee during the 87th Congress.

I first want to congratulate and thank the Speaker for the cooperation he has given me as chairman of the House District Committee, and also I want to thank the chairman of the Senate District Committee and the Commissioners for their cooperation in our efforts to solve some of the problems confronting the Nation's Capital. We all know that the Constitution specifically states that the Congress of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all legislation affecting the 10-mile square Federal site known as the District of Columbia.

My committee has made an effort to transact all the legislation necessary to keep the Nation's Capital and the entire Federal site known as the District of Columbia, solvent, beautiful, and a decent place in which the Federal employees and residents of the District of Columbia can live. Serving on the District Committee is absolutely voluntary service, and I believe that this committee comes nearer to having a quorum at every meeting than any committee on Capitol Hill, which surely proves that all the Members of Congress are interested in the welfare of their Nation's Capital.

During the 87th Congress, the House District Committee has acted upon a total of 299 bills, and the House has passed 59 of our bills introduced by House Members and 33 which were introduced in the U.S. Senate, for a total of 92 bills. I doubt seriously whether any other committee on Capitol Hill has been able to have the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate take favorable action upon that number of bills during any Congress. We are of the opinion that some of this legislation is vitally necessary and will prove to be of great benefit to the courts, the law enforcement agencies, and the Treasury of the District of Columbia. One of these bills we enacted this session permitted the collection of over $12 million of additional taxes annually by increasing the sales tax 1 cent, by increasing from 3 to 4 cents the small tax on other additional items such as hotel rooms, and by an additional tax on liquor of 5 cents per fifth of a gallon.

We House Members are very much disappointed over the fact that the other body did not take action on three bills which would have strengthened the hands and boosted the morale of the law enforcement officers at a time when crime in the Nation's Capital should be met with a strong and positive force. The House enacted an amendment to the Mallory rule and to the Durham rule and gave the Commissioners authority to add an unlimited number of dogs to the Canine Corps of the Metropolitan Police Department. However, these bills did not clear the other body before we adjourned.

Of major significance with respect to the local courts was our passage of a bill expanding the jurisdiction of municipal court, to enable it to handle cases ranging from $3,000 to $10,000, with power in the court to issue and serve subpenas within a 25-mile radius of the city, and giving such enlarged court a new name, the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, with a similar change in name of the Municipal Court of Appeals to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

The committee also initiated what are expected to be very comprehensive hearings on legislation bearing on crime, the detention or arrests of persons in connection with investigations of crime, more severe penalties for the repeater, and so forth, all designed to materially assist the police in alleviating the horrendous crime situation in the District.

Of particular help, it is believed, to the business community and to District residents generally, was the approval by the committee of uniform model acts for the District based upon legislation approved in other jurisdictions, namely, the Uniform Partnership Act, the Uniform Limited Partnership Act, and the Uniform Gifts to Minors Act—all of which have been approved and are in effect in 39 or more States.

Our committee also passed legislation much sought by the business community, namely, expanding the authority of the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia to permit the redevelopment of areas that are predominantly nonresidential in character, such as downtown Washington, the central business area of the city, but the bill failed of passage by the other body.

The committee acted commendably to meet the area needs with respect to hospitals by, first, approving legislation granting $2.5 million to pay one-half the cost of a $5 million expansion and improvement of the George Washington Hospital, including a 100-bed addition; second, initiating legislation which became law extending for another year the Washington Hospital Center Act of 1946, to enable the Washington Hospital Center to complete plans for a new 300-bed wing for treatment of chronic diseases, costing about $4 million; and, third, by increasing by $375,000 the appropriation authorization under the said 1946 act, thus providing one-half the additional funds needed to complete the Greater Southeast community 305-bed hospital for which $3 million has already been appropriated, thereby enabling the completion of this hospital to serve an area of the city which has increased in population from 105,000 in 1940 to 293,000 in 1960—a 175-percent increase in the past 20 years.

Also of appreciable benefit to local hospitals, as well as to other nonprofit educational and scientific institutions, was legislation enacted to reduce the 3-year period required for a determination of experience rating employed in establishing the rate of contribution to be paid by such institutions under the Unemployment Compensation Act, thereby relieving them of heavy financial burdens which otherwise would have been passed on to those using the services, as patients, students, and the like.

Pay raises for certain District employees—teachers, policemen, firemen—to enable them to keep apace increased living costs, as well as matching the pay raises given the Federal and District government civilian employees, were also enacted after much consideration, hearings and debate. Increased benefits were also provided to widows and surviving minor children of deceased former members of the police and fire department, and others. Of equal importance to the committee in its consideration of the need for such increases was where were the funds to come from. Hence, the earnest effort made by our committee to secure assurances from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that the increases in question could be supported by the District without the need of increasing taxes of any kind.

The increase to teachers will raise the salaries of approximately 5,000 teachers at a cost of $4.2 million annually. This is at the level originally proposed by the Commissioners and within their available finances. The increase to firemen and policemen will require approximately $3.7 million annually, which likewise is within the available finances of the District.

The full District Committee held 11 closed meetings during the second session of the 87th Congress for the purpose of reporting bills to the floor of the House. The idea of closed meetings is not a rule of the District Committee but a rule of the U.S. House of Representatives. The subcommittees of the House District Committee held 37 hearings and 28 executive meetings. All the hearings were open, and the law requires that meetings in which bills are reported to the full committee shall be executive.

I want to congratulate every member of the House District Committee for giving so generously of his time in connection with legislation for the Nation's Capital. I am certain that no State in the Union has fared as well as the District of Columbia so far as legislation and appropriated funds are concerned, as all Government property in the States is tax exempt the same as it is in Washington, and at the present time there are approximately five large Federal buildings under construction at a cost of approximately $250 million. This affords work for thousands of employees at a very high salary in the District of Columbia, in addition to the expenditure of multimillions of dollars in connection with the highway system where the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost.

As chairman of the House District Committee, I have always stressed economy in connection with the District government, as we were promised when the Reorganization Act was passed in 1954 that within 5 years the expenses of the District government would be reduced. Yet, in fact, they have almost doubled during the past 7 years. We all realize that pay increases absorb a great deal of this additional expense; however, numerous new bureaus have been created without any congressional authorization and some of them have been receiving Federal appropriations.

Accomplishments of the 87th Congress: Report of the House Majority Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of the 87th Congress have been historic in every important area.

Responding to the leadership of President Kennedy, this Congress has enacted more important and far-reaching measures across the broadest legislative front than this country has witnessed in years.

Under the leadership of two of the greatest Speakers of all time, former Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, the House of Representatives together with its coequal partner in our legislative system, the U.S. Senate, has written a record in which all Members can take great pride.

We strengthened the national economy. We bolstered the Nation's armed power as never before in peacetime. We launched a full-scale attack upon the many and baffling problems of the 1960's.

During the 1st session, the 87th Congress approved 62 percent of President Kennedy's legislative requests. The Republican-controlled 83d Congress, during its 1st session—and such is a proper comparison—approved only 52 percent of President Eisenhower's requests.

During its 2d session, the 87th Congress approved 74 percent of President Kennedy's requests; the 83d Congress, 2d session, approved only 40 percent of President Eisenhower's requests.

Regardless of legislative comparisons, and true to the traditions of our great people, this Congress as before has kept matters of national defense and foreign policy outside the realm of partisan politics. We have faced the enemies of freedom from a position of strength and as a resolute and united nation.

Under the Foreign Assistance Act, we have buttressed the forces of freedom around the world.

Through the Alliance for Progress, we have joined our neighbors to the south in trying to fulfill the promise of the New World.

We have supported the United Nations and its peacekeeping efforts in the Congo and the Middle East.

We have passed, substantially as recommended by the President of the United States, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which, in language typical of editorial comment across the country, the Washington Post described as "an historic monument to the work of this Congress—the kind of monument that the 80th Congress made for itself when it approved the Marshall plan."

We have established the Peace Corps, a new, imaginative, and informal approach to the field of foreign aid to the lesser developed nations.

In spite of the efforts of the United States to cultivate freedom, peace, and prosperity, crisis is still very much with us, and perhaps more so than at any time since Korea, and possibly since World War II.

Though the immediate shock of the Berlin wall's construction has been forgotten, the daily anxieties and blood-filled encounters around it have not. In another hemisphere, an old Latin friend and neighbor, only 90 miles from us, has become a host to our enemies, and has caused our friendship to change to anger. The 87th Congress, for Berlin and for Cuba, has told the President to use whatever means he finds necessary. And, with Berlin, it was necessary to call up troops.

Cuba and Berlin, however, are like a bad case of measles or chickenpox; they are visible signs of an internal infection. Other signs were trouble in Laos in 1961, and now trouble in South Vietnam.

Yet, as if international affairs did not present enough problems, domestic affairs have been of a critical nature. Many who lived through the great depression of a generation ago saw, at the time John F. Kennedy assumed the Presidency, reminders and similarities of those empty, jobless days.

An important part of the New Frontier's domestic program has been made up of antirecession measures. The contribution of the 87th Congress to this program and to the Nation's economic health is outstanding by any standards.

In the second session, Congress approved the $435 million Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The President, when he signed it into law on March 15 of this year, said that the act was "perhaps the most significant legislation in the area of employment since the historic Employment Act of 1946." This program, indeed, is one significant answer to the labor problems caused by technological changes.

Another part of the overall administration program to stimulate the Nation's economy was enacted under the name of the Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act of 1962. This legislation authorizes the President to allocate $900 million for public works projects in areas with heavy, persistent unemployment. The problem in these areas is not that men will not work; it is that they cannot find work.

Solutions of this problem have to be carefully worked into solutions of problems caused by the swift changes in the nature and structure of American industry, the most highly developed in the world.

The 87th Congress, under the leadership of the Democratic Party, made another effort to combat the Nation's economic problems by reforming Federal welfare law. The reforms will enable money, spent to relieve the distressed, to go further and to do more. In addition, the reforms contain provisions, such as the day-care center program, designed to enable people to work who have been forced to accept relief in order to care for their children.

Still another effort approved by the 87th Congress to tone up the economy was passage of legislation to revise our tax laws. This legislation provides for the first major revision of taxes since 1954. In part, it allows businesses to deduct the costs of certain investments, in new and used property, from their income tax liability. This legislation, as is true of much other legislation recommended by the Kennedy administration, is designed, in part, to stimulate and strengthen industries, small and large, light and heavy, of the United States. But the revision, directly and indirectly, will benefit many other interests of the country.

All of this session's antirecession legislation was enacted, to some degree, during a comparatively prosperous time, though areas of serious unemployment and industrial stagnation have continued. The general prosperity of this summer was produced, in part, from legislation enacted in 1961, during the first session.

At the time of the 1960 national elections, and later, when President John F. Kennedy assumed office, the crises that our Nation was going through were more apparent than had been true for many years, though, in fact, crises had existed all the time. Recession was growing and deepening, and the first vestiges of financial panic were claimed to be seen by some and feared by many. The President had been elected through his insistence that the critical nature of the times be publicly recognized and vigorously handled. It was in the context of a new national mood, demanding action, that the 87th Congress passed legislation extending unemployment compensation for 13 weeks.

The extension was quickly followed by passage of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1962, which provided for Federal loans and grants to areas of chronic unemployment. This legislation had been vetoed twice under the previous administration.

And, to provide for the responsibilities of those affected by the recession, Congress in 1961 enacted legislation to make families of unemployed workers with dependent children temporarily eligible for Federal public assistance payments. It has been estimated that more than a million people have benefited from this assistance.

Furthermore, the 87th Congress during its 1st session provided for changes in the social security laws, along the lines of President Kennedy's proposals: benefits for retired workers and for widows were raised, men as well as women were permitted to collect benefits at 62, and social security taxes were increased. The increased pensions injected more money where it would do the most good, in the marketplace. And, the increases made the retirees' well-deserved rest more comfortable.

Later, in its second session, Congress approved legislation to encourage the self-employed to establish personal pension funds, through special tax deductions.

Another program that the Democratic 87th Congress approved was an alteration of the highway program's financing. Certain Federal gasoline and truck equipment taxes were raised in order to meet an estimated increase from $25 billion to $37 billion for the Federal share of the 41,000-mile interstate highway program.

And, since building and construction is one good indication, as well as stimulant, of our Nation's economic growth, Congress also approved an authorization of $225 million for Federal matching grants to State and local authority for construction and modernization of public airports.

Another act passed by the 87th Congress, contributing greatly to our Nation's economy, was the $4.88 billion omnibus housing bill. This generally followed the recommendations of President Kennedy, who called it "the most important and far-reaching" housing legislation since 1949. In 1962, Congress provided a housing program for our senior citizens. One of the last measures approved by Congress in this last session appropriated more than $1 billion for rivers, harbors, and flood control projects.

During the 1st session, the 87th Congress also approved legislation increasing the minimum wage and broadening the coverage. President Kennedy in his February 2, 1961, economic message and in a letter of February 6 of the same year to Congress, asked for this legislation. Its enactment was a major victory for the administration.

For the farmers, the 87th Congress and the administration during the past year raised net farm income by more than $1 billion, to an 8-year high. This represents an increase of 10 percent in farming income for the Nation.

The President on October 6 described the result of the efforts of the Congress and the administration in the following statement:

> We have achieved the best 2-year advance for American farmers since the days of the great depression. We have helped to put [money] into the farmer's pocket, into his family budget and into the cash registers on Main Street in the small towns.

While the income of American farmers has been increasing in the past year, wheat surplus has been lessened by 400 million bushels. This was due partly to the enactment of the emergency food grain program, and partly through provisions of the omnibus farm bill, which gave the President the powers he asked for to help cut back acreage of wheat and feed grains on the 1962 crop. Under the omnibus measure, Congress dealt with problems of other agricultural surpluses by empowering the President to use certain marketing orders and agreements.

Under the 1962 omnibus farm bill, the 87th Congress approved an 18 cents per bushel payment-in-kind to wheat growers and livestock feed grain producers who cooperate in Government programs to reduce surpluses of these grains. And so, the problems caused by the inordinate size of U.S. agricultural surplus are expected to continue to lessen.

Under the Sugar Act of 1962, the portion of the U.S. sugar market going to American farmers was increased from 55 to 66 percent.

Business received its fair share of attention from the 87th Congress. For instance, the Satellite Communications Act is an outstanding example of cooperation between Government and private enterprise in a very important new area of human endeavor. Congress also provided for an unusual, but what appears to be a highly successful, government-business space communications venture: Telstar, the world's first telecommunications satellite. To make sure that the maximum number of television channels shall be used for tuning in Telstar and other television sources, Congress passed a law that required television manufacturers to equip their sets to receive all ultrahigh frequency—UHF—and very high frequency—VHF—television signals. An added attraction is that new television stations will probably be built to transmit to the additional channels, thus providing one more stimulant to our economy.

One measure that was passed by Congress to tighten up certain practices in the drug industry was the Drug Amendments Act of 1962. The legislation was brought to national attention through the tragedy of thalidomide, a drug suspected of causing deformities in babies.

The 87th Congress gave labor proper consideration when legislation was enacted providing increased minimum wages, and establishing shorter working hours on projects done under Government contract or with Government aid. The Congress also enacted a major labor measure in the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1962, which tightened up the ways in which unions may administer the pension funds of their members.

In matters of civil rights, the 87th Congress enacted the first step of a constitutional amendment for abolition of the poll tax in Federal elections. The Kennedy administration through executive action has done far more for civil rights than was done by any previous administration.

The 87th Congress gave Federal employees a pay raise of $1 billion annually to insure that the high caliber of public servants continues. And, pay differences between Government and industry were closed or narrowed, according to the jobs. In addition, Congress raised the pensions of retired Government employees.

In the same bill that Congress passed to provide the pay raises and pension increases, an increase in postal rates was included. This is another reform which Congress felt necessary. This measure was estimated to increase postal revenues by a little more than $600 million, when fully effective in fiscal 1965.

Finally, two measures which highlight the accomplishments of the 87th Congress concern the Nation's health and water supply: The Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1961. The latter measure had been vetoed by the previous administration.

The preceding description was designed to define the problems facing the Congress, the administration, and ultimately, the Nation. The approximately twoscore of enactments mentioned represent some of the highlights of the 87th Congress attempts to solve the Nation's legislative problems. Following is a detailed explanation of these and other bills enacted by this Congress.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

On August 9, 1962, President Kennedy signed the Department of Defense appropriations measure—Public Law 87-577—for fiscal 1963. The total appropriations were $48,136,247,000, the largest in U.S. history. And, this appropriation did not include funds for military construction, civil defense, public works, or oversea military assistance.

The current appropriation totaled $1.6 billion more than last year's appropriations bill—fiscal 1962. Most of the increase was for research and development, and procurement of aircraft for the Air Force, and aircraft and missiles for the Navy. Reductions, below fiscal 1962 levels, were made in outlays for military personnel, and operations and maintenance. The reductions were caused by the planned release of reservists called to active duty to meet the 1961 Berlin crisis.

Congress has felt as strongly in the second session as it had during the first that the addition of more than a billion dollars for defense was necessary. Altogether, in our two sessions, we appropriated $8.5 billion more than was recommended for this period by the Eisenhower administration—an increase of 20 percent in our defense outlays.

During the first session, the increased appropriations were mainly for enlargement of our Armed Forces, modernization of the Army's weapons system, increases in our bomber alert and in the U.S. missile program particularly in the Polaris system. The funds increase at that time was also for a sharp increase in our nuclear capacity. In addition, Congress strengthened the discretionary powers of the President in defense matters.

In addition, the current defense appropriation law has these provisions:

First. Prohibits obligation for fiscal 1963 of funds appropriated in fiscal 1962 for long-range bombers.

Second. Delegates $157 million of Air Force research and development funds for the Dyna-Soar manned space glider, and $362.6 million for the RS-70 bomber.

Third. Authorizes expenditures for military personnel greater than the appropriated amounts, if the President determines that increases are necessary.

Fourth. Continues the President's authority to make expenditures to institute an airborne alert.

Fifth. Sets limits on Navy repair, shipbuilding and conversion funds so that at least 35 percent of the funds are to be allotted for work in privately owned shipyards, unless the Secretary of Defense finds that privately done work is "inconsistent with the public interest based on urgency of requirement."

Sixth. States that indirect costs of Defense Department research grants may not exceed 20 percent of direct costs.

Seventh. Authorizes the Defense Secretary to transfer up to $150 million from other fiscal 1963 Department funds to the Defense Department emergency fund, provided that no transfer exceeds 7 percent of the appropriation from which it is taken.

DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

In addition, the Army Corps of Engineers received appropriations of $3,900,000 under the Second Supplementary Appropriations Act for 1963. These funds are not counted in the main defense appropriation figure. During the first session, $40 million in supplementary appropriations were given to the Navy for procurement, shipbuilding, and conversion.

PRESIDENT'S DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY

In addition to appropriations for defense, Congress enacted in 1962 a highly important measure giving the President discretionary authority to call up 150,000 ready reservists, and to extend the terms of men now in uniform. Congress felt this was necessary because of the continuing critical nature of the world situation.

Under the new law, the President may call up ready reservists and extend existing tours of active duty without declaring a national emergency. The law is similar in this respect to last session's Berlin mobilization legislation, which empowered him to call up to 250,000 reservists. About 148,000 were called.

The President's special mobilization powers of last year expired July 31, 1962. The new legislation restored these powers, beginning with the adjournment of the second session, and ending February 28, 1963, about 2 months after the next Congress is due to convene.

In the words of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. VINSON, of Georgia:

> The current legislation is a clear indication of our determination to be prepared for any explosive crisis that may develop anywhere in the world. It would be a mistake for anyone to look upon this resolution as our answer to the crisis in Cuba, but it would also be a mistake not to consider this resolution as part of our answer to the crisis in Cuba.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara said, at least twice during the second session, that "frequent and continuing callups are undesirable." This statement and the general responsibility and capability with which the Defense Department has been administered under the Kennedy administration are among the assurances that the American people have that the President will exercise his authority with discretion. In addition, Secretary McNamara has assured Congress that the Pentagon has been conducting a "complete review of all our force levels."

Because of the large, continuing national defense effort, laws affecting defense have become many and complex, as have the working of the Defense Establishment. Defense procurement has become a delicate and sensitive subject, because of its unique nature.

The 1962 military procurement authorization legislation, Public Law 87-436, was approved by the President on April 27, 1962. It authorizes appropriations of $12,969,300,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in fiscal 1963.

The law frees for unrestricted use $525 million, authorized and appropriated in 1961 solely for the procurement of B-52 bombers in fiscal 1962. In addition, the law requires that all funds appropriated for "research, development, testing, and evaluation" of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels must have prior authorization beginning with funds for fiscal 1964.

The first session of Congress authorized $12.4 billion for defense procurement, under Public Law 87-53.

As one solution to difficulties that come from procurement, President Kennedy on September 10, 1962, approved legislation—Public Law 87-653—to bring negotiated defense procurement contracts under more rigid legislative control and to encourage use of the advertised, competitive bid method in placing most contracts for military supplies and services.

In addition, Congress for fiscal 1963 appropriated $1,319,144,500, which is to be used for authorized construction and related authority for the military departments and the Department of Defense. For fiscal 1962, Congress appropriated $951,690,750, which was used for the same authorized general purposes that obtained for fiscal 1963, though often for different individual projects.

Among other legislation enacted into law relating to our national defense was:

First. A bill providing for the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries and for the extension of certain naval vessel loans.

Second. A bill providing for more effective participation in Reserve components of the Armed Forces, chiefly by amending the laws relating to the 6-month training program and participation in the Reserve components.

Third. A bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft missiles and naval vessels for the Armed Forces.

Fourth. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for aircraft in the sum of $958,570,000.

Fifth. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations both within and outside of the United States in the sum of $893 million, and of this total, $67,097,750 was authorized for construction of Reserve facilities.

Sixth. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. This law clarifies and removes any doubts that might arise with regard to the reemployment protection to be accorded certain persons who leave their jobs to enter the Armed Forces in the interest of national defense, as well as correcting other inequities. It also creates an additional 4-year period of service for reemployment rights purposes for persons entering or reentering on active duty after August 1, 1961.

Seventh. A bill to provide for the more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces. The basic purpose of this law is to make omnibus amendments to the laws relating to the 6-month training program and participation in the Reserve components. The act contains five major revisions to existing laws relating to the Reserve components and the National Guard.

Eighth. Under Public Law 87-505 enacted on June 28, 1962, the Defense Production Act of 1950 was extended for 2 years, through June 30, 1964. The act authorizes the President to establish priorities for defense contracts, allocate scarce materials, and guarantee defense loans.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The entire Federal civil defense administration was reorganized during the 1st session of the 87th Congress. President Kennedy, in his May 25, 1961, special message of urgent national needs, announced that primary responsibility for civil defense programs would be removed from the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization and assigned to a new Pentagon office, the Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense—Civil Defense.

In an Executive order of July 20 of the same year, the President gave the new Office responsibility for the protection of the civilian population against nuclear attack. The President said the Office was to discharge its responsibility by preparing emergency warning and communications plans and by directing the fallout shelter program.

The President also charged the OCDM to coordinate civil defense preparations with other nonmilitary defense preparations, and to plan the management of national resources in emergencies.

At the President's request, Congress in 1961 passed legislation, which he signed, changing the name of OCDM to the Office of Emergency Planning.

The President for fiscal 1962 requested and received $207.6 million, in the Defense Department Appropriations Act of 1961, for the Department's civil defense activities, of which $169.3 million was for locating, marking, and stocking fallout shelter space in existing public and private buildings.

In addition, the independent offices appropriations law gave $86.5 million to the OCDM—the law was generally shaped up by the time the reorganization took place. After the reorganization and civil defense funds were synchronized, the $86.5 million civil defense appropriation had been reduced, so that the new Defense Assistant Secretary's Office received $48 million for its activities, and the Public Health Service received $13 million for civil defense medical stockpile supply activities. The remaining funds were allocated—for noncivil defense activities, generally speaking—to the Office of Emergency Planning, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the General Services Administration.

Congress, in the second session, for civil defense voted $113 million for the Defense Assistant Secretary's Office, $10 million for the Office of Emergency Planning, and $7 million for the Public Health Service.

CUBA

The United States is answering the gravest challenge to its position in the Western Hemisphere since the Monroe Doctrine was formulated 139 years ago. Diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba have been broken. The United States is bringing about a severe embargo against Cuba, forbidding U.S. ships to carry goods to that country, and excluding those foreign ships who trade with Cuba from trading with the United States. The only goods exempt from the embargo are U.S. food and medical items.

In reply to the dangers that the Castro regime presents, the 87th Congress in 1961—as the preceding Congress had done in 1960—voted to give the President power to deprive Cuba of its huge, profitable sugar market in the United States, which the President did in both years. Public Law 86-592 contained such a provision in 1960, and Public Law 87-15 contained it in 1961.

The current Cuban regime was permanently excluded from the U.S. sugar market in 1962 under Public Law 87–535. Congress had made clear, however, that Cuba shall be readmitted under the U.S. sugar quota, if she discards its Communist government and renounces aid from Communist countries.

Most recently, Congress and the President approved a strong resolution expressing U.S. "determination to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending by force or threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere."

In addition, the resolution said the United States was determined "to prevent, in Cuba, the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States" and to "work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

BERLIN RESOLUTION

Congress, on October 10 of this year, approved a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States is "determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms," any Soviet violation of Allied rights in Berlin including those of ingress and egress.

We made clear to the entire world that the United States would regard as intolerable any violation by the Soviet Union "directly or through others" of such rights.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

The enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provided the Kennedy administration, and in fact the Nation, with one of the most striking legislative successes in many generations. I quote the eloquent language of the President of the United States:

> This is the most important international piece of legislation, I think, affecting economics since the passage of the Marshall plan. It marks a decisive point for the future of our economy, for our relations with our friends and allies, and for the prospects of free institutions and free societies everywhere.
>
> This act recognizes, fully and completely, that we cannot protect our economy by stagnating behind tariff walls, but that the best protection possible is a mutual lowering of tariff barriers among friendly nations so that all may benefit from a free flow of goods. Increased economic activity resulting from increased trade will provide more job opportunities for our workers. Our industry, our agriculture, our mining will benefit from increased export opportunities as other nations agree to lower their tariffs. Increased exports and imports will benefit our ports, steamship lines, and air lines as they handle an increased amount of trade. Lowering of our tariffs will provide an increased flow of goods for our American consumers. Our industries will be stimulated by increased export opportunities and by freer competition with the industries of other nations for an even greater effort to develop an efficient, economic and productive system. The results can bring a dynamic new era of growth.
>
> By means of agreements authorized by the act, we can move forward to partnership with the nations of the Atlantic Community. Together with the Common Market, we account for 90 percent of the free world's trade in industrial products. Together we make up—and I think this is most important in this vital period—the greatest aggregation of economic power in the history of the world. We now have the means to make certain that we build our strength together and that we can maintain this preeminence.
>
> We shall also use the authority of the act to negotiate with our other great trading partners, Canada and Japan, and with the countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa—and we are particularly concerned that the countries of Latin America shall have an opportunity to participate in this period of economic growth particularly as it effects the Common Market as well as our own United States. We will use the specific authorities designed to widen markets for the raw materials and manufactures of the less developed nations whose economic growth is so important to us all and to strengthen our efforts to end discriminatory and preferential arrangements which in the long run can only make everyone poorer and the free world less united.
>
> A vital expanding economy in the free world is a strong counter to the threat of the world Communist movement. This act is, therefore, an important new weapon to advance the cause of freedom.

Provisions of the act are summarized as follows:

It gives the President a 5-year authority to cut tariffs by 50 percent; to eliminate tariffs on goods of which the United States and the European Common Market together account for 80 percent of free world trade; and to eliminate tariffs on certain tropical products and on goods on which duties were currently 5 percent or less.

When tariff cuts hurt domestic interests, the President may raise tariffs through use of the "escape clause" in trade agreements, could devise other import restrictions such as international quota arrangements, or give Federal "trade adjustment" assistance.

Assistance for workers may be Federal unemployment compensation at higher rates and for a longer period than any other unemployment compensation system, plus retraining and relocation allowances.

Aid for firms may be loans, loan guarantees, technical assistance, and tax breaks. The President may offer both import protection and trade adjustment to a given industry, in order to cushion it while it converted to new fields, or modernized.

In addition, congressional conferees on the act agreed to suspend the most-favored-nation treatment to Poland and Yugoslavia.

MONETARY FUND LOAN

The United States is authorized to lend up to $2 billion to the International Monetary Fund, as part of a $6 billion standby currency stabilization pool, through the enactment of Public Law 87–490.

Another measure approved by Congress, affecting international finance, permits U.S. commercial banks to pay a higher interest rate on time deposits—short-term investments—of foreign governments. The purpose of the law was to help maintain foreign dollar accounts in the United States and prevent conversion of the accounts to gold. Treasury officials have said the law will help to improve the U.S. balance-of-payments position, and will save the Government up to $300 million in gold reserves.

This legislation, economies in oversea operations brought about in the Department of Defense under the Kennedy administration, and certain practices of the Treasury Department have substantially reduced the drain on the Nation's gold reserve. The gold reserves under the previous administration were allowed to reach a dangerous low.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT

Public Law 87–515 provides that the Export Control Act of 1949 be extended for 3 years, through June 30, 1965; it is the law which restricts exports to Communist countries. In addition to raising the penalties for violation of this act, the Congress declared that it is the policy of the United States to formulate East-West policies that will have the cooperation of U.S. allies and nonalined nations.

TARIFF RECLASSIFICATION

The Tariff Classification Act of 1962—Public Law 87–456—reclassified the U.S. tariff schedule. On May 25, 1962, when he signed the bill into law, the President stated:

> The law embodies over 6 years of effort by the U.S. Tariff Commission, undertaken in response to the mandate from Congress under title I of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954.
>
> The new tariff schedules will simplify the determination and application of rates of duty.

The importance of this act was accentuated by passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

FOREIGN AID

The United States has spent nearly $87 billion on foreign aid since World War II. The aid, at first, went mostly toward setting the European nations back on their feet after the war. Over the years, however, more and more aid has been shifted to underdeveloped countries, on the theory that communism feeds on poverty.

In 1961 President Kennedy proposed to the American people and to the nations of the world that we undertake together a decade of development in which the industrialized nations would assist the peoples of the newly independent and less-developed nations of the world in their own efforts for peaceful economic and social progress. In order that the United States might undertake a position of leadership in this great program for progress, the President asked the Congress to enact the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

In 1962, as in 1961, the heart of the President's proposal was his request for authority for a great program of development loans. In order that it might be clear to the world that the United States is indeed committed to leadership in the decade of development and to provide other nations with the assurances necessary for their own planning, the President asked that the Congress provide authority for the loan program for a period of 5 years and that the Congress also provide the authority necessary to make long-term commitments to the less-developed nations against which they might plan more surely for their own progress.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 provided that authority. For the first time U.S. development assistance had been put upon an assured basis of 5-year duration. For the first time the Congress had specifically granted the President the authority to give commitments to friendly countries that over a period of 5 years we would provide aid to them in specified amounts. The legislation declared that:

> Whenever the President determines that it is important to the advancement of United States interests and necessary in order to further the purpose of this title, and in recognition of the need for reasonable advance assurances in the interest of orderly and effective execution of long-term plans and programs of development assistance, he is authorized to enter into agreements committing, under the terms and conditions of this title, funds authorized to be appropriated under this title, subject only to the annual appropriation of such funds.

While the legislation represented a compromise under which the Congress provided the President with the long-term commitment authority which he had declared essential to U.S. leadership in the world and under which the Congress retained its power over appropriations, nevertheless this is the first time the Congress gave such authority to a President, and this compromise is decidedly in the direction of the recommendations of the President.

It is clear that the funds to meet the commitments made by the President must come from appropriations as authorized in the legislation. It was equally clear that the Congress had accepted a moral obligation to appropriate in the future the funds which will be necessary to meet commitments made by the President under the authority granted by the Congress unless there should occur some most unusual and unforeseen reasons for our Government to withhold future appropriations in connection with any commitments that may be made.

For this lending program the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorized appropriations of $1,200 million for the first year and $1,500 million for each of the following 4 years. These funds are to remain available until expended and authorizations unused by appropriations will remain available for future appropriations. In order to provide the American aid program with the most effective administration possible the Congress in 1961 granted the President authority to establish a unified administration for the whole economic aid program. Programs formerly administered by the International Cooperation Administration, the Development Loan Fund, and otherwise were placed under a unified Agency for International Development. The Congress provided the President with authority to appoint an official with the rank of an Under Secretary of State as Administrator of this new Agency for International Development—AID—reporting directly to the Secretary of State and to the President and having as his assistants two Deputy Directors of the rank of Deputy Under Secretary of State and nine assistant administrators with the rank of Assistant Secretaries of State. This action by the Congress should provide the AID administration with the ability to attract men of the highest caliber to join in the administration of this vital function of our foreign relations.

The legislation in 1961 consolidated former categories of assistance into a new category of supporting assistance. Among other purposes this will assist those nations who in cooperation with our own military assistance program are engaging in military efforts greater than they can support without our help. The legislation will continue and strengthen the point 4 program originated by former President Truman. It is continued as part of the program of development grants which will be directed toward the strengthening of human resources in developing countries through programs of education, health, and training in many fields essential to the progress of these nations. Development grant funds will help carry forward programs of community development, land reform, agricultural credit, sanitation and health facilities, urban and rural housing, and similar programs fundamental to social progress. The 1961 legislation continued the leadership of the United States in the United Nations technical assistance and special fund. It provided funds for our part in the work of the United Nations to bring order and peace out of chaotic conditions in the Congo. It provided funds to continue the U.S. assistance to the refugees in the Middle East and to help in their resettlement. Contributions were authorized to other United Nations activities such as the Emergency Fund in the Middle East, the Children's Fund, the malaria eradication program of the World Health Organization, the international atomic energy program and others.

The 1961 legislation authorized for the first time a program of development research to analyze the problems of development with a thoroughness never before possible and to apply the principles of research, well established in industry, to the more efficient conduct of our economic and social development programs.

The aid legislation also provided encouragement and incentives to private enterprise never before authorized. It is a basic policy of the Congress and the administration to encourage the participation of private enterprise in the effort undertaken by the Government to advance economic growth in the newly developing countries. The new legislation expanded existing guarantees, and provided for the first time an all-risk guarantee, on any experimental basis, to insure against losses of investment for any reason, up to 75 percent of the investment. The new act also provided newly authorized assistance to private investors in locating investment opportunities. The act is especially mindful of the interest and potential contribution of small business and gives the President specific authority to assist American small business to participate in the program.

The second portion of the 1961 legislation, the International Peace and Security Act, directed our military assistance not only toward protection of the free world from the older forms of Communist bloc aggression: infiltration, guerrilla warfare, and internal agitation, the legislation authorized $1,700 million for military assistance and provided for the first time an additional special authority to the President to draw upon defense stocks up to the value of $300 million for military assistance purposes should the vital interests of the United States require it. This has been a matter of great importance.

In 1961, the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1962, appropriated, for the foreign aid program, the largest sum made available in 8 years. The total new obligational authority is $3,878 million; together with the carryover of unobligated balances, and $30 million for the newly established Peace Corps, the funds made available total $4,014 million.

The country and the free world have been heartened by the outstanding leadership of President Kennedy—the strength and firmness of his policies and actions.

The President has evidenced such leadership in many ways: his recognition of the world situation by sharply increasing appropriations for our national defense, his firm stand on the Berlin crisis, and his prudent, but firm, policy toward Cuba.

On May 27, 1961, the President signed a bill appropriating $500 million for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, and $100 million for the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program in fiscal 1961—Public Law 87–41—definite steps to furnish concrete support to his Alliance for Progress.

This has been a program of major importance to President Kennedy in carrying out his far-reaching policy of strengthening our friendship with American nations in Central and South America through loans and grants for economic progress of their people and for political stability and strength.

Earlier steps had been taken, precedent to the appropriations granted in Public Law 87–41. Congress had authorized the programs in August 1960—Public Law 86–735—and the United States had subscribed to the Act of Bogotá, agreeing to join 18 other American Republics in promoting economic and social development in the Western Hemisphere. On January 18, 1961, former President Eisenhower requested, without success, $500 million to implement the inter-American social and economic cooperation program. President Kennedy repeated that request, and also asked for $100 million for the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program in his March 14 message to Congress on Latin America.

A new Caribbean organization—successor to the Caribbean Commission—was accepted by the United States in an act passed during the first session. The agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean organization was signed June 21, 1960, by France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The four countries had been members of the Commission which had served as advisers on economic, social, and cultural matters for the area since the Commission was created in 1946.

The establishment of the new organization gives its members greater stature and demonstrates to the world a process for extending local autonomy.

The Foreign Aid Assistance Act of 1962—Public Law 87-565—authorizes $4,572 million to be spent on foreign aid for fiscal 1963. Of this total, $1,818,900,000 is designated for new authorizations. One of the most important provisions of the new authorizations is the $500 million for loans and $100 million for grants to Latin America as part of a $2.4 billion, 4-year authorization for aid to Latin America under the Alliance for Progress.

From fiscal 1964 through 1966 the law also provides $600 million annually for loans to Latin America. The conferees said that Congress supported the Alliance, and would consider requests for additional Alliance funds, if necessary.

In addition, the law provides $1,250 million for Development Loan Fund loans, and $1.5 billion for military aid.

Also, the law authorizes an unspecified amount for the Investment Guarantee Fund.

Strongly debated by Members of Congress was a provision of the law which prohibits the President from furnishing aid to Communist nations, including 18 listed nations, unless he determined and reported to the Congress that the aid was vital to U.S. security, that the recipient was not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy, and that the aid would promote the recipient's independence from international communism. Also, the President may furnish local currency aid, without restriction, to U.S.-founded and sponsored schools, libraries, and hospitals in Communist nations.

In addition, $70,100,000 was appropriated for the relief of Cuban refugees in the United States; the appropriation provided the full amount requested by the administration.

Another provision of the law would require the suspension of aid to nations in which U.S. property was expropriated without adequate compensation. This provision applies to property owned not only by U.S. citizens, but also by associations and firms in which U.S. citizens owned at least a 50-percent interest. The law—under the aid suspension provision—requires expropriating nations, or their political subdivisions, to meet their obligations to former owners under the dictates of international law, and to include arbitration as a step which would be considered "appropriate" under the new law.

PEACE CORPS

One of the most idealistic proposals advanced during the 1960 presidential election campaign by President Kennedy was that of enlisting young Americans in a Peace Corps to serve as instructors and helpers in underdeveloped countries.

The President established the Corps by Executive order March 1, 1961, at which time he also asked Congress to give it permanent legislative authority. Members of the Corps, he said, would help provide skilled manpower for development projects, "acting at a working level and serving at great personal sacrifice." By the time he had sent up a draft bill May 30, 1961, the Corps had received 8,500 applications, primarily from young college graduates, and the President had arranged to send groups to Tanganyika, Colombia, and the Philippines.

The final measure, approved September 21, 1961, authorized the Corps to pay each volunteer's expenses and $75 per month, to be paid after completion of his service.

Congress authorized $40 million for the program's first year and appropriated $30 million.

The program was such a success that Congress, in 1962, authorized for the Corps $63,740,000, the full amount requested by the administration. Congress appropriated $59 million.

REFUGEE ASSISTANCE ACT

By enacting the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, Public Law 87-510, the Congress and the President once again demonstrated the concern that the United States holds for the many persons, homeless and destitute, who are victims of communism or of other social disasters.

The act embodied President Kennedy's request for legislation to continue and centralize the authority for U.S. assistance to refugees escaping political, religious, or racial persecution. The act lifted out of foreign aid legislation, and established in a separate statute, authority for the United States to operate the U.S. escapee program—USEP—and a program of aid to Cuban refugees in the United States, and to participate in programs run by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration—ICEM and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—UNHCR.

President Kennedy, upon signing H.R. 8291 into law, made the following remarks:

> In continuing this endeavor, we will be carrying forward a great American tradition which is as well known as the generosity of our people in coming to the aid of those in need.
>
> The Congress is to be congratulated for its action in providing the necessary authorization.

U.N. BOND LOAN

A significant bipartisan effort, recommended by President Kennedy during the 87th Congress, was the enactment of a bill authorizing the United States to lend up to $100 million to the United Nations on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis with other nations.

The U.N. bond proposal was authorized by the General Assembly December 20, 1961, to meet a financial crisis created by U.N. peace-keeping actions in the Middle East and in the Congo. The world organization proposed issuing bonds repayable at 2-percent interest over 25 years. Nineteen nations as of September 14, 1962, had purchased $27,750,000 in bonds, and 31 other nations had pledged to buy $45,518,257.

The statute authorizing the U.S. loan, Public Law 87-731, was signed by President Kennedy on October 2, 1962.

The law authorized appropriations of $100 million for a loan to the U.N. and directed that "proceeds of such loan shall not be used" to relieve U.N. members of their obligation to pay arrearages on U.N. assessments and "shall not be used to reduce" regular or special assessments.

The law also required that the total amount of money loaned shall not exceed the amount of loans made by other U.N. members.

In addition, the law required deducting from the annual U.S.-assessed share of the U.N. budget an amount equal to the corresponding annual installment of principal and interest due the United States because of the loan.

Furthermore, the statute stated that it—Public Law 87-731—did not authorize the United States to participate in future U.N. borrowing, and expressed the sense of Congress that the United States should "use its best efforts" to promote a U.N. financing pattern that would avoid future large-scale deficits.

The law expressed the "satisfaction" of the Congress that the International Court of Justice had decided special assessments for Middle East and Congo operations were "expense of the organization," thereby providing a sound basis for obtaining prompt payment of assessments.

The law also stated the sense of the Congress that the U.N. "should take immediate steps to give effect" to the World Court advisory opinion "to assure prompt payment of all assesments."

The law directed the State Department to submit to Congress by January 31, 1963, a report on steps taken by the U.N. on long-term financing of the organization.

Stated in a September 11, 1962, letter to Speaker of the House, the Honorable John W. McCormack, was President Kennedy's reaction to the bill—"wholly satisfactory." Last January 30, the President had asked Congress to authorize the outright purchase of $100 million of a $200 million U.N. bond issue; and on last August 22, he had described the bill as one of five "particularly important measures" awaiting congressional action, and said the bill posed "a test of this Nation's good faith in supporting the peace-keeping efforts of the U.N."

Former Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman also endorsed the U.N. loan. General Eisenhower, August 25, said the bond issue was a measure "helping to open the door of hope for all mankind."

He said:

> Our country has played a leading role in the development of this great forum and we must not fail it now.

Mr. Truman on September 10 said that Congress should pass the bill by a "large majority." Mr. Truman said:

> The United Nations should be supported in every way, as it was in Korea and as it is now in the Congo, or we are headed for World War III.

DIPLOMATIC RADIO STATIONS

The 87th Congress, 2d session, enacted legislation which authorizes the President to license foreign governments, on a reciprocal basis, to operate 10 watt power, point-to-point stations in the

District of Columbia, for transmission of messages outside the United States.

WAR CLAIMS

The Congress in 1962 approved an omnibus bill authorizing payments to Americans who lost property abroad during World War II, and permitting the Government to sell General Aniline and Film Corp., seized during World War II as German-owned.

The General Aniline provision authorizes the Justice Department to sell the Government's 93-percent stock interest in the company. Special legislation is needed because the Federal seizure has been challenged by Interhandel, a Swiss holding company that contends it was the prewar owner of the seized shares. The bill provides that, if this claim is upheld in the courts, proceeds from the sale of the Government stock, estimated at $150 million, would be used to compensate the Swiss company. It is expected that the court case will take several more years.

The general war claims provisions of the bill authorize compensation to U.S. citizens, or their heirs, who lost property in Europe, in the Far East, or at sea during World War II, or who suffered death, disability, or property loss on civilian passenger vessels attacked before the United States entered the war. The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission estimates it will receive more than 35,000 claims and will approve payments totaling over $300 million. Only $100 million, however, will be available immediately, and there is no certainty that all the approved claims will be paid in full. The money will come from the sale of alien property seized in this country.

The bill specifies full payment must be made in cases of death or injury and to small businesses.

The bill also provides for the return, to their former owners, of seized patents and copyrights, estates, trusts, insurance policies, annuities, and pensions.

Public Law 87-616 was approved on August 30, 1962, by President Kennedy, thus authorizing $73 million to be paid to Philippine citizens and corporations for World War II damage awards. The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 authorized full payment of war damage claims up to $500, and 75 percent of losses over the $500 limit. A subsequent appropriation provided $389 million for payment of all claims up to $500 but only 52.5 percent of awards beyond $500. The new law authorized the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to use the $73 million to pay the remaining 22.5 percent claims.

President Kennedy on August 27, 1962—the day that the Senate cleared the measure for the President—said that the passage of the bill was a "source of great satisfaction" to him, and that the measure marked "the opening of a new and happier chapter in the relationship between the United States and the Philippines."

U.S. ECONOMY IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

Economists, during the last Republican administration, began to note an increase of chronically depressed U.S. industrial areas. Persistent unemployment became more and more widespread. Major labor areas with "substantial labor surplus"—more than 6 percent of the working force out of work—increased very rapidly between 1955 and 1961. And smaller labor market areas suffered the same troubles.

In 1955, the Joint Economic Committee called on the Federal Government to set up an extensive area redevelopment program, and the committee proposed legislation to carry out its suggestions.

A year later, President Eisenhower requested Congress to pass limited area redevelopment legislation. In 1958, the administration again asked for a limited bill; when Congress obliged, the bill was pocket vetoed for providing "too little local responsibility." The 1960 area redevelopment bill was also vetoed.

Mr. Kennedy made the following statement during the 1960 presidential campaign in a speech he delivered September 19 in Charleston, W. Va.:

> During your [presidential] primary I pledged that within 60 days of my election I would send to the Congress a complete program to restore and revive the economy of West Virginia—to bring new industry and new jobs to your State, and all other neglected areas of our country. Today, I reaffirm that pledge.

On December 5, 1960, Mr. Kennedy appointed a special 23-member task force on depressed areas. Its report, submitted January 1, reaffirmed Democratic support for an area redevelopment bill. On hearing the report, Mr. Kennedy said he thought depressed area problems deserved "the most important domestic priority."

AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

In 1961, a third attempt on the part of Congress to alleviate the economic hardships of recessioned areas met with success under a sympathetic President. On May 1 President Kennedy signed the Area Redevelopment Act. At last the Federal Government was able to step into areas of chronic high unemployment and work with State and local officials in programs to attract and settle new industries in the area; to assist in the provision of necessary public facilities; and provide assistance to those undergoing job retraining. Through a program of loans and grants, a total of $394 million in 1961 was authorized for a 4-year program. Responsibility for overall administration has been vested by the Commerce Department in the Area Redevelopment Administration. Six other departments and agencies—Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare; Housing and Home Finance Agency; Agriculture; Interior; and the Small Business Administration—have pooled their resources to discharge their various responsibilities toward the program.

On June 9, Commerce Secretary Hodges released a list of 114 depressed industrial areas which would be eligible for aid under the program; on July 20 he released a list of 468 rural counties and 48 Indian reservation areas eligible for aid because of chronic unemployment or underemployment. The designation of specific areas was deemed necessary in order that the funds available would not be spread so thinly that the assistance would not accomplish the desired objective in any one area.

The depth and breadth of recovery effort is amazing and inspiring.

On May 1, 1962, the first anniversary of the Area Redevelopment Act, the President stated that "these first 12 months of operation have demonstrated conclusively that the economic weight of the Federal Government can be brought to bear to help communities help themselves in alleviating chronic unemployment. The progress that has been made is a result of community initiative, private investment, State action, and Federal assistance. This kind of joint action represents the genius of our free enterprise system."

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF UNEMPLOYED PARENTS

Another end-the-recession measure enacted in 1961 was the aid to dependent children's program. This legislation added a new section to title IV of the Social Security Act to make available, during the period beginning May 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1962, Federal grants to States wishing to extend their aid-to-dependent-children programs to include needy children—and relatives caring for them—of unemployed parents, on the same basis as Federal grants are available to needy children—and relatives caring for them—who have been deprived of parental support by the death, absence or incapacity of a parent. The bill included provisions designed to facilitate the employment of unemployed parents, or the retraining of such parents, if appropriate, and provisions to assure that aid is not provided when the parent has refused employment that it would be reasonable for him to accept.

The legislation was recommended by the President in 1961 as a part of his broad program to combat the then existing recession and to relieve resulting hardships.

Early in the first session the Congress passed three other acts intended to furnish prompt relief to workers out of employment in the recession.

The first major bill proposed by the new Democratic administration to deal with the recession was enacted as the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961. An act extending similar benefits to unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act supplemented the first measure. A third law authorized temporary grants to the States to finance inclusion of the dependent children of unemployed workers under the Federal-State public assistance program.

The President's statement on signing the temporary extended unemployment compensation bill contained, in brief form, a summary of the purposes and the effects of its provisions, quoted in part as follows:

> This program will immediately provide economic help for some 700,000 jobless workers and their families whose rights to receive regular unemployment insurance benefits under State law are exhausted. Within the next year it will provide benefit payments to an additional 2½ million workers who are expected to exhaust their benefits.
>
> This Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act will add almost $1 billion to the Nation's purchasing power in the next

> 15 months. These dollars will be hard-working dollars. They will be spent almost immediately—for food, for shelter, for the bare necessities. These dollars will flow into our stores, into our factories, onto our farms.
>
> This act is important, because it will provide much-needed help to over 3 million American workers and their families. It is important also because it will add hard-working dollars to the Nation's purchasing power. But important as it is, it is but a temporary measure to alleviate an immediate need. We must move forward with other and more permanent programs to invigorate our economy so that our free enterprise system can reach the level of production and employment which is its obligation and which its capacity and traditions promise.

The second measure authorized the Railroad Retirement Board to extend duration of benefits by 50 percent to workers who had exhausted normal benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. It was estimated that 60,000 or more workers would be eligible.

In both measures provision was made for repayment of Federal funds advanced to cover payment of benefits, by increasing temporarily the Federal unemployment taxes levied on employers.

The third act made families of unemployed workers with dependent children temporarily eligible for Federal public assistance payments. It was estimated that about 750,000 children and 250,000 adults received benefits during the 14-month duration of the program. Other provisions of the bill increased Federal payments for medical aid to public assistance recipients and for aid for children placed in foster homes.

MINIMUM WAGE LEGISLATION

The passage this session of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 represents one of our most significant actions in the field of domestic legislation. The 1961 amendments represent the third time the minimum wage has been raised since the original act was passed. Under the provisions of the act, the minimum wage of persons previously covered was raised from $1 an hour to $1.15 an hour during the first 2 years that the amendment went into effect and to $1.25 an hour thereafter. Persons not previously covered who now came under the act qualified for a slightly different wage scale—$1 an hour during the first 3 years after the amendment went into effect, $1.15 during the 4th year, and $1.25 an hour thereafter. The newly covered persons also qualified for overtime pay on a scale slightly different from that of those already covered.

Several new precedents were established by the 1961 legislation: In the first place, coverage under the law was expanded for the first time since 1938. An estimated 3,624,000 additional workers, most of them in the retail trades, came under the provisions of the law. The inclusion of retail and service workers for the first time was a second precedent. In general, all employees of retail or service enterprises that maintain one or more stores, have an overall gross annual sales volume of $1 million, and buy annually at least $250,000 worth of goods which have been moved in interstate commerce, come under the act.

The introduction of the dollar-volume-of-business test as a criterion was another feature wherein the new legislation differed from the previous law; also included was the concept of "established coverage," whereby all employees of a covered firm came under the law, regardless of whether or not they are personally engaged in activities classified as interstate commerce.

The new minimum wage legislation went into effect on September 3, 1961.

MANPOWER TRAINING

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is one of the Kennedy administration's principal programs for stimulating the U.S. economy, and firming up its foundations.

When the President signed the act, Public Law 87-415, on March 15, 1962, he stated:

> The legislation is perhaps the most significant legislation in the area of employment since the historic Employment Act of 1946. For this reason, I have acted at the earliest opportunity to sign this measure into law. The new training program will give real meaning to the act by making possible the training of the hundreds of thousands of workers who are denied employment because they do not possess the skills required by our constantly changing economy. Their training is important both to them as individuals and to the economic health of the entire Nation.
>
> I commend the Congress for the support it has given to this important proposal of the administration.
>
> This far-reaching bill not only addresses itself to the problems of the present, but requires us to anticipate future needs as employment conditions change.

The law provides that the manpower retraining program shall last 3 years through fiscal 1965, and authorizes $435 million for it.

The law empowers the Secretary of Labor to assess and report on the manpower needs of the Nation. The law also empowers the Secretary to test, counsel, and refer for suitable training all applicants—giving preference to unemployed persons, including members of farm families with incomes of less than $1,200 annually.

Moreover, the law empowers the Secretary to pay a training allowance to unemployed heads of families with at least 3 years of working experience and under limited conditions to youths 19 to 21 years old.

In addition, the law empowers the Secretary of Labor to promote on-the-job training programs, which would enable workers to upgrade their skills.

The Secretary is to contract with the States to provide vocational training for persons referred by the Department of Labor. The States are required to provide 50 percent of the costs of the program after the first 2 years.

It is estimated that the law will provide vocational training and on-the-job training for almost 1 million workers during its duration. It is expected that approximately 110,000 workers shall receive vocational training in fiscal 1963, approximately 160,000 in fiscal 1964, and—with matching funds from the States—320,000 in fiscal 1965. In addition, approximately 50,000 workers shall receive on-the-job training in fiscal 1963, about 100,000 in fiscal 1964, and 200,000 in fiscal 1965. Of the total, about 100,000 receiving training would be less than 21 years of age.

In the past, Congress has set up training programs for specific trades and fields, but no general retraining legislation has been enacted. Most of the appropriations for these programs are available to States and local communities on a matching basis for the partial reimbursement of teachers and others involved.

The Honorable Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated on October 6 of this year that the Federal Government expects to retrain 200,000 unemployed persons next year in skills for which there is a demand.

Secretary Celebrezze said that 100,000 out-of-work people were taught new skills last year under the Government's retraining program. He said the program is in line with his recently announced policy of stressing rehabilitation instead of relief for the unemployed.

PUBLIC WORKS

Another push for the U.S. economy is provided by the Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act of 1962—Public Law 87-568—which authorizes the President to allocate $900 million for public works projects in areas with heavy unemployment; and the act authorizes funds for this program.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], one of the chief sponsors of this legislation, said the act would "make a direct attack on high unemployment and provide a wide range of necessary Federal and local public works" in more than 1,000 areas in the Nation which had not recovered sufficiently from the 1960-61 recession.

The act authorizes the President to allocate $900 million to initiate or accelerate, in eligible areas, previously authorized Federal public works projects, or State, or local public works projects for which Federal aid has been previously authorized.

In addition, the act specifies that allocated funds are not to be used for the planning or construction, directly or indirectly, of schools, or other educational facilities.

Furthermore, the act made those areas eligible for the public works aid which are designated by the Secretary of Labor as areas of substantial unemployment during 9 of the preceding 12 months, at least, or designated by the Commerce Secretary as "redevelopment areas" under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The President is authorized under the act to allocate funds to the heads of Federal instrumentalities or agencies responsible for administering Federal projects, or Federal aid to State and local projects.

Also, the act made the allocated funds subject to requirements in the original project authorizing legislation, but the act exempts them from provisions limiting allocation of funds among States and limiting total grants committed over a specified period of time.

In addition, the act prohibits commitment to any one State of more than 10 percent of the total allocations made under the act.

Under the act, the Federal share of a project's cost is authorized to be at least 50 percent, and as much as 75 percent, if the State or local government is not economically or financially capable of raising 50 percent of the project funds.

The President is required by the act to prescribe rules and procedures to assure adequate consideration of the relative needs of eligible areas, including the severity and duration of unemployment and the extent of underemployment and income levels in the eligible areas.

The act also requires that projects aided must be capable of being initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short time, that the projects shall meet an essential public need, that they shall be completed substantially within a year, shall contribute significantly to reducing local unemployment, and shall not be inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans.

Finally, the act prohibits allocation of funds to local or State governments, unless their planned expenditures for capital improvement projects are increased by an amount approximately equal to the amount of non-Federal funds for the aided projects.

HANFORD POWERPLANT

The 87th Congress, 2d session, approved an authorization to construct the world's largest atomic electric-powerplant at Hanford, Wash. This was another Kennedy administration victory.

The plant is to be built by the Washington Public Power Supply System, a group of 16 utility districts in that State. No Federal funds are involved in the construction.

The powerplant authorization occurred in authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission for fiscal 1962 was appropriated $2,547,361,000, and for fiscal 1963 was appropriated $2,872,224,000. In addition, legislation was passed in both sessions to revise certain functions of the AEC.

HOUSING

Housing construction is another major economic stimulant. In addition, such construction has other benefits. For instance, the Housing Act of 1961 and certain other related housing legislation will exert a long-range effect on many classes of individuals, particularly those in the middle and lower income ranges, who are ineligible for public housing and who up until now have been unable to afford to buy their own homes. This is another illustration of legislation passed by the Democratic Party to strengthen the family life of millions of American families. On June 30, 1961, President Kennedy signed the most comprehensive Housing Act ever passed by Congress. The following is a brief sketch of the major provisions of the act.

Under new housing programs, five categories of mortgage loans were established that could be insured by the Federal Housing Administration. Limited-interest loans are made to commercial developers, for construction or rehabilitation of sales and rental housing for moderate-income families. Persons buying new homes costing up to $15,000 now have lower downpayments and longer terms—in some cases up to 40 years—in which to pay for their homes. Especially favorable financing arrangements are available to nonprofit organizations and public agencies for construction or rehabilitation of multiple-family rental dwellings—apartments—for moderate-income families. Funds are available on loans for improvement of existing dwellings, within urban renewal areas. Loans are also available on cooperative apartments where the units are individually owned.

The new legislation increased the 1959 authorization of a $50 million revolving loan fund to $125 million, to be used to make direct loans to nonprofit organizations for construction of housing for the elderly. It also authorized the Public Housing Administration to contract for an additional 100,000 public housing units.

An additional $2 billion in Federal capital grants for urban renewal projects was authorized with $25 million of this amount reserved for Federal grants to local agencies to apply toward the cost of mass-transportation demonstration projects, and $25 million for low-rate loans by the Small Business Administration to small businesses which are forced to vacate by urban-renewal projects or by other governmental actions.

One billion two hundred million dollars was added to the revolving fund for loans to colleges, universities, and hospitals for the construction of housing.

The community facilities loan fund for local water, gas, and sewage plant improvement was raised from $150 million to $650 million, with $50 million set aside for the construction of mass-transportation systems.

Under another title of the act a number of changes were made in the National Housing Act, including authorization to the Federal National Mortgage Association to borrow for its special assistance program an additional $750 million; expansion of the existing home improvement loan guarantee program; easement of terms for Federal Housing Administration home mortgage insurance by extending the maturity date of mortgages on new homes and lowering required downpayment; and others.

To help States and localities to acquire land in and around urban centers for recreational, conservation, scenic, and historic purposes, the act authorized $50 million in Federal grants.

And, finally, the farm housing program was extended for 4 years and the existing $207 million authorization was increased by $200 million.

From the above summary, which describes only the more significant aspects of the legislation, one can readily grasp the comprehensiveness of the Housing Act of 1961. It is certainly true as President Kennedy said, that the legislation "provides an opportunity for a giant step toward better cities and improved housing."

Any summary of action by Congress during the first session relating to housing would be incomplete without mention of the action taken to extend the time in which veterans may apply for guaranteed and direct home loans, and providing $1.2 billion over the next 6 years—from 1961—for direct home loans. The bill also increases the maximum amount available to an individual through direct loan from $13,500 to $15,000. Under the new law, a veteran will be eligible for a GI loan for 10 years from the date of his discharge, plus an additional year of eligibility for each 3 months of active wartime service. The new cutoff dates for World War II veterans will be from July 25, 1962, to July 25, 1967; for the Korean war veterans the new dates will be from January 31, 1965, to January 31, 1975.

SENIOR CITIZENS HOUSING ACT

The 87th Congress, in its 2d session, approved legislation authorizing a $200 million expansion of Federal programs to promote better housing for elderly people.

The measure authorizes a $100-million increase in the $125-million fund currently authorized for direct loans to older citizens for housing in nonrural areas. It also sets up a new program under the Farmers Home Administration to aid elderly persons living on farms.

The bill establishes a $50-million program of direct loans by the farm agency to older rural residents for new housing or home improvements. It also provides a $50-million program of loans to nonprofit corporations or cooperatives to finance moderate-cost rental housing for the elderly in rural areas.

MASS TRANSIT LOANS

During its 2d session, the 87th Congress approved legislation to extend through June 30, 1963, a provision of the community facilities section of the Housing Act of 1961 authorizing Federal loans for urban mass transportation improvement.

PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1962

On July 26, 1962, President Kennedy signed legislation to overhaul thoroughly the Federal administration of the public welfare program of the United States. When the President signed the bill, he made the following statement:

> I have approved a bill which makes possible the most far-reaching revision of our public welfare program since it was enacted in 1935.
>
> This measure embodies a new approach—stressing services in addition to support, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work instead of prolonged dependency. Our objective is to prevent or reduce dependency and to encourage self-care and self-support—to maintain family life where it is adequate and to restore it where it is deficient.

The law gave the President most of the welfare changes that he requested. The legislation liberalizes Federal assistance for the needy, aged, blind, and disabled; and, at the same time, it encourages certain welfare recipients to get off relief and on payrolls.

The law requires the Government to give the States $4.20 extra a month for every one of the 2,800,000 needy aged, blind, and disabled persons on State-administered relief rolls. This provision took effect on October 1. Under the new law, the Federal Government is to share in the first $70 a month in payments, The States would pay $6 of the first $35, and 35 to 55 percent of the next $35.

The State governments receiving such aid may choose one of three alternatives: pass the increased benefits on to the needy, pocket the savings, or spend the money on liberalizing medical care or other provisions of the welfare programs.

The total Federal cost of public assistance programs for 1962 is expected to run about $2,800 million. States and counties are expected to spend $2 billion for matching grants, administrative costs, and various other local relief programs.

An example of the law's self-help emphasis is the provision for day care centers. Such centers are to take care of the children of families on relief, so that the parents can work. The law authorizes $5 million of Federal child welfare funds in fiscal 1963, and $10 million for each fiscal year thereafter, for allotment among the States to build and operate day care facilities.

The law also allows welfare officials to withhold relief checks from able-bodied persons who refuse to work on community projects.

And the law permits welfare officials to withhold relief checks from parents who squander money. Payment could be made to a responsible third party who would provide children with their needs.

HEALTH LEGISLATION

In response to a special message of President Kennedy, the Congress enacted the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961. Assistance has been provided in three general areas—community health services, nursing homes, and hospital and other medical research and construction.

The question of the health of our people is of paramount interest to President Kennedy and the Congress. The action taken has covered a wide field including hospital and other medical research and construction, for increased Federal grants-in-aid to the States for construction of nursing homes, for increased annual authorization for community health services.

An excellent record was made in the first session in these important fields meaning so much to all of our people. Furthermore, the progress made in medical research will benefit all mankind due to our wise policy of making medical progress available to people everywhere, for illness, sickness, and disease are worldwide.

A second measure extended for 4 years the program of $5 million for grants and scholarships for training of practical nurses under the Vocational Education Act of 1946.

The appropriations for the major health programs of the Federal Government are contained in two acts—the Appropriation Act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1962, and the Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal 1962.

In the first act the appropriation for the Public Health Service totaled $1,240,052,000. Of this amount $738,335,000 was given to the National Institutes of Health—$155,335,000 more than the President had requested. Another large item—$203 million for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act—represented an increase of about $15 million over his request. Most of the remainder of the appropriation was allocated to the numerous programs of Federal grants-in-aid, administered by the Public Health Service.

In the second session, Congress appropriated $1,504,043,000 to the Public Health Service. From this, NIH received $880,800,000, and hospital construction received $226,220,000.

The Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal 1962 contained items totaling over $67 million, chiefly for grant-in-aid programs.

In the meantime, Congress increased support of community health services and facilities serving to furnish more assistance to the aged, pending decision on the legislation dealing specifically with the problem.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Several important changes which liberalized provisions of the Social Security Act were incorporated in a measure which became law on June 30, 1961. The bill was signed by the President "with great satisfaction."

The principal effect of the new law was to increase social security benefits for some 4 million elderly persons. Some of the major provisions, briefly summarized, are as follows:

First. Minimum benefits for retired workers under the Social Security Act were increased from the present $33 to $40 per month. It was estimated that this would affect approximately 2,175,000 persons of retirement age.

Second. Men will be permitted to retire at the age of 62, the present retirement age for women, at a lower rate than they would receive if they waited until age 65. In the first year, about 560,000 persons were expected to receive benefits amounting to $440 million under this provision.

Third. Widows and widowers of an insured worker will get 82½ percent of his—or her—retirement benefits, instead of the present 75 percent. At an estimated cost of $105 million in the first year this will benefit more than 1½ million persons.

TAX REVISION

A major accomplishment of the 87th Congress was the enactment of legislation to revise the Nation's Federal tax structure. This legislation provided for the first omnibus tax revision since 1954.

One of the most important features of the measure allows businesses to deduct from their income tax up to 7 percent of investments in certain types of new and used property.

The base for depreciation on a new investment must be reduced by the amount of the credit taken on it, under the new law. Such credit is applicable to investments made after December 31, 1961.

The law also requires that interest and dividend payments above $10 be reported annually to the recipient, and to the Government. Penalties up to $50,000 are provided for failure to make such reports.

The congressional conferees on the measure, in their report, requested the Treasury Department to make annual reports to the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees "on the improvement in the reporting on tax returns of dividends, interest, and patronage dividends."

Tax deductions for business expense accounts, under the new law, are stiffer than under the old. The new law, however, still permits deductions of entertainment expenses "associated with" the conduct of a trade or business. The new law is clearer than the old law about the requirement for such deductions being based on business meetings or discussions. Deductions for entertainment are to be prohibited unless detailed records are kept to substantiate outlays. Taxpayers may not claim deductions for taking business associates to night clubs or sport events, unless the entertainment preceded or followed bona fide business discussions.

Also, deductions for such facilities as yachts or hunting lodges will be disallowed unless the facility is used "primarily for the furtherance of the taxpayer's trade or business," and is "directly related" to active conduct of the business.

The law also requires taxpayers to substantiate, with records, expenses claimed as deductions. The law also limits deductions for travel and lodging expenses, and for business gifts above $25 for one person.

The entertainment provisions of the law are expected to raise about $105 million annually for the Treasury, according to congressional tax experts.

Among the highly complex provisions on taxation of foreign income that are in the new law, one part would subject to immediate U.S. taxation the income of most so-called tax-haven corporations. These corporations usually are established in countries with low tax rates in order to avoid payment of virtually all taxes. Such companies serve as sales outlets for products that are manufactured elsewhere by sister subsidiaries, and sold to them at nominal prices. As is true with other U.S. subsidiaries abroad, their earnings are not subject to U.S. taxation until they are returned to the U.S. parent corporations as dividends.

The foreign earnings provisions of the new law increase the taxes on many other income sources. One section limits to $35,000—$20,000 for the first 3 years—the amount of annual income an American citizen living abroad may exclude from U.S. taxation.

Another tax deduction provided by the new law permits tax deductions for lobbying activities before legislatures, if the expenses are otherwise "ordinary and necessary" business expenses, and are concerned with legislation of direct interest to the taxpayer claiming the deduction.

DISASTER TAX RELIEF

Congress March 21, 1962, sent to the President a measure, Public Law 87-426—signed March 31—permanently amending tax law to permit persons in disaster areas to deduct, from their tax returns, losses caused by natural disasters which occurred after December 31 of the tax year, but prior to the final filing date.

CORPORATE, EXCISE TAXES EXTENDED, TRAVEL TAX CUT

When Congress on June 28, 1962, enacted Public Law 87-508, most existing corporate and excise taxes were extended for a year, and transportation and certain communication excise taxes were reduced.

The law extends for 1 year, until July 1, 1963, the current 52-percent corporate income tax rates and the current rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, and general telephone service. This provision is expected to retain about $2.3 billion in Federal revenues in fiscal 1963.

In addition, the law repeals, effective November 15, 1962, the 10-percent tax on transportation of persons by railroad, bus, plane, and water. The law further extends from November 16 through June 30, 1963, the tax on travel by air, but at a reduced rate of 5 percent. These provisions are expected to cost the Government $27.5 million in revenues, for fiscal 1963, but should provide a needed stimulant to our transportation industries.

Also, the law exempts from the transportation tax, effective November 15, the portion of an international air trip that is made in the United States, provided that any scheduled stopover in this country is not more than 6 hours. A loss of $2.5 million in revenues is expected by the Government because of this provision.

And, the law exempted from the 10-percent general telephone tax, or the 10-percent wire mileage tax private lines, or leased wires which permit communication from one fixed location to another, if the lines are used in a trade or business.

The 87th Congress in 1962 also approved legislation giving transportation companies a longer time to apply losses against later earnings on their tax returns.

The new law applies to railroads, local bus and streetcar lines, interstate trucking and bus firms whose rates are subject to regulation, barge lines, and airlines.

Under it, the companies may carry forward losses for 7 years instead of 5 as provided by present law.

HEALTH POLICIES TAX DEDUCTION

Congress approved legislation in late September that would give a tax deduction to life insurance companies that write individual accident and health policies.

TAXATION

To help lessen the outflow of gold from the United States, a bill was signed on May 4, 1961, amending the Internal Revenue Code to exempt all foreign banks of issue from the U.S. tax on interest earned on investments in U.S. Government obligations unless the obligations are held for, or used in connection with, the conduct of commercial banking functions or other commercial activities.

Two other actions in the field of taxation might be mentioned. Public Law 87-17, approved April 7, 1961, expanded the scope of the study which was first authorized in 1959 by Public Law 86-272, concerning the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce, to include all matters pertaining to the taxation of interstate commerce by the States, territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Authority under this act is given to the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Committee on Finance who are making these studies.

Also passed is a measure which empowers the Internal Revenue Service to assign identifying numbers to all taxpayers. By the single expedient of providing a means by which individuals are identified regardless of discrepancies in address or spelling of names, tax evasion is made infinitely more difficult.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Through the enactment of Public Law 87-512, the public debt limit was increased from $300 billion to $308 billion from July 1, 1962, through March 31, 1963. The law set a ceiling of $305 billion from April 1 through June 24, 1963, and a ceiling of $300 billion from June 25 through June 30, 1963, when the debt would return to its permanent level of $285 billion.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The President in 1961 paid tribute to the diligent and conscientious work that was done by the Members of Congress in working out the resolution of the many problems which were embodied in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961. The task which Congress faced was the provision of funds needed to permit the completion of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System by a deadline of 1972. Authorized by the 1961 legislation was an additional $11.5 billion needed to complete the program after hearings on the tax features by the Ways and Means Committee. Provision was made in the legislation for raising approximately $9.6 billion in additional revenues by increasing taxes on various highway users, particularly the trucking industry, and on related rubber industries who manufacture tires and tubes, and so forth. In addition, the present Federal tax of 4 cents a gallon on gasoline which had been scheduled to revert to 3 cents a gallon on June 30, 1961, was continued. At the same time all of the 10 percent manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, buses, and trailers was diverted into the highway trust fund.

Under the interstate highway program, the Federal Government supplies 90 percent of the funds and the States supply the remaining 10 percent. The billboard bonus program, which allows the States an additional one-half of 1 percent reduction in its matching funds provided they agree to regulate billboard advertising within 660 feet of certain sections of the highway system, was extended for an additional 2 years, through June 30, 1963.

The legislation also provided an amount of $400 million to pay for an increase in Federal outlays for primary, secondary and urban roads, costs of which are shared equally by the Federal Government and the States.

President Kennedy said the program was beneficial because it "will increase our defense readiness, decrease the appalling highway accident toll, lower transportation costs, and stimulate economic development."

Another act that has been beneficial to the U.S. economy was the administration program for the development of public airports by making additional millions available over a 3-year period. Also beneficial is the 1962 river and harbors project, funded with $1,041,358,800.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM

President Kennedy gave the Federal water pollution control program a boost when he enacted into law, during the first session, legislation authorizing appropriations of $570 million through June 30, 1967, for Federal grants to help communities construct sewage treatment plants. The law also increased from $3 million to $5 million the annual Federal matching grants to States for the administration of such control programs, available through June 30, 1968.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

The Air Pollution Control Act—Public Law 87-761—was extended by the 87th Congress for 2 years, through June 30, 1966. Federal grants and assistance was authorized to provide such control.

In addition, the new law directs the Surgeon General to study the amounts and kinds of substances discharged from motor vehicle exhausts, and to determine how much may be safely discharged into the atmosphere.

Under the annual appropriation act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Congress provided $11,069,000 for all air pollution control activities in fiscal 1963.

The act was initiated in 1955—Public Law 84-159—when Congress authorized research, and technical and financial assistance to State, local, and private agencies interested in air pollution control.

President Kennedy, during his February 27 speech of this year, urged that the act be extended.

FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT

The 87th Congress enacted a conservation measure which has been pending for many years: the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. This project is a multiple-purpose plan to divert water from the Fryingpan River in the Colorado River basin across the Continental Divide to the Arkansas River basin. The project, when completed, is to provide supplemental irrigation water, flood control, electric power, municipal and industrial water to the Arkansas Valley in Colorado. President Kennedy in his conservation message of March 1, 1962, urged Congress to pass the legislation.

COLUMBIA BASIN IRRIGATION

Public Law 87-728 approves a "short form" repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District in eastern Washington.

In addition, the law lifts ceilings on Government spending for drainage and irrigation work within the district.

WETLANDS DRAINAGE

Public Law 87–732 is designed to protect wetland waterfowl refuges in the Dakotas, and in Minnesota, from drainage.

NAVAJO, SAN JUAN-CHAMA

Public Law 87–483 authorizes two water projects in New Mexico; the $135 million Navajo Indian irrigation project, and the $85.8 million initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project, which would carry water from the western to the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains.

BAKER RECLAMATION PROJECT

Congress on September 20 of this year approved legislation authorizing $6,168,000 to construct the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project in the Baker Valley, Oreg. The project is to furnish supplemental irrigation for 18,000 acres near the Powder River; and the project would include flood control, fish and wildlife conservation, and recreation facilities.

PARK AND MILITARY LAND BILLS

Various bills were enacted, authorizing sizable additions to the national park system, including a major accomplishment in this field of the creation of the Cape Cod National Seashore in Massachusetts, the Point Reyes National Seashore in northern California, and Padre Island National Seashore Park, off the Texas gulf coast. Also, several bills provided for military use of extensive land.

RECREATION IN WILDLIFE RESERVES

Public Law 87–714 authorized the establishment of public recreation facilities in fish and wildlife conservation areas maintained by the Department of the Interior.

POLL TAX CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The House on August 27, 1962, finished congressional action on a proposed constitutional amendment by passing it with a rollcall vote. The proposed amendment would bar the requirement of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries.

If the proposed amendment is ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years, it would become the 24th to the Constitution.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Congress in 1961 acted to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for another 2 years.

An appropriation of $888,000 for the activities of the Commission for fiscal 1962 was included in the bill. Congress in the second session appropriated $950,000 for the Commission, for fiscal 1963.

EDUCATION

IMPACTED AREA LEGISLATION AND NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Congress voted a 2-year extension of Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress—the impacted area programs—and of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Additional funds—$15,707,000—for fiscal 1962, for maintenance and operation of schools under the impacted areas program, were provided in Public Law 87–545 on July 25 of this year. The 1962 appropriations law—Public Law 87–582—for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also provides $22,799,000 of Federal funds to impacted school areas.

COLLEGE FACILITIES

Title IV of the Housing Act of 1961 provided for an annual increase in the loan authorization for college housing facilities of $30 million for the years 1961 through 1964. While most of these funds have been used for the construction of college dormitories, some also have been spent for dining halls, cafeterias, student centers, and so forth. Loans for construction of housing facilities for interns and student nurses have also been available.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Public Law 87–447 was enacted May 1, 1962, authorizing $32 million over a 5-year period for Federal matching grants to help develop and construct educational television facilities.

Upon the law's enactment, the President said:

> In spite of the vigorous efforts of many States and communities, 215 of the television channels reserved for education 9 years ago remain unused. At a time when the wide availability of quality education is vital to our national growth and security, we must make effective use of all of our educational resources.

The Educational Television Act of 1962 authorizes $32 million to be appropriated over a 5-year period, beginning in fiscal 1963, for matching grants to the States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, up to a limit of $1 million per State, for the acquisition and installation of transmission equipment for educational television facilities.

RESEARCH CONTRACT COSTS

Public Law 87–638 was enacted in 1962 to reform administrative functions of educational institutions receiving certain Government contracts and grants. The new law is to simplify such institutions' administration of cost-type research as well as development contracts. In addition, the law is to facilitate the institutions' budget preparations, and to stimulate more efficient examinations of such contracts when they have run out.

SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Congress in late 1962 passed legislation to revise the State allotment formula of the National School Lunch Act of 1946. The revision would apportion the cash assistance funds to the States on the basis of the number of children actually participating in the school lunch program, rather than on the school-age population of a State, as was provided in the original act.

SPACE PROGRESS

On September 12, President Kennedy, delivering a space policy speech at Houston, Tex., during a 2-day tour of U.S. space facilities, emphasized America's space achievements and promised further efforts in a peaceful space race to the moon. The President denied that his administration was ignoring the military possibilities of space at the peril of the Nation.

The President said:

> I do not say that we should or will go unprotected against the hostile misuse of space any more than we go unprotected against the hostile use of land or sea, but I do say that space can be explored and mastered without feeding the fires of war.

On the cost of space exploration, the President said the fiscal 1963 space budget was $5.4 billion, "a staggering sum, though somewhat less than we spend for cigarettes and cigars every year."

The total includes $3.7 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the civilian space agency with headquarters in Houston, and more than $1.5 billion for military space programs.

U.S. space achievements have been considerable. The President noted in his Houston speech that the United States had made 40 of the 45 satellites which had been in orbit during the previous 19 months. Our satellites are far more sophisticated and have supplied far more knowledge to the people of the world than have those of the Soviet Union, the President added.

An additional benefit of the Nation's space effort are the many new companies and jobs which are being created. Space and related industries are generating new demands in investment and skilled personnel.

On August 27—the day after the 447-pound instrument-packed American satellite, Mariner II started toward the planet Venus through the vast emptiness of space—the House gave final approval to the Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

On August 31, when President Kennedy signed into law the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, he called the occasion of historic importance. He said that the joint business-Government enterprise, to finance the world's first communications satellite, was a project in which "the vigor of our competitive free enterprise system will be effectively used in a challenging new activity on the frontier of space."

The legislation accomplished two things: It provided for the establishment of a private corporation to set up, operate, and own a commercial communications satellite system; and it dramatized the Kennedy administration's high regard for American business.

Under the law, a profitmaking corporation is to be established. The corporation's board of directors are to represent the Government, the communications companies, and the public; this distribution is to insure that the three interests may equally set the corporation's policy. The Federal Communications Commission shall set rates for the use of the satellite's facilities. Up to 50 percent of the stock, selling at about $100 a share initially, is to be reserved for the communications companies, and the rest allotted to private investors.

SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Early in 1961 the President made recommendations for a comprehensive space program to enable our country to be the leader in all aspects of stellar technology.

The Congress in recent years established the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA.

The Congress has strengthened the original act by amendments and cooperated by making adequate appropriations. The importance of the success of NASA, and keeping our country in the forefront cannot be overemphasized. The President and Congress recognize this fact.

The President recommended the authorization for 1961 of $1,784,300,000 for NASA for fiscal year 1962, which the Congress has passed. NASA was appropriated $3.7 billion for fiscal 1963.

In addition, Congress enacted a bill amending the existing law revising the organizational setup of the NASA and the Space Council, and providing for the Vice President to preside as Chairman of the Space Council.

OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

At the end of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, legislation was enacted to encourage development of a long-range national oceanographic program. Responsibility for developing the program belongs, under the law, to the Office of Science and Technology, in the Executive Office of the President.

SALINE WATER RESEARCH

A bill providing for a sharp increase of the saline water research program was approved in 1961 by Congress.

During the past few years, expenditures for this important work have been running at the rate of less than $2 million a year. Under the expanded program authorized for the next 6 years, this amount can be increased by at least fivefold. The results of this research activity will be of great importance to our people, but more broadly, if we are successful first, in making salt water economically feasible by giving mankind everywhere such results and benefits, we could greatly improve our international situation. For the shortage of water for human consumption and for agricultural uses, which problem is rapidly growing, is a matter of deep concern throughout the world.

NEW ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Upon the enactment of Public Law 87–405 on February 16, 1962, a fourth Assistant Secretary of Commerce was authorized, with responsibility for the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Patent Office, and staff responsibilities for research and development activities pursued by the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Maritime Administration.

AGRICULTURE

One of the challenges that confronted the Kennedy administration when it assumed office in January 1961 was straightening out the mess in the Department of Agriculture left by the previous administration. In this endeavor, the administration and Congress have had a great measure of success.

Immediately after Congress came into its first session, it was necessary to take up the feed grains problem, because the time was not far off when crops must be planted. The enormous surplus of wheat and feed grain, it was feared, would be increased if the 1961 crops were not reduced in some way. Oversupply and low prices were depressing the agricultural industry and taxpayers were having to pay for holding nearly $4 billion of grains.

Without going into the details of the Feed Grain Act, signed into law on March 22, 1961, its provisions and purposes may be briefly stated. A 1-year emergency program provided specific incentives for farmers to reduce their production of feed grain, making the law of supply and demand work for the farmers. A voluntary cut in acreage and crops of feed grains was provided, with increased price-support payments to participants in the program for certain crops. Farmers responded enthusiastically and feed grains production for 1961 was brought to a reasonable rate. It is estimated that about $750 million, in 1961, was added to the 1960 income of producers of corn, grain sorghum, oats, barley, and soybeans.

Even a brief summary of the Agricultural Act of 1961 would be too lengthy for inclusion in the present report. Title I, dealing with supply adjustment and price stabilization, permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to consult with farmers and farm commodity organizations in developing agricultural programs. Producers were permitted to retire up to 40 percent of wheat allotments, 10 percent mandatory and 30 percent voluntary, or 10 acres, whichever is greater.

The act established payments under the wheat control program at 45 percent for the mandatory reduction and 60 percent for the voluntary reduction. The 1962 feed grains program is defined in title I; the regional marketing order authority is extended to all agricultural commodities not specifically excluded; and the National Wool Act is extended from March 31, 1962, to March 31, 1966. Title II extended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 from December 31, 1961, to December 31, 1964, with increased authorizations and other implementing provisions. Title III contained the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961. Title IV extended to December 31, 1971, the final date for entering into contracts under the Great Plains conservation program; extended the school milk programs through June 30, 1967; and extended the Veterans and Armed Forces dairy programs through December 31, 1964.

The act, which was finally passed and signed by the President on August 8, 1961, was described by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, as "the most important piece of legislation, in the interest of farmers, to be enacted in a decade."

The agricultural appropriation law for fiscal 1962 contained items totaling nearly $6 billion—almost $2 billion more than the funds for 1961.

The increase was largely due to the foreign assistance programs which, for the first time, were put on a pay-as-you-go basis by appropriation of funds for the current year. Previously the Commodity Credit Corporation had been merely reimbursed for the cost of farm surpluses disposed of abroad under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for related foreign programs.

During the second session, the far-reaching Agriculture Act of 1962 was enacted.

One significant provision of the farm bill enables the administration to start a 10-year pilot program to convert idle farmland to recreation, wildlife and other conservation uses. Farmers and State and local agencies will be aided in cost-sharing programs to establish hunting, fishing, boating, and other outdoor leisure areas and in the redevelopment of blighted rural areas where unemployment may be high.

Another provision permits the Government to sell surpluses on long-term credit to private traders for dollar sales overseas. Formerly, the law limited such sales to foreign governments for foreign currencies. The law also permits private welfare agencies to use surplus food stocks for school lunch programs overseas.

Of greater importance than the subsidy programs for 1963 are the wheat and feed grain plans in the measure for 1964. Wheat is to come under a certificate system and tighter controls in 1964 if the plan is approved by a two-thirds vote of farmers in a national referendum.

Corn and other feed grains will, in effect, be turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture to support at a level that he believes will not add to the surplus. He could set the support price between 50 and 90 percent of parity, a formula designed to give farmers a fair price for their products in relation to their cost of production.

That a major effort will be made in 1963 to amend the permanent provisions of the act relating to feed grains is now a foregone conclusion. For wheat and feed grains, a temporary program for 1963 was set up. The feed grains program covering corn, barley, and grain sorghums will work this way:

Producers can participate voluntarily by reducing their 1959–60 base acreage by a minimum of 20 percent and a maximum of 50 percent. This reduction will make them eligible for price supports at $1.20 a bushel for corn. The supports on other feed grains are set in relation to corn.

A similar program will be in effect for wheat next year. Cooperating farmers will get 18 cents a bushel to make up the difference between a support price of $1.82 a bushel and the current price of $2 a bushel. They will also receive payments for making land idle.

In 1964, however, the wheat program is to shift to a stricter control plan. The present national planting allotment of 55 million acres is to be abandoned and the Secretary of Agriculture is to set the number of acres needed to produce the total requirement for wheat. Producers are to be paid for the acres they are required to divert from production for 2 years. The 15-acre exemption was eliminated from the permanent law but was extended to the 1963 crop by an amendment passed shortly before the end of the session.

Farmers will also be issued certificates for that portion of their crop that would normally be marked for domestic consumption and for export. These certificates will be worth about 60 cents a bushel, the difference between a support price of $1.40 a bushel and the present $2 a bushel.

All other wheat for seed and livestock feed will be supported at $1.40 a bushel. The certificates will be negotiable and millers and other processors will be required to have them for all wheat used for food or sent overseas.

Agricultural appropriations for fiscal 1963 amounted to $5,487,029,500.

In addition to the laws just discussed, Congress passed many others affecting agriculture. Only the Sugar Act can be listed because of the space limitations of this report.

SUGAR ACT

The world's largest importer of sugar is the United States. U.S. sugar consumption in 1961 was 9.7 million tons, of which 4.3 million were imported. The imports have been governed under a quota for importers, set by the 1934 Sugar Act, and have been divided annually among foreign nations.

In 1960, the U.S. sugar-purchasing program was altered drastically by President Eisenhower's decision to cut off purchases of Cuban sugar, which had totaled more than two-thirds of the whole U.S. import quota. Other Latin American countries requested increased shares, and they received them on a temporary basis pending congressional action on new sugar legislation.

The new law, as enacted—Public Law 87–535—retained the quota and premium systems, but cut the import quota and provided for gradual scaling down of the premiums.

Specifically, the law provided for an increase, from 55 to 60 percent, of the sugar market for domestic producers. And, it provided an import quota of 1,205,000 tons for 27 countries, plus a special allocation for the Philippines in accordance with a treaty.

Also, the law provides a reserve of 1,635,000 tons for Cuba, should it be freed from Communist rule, with the same amount to be bought elsewhere at the world price in the interim.

In addition, the law reduced by 10 percent, annually, premium payments, pending congressional review in 1964.

Congressional action on sugar legislation was completed on July 15 when the House passed and sent to the President certain amendments to the Sugar Act. The amendments—signed into Public Law 87–539—permit the President to boost by 150,000 tons the annual U.S. sugar purchases from the Western Hemisphere.

When the President signed the amendments into law on July 21, 1962, he also issued an Executive order allocating the extra quotas to the Dominican Republic and Argentina, raising the former country's sugar marketing quota to 320,000 tons, and establishing for the latter country a quota of 20,000 tons.

DU PONT STOCK DIVESTITURE

In 1962 Congress approved legislation providing tax relief to individual Du Pont Co. stockholders who received distributions of General Motors stock as a result of a 1961 Supreme Court order. The order required Du Pont to divest itself of its 63 million shares of GM stock within 10 years. The legislation became Public Law 87–403 on February 2, 1962.

RENEGOTIATION ACT

The Renegotiation Act of 1951 was extended for 2 years, from June 30, 1962, to June 30, 1964, under legislation passed by the 87th Congress, 2d session. The act, Public Law 87–520, prescribes a method by which the Government may regain "excessive profits" charged by private firms on defense contracts and related subcontracts with certain specified departments.

DRUG LAW

A significant achievement of the 87th Congress was the enactment of the Drug Amendments Act of 1962. This law authorizes thorough Federal inspection for factories producing prescription drugs.

Drugs must be produced under good manufacturing practices, must be safe, and must meet the quality and purity characteristics claimed for them, according to the new law.

New drugs cannot be marketed until specific approval is granted by the Food and Drug Administration, and a manufacturer must show substantial evidence that a new drug will have the effect claimed for it.

The Government may withdraw from the market any drug believed to present an imminent hazard to the public.

Government controls over the manufacture of certain antibiotics are extended to all of them.

SUPPLEMENTAL AIRLINES

The Civil Aeronautics Board now has permanent authority to license and regulate supplemental—nonscheduled—airlines, because of the enactment of Public Law 87–528.

The law authorizes the CAB to license supplemental carriers to engage in charter services.

ANTITRUST DOCUMENTS

On September 7, 1962, Congress approved legislation to compel certain businesses to release to the Justice Department corporate records for use in civil antitrust investigations. The law permits documents to be obtained only from companies under investigation, and limits their use to the Justice Department.

SAVINGS AND LOAN FIRMS' APARTMENT HOUSE LOANS

Congress on September 30, 1962, approved legislation that would permit federally insured savings and loan associations to invest more of their assets in apartment buildings.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

In 1961, Congress enacted legislation authorizing the Export-Import Bank to guarantee, insure, coinsure, and reinsure political and credit risks arising in connection with U.S. exports. Such legislation is important for placing American exports on an equal basis with foreign competitors.

NATIONAL BANKS

The 87th Congress, 2d session, approved legislation to allow national banks and certain other federally supervised banks to form corporations to perform clerical, bookkeeping, and data-processing services.

TEXTILE IMPORTS

Through the enactment of Public Law 87–488, the President's authority to regulate imports of textiles and agricultural products was extended.

ALL-CHANNEL TV SET BILL

This law is designed to make television more competitive by encouraging growth of the number of commercial and educational television stations.

The legislation authorizes the Commission to require television set manufacturers to equip sets to receive the 70 ultra high frequency (UHF) channels in addition to the 12 very high frequency channels that most sets now pick up.

President Kennedy recommended the legislation during his March 15, 1962, message to Congress, discussing protection of U.S. consumers' interests.

RETIRED OFFICERS SALESMANSHIP PROHIBITION

Congress and the President enacted into public law legislation which amends conflict-of-interest laws concerning retired military officers. The new amendment provides, among other things, a uniform penalty of loss of retirement pay for retired Regular officers of the military services, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service, if they engage in selling to, or contracting with, any agency of the Defense Department, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, within 3 years after the date of retirement.

SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

To minimize ill effects that may occur from the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, Congress in 1962 enacted Public Law 87–550 to empower the Small Business Administration to aid small business firms injured by imports allowed by the Trade Act. And, Congress increased the total SBA revolving fund authorization from $1,200 million to $1,666 million.

The new small business law, among other things, limits the maximum amount outstanding at any one time for regular business, prime contract, and disaster loans to $1,325 million, and for Small Business Investment Corporation programs under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to $341 million.

Because the funds for the Small Business Administration's loan program were exhausted at the end of August 1961, Congress appropriated an additional $20 million as a stopgap measure—Public Law 87–198—pending passage of bills providing funds and containing amendments to the Small Business Investment Act.

Public Law 87–305 contained authorization for $725 million to be used for loans to small business—an increase of $105 million over the current amount. This covers both the prime contract revolving fund and the business loan fund.

A second important act incorporates several major changes in the Small Business Investment Act, which gives tax shelter to companies established to aid small business.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1962

On March 20, 1962, upon signing into Public Law 87-420, the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1962, President Kennedy said:

> [The provisions of the act corrected] serious deficiencies in the basic legislation and represent a major advance in our effort to protect the economic security of our labor force.
>
> Now the act will give the more than 44 million workers covered by welfare and pension plans greater assurance of accurate and full disclosures of plan operations. The reports required will now parallel those required in connection with the handling of the funds of labor unions.
>
> At the present time, employee assets in our Nation's welfare and pension programs total nearly $60 billion; by 1970, they will total $90 billion. I believe that the men and women who are the beneficiaries of these programs have a right to expect that these vast sums of money—representing their future welfare—are protected by our laws.

The legislation that the President signed strengthens the enforcement provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958.

The new legislation, in part, authorizes the Secretary of Labor to conduct investigations where he has reasonable cause to believe that investigation might disclose violations of the act, provided that, in the case of annual financial reports, he first requires their certification by a certified public accountant.

OTHER LABOR LEGISLATION

WORK HOURS ACT

On August 13, 1962, the Work Hours Act of 1962 was signed into law by the President. The act established standards for working hours and overtime pay for laborers and mechanics employed on projects done under Federal contract or with Federal aid.

The law provides for a 40-hour work week, with not less than time and one-half for overtime work thereafter. The preceding legislation had permitted up to a 45-hour work week before providing overtime compensation.

The new law replaces, with a single statute, a series of 8-hour day laws, enacted between 1892 and 1940, which prescribed a standard 8-hour day for employees of Government contractors or subcontractors.

The new law applies to the following Federal legislation: Federal-Aid Highway Acts; Housing Acts; Hospital Survey and Construction Act; Federal Airport Act; School Survey and Construction Act of 1950—aiding impacted area schools—Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act of 1951; Water Pollution Control Act; Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; and the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961.

MIGRATORY LABOR

President Kennedy on September 26, 1962, enacted a measure that authorizes a 3-year program of Federal grants up to $3 million annually to help establish clinics and other health projects for this group.

The funds will be used to stimulate State and local health agencies in areas seriously affected by the seasonal impact of migratory workers.

PENSIONS FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

On September 28, 1962, Congress approved legislation to permit professional and self-employed persons to lay aside each year for their retirement 10 percent of their earned income, or $2,500, whichever is smaller, and receive deductions from their tax liability for doing so.

Fifty cents of every dollar put into such a pension plan would be tax deductible up to a maximum of $1,250 a year. An owner-employee could participate by providing pension plans for anyone in his employ for 3 years. His contribution to his employees' pension also would be tax deductible.

VETERANS' DISABILITY INCREASES

Veterans with service-connected disabilities received an increase in their compensation payments under Public Law 87-645, signed by the President on September 7 of this year.

President Kennedy, in his January 18, 1962, budget message, asked for disability payments to be increased by approximately $65 million; the current law is estimated to increase such payments by a little over $98 million.

The law is designed to reflect increases in the cost of living since the last compensation increase in 1957, and to more adequately compensate the most seriously disabled. Those who have sacrificed part of themselves for our Nation's security well deserve the benefits of this law.

VA SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATIONS

The President on February 13, 1962, approved Public Law 87-404, which provided supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, for fiscal 1962. The law appropriated $55 million for readjustment payments to Korean war veterans attending school under the GI bill of rights. And the law transferred $115,247,000 from funds set aside for direct home loans to veterans, and made the sum available for the VA loan guaranty revolving fund.

Among veterans' legislation enacted in 1961 are:

First. A bill to extend the veterans guaranteed and direct home loan program and to provide additional funds for the veterans' direct loan program.

This act extends expiration dates for the home loan programs for World War II and Korean veterans.

Second. A bill relating to special insurance dividends for certain veterans of the Korean conflict.

This act provides for the immediate payment of dividends on insurance heretofore issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, which has been converted or exchanged for new insurance under such section.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

On August 20, 1962, President Kennedy signed into law Public Law 87-592, legislation to reform the Securities and Exchange Commission. The purpose of the reform was to speed up the Commission's handling of major cases.

The law, among other things, authorized the SEC to delegate authority for making decisions on quasi-judicial and certain specific rulemaking actions to a panel of commissioners, an individual Commissioner, a hearing examiner, or an employee board. The law, however, prohibited the Commission from delegating any of its general rulemaking powers.

The 87th Congress enacted much other legislation to reform and revise the procedures of the regulatory commissions. Unfortunately, space limitations preclude their description in this report.

THE JUDICIARY

The prompt administration of justice by our courts, as well as effective law enforcement to protect law-abiding citizens, and to detect and prosecute crimes of all kind, particularly organized crime, with adequate laws to enable enforcement, is a matter of primary importance. The President and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy are to be highly complimented for their leadership and affirmative activity in these fields.

The following measure was enacted into law:

A bill providing for 73 additional district and circuit judges.

This act, one of major importance, will assure decongestion of the Federal court calendar, for justice delayed is justice denied.

CRIME LAWS

In response to recommendations by Attorney General Kennedy for legislation to combat organized crime and racketeering, and to meet criminal acts in other directions, legislation was enacted:

First. To prohibit travel or transportation in commerce in aid of racketeering enterprises.

Second. A bill with respect to the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information.

Third. A bill to provide means for the Federal Government to combat interstate crime and to assist the States in the enforcement of their criminal laws by prohibiting the interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia.

Fourth. Extending the Fugitive Felon Act.

Fifth. A bill to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communications facilities.

Sixth. A bill amending the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.

Seventh. A bill to prohibit the counterfeiting of State obligations in certain cases.

Eighth. A bill to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18 relating to espionage and censorship.

Ninth. A bill supplementing existing criminal laws providing a more effective deterrent to willful destruction and damage of property moving in interstate or foreign commerce.

SMITH ACT AMENDMENT

Public Law 87-486, approved June 19, 1962, redefines the term "organize" as used in the 1940 Smith Act, which outlawed conspiracy to overthrow the U.S. Government. The new law added a new paragraph to the act, defining the prohibition against organizing a group advocating forcible overthrow of the Government as applying not only to the initial act of bringing the group into being, but also to continuing organizational activities, such as recruiting new members or conducting classes.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Congress in the first session, passed legislation to extend to June 1, 1963, the powers of the President to submit reorganization plans.

RYUKYU ISLANDS

Congress authorized $12 million annually to promote economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. Previously, the authorization had been $6 million annually. This was one of a number of laws that Congress passed affecting areas administered by the United States, but not the States.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST LAW

The 87th Congress, near the end of its 2d session, passed legislation to make major revisions in Federal Government conflict-of-interest laws.

It is the first important attempt to make uniform and bring up to date the century-old patchwork of legislation aimed at preventing present and former Government employees from improperly mixing private interest with their public office.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE

Legislation providing for an increase in postal rates was approved in the last part of the 2d session, 87th Congress. The following lists some of the rates that have been raised, in order to reduce the postal deficit:

A 1-cent increase per ounce on first-class letters, from 4 to 5 cents; post cards, from 3 to 4 cents; airmail letters, from 7 to 8 cents, and airmail cards, from 5 to 6 cents, all effective next January 7.

In second-class mail, magazines and newspapers, the 90-year-old free in-county mailings of small county newspapers would be eliminated. The rate on them would be 1 cent a pound and one-eighth of 1 cent minimum charge per piece in 1963 and 1964, and it would rise to 1¼ cents a pound and continuation of the one-eighth of 1-cent minimum during the 1965 calendar year.

FEDERAL PAY RAISE

President Kennedy approved in 1962 legislation to raise the salaries of employees of the Federal Government, and to adjust the Federal pay scale to make Federal salaries and those in private industry generally comparable, wherever possible.

An average pay raise of about 10 percent will be given the more than 1.6 million non-wage-board employees, to be effective in two stages: the first at the start of the first pay period after enactment into law, and January 1, 1964.

The million classified workers in the Federal and District Governments would get average annual increases of $342 and $261, or 5.5 and 4.1 percent over the two steps. The 590,000 postal workers would get average raises of $446 and $138, or 8.6 and 2.6 percent.

Other Federal employees affected by the new pay act will receive pay increases roughly equivalent to the above figures.

FEDERAL PENSION INCREASE

Congress and the Kennedy administration approved legislation in 1962 to provide a 5-percent increase, effective January 1, 1963, for 630,000 retirees and survivors. In addition, the law provides, among other things, an automatic increase in benefits of 3 percent when living costs rise by that amount.

In addition, more legislation enacted of interest to Federal employees is:

First, a bill relating to interest earning of Treasury issues held by the civil service retirement and disability fund.

This act is important in that it will strengthen the financial integrity of the retirement and disability fund, and as a result of a new civil service formula the interest rate currently will be at least 1 percent in excess of the interest rate provided under the old formula.

Second, 1961 legislation providing for increase in top grade positions under the Classification Act of 1949, and research and development positions of scientists and engineers.

This legislation has been under consideration for several years, and is a marked contribution toward efficiency in the agencies covered by this law.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

With reference to the District of Columbia, the most important piece of legislation which the current Congress passed was legislation which set up the election machinery for the District in preparation for the presidential elections of 1964. On March 29, 1961, the 23d amendment was ratified by the required three-quarters of the States. This amendment gives to the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for presidential and vice presidential candidates in national elections, a right they have not had since the District was created at the beginning of the 19th century.

To carry on the important activities of the various departments and offices of the District of Columbia government in the fiscal year 1962, Congress this year approved appropriations totaling $270,067,897. Federal payments to the District totaling $32,753,000 and loan authorizations totaling $29 million were also approved. For fiscal 1963, the District received a total appropriation of $288,986,350; the Federal payment was $33,199,000.

The action of Congress in the 1961 session to transfer from the Federal Government ownership and administration of Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, D.C., to Howard University, and to authorize appropriations for the construction of a new hospital to replace the totally inadequate and antiquated present establishment, will meet with general approval.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUVENILE COURT

Appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia was authorized when Public Law 87-413 was enacted on March 9, 1962. Previously, the court had one judge.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

The 87th Congress granted congressional consent to the creation of a Delaware River and Bay Authority by New Jersey and Delaware, and other interstate compacts.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is evident that the total impact of the legislation approved by the 87th Congress is a vindication of a system of government well adapted to the needs of a great country and a diverse people. Our far-reaching record is ample evidence that this Congress was in constant and continuous contact with the entire people of this Nation.

We labored long and hard. We wrote a record which will stand as an outstanding tribute to the effectiveness of the democratic system and as a monument to the constructive forces which only freedom can muster.

Congressman John D. Dingell Reports to the People of the 15th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am making, at this time, my seventh annual report to the people of my district on my stewardship on their behalf in the Congress. I have filed such a report at the end of each session of Congress in which I have served.

During this session I have continued my service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I have achieved significant seniority on both of these committees and serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the latter committee, which is responsible for $123 million in research into the oceans of the world.

I maintain two offices to serve my constituents, one in Washington, D.C., and one in Detroit at 7310 Grand River, where I will again be available during the fall to meet with my constituents to discuss their problems.

I have appeared before appropriate committees on behalf of legislation to provide equality of opportunity to all our people and to liberalize social security and have devoted much time to study and sponsorship of changes in this system to offer more real protection to all our people.

I worked hard on behalf of enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation, and am happy that I helped secure passage of a measure of which I was the first sponsor in this Congress, House Joint Resolution 3, a constitutional amendment outlawing the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting.

I was a leader in the fight for the strong drug-control legislation reported by my committee and enacted by the Congress. I am particularly proud of defeating weakening amendments to the administration's drug bill, and of leading the floor fight to remove one very bad provision, inserted in committee over my objection, which would have permitted nondisclosure or false and misleading advertisements to physicians and others regarding dangerous side effects of drugs.

I have opposed price-fixing legislation which would have raised consumer prices by $12 billion per year for the consumers of this country.

I devoted a great deal of time and energy to securing enactment of President Kennedy's program for hospitalization for the aged within the framework of the social security system, one of the Nation's greatest unmet social needs, of which legislation I was one of the earliest sponsors in Congress.

I. LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL WHICH BECAME LAW DURING THE 87TH CONGRESS

I was author and sponsor of 11 measures which were enacted by this Congress among which are:

House Joint Resolution 3: A constitutional amendment outlawing the poll tax as a condition for voting in Federal elections.

H.R. 4038: The Blatnik-Dingell Water Pollution Control Act of 1961, providing stricter sanctions against polluters of our Nation's waters and increasing Federal grants for water pollution abatement works. This bill, endorsed by all conservation, municipal and public health groups, will result in real progress in cleaning up our water pollution problems, and is at this moment being used to clean up pollution in the Detroit River.

H.R. 3874: Providing for reduction of retirement age for men under social security from 65 to 62.

H.R. 7404: Opening over a million acres of wildlife refuges to public recreation under controlled conditions.

H.R. 12601: For the first time establishing a program for coordination of the $123 million in oceanographic research expended by the Federal Government.

H.R. 6471: Requiring drug advertisements to give truthful statements of side effects, contraindications, and the generic names as provided in the strong drug control bill just enacted, as a result of the fight which I led on the House floor.

I joined in sponsorship of the Area Redevelopment Act, the Manpower Retraining Act, and the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act, and had the great pleasure of helping to bring to a successful conclusion my 6-year fight for a $1.25 minimum wage with enactment of legislation similar to my bill, H.R. 2412. The $900 million emergency Public Works Act passed by this Congress is legislation similar to that which I have cosponsored in several Congresses.

Other pieces of legislation which I cosponsored are the provisions raising the minimum primary benefits under social security from $33 to $40 per month, including increased widows' benefits, and covering the children of unemployed under the aid-to-dependent children program.

II. OTHER LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY HON. JOHN D. DINGELL DURING THE 87TH CONGRESS

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

H.R. 4084: To establish Federal standards for unemployment compensation to guarantee benefits equal to not less than 50 percent of the worker's weekly wage, but not more than two-thirds of the average weekly wage prevailing in the State for a minimum of 39 weeks. Had this bill been enacted the average unemployed Michigan worker would have gotten an additional $19 per week for the period he may now draw unemployment compensation, plus an additional 13 weeks compensation at the rate of $49 per week. The American economy would have benefited by $1.3 billion in additional purchasing power.

H.R. 6715: A bill to establish a self-liquidating fund to protect unemployed workers in areas of substantial unemployment from foreclosure of VA and FHA insured mortgages for a period of 1 year while unemployed and for 30 days after their reemployment.

CIVIL RIGHTS

H.R. 2413: A bill to make it an unfair labor practice to discriminate in hiring on account of age. This would solve one of the greatest problems of the middle aged in securing employment.

H.R. 101: This bill, the first civil rights legislation introduced in this Congress, is an omnibus proposal to outlaw discrimination in voting, housing, transportation, and employment, and to create a strong Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission to guarantee equality of opportunity in employment.

H.R. 102: A bill to authorize the Attorney General of the United States to file civil actions for injunctions on behalf of citizens whose civil rights are threatened or denied.

H.R. 103: A strong antilynching measure to protect minority groups from racially inspired violence.

H.R. 104: A bill to establish a strong Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission to guarantee equality of opportunity in employment to all.

NATIONAL CONTRIBUTORY HEALTH INSURANCE

H.R. 4413: A bill to establish a national program of contributory health insurance and make adequate medical care available to all on a prepaid basis. Ample provision is made for freedom of choice by doctor and patient.

SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 4602: A bill to liberalize the definition of permanent and total disability under the social security program to permit those who are so disabled as to be incapable of continuing work in their regular employment to receive benefits without waiting until the age of 62. This bill would ease the heartbreaking plight of many now, in fact, disabled but denied benefits by the unduly harsh interpretation of the present disability sections of the act.

H.R. 5401: A bill to reduce the retirement age for men to 60 and to 55 for women, and eliminate reduction of benefits because of early retirement.

H.R. 5891: A bill to continue payment of survivor and other benefits to children attending school from the present age of 18 to 21.

H.R. 4309: This is President Kennedy's program which I sponsored with many colleagues for hospitalization of the aged within the framework of social security, providing hospitalization, outpatient, and skilled nursing home care for all recipients of social security retirement benefits. This measure was defeated in the Senate and in the House Ways and Means Committee by a coalition of reactionary Republicans and southern Democrats aided and abetted by outrageous lobbying practices and enormous expenditures of money by the American Medical Association, and the insurance lobby.

TAXATION

H.R. 2409 and H.R. 2410: Bills to raise individual exemptions to $700 and $800 respectively. For a family of four in the lowest taxable income bracket this could mean an additional $80 or $160 per year. I have sponsored other legislation closing loopholes to raise sufficient revenue to meet the cost of this tax readjustment.

H.R. 2408: A bill to eliminate the 10-percent Federal excise tax on automobiles to stimulate our Michigan economy.

III. LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

The 87th Congress will go down in history as one of the hardest working and most productive Congresses in history. The Democratic majority working together with our great President have fashioned a record of fine legislation to benefit all of the people.

I was one of the first and most aggressive advocates of the first action of this Congress which was the reorganization of the House Rules Committee, to make it more difficult for that body to be used as a roadblock to important liberal legislation.

This Congress has enacted over 800 public laws, and has given President Kennedy 74 percent of the major measures for which he asked during this session. The Republican critics of the Congress will not point out that many measures which could have been enacted failed because of their coalition with reactionary Democrats. The defeat of the bill to provide aid to colleges and universities, to bring the cost of educating generations to come within reach of all, and to help ease the incredible overcrowding of our schools of higher learning, is a monument to this reactionary coalition, as was the defeat of general school aid legislation to ease the crippling overcrowding in schools and excessive tax burdens on homeowners in large cities across the land.

ANTIRECESSION ACTION

Action by President Kennedy and the Congress reduced unemployment of 6.9 percent nationally to 5.8 percent, and increased the gross national product and per capita income by 10 percent, by a number of legislative and administrative actions. Immediately upon his inauguration the President doubled the amount of surplus food going to needy families and ordered use of the food stamp program, authorized by H.R. 5191 of which I was the author and sponsor in the last Congress.

Congress quickly enacted extended unemployment compensation coverage on a temporary basis to assist 600,000 unemployed workers, and to pump $1 billion into the economy.

Congress enacted legislation to provide benefits under the aid to dependent children program to children of the unemployed. Unfortunately, to its great discredit, the Republican-dominated Michigan Legislature refused to enact legislation to carry out State responsibility under the act, and denied children of our unemployed, and the economy of Michigan the sum of $20 million.

I was among the first sponsors of the Area Redevelopment Act, passed by this Congress, and signed by President Kennedy, after two Eisenhower vetoes. This act is making $394 million available for redevelopment projects, and for businesses which need funds for expansion of job opportunity, for industrial and commercial development projects, public facility construction, and subsistence payments to workers retrained under the program.

The enactment of the Manpower Retraining Act authorized expenditure of $435 million to retrain up to 1 million unemployed workers, with a potential of approximately 10 percent of this figure to be retrained in Michigan. The purpose of this bill is to provide Federal assistance to States in retraining workers in areas of high and persistent unemployment by paying both the cost of retraining and subsistence to the worker during his retraining.

Emergency public works acceleration in areas of high unemployment was authorized in the amount of $900 million to assist in Federal public works programs on a matching basis with State and local projects. Michigan's economy will be benefited by $90 million under this proposal.

Social security was liberalized by reduction of the retirement age for men to 62, of which bill I was a sponsor, and by raising the minimum monthly benefit from $33 to $40 per month, widows' benefits by 10 percent, and extending coverage to 160,000 persons previously excluded.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I am unalterably convinced that both legally and morally all of our people should have equality of opportunity to fully share and completely participate in the total life of our great Nation. Therefore, I have worked earnestly seeking the enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation as an important step forward in creating the type of national fabric where all of our people will have equal opportunity to progressively develop to the fullest of their potential and make purposeful contributions throughout the entire spectrum of our democratic society.

My bill, House Joint Resolution 3, a constitutional amendment outlawing the poll tax as a condition for voting, was enacted to halt for all times this highly discriminatory practice.

The Congress extended the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. Unfortunately this represents a compromise less than complete acceptance of my bill, H.R. 6879, which would make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency.

I joined with the Attorney General in a petition to the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish rules and regulations to halt unlawful racial segregation on buses and in bus terminal facilities.

These rules have now been adopted by the ICC and will go a long way to provide equality of opportunity in travel for all.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

I am proud that my 2-year fight for stronger controls to assure safety of drugs was successful and that I was able to secure enactment of my bill H.R. 6471 requiring truthful information in advertisements on side effects, contraindications, and other dangers, together with information on generic name to permit physicians to prescribe equally high quality drugs of more economical price to their patients. These provisions were part of the strong drug control bill enacted by this Congress to halt dangerous practices which have had so many unfortunate effects recently in the drug industry.

I led the fight in committee and on the floor of Congress to beat off weakening amendments, and was successful in two instances in strengthening the bill for the protection of our people.

GENERAL HOSPITALIZATION FOR THE AGED WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK

Most unfortunate was defeat of legislation to help the aged meet the cost of hospitalization within the framework of the social security program. This will continue placing many of the aged at the mercy of public or private charity, or require them to be treated at the expense of the general taxpayers instead of on a contributory insurance program.

The overall record of this Congress is a great one. The Peace Corps, perhaps the most striking and appreciated advance in our foreign aid program, was established; the missile gap narrowed and reversed in favor of our Nation; milestone changes in our foreign trade laws to assist American exporters were enacted; and more efficient and adequate national defense was provided through reorganization of the armed services and more careful scrutiny of the appropriation process.

The Alliance for Progress was enacted to restore the good-neighbor policy and to raise the standard of living of our American neighbors to the south; the foreign aid program was revamped to emphasize loans, repayable to the United States, and to require use of our funds in programs which contribute substantially to the improvement of the economy and lot of the people; business was aided by a new depreciation schedule to make possible more rapid write-offs of investment and a special investment credit was given to industry by the 1962 tax law. Both of these measures will provide increased employment. Also, the lending authority of the Small Business Administration was doubled; the Area Redevelopment Act providing substantial additional funds to assist in job-creating opportunities through expansion of private enterprise became law; a massive housing bill making possible 100,000 new public housing units for low-income families, with special provision for housing of minorities, and reduced downpayments was enacted and has significantly benefited the housing industry and home buyer; the minimum wage was raised to $1.25 and 3.6 million workers previously excluded from the Fair Labor Standards Act are now protected.

In addition, legislation was enacted authorizing the President to use all necessary measures to protect the interests of the United States and the peace of the Western Hemisphere to guard against any expansion of Communist Cuba, and active measures to discomfort Mr. Castro through economic and other sanctions are being employed; provision for growth of our Nation by investment in its natural resources was provided; new national parks and recreation areas were established; strong water pollution control legislation authored by Congressman BLATNIK and myself became law and is being implemented; the postal deficit was reduced; and the pay of our Federal employees made competitive with the scales in private industry.

I have sought to provide vigorous and effective representation to the people of my district in the Congress and in the handling of the many types of problems which they bring to me.

It was my suggestion which helped bring to Michigan the whole mobility command of the Department of Defense and to locate in this area headquarters for 40,000 Federal positions. The jobs of thousands of employees at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command were saved by this action.

I pledge to continue my efforts on behalf of the people of my district, and to continue the same record of legislative endeavor.

Railroad Investors Have Best Featherbed in the Transportation Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, recent Congresses have devoted substantial quantities of time, energy and research to the economic complaints of the American railroads. They have complained to us about everything from taxation, discriminatory subsidization of competing modes of transportation and over-regulation, to and including the working rules which they themselves negotiated with their employees over the years. These rules they now call "featherbedding." The railroad propagandists have claimed that these rules alone cost them some $600 million a year. The net income of the railroads has averaged about $600 million in recent years, so it is fair for one to assume that the railroads could just about double their income if they could manipulate their employees at their will and without regard for the individual dignity and well-being of their work force.

Coincidentally with the close of Congress, Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York Times a table showing the dividends and yields of some 21 railroads which constitute substantially all of the major railroads except those in the northeast part of the country, which do have special competitive problems. That table shows that on the basis of market price this year investors are receiving magnificent returns running as high as 9 percent on their investment. The excerpt from the Times is as follows:

TRENDS IN RAILROAD SHARES NOTED

The following table compares the prices of leading railroad issues at their highs in 1959, the dividend paid then, and the yield at that high with this year's lows to date, the latest dividend rate, and the yield at the low:

Railroad	1959 high	1959 dividend	Yield	1962 low	Latest 12 months dividend	Yield
Atchison	32½	$1.45	4.5	20½	$1.20	5.9
Atlantic Coast Line	62½	3.00	4.8	31⅝	2.00	6.3
Canadian Pacific	32¾	1.50	4.6	19⅝	1.50	7.7
Chesapeake & Ohio	74⅝	4.00	5.4	44½	4.00	9.0
Chicago, Rock Island	37¼	1.00	4.3	13⅝	1.05	7.8
Delaware & Hudson	33	2.00	6.1	12½	.90	7.2
Denver & Rio Grande Western	21	.96	4.6	15½	1.00	6.5
Great Northern	50⅝	3.00	5.0	35	3.00	8.6
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio	30¾	2.00	6.5	20⅛	1.50	7.4
Illinois Central	55¼	2.00	3.6	31⅛	2.00	6.4
Louisville & Nashville	88	5.00	5.7	50	3.00	6.0
Missouri Pacific, A	52⅜	2.40	4.6	35¼	2.40	6.8
Nickel Plate	36½	2.00	5.5	28	2.00	7.1
Norfolk & Western	108	4.70	4.4	85¼	4.00	4.7
Northern Pacific	57⅛	2.00	3.5	31⅛	2.20	7.1
St. Louis-San Francisco	27	1.00	3.7	13⅝	1.00	7.3
Seaboard	40¾	2.00	4.9	21	1.60	7.6
Southern Pacific	24⅝	1.06	4.3	21⅜	1.20	5.5
Southern Ry	60¾	2.80	4.6	44	2.80	6.4
Union Pacific	38⅝	1.60	4.2	27½	1.20	4.4
Western Pacific	27¼	1.00	3.7	18⅜	1.00	5.3

If the railroads are permitted to eliminate employees on an industrywide basis, the speculators in railroad securities in the year 1962 will be able to increase yields, on the basis of this list, from a minimum amount of 8.8 percent to as high as 18 percent each year, because the net income of the railroads would just about double if everything that the railroads say about their work rules is true.

These figures indicating the yield to a current investor are certainly a much more realistic indicator of the prospects of capital in a railroad enterprise than are the self-serving figures showing net railway operating income as a percent of net investment in railway property used in transportation service, which is the figure that the railroad propagandists offer to demonstrate their impoverishment.

Judging from these figures it is indeed unfortunate that the financial structure of the railroad industry was not thoroughly examined at the time that the executive branch established the Presidential Railroad Commission to study work rules. If one is willing to sacrifice human values, any service enterprise can be made more efficient and productive. It is now an official finding in the report of the Presidential Railroad Commission that—

> Operating employees have had to adjust to a way of life which is in many ways different from the pattern of employees in outside industry. They are subject to call at irregular hours, round the clock; many of them cannot accommodate their time away from duty to the normal family program of free Sundays and evenings. Many of them must spend considerable time at distant terminals, away from their families and communities. They work out of doors regardless of weather, in the desert heat, or pouring rain, or amid snow and ice. Until they have achieved very considerable seniority they are subject to irregularity of employment and often to extensive furloughs.

Nothing should be done to disturb the job security and seniority of these employees on an industrywide basis where the result is going to be to place windfall profits and inflated incomes in the pockets of superfeatherbedding speculators. This problem can only be solved on a regional basis or individual system basis because of the wide disparity in railroading problems and economic health in the industry.

Before railroad workers as a class are singled out for special liquidation treatment their particular employer should be required to establish that it is, in fact, in such dire financial straits that all employment on that particular railroad would be jeopardized unless the work rules were changed.

Review of the Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, to review a session of Congress which has been as tumultuous as this one is not easy, but I want to try to explain some of the more important measures which I believe are of particular interest to the people of southeastern Ohio.

This has been a very long session of Congress. It has been the longest continuous peacetime session in 112 years. Some of the statistics about what has transpired in the Nation's Capital will furnish some insights about the work this Congress has done. The House of Representatives has been in actual session for more than 150 days of this year. The proceedings of the House have filled more than 8,000 printed pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the House and Senate since January 1961, almost 18,000 proposals or new laws and changes in old laws have been offered. Since January of this year, 310 of these proposals have been enacted into law. The President has, so far, vetoed five bills and Congress has not overridden any of the vetoes.

These are some of the bare statistics of the session and, of course, do not reflect the kind of measures offered, nor do they tell us anything about the quality of the legislation that has become law.

There have been many behind-the-scenes pressures and much apparent contention among the leadership which has tended to extend the session without fruitful results. A huge logjam of legislation piled up for the adjournment rush and was finally considered under circumstances far from ideal. Foreign aid, assistance for college facilities and students, United Nations bonds, the trade bill, taxes, postage rates and postal pay, the farm bill, and authority to recall Reserve Forces to active duty were some of the issues caught in the last-minute rush.

The House of Representatives was composed of 263 Democrats and 174 Republicans. It was a heavy-spending Congress. It achieved a peacetime record of increasing public spending this year beyond the $100 billion mark. In the first of its 2 years, it operated in the red to the tune of $8.2 billion. Estimates for the second year promise another deficit of $6 billion. Of last year's $8 billion deficit, $2 billion was for defense and $6 billion went for new and additional domestic spending. The national debt is now over $300 billion and is now approaching its legal limit of $308 billion. This represents almost $40 billion more than the combined debts of all other countries of the world. But when we talk of spending and debt, we can still overlook some of the important processes that are guiding us.

There is a consistent trend which has been clear during the past 2 years and it might be well to summarize both the trend and some of the important bills and policies which show what direction the country is going. Basically, it is a question of how we wish to solve the Nation's problems.

There are in Washington today two basic philosophies that are in conflict and the margin between them has been close in many of the votes that have been taken on specific measures in Congress during the last 2 years. In simple terms, one philosophy holds that the Federal Government should have more authority to direct and manage the affairs of individual citizens and many of the Nation's institutions. The other philosophy calls for strengthening the activities of State and local governments. Those who hold that the Federal Government should be the most powerful instrument in American life also believe that the powers of the President should be vastly expanded. Those who resist that point of view believe that we must maintain the constitutional balance of power which provides that the President, that is the executive branch of government, is a coequal and coordinate branch, sharing powers with the Congress and the judicial branch. The great arguments of this Congress have involved this tremendously important issue more than any other. They have arisen in many bills dealing with a variety of national problems.

First, we must look at the direction agricultural policy has taken in these 2 years. This is symptomatic of many other issues and problems that have been left unsolved and which will be considered again next year. We all know how serious the farm problem has been—low farm income and tremendous surpluses of grain that cost the taxpayers huge amounts of money for storage costs are part of this picture. For years, we have had price supports for several basic crops. This program has failed. It has not significantly improved the welfare of the farmer and its cost has mounted into the billions. How to deal with it is the problem. The two approaches reflect the two opposing philosophies. One is for greater Government control of farmers. The other is for the decrease of Government intervention and control of farmers so that we can gradually see to it that supply and demand has greater influence in our agricultural markets.

The President's proposal for a farm program in 1961 was certainly the most revolutionary farm bill ever recommended to the Congress by the White House. In sweeping terms, it asked the Congress to surrender its legislative responsibilities and give permission to the Department of Agriculture to write and enforce the laws pertaining to farm controls and subsidies over every farm commodity produced in America. There are 256 agricultural commodities produced on American farms and all could have been put under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture had this plan gained congressional approval. The actual legislation embodying this radical plan was killed in the Agriculture Committees of the House and the Senate and never reached the stage of full-dress debate.

Since that bill failed, variations of this legislation have been recommended by the White House. All have been pointed toward the same strict controls over one or more segments of American agriculture. Just how far Federal powers would extend is shown by the request for authority to jail dairy farmers who did not keep records to the liking of the Secretary of Agriculture. I would like to quote the actual language of the dairy section of the bill recommended to Congress for passage. It reads as follows:

> Any person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by the Secretary (of Agriculture), pursuant to this subtitle, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

A proposal of this kind would have seemed ridiculous had it not been recommended by a President of the United States, and I am glad to say that the administration's endorsement of this penal provision was later withdrawn.

Through many months of argument, the debate continued. A short time ago, a farm bill was passed by a narrow margin. This bill involves the philosophy of very strict controls but it delays the full effects until 1964, when farmers will certainly feel the sharp teeth in it. This debate will go on next year.

A second great issue of this Congress concerned whether the President should be given far greater powers than he now possesses over tariffs. Should he be given the right to cut tariffs in half or abolish them entirely The President based his request upon the new economic power of the European Common Market and his belief that by cutting tariffs we will increase American exports throughout the world.

For years, southeastern Ohio has been an unfortunate laboratory where we have seen the results of lower and lower tariffs. Our pottery, ceramic tile and glass industries and coal mines have suffered great economic distress because of Federal trade policies that have encouraged imports from abroad. Some of these industries have been virtually destroyed and the great harm has spread out into our communities, creating serious social as well as economic problems. Now we begin to see the same situation developing in our major industries. Steel, aluminum, ferroalloys, and chemicals are all being attacked by import competition under much less drastic trade policies than we are embarking upon at this time. There are those in Congress, and I am one of them, who feel that the granting of power the President has asked is courting economic disaster for this country. I am convinced that the problems we have seen here in southeastern Ohio will be visited upon the rest of the country, with very serious results.

The European Common Market is an organization of Western European countries which have banded together to create a trading area among themselves. They have erected a high tariff wall around themselves. In addition to tariff, they have resorted to all sorts of protective devices—quotas, import limits, and so forth—largely for the purpose of keeping out the products of American industries and farms. Over many years, we have already negotiated away 80 percent of our tariffs, and now it appears we are about to negotiate away the other 20 percent. There is little doubt in my mind that we are oversimplifying the Common Market problem and that the only result we will achieve will be a further opening of our markets to foreign imports without obtaining reciprocity and without any real possibility or guarantee of increasing our exports to the Common Market countries. What I believe will happen is that further slashing of tariffs will encourage American industries to set up branch factories behind the Common Market protective tariff walls. If this happens, we will be actually exporting jobs and not products. John L. Lewis has called this bill the "job destruction act," and I believe he is absolutely right. For many years, there has been a refusal to recognize the damage inflicted by import competition. By this I mean that under previous trade agreements acts there have been mechanisms intended to protect American industries when tariff reductions caused economic hardships. However, these mechanisms have rarely been effective and there has been, in fact, little protection forthcoming even when damage was recognized. This was illustrated last year in the mosaic tile case before the U.S. Tariff Commission. In that case, the Commission recognized the serious import competition problem and recommended redress. The President refused to concur in the findings and provide the damaged industry with the assistance it needed. The same thing has happened to the coal industry and its long fight against residual fuel oil imports. In that instance, the President has had the power to limit imports but he has refused to do so.

This new trade program has written into it an elaborate system of Federal relief for industries and workers who have been affected by lower tariffs. I can find little assurance in this. Industries caught in import competition problems are not bankrupted suddenly. Jobs are not destroyed overnight. It is, rather, an evolutionary process. The damage occurs over a period of time. I predict a rude shock for the first company or group of unemployed who go to the Government in Washington seeking relief because of closed factories or lost jobs. The promises that sound so reassuring will melt away except in the most clearly definable situations. I seriously argue with the philosophy of this bill and with the immense grant of power over industry, labor, and the entire economy which it grants to one man—the President.

There are many other Executive powers that have been requested but not granted. One is the right of the President to adjust tax rates. Under the Constitution, this cardinal power is granted solely to the Congress. However, the President attempts to justify his request as a means for dealing quickly with economic slumps—to pour more money into a sagging economy. Of course, this is a tremendous grant of power to any President, and in the hands of a President who is more concerned about his political future than the public interest it could be very seriously abused. There are several dozen more of such requests which would give powers to the White House that should be reserved to the Congress or to the independent, regulatory commission of government.

If we were to seek a reason for the long session this year, it would lie largely in disagreements over which of the two philosophies will prevail in the country. This Congress has been a preparation for the next. The great issues and opposing philosophies are being debated today and the Congress in January will begin to make decisions on those questions that the past Congress has not considered.

There were some significant advances during the past 2 years. One was certainly the Area Redevelopment Act, on which I had the pleasure to work as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. For localities such as southeastern Ohio, this program offers a kind of impetus that has been needed. However, it is not a Federal handout. It is firmly based upon local initiative and local effort. Already six of the seven counties of the 15th District are eligible for this kind of help, and I have reason to believe they will offer us great assistance in the future to improve our local economy and to enable us to contribute to the productivity of the Nation. We have already obtained some help, principally through the retraining of men to assume highly responsible jobs in electronics work in Guernsey County.

Even more encouraging is the survey now going on in Monroe and Washington Counties, under Area Redevelopment Act auspices, to explore the salt domes under the earth. If this study of our natural resources turns out as we hope it will, it could mean that we possess resources to support large developments in the chemical industry. It has been a long dream of southeastern Ohioans that, with our coal, abundance of electric power, oil, and natural gas, plus salt, a new era of industrialization for our area could be dawning.

We know that sound prosperity comes only from industry producing products that employed people want and can afford to buy. When the Government can provide this stimulus, it should. Government must not, however, impede industrial growth through punitive taxation and the destruction of confidence in private investment. In past months, I believe that the Federal Government has been guilty of impeding growth at the same time it professes eagerness to help. Nevertheless, I am pleased that this Congress has placed upon the books the Area Redevelopment Act, even though it is not entirely the way I would have written it if the responsibility had been mine alone.

Another excellent piece of legislation to come out of this Congress is the Manpower Retraining Act. We all know that technological changes make certain skills obsolete and require new and more complex skills. There are fewer jobs today for the unskilled or semiskilled worker. When men are unemployed, their old jobs may be lost to them forever. Are these people to be consigned to a future of unemployment compensation and public relief? Unemployment compensation and public relief are necessary and useful programs, but they are temporary stopgaps. Actually, they are negative programs over a long period of time if we know that the basic problems are a lack of skills and training among so many of the unemployed. The positive approach is to work in concert with the State to help retrain unemployed men and women so that they can become productive workers again. This is what is being attempted in the Manpower Retraining Act. It is certainly a sound idea and one that should be pursued as the country keeps pace with technological progress.

These are only some of the issues that have arisen in Washington during the last 2 years. It has been my purpose to report to you, on a weekly basis, important events affecting the lives of the American people. The reports have by no means been a one-way street. A great many people of southeastern Ohio have taken the trouble to express their views to me on legislation of all kinds. During the 2 years of this Congress, I have received more than 8,000 letters from southeastern Ohioans, commenting on legislative questions. Several thousand more have written to me for assistance in personal problems involving the Federal Government. As I have attempted to represent the people of the 15th District, their comments and suggestions have made that job easier and have added a real challenge to the responsibility and honor that has been conferred upon me.

Land and People Conferences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture is sponsoring five regional land and people conferences this fall. Three already have been held—one in St. Louis, Mo., for the Midwest; one in Portland, Oreg., for the West; and one in Denver, Colo., for the Great Plains. Others are scheduled in New Orleans, La., for the South, and in Philadelphia, Pa., for the Northeast.

The purpose of these meetings is for the Department of Agriculture to have a means of counseling with rural and urban leaders to find ways and means of strengthening rural America, of providing for adequate family farming, and of stimulating economic growth throughout the rural areas of the Nation. The conferences are open for public participation.

At St. Louis there were about 1,500 rural and urban leaders in attendance from the 10 Midwestern States. At Portland there were over 1,700 rural and urban leaders in attendance from the seven Western States. At Denver this week there were 2,000 rural and urban leaders from the 10 Great Plains States. There has been broad representation and lively participation at each of these conferences, including rural leaders from the States and counties, citizens organizations, chambers of commerce, labor unions, church and youth groups, producer and consumer cooperatives, schools and colleges, county and municipal governments, agencies of State government from all States in each region, and the rural news media.

Each conference is opened by the Governor of the host State. Except for the keynote address, which is given by the Secretary of Agriculture, all of the speaking is done by citizen spokesmen. A regional speaker addresses the gathering on the subject of "Rural-Urban Interdependence in This Region." A panel of four citizens discuss "Rural Changes in Our Region," after which the conference is open to the floor for comments and questions.

The full afternoon is devoted to a second panel of six citizens discussing "Stimulating Economic Growth in Rural Areas," after which the conference is open to the floor for comments and questions. In the evening the conference breaks up into four discussion groups on the following subjects:

First. How can family farms be strengthened for rural development?

Second. How can new uses and conservation of land and water expand income, employment, and better living in rural communities?

Third. How can planning and implementation of economic development for a county or rural area be accomplished?

Fourth. How important is rural-urban community planning?

On the second day each of the four discussion-group leaders reports the consensus of his discussion group to the full conference, after which the conference is open for floor discussion and the administrators of USDA agencies responsible for financial and technical services important to rural areas development are available on the platform to receive comments and answer questions.

At Denver a spokesman for the rural leaders summarized the conference by saying:

> It seems to me that sincere thanks are in order to Secretary Freeman and other personnel of the Department of Agriculture for holding a conference of this type where people from different walks of life have an opportunity to discuss and express their ideas on a subject that is of vital importance to the future of America.
>
> I believe there is new hope for the family-type farm when we have a dedicated Secretary of Agriculture who is determined to put agriculture in proper focus with the rest of our economy. Surely his position in this regard merits our support.
>
> It has been clearly brought out at this conference the Department of Agriculture now has many programs available to us. For example, in the Great Plains we have the Great Plains Conservation program which was a special tool designed for this area. There are many others. It is our job to make the best possible use of them. Soil conservation districts can and must assume greater responsibilities than ever before.
>
> After listening to the discussions and conversations that are heard in the lobbies, I am convinced that these remarks I have made are the sentiments of a majority of the folks that are here at the conference.
>
> Again may I say "Thank you" for making such a conference possible.

Each land and people conference is chairmaned by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development and Conservation John A. Baker serves as alternate chairman and has the task of funneling the questions asked, the answers given, and the opinions expressed into a conference summary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from the keynote address of Secretary Freeman given at Denver this week, the reports from the discussion groups, and the summary of Assistant Secretary Baker.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts of Keynote Address by Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture

We are here to listen, and to learn. We want your suggestions for improving the Department's services for conservation and development.

To make the services of the Department more effective, I have reorganized it to place under one leader—which is the Assistant Secretary for Rural Development and Conservation—the Farmer Cooperative Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the Forest Service, the Office of Rural Areas Development, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Soil Conservation Service. This is a grouping—a packaging—of important development and conservation services to enable the Department to help you more effectively.

In making these and other changes in the Department, I have sought the advice of almost countless rural leaders. I have worked closely with Members of Congress.

And I am happy to report to you today that the Congrses has provided new and important tools for your use in revitalizing the countryside.

Some of these are in the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, which President Kennedy signed less than 2 weeks ago.

Some are in the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, also just approved by the President. USDA's Farmers Home Administration is now authorized to make loans to provide low and moderate cost rental housing and related facilities for elderly persons and families in rural areas.

Other new tools are in the Public Works Acceleration Act which the President signed into law in mid-September. This act's purpose is the immediate creation of new jobs in financially hard pressed rural as well as urban areas.

The Department of Agriculture has a massive backlog of work projects ready to provide new jobs and economic upswing in rural areas eligible for help under the accelerated public works program, in virtually every State.

Some of the projects ready for operation are Federal. These are in the national forests, in soil conservation districts, or for the Agricultural Research Service.

Some are cooperative projects with State and local governmental subdivisions. Local cost-sharing or matching of Federal funds is required for these projects. Scores of multipurpose dams in small watershed projects sponsored by local agencies in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service could be included. So could State-Forest Service cooperative projects, including protection of forested areas from fire, insects, and diseases.

USDA is working closely with the Department of Commerce, which administers the accelerated public works program, in getting rural projects started immediately. USDA already was working with the Department of Commerce in carrying out the Area Redevelopment Act in eligible rural areas.

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 gives the Department authority to aid rural people in new long-range programs for putting the land we don't need for crops into new and profitable uses, including a great expansion of outdoor recreation for all Americans.

Permit me to briefly describe some of these new authorities.

USDA now can enter into agreements up to 10 years with farmers and ranchers to carry out long-range conservation plans. These agreements will provide for cost sharing and other help for changes in cropping systems and land use, and for development of soil, forest, wildlife, and recreation resources. This includes land on which conservation reserve contracts are expiring.

The Department has authority to assist State and local public agencies designated by the Governor or the State legislature to carry out land use plans. Federal loans, repayable within 30 years, can be made to the designated State and local agencies.

In small watershed projects, the Department now may share with agencies of the State up to one-half of the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way for reservoir or other areas to be managed by State and local agencies for public recreation. Cost-sharing also may be made available for providing sanitary and other facilities needed for recreation. State fish, wildlife, and park agencies are eligible for help. So are counties, municipalities, and special purpose districts created by or under provisions of State legislation.

The Department may now advance funds to local organizations for immediate purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way to prevent encroachment of other developments in small watershed projects. These funds would have to be repaid with interest before construction is started.

The Department now may aid local organizations in developing water supply for future use in small watershed projects. USDA can pay up to 30 percent of the total cost of a reservoir to store water for future municipal or industrial use. Repayment and interest charges may be deferred up to 10 years if the water stored for future use is not used during that period. Repayment with interest will begin as soon as the water is first used.

All these and other Watershed Act amendments are applicable to the 11 watersheds, such as the Washita River flood prevention project in Oklahoma, authorized under the Flood Control Act of 1944.

For the first time, the Department through the Farmers Home Administration can make loans to individual farmers for development of outdoor recreation. The owner-operator of a family-size farm may borrow up to $60,000 for construction of fish ponds, development of hunting preserves, construction of cabins, picnic and camping areas, and other facilitier for outdoor recreation. The borrower may have up to 40 years to repay the loan at 5 percent interest.

Operating loans up to $35,000 also are available to owner-operators and to farm tenants for operation of recreational facilities. These loans are repayable in 7 years at 5 percent interest.

FHA also may make loans up to $1 million to aid associations serving farmers and other rural families to make changes in land use, including the development of recreational facilities.

With these new tools, the Department can assist you and your local agencies in planning and carrying out rural renewal projects, resource conservation and development projects, watershed recreation developments, creation of water supply for future needs, projects for expanding grasslands and family forests, and for the development of outdoor recreation facilities on farmland.

The Department looks to local people to initiate, to plan, and to carry out these projects in cooperation with local and State agencies, just as it does in its long-established conservation and development programs for other privately owned land.

The ultimate success of rural areas development is—and must be—the responsibility of local people. The impetus and the drive must come from them.

The Federal Government can provide incentives and technical services, but Government cannot and should not do the job for local people. Government cannot and should not control all the land-use activities of its citizens. The Government has programs and resources that will help them. But any community—any area—that waits for Government to pull it out of the problems caused by change and shifting economic and social patterns will be submerged.

The challenge, then, is to the leadership of the people of this great countryside of ours. Countless thousands of people, living up to the tradition born in rural America of local effort to meet local problems, have already accepted the challenge. They have sound experience and notable achievements to back them in this effort. Local leadership has demonstrated its worth in farmer committees, electric and other cooperatives, in soil and water conservation districts, in rural areas development committees, as well as in scores of organizations in our towns and villages. A united and coordinated effort of all these forces will insure the future of rural America.

I should like to conclude by pointing out that our program for strengthening rural America is an integral part of our program for food and agriculture in the 1960's. The heated debate over controversial supply management features of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 obscured the great advances authorized in the act for conservation and development—advances that drew quiet but strong support from conservation leaders in all fields and at all levels, rural and urban. But the goal of strengthening the income of the family farm, by means of adjusting production to amounts that can be used, is inseparable from the goal of strengthening rural America.

We seek increased efficiency on our farms, and we would further this goal by helping farmers to acquire and operate more efficient farming units; but along with this we seek farm programs that will enable the farmer, as well as the consumer, to benefit from this increased efficiency.

We seek, therefore, to manage our abundant productivity, not by idling land, but by putting it to use to provide services such as recreation that are in increasingly scarce supply.

We repudiate the CED proposals to use poverty as a weapon to accelerate the migration from our farms, and to replace a surplus of wheat and corn with a surplus of men and women.

Instead, we can provide, in rural America:

A land of prosperous farms and thriving towns, where people may choose to earn a living, not only by producing food and fiber, but also from among a number of attractive alternatives that result from building new enterprises and creating new opportunities.

Opportunities for combining part-time employment with part-time agriculture to help to provide a good life for those many Americans who prefer to live in nonmetropolitan areas.

Decent housing and adequate living for the millions of senior citizens who live in greater proportions in our rural areas than in our cities.

Communities that can provide health, education, and other public services equal to the best that we know how to provide.

Resources of outdoor recreation of all kinds and in sufficient supply to meet the needs of our growing urban population.

The conservation of our soil and water resources to meet the needs of future generations.

This kind of rural America will add to the economic strength of the Nation, and will continue to make invaluable spiritual and social contributions to our national life. We can have this kind of rural America if we work together to preserve the real values of our heritage as we use the new science and technology to meet changing human needs.

[Land and people conference, Denver, Colo., Oct. 8–9, 1962]

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION GROUP NO. 1 ON STRENGTHENING THE FAMILY FARM

(By Ben H. Radcliffe, president, South Dakota Farmers Union, discussion leader)

Some 600 intensely interested people with a sprinkling of farm wives discussed for nearly 3 hours the subject of strengthening the family farm.

There appeared to be a restrained feeling of optimism toward the Department of Agriculture's new farm income improvement programs and the prospect of implementing the self-help sections.

The first point of discussion centered on the definition of a family farm. The general definition term arrived at was that the family farm was not related to the acreage of the farm but is a unit on which the family furnishes most of the labor, capital, and the management. It might be further defined as a unit with sufficient potential income to provide an average standard of living.

There was considerable discussion on the need for legislation restricting vertical integration especially as it relates to the cattle feeding industry. It was the general concensus that this kind of vertical integration created unfair competition to family agriculture.

A spokesman for the Nebraska feed grain growers said that if larger integrated cattle feeders gained control of the cattle market, they would eventually control the price of feed.

Opinions were nearly unanimous that the real threat to the family farm was low farm prices. Speaker after speaker pointed out the need for a farm program that would bring parity prices to American agriculture. Supply management of feed grain and wheat was discussed thoroughly and compared to supply management production by industry to attain a desired selling price for a given commodity.

On a comment by one participant that the farmers should have the same right to put a price tag on what they have to sell as does industry, another speaker pointed out that industry can successfully do this only because it controls production to meet real demands. This must be done at the production end of the operation, not at the marketing or pricing end of the transaction.

We will be able to price our own commodities only when we agree to manage our production. Obviously 5 million farmers cannot do this voluntarily but must use the devices of a governmental program within which to achieve this end.

Considerable discussion centered around the need in any farm program for a minimum, below which a family farmer's production would not be cut. It was agreed that this family farm cutoff could not be tied to acres; rather it might be geared to a gross dollar volume of a given commodity using the normal yield as a factor to arrive at the number of acres to be sustained on each farm. This provision embodied in a supply management program would substantially reduce the annual toll of family farms.

Without a doubt the subject receiving the most attention was farm credit. Time and time again it cropped up even during discussion of other subjects. Young and old farmers alike but especially young farmers, described the need for more adequate credit. Estimates from $50,000 to $200,000 and capital investment for the establishment of an efficient operation were alluded to. Too often when a young farmer needs credit, the FHA is out of funds, and he leaves discouraged or borrows less than enough from some other source thereby compounding his problem.

In addition to more available funds, there appears to be a lack of sufficient numbers of qualified personnel in the FHA to properly supervise and assist borrowers in working out farm operating plans. At least three bankers, including the executive secretary of the South Dakota Bankers' Association, took the floor to state their complete agreement with the FHA program. They said that, almost without exception, a farmer who is helped to become established or helped out of financial difficulty by FHA became a substantial farm operator and good bank customer.

Let me quote from a statement by a farmer participant:

"Available finance to family-type farmers is the greatest and most pressing need today. It can be provided through Farmers Home Administration supervised loans. It is and will prove to be the first step necessary for an expanded rural economy.

"We realize that agriculture is the basic source of economic prosperity in America, and to bring about a sounder operating program for a large segment of our American farmers the Congress of the United States needs to increase funds for operating loans. Housing funds should be greatly increased with larger appropriations; this year funds were almost exhausted the first 90 days.

"Administrative funds should also be increased to take care of the already tremendous duties and those that will come with an expanded program."

Perhaps additional legislation and authorities are needed to meet agricultural credit needs of today.

The program should be expanded to meet up to 25 percent of agriculture's credit needs, in assisting young farmers endeavoring to get started and older established farmers in making major adjustments. Adequate credit tends to strengthen the total farm and general economy and will stop outmigration and keep the people on the land.

A Presbyterian minister said, "a farmer without land is like a man without a soul".

An REA man from Oklahoma suggested that farmer-owned cooperatives could do much more in the field of processing and marketing of farm commodities than they have in the past.

He cited the instance of the citrus growers who control their product from the field to the consumer. Technical assistance for developing such programs is available through RAD.

Diversion of farmland from production to recreation facilities received a minimum of discussion. It was felt that only areas surrounding metropolitan centers have recreation potential of any great importance. Instances of hunting and fishing resorts replacing agriculture were reported. One Oklahoma cotton grower said "a Yankee tourist is worth more than two bales of cotton and he is a lot easier to pick."

In conclusion, the consensus of the discussion group was that the only way a family farm can be strengthened is by increasing farm income. It was felt that the key to improving farm income is to increase farm prices along with having an adequately funded and staffed farm loan program. These two major points should be supplemented by the expansion of farmer cooperatives, increased technical assistance and the development of recreation facilities.

[Land and people conference, Denver, Colo., Oct. 8 and 9, 1962]

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION GROUP NO. 2 ON EXPANDING RURAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

(By Dr. John E. Thompson, extension economist, South Dakota State College, Brookings, S. Dak.)

1. A strong farm operation can result from the utilization of the facilities that are already available through the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These programs can make a stronger and more prosperous agriculture.

2. There is a need to inventory all of the resources following it up with proper zoning and multiple uses of land.

3. In parts of the Great Plains, particularly the mountainous areas, it was pointed out that recreation is the best use of land providing that money is available to develop the water resources and secondary roads necessary to reach these areas.

4. Several of the statements made referred to the need for trade schools to train youth for both on farm and off farm occupations. It was further pointed out that existing educational facilities should be utilized to the maximum extent.

5. It was emphasized that many tools are needed to implement the rural areas development program and that many farmers need immediate supplies of new capital. This point was made by several people.

6. It was pointed out that some areas are dependent upon a single cash crop in their preset farming operations and are in dire need of a supplemental high income crop.

7. The possibility ought to be explored of reducing capital requirements for young farmers getting started through cooperative ownership of farm equipment.

8. It was pointed out that an adequate water supply is basic for the development of any small community and its interrelated farming activities. Watershed development provides an excellent tool to provide such water supplies. Therefore, greater emphasis needs to be given to speed up the watershed planning process by greater appropriations for that purpose. People from small towns need to make themselves heard if this is to be accomplished.

9. The many opportunities that exist for improving the economy of the Great Plains area by greater emphasis in developing forest resources was also emphasized. The possibility of utilizing seldom utilized woody plants should be explored through research.

10. In one area there is some consideration being given to the possibility of setting up new grower allotment reserves for the young farmers who desire to become established in farming.

11. The competency of U.S. farmers must be kept to the highest level possible because you get many accomplishments through individual action.

12. In order for us to develop employment opportunities in farming we must first determine the reasons why people do not seek farm employment but prefer to work in cities. Such reasons were given as better pay, shorter working hours, and better living conditions. If farmers' income were nearer to parity, it would then be possible for them to overcome some of the above-mentioned disadvantages.

13. One suggestion made for increasing income and the ability to pay higher prices was through the adoption of marketing agreement programs, and it was pointed out that this has been proved successfully on a local basis and should be broadened.

14. While recreation provides opportunities for expanded income in rural areas, it was pointed out that there are limitations and these must be recognized. The seasonal nature of some types of recreation is an example.

15. Another suggestion was to explore all possibilities of developing small industries on the farm as well as in the nearby towns and cities.

16. It was also pointed out that we should not overlook the real value of independent action on the part of the farmers or groups of people in studying their potential and opportunities.

17. It must be recognized that problems arise when change occurs. Social institutions often do not keep up with the rapid changes which are occurring. In order to

develop resource opportunities, three basic steps are necessary:

a. Local people must identify real problems and not symptoms.

b. They must decide what would be a desirable solution to these problems.

c. They must explore alternate courses of action. It was further pointed out that all people need to be involved—not just a few leaders, which means that this is basically an educational job involving everyone.

18. Research on many possibilities that can lead to rural economic expansion and job opportunities is needed and should be encouraged. Getting industrial development in rural areas does not happen easily. It was pointed out by one who has had experience in this field for many years that "The first 20 years are the toughest." This man reminded us that farmers are not the only ones having problems. In a rapidly changing world, everyone has problems, whether they are in farming, manufacturing, mining, or whatever it may be. The important thing to remember is that rural development and the creation of job opportunities requires a lot of work by dedicated people who will stay with it until the job is done.

Summary of Discussion Group No. 3 on Revitalizing the Rural Community and Its Institutions

(By Lowell H. Watts, director of agricultural programs, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.)

The topic of discussion for group 3 was "revitalizing the rural community and its institutions." Two hundred and fifty persons participated in the discussions.

The comments varied from relatively specific recommendations and requests for governmental assistance to general statements of concern regarding problems for which there are at this time no easy or clear-cut solutions.

Although the participants did not specifically identify these needs, there was threaded through the discussion a feeling that the colleges and universities should conduct more effective sociological and economic research. A specific need exists to develop more specific standards and criteria by which to judge area or community vitality.

An agricultural economist suggested that vitality was not necessarily related directly to the number of people in a community. He stated that some communities can and must adjust to a declining or stable population. Under certain conditions he said that an increase in population may not prove feasible. This discussant said that "we can adjust communities to a declining or stable population providing we can maintain sufficient vitality within the community." However, no clear-cut definition of how to measure vitality was offered.

There was considerable concern expressed regarding the outmigration of young people from rural areas. It was agreed that limited income potentials are a primary deterrent to the return of young college graduates of many rural areas. Fundamentally, this point involved a concern regarding high initial investment in farming and relatively low return per dollar invested. There was no attempt to discuss farm price policies. There was, however, a persistent concern regarding the relative disadvantage held by the farmer in terms of the price received for his production efforts. No direct recommendations were presented on this point.

Two broad areas were discussed at length. These included recreation and education.

The discussion indicated that recreation is viewed as a major undeveloped potential for economic development, not only in the mountain areas but also in certain areas of the Great Plains.

Participants from New Mexico outlined recreation developments in one local area which involved a total expenditure of approximately $24,000. This investment has resulted in the attraction of approximately 7,000 persons annually to the area for fishing and related recreation. In spite of this achievement, it was suggested that financial assistance from the Federal Government is badly needed to expand the recreational development already begun. Newly authorized lending authority of FHA seems adequate to meet this particular type of situation. This same discussion implied that the Extension Service should serve as a catalyst to bring various agencies together in their work with local people.

It was indicated that USDA assistance to departments of game and fish would be helpful. A game and fish director stated that individual farmers and ranchers could be assisted by game and fish departments in developing recreation facilities and activities. He pointed out, however, that there is a need for a stimulated interest and an organized educational and informational effort to bring individual operators and game and fish departments closer together. Interwoven into this discussion was the viewpoint that some type of education and information program is essential in all types of development programs.

An additional consideration involved the acknowledged requirement for close interrelationships between Federal agencies as well as between agencies of State and local governments. Several speakers indicated a desire to see closer coordination between agencies.

Specific suggestions made regarding governmental assistance in stimulating recreational development included the following:

1. Government loans to finance the construction of buildings and development of grounds around reservoirs and adjacent public areas which require the improvement of facilities to service the public.

2. Development of satisfactory access roads into recreation areas which can be developed locally but which depend upon adequate highways and roads if nonresidents are to be able to use the newly developed recreational capability.

Farm and ranch operators generally expressed a need for information on how to develop, maintain and use recreational capability on private lands, particularly for hunting and fishing.

One New Mexico businessman had this to say, "Our people cannot take advantage of a rich natural endowment in recreation areas because of poor access and high associated costs of development. Our plea is of the costly type—we need roads. The road to market in our country is the road to the top of the hill."

The discussions regarding recreation as a potential for economic development indicated that programs of education, financial assistance, and increased cooperation are badly needed.

A second area which received a bulk of the discussion was education. Discussions on this point led to the following comments:

1. There is no present college curriculum which provides adequate training in either agricultural college administration or in agricultural program administration. In addition to formal training in these areas, it was suggested that universities provide college-trained people who might be available at the local level to provide special training programs for both agency personnel and farmers.

One farmer indicated that sole emphasis upon university degree programs was improper. He stated that high school and junior college emphasis on vocational training should be increased—that college and university emphasis today does not provide adequate terminal vocational training for blue collar workers.

A representative of vocational education pointed out that there is a great opportunity for adult education programs conducted under the leadership of the public school system.

2. Two university vice presidents indicated that continuing review and evaluation of program efforts is required.

One suggested that 4–H and FFA programs should be reoriented to provide a more adequate training base for youngsters who might go into either rural or urban employment. In this connection, a deemphasis in skill training was suggested.

It was suggested that our social, our political, our governmental, and our educational institutions have developed a degree of obsolescence which will require continual and serious evaluation if they are to maintain full vitality.

A further observation was made that the educational system must provide more adequate off-campus, continuing education-type programs. A primary involvement of the Extension Service in these efforts was indicated.

Throughout the discussions a concern was evidenced regarding the degree of coordination needed between various agencies of State and Federal Government. A similar concern was expressed regarding the need for total community or area consideration of problems. In this connection, it seemed obvious that greater interaction is needed between individuals and groups in an economic community or a trade area.

Serious concern was evidenced regarding the problem of enticing outstanding young people to return to rural areas after they receive their formal education. One recommendation in this regard was made suggesting that adults attempt to involve teenagers in local community affairs and problems before they go away to college.

There seemed to be general agreement that no new agencies are needed. It was indicated that the kinds of government assistance which have proved so effective in achieving high agricultural production capability can be applied with equal effect to revitalizing the rural economy of the Great Plains, but to achieve this we must achieve a unity of purpose and an effective coordination between those agencies of government that are involved.

[Regional land and people conference, Oct. 8–9, 1962, Denver, Colo.]

Discussion Group No. 4—Rural-Urban Community Planning

(James W. Fagan, moderator)

The panel was in general agreement that if effective urban and rural community planning was to become a reality, several basic requirements will be necessary.

Local leadership must be established that desires to put the power and talent of both the rural and urban committees behind a common purpose.

The panel discussed a number of vehicles which might be used for this purpose. It was the consensus of the group that State and local community RAD committees may offer the brightest hope to achieve this. The panel's discussion of various RAD committees indicated RAD's have been able to enlist both urban and rural personnel of considerable talent.

Through the development of RAD committees, for the first time the many abilities of the Federal and State agencies may be geared to the solution of community problems by the local RAD committee.

The panel was of the opinion that lay members of both the urban and rural communities, as well as local governmental people, should be encouraged to serve on local RAD committees. Community planning will require complete knowledge of the technical abilities available, upon call from the various agencies, and it therefore seems apparent that mayors, county commissioners, and other local governmental people should have every opportunity to take an active part in RAD committee planning.

It was the consensus of the panel that aggressive action should be taken now to implement RAD committees on a local level, as directed by the Secretary. It was the panel's opinion that the RAD plan is sound, and that to delay its implementation is to lay waste the best tool available for urban and rural planning by local communities.

The panel discussed other approaches to community planning, including city-county planning and zoning commissions, civic organizations, church organizations, and similar groups. Representation by these various groups on local RAD committees, it would seem, is necessary to the success of the RAD committee, or any committee whose objective is long-range urban and rural community planning.

A number of unique suggestions were made by panel members to bring about understanding of urban and rural problems. Most of these suggestions centered upon bringing together people of both communities for the purpose of informing each other of the problems with which each is confronted.

The panel also considered the question of recreation and industry expansion through community planning. There was general agreement that not much could be accomplished through a combined effort of urban and rural people to achieve both.

Our panel concluded that community planning is not new. It is only the approach to such planning that has developed new dimensions. The crux of the problem may well rest upon timely recognition of the fact that urban and rural communities are interdependent. This means they must solve their problems through joint efforts.

Conference Summary

(By John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture)

This has been a great conference. Secretary Freeman and I and the Department's administrators came here to listen and learn. You have told us. The major accomplishments of this conference will be what we—you and us—carry to our home communities in our hearts and minds.

You have been most cooperative and frank in expressing your opinions of ways to develop rural America. You may be interested in a brief summary of the notes we have made of the key consensus points you gave us to ponder.

If we read correctly your signal, you have told us:

1. Together we must build a firm foundation for permanent prosperity in rural America.

2. Poverty must not be used as a weapon to force economic adjustments in rural America—rather we want prosperous family farms and thriving towns and small cities.

3. We want deliberately and systematically to put land, water, timber, and related resources to work to move all of America forward more rapidly.

4. We need to find workable ways to stabilize and improve family farm income.

5. We must apply to private land the multiple-use principle that has been so successfully applied to publicly owned national forests and grasslands.

6. We urge management of publicly owned resources to maximize area development and prosperity of rural communities and small cities consistent with our national responsibility for a more rapid rate of economic growth and on stewardship responsibilities for natural resources for all the people.

7. If we want to get rural America on the move, we need to excite the human mind in rural America.

8. What must be done in rural America can only be done through local leadership and local initiative.

9. We realize rural area development is a vast undertaking requiring comprehensive preparation and synchronized action to build factories, develop adequate family farms, expand business enterprises, provide better public facilities such as rural electric systems, telephones, housing, water and sewer systems, swimming pools, better schools, golf courses, and tourist attractions.

Federal and State Governments should cooperate to provide coordinated technical services to help local, private and governmental leaders make comprehensive consistent farm and home plans, soil conservation district programs, watershed plans, areawide economic development plans voluntarily fitted in where appropriate to comprehensive coordinated development of the economy and resources of entire river valley basins. We must extend the principles of the Great Plains conservation program and expand the beneficial use of power and water.

10. We want in rural America to improve family farm income, raise rural living standards and increase job opportunities in rural America—to start a chain reaction of more remunerative business transactions that will start Main Street cash registers ringing more often and more meaningfully. We from the Department of Agriculture have been listening. This, I believe, is what you wanted us to learn. Have I summarized an accurate account of what you told us?

Now, on our part in USDA I make you this pledge. USDA is geared up by legislation, is gearing up personnelwise and administratively, is ready, willing, and able to respond appropriately with facilitating technical and financial resources warranted to augment private and cooperative local and State initiative, determination, effort, and drive.

My Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Al Smith once said, "Let's look at the record." Even the unfriendly New York Times on the 4th of July 1956, had to state, "The fighter for civil rights, Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., the country's most vocal crusader for Negro rights." This I have consistently tried to be all my life—fighting for the rights of all peoples, especially minorities, and especially those of my congressional district—Puerto Ricans and Negroes.

On October 15, 1962, the New York Times had a full-page analysis of the voting record of all of the Members of Congress on what the New York Times considered "the seven major issues in Congress." Four Congressmen from New York, incidentally all Republicans, were not recorded on several of these major issues by the New York Times. But the New York Times did state that Adam Clayton Powell was recorded on each and every issue.

The AFL–CIO's voting record indicates that Powell's record on labor issues is 100 percent correct. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in the October issue of the Crisis, picked the important votes in the field of civil rights, and Powell's record was perfect.

On October 8, 1962, the White House wrote me as follows:

> The contribution of your Committee on Education and Labor has enhanced substantially the legislative accomplishments of the past 2 years.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John McCormack, in the New York Post on February 18, 1962, said:

> But he's doing a fine job, a fine job. * * * The answer for northern liberals is to keep sending their good men back.

The Library of Congress stated upon the query from my office, "The most bills enacted into law by any major committee of the House of Representatives came from the Committee on Education and Labor under Chairman Powell"—15 laws in 15 months. Under me, this committee enacted 18 laws signed by the President of the United States and reported 18 other bills to the Rules Committee for further action.

Now let's look at the record:

I. SPECIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE AREA OF EQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION

Investigations and hearings conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor have revealed that equal opportunities in education and employment are vital to the development of America and indispensable to the economic survival of minority groups.

Among the key accomplishments of my committee in this area are:

IN GOVERNMENT

First. In May 1962 my office received a complaint from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, headed by Rev. Martin Luther King, that a nonwhite delegate on the payroll of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare attending a medical convention in Atlanta, Ga., was subjected to discriminatory treatment. I sent a telegram to Secretary Ribicoff requesting that he, first, forthwith direct the withdrawal of all Federal employees from this program; and, second, that the necessary directives be issued to insure the termination of such discriminatory practices.

Within 1 hour after receipt of my telegram, the Secretary issued an order to all of his officers throughout the country terminating the discriminatory practices and forwarded a copy to my office.

On June 22, 1962, I received a letter from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference stating:

> The Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the Negro people of Atlanta are eternally grateful for * * * your forthright actions in calling a halt to the U.S. Government's participation in a segregated conference here in Atlanta Ga. * * * We are sure that without your aid in this incident of our protest against segregation * * * nothing would have happened.

Second. After investigation and hearing by my committee, the U.S. Department of Labor, District of Columbia Apprenticeship Training Council, admitted that each application on file for appprenticeship training was coded to reflect the racial identity of the applicant. As a result of this disclosure, the Secretary of Labor immediately abolished this system of recording.

Third. After our investigation of the National Guard, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C., it was revealed that of the 86 officers assigned to the Bureau, there were no nonwhites. Following this communication and as a direct result of my investigation three nonwhite officers were assigned to the National Guard Bureau.

Fourth. During the course of FEPC hearings by the committee, a representative of the NAACP testified as to discriminatory actions by the State employment office located in Dallas, Tex. Upon receipt of the testimony, and during the course of the hearings, I dispatched a team of investigators to Dallas, Tex., who confirmed the allegation made at the hearing. An order was immediately issued by the State employment agency in Texas terminating the discriminatory practices.

Fifth. On November 29, 1961, I addressed a letter to the President of the United States, stating:

> After almost 1 year of trying to work out this problem with the Pentagon, I must now appeal to you. Members of the Defense Establishment continue to use not only the question of the individual's race, but also the race of his spouse. Repeated objections by me have met with no success.

On December 13, 1961, I received a reply from Alfred B. Ditt, Deputy Under Secretary—Manpower—stating:

> The requirement that a married service school applicant state his wife's race, if different from his own, will be dropped.

Sixth. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, appearing before my committee, adopted the Powell amendment and pledged that Federal funds would be withheld from certain schools practicing segregation. The Department of Justice supported the Secretary and the committee by instituting the suits.

OUR CHILDREN

As a result of the first legislation in the field of juvenile delinquency which was reported by my committee, central Harlem has received a sizable grant. This project will provide opportunities for the children and youth of our community to be directed into worthwhile activities and will help to eliminate the growing problems of juvenile delinquency in our area.

Through the utilization of a domestic service corps, a new and entirely creative program will come to the people of Harlem. In accepting the plan, representatives of the Department of Justice hailed this project as a pioneer in an important arena of American life.

KEY NEGRO APPOINTEES IN THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION FROM NEW YORK CITY

Through my efforts at least 17 persons from the city of New York received top-level appointments in the Kennedy administration, with salaries totaling approximately $250,000.

THROUGHOUT THE NATION

As of September 1961, over 65 nonwhites had been appointed to positions ranging from $10,000 to $20,000 a year. A leading official in the Democratic Party involved in these appointments stated:

> ADAM POWELL has played a key part in every one of these appointments.

IN INDUSTRY

First. The Harlem liquor dispute had been the source of deep tension between the liquor industry and the Harlem community for the past 15 years. As a direct result of my entrance into the matter the dispute was settled on January 4, 1962. The settlement provided for an additional $15 million in gross sales and over $400,000 in commissions to nonwhite salesmen.

Second. The committee caused the reemployment of 260 workers—including nonwhite—by the Interstate Container Corp., New York City, after committee investigation revealed that the discharge had been unreasonable.

Third. The committee's investigation revealed unfair treatment and other abuses involving migratory laborers by crew leaders in Riverhead, Long Island, New York City, and Glassboro, N.J.

The New York State Employment Service advised the committee that this condition would not reoccur and that a close scrutiny of all migratory labor camps under their jurisdiction would be maintained.

Fourth. The investigation of the committee revealed that the Aluminum Corp. of America and its subsidiary, Wear-Ever, Inc., discriminated in its hiring policy. Through the efforts of the committee, the company announced that as of January 12, 1962, the company hired its first nonwhite salesman and discontinued its discriminatory credit policy.

II. ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE FIELD OF LABOR

First. Investigation and intervention by the committee led to the acceptance of two Negro carpenters by Local No. 2710, United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, New York City; and caused the acceptance of a nonwhite youth into apprenticeship training by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, Washington, D.C.

Second. After investigation and hearing, it was revealed that the Consolidated Edison Co., of New York conducted a pattern of discrimination in hiring and promotion with respect to minority groups.

This revelation caused the company to announce a new policy granting equality in employment and the introduction of a program to train nonwhite executives within the company.

YOUR STAKE IN KEY LABOR BILLS

First. Minimum wage and hour amendments of 1961: The first minimum wage legislation since 1938, establishing a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour, and extending coverage to thousands of employees. If you were in this group, your salary was raised.

Second. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962: Provides training opportunities for the unemployed and a chance to upgrade the skills of the unskilled worker while receiving Government training allowances. Also amended this law to give its full benefits to railroad workers.

The New York Times on September 9, 1962, stated the Manpower Development and Training Act is "potentially the most significant piece of manpower legislation in the Nation's history." They further editorialized on October 14, 1962, when they stated:

> The most glaring deficiencies in the congressional record were in the rejection of virtually all bills that entailed any element of originality or experimentation in coping with urgent domestic problems. The lone exception was the $435 million job retraining program.

This important legislation came from my committee.

OTHER LAWS ENACTED IN THE FIELD OF LABOR

Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act; Federal Employees Compensation Act; additional Assistant Secretary of Labor; Metallic and Non-Metallic Mines Safety Act; Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; and the 8-hour law.

BILLS PASSED BY MY COMMITTEE IN THE FIELD OF LABOR

Equal Pay for Equal Work Act of 1962: First successful effort to get an equal pay bill for women out of the House in the memory of man or woman.

Youth Employment Opportunities Act: Gives a real "break" to the unemployed out-of-school youth who needs a chance to learn work habits and a trade. Particularly important to minority groups which have the highest percentage of out-of-work and out-of-school youths.

Equal Employment Opportunities Act: First fair employment practices bill to get out of a House or Senate committee in over a decade.

Migratory labor legislation: For the men, women, and children who roam the land homeless to supply the labor that plants and harvests our crops. For the first time this Congress passed legislation considered and proposed by my committee to help this exploited group, which is composed mainly of minorities.

MISCELLANEOUS IN THE FIELD OF LABOR

The Subcommittee on the Operations of the National Labor Relations Board: The exercise of its oversight function by the committee through the hearing conducted by this subcommittee led to a reevaluation of many practices and decisional policies adopted over the preceding 8 years.

Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment: An inquiry in depth in keeping with the committee's responsibilities.

The Subcommittee on Irregularities in the Garment Industry: Investigation of racial discrimination, possible violations of existing labor-management relations statutes, and corruption based on complaints and information received by the committee over the past 18 months.

III. ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

Fifteen days of public hearings were conducted to ascertain the extent to which there had been compliance to the Supreme Court decision of 1954 outlawing segregation in public education. Witnesses from all parts of the United

States testified. On the basis of these hearings and an intensive 3-month research investigation, the following facts were released:

First. Eight years after the Supreme Court decision, 2 million southern nonwhite children—over 70 percent of the total in this region—live in completely segregated school districts.

Second. Two of the 16 land-grant colleges for nonwhites are still provisionally accredited by their respective regional associations.

Third. In all of the 16 white land-grant institutions, there are accredited professional schools offering a total of 21 areas of specialization, as against 10 nonwhite land-grant institutions offering a total of 5 areas of specialization.

Fourth. Wherein all-white land-grant institutions offer the Ph. D. or equivalent degree, not any of the 16 institutions for nonwhites offer these degrees.

Fifth. Because of the nature of the legal provisions of the Hatch Act and the Agricultural Marketing Act, none of the 16 nonwhite land-grant colleges received Federal funds from these sources for research in agriculture in 1960.

Based upon reports that discrimination was being shown in the engagement of teachers for dependents of military personnel, complaints were made to the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Responses from these Departments indicate that necessary investigations were made.

Upon requests from teachers allegedly unfairly fired, investigations were made and the necessary provisions followed to assure hearings for these persons.

YOUR STAKE IN KEY EDUCATION BILLS

First. The Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961. Important for minorities since so many are employed in this field.

Second. Establishment of teaching hospital for Howard University. More than 50 percent nonwhite physicians have been trained at Howard University. The transferal of Freedman's Hospital as a teaching hospital enhances the professional preparation possible at Howard.

Third. Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961: First legislation of its kind. Provides Federal assistance to establish a program for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency, including training of personnel for work in this field.

Fourth. School Lunch Act amended: Important for minorities since it removes the specific designation to race.

OTHER LAWS ENACTED IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

Teachers for the Deaf and Speech Pathologists and Audiologists Act; Education for the Blind; increased appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind; extension of National Defense Education Act of 1958—extension of impacted areas legislation; amendment to title II of National Defense Education Act—provides more funds for student loans; and Captioned Films for the Deaf Act.

BILLS PASSED BY MY COMMITTEE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

University extension; special education and vocational rehabilitation; Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts; adult basic education; Quality Education Act; general aid to elementary and secondary education; amendment to Land-Grant Colleges Act to eliminate the separate but equitable clause of the act; amendment to impacted areas laws to deny payments to school districts that practice racial discrimination and segregation.

IV. KEY ACCOMPLISHMENTS—INVESTIGATIVE TASK FORCE

In January 1961 I created an investigative task force directly under my jurisdiction with offices located in New York City and Washington, D.C. The duty of this task force is to investigate discrimination and irregularities in government, labor, and industry.

To date this task force has received over 3,800 telephone complaints and over 1,800 personal complaints.

In order to more effectively combat the forces of discrimination I provide space in the committee's New York office for representatives of the New York State Committee Against Discrimination, the National Labor Relations Board, the Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor, and the Bureau of Labor-Management reports. Thus, in New York City for the first time a complainant has access to four distinct agencies, Federal and State, working cooperatively to hear his grievance.

The task force was instrumental in obtaining a decertification election where the employer was involved in a "sweetheart" contract with a union not selected by the workers. The employer fired 25 of his workers. These people were reinstated.

Instrumental in settling a labor dispute at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and getting the strikers back to work.

Caused the roofers union, Paterson, N.J., on May 24, 1962, for the first time in its history to admit minority groups to membership.

Two nonwhite employees of the Labor Department were dismissed for filing discrimination charges. We were able to get these workers reinstated.

Three nonwhite pickets arrested in Brooklyn for picketing Beth-El Hospital, investigation task force intervention with the police department resulted in the police dropping charges.

Conferences with the Vulcan Society, community leaders, clergy, and so forth, were instrumental in settling dispute with the New York City Fire Department relative to charges of racial discrimination within the department.

The Yardney Electrical Corp. planned to move its plant out of the city, putting some 850 IUE workers out of work. Conferences with city, company, and union officials resulted in the city making a search for a new plant site for the company.

Upon complaints of discrimination in the New York City Transit Authority, the investigative task force investigated and met with top executives of the transit authority—caused one nonwhite to be appointed in labor relations department of the transit authority. Received assurances of other appointments.

Upon complaint of nonwhite members of Local No. 48, Mason Tenders & Hod Carriers, that they were not given work, caused workers to be given steady jobs.

Helped the new Americana Hotel to integrate its staff, including several nonwhites in responsible positions.

After complaints of discrimination, caused two nonwhites to get supervisory positions with General Motors.

Instrumental in getting the first nonwhite into Local No. 15 of Operating Engineers.

Of 382 Puerto Rican complaints relative to first, "sweetheart" contracts; second, nonunion representation; third, nonintegration of union and management; and, fourth, lack of legal protection—208 were successfully resolved.

Review of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 1961–62 sessions of Congress—the Congress elected with President Kennedy—began the process of getting the United States up to date with the changing world.

Important things were left undone for the next Congress and those that come after. It is nevertheless fair to say that for the first time Congress was able to face the realities of the world, to recognize that our country must deal with new conditions and problems abroad.

At the same time, action in the session just ended underscores what I reported a year ago, that this Congress has been one of extraordinary activity, producing more affirmative legislation than any other within the relatively recent past.

The bills passed this year dealing with domestic and internal issues took the people further toward meeting an accumulation of piled-up needs that President Kennedy inherited from the past.

Three major measures of the session just ended carve out new ground:

First. The foreign trade bill was designed to boost our exports abroad in competition with the Soviet system and in cooperation with the European Common Market, and it is radically different from any other trade-and-tariff bill in the country's history.

Why did we have to write a different kind of bill? Because the Common Market—a huge economic alliance of six Western European nations—is a new thing in the history of the world, an economic union of Western peoples with great industrial strength, with tremendous power and vitality, and we cannot afford just to sit on our hands and watch it grow until it squeezes us out of the world's markets.

Our new trade bill, arming the President with power to negotiate with the European Common Market and other Western nations on trade policies, tariffs and the economic needs of the whole non-Communist world, is a departure from our past because the times demanded a fresh beginning.

Second. Congress this year passed a Manpower Development and Training Act, under which for the first time the Federal Government takes responsibility for helping jobless workers equip themselves with new skills and get themselves new jobs.

Why was this necessary? Because automation and the new technology, our rapidly developing scientific progress, are leaving great pools of unemployed, while at the same time there is an actual shortage of workers with higher skills or different skills.

The four recessions we have had since World War II, including the last two recessions of the Eisenhower administration in 1957–58 and 1960–61, have nothing in common with the now almost-forgotten great depression of 1929. Our economy is strong and vital. It is inventive. It has plenty of jobs to offer in the future—but we must fit the training of people for the kind of jobs that will be available.

For hundreds of thousands of workers now left stranded, the retraining bill offers programs to equip them once more for useful, well-paid work. For the future, it is our hope that the education and training of our growing population will be brought closer to the needs of commerce, farming and industry.

In my review of the first session of Congress for Journal readers last year, I predicted that action on the manpower training bill would be completed this year, and it has been done.

Third. Congress this year also passed a major revision of our public assistance system, with the emphasis placed on giving people on relief a chance to start over again. It is the first great change in a quarter of a century.

This should not be misunderstood. There will always be a need for public assistance for the unfortunate, the helpless, the aged, the sick, the children too young to cope for themselves. Our welfare revision bill is based on more Federal aid for these purposes—not less. But a new emphasis was added, so that citizens will not have to stay stuck on the relief rolls because they have temporary misfortunes. The program is designed to help them help themselves back to productive and happier lives.

These are things that President Kennedy had in mind, partly, when he said during the campaign of 1960 that we must "get America moving again." It is what he talked about in his inaugural address when he said "we might not complete all our tasks immediately, but let us begin."

I believe very deeply that the world of the sixties is radically different from that which existed before World War II. This is not only a matter of the threat of the new Soviet Empire; we have been living with Soviet aggression for years, and we may have to live with it for decades in the future.

The point is that there have been other revolutionary changes in the world—the rise of African and Asian independence, the rise of the European Common Market, the virtual certainty that Great Britain and her great Commonwealth countries will be associated with the Common Market. There have been revolutions in technology, and vast new discoveries are on the way.

The 87th Congress was the first that was called on by a President to face these new realities and meet them, and I think Congress made a constructive beginning.

A Member of Congress has special obligations to the people of the district he has been privileged to serve, and there are some gains to report for Madison and St. Clair Counties.

The $61 million Kaskaskia River channelization project is on its way at last, after the long years of preliminary work in getting approval from both the Army Engineers and the Budget Bureau.

This project, which I sponsored in the House, will open up large areas of southern St. Clair County to new industries that can employ our workers. The project is now officially authorized by Congress. The Budget Bureau has approved an appropriation of $100,000 for the drawing up of detailed plans. I am hopeful Congress will approve $325,000 for planning next year.

In addition, we were able this year to secure final authorization of $4,995,000 for the flood control project on Richland Creek, which will protect the Belleville area from the flash floods that have devastated farms and homes in the past.

For the southwestern part of St. Clair County $921,000 was authorized for flood control work in the Prairie DuPont Levee and Sanitary District. For the flood wall at New Athens, $73,000 has been appropriated for construction planning.

On one special project I am still working, a project that involves the very important question of whether the cities and towns of our district will be allowed to share in the benefits of the new Federal emergency public works program.

This $900 million program was passed, at President Kennedy's request, to speed up actual construction of Federal and local construction operations that have already been approved but were slated for "future delivery."

The bill was designed, very simply, to help meet local conditions of substantial unemployment by advancing the construction date of sound public projects and paying the cost with Federal funds. It specifically provides that the projects must have been locally approved, and that Federal funds are needed because State and local money is not now sufficient.

To key the program directly to communtiy needs, the bill further provides that the Federal funds shall be used in communities meeting certain formulas on the rate of unemployment.

Our problem is that Madison and St. Clair Counties are tied into the so-called Greater St. Louis area, for certain statistical purposes, by the departments of the Government. Across the river there is one set of conditions and in our own home area there is another set of conditions—yet they are tied together.

There is no law that requires them to be tied together, and there is no special reason for putting them together administratively.

In many other Federal fields, East St. Louis is related to Chicago or Springfield for administrative purposes, rather than to St. Louis. Our Federal district courts, for example, are part of the U.S. District Court for Southern Illinois, and have no immediate connection with the U.S. District Court for Eastern Missouri. Likewise, to be eligible for consideration under the Area Redevelopment Act, the separation of St. Clair and Madison County from the St. Louis labor market area is essential.

I have endeavored to persuade the Departments of Labor and Commerce that our community should be separated from the Greater St. Louis area for purposes of deciding eligibility for the public works program aimed at getting people back to work. Commerce Department officials have my proposal under active consideration, and I shall continue to press the point until we get results.

In these annual reports on the work of Congress I have often emphasized the importance of the great standing committees of the House. This is where much of the real work is done.

My own assignments for many years have been with the House Committee on the Armed Services, and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. The accumulated expert testimony available to these committees, given by our top military men and scientists and military-scientific administrators, is literally vital to the security of our country.

It is again a source of particular satisfaction to report that President Kennedy has continued his program of building up our ground forces, including forces for special services in areas where Communist penetration comes from guerrilla infiltration rather than overt invasion.

I never had faith in the former Eisenhower administration's doctrine of the budget balancers, that we could solve all our problems with the slogan, "More bang for a buck." What that slogan meant was acceptance of the theory that any future war must be a nuclear war, an all-out war, that would devastate this country and Western Europe and the Soviet Union and Communist China.

President Kennedy met the crisis of Berlin last year by beefing up our forces in West Germany and by calling up the Reserves needed to maintain our military posture and demonstrate our firmness.

Congress this year passed a joint resolution, at Mr. Kennedy's request, authorizing the President to call up Reserves again to meet any crisis that may develop while the legislature is not in session.

This resolution is aimed specifically at the situation in Cuba—but it is much broader than Cuba. The Soviet wall that cuts Berlin in two separate pieces is a constant provocation, and danger. The resolution Congress passed gives the President full authority to meet any emergency, and we are much better equipped today than we were 2 years ago to respond to emergencies all over the world.

It has cost more money to rebuild the armed services. The defense appropriations have been substantially increased and the effect is shown in our budget figures. But the great American democracy must not be left in a position where it has no answer for Communist aggression except nuclear bombs. We are moving toward the idea of flexible power.

In the field of foreign policy, I am happy to report that most Republican Members of Congress showed a fine spirit of bipartisanship in support of necessary measures the President advocated.

This is exactly what Democrats did when President Eisenhower was in the White House for 8 years.

It may be that during the campaign ahead, some partisan things will be said about Cuba and Castro. Campaigns sometimes have a way of bringing out the worst in candidates for office. In my opinion, frankly, it would be a mistake for Republican candidates to try to blow up Cuba into a partisan issue, because the trouble began a long time ago, and all of us share the problem together.

We have launched an expanded program to strengthen the Western Hemisphere—President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. The nations of Central America and South America are perfectly capable of seeing the danger from a Soviet takeover of Castro; and we have made it perfectly clear that we will tolerate no "export" of Castro's kind of revolution to other republics in our part of the world.

To return to the subject of major legislation passed by this session of Congress, five bills should be mentioned in addition to those cited earlier.

Congress made further improvements in the basically new farm program launched in the feed grains program last year.

We are moving step by step toward cutting the cost of farm supports without treating farmers as expendable and without treating our tremendous production of food and fibers as a curse. A new system was extended this year to the wheat crop.

The problem left over from Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's 1958 system is that the price support program, which encouraged production of more and more crops on smaller acreage, became rapidly intolerable in its burden on taxpayers generally. This administration is facing frankly the fact that the size of the harvest, not the number of acres cultivated, is the key.

To face this fact requires no "regimentation" of farmers. On the contrary, the developing system takes account of our growing population and the possibility that all the fibers and food we can produce may be needed in the future. But the system promises tremendous savings in the years immediately ahead, and no one who prates about "fiscal resonsibility" can recklessly disregard the importance of the savings.

We are moving the farm program toward a rational basis good for the farmer and good for the country, a progran. that the public accepts.

Congress this year passed a new drug control bill, strengthening the authority of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Administration to protect the public from adulterated or unsafe products and to force removal from sale of new drugs shown to have bad side effects on human beings.

Congress also passed a new program adjusting and raising the salaries of Federal workers, both in the postal service and nonpostal Government activities.

The new pay scales give the Government greater bargaining power in competing with private industry and the academic world for the services of first-class scientists, educators, and administrators, plus experts of various kinds. It also increases the salary level of lower paid workers to bring them into balance with incomes obtainable in private enterprise.

It is my belief that the Federal Government has a moral obligation to treat its employees fairly and equitably. They have no way of obtaining equity for themselves, because economic pressure such as strikes cannot be allowed for workers in Government service.

The extraordinary thing is that President Kennedy is the first Chief Executive in this century to take the initiative in proposing a salary increase for Government workers; in every other case, Congress has had to take the initiative, often over the protests of the executive branch.

The pay bill was coupled this year with the first substantial move in years to cut the deficit of the Post Office Department by raising postal rates closer to the break-even point.

I do not share the view of some that the Post Office should be compelled to operate as a profit-seeking private business; the Government has a social obligation to deliver the mails. The basic business of the Post Office is to help people to communicate, to spread information and enlightenment, to stimulate our great national economic system. But there should be a reasonable relationship between postal costs and postal rates, and Congress took a long step toward restoring the balance.

In this session a tax bill was passed that extended the revisions begun last year. We have not given the revenue system the thoroughgoing reform that is needed. That will come in the next Congress, and President Kennedy has made preliminary suggestions that indicate the direction of the recommendations he will make. But in 1962 some of the abuses shown up in the old system were checked and steps were taken to stimulate business by a special system of tax credits for specific kinds of investment.

Congress also authorized purchase by the United States of up to $100 million in bonds of the United Nations—bonds that will give the U.N. the funds to finance its stabilizing activities in such operations as the Congo and the Near East.

The Soviet Union and its satellites have refused to pay assessments properly imposed to finance these operations and the U.N. General Assembly now in session will be compelled to devise a method by which the delinquents can be required to pay their share of the bill or lose their U.N. voting rights. But in the meantime, approval by Congress of our purchase of the bonds gives the U.N. money to tide the organization over a period of fiscal crisis.

Congress passed one other bill to which I give almost special mention because its enactment ended an almost incredibly ridiculous situation.

The Atomic Energy Commission has a great plant for plutonium production at Hanford, Wash., and as a byproduct this plant furnishes enormous amounts of steam. To many of us it seemed merely sensible to harness the steam for the production of electric power, and bills for that purpose have been sponsored. President Kennedy recommended a Federal facility to take the steam produced with taxpayers' money and use it for power generation.

Such is the foolishness of doctrinaire opponents of public power that they literally killed this program last year. They preferred waste rather than production.

This year a way was found to get around their opposition. A group of electric cooperatives in the Northwest offered to build the facilities to use Hanford steam, and Congress authorized the project.

A list of major bills passed in the 1st session of the 87th Congress last year emphasizes the record of affirmative activity in President Kennedy's first 2 years.

There was the 1961 minimum wage bill, extending the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to millions of workers previously left without coverage and raising the basic minimum to $1.25 an hour in a succession of step-ups.

There was the omnibus housing bill—the first important revision in housing legislation since the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill of 1949—that allows a broad attack on urban blight and offers help to cities in straightening out and financing their transit and traffic systems.

New social security amendments broadened benefits for an estimated 4.4 million persons and provided for financing the benefits through increased taxes.

An area redevelopment bill was passed and signed by the President, after similar bills had been twice vetoed by former President Eisenhower. The effect has already been felt in many regions where unemployment has been chronic and heavy.

Congress approved an increase in authorized funds to speed up the vast Interstate Highway System, and the evidences of its construction can be seen all over the land. Congress raised the authorization of Federal funds to assist communities in cleaning up polluted river systems—a program that Mr. Eisenhower for the last 2 years of his administration had tried to get killed.

There is plenty of work left for the future. Congress this year was unable to reach agreement on aid for our school systems and for colleges and universities. It was unable to complete work in a new program for employing young people on useful conservation works, despite the example of the usefulness of the

Civilian Conservation Corps of the thirties.

These issues were left for the 88th Congress, and I have no doubt that they will be actively advocated by the President and vigorously debated. It is my belief that the President is on sound ground when he says that we have many social reforms to make in our generation, and that we must face up to our responsibilities.

I add one word in emphasis on the tone of the Federal Government under President Kennedy's administration.

The Government has been active and affirmative in its approach toward our problems.

Mr. Kennedy took personal responsibility for the failure of the attempted operation by Cuban refugees and exiles against Castro—and so he should have taken responsibility even though the operation was an inherited one, already extensively planned and prepared. He did no buckpassing; he sought no scapegoats among blunderers below.

The Preseident has sharply reduced the unfavorable balance of payments that was draining gold from this country into the pockets of foreign speculators and placing the American dollar under attack.

He has steadily extended Federal activity to protect the civil rights of all our citizens, in every State, including the State of Mississippi, and he has helped create a climate in which minority groups previously denied the vote are registering and voting in large numbers.

The President has stood firm under the pressures and threats of Soviet leaders, has asserted our determination to defend the freedom of Berlin, and has patiently continued to build our strength and the strength of the North Atlantic Alliance that is the basic defense of the free world.

He has given strong and effective leadership to Congress and this is vital, because we learned in other administrations that a disinterested President has only negative power. He can veto bills but he cannot initiate programs. Mr. Kennedy has played an active part in working with Congress to help it achieve its creditable record.

Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at 10:13 a.m. on July 25, 1962, in the Senate conference room in the U.S. Capitol, it became the privilege of the junior Senator from Illinois, acting for the Chicago Anti-Superstitution Society, with 13 of my colleagues in the Senate participating, to make an unusual award presentation to the famous American astronaut, Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., before batteries of newsreel and television cameras and representatives of other news media. Because of the unique nature of this presentation, I ask unanimous consent to include a transcript of the proceedings—which records one of the most relaxed moments in the history of outer space—in the Record.

Senator Dirksen. In a sense this is a kind of deputized meeting of the Anti-Superstition Society of Chicago and I think it ought to open in the traditional fashion. The society, as you know, is dedicated a little to jollification somewhat discouraging to popular belief in superstitions and then for charitable purposes and recognition of people who have rendered notable public service. So, I shall open this little informal meeting with my colleagues, 13 in number, from the Senate, and do it as we've always done it * * * breaks mirror with hammer * * * the meetings of the society always begin with crashing a mirror and there is the exhibit of number 13.

Now, you may wonder what this is all about. The Anti-Superstition Society was established in Chicago in 1930, so it's been doing business for 32 years. It presently has about 400 members including a great many of our outstanding businessmen. They meet only on Friday, the 13th. They hold a dinner, they always seat 13 at each table, the tab is $13.13 for a dinner ticket, and they perform charitable and other activities. Now at the meeting on April 13, 1962, they felt that they ought to present Colonel Glenn with a token of their appreciation for his great feat. In doing so, they realized of course that his capsule was number 13 and so I've summoned 13 of my colleagues here for this purpose. They're all identified with thirteens. Senator Russell is one of 13 children and he comes from Winder, Ga., and I think there are 13 letters in the words Winder, Ga. I believe there are 13 letters in Senator Cannon's name, there are 13 letters in my hometown of Pekin, Ill., there are 13 letters in the majority leader's name. There are 13 letters in Massachusetts from whence Senator Saltonstall comes. There are 113,000 square miles in the State of Arizona from which Senator Goldwater comes. There are 13 letters, I think, in the name of Strom Thurmond, and in the case of George Smathers, he was born in 1913, in Florida, which was founded in the year 1513. Now, Kenneth Keating lives at 1233 31st Street and I believe that adds up to 13. And there are 13 letters in U.S. Marine Corps, Colonel, so that we get that properly in the picture. So, here we are, doing our bit in dissuading people from these popular superstitions and on this day, in keeping with the traditions of the society, I'm now going to ask Colonel Glenn, our very distinguished guest, to come up and receive the society's award.

Colonel, this is a beautiful and excellent watch but I ask you to take a little look at the dial. Instead of the customary numerals on the dial, there are all thirteens on the dial and it is a very good watch. And Colonel, it is inscribed to you by the Anti-Superstitution Society of Chicago of which Ben Reagen, formerly of Chicago, now of New York, was the award chairman, and P. J. Collerton is the president.

Now, I've been specially deputized to present this award to you today, and so first, before we hear from you I think we ought to have a word from our distinguished majority leader. I should point out that what we have here today are the three marines in the Senate, the majority leader, Mike Mansfield, Senator Smathers, of Florida, and Senator Douglas, of Illinois. In addition, we have the four Members of the Senate holding military rank of general; namely, General Cannon, General Keating, General Goldwater, and General Thurmond. So, we've got a very distinguished group here today participating in this award. We want you to feel at home in the presence of the marines and may I take occasion to say that we were so distressed some weeks ago that another member of the Marine Corps should pass into the great beyond. May I suggest at this moment we stand in respectful silence for 30 seconds in tribute to Francis Case, former Member of the Senate, and a great marine.

And now we'll have a word from our distinguished majority leader, a great marine, Senator Mansfield.

Senator Mansfield. Well, Everett I'm delighted to be here with you and my colleagues to the number of 13 in participating in this ceremony. All I can say is that 13 is my lucky number, I hope.

Senator Dirksen. Now Colonel, I'm going to call the roll. Senator Thurmond, Senator Wiley, Senator Mansfield, Senator Saltonstall, Senator Goldwater, Senator Smathers, Senator Douglas, Senator Keating, Senator Kerr, Senator Kuchel, Senator Cannon, Senator Russell, and Senator Humphrey.

Now Colonel, if you'll talk 13 seconds we'll love you. If you talk 13 minutes we'll wonder how you ever got into orbit, and if you talk 13 hours we'll be in orbit. Colonel we're glad to see you.

Colonel Glenn. I thought you were going to say if I talked 13 hours I'd be in good company here. [Laughter and applause from members of the press and the Senators.] I wish you could see this watch closer up here; this is not just a toy watch, this is a dandy. It's a beautiful watch, everything is inscribed 13 on it here and I can assure you that 13 I consider to be my lucky number too. Someone asked me before the flight of *Friendship 7* what I thought of having capsule No. 13. We in fact received some serious letters advising us to change the number of the capsule. However, we had to do it or to pick another capsule for our first orbital flight because of the number. But I could only reply to those people that 13 boded or bided, whatever it is, only good as far as I was concerned and I still look at 13 the same way. I think that this is good evidence that I was right this morning. Thank you very much.

Senator Dirksen. Colonel, those letters you received only give encouragement to the Anti-Superstitution Society. It indicates there is still work to be done to discourage these popular beliefs in superstition. To my colleagues I want to say I'm deeply grateful that you should come this morning as we honor Colonel Glenn and I am grateful to the Anti-Superstition Society that I was privileged to have this deputized meeting in Washington. Thank you all.

Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.'s Report to the Fifth District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record:

Voting record, Representative GERALD *R.* FORD, *Jr., 5th District of Michigan*

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 10	Quorum call	Present.
2	do	Election of Speaker	Halleck.
3	Jan. 18	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 23	do	Present.
5	Jan. 24	do	Present.
6	Jan. 25	do	Present.
7	Jan. 30	do	Absent.[1]
8	do	H.R. 8900: To authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning for construction and improvement of facilities. (Passed 319 to 79.)	Absent.[2]
9	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
10	Feb. 5	do	Present.
11	do	S. 383: To suspend rules and pass bill providing for acquisition of a patented mining claim at Grand Canyon National Park. (Defeated 202 to 136; 2/3 vote being required.)	No.
12	Feb. 6	H.R. 6360 (S. 1456): To provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce (for scientific and technical matters). (Passed 231 to 169.)	No.
13	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Present.
14	do	do	Present.
15	do	do	Present.
16	Feb. 20	do	Present.
17	do	H. Res. 549: To provide for consideration of H.R. 10050 (to increase debt limit) under procedure permitting no amendments from the floor. (Passed 258 to 133.)	Yes.
18	do	H.R. 10050: To provide for a temporary increase in debt limit to $300,000,000,000 until June 30, 1962. (Passed 251 to 144.)	Yes.
19	Feb. 21	Quorum call	Present.
20	do	H. Res. 530: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. (Passed 264 to 150.)	Yes.
21	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
22	do	H.R. 6747 (S. 486): To provide for the appointment of 2 additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. (Passed 222 to 142.)	Yes.
23	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
24	do	do	Present.
25	Feb. 28	do	Present.
26	do	H.R. 8399 (S. 1991): To pass the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 as amended. (Passed 354 to 62.)	Yes.
27	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
28	do	do	Present.
29	Mar. 7	do	Present.
30	do	H.R. 132 (S. 205): To assist in construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes. (Passed 337 to 68.)	Yes.
31	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
32	do	do	Present.
33	Mar. 13	do	Present.
34	do	S. 167: To authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws; amended. (Passed 338 to 58.)	Yes.
35	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 15	do	Present.
37	do	H.R. 8723: To recommit to the conference committee the report of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments in order to restore the original House provision to prevent a conflict of interest when employees of the Department of Labor enforce this law. (Defeated 182 to 218.)	Yes.
38	do	H.R. 8723: To adopt the conference report on the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments. (Passed 284 to 108.)	Yes.
39	do	H.R. 10606: To recommit to committee the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 in order to reduce the Federal contributions to the States by $140,000,000. (Defeated 155 to 232.)	Yes.
40	do	H.R. 10606: On final passage of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. (Passed 319 to 69.)	No.
41	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
42	Mar. 21	do	Present.
43	do	H.R. 9751: To authorize 1963 appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. (Passed 403 to 0.)	Yes.
44	Mar 27	Quorum call	Present.
45	do	H.R. 10904: To recommit to committee the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Defeated 24 to 371.)	No.
46	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
47	do	H. Res. 576: A motion calling for the previous question on the resolutions providing for a closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 10650, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act. (Defeated 224 to 184.)	No.
48	Mar. 28	H. Res. 576: To adopt the closed rule for consideration of H.R. 10650, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act. (Passed 234 to 172.)	No.
49	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
50	do	do	Present.
51	do	H.R. 10650: To recommit to committee the Revenue Act of 1962 for the purpose of striking out sec. 2 (investment credit provision) and sec. 19 which extends the withholding tax to dividends and interest. (Defeated 190 to 225.)	Yes.
52	do	H.R. 10650: On final passage of the Revenue Act of 1962. (Passed 219 to 196.)	No.
53	Apr. 2	Quorum call	Present.
54	do	H.R. 10162: To amend the Bretton Woods Agreement Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system. (Passed 256 to 94.)	Yes.
55	do	H.R. 10743: To provide increased rates for VA compensation (service-connected disability). (Passed 345 to 0.)	Yes.
56	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
57	do	H.R. 10700: To authorize an appropriation of $63,750,000 for the Peace Corps in fiscal 1963. (Passed 316 to 70.)	Yes.
58	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
59	do	H.R. 11038: To recommit to committee the 2d supplemental appropriations bill for 1962 in order to limit U.S. contributions to the United Nations Special Assessment Fund to 32.02 percent of the total assessed on all nations. (Defeated 153 to 235.)	Absent.[2]
60	Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
61	do	H.R. 4441: To recommit to committee a bill to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 to reimburse New York City for extraordinary expenses incurred during 15th General Assembly of U.N. when Khrushchev and other leaders attended. (Defeated 142 to 215.)	Yes.
62	do	H.R. 4441: On final passage of the bill to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 to New York City for extraordinary expenses incurred during U.N. Assembly (1960) when Khrushchev and other leaders attended. (Passed 207 to 152.)	No.
63	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
64	do	do	Present.
65	do	H. Res. 589: To adopt a rule to take up for consideration H.R. 10788, a bill relating to the regulations of textile imports. (Passed 264 to 76.)	No.
66	do	Quorum call	Present.
67	Apr. 11	do	Present.
68	do	H.R. 10788: To increase the power of the President relative to agreements with certain countries on the importation of cotton textiles. (Passed 312 to 80.)	No.
69	do	H.R. 11151: To recommit to committee the legislative appropriations bill in order to eliminate the provisions granting Congressmen the privilege of addressing mail to "occupant or boxholder." (Defeated 192 to 197.)	Yes.
70	do	Quorum call	Present.
71	do	do	Absent.[4]
72	Apr. 12	do	Present.
73	Apr. 16	do	Present.
74	Apr. 17	do	Present.
75	do	do	Present.
76	Apr. 18	do	Present.
77	do	do	Present.
78	do	H.R. 11289: To pass the $47,800,000,000 defense appropriation bill. (Passed 388 to 0.)	Yes.
79	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
80	May 2	H.R. 8031: To authorize the FCC to require all new TV sets to be equipped to receive both UHF and VHF signals. (Passed 279 to 90.)	Yes.
81	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
82	do	H.R. 11040: To provide for the establishment, operation, and regulation of a commercial satellite system. (Passed 354 to 9.)	Yes.
83	May 8	Quorum call	Present.
84	May 9	H.R. 8617: To authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 to pay the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission. (Defeated 171 to 201.)	Yes.
85	do	H. Res. 625: To send to conference H.R. 8900, a bill authorizing assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning for construction and improvement of facilities. (Passed 294 to 76.)	Yes.
86	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
87	do	do	Absent.[5]

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative G*erald* R. F*ord*, *Jr., 5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
88	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
89	do	do	Present.
90	May 17	do	Absent.[8]
91	May 22	do	Present.
92	do	do	Present.
93	May 23	do	Present.
94	do	do	Present.
95	do	H.R. 11737: To authorize an appropriation of $3,700,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 342 to 0.)	Yes.
96	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
97	June 5	do	Present.
98	June 6	do	Present.
99	do	H.R. 11665: On a motion to recommit the bill amending the National School Lunch Act to committee for the purpose of further revising the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States. (Defeated 160 to 220.)	Yes.
100	do	H.R. 11665: On final passage of the bill to amend the National School Lunch Act. (Passed 370 to 11.)	Yes.
101	do	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 7	do	Present.
103	do	H.R. 5532: To amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 in general to tighten up negotiated procurement. (Passed 362 to 0.)	Yes.
104	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
105	do	do	Present.
106	do	do	Present.
107	June 13	do	Present.
108	do	do	Present.
109	June 14	do	Present.
110	do	H.R. 11990: To recommit to committee the bill raising the public debt limit in order to substitute the text of H.R. 12026 increasing the limit to $306,000,000,000. (Defeated 145 to 258.)	Yes.
111	do	H.R. 11990: To increase the debt limit to $308,000,000,000 until Mar. 31, 1963, to $305,000,000,000 from Apr. 1 to June 24, 1963, and back to $300,000,000,000 on June 24, 1963. (Passed 211 to 192.)	No.
112	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
113	June 18	do	Present.
114	do	H. Res. 691: On a motion to consider the resolution providing for a closed rule and 3 hours of debate on H.R. 12154, the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962. (Passed 262 to 32.)	Yes.
115	do	Quorum call	Present.
116	do	do	Present.
117	June 19	H.R. 12154: To recommit to committee the amendments to the Sugar Act in order to remove the provisions awarding $22,700,000 to 3 sugar companies of the Dominican Republic in refund of import fees paid in 1960–61. (Defeated 174 to 222.)	Yes.
118	do	H.R. 12154: On final passage of the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962. (Passed 319 to 72.)	Yes.
119	do	Quorum call	Present.
120	June 20	do	Present.
121	do	do	Present.
122	June 21	do	Present.
123	do	H.R. 11222: An amendment to the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 (omnibus farm bill) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to exempt certain deficit areas from compliance with programs. (Passed 267 to 151.)	No.
124	do	H.R. 11222: On a motion to recommit to the Committee on Agriculture the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. (Passed 215 to 205.)	Yes.
125	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
126	June 25	do	Present.
127	do	H.R. 11500: To extend for 2 years (to June 30, 1964) the present Defense Production Act. (Passed 327 to 0.)	Yes.
128	do	H.R. 11309 (S. 3161): To extend for 3 years (to June 30, 1965) and amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to regulate exports from the United States to Soviet bloc destinations. (Passed 339 to 0.)	Yes.
129	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
130	June 27	do	Present.
131	do	do	Present.
132	do	do	Present.
133	June 28	do	Present.
134	do	H.R. 11970: To recommit to committee the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and to extend for 1 year the present law relative to reciprocal trade agreements. (Defeated 171 to 253.)	Yes.
135	do	H.R. 11970: On final passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. (Passed 299 to 125.)	Yes.
136	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
137	do	S. 1658: To prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. (Passed 348 to 1.)	Yes.
138	do	S. 1969: To adopt the conference report on the bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act to provide for supplemental air carriers. (Passed 339 to 0.)	Yes.
139	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
140	do	do	Present.
141	do	H.R. 12154: To adopt the conference report on the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962. (Passed 248 to 31.)	Yes.
142	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
143	do	do	Present.
144	do	H.R. 11586: To extend for 3 years present law providing for a Federal subsidy limit of 55 percent on ship construction and conversion and a 60-percent limit for passenger ships. (Passed 293 to 5.)	Yes.
145	do	S. 2775: To authorize an increase in the appropriations for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from $7,500,000 to $17,500,000. (Passed 281 to 14.)	Yes.
146	do	H. Res. 714: Expressing the "sense of the House of Representatives" that the Federal Communications Commission should authorize "clear channel" radio stations to use in excess of 50 kilowatts of power if FCC finds it to be in the public interest. (Passed 198 to 87.)	Yes.
147	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
148	do	do	Present.
149	do	do	Present.
150	July 11	do	Present.
151	do	do	Present.
152	July 12	do	Present.
153	do	H.R. 11921: On final passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 authorizing appropriations for the mutual security program. (Passed 250 to 164.)	Yes.
154	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
155	do	do	Present.
156	July 16	do	Present.
157	do	H. Res. 726: To agree to Senate amendments to H.R. 8050 allocating premium sugar quotas to Argentina and the Dominican Republic, granting a sugar quota to Ireland and making other changes in the Sugar Act. (Passed 196 to 142.)	No.
158	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
159	do	do	Present.
160	do	H.R. 11974: On an amendment to the bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission prohibiting any agreement providing for the construction or operation of electric generating and transmission facilities at the Hanford (Washington State) atomic production reactor. (Passed 232 to 163.)	Yes.
161	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
162	do	S. 167: To recommit to the conference committee the bill to authorize the Attorney General to search and seize, without a warrant except his own, the confidential documents of business concerns being investigated for possible violation of antitrust laws. (Passed 202 to 200.)	Yes.
163	do	H.R. 12135: To amend the Highway Act of 1962 by striking out a provision giving to the Secretary of Commerce sole power to determine whether a State provides feasible methods for relocating families removed from their homes because of new highway construction. Under the amendment this would be left to the States. (Passed 236 to 159.)	Yes.
164	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
165	do	H.R. 10606: To adopt the conference report on the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. (Passed 357 to 34.)	Yes.
166	do	H.R. 12391: On final passage of a farm bill entitled "Food and Agricultural Act of 1962." (Passed 229 to 163.)	No.
167	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
168	do	do	Present.
169	do	H.R. 12580: To adopt the appropriation bill for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the Judiciary in the amount of $1,900,000,000. (Passed 266 to 55.)	Yes.
170	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
171	do	do	Present.
172	July 24	do	Present.
173	do	S. 2996: On adoption of the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 authorizing appropriations of $3,600,000,000 for the mutual security program. (Passed 221 to 162.)	Yes.
174	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
175	do	H.R. 12648: To approve the 1963 appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture in the amount of $5,900,000,000. (Passed 345 to 41.)	No.
176	do	Quorum call	Present.
177	July 26	do	Present.
178	do	H.R. 529: To authorize the construction and operation of the Mann Creek reclamation project in Idaho. (Passed 199 to 162.)	No.
179	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
180	do	do	Present.
181	do	do	Present.
182	July 31	do	Present.
183	do	do	Present.
184	Aug. 1	H.R. 12711: To adopt the independent offices appropriation bill of 1963 involving $11,500,000,000. (Passed 368 to 12.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, *Jr., 5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
185	Aug. 1	H.R. 575: To authorize the appropriation of $6,100,000 for construction of the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon. (Passed 200 to 182.)	No.
186	do	H.R. 10904: To recommit conference report on appropriations bill for Department of Labor and HEW in order to reduce funds for the National Institutes of Health from $880,000,000 to $840,000,000 which would be $60,000,000 more than requested by the President. (Defeated 173 to 214.)	Yes.
187	do	H.R. 10904: On final passage of the appropriations bill for Departments of Labor and HEW in 1963 involving $5,300,000,000. (Passed 347 to 35.)	Yes.
188	do	Quorum call	Present.
189	do	do	Present.
190	Aug. 7	do	Present.
191	Aug. 8	do	Present.
192	do	H.R. 4055: To authorize a lump-sum payment of an amount not over $10,000 to those awarded national medals of science. (Defeated 193 to 177; ⅔ vote being necessary to suspend rules and adopt.)	No.
193	do	H.R. 7283: To provide for payment of valid claims of American citizens for losses incurred during World War II; payment to be paid out of proceeds from sale of German and Japanese assets in United States and taken over by U.S. Government. (Passed 354 to 15.)	Yes.
194	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 14	do	Present.
196	do	S. 1005: To require approval by the Federal Reserve Board of construction of buildings for branches of Federal Reserve banks and to increase cost limit on the buildings from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000. (Passed 314 to 50.)	Yes.
197	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
198	do	On a motion that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with. (Passed 298 to 65.)	Yes.
199	do	Quorum call	Present.
200	do	do	Present.
201	do	On a motion that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with. (Passed 312 to 62.)	Yes.
202	do	S.J. Res. 29: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment outlawing the payment of poll or other tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections. (Passed 294 to 86.)	Yes.
203	do	H. Res. 769: To agree to Senate amendments to H.R. 11040 providing for the establishment and operation of a communications satellite system. (Passed 372 to 10.)	Yes.
204	do	H.R. 12628: To authorize the appropriation of an additional $100,000,000 for direct loans by HHFA for rental and cooperative housing for the elderly. (Passed 367 to 6.)	Yes.
205	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
206	do	do	Present.
207	Aug. 29	do	Present.
208	do	H.R. 10113: To recommit to committee the Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act. (Defeated 192 to 221.)	Yes.
209	do	H.R. 11974: On a motion directing the House managers in conference not to agree to sec. 112 authorizing electrical generating facilities for the reactor at Hanford, Wash. (Defeated 148 to 246.)	Yes.
210	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
211	Sept. 11	do	Present.
212	Sept. 13	S. 4: To provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore in Texas. (Passed 256 to 87.)	Absent.[7]
213	do	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
214	Sept. 14	do	Present.
215	do	S. 2768: To recommit to committee the bill relative to U.N. bond purchase in order to make any U.S. loan to the U.N. contingent upon adoption by the U.N. of the World Court's opinion that members must pay the special assessments in order to retain voting rights in the General Assembly. (Defeated 171 to 219.)	Yes.
216	do	S. 2768: On final passage of the House version of the U.N. bond bill authorizing a U.S. loan equal to the total actual loans of all other nations. (Passed 256 to 134.)	Yes.
217	do	Quorum call	Present.
218	do	H.R. 11974: To recommit to conference committee the bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission insisting on the House disagreement to sec. 112 authorizing electrical generating facilities for the reactor at Hanford, Wash. (Defeated 151 to 186.)	No.
219	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Present.
220	do	do	Present.
221	do	do	Present.
222	do	do	Present.
223	Sept. 18	do	Absent.[3]
224	do	H. Res. 777: To call up for consideration S. 2429, a bill to revise the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park. (Passed 268 to 5.)	Absent.[3]
225	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
226	do	On a motion to dispense with the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule. (Passed 355 to 17.)	Absent.[2]
227	do	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
228	do	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the previous quorum call. (Passed 339 to 26.)	Absent.[2]
229	do	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
230	do	H.R. 12082: To amend the Internal Security Act to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency. (Passed 351 to 24.)	Absent.[2]
231	do	H.R. 11363: To strengthen the national security program with respect to defense contractors and their employees, and to protect classified information. (Defeated 247 to 132; ⅔ vote being necessary to suspend rules.)	Absent.[2]
232	do	H.R. 12648: To agree to the Senate amendment to the agriculture appropriation bill to provide $1,600,000 for construction of a peanut research laboratory in Georgia. (Defeated 143 to 221.)	Absent.[7]
233	do	H.R. 11151: To insist upon the House provisions in legislative appropriation bill authorizing the use by Members of Congress of the privilege of "occupant" mailing. (Defeated 125 to 246.)	Absent.[7]
234	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
235	do	H.R. 12391: To approve the conference report on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. (Passed 202 to 197.)	No.
236	do	Quorum call	Present.
237	do	do	Present.
238	do	do	Present.
239	do	H.R. 8900: To recommit to conference committee its report on the College Academic Facilities Act with instructions to insist on House position relative to student loans. (Passed 214 to 186.)	Yes.
240	do	Quorum call	Present.
241	do	H.R. 13175: To recommit to committee the foreign aid appropriations bill in order to reduce the amount for economic assistance by $100,000,000. (Defeated 190 to 203.)	No.
242	do	H.R. 13175: On final passage of the foreign aid appropriation bill in the amount of $3,600,000,000. (Passed 249 to 144.)	Yes.
243	Sept. 21	H.R. 12180: To extend temporarily the existing law relative to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. (Passed 324 to 8.)	Yes.
244	do	H.R. 11732: On a motion to recommit to committee a bill to authorize foreign governments to operate radio stations in the District of Columbia for transmission of messages outside the United States. (Defeated 95 to 208.)	Yes.
245	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
246	do	do	Present.
247	do	S.J. Res. 244: To authorize the President to call units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months and to extend enlistments on periods of duty for not more than 12 months. (Passed 342 to 13.)	Yes.
248	Sept. 25	H.R. 10: To accept the conference report on the bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals. (Passed 361 to 0.)	Absent.[3]
249	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
250	do	do	Absent.[3]
251	do	S.J. Res. 230: To recommit to committee the resolution concerning Cuba in order to strengthen the language to indicate congressional approval of U.S. action to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. (Defeated 140 to 251.)	Absent.[3]
252	do	S.J. Res. 230: To adopt the resolution "expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba." (Passed 384 to 7.)	Absent.[3]
253	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
254	Oct. 1	do	Present.
255	do	H.R. 7927: To send to conference the House-approved postal rate bill as amended by the Senate and to which the Senate had added Federal employees salary legislation. (Passed 327 to 22.)	No.
256	do	Quorum call	Present.
257	do	H.R. 5698: To require that summer employment through the Civil Service Commission be apportioned among the States as is regular employment. (Passed 300 to 19.)	Yes.
258	do	Quorum call	Present.
259	do	do	Present.
260	do	H.R. 13241: To correct an error in sec. 300 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 relating to small farm exemption from 1963 wheat program. (Passed 255 to 60.)	Yes.
261	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
262	do	do	Present.
263	do	H. Res. 822: To agree to Senate amendments to H.R. 8181 to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. (Passed 244 to 104.)	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, *Jr., 5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
264	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
265	do	do	Present.
266	Oct. 3	do	Present.
267	do	H. Res. 823: To adopt the rule under which H.R. 13273, the bill on rivers and harbors and flood control property, would be considered. (Passed 344 to 4.)	Yes.
268	do	Quorum call	Present.
269	do	H.R. 13273: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing rivers, harbors and flood control projects in order to delete the Burns Creek project in Idaho. (Passed 203 to 130.)	Yes.
270	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
271	do	H.R. 11970: To adopt the conference report on the "Trade Expansion Act of 1962." (Passed 256 to 91.)	Yes.
272	do	S. 1552: To adopt the conference report on the bill entitled, "Drug Amendments of 1962." (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yes.
273	do	H.R. 12648: To adopt the conference report on the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. (Passed 399 to 5.)	Yes.
274	do	H. Res. 803: To adopt the rule providing for consideration of S. 1123, a bill to extend the child labor provisions of Fair Labor Standards Act to certain children employed in agriculture. (Passed 257 to 81.)	Yes.
275	do	S. 1123: To recommit to committee the bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to extend its child labor provisions to certain children employed in agriculture. (Defeated 137 to 193.)	No.
276	do	H.R. 4670: To adopt the conference report on the bill to provide penalties for distributing obscene publications, recordings and other things in the District of Columbia. (Passed 270 to 18.)	Yes.
277	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
278	do	do	Present.
279	do	H.R. 7927: To adopt the conference report on the bill to increase postal rates and to raise salaries of Federal employees. (Passed 312 to 20.)	No.
280	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
281	do	do	Present.
282	do	H. Con. Res. 570: To adopt the resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States maintain by every means its rights in Berlin. (Passed 311 to 0.)	Yes.
283	do	S. 1447: To amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955. (Passed 260 to 9.)	Yes.
284	Oct. 6	Quorum call	Present.
285	do	H.R. 13175: To adopt the conference report on the foreign aid appropriation bill. (Passed 171 to 108.)	Yes.
286	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
287	do	H. Res. 381: To return to the Senate S. J. Res. 234, making continuing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture which was held to be an infringement of the privilege of the House to originate appropriation bills. (Passed 245 to 1.)	Yes.
288	do	H.R. 12580: To adopt the conference report on the $2,020,000,000 appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary. (Passed 172 to 76.)	Yes.
289	do	H.R. 8962: To adopt the conference report on the bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act relative to the manufacturer's excise tax and the special constructive sale price rule. (Passed 247 to 6.)	Yes.
290	Oct. 11	S. 3451: To adopt the conference report on a bill to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims. (Passed 182 to 77.)	No.
291	do	Quorum call	Present.
292	Oct. 12	H.R. 12900 (public works appropriation bill): On motion to recede and concur in Senate Amendment No. 2 with an amendment to reduce by $16,382,000 the general construction funds. (84 to 120; no quorum.)	Yes.
293	Oct. 13	H.R. 12900 (public works appropriation bill): On motion to recede and concur in Senate Amendment No. 2 with an amendment to reduce by $16,382,000 the general construction funds. (Defeated 93 to 143.)	Yes.

---

[1] In Michigan for father's funeral.
[2] If present, would have voted "yes."
[3] In 5th District for speaking engagement.
[4] Night session; at White House for previous engagement.
[5] Unavoidably detained while away from the Capitol.
[6] In Stockholm for Bilderberg Conference.
[7] If present, would have voted "no."
[8] In Philadelphia.

Gen. Julius Klein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Julius Klein and I have been friends for many years. He is a genuine Republican, but one who will cross party lines in any good cause. When it comes to national security, party affiliation goes out the window. He has an excellent war record and is the recipient of many military awards and medals. These have been specified on numerous occasions and need not be detailed here. He has served in civilian as well as military capacities in numerous administrations. I do not know of a public figure who enjoys the friendship and esteem of so many Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

General Klein has been the subject of intense criticism in the German press. There was no basis therefor. The general needs no defense from me, but I am happy to express favorable comment concerning him.

He is the public relations counselor to many nationally known concerns. His clients form a "who's who" of business and industry. Most of his valuable time is dedicated to their interests.

In the many years I have known the general, I have often sought him out for his advice and counsel, especially on matters appertaining to industry in West Germany. He is a sort of bridge between American and German business corporations. He represents numerous German firms in America and interprets for the United States the interests, aims and purposes of his German clientele. He is to that extent a "foreign agent" and has registered as such.

He is a man of probity and his representations may be deemed trustworthy. His effectiveness as a public relations counselor and as a duly registered "foreign agent" are excellent. There have been no departures from any legal or ethical standards.

Public relations is an art—the art of conveying to the public the worthiness of a firm or a product—the art of presenting the good qualities of individuals or firms or their wares through various communications media. It is the art of creating consumer demand for a gadget or a package or an object. It is the art of selling to the public the good character, the wisdom, the courage, the honesty of a personage—or even a city or a country. It is all these and more. In these pursuits, General Klein excels. No successful firm or corporation is without its "public relations" man. Public relations—the establishment of good and cordial relations between the company and the public—has become an integral part of modern management. In public relations, management has a weapon to counteract or minimize a bad press, to present to the public the true image of the man or the company, to answer or obliterate unfair criticism or attack. The public relations man establishes good will.

There are public relations counselors on the domestic and on the foreign scenes. General Klein covers both. He represents domestic concerns and German entities.

Some members in the German press have criticized General Klein as a foreign agent in an unfair and caustic manner. This is unfortunate. This unjust criticism prompted the distinguished Senator from Missouri, Senator EDWARD V. LONG, to state on September 18 last on the floor of the Senate:

> I am convinced that confusion exists in the public mind as to the respective roles of the lobbyist and the foreign agent. Many people apparently believe that they are one and the same. Such is certainly not the case. * * * In this regard, I might mention that several unfortunate articles recently have appeared on the subject in the German press. It was obvious that these publications did not even comprehend the difference between a lobbyist and a foreign agent. * * * Some German newspapers went so far as to write that one of the most reputable foreign agents in the United States may be involved in "a court hearing by the State Department." This statement certainly reflects misunderstanding and confusion. * * *
>
> It is unfortunate that many people are wont to confuse the activities of one person

such as Alexander Guterma, who represented the dictator Trujillo and who was prosecuted for not registering as a foreign agent, when the actual foreign agent registration files in the Department of Justice include the names of some of the most prominent men in our country. * * *

I might list just a few of these gentlemen, who either are or have been registered foreign agents: former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, John and Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, and Maj. Gen. Julius Klein. * * * This country spends many millions of dollars annually to protect the proper image of America in foreign countries. It is heartening that the Western European democracies are cooperating in encouraging mutual understanding.

Concerning recent attempts to discredit General Klein for his services to foreign clients, Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, said that he was "shocked about misleading and mischievous information" spread in discussing the general's activities. Senator Humphrey added that he was deeply concerned about the spread of such information.

Referring to criticism of General Klein's possible effectiveness in representing some of his clients' interests in Washington because he is a Republican, the Senator further said:

> Tell anyone that Julius Klein has more friends in the Senate and the House of Representatives than any man I know. We respect his partisanship, but even more, we cherish his friendship.

Revision and Reorganization of Congressional Procedures Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the action of Congress in the last few weeks and the events leading to its adjournment forcefully and dramatically illustrate the urgent need for an overhauling of our congressional procedures. This is imperative if the Senate and the House of Representatives are to effectively fulfill their constitutional responsibilities.

Our respected majority leader, Senator Mansfield, is one of many legislators who realizes the challenge to act affirmatively in this problem, and has so stated.

Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

President Madison said in speaking of the powers given by the Constitution to Congress:

> The whole system of the National Government may be said to rest essentially on the powers granted to this branch. They mark the limit within which, with few exceptions, all the branches must move in the discharge of their respective functions.

Congress has not considered general procedural and organizational problems since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. In the meantime, our Nation has acquired two new States and 50 million additional persons with a consequent overwhelming increase of responsibility for the Federal Government.

I do not presume to criticize or place blame on members of either the Senate or the House of Representatives, nor is it a reflection on either the majority or minority parties, but I believe sincerely that we should make a concerted effort to modernize the legislative processes by a constructive reappraisal of procedural and organizational problems.

However, I remind my Democratic colleagues that the platform adopted at our national convention in Los Angeles, July 12, 1960, included the following assertion:

> CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES
>
> In order that the will of the American people may be expressed upon all legislative proposals, we urge that action be taken at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve Congressional procedure so that majority rule prevails and decisions can be made after reasonable debate without being blocked by a minority in either House.
>
> The rules of the House of Representatives should be so amended as to make sure that bills reported by legislative committees reach the floor for consideration without undue delay.

Mr. President, on the first day of the 87th Congress, I joined with 22 other Senators in sponsoring Senate Resolution 5, which would amend section 3 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate. However, on January 11, 1962, the Senate adopted a motion to refer Senate Resolution 4, which would also have amended rule XXII, to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and subsequently referred all similar pending resolutions, including Senate Resolution 5, to the same committee.

Referring to this action, on September 16, 1961, I joined with 26 Democratic Senators and 10 Republican Senators in releasing statements which summarized our views on this important proposal. In both pronouncements we reaffirmed that the beginning of a new Congress is the proper time to try to make changes in the rules of the Senate, and I quote in part:

> We said in January, 1961, and we say again now, that the rules question can best be settled at the opening of a new Congress. At that moment, a majority of the Senate of the new Congress has the constitutional right to determine its rules without minority obstruction.

The Senators signing the statements were Joseph S. Clark, Clinton P. Anderson, Quentin N. Burdick, Frank Church, Clair Engle, Philip A. Hart, Eugene J. McCarthy, Wayne Morse, Edmund S. Muskie, John O. Pastore, William Proxmire, Benjamin A. Smith II, Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Frank J. Lausche, Paul H. Douglas, E. L. Bartlett, John A. Carroll, Thomas J. Dodd, Ernest Gruening, Edward V. Long, Pat McNamara, Frank E. Moss, Maurine B. Neuberger, Claiborne Pell, Jennings Randolph, Stuart Symington, Stephen M. Young, Gordon Allott, J. Glenn Beall, Prescott Bush, Clifford P. Case, Jacob K. Javits, Kenneth B. Keating, Thomas H. Kuchel, Hugh Scott, Margaret Chase Smith, and Alexander Wiley, who concurred in the declaration of the Republican Senators with the exception of one sentence.

It is my intention to join with Senators Hubert Humphrey and Philip Hart, and other Members of our forum, in working for a change in Senate rule XXII at the opening of the 88th Congress in January 1963. It is encouraging to note that when a rule change was proposed in the 83d Congress, 23 Senators voted to support it and in the 87th Congress, there were 48 Senators who favored it.

On September 25, 1962, I cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 93 with a bipartisan group of colleagues in both Houses of Congress, to create a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements therein. The major objective of the resolution is to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of the Congress and to recommend changes in the present procedures which would strengthen, simplify, and expedite its operations and enable it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution. I am sure that we shall reintroduce this important measure in January 1963.

One of our widely read journalists, Roscoe Drummond, has written a cogent and timely article, "Crisis in Congress," which appeared in the Washington Post of October 13, 1962, affirming the urgent need for reform in congressional procedures.

While I do not agree that Congress is losing power, I do believe it is losing prestige and at a time when we can ill afford to lessen confidence in the legislative forums of our country. Congress must improve its procedures for conducting business if our legislative process is to meet the test of the times.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Drummond's article reprinted in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> CRISIS OF CONGRESS—THE GREAT NEED: SELF-REFORM
>
> (By Roscoe Drummond)
>
> The greatest national need today is not to get a man on the moon nor to build an aquarium in the District of Columbia.
>
> These things are all right and they are going to be done. But I submit that the frantic scramble of Congress to pass vital bills and appropriate vast sums of money in the last weary, out-of-breath hours of the tail end of the session reveals that the greatest need today is not for Congress to do something about others but to do something about itself.
>
> Congress is perilously near to losing its capacity to transact the public business.
>
> It has already lost the capacity to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently.
>
> Congress is losing power. It is losing prestige. It risks losing the confidence of the country.
>
> This isn't just bad for the Congress. It is bad for the country. It means that our very system of government—a government of balanced and coequal powers—is being altered by default.

With all the earnestness and conviction of a deathbed confession, Republican Senate floor leader Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska, shortly before his passing some 10 years ago, pleaded with his colleagues in these words:

"The creaking machinery of Congress is so appallingly inadequate for modern times that free representative government is endangered."

But Congress has been too busy to attend to itself.

It not only has not given "continuous attention" to the problem. It has not given it any attention—in 16 years.

Since then a few things have happened—like the cold war, $90-billion budgets, an exploding population, the race into outer space, a Soviet satellite state planted in the Western Hemisphere—which make the careful, responsible, efficient transaction of the public business by Congress a matter of national survival.

Congress simply isn't doing its job. It is doing it less well every year. This can't go on much longer.

Fortunately, two of the most influential Members of the House—Representatives Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri, and Chet Holifield of California—have been working on a bipartisan project which can lead to wide-ranging reorganization of congressional procedures, practices, and rules. They have already identified many of the areas crying for reform.

Senator Joseph Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, has sponsored a resolution with bipartisan backers in both Houses to create a joint committee on the reorganization of Congress. There is obviously gathering support for some kind of congressional reorganization.

Congress should certainly pick the scholars to do this study, but it seems to me that at least a half dozen of the big foundations would want to volunteer to contribute the funds to make it possible.

Congressman Wilson Reviews His 10 Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the final adjournment of the 87th Congress completes my 10th year of service to the 30th District of California. These have been 10 eventful years, and I shall be less than modest if I did not reflect pride in having served in these time-honored Halls during the past decade.

A 400,000 POPULATION INCREASE

My district, the most southwesterly in our Nation, has grown amazingly since 1952. An estimated 400,000 new residents have moved into new homes, working at over 100,000 new jobs, attending new schools and new churches. Literally, a community the size of Louisville, Ky., has come to life in the 30th District of California in the relatively brief but action-packed span of years.

INDIVIDUALS HELPED

I must confess that I have enjoyed being a part of this dynamic growth. My job as Representative of such a district has been always challenging, sometimes harried, but never dull. I owe many thanks to an able and dedicated staff of eight assistants, who have manned my offices in San Diego and Washington. To my surprise most of our time has been spent in helping individuals with personal problems. We have answered hundreds of thousands of constituents' letters and patiently solved the pressing problems of countless citizens who in one way or the other have needed the personal attention of their Congressman.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE IMPORTANT

I also owe many thanks to my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, who have cooperated with me, as I have tried to cooperate with them. The two chairmen of the House Armed Services Committee, the Honorable Dewey Short, Republican, of Missouri, and the present chairman, the Honorable Carl Vinson, Democrat, of Georgia, and the committee staff, have been especially helpful and patient, recognizing the multiplicity of problems that develop in a community so dependent on the Federal Government, and assisting the Representative of that district in adequately attending to the interests of his constituency so long as those interests paralleled the overriding interest of our great country.

KEEPS IN TOUCH WITH DISTRICT

My family has been very patient and understanding as I have practically commuted between San Diego and Washington, keeping up with vital growth and constant changes that have characterized this period. Although Members of Congress are reimbursed for only one round trip to Washington per year, I have made it a practice to visit my district once or twice each month, and clearly hold the record for west coast Members as to the frequency of visits home. Keeping in touch with district problems in this way plays hob with the pocketbook and with perfect attendance records, yet I know my district has been better served by my being on the scene often enough to keep up with the changing problems that have beset us.

Legislatively, I have worked on significant bills affecting the military strength of our country. I have been particularly interested in personnel legislation for the armed services. In addition, I have testified before many committees urgently stressing the need for legislation, much of which was beneficial to my constituents.

OVER $165 MILLION FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

It is difficult to recap all of the activities that in one way or another involve a congressional district and the Federal Government. For example, over $165 million has been spent in San Diego for military construction projects. Each project required authorization of my committee, the House Armed Services Committee, before the funds were appropriated. I am listing herewith some of the more important things that have touched the 30th District, some of which I worked on actively, some of which I supported or pushed, and some of which merely received my personal interest and attention. It proves, if nothing else, how great a role the Federal Government plays in the daily lives of all of us.

PROJECTS LISTED

Worked for airport tower and improvements for Gillespie Field. Worked for new post offices in Ocean Beach, Encanto, Bostonia, Lakeside, Chula Vista, Santee, Point Loma, College Park, Imperial Beach.

HELPED SCHOOLS

Introduced bill to remove suspected subversives from defense plants. Pushed for funds for five groins to repair beaches at Imperial Beach. Helped obtain Federal land for San Miguel School, California Western University, University of San Diego, Chula Vista Hilltop High School, San Diego city schools, University of California.

Pushed for electronics building, naval station, super carrier piers, electronics building and helicopter test facility, naval air station, and $60 million improvements at Miramar Naval Air Station.

FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

Worked for sale of Linda Vista homes to occupants. Helped write wetback control law. Additional funds for fire control in Cleveland National Forest, Sweetwater flood control survey. Return of 30,000 acres Camp Elliott to tax rolls.

SUPPORTED PAY INCREASES

Supported pay increases, medicare, and insurance provisions for Post Office and Government workers. Pushed through 54 bills for relief of private citizens. Helped write pay raise legislation for military personnel.

Pushed for over $80 million of "Federal impact" funds for San Diego schools. Supported medicare for military dependents. Supported Kerr-Mills medicare bill for needy senior citizens.

FOR CIVIL RIGHTS 100 PERCENT

Supported civil rights legislation 100 percent. Pushed legislation for retired Federal employees. Persuaded Maritime Administration to reduce rates for port of San Diego. Pushed simplified customs clearance for boats between San Diego and Mexico.

Pushed legislation for increased veterans' benefits. Supported $40 billion Federal highway program, benefiting U.S. 80 and U.S. 101. Pushed bill for new Federal judgeship, plus courtroom.

BROUGHT SEAWATER CONVERSION PLANT TO SAN DIEGO

Introduced first legislation for San Diego seawater conversion plant. Introduced bills for relief of Greek and Korean orphans. Land for expansion of Cabrillo Monument.

Introduced first bill, now law, transferring $3 million Camp Matthews land for University of California at San Diego. Introduced legislation to benefit Philippine servicemen. Introduced legislation credited with bringing major shipbuilding to San Diego.

HARBOR DEVELOPMENT PUSHED

Originated amendment for San Diego Harbor dredging for *Forrestal* carriers. Pushed first successful appropriation to reopen Mission Bay Channel and additional dredging.

Introduced Fisherman's Protective Act to benefit local tuna fishermen. Introduced original Fisherman's Policy Act to improve fishing industry.

Supported nuclear submarine pier, now permanent submarine home port facility.

APPROPRIATION OF $215,000 FOR PORT SURVEY

Obtained $215,000 for Corps of Engineers San Diego Harbor Improvement Survey now underway. Helped draft Federal Aviation Agency legislation to improve air service. Instrumental in bringing international conferences on aviation and tuna to San Diego. Congressional delegate to nuclear test ban negotiations in Geneva.

Congressman Harold M. Ryan Reports to the People of the 14th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as the 87th Congress draws to a close, I wish to report to the people of the 14th Congressional District upon my activities in Congress and the accomplishments of this Congress. This session was the longest in peacetime history.

It was a tremendous privilege that was bestowed upon me by the people of the 14th Congressional District of Michigan when they elected me, on February 13, 1962, to serve them and to help them with their various problems.

One cannot serve a term in this great legislative body without gaining renewed confidence in this Nation and our form of government.

From the time I raised my right hand and repeated the oath of office as given to me by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, I have conscientiously tried to discharge my duties in the national interest and in the interests of my constituents.

This will be a brief report on some of the more important issues considered in the 1962 session, now close to adjournment.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

Immediately after being sworn into office, I was assigned to a very powerful committee, the Banking and Currency Committee. This committee has broad powers over the banking and money problems, as well as in the field of housing, urban renewal, area redevelopment, Federal credit unions, the insurance of bank deposits, and on subjects of International Monetary Fund and the Import and Export Bank.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Congress reflected its sentiments concerning the graveness of the situations in Berlin and Cuba, by adopting strongly worded resolutions stating that Soviet intervention in our hemisphere constituted a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and that Berlin must be defended at all costs.

Troubles were also apparent in South America, the Congo, Laos, and in China. Because of the tense international situation, our defense has been greatly strengthened. We increased the Regular Army divisions from 11 up to 16, an increase of 45 percent. The President called up over 157,000 Reserves, and made many recommendations to improve the defense of our Nation.

The trouble spots also caused Congress to give attention, once again, to the passage of foreign aid for friendly nations. The House of Representatives originally reduced the President's request from nearly $5 billion to a little over $3½ billion, but the Senate restored some of the reduction and, as a result, when the bill was finally approved by the Congress, it was $289 million higher than the bill recommended by the House, but was over $1 billion less than the amount requested by the President.

The Congress also gave the President new authorizations for missiles, naval vessels and aircraft to strengthen free world defenses.

This Congress also authorized loans up to a total of $100 million by the United States to the United Nations based on matching combined subscriptions of all other countries.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

In dealing with economic measures to reduce unemployment and lessen its hardships, many measures were passed by the Congress. Among those were: a greatly expanded housing program; a broader minimum wage law; temporary increase in State unemployment compensation, a new farm program, a two-step pay increase for all Federal employees; tighter controls over public and private pension and welfare funds.

One of the most important was the manpower retraining program which authorizes a 3-year program of training of unemployed in vocational schools, or on-the-job retraining, to develop new skills; first 2 years' cost to be paid by Federal Government, third year, 50-50 with States.

Another vast program to alleviate unemployment was congressional action which provides for $900 million in immediate loans or grants for public works projects in redevelopment areas and communities with excess unemployment.

Legislation was enacted during this congressional session which increases lending authority of Small Business Administration for business loans and disaster loans to a combined total of $1.109 billion; investment company loans from $325 million limit to $341 million; authorizes loans to firms in need of assistance under Trade Expansion Act.

To continue the highway construction program, Congress authorized funds for allocation to the States for primary and secondary highway systems and extensions into urban areas.

SPACE PROGRAM

The effort in this field has been more than tripled since 1960. This Congress has authorized nearly $4 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency for the next fiscal year. This includes $263 million for planetary and lunar exploration.

These measures will enable American science to keep pace with developments in the space age and advance American space exploration programs.

A major achievement this year was the enactment of a law authorizing creation of a privately owned, Government-supervised corporation to handle this country's participation in developing a worldwide system of communication by satellite.

HOUSING

Congress extended the programs and also provided programs to enable private enterprise to provide housing for moderate income families and to permit owners of homes to repair and improve them with FHA insured loans. There was also a provision to increase the loans available to colleges to build dormitories and urban renewal grant authority was extended.

Legislation was also enacted to provide an increase in the authorization to insure mortgages by FHA so citizens can borrow money at the bank to buy a house with a smaller downpayment than otherwise would be possible. Thousands of homes are now being purchased under this present program.

VETERANS

The 87th Congress authorized payment of $60 million special dividend to eligible policyholders of national service life insurance.

It extended direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975. It also authorized $1.2 billion for direct loans program through fiscal year 1967.

In this session, Congress also increased by an average of 9.4 percent the rate of compensation for service-connected disability paid to 1.9 million veterans; provided increased benefits to parents and children of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities. A permanent program of vocational rehabilitation was provided for veterans with service-connected disability serving between World War II and the Korean conflict and thereafter. Compensation was also increased for blinded veterans.

Legislation was passed which authorizes VA hospital and medical care for peacetime veterans with noncompensable service-connected disabilities.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 clearly will become a historic monument to the work of this Congress. The tariff powers it confers upon the President are the powers that are needed if the Nation is to embrace the opportunities in the rapid expansion of the European trade arising out of the Common Market. The 87th Congress, by the passage of the Trade Expansion Act, is making the recovered and rejuvenated Europe of large consequence in the economic life of the free world.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE

The 87th Congress amended the Social Security Act, to reduce public assistance rolls, by: Providing grants to States that establish work programs for needy; increasing U.S. share of administrative costs; extending for 5 years payments to families of unemployed fathers and other needy children; raising by $4 per month ceiling on Federal matching grants for aged, blind, and disabled; and increasing grants for child welfare services.

Congress also passed legislation which encourages self-employed and professionals to establish pension plans for themselves and employees by granting income tax deduction for funds set aside up to $2,500 per year.

The senior citizens of this country were not forgotten by this Congress. Action was taken and legislation was passed which provides for low- and moderate-cost housing for elderly in urban and rural areas; authorizes $200 million for loan funds for new construction and other programs.

Legislation was also provided which raised minimum monthly old-age insurance payments under Social Security Act from $33 to $40; increases benefits to widows; provides male workers may draw reduced benefits upon retirement at age 62; liberalizes disability provisions.

In the field of public health, Congress saw that it was necessary to provide for the stricter regulation of drug industry and of distribution of new drugs, which topped the list of health and welfare measures.

It also enacted legislation which authorized a 3-year program of grants to aid States and communities in carrying out mass vaccination programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus.

In the field of education, Congress authorized matching Federal grants up to $1 million for any State to purchase TV transmission equipment for educational purposes, providing the State or sponsoring agency furnish the land, building, and guarantee to operate and maintain the channel.

U.S. PEACE CORPS

A U.S. Peace Corps has been established as an independent agency subject to policy guidance of the State Department. The Peace Corps has already achieved great success as can be seen by its unparalleled, enthusiastic acceptance in foreign countries. It indicates that programs of a relatively modest size, if tailored to fit the social and economic needs of other countries, may be the most effective kind of foreign aid. President Kennedy's bold approach has been most successful.

In the second session, the Peace Corps was extended and expanded. This agency has been acclaimed by many writers on foreign affairs as the most significant and advantageous change in our relationship with the underdeveloped countries of the world in the 20th century.

BILLS I HAVE INTRODUCED AS A CONGRESSMAN

H.R. 10834, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. The major objective of this bill is to eliminate nationality discrimination from our general immigration laws. The new quotas provided for in the bill reflect the actual experience of recent years of our immigration policy.

H.R. 11013, a bill to allow, as a deduction from income taxes, the amount paid for tuition. This bill will allow a taxpayer a deduction for the tuition that has been paid to any grade school, high school, or college.

H.R. 11406, a bill to provide assistance in the development of mass transportation. This bill would authorize the Federal Government, through the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, to make Federal loans or grants to assist State and local bodies and agencies in financing facilities and equipment to provide mass transportation to move people much faster in the metropolitan areas.

H.R. 12912, a bill to accelerate the research with respect to the causes, prevention and cure of cancer, heart diseases, and mental illness. This bill would grant the authority to proceed at a more rapid rate to determine the causes, find methods to prevent and effect cures of cancer, heart disease and mental illness. These illnesses are the greatest killers, and take a terrible toll of life. Research would be stepped up to prevent much less suffering and greater loss of life.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 87TH CONGRESS

This Congress has enacted over 800 public laws and has given President Kennedy 74 percent of the major measures for which he asked during this session. The Republican critics of the Congress will not point out that many measures which could have been enacted failed because of their coalition with reactionary Democrats. The defeat of the bill to provide aid to colleges and universities, to bring the cost of educating generations to come within reach of all, and to help ease the incredible overcrowding of our schools of high learning, is a monument to this reactionary coalition, as was the defeat of general school aid legislation to ease the crippling overcrowding in schools and excessive tax burdens on homeowners in large cities across the land.

Disagreements in many areas on major legislation between the House and the Senate became a frequent occurrence. The total number of bills introduced in the House of Representatives during the near 10-month session exceeded 6,000 and brought the 2-year total of bills to more than 13,600. Less than 8 percent became law and many of these were bills of a private nature. As is generally true in our legislative process, many bills of prime importance were not even considered. To attempt to sum up this Congress as being one primarily of achievement or failure is, of course, entirely a matter of one's personal point of view.

PERSONAL REPORT

During the 1962 session, more than 400 residents of the 14th Congressional District visited my office in Washington. My staff arranges tours of the White House, provides gallery passes for both the House and Senate, and schedules tours of many other places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital.

In April of this session of Congress, I took a special opinion poll in my district to determine how the majority of my constituents feel about the many controversial legislative issues. The poll brought a tremendous response running considerably higher than the average mail public opinion poll return. Tabulations on each question were carefully summarized and the results placed in the press as well as in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 1962.

I have sought to provide vigorous and effective representation to the people of my district in the Congress and in the handling of the many types of problems which they bring to me.

I assisted in bringing to Michigan the whole mobility command of the Department of Defense and to locate in this area headquarters for 40,000 Federal positions. The jobs of thousands of employees at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command were saved by this action.

Although this report might appear quite lengthy, it is actually but a brief analysis of what Congress did during this past session.

I pledge to continue my efforts on behalf of the people of my district, and to continue the same record of legislative endeavor.

Hospital Insurance Under Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been a consistent and resolute supporter of legislation designed to provide hospital and related benefits to our senior citizens through the social security mechanism. I continue to support it, even though we have been forewarned of what to expect by way of political activity by the American Medical Association. My support is based on five factors.

First, a vast body of data, and more importantly the testimony of thousands upon thousands of older Americans, pinpoint the problem of financing the costs of care as pervasive, growing, and insoluble on an individual basis.

Second, this problem not only affects the more than 17 million persons who are 65 or older, but also directly involves and is equally acute for the many millions of Americans who are their relatives.

Third, despite much hullabaloo and sloganeering by the AMA and its economic cronies, Kerr-Mills and private health insurance are totally inadequate to the task. Burying one's head in the sand does not make Kerr-Mills any more adequate nor any less degrading. The ostrich's viewpoint does not eliminate the inadequacy of private health insurance nor does it justify the many instances of exploitation of the elderly by private insurance carriers.

Fourth, the Nation is the real loser when a great many of our people live in genuine fear of impoverishment as a result of inevitable illness. Can we as a nation tolerate a situation that forces older Americans, after a lifetime of struggle and work, to hold their meager assets in readiness for the crushing and certain expenses of illness? Must we look on passively while our senior citizens, after virtually everything is gone, are forced to plead poverty in order to secure needed medical attention?

Fifth, the clear answer to a national problem is national action. No one has come forward with a more honorable or more workable or more equitable solution to this problem than that represented by the program of protection that would be provided through the time-tested and highly efficient social security system. The proposed program would provide immediate help to 17 million older Americans. It would enable the younger generation to adequately anticipate and provide for the inevitable expenses of their older years. The King-Anderson bill, as amended in the Senate, is essentially a self-financing program that would make protection available to all in a dignified and assured fashion.

Now just who would be covered under the amended King-Anderson bill and what benefits would be guaranteed to them?

PERSONS COVERED

Basically, this is a program for people who now are or will be eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits. In the future, this will obviously include almost the entire population except for Federal employees, who have their own program, and a few groups such as doctors. Doctors have indicated that they would like to participate under the social security program—but the AMA stringently enforces its rule by intimidation and has vetoed physician participation thus far.

Most of those who are eligible for social security today, will, of course, not have an opportunity to contribute toward the cost of their protection. Payment for coverage of these people will obviously comprise part of the social security contributions of younger people. But this is essentially a one-shot proposition and in the future all new eligibles will, of course, have contributed toward the cost of their insurance. To leave those presently eligible for social security out of the program because they had not contributed would condemn them for the shortsightedness of an earlier generation—and would leave the Nation with an enormous problem of unmet desperate need. It would continue to place a great burden upon their younger relatives who have sufficient difficulty struggling to meet their own everyday needs. The younger generation has expressed its readiness to have this burden—not only economic but emotional—lifted from them in major part and has expressed its willingness to do so through means of rational and moderate payroll deduction.

In addition, the program would cover, during its first few years, those persons over the age of 65 or reaching 65 during the initial years, who have never had a chance to become covered under social security or who have participated for a very brief period only. Coverage for this group of older Americans would also be on a one-shot basis and would be financed from general revenues.

It should be recognized that inclusion of the presently retired elderly in the program would lead to some significant financial savings in other areas. Savings in Federal, State, and local appropriations for public assistance care, as well as in charitable expenditures would be hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

BENEFITS

The program would provide 90 days of hospital care with the beneficiary contributing $10 daily for the first 9 days—minimum $20 contribution; 180 days of care in a skilled nursing home—that is, an institution which is basically medically oriented; 240 home health visits; and diagnostic services rendered by the outpatient department of the hospital, with beneficiary paying the first $20 toward the cost of diagnostic services during any consecutive 30-day period.

Persons having these benefits under a private insurance plan could use them and have the company compensated from the social security fund.

It should be noted that this program only provides a "floor of protection." There are substantial expenses that will still have to be met through other means. Personal resources, family help, and Kerr-Mills would have to be employed to cope with doctor bills, the cost of drugs and medications, and similar major items of expense. The point is that the amended King-Anderson bill would help meet those expenses that have the greatest impact in the shortest period—those incurred for hospital and related care.

NEED

One of every six Americans over the age of 65 is hospitalized each year. Nine of every ten Americans reaching 65 can expect to be hospitalized at some time. And in many cases this means recurrent periods of hospitalization, for the elderly have a far higher incidence of chronic illnesses than does the younger population.

What does this mean in dollars and cents? The average cost of a day's hospital care in Oregon is almost $40. The average hospital stay for an older person is 15 days. The cost of an average stay would therefore be about $600 in Oregon.

But these are only averages. All too many senior citizens are hospitalized for 30, 60, or 90 days and more than once. Again, the costs of hospital care are only part of the medical expenses these Americans face. When we realize that more than 50 percent of the elderly have annual incomes of less than $1,000 the enormity of the problem becomes apparent. The necessity of doing something about it is equally apparent.

And what about the burden of expense thrust upon young families by the illnesses of older relatives? The costs of decent education are rising rapidly. How can money be put aside for the college education of grandchildren when the medical expenses of grandparents create a constant drain upon the resources of young families already struggling to make ends meet. And the grandparents are aware of this problem, too. All too many of our elderly put off or just do not seek necessary care for fear of upsetting the plans and families of their loved ones. This is what I am referring to when I say that enactment of the King-Anderson bill would help solve the problems of several generations of Americans—not just those who are over 65. Are there acceptable and workable alternatives to a program of protection provided through the social security system? I think not.

INADEQUACY OF KERR-MILLS

The American Medical Association and its apologists point, I am sure with less than pride, to the Kerr-Mills Act and to private health insurance as substitutes for the King-Anderson. At best, these are not substitutes but supplements. Neither Kerr-Mills nor private insurance can do the job that must be done, and I say that as one who helped pass the Kerr-Mills Act.

Kerr-Mills aid is now available in only 25 States—more than 2 years after its enactment. It is a relief program complete with means tests and investigations, not only of the sick person, but in some States of his or her children and other relatives. It is replete with indignities for Americans whose only crime is that they grow old. These people must prove that they are virtually "broke" in order to get help. And even after suffering through means tests there are no assurances that adequate benefits will be available. Only 3 or 4 of the 25 States with Kerr-Mills programs have plans that can possibly be clasified as comprehensive. Oregon, most assuredly, is not one of those three or four States.

Oregonians, who can qualify for Kerr-Mills, have available to them a grand total of 14 days of hospital care a year. And, of course, they are required to pay $7.50 a day for the first 10 days. Oregon, I am sad to say, is not overgenerous with its older citizens. By May of this year, fewer than 2 out of every 1,000 Oregonians 65 or over had received anything under it, for a grand total of 372 people.

It is illuminating to compare our Kerr-Mills program in Oregon with that of our sister State of California. California and Oregon both started making Kerr-Mills payments in January of this year. While it is true that California has almost 8 times as many people 65 or over as Oregon, during the first 6 months of this year: First, California paid out 80 times as much Kerr-Mills money as did Oregon; and, second, California gave some Kerr-Mills help to 66 times as many people as did my State of Oregon.

There is a further amazing comment on the wondrous world of Kerr-Mills in Oregon. The administrative expenses of the feeble Kerr-Mills effort in Oregon are fantastic. It costs the State 38 cents in redtape to pay out $1 in benefits. Of course, this situation is completely understandable. After all, investigations and means tests and making sure that an Oregonian pays his $7.50 a day toward his hospital bill costs an awful lot of money.

The means test alone makes Kerr-Mills an unacceptable method for financing health care for our older citizens. But it has other flaws that make it an impossible solution to a national problem. These stem from the fact that the efficacy of Kerr-Mills is totally dependent upon the resources and propensities of each one of the 50 States. As has been noted, either as a consequence of propensity, lack of resources or both, 25 States have not put Kerr-Mills programs into effect.

It must be remembered that States receive matching Federal funds contingent upon what the States themselves can raise—or rather scrape up. There is the rub. The large majority of the States, because of urgent and competing demands for available funds from programs such as school and road construction, cannot raise sufficient "seed money" to secure the Federal grants necessary to finance adequate Kerr-Mills programs. Most of the States, according to their own standards of need, do not even adequately finance their programs for the most needy—those on relief. As we all know, welfare appropriations are usually at the bottom of State legislative lists.

KERR-MILLS IS TRUE SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

One of the strangest things about the medical profession's announced reliance upon the Kerr-Mills program is that it is really socialized medicine. The States decide what medical costs shall be financed under it, including doctors' bills, and who shall be eligible for them. Then it pays the bills.

There is nothing whatever to stop the States from eliminating the means test and just paying medical bills for its elderly, with up to 70 percent coming right out of the Federal Treasury. They can do that under this statute. They are limited only by their lack of matching funds, and by the general attitude that this should be a program primarily for the indigent.

There is no insurance principle to Kerr-Mills. There is no fund made up of tax contributions by those who will receive its benefits. It is often cited as an objection to King-Anderson that some would receive benefits under it who have not paid into the fund. Yet its critics are backing a plan financed entirely by general revenues, where no one pays into a fund from which the benefits will be paid.

Another inadequacy of Kerr-Mills is that it varies even among the 25 States that do have it. We are a mobile population. But, it may very well be financially impossible for an older individual eligible for Kerr-Mills help in one State to visit or reside with his family in another State that has no Kerr-Mills program. For example, that senior citizen blessed with the rather dubious benefits provided under Oregon's Kerr-Mills program would not even have meager protection if he chose to visit relatives in say, South Dakota. South Dakota does not have a Kerr-Mills program. It is really a 25–25 proposition. Twenty-five States have programs and 25 States do not. As to moving among the States that do have Kerr-Mills programs, it is comparable to Russian roulette with a 25-chambered revolver. You may pull the trigger on a State that has a fair program but the odds are against it.

Obviously, Kerr-Mills is no substitute for a program guaranteeing our older citizens the same protection wherever they may be in the Nation. It was not intended to be. It is not aimed at the general health needs of the elderly, but at those who are truly destitute. Those who are trying to call it a complete substitute for insurance against hospital costs are really doing great harm to the Kerr-Mills Act itself.

PRIVATE INSURANCE INADEQUATE

Private health insurance cannot do the necessary job, either. It is estimated that only one-sixteenth of the health expenses of people 65 and over is covered by insurance. The commercial insurers are in business to make a profit—and you do not make a profit insuring older Americans. The programs that are offered to our senior citizens are generally high priced, limited in benefits, and unavailable to those persons who need the protection most. A fat part of premiums paid by the elderly goes not for benefits but for commissions and stockholder profits.

However, the King-Anderson program would give standing in its coverage to individuals having private coverage. They could use their private insurance benefits.

As for Blue Cross, well they really cannot do the job, either. As Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey pointed out in the Senate a few weeks ago, the Blue Cross Association—the national organization of Blue Cross plans—seems to be mainly interested in creating an illusion of action rather than in problem solving. In all fairness, it must be admitted that illusion is probably Blue Cross' only alternative here. Despite their best efforts, they have conceded that 94 percent of the elderly cannot finance their medical expenses without sacrificing some of life's necessities—that is, reducing their expenditures for food, clothing, and shelter.

The Blue Cross Association spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on advertising in national magazines urging older Americans throughout the country to contact their local Blue Cross plan for "full details" of new amplified programs of protection. As Senator WILLIAMS pointed out, most of the plans are offering what they have always had in the shop—some of them adding a little dressing and fat price increases.

Our Oregon Blue Cross says it has nothing readily available but hopes to offer something for older Oregonians at the end of the year. I sincerely trust it is a package superior to that amplified new program being offered in our sister State of Washington.

Senior citizens in Washington are at complete liberty to purchase Blue Cross coverage at the fantastic monthly cost of $27.50 per couple—$334 a year. This does not include the cost of companion Blue Shield benefits. In return for this huge sum, they get a plan that does not even cover any preexisting conditions—that is, any illnesses they may have when the coverage commences or a new episode of a prior condition. This is great protection for the many thousands of older Washingtonians who suffer from chronic illnesses. Not only does the Washington Blue Cross plan exclude coverage for preexisting conditions, but will not provide protection for any care provided for hernias, cardiac, vascular, renal, cancerous, or tumorous conditions until after 12 months of continuous coverage under the plan—despite the fact that these illnesses occurred after coverage commenced. Indeed, I fervently trust the Oregon Blue Cross plan will offer something more meaningful than the lovely package developed by the Washington Blue Cross.

COST OF KING-ANDERSON

Mr. President, I believe the point need not be labored. I believe it is crystal clear that the financing of the hospital and related costs of care of our senior citizens can only be adequately achieved by a program such as that envisaged by the King-Anderson bill.

Far from the inflated cost which its opponents charge it with, the maximum social security tax to pay for it would be $17.16 a year for a worker earning the highest amount of earnings taxed or $5,200 a year. It would be matched by an equal amount from his employer.

That is his annual contribution toward medical insurance for himself and his wife after they reach 65—$17.16. At the same time, his aged parents, or his inlaws, who may already be over 65, would also be eligible for benefits. Compare $17.16 a year to the $40 a day this Oregon worker could pay for the hospitalization of one of these aged parents.

In such cases, the young married couple is better off if their parents are completely destitute, because then they have a chance of getting some help under the Kerr-Mills program.

That is really all Kerr-Mills was intended for. To ease the financial burden of medical treatment for the great number of elderly men and women who are neither destitute nor well off, we need insurance under social security.

Highlights of 87th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, though it has been long, this 2d session of the 87th Congress has been highly productive. We have had some disappointments but many accomplishments.

I am especially proud of the enactment of a strong drug bill. After 2½ years of hearings by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, and despite efforts to torpedo it, we finally achieved legislation which will go far toward correcting abuses in prescription drugs.

It will mean, I believe, safer, more effective and—to some extent—lower priced drugs. Provisions which would have helped to lower the prices of patented drugs were left out, but I hope something can be done about this in the 88th Congress.

We also moved ahead domestically with a public works acceleration bill and job retraining legislation. We strengthened our defenses. And we are, literally, beginning to shoot for the moon.

In the foreign field, this Congress reached new heights of statesmanship with enactment of the Trade Expansion Act, giving a new dimension to the Cordell Hull free-trade principle, and creation of the Peace Corps.

And with the resolutions on Cuba and Berlin, we have let the Communists know we stand behind our President in what he may have to do to safeguard freedom.

I regret the failure to pass sound legislation for medical care for the aging. I regret that the tax revision bill which became law turned out to be just a hollow shell of what is drastically needed. And a major defeat for the public interest, in my opinion, was passage of the communications satellite bill, creating a private monopoly in this field before it has been fully explored.

For Tennessee, however, it was a good year. We will start construction of the Percy Priest and Cordell Hull Dams and the Dale Hollow Fish Hatchery. A much-needed 48-mile road from Tellico Plains, Tenn., through the Cherokee National Forest to Robbinsville, N.C., was authorized. We just missed getting a go-ahead on two long-sought projects, Devils Jump Dam in the Kentucky-Tennessee Cumberland border area and the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway through Tennessee and Alabama to the gulf. I hope these will be approved next year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include a brief résumé of the highlights of this second session in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF 87TH CONGRESS

ECONOMIC AREA

Agriculture

Senate passed two farm bills during the 2d session of the 87th Congress. The first bill, S. 3225, with two exceptions was very much like the second farm bill which has been enacted into law. The two exceptions were the provisions relating to price supports and production controls for feed grains. (S. 3225 was killed in the House.)

Second farm bill: As enacted this bill has four major titles, which contain numerous innovations as aids to reducing farm surpluses and solving agricultural problems by providing for a new permanent supply management wheat program, a 1-year extension of present feed grain program and replacing the 1958 corn law with a provision effective in 1964 permitting the Secretary to set price supports for corn between 50 and 90 percent of parity and expansion of surplus disposal under Public Law 480. Includes a new land-use-adjustment program to take land out of production and divert its use to recreational and public purposes. Public Law 87-703.

Sugar Act extension: Extended to December 31, 1966, the Sugar Act of 1948 and set new quotas for domestic and foreign sugar producing areas. Public Law 87-535.

Sugar—Western Hemisphere: Reserved 150,000 tons of premium-priced sugar for Latin American supplies for 1963 and 1964, and 75,000 for balance of 1962. Public Law 87-539.

Farmers Home Administration loans: Raised the annual limitation on Farmers Home Administration insured loans from $150 million to $200 million. These farm ownership loans made to families with a farm background and experience or training to help them buy, enlarge, or develop farms and to refinance debts. Public Law 87-749.

Textile imports: Authorized the President, for the purpose of carrying out any agreement under section 204 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1956, to limit imports of any agricultural commodity or product covered by such agreement from countries not participating in the agreement, if, in his judgment, such imports would seriously affect domestic producers. Public Law 87-488.

Cotton disposal: Provided for disposal of all extra-long-staple cotton in the strategic stockpile by transferring domestic cotton to the CCC for unrestricted use at not less than 115 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges, and foreign cotton for export only at not less than the world price. Public Law 87-548.

Cotton farmers: Extended for 1 year an emergency measure enacted last year to bring relief to cotton farmers whose land has been and is unplantable because of recent floods or whose plantings have been washed out. Public Law 87-446.

Feed grains: Liberalized requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program by permitting farmers to plant barley on land taken out of wheat production and make barley interchangeable with other feed grains. Public Law 87-425.

Forest management: Doubled the authorization under the Cooperative Forest Management Act which furnishes technical assistance to small forest and woodlot owners. Public Law 87-680.

Federal Extension Service: Authorized funds appropriated in excess of the 1962 funds to be distributed on the basis of an equalized formula, for the first 20 percent. Public Law 87-749.

Forestry research: Authorized matching grants for forestry research to land-grant colleges, agricultural experiment stations, other colleges and universities offering graduate training in sciences basic to forestry and having a forestry school. Public Law 87-788.

Manpower retraining: Authorized a 3-year, $435 million, program of training of unemployed in vocational schools or on-the-job retraining to develop new skills; first 2 years' cost to be paid with Federal funds, third year 50-50 matching with the States. Public Law 87-415.

Work Hours Act: Provided for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time and a half for overtime after an 8-hour day or 40-hour week. Public Law 87-581.

Accelerated public works program: Authorized the President to allocate $900 million for job-creating public works projects in areas where there is heavy unemployment, the funds to be allocated to Federal agencies for acceleration or initiation of authorized projects. Public Law 87-658.

Public debt: Enacted a $2 billion temporary increase in the public debt—from $298 billion to $300 billion (to June 30, 1962). Public Law 87-414.

Tax revision: Enacted a major revision and reform of our Federal tax system which would (1) permit a business to claim a tax credit up to 7 percent (3 percent in the case of certain utilities) of the price of newly purchased business equipment, but requires a businessman to reduce his tax reductions for the depreciation of an item if he claims the investment credit at time of purchase; (2) tighten the allowable tax deductions on business expense accounts; (3) legalize tax reductions for lobbying expenses directly relating to appearances before and communications with any legislative body or individual legislator providing this affects the taxpayer's business; (4) continue the current deferral privileges for manufacturing subsidiaries of controlled foreign corporations, but would tax earnings of nonmanufacturing subsidiaries unless they were located in an underdeveloped country and their earnings put back into an underdeveloped nation; (5) impose on U.S. citizens who are bona fide residents of foreign countries a tax on income in excess of $20,000 in the first 3 years of residence abroad and in excess of $35,000 thereafter; (6) increase taxes on earnings of savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks, which are now largely tax exempt; and (7) require that corporations and financial institutions report to the taxpayer and to the Government any dividend, interest, or patronage dividend payments of $10 or more. (H.R. 10650.) Public Law 87-834.

Tax changes: Permitted an employer to claim tax deductions for his contributions to employee pension plans which include medical care among their retirement benefits; broadened the allowable individual tax deductions for medical expenses; permitted oil companies, for 1962 only, to deduct drilling costs on tax returns in 1 year rather than claim them as depreciation over several years; and required a State or local government operating retail liquor stores to buy only one $54 Federal liquor tax stamp a year instead of one for each store. (H.R. 10620.) Public Law 87-863.

Tax Rate Extension Act of 1962: Extended for 1 year the existing corporate tax rate and certain excise tax rates, while reducing or eliminating taxes on the transportation of persons. Public Law 87-508.

Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962: Authorized an additional $100 million (to $225 million) for the existing program of direct loans to provide housing for the elderly. Established a new program for rural areas and authorized $50 million for loans to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies to build rental housing for the elderly and related facilities such as dining halls and infirmaries. The new plan to be administered by the Farmers Home Administration includes $50 million loan fund to help elderly persons purchase an existing home or housing site. Public Law 87-723.

Foreign bank deposits: To help slow the U.S. gold outflow, removed for a period of 3 years the Federal Reserve Board's present ceiling—which ranges up to 4 percent, varying with the duration of a deposit—on interest rates paid by U.S. commercial banks on time deposits of foreign governments, their central banks or other monetary authorities, and international institutions of which the United States is a member. (H.R. 12080.) Public Law 87-827.

Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962: Authorized a total of $2.3 billion for fiscal years 1963-65 to continue the Federal-aid highway program for the regular system; for additional amounts for roads on Federal lands; for completion of the Rama Road in Nicaragua, the Inter-American Highway in Central America and Panama; and for relocation payments for families and businesses displaced by acquisition or clearance of rights-of-way for Federal-aid highways. Authorized a new category of public lands development roads and trails for important roads on the public domain. Permits use of secondary highway funds for roads on that system located in urban areas. Promotes cooperative transportation planning in certain urban areas by Federal, State, and local authorities; and permits the use of additional Federal-aid funds for highway planning and research. (H.R. 12135.) Public Law 87–866.

Public debt limit increase: Provided for a temporary debt limit of $308 billion through March 31, 1963, and $305 billion from April 1, 1963, through June 24, 1963, and $300 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963. Public Law 87–512.

SBA amendments: Increased the Small Business Administration's revolving fund ceiling to $1,666 million. Of the $1,666 million authorized, $1,325 million will be used for regular business and disaster loans. Earmarks a separate fund of $341 million for loans to small business investment companies. Public Law 87–550.

Self-employed voluntary pension plans: Encouraged establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed professionals by permitting them to set aside up to $2,500 or 10 percent of their income, whichever is lesser, in an approved retirement program and permits them to deduct from taxable income up to a maximum of $1,250 in any one year for contributions to the fund. Public Law 87–792.

Civil service retirees: Provided a 5-percent increase, effective January 1, 1963, to all entitled annuitants on that date. Public Law 87–793.

Retirement income credit: Increased to $1,524 from $1,200 the maximum annual amount a retired person can substract from his tax payment. (H.R. 6371.) Public Law 87–876.

Alumina and bauxite—Duty free: Continued to July 16, 1964, suspension of duty on alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum, crude bauxite, and calcined bauxite. Public Law 87–567.

Duty suspension—Shoe lathes: Continues to August 7, 1964, existing suspension of duties on shoe lathes. Public Law 87–607.

Bicycles: Provided a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles to preclude middleweights from coming in as lightweights. (H.R. 8938.) Public Law 87– .

Trade and communications economy

Trade Expansion Act of 1962: Gave the President general authority to cut all tariffs as much as 50 percent over the next 5 years; empowered him to remove tariffs as much as he believes desirable on products in which the United States and Western Europe account for most of the world trade; permitted the President to negotiate tariff reductions on entire categories of commodities instead of item by item as at present; established a new program of subsidies to serve as a substitute for tariff protection for workers and companies hurt by import competition; prohibited the United States from granting tariff concessions to Poland and Yugoslavia and eliminated present concessions to these nations; and removed the peril-point provision of present law which empowers the Tariff Commission to recommend minimum safe tariffs on specific items prior to international trade negotiations, and authorizes the Commission only to advise the President on the probable economic effect of any proposed trade agreement action. Public Law 87–794.

All-channel television receivers: Authorized Federal Communications Commission to require all television receivers shipped in interstate commerce or imported into the United States must, at the time of manufacture, be capable of adequately receiving all TV channels. Public Law 87–529.

Railroads—Tax relief: Permitted any regulated transportation company to spread its net operating loss over 7 succeeding years in computing its taxable income. Public Law 87–710.

DEFENSE AND SPACE EXPLORATION AREAS

Ready Reserves: Gave President standby authority to call 150,000 military reservists to active duty if an international crisis should require it. Public Law 87–736.

Berlin resolution: Approved a concurrent resolution putting Congress on record for any action, including the use of military force, needed to uphold Western rights in Berlin. Adopted unanimously by both Houses.

Cuban resolution: Approved a resolution on Cuba stating the United States will use force if necessary to halt the spread of communism in this hemisphere. Public Law 87–733.

Military construction authorization: Authorized $1,455,672,500 for construction and related authority for the military departments and the Department of Defense. Public Law 87–554.

Space authorization: Authorized $3.7 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1963. Public Law 87–584.

Communications satellite system: Established Communications Satellite Corporation, subject to Government regulation, to plan and operate with foreign governments and businesses a commercial communications satellite system. Public Law 87–624.

AEC authorization: Authorized appropriations of $242,695,000 for AEC construction projects; of this amount $159,415,000 was authorized for 42 new projects; authorized AEC to contract with Washington Public Power Supply System for sale of byproduct steam under certain conditions and for construction of electric generating facilities in connection with AEC's atomic reactor in Hanford, Wash. Act stipulates that sale of Hanford steam must provide a substantial financial return to the Treasury, any modification of the reactor for utilization of the steam must be paid by the purchaser of the steam, and the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee must be given an opportunity to review the contract before the Government signs it. If these and other conditions are not met, the steam cannot be sold. Public Law 87–701.

AEC amendments: Amended Atomic Energy Commission Act of 1954 by authorizing establishment of one or more atomic safety and licensing boards; provided Government indemnity coverage for oversea nuclear accidents involving contractors or subcontractors of AEC and limited oversea coverage to $100 million. Public Law 87–615.

Armed services procurement: Amends the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 controlling procurement of property and services by the Armed Forces and NASA—to encourage procurement by formal advertising; to obtain more competition in negotiated procurement; and to provide safeguards for the Government against inflated cost estimates in negotiated contracts. Public Law 87–653.

Southern interstate nuclear compact: Granted congressional consent to southern interstate nuclear compact which will establish a regional agency, the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board, to develop and control peaceful uses of nuclear energy throughout the compact area. Public Law 87–563.

Public facility loans: Makes certain federally impacted areas in which there is located a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration eligible for a loan under the public facility loan program. Public Law 87–634.

Civil defense emergency authorities extended: Extended to June 30, 1966, the provision of title III of the Civil Defense Act which authorized the President to declare a national emergency for civil defense purposes and to assume emergency powers during such an emergency. Public Law 87–501.

Reserves—Lump-sum payments: Equalized the treatment between "Reserves" and "Regulars" by increasing the readjustment payments to 2 months' basic pay for each year of active duty for a Reserve member released after 5 years' active duty; and authorized maximum readjustments of 2 years' basic pay or $15,000, whichever is lesser. Public Law 87–509.

World War I emergency officer retirement: Reopened the emergency officers' retirement program to permit a limited group of former World War I emergency officers to apply for and receive the benefits of that program. (H.R. 8517.) Public Law 87–875.

INTERNATIONAL AREA

Foreign aid authorization: Authorized $1.2 billion in foreign aid for fiscal 1963 for development grants, investment guarantees, investment surveys, international organizations and programs, supporting assistance and the contingency fund, and $2.4 billion over a 4-year period for the Alliance for Progress, which includes $600 million for fiscal 1963. Public Law 87–565.

International Monetary Fund: Granted the Secretary of the Treasury standby authority to lend up to $2 billion to the International Monetary Fund so that 10 industrialized nations, including the United States, can participate in a special lending program. Public Law 87–490.

Peace Corps: Authorized $63,750,000 to finance the operations of the Peace Corps during fiscal 1963. (Forty million dollars was authorized last year but only $30 million appropriated.) Public Law 87–442.

U.N. bonds: Authorized an appropriation of $100 million for a loan to the U.N. on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis with other nations for the purchase of U.N. bonds to ease the financial crisis caused by the Congo. Public Law 87–731.

Drugs: Strengthened Federal regulation under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide consumers with better, safer, and less expensive drugs. Public Law 87–781.

Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962: Authorized a 3-year program of special project grants to States and, with State approval, to local communities to pay part of the cost of intensive vaccination programs against four contagious diseases—polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. (H.R. 10541.) Public Law 87–868.

Air pollution control study: Extends to June 30, 1966, and authorizes up to $5 million annually in appropriations for a continuation of the present study being conducted by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in conjunction with various State agencies into the causes, effects, and ways to abate air pollution with special emphasis on the effects of automobile exhaust fumes. Public Law 87–761.

National school lunch funds: Revised the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds to States in the school lunch program to base it on the number of lunches served the previous year plus the assistance-need factor instead of the present system of number of children aged 5 to 17 plus the assistance-need factor. (H.R. 11665.) Public Law 87–823.

CRIMINAL LAWS STRENGTHENED

Gambling devices: Broadened the definition of gambling devices to cover additional types of machines manufactured for gambling purposes, and requires detailed records of all such devices shipped in interstate commerce. (S. 1658.) Public Law 87–840.

Antitrust: Authorized Department of Justice to demand the records of business firms under investigation for possible use in antitrust cases. Public Law 87–664.

Smith Act amendment: Defines and clarifies the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act of 1940 to make it apply to continuing as well as original Communist activities. Public Law 87–486.

Juvenile delinquents: Requires juveniles adjudged delinquents be committed to the custody of Attorney General for observation and study and that a full report be submitted within 60 days by the Bureau of Prisons. Public Law 87–428.

Adoption of minors: Imposing criminal penalties on persons trafficking for profit in interstate commerce in placing, or in arranging for placement of, children for adoption or permanent free care. (S. 654.)

Trafficking in phonograph records: Provided a criminal penalty for counterfeiting phonograph records and labels. Public Law 87–773.

WELFARE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT AREAS

Education and training

Aid to education: Enacted a $2,550 million 3-year Federal-aid-to-education program for school construction and increasing teachers salaries. (S. 1021.)

Educational television: Authorized a 5-year, $32 million program of grants to the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, to establish or improve the educational television broadcasting facilities in our public schools, colleges, and in adult training programs. Grantees may be any nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage educational television broadcasting and which is eligible according to the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in effect on April 12, 1962, to receive a license from the Commission for a noncommercial educational broadcasting station. Public Law 87–447.

Surplus personal property to schools: Clarified the provisions of existing law permitting disposal of surplus Federal property for activities providing educational or occupational training for mentally retarded children, schools for the physically handicapped, educational television stations, and public libraries. Public Law 87–786.

War orphans education aid: Raised the present ceiling-age of 23 to 31 when a war orphan must have completed his education provided the suspension was due to conditions beyond his control. (H.R. 9737.) Public Law 87–819.

Research costs: Authorized Federal agencies, when awarding research and development contracts to education institutions, to provide for payment of a fixed percentage of the direct research or development cost to cover the indirect overhead costs associated with the work. Public Law 87–638.

Religious articles—Duty free: Broadened coverage of certain duty-free imports to include cemeteries, schools, hospitals, orphanages, and similar nonprofit activities staffed and controlled by corporations or associations organized and operated for religious reasons. Public Law 87–604.

Social Security Amendments of 1962: Extended and improved public assistance and child welfare service programs of the Social Security Act. Public Law 87–543.

Pension plans: Strengthened the 1958 Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act by providing additional enforcement procedures and imposing criminal sanctions. Public Law 87–420.

Captioned films for the deaf: Strengthened and improved the existing program of providing captioned films for nonprofit purposes to groups of deaf persons, by authorizing the production and distribution of training films for the deaf, research in the use of educational and training films and training persons in the use of these films for the deaf and raised the established loan ceiling of $250,000 to $1,250,000. Public Law 87–715.

Du Pont: Enacted into law the so-called Du Pont bill providing that a distribution of stock made to an individual, or certain corporations, pursuant to an order enforcing the antitrust laws shall be treated as a return of capital; and that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value. Public Law 87–403.

National Science Foundation amendment: Eliminated the non-Communist disclaimer affidavit required in the existing National Science Foundation Act; made it a crime for any member of a Communist organization to apply for or to use any scholarship or fellowship award under section 10 of the act; required each applicant for scholarship or fellowship to provide the NSF with a full statement of the crime of which he has been convicted and information regarding any criminal charges punishable by confinement of 30 days or more. (H.R. 8556.) Public Law 87–835.

Pay reform: Enacted a two-step pay-reform measure for the classified, postal, Foreign Service, and Veterans' Administration employees in an effort to lessen the discrepancies between industry and the Federal worker. Public Law 87–793.

Resource buildup

Rivers and harbors and flood control: Authorized $2.26 billion for 91 rivers and harbors projects and 108 flood control projects. (H.R. 13273).

Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado: Authorized Department of Interior to spend up to $170 million to construct facilities for the diversion of water from the Colorado River Basin in western Colorado to the Arkansas River Basin. Water will be used for irrigation, flood control, power, and to meet the municipal water needs of Colorado Springs and other cities. Public Law 87–590.

Pacific Northwest power preference: Guaranteed permanent priority on Pacific Northwest power to consumers of electricity from Bonneville Power's marketing area, whether public or private users. Permits Bonneville to sell surplus power, outside its marketing area but subject to recall when power is needed in the Northwest. Areas given priority include Oregon, Washington, Montana, and, on determination by Secretary of Interior, parts of Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, and Idaho. (S. 3153.)

Forest survey authorization: Increased from $1.5 to $2.5 million the authorization for keeping current a survey of the Nation's forest resources. Public Law 87–685.

Fish and wildlife: Authorized the use of national fish and wildlife conservation areas for public recreation. Public Law 87–714.

Outdoor Recreation Act of 1962: Establish Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in Department of Interior with overall responsibility for leadership of a nationwide effort by coordinating various Federal programs and assisting other levels of government to meet demands for outdoor recreation. (S. 3117.)

Minerals study: Authorized a comprehensive 2-year study of the efficacy of modern metallurgical methods including electrometallurgy on ores found in the United States. Study to be made under direction of Secretary of Interior in cooperation with other agencies of the Federal Government, with the States, and with private industry, (S.J. Res. 136.)

National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in District of Columbia: Authorized Federal construction and operation of a $10 million National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–758.

Veterans' aid

Disability compensation increase: Provided for increases from 5.3 to 11.1 percent for veterans disabled 10 to 100 percent, retroactive to July 1, 1962. Public Law 87–645.

Veterans' Administration: Appropriated an additional $55 million for readjustment benefits payments to Korean war veterans attending school under the GI bill of rights; and provided for a $115,247,000 increase, by transfer, in the VA loan guarantee revolving fund to enable the Federal Government to repossess homes on which GI home mortgages have been foreclosed. Public Law 87–404.

Veterans: Extended the time during which individuals affected by Public Law 87–117 may pursue and complete a program of education or training under the Korean GI bill or the War Orphans' Education Act. The individuals affected served an additional tour of duty because of the war threats in 1961. (S. 2697.) Public Law 87–815.

VA pensions—Hospitalization: Continue pensions for married veterans while hospitalized in veterans' hospitals. Public Law 87–556.

Disability compensation: Increases compensation for certain veterans disabled by blindness or kidney involvements. Public Law 87–610.

National service life insurance—Assignments: Broadened assignment provisions of national service life insurance available to World War II veterans and maturing on or after date of enactment of this bill. Public Law 87–557.

War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act: Permits eligible beneficiaries under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act to attend foreign educational institutions. Public Law 87–546.

VA—Hospital and medical care: Furnished hospital and medical care, including outpatient treatment, to peacetime ex-servicemen for service-connected disabilities on same basis as care and treatment is furnished war veterans. Public Law 87–583.

Deceased veterans' benefits: Permits payment of compensation, retirement, or pension benefits withheld from deceased veterans during VA hospitalization only to spouse, children, or dependent parents. Public Law 87–544.

Prosthetic research—VA: Removed the $1 million ceiling on funds for research in the fields of prosthesis, prosthetic appliances, orthopedic appliances, and sensory devices. Public Law 87–557.

Endowment at age 96: Permits veterans holding U.S. Government life insurance to exchange for a policy providing death protection only—with reduced premiums. Public Law 87–549.

Blind veterans: Vocational rehabilitation.—Permits World War II or Korean veterans blinded by reason of a service-connected disability to obtain vocational rehabilitation training up to June 30, 1975. Public Law 87–591.

VA—Prosthetic appliances: Broadened the provisions of existing law by authorizing the Veterans' Administration to repair or replace a prosthetic or other appliance (other than dental appliances) if the appliance is damaged or destroyed in a fall or other accident caused by a compensable service-connected disability. (H.R. 6190.) Public Law 87–850.

Elections and the White House

Poll taxes abolished: Congress approved a constitutional amendment barring the requirement of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries. The amendment, if ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years, will become the 24th amendment to the Constitution. There are only five States with such a requirement: Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia. (S.J. Res. 29—submitted to States.)

Reorganization and Government aids

Government reorganization: Restored the authority of the President to submit plans for the reorganization of the Government. Public Law 87–18.

Civil Rights Commission: Extends the life of the Commission for 2 years, or until September 30, 1963. Public Law 87–264.

Postal-rate increase: Raised postal rates to produce an estimated $600 million in additional revenues to cut the large postal deficit. Increased first class from 4 to 5 cents an ounce, airmail from 7 to 8 cents effective next January 7; with graduated increases for second- and third-class mail. (H.R. 7927.) Public Law 87–793.

Conflicts of interest: Enacted a measure making major revisions in Federal Government conflicts-of-interest laws to make uniform and bring up to date existing laws aimed at preventing present and former Government employees from improperly mixing private interest with their public office. (H.R. 8140.) Public Law 87–849.

FCC: Added a new section to the Communications Act of 1934 to grant authority to the Commission to impose monetary forfeitures for violation of the Commission's rules and regulations by radio stations operating the common carrier and safety and special radio fields. It also provides for the remission or mediation by the Commission of such forfeitures if warranted. Public Law 87–448.

FCC—Station license: Authorized the Federal Communications Commission to renew a license in the safety and special radio services field more than 30 days prior to the expiration of the original license. Public Law 87–439.

FCC documents: Repealed the requirement that, prior to submission, all annual and certain other reports, applications for construction permits, station licenses, modifications, or renewals must be notarized. Public Law 87–444.

Government Training Act: Restored travel authority to attend training meetings to Foreign Service employees of Department of State, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Presidential appointees. Public Law 87–566.

U.S. Park Police: Provided for the creation of trial boards for the U.S. Park Police as a means of assuring better discipline and more equitable treatment. (H.R. 8567.) Public Law 87–797.

Hatch Act: Liberalized the provision requiring the Civil Service Commission to impose a minimum penalty of 90 days' suspension for violations of section 9 of the Hatch Act by reducing the suspension period to 30 days. Public Law 87–753.

My Record in the 87th Congress—Report to the People of the First Congressional District of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the people of the First Congressional District of Montana concerning my votes during the 87th Congress.

At this point, I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which lists my rollcall votes during the 1st and 2d sessions of the 87th Congress:

Voting record of Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN, *87th Cong., 1st sess.*

My stand	Issue	Status
For Rayburn	Election of Speaker Sam Rayburn	Rayburn elected.
Voted for	Enlarge the House Rules Committee from 12 to 15 members	Committee enlarged.
Voted for	Temporary extension of unemployment compensation recommended by President Kennedy	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize budget for House Un-American Activities Committee for 1961	Approved.
Voted for	3d supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1961, school districts	Became law.
Voted for	Emergency feed grains program	Became law.
Voted for	Extend Sugar Act through December 1962 and authorize President to deny the Dominican Republic any quota "bonus" resulting from Cuban cutbacks.	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize $804,000,000 in military construction	Became law.
Voted for	Create additional Federal judgeships	Became law.
Voted for	Area Redevelopment Act program for Federal loans, and grants for redevelopment of economically depressed industrial and rural areas.	Became law.
Voted for	Social security amendments to extend benefits to widows, disabled and retired people	Became law.
Voted for	Appropriate $500,000,000 for aid to Latin America in accordance with President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress program	Became law.
Voted for	Minimum wage legislation, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1961	Became law.
Voted for	Water Pollution Control Act, to assist State and local agencies solve water pollution problems	Became law.
Voted against	Extend for 2 years, Mexican farm labor law	Became law.
Voted for	Raise ceilings on salaries of members and employees of Council of Economic Advisers, as requested by President Kennedy	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of Office of International Travel and Tourism	Became law.
Voted for	Resolution favoring collective sanctions by Organization of American States against Castro government	Adopted.
Voted for	Authorize appropriations of $12,000,000,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval ships in 1962	Became law.
Voted for	Repeal of a provision in Railway Mail Pay Act intended to prevent railroads from charging higher rates for carrying non-first-class mail than for carrying express matter.	Became law.
Voted for	Appropriate $5,900,000,000 for Agriculture Department and Commodity Credit Corporation	Became law.
Voted for	Appropriate $751,000,000 for Departments of State, Justice, and the judiciary	Became law.
Voted for	Extend existing corporation and excise taxes	Became law.
Voted for	Motion to recommit bill to qualify Supreme Court decision relating to unnecessary delay in criminal arraignments	Passed House.
Voted against	Resolution disapproving President's reorganization for Federal Communications Commission. ("No" vote supported reorganization.)	Reorganization disapproved.
Voted against	Resolution disapproving President's reorganization plan for Securities and Exchange Commission. ("No" vote supported reorganization.)	Reorganization approved.
Voted for	To permit International Finance Corporation, an affiliate of the World Bank, to acquire stock in private companies in underdeveloped nations.	Became law.
Voted for	Appropriate $47,000,000 in supplemental funds for State, Justice, Treasury, and Defense	Became law.
Voted against	Disapproving President's reorganization plan for Federal Trade Commission. ("No" vote supported reorganization.)	Reorganization approved.
Voted for	Housing Act of 1961	Became law.
Voted for	Increase national debt limit for 1 year	Became law.
Voted for	Appropriate $42,000,000,000 for defense	Became law.
Voted against	Establish uniform procedure for Federal court review of alien deportation and exclusion orders	Passed House.
Voted for	Establish Cape Cod National Seashore Park	Became law.
Voted against	Disapproving President's reorganization plan for Civil Aeronautics Board. ("No" vote supported reorganization.)	Reorganization approved.
Voted for	Authorize commemoration of Department of Agriculture Centennial	Became law.
Voted for	Provide evacuation pay to civilian employees evacuated in emergencies	Became law.
Voted for	National Aeronautics and Space Agency appropriations	Became law.
Voted against	Disapproving Reorganization of National Labor Relations Board. ("No" vote supported reorganization)	Reorganization disapproved.
Voted against	Disapproving reorganization of Federal Maritime Board. ("No" vote supported reorganization)	Reorganization approved.
Voted for	Appropriate $883,000,000 for military construction	Became law.
Voted for	Give President authority to call up Reserve forces	Became law.
Voted for	Supplemental military appropriation to meet Berlin crisis	Became law.
Voted for	Farm bill, including improved emergency and disaster relief programs	Became law.
Voted for	Reorganization of Federal Communications Commission	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize military to sell supplies or services to aircraft owners in national emergencies	Passed House.
Voted for	Supporting construction of powerplant at Hanford reactor to harness steam energy which otherwise would be wasted	Rejected.
Voted against	Reorganization of Interstate Commerce Commission	Became law.
Voted for	Transfer Freedmen's Hospital in District of Columbia to Howard University	Became law.
Voted for	1961 mutual security authorization	Became law.
Voted for	Amend Federal Aviation Act to make airplane hijacking an offense punishable by imprisonment or death	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize planning U.S. participation in 1964 New York World's Fair	Passed House.
Voted for	Authorize lead-zinc subsidy for small operators	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize National Fisheries Center in Washington, D.C	Passed House.
Voted for	Authorize Attorney General to fix salaries of aids	Rejected.
Voted for	Equalize readjustment payment for Reserve forces	Became law.
Voted for	Emergency school aid program sought by President	Rejected.
Voted against	Amendment substantially restricting juvenile delinquency studies	Amendment defeated.
Voted against	Admission of Communist China to United Nations and U.S. recognition	Unanimously rejected.
Voted for	Authorize national hog cholera eradication program	Became law.
Voted for	To increase military aid program in mutual security bill	Amendment approved.
Voted for	Passage of mutual security appropriations	Became law.
Voted for	Extend Federal aid to federally impacted school districts	Became law.

Voting record of Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN, *87th Cong., 1st sess.*—Continued

My stand	Issue	Status
Voted for	Amend Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to provide for more effective enforcement. (Motion to pass under suspension of rules, ⅔ majority required.)	245 to 161; failed ⅔ majority.
Voted for	Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act	Became law.
Voted for	Peace Corps	Became law.
Voted for	Increase longevity step pay for postal workers	Vetoed.
Voted for	Publicize dissemination of Communist propaganda through mails	Passed House.
Voted for	Permits midwestern farmers to plant barley crop on lands prepared for wheat before acreage control program for 1962	Became law.
Voted for	To increase number of supergrade civil service positions	Became law.
Voted for	U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize study of National Tropical Botanic Garden, Hawaii	Failed to obtain ⅔ majority.
Voted for	Establish Federal Advisory Council on Arts	Failed to receive ⅔ majority.
Voted for	Amend District of Columbia Sales Tax Act	Became law.
Voted for	Public works appropriations	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize new Federal supergrade positions for National Security Agency	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of Federal Airport Act to permit continued assistance to local airport projects	Became law.
Voted against	Rule prohibiting amendments to postal rate increase bill	Rejected.
Voted for	Bill to publicize distribution of Communist propaganda and facilitate its rejection	Passed House.
Voted for	To accept Senate proposal that President can withhold information on mutual security if he certifies reasons for action	Approved.

Voting record of Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN, *87th Cong., 2d sess.*

My stand	Issue	Status
For McCormack	Election of Speaker John W. McCormack	McCormack elected.
Voted for	Federal assistance for construction of college academic facilities	Rejected.
Voted for	To permit acquisition, free of charge, of 21 acres of privately owned land in Grand Canyon National Park	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize Fourth Assistant Secretary of Commerce	Became law.
Voted for	To increase national debt limit ceiling to $300,000,000,000	Became law.
Voted against	Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 (Urban Affairs). ("No" vote favored reorganization.)	Reorganization approved.
Voted for	Approve improvements in the District of Columbia juvenile court system	Became law.
Voted for	Adopt a 2-year program to train unemployed workers	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize assistance to States developing educational television programs and facilities	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize Attorney General to issue civil investigative demands in antitrust cases	Became law.
Voted for	Strengthen Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to reduce Federal payments to needy aged, blind, and disabled to $66 per month	Motion defeated.
Voted for	Passage of bill designed to stress rehabilitation of welfare recipients, improve welfare services, and eliminate abuses	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize standby authority for the United States to lend $2,000,000,000 to International Monetary Fund	Became law.
Voted for	Raise compensation payments to veterans with service-connected disabilities	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize an appropriation of $63,750,000 for Peace Corps to permit expansion of Corps to about 10,000 volunteers	Became law.
Voted against	Recommital motion on 2d supplemental appropriations. (Bill subsequently passed by voice vote.)	Became law.
Voted for	Authorizes appropriation of $13,000,000,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill $5,170,788,000 appropriation for Departments of Labor; Health, Education, and Welfare. (Bill which included assistance to schools in federally impacted areas, subsequently passed by a voice vote.)	Motion defeated.
Voted for	Passage of 1962 tax revision bill	Became law.
Voted for	Authorize appropriation of $3,000,000 to reimburse New York City for overtime payments to police force during the 1960 U.N. General Assembly.	Passed House.
Voted for	Authorize President to regulate imports of cotton and textiles	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill legislative appropriations. (Bill subsequently passed by a voice vote.)	Became law.
Voted for	To appropriate $48,000,000,000 for defense of our Nation	Became law.
Voted against	To authorize Federal Communications Commission to require television manufacturers to equip all sets for receiving ultra-high frequency channels in addition to very high frequency.	Became law.
Voted for	To establish private corporation to operate a commercial communications satellite system	Became law.
Voted for	To authorize payment of $73,000,000 to Philippine Islands for World War II damages	Defeated.
Voted for	To authorize assistance for construction of facilities at public and nonprofit colleges	Passed House.
Voted for	To authorize $3,600,000,000 appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in fiscal 1963	Became law.
Voted for	To amend the National School Lunch Act to improve provisions and establish special fund for needy schools	Became law.
Voted for	To bring negotiated defense procurement contracts under more rigid legislative control	Became law.
Voted for	Temporary increase in national debt	Became law.
Voted for	Sugar Act Amendment for 1962	Became law.
Voted against	To kill farm bill	Bill killed.
Voted for	To extend Defense Production Act	Became law.
Voted for	To amend Export Control Act	Became law.
Voted against	Trade Expansion Act of 1962	Became law.
	(NOTE.—This bill was not as good as I would have liked it. I wanted more reciprocity to the United States. The lumber industry and the metal industry are having trouble and we must give more attention to them in this country.	
Voted for	To ban interstate transportation of gambling machines	Became law.
Voted for	To give Civil Aeronautics Board permanent authority to regulate supplemental airlines	Became law.
Voted for	To extend ceiling on subsidies for domestic ship construction and conversion	Passed House.
Voted for	Mutual Security Act of 1962	Became law.
Voted for	Increase authorizations for Pacific Trust Islands	Became law.
Voted for	Urging Federal Communications Commission to permit increase of power on clear-channel AM radio stations	Passed House.
Voted for	To appropriate $1,900,000,000 for Department of State, Justice, and Commerce	Became law.
Voted for	To appropriate $5,400,000,000 for Department of Agriculture	Became law.
Voted for	To authorize construction of Mann Creek reclamation project	Became law.
Voted for	To appropriate $11,500,000,000 for operation of 23 independent and executive offices	Became law.
Voted for	To authorize construction of Baker reclamation project	Became law.
Voted for	To appropriate $5,300,000,000 for Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare	Became law.
Voted for	To authorize cash awards for winners of National Medal of Science (a ⅔ majority required)	Failed to receive ⅔ majority.
Voted for	To authorize compensation to U.S. citizens for personal or property losses in World War II	Became law.
Voted for	To permit President to distribute additional sugar quotas to Western nations	Passed House.
Voted against	Motion to permit continued waste of steam energy at Hanford nuclear reactor	Motion defeated.
Voted against	Enactment of temporary farm bill to continue programs for 1 year	Became law.
Voted for	To increase limits on size of Federal Reserve Bank branch bank buildings and require Federal Reserve Board approval of contracts.	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act. (Subsequently passed by voice vote.)	Motion rejected.
Voted against	Motion to reject Senate amendment to AEC appropriations which would permit utilization of waste steam energy at Hanford nuclear reactor.	Motion defeated.
Voted for	Constitutional amendment to ban poll taxes in Federal elections	Passed House.
Voted for	Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of Padre Island National Seashore	Became law.
Voted for	United Nations bond issue	Became law.
Voted for	Rule to permit expansion of Virgin Islands National Park. (Bill subsequently passed by voice vote.)	Became law.
Voted for	To increase security provisions at National Security Agency	Passed House.
Voted against	To extend Federal internal security programs into private enterprise including denial of right of cross-examination	Defeated.
Voted for	To permit construction of a peanut research laboratory	Defeated.
Voted for	To permit continued expeditious handling of legislative franked mail to postal patrons	Defeated.
Voted for	Food and Agriculture Act of 1962	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill College Assistance Act	Act rejected.
Voted for	To permit duty-free entry of personal and household goods of Government personnel on orders	Became law.
Voted against	Motion to kill bill to permit President to authorize diplomatic radio facilities in the District of Columbia	Became law.

Voting record of Congressman ARNOLD OLSEN, *87th Cong., 2d sess.*—Continued

My stand	Issue	Status
Voted for	Standby authority for callup of 150,000 members of Ready Reserve	Became law.
Voted for	To require that temporary summer jobs in Government agencies in Washington, D.C., be apportioned among 50 States	Passed House.
Voted for	To approve National Fisheries Center	Became law.
Voted against	To delete Burns Creek, Idaho, project from public works bill	Project deleted.
Voted for	Drug Act of 1962	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	To curb indecent publications in District of Columbia	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	Postal Service and Federal Employees Act of 1962	Became law.
Voted for	Berlin resolution	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	Adjust annuities for District of Columbia teachers retirement fund	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	To return to Senate continuing Agriculture appropriations bill	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	To exclude certain household items from manufacturers excise taxes	Approved by Congress.
Voted for	Public works bill	Approved by Congress.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Summary of Major Legislative Activity, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 108, 87th Congress, I submit herewith a summary of the major legislative accomplishments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 87th Congress.

During this Congress, 816 House bills and resolutions and 39 Senate bills were referred to the committee, 2 of which were rereferred to other committees having legislative jurisdiction over the subject matter; 58 bills were reported to the House, of which 48 were enacted into public law; 5 were approved by the House but not acted upon in the Senate, 1 resolution required only House approval, and 4 remained on the House Calendar on the adjournment of the Congress.

The following bills reported from the committee became public law:

S. 610 established a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to encourage foreign residents to visit this country. House Report No. 323 on H.R. 4614, Public Law 87–63.

H.R. 4998, the administration's proposal to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of the aged. House Report No. 599, Public Law 87–395.

S. 2034, Federal Communications Commission reorganization. House Report No. 723 on H.R. 7856, Public Law 87–192.

S. 2268 extended Federal criminal laws to certain crimes occurring on board aircraft in air commerce, such as hijacking, murder, manslaughter, and so forth. House Report No. 958 on H.R. 8384, Public Law 87–197.

S. 205 established a program of Federal matching grants for educational television facilities. House Report No. 999 on H.R. 132, Public Law 87–447.

S. 1552, drug amendments of 1962 to assure the safety, effectiveness, and reliability of drugs. House Report No. 2464 on H.R. 11581, Public Law 87–781.

H.R. 9045 amends the Trading With the Enemy Act to divest the Government's interest in copyrights and trademarks in favor of the former owners. House Report No. 2091.

Note the provisions of H.R. 9045 relating to copyrights are contained in H.R. 7283, which became Public Law 87–846.

The other provisions of H.R. 9045 dealing with trademarks became Public Law 87–861.

H.R. 3460 amends the Trading With the Enemy Act to authorize the Attorney General to sell the General Aniline & Film Corp. House Report No. 2046.

Note the provisions of H.R. 3460 are contained in H.R. 7283, which became Public Law 87–846.

H.R. 5028 provides for a lump-sum settlement of all claims of successor organizations for return of heirless vested property pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act. House Report No. 2027.

Note the provisions of this bill are contained in H.R. 7283, which became Public Law 87–846.

H.R. 7283 provides compensation for American nationals for certain World War II losses. House Report No. 2035.

Note: This bill, as amended, contains the provisions of H.R. 5028, H.R. 3460, and part of H.R. 9045; Public Law 87–846.

H.R. 10541, Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962. This legislation authorizes a 3-year program of special project grants to States for intensive vaccination programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. House Report No. 1835, Public Law 87–868.

H.R. 11040 provides for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system. House Report No. 1636, Public Law 87–624.

H.R. 3980 amended the Food and Drug Act to permit the continued use of certain food additives and pesticide chemicals which have been in commercial use since January 1, 1958, until the necessary investigations and scientific studies now in progress can be completed and regulations adopted to provide final assurance of the safe use of these additives and chemicals. House Report. No. 53, Public Law 87–19.

H.R. 5075, extension of unemployment and sickness insurance benefits to railroad workers who had exhausted their existing compensation. House Report No. 54, Public Law 87–7.

H.R. 1163 provided for an extension of 27 months to the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee loans to railroads for capital expenditures. House Report No. 65, Public Law 87–16.

H.R. 8102 provided for a 3-year extension of the Federal Airport Act with a new method of financing. House Report No. 728, Public Law 87–225.

H.R. 8033 authorized the Interstate Commerce Commission to delegate certain functions to employee boards. House Report No. 750, Public Law 87–247.

House Joint Resolution 438 authorized the Securities and Exchange Commission to make a study and investigation of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations. House Report No. 882, Public Law 87–196.

S. 2395 amended the Railroad Retirement Act to permit male railroad employees with less than 30 years of creditable service to retire at age 62 on a reduced annuity. House Report No. 1067 on H.R. 8597, Public Law 87–285.

S. 320 amended part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicle may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State. House Report No. 1090, Public Law 87–805.

S. 1969 authorized the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant limited certificates to supplemental air carriers. House Report No. 1177 on H.R. 7318, Public Law 87–528.

S. 1186 amended the act of June 13, 1906, regarding the stamping of gold and silver articles. House Report No. 1190, Public Law 87–354.

H.R. 2429 supplemented existing Federal criminal laws in order to provide more effective deterrents to the willful destruction or damage of property moving in interstate or foreign commerce. House Report No. 727, Public Law 87–221.

S. 1440 amended the act providing for the establishment of a national register of names of certain motor vehicle operators so that additional States may participate in the national driver license program. House Report No. 1181, Public Law 87–359.

S. 1931 provided for an extension of the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risks insurance. House Report No. 567, Public Law 87–89.

S. 1456 authorized the Secretary of Commerce to appoint an additional Assistant Secretary to serve as his principal adviser on scientific and technological matters. House Report No. 885 on H.R. 6360, Public Law 87–405.

S. 1288, inspection of radio equipment on board U.S. ships. House Report No. 2486, Public Law 87–811.

S. 962, clarifying the Civil Aeronautic Board's authority to conduct investigations of aircraft accidents. House Report No. 2487, Public Law 87-810.

S. 455 extended the Federal Air Pollution Control Act for an additional 2-year period. House Report No. 2265 on H.R. 12833, Public Law 87-761.

S. 1130 authorized grants for family health clinics for domestic agricultural migratory workers. House Report No. 2253 on H.R. 12365, Public Law 87-692.

H.R. 10129, extension for 5 years the authority of the Federal Government to guarantee private loans to certain supplementary airlines for the purchase of aircraft. House Report No. 2250, Public Law 87-820.

H.R. 11732 authorizes the President to license foreign governments to operate radio stations in the District of Columbia. House Report No. 2248, Public Law 87-795.

S. 319 exempts express companies from long- and short-haul charges under the Interstate Commerce Act. House Report No. 2247 on H.R. 4272, Public Law 87-707.

S. 1606 authorizes the Federal Power Commission to exempt small hydroelectric power projects from certain of the licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act. House Report No. 2241, Public Law 87-647.

S. 2135 authorizes the Securities and Exchange Commission to delegate certain functions. House Report No. 2045, Public Law 87-592.

H.R. 11099, establishment of Institute of Child Health and Human Development. House Report No. 1969, Public Law 87-838.

S. 2256 provides benefits to certain Guamanians under section 5 of the War Claims Act. House Report No. 1837 on H.R. 4753, Public Law 87-617.

S. 1658 amends the act of January 2, 1951—Johnston Act—to extend the provisions of the act to additional gambling devices not now covered. House Report No. 1828, Public Law 87-840.

S. 3025 supplements the act incorporating the Texas & Pacific Railway Co., to permit that company, subject to the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, to acquire the stock or property of other carriers, and to increase the company's authorized stock from $75 to $100 million. House Report No. 1813 on H.R. 11244, Public Law 87-527.

H.R. 11643 is legislation which clarifies the Interstate Commerce Act so that the users of motor-water services between Alaska or Hawaii and the other 48 States may have the same benefits of through routes and joint rates which are enjoyed by users of motor-water services among the other 48 States, and by users of rail-water services or of any combination of service with air services among all of the 50 States. House Report No. 1769, Public Law 87-595.

H.R. 2446 provides that hydraulic brake fluid sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles shall meet certain specifications. House Report No. 1604, Public Law 87-637.

S. 1668 authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to impose small fines. House Report No. 1561, Public Law 87-448.

S. 1589 authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to issue radio operator licenses to nationals of the United States. House Report No. 1560, Public Law 87-445.

H.R. 8031 authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to require that all television receivers be equipped to receive all television channels—70 UHF and 12 VHF. House Report No. 1559, Public Law 87-529.

S. 1595 amends the Natural Gas Act to give the Federal Power Commission authority to suspend changes in rate schedules covering sales for resale for industrial use only. House Report No. 1547 on H.R. 6949, Public Law 87-454.

House Resolution 714 expresses the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the authorization by the Federal Communications Commission of class I-A clear-channel operations.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE WHICH PASSED THE HOUSE AND NOT THE SENATE

H.R. 8465 prohibits the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of articles imported into the United States from Cuba. House Report No. 1182.

H.R. 134 establishes minimum Federal safety standards for automobile seat belts sold or shipped in Interstate Commerce. House Report No. 2491.

H.R. 10542 repeals the Inland Waterways Corporation Act. House Report No. 2192.

H.R. 1341 requires passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards. House Report No. 2112.

H.R. 4749 amends the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to presunrise operation by daytime radio stations. House Report No. 1870.

BILLS REPORTED TO THE HOUSE ON WHICH NO ACTION WAS TAKEN

H.R. 5978 provides for partial exemption from the provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act of terminal area motor carrier operations performed by or for common carriers by water in interstate commerce subject to the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933. House Report No. 1116.

H.R. 12201, relating to unifications or acquisitions of control of freight forwarders under the Interstate Commerce Act. House Report No. 2268.

H.R. 4999, Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. The legislation authorizes grants for construction of teaching facilities; loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy; and extends for a 3-year period grants for construction of health research facilities. House Report No. 1489.

House Joint Resolution 636, to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to promote quality and price stabilization. House Report No. 2352.

A detailed explanation of the reported bills is contained in the committee reports which accompanied them, and in the activity reports of the committee for the 1st and 2d sessions of the 87th Congress—House Report No. 1280 for the 1st session and House Report No. 2553 for the 2d.

In addition to the bills which the committee reported to the House during the 87th Congress, public hearings were held on milk sanitation; sales below cost and cease and desist orders; Civil Aeronautics Board legislative recommendations; hardwood labeling; establishment of a national accident prevention center; water carrier bulk commodity exemptions; inclusion of flight attendants in definition of "airman"; securities regulations for the District of Columbia; National Capital Airports Corporation; medical care for fishing boat owners; fish flour; omnibus transportation bills; humane treatment of laboratory animals; and aircraft noise.

Congressman Samuel S. Stratton's Report to the People of Upstate New York on the Accomplishments of the 87th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity again, as I have done regularly in the past, to report to the people of my upstate New York district, and especially to the people of the six new counties which have been added to it—Chenango, Cortland, Cayuga, Seneca, Ontario, and Yates—on the accomplishments of this session now concluding, and on my stewardship here as their Representative.

BRIEF SUMMARY

No Congress ever accomplished everything that might be hoped for it. This session has been no exception. Yet much has been done that is impressive and that can benefit the people of upstate New York. Of course Congress did not approve every request the President made of it. But that is not the function of Congress. We are after all a coordinate and coequal branch, in a government of constitutional checks and balances. We cannot be a rubber stamp, or democracy could never survive. In our record this year Congress has, I believe, reflected the prevailing mood of the country: anxious to move ahead, but also wary of moving too rapidly or in the wrong direction.

THE BATTLE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT

As I see it, the work of this session has been concentrated on the solution of two major problems, first, unemployment; and, second, winning the cold war against communism.

Of these two objectives, the battle against unemployment has been of most immediate concern to the people of our district since we include so many major unemployment areas—Amsterdam, Gloversville, Schenectady, Oneonta, and Auburn, as well as Geneva, Seneca Falls, and Penn Yan.

The 1st session of the 87th Congress enacted the Area Redevelopment Act, of which I was a coauthor, to help unemployment areas help themselves in attracting new industry. Administration of this act has not moved as rapidly in

New York State as I had hoped, but we are making progress.

MANPOWER RETRAINING

Supplementing the ARA program was the Manpower Training Act, passed in this session. It is designed to train unemployed workers so as to enable them to qualify for new jobs. I am proud that the first training projects approved for New York State were for my district, Gloversville and Amsterdam.

BOOST IN CARPET TARIFFS

The single most important economic boost for our area was the President's approval, in response to repeated pleas from many of us, of the full tariff boost recommended for the carpet industry.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS

While the increase in defense contracts for New York has not been as substantial as I would like to see, our continued pressure on the Pentagon has brought results in sizable increases for upstate unemployment areas.

EMERGENCY PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Another major economic boost for our area was passage of a $400 million appropriation for an emergency public works program geared to the most critical unemployment areas in our district—Amsterdam, Gloversville, Schenectady, Oneonta, and Auburn. This new program will provide up to 50 percent Federal help in financing new public works projects in these communities. Even before the final bill was passed, representatives from many communities, including Schenectady and Auburn, were invited to Washington for a full briefing on how the bill could benefit their areas without delay.

CAYUGA COUNTY SUGARBEET PROJECT

In all our efforts at combating unemployment, the Government's basic theme has been that Government best helps those who help themselves. One of the finest examples of this kind of self-help that I have seen is the Cayuga County sugarbeet project. I have worked closely with county representatives on this project since the 1962 Sugar Act reached the House floor last July. In spite of some misgivings about some sections, I voted for the bill because only with its passage could Cayuga County have a fighting chance to obtain a sugar allotment big enough to support a new multi-million-dollar sugar refinery. I am proud to have been the only Member of Congress to testify in person in support of the Cayuga project at the recent departmental hearing in Washington.

SOUTH AMSTERDAM FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

Approval of this vital South Amsterdam project, for which $300,000 has now been appropriated in the final public works bill, will mean still another significant boost to Amsterdam's economy.

THE SEARCH FOR NEW JOBS

In the long run, of course, our best answer to unemployment lies in a substantial expansion of our own industries. This session of Congress has taken two significant steps to encourage such expansion.

One was the adoption of an extensive tax relief for businesses which buy new equipment or otherwise expand and thereby create new job opportunities. This investment tax credit, as it is called, together with a stepped-up schedule of business depreciation, will now make it profitable for businesses to create new jobs by expanding or buying more modern machinery.

NEW MARKETS FOR U.S. PRODUCTS ABROAD

The second step this Congress took to stimulate greater growth in our economy was passage of the trade expansion bill. This bill will help us sell more of our products abroad—turbines, dishwashers, disposals, and the like—within the European Common Market area, and thus create more jobs back home. At the same time the bill also increases protection for local businesses against the inroads of foreign competition by making existing escape clause procedures more effective, and by supplying the first real assistance to communities suffering from the effects of foreign competition.

In the past year the Small Business Administration has helped an increasing number of companies in our area. At the same time my office in Washington has been informing area businessmen regularly of up-coming opportunities to bid on Government contracts.

One helpful thing Congress failed to do this year was to pass the Youth Opportunities Act. This bill would have increased job openings for our young people and would have established a Youth Conservation Corps to give unemployed young men an opportunity to do useful conservation work in the forests and the fields of our Nation while waiting for other jobs to open up.

GREATER DEFENSE STRENGTH AND FLEXIBILITY

Perhaps the session's most significant accomplishment has been the steady improvement made possible in the field of national defense. Our nuclear missile capability has steadily increased, so that today we are ahead of the Soviets. In addition, our conventional forces have also been increased. The Army, for example, has grown from 11 to 16 divisions. And our own Armed Services Committee has won its fight for greater emphasis on manned bombers in the now-familiar B–70 controversy. These increases in conventional weapons make us no longer the prisoner of a single massive retaliation strategy in which we either launch an all-out nuclear warfare or else back down under Russian pressures. Now we have at our disposal a variety of strategic choices, and as a result we have been able to strengthen our garrison in Berlin at the same time that we are supporting our allies in combat operations in Vietnam.

Congress did turn thumbs down on any massive program of building fallout shelters.

PROGRESS IN SPACE

Very substantial sums of money have been voted in connection with our space program this year because we all recognize the vital importance of getting ahead of the Russians in space. The spectacular achievements this year of Colonel Glenn, Major Carpenter, and Commander Schirra all demonstrate that our space program is moving ahead with precision and reliability though much more remains to be done.

Congress also established the machinery to operate a permanent communications satellite like Telstar, and did so, incidentally, on the basis of full cooperation with private business rather than through some purely Government corporation. I supported this private business approach, because I believe strongly that Government must not encroach on areas where individual persons or private business can do the job just as effectively.

WINNING THE COLD WAR

Of course the fight against communism is more than a purely military contest. While Congress has worked this past year to build a stronger defensive shield, we have not neglected to act to meet the Soviet threat in other ways as well. One of our greatest sources of danger today is that the Russians might move against us as a result of some mistaken notion that we do not really intend to stand up and defend our rights in Berlin or Cuba after all. To dispel any such idea promptly, Congress passed resolutions reiterating the deep concern of the American people over both Berlin and Cuba, and backing up the President fully and without regard to party lines in whatever action he might decide to take in dealing with these threats. It was my privilege to preside over the House when the important Berlin resolution was adopted.

RESERVE CALLUP LEGISLATION

In addition Congress passed legislation to give the President the standby authority he had requested to call up certain reservists during the 3-month period when Congress will be out of session in case some emergency should suddenly erupt. Only last August of course the reservists and National Guardsmen called up in connection with last year's Berlin emergency were released to inactive duty. Yet we cannot afford to take any chances. If President Kennedy were to decide that a blockade of Cuba was desirable, for example, under this new bill he would have the power to call to duty immediately the trained sailors and airmen he would need to enforce it. So as not to impose a special burden on those reservists only recently released from duty, the law does provide that none of the Berlin reservists can be recalled under the new standby legislation. In any case, we all hope this callup authority would not have to be used at all; it is just there, like a fire extinguisher, to be used in case an emergency should arise.

FOREIGN AID

Again this year, as so often before, Congress has been asked to fight communism by continuing our program of economic and military assistance to foreign countries. Congress recognizes, of course, the need for some such program. Foreign aid has been endorsed by the leaders of both major parties. Yet many of us are deeply disturbed about the lasting effectiveness of the program. We are concerned over the persistent reports of inefficiency in its management. We resent the fact that many recipient nations have refused to go along with us in such proposals as instituting a trade embargo against Cuba, for example, and we are shocked that some countries receiving aid, as in Latin America, seem to be moving further away from free government practices rather than closer toward them.

In an effort to require more careful administration of foreign aid, therefore, Congress cut back the original sums requested by the administration, by almost $1 billion.

THE PEACE CORPS

On the other hand, we went along almost unanimously with a very substantial increase in the Peace Corps. Even those who originally opposed the Peace Corps acknowledged that after 1 year's operation it had proved its worth, and had constituted a fresh and encouraging new approach to the problem of winning friends in foreign lands.

FARM LEGISLATION

As the only Member of my party in Congress in the entire northeastern United States representing any very substantial farm population, I have continued in the past year, as I have done since coming to Congress, to serve as a spokesman and champion of the interests of our upstate New York farmers.

COMPENSATORY PAYMENTS DECISION

When the Supreme Court overthrew the compensatory payments feature of our New York milk order last July 2, for example, thereby jeopardizing the stability of all dairy farm income in New York State, a delegation of upstate farmers promptly called on me in Washington to enlist my help in their fight to restore the order to its original form. I was happy to take the lead in the fight to overrule the Court's decision with appropriate legislation. Because of the opposition of Midwestern farmers we were not successful in this fight this year, but we did at least force the Department to hold hearings on the matter which will, I hope, bring some measure of relief.

THE 1962 DROUGHT

The drought this year brought heavy financial hardship to many of our farmers. In Washington we were successful in getting nearly all of the upstate counties affected by the drought declared disaster areas, thus making possible the harvesting of hay from Soil Bank land. I also persuaded the railroads to reduce their rates for shipping additional hay and feed grains into these disaster areas. And I introduced legislation to allow the Government to release, at no charge to farmers in these areas, needed feed grains from its own surplus stocks now held in storage. Though my bill was not adopted, the Government has now begun making these stocks available in some areas, in line with the provisions of existing law, at 75 percent of parity. This price is no bargain, to be sure; my own bill would have been more desirable. But at least this action will help to prevent any sharp speculative increase in feed grain prices that could be even more damaging to our farmers.

MILK PRICES AND THE FARM BILL

To compensate for some of these heavy drought losses, I joined early last summer in an effort to get the Department of Agriculture to approve a higher return to the farmer on his fluid milk. Unfortunately this drive was not successful. As an alternative, therefore, I supported a provision in the original version of the farm bill which would have paid dairy farmers a bonus if their 1962 production fell below their 1961 figure. Because of the 1962 drought, such a drop would have been almost automatic for our upstate New York farmers. In the hope of putting this bonus plan through I supported the farm bill when it first came up. But after the milk bonus section had been stricken from the final version, I voted against the farm bill, one of the few members of my party to do so—and incidentally received some nice congratulatory notes from several Farm Bureau officials about my vote.

TAX RELIEF—RETIREMENT PROGRAMS FOR SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS

One area in which the 87th Congress made progress has been the area of tax relief. Besides the substantial tax relief for businesses which expand, mentioned above, Congress also repealed the wartime 10 percent excise tax on transportation, and enacted into law a bill to give self-employed persons—doctors, lawyers, and accountants—plus the people who work for such persons, a tax break to encourage them to set up their own retirement and pension programs.

Incidentally, when the economy this summer began to suggest the desirability of a tax cut, the highly unpopular proposal for a withholding tax on income from dividends and interest was quickly shelved.

OTHER FLOOD CONTROL MATTERS

The flood control survey for the Otsego County area, which Congress authorized last year in order to find a suitable alternative to big reservoir dams, got officially underway this year. This survey, as I have previously reported, has suspended any possible action on these big dams for at least another 3 years, and perhaps permanently—the first real relief from the threat of big dams that Otsego County has had since 1935.

In the meantime, to meet Oneonta's immediate flood problems, the Army Engineers, at my insistence, are now processing an undertaking that will bring about some clearing and dredging of the Susquehanna in the vicinity of the Main Street Bridge. If this project of ours is finally approved, as I trust it will be, work could get underway before the end of this year.

To help those damaged by periodic floods in such spots as Oneonta and Norwich, I introduced legislation in this session to authorize a study of the best means of making some kind of flood insurance available to people in these communities. My bill received the favorable endorsement of the administration, although it did not come out of committee. I do hope to reintroduce it next year.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

As a veteran I was, of course, happy to support legislation this year to give a much-needed increase in benefits to veterans with service-connected disabilities. The effort to do better by our World War I veterans, on the other hand, was still stalled in committee in spite of our discharge petition.

EDUCATION

Considering the importance of scientific knowledge to our long-range victory over communism, the record of the 87th Congress on education must be regarded as falling short of our need.

We did enact one educational measure, a bill to provide some Federal help to educational television stations, of which we already have several in New York State. These funds will supplement the assistance already provided for ETV by the State.

But Congress failed to pass a bill to help colleges in constructing needed classrooms, and to provide additional scholarship loan funds for students. The eight counties of the new 35th District boast seven colleges which contribute to the economy of the district and enhance the progress of our State. No student today who is qualified to profit from a college education should be denied it because of lack of funds. I hope to revive this scholarship loan bill in the new 88th Congress.

OTHER ACHIEVEMENTS

Athletic professionalism in our service academies: As a result of evidence which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during this session, steps are now being taken by the Pentagon to eliminate a form of athletic professionalism that had begun to creep into some of our service academies. Such practices are not only contrary to the best interests, of the services, but are also wasteful of taxpayers' money which provides free college education for our cadets and midshipmen.

Antigambling statutes: Two bills were passed during the session to outlaw interstate gambling operations. As mayor of Schenectady I fought hard, you may remember, against illegal gambling, racketeering, and crime. As a Member of Congress I was glad to have been able to join in creating further Federal weapons to be used to fight these unsavory operations.

Repealing the poll tax: A long drive to eliminate the poll tax in our Southern States finally culminated this year in our adoption of an anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution, which now goes to the States for final ratification.

Polish war claims legislation: Another bill for which I have long campaigned was passed this year, allowing Americans who suffered injury or damage in foreign countries during World War II to recover damages from Nazi wartime assets still frozen in this country. Polish-American organizations had been especially strong in their support of legislation of this kind, even though the bill as finally enacted did not go as far as many of us would have liked to see it go.

U.S.S. *Pulaski:* My long fight to have one of our Polaris missile submarines named after Polish Count Casimir Pulaski ended in victory last month when Secretary of the Navy Korth informed me that the keel for the submarine U.S.S. *Pulaski* will be laid in January. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I look forward to being on hand for this historic ceremony.

Daytime radio: I am glad to report that we passed a bill that will allow daytime radio stations, like WDOS in Oneonta, WCHN in Norwich, and WCGR in Canandaigua, to continue to operate during early morning hours before sunrise. Without this legislation, a very valuable early-morning information service for rural areas would have been foolishly eliminated.

No Binghamton TV changes: I am also happy to report that as a result of protests by many of us, the FCC finally dropped their plan to replace long-range VHF television service out of Binghamton into parts of Otsego, Chenango, and Cortland Counties, with short-legged UHF service. We finally convinced the Commission that any such move would only have the practical result of depriving many areas of our district of any direct television reception at all.

KEEPING IN TOUCH

This year, as in the past, I have reported regularly to you on developments in Washington through my monthly newsletter. Many of you have been good enough to comment favorably to me on these letters. I have also sent out to you our annual congressional questionnaire, and I have continued to send back to you my periodic radio and television reports on happenings in Washington.

We have also continued to maintain a congressional district office on a full-time basis, thereby providing direct and immediate service to you on all matters affecting the Federal Government. Recently I opened a second district office, in the post office building in Amsterdam, to give even more direct service to people in the Montgomery-Otsego Counties area. Mail addressed to me there will be promptly handled while Congress is in recess, and either I or my staff can be reached during business hours at the Amsterdam office, on VI 3-3400. Our Schenectady office phone continues to be FR 4-4000.

Once again, my thanks to you for all your interest and support. It has been both an honor and a real pleasure to serve once again during the past year as your spokesman, your ambassador, and your servant at the seat of the U.S. Government in Washington during these often trying but always challenging times.

Four Years of Unprecedented Achievement—the Greatest Progress in Alaskan History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, nearly 4 years as a State have brought to Alaska tangible results not possible during the long years the 49th State was a Territory.

Alaska entered the Union on a footing politically equal to its sister States but economically neglected through years of territorial rule. Efforts during both the 86th and 87th Congresses were necessarily directed toward correcting this economic inequality.

Federal Government departments and agencies, informed and prodded for the first time by elected, voting congressional Representatives of the State of Alaska, have increased their programing for the State by millions of dollars.

Part of the task of the Alaska congressional delegation during these years has been to make certain that existing and proposed Federal programs were tailored to suit Alaska's special needs.

Another part of the task has been to take decisive action with Federal agencies to protect Alaska's interests against encroachment, such as our protests against Russian and Japanese fishing intrusions.

Many advances have been made in the economic development of Alaska, some of major significance to the future of our State, others of less import but significant nevertheless in clearing away obstructions which would hinder future growth.

A HIGHWAY PROGRAM FOR ALASKA

One of the most important bills for Alaska approved by the 87th Congress is Senate Joint Resolution 137, now a part of the Federal Aid Highway Act which takes the important long-awaited first step toward positive planning and development of a road system within our State.

I introduced the measure which was cosponsored by Senators DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia; STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio; and OREN LONG, Democrat, of Hawaii.

President Kennedy, the Department of Commerce, and the Bureau of the Budget endorsed the legislation which authorizes the appropriation of $800,000 for engineering studies, cost estimates, and planning surveys.

It specifies that the Secretary of Commerce will work cooperatively, through the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, and the State of Alaska to make the necessary surveys. The final report is to be submitted to the Congress on or before May 15, 1964, although it is expected that interim reports will be submitted from time to time.

The report will include:

First. An analysis of the adequacy of the Federal-aid highway program to provide for a satisfactory program in both the populated and the undeveloped areas in Alaska.

Second. Specific recommendations as to the construction of roads through undeveloped areas of Alaska and to connect them with roads from Canada.

Third. A feasible program for implementing such specific recommendations, including cost estimates, recommendations as to the sharing of cost responsibilities and other pertinent matters.

The endorsement by the Kennedy administration carries out the President's statement on the floor of the Senate on June 24, 1960, when, as a Member of the Senate, he said:

> We must expand and modernize Alaska's highway system—a system is an essential condition of Alaska's future development—by greatly increasing our highway program so that Alaska's highways will be the equal of those in other States, which have been receiving Federal help over a long period of time.

During my testimony on behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 137 I compared the cost of visits to three large cities in three States by a family of four, mother, father, and two children, ages 10 and 14. The States compared were Oklahoma, Michigan, and Alaska. The Oklahomans followed roads to and from Beaver City to Oklahoma City, a distance of 450 miles and the gasoline cost was $7.50. The Michiganites made a round trip from Alpena to Detroit, 464 miles, for the same amount. The Alaskans' round trip to Anchorage and back to Bethel cost $462 via air highway—since no road exists.

TWO NEW HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS FOR ALASKA

The 87th Congress has shown its interest in the development of Alaska's great natural resources by its authorization of the construction of two new hydroelectric power projects:

First. The Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project near Juneau.

Second. The Bradley Lake project on the Kenai Peninsula.

Now that these projects have been authorized, the next step is to seek the appropriation of funds for preconstruction planning.

These two hydroelectric power projects for south central and southeastern Alaska are the first hydroelectric projects approved by the Congress since the approval of the Eklutna project under the Truman administration. There have been, of course, other power projects constructed in Alaska in the past 3 years with Federal funds but under programs not requiring project-by-project congressional approval. These include the Cooper Lake hydro project on the Kenai Peninsula, whose dedications I attended last year with REA Administrator Norman Clapp, and the Burns Lake power project, now under construction near the new oil refinery on the Kenai Peninsula. Both of these projects were financed by loans obtained through the Rural Electrification Administration, whose general program and appropriations I have wholeheartedly supported. The REA was, of course, a program which was brought to the people under the Roosevelt administration. Through my efforts, a difficult problem which blocked completion of Chugach Electric Association transmission lines from the Cooper Lake power project to Anchorage was cleared away by negotiations with the Forest Service.

Recommended for the Bradley Lake project is the sum of $45,750,000 and $41,634,000 is recommended for the Snettisham project. Both projects have plus benefit-to-cost ratios. The benefits of such projects must exceed the costs—the amount of return for dollars expended—before being approved. The Bradley Lake project's benefit-cost ratio is 1.7 and that of the Snettisham project is 2.18. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors found that the Bradley Lake project near the head of Kachemak Bay is needed and economically justified to alleviate the impending power shortage in the Anchorage-Kenai Peninsula area. The Snettisham project would provide also gravely needed power by the Gastineau Channel area. It would harness water power from hanging lakes—Crater and Long Lakes—above Port Snettisham, located southeast of Juneau.

ADVANCEMENT FOR RAMPART

When the Development & Resources Corp. of New York presented its final report on the proposed Rampart project to the Corps of Engineers it said the market for power from the project would create a busy and prosperous Alaska which would "almost certainly become a substantial producer of electric-furnace pig iron and steel, ferroalloys, copper, magnesium, chlorine and caustic soda, calcium carbide, abrasives, nitrogen, phosphorous titanium, and other products." The study is part of intensive investigations now underway on the proposed project for a $1⅓ billion dam which will have installed capacity of approximately 5 million kilowatts and will produce energy at a cost of 2 mills at the bus-bar and not to exceed 3 mills per kilowatt-hour at tidewater.

Rampart Dam would be the biggest power producer in the free world. Better than $900,000 will have been used for Rampart project studies by the close of fiscal year 1963 on June 30, 1962. The total estimated Federal cost of the survey is $1.3 million which the Alaska congressional delegation hopes can be completed in fiscal year 1964. The money so far expended, and to be expended, on Rampart is not a cost to the Federal Government but rather a loan, as every penny of it, with interest, will be repaid out of power sale revenues.

Funds to undertake the study of the Rampart Dam project were first secured in 1959 when, over administration protests, I persuaded the Senate Appropriations Committee to include the sum of $100,000 in the Public Works Appropriations Act for 1960.

At my request Chairman DENNIS CHAVEZ, of the Senate Public Works Committee, and the committee had approved on April 24, 1959, a resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers Harbors "to determine the advisability of improvements in the interest of hydroelectric power and other water uses in the Yukon River Basins, Alaska, with particular reference to the Rampart Canyon site."

However in hopes of avoiding a Presidential veto, the amounts for all public works projects throughout the country were cut. Rampart was cut to $48,750. Despite this showing of congressional cooperation, the Republican President again vetoed the bill, but we were successful in overriding the veto for the first time in the Eisenhower administration.

Thus from this modest beginning of $48,750 in 1959 more and more funds have been appropriated for the Rampart Dam project and the end of the survey is in sight.

The Development and Resources report makes clear that even the tremendous power to be generated by Rampart will be insufficient for Alaska's needs and that a whole Yukon River development will be required. In pursuance of this conclusion, I requested and obtained authorization for the Corps of Engineers to investigate the Woodchopper site upstream from Rampart.

NEW STARTS ON THE NEW FRONTIER

I. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

May 1, 1962, may some day be known as Law and Education Day. On this date President Kennedy signed Public Law 87-447 which contained language to expedite the utilization of television for educational purposes. We know this law as the Educational Television Act which has captured the imagination of many Americans.

In Alaska, Gov. William A. Egan has named a statewide committee and asked its members to explore and find ways in which ETV can best be used in the State. The public law authorizes matching funds up to $1 million to each State to help establish educational television facilities. President Kennedy, an enthusiastic supporter of educational television, said when he signed the act:

> This marks a new chapter in the expression of Federal interest in education. At a time when the wide availability of quality education is vital to our national growth and security, we must make effective use of all of our educational resources.

I am concerned with the lack of action at the Federal level to make available funds for school construction and teachers' salaries. The Senate approved such legislation but the House Rules Committee would not permit the bill to be acted on by the House. Under such circumstances it becomes more necessary to utilize available legislative aids such as the Educational Television Act.

II. AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

How to relieve the problem of chronic unemployment which affected many areas of the Nation was a major item confronting Members of the 87th Congress. Unemployment stood at more than 5 million workers. In Alaska the percentage of unemployed was high in most parts of the State. On January 4, 1961, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, introduced S. 1, the Area Redevelopment Act, a bill he had sponsored since 1955. Once again I joined as a cosponsor of this important legislation, as I had during the previous Congress.

I found it interesting to read the departmental and agency reports. For example, the Commerce Department report for January 13, 1961, was adverse, but the Commerce Department report of February 27, 1961, was favorable with amendments. You will recall that the administration had changed on January 20, 1961.

The Area Redevelopment Act became Public Law 87-27 on May 1, 1961. The act is administered through the Area Redevelopment Administration in the U.S. Department of Commerce. ARA brought together a number of Federal Government departments and agencies with resources which could be focused on the problem of helping create new jobs. It helps areas diversify and rebuild their economic base. It creates new employment opportunities through its positive approach, and astute administration of the program has furthered its development.

As this report was being prepared, nine ARA projects, with a monetary value of $1,580,962, have been approved for Alaska. The four training programs and the one public facilities loan will provide jobs for 595 persons, and will help correct the situation which existed early in January 1961, when the State unemployment rate was 18.7 percent.

The following table provides a project-by-project breakdown:

Area Redevelopment Administration projects

Location	Type	Funds	Description
Statewide	Technical assistance by Institute of Business, University of Alaska.	$40,500	Study ways to increase and expand market for Alaska native arts and crafts.
Anchorage	Training, 15 electronic mechanics and 20 clerk-stenographers.	32,660	
	Training, 20 clerks	15,690	
Fairbanks	Training, 20 general clerks	16,654	
	Technical assistance	1,500	U.S. Forest Service feasibility study of proposed sawmill and lumber finishing facilities.
	do	6,850	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, to develop integrated economic development program.
Ketchikan	Training, 20 general clerks	17,108	
Saxman	Public facilities loan, 500 jobs	1,400,000	To construct port facilities.
Kotzebue	Technical assistance	50,000	Study of meat, cannery, and fish-processing operation.

Alaska's interest in the ARA program has drawn commendation by ARA spokesmen. The 49th State is one of two in the Union to present an overall economic development program. This was done in September of 1962 and the program is now under consideration.

Within Alaska individual areas have shown interest. The following have submitted programs which have been approved: Palmer-Wasilla-Talkeetna, Kobuk, Wrangell-Petersburg, Nome, Kenai-Cook Inlet, Cordova-McCarthy and portions of the Chitina and Prince William Sound area, Seward, Aleutian, Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Ketchikan.

III. ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS ACT

Taking positive action to alleviate unemployment and underemployment in many communities, the Senate Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, held hearings and then favorably reported the proposed Accelerated Public Works Act. I had contacted the Governors of each State having areas of substantial unemployment to determine the number of public works projects that were ready to get underway and also to learn what would be a reasonable and usable sum to appropriate. Information varied.

I discovered 17 States whose Governors replied that a sum of more than $1.7 billion could profitably and usefully be utilized. Thus I suggested that the proposed authorization of $600 million be increased to $2.645 billion. A compromise figure of $900 million became part of Public Law 87-658.

Certain limitations exist. No more than 10 percent of the total can be spent in one State, the program must be ready to go, and "no part of any allocation made by the President under this act shall be made available for any planning or construction, directly or indirectly, of any school or other educational facility." The program is being coordinated by the Area Redevelopment Administration, but some of the funds will be spent by Federal agencies on public works projects.

IV. MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

With rapid technological changes occurring in industry, the needs of labor change and the skills become outmoded. The Manpower Development and Training Act provides a positive approach for meeting this challenge. I supported this legislation and endorsed its full funding. The acting director of the Alaska State Division of Vocational Education on July 14, 1962, Mr. C. G. Fader, wrote to me to urge that I support the full authorized amount of $100 million for carrying out the act.

The program is suited to Alaska and its training and employment needs. As Mr. Fader pointed out, 85 percent of the Alaska labor needs are in the nonindustrial areas and people must be trained to fill the needs of the labor market. Such needs include the development of the oil industry, the expansion of the highway program and the extension of the agriculture potential.

V. TELEPHONE AND AIR TRANSPORTATION TAXES

Alaskans, dependent on air transportation for much of their travel, will benefit from congressional action which I supported. The transportation tax on air travel drops from 10 to 5 percent on November 15, 1962. The air transportation tax ends June 30, 1963. I voted to repeal the tax completely when a rollcall vote was taken in the Senate in the 86th Congress.

The tax on long distance telephone calls is now on a year-to-year extension basis. The current extension expires June 30, 1963. The tax on local calls was removed July 1, 1960.

VI. IMPROVED CONTROLS ON DRUGS

The health of the public will be better protected by legislation approved this Congress which amends the Food and Drug Act. It requires adequate controls in the manufacture and marketing of drugs.

VII. IMPROVED VETERANS LEGISLATION

The 87th Congress approved legislation correcting inequities in programs pertaining to veterans. They include laws which:

First. Increase the lump-sum readjustment payments to members of Reserve components involuntarily released from active duty;

Second. Equalize per diem travel rates of servicemen with those of Federal career employees;

Third. Permit members of the Armed Forces to accept fellowships, scholarships, and grants;

Fourth. Authorize Veterans' Administration hospital and medical care for peacetime veterans with noncompensable service-connected disabilities;

Fifth. Extend the period of vocational rehabilitation for blinded veterans until 1975;

Sixth. Increase the basic allowance for living quarters for members of the Armed Forces.

The Senate Veterans Committee reported favorably S. 801, a bill I cosponsored to furnish care needed by veterans in Alaska and Hawaii who suffer from non-service-connected disabilities. Since the House did not act on the bill, I will reintroduce this legislation in January, and I will continue to work for the enactment of the cold war GI bill, which I also cosponsored.

VIII. HEALTH CARE

Congress considered but did not enact legislation which would provide for hospital care for the aged under social security. The debate which raged nationally on the issue of medicare was improperly named inasmuch as the legislation provided limited hospital care, not care by doctors outside the hospital. This legislation will be considered by the 88th Congress, as it should be. Need exists for a program to protect those aged people on limited incomes from excessive hospital costs which will absorb their savings. I believe this can be accomplished equitably and without disrupting in any way the doctor-patient relationship.

The Kerr-Mills law of 1960 goes only a part of the way by providing medical assistance to those who are poverty stricken.

IX. TRADE EXPANSION ACT

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is historic legislation which will give the President tools to increase our export trade to meet the threat of the European Common Market and to maintain a favorable balance of funds. The bill also provides assistance to industry and workers affected by increased imports. Our world is shrinking—we cannot live apart from others. The Trade Expansion Act properly provides aid for business firms in the form of loans, loan guarantees, technical assistance, and tax benefits and unemployment benefits for displaced employees.

X. ALASKA TOWNSITES

The Congress approved and the President signed into Public Law 87-742, the Alaska townsites legislation. The Senate bill, S. 3160, was identical to H.R. 11266 introduced by Congressman RALPH RIVERS. It was introduced by Senator BARTLETT and me primarily to assist the communities of Barrow and Wainwright. It allows establishment of townsites on public land in Alaska known to be mineral in character. It was favorably reported by the Senate Interior Committee, of which I am a member, and paves the way for similar developments elsewhere in Alaska.

XI. JUDGESHIP BILL

Early in the 87th Congress Public Law 87-36 was enacted. This omnibus Federal judgeship bill included provision for appointment of a second judge for Alaska. Today Alaska has two U.S. district court judges. I first pointed up the need when I introduced a bill during the 86th Congress providing for a second judge.

XII. MARINE SCIENCES AND RESEARCH ACT

One of the pressing problems of our times is the survey of the seas and their resources. This is important to our economic well-being and resource development, our national defense, and our education.

I cosponsored S. 901, familiarly identified as the oceanography bill. Alaska with its coastline of more than 25,000 miles, longer than the combined Pacific, Gulf, and Atlantic coastlines of the 48 older States, is deeply concerned with this legislation which promotes oceanographic research and advances the marine sciences. At my request the scope of the investigation was broadened to include, specifically, the Arctic Ocean and the Bering Sea.

In 1960 the Legislature of the State of Alaska authorized the establishment at the University of Alaska of an institute of marine sciences. I envision the day when Alaska will be internationally renowned for work in oceanography. In no other area is the field so fertile for the training of oceanographers and marine scientists for work in the Arctic and in the Antarctic.

XIII. PARCEL POST SIZE-WEIGHT LIMITATION CHANGE

Members of the Alaskan and Hawaiian congressional delegations were successful this Congress in restoring for patrons of first-class post offices the size and weight limitations of fourth-class mail—parcel post—that existed during territorial days. The limitations now restored are 70 pounds and 100 inches in girth. Second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices were never affected by the change and did continue to handle fourth-class matter as in territorial days.

The restoration of the service for users of the first-class post offices in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Kodiak, Ketchikan, and Sitka is both desirable and fair.

This restoration came as an amendment to the Postal Revision Act of 1961.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Many bills are introduced during each Congress. Some become law. During the 86th Congress of 1959-60, 19 bills which I authored or cosponsored were approved by the Senate and House and became public law.

Those which became public law are:

Bill No.	Short title	Public Law No.	Date
S. 1	Amends Federal Airport Act to provide increased Federal grants.	86-72	June 29, 1959
S. 50	Hawaii Statehood Act	86-3	Mar. 18, 1959
S. 56	Establishing program for Indian sanitation facilities.	86-121	July 31, 1959
S. 931	Increase bond sales by Tennessee Valley Authority.	86-137	Aug. 6, 1959
S. 1018	Agricultural surplus property made available to State and county agencies.	86-570	July 5, 1960
S. 1094	Bretton Woods Agreement extension	86-48	June 17, 1959
S. 1411	Clarifies words "restored lands"	86-512	June 11, 1960
S. 1412	Enlarges Alaska's discretion in land selection under Statehood Act.	86-173	Aug. 18, 1959
S. 1670	Mineral rights for Alaska homesteaders.	86-789	Sept. 14, 1960
S. 1728	Increasing coal-leasing acreage	86-252	Sept. 9, 1959
S. 2669	Vessels' inspection exemption	86-688	Sept. 2, 1960
S. 2630	Library services extension	86-670	Aug. 31, 1960
S. 3054	Hawaii omnibus	86-624	July 12, 1960
S. 3267	Disposal of certain public Alaska lands at not less than fair market value.	86-702	Sept. 14, 1960
S. 3290	Federal Highway Act funds authorization.	86-657	July 14, 1960
S. 3434	States rights to select certain public lands.	86-786	Sept. 14, 1960
S. 3545	University of Alaska—facilitating disposition of lands.	86-620	July 12, 1960
S.J. Res. 41	International Health Research	86-610	Do.
S.J. Res. 39	Filling House vacancies	23d amendment to U.S. Constitution.	

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

During the 87th Congress of 1961–62, 22 bills which I authored or cosponsored were approved by the Senate and House and were signed into public law by the President. Those which became public law are:

Bill No.	Short title	Public Law No.	Date
S. 1	Area redevelopment	87-27	May 1, 1961
S. 100	Saline water conversion	87-295	Sept. 22, 1961
S. 248	Postal limitations of parcel post packages in 1st-class post offices (corrected by amendment to Postal Revision Act).	87-793	Oct. 11, 1962
S. 345	Mass transportation	87-70	June 30, 1961
S. 353	Ladd-Eielson land withdrawal	87-326	Sept. 26, 1961
S. 354	Fairbanks land withdrawal	87-320	Do.
S. 355	Fort Greely land withdrawal	87-327	Do.
S. 356	Granite Creek land withdrawal	87-334	Oct. 3, 1961
S. 357	Campbell Creek land withdrawal	87-306	Sept. 26, 1961
S. 594	Authorizing Snettisham project (incorporated in H.R. 13273—Omnibus rivers and harbors bill).		
S. 610	Office of International Travel	87-63	June 29, 1961
S. 707	Canadian vessels transportation	87-77	June 30, 1961
S. 799	Permits sale of disconnected tracts of Alaskan land, reserving mineral rights.	87-147	Aug. 17, 1961
S. 800	Extends time to file adverse suits against mineral entries in Alaska.	87-260	Sept. 21, 1961
S. 1245	Omnibus Housing Act of 1961 providing housing funds for moderate income and displaced families.	87-70	June 30, 1961
S. 1703	Extends Federal Airport Act for 3 years.	87-255	Sept. 20, 1961
S. 2154 (amendment).	Dual rate contract agreement	87-75	June 30, 1961
S. 2156	Saline water conversion	87-295	Sept. 22, 1961
S. 2382	Adjust postal rates (incorporated in H.R. 7927—Postal Revision Act).	87-793	Oct. 11, 1962
S. 3077	Bradley Lake (incorporated in H.R. 13273—Omnibus rivers and harbors bill).		
H.R. 6713 (amendment).	Controlling billboards	87-61	June 29, 1961
S.J. Res. 98	Homestead Act centennial	87-272	Sept. 22, 1961

ALASKAN DEVELOPMENTS

1. ANCHORAGE INTERNATIONAL RECEPTION CENTER

On August 30, 1961, I introduced for myself and Senator Bob Bartlett legislation to provide for establishing and operating a foreign trade zone, a Hall of States, and an international reception and information center at the Anchorage International Airport. Nowhere in America did the establishment of a free port similar to that operated at the airport at Shannon, Ireland, seem so reasonable and so possible. The Senate bill was S. 2484. Identical legislation was introduced by Congressman Rivers.

More than 150,000 visitors from other countries yearly visit in Anchorage and the number grows daily. Our Shannon, if you will, could also be the prime display point of the many remarkable goods manufactured and produced in the 50 States of the Union. It could give foreign visitors a glimpse of and an opportunity to buy or order some of the many and varied products produced under the American system of free enterprise.

As with any new proposal involving a number of Federal agencies it takes time to get acceptance. I have been very gratified at the very favorable response received from the Federal agencies and their desire to cooperate. It is my intention to introduce similar legislation in the 88th Congress.

2. THE COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM

The Communications Satellite legislation is now Public Law 87–624. Its road to final passage was not smooth, and even with final passage I cannot say in truth that I am satisfied that it is the best bill possible, nevertheless it does represent the majority.

I believe that a worldwide communications satellite system can implement better international understanding but I do regret that the public law in effect has created a monopoly. Competition is curtailed, in fact eliminated, at a time when there is need to combine the best of Government and free enterprise. Therefore, I introduced amending legislation which would have permitted the Government to retain ownership of the program but which authorized leasing and operation to private enterprise.

So, as I said once before on the floor of the Senate on August 1, 1962, I welcome legislation making possible a communications satellite bill, but I do want any such bill to contain safeguards permitting the U.S. Government to deal effectively and efficiently with the multitude of obstacles it must meet and master.

Negotiations with other governments, particularly with totalitarian regimes, are tough. Such negotiations properly should be made by the Department of State—not a private concern. I fear we shall again have to consider legislation which will amend the public law that nearly a score of us in the Senate, including Bob Bartlett, had doubts about.

We want live televison available in Alaska. But we prefer that the television at all times be the best available. Competition is the cornerstone of our free enterprise system; monopoly is not.

3. HELP FOR HOMESTEADERS

Since I have been a Member of the Senate I have received far too many letters from homesteaders who have described arbitrary action by officials of the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey concerning the uses or claims to homesteads. A need exists for the establishment of procedures to insure an objective review of earlier decisions. The laws and regulations governing the use and disposition of the public lands should be interpreted and applied uniformly and equitably.

This can be done only if the initial decision is subject to objective administrative review, with ultimate recourse to the courts.

On April 4, 1962, I introduced legislation to establish in the office of the Secretary of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals. My colleague, Bob Bartlett, and 12 other Senators from throughout the West have joined as cosponsors of S. 3107. Response to this proposed legislation has been gratifying. Endorsement comes from all States where homesteaders' rights are clouded.

The Board I propose would have three members who would hear appeals from decisions rendered by the BLM concerning the uses or claims to public lands under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department. Appellants, upon their request, could have a hearing at a location convenient to the appellant, either before a member of the Board or before a hearing examiner employed by the Board.

Thus, there would be made available practical machinery to bring the hearing to the place where the person who appeals lives. Under present law any hearing on an appeal, if granted, must be held in Washington, D.C. This is too expensive a burden for the homesteaders.

Second, no longer would a branch chief be required to rule on the decision of an associate solicitor, a man his superior. It is unrealistic to continue a situation wherein a subordinate approves or disapproves the ruling of his chief.

The Social Security Administration finds it possible to handle its claims program with respect to the old-age survivors and disability program under title II of the Social Security Act in much the same manner as I have suggested.

If the Department of the Interior does not make the necessary corrections administratively, I plan to reintroduce this legislation in January of 1963.

4. COMMEMORATIVE 50-CENT PIECES FOR ALASKA'S BIRTHDAY

I have cosponsored Senator BARTLETT's S. 3055 which would authorize the coinage of a 50-cent piece in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska from Russia. Such coins would be struck in 1967.

5. DUAL-RATE AMENDMENT

The continuing struggle to obtain a fair break for Alaska on water freight rates never ends. In the 1st session of the 87th Congress I introduced an amendment to H.R. 6775 which modified the laws governing conference agreements of water carriers in foreign commerce. Senator BARTLETT was cosponsor. Our amendment was enacted and it gives special procedural advantages to Governors of States against which conference-imposed rates discriminate against consumers. If the rate for water shipments imposed by a conference is found discriminatory the Maritime Commission is required to make a ruling within 180 days following the Governor's protest.

Alaskan consumers and businessmen are also plagued by the charge for the transportation of freight by transcontinental railroads. At my request the General Services Administration has worked diligently to correct this discriminatory situation. Hearings have been held on S. 1723 which I introduced and which would prohibit transcontinental railroads hauling shipments destined for Alaska from charging more for such shipments than for shipments bound to other parts of the Pacific rim nations.

The GSA has earned commendation for its efforts to effect a new deal for Alaska through extension of transcontinental rail service to Alaska on the four great transcontinental railroads which cross our Nation. Negotiations continue and a compromise is to be discussed when the carriers meet in Chicago later this year with GSA representatives who are well aware of Alaska's desires and needs in this area.

6. FAIRBANKS FORESTRY RESEARCH LABORATORY

The assessment and utilization of Alaska's vast forest resources will be speeded considerably when the forestry research laboratory near Fairbanks is completed. I am glad that I was persuasive in obtaining an amendment for the necessary $350,000 to the budget recommendations of the Department of Agriculture in 1961 for construction of the laboratory on the campus of the University of Alaska at College.

7. ALASKAN AGRICULTURE MOVES AHEAD

Homesteader-farmers in the 49th State must overcome obstacles foreign to their counterparts in other States. The agriculture potential within Alaska is barely tapped.

Many improvements in the situation have come as a result of actions initiated by me and my colleagues in the Alaska delegation. Our successful fight to obtain a decision by the Department of Defense to purchase fresh milk for troops stationed in Alaska, in place of reconstituted grade C milk previously imported from the other States, has immensely benefited the dairy industry in both the Matanuska and Tanana Valleys.

Legislation introduced this Congress by Senator BOB BARTLETT and me will provide some useful tools for land development. The bill has the support of the President, the Bureau of the Budget and the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. It authorizes the appropriation of $1,250,000 over a 10-year period and provides for the development of some 20,000 acres on a cost-sharing basis. It will help fill the gap between food needs and supply in the State.

S. 2805 passed the Senate and prior to adjournment had received favorable consideration from the House Agriculture Committee. Most of the major hurdles have been cleared. Its passage next Congress will mean a great deal to Alaska.

8. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PROVIDES AID AND AIDES

The Department of Agriculture has earned special commendation for its interest in the development of agriculture in Alaska. A number of specialists have visited in the State and given advice where requested.

Elsewhere in this report I have indicated the extent of funds which have come to Alaska from some USDA agencies. The change in attitude on the New Frontier so far as loan assistance is concerned is evident.

9. AID TO EDUCATION LEGISLATION AND A SAFEGUARD FOR ALASKA

I support Federal aid to education but I believe it is only realistic to accept the fact that an allocation of funds to the States on a basis of per capita income is manifestly unfair to Alaska. For this reason in 1961 I arranged with the University of Alaska, in cooperation with the Alaska State Board of Education, for the advisory services of Dr. George Rogers, to assist in developing a formula for Alaska which would put our State in a position equivalent with others. His research revealed that education costs in Alaska are much greater than in other parts of the Nation, thereby making a valid case for specialized treatment in the apportionment of school aid funds. The amendment adopted authorizes a special allotment ratio in cases where costs of one State appreciably exceed those in another. When the 88th Congress considers aid to education legislation, we will again offer this necessary amendment.

POST OFFICE SERVICE

Statehood has brought expanded postal facilities to Alaska. The delegation has fought and won its battle to speed and improve mail servicing into and within the State.

Following is a list of new postal establishments in Alaska for 1959 through September 1962:

Airport annex, classified branch of Anchorage, January 23, 1961.

No. 2, contract station of Anchorage, April 3, 1961.

Arctic Village, independent post office, April 1, 1959.

Buckland, independent post office, November 1, 1961.

Chefornak, independent post office, July 22, 1961.

Dot Lake, rural station of Delta Junction, September 1, 1961.

Eagle River, independent post office, August 1, 1961.

Eielson Air Force Base, independent classified branch of Fairbanks, January 11, 1960.

Money Order Unit No. 1 (Fairbanks), August 15, 1960.

Halibut Cove, rural station of Homer, August 20, 1961.

Kasigluk, independent post office, January 19, 1962.

Knudson Cove, rural station of Ketchikan, July 1, 1961.

Ladd Base Exchange, contract branch of Fairbanks, March 5, 1960 (name changed to Fort Wainwright Post Exchange April 10, 1961). Now known as Fort Wainwright Classified Branch.

Lower Kalskag, independent post office, January 16, 1962.

Manokotak, independent post office, April 1, 1960.

Myers Chuck, rural station of Ketchikan, November 1, 1961.

Napakiak, independent post office, May 1, 1961.

New Stuyahok, independent post office, July 1, 1961.

Nunaka Valley, contract branch of Anchorage, November 1, 1959.

Paxson, rural station of Delta Junction, October 1, 1961.

Russian Mission, independent post office, July 1, 1961.

Togiak, independent post office, March 1, 1959.

Tuntutuliak, independent post office, August 1, 1960.

Wildwood, classified branch of Kenai, June 1, 1961.

IMPROVED SERVICE TO ALASKANS

With statehood came the need to retain Government and to improve services of Federal agencies within the State. Progress has been made. For example:

First. The Internal Revenue Service moved its Alaskan office from Tacoma, Wash., to Anchorage in January 1961.

Second. The Department of Commerce agreed in July 1962 to establish an office of field service in Alaska. The State has been serviced by the Seattle office. The Department of Commerce also agreed to establish an Alaska Regional Export Expansion Council, ending the practice of naming Alaskans to a Seattle council. This change followed my request in testimony before the Appropriations Committee and letters to the Department.

Director of the Office of Field Service Roy L. Morgan in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee observed that Alaska "a young, dynamic State does need help."

Three. The Farmers Home Administration has opened three new area offices in Fairbanks, Palmer, and Soldatna in 1961 and 1962.

DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Employment opportunities within a State such as Alaska must be developed.

The need to make it possible for all Americans to be economically independent and self-sufficient cannot be stressed too often. A number of young Alaskan natives have demonstrated conclusively that they need no doles and do deserve and will utilize opportunities making possible full utilization of their skills and resources.

Given an opportunity by the Radio Corp. of America to train as electronic technicians for subsequent employment on the White Alice Communications System and on the Ballistic Missiles Early Warning System in Alaska, they showed zeal and ability for the work and graduated with honors.

Such wise utilization of human resources has long had my complete support. The achievement of these Alaskan young men in the RCA program was noted and commended by President Kennedy who visited with them and the congressional delegation at the White House earlier this year.

HOMEBUYERS PROTECTION

I introduced S. 3460 on June 21, 1962, to insure that houses delivered as "FHA insured" met the standards of specifications established by the Federal Housing Administration.

My discussions with officials of the agency revealed that even though homes were represented to prospective purchasers as "FHA insured" the buyer had no legal recourse if homes were poorly made. Evidences of this legislative loophole were found in many parts of the Nation, including Alaska.

The language of S. 3460 will give the words "FHA insured" validity. It will put an end to the temptation by manufacturers of prefabricated homes to "cut corners," resulting in homes not built to proper specification thereby making them uninhabitable. When just this occurred in connection with 48 homes built in and around Anchorage, I persuaded the FHA to require the builder to correct the deficiencies.

My bill would permit FHA to pay to the mortgagor under an FHA-insured mortgage the reasonable costs of correcting structural or other major defects which require correction in order to bring the dwelling into substantial conformity with FHA requirements to render the dwellings safe and habitable.

The agency has endorsed S. 3460 which is cosponsored by 12 Senators representing all parts of the United States. I will reintroduce this legislation in January.

WILDERNESS BILL LEGISLATION

When the Senate considered the wilderness bill early in the 87th Congress, my amendment to prevent arbitrary land withdrawal action by any Secretary of the Interior was accepted. The amendment would insure an end to actions taken previously by Secretary of Interior Ickes in 1940 and Secretary of Interior Seaton in December of 1960. It will be recalled that Secretary Ickes in 1940 withdrew 2 million acres for the Kenai National Moose Range without public hearing or advance notice to the public or State officials. Secretary Seaton followed a similar course of action when he withdrew, despite adverse action by the Congress, 9 million acres of Arctic wildlife range.

I pointed out these instances in my individual views on the bill in Report No. 635 which accompanied S. 174, the wilderness bill, and said we did not want the actions "repealed by their unknown successors 10 years hence under the provisions of this bill."

My amendment, accepted by the committee, offered the following safeguard:

In any State having more than 90 percent of its total land area owned by the Federal Government on January 1, 1961, a Presidential Land Use Commission shall be established to advise and consult with the Secretary of the Interior "on the current utilization of federally owned land in such State and shall make recommendations to the Secretary as to how the federally owned land can best be utilized, developed, protected, and preserved."

The Commission of five members appointed by the President will have no more than three members of the same political party. Three Commission members "shall be residents of the State concerned."

Reports of the Commission as well as the Secretary of the Interior shall be made to the Congress.

The committee also accepted a second amendment which I offered specifying that any addition to the wilderness system can be made only by an act of Congress.

The wilderness legislation passed the Senate, but died in the House of Representatives. I will offer these safeguarding amendments when the legislation is reintroduced.

A PROGRAM FOR FISHERIES REHABILITATION

Senators from fish States have worked hard to secure funds for fisheries rehabilitation. Support is growing for the approach I have proposed which would authorize distribution to State fish and game agencies of funds collected from tariffs on imported fishery products. This approach would be simple to administer because the funds would be allocated directly to States having important fishery resources rather than being diverted to the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. Twenty-three Senators joined as cosponsors of my bill, S. 1230.

I intend to reintroduce this bill when the 88th Congress convenes. The bill includes all types of fisheries. There was a time when the Alaska fishery resources were perhaps the greatest in the Nation, but during the years of territorial status this wealth was carelessly flung away through incredibly poor management on the part of the Federal Government.

Alaskans understood the plight of their great fisheries. Time after time the territorial legislature adopted memorials which were unheeded in the Congress even though the voteless delegates of the State in the Congress spoke out the plain facts that Alaska fisheries were declining.

It was more in sadness than in rebuff that I called to the attention of the Senate March 7, 1961, the fact that the U.S. Government spent $12,231,000 to rehabilitate the fishing resources of foreign countries under the foreign aid program even as U.S. fishery resources declined.

Certainly anyone who has followed closely the steady inroads being made into our fishery resources by the Japanese and the Russians will readily understand that the United States has been standing still in the development of its own fishery resources.

BUDGET REVIEWS

Part of the work of Alaska's congressional delegation has been to reshape the thinking of many of the executive agencies as to the great unmet needs of Alaska. This retraining does not occur immediately. However, I am encouraged with the action taken by some of the executive departments. To illustrate how budgets for Alaska may be improved I have traced certain interdepartmental budgets of three departments of prime importance in the 49th State—the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of the Interior.

Review of the budget from 1959 to 1963

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service:	
Expended:	
1959	$342,786
1960	346,044
1961	384,674
1962	402,247
1963 estimate	405,100
Forest Service:	
Expended:	
1959	2,390,665
1960	2,594,569
1961	3,661,012
1962	4,569,259
1963 estimate	4,688,092
Soil Conservation Service:	
Expended:	
1959	132,356
1960	135,314
1961	159,933
1962	164,545
1963 estimate	192,000
Farmers Home Administration:	
Expended:	
1959	131,708
1960	377,356
1961	459,063
1962	1,345,688
1963 estimate	1,662,000
Rural Electrification Administration:	
Expended:	
1959	875,000
1960	5,155,000
1961	2,524,000
1962	6,596,000
1963 estimate	(1)

[1] The estimate for 1963 is not available at this time.

Review of the budget from 1959 to 1963—Continued

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE	
Food and Drug Administration:	
Appropriation:	
1959	$1,000
1960	1,000
1961	1,000
1962	1,000
1963 estimated	1,000
Obligation:	
1959	1,000
1960	1,000
1961	1,000
1962	1,000
1963 estimate	1,000
Office of Education (some State funds required):	
Appropriation:	
1959	5,467,943
1960	9,203,206
1961	10,327,413
1962	8,683,638
1963 estimate	8,468,583
Obligation:	
1959	5,417,941
1960	9,132,798
1961	10,281,275
1962	8,683,638
1963 estimate	8,468,583
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation [State funds required]:	
Appropriation:	
1959	136,610
1960	145,612
1961	172,950
1962	252,210
1963 estimate	236,827
Obligation:	
1959	111,151
1960	119,464
1961	116,966
1962	169,912
1963 estimate	214,129
Public Health Service [State funds required]:	
Appropriation:	
1959	23,608,834
1960	12,897,769
1961	14,299,271
1962	14,990,310
1963 estimate	17,552,560
Obligation:	
1959	16,633,559
1960	19,159,681
1961	13,684,308
1962	13,842,013
1963 estimate	16,896,100
Social Security Administration [State funds required]:	
Appropriation:	
1959	5,983,936
1960	6,534,311
1961	6,865,889
1962	7,597,111
1963 estimate	8,175,828
Obligation:	
1959	5,983,936
1960	6,534,311
1961	6,865,689
1962	7,597,111
1963 estimate	8,175,828
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	
The Alaska Railroad:	
Expended:	
1959	17,174,000
1960	17,464,000
1961	14,335,000
1962	14,460,000
1963	14,040,000
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:	
Appropriated:	
1959	3,336,970
1960	4,617,778
1961	5,272,302
1962	4,816,309
1963	4,286,300
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—continued	
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries—Continued	
Expended:	
1959	$4,655,797
1960	4,421,775
1961	5,264,781
1962	4,816,309
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:	
Appropriated:	
1959	655,475
1960	813,670
1961	787,610
1962	919,050
1963 estimate	1,031,050
Expended:	
1959	641,513
1960	801,506
1961	765,809
1962	919,050
Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
Appropriated:	
1959	9,130,402
1960	7,250,813
1961	8,737,564
1962	13,195,497
1963 estimated	15,978,123
Expended:	
1959	8,703,083
1960	8,606,399
1961	9,851,590
1962	13,849,749
1963	15,978,123
Bureau of Land Management:	
Appropriated:	
1959	4,850,249
1960	4,817,774
1961	4,637,098
1962	4,099,933
1963	4,566,900
Expended:	
1959	4,892,140
1960	4,812,055
1961	4,682,014
1962	4,004,028
Bureau of Mines:	
Appropriated:	
1959	423,900
1960	428,100
1961	420,000
1962	391,200
1963	392,700
Expended:	
1959	420,169
1960	425,189
1961	418,320
1962	391,200
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Appropriated:	
1959	504,808
1960	522,422
1961	552,002
1962	643,700
1963 estimate	654,135
Expended:	
1959	617,469
1960	504,026
1961	542,912
1962 estimated	643,700
1963 estimate	654,135
Geological Survey:	
Appropriated:	
1959	2,720,000
1960	2,968,000
1961	3,049,000
1962	2,787,000
1963	3,325,000
Expended:	
1962	3,020,000
Minerals exploration:	
Appropriated:	
1962	11,000
1963 estimate	11,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—continued	
Geological Survey—Continued	
National Park Service:	
Appropriated:	
1959	$959,626
1960	1,418,932
1961	1,231,239
1962	627,280
1963 estimate	1,045,748
Expended:	
1959	1,829,044
1960	955,137
1961	1,387,294
1962	1,225,142
Office of the Secretary:	
Appropriated:	
1962	23,800
1963 estimate	24,000
Office of the Solicitor:	
Appropriated:	
1959	114,400
1960	109,900
1961	111,500
1962	122,635
1963 estimate	123,600
Expended:	
1959	114,400
Office of Territories:	
Appropriated:	
1959	5,461,660
1960	290,000
1961	250,000
1962	78,000
Expended:	
1959	6,001,010
1960	4,582,783
1961	1,667,863

In all modesty I think I can say that more has been accomplished for the people of Alaska in Washington in the past 2 Congresses than in the 85 which preceded them. Without a strong, united delegation such results would not have been possible. I cannot find terms of praise too strong to apply to my colleagues BOB BARTLETT and RALPH RIVERS. Their performance has been superb. But in all truth, I must say that much remains to be done to put Alaska on a basis of economic as well as political equality with the other States. The team we now have in Congress has demonstrated it has the know-how experience and drive to carry the work forward in future sessions.

Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my views concerning the farm bill.

I have always been extremely anxious to support farm legislation that I thought would be beneficial to the farmers and the Nation as a whole, and I have time and again expressed my willingness by voice and vote in this body to give the

Department of Agriculture full opportunity to correct and reform present deficiencies in the price support system and other agricultural affairs.

However, the situation has deteriorated from year to year, and I think that Congress, the farmers, the Department of Agriculture, and the American people need urgently to seek more constructive, adequate solutions.

I voted to recommit the farm bill because it seemed to me that course would give the committee another opportunity to report an integrated bill eliminating the objections to the pending measure.

There are great complexities and difficulties in farm legislation. Clearly, a new, constructive program is urgently required. Any effective bill must find a solution for the huge agricultural surpluses piling up, and in some instances rotting in the warehouses of the country at great and increasing annual cost to the taxpayers.

Such a bill should seek to insure reasonable prices of foodstuffs for the consuming public, and feedstuffs for our farmers, with a maximum of freedom of enterprise and action.

Feeling as I did that these ends were not fully achieved, and that consumers and farmers of my district, State, and area would face higher prices, I thought the House Committee on Agriculture should exert additional efforts to come up with a measure that would attack the challenging problems of surpluses without increasing the burdens upon consumers, farmers, and taxpayers.

I earnestly hope this may soon be accomplished.

Report to Indianians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at the close of each session of Congress, it has become my custom to report to my fellow citizens of Indiana on our work. I ask that this report now be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REPORT TO INDIANIANS

More jobs for Hoosiers. This has been the net effect of the last 22 months, and our most notable achievement. In modesty, we in Washington, through cooperation between Congress and the administration, have been able to mark up great success in the economic field. The State of Indiana offers a wonderful example of what can be done through hard work and cooperation, not only among us here in Washington, but with local interests.

Latest figures show 100,000 more people working in Indiana than there were in January 1961, at the beginning of the Kennedy administration. The total employment figure has climbed from 1,632,900 to 1,733,400. Unemployment has dropped in the same period from 154,700 to 88,000.

The Nation as a whole has bounced back during the same period. Certainly the beginning of the Kennedy administration came during a recession. Despite what critics may say, much progress has been made in the 22 months since that cold and snowy January day in 1961. The rate of unemployment in early 1961 was around 7 percent both nationally and in Indiana. This has been reduced to 5.3 percent nationally and 4.8 percent in Indiana.

Hoosiers will be pleased to know that only one major metropolitan area in our State remains on the critical list of high unemployment. In January 1961 there were five. Nationally the number of critical areas has been cut in half.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS UP 105 PERCENT

Many factors contribute to such an outstanding record; not the least is defense work. We have, in 22 months, managed to increase the amount of defense work for Indiana 105 percent—an increase exceeded only by one State. During the past year $637 million in defense contracts have come to Indiana. We are beginning to get our fair share of the defense dollar. It is helping business and providing jobs for our people. One Indiana factory reports it has increased employment from 950 in early 1961 to some 3,000 today. We are proud of such results.

Legislation enacted by the 87th Congress also has been of material help already. Effects of some of the actions of Congress will not be felt fully for another year or two. One of the greatest steps forward in this field in the future will be from the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. One of the forward steps which has already taken effect is the Area Redevelopment Act, of which I was a coauthor.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

The ARA has placed more than $2 million in loans and grants into Indiana, creating more than 800 jobs. One of the requirements for a loan or grant or retraining program is that it must be shown that the money spent will actually produce jobs. Evansville obtained a loan for a sewer system which will serve a new section of the city and a shopping center that will generate more than 500 jobs directly. Sixty-three trainees learning new trades in Evansville also have received jobs as a result of these classes. A new water system has been built in Borden to serve a cabinet company with 241 jobs. A new industry is coming to Corydon through ARA. It is the Indiana Glass Sand Corp., started with ARA help. In addition to these programs, ARA designation of an area as eligible for assistance means that low-interest loans aid in defense contracts and other special help to businesses can be arranged. This is possible in 2 of Indiana's 92 counties.

Project proposals still pending before ARA include: Reservoir project for New Providence, plastics molding plant in Clark County, Milan water system, Bloomfield sewer system, Jasonville sewer system, expansion of North Vernon Processing Co., building for Acme Business Forms in Jennings County, Grow Co. project for conversion of sawdust in Orange County, airport in Orange County, Middle Fork of the Anderson River watershed in Perry County, airport in Perry County, and food store in Sullivan County.

PUBLIC WORKS SPEED UP

Many communities will also be able to benefit from the accelerated public works program approved by Congress this year. These loans and grants have been established to encourage local communities to put in water lines, sewer lines, public buildings, roads and bridges which have been delayed or curtailed because of bond limitations or high local taxes. Federal funds are now available to match local moneys in order to hurry along some of this work. Speedy construction not only provides jobs now, but the work done stimulates the local economy and attracts industry. This public works program is available to communities which have been designated as eligible by ARA on the basis of lagging business and employment over a long period. Half a dozen public administrators from Indiana participated in a recent meeting with Commerce Department officials on ways to benefit from this new law.

The Small Business Administration not only gives special attention to applications for loans from firms in these depressed areas, but also tries to help businessmen throughout the State. Assistance is made not only in loans, but in helping to obtain Government contracts and in helping to set up small business investment companies to boost business in a given area. In the past year, 167 applications for loans were received from Indiana companies. Of these, 77 were approved and about $6½ million loaned. Communities which have benefited directly include: Elkhart, Jasonville, Marion, Marshfield, Mishawaka, South Bend, Terre Haute, Brazil, Carlisle, Dunkirk, Middletown, Muncie, Burket, Flora, Fort Wayne, Geneva, Linton, North Vernon, Pendleton, Pierceton, Portland, Upland, Warren, Boswell, Bunker Hill, Columbia City, Connersville, Hartford City, Huntington, Sellersburg, Vincennes, Warsaw, Chesterton, Logansport, Lynn, New Castle, Wabash, Winchester, Cannelton, Columbus, Evansville, Indianapolis, Loogootee, Mentone, Princeton, Angola, Dugger, Albany, Bluffton, Decatur, Oxford, Brookville, Valparaiso, Jeffersonville, and Milford. Our office is pleased to assist in obtaining these loans.

HOOSIER TRADE CONFERENCE

About 75 representatives of chambers of commerce and Indiana manufacturers attended a conference I set up designed to help businessmen in our State learn more about selling to the Federal Government, to suppliers of the Federal Government and to foreign countries through the new Trade Expansion Act. Emphasis was on foreign trade, which is already a big item in the Hoosier economy.

Indiana jobs also are created by the mutual security program—the so-called foreign aid program. During the bookkeeping year just ended, $1½ million was spent in Indiana for items being bought to help our friends and allies throughout the world. This is up about 25 percent from the year before. If we must continue helping other countries, I am glad that 80 percent of the money is spent in the United States for goods instead of sending money abroad. As long as $4 out of every $5 in the program is spent in this country, I am glad that we are able to generate more business for Indiana through the program. Thus, foreign aid money is going into Columbus, Connersville, East Chicago, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Indianapolis, Kendallville, Lawrenceburg, Michigan City, Mishawaka, Mooresville, North Manchester, Richmond, and South Bend. These contracts placed us among the top States in the country supplying goods for the mutual security program.

Increased business activity and the accompanying increase in jobs for Indiana is due to more than Hoosiers doing business with the Government. Contracts with the Federal Government or subcontracts are, of course, a large item. After all, nearly one-tenth of the entire gross national product—the value of all goods and services in the country—is going into defense buying alone.

We have found that the Department of Commerce, especially, is making special and strenuous efforts to build business. Our office works closely with the Office of Business and Defense Services and with the Bureau of Business Assistance in the Commerce Department to try and help build the kind of prosperity that will create new jobs and boost the Indiana economy.

FLOOD CONTROL EFFORTS

Aside from these activities listed above, much of my efforts outside the legislative field have been directed toward development and protection of our vast water resources. Floods have cost Hoosiers more than $10 million a year during the last dozen years. In addition, hundreds of tons of rich, black soil have been washed away. There has been loss of life and property and untold misery from these floods.

Moreover, the long-term industrial development of the State demands full availability of water the year around and the transportation afforded by our rivers. Industrial development also demands outdoor recreation which can be provided along with flood control and water development. They all go hand in hand. This is a job which demands coordination and cooperation among city, county, State, and National Government; civilian and military arms, and private business, civic organizations and trade associations.

We are pressing ahead with the new navigation locks on the Ohio River. Work is also proceeding at Cannelton, and planning is being rushed at Newburgh and Uniontown.

At the same time we are pressing for a study which would lead to navigation along the Wabash River. We are making strenuous efforts, too, to improve navigation along the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and from this vast new ocean into our State. In this connection, we are continuing our work on the development of harbors and navigation along the Calumet Waterway and the Illinois Waterway.

The Burns Waterway Harbor, the proposed public harbor in Porter County, will become a reality. It is expected that authorization of this project will be made by Congress in the year ahead and that funds for this work will be provided soon thereafter. This does not mean that we have abandoned hope for the development of the Lake Michigan shoreline for recreation and preservation of its priceless natural beauty.

BILLS FOR WATER DEVELOPMENT

These principles were embodied in a bill I submitted to the Congress. The bill was held in the Interior Committee by those who opposed the port project. My bill to set up a Wabash Valley Interagency Commission to supervise and coordinate protection and development of this valley passed the Senate, but was held up in the House. We will continue to press for this needed legislation.

We had considerably more success with flood control projects which also will serve to provide a continuous supply of water and sources of recreation land. During the year just ended some $29 million was spent on Indiana flood control, water development and navigation projects. Most of this, of course, was for navigation on the Ohio River, which handles more traffic than any other waterway in the world.

But notable advances were made on other projects: Calumet Harbor, Indiana Harbor, Monroe Reservoir, Salamonie Reservoir, Mississinewa Reservoir, West Terre Haute levee, Evansville floodwall, Niblack levee. Advance engineering was completed on levee unit No. 5, Huntington Reservoir, and Uniontown locks and dam went into final planning stages.

Surveys which will lead to construction work are being rushed at Gary Harbor, Kankakee River, Little Calumet River, Maumee River, Ohio River Basin, Oil Creek, Pigeon Creek, St. Joseph River, Wabash River, White River and Whitewater River.

WATERSHED PROJECTS

During the year just passed, too, we were able to press ahead with watershed projects under the Agriculture Department. More than $1 million was spent on the Middle Fork of the Anderson River in Perry and Crawford Counties. Planning funds have been approved for projects on Bachelor Run in Carroll and Howard Counties, Stucker Fork in Washington, Scott, Jefferson, and Clark Counties, Lattas Creek in Green County and Little Wea Creek in Tippecanoe County.

The prevention of pollution of streams is of great importance also to the maintenance of continuous pure supplies of water. Indiana has been allotted $1,897,065 this year for this work. It will allow 14 projects to proceed, including those at: Roanoke, Anderson, Union City, Hammond, Munster, Orleans, Cannelton, Brookville, St. Paul, Goshen, Lawrenceburg, Bargersville, Monroeville, and Veedersburg.

Closely tied to water transportation and water development in the quest of more jobs is transportation. In the bookkeeping year just ended, $82½ million was allocated to Indiana for highways. The primary roads program is moving ahead rapidly. Indiana is drawing on funds allocated 2 years ago to the interstate program. More than three-fourths of the highway funds available to Indiana each year are for this new system of expressways. About $185 million can be drawn by Indiana for these superhighways.

AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

Indiana's airport development moved ahead also during the bookkeeping year just passed. We received $590,871. In the present money year Hoosier communities are to receive more than $2 million, including airports at Tell City and French Lick which I noted in my discussion of area redevelopment projects. Considerable work also is being done at Anderson, Evansville, Indianapolis, Huntington, Mount Vernon, and South Bend.

Military construction funds spent in Indiana during the year just ended included $144,000 for an armory at Monticello, $144,000 for an armory at North Vernon, completion of an armory at Richmond for $182,000 and alteration of the Bedford Armory for $49,000. Facilities for the regular forces were built also at Ft. Benjamin Harrison and at Bunker Hill Air Force Base. Expenditures there were about $1 million.

Many Hoosiers were called upon also to serve their country actively in the cold war. In addition to the young men drafted and enlisted, Air National Guard units and several Army Reserve units were called up during the Berlin crisis. I wrote to each of the 2,000 men so called up and told them how much their service was appreciated. The Army National Guard of our State, meanwhile, was rated "superior" by Federal inspection.

VETERANS' AID

Not only is the cost of defense high, so is the cost of services for veterans who served faithfully in past wars. Indiana has 582,000 veterans—about 3,000 from before World War I, about 69,000 from World War I, and the rest from World War II and Korea. Five Veterans' Administration installations in Indiana employ 28,000 persons and cost $13 million in payroll. Total expenses for the five installations—a regional office and two hospitals at Indianapolis, a hospital in Marion and one in Fort Wayne—run $138 million. A huge construction program for one of the Indianapolis hospitals was announced a few weeks ago and will probably get underway next fall.

The VA pays some $78 million to 67,000 disabled veterans in Indiana and to 25,000 dependents of deceased veterans. Compensation payments are being increased due to action in this Congress. There have been 113,000 guarantees of loans to veterans having a total face value of $788 million and some $220,000 has been paid for education and training of veterans in Indiana.

Our office this year has handled 368 service and veterans' problems. A typical case is that of Mrs. Billy Bell whose lost allotment checks were found. Another is that of a serviceman transferred to Alaska whose belongings were held up in transit and we were able to see that they were found and delivered. A third is that of a 36-year-old veteran with a child who was turned down for a veteran's pension for whom we were able to get social security benefits. In addition, we handled 146 other social security cases, including the problem of a group of policemen from Indiana who had been paying into the account even though State law had taken them off some years ago.

HELP FOR HOSPITALS

Also in the field of health, $5½ million in Hill-Burton fund grants to hospitals were made during the bookkeeping year just ended. These grants were made to hospitals and other health institutions in the following Indiana communities: Auburn, Danville, Elkhart, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Greenfield, Greensburg, Indianapolis, Jeffersonville, Kendallville, Lafayette, Lawrenceburg, Monticello, New Albany, Princeton, Sullivan, Washington, and Winamac. Hospital and other health centers in Fort Wayne, Greenfield, Greensburg, Indianapolis, Jeffersonville, Dearborn County Hospital, Lawrenceburg, and Daviess County Hospital, Washington.

More than half a million dollars also was given to Indiana institutions for research in Federal grants. Indiana's Division of Mental Health received $5,000 for its Institute for Psychiatric Administrators. Other recipients were: Indiana University, Indianapolis' LaRue Carter Hospital, Notre Dame and Purdue.

SCHOOL AID

Local school systems also received Federal assistance under the program to help the so-called impacted areas—those in which children of Federal employees cause a burden on classrooms and teachers. A total of $1,330,000 went to Indiana communities under this program. Those who have received assistance are listed below. I have checked with township trustees and school board members on whether there has been any taint of Federal domination because of this allocation of funds. Not one person has complained of any such attempt at domination. School systems receiving assistance are:

Odon-Madison Township School Corp., Odon; Jackson Township School Corp., Morgantown; Perry School Township, Loogootee; Loogootee School City; The Shoals Community Schools, Shoals; The Metropolitan School District of Charlestown Township; Rockville Consolidated Schools; Schools, Town of Edinburg; Washington School Township, Kingsbury; Rutherford School Township, Loogootee; Franklin City Schools; Elmore School Township, Elnora; Reeve School Township, Alfordsville; Van Buren School Township, Odon; Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township Schools, Indianapolis; Washington School Township, New Washington; Blue River-Jackson-Spencer Township School; Clarksville School Township; Silver Creek School Township, Sellersburg; Monroe School Township, Henryville; Jeffersonville School Township; Wood School Township, Borden; Owen School Township, Charlestown; Utica School Township, Jeffersonville; Schools, City of Jeffersonville; Barr School Township, Montgomery; Jennings Township Schools, Leavenworth; Madison Consolidated Schools; Steele School Township, Plainville; Washington

School Township; Vevay Town Schools; Jackson Township School District, Galveston; Tipton Township School District, Onward; Linton-Stockton School Corp., Linton; Pipe Creek School Township, Peru.

Peru School Township; Washington School Township, Peru; Worthington-Jefferson Consolidated School Corp.; Schools, City of Peru; Mooresville Consolidated School Corp.; Lincoln Township School District, Brownsburg; Avon-Washington Township School District, Danville; S. Central School Corp., Elizabeth; Deer Creek Township Schools, Peru; Bean Blossom School Township, Stinesville; Schools, City of Bedford; Indian Creek School Township, Fayetteville; Marion School Township, Mitchell; Marshall School Township, Avoca; Schools, City of Mitchell; Perry School Township, Springville; Shawswick School Township, Oolitic; Spice Valley School Township, Huron; Van Buren School Township, Stanford; Washington School Township, Bloomington; Eminence Consolidated School District; Metropolitan School District, Martinsville; Monroe Township School District, Monrovia; Metropolitan School District of Warren Township, Indianapolis; Decatur School Township, Indianapolis; Franklin School Township, Roachdale; Washington School Township, Greencastle; Metropolitan School District of Clay Township, Carmel; York Township School District, Florence; Greenfield School City.

Cotton Township School District, Bennington; Delaware Township, Fishers Schools, Fishers; Patriot-Posey Independent School District, Patriot; Central School District, Switz City; Washington-Stafford Consolidated School Corp., Lyons; Rising Sun-Ohio County Consolidated Schools; White River School Township, Greenwood; Franklin School Township, Marion; Center School Township, Marion; Mississinewa Jt. Schools, Gas City; Sims School Township, Swaysee; Van Buren School Township; Fairmount School Township; Marion City Schools; Monroe School Township; Jefferson School Township, Upland; Eastern School District, Bloomfield; Jefferson-Craig Consolidated School District, Vevay; Schools, City of Greenwood; Central School District, Greenfield; Vernon Township Schools, Fortville; Taylor School Township, Center; Bloomfield School District; S. Western Jefferson County Consolidated School Corp., Hanover; Metamora Township School District.

Milan Consolidated School Corp.; Sunman Consolidated Schools; Schools, City of Aurora; Harrison Township School District; Manchester Township School District, Aurora; Moores Hill School District; Miller-Logan-Harrison School District, Lawrenceburg; Miller-York School District, Guilford; N. Dearborn North School District, Guilford; Dillsboro School, Caly Township, Dillsboro; S. Vermillion Community School Corp.; N. Vermillion Community School Corp., Newport; Franklin Community High School District; N. Knox School Corp., Bicknell; Brown Township Schools, Cross Plains; Shelby Township Schools, New Marion; Johnson Township Schools, Versailles; Metropolitan School District of Shakamak, Jasonville.

Fifty-one Hoosiers have received educational grants to study, lecture, and teach in foreign countries.

Evansville College and Ball State College are among the latest colleges and universities in Indiana receiving assistance in building of dormitories. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Housing and Home Finance Agency have allocated more than $66 million to Indiana for college housing, providing more than 13,000 units.

HOUSING PROGRAM

HHFA also is charged with administration of Federal Housing Administration loans to private individuals and for projects, with assistance for elderly housing, public housing programs, community facilities loans and grants for such purposes as water lines and sewer lines, and the urban renewal program. Through cooperation with local officials we have been able to speed up the clearing of slums and improvement of housing conditions in Indiana. Some $11 million has been spent or is being spent in Indiana already on these programs. The efforts of this agency extend into virtually every community in our State.

In the public buildings field, General Services Administration is the builder and housekeeper for the Federal Government. We assisted more than 30 Indiana firms in becoming eligible for selling to GSA and many more in becoming eligible to build. For instance, International Steel Corp. in Evansville is the world's largest maker of revolving doors. These doors are used in virtually no Federal buildings. Through our efforts this is being changed. Another example of our assistance is shown in a problem involving International Seating Corp., Union City. Government specifications on theater-type seats bought for institutions barred this firm from selling to GSA. We were able to work with both GSA and the Hoosier factory to iron out differences so that this Indiana firm could sell to the Government while GSA maintained quality. This was done.

New post office buildings and major renovations in Indiana during the past year include: Clarks Hill, Hanna, Harlan, Burlington, Harmony, Hillsboro, Stockwell, Miller Station at Gary, Lynnville, Stilesville, Dublin, Losantville, Lynn, Madison, Oakland City, Williamsport, station A at Indianapolis, Rosedale, Warren, parcel post annex at South Bend, Van Buren, Milan, Brook, Richland, Bargersville, Brookville, Brightwood Station at Indianapolis, Garfield Station at Indianapolis, St. Meinrad, Muncie, Howe, Tippecanoe, and Clay City.

We have also appointed 26 new rural carriers for Indiana and 69 permanent postmasters this year.

HELP FROM HARTKE OFFICE

In addition to this work, we assisted Hoosiers in getting passports and worked on 83 immigration cases during the past year. We also wrote to 551 newly naturalized citizens of Indiana.

Our office staff mailed 918 publications other than copies of bills and reports of committees and hearings. These included 500 agricultural yearbooks. In addition to this, we mailed 122 flags which had been flown over the Capitol, answered 1,290 requests for information other than on legislation, mailed 182 photographs, greeted 4,160 visitors from Indiana in the office, and answered some 75,000 incoming phone calls, and talked to 100 high school groups from home.

Through the end of September, we had received 68,325 letters this year, including many questionnaires mailed out to constituents late last year, and wrote 59,753 letters aside from our weekly news report. It was my pleasure also to report to Hoosiers through statements, some 60 speeches, television programs and radio tapes. We have estimated that I spent about 15 hours this year in front of microphones and television cameras reporting to Hoosiers.

The Senate was actually in session 1,005 hours during 146 days. This is, of course, aside from hundreds of hours in committee work. There were more than 14,000 bills introduced in the House and Senate, some of them identical. The Senate passed 1,133 measures.

In spite of other commitments, I was present for more than 85 percent of the quorum calls and rollcalls in the Senate.

In order to meet this kind of schedule requires that I be in my office, in a committee meeting, with some constituent group or in the Senate Chamber from around 9 a.m. to around 9 p.m. Many nights I do not get home to dinner and often do not manage to finish work until much later.

LEGISLATION CHIEF JOB

Members of the Senate and House, while called upon for a variety of services and assistance, are elected primarily to go to Washington to legislate—to offer, discuss, hear testimony on, debate and vote on bills and resolutions. This should occupy most of the time of a Member. As far as I am concerned, this is my most important work.

I am proud to have been a part of the 87th Congress, especially as the fourth member of the majority leadership through my chairmanship of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. Yet, I view my position as a U.S. Senator as one which calls for working for the national benefit as seen by a Hoosier, whose primary interest is to his constituents. This should be done in as nonpartisan a manner as possible. The Senate has been described as the "living symbol of the Union of States." I strive to work as a Hoosier for a better America and a better Indiana.

The 87th Congress has been the most productive one in a generation. It dealt with big problems and far-reaching solutions. There was not always agreement between the administration and the Congress. But this is nothing new under our system.

KENNEDY BATTED 74 PERCENT

Yet, the scoreboard of accomplishment is very revealing. The President made 54 major recommendations in the 2d session—the 1962 half of the 87th Congress—and 40 of these were accepted. This is a 74 percent average. President Kennedy, during 1961, made 55 recommendations of which 33 were accepted. This is a 62 percent average.

By way of comparison, President Eisenhower had far less success with his first Congress—the 83d—which had a Republican majority in both Houses. In the 1st session, President Eisenhower had 52 percent of his major proposals accepted and in the 2d session only 40 percent.

The Kennedy program was fundamentally a "win" program designed to give us eventual victory in the cold war and to strengthen and revitalize our economy at home. It has been shown above that America was, indeed, caught in the quicksand of recession at the outset of the administration and has largely recovered.

If one thinks back 2 years, it is easy to see that we have not only improved our economy, but also our position in the world. We are closer to the Russians in space success. We have no missile gap. We have reversed the policies of stagnation on the home front—policies such as the one which insisted that we have no new starts in public works. Now we tell the people of this country and the world that we will have new starts. We will progress. We will prepare for a better America for our children.

There has been a 10-percent increase in gross national product, a 10-percent increase in personal income, a 28-percent increase in corporate profits, a leveling of prices that had been in an inflationary spiral. Budget expenditures and the national debt today represent a smaller share per person and a smaller share of our total national output than they did 2 years ago. The balance-of-payments problem, where more of our money was going overseas than coming back from abroad, has been cut to one-third of its former proportions.

OUR "WIN" POLICY

In order for us to win the cold war, we need to have a strong and growing economy and a healthy society at home. We must be good neighbors here if we are to be good neighbors to our friends and strong contenders with our enemies. There often are debates among ourselves as to the best way to accomplish these ends and to solve our problems. My quarrel is not with those who do not see problems as I do or who would seek other solutions than those I find best.

My quarrel is with those who refuse to recognize problems and, therefore, decline to seek solutions and blindly oppose those of us who do try and find the answers.

As leader of the free world and the chief country dedicated to inevitable victory over the godless tyranny of communism, America needs a Congress as well as an administration which will strengthen us at home and abroad and which will work to solve these problems.

Congress strengthened our national defense by a 20 percent increase in appropriations while the administration was devising ways to cut fat and waste as outlined by Secretary McNamara. The Polaris missile program, which Congress earlier had pushed over objections by the Eisenhower administration, was doubled. With an increase in the Minuteman missile program, we now have double the number of missiles and bombers on alert which are certain to survive an attack if one should come. This retaliatory force is of great importance in strengthening our hands in negotiating with others and in deterring them from attacking us. We also added five combat-ready divisions and four times the guerrilla forces with which to fight limited wars through which the Communists had made great advances in recent years.

STRIDES IN SPACE

It has taken a 200 percent increase in space appropriations to push ahead in this field. There is not only great propaganda advantage to being ahead in space, but there is great potential military advantage. We dare not leave outer space to our enemies. We are not backing away from the Russians in this vital field.

In international communications, we have been the acknowledged leader. We took a giant step toward keeping that lead with the communications satellite bill, which also assures that free enterprise will carry the American flag in space through cooperation with the Government. I was pleased to have worked on this measure during many committee hours.

World trade and the growth of our own economy and those of the other free world partners is being boosted by the Trade Expansion Act. Our leaders have been given by Congress unprecedented authority to batter down the walls of tariffs in an effort to build the free world trade partnership. This is the key to winning the cold war in the economic field. We shall, through this partnership, prove to Khrushchev that he cannot bury us economically. And this is why he has blasted this act and the European Common Market with which the act will enable us to work closely. This bill, too, was hammered out in a committee of which I am a member.

In this field of foreign affairs and strengthening of the free world, this Congress and this administration have shown great vision and daring in seeking new approaches to problems. One new approach adopted by this Congress was the Peace Corps. Many Hoosier youngsters are in this organization. Training is being accomplished in Indiana, as well as other States. These volunteers now are serving in 43 countries. The idea generated much opposition when it was proposed early in 1961. The renewal and expansion in 1962 drew far less opposition.

OTHER STEPS FOR WINNING

Congress has adopted also long-term mutual security programs, Alliance for Progress, a Disarmament Administration and Food for Peace.

Aside from the Area Redevelopment Act, adopted in the first session of this Congress, and the Trade Agreements Act, I believe the tax revisions approved at this session are probably the most important in their impact on the economy and on keeping America rolling forward. It also was my pleasure to have worked on this tax revision legislation in committee.

An important factor in this law is a 7 percent investment tax credit to business and industry to modernize equipment, machinery and buildings. This will create jobs and will enable us to compete better with foreign competition. Added to the administration's revision of depreciation schedules for business these are important steps forward, results of which will be felt for many years in the future.

RETRAINING WORKERS

As industry modernizes and automates, there will be men who are put out of work temporarily. In a growing economy it is not that there will be no jobs for these men, but rather that new skills will be needed. This is why we passed a manpower development and retraining program. Recommendations for this program go back to 1959 and the work of the Unemployment Problems Committee on which I served and for which I held many Indiana hearings.

In the field of social security, this Congress enabled senior citizens to earn more money without jeopardizing their benefits. This was something I pushed in the Finance Committee and before the full Senate. We also were successful in pressing for a law allowing men to retire at age 62 at reduced benefits. This also was one of my personal projects. We succeeded also, with my insistence, in liberalizing benefits for the blind.

Senior citizens also are benefiting from provisions of the Housing Act that this Congress passed and which is the most far reaching in 20 years. Rural senior citizens benefit from a new law passed this year to assist them in getting and keeping decent housing in their declining years.

FOR FARMERS

Crop insurance, more and better farm home loans, better food distribution and expanded school lunch and milk programs all will benefit the farmers. So will the farm bill of 1962 which not only continues the popular feed grains program, but also establishes the permanent wheat program sought by farmers for 10 years. It also will save an estimated $500 million a year in storage costs by reducing surpluses.

Some cropland will be put to new recreational use. In Indiana, we hope to benefit from conservation projects like the wetlands bill which will seek to save and increase the duck and goose population and preserve lands for outdoor recreation.

Through our efforts and those of Congressman DENTON, of Indiana, we were successful in establishing Indiana's first link in the national park system—the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in Spencer County. This park was dedicated in July by the Secretary of the Interior. It should be a boon to tourist trade. We hope it is the first of several in our State.

FIGHTING CRIMES

And, while we are discussing the accomplishments of this Congress, we must point with great pride to the first significant attack on organized crime since 1934. The six new laws passed have enabled the FBI to take on 4,000 investigations in this field. This Congress also passed the first Federal support program for training workers to fight juvenile delinquency.

I believe we made another major stride in this field in our reforming of the welfare system. There will be more dignity for those in need and less chiseling by those who only want to loaf and sponge off the taxpayers because of action of this 2d session of th[illegible]7th Congress. I am proud that I worked on this bill in committee, too.

In addition, the scare of the drug thalidomide aroused public support for the first major amendments to the food and drug law since 1938. These were before Congress for action this year and were taking a beating from the blind opposition until the public was aroused. Drugs now must be effective and safe.

Congress in the first session expanded coverage of the wage-hour law and increased the minimum wage. These increases are now in effect. These were the first expansions of coverage in 25 years.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Finally, Congress worked with the administration for expansion of human rights. After 20 years of unsuccessful attempts, this session of Congress passed a constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll tax. This is now before the States for final action.

I regret that I have been limited by time in listing the accomplishments of the 87th Congress and especially those of the 2d session. I look to January when we will meet again to keep America moving forward.

The 88th Congress ahead will mark the last in my first term in the Senate. I anticipate hard work, careful study, and voting in the best interests of our State and Nation. Upon these deeds I would be judged.

Opposition To Commercializing and Copyrighting of Official Information in the Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the growing practice of public officials using their official status to acquire information that they publish for private profit has been disturbing to me. This practice goes against our democratic heritage of full and free knowledge of the activities of public servants. It seems to me that unclassified materials prepared as a result of the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars should be public information, unlimited by private copyright and uncommercialized for personal gain. Believing that basic principles may have been blurred in this area, I introduced a resolution asking for a study of Government copyright law and practice.

I am not alone in my concern about developments in this regard. Among those who have expressed opposition to the commercializing and copyrighting of official information in the public domain are the following newspapers and magazines:

New York Times: August 22, September 18, October 7.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch: September 22, September 29.

Editor and Publisher: June 23, September 8, September 22.

Saturday Review: August 11.

Hartford Courant: September 22, also May 18, 1959.

Des Moines Tribune: September 11, also November 3, 1959.

Washington, D.C., Star: September 19.

Washington, D.C., Post: April 3, also May 19, 1959, October 28, 1959, and November 7, 1959.

Washington, D.C., News: September 21.

Buffalo, N.Y., News: October 5, also November 1959.
Milwaukee Journal: September 17.
Atlanta Journal: September 17.
Birmingham, Ala., Post-Herald: September 19.
Philadelphia Inquirer: September 26.
Cincinnati Post: September 21.
Seattle, Wash., Journal of Commerce: August 18.
Champaign, Ill., Courier: September 19.
Spokesman Review, Spokane, Wash.: October 24, 1959.
Konoska, Wis., News: October 3.
Grand Junction, Colo., Sentinel: September 26.
Yakima, Wash., Republic: September 20.
Decatur, Ill., Herald: September 14.
Wichita, Kans., Eagle: September 19.
Salt Lake City Tribune: September 21.
Newsday (Garden City, N.Y.): September 18.
New Orleans Times Picayune: September 21.
Roanoke, Va., World News: September 18.
Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch: July 13.
Phoenix, Ariz., Republic: July 17, August 12.
Wausau, Wis., Record-Herald: July 11.
Duluth, Minn., Herald: July 13.
Augusta, Ga., Chronicle: July 10.
Nashville Banner: July 16.
Terre Haute, Ind., Star: September 26.
Dubuque, Iowa, Telegraph-Herald: September 26.
Burlington, Vt., Free Press: September 25.
Montgomery, Ala., News: October 5.
Dallas News: November 27, 1959.
Providence, R.I., Journal: December 30, 1959.
Muncie, Ind., Star: January 12, 1959.
New York Daily News: February 12, 1959.
Publishers Auxiliary: July 14.
Durham, N.C., Herald: September 17.
Fargo, N. Dak., Forum: August 3.
San Jose, Calif., Mercury: November 11, 1959.
Honolulu Star-Bulletin: October 27, 1959.
Raleigh, N.C., Times: November 7, 1959.
Portland, Oreg., Journal: November 8, 1959.
Corpus Christi Caller: October 30, 1959.
Indianapolis Star: January 6, 1960.
Albuquerque, N. Mex., Journal: September 14.

The National Labor Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, early in this Congress I introduced a bill (H.R. 5662) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, which would permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of this act. I am very disappointed that no decisive action was taken on my bill, and I intend to reintroduce it in the early days of the next Congress.

I appreciate the cooperation I have received from the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, to which my bill was referred, and he has assured me that he will schedule a hearing early in the next session.

My proposal would strike out the definition of "supervisor" which, in effect, deprives the foremen in American industry of all the benefits provided by this law to other employees. This is not the first bill of its kind that has been introduced. As a matter of fact, Mr. Joseph F. Murphy, of Buffalo, N.Y., who has been championing this cause for years, testified before a subcommittee in the last Congress.

The lack of legislation which would grant equal rights to the foremen has been most discouraging to this group of men. They deserve equal status with all the rights and privileges accorded to the rank and file worker. They are entitled to a voice and vote in affairs which affect their welfare and their future.

The foreman, in his capacity, is an employee who must adhere to the conditions and terms of employment imposed upon him—a matter over which he has no voice or control. But he is denied the right, as an employee, to participate in any decision which affects that employment. This is sheer injustice. The time to correct this is long overdue, and I am hopeful that the 88th Congress will act speedily in enacting this legislation.

Representative James A. Byrne Reports to the People of Pennsylvania, Third Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the 87th Congress, I think it is well to review the record with regard to the legislation sponsored by the administration of President Kennedy. In many instances these laws were passed despite the opposition of a large majority of the Republicans. In some other instances they gave grudging and reluctant support on final passage, after having utilized every parliamentary device to diminish or decrease the scope of the recommendations which President Kennedy had made for the benefit of the American people. They hoped in this way to obscure their opposition to the President's proposals and to pose as being favorable to legislation which they had tried in every way to minimize or defeat.

For myself, I am glad to have the people of my district and my State know what my position has been and how I have voted on these important matters which were before the Congress. I supported the President on all defense measures which he recommended to the Congress as necessary if we are to successfully resist the attempt of Soviet Russia to spread its communistic domination throughout the world. I also supported him with regard to his progressive and humanitarian proposals to prevent evils developing in our domestic economy and to correct and adjust those situations which were causing hardship and limiting opportunities for so many average citizens.

I voted to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and to extend this protective legislation to many who were not heretofore covered. I supported and voted for President Kennedy's proposal increasing social security benefits to widows and liberalizing its provisions for the disabled. I voted for the legislation recommended by the President giving salary increases to postal and other Federal employees. I supported the legislation for urban renewal which means so much to Philadelphia. I voted for public works programs for depressed areas and for manpower retraining programs to train for employment in other industries those thrown out of work because of closedowns in their own employment. Both these measures were priority items on President Kennedy's program and were of the utmost importance to the people of Pennsylvania and of immense concern to the economy of the city of Philadelphia.

I supported moderate cost housing for the elderly and improved housing for low- and moderate-income groups. I voted for Federal aid to colleges including scholarships and for the construction of college facilities. This in my opinion is most important if young people in our moderate income groups are to have educational opportunities not only for their own benefit but also that we may utilize our full potential in our competition with communistic Russia in scientific and technological endeavors. In the same spirit I likewise supported Federal assistance and aid for the construction of television facilities for educational purposes.

President Kennedy and the Democratic Party certainly merit the approval and the support of the American people for these progressive and intelligent recommendations, which are for our national safety and for the well-being of the greatest number of our citizens. When one recalls the attitude of the majority of Republicans on many of the President's proposals there certainly seems to be no question about this.

On the wage and hour bill, for example, my Republican colleague from Pennsylvania, who is now the Republican candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania, supported every attempt to reduce the recommendation of the President from $1.25 an hour to $1.15 and also opposed extending its coverage to many low wage workers who had not been covered by existing legislation.

It is also interesting to note that the President's recommendation for the extension of unemployment benefits to those out of work and in dire need of everyday necessities of life was prevented from coming to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote because it was blocked in the Ways and Means Committee, and that every Republican but one on that committee voted to kill the legislation.

The Republicans are almost solidly against the President's recommendation for medicare, which is so important to everyone and particularly to our elderly people. The cost of medical care is nearly prohibitive. This legislation is a must in the next Congress. I sincerely hope we will have a Congress which will support the President on this question and that we will be successful in having it enacted.

Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths Reports to the People of the 17th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to provide the residents of the 17th District of Michigan with a brief résumé of major legislation and of my activities as their Representative in the 87th Congress.

The 87th Congress convened on January 3, 1961, in a period of economic recession and a time of international tension. It was not an ordinary Congress, if indeed there is such a thing. It was marked by a change of administration, and a change of leadership in the House. On January 30, 1961, John F. Kennedy, the new President of the United States, presented his state of the Union address to a joint session of Congress with Speaker Rayburn and Vice President JOHNSON presiding. When the House convened on January 10, 1962, it was an atmosphere saddened by the death of Speaker Rayburn. The House quickly elected one of his most loyal and trusted friends, JOHN W. MCCORMACK as Speaker.

In January 1961, 5,435,000 men and women were unemployed throughout this Nation; 6.7 percent of our labor force. One hundred and sixty-six thousand of these unemployed were in Detroit; 11.6 percent of the labor force, almost double the national unemployment figure. In September 1962, 3,512,000 in our Nation were unemployed; 4.9 percent of the labor force. Seventy-four thousand of these unemployed are in Detroit; 5.4 percent of the labor force—still higher than the national average but in a much smaller amount. Approximately 16,000 of Detroit's unemployed are termed "hard-core" unemployed—those who have long exhausted all of their unemployment benefits and have not been able to get back into the labor force.

Automation and the entrance of 1 million young job applicants into the labor force each year have made unemployment the No. 1 domestic problem facing our Nation. The solution of this problem is a monumental task; but the combined efforts of Government and business are beginning to show results. First, temporary emergency measures were taken to help meet the immediate needs of the unemployed.

The amount of surplus foods and distribution to our hungry was increased—the new President's first Executive order.

The extension of unemployment benefits for the jobless whose payments had expired, and similar benefits to unemployed railroad workers.

Aid to dependent children of unemployed fathers: Michigan legislature refuses to participate, costing Michigan taxpayers $10 million a year in Federal funds.

Next, Congress turned to long-termed solutions to our unemployment problems.

Minimum wages increased to $1.25 an hour and the law extended to cover 3½ million workers not covered before. The first Minimum Wage Act was passed in 1938. This was the third raise given since then. A good wage means more jobs—to supply goods and services that low-wage workers could not previously buy.

Social security changes to permit men to retire at 62, the present retirement age for women; increased minimum benefits, and increased benefits for retired widows and widowers: Many unemployed older men who had to give up hope of finding regular work have been helped by this measure.

Area Redevelopment Act: A program of loans and grants to assist local communities in the construction of new public facilities and to aid areas which are seeking new industry. Many of Michigan's communities, including Detroit and Plymouth, have programs underway—programs to bring new payrolls and form the basis for further economic growth.

Manpower retraining: In today's rapidly shifting, increasingly automated economy, workers must often move to new jobs and new trades which frequently require new skills. This program provides training for workers whose jobs have been eliminated by automation or other forms of technological advance. Michigan was one of the first to take full advantage of this program. This will help reduce unemployment and add productive capacity to our Nation's resources.

Public works acceleration: Authorized $900 million for speeding up construction of needed public works—such local public works as water and sewer works, hospitals, public buildings, streets and sidewalks are eligible. This program has a dual purpose of providing new jobs and completing needed public works projects. This is an additional stimulus to our economy.

There is no single dramatic answer, no magic formula to meet the problem of unemployment. There will be more jobs only as we do more business—with ourselves, in meeting our unmet needs, and with the rest of the world. The only long-term answer to unemployment is economic growth.

This Congress took two major steps to speed our economic growth.

Trade bill: The first major change in our trade policy since 1934 gives the President power to cut tariffs, to enable our Nation to deal realistically with the vast trade rising in Europe among the Common Market nations. If American industry and agriculture are to prosper we must enlarge our share of growing world markets. To do this we must also buy goods from other countries. Detroit has a tremendous stake in foreign trade.

Tax revision: A bill designed to raise some increased revenue by plugging tax loopholes and to give credit to business to stimulate job-creating new capital improvements passed. The President is going to propose major tax revisions next year. A comprehensive reform of our tax structure is sorely needed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

An alltime record appropriation of $48.1 billion was provided to strengthen American defense. There is new emphasis on ability to provide needed forces on a moments notice, for wars of any size, anywhere in the world. Improved armaments supplied to our fighting men include faster aircraft of increased range, nuclear frigates, atomic submarines equipped with Polaris missiles, and improved small arms. Development is being accelerated on long-distance bombers and on intercontinental ballistic missiles.

People frequently forget just what it is costing us to remain prepared. Defense spending proposals are one-half of our Federal budget and about 10 percent of our gross national product. In addition to the 2½ million men in uniform and the 1 million civilian employees of the Defense Department, there are 3 to 4 million people in the United States working for defense contractors. Adequate defense is a costly business and more than anything else is responsible for high Federal taxes. Over two-thirds of your Federal tax dollar goes for national security and the costs for past wars—the high price of freedom in today's uncertain world.

However, a large defense budget is no excuse for extravagance and waste. In 1957 in my maiden speech before the House of Representatives, I said that $10 billion alone could be saved from our then $40 billion defense budget if proper procurement procedures were instigated and duplication and waste kept to a minimum. In my opinion, Secretary of Defense McNamara has taken a major step to see that our taxpayers get, as he says, "a dollar of defense for every dollar spent." This is in his establishment of a new Defense Supply Agency. The purpose of this Agency is to unify purchasing and procurement of supplies and services for all our military forces—Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard—a program that has long had the support of the Hoover Commission. While this is a major step forward in bringing about economy in our Defense Department, it will not necessarily cut our needed defense expenditures but should free the tax dollar for our increasing defense needs.

The dark cloud of international communism covers the horizon of all free nations throughout the globe. As your

Representative under two Presidents—Eisenhower and Kennedy—I have made every effort to support the Commander in Chief on all foreign policy programs which each administration has recommended for the best interests of our Nation and the free world. Presidents Eisenhower and Truman have publicly stated that the executive department possesses all information and confidential knowledge on conditions over the globe and their decisions on international matters are often based on facts not known to the general public. World conditions today demand that the American people must be united and all differences on international problems should stop at the oceans' shoreline.

In foreign affairs traditional bipartisanship has prevailed. On July 25, 1961, the President outlined the Berlin crisis to the American people and Congress wasted no time in backing him up. The Senate—75 to 0—and the House—403 to 2—in 5 days, passed a measure allowing the administration to call up 250,000 ready reservists.

The foreign affairs appropriation, the Peace Corps, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency all received majority support from both parties. And both Houses by an overwhelming vote passed resolutions on Red China, Berlin, and Cuba.

This Congress cut the President's foreign aid request by more than $1 billion. It is my belief that the primary obligation of foreign aid is to the United States. It should be directed toward aiding democracy in the world and to prove the benefits of a free enterprise system. Secondly, it should be directed toward keeping communism down at all costs. The administration is now undertaking a major reappraisal of its foreign aid program with the objective to reduce oversized spending and establish new tough-minded standards for the distribution of funds.

EDUCATION

The House enacted a bill providing for the construction of college academic facilities but because the Senate passed an amended education bill far more liberal than the House would accept, the compromised version was defeated and again no education bill at all was passed by Congress. However, a program of Federal aid to impacted school districts was extended as was the scholarship-loan provision of the National Defense Education Act and a grant program to develop our educational television stations.

HEALTH CARE FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Legislation to provide medical care for the aged, which I support, did not fare well during this Congress. Efforts by the Senate to take up a bill failed by a vote of 52 to 48 and the House failed to take any action.

The temporary defeat of this program does not diminish the obvious need for it. Each day in this country the number of Americans over 65 increases by 1,000 and the vast majority of them lack adequate financial protection against serious illness. In 90 percent of the States, the Kerr-Mills bill is not functioning, and in the remaining States it is a replica of the ancient poorhouse operation.

The following legislation was given favorable consideration by Congress:

A nationwide inoculation program to stamp out polio, diphtheria, whooping cough and tetanus is to be commenced on a State-Federal partnership basis.

Tighter regulations imposed on the drug industry to insure against recurrence of tragedies similar to those occurring from the premature use of the drug thalidomide.

Ten million dollars appropriated for control projects to find more effective ways of combating juvenile crime and delinquency. Detroit has a project underway.

Increased compensation for our service-connected disabled veterans.

Approved a bill to permit self-employed persons to establish funds for their retirement years and receive tax deferrals on part of the contributions to the fund; a privilege that is now given to employees of companies and corporations.

A constitutional amendment outlawing the poll tax laws which still remain in five States. To become effective this proposed amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years.

All television sets for sale in this country must be capable of UHF—ultra high frequency—as well as VHF—very high frequency—most of the channels in general used in this country are of this type. This legislation will increase from 681 to 2,025 the number of available television channels and will greatly increase the opportunity for educational television stations, assuring the public of the fullest benefit from television service.

Postage rates increases to go in effect January 1963: First-class mail from 4 to 5 cents, airmail 7 to 8 cents. Also controls on Communist propaganda coming in from abroad.

The most comprehensive housing program in a decade:

Major expansion of urban renewal and housing for the elderly.

First major middle-income housing.

First aid to local mass transit—Detroit received first study grant.

First protection of open spaces in urban areas.

Increased appropriations to combat the pollution of our rivers; program for economic conversion of salt water to fresh; new laws to combat organized crime; and the first major additions to our national park system in 16 years: Padre Island National Seashore, an island on the coast of Texas near Corpus Christi; Point Reyes National Seashore on the northern coast of California near San Francisco; and a national seashore on Cape Cod, Mass.

Public welfare improvements: The first major revision since 1950 of our Federal-State welfare program. The bill was designed to end abuses in the welfare program and to develop more constructive ways of getting people off the welfare rolls and keeping them off.

A revised Welfare Pension Plans Disclosures Act to protect the pension funds of America's working men and women. Anti-crime and anti-racketeering legislation.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Early in 1961, Speaker Rayburn appointed me a member of the Joint Economic Committee, the Senate-House committee that studies and reviews our Nation's economic policies. As a member of this committee, I traveled to six countries in Latin America last year examining the economic relationship between Latin America and the United States. We issued a report on our findings. An editorial in the Washington Post on February 13, 1962, called it a painstaking and worthwhile report. If you would like a copy, I will be glad to send you one.

In January of 1962, I was the first woman ever to be elected to serve on the Ways and Means Committee, without question the busiest committee in the 87th Congress. More important, this is the first time the 17th District of Michigan has had a vote on the tax-writing committee of our Congress. During this Congress the committee held extensive lengthy hearings on tax revision which will serve as a background for the major tax revision proposals the President is going to introduce next January; the Trade Agreements Act—the first major change in our trade policy since 1934; social security changes; unemployment compensation; and public welfare changes.

ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

In addition to my legislative duties, I have tried to keep the residents of the 17th District as fully informed as possible via my monthly newsletter. If you would like to be placed on my mailing list, call my Detroit office.

It was a real pleasure to once again teach civics to all the senior high schools in our district.

My two full-time offices, in Washington at 1516 House Office Building; in Detroit at 14815 Grand River, are there to serve you. If you have any problems—veterans, immigration, or with the various agencies of our Federal Government—I would like to help you.

Your letters, phone calls, and visits are always appreciated.

I have served you for almost 8 years. If it is your wish, I shall continue to serve you with the same interest in your welfare and the welfare of our country and with the same pride I have in being the Representative of the very best congressional district; a district that is alert and interested, not only to domestic affairs, but to the great issues that confront us as leaders of the free world.

Hon. Dale Alford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, among those Members who are retiring voluntarily from Congress at the end of this session is the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, Hon. DALE ALFORD.

Congressman ALFORD was elected to the 86th Congress through the process of a write-in campaign, which in itself is evidence of the high esteem in which he is held by his people.

Since coming to Congress, Dr. ALFORD has gained the respect and good will of this body, and has distinguished himself as a productive and hardworking representative of his people. He has been an ardent and unwavering advocate of constitutional principles, and a relentless foe of those who would do violence to our cherished freedoms. He has always exhibited courage and integrity in facing legislative issues and certainly can take great pride in the splendid record he leaves in this body.

During his period of service in this House, I have known DALE ALFORD as a warm personal friend. As he leaves us to resume his practice of medicine in his home city of Little Rock, I can assure him he takes with him my very best wishes and appreciation for his fine work in behalf of the cause of Americanism. I am sure I speak, also, for nearly everyone here in this expression to Dr. ALFORD.

DALE ALFORD will be sorely missed in this Chamber, but I am certain that in private life he will continue his fight for the same deathless principles of freedom that distinguished his career in this body.

The Fight for Equal Staffing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, has announced the organization of a Special Committee To Improve Congressional Committee Staffs. Senator SCOTT, who is an able and constructive legislator, a forthright and forward-looking former chairman of the Republican National Committee, and a leader in the fight for better staffing of congressional committees, will serve as chairman of the special committee. Other members are Senators CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska, and WINSTON L. PROUTY, of Vermont; Representatives GLENN P. LIPSCOMB, of California, and FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa. I have the honor of serving as vice-chairman of the committee.

Few reforms would contribute more to the cause of good government than the improvement of congressional staffing procedures, particularly as regards the need to end the present unfair division of staff between Democrats and Republicans. A more equitable sharing between the parties of congressional staff positions would increase the effectiveness of Congress and help to maintain the strength of our two-party system. In addition, it would also enable whatever party happened to be in the minority at the time to serve the Nation as a more active and effective loyal opposition.

Without adequate staff help, the minority is unable to give careful study to legislation coming before the Congress and to do the hard, time-consuming research which is required to come up with constructive proposals of its own.

In addition, the reforms for which I and the special committee will fight in the coming months will serve to strengthen the hand of Congress vis-a-vis the executive branch. If the Congress is to be a more viable and contributing branch of Government, and not merely a rubberstamp for the Executive, it must have at its command more adequate staff resources with which to study independently the difficult problems facing our Nation. Otherwise, the Congress will have to rely increasingly for its information and advice on the vast apparatus of the executive branch, a situation which is not conducive to the development of sound public policy.

In the weeks ahead, the press and political leaders of both parties, including new Members of Congress as well as those who will be returning to Congress, have a heavy responsibility to give careful study to the problem of congressional staffing and to encourage wide discussion of the issue. Reform of staffing procedures is not a partisan issue, but rather one which both Democrats and Republicans can and should support in the interest of a more effective Congress and better government in general.

Under unanimous consent, I insert a press release issued by the office of Senator SCOTT announcing the organization of this committee at this point in the RECORD.

SENATORS, REPRESENTATIVES ORGANIZE TO FIGHT FOR BETTER COMMITTEE STAFFS

WASHINGTON.—A new drive to improve the staffs of congressional committees was announced today by U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT.

A group of six Republican Senators and Representatives organized into a Special Committee To Improve Congressional Committee Staffs.

Members include Senators CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska, WINSTON L. PROUTY, of Vermont, and HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania; Representatives THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, GLENN P. LIPSCOMB, of California, and FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa. Senator SCOTT was named chairman and Representative CURTIS, vice chairman.

Senator SCOTT said:

"Congress and the Nation suffer under the present unfair division of staff between Democrats and Republicans. The congressional committees have Democratic employees on their staffs far out of proportion to the Democratic Senators or Representatives on the committees. This seriously hampers the work of the committees.

"At present the minority party happens to be Republican. But the pendulum will swing and our efforts for a fair and constructive division of congressional staff will benefit both parties in the long run.

"Our objectives are—

"1. To make Congress more effective.

"2. To maintain the strength of the two-party system.

"3. To implement the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

"4. To help the minority party be more effective as a loyal opposition.

"We realize that the vast majority of congressional committee staff employees are capable and devoted persons who are doing good jobs. But we object to the system which permits them to be appointed in an arbitrary way that is not good for either Congress or the Nation. We also recognize that some staff employees work in a nonpartisan manner.

"Therefore we will work toward the objective that each congressional committee have on its staff employees in three categories: (a) nonpartisan, (b) appointed by the majority, and (c) appointed by the minority—with the proportion of majority and minority employees in the same general ratio as there are Democratic and Republican Senators or Representatives on the committee. It is intended that staff employees, regardless of category, be selected on the basis of their ability to perform the particular duties assigned.

"While my own relationships with the majority leadership and the committee chairmen are excellent, my observations are addressed to the whole broad question.

"We will continue to work with the congressional leadership of both parties as we have done in the past. As the result of our actions as individuals in the past year, the public is considerably better informed about this problem and some slight progress has been made in Congress. We hope that the formation of our special committee will hurry that progress along."

MacGregor Reports to the People of the Third Congressional District of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a report to the people of the Third Congressional District of Minnesota on my voting and attendance record for the 1st and 2d sessions of the 87th Congress. The report includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls.

I am including this record because I believe that the people of the congressional district which I have the honor of representing deserve to know how their Congressman votes. In order for our representative system of government to prosper, the people must be fully informed of the actions of their elected representative.

All of the people will obviously not agree with their Congressman on every issue as it is impossible for any two men or women to always be in agreement. But the people deserve to examine their Congressman's record in order that they may place the final responsibility upon him for the votes he has cast.

The preparation of this report is one manifestation of my sincere belief that a public official's first responsibility is to the people he represents. This belief has also been manifested at earlier stages of the 87th Congress in the two annual legislative questionnaires which I distributed to nearly every home in the Third Congressional District. In addition, I held three open discussion meetings in the district upon major legislative issues to which every citizen of the district was encouraged to attend.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through more than 42,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

Voting record, Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, *3d District of Minnesota, 87th Cong., 1st sess.*

No.	Date, 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	do	Election of Speaker	Halleck.
3	do	H. Res. 1: Motion to vote without debate on resolution denying seat to either candidate for Congress from the 5th District of Indiana. (Passed 252 to 166.)	No.
4	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
5	do	H. Res. 127: To increase membership on House Committee on Rules from 12 to 15. (Passed 217 to 212.)	No.
6	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
7	do	H.R. 4806: To provide for the establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation. (Passed 392 to 30.)	Yes.
8	do	H.Res. 167: To provide $331,000 to House Committee on Un-American Activities for investigations in 1961. (Passed 412 to 6.)	Yes.
9	Mar. 7	H.R. 5188: To amend the 3d supplemental 1961 appropriation bill by adding $29,990,000 for aid to school districts in federally impacted areas. (Passed 336 to 62.)	Yes.
10	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
11	do	do	Present.
12	Mar. 9	do	Present.
13	do	H.R. 4510: To recommit to committee the bill providing a program for feed grains for 1961 in order to eliminate sec. 3 which authorized sale of stored corn at 20 cents below support price of corn. (Defeated 196 to 214.)	Yes.
14	do	H.R. 4510: On final passage of feed grains bill increasing support price on corn for those who reduce acreage, etc. (Passed 209 to 202.)	No.
15	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 15	do	Present.
17	Mar. 21	H.R. 4510: To approve the conference report on the feed grains program, 1961. (Passed 231 to 185.)	No.
18	do	Quorum call	Present.
19	do	H.R. 5463: To suspend the rules and pass the bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948. (Passed 284 to 129.)	No.
20	Mar. 22	H.R. 4806: To approve the conference report on the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961. (Passed 362 to 31.)	Yes.
21	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
22	do	H.R. 5000: To adopt an amendment to the military construction authorization bill requiring a study to determine whether Army Quartermaster Food and Container Institute should be relocated. (Passed 267 to 145.)	Yes.
23	do	H.R. 5000: On final passage of the bill to authorize certain construction for military departments. (Passed 412 to 0.)	Yes.
24	do	Quorum call	Present.
25	do	do	Present.
26	Mar. 24	do	Present.
27	do	H.R. 3935: To approve the Ayres-Kitchin substitute for the committee's bill amending the Fair Labor Standards Act. (Passed 216 to 203.)	Yes.
28	do	H.R. 3935: On a motion to recommit the bill to committee. (Defeated 196 to 224.)	No.
29	do	H.R. 3935: On final passage of the bill (minimum wage) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. (Passed 340 to 78.)	Yes.
30	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 29	do	Present.
32	do	S. 1: On a motion to recommit the area redevelopment bill to committee in order to substitute H.R. 5043 for S. 1. (Defeated 125 to 291.)	Yes.
33	do	S. 1: On final passage of the area redevelopment bill. (Passed 251 to 167.)	Yes.
34	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
35	Apr. 13	do	Present.
36	Apr. 18	do	Present.
37	Apr. 19	do	Present.
38	do	S. 912: To adopt the omnibus judgeship bill providing for 70 additional Federal judges. (Passed 336 to 76.)	No.
39	Apr. 20	Quorum call	Present.
40	do	H.R. 6027: On final passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1961. (Passed 400 to 14.)	Paired for.
41	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
42	do	H.R. 6518: To appropriate $600,000,000 for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean rehabilitation program. (Passed 330 to 82.)	Yes.
43	Apr. 26	Quorum call	Present
44	do	S. 1: On adopting the conference report providing for "backdoor financing" of the Area Development Act. (Passed 223 to 193.)	No.
45	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
46	do	H.R. 3935: To adopt the conference report on amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. (Passed 230 to 196.)	No.
47	do	H.R. 6441: On motion to recommit to committee the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961 in order to reduce the authorization from $100,000,000 to $75,000,000 annually and to require States after June 1964 to match all funds in excess of $50,000,000 and to retain State jurisdiction over intrastate waters. (Defeated 165 to 256.)	Yes.
48	do	H.R. 6441: On final passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendment of 1961. (Passed 307 to 110.)	Yes.
49	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 9	do	Present.
51	May 10	do	Present.
52	May 11	do	Present.
53	do	H.R. 2010: On final passage of the bill to extend the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years. (Passed 231 to 157.)	Yes.
54	do	H.R. 6094: To recommit to committee the bill to authorize additional funds to Council of Economic Advisers personnel in order to cut the amount from $2,000,000 to $700,000. (Defeated 151 to 199.)	Yes.
55	do	H.R. 6094: On final passage to authorize an additional $2,000,000 for personnel of Council of Economic Advisers. (Passed 209 to 136.)	No.
56	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 16	do	Present.
58	do	H. Res. 284: To adopt a rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4614, a bill to encourage travel in the United States by residents of foreign countries and to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism. (Passed 239 to 70.)	Yes.
59	do	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 17	do	Present.
61	do	H. Con. Res. 226: To indicate congressional support for taking of collective measures by the Organization of American States against the Castro government of Cuba. (Passed 402 to 2.)	Yes.
62	do	H.R. 4614: To establish an Office of International Travel and to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries. (Passed 305 to 104.)	Yes.
63	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
64	do	S. 1852: To authorize about $12,500,000,000 for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. (Passed 402 to 0.)	Yes.
65	May 25	H.R. 1986: To recommit to committee a bill relating to information furnished the Postmaster General by ICC concerning revenues received by railroads from express companies. The recommittal motion was designed to provide that certain technical information be gathered annually by ICC concerning revenue paid railroads by the Post Office. (Defeated 16 to 345.)	No.
66	June 1	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
67	do	H.R. 7371: The appropriation bill for Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary and related agencies ($751,300,050). (Passed 256 to 71.)	Yes.
68	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
69	do	do	Present.
70	do	H.R. 7444: To recommit the Agriculture appropriations bill to committee in order to cut $100,000,000 from funds for agricultural conservation program. (Defeated 184 to 196.)	Yes.
71	do	H.R. 7444: On final passage of the agricultural appropriations bill involving $5,900,000,000. (Passed 318 to 65.)	Yes.
72	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
73	June	Quorum call	Present.
74	do	do	Present.
75	do	H.R. 7446: To recommit to committee the Tax Rate Extension Act in order to eliminate the transportation tax on persons. (Defeated 189 to 196.)	Yes.
76	do	H.R. 7446: On final passage of the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1961. (Passed 295 to 88.)	Yes.
77	June 12	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative Clark MacGregor, *3d District of Minnesota, 87th Cong., 1st sess.*—Continued

No.	Date, 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
78	June 12	H.R. 7053: To recommit to committee the bill providing that in the District of Columbia courts confessions and other evidence shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay. (Defeated 104 to 252.)	Yes.
79	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
80	June 14	do	Present.
81	June 15	do	Present.
82	do	H. Res. 303: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2, concerning the FCC, submitted by the President on Apr. 27. (Passed 323 to 77.)	Yes.
83	do	H. Res. 302: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1, concerning the Securities and Exchange Commission, submitted by the President on Apr. 27. (Defeated 176 to 212.)	Yes.
84	June 19	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
85	do	H.R. 6765: To authorize acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock. (Passed 328 to 18.)	Absent.[3]
86	do	H.R. 7712: 4th supplemental appropriation bill for 1961 involving $88,000,000. (Passed 291 to 68.)	Absent.[4]
87	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
88	do	H. Res. 304: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 3, concerning the Civil Aeronautics Board, submitted by the President on May 3. (Defeated 178 to 213.)	Yes.
89	do	H. Res. 305: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 4, concerning the Federal Trade Commission, submitted by the President on May 9. (Defeated 178 to 221.)	Yes.
90	June 21	Quorum call	Present.
91	do	do	Present.
92	do	do	Present.
93	do	do	Present.
94	June 12	do	Present.
95	do	H.R. 6028: To recommit to committee the Housing bill for the purpose of substituting provisions which would extend present program for 1 year. (Defeated 197 to 215.)	Yes.
96	do	H.R. 6028: On final passage of the Housing Act of 1961 carrying authorizations of $9,000,000,000. (Passed 235 to 178.)	No.
97	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
98	do	do	Present.
99	do	H.R. 7677: To raise the public debt limit for 1 year by $13,000,000,000 to $298,000,000,000. (Passed 231 to 148.)	No.
100	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
101	do	do	Present.
102	do	do	Present.
103	June 28	do	Present.
104	do	H.R. 7851: On amendment to defense appropriation bill in order to remove provision prohibiting use of funds for payment of a price differential on contracts made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations. (Defeated 173 to 239.)	No.
105	do	H.R. 7851: On final passage of the defense appropriation bill ($42,700,000,000). (Passed 412 to 0.)	Yes.
106	do	S. 1922: To adopt the conference report on the Housing Act of 1961 as approved by conferees of the House and Senate. (Passed 229 to 176.)	No.
107	June 29	H. Res. 354: To authorize a special flag for Members of the House of Representatives. (Defeated 108 to 270.)	No.
108	do	H. Res. 225: To recommit to committee the resolution granting consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin compact in order to delete provisions for Federal voting membership and Federal cost sharing. (Defeated 92 to 257.)	Yes.
109	July 10	H.R. 187: To expedite judicial review of orders of deportation of undesirable aliens. (Passed 304 to 60.)	Yes.
110	do	H.R. 5786: To establish the Cape Cod National Seashore. (Passed 278 to 82.)	No.
111	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
112	July 17	H.J. Res. 435: To provide for the observance of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture. (Passed 367 to 12.)	Yes.
113	do	H.R. 2555: To provide for allotment and advancement of pay to U.S. civilian employees in emergency evacuations. (Passed 285 to 86.)	No.
114	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
115	do	do	Present.
116	July 20	H.R. 6874: To authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in the amount of $1,780,000,000. (Passed 354 to 59.)	Yes.
117	do	H. Res. 328: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 5 concerning the National Labor Relations Board. (Passed 231 to 179.)	Yes.
118	do	H. Res. 336: To discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 7 concerning the Maritime Administration. (Defeated 184 to 218.)	Paired for.
119	July 25	H.R. 8302: To adopt an amendment to the military construction appropriations bill deleting $3,400,000 for transfer of the Food and Container Institute of Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Passed 241 to 170.)	Yes.
120	do	H.R. 8302: On final passage of the military construction appropriations bill providing for an expenditure of $883,300,000. (Passed 409 to 0.)	Yes.
121	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 27	do	Present.
123	July 31	do	Present.
124	do	S.J. Res. 120: To authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months. (Passed 403 to 2.)	Yes.
125	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
126	Aug. 2	do	Present.
127	do	S. 2311: To authorize appropriations of $958,500,000 for additional aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. (Passed 406 to 0.)	Yes.
128	do	H.R. 30: To recommit to committee the bill granting approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact in order to have the seven Federal representatives on the Commission serve only in an advisory position. (Defeated 130 to 261.)	Yes.
129	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
130	do	S. 1643: On adoption of the conference report on the Agricultural Act of 1961. (Passed 224 to 170.)	Yes.
131	do	Quorum call	Present.
132	do	H.R. 7856: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 for the announced purpose of facilitating the prompt and orderly conduct of FCC business. (Passed 198 to 150.)	No.
133	Aug. 7	H.R. 7728: To authorize the Secretary of a military department to sell goods and services to the owner of an aircraft in an emergency. (Passed 307 to 78.)	No.
134	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Absent.[5]
135	do	H.R. 7576: On a motion to lay on the table the motion to instruct House conferees not to agree to a project involving electric energy generating facilities for the new production reactor at Hanford, Wash., at a cost of $95,000,000. (Defeated 164 to 235.)	Paired against.
136	do	H.R. 7576: To adopt the motion instructing House conferees not to agree to the Senate provision providing for electric energy generating facilities at Hanford, Wash., at a cost of $95,000,000. (Passed 235 to 164.)	Paired for.
137	do	Quorum call	Absent.[6]
138	do	H.R. 8033: To amend the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize delegation of certain duties to ICC employee boards. (Passed 212 to 174.)	Absent.[5]
139	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
140	do	H. Res. 406: On adoption of resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6882, to establish an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor. (Passed 369 to 16.)	Yes.
141	do	Quorum call	Present.
142	do	H.R. 6302: To transfer Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University (District of Columbia) and to make it a teaching hospital for the university. (Passed 321 to 61.)	Yes.
143	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
144	do	H.R. 7851: On the adoption of the conference report on the $46,500,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. (Passed 383 to 0.)	Yes.
145	do	Quorum call	Present.
146	Aug. 14	do	Absent.[6]
147	do	do	Present.
148	do	do	Present.
149	do	do	Present.
150	Aug. 15	do	Present.
151	do	do	Present.
152	do	do	Present.
153	Aug. 16	do	Present.
154	do	do	Present.
155	Aug. 17	do	Present.
156	Aug. 18	do	Present.
157	do	H.R. 8400: To adopt the mutual security authorization bill as amended by the House to include, among other things, a 1-year authorization for developmental loan assistance. (Passed 287 to 140.)	Yes.
158	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
159	do	do	Present.
160	Aug. 21	H.R. 8384: To make aircraft piracy a Federal crime punishable with a possible death sentence. (Passed 373 to 5.)	Absent.[7]
161	do	Quorum call	Absent.[8]
162	Aug. 22	do	Present.
163	do	do	Present.
164	do	H.R. 7763: To provide for planning the participation of the United States in New York's World Fair of 1964 and 1965. (Passed 353 to 42.)	No.
165	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
166	Aug. 24	do	Present.
167	do	H.R. 84: To stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by domestic producers on public, Indian, and other land. (Passed 196 to 172.)	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, *3d District of Minnesota, 87th Cong., 1st sess.*—Continued

No.	Date, 1961	Measure, question, and result	Vote
168	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Absent.[9]
169	Aug. 28	H.R. 8181: To order the engrossment and 3d reading of a bill to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. (Passed 223 to 120.)	Absent.[10]
170	do	H.R. 8181: On final passage of the bill to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. (Passed 208 to 135.)	Absent.[10]
171	do	H.R. 7176: To provide for a national hog cholera eradication program. (Passed 337 to 3.)	Yes.
172	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Present.
173	do	H.R. 8773: To increase the lump-sum readjustment payments for Reserve personnel involuntarily released from active duty. (Passed 394 to 0.)	Yes.
174	do	Quorum call	Present.
175	do	H.R. 6242: To authorize the Attorney General to fix the salaries of certain attorneys in the Department of Justice. (Defeated 172 to 223.)	Yes.
176	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
177	do	H.R. 8890: To consider the bill entitled "Emergency Education Aid Act of 1961" (Calendar Wednesday procedure). (Defeated 170 to 242.)	No.
178	do	Quorum call	Present.
179	do	H.R. 8028: To amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Act of 1961 by restricting Federal grants to the District of Columbia. (Defeated 187 to 217.)	Yes.
180	Aug. 31	S. Con. Res. 34: Expressing the opposition of the Congress to diplomatic recognition of Red China or its admission to the United Nations. (Passed 395 to 0.)	Yes.
181	do	S. 1983: To adopt the conference report on the Mutual Security Authorization Act of 1961. (Passed 260 to 132.)	Yes.
182	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Present.
183	do	do	Present.
184	do	H.R. 9033: To amend the mutual security appropriations bill by increasing the funds for military assistance by $300,000,000. (Passed 242 to 151.)	Yes.
185	do	H.R. 9033: On final passage of the $3,800,000,000 mutual security appropriation bill. (Passed 270 to 123.)	Yes.
186	Sept. 6	Quorum call	Present.
187	do	do	Present.
188	do	H.R. 9000: To extend for 2 additional years the National Defense Education Act and the Federal impacted school districts bill. (Passed 378 to 32.)	Yes.
189	do	Quorum call	Present.
190	do	H.R. 8723: To suspend the rules and pass the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1961. (Defeated 244 to 161; ⅔ vote needed for passage.)	Yes.
191	do	H.R. 8666: To suspend the rules and pass the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. (Passed 329 to 66.)	Yes.
192	do	Quorum call	Present.
193	Sept. 11	do	Absent.[11]
194	Sept. 12	do	Present.
195	do	do	Present.
196	Sept. 13	do	Present.
197	do	H.R. 8302: To eliminate from the military construction appropriation bill funds to provide for the transfer of the Food and Container Institute from Chicago to Natick, Mass. (Passed 212 to 185.)	Yes.
198	do	H.R. 7371: To accept a provision in the appropriations bill for the Departments of State and Justice and the judiciary extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to Sept. 30, 1963. (Passed 300 to 106.)	Yes.
199	do	H.R. 9076: To recommit to committee the public works appropriation bill in order to reduce funds for the Upper Colorado River Basin and to eliminate certain proposed transmission lines. (Defeated 182 to 224.)	Yes.
200	do	H.R. 9076: On final passage of the public works appropriation bill in the amount of $3,600,000,000. (Passed 377 to 31.)	Yes.
201	do	Quorum call	Present.
202	Sept. 13	H.R. 7576: To adopt the conference report authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission containing provisions approving an electric powerplant at Hanford, Wash. (Defeated 155 to 251.)	No.
203	do	H.R. 8102: On a substitute bill for the Federal Airport Act, as passed by the House but amended by the Senate, submitted by the conferees calling for a 3-year extension with annual appropriations instead of "back-door financing." (Passed 396 to 4.)	Yes.
204	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Absent.[12]
205	do	H.R. 7500: On final passage of the bill to provide for a Peace Corps. (Passed 287 to 97.)	Yes.
206	Sept. 15	Quorum call	Present.
207	do	H. Res. 455: A resolution sending to conference H.R. 2010 extending the Mexican farm labor program. (Passed 243 to 135.)	Yes.
208	do	H. Res. 464: To adopt a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 7927 to adjust postal rates. (Defeated 142 to 222.)	Absent.[13]
209	Sept. 16	Quorum call	Present.
210	Sept. 18	S. 2393: On final passage of a bill similar to H.R. 9000 extending for 2 years the provisions of the National Defense Education Act and the federally impacted school area bill. (Passed 342 to 18.)	Yes.
211	do	S. 1459: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the law relating to longevity step increases for postal employees. (Passed 358 to 4.)	Yes.
212	do	H.R. 5751: To amend Subversive Activities Control Act to require the registration of persons disseminating political propaganda within the United States as agents of a foreign power. (Passed 369 to 2.)	Yes.
213	do	H.R. 8914: To suspend the rules and pass the bill amending the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (feed grains) to enable certain farmers to grow more barley. (Defeated 213 to 149; ⅔ vote needed.)	No.
214	do	H.R. 7377: To suspend the rules and pass the bill increasing the limitation on the number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Civil Service Classification Act. (Passed 305 to 53.)	Yes.
215	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Absent.[14]
216	do	H.R. 9118: To establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency. (Passed 216 to 54.)	Absent.[15]
217	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Absent.[16]
218	do	do	Absent.[16]
219	Sept. 21	H.R. 7500: To adopt the conference report on the Peace Corps. (Passed 253 to 78.)	Yes.
220	do	H.R. 5628: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for a study of the desirability of establishing and maintaining a National Tropical Botanic Garden in Hawaii. (Defeated 215 to 125; ⅔ vote being necessary.)	No.
221	do	H.R. 4172: To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. (Defeated 166 to 173; ⅔ vote being necessary.)	Yes.
222	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
223	do	H.R. 258: To adopt the conference report increasing the District of Columbia sales tax from 2 cents to 3 cents, transferring certain moneys to the highway fund, and including an amendment providing for the inclusion of the District of Columbia among those areas to receive Federal funds as "federally impacted school areas." (Defeated 142 to 159.)	No.
224	Sept. 23	Quorum call	Absent.[17]
225	do	H.R. 7377: To adopt the conference report increasing the limitation on number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Civil Service Classification Act which report increased the number of positions beyond the House bill. (Passed 228 to 71.)	Absent.[18]
226	do	H.R. 9118: To adopt the conference report establishing a U.S. Arms Control Agency. (Passed 252 to 50.)	Paired for.
227	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
228	do	do	Present.
229	do	H.R. 258: On conference report on bill to increase District of Columbia sales tax from 2 cents to 3 cents and transferring certain parking fees and other moneys to highway fund. (Defeated 97 to 173.)	No.
230	do	H.R. 9033: To adopt conference report on bill making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies. (Passed 192 to 81.)	Paired for.
231	do	H.R. 9033: On motion to adopt Senate amendment 27 providing that foreign aid Inspector General need not honor request for information from Congress if the President certifies he has forbidden him to do so. (Passed 152 to 119.)	Absent.[19]

---

[1] Returning from home district.
[2] In home district.
[3] If present, would have voted "yes."
[4] If present, would have voted "yes."
[5] On official leave of absence to represent House Judiciary Committee at American Bar Association sessions in St. Louis, Mo.
[6] Returning from Minnesota.
[7] If present, would have voted "yes."
[8] Attending conference in downtown Washington.
[9] In home district.
[10] If present, would have voted "no."
[11] Guest of General Eisenhower at conference in Pennsylvania.
[12] Addressing conference in Hartford, Conn.
[13] If present, would have voted "no."
[14] In home district.
[15] If present, would have voted "yes."
[16] In home district.
[17] In Minnesota.
[18] If present, would have voted "yes."
[19] If present, would have voted "no."

Voting record, Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, *3d District of Minnesota, 87th Cong., 2d sess.*

No.	Date, 1962	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 10	Quorum call	Present.
2	do	Election of Speaker	Halleck.
3	Jan. 18	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 23	do	Present.
5	Jan. 24	do	Present.
6	Jan. 25	do	Absent.[1]
7	Jan. 30	do	Present.
8	do	H.R. 8900: To authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning for construction and improvement of facilities. (Passed 319 to 79,)	Yes.
9	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
10	Feb. 5	do	Present.
11	do	S. 883: To suspend rules and pass bill providing for acquisition of a patented mining claim at Grand Canyon National Park. (Defeated 202 to 136; 2/3 vote being required.)	No.
12	Feb. 6	H.R. 6360 (S. 1456): To provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce (for scientific and technical matters). (Passed 231 to 169.)	No.
13	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Present.
14	do	do	Present.
15	do	do	Absent.[2]
16	Feb. 20	do	Present.
17	do	H. Res. 549: To provide for consideration of H.R. 10050 (to increase debt limit) under procedure permitting no amendments from the floor. (Passed 258 to 133.)	No.
18	do	H.R. 10050: To provide for a temporary increase in debt limit to $300,000,000,000 until June 30, 1962. (Passed 251 to 144.)	No.
19	Feb. 21	Quorum call	Present.
20	do	H. Res. 530: To disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962 establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. (Passed 264 to 150.)	Yes.
21	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
22	do	H.R. 6747 (S. 486): To provide for the appointment of 2 additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. (Passed 222 to 142.)	Absent.[4]
23	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Absent.[5]
24	do	do	Absent.[5]
25	Feb. 28	do	Absent.[5]
26	do	H.R. 8399 (S. 1991): To pass the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 as amended. (Passed 354 to 62.)	Yes.
27	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
28	do	do	Present.
29	Mar. 7	do	Present.
30	do	H.R. 132 (S. 205): To assist in construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes. (Passed 337 to 68.)	Yes.
31	Mar. 8	Quorum call	Present.
32	do	do	Present.
33	Mar. 13	do	Present.
34	do	S. 167: To authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws; amended. (Passed 338 to 58.)	Yes.
35	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 15	do	Present.
37	do	H.R. 8723: To recommit to the conference committee the report of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments in order to restore the original House provision to prevent a "conflict of interest" when employees of the Department of Labor enforce this law. (Defeated 182 to 218.)	Yes.
38	do	H.R. 8723: To adopt the conference report on the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments. (Passed 284 to 108.)	Yes.
39	do	H.R. 10606: To recommit to committee the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 in order to reduce the Federal contributions to the States by $140,000,000. (Defeated 155 to 232.)	Yes.
40	do	H.R. 10606: On final passage of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. (Passed 319 to 69.)	No.
41	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
42	Mar. 21	do	Present.
43	do	H.R. 9751: To authorize 1963 appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. (Passed 403 to 0.)	Yes.
44	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
45	do	H.R. 10904: To recommit to committee the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Defeated 24 to 371.)	No.
46	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
47	do	H. Res. 576: A motion calling for the "previous question" on the resolutions providing for a closed rule for the consideration of H.R. 10650, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act. (Defeated 224 to 184.)	No.
48	do	H. Res. 576: To adopt the closed rule for consideration of H.R. 10650, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act. (Passed 234 to 172.)	No.
49	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
50	do	do	Present.
51	Mar. 29	H.R. 10650: To recommit to committee the "Revenue Act of 1962" for the purpose of striking out sec. 2 (investment credit provision) and sec. 19 which extends the withholding tax to dividends and interest. (Defeated 190 to 225.)	Yes.
52	do	H.R. 10650: On final passage of the "Revenue Act of 1962." (Passed 219 to 196.)	No.
53	Apr. 2	Quorum call	Present.
54	do	H.R. 10162: To amend the Bretton Woods Agreement Act to authorize the United States to participate in loans to International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system. (Passed 256 to 94.)	Yes.
55	do	H.R. 10743: To provide increased rates for VA compensation (service-connected disability). (Passed 345 to 0.)	Yes.
56	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
57	do	H.R. 10700: To authorize an appropriation of $63,750,000 for the Peace Corps in fiscal 1963. (Passed 316 to 70.)	Yes.
58	Apr. 4	Quorum call	Present.
59	do	H.R. 11038: To recommit to committee the 2d supplemental appropriations bill for 1962 in order to limit U.S. contributions to the United Nations Special Assessment Fund to 32.02 percent of the total assessed on all nations. (Defeated 153 to 235.)	Yes.
60	Apr. 5	Quorum call	Present.
61	do	H.R. 4441: To recommit to committee a bill to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 to reimburse New York City for extraordinary expenses incurred during 15th General Assembly of the U.N. when Khrushchev and other leaders attended. (Defeated 142 to 215.)	Yes.
62	do	H.R. 4441: On final passage of the bill to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 to New York City for extraordinary expenses incurred during U.N. Assembly (1960) when Khrushchev and other leaders attended. (Passed 207 to 152.)	No.
63	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
64	do	do	Present.
65	do	H. Res. 589: To adopt a rule to take up for consideration H.R. 10788, a bill relating to the regulations of textile imports. (Passed 264 to 76.)	No.
66	do	Quorum call	Present.
67	Apr. 11	do	Present.
68	do	H.R. 10788: To increase the power of the President relative to agreements with certain countries on the importation of cotton textiles. (Passed 312 to 80.)	No.
69	do	H.R. 11151: To recommit to committee the legislative appropriations bill in order to eliminate the provisions granting congressmen the privilege of addressing mail to "occupant or box holder." (Defeated 192 to 197.)	Yes.
70	do	Quorum call	Present.
71	do	do	Present.
72	Apr. 12	do	Present.
73	Apr. 16	do	Present.
74	Apr. 17	do	Present.
75	do	do	Present.
76	Apr. 18	do	Present.
77	do	do	Present.
78	do	H.R. 11289: To pass the $47,800,000,000 defense appropriation bill. (Passed 388 to 0.)	Yes.
79	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
80	May 2	H.R. 8031: To authorize the FCC to require all new TV sets to be equipped to receive both UHF and VHF signals. (Passed 279 to 90.)	No.
81	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
82	do	H.R. 11040: To provide for the establishment, operation, and regulation of a commercial satellite system. (Passed 354 to 9.)	Yes.
83	May 8	Quorum call	Present.
84	May 9	H.R. 8617: To authorize the appropriation of $73,000,000 to pay the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission. (Defeated 171 to 201.)	Yes.
85	do	H. Res. 625: To send to conference H.R. 8900, a bill authorizing assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning for construction and improvement of facilities. (Passed 294 to 76.)	Yes.
86	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
87	do	do	Present.
88	May 16	do	Present.
89	do	do	Present.
90	May 17	do	Present.
91	May 22	do	Present.
92	do	do	Present.
93	May 23	do	Present.
94	do	do	Present.
95	do	H.R. 11737: To authorize an appropriation of $3,700,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Passed 342 to 0.)	Yes.
96	May 24	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative Clark MacGregor, *3d District of Minnesota, 87th Cong., 2d sess.*—Continued

No.	Date, 1962	Measure, question, and result	Vote
97	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 6	do	Absent.[6]
99	do	H.R. 11665: On a motion to recommit the bill amending the National School Lunch Act to committee for the purpose of further revising the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States. (Defeated 160 to 220.)	Paired for.
100	do	H.R. 11665: On final passage of the bill to amend the National School Lunch Act. (Passed 370 to 11.)	Absent.[7]
101	do	Quorum call	Absent.[8]
102	June 7	do	Present.
103	do	H.R. 5532: To amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 in general to tighten up negotiated procurement. (Passed 362 to 0.)	Yes.
104	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
105	do	do	Present.
106	do	do	Present.
107	June 13	do	Present.
108	do	do	Present.
109	June 14	do	Present.
110	do	H.R. 11990: To recommit to committee the bill raising the public debt limit in order to substitute the text of H.R. 12026 increasing the limit to $306,000,000,000. (Defeated 145 to 258.)	Yes.
111	do	H.R. 11990: To increase the debt limit to $308,000,000,000 until Mar. 31, 1963, to $305,000,000,000 from Apr. 1 to June 24, 1963, and back to $300,000,000,000 on June 24, 1963. (Passed 211 to 192.)	No.
112	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
113	June 18	do	Present.
114	do	H. Res. 691: On a motion to consider the resolution providing for a closed rule and 3 hours of debate on H.R. 12154, the Sugar Act amendments of 1962. (Passed 262 to 32.)	Yes.
115	do	Quorum call	Present.
116	do	do	Present.
117	June 19	H.R. 12154: To recommit to committee the amendments to the Sugar Act in order to remove the provisions awarding $22,700,000 to three sugar companies of the Dominican Republic in refund of import fees paid in 1960–61. (Defeated 174 to 222.)	Yes.
118	do	H.R. 12154: On final passage of the Sugar Act amendments of 1962. (Passed 319 to 72.)	No.
119	do	Quorum call	Present.
120	June 20	do	Present.
121	do	do	Present.
122	June 21	do	Present.
123	do	H.R. 11222: An amendment to the "Food and Agriculture Act of 1962" (omnibus farm bill) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to exempt certain deficit areas from compliance with programs. (Passed 267 to 151.)	No.
124	do	H.R. 11222: On a motion to recommit to the Committee on Agriculture the "Food and Agriculture Act of 1962." (Passed 215 to 205.)	Yes.
125	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
126	June 25	do	Present.
127	do	H.R. 11500: To extend for 2 years (to June 30, 1964) the present Defense Production Act. (Passed 327 to 0.)	Yes.
128	do	H.R. 11309 (S. 3161): To extend for 3 years (to June 30, 1965) and amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to regulate exports from the United States to Soviet bloc destinations. (Passed 339 to 0.)	Yes.
129	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
130	June 27	do	Present.
131	do	do	Present.
132	do	do	Present.
133	June 28	do	Present.
134	June 28	H.R. 11970: To recommit to committee the "Trade Expansion Act of 1962" and to extend for 1 year the present law relative to reciprocal trade agreements. (Defeated 171 to 253.)	Yes.
135	do	H.R. 11970: On final passage of the "Trade Expansion Act of 1962." (Passed 299 to 125.)	Yes.
136	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
137	do	S. 1658: To prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. (Passed 348–1.)	Yes.
138	do	S. 1969: To adopt the conference report on the bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act to provide for supplemental air carriers. (Passed 339 to 0.)	Yes.
139	June 30	Quorum call	Absent.[9]
140	do	do	Absent.[9]
141	do	H.R. 12154: To adopt the conference report on the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962. (Passed 248 to 31.)	Absent.[10]
142	July 2	Quorum call	Absent.[11]
143	do	do	Absent.[11]
144	do	H.R. 11586: To extend for 3 years present law providing for a Federal subsidy limit of 55 percent on ship construction and conversion and a 60-percent limit for passenger ships. (Passed 293 to 5.)	Absent.[12]
145	July 2	S. 2775: To authorize an increase in the appropriations for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands from $7,500,000 to $17,500,000. (Passed 281 to 14.)	Absent.[12]
146	do	H. Res. 714: Expressing the "sense of the House of Representatives" that the Federal Communications Commission should authorize "clear channel" radio stations to use in excess of 50 kilowatts of power if FCC finds it to be in the public interest. (Passed 198 to 87.)	Absent.[13]
147	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
148	do	do	Present.
149	do	do	Present.
150	July 11	do	Present.
151	do	do	Present.
152	July 12	do	Present.
153	do	H.R. 11921: On final passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 authorizing appropriations for the Mutual Security program. (Passed 250 to 164.)	Yes.
154	July 13	Quorum call	Present.
155	do	do	Present.
156	July 16	do	Absent.[13]
157	do	H.R. 726: To agree to Senate amendments to H.R. 8050 allocating premium sugar quotas to Argentina and the Dominican Republic, granting a sugar quota to Ireland and making other changes in the Sugar Act. (Passed 196 to 142.)	Absent.[14]
158	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
159	do	do	Present.
160	do	H.R. 11974: On an amendment to the bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission prohibiting any agreement providing for the construction or operation of electric generating and transmission facilities at the Hanford (Washington State, atomic production reactor. (Passed 232 to 163.)	Yes.
161	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
162	do	S. 167: To recommit to the conference committee the bill to authorize the Attorney General to search and seize, without a warrant except his own, the confidential documents of business concerns being investigated for possible violation of antitrust laws. (Passed 202 to 200.)	Yes.
163	do	H.R. 12135: To amend the Highway Act of 1962 by striking out a provision giving to the Secretary of Commerce sole power to determine whether a State provides feasible methods for relocating families removed from their homes because of new highway construction. Under the amendment this would be left to the States. (Passed 236 to 159.)	Yes.
164	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
165	do	H.R. 10606: To adopt the conference report on the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. (Passed 357 to 34.)	Yes.
166	do	H.R. 12391: On final passage of a farm bill entitled "Food and Agricultural Act of 1962." (Passed 229 to 163.)	Yes.
167	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
168	do	do	Present.
169	do	H.R. 12580: To adopt the appropriation bill for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the Judiciary in the amount of $1,900,000,000. (Passed 266 to 55.)	Absent.[15]
170	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
171	do	do	Present.
172	July 24	do	Present.
173	do	S. 2996: On adoption of the conference report on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 authorizing appropriations of $3,600,000,000 for the mutual security program. (Passed 221 to 162.)	Yes.
174	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
175	do	H.R. 12648: To approve the 1963 appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture in the amount of $5,900,000,000. (Passed 345 to 41.)	Yes.
176	do	Quorum call	Present.
177	July 26	do	Present.
178	do	H.R. 529: To authorize the construction and operation of the Mann Creek reclamation project in Idaho. (Passed 199 to 162.)	No.
179	July 30	Quorum call	Absent.[16]
180	do	do	Absent.[16]
181	do	do	Absent.[16]
182	July 31	do	Present.
183	do	do	Present.
184	Aug. 1	H.R. 12711: To adopt the independent offices appropriation bill of 1963 involving $11,500,000,000. (Passed 368 to 12.)	Yes.
185	do	H.R. 575: To authorize the appropriation of $6,100,000 for construction of the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon. (Passed 200 to 182.)	No.
186	do	H.R. 10904: To recommit conference report on appropriations bill for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare in order to reduce funds for the National Institute of Health from $880,000,000 to $840,000,000 which would be $60,000,000 more than requested by the President. (Defeated 173 to 214.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, *3d District of Minnesota, 87th Cong., 2d sess.*—Continued

No.	Date, 1962	Measure, question, and result	Vote
187	Aug. 1	H.R. 10904: On final passage of the appropriations bill for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare in 1963 involving $5,300,000,000. (Passed 347 to 35.)	Yes.
188	do	Quorum call	Present.
189	do	do	Present.
190	Aug. 7	do	Present.
191	Aug. 8	do	Present.
192	do	H.R. 4055: To authorize a lump-sum payment of an amount not over $10,000 to those awarded National Medals of Science. (Defeated 193 to 177: ⅔ vote being necessary to suspend rules and adopt.)	No.
193	do	H.R. 7283: To provide for payment of valid claims of American citizens for losses incurred during World War II; payment to be paid out of proceeds from sale of German and Japanese assets in United States and taken over by U.S. Government. (Passed 354 to 15.)	Yes.
194	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 14	do	Present.
196	do	S. 1005: To require approval by the Federal Reserve Board of construction of buildings for branches of Federal Reserve banks and to increase cost limit on the buildings from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000. (Passed 314 to 50.)	Yes.
197	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Absent.[17]
198	do	On a motion that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with. (Passed 298 to 65.)	Absent.[18]
199	do	Quorum call	Absent.[19]
200	do	do	Present.
201	do	On a motion that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with. (Passed 312 to 62.)	Yes.
202	do	S.J. Res. 29: To suspend the rules and pass the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment outlawing the payment of poll or other tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections. (Passed 294 to 86.)	Yes.
203	do	H. Res. 700: To agree to Senate amendments to H.R. 11040 providing for the establishment and operation of a communications satellite system. (Passed 372 to 10.)	Yes.
204	do	H.R. 12628: To authorize the appropriation of an additional $100,000,000 for direct loans by HHFA for rental and cooperative housing for the elderly. (Passed 367 to 6.)	Yes.
205	Aug. 28	Quorum call	Present.
206	do	do	Present.
207	Aug. 29	do	Present.
208	do	H.R. 10113: To recommit to committee the "Public Works Coordination and Acceleration Act." (Defeated 192 to 221.)	Yes.
209	do	H.R. 11974: On a motion directing the House managers in conference not to agree to sec. 112 authorizing electrical generating facilities for the reactor at Hanford, Wash. (Defeated 148 to 246.)	No.
210	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
211	Sept. 11	do	Absent.[20]
212	Sept. 13	S. 4: To provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore in Texas. (Passed 256 to 87.)	No.
213	do	Quorum call	Present.
214	Sept. 14	do	Present.
215	do	S. 2768: To recommit to committee the bill relative to U.N. bond purchase in order to make any U.S. loan to the U.N. contingent upon adoption by the U.N. of the World Court's opinion that members must pay the special assessments in order to retain voting rights in the General Assembly. (Defeated 171 to 219.)	Yes.
216	Sept. 14	S. 2768: On final passage of the House version of the U.N. bond bill authorizing a U.S. loan equal to the total actual loans of all other nations. (Passed 256 to 134.)	Yes.
217	do	Quorum call	Present.
218	do	H.R. 11974: To recommit to conference committee the bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission insisting on the House disagreement to sec. 112 authorizing electrical generating facilities for the reactor at Hanford, Wash. (Defeated 151 to 186.)	Paired against.
219	Sept. 17	Quorum call	Present.
220	do	do	Present.
221	do	do	Present.
222	do	do	Present.
223	Sept. 18	do	Present.
224	do	H. Res. 777: To call up for consideration S. 2429, a bill to revise the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park. (Passed 268 to 5.)	Yes.
225	Sept. 19	Quorum call	Present.
226	do	On a motion to dispense with the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule. (Passed 355 to 17.)	Yes.
227	do	Quorum call	Present.
228	do	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the previous quorum call. (Passed 339 to 26.)	Yes.
229	do	Quorum call	Present.
230	do	H.R. 12082: To amend the Internal Security Act to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency. (Passed 351 to 24.)	No.
231	Sept. 19	H.R. 11363: To strengthen the national security program with respect to defense contractors and their employees, and to protect classified information. (Defeated 247 to 132; 2/3 vote being necessary to suspend rules.)	No.
232	do	H.R. 12648: To agree to the Senate amendments to the Agriculture appropriation bill to provide $1,600,000 for construction of a peanut research laboratory in Georgia. (Defeated 143 to 221.)	No.
233	do	H.R. 11151: To insist upon the House provisions in legislative appropriation bill authorizing the use by Members of Congress of the privilege of "occupant" mailing. (Defeated 125 to 246.)	No.
234	Sept. 20	Quorum call	Present.
235	do	H.R. 12391: To approve the conference report on the "Food and Agriculture Act of 1962." (Passed 202 to 197.)	No.
236	do	Quorum call	Present.
237	do	do	Present.
238	do	do	Present.
239	do	H.R. 8900: To recommit to conference committee its report on the College Academic Facilities Act with instructions to insist on House position relative to student loans. (Passed 214 to 186.)	Yes.
240	do	Quorum call	Absent.[21]
241	do	H.R. 13175: To recommit to committee the foreign aid appropriations bill in order to reduce the amount for economic assistance by $100,000,000. (Defeated 190 to 203.)	Paired against.
242	do	H.R. 13175: On final passage of the foreign aid appropriation bill in the amount of $3,600,000,000. (Passed 249 to 144.)	Paired for.
243	Sept. 21	H.R. 12180: To extend temporarily the existing law relative to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. (Passed 324 to 8.)	Absent.[22]
244	do	H.R. 11732: On a motion to recommit to committee a bill to authorize foreign governments to operate radio stations in the District of Columbia for transmission of messages outside the United States. (Defeated 95 to 207.)	Absent.[23]
245	Sept. 24	Quorum call	Present.
246	do	do	Present.
247	do	S.J. Res. 244: To authorize the President to call units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months and to extend enlistments on periods of duty for not more than 12 months. (Passed 342 to 13.)	Yes.
248	Sept. 25	H.R. 10: To accept the conference report on the bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals. (Passed 361 to 0.)	Yes.
249	Sept. 26	Quorum call	Present.
250	do	do	Present.
251	do	S.J. Res. 230: To recommit to committee the resolution concerning Cuba in order to strengthen the language to indicate congressional approval of U.S. action to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. (Defeated 140 to 251.)	Yes.
252	do	S.J. Res. 230: To adopt the resolution "expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba." (Passed 384 to 7.)	Yes.
253	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
254	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
255	do	H.R. 7927: To send to conference the House-approved postal rate bill as amended by the Senate and to which the Senate had added Federal employees salary legislation. (Passed 327 to 22.)	Yes.
256	do	Quorum call	Present.
257	do	H.R. 5698: To require that summer employment through the Civil Service Commission be apportioned among the States as is regular employment. (Passed 309 to 19.)	Yes.
258	do	Quorum call	Absent.[24]
259	do	do	Absent.[24]
260	do	H.R. 13241: To correct an error in sec. 309 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 relating to small farm exemption from 1963 wheat program. (Passed 255 to 60.)	Paired for.
261	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Absent.[25]
262	do	do	Absent.[25]
263	do	H. Res. 822: To agree to Senate amendments to H.R. 8181 to authorize the construction of a National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. (Passed 244 to 104.)	Paired against.
264	do	Quorum call	Absent.[25]
265	do	do	Absent.[25]
266	Oct. 3	do	Absent.[26]
267	do	H. Res. 823: To adopt the rule under which H.R. 13273, the bill on rivers and harbors and flood control property, would be considered. (Passed 344 to 4.)	Absent.[26]
268	do	Quorum call	Absent.[25]
269	do	H.R. 13273: To recommit to committee the bill authorizing rivers, harbors, and flood control projects in order to delete the Burns Creek project in Idaho. (Passed 203 to 130.)	Paired for.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, *3d District of Minnesota, 87th Cong., 2d sess.*—Continued

No.	Date, 1962	Measure, question, and result	Vote
270	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Absent.[25]
271	do	H.R. 11970: To approve the conference report on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. (Passed 256 to 91.)	Paired for.
272	do	S. 1552: To approve the conference report on the Drug Amendments of 1962. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Absent.[26]
273	do	H.R. 12648: To adopt an amendment to the fiscal 1963 Agriculture Department appropriations bill providing for certain agricultural research activities. (Passed 330 to 5.)	Absent.[26]
274	do	H. Res. 803: To adopt an open rule on amendments and 1 hour of debate on S. 1123, a bill to change laws governing children employed in agriculture. (Passed 257 to 81.)	Absent.[26]
275	do	S. 1123: To adopt an amendment striking the enacting clause and therefore killing a bill providing for the extension of the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to children employed in agriculture. (Defeated 137 to 198.)	Paired against.
276	Oct. 4	H.R. 4670: To approve the conference report on a bill to amend the law relating to indecent publications in the District of Columbia. (Passed 272 to 18.)	Absent.[26]
277	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[27]
278	do	do	Absent.[25]
279	do	H.R. 7927: To approve the conference report on the postal rate and government salary adjustment bill. (Passed 312 to 20.)	Absent.[28]
280	do	Quorum call	Absent.[24]
281	do	do	Absent.[25]
282	do	H. Con. Res. 570: To agree to a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should protect, by whatever means necessary, its rights in Berlin. (Passed 311 to 0.)	Absent.[28]
283	Oct. 5	S. 1447: On passage of a bill increasing the salaries of District of Columbia teachers. (Passed 260 to 9.)	Absent.[28]
284	Oct. 6	Quorum call	Present.
285	do	H.R. 13175: To approve the conference report making appropriations for foreign aid for fiscal 1963. (Passed 171 to 108.)	Yes.
286	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[27]
287	do	H. Res. 831: To adopt a resolution to return to the Senate a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1963 because it infringed upon the exclusive right of the House under the Constitution to originate appropriation bills. (Passed 245 to 1.)	Absent.[28]
288	do	H.R. 12580: To approve the conference report making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1963. (Passed 172 to 76.)	Absent.[28]
289	do	H.R. 8952: To approve the conference report of a bill concerning use of the special constructive sale price rule for purposes of certain manufacturers' excise taxes. (Passed 247 to 6.)	Absent.[28]
290	Oct. 11	S. 3451: To approve the conference report on a bill to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed. (Passed 182 to 77.)	Paired against.
291	do	Quorum call	Absent.[27]
292	Oct. 12	H.R. 12900: On a parliamentary motion having effect of striking out funds for a Florida canal from the public works appropriation bill. (84–120, not a quorum, whereupon House adjourned.)	Absent.[28]
293	Oct. 13	H.R. 12900: On a parliamentary motion having effect of striking out funds for a Florida canal from the public works appropriation bill. (Defeated 93 to 143.)	Absent.[28]

---

[1] In home district.
[2] Attending conference in downtown Washington.
[3] In home district.
[4] If present, would have voted "yes."
[5] In home district.
[6] In home district.
[7] If present, would have voted "yes."
[8] In home district.
[9] On official leave of absence.
[10] If present, would have voted "yes."
[11] On official leave of absence.
[12] If present, would have voted "yes."
[13] Returning from home district.
[14] If present, would have voted "no."
[15] If present, would have voted "yes."
[16] With 103d Army Reserve Artillery Division at Camp Gurnsey, Wyo.
[17] Returning from Minnesota.
[18] If present, would have voted "yes."
[19] Returning from Minnesota.
[20] In home district casting ballot in Minnesota primary election.
[21] In home district.
[22] If present, would have voted "yes."
[23] If present, would have voted "no."
[24] In home district.
[25] On official leave of absence on account of death in the family.
[26] If present, would have voted "yes."
[27] In home district for scheduled debates with challenger.
[28] If present, would have voted "yes."

Congressional Shortcomings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following newsletter to my constituents:

For a Congress which seemed to linger on and on, the accomplishments, despite a heavy majority control—2 to 1 in the Senate and 3 to 2 in the House—were far from the ambitious program of the New Frontiersmen. They were not able to sell their program to a thoughtful public or members of their own party who saw through the veil of oratory thrown over the offer of gifts, for which they would have had to bargain away their future and their children's future and their grandchildren's future. Among the proposals that failed to clear a wary Congress, despite their substantial party majority, were an urban affairs department—one would think the local municipalities were not able to manage their own affairs; a mass transit bill for big city areas; standby tax reduction authority which would have superimposed Executive authority over the prerogatives of the legislative branch, raising serious questions as to its constitutionality. Because of an obvious attempt at boondoggling, they failed to clear a standby public works authority bill, which would have given the President a blank check on the Nation's pursestrings to the tune of $2 billion. The $900 million finally authorized was bad enough.

Out of the maze of legislative proposals which were sent to the Congress, there emerged a pattern of spending and more spending. We are now over the $100 billion figure annually. The public debt ceiling has been raised to $308 billion and an Eisenhower surplus for fiscal 1962 was turned into a $6.5 billion deficit. Burdensome wartime excise and corporate taxes were continued. The withholding of dividends and interest—a tax that would have penalized the small investor and pensioner—was prevented by the Republicans. A tax revenue bill was patched together, with a promise of a tax reform bill being in the works for next year. Why was this not done in this Congress? I had a bill in that would have accomplished this purpose, but the administration ignored it. This bill would have given back to the States some of the taxing privileges rightfully belonging to them, enabling them to better handle their own affairs.

A quantity of proposals and bills were sent to the Congress by the executive branch, it is true, but there was considerable doubt about the quality. Farm legislation was proposed which would have put the farmers into such a tight corner they might never have wiggled loose, yet these proposals did little to raise the farmers' income or give them a measure of the security they need. The farmers have shown they won't accept the compulsory controls the administration tried to ram down their throats and so, because of its regimentation-or-ruin provisions, the administration did not win the proverbial half-a-loaf in farm legislation.

Another of the New Frontier's unkept promises was the medicare bill which excluded 4 million of our neediest senior citizens, forgot need, jeopardized social security, duplicated the yet unevaluated Kerr-Mills Act.

The fact that there are more than 15 different agencies and departments already conducting major programs in higher education under previously passed legislation and Federal directives did not deter the administration joining school construction with across-the-board aid and throwing out the concept of need. This bill failed to clear the Rules Committee. Also on the higher education front, the student scholarship and loan issue was rung into the House-passed measure, thus injecting the religious issue. This bill went back to conference, where it died.

There was the U.N. bond issue, which the administration proposed, asking us to absorb the responsibilities of other nations, including Communist nations. With but one vote in the United Nations, we subscribed to 50 percent of this issue. Everyone should face up to their responsibilities, including financial. You can't belong to a club and make up your own rules of membership, as the Communists are wont to do.

Republicans helped to achieve improvements in tax and trade bills passed by the Congress; rewrote the manpower retraining measure, which has yet to get its feet off the ground; helped put a space program into orbit; blocked much unnecessary spending; helped write a ban against White House efforts to aid Communist Poland and Yugoslavia.

We were faced with a Tower of Babel in the many proposals that came to the Congress from the administration. A merry-go-round of unabated foreign aid—to the tune of 1,000 23-inch television sets ordered for use in community education programs in underdeveloped oversea areas, with no electrical supply, at a cost of $400,000. Reason and commonsense seems to have been thrown overboard, but Republicans were able to prevent any aid being earmarked for Communist Poland and Yugoslavia. Then there was a seemingly lackadaisical approach to the civil rights issue. There was no effort made on the part of the majority to push this legislation. Under Eisenhower we observed our gross national product increased 3 percent per year, while under Kennedy it went up but 1.8 percent in his first annual report. One wonders what direction we are heading. It is plain it is not forward—as the President promised—instead rather sideways, or even backwards, when we note the rise in unemployment—up to 5.8 percent—and the profits and revenues down. And then there are those traveling about the country, peddling their wares—saying this country needs more of their membership in Congress. Why should this be necessary when they already have a substantial majority? It boils down to the fact that the responsible Members of Congress were not sold on the mass giveaways which were proposed.

On the credit side of the ledger for the 87th, with bipartisan support, we achieved more freedom and less regimentation for the farmer by turning down the compulsory controls for agriculture; maintained a steady growth of rural electrification; extended the Sugar Act—after much milling around of highly paid foreign lobbyists; protection for the public against dangerous drugs; facilitation of our Interstate Highway System; a fairly good foreign trade bill to enable us to better compete in the world market and dispose of more of our surplus farm products abroad; a postal rate bill; establishment of a good communications satellite system, working for the benefit of everyone; and some constructive veterans' benefits.

It is good to be home visiting with as many of you as possible during the congressional recess. I hope to be able to discuss congressional accomplishments and its failures with many of you, continuing to be of service to you through my district office in Bismarck and my Washington office. In this legislative wrapup, I have tried to cover the important issues that were before the 87th Congress. Space does not permit me to cover them all. In closing, let me urge you to go to the polls November 6 and vote for the individuals whom you believe can best help govern this great country of ours.

Services for Disabled Veterans by the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning the service to disabled veterans by the Disabled American Veterans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CARROLL

I am very pleased to note that the Disabled American Veterans at their national convention in Atlantic City have elected a constituent of mine as their national commander. Peter L. Dye, an assistant attorney general of Colorado, has long been active in the Disabled American Veterans as a member of the Murphy-Borelli Chapter of Denver. He has also been a department commander of the State of Colorado for the Disabled American Veterans and has previously served as a national junior vice commander of the organization. Mr. Dye, as the newly elected national commander, has pledged to continue to support the fine rehabilitation service of the Disabled American Veterans to all disabled veterans who have suffered injuries or diseases in time of war while in the service of their country.

The Disabled American Veterans was chartered by special act of Congress in 1932 for the purpose of extending free, expert, personalized service for America's disabled defenders. This rehabilitation program is designed to help these wartime disabled veterans to help themselves. Originally, of course, this service was utilized by veterans of World War I but today the files of the Disabled American Veterans include World War II veterans and Korean conflict veterans as well.

The Veterans' Administration provides available space in each of its regional offices throughout the Nation for the national service officers of the Disabled American Veterans. They also provide space in each district office and in the central office in Washington, D.C. This space is provided by the Veterans' Administration because it is recognized that veterans need expert legal help in the development and prosecution of their claims. Each case handled by the Disabled American Veterans receives the attention of national service officers who have spent anywhere from 15 to 30 years in this specialized branch of the law. Some of these national service officers are attorneys at law and all of them are attorneys in fact, devoting their talents in the practice of this profession which demands that constant attention be given to the changes in rules and regulations by the Veterans' Administration as well as by laws enacted by Congress.

It is surprising to note that the Disabled American Veterans is continuing to obtain service connections for disabilities incurred during wartime service for veterans who have been out of service for 40 years in some instances and over 17 years in other instances.

The Disabled American Veterans is, of course, very active in the Halls of Congress as guardians and protectors of veterans. During this session of Congress the Disabled American Veterans has been most active in fighting to secure a compensation increase measure for the benefit of over 2 million of the Nation's wartime disabled veterans.

In its service and legislative programs the Disabled American Veterans is mindful of the principle on which it was founded, which is that this Nation's first duty to veterans is the rehabilitation of its wartime disabled. The principle includes:

1. Proper medical care and treatment of veterans for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by military service.
2. Adequate compensation for the degree of disablement caused by such disabilities.
3. Training and/or education to restore employability of the wartime disabled into gainful employment.
4. Adequate compensation to the widows, minor children, and dependent parents of veterans who die as the result of a service-incurred disability.

The Disabled American Veterans does not limit its aid to disabled veterans to those who are members. Indeed many veterans served by the Disabled American Veterans in their claims are not even eligible for membership in the organization.

It is interesting to note that the Disabled American Veterans has continued to grow in membership each year and today more than 10 percent of the 2 million veterans receiving disability compensation have joined this fine organization. This is an increase over previous years and points to the growing interest by disabled veterans in this organization which has as its sole purpose the welfare of those who were disabled during time of war.

A review of the service accomplishments of the Disabled American Veterans would justify a greater membership record than has thus far been accomplished. For example, during the last fiscal year, July 1, 1961, through June 30, 1962, the report of the Disabled American Veterans shows the following monetary benefits obtained in behalf of veterans and their dependents represented by the Disabled American Veterans national service officers:

Total monthly increases obtained in compensation and pension, $6,084,689.85.

Total retroactive payments obtained, $72,650,386.72.

The full amount of recoveries obtained by the Disabled American Veterans was $78,735,076.57.

Also during the past year the national service officers of the Disabled American Veterans have reviewed 240,172 case files and the organization has made 102,509 appearances before the rating boards of the Veterans' Administration throughout the Nation for and in behalf of veterans and their dependents who have entrusted their claims into the professional hands of a Disabled American Veterans attorney in fact.

With a membership of approximately 210,000 it is evident that the Disabled American Veterans must seek other support than from membership alone to carry on this great work. While these figures alone would justify the existence of this organization of the Nation's defenders in time of war, there are many other personalized services given which cannot be measured or recorded statistically. These include helpful advice to veterans on personal problems, referring them for employment as well as referrals to other Government agencies for assistance in a multitude of problems.

The Disabled American Veterans income is derived to a large extent from its "Idento-Tag" project. Here the Disabled American Veterans renders a distinct service to millions of the Nation's motorists. The "Idento-Tag," which is attached to the keyring, has enabled the Disabled American Veterans to return millions of sets of lost keys to the rightful owners regardless of whether or not a contribution was made previously. Fortunately, the receipts from these "Idento-Tags" have enabled the Disabled American Veterans to maintain its fulltime staff of national service officers and, in fact, the Disabled American Veterans has the largest national staff of attorneys in fact than any other veterans organization.

If each recipient of "Idento-Tags" was to donate $1, the Disabled American Veterans would be able to expand its rehabilitation services not only in the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration but also to all Veterans' Administration hospitals. It would enable the organization to provide personalized service to bedridden patients, many of whom are in great need of rehabilitation service during their time of confinement.

This service that is provided for disabled veterans must be a continuing one. The Honorable John S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of Veterans Affairs, made this statement before the national convention of the Disabled American Veterans in Atlantic City, N.J., in August 1962:

"Finally, let me say that there is no way * * * through money or training, or medical care * * * to go to a veteran with a serious disability and say, 'There, we are even now.' And I don't think for a moment that anyone feels that way. I think that every American realizes that you are owed a debt which can never be repaid * * * except perhaps by according to you the deep honor and respect you so well deserve."

The Disabled American Veterans national service officers serve under the national service director, Irving Peltz. National service headquarters are located at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. Mr. Peltz has a staff of experts to assist him in administering the affairs of the national service program. Mr. Frank G. Wood, the assistant national service director of claims, and Mr. Pasquale Gervace, the assistant national service director of employment, are also located at national service headquarters and aid in formulating the policy of the organization on the national level in the service program. Mr. Charles L. Huber has recently been appointed the national legislative director of the Disabled American Veterans and it is his responsibility to keep the Congress of the United States aware of the problems of the disabled veterans and to suggest legislative remedies.

National service officers of the Disabled American Veterans have spent years in this profession at a salary level far below that which they deserved. However, owing to the generosity of the public in supporting the program of the Disabled American Veterans, the financial position of the organization has slowly improved. It is gratifying to note that the salary structure of the organization has undergone some improvement in recent times.

However, as General Gleason states, this is a continuing responsibility not only of the Federal Government but of all the citizens of our land as well. By continuing to support the Disabled American Veterans the American public will continue to support one of the great benefits of a free nation and that is to assure its nation's defenders a life of security and dignity, notwithstanding disablement that may have been incurred during the mortal battles fought in the course of the preservation of our free institutions.

Heber Herbert Votaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute to a great champion of religious liberty in the democratic processes of our Government as lived out in the life of the Reverend Heber Votaw, who, until his recent death, was a resident of my congressional district.

Heber Herbert Votaw, 81, a brother-in-law of President Harding, the first Seventh-day Adventist missionary to Burma in 1905, and Superintendent of Federal Prisons, 1921 to 1925, died October 7 at the Washington Sanitarium and Hospital of cancer.

Born in West Mansfield, Ohio, Mr. Votaw was educated in public elementary schools in Ohio, and a Seventh-day Adventist junior college in Michigan. He received his bachelor's degree from George Washington University.

He began his career with the Adventist denomination in Ohio in 1903 when he helped start the Harding Sanitarium and Hospital, still operated today by the Harding family. The same year he married Carolyn Harding, youngest sister of Warren Harding, and a girl who was to become known for her work with girls as a U.S. Public Health Service official. Mrs. Votaw died in 1951.

Ordained as an Adventist gospel minister here in 1904, Mr. Votaw went with his wife to Burma the following year, where he established the country's first manual training school and began publication of a quarterly journal printed in Burmese.

Illness forced the Votaws back to America, and during the years 1915 to 1917 he served on the faculty of Washington Missionary College, now Columbia Union College, in Takoma Park. He served for 1 year as service manager of the Washington Sanitarium and Hospital where he died.

He joined the staff of then Senator Harding in 1919. Later he went into prison work. In addition to serving as prison superintendent, he was Chairman of the Federal Boards of Parole.

During this time, Mr. Votaw joined the newly formed women's police bureau here, then under the Public Health Service, and established a voluntary probation department.

Mr. Votaw returned to denominational service in 1926, when he became associate secretary of the Adventists' Religious Liberty Department. He served for more than 20 years as editor of Liberty magazine, a quarterly journal, and retired in 1954.

For 24 years he served as chairman of the John Nevins Andrews Elementary School Board in Takoma Park.

Mr. Votaw wrote "Your Freedom and Mine," now in its third edition, and was coeditor of "American State Papers."

In Takoma Park he lived at 7633 Carroll Avenue, was a member of the board of the Citizens Bank, and a volunteer of the Takoma Park Fire Department. For 36 years he was on the board of the Federal Service Finance Corp.

He leaves several nieces and nephews. Services were held on Thursday, October 11, at the Takoma Park Seventh-day Adventist Church. Burial was in Lincoln Cemetery.

The Story of W. H. "Ping" Ferry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that, as some of my colleagues have already pointed out, a speaker at the Western States Democratic Conference used his appearance at that gathering on August 6 to viciously attack one of America's outstanding public servants. The speaker was Wilbur H. "Ping" Ferry, a vice president of the so-called Fund for the Republic, which is sometimes referred to as the "Fund for Whose Republic?" Mr. Ferry is also a staff director of the fund's center for the study of democratic institutions in Santa Barbara, Calif. The man he attacked was FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. Hoover needs no defense in this body. He has done so outstanding a job as Director of the FBI that, after his appointment in 1924 during the administration of Calvin Coolidge, five succeeding Presidents—Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy—have asked him to continue leading the agency which he has made the most widely known, respected, and efficient investigative force in the world. He has raised the agency and his position to so high a level that a bill has recently been introduced in the Congress which would require that future Directors of the FBI be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

In his attack on Mr. Hoover, Mr. Ferry peddled the same line he and his cronies of the fund have been disseminating through that foundation since it was set up in 1953 with 15 million tax-exempt dollars of the Ford fortune. This is the line that there is no Communist danger in the United States and that, to the contrary, the major threat to our democratic institutions comes from anti-Communists and anticommunism.

Apparently, Mr. Ferry took out after Mr. Hoover because he realizes that the FBI Director, the esteem in which he is held, and the truth with which he speaks, have been—and still are—a major obstacle to the Fund for the Republic's success in promoting its false and dangerous line. He attempted to heap ridicule on the FBI Director and paint him as a calculating prevaricator who, for years, has been misleading the American people and feeding them falsehoods about communism.

He referred to Mr. Hoover as "our official spy swatter" who, through "sententious poppycock" has been creating a completely false picture of Communist strength and "a mischief-making tapestry of legend and illusion if ever there was one." He claimed that Mr. Hoover's warnings about Soviet espionage are merely "an old line of the FBI Chief."

Congress was included in Ferry's attack. Referring to this alleged old line of Mr. Hoover concerning Soviet espionage, Mr. Ferry stated that "its success year after year is a tribute to the trance into which his sermons throw Americans, not excepting Congressmen." He bemoaned the fact that "Congress never grudges Mr. Hoover a penny."

It was with great pleasure that I later read that the U.S. Attorney General, Mr. Robert F. Kennedy, repudiated Mr. Ferry and came to the defense of, and paid tribute to, Mr. Hoover at a press conference following a speech he gave before the same group. It was with equal pleasure that I have on several occasions since then read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—or heard on this floor—remarks made by my colleagues in this body in defense of Mr. Hoover.

The Attorney General stated in the course of his press conference that Communist espionage in the United States is on the increase and that those who dismiss this problem are badly informed and "perform a disservice to the Nation." Of Mr. Hoover, the Attorney General said:

> I believe the country owes him and his organization a real debt of gratitude. I hope he will continue to serve the country for many, many more years to come.
>
> I admired him and the FBI before I became Attorney General, but my admiration has increased tremendously after seeing his work close at hand.

As I said before, Mr. Hoover needs no defense before this body, but I do believe that this body should know—and most of its Members want to know—something about his critic, Wilbur H. Ferry.

"Ping" Ferry, class of 1932 at Dartmouth, taught for about a year after completing college. During the years 1934 to 1941 he worked as a newspaperman—with a side excursion into the publicity field in 1936 to 1937. Fellow newspapermen who knew and worked with him during this period have variously described him as "radical," "pacifist," "liberal," "leftist," "arbitrary," and "egghead" and "stormy petrel" who was always involved in controversies.

In May 1942, at the height of World War II, Ferry secured a position as OPA inspector for the State of New Hampshire. A year later, in May 1944, he resigned that Government post to become publicity director of the CIO Political Action Committee.

In an action that was praised throughout the Nation, the CIO in 1949 and 1950 ousted a dozen unions which were Communist controlled and, with them, hundreds of Communists who had obtained positions of leadership in the organization. Prior to that time, however, in the fall of 1944, a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, after investigating the Political Action Committee of the CIO, reported that—

> While the political action committee purports to be a democratic political organization for the rank and file of labor in the Congress of Industrial Organizations, it is, in fact, a dictatorial political pressure organization being directed and controlled in a large measure by Communists who are entrenched in positions of leadership in the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

FERRY'S WORK WITH REFUGEES

During the period of his affiliation with the CIO-PAC, "Ping" Ferry was also close to the national officers of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, being a member of an advisory committee of publicity men who met with JAFRC officials to assist in mapping out a national fund-raising campaign for the organization.

What was the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Attorney General, now Supreme Court Justice, Tom Clark cited it in 1948 as a subversive and Communist organization. It has also been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I have the honor to be chairman. Louis Budenz, former member of the Communist Party's national committee and managing editor of the Daily Worker, has written that the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was "set up for the specific purpose of bringing useful European Communists—useful, that is, from Moscow's angle—to the United States."

Of course, Ferry's associations with the CIO-PAC and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee date back almost 20 years now. Many people who were tied up with such organizations and causes in those days have since changed. They no longer have anything to do with Communist-influenced or Soviet-serving operations.

But this is not true of Mr. "Ping" Ferry.

"PING," COMMUNISTS, AND THE NEW HAMPSHIRE ATTORNEY GENERAL

On December 7, 1953, under authority of a New Hampshire law which has since been upheld as constitutional by the State's supreme court, the attorney general of New Hampshire interrogated Mrs. Elba Chase Nelson, chairman of the Communist Party of New Hampshire, concerning party activities in that State. She refused to cooperate in the investigation and was prosecuted for contempt. She was defended in these proceedings by Attorney John R. McLane of Concord, N.H. The indomitable "Ping" Ferry went out of his way at this time to write to Mr. McLane congratulating him for his defense of Mrs. Nelson.

About the same time, there were reports that the New Hampshire attorney general was questioning some Dartmouth professors in his investigation of Communist activities. On December 12, 1953, "Ping" Ferry wrote a letter to President John S. Dickey of Dartmouth in which he said that the New Hampshire attorney general's investigation was "a fishing trip of a ranker stripe than most and should be resisted, derided, and put in its proper contemptible light."

Mr. Ferry advised Mr. Dickey that it would distress him—"Ping" Ferry—and many others if Dartmouth College cooperated with the attorney general who, I want to stress, was doing no more than attempting to carry out duties assigned him by the people of New Hampshire. Ferry urged that the college resist the investigation. He told the Dartmouth president that he was writing as "an indignant alumnus" and that if he could do anything to help in any way "you have only to call on me."

FERRY AND THE OSLO CONFERENCE

In May of 1961, a 5-day conference against the spread of nuclear weapons was held in Oslo, Norway. This conference was called and organized by Dr. Linus Pauling and his wife. Dr. Pauling is the top scientific peace traveler in the United States. Since the end of World War II, Dr. Pauling has an unbroken record of support of, and leadership in, Communist-oriented and Communist-serving peace movements.

About a dozen U.S. representatives took part in this conference—and "Ping" Ferry was one of them. Of course, there were representatives of other nations there as well—representatives of the Soviet Union, Communist Hungary, Communist Poland, and Communist Czechoslovakia, as well as those from a few Western powers. The conference was favorably publicized by Communist journals in this country and throughout the world. It was promoted by Moscow radio.

Before leaving this country to take part in the conference, Dr. Pauling held a press conference during which he stressed his belief that the greatest danger to world peace was the possibility that our NATO allies might be armed with nuclear weapons. And it is most interesting to note, in mentioning this fact, that the Oslo conference was timed to end on the eve of the opening of the NATO Foreign Ministers Conference in that same city. This timing of Pauling's conference, in which Mr. Ferry participated, was perfect—from the Soviet viewpoint.

The New York Times, in a report which mentioned the timing of the close of the Oslo Conference, stated:

> Without mentioning the alliance—

That is, NATO—

> by name, the [Oslo] Conference called for quick negotiation of a treaty that would bar the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from ever becoming a nuclear power.

This demand was not the only one made at the Pauling-Ferry Oslo conference. Those participating in it issued a statement at its close which called for general and complete disarmament, the demilitarization of Central Europe, and the immediate cessation of all nuclear weapons testing. As all of you know, I am sure, these are also the main propaganda themes of Moscow and the U.S. Communist Party.

"PING'S" MINORITY OF ONE

The August 1961 issue of the magazine Minority of One listed Mr. Ferry as one of eight signers of a statement of purpose by the "Friends of the Minority of One." The other seven persons who signed this statement included Dr. Linus Pauling and his wife; the Reverend Stephen H. Fritchman, a clergyman who has invoked the fifth amendment when questioned about his Communist Party membership; and the Reverend Clarence Duffy, a Roman Catholic priest who has been disciplined by church authorities because of his associations with Communist causes.

AND WHAT IS THE MINORITY OF ONE?

Edited by M. S. Arnoni, a citizen of Israel who has lived in the United States since 1954, the magazine is a promoter of Dr. Pauling and his Soviet-serving peace activity and also of "Ping" Ferry's Fund for the Republic; a defender of persons such as Alger Hiss and Paul Robeson, Jr., who, like his father, has been identified as a Communist Party member; and, at the same time that it finds reason for defending the Soviet Union and Communist Hungary and praising Castro's Cuba, it attacks the United States and all anti-Communists, and protests talk of freedom versus slavery, satellites versus allies, and peace with justice against aggression.

Among its contributors have been such persons as retired Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, an aggressive supporter of, and speaker before, Communist fronts and writer for the Communist magazine New World Review.

"PING'S" PLEA FOR CARL BRADEN

In the fall of 1961 the Communist Party undertook another one of its typical operations—a maneuver to rescue one of its identified agents, the agent being Carl Braden.

In November 1954 Carl Braden was indicted for sedition in Kentucky following the bombing of the home of a Negro couple who had moved into a white community in the Louisville suburbs Evidence presented to the grand jury investigating the bombing and in the course of Braden's trial indicated that the bombing was a Communist scheme to create racial tension in the Louisville area. Braden and his wife, Ann, had bought the home on the pretext that they intended to live in it and had then turned it over to the Negro family which was living in it at the time it was bombed.

In the course of his trial, both Braden and his wife were identified as Communist Party members by undercover informants of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Braden was convicted, sentenced to 15 years in prison, and fined $5,000. He was in prison pending appeal when the Supreme Court handed down its Nelson case decision invalidating State sedition laws. This freed him.

Braden ran into trouble again in 1953 when the Committee on Un-American Activities was holding hearings in Atlanta, Ga. Subpenaed to testify before the committee, Braden refused to answer questions on grounds of the first amendment. He was, therefore, indicted, tried, convicted of contempt, and sentenced to a year in prison. The Supreme Court upheld his conviction.

It was then that a petition to President Kennedy asking clemency for Braden was initiated and circulated. The name of "Ping" Ferry appears on this petition as one of its signers.

The petition itself is so worded as to create racial antagonism and dissension. It vilifies the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It falsely states that "Braden has already spent 8 months in prison in Kentucky for his stand for integration."

What a way this is to describe the bombing of the home of a Negro family. Yet "Ping" Ferry, along with many others, had the gall to sign this statement. He also had the effrontery to claim, as a petition signer, that in seeking clemency for Braden, his purpose was "to reaffirm the position of the Federal Government supporting peaceful and orderly integration in the South."

Since when is it supporting peaceful and orderly integration in the South—or anywhere else—by trying to spring a convicted racial agitator.

FERRY, SOCIALISM, AND THE MONTHLY REVIEW

The March 1962 issue of the magazine Monthly Review turned the No. 1 spot in its book review section over to Mr. Ferry so that he could review—and praise—a novel of social protest written about 50 years ago and recently republished by the Monthly Review Press. This book, "The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists," was described in the Monthly Review as a working class classic. It is a book in which capitalism is the villain and the church and clergy are objects of contempt.

In the course of praising this work in the March 1962 issue of the Monthly Review, Ferry expressed his contempt and disdain for the United States and its people and pointed out that, in his opinion, the author of the book had succeeded brilliantly in his stated aim of showing the evils of the capitalist system and "the only true remedy—socialism."

Because of this fact and the fact that the Monthly Review claims to be an independent socialist magazine, you may get the impression that "Ping" Ferry is a Socialist. But this would be a wrong impression.

The Monthly Review is edited by Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy. Both Huberman and Sweezy have extensive records of Communist-front activity, and both are still most actively promoting Communist causes. They are coauthors of the book, "Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution," published by their Monthly Review Press and highly praised in the Communist press. In the years they have been editing the Monthly Review, they have made it clear, beyond all doubt, that when they advocate socialism, they mean Soviet style socialism.

Although the Monthly Review features an unusually large number of anonymous articles, the backgrounds of certain of its contributors whose names its editors have chosen to reveal leave no doubt about its orientation. Among its recent contributors have been:

Che Guevara, Castro's expert in bloody revolution.

Cheddi Jagan, Communist Premier of British Guiana, and also his American-born wife, Janet Jagan, the former Janet Rosenberg, who was a member of the Young Communist League during her student days in this country.

Carl Marzani, former State Department employee whose Communist Party name was Tony Wales and who has been convicted of perjury for falsely denying Communist Party membership while employed by the State Department.

Millionaire Communist Corliss Lamont.

The recently deceased Julius Emspak, for years a top leader of the Communist-controlled United Electrical Workers Union, whose Communist Party name was Comrade Juniper.

Some of the books published and now being promoted by the Monthly Review Press, whose most recent book "Ping" Ferry has praised in its pages, include the following:

"The Great Road" by Agnes Smedley, the American who was tied in with the Sorge Soviet espionage ring. When Miss Smedley died in 1950, she willed her U.S. Government bonds, royalties from her books, and "anything else of value included in my estate" to Chinese Red Army Commander in Chief Gen. Chu Teh. She is buried in the Cemetery of Revolutionaries outside of Peiping.

"The Wall Between" by Ann Braden, an identified member of the U.S. Communist Party.

"Guerrilla Warfare" by Che Guevara, whom we have already mentioned.

"The Chinese Economy" by Solomon Adler, a former U.S. Treasury Department employee who has been identified as a member of the Silvermaster espionage ring and as having collaborated with agents of the Soviet intelligence apparatus.

"Ping" Ferry's contribution to and open support of the Monthly Review, which features and promotes the writings of notorious Communists, speaks volumes. I need make no interpretive comment on it.

"PING" AND THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Since 1938 the Communist Party has been attacking the Committee on Un-American Activities and attempting to have it abolished. This campaign has been greatly stepped up during the last few years. One of the major features of the current Communist campaign has been the appearance of full-page anticommittee ads in such papers as the New York Times, usually signed by a few hundred people and appealing to this House to abolish the committee.

The latest such ad was published in the New York Times on February 22 of this year. It was typical of the rest of these ads in its falsity, claiming, among other things, that Carl Braden, whom we have already discussed, Frank Wilkinson, Chandler Davis, and Lloyd Barenblatt are in prison for defying the committee's probing of their personal beliefs and associations, and that 35 others are threatened with imprisonment for the same reason.

There were, of course, a good many known Communists who signed this ad—and dozens of the most notorious fellow travelers in the country, along with the usual innocent dupes, joined with them in doing so. "Ping" Ferry, too, was a signer.

FERRY AND SURRENDER TO MOSCOW

The deeper you look into "Ping" Ferry's record, the more you wonder just how he can maintain a position with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and serve as vice president of a fund which claims to have as its aim the preservation of this Republic.

On January 13, 1960, the Santa Barbara News-Press featured a letter written by "Ping" Ferry and entitled "Alternatives to Arms Race—Drastic But Thinkable." In this letter Ferry, in effect, proposed as his solution to the arms dilemma, the surrender of the United States to the Soviet Union—not when a war might develop between the two nations, but right now. Nuclear war, he said, was unthinkable. He classified all solutions to the threat of nuclear war thus far proposed as sterile and hopeless. He therefore recommended that the United States junk all our weapons of whatever kind and announce to the world that it had taken this step.

Two results could flow from this, he said: The best possible would be that the Soviet Union would follow our example because of its declared eagerness to compete with the United States on nonmilitary grounds. The worst possible result, he said, would be that the Soviet Union would take advantage of our defenselessness and instantly bomb the United States into radioactive rubble. If this happened, he added, we would be no worse off than if we had waged war in our own defense and "all that would be lacking would be a regret among survivors that we had not had vengeance on our attackers."

These are the words, believe it or not, of a man who claims that his dedication is to the preservation of this Republic.

He then went on to assure his readers, however, that he believed a massive Soviet attack would be wholly unlikely. The U.S.S.R. does not desire the extinction of this country but only "its submission as a nation and great production center to communism." Admittedly, Ferry added, the submission of the American people and our allies in Western Europe and other parts of the world to Soviet Communist rule and oppression was a desperate and repellent vision, but he insisted that it was thinkable while nuclear war is unthinkable. Decades later, he pointed out, there might be a chance for the American people to regain justice and their freedom.

The editors of the previously mentioned Monthly Review were so impressed with "Ping" Ferry's letter as the kind of propaganda that should be disseminated among the American people that they reprinted it in the February 1960 issue of their pro-Communist magazine. They praised Ferry's message as courageous thinking.

A few months later, in August 1960, the American Friends Service Committee, the pacifist organization which—since it was created in 1917—has opposed U.S. defense preparations, the drafting of its citizens for military service, and so forth, also published Ferry's letter in a small brochure entitled "Alternatives to the Arms Race—Drastic But Thinkable." It is still selling "Ping's" masterpiece of political thinking at a fair price—5 cents per copy.

"PING" AND CAPITALISM

Just a few months ago a Member of this body included as an extension of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. Ferry entitled "Caught on the Horn of Plenty." This was done with the expressed belief that Members of the House would want to give constructive thought to the questions Mr. Ferry's thoughtful and provocative article would raise in their minds.

I agree that the article was provocative—it provoked me—but I have doubts about its thoughtful quality. It was no more than a plea for more and more Government intervention in, and control over, the lives of the American people. To cure our economic problems, as Ferry sees them—and he sees them caused by overabundance—we must do such things, he said, as use public funds to pay people for painting pictures, composing music, writing novels, poems, and plays and—mark this—for doing nothing at all.

Our policy toward foreign countries "should be not that of sustaining capitalism."

If the United States is to advance, he added, it must stifle private ambition and abandon the pseudomoral principles of capitalism such as efficiency, administration, progress, success, profit, competition, and private gain.

"Ping" Ferry is a vice president of a fund allegedly established to preserve this Republic—but this is his attitude toward the economic system on which this Republic rests and on which it has made such progress for so many years that it is the envy of the world.

FERRY, CASTRO, AND KHRUSHCHEV

On September 16, 1962, a statement on the Cuban crisis, in the form of a paid advertisement, was published in the New York Times. It was signed by a mixed group of about 40 Socialists, pacifists, appeasers, and fronters. "Ping" Ferry was one of the signers.

This ad denounced Khrushchev for what he was doing in Cuba. Yet it most definitely was not a pro-United States, profreedom, or anti-Communist statement. It denounced the Soviet dictator not for establishing a military base in Cuba as a major step in his grab for power in the Caribbean and Latin America and his aim of conquest of the United States, but only because he was allegedly giving a new opportunity to those who feed on world tensions. This was an obvious reference to, and disparagement of, those in this country who believe we should face the reality that the Communists are out to destroy us and that we should act accordingly in our dealings with them.

The ad stated that the use of force by the United States to help the Cuban victims of communism free themselves would be an act of international immorality.

This Ferry-signed statement was actually a backhanded defense of Khrushchev's invasion of the Western Hemisphere. It unfairly compared his seizure of Cuba to this country's military assistance to Turkey and its establishment of a base in that country in response to Turkey's plea for help when it was threatened by Soviet aggression. It said that these two actions, so vastly dissimilar in intent, were equally justifiable.

The statement signed by Ferry went on to say, incredibly, that there is no more danger in Khrushchev's building a base in Cuba than there was in the United States establishing defense bases in England or sending military aid to South Vietnam—a statement which future developments, I am sure, will prove to be false.

It also urged that this country reestablish diplomatic relations with Castro's Cuba.

The statement, of course, was couched in noble terms. It was allegedly a plea for peace and disarmament. In reality, however, like all unrealistic and appeasement-oriented statements, it was a Communist-serving declaration and, for this reason, a war-promoting one.

Here, then, is the record, up to date, of "Ping" Ferry's activities, exclusive of what he has done as an official of the Fund for the Republic. His actions in that capacity are another story. These facts about Mr. Ferry, I believe, provide clear insight into why he should attack and attempt to discredit a man such as J. Edgar Hoover.

The best that can be said of Ferry is that he is himself a living refutation of his own line and the line of the Fund for the Republic—the line that the Communist Party is impotent and that there is no danger from communism in the United States. Ferry's adult life is a tribute to the ability of Communists to win the support of gullible persons who occupy positions of influence, to sell important elements in the party line to them, and thus infect many thousands of others with the virus of promoting Communist-serving policies and propaganda.

Report of Activities of Committee on the District of Columbia, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as chairman of your Committee on the District of Columbia, I am honored to present to the Senate a report of the activities of your committee during the 87th Congress.

Your committee has seen one of the busiest and, I believe, most productive periods in some years, as the statistics and explanations I will submit hereafter fully support.

The Senate District Committee is unique among Senate committees by virtue of the great variety of problems and legislative proposals that come before it. The committee in some respects is not unlike a Senate legislature and city council combined. Constitutionally, the Congress is the legislative arm for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I am aware that few Members of this distinguished body aspire to serve on the District of Columbia Committee. I believe that my colleagues on this committee are most deserving of the gratitude of the entire Congress, the people of the District of Columbia, and the people of the whole country generally for the long hours they spend in conferences, hearings, and executive sessions to tend to the business of the Nation's Capital City. May I, therefore, take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to my subcommittee chairmen who so unselfishly gave of their time and their energy. They are my distinguished colleague, the very effective and hard-working senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety Subcommittee; the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], whose energies and skills and experience in municipal government have been invaluable to our committee as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee; my warm friend and capable junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], who is chairman of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee; and my close friend and willing worker, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], whose long service, both in the Senate and the House, made his work most valuable as chairman of his subcommittee, Business and Commerce. To the other committee members, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whose past service in the House has been generally valuable to our committee; and to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], whose experience in the executive branch of the Government and in the legislature of his home State has done much to assist the committee with its multitude of problems, I wish to express my sincere thanks and deep appreciation for the hours they gave to our committee.

Mr. President, I believe this year the Senate as well as the House made real strides in enacting constructive legislation for the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area. As in the past, the Congress during this Congress has recognized the great metropolitan growth of Washington, D.C., and its diversified attendant problems.

In furtherance of the act establishing the National Capital Transportation Agency and the proclaimed Federal policy of the Congress to have a study made of the area's traffic problems with a view toward developing a comprehensive transit program for the National Capital region, the committee approved a bill to authorize the acquisition of certain lands in adjoining counties that will be needed as corridors for a rapid transit system. In approving this legislation the committee felt that acquisition of these parcels of land is essential at this time if space is to be reserved at a relatively low cost.

Again, as in other sessions of the Congress, the fiscal problems confronting the District of Columbia were important matters of consideration for the committee. The District's financial problems are being continually aggravated by the ever increasing operating costs imposed upon the District government. These costs must be met with additional revenues acquired either through additional taxes or a larger Federal payment to the District. The former has its limitations for the simple reason that too great a tax increase on District residences and businesses could cause an imbalance with the surrounding county governments.

Being completely realistic about the District's financial plight, it is my judgment that Congress must do a better job of helping the District meet its fiscal needs by providing a greater Federal payment than that which has been appropriated by the Congress in recent years.

The Congress must share some responsibility for the District's ever increasing budget. In 1960, the Congress enacted mandatory pay raises for District employees, including teachers, policemen, and firemen. These fiscal measures contributed in part to the District's critical revenue deficit in fiscal 1962.

In an effort to meet this fiscal deficit, the committee during the 1st session of the 87th Congress approved a revenue bill which was finally enacted into law in March of 1962. This bill, along with an increase in the real estate tax, has assured the District of at least $16 million in increased revenues for the general fund.

On the basis of these revenue-producing measures, the fiscal situation for the District has improved in fiscal 1963.

Although such is the status now, it may become less favorable as the committee has approved salary increases for District employees in accordance with the congressional policy of providing salary increases for all classified and postal employees. However, the legislation providing for these pay increases was not approved by the committee without full realization that the District's revenue in 1964 may again be on the deficit side and require a greater Federal payment and possibly an increase in District taxes.

The fiscal measures that the committee approved during both sessions of the 87th Congress are as follows:

First. Provided a 10-percent increase in the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education. It was the view of the committee that such increases will be instrumental in helping to recruit and maintain competent teachers and other personnel in the District's schools. The increase places the District's school system fourth highest among cities of over 500,000 population in the Nation.

Second. Provided increases of 11 percent in the salaries of policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia. These increases will place the District in fifth place among cities with a population of 500,000 and over.

Third. Provided increases in the retirement benefits of widows and children of former members of the various police and fire departments of the District of Columbia.

Fourth. Provided for the payment of a subsidy to the D.C. Transit Co. for the transporting of schoolchildren when the earnings of the company are less than an amount established by a prescribed formula.

Fifth. Provided for a reduction in the working week of the firefighters of the District of Columbia Fire Department to 48 hours. On an overall comparison with 20 of the largest cities' average workweek, the 48-hour workweek for the District firefighters would place it 5 hours under the average 53-hour workweek for this group.

In addition to these fiscal authorizations, the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee approved a bill to authorize the District of Columbia to increase the limit of borrowing for the general fund of the District of Columbia, from $75 to $150 million. This additional borrowing authority would be used by the city to finance in 1964–68 a $142 million capital improvement program that would include the construction of many new elementary and junior high schools and other vitally needed service facilities.

The committee, recognizing the need to cooperate with the adjacent county governments, approved another bill that would permit the District of Columbia government to sell real property owned by the District to Prince William County, Va. The county envisions this land as being used for purposes of heavy industry that will in time add to the tax base of the county and promote general welfare among its citizens.

In the field of judicial legislation, I believe this committee has made some real headway during this Congress. The Senate enacted several important measures that will greatly assist the courts of the District of Columbia and also provide for more effective law enforcement in the Nation's Capital.

After several years of stalemate between the Senate and the House, a workable juvenile court bill approved by this committee was finally agreed to by the House and enacted into law. The measure provides for two additional judges to be added to the court.

This increase in judicial manpower will enable the juvenile court to be kept current and thus bring to an end the ever-increasing backlog of juvenile cases which has delayed justice and caused in some measure serious social problems.

This committee approved a bill outlawing mandatory capital punishment in the District. This measure was also approved by the House, and it has now been enacted into law. Its enactment will remove a harsh and archaic principle of law that requires the imposition of the death sentence for all persons convicted of first degree murder in the District of Columbia. The change that has been made in existing law is long overdue, and will conform the law of the District more closely to that of every other jurisdiction in the United States, both Federal and State.

The Senate also approved another bill of the committee which was enacted into law. This particular measure increased the ad damnum jurisdiction of the municipal court of the District of Columbia in civil cases from $3,000 to $10,000. The bill also changed the names of the municipal court and municipal court of appeals to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, respectively. This legislation will have the effect of relieving the congested calendars of U.S. district court of the cases involving small amounts claimed and thus free Federal judges for consideration of many more and far-reaching classes of litigation that come before it as a Federal court. Also, the measure will make the minimum ad damnum jurisdiction uniform with that of the other U.S. district courts.

The committee also cleared legislation for Senate action, and which was enacted into law, amending the various District laws relating to uniform partnerships, uniform limited partnerships, uniform gifts to minors, and incorporation of nonprofit corporations. The enactment of these measures had the effect of modernizing the law, and making it clear what the nonprofit corporations and partnerships may do, and how to do it. The bill amending the Gifts to Minors Act, also modernizes existing law, and makes it possible for donors to make gifts of money to children.

In the field of public health, and following committee approval, the Senate enacted several important measures. These included legislation authorizing the licensing of tissue banks in the District of Columbia; the authorization of grants for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of George Washington University Hospital; the regulation of the practice of physical therapy; amended the Hospital Center Act to provide fund authorization increase and time extension for grants for the Southeast Community Hospital; and extended the Hospital Center Act for 1 year.

This year the Senate and House enacted several amendments that will do much to improve the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act. This was accomplished after several years of stalemate between the Senate and the House on how best to improve the program. The enactment of the legislation increases unemployment benefits, extends period of time of eligibility, and brings many new groups of individuals under the program.

In the public welfare area, following committee approval, the Senate and House concurred in legislation providing for a more effective administration of public assistance and to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons. This legislation was long sought by the District government.

The committee again this Congress approved legislation supporting the establishment of a junior college division within the District of Columbia Teachers College.

The committee also approved several insurance bills which will have the effect of generally improving the insurance laws of the District of Columbia. Foremost of the legislation include authority to permit domestic insurance companies to invest bonds, notes, and evidence of indebtedness of the Inter-American Development Bank; exemption of the policies of group life insurance issued to credit unions from the requirement of the Life Insurance Act that such policies contain certain standard provisions; and provisions for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia, which is written in connection with loans or other credit transaction of less than 5 years' duration.

The latter measure which pertains to credit life insurance is important for the reason that it will curb abuses most frequently encountered such as: First, selling the debtor insurance in excess of the amount of indebtedness; second, selling the debtor a policy for a term longer than the debt's life; third, failing to inform the debtor of the term, amount, and premium cost of such insurance; fourth, failing to refund unearned premiums when the debt is prematurely paid or renewed; and, fifth, charging excessive premiums for insurance of the proper term and amount.

Before closing I desire to express my deep appreciation for the cooperation that my committee received from Congressman **McMillan**, the chairman of the House District Committee, and the members of his committee. I also wish to commend the cooperation that the staff members of the House District Committee extended to the staff members of my committee during this Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to include the report in the Record at the conclusion of my statement. It contains a summary statement and statistical table of committee action on matters referred to it.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of Activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia, 2d Session, 87th Congress

The Committee on the District of Columbia received for consideration in the 2d session, 87th Congress, the following:

Senate bills	48
House bills	22
Senate resolutions	0
Senate joint resolutions	1
House joint resolutions	1
Nominations	10
Grand total	82

During the session there were reported to the Senate from the committee 27 Senate bills and 17 House bills. Two Senate bills and one House bill remain on the Senate Calendar.

Of the 22 House bills referred to the Senate District of Columbia Committee, 10 are pending before the committee.

Thirty-five bills and acts have become public law.

Forty hearings were held by subcommittees on Senate bills and 14 hearings were held by subcommittees on House bills.

The full committee held hearings on 10 nominations.

The full committee met in executive session on six occasions.

Following is statistical data of actions by the Senate District of Columbia Committee during the 2d session, 87th Congress:

Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations referred to committee	82
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations reported to Senate	54
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions in process (hearings held)	7
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions indefinitely postponed within committee, including consolidation	15
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions awaiting final action	31

Number of bills, acts, and resolutions received during the 1st session of the 87th Congress upon which the committee has acted during the 2d session:

Senate bills reported favorably	5
House acts reported favorably	7
Senate bills in process	5
House acts in process	0
Senate bills postponed indefinitely	9
House acts postponed indefinitely	0

Comparative statistical data of action by the Senate District of Columbia Committee during the 1st and 2d sess. of the 86th Cong. and the 1st and 2d sess. of the 87th Cong.

	1st sess., 86th Cong.	2d sess., 86th Cong.	1st sess., 87th Cong.	2d sess., 87th Cong.
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations referred to committee	112	96	135	82
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations reported to Senate	53	44	61	54
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions in process (hearings held)	7	4	2	7
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions indefinitely postponed within committee, including consolidation	27	17	14	15
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions awaiting initial action	26	29	44	31
Hearings held by subcommittees on Senate bills	64	57	47	40
Hearings held by subcommittees on House bills	18	17	13	14
Hearings held by subcommittees on resolutions	8			
Total hearings held by subcommittees	90	74	60	54
Hearings by full committee on bills, resolutions, and nominations	7	2	17	13
Full committee meetings	7	5	5	6

The following is a list, by title and number, of all bills, acts, and resolutions passed by the Senate during the 2d session of the 87th Congress. Those that became law are indicated by the public or private law number.

S. 778, to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950.

S. 1447, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended. Public Law 87-881.

S. 1834, to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes. Public Law 87-511.

S. 2139, to exempt from taxation certain property of the American War Mothers, Inc.

S. 2250, to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 78 years old. Public Law 87-650.

S. 2357, to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia. Public Law 87-686.

S. 2436, to transfer certain land in the District of Columbia to the Secretary of the Interior for administration as a part of the National Capital parks system, and for other purposes.

S. 2793, to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assess reasonable fees for the restoration of motor vehicle operators' permits and operating privileges after suspension or revocation thereof. Public Law 87-745.

S. 2795, to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that any such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia. Public Law 87-837.

S. 2977, to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia. Public Law 87-740.

S. 3011, to amend section 4 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1899, entitled

"An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous and unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes."

S. 3013, to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained.

S. 3063, to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–523.

S. 3086, to provide for a reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. Public Law 87–697.

S. 3313, to authorize an increase in the borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia.

S. 3314, to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act.

S. 3315, to relieve owners of abutting property from certain assessments in connection with the repair of alleys and sidewalks in the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–700.

S. 3317, to amend provisions of law relating to personal property coming into the custody of the property clerk, Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes. Public Law 87–691.

S. 3350, to amend the act of August 7, 1946, relating to the District of Columbia hospital center to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of that act.

S. 3358, to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the Inter-American Development Bank. Public Law 87–739.

S. 3359, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to lease certain public space under and in the vicinity of 10th Street SW., for public parking.

S. 3428, relating to the appointment of judges to the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–596.

S. 3705, to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alinement, and for other purposes. Public Law 87–882.

H.R. 2838, to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation. Private Law 87–385.

H.R. 5143, to amend section 801 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901. Public Law 87–423.

H.R. 6836, to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act. Public Law 87–857.

H.R. 6967, to provide for the incorporation of certain nonprofit corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. Public Law 87–569.

H.R. 7752, to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes. Public Law 87–470.

H.R. 8074, to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, and the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act, as amended, with respect to certain foreign corporations.

H.R. 8563, to amend the life insurance act of the District of Columbia to permit certain policies to be issued to members of duly organized national veterans' organizations. Public Law 87–855.

H.R. 8738, to amend sections 1 and 5b of chapter V of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–738.

H.R. 8916, to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of George Washington University Hospital in the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–460.

H.R. 9699, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes. Public Law 87–475.

H.R. 9954, to amend the act of June 6, 1924, chapter 270 (43 Stat. 463), relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, as amended by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 781; 40 U.S.C. 71). Public Law 87–683.

H.R. 11018, to amend the act concerning gifts to minors in the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–821.

H.R. 11019, to provide that the Uniform Limited Partnership Act shall apply in the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–716.

H.R. 12547, to amend the act of August 7, 1946, relating to the District of Columbia hospital center, to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of that act. Public Law 87–593.

H.R. 12675, to provide for the formation of partnerships in the District of Columbia and to make uniform the law with respect thereto. Public Law 87–709.

H.R. 12689, to repeal section 557 and to amend section 559 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901. Public Law 87–694.

H.R. 12708, to increase the jurisdiction of the municipal court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the name of the court, and for other purposes. Public Law 87–873.

H.R. 12727, to amend the act of February 28, 1901, to insure that policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia will receive medical care for all injuries and diseases. Public Law 87–708.

H.R. 12546, to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145), approved June 19, 1934, as amended.

H.R. 12762, to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended. Public Law 87–705.

The following is a list of nominations confirmed by the Senate:

John L. Newbold, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the term expiring March 3, 1965.

Edwin T. Holland, of Virginia, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

Frank Hammett Myers, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years, vice Leo A. Rover, deceased.

Joseph C. Waddy, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, domestic relations branch, for the term of 10 years, vice Frank Hammett Myers, elevated.

John J. Malloy, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 24, 1962.)

Thomas D. Quinn, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 24, 1962.)

John Joseph Gunther, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the term expiring March 3, 1967. (Reappointment.)

Edgar H. Bernstein, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1965.

Morris Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be chief judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years.

Marjorie McKenzie Lawson, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years.

Accomplishments of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs During the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 87th Congress draws to a close, I believe that a summary report of the accomplishments of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, would be of interest to all Members. It is a matter of great personal satisfaction to me to be able to report that this has been one of the most productive Congresses on record from the standpoint of matters under the jurisdiction of this committee. Advances in the fields of conservation and water resources development have been particularly noteworthy.

Before summarizing the legislation that has been enacted in this Congress and discussing other activities of the committee, I would like to take this occasion to express my appreciation to every member of the committee for his cooperation and attention to the committee's work, without which our record of achievement would not have been possible. I especially want to recognize the energetic leadership of the subcommittee chairmen—Hon. Leo W. O'Brien, Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs; Hon. Walter Rogers, Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation; Hon. Gracie Pfost, Subcommittee on Public Lands; Hon. James A. Haley, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs; Hon. Ed Edmondson, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining; and Hon. J. T. Rutherford, Subcommittee on National Parks. I want, also, to note the help given all of us by the ranking minority member, Hon. John P. Saylor, and those who were named by him as the minority counterparts to the subcommittee chairmen; namely, Hon. J. Ernest Wharton, Mines and Mining; Hon. E. Y. Berry, Indian Affairs; Hon. Jack Westland, Territorial and Insular Affairs; Hon. Craig Hosmer, Irrigation and Reclamation; Hon. J. Edgar Chenoweth, National Parks; and Hon. Glenn Cunningham, Public Lands.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs worked very hard during the 87th Congress. Of the 909 measures referred to the committee, 479 were given active consideration and 181, representing 365 of the total referred, were favorably reported to the House, the House passed 178 of the measures favorably reported, and 163 of these were enacted into law. It is significant to note that 17 percent of all the public laws that were enacted by the 87th Congress came from our committee.

Consideration of these measures and other committee business necessarily consumed an enormous amount of time. Either the committee or one of its subcommittees met, with very few exceptions, on every working day during the entire Congress. In Washington alone, 350 committee meetings were held. These were, in addition, a number of field hearings and inspection trips. Many important bills which the committee handled did not become law because of the lack of time or because of their controversial nature. Time spent in hearings and in considering these measures was not wasted, and the record that was made and the added knowledge of the Members with respect to these measures will be valuable when the subjects are taken up again in the next Congress.

Probably no two of us would agree on precisely which of the numerous laws enacted are the most important, or in which field of committee jurisdiction the greatest advance were made. In the field of water resources development this has unquestionably been one of the most productive Congresses in our history. Nine new reclamation projects were authorized involving a total investment of about $426 million. These projects will provide irrigation water for about 560,000 acres of land, most of which is presently in production but without an adequate water supply. They will also provide about 30 billion gallons of water annually for municipal and industrial use and over half a billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually to meet our ever-increasing power needs. In addition, these projects will provide the opportunity for millions of Americans to enjoy various forms of outdoor recreation. In recognition of the fact that a continued adequate supply of water is necessary to our national economic growth and well-being, the Nation's effort to hasten the economic conversion of saline water to fresh water was greatly expedited in this Congress. The results of this stepped-up research program will be of great importance not only to the American people but to the entire world. In the field of conservation there was the unprecedented action of establishing three new additional seashores which adds more than 200 miles of unspoiled coastline to the national parks system. A great deal of progress was made on the recommendation of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission for developing fully the outdoor recreation resources of the Nation. Our increasing needs in this area are pointed up by the fact that recreational use of available Federal areas alone has increased tremendously in recent years until visits have now reached approximately 400 million annually.

TERRITORIAL AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

With the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States in previous Congresses, the volume of bills referred to the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs in the 87th Congress was not as great as before. Nevertheless, this subcommittee, which has major responsibility for legislation affecting the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, as well as limited responsibility in Antarctica, favorably reported 11 measures of the 57 referred to it. Six of these were enacted. Public Law 87-419 provides for the appointment of acting government secretaries for the Virgin Islands and Guam. Public Law 87-382 increases by $4 million the amount which the Virgin Islands Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury. Public Law 87-421 amends the 1944 Virgin Islands Organic Act by placing the government comptroller under the Classification Act of 1949. Public Law 87-688 extends certain Federal laws to American Samoa. Public Law 87-541 increases the authorized appropriations for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by $10 million annually. Public Law 87-121 removes the debt limitation provisions of the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act. Progress was also made on other important legislation which is expected to be before the committee in the next Congress.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, having jurisdiction generally of legislation relating to development of our Nation's water resources, favorably reported 29 measures of the 162 referred to it. Of these, 25 were enacted. I have already mentioned that nine new reclamation projects were authorized. Public Law 87-590 authorizes the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado, a multiple-purpose development for furnishing supplemental irrigation water to 280,000 acres of land in the Arkansas Valley, about 20,500 acre-feet of municipal water to meet the critical needs of cities and towns in the valley, and over half a billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually. In addition, it will prevent extensive flood damage and provide recreational opportunities. Public Law 87-483 authorizes the San Juan Chama reclamation project and Navajo Indian irrigation project, New Mexico, developments which will provide for the irrigation of 110,000 acres for the benefit of the Navajo Indians and 121,000 acres in the Rio Grand Basin, furnish municipal and industrial water to the city of Albuquerque, and provide extensive fish and wildlife benefits and recreational opportunities. Public Law 87-630 authorizes the Spokane Valley project, Washington-Idaho, to provide water service to about 7,250 acres, as well as domestic water supply to the project area. Public Law 87-589 authorizes the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, which will furnish irrigation water to 5,060 acres and provide fish and wildlife benefits and recreational opportunities. Public Law 87-706 authorizes the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, which will furnish water to 18,000 acres, prevent floods, and provide fish and wildlife and recreational opportunities. Public Law 87-762 authorizes the Oroville-Tonasket unit, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, which will furnish water to 8,200 acres and provide fish and wildlife benefits. Public Law 87-727 authorizes the Agate Dam and Reservoir, Rogue River project, Oregon, which provides for irrigation water for 6,630 acres.

One measure—Public Law 87-613—was enacted which amends the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 by giving the Secretary additional authority with respect to establishing development periods and providing for block development. This new authority will permit irrigation operations at an earlier date and provide the means for coping with unforeseen difficulties that develop in getting projects under way.

Four measures were enacted dealing with amendatory repayment contracts on existing projects. They involve the irrigation districts of the Columbia Basin project, Washington, Public Law 87-728; the Burley Irrigation District and the Minidoka Irrigation District, Idaho, Public Law 87-472; the Fort Shaw Irrigation District, Sun River project, Montana, Public Law 87-477; and the Huntley Irrigation District, Montana, Public Law 87-168.

Three measures were enacted dealing with the disposal of Federal property. Public Law 87-151 involves disposal of property in the Minidoka project, Idaho; the Shoshone project, Wyoming; and the Yakima project, Washington. Public Law 87-156 authorizes the transfer of a reclamation bridge across the Colorado River to local control. Public Law 87-220 involves an exchange of land in the Central Valley project, California.

Two measures were enacted authorizing the delivery of water during calendar year 1962 under circumstances which would otherwise preclude it—Public Law 87-169, relating to the Columbia Basin project, Washington, and Public Law 87-479, relating to the Riverton project, Wyoming.

Public Law 87-289 authorizes the replacement of pipelines for three irrigation districts in Idaho, Public Law 87-542 provides for construction of recreational facilities at reservoirs of the Rio Grande project in New Mexico, and Public Law 87-440 provides for adjustment of irrigation charges to the Angostura Irrigation District, South Dakota.

Three measures were enacted relating to interstate compacts: The Sabine River compact, Louisiana and Texas, Public Law 87-418; the Niobrara River compact, Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota, Public Law 87-181; the Little Missouri River compact, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, Public Law 87-452.

I have already mentioned the Saline Water Research program. The legislation—Public Law 87-295—expands and extends the research and development program being conducted by the Federal Government by providing a 6-year program and authorizing the expenditure of $75 million.

The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee spent considerable time on other important legislation which was not enacted but much of which will be before the committee next year. The subcommittee also spent considerable time on legislative oversight activities, including the review of 11 small reclamation project loan applications and examination of the findings of the Department of the Interior on 10 rehabilitation and betterment projects.

PUBLIC LANDS

The Public Lands Subcommittee, the jurisdiction of which extends to the public lands generally, including forest reserves created from the public domain, favorably reported 32 measures of the 116 referred to it; 21 of these were enacted.

Three acts which came from this subcommittee are of general significance in the administration of public lands. Public Law 87-851 permits holders of unpatented mining claims who reside on the property to obtain, at fair market value, an interest in not more than 5 acres in the event the mining claim is invalidated or the holder relinquishes the patent under the mining laws. Public Law 87-558 has the objective of providing permanent settlement of problems arising out of having military bounty land warrants outstanding. Public Law 87-524 grants national forest status to land within the exterior boundaries of national forests where such lands have been acquired under the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act.

Seven measures were enacted which relate to military use of public lands. In the aggregate, they provide for the withdrawal and reservation of more than 2 million acres of land in Alaska, Nevada, and Arizona for use by the military departments for defense purposes. These seven acts are Public Laws 87-308, 310, 320, 326, 327, 334, and 597. They all incorporate provisions to assure maximum public utilization of the withdrawn areas insofar as this is not incompatible with their use for defense purposes.

Several bills were enacted which are designed to assist States and municipalities. Two of these, which are designed to assist in the development of the State of Alaska, are Public Law 87-147, which deals with the sale of isolated and disconnected tracts of land, and Public Law 87-742, which deals with the sale of land under the townsite laws. Public Law 87-752 provides for conveyance of public land to the city of Needles, Calif., thereby permitting orderly expansion of the city. Two other laws relating to Nevada are Public Law 87-340, which disclaims any interest the United States may have in land granted to the State of Nevada incident to its admission as a State in the Union, and Public Law 87-784, which extends the time within which the State of Nevada may exercise an option to purchase certain public lands made available for sale to the State by an earlier law. Public Law 87-40 provides a limited waiver of the Federal prohibition against the State of New Mexico passing title to lands granted to it by the United States, and Public Law 87-473 authorizes the State of Washington to utilize funds obtained from the sale of lands granted to it by its statehood enabling act for the construction of State institutions.

Four other measures of a minor nature involving title problems were enacted. These four acts are Public Laws 87-468 and 469, and Private Laws 87-183 and 193.

Among the legislation which the Public Lands Subcommittee and the full committee approved but which was not enacted was a measure referred to as the wilderness bill. It was designed to provide a statutory base for the permanent preservation of wilderness areas. The subcommittee spent many days in its consideration of this legislation. Field hearings were held in Idaho, Colorado, and California. Extensive hearings were also held in Washington. The bill, as reported, included provisions to govern all future withdrawals, reservation, restrictions, classifications, and uses of public, forest, and shelf lands as well as providing specifically for preservation of some areas in their primitive or wilderness state.

Another measure which was approved by the committee, passed by the House, but was not enacted was a bill to permit the railroad companies to convey, subject to certain limitations, portions of their rights-of-way no longer required for railroad purposes.

A bill which was not reported by the committee but which involved considerable time and study had as its purpose the modification and modernization of procedures for disposing of public lands. This legislation would have authorized the classification, segregation, and disposition of public lands for urban or suburban development, for business and commercial use and, where the lands are excess, for any private purpose.

Other important legislation was considered by the Public Lands Subcommittee and, in addition, the subcommittee spent considerable time on legislative oversight activities. For example, the subcommittee considered 20 proposed withdrawals of public lands for nondefense purposes.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, which has legislative responsibility over matters involving governmental relations with our Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts, and over their landholdings and reservations, reported 56 measures of the 169 referred to it; 49 of these were enacted. Seven of those enacted are measures of general importance in the administration of Indian affairs. Public Law 87-279 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to contract for the disposition, operation, and maintenance of Government-owned utility systems used in the administration of Indian affairs. Public Law 87-417 permits the Secretary to convey up to 50 acres of Indian school property to local school districts. Public Law 87-283 provides for the restoration to organized Indian tribes of funds available for distribution to individual members but not claimed by them. Public Law 87-250 increases the amount authorized for the Indian revolving loan fund from $10 to $20 million. Public Law 87-273 increases the amount to be appropriated for implementation of the Indian Vocational Training Act of 1956 from $3½ to $7½ million annually. Public Law 87-23 authorizes the payment of per diem to the five members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board. Public Law 87-48 extends the life of the Indian Claims Commission for 5 additional years.

Four measures were enacted which relate to the termination of Federal supervision over Indian tribes. Public Law 87-629 provides for the preparation of a roll of members of the Ponca Tribe, division of the tribal assets among the enrolled members, and for termination of Federal supervision and control. Public Law 87-432 authorizes Federal financial assistance to the Menominee Indians by assisting the school district and providing sanitation facilities. Public Law 87-609 provides 3 additional years for carying out the provisions of the 1959 act relating to termination of the Choctaw Tribe of Oklahoma. Public Law 87-698 provides that stock in the Ute Development Corporation, which was established by the Uintah and Ouray Termination Act of 1954, shall not be subject to hypothecation, pledge, mortgage, or any other encumbrance which may lead to its dispersal other than by outright sale.

Fourteen measures from the Indian Affairs Subcommittee deal with land transfers to Indian tribes or individual Indians. They are Public Law 87-519, relating to the Cherokee Tribe of North Carolina; Public Law 87-284, relating to the Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma; Public Law 87-150, relating to the Cocopah Indians of Arizona; Public Law 87-379, relating to the Crow Tribe, South Dakota; Public Law 87-288 and Public Law 87-696, relating to the Jicarilla Apache Tribe, New Mexico; Public Law 87-503, relating to the Potawatomi Tribe, Kansas; Public Law 87-102, concerning the Potawatomi Tribe, Oklahoma; Public Law 87-25, relating to the Lac de Flambeau Reservation, Wis.; Public Law 87-231 and Public Law 87-687, relating to the Pueblos of New Mexico; Public Law 87-806, relating to the Quinault Tribe, Washington; Public Law 87-828, relating to the Southern Ute Tribe, Colorado; and Public Law 87-416, relating to the Zuni Tribe of New Mexico.

Six measures were enacted which deal with the sale, conveyance or lease of Indian lands. They are Public Law 87-145, relating to the Big Sandy Rancheria, Calif.; Public Law 87-445 and Public Law 87-446, relating to the Chippewa Tribe, Minnesota; Public Law 87-35, concerning the Pala Band, California; Public Law 87-230, relating to the Seneca Nation of New York; and Public Law 87-695, concerning the Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.

Three other measures were enacted which extend to 99 years the maximum period for which leases of Indian lands may be made for certain purposes. These are Public Law 87-375, dealing with the Dania Reservation, Fla.; Public Law 87-627, dealing with all the lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation on the Arizona side of the river and with certain of the reservation lands on the California side; and Public Law 87-785, dealing with the Southern Ute Reservation, Colo.

Five measures were enacted providing for the use of tribal funds deposited in the Treasury. They are Public Law 87-24 and Public Law 87-232, relating to the judgment and other funds of the Nez Perce Tribe, Idaho-Washington; Public Law 87-235, relating to judgment funds of the Omaha Tribe, Nebraska; Public Law 87-205, relating to funds awarded to the Potawatomi Nation, Kansas and Oklahoma; and Public Law 87-298, which provides that any judgment against the United States recovered in the Indian Claims Commission by any constituent group of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Wash., shall be credited in the Federal Treasury to the account of the Confederated Tribes.

Four measures were enacted which relate to Indian irrigation projects. Public Law 87-237 authorizes the transfer of title to units of the Fort Belknap irrigation project to an organization of landowners served by the project. Public Law 87-154 establishes the acreage of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project and the amount of water to be furnished. Public Law 87-516 relates to payment of irrigation charges in connection with the Wind River irrigation project, Wyoming. Public Law 87-316 relates to the construction cost and repayment for irrigation works of the Wapato Indian irrigation project on the Yakima Reservation.

Among the other miscellaneous measures enacted are Public Law 87-287, relating to mineral leases on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, Mont.; Public Law 87-734 and Public Law 87-735, providing for reimbursement of individual Indian landowners of the Lower Brule and Crow Creek Sioux Tribes; Public Law 87-229, relating to the mineral rights of land within the Walker River Paiute Reservation; and Public Law 87-202, permitting the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation to acquire certain non-Indian land.

The Indian Affairs Subcommittee considered 24 additional measures which did not become law.

MINES AND MINING

The Mines and Mining Subcommittee has jurisdiction over mining interests generally, with particular reference to the mineral resources of the public lands, the mineral land laws, the Geological Survey, and petroleum conservation on all Federal lands. This subcommittee reported 16 measures of the 78 referred to it, and 14 of these were enacted.

The subcommittee spent considerable time in connection with problems of the domestic mining industry. One bill in this area which became law was a measure—Public Law 87-347—for the stabilization of lead and zinc mining by small producers. While not considered a permanent solution to the problems of this industry, this legislation is designed to assist small producers and allow them to maintain their business operations until such time as long-range assistance to the industry can be accomplished.

Six measures were enacted which relate to the recurring problem involving interference with surface development and use of lands caused by mineral reservations. They are Public Law 87-747, which withdraws from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws land within the city of Tucson and immediately adjacent thereto in Pima County, Ariz.; Public Law 87-754, which withdraws from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws an area in Maricopa County, Ariz.; and Private Laws 87-181, 182, 185, and 574, which authorize the sale of reserved phosphate interests to the surface owners of lands in Polk, Sarasota, Highlands, and Orange Counties, Fla.

Seven additional measures dealing with various miscellaneous subjects were enacted. Public Law 87-818 provides Federal assistance, under certain circumstances, to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in sealing and filling abandoned anthracite coal mines. Public Law 87-626 extends the authority of the Geological Survey to permit operations outside the continental United States. Public Law 87-713 makes petrified wood subject to sale under the Materials Act of 1947. Public Law 87-689 provides authorization for the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate sales of minerals and materials coming within the scope of the Materials Act of 1947. Public Law 87-822 authorizes reinstatement of oil and gas leases that have been terminated under certain circumstances relating to rental payments. Public Law 87-260 places Alaska under the same time restrictions applicable to the rest of the United States with respect to the filing of various claims under the Federal mining laws. Private Law 87-192 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a negotiated lease covering gilsonite mining within the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation.

The subcommittee considered other important legislation which was not enacted, including bills designed to assist the gold, mica, and tin mining industries. The subcommittee also held hearings on and exercised surveillance over problems involved in the stockpiling of mineral materials.

NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks has jurisdiction over legislation affecting national parks, monuments, historic sites, and recreation areas; military parks and battlefields; national cemeteries; and related matters. This subcommittee favorably reported 52 measures of the 305 referred to it; 47 of these were enacted.

I have already mentioned that three new national seashores were created in the 87th Congress. They are the Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass., Public Law 87-126; the Point Reyes National Seashore, Calif., Public Law 87-757; and the Padre Island National Seashore, Tex., Public Law 87-712. When fully established, the Cape Cod National Seashore will include approximately 26,700 acres and about 55 miles of shoreline on both the ocean and bay side of Cape Cod; the Point Reyes National Seashore will include 53,000 acres and 72 miles of Pacific Ocean and bay shoreline; and the Padre Island National Seashore will include about 80 miles of shoreline and about 47,000 acres.

Nine other measures were enacted authorizing the establishment of new units in the national park system. They are Public Law 87-213, authorizing the acquisition of the site of Old Fort Davis, Tex., and its maintenance as a national historic site; Public Law 87-215, authorizing the acquisition of Fort Smith in the State of Arkansas and its establishment as the Fort Smith National Historic Site; Public Law 87-286, providing for administration of the White House and its surrounding grounds in accordance with the basic laws governing the national park system; Public Law 87-362, authorizing the acquisition of land and scenic easements across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon, an area known as Mockley Point; Public Law 87-407, establishing the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Ind.; Public Law 87-438, authorizing the acquisition of Alexander Hamilton's home in New York City, The Grange; Public Law 87-547, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations of Theodore Roosevelt House in New York City and Sagamore Hill on Long Island and administer them as national historic sites; Public Law 87-633, authorizing acceptance of the donation of Cedar Hill in the District of Columbia, which was the home of Frederick Douglass, and administer it as a unit of the National Capital parks system; and Public Law 87-798, authorizing acceptance as a donation the site of former Fort St. Marks in Florida and its administration as a national historic site.

Thirteen measures became law authorizing enlargement of existing units of the national park system. The units of the national park system enlarged by these acts are the Capulin Mountain National Monument, N. Mex., Public Law 87-635; Cedar Breaks National Monument, Utah, Public Law 87-81; Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, Ky., Public Law 87-111; Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa, Public Law 87-44; Fort Necessity National Battlefield, Pa., Public Law 87-134; Fort Raleigh National Historical Site, N.C., Public Law 87-148; Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Wash., Public Law 87-78; Joshua Tree National Monument, Calif., Public Law 87-80; Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif.; Public Law 87-129; Petersburg National Battlefield, Va., Public Law 87-603; Tupelo National Battlefield, Miss., Public Law 87-133; Virgin Islands National Park, V.I., Public Law 87-750; and Wupatki National Monument, Ariz., Public Law 87-136.

Twenty measures were enacted and one concurrent resolution was adopted which relate to miscellaneous matters within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on National Parks. The concurrent resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 14—salutes "Uncle Sam" Wilson, of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of America's symbol of Uncle Sam. Public Law 87-68 excludes certain lands from the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and adds other lands to the monument. Public Law 87-71 provides for a transfer of Blue Ridge Parkway land to the Shenandoah National Park. Public Law

87-131 provides for the administration of two national monuments as part of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Miss.-Tenn. Public Law 87-135 authorizes a study of extending the Blue Ridge Parkway into Georgia. Public Law 87-146 relates to an exchange of land and property within the Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo. Public Law 87-193 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to extend, on certain conditions, the water and sewerage systems of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park to serve the adjacent village of Medora, N. Dak. Public Law 87-278 separates the Hawaii National Park into two parts and designates that portion on the island of Hawaii as the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. Public Law 87-471 changes the name of the Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site. Public Law 87-504 authorizes the National Park Service to participate in the First World Conference on National Parks. Public Law 87-608 authorizes the inclusion, in concession contracts involving Government facilities, provisions for maintenance and repair of those facilities. Public Law 87-628 merges the Edison Home National Historic Site and the Edison Laboratory National Monument under the single name of "Edison National Historic Site." Public Law 87-99 authorizes a Federal contribution of $500,000 toward the cost of constructing a bridge in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Public Law 87-797 gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to punish, within certain limitations, violations of rules governing the U.S. Park Police. Seven additional measures, Public Laws 87-76, 313, 457, 458, 596, 628, and 652, provide for minor land purchases or exchanges in connection with units of the national park system.

One measure—Public Law 87-178—was enacted which relates to the national cemetery system. It modifies prior law with respect to the selection of superintendents of national cemeteries.

With respect to outdoor recreation, legislation—Public Law 87-12—was enacted to extend the time for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to submit its report.

The National Parks Subcommittee spent considerable time on other important legislation which was not enacted but which is expected to be before the committee in some form again next year. One group of bills in this category relate to outdoor recreation research and planning and land acquisition. The matter of providing additional outdoor recreation facilities for our exploding population is one of national emergency. Hearings were held on several measures which would establish new major units of the national parks system. The subcommittee also held extensive hearings and devoted a great deal of study to the matter of national cemetery policy. This resulted in the development of legislation but no final action was taken.

The legislative oversight activities of the National Parks Subcommittee included the consideration of 19 concession contracts.

I mentioned at the beginning of this report the great assistance I have had from the subcommittee chairmen, the ranking minority member, and other members of the committee. I cannot close without mentioning also the invaluable service rendered by the four full-time members of the professional staff, Sidney L. McFarland, professional staff director and engineering consultant; T. Richard Witmer, counsel and consultant on national parks; John L. Taylor, consultant on territorial and Indian affairs; and Milton A. Pearl, consultant on mining, minerals, and public lands; and the six full-time members of the clerical staff, Nancy J. Arnold, chief clerk; Dixie Duncan, Penelope Harvison, Virginia Bedsole, Patricia Freeman, and Susan Whitener.

Summary of Activities of Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am happy to submit a summary of the activities of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 87th Congress. The summary is broken down into the areas of responsibility of our five subcommittees.

The 87th Congress was my first as chairman of this committee, and I am deeply indebted to the members of my committee on both sides of the aisle and to the leadership in the Senate for what I believe has been a very constructive record of accomplishment.

The committee has responsibility for a wide range of subjects. Our jurisdiction extends from our islands in the Pacific and Caribbean to the conservation and wise utilization of the great natural resources in this country. I believe we have accomplished a great deal, and we have truly been successful from the standpoint of the development of our natural resources. Important strides have been made by the authorization of great new water projects in the arid areas of the West. Legislation creating three new national seashores has been enacted into law, thus providing public recreational facilities for millions of Americans.

In order to expedite legislation in which more than one subcommittee was concerned, the full committee held hearings and acted on several measures of major importance. These included:

S. 174, to establish a national wilderness preservation system, a measure which had been before two preceding Congresses. Hearings were held on the proposal in February 1961. After extensive consideration and revision of the provisions of the bill, the committee reported it to the Senate favorably on July 27. It was passed in the Senate by 78 to 8 on September 6, after 2 days of debate.

S. 3117, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning. This bill, recommended by the administration to implement the report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission of January 30, 1962, was introduced on April 4. Hearings were held May 10 and 11. The bill was reported with amendments on August 3, and passed the Senate as amended on August 9, 1962. Hearings were also held on S. 3118, a companion measure proposed by the President to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund, from which parks and recreational areas would be acquired. Time was not adequate, however, to complete committee action on this measure, which will receive continued attention next year.

One of the major contributions of our committee during the 87th Congress was the completion and publication of a study on fuels and energy resources. This study is an assessment of existing knowledge of fuels and energy existing in the country. One of the tasks facing the committee next year will be to consider this study and, if it so decides, to report to the Senate any conclusions the committee might make after careful deliberation.

The committee had before it S. 2246, a measure proposed by the President to bring about planning for optimum use of the water and related resources in all the major river basins of the Nation. Hearings in 1961 revealed opposition to the bill centering around concern that the rights of the States in relation to water might be disturbed. Consideration of the bill was extended over the recess to permit the Council of State Governments to complete a survey of the States and perfect its position in relation to the matter. Early in 1962 a second hearing was held at which the Council of State Governments presented the position of the States in detail. There has ensued a series of conferences between representatives of the State governments and committee staff on a draft of a bill which would neither enhance nor diminish the rights and responsibilities of either the Federal Government or the States in relation to water and related resources. These conferences are continuing. It now appears hopeful that a measure on which there is a considerable possibility of agreement will be ready for introduction in the 88th Congress.

The committee has also undertaken to assure the implementation of the recommendation—No. 3—of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources that the Federal Government undertake a greatly expanded and coordinated program of research on water problems. An extensive survey of research projects on water and related resources which are in progress within the Federal Government, at land grant colleges and State universities, at other universities, private foundations, and institutions, and by private firms and individuals, has been made and will be available when the committee reviews its consideration of water research in the 88th Congress.

There are other tasks which remain uncompleted, but I am confident that in the 1st session of the 88th Congress we shall resume our efforts and continue our progress toward greater utilization of our human and natural resources.

I want to reiterate that the committee is grateful to the majority leader, Mr. Mansfield, for his constant advice and invaluable help in the enactment of our program.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

The Public Lands Subcommittee considered 221 original measures plus 55 House-passed bills, and enacted a total of 78 bills.

These bills covered all facets of public land administration, including the creation of new national parks and seashore recreation areas, improved management of public lands including national forests and parks through land exchange, purchase, and boundary adjustments, legislation to deal with the surface use of land on unpatented mining claims, the definition of land withdrawals for defense and other purposes, and title confirmation stemming from clouds on title.

Among the more significant bills enacted were:

First. Senate Resolution 361, which authorizes a special Subcommittee on Natural Resource Revenues, whose object is to make a review of the entire subject area. The subcommittee consists of Senator Hickey as chairman, and Senators Church, Metcalf, Kuchel, and Allott.

Second. S. 3451, which provides the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture with the legal tools to provide a fair and just means of dealing with the use of unpatented mining claims, which are relinquished or invalidated, where the land contains residences. The legislation is permissive in nature and is designed to meet the situation where a hardship would result and the public interest not benefited by immediate removal of the residence. To protect the public interest with equity to the residents, the legislation permits the Secretary to grant a fee title, life estate, or less for an area of not more than 5 acres, but in no event more than is reasonably needed by the resident. The person must have residence since July 23, 1955, and must be an owner-occupant whose purposes are clearly residential and where the property is a principal place of residence.

The bill prescribes sale at fair value taking into account equities, with reservation to the United States of mineral rights and provision for removal of improvements where less than a fee patent is issued.

Third. S. 4, to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore, which was reported to the Senate with amendments in March 1962, and adopted by the Senate April 10. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives September 13, and approved by the President September 28, 1962.

Fourth. S. 476, to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, which was passed in the Senate in September 1961, by the House of Representatives in July 1962, signed by the President on September 13, 1962.

Fifth. S. 857, to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park. This measure was passed by the Senate in June 1961, subsequently passed by the House and signed by the President August 7, 1961. It was the first major addition to the national park system in a decade and provided for the establishment of the Nation's second Federal seashore park. The first was Cape Hatteras, established in 1937 as a result of a gift of land from the State of North Carolina. Point Reyes and Padre Island, mentioned in preceding paragraphs, became the third and fourth such Federal seashore areas within the national park system.

Sixth. S. 543, to promote the preservation, for the public use and benefit, of portions of the shoreline areas of the United States. This measure authorized the study of 15 specified areas to provide the basis for later consideration of them as additional Federal shoreline parks or recreational areas. Also authorized was an appropriation of $25 million to assist States in acquiring shoreline parks. The bill directed the Forest Service to survey the shores of oceans, lakes, and rivers of its jurisdiction for potential recreational area sites. The measure passed the Senate in August 1961, as reported by the subcommittee and full committee.

The subcommittee reported bills to establish two additional major national park units: S. 2387, to establish the Canyonlands National Park, 332,000 acres in the State of Utah, and S. 1760, to establish the Great Basin National Park in the State of Nevada. Both of these measures were reported favorably to the Senate. The Great Basin Park bill was passed by the Senate. Time was too short for final action on the Canyonlands proposal. The merit of both of these proposals assures that they will have further consideration as the next Congress continues to implement the program necessary to meet the country's outdoor recreation facilities requirements.

A considerable number of measures of lesser importance in the park and recreation field were considered and reported by the subcommittee. These included S. 77, to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park; S. 55, to authorize establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site in Arizona; S. 765, to consolidate Vicksburg National Military Park; S. 1775, to provide for an addition to Richmond National Battlefield Park in Virginia, and numerous others.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs has legislative responsibility over matters involving the relations of the Federal Government with approximately 500,000 Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts, about half of whom reside on reservations; over Indian landholdings and reservations which, subject to varying degrees of Federal control, total approximately 52 million acres in 29 States; and over the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In addition the Indian health and sanitation program supervised by the Division of Indian Health in the U.S. Public Health Service is of concern to the subcommittee.

Of the 120 measures referred to the subcommittee, 55 were reported and 49 were enacted.

The following Indian bills of general applicability throughout Indian country were enacted or passed by the Senate during 1961–62:

S. 108, Anderson, Goldwater: Amends section 1 of the 1955 Leasing Act to permit leases of Indian lands for educational, recreational, business, and so forth, purposes for up to 99 years. Present law limits leases to 25 years. Ninety-nine year leases have been extended to the Navajos and Palm Springs Indians, California. Longer term leases are needed in order to enable lessees to obtain financing for the type of development contemplated. S. 108 passed the Senate March 30, 1961, but was not acted on in the House.

Public Law 87–273, Anderson (S. 200): Amends the Indian Vocational Training Act of 1956 by increasing the $3.5 million authorization for this program to $7.5 million.

Public Law 87–48, Church (S. 751): Amends the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946 to provide for a 5-year extension in the life of the Commission from April 10, 1962, to April 10, 1967. Additional time is needed to complete action on approximately 468 dockets pending before the Commission.

Public Law 87–250, Metcalf, Mansfield (S. 1540): As introduced in the Senate, S. 1540 would have amended the act of June 18, 1934—Wheeler-Howard Act—by deleting the $10 million authorization in the revolving credit loan provision and providing for an open-end authorization. Senate action increased the $10 million to $35 million and provided for a merging of the Navajo-Hopi funds and the Oklahoma fund with the general fund. In a House-Senate conference it was agreed to increase the $10 million limit to $20 million and delete the merger provision.

Public Law 87–282, Church (S. 1719): This law amends title 23 of the United States Code to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the cooperation of any State, county, or local subdivision in connection with the construction of Indian reservation roads and bridges. Such cooperation will ordinarily be in the form of contributions or materials, or both.

Public Law 87–283, Church (S. 1768): Permits the payment to tribes of unclaimed per capita payments arising from income to tribes from various sources, such as treaty agreements, oil and gas leases, and so forth. In many cases these payments have lain in the Treasury for many years and will never be collected. The law restores the funds for tribal use.

Public Law 87–279, Mansfield, Metcalf (S. 1501): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to contract for the sale, operation, maintenance, repair, or relocation of Government-owned utility systems—except utility systems operated as part of an irrigation system—used in the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Provides that the Secretary shall not execute any contracts until the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House and the Senate have been notified and furnished a proposed contract and supporting data.

Public Law 87–417, Church (S. 1299), by request: Amends a 1952 statute to increase from 20 to 50 acres the size of surplus Indian school properties which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to local school districts or public agencies.

Public Law 87–23, Church (S. 1297), by request: Authorizes the members of the Indian arts and crafts board to receive per diem payments at the same rate that is paid to other persons serving the Federal Government without compensation.

ARIZONA

Public Law 87–150, Goldwater (S. 54): Grants 81 acres of land in Arizona to the Cocopah Indians to be held in trust as other tribal lands. It was originally believed that the subject land was included within the reservation, and the law secures to the Indians lands it was always believed were a part of their reservation.

Public Law 87–627, Kuchel, Goldwater, Engle (S. 1208): This legislation has two purposes. First, it extends to certain lands of the Colorado River Indian Reservation in California provisions of a 1960 act which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to lease lands on the Arizona side of the reservation. Second, it enlarges the permissible term of leases up to a maximum of 99 years in order to bring new investments and development on the reservation that will greatly benefit the Indians.

CALIFORNIA

Private Law 87–145 (H.R. 1593): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey by a quitclaim deed to the American Baptist Home Mission Society all right, title, and interest of the United States in 7½ acres of land on the Big Sandy Rancheria, Calif., and to accept in exchange therefor a conveyance in fee simple to the United States by the mission of 12½ acres which will become a part of the Rancheria.

Public Law 87–35 (H.R. 2195): Conveys, without compensation, all the right, title, and interest of the United States and the Pala Band of Indians in three-quarters of an acre of land on the Pala Indian Reservation in California to the diocese of San Diego Education & Welfare Corp. to be used for educational purposes. The conveyance will be subject to reversion of title if the land ceases to be used for this purpose.

H.R. 567: Permits Indian lands on the Torres-Martinez Reservation in Riverside County, Calif., to be leased for business and various other purposes for a term of 99 years or less instead of, as at present, for 25 years with right of renewal for another 25 years. Grazing leases, if any, will continue to be for a term of 10 years or less. This legislation pending on Senate calendar at adjournment.

COLORADO

Public Law 87– (H.R. 8113) (S. 3714), Carroll: Permits Indian lands on the Southern Ute Reservation to be leased for business and various other purposes for a term of 99 years or less instead of, as at present, for 25 years with right of renewal for an additional 25 years. Grazing leases, if any, will continue to be for a term of 10 years or less. Such authority is needed in order to encourage the type of commercial development which, it is expected, will materialize on the Southern Ute Reservation following construction of Navajo Dam and Reservoir, a project which was authorized several years ago and is now under construction. Some of the sites upon which development is anticipated adjoin land included in the reservoir.

Public Law 87– (H.R. 9342) (S. 3713), Carroll: Provides for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Tribe of southwestern Colorado in connection with the construction of the Navajo Dam and Reservoir. Some 707.5 acres of Indian land located within the boundaries of the reservation are needed for the Navajo Dam and Reservoir unit of the Colorado River storage project authorized by the act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105). The tribe desires to exchange this acreage for public land instead of selling it. Accordingly, 2,200 acres on the Archuleta Mesa immediately adjoining the eastern boundary of the reservation have been designated for exchange. Provides that the lands conveyed to the United States will not be utilized for public recreational facilities without the approval of the Southern Ute Tribal Council.

FLORIDA

Public Law 87–375 (H.R. 3575): Permits leases of Indian land on the Dania Reservation in Florida for business and other purposes to be made for a term of 99 years or less instead of the present 25 years with right of renewal for another 25 years. Grazing leases, if any, will continue to be for a term of not to exceed 10 years. The legislation is needed in order to permit development of lands lying in an expanding business and tourist area.

IDAHO

Public Law 87–232, Church (S. 322): Makes available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho the unexpended balances in two special accounts in the Treasury totaling $6,400, the balance of a $1,626,000 payment to the tribe for lands ceded to the United States in 1894. All of the moneys were distributed per capita many years ago except for the small balance that is still in the account. The balance in the second account is the remainder of the interest that has accumulated on the principal account.

Public Law 87–154, Church (S. 1294): The purpose is first, to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior eliminating certain lands from the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project; second, to change the size of the project as defined in the act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1167), from 47,044.63 acres to 47,064.63 acres and authorize the Secretary to redesignate the irrigable acreage from time to time within the limits of the total figure; and, third, to increase the duty of water to be furnished project lands by 0.5 acre-foot per acre per year.

Public Law 87–24, Church (S. 1295): Authorizes the distribution of a $4,177,605.06 judgment recovered by the tribe against the United States in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 175–A, less expenses of litigation and attorney fees. Divides the funds between the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Wash. In addition, provides for the same division—86.6 percent to the Nez Perce and 13.4 percent to the Colvilles—in connection with any other judgment awarded to either group.

KANSAS

Public Law 87–503, Church (S. 2893), by request: Vests title in the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians, Kansas, to a 10-acre tract of land now excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The land in question was purchased in 1912 with funds belonging to the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians and was used for agency purposes. Title to the land was taken in the name of the United States with the result that the United States, while holding legal title to the land, does so as trustee for the tribe.

MINNESOTA

Public Law 87–445, Church (S. 2895), by request: Authorizes the conveyance of 4.78 acres of Minnesota Chippewa tribal land on the Mille Lacs Reservation to the Little Flower Mission of the St. Cloud diocese for recreational facilities and other uses beneficial to the local Indians.

Public Law 87–446, Church (S. 3018): Permits the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, to convey 39 acres of tribal land on the Fond du Lac Indian Reservation to the SS. Mary and Joseph Church, Sawyer, Minn., for church and cemetery expansion.

MONTANA

S. 1316, Metcalf, Mansfield: As amended, S. 1316 would improve the land tenure patterns on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation by authorizing the tribe to sell tribal lands to members of the community, and to exchange tribal land for trust or restricted land owned by members of the community in order to block out economic farms and ranches. Existing statutes prohibit Indian tribes from selling tribal lands to individual enrolled Indians. No action taken on S. 1316 in House Interior Committee.

S. 1912, Metcalf, Mansfield: Increases the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, to $6,200,000. Additional construction is necessary to complete the irrigation and power facilities through extension and rehabilitation of the canal and lateral systems and of the power and electric service lines. Bill awaiting action of House Interior Committee at adjournment.

Public Law 87-237, Mansfield, Metcalf (S. 2216): Authorizes the transfer of project works in three units of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project to an organization of landowners whose lands are served by the units. Following the conveyance of the project works, the landowners will have complete responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the works. The bill also provides for the cancellation of $24,859.44 of delinquent operation and maintenance charges. It is the Indians' request that title to the works on the three units be transferred in the belief that they can operate and maintain the works more economically than the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Public Law 87-287, Metcalf, Mansfield (S. 2224): Modifies and clarifies a section of the act of June 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 690), as amended, which relates to mineral deposits on the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, first, by permitting leases to be entered into in accordance with the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347; 25 U.S.C. 396a–f); second, by providing that mineral rights may go to an allottee's devisees, as well as the allottee himself and his heirs, when the tribal interest ends in 1976 and that the ownership of the allottee, his heirs, or devisees in 1976 shall be subject to then outstanding leases; third, by providing that no conveyance of the surface of the land, whether heretofore or hereafter made and regardless of reference or lack of reference to minerals, shall carry with it mineral rights; and, fourth, by providing that the Indian allottee or his successors in interest shall take a trust title in the minerals unless the surface of the land is held in fee.

NEBRASKA

Public Law 87-235, Curtis (S. 1518): Provides for the disposition of a judgment awarded the Omaha Tribe of Indians by the Indian Claims Commission. The amount of the award was $2,900,000, which was appropriated by the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1960 and deposited in the Federal Treasury. Attorney's fees and expenses reduced the net amount of the judgment to $2,648,581, which is drawing 4 percent interest. The current balance amounts to $2,722,288. Directs the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a roll that includes all persons eligible to share in the judgment and makes that roll the official membership roll of the tribe. Provides that the judgment fund shall be used to make a per capita payment of not more than $750 to each enrolled member and that the balance, estimated at about $1,200,000, may be used for other purposes authorized by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary.

Public Law 87-629, Church, by request (S. 3174): The act provides, first, for the preparation of a tribal roll of members of the Ponca Tribe of Native Americans of Nebraska; second, for the division of the tribal assets among the enrolled members; and finally, for termination of Federal supervision and control over tribal affairs. All tribal property will be disposed of within 3 years or as soon thereafter as practicable. The estimated value of this property is approximately $105,000. Each member of the tribe will be entitled to buy not more than 5 acres of tribal land for homesite purposes at current market value. The remainder of the tribal land is to be sold. Property distributed under the act will not be subject to Federal or State income tax at the time of distribution.

NEVADA

Public Law 87-229, Bible, Cannon (S. 2016): Declares that the title to the minerals underlying 168,254 acres of land added to the Walker River Reservation by secretarial order dated September 25, 1936, are held in trust by the United States for the tribe. Mineral patents and claims validly initiated before passage of the bill are not affected. Also provides for the leasing of the minerals under the general tribal Mineral Leasing Act of May 11, 1938. The tribe already owns the minerals in 142,503 acres of other tribal lands.

NEW MEXICO

Public Law 87-231, Chavez, Anderson (S. 203): Declares that the United States holds in trust for the Pueblos of Santa Ana, Zia, Jemez, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, Cochiti, Isleta, and San Ildefonso approximately 69,706 acres of public domain lands, subject to valid existing rights. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by exchange any lands or interests therein within the Pueblo land consolidation areas, and to convey in exchange therefor any unappropriated public lands within the State of New Mexico, or, with the consent of the Pueblo authorities, any Pueblo tribal lands or interests therein. Directs the Indian Claims Commission to determine the extent to which the value of the title conveyed thereunder should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission. The lands are grazing lands used by the Indians exclusively and continuously over the past 20 years under free use permit. By transferring title BLM would be relieved of the burden of administering these lands. Present maintenance is difficult and complicated by the existence of intermingled and surrounding tribal trust lands. The economy of the Pueblos is largely dependent on livestock operations on these and other trust lands. Donations of these lands to the Pueblos will foster the initiation and continuation of better soil conservation practices in the entire area through the use of tribal funds and appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Public Law 87-687, Anderson (S. 2696): Corrects two errors in a long list of land descriptions in Public Law 87-231 donating certain public domain to Pueblo Indians in New Mexico. When the original legislation, S. 203, passed the Senate and House, it was correct, and the errors apparently occurred at the time of enrollment.

Public Law 87-416, Anderson (S. 201): Donates approximately 610 acres of federally owned land in New Mexico to the Zuni Tribe. This acreage is a part of a larger tract acquired in 1937 by the United States under the provisions of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Act. By the act of August 13, 1949, several thousand acres of these Federal lands were donated to the Zuni Tribe. The 610 acres were not donated since the land was then being used for administrative purposes in connection with the Zuni livestock enterprise. The land is completely surrounded by Zuni land and is used by the tribe for grazing purposes. The Department of the Interior has no further use for the tract.

Public Law 87-288, Anderson, by request (S. 2241): Donates to the Jicarilla Apache Tribe 391.43 acres of federally owned land in the State of New Mexico. The land donated is needed by the Jicarilla Tribe in order to control a watershed on which the tribe is dependent for its domestic water supply. The land consists of four tracts, three of which border the original eastern boundary of the reservation and all of which are surrounded by or adjacent to other tribal lands purchased for the Jicarillas by the United States in the 1940's. The four tracts are key tracts for the water system that serves the Jicarilla Agency, the Indian boarding school dormitory, the Dulce Public School, the Public Health Service facilities, and the tribal housing and development program. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine the extent to which the value of the title conveyed should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

Public Law 87-696, Anderson (S. 2971): Declares that 7 acres of Federal lands on the Jicarilla Indian Reservation in New Mexico shall be held in trust for the tribe. The lands are within the boundaries of the reservation. The lands were purchased by the United States in 1931. Improvements consisting of lookout towers, two cabins, and two concrete cisterns, were transferred to the tribe in 1953. The tribe desires the land for forest fire protection purposes in connection with its sustained-yield forest management program. The right to use the lands and improvements thereon in the administration of tribal affairs is reserved to the United States. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to consider a possible setoff of the value of the lands donated against any tribal claim.

NEW YORK

Public Law 87-230, Keating, Javits (S. 344): Amends the Seneca Leasing Act of August 14, 1950 (64 Stat. 442), in two respects. First, it allows the Seneca Nation more discretion than now exists with respect to the use of funds derived from lease on its reservations in New York. Second, it permits the Council of the Seneca Nation to grant easements and rights-of-way across its lands. The act gives the Senecas greater leeway in the handling of transactions involving their lands and the use of lease income.

NORTH CAROLINA

Public Law 87-519, Ervin, Jordan (S. 3224): Conveys in trust to the eastern band of Cherokee Indians of North Carolina 22.71 acres of federally owned school land and improvements thereon. The land is no longer needed for Federal purposes. Its use by the tribe will be for a council house, parking space, and homes for Indians. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to consider whether to set off the value of the lands against any tribal claim.

NORTH DAKOTA

Public Law 87–695, BURDICK, YOUNG of North Dakota (S. 1161): Gives permission to the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to graze stock without charge on such former Indian land acquired by the United States for Garrison Dam and Reservoir as the Secretary of the Army determines is not devoted to recreational or other beneficial uses. By the act of October 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 1062) the Federal Government acquired approximately 152,000 acres of individual and tribal Indian land for the Garrison project. The Indians were paid $12,605,625 for all of the right, title, and interest in the lands, including intangible damages. Approximately 52,000 acres of the total amount of Indian land taken is suited to grazing. The grazing permission will materially benefit and stabilize the Indian livestock industry which was severely restricted by the construction of the Garrison project.

OKLAHOMA

Private Law 87–102 (H.R. 4500): Donates to the heirs of Anthony Bourbonnais in an unrestricted status approximately thirty-six one-hundredths of 1 acre of land in Pottawatomie County, Okla. The land is a narrow strip lying between the Bourbonnais Indian allotment and an adjoining State highway. Until a recent survey indicated the contrary, it was assumed that the acreage was part of the allotment, and it was so treated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The act is needed to overcome the problems raised by the survey. The United States reserves a right of access across such land whenever such land is needed for public purposes.

Public Law 87–205 (H.R. 5964): Authorizes the use and distribution of funds already appropriated to satisfy a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission in favor of the Potawatomi Nation of Indians. The judgment, based on inadequate consideration for Potawatomi land in Iowa and Kansas which was ceded to the United States in 1846, amounted to about $3,288,975 less litigation costs and attorney fees of $312,052. Under the act the prairie band will receive $^{780}/_{2,180}$ of the award and the citizens band will receive $^{1,400}/_{2,180}$ of the judgment. This proportion arises from an 1873 agreement in which the two bands agreed to divide the assets of the nation on the basis of the relative number of their enrolled members. Per capita distributions, if any are made, are not subject to Federal or State income tax.

Public Law 87–284, CHURCH, by request (S. 1807): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey the title to two homestead sites located within the Chilocco Indian Industrial School Reserve in Oklahoma upon completion of payments required by existing homestead agreements. The two homesteads, each containing 5 acres, have been declared excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Public Law 87–609 (H.R. 12355): Extends by 3 years the time within which certain provisions of the act of August 25, 1959, are to be carried out. The 1959 act provided the rules governing completion of disposition of the assets of the Choctaw Tribe. Under the 1959 law the Secretary of the Interior was directed to dispose of the lands—except a one-half mineral interest—belonging to the Choctaw Tribe and held by the United States in trust for the tribe or subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States. A legal entity was to be organized under the laws of Oklahoma, as the successor in interest to the Choctaw Tribe to hold the reserved mineral interest, and if it so chose, to take title to the Choctaw lands. The tribe has had to engage in several lawsuits in order to protect its claims with respect to tribal land that is to be disposed of. Additional litigation is in contemplation. This, plus unforeseen problems in organizing a suitable entity to take over tribal assets, makes necessary an extension of the time allowed under the 1959 act.

Public Law 87–775 (H.R. 11590) (S. 3250, MONRONEY-KERR): Provides for the per capita distribution of an appropriation heretofore made in satisfaction of a judgment awarded the Cherokee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma by the Indian Claims Commission. The fund amounts to nearly $14,800,000 less offsets, attorneys' fees and expenses. About 42,000 enrollees or their heirs are potentially entitled to share in the distribution. The net amount available for distribution will thus average about $283 for each enrollee. The act will simplify distribution problems and eliminate the necessity of distributing shares which are so small as not to warrant the expense involved, free recipients of distributive shares from the possibility of income tax liability, and limit the effects which the distribution might otherwise have on social security eligibility. Cost of distribution will be borne by the tribe.

OREGON

S. 3342, CHURCH, by request: Approves an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Klamath Indian irrigation project, Oregon. The act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 719), terminating the Klamath Indian Tribe authorized the adjustment or cancellation of reimbursable construction, operation, and maintenance charges against the Indian land on the Klamath irrigation project. The Secretary of the Interior, by an order on April 10, 1961, canceled a total of $266,619.64 of construction and operation and maintenance costs on Indian land. This bill would adjust or cancel reimbursable charges against non-Indian lands within the Klamath project in accordance with the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), which requires congressional approval. A total of $329,301.86 in construction costs and $72,138.69 in operation and maintenance costs is canceled on the non-Indian land. The effect of the bill is to place the non-Indian landowners on this project in the same position as the Indian owners. S. 3342 was reported by the House Interior Committee but failed of enactment.

Public Law 87–202 (H.R. 5235) (S. 1309, MORSE-NEUBERGER): Permits the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon to acquire non-Indian land situated within the reservation boundaries and to take title in a trust status. The reservation contains about 600,000 acres, of which about 3,700 acres are held by non-Indian owners. Of these 3,700 acres only a 313-acre tract is immediately desirable to the Warm Springs Indians. This tract includes the Kahneeta Hot Springs which have been commercially operated by non-Indian owners for many years. The tract is for sale—appraised value of $165,000—and the tribe has an option to purchase it to be operated as a tribal enterprise. Annual appropriation acts of the Department of the Interior have contained a provision prohibiting the use of tribal funds for the acquisition of land or water rights within the State of Oregon if the acquisition would result in the property being exempted from taxation. This act will permit the acquisition of fee land within the reservation notwithstanding this provision.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Public Law 87–379 (H.R. 3572) (S. 630, CASE of South Dakota): Places in trust status 1,276.25 acres of federally owned lands on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation. The land was purchased in 1944 with Federal funds for cattle-raising activities at the Crow Creek Indian school which closed in 1954. The tribe will lose much of its present land in connection with the construction of Big Bend Dam on the Missouri River, and the lands donated by this act will provide some homesites for dislocated Indians. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to consider whether value of these lands should or should not be set off against any claim the tribe may have.

Public Law 87–734 (H.R. 5144) (S. 1251, MUNDT and CASE of South Dakota): Reimburses individual Indian landowners and the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe in South Dakota for the trust lands acquired by the United States for the construction and operation of the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Missouri River. Compensates the tribe and its members for treaty and tribal damanges, and provides for the improvement of the social and economic conditions of the members of the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe.

Takes the entire outstanding interest, including gravel but excluding oil, gas, and other minerals, in 14,299.03 acres of tribal and individual trust land and such interest as the tribe may have in the bed of the Missouri River for which the United States will pay $825,000 from funds appropriated for Big Bend Dam. The Government will also pay, by way of intangible and indirect damages, $400,715 in settlement of all claims, rights, and demands of the tribe and individual Indians arising from the taking. This figure includes $26,910 for the tribe's interests in the bed of the river. Out of the $400,715, not to exceed $247,325, will be available to pay the expenses and losses incident to moving and relocating members of the tribe directly affected by the taking.

Authorizes the appropriation of $1,968,750 for rehabilitation funds for development of individual and family plans, relocating, reestablishing, and providing other assistance designed to improve the economic and social conditions of approximately 900 enrolled members of the tribe, both on and off the reservation. This is the largest sum per capita ever recommended for rehabilitation purposes, but in view of the need and the fact that the Lower Brule Tribe has twice been called upon to give up its best bottom land for dam purposes, a generous rehabilitation program is warranted.

The act also provides for expenditures of approximately $1,300,000 by the United States for the following purposes:

First. The relocation and reconstruction of the town of Lower Brule to take the place of the present town of Lower Brule which will be inundated by Big Bend Dam.

Second. Relocation and reestablishment of Indian cemeteries, tribal monuments, and shrines within the taking area.

Third. Construction of replacement roads and replacement or reconstruction of existing essential governmental and agency facilities.

Fourth. Expenses of the tribal council incurred in connection with the taking of the land for the Big Bend project, not to exceed $75,000, including appraiser fees and the fees and expenses of the tribal attorney.

The act confers on members of the tribe the following rights or privileges:

First. To remain on and use the lands taken until required to vacate.

Second. To cut and remove timber and to salvage the improvements.

Third. To graze stock without charge on the former trust land acquired by the United States between the water level of the reservoir and the taking line to the extent that this land is not devoted to other beneficial uses as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

Fourth. To have free access to the shoreline of the reservoir including, as a part thereof, the right to hunt and fish subject to regulations.

The act contains authority to purchase land and to sell tribal land for the purposes of first, providing substitute land for individual Indians who owned land within the taking area of Fort Randall or Big Bend projects; second, consolidating land holdings; and, third, eliminating fractionated heirship interests within the reservation.

Public Law 87-735 (H.R. 5165) (S. 1252, CASE of South Dakota, and MUNDT): Reimburses individual Indian landowners and the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe for the trust lands acquired by the United States for the construction and operation of the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir on the Missouri River, compensates the tribe and its members for treaty and tribal damages, and provides for the improvement of the social and economic conditions of the members of the tribe.

The act takes the entire outstanding interest, including gravel but excluding oil, gas, and other minerals, in 6,283.57 acres of tribal and individual trust land. It also takes such interest as the tribe may have in the bed of the Missouri River.

As compensation for the lands, the United States will pay $355,000 from funds appropriated for Big Bend Dam. The Government will also pay, by way of intangible and indirect damages, $209,302 in settlement of all claims, rights, and demands of the tribe and individual Indians arising from the taking. This figure includes $13,890 for the tribe's interests in the bed of the river.

The act also authorizes the appropriation of $3,802,500 for rehabilitation through family plans, relocation, and other assistance designed to improve the economic and social conditions of 1,800 enrolled members of the tribe, on and off the reservation. The rehabilitation fund is the largest sum per capita ever recommended for this purpose, but in view of the need and the fact that the Crow Creek Tribe has twice been called upon to give up its best bottom land for dam purposes, a generous program is warranted.

The act provides for expenditures of approximately $590,000 for the following purposes:

First. The location and construction of a Fort Thompson townsite, including a community center.

Second. Relocation and reestablishment of Indian cemeteries, tribal monuments, and shrines within the taking area.

Third. Construction of replacement roads and replacement or reconstruction of existing essential governmental and agency facilities.

Fourth. Expenses of the tribal council incurred in connection with the taking of the land for the Big Bend project, not to exceed $75,000, including fees of an appraiser and fees and expenses of the tribal attorney.

The act confers on members of the tribe the following rights or privileges:

First. To remain on and use the lands taken until required to vacate.

Second. To cut and remove timber and to salvage the improvements on the lands taken.

Third. To graze stock without charge on the former trust land acquired by the United States to the extent that this land is not devoted to other beneficial uses as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

Fourth. To have free access to the shoreline of the reservoir including, as a part thereof, the right to hunt and fish subject to regulations.

The act contains authority to purchase land and to sell tribal land for the purposes of first providing substitute land for individual Indians who owned land within the taking area of Fort Randall or Big Bend projects; second, consolidating landholdings; and third, eliminating fractionated heirship interests within the reservation.

UTAH

Public Law 87-698, Moss (S. 1924): Amends the Uintah and Ouray Reservation Termination Act of August 27, 1954, which provided for the division of Ute tribal assets between the mixed-blood and the fullblood members and the termination of Federal trust over the property of the mixed-blood members. Section 10 of the Termination Act excepted from the division and retained in common ownership all mineral rights and all claims against the United States, and the Ute Development Corp. handles the assets and distributes income from the undivided tribal property. Public Law 87-698 will insure that the mixed-bloods' corporation stock will not be lost by being offered as security for minor debts so long as the stock remains in the ownership of the original stockholder or his heirs or legatees. The stock will not be subject to mortgage, hypothecation, execution, or similar process.

WASHINGTON

Public Law 87-298 (H.R. 8236) (S. 2123, JACKSON, by request): Provides for the disposition of a $1 million judgment—less attorney fees and expenses—recovered by one of the Confederated Tribes in Indian Claims Commission docket 181. The provisions of the act also cover such amounts, if any, as may be awarded in several other dockets pending before the Indian Claims Commission. Any per capita distribution that may be made under the provisions of the bill will not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

Public Law 87- , JACKSON (S. 507): Sets aside in trust approximately 85 acres of land within the Quinaielt Reservation for the benefit of the Quinaielt Tribe. The lands were purchased by the United States for lighthouse purposes in 1914. The lands are now excess to Federal needs. The act directs the Indian Claims Commission to determine the extent to which the value of the title conveyed to the Indians should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

S. 2087, JACKSON, by request: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Washington, without consideration, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in approximately 14.56 acres of federally owned land located on the Quinault Reservation, together with the improvements and utilities located on the land. Authorizes the Secretary to donate to the State of Washington federally owned equipment that is now in the possession of the State under a fire protection agreement. The land, buildings, and equipment have a total value of approximately $92,267. S. 2087 passed the Senate July 27, 1961, but was not acted upon by the House Interior Committee.

WISCONSIN

Public Law 87-25, CHURCH, by request (S. 1298): Permits the Secretary to revoke in part or in entirety the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation in Wisconsin. The act of May 19, 1924, reserved approximately 700 acres of land in certain designated sections of the Lac du Flambeau Reservation for a school and agency farm. The Bureau of Indian Affairs still needs for administrative purposes about 15 acres; the balance is no longer needed and will be restored to its prior status of tribal land. It will then be subject to regulations that are applicable to such land. The bill is so drawn that if the 15 acres, or any part of them, become surplus, they can also be removed from reserve status.

Public Law 87–432 (H.R. 4130) (S. 870, PROXMIRE and WILEY): Provides financial assistance to Menominee County, Wis., for a transitional period after April 30, 1961, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, notwithstanding the Menominee Termination Act of 1954, to make grants either to the State of Wisconsin for distribution to the county or town of Menominee or directly to the county or town, for contributions to joint school district costs up to a maximum of $660,000 over a 5-year period.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is authorized to construct such sanitation facilities on the former Menominee Reservation as he finds are reasonable and justified and to expend for this purpose not more than $438,000.

The purpose of the act is to lessen the impact of termination of Federal services to this group of Indians and to aid the new Menominee County in providing services to its citizens.

WYOMING

Public Law 87-516 (H.R. 3444) (S. 536, HICKEY and MCGEE): Approves an order of the Secretary adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands on the Wind River Indian irrigation project in Wyoming. The act of June 22, 1936, authorizes the Secretary to cancel, adjust, and defer water charges in whole or in part or to enter into contracts if departmental investigations prove them to be too high for the farms to be profitably operated. The act provides that his determination shall not be effective until approved by act of Congress.

An investigation of the Wind River project was completed in 1956 and three schedules of cancellation involving 103 owners and charges of $36,439 plus accrued interest were submitted to Congress with the required findings. This act will ratify the Secretary's order and thus complete the cancellations and deferments.

OTHER SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIONS

Indian heirship: One of the most important problems on which the subcommittee acted during the 87th Congress related to a legislative solution to the complicated problem of multiple ownership of Indian allotted lands. Following the completion of an exhaustive study of the subject in the 86th Congress which was printed and widely distributed, Senator CHURCH introduced S. 1392. Hearings were held on this bill on August 9 and 10, 1961, and the hearings were printed. Careful study was given to the testimony on S. 1392, and subsequently in the second session Senator CHURCH introduced a second heirship bill, S. 2899, and hearings were conducted on this proposal on April 2 and 3, 1962. The hearings were printed.

The subcommittee has accumulated a great deal of information about the heirship problem, its effect upon the individual Indian owners, and the administrative burden that the problem creates. A number of excellent recommendations and suggestions were presented to the subcommittee by attorneys and representatives of Indian tribes, all of which are being studied in detail, looking toward the formulation of legislation on the subject to be introduced early in the 88th Congress.

On September 21, 1962, the House passed H.R. 3529, a bill to amend the act of June 25, 1910, with respect to the sale of Indian timber. Much of this timberland is in heirship status, and because this problem is closely related to that sought to be resolved by S. 2899, the subcommittee put over until next year consideration of a timber bill.

Submarginal lands: S. 2183 was introduced by Senator CHURCH at the request of the Department of the Interior, and its purpose is to provide for the conveyance in a trust status of approximately 346,000 acres of submarginal lands that are currently being used by Indians of the reservations on which the lands are located. The subcommittee held a hearing on April 3, 1962, but took no action pending receipt of a detailed report requested from the General Accounting Office. The Comptroller General's report was not received until August 13, 1962, and it was not possible to schedule further action on S. 2183 and related bills during the time remaining in the second session of the Congress.

Land donations: At the conclusion of the 87th Congress, there were pending in the subcommittee several House-passed bills—H.R. 4592, H.R. 10452, H.R. 10485, and H.R. 10530—and Senate companion bills that would donate surplus Federal lands to Indian tribes in a trust status. The subcommittee did not act on these measures for the reason that a motion by Senator ALLOTT, of Colorado, that the subcommittee adopt a resolution spelling out guidelines of the conditions under which surplus lands would be conveyed to Indians had not been acted upon. It is expected that this subject will be taken up again in the 88th Congress.

S. 337: The subcommittee considered S. 337, a bill authorizing the enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation to acquire tribal lands of the reservation. The sale of these lands to the tribal members was requested in order that economic farming and ranching units might be blocked out on the reservation. The subcommittee amended the bill to provide that the title in lands sold could be taken in fee or in trust as determined by the Secretary. The tribe objected to this amendment, and at their request no further action was taken on the bill.

Senate Joint Resolution 168: The subcommittee also considered Senate Joint Resolution 168, to cancel any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against certain non-Indian lands. A hearing was held on this bill on June 11, 1962. Due to a lack of adequate information about the problem, the joint resolution was not acted upon, and the Department of the Interior was requested to initiate an investigation and study of the Wind River project, to be submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs early in the 88th Congress so that corrective legislation may be further considered.

S. 3178 (ANDERSON, CHURCH): This proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to finance the testimony of expert witnesses needed by Indian claimants before the Indian Claims Commission. The need arose out of a decision in the Crow case, and following receipt of favorable reports from the executive departments, the subcommittee held hearings on the bill. No action was taken.

S. 3056 (ANDERSON, CHAVEZ): This bill would amend the act of October 31, 1949, by authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a county hospital in Albuquerque, N. Mex., to provide facilities for the treatment of Indians. The purpose of the bill was to provide for a minimum bed level at the hospital which would be available for Indian patients. It was possible to arrive at an administrative solution to the problem, and no action was taken on S. 3056.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

During the 87th Congress, 68 Senate bills, 4 joint resolutions, and 10 House bills were referred to the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee, as well as 11 small reclamation project proposals and 10 rehabilitation and betterment contracts, and 2 drainage and minor construction reclamation projects. In addition hearings were held on the San Luis contract between the Department of the Interior and the State of California; the proposed release of water for sediment control in the lower Colorado River; the proposal of the Department of the Interior for the construction of transmission lines as a part of the Colorado River storage project; and various other matters.

Field hearings were held in Eden and Riverton, Wyo., on legislation that had been proposed for the relief of the settlers on the projects. In addition a field hearing was also held in Rawlins, Wyo., on the Savery-Pothook project, which is near the Colorado-Wyoming line and affects both States.

NEW PROJECTS

S. 103, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws.

Favorably reported by the full committee with amendments on August 1, 1962. Reported to the Senate with amendments, August 7, 1962.

The bill would authorize the construction of Auburn Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant on the north fork of American River, the Folsom South Canal and distribution works, and facilities to provide a water supply to the Forest Hill divide and Folsom-Malby areas. This Department has transmitted to the Congress a planning report recommending construction of the Auburn-Folsom south unit. The facilities described in the bill are generally consistent with that report. This multiple-purpose unit represents an additional stage of the plan to conserve and make more useful the waters of the American River under the provisions of the American River Basin Development Act of October 14, 1949. It would be coordinated with and made an integral part of the Central Valley project.

The Auburn Dam would form a 1-million-acre-foot reservoir and would include a 155,000-kilowatt powerplant at the toe of the dam. It would supply 265,000 acre-feet of water annually to the Folsom South Canal in addition to the water to be supplied by the Folsom Reservoir. It would also provide additional flood protection to the American River area and the city of Sacramento, and add 516 million kilowatt-hours annually to the Central Valley project hydroelectric power generation. Its cost is estimated to be $138,812,000, including $557,000 for recreation lands and basic public use facilities. The total benefit-cost ratio for this feature on a 100-year period of analysis is 2.24 to 1. On a 50-year period, using direct benefits only, the ratio is 1.53 to 1.

S. 107, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation projects and the initial state of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project.

Public Law 87–483. Approved June 13, 1962.

This legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project. The construction and operation of these works coordinated with the operation of the Navajo Reservoir, which is presently under construction, would enable New Mexico to put to use a major portion of the water of the Upper Colorado River system to which it is entitled under the Colorado River compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin compact. The Navajo Indian irrigation project would provide for the irrigation of about 110,000 acres for the benefit of the Navajo Indians. The initial phase of the San Juan-Chama project would provide for the diversion from the San Juan Basin to the Rio Grande Basin of about 110,000 acre-feet of water annually to be used to supply irrigation water to an estimated 121,000 acres of land in the Rio Grande Basin and furnish additional municipal and industrial water to the city of Albuquerque.

S. 114, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma.

Passed the Senate, as amended, June 26, 1962.

This project is located in southwestern Oklahoma in Jefferson, Stephens, Cotton, and Comanche Counties. Waurika damsite is in Jefferson County about 6 miles northwest of Waurika on Beaver Creek, a tributary of Red River. The urban areas which would be furnished water supplies from Waurika Reservoir surround the Beaver Creek Basin. The lands to be irrigated from the reservoir are located along the north bank of the Red River near Ryan, Okla., near the confluence of Beaver Creek, about 20 miles downstream from Waurika Dam site.

The Waurika project would provide for maximum practicable regulation of Beaver Creek flows at the damsite for the dominant purpose of municipal and industrial water supply for six municipalities and an oil refinery and a vital national defense installation. It would provide for construction of the Waurika Dam and Reservoir; an aqueduct system to deliver Beaver Creek flows from the reservoir to the cities of Lawton—including Fort Sill—Duncan, Waurika, Comanche, Temple, Walters, and the DX-Sunray refinery; a pumping plant and distribution system at a point 20 miles below the damsite to deliver reservoir releases to lands in the vicinity of Ryan, Okla., for the irrigation of about 2,000 acres; and recreation and fish and wildlife facilities. The project would provide essentially full control of floods on Beaver Creek at the Waurika damsite and desirable flood control benefits along the Red River.

S. 230, to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

Reported to the Senate with amendments, August 3, 1961.

This project would provide for necessary modifications in the Missouri River Basin project authorizations to accommodate the special conditions of the Garrison diversion unit. The principal revision would be to reduce the irrigated acreage from the original proposed 1,007,000 acres to 250,000 acres, with the corresponding decrease in costs.

The plan of development for the initial stage provides for irrigation of 250,000 acres, a municipal and industrial water supply for 15 towns and cities, 24 areas for fish and wildlife conservation, and recreation development at 7 major water impoundments. Flood control and incidental drainage of nonirrigable lands are other benefits.

Six areas make up the 250,000 acres. They constitute a feasible development, but other areas could also be used in the event any should drop out of the initial development. The system includes 1,932 miles of canals and laterals, 4 regulating reservoirs, 156 pumping plants, and about 2,265 miles of drains to control ground and surface water. Pumping power will be supplied by either existing or proposed federally constructed facilities, or by wheeling over electric cooperative or utility lines.

The facilities to serve the modified plan will be constructed during a period of about 11 years to full initial size, with first delivery water for irrigation during the fifth year of construction. Construction of deferred drains is expected to continue for another 20 years.

S. 284, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado.

Public Law 87–590.

Reported to the Senate July 19, 1962. Senate passed H.R. 2206, August 6. Approved August 16, 1962.

This authorizes the construction and operation by the Secretary of the Interior of the multiple-purpose Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado, for furnishing supplemental irrigation water, furnishing industrial and municipal water, controlling floods on the Arkansas River, supplying electric power and energy, and other incidental purposes. The project would constitute a major step in maximum utilization of water and land resources in Colorado.

Supplemental irrigation water would be made available for approximately 280,000 acres of land through the transmountain diversion of an average of about 83,000 acre-feet of water annually—including additional diversions through existing works—the conservation of floodflows in the Arkansas Valley, the reregulation of winter flows there, and the reuse of return flows. In addition, about 20,500 acre-feet of water would be made available annually to meet the rapidly expanding municipal water needs of Colorado Springs, Pueblo, and other Arkansas Valley towns. Operation of the project for flood control would prevent a large part of the flood damages which, under present conditions, occur annually in the Arkansas Valley. The hydroelectric plants and related facilities would provide over half a billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually to meet the expanding power and energy needs in the area. Also, the project would benefit fish and wildlife, provide recreational opportunities, help control sediment, and prevent stream pollution.

S. 308, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

Reported favorably to the full committee, July 31, 1962. Companion bill, H.R. 575, reported to Senate, September 5, 1962.

The development of the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Oregon, would be a multipurpose project, including the functions of irrigation, flood control, fish and wildlife, and recreation. Project works would consist of the earth and rock-filled Mason Dam and 100,000 acre-foot reservoir on the Powder River some 18 miles upstream from the city of Baker, the Lilley pumping plant and relift pumping plant, minimum recreation facilities, and a hydrologic network consisting of precipitation gages and snow courses to predict runoff from the drainage basin above the reservoir. The irrigators contemplate rehabilitating and extending the present distribution systems so no new diversion structures, canals, or laterals would be constructed as part of the potential Federal development.

Approximately 13,990 acres of the project lands now receive a partial water supply, primarily by flooding the lands during the spring runoff. After July 1 of most years, there is little natural streamflow and, except for a small amount of pumping from wells, the irrigation season is at an end. The water that would be stored in Mason Reservoir would provide a reasonably firm water supply to the 13,990 acres over the entire irrigation season as well as a full water supply to 4,010 acres that are not now irrigated.

S. 405, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho. H.R. 529, companion bill.

S. 405 passed the Senate June 26, 1962. Public Law 87–589, approved August 16, 1962.

The plan of development for the Mann Creek project would provide a supplemental water supply to 4,465 presently irrigated acres and, in addition, would provide an adequate water supply to 595 acres which are not now irrigated. The principal works consist of the Spangler Dam and Reservoir on Mann Creek, diversion facilities from the reservoir to the existing distribution systems, and drainage facilities for the Mann Creek area of the project. The Spangler Reservoir would have a total capacity of 13,000 acre-feet, of which 11,000 would be active storage—prorated 9,400 acre-feet to the Mann Creek Irrigation District and 1,600 acre-feet to the Monroe Creek Irrigation District.

S. 594, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project, Alaska, and for other purposes.

Reported to the Senate, July 25, 1962. Taken from calendar and rereferred to Public Works, August 28, 1962.

The plan of development for the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project, consists of tunnels from existing Crater and Long Lakes leading to a single powerplant at tidewater on Speel River with the necessary transmission facilities to deliver the power to the Juneau area. The natural lakes are at elevations 1,022 and 815 feet above mean sea level, respectively. The proposed tunnel intakes would be at such elevations as to permit drawing down the natural levels of these lakes by about 200 feet and 165 feet, respectively, thereby creating approximately 270,000 acre-feet of active storage regulation. The pressure tunnel from Crater Lake would be 7 feet in diameter and 6,175 feet long, ending in a 20-foot-diameter surge tank. The tunnel from Long Lake would be 10.5 feet in diameter and 8,150 feet long with a similar surge tank. Steel penstocks would lead from the surge tanks to the powerplant.

The powerplant would consist of three turbine-generator units, providing a total installed capacity of 60,000 kilowatts and an average annual energy output of about 303,300,000 kilowatt-hours, consisting of 280 million kilowatt-hours of firm energy and 23,300,000 kilowatt-hours of nonfirm energy. This power would be delivered to the Juneau area over a 115,000-volt transmission line 38.7 miles long, 2.7 miles of which would be in submarine cable under Taku Inlet.

Because of the provision of this bill that the project would be constructed by the Corps of Engineers but be operated and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation. The report on it recommended that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works for further consideration.

S. 809, to authorize the transfer of a Bureau of Reclamation bridge across the Colorado River near Needles, Calif., to San Bernardino County, Calif., and Mohave County, Ariz.

Public Law 87–156. Approved August 17, 1961.

The purpose is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a Bureau of Reclamation bridge which crosses the Colorado River approximately 1 mile east of Needles, Calif., to the counties of San Bernardino, Calif., and Mohave, Ariz. The transfer would be made without monetary consideration and would be subject to terms and conditions specified by the Secretary.

S. 892 (H.R. 23), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Arbuckle reclamation project, Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

S. 892 reported to the Senate August 3, 1962. H.R. 23 approved August 24. Public Law 87–594.

The plan of development for the Arbuckle project provides as a Federal project, first, the construction of the Arbuckle Dam and Reservoir; second, the construction of pipelines and pumping facilities required for the delivery of water to the project cities; third, the purchase and development of lands for fish and wildlife purposes; and fourth, the development of basic recreational facilities at the reservoir site.

The Arbuckle Dam and Reservoir site is located on Rock Creek about 4 miles above its confluence with the Washita River near Dougherty, Okla. The dam would be a rolled earthfill structure 139 feet high and 1,870 feet long. The reservoir would have a total capacity of 226,450 acre-feet, of which 120,650 acre-feet would be surcharge. The balance of the capacity is tentatively allocated to provide 58,300 acre-feet for municipal and industrial water supply, 35,900 acre-feet for flood control, and 11,600 acre-feet is dead and sediment storage. The surface area at the top of the conservation—water supply—pool at elevation 871 is 2,248 acres.

S. 923, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to replace lateral pipelines, line discharge pipelines, and to do other work he determines to be required for the Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake Irrigation Districts in the State of Idaho.

Reported to the Senate August 25, 1961. Indefinitely postponed September 11, 1961—see H.R. 4458.

The purpose of S. 923 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to replace lateral pipelines, perform interior lining of discharge lines, and do other work he determines to be required in the replacement, modification, or improvement of facilities heretofore constructed by the United States for the Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake Irrigation Districts in the State of Idaho.

Replacement of pipelines or lining of existing pipelines serving the three districts is necessary because of accelerated interior and exterior corrosion and deterioration of such pipelines. Corrosion has penetrated the pipe in numerous places, and it is estimated that 50 percent or more of the surface area of the lighter gage pipe will be penetrated before 1963 and the situation will grow progressively worse. Considering the fact that the livelihood of a large number of farmers is dependent upon the proper functioning of this distribution system, the need for replacement is considered urgent.

S. 970, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska, and for other purposes.

Passed the Senate, amended, September 21, 1961.

The project is located in central Nebraska along the north side of the Platte River. Lands to be benefited cover a width of from 10 to 20 miles from east of Lexington to the vicinity of Silver Creek, Nebr. There are approximately 550,000 acres of land within the mid-State district boundaries, of which about 363,000 acres have been designated as arable. Nearly 260,000 acres of land are now dependent on wells and pumps drawing upon the ground water and upon streams for their irrigation supplies.

The project would provide a regulated gravity and well combination water supply for approximately 140,000 acres of land and would replenish and stabilize to the maximum extent practicable the aquifer from which about 4,600 irrigation wells are pumping ground waters within the boundaries of the district. In addition, the development would produce substantial flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits. Provision also is made for initial irrigation pumping power and for ultimate development of commercial power.

S. 1023, to amend the act of August 20, 1954 (68 Stat. 752) in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of additional features of the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon.

Passed the Senate March 8, 1962. Approved October 1, 1962. Public Law 87–727.

S. 1060, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes.

Passed the Senate, amended, September 15, 1961. Cleared for President, September 28, 1962.

The Oroville-Tonasket unit is a proposed irrigation development in the Okanogan River Basin in northern Washington. The lands are located along the river and on benches and slopes on both sides of the river in the general vicinity of the towns of Oroville and Tonasket. The area is about 25 miles long and 3 miles wide at its widest point. It contains 8,450 acres of irrigable lands, of which about 6,950 were irrigated and 1,500 acres have no water supply. Of the total irrigable area, about 7,500 acres are within the boundaries of the presently operating Oroville-Tonasket Irrigation District. The intention is for all lands within the unit to be incorporated within the district. The objective of the plan is to construct new irrigation works and rehabilitate portions of the present district so as to provide an adequate irrigation water supply to the 1,500 acres now dry and to supply about 3,650 acre-feet of supplemental water annually to the remainder of the irrigable area. This will require a total average annual new diversion water supply of about 13,850 acre-feet.

S. 1085, to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property on the Minidoka project, Idaho, Shoshone project, Wyoming, and Yakima project, Washington, and for other purposes.

Public Law 87-151. Approved August 17, 1961.

The purpose of H.R. 7601 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain Federal property located on the Minidoka project, Idaho, the Shoshone project, Wyoming, and the Yakima project, Washington, and to use the proceeds from such sales for the construction or expansion of operation and maintenance headquarters facilities serving the three projects.

S. 1139, to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the waters of the Little Missouri River in order to extend the expiration date of such act.

Public Law 87-452. Approved May 15, 1962.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this legislation is to allow 4 years' additional time for the negotiation of a certain compact by the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming for an appointment of the waters of the Little Missouri River and its tributaries.

S. 1581, for the allocation of costs on the Wapato-Satus unit of the Wapota Indian irrigation project.

Passed the Senate September 15, 1961. H.R. 115 approved September 26, 1961. Public Law 87-316.

The principal purposes of S. 1581 are to fix the final construction costs of the irrigation works that have been constructed on the Wapato-Satus unit of the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Washington, to allocate those costs among the lands that can be served by those works, and to provide a formula for distributing construction costs hereafter incurred for serving additional lands. The portion of the costs that are allocated to non-Indian land will be assessed, and the portion that is allocated to Indian land will be deferred under the Leavitt Act of July 1, 1932.

S. 1697, to approve the amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Huntley Project Irrigation District, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes.

Public Law 87-168. Approved August 30, 1961.

S. 1697 will approve the repayment contract negotiations that have taken place between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Huntley Project Irrigation District in Montana and will authorize the execution of that repayment contract.

The Huntley project was authorized in 1905, to serve approximately 32,000 acres of land. The original land classification, in 1905, recognized a considerable acreage of so-called class 3 lands, consisting largely of heavy textured alkaline soils. In 1925, reclassification of lands, which was the basis for the Huntley project adjustments approved by the act of May 25, 1956, designated 831 acres as permanently unproductive and 13,476 acres, including 1,336 acres of unpledged lands, as temporarily unproductive.

S. 1988, to aid in the administration of the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California, and for other purposes.

Passed the Senate May 16, 1952.

Generally the bill provides:

First. The public lands within the boundaries of the Executive orders establishing the Tule Lake, upper Klamath, and lower Klamath refuges in California and Oregon will be retained in Federal ownership with the major purpose of waterfowl management. Homesteading would be prohibited.

Second. The agricultural use of these lands will be continued under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Third. The revenues from the leases will be shared equitably with the local counties on the basis of a payment of 25 percent of the lease revenues but not to exceed 50 percent of the average per acre tax levied on similar lands in private ownership.

Fourth. The basic question is what will be the ultimate use of the 15,000 acres of leased agricultural land within the Tule Lake refuge and 6,400 acres in the Klamath Straits unit within the lower Klamath refuge. Local interests have held that these lands should be sold or made available for homesteading. Conservation and wildlife groups have urged maximum use of these lands for waterfowl.

S. 2008, to amend the act of September 16, 1959 (73 Sta. 561, 43 U.S.C. 615a), relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Spokane Valley project.

Approved September 5, 1962. Public Law 87-630. Passed the Senate, as amended in committee, September 19, 1961. August 24, 1962, Senate concurred in House amendments.

As now proposed, the Spokane Valley project would provide a replacement water supply for irrigation to 7,250 acres of land in the Spokane River Valley in the northeast corner of the State of Washington, and water for domestic use. Irrigation water service to the project lands and adjacent lands has for many years been furnished through a gravity surface water system utilizing water of the Spokane River. The existing works are in a seriously deteriorated condition, and continued operation and maintenance of those works is becoming progressively more difficult and more expensive.

The project plan is to abandon the works now serving the project lands and to substitute closed-pipe pressure distribution systems utilizing water pumped from wells in the abundant ground water aquifer underlying the area. Turnouts from this system will provide water for irrigation of farms and small tracts as well as for delivery to non-Federal domestic water distribution and delivery systems.

S. 2132, to approve the revised June 1957 reclassification of land of the Fort Shaw division of the Sun River project, Montana, and to authorize the modification of the repayment contract with Fort Shaw Irrigation District.

Public Law 87-477. Approved June 8, 1962.

S. 2132 will approve the reclassification of land of the Fort Shaw division of the Sun River project and authorize the modification of the present repayment contract with the Fort Shaw Irrigation District.

The Fort Shaw division is one of the older projects of the Bureau of Reclamation. Construction of works for the irrigation of 16,000 acres was started in 1905, and the first water delivered in 1909.

Reclassification of lands in 1959 indicate that 531.77 acres of pay lands have been determined to be permanently unproductive and 36.47 acres of formerly determined unproductive land have been reclassified into a productive category. The changes in the repayment contract indicated by the reclassification are: $7,702.59 charge against 531.77 acres will be written off; $1,193.67 charge for 34.74 acres will be added to the contract; and there will be no extension of the payout period.

SALINE WATER CONVERSION

S. 2156 and H.R. (Public Law 87-295).

This measure provides for a $75 million 6-year program for an expanded saline conversion research and development program. Its principal purpose is to provide funds for broad basic research to supply new ideas and basic data necessary for the development of new processes to accomplish the goal of truly low-cost desalinization. The bill does not provide for financing construction or the participation in the financing of further demonstration plants.

S. 2179, to amend section 9(d)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U.S.C. 485), to make additional provision for irrigation blocks, and for other purposes.

Approved August 28, 1962. Public Law 87-613. Passed the Senate May 17, 1962.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend repayment contracts with irrigation districts to provide for block development where that was not originally provided for. Block development permits irrigation to get started earlier in part of a district as soon as progress with construction will permit, while construction continues in the balance of the district. Testimony indicated that it is not always wise or possible to complete construction of a project and have water available for all the lands at the same time. In order to equalize the burden of the construction costs on all irrigators the committee feels that the Department proposals offer the best means accomplishing this goal.

The bill would also provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to extend the length of the development periods up to a maximum of 10 years, and to cancel supplemental contracts where the extension of the development period would remove the necessity of such a contract. Under present law the exact length of the development period is written into the repayment contract signed prior to the commencement of construction.

S. 2245, to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota in order to extend the time for such negotiation.

Public Law 87-181. Approved August 30, 1961.

The purpose of this legislation is to allow 2 years' additional time for the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota for equitable apportionment of certain river waters. This bill does not authorize the appropriation of additional funds.

S. 2522, to defer the collection of irrigation, maintenance, and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project.

Public Law 87-440. Approved April 27, 1962.

This bill would authorize the Department of the Interior to defer the collection of $24,000 of operation and maintenance charges due in 1962 from the Angostura Irrigation District. An extended drought has caused a critical water shortage with resultant decreases in crop production. Records indicate that the annual runoff within the basin has been decreasing for the past 3 years. In 1959 it was 42 percent of normal. In 1960 it was 29 percent, while in 1961 only 25 percent of the annual average. Because of the shortage, much of the land was not irrigated with low yields on the balance. Many of the district water users have loans on land, improvements, and equipment. As a result of a situation over which they had no control, many of the landowners are in a critical financial condition and are unable to meet the 1962 charges now due.

S. 2665, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an amendatory contract with the Burley Irrigation District, and for other purposes.

Public Law 87-472. H.R. 9647, approved May 31, 1962.

S. 2665 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into amendatory contracts with the Burley Irrigation District and with the Minidoka Irrigation District, both in Idaho, with respect to the disposition of electric energy and power from the first six units of the Minidoka powerplant, and other matters. Under the contract terms proposed, the districts would give up their present interest in the power revenues from the six units in exchange for a dependable supply of pumping power at a reduced rate.

The exchange of the districts' interest in the power revenues from the Minidoka powerplant for an assured supply of pumping power is not expected to result in any additional cost to the Federal Government. It probably will result in savings to the United States.

S. 3153, to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Passed the Senate August 8, 1962.

The bill would provide that the marketing area of the Federal Columbia River power system be the "Pacific Northwest," approximately the Columbia River drainage. Presently, the Bonneville Project Act, 50 Stat. 731, as amended, provides no limit on the marketing area other than one of economic transmission distance; with extra-high-voltage transmission, this could include most of the Western States.

In general, the bill would permit the Secretary of the Interior to market only surplus power outside the Pacific Northwest. Any contract of the Secretary for the sale of surplus energy must provide that deliveries may be terminated on not to exceed 7 days' notice, if the energy is needed in the Pacific Northwest. For that reason, no energy could be sold outside the region as firm energy. Any contract for the sale of peaking capacity must provide that the arrangement may be terminated on not to exceed 48 months' notice. Exchanges could be made without regard to these restrictions only if the facts warrant a determination by the Secretary of the Interior that the conditions specified in section 5 would be met. Provision would be made for the transmission of non-Federal power over any interconnecting lines between the Pacific Northwest and other regions which may be constructed by the United States. The bill contains no authorization for the construction of Federal lines between those regions. Existing statutes provided such authority.

S. 3162, to approve an amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Quincy Columbia Basin Irrigation District, authorize similar contracts with any of the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 14) as amended, and for other purposes.

Reported to the Senate with amendments, August 9, 1962. Companion bill, H.R. 11164, reported to Senate September 6, 1962. H.R. 11164 passed Senate September 20, 1962. Approved October 1, 1962. Public Law 87-728.

Senate Joint Resolution 76, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior during the calendar year 1962 to continue to deliver water to lands in certain irrigation districts in the State of Washington.

Public Law 87-169. Approved August 30, 1961.

Senate Joint Resolution 151, permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

Public Law 87-479. Approved June 8, 1962.

SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Under Public Law 84-984, the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, all small project applications after approval by the Secretary of the Interior must be submitted to the Interior and Insular Affairs of both the Senate and the House of Representatives for 60 days before appropriations may be made to implement the project, and then only if neither of the committees have by resolution disapproved the proposal.

During the 87th Congress, 11 proposals have been received by the committee. All of these have either been approved by resolution or the 60-day waiting period has expired without unfavorable committee action. The projects are listed as follows:

Eastern Municipal Water District at Hemet, Riverside County, Calif	$4,980,000
Klamath Basin Improvement District, Klamath County, Oreg	942,100
Molokai project, State of Hawaii	4,514,000
Haights Creek Irrigation Co., Kaysville, Utah	340,000
Weber-Box Elder Conservation District, Ogden, Utah	811,000
Cassia Creek Reservoir Co. of Cassia County, Idaho	2,351,600
Grants	146,400
Settlement Canyon Irrigation District of Tooele County, Utah	907,000
Grants	180,000
Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, San Joaquin County, Calif	964,000
Orchard City Irrigation District, Delta County, Colo	270,000
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, El Dorado County, Calif	4,637,000
Roosevelt Irrigation District, Buckeye, Ariz	4,620,000

REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT CONTRACTS

The act of October 7, 1949, as amended, provides that the expenditure of funds specifically appropriated for rehabilitation and betterment of irrigation systems or projects constructed under the Federal reclamation laws shall be made only after the organizations benefiting from such expenditures shall have obligated themselves for the return thereof in installments fixed in accordance with their ability to pay, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the provision that the determination of the Secretary of the Interior does not become effective until the expiration of 60 days after it has been submitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the House.

In accordance with the above requirements 10 contracts were submitted to the committee by the Secretary of the Interior. None of these were rejected.

Extensive hearings were held on the Coachella Valley County Water District contract to determine if the works proposed and the funds to be expended came within the scope of the rehabilitation and betterment act.

The contracts considered and the cost of each follows:

Arch Hurley Conservancy District, Tucumcari project, New Mexico	$750,000
Prosser Irrigation District, Sunnyside division, Yakima project, Washington	346,000
Pathfinder Irrigation District, interstate division, North Platte project, Nebraska	90,000
Coachella Valley County Water District, All-American Canal system, Boulder Canyon project, California	7,150,000
Orchard Mesa division, Grand Valley project, Colorado	$750,000
Sunnyside Irrigation District, Sunnyside division, Yakima project, Washington	517,000
Gem and Ridgeview Irrigation Districts, Owyhee project, Idaho and Oregon	260,000
Gering and Fort Laramie Irrigation District, Fort Laramie division, North Platte project, Nebraska	2,000,000
Bitter Root Irrigation District, Bitter Root project, Montana	510,000
Unit B Irrigation and Drainage District, Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona	450,000

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

The Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs has responsibility for measures relating to the insular possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, except those measures affecting their revenue and appropriations.

Of 15 Senate bills referred to the subcommittee, 3 were reported and subsequently enacted. Of six House bills referred to the subcommittee, two were enacted. These bills are as follows:

Public Law 87-750, S. 2429 (Anderson):

Public Law 87-750 furthers the purposes of the act of August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 940) providing for the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, V.I., by revising the boundaries of the park, subject to valid existing rights, to include adjoining lands and submerged lands and waters.

The legislation has two purposes: First, to enlarge the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park to include adjoining submerged lands and waters in a north offshore area of 4,100 acres and a south offshore area of 1,550 acres; and, second, to permit appropriated funds to be used for the acquisition of other lands and interests which were included within the original boundaries of the park but which have not been acquired.

An appropriation of $1,250,000 is authorized to accomplish the latter purpose. A provision in the Senate bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire inholdings by condemnation was stricken by a House amendment to which the Senate subsequently agreed.

Public Law 87-750 will insure that the exceptional marine features of the offshore areas—including Coral Gardens, among the most beautiful in the world—are preserved. The acquisition of inholdings within the original park boundaries will make it possible to utilize more effectively the existing park facilities and resources.

Public Law 87-419, S. 2774 (Jackson):

Public Law 87-419 amends section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam and section 15 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for appointment of acting secretaries for such territories.

This legislation would authorize the appointment of acting government secretaries during a vacancy in that office or while the secretary is unable to act, is absent, or is acting as Governor. The respective Organic Acts presently provide that the secretary for each territory shall act as Governor when the Governor is absent or unable to act, or when there is a vacancy in that office (48 U.S.C., sec. 1422A, 1595). They also make provision for designation of an Acting Governor when both the Governor and secretary are absent or unable to act or when both officers are vacant (48 U.S.C. secs. 1422B, 1596). There is, however, no authority for the appointment of an acting secretary. By correcting this omission, Public Law 87-419 will facilitate the administration of the territorial governments during the absence of one or more of their principal officials.

The acting secretary will be selected from among territorial department personnel and the legislation provides that he will receive no additional compensation for his work as acting secretary. Consequently, no expenditure of Federal funds will be required by the enactment of Public Law 87-419.

Public Law 87-541, S. 2775 (Jackson):

Public Law 87-541 amends the act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), providing for a continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by increasing the appropriation authorization in section 2 of the act from $7,500,000 to $17,500,000. The legislation provides that not more than $15 million is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1963.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is administered by the Secretary of the Interior under Executive Order No. 10265, as amended, in accordance with a trusteeship agreement between the United States and the Security Council of the United Nations. Under the terms of the agreement, the United States exercises full administrative, judicial, and legislative authority over the former Japanese-administered territories and has undertaken obligations to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants.

The Department of the Interior, by executive communication, requested the introduction of the legislation to remove the ceiling then applicable to appropriation authorization for the administration of the trust territory. This was to permit requests for appropriations substantially in excess of the $7,500,000 ceiling in accordance with the comprehensive program of the Department for development of the trust territory.

Although the appropriation authorization ceiling is not removed by Public Law 87-541 as originally requested by the Department of the Interior, it is raised sufficiently to permit the Department to make proposed appropriation requests through fiscal year 1965.

Public Law 87-421, H.R. 7666; companion bill S. 2088 (Jackson):

Public Law 87-421 amends section 17 (a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 505) pertaining to the salary of the government comptroller. This legislation was requested by the Department of the Interior to establish the salary of the government comptroller of the Virgin Islands in accordance with the standards of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. This would permit the government comptroller to receive such salary adjustments as may be authorized in the future by Congress for those Federal employees under the Classification Act. Prior to the enactment of Public Law 87-421, the compensation of the government comptroller was fixed by the Revised Organic Act at $12,500 per annum.

Public Law 87-688, H.R. 10062; companion bill S. 2440 (Long, Gruening):

Public Law 87-688 extends the application of certain laws to American Samoa. The legislation provides that any Federal department, agency, or corporation may extend to American Samoa, without reimbursement, scientific, technical, or other assistance under any program which it administers and which, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, will promote the welfare of the territory. The Secretary of the Interior may not request assistance which will involve nonreimbursable costs as estimated in advance in excess of an aggregate of $150,000 in any one fiscal year.

Public Law 87-688 also authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to extend to American Samoa the provisions of the National School Act (60 Stat. 230) and authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to extend to American Samoa the benefits of the Vocational Educational Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 775), the Hospital Services Act (70 Stat. 293), the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (60 Stat. 1040), and section 314 of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 693).

Public Law 87-688 will permit technical assistance to be given to American Samoa in such varied fields as tax revision, education, agriculture and fisheries production, harbor development, public utility improvement and land planning and zoning. The extension of the specified grant and aid programs to American Samoa permits the Territory to share in programs presently enjoyed by other insular possessions of the United States.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERALS, MATERIALS, AND FUELS

Twenty-eight measures were referred to the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels during the 87th Congress. Of these, 19 were Senate bills, 2 were Senate joint resolutions, and 7 were House bills.

Eighteen measures were reported favorably by the subcommittee and approved by the full committee.

Major bills considered were:

Stabilization of domestic lead and zinc production—S. 1747, by the chairman; S. 115 by Senator Kerr; and H.R. 84 by Congressman Edmondson. This latter became Public Law 347, 87th Congress.

Stimulation of domestic production of gold and silver. Senate Joint Resolution 44. Two public hearings were held on the measure, but because of administration opposition, no further action was taken. The hearings attracted widespread attention and favorable comment.

Survey of Federal laws for purpose of locating minerals, sponsored by Senator Metcalf.

Among bills on which hearings were held but which were not acted upon favorably were Senator Lausche's bill, S. 3304, for a study of strip mining in the United States. The tariff provisions of my lead and zinc stabilization bill were given intensive study and reported favorably by the full committee, but were deleted by the Finance Committee upon referral to that committee due to the revenue implications.

Also of very substantial public interest was our hearing on the iron ore industry in the Upper Great Lakes—no bill.

Of potential importance is our action in passing the extension of the authority of the U.S. Geological Survey to areas outside the national domain. Public Law 87-625.

Increased Presidential Requests for Money and Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, just 5 short months ago I rose in this Chamber to express concern, not only for myself but for thoughtful citizens everywhere, over the demand for more power for the President and more money to be spent under the President's direction.

At that time I asked unanimous consent that there be placed in the Record a tabulation showing that by the end of April 1962 the President had in 4 months made 62 requests for more spending and 25 requests for more power. I also stated that I intended to advise this body of further requests.

Since that time, his requests for power have multiplied and the call for further appropriations, over and above those originally requested, has continued unabated. Today these totals stand at 88 requests for more spending and 29 requests for additional Executive power.

"Money," said Leon Samson, "is the power of impotence," and "The law," said Aristotle, "has no power to command obedience except that of habit, which can only be given by time, so that a readiness to change from old to new laws enfeebles the power of the law."

I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the Record at this point a tabulation supporting my statement that by the end of September the President had in 1962 made 88 requests for more spending and 29 requests for more power.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PART I, PRESIDENTIAL REQUESTS OF CONGRESS FOR MONEY, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, BEGINNING JANUARY 10, 1962

January 11, 1962: The beginning (President proposes rash of new laws to appropriate Federal funds in state of Union message):

(a) Federal funds to help retrain jobless persons.

(b) Federal funds to train and find work for out-of-school youngsters.

(c) An 8-percent investment tax credit.

(d) Changes in unemployment insurance program.

(e) Federal pay increases.

(f) Higher postal rates.

(g) Imposition of withholding taxes on dividends and interest income.

(h) Extension of excise and corporate tax rates, with some changes affecting transportation industries.

(i) New comprehensive farm program.

(j) Federal aid to medical and dental colleges.

(k) Mass immunization program (State administered).

(l) Compulsory health insurance for aged under social security.

(m) Federal aid to higher education.

(n) Federal aid for public school construction and teachers' salaries.

(o) A 5-year trade expansion act—featuring elimination of many tariffs and reduction of others.

(p) Special fund to give long-term support to Alliance for Progress program in Latin America.

January 18, 1962: Record high $95.5 billion proposed budget for fiscal year 1963.

January 25, 1962: Trade Expansion Act of 1962:

1. Assistance to U.S. workers idled due to increase in imports—to include:

(a) Readjustment allowances—up to 65 percent of individual's average weekly wage for 52 weeks—13 additional weeks for workers over 60 years of age.

(b) Unemployment insurance benefits deducted from workers' allowances to extent available.

(c) Vocational education and training assistance.

(d) Financial assistance for relocation in new communities for those who cannot find employment near their homes.

2. Specific aid to businessmen and farmers—harmed by a flood of foreign goods—to include:

(a) Tax benefits.

(b) Loan guarantees and loans not otherwise commercially available.

January 30, 1962: United Nations bonds: Requested authorization of up to $100 million for purchase of United Nations bonds.

Total issue would amount to $200 million repayable at 2-percent annual interest over a 25-year period.

January 31, 1962: Public welfare programs:

1. Proposed Federal Government provide three-fourths instead of one-half of funds shared with States for rehabilitation and preventive services offered to dependent persons.

2. Proposed increase from $30 million for 1963 to $50 million for 1969 and succeeding years of authorized ceiling for annual grants to States for child welfare services.

3. Requested earmarking of $5 million in 1963 and $10 million a year thereafter for grants to States in establishing day-care programs for young children of working mothers, through revision of the Social Security Act.

4. Provide Federal financial assistance to permit States to maintain community work and training projects for unemployed people receiving welfare payments (under certain stipulated conditions).

5. Increase Federal assistance to States for training of additional welfare agency workers.

6. Extend Federal sharing in assistance payments to both needy relative and his or her spouse when both are living in home with child receiving aid to dependent children payments.

7. Provide small increase in assistance funds to those States which simplify their laws by removing all residence requirements in any of their federally aided programs.

January 31, 1962: Farm program: Proposed pilot projects leading to permanent conversion of some 68 million acres of cropland to grassland, forests, and recreational areas.

Cost estimated at $15 million the first year, rising to as much as $700 million or more annually by mid-1969.

February 1, 1962: International Monetary Fund: Suggested legislation to implement recommendations made by National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems:

(a) Would authorize the United States to lend up to $2 billion to the Fund.

(b) The other nine participating nations to provide the remaining $4 billion.

February 5, 1962: Aid to education: Proposing the expenditure of $5.7 billion to expand and improve the educational system—

(a) Providing Federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools through financing increase in teachers' salaries and building more classrooms.

(b) Supporting, with Federal money, expansion of medical and dental education.

February 7, 1962:

1. Proposed legislation to establish $1 billion Government-created monopoly of privately owned commercial communications system for satellites—operated under supervision of Federal Communications Commission.

2. Supplemental appropriations for 1962 and budget amendments for 1963, including:

(a) Seven proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1962 for various agencies — totaling $418.5 million — plus $700,000 for the District of Columbia.

(b) Amendment to budget for fiscal year 1963 in amount of $2.6 million to Department of Interior for construction of educational television station at American Samoa.

(c) Another amendment to fiscal year 1963 budget to increase by $600,000 amount of money for the Patent Office.

February 13, 1962: Department of Defense request for military construction authorization totaling $1.59 billion.

February 19, 1962: Requested authorization of $2 billion public works program.

February 20, 1962: Proposed increase of Federal Government salaries costs to amount to over $1 billion annually.

February 26, 1962: Program for health insurance for the elderly through social security benefits—a 10-year federally financed program for expanding medical and dental training facilities; nationwide immunization program; increase in funds to National Health Institutes and research facilities, and funds for various mental health programs.

Established costs vary from $1.2 billion to $1.7 billion per year.

Peace Corps: Expansion of Peace Corps—and cost—from $40 million for fiscal year 1962 to $63.8 million for fiscal year 1963.

February 28, 1962: Conservation: To set up a land conservation fund with advances from the Treasury not to exceed $500 million over an 8-year period. Money would be made available from the fund for land acquisition by annual appropriations by the Congress. (The New York Times, Mar. 2, 1962, set the total cost of the President's program at $1 billion.)

March 5, 1962: To amend Small Business Act of 1953, Public Law 85–536. (Would remove statutory limitation on authorizations to appropriate funds, as well as the separate limitations on the amounts of appropriated funds which may be utilized for various SBA assistance programs.)

March 12, 1962: 1. Proposed changes in the temporary extended unemployment compensation program, requiring States to increase weekly unemployment benefits to at least one-half of the former weekly wage up to a fixed maximum. The maximum would also be raised gradually until it reached 66 percent of a State's average wage. A permanent extension of the 13 weeks of benefits would be provided for those having a work history of 3 years.

2. Foreign aid authorizations and appropriations: Requested authorization and appropriations for fiscal year 1963 totaling $4.9 billion for various foreign aid programs. Also proposed $2.7 billion for development lending, and requested $3 billion authorization for the Alliance for Progress program of aid to Latin America for the next 4 years. This authorization to be separate from the supplementary to the $6 billion already authorized for loans for development for 1963 through 1966.

March 13, 1962: Requested a supplementary appropriation of $25 million for fiscal year 1962 for Department of Commerce to provide for construction of pavilion and numerous exhibits at the 1964–65 New York World's Fair.

March 15, 1962: Consumer protection: A lengthy omnibus message containing four legislative proposals and many recommendations to strengthen programs for protection of consumer interests, which ranged from cosmetics and prescription drugs to installment buying interest charges and ultra-high-frequency television. No budgetary estimates were made on the costs of these programs.

March 19, 1962: Asked Congress for $35 million supplementary appropriations for fiscal year 1962 for storm damage relief, $25 million of this amount to replenish the President's disaster relief fund for both current and next fiscal year.

March 26, 1962: Urged immediate congressional approval of a $600 million authorization of Federal grants for various types of public works in areas of substantial unemployment: This, in addition to his request last month for standby authority to expend up to $2 billion on public works projects in future recessions.

March 28, 1962: Balance of payments: Requested appropriations adequate to staff and operate the office of a recommended export coordinator and enlarged functions of Departments of Commerce and State in stimulating exports.

April 3, 1962: New Frontier recreation tax proposal:

1. Proposed that user fees be imposed on pleasure boat owners and on motorists entering national parks or other Federal recreational areas, money to be used to expand our present and future needs of recreational resources.

2. Tax take would amount to an estimated $81 million.

3. Also asked authorization for $500 million from Federal Treasury for recreational land purchases over the next 8 years.

4. Asked for supplemental appropriations of $17.3 million to be distributed to nine different agencies and departments: Less than one-third to be used to restore facilities destroyed during the severe March storm on the east coast.

April 5, 1962: Transportation message:

1. Requested user's tax on inland waterways; 2 cents tariff per gallon on fuel used in such transportation.

2. Stepped-up research program for transportation industry.

3. Proposed abolishing mandatory minimum rates for intercity passenger travel.

4. That airlines be given approval to cut rates in a gradual or temporary basis only.

5. Urged authorization of a long-range program of Federal aid to urban regions for the revitalization and expansion of public mass transportation; wanted grant of $500 million over a 3-year period with $100 million available beginning July 1, 1962.

April 10, 1962: Requested emergency jobless pay extension, a 1-year renewal of a temporary anti-recession-type program cost; $183 billion from special taxes to be collected on 1962 and 1963 payrolls.

April 19, 1962: Proposed amendment to the budget for fiscal year 1963 involving an increase of $2 million for Department of the Interior to start a pilot project to increase productivity of depleted rangelands.

May 10, 1962: Requested amendments to the 1963 budget involving an increase of $101.5 million for Department of Labor, to provide for training of approximately 100,000 unemployed workers; increase of staff in Office of Secretary, and the Office of the Solicitor; staff for an Office of Policy Planning and Development; an Office of Labor Management Services and Women's Bureau; staff for the Commission on the Status of Women.

May 15, 1962: Issued Executive order establishing a President's Council on Aging. Asked for legislation to authorize a 5-year, $50 million program of grants to improve services for the aged, Senior Citizen Act of 1962.

May 21, 1962: Proposed an amendment to the 1963 budget involving an increase of $210.8 million for the Atomic Energy Commission.

May 23, 1962: Requested Congress to remove the limitation previously placed on indirect expenses connected with research grants included in the pending Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1963.

May 24, 1962:

1. Requested $750,000 increase for construction of additional power facilities on the Colorado River, increasing the original budget estimate of this item from $159.8 million to $160.6 million.

2. Requested $400 million increase for loan program for various small reclamation projects.

June 25, 1962: Requested Congress to increase the 1963 budget of the Department of Agriculture by $1,500,000 for activities of the Agricultural Research Service, Soil Conservation Service, and civil defense activities of the Agricultural Marketing Service and Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

July 25, 1962: Requested an amendment to the 1963 budget involving an increase of $23,300,000 for operating expenses of the Atomic Energy Commission, to prevent the possibility of unauthorized use of deployed nuclear weapons.

July 16, 1962:

1. Requested an amendment to the 1963 budget involving a net increase of $2,869,000 for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers.

2. Requested an amendment to the 1963 budget involving a net increase of $550,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation.

July 23, 1962:

1. Requested amendments to the 1963 budget involving an increase of $17,570,000 for the Department of Commerce.

2. Requested an amendment to the 1963 budget involving an increase of $198,000 for the Panama Canal and Canal Zone Government.

July 28, 1962:

1. Requested a supplemental appropriation of $850,000 for fiscal year 1963 to finance the Office of Science and Technology.

2. Requested an amendment to the 1963 budget involving an increase of $382,000 for the civil functions of the Department of the Army for administration of the Ryukyu Islands; raising the previously amended budget estimate of $13,900,000 for administration of the Ryukyu Islands, Army, to $14,282,000.

July 31, 1962: Requested amendments to the 1963 budget involving an increase of $276,729,500 for the Department of Defense, principally to provide funds for military family housing authorized in the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1962.

August 6, 1962: Requested an amendment to the 1963 budget involving an increase of $80 million for the foreign investment guarantee program of the Agency for International Development.

August 13, 1962: Requested supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1963 amounting to $595,480,000 for the executive branch, $120,000 for the judiciary, and $10,886 for the District of Columbia.

August 17, 1962:

1. Requested of Congress $28,089,000 in supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1963 for the Department of State to cover contributions and administrative cost associated with the Department's refugee activities and to provide for additional training of Foreign Service personnel. Included in this amount was an item of $12,000 to assist in meeting the expenses of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union.

2. Requested a supplemental appropriation of $1,075,000 for the fiscal year 1963 for the Department of the Interior to cover advanced planning on the Arbuckle, Mann Creek, and Fryingpan-Arkansas projects.

September 6, 1962: Requested supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1963 of $8,394,000 for the executive branch and $185,000 for the District of Columbia.

September 21, 1962: Three communications from the President transmitting amendment to the budget for fiscal year 1963 were received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, with accompanying papers, as Senate documents, as follows:

1. In the amount of $3 million for the Corps of Engineers Civil, Department of the Army (S. Doc. No. 135);

2. In the amount of $2,344,000 for the Department of the Interior (S. Doc. No. 134); and

3. In the amount of $100 million for the Department of State (S. Doc. No. 133);

September 28, 1962: Three communications from the President transmitting amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1963 were received, as follows:

1. In the amount of $5,357,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, supplemental appropriations;

2. In the amount of $5 million for the acquisition of lands for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, supplemental appropriations; and

3. In the amount of $10,191,000, supplemental appropriations for the trade adjustment program of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Grand total of 88 requests as of September 28, 1962.

PART II. PRESIDENTIAL REQUESTS OF CONGRESS FOR NEW POWERS, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, BEGINNING JANUARY 10, 1962

January 11, 1962: Sweeping new powers requested in state of Union message:

(a) Standby power to cut taxes temporarily to combat business recessions.

(b) Standby power to launch public works (when the economy slackens).

(c) Creation of new Cabinet rank (Department of Urban Affairs and Housing)

(d) Civil rights protection, including outlawing of literacy tests and poll taxes.

(e) Tightening of food and drug laws.

(f) Renewed request for powers (which Congress refused to allow in 1st sess., 87th Congress, such as reorganization plans for FCC, SEC, NLRB, Maritime Board and Federal Home Loan Bank Board).

January 18, 1962:

1. Requested a 5-year authorization to reduce existing tariffs by 50 percent in reciprocal negotiations covering broad categories, rather than through item-by-item review.

2. Asked special authority to negotiate with the Common Market to reduce or eliminate all tariffs on certain groups of products.

3. Special authority to reduce or eliminate all duties and other restrictions on importation of tropical, agricultural and forestry products—not produced in quantity, in the United States.

January 30, 1962: Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, headed by a new Cabinet-rank Secretary.

January 31, 1962: Trade Expansion Act of 1962:

1. Permit to appoint Advisory Council on Public Welfare representing broad community interests and concerns, to advise HEW Secretary in administration of Social Security Act.

2. J.F.K. farm program—demanding tight curbs or aid cutoff—deals mainly with wheat, feed grains, and dairy products.

To cut production below consumption—so difference can be made up from Nation's surplus of agriculture commodities.

February 19, 1962: Public works authorization: Asked authority to launch a public works program without further legislation, when certain criteria are met.

March 28, 1962: Balance of payments: Requested authority for various measures to increase exports and maintain the strength of the dollar—contended that he was appointing a new top-level official in Department of Commerce to oversee this program:

(a) Authority to participate in the supplementary International Monetary Fund arrangements.

(b) Authority to bargain effectively for lower tariffs with European Common Market and other countries.

(c) To offer incentive for more rapid modernization of industrial equipment by means of investment tax credit.

(d) Removal of special inducements to invest abroad by eliminating possibilities for tax avoidance.

(e) Simplified visa requirements for foreign visitors.

March 29, 1962: Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962:

(a) To create a new Office of Science and Technology as a unit within the Executive Office of the President.

(b) To transfer to above office certain functions of the National Science Foundation.

(c) To abolish or change certain functions of the National Science Foundation.

(d) Incidental transfers to proposed new Office of Science and Technology of personnel records, property—unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations and other funds presently being held, used, available, or to be made available as the Director of the Budget shall determine.

April 6, 1962: Requested more home rule for Virgin Islands—to elect their own officials, reapportion the legislature, and to transfer assets and activities of the Virgin Islands Corporation to the Government of the Virgin Islands.

April 11, 1962: Asked for new controls in the drug business—particularly on drugs sold over the counter without prescriptions and drugs which may have some doubtful effectiveness.

April 14, 1962: Asked that Congress give the President power to select his own Federal Reserve Board chairman—changing term of appointee to 4 years instead of present 14-year term. Claimed it is essential for the effective coordination of the monetary, fiscal, and financial policies of the Government.

April 19, 1962: Requested authority for Federal Government to withhold from the pay of civilian employees of the United States union dues for membership in certain employee organizations.

May 7, 1962: Requested standby Presidential authority to cut individual income taxes temporarily as much as 5 percent in each tax bracket.

May 16, 1962: Submitted bill to amend existing statutes relative to disposal of federally owned real property, surplus to the needs of the Federal Government, would (1) provide common standards for determining terms and conditions on which Federal surplus real property may be conveyed for authorized public purposes; (2) provide for sale of such property to public bodies at 75 percent of fair market value rather than 100 percent of fair market value as presently required; (3) define and make uniform the administrative responsibilities of the various Federal agencies involved.

August 5, 1962: Requested legislation to strengthen S. 1552 to provide for stiffer controls on the manufacture and sale of pharmaceutical drugs. In addition, advertising requirements for prescription drugs are tightened and the legislation removes certain restrictions relating to the certification of antibiotics.

Grand total of 29 requests as of September 17, 1962.

Judge Morgan M. Moulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the compensations for service in the House is the opportunity for association with many exceptional men.

One of these is Judge MORGAN M. MOULDER, of Missouri, who, after a service of 14 years, announced early in the session his intention to retire from the House at the close of this Congress and return to his first love, the practice of the law.

Judge MOULDER came to the House a successful and seasoned lawyer. Few men in the State have attained the eminence as a practitioner and jurist which he occupied, and the wide esteem in which he was held throughout the State, at the time he came to Washington as a Member of the 81st Congress.

On this account it was not necessary for him to pass through the customary probationary period which awaits the new Congressman but he was admitted at once to the inner circle and was from the beginning one of the most popular and most influential men in the Missouri delegation and on the floor.

His sound judgment, his knowledge of the law, and his judicial temperament and experience have been invaluable factors in the solution of many vital national problems in these last critical years.

His retirement is a loss to the House and to the Nation.

But he is entitled to the best years of his life in the forum which he enjoys most. He retires in the prime of life and at the zenith of his legislative career and has before him many years of service at the bar. With his experience in the making of law he is all the more competent and capable in the interpretation of the law and I predict for him even greater eminence and success in the future than in the past.

We hope to see him back in Washington frequently for counsel and advice. And, in the meantime, we wish for him good luck and Godspeed.

Another Kremlin Weapon: Red Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the National Petroleum Council recently reported that oil is Russia's most important weapon in its politicoeconomic offensive against the free world.

Now, this observation did not receive front page attention—nor should it have from the standpoint of news value; yet the Russian oil story is one of the most disturbing situations on the international news front. Russia's use of oil as an economic and political weapon has long been evident. The alarming factor is that there has been no leadership on the part of anti-Communist nations in meeting the issue.

Russia's oil offensive actually got underway in 1960. There was no question about the Kremlin's ability to undersell competitors in an all-out campaign, because under the totalitarian system the selling price of a commodity can be fixed without regard to production costs. Moscow has also taken advantage of its grip on satellite nations by keeping its oil prices low on the world market, then compensating by gouging her captive buyers. The U.S.S.R. has delivered crude for $13 a ton at Bombay and for less than $12 a ton at Montevideo while forcing the Poles, whose markets are within close proximity of Soviet oilfields, to pay $22 a ton for the same product at the same time. Finally, Russia's offer to barter oil for materials needed at home has proved added inducement for getting business among the non-Communist nations. She will accept finished manufactured products from Western

Europe in exchange for oil, and she has swapped oil for Fidel Castro's sugar, Brazil's coffee, and Argentina's beef.

The free world began to sense Russia's intentions of using oil in her plans for world conquest when exports jumped sharply in 1959. From 1950 to the middle of 1960 shipments went from 18,200 to 57,000 barrels a day in West Germany, from 16,400 to 63,000 in Italy, and from 0 to 14,000 in Brazil and 22,000 in Japan. For the year 1960 as a whole, sales to non-Communist countries were one-third greater than in the preceding year.

In May of last year, the Bureau of Mines issued a report on the Soviet 7-year plan for oil. It pointed out in its very first paragraph that the rapid growth of Soviet petroleum production, which was only a tenth of U.S. output in 1946, would be more than half by 1965, at which time 50 percent of Russia's exportable 359 million barrels could be confined to free world destinations.

Still another study, "Soviet Oil in the Cold War," was released in May of 1961. Prepared by the Library of Congress at the request of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, its findings included this observation:

> The dependence of any member of NATO alliance on Russian oil in a substantial measure inevitably has a significant bearing on its position relative to the security of the Western World. With Italy becoming increasingly bound up in Soviet oil schemes, the question is bound to arise as to its probable behavior in the event of a serious crisis in the cold war.

Let us stop here and examine the "probable behavior" of any non-Communist nation that is willing to make its energy requirements dependent upon sources within the periphery dominated by the godless and brutal criminals in the Kremlin. It matters not whether that nation lies along the Adriatic within easy reach of Khrushchev's short-range missiles, in South America across from the new Russian fortress in the Caribbean, or on an island in the relatively calm seas of the Indian Ocean. For the record, all three areas are already being saturated with Red oil. Italy receives more than one-half of the Soviet oil imported by Common Market countries. In addition to Brazil and Argentina, Uruguay is buying oil directly from U.S.S.R. production fields, and Castro is importing increasing amounts of crude for processing in the refineries he expropriated from American companies. On the other side of the world, Russian oil products are sold at service stations which the Government of Ceylon seized from American and British companies as part of its deal with the Soviet.

Assorted other importers of Red oil include India, Denmark, Finland, Belgium, Egypt, France, West Germany, Sweden, Iceland, Norway, and of course, Yugoslavia.

The economic threat involved in Russia's oil export campaign has been indicated in news stories almost from the time the all-out invasion got underway, and there is no reason to believe there is going to be any lessening of the Red offensive. The August 6, 1952, issue of International Commerce, a U.S. Department of Commerce publication, contained an article under this heading: "Soviets Pushing Petroleum Production and Exports—Gap With United States Narrowing Rapidly."

Following this illustrated documentary was an item entitled "Pipelines in U.S.S.R. Spread Far Over Land." It describes the giant strides made by the Soviet Union in expanding oil pipelines in the past decade, pointing out that by 1965 the total lineage will be more than nine times greater than the 1950 capacity.

The current issue of a leading business publication features an article on communism as viewed by a number of prominent authorities, including Dr. Walt Whitman Rostow, key adviser to President Kennedy and counselor and Chairman of the Policy Planning Council of the U.S. Department of State. A chapter on economic warfare, whose author is Leon M. Herman, a senior specialist in Soviet affairs for the Library of Congress, contains this passage:

> TRADE FOR POLITICS
>
> Foreign trade in Russia is more suitable for political combat than for commercial exchange. There is no independent trading community. All citizens and organizations are forbidden to engage in trade. A single government agency, the Ministry of Foreign Trade, has exclusive power to maintain contact with the outside world for trading.
>
> Soviet behavior in the world market has shown the Kremlin is willing and able to disrupt the normal pattern of commodity trade for political advantage. Its potential for disruptive tactics is sizable.
>
> In the marketing of petroleum, for example, the Soviet trade monopoly does not hesitate to slash the going price, by as much as 20 and 33 percent, to break into markets of other suppliers, primarily producers in the Middle East.

So, Mr. Speaker, we can assume that it is well established even in the official minds of the administration that the U.S.S.R. is using its oil as an economic and political tool to sabotage industrial and business activity in non-Communist countries. The implications of the overseas flow of Red oil have been commented upon in the daily press for at least a year and a half, and Government publications have thoroughly studied and analyzed the Soviet oil program for almost as long. Despite this official recognition, there has been a very grave dual deficiency of purpose on the part of the State Department: First, because no effective measures have been adopted—and so far as Congress knows, have not been recommended—to combat the Soviet scheme; second, the military factors have either been overlooked or disregarded in the various pronouncements by spokesmen of the State Department and other Government offices. If we wish to be generous, let us initially inspect the military aspects of the Soviet program.

Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, came back from a technical conference in Geneva, Switzerland, in early 1961 and immediately announced that the Kremlin had begun to destroy the fuels self-sufficiency of nations outside the Soviet orbit. He said that if the threat continues, a dangerous energy gap could very well develop in the midst of America's most energetic mobilization program in peacetime history.

A short time later, on June 12, 1961, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall told the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee:

> In short, we should take action now to insure against an energy gap. A study of fuels and energy by a Senate committee, and appropriate action based upon its recommendations, would go far toward assuring all Americans that they will never be faced with such a gap.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that so long as we are going to walk arm-in-arm with selected non-Communist nations down what we hope is the path to maximum unified military strength and ultimate peace, then it is incumbent upon us to make every effort possible to preclude the development of an energy gap in a single country allied with us. What is it going to avail the cause of America and the free world if we sent forth our dollars and our defense materials to a nation that is agreeable to placing its energy requirements in the hands of Nikita Khrushchev? How are those tanks and airplanes going to contribute to the defense of the free world if their fuel tanks are empty when the crucial time arrives?

In these instances, of course, for each barrel of Russian oil that is imported, a barrel of oil or its coal equivalent from the free world is displaced. The arrangement not only deprives non-Communist nations of an opportunity to enjoy the economic advantages of this trade, but places a reliance upon the Kremlin that could very well be fatal in an all-out conflict. Every industrial operation in Western Europe or anywhere else in the world now being supplied by Red oil would be subject to immediate shutdown if the despots in the Kremlin so willed. Merely by shutting off the valves from producing fields would the Kremlin be able to shift into idleness an important ratio of industrial activity outside its own sphere of influence.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, America must recognize the military as well as the economic and political dangers in the Red oil program. It must be recognized as a situation that will become progressively intensified unless checked forthwith. Opposition cannot wait until the Library of Congress is ready to issue another report, or until the Bureau of Mines completes a second study, or until the impressions on Russian oil formed during his recent visit to the Kremlin are made public by the Secretary of the Interior.

We need action now. We need leadership. While we wait, giant pipelines are snaking their way from Russia's producing fields into East Germany and Czechoslovakia for stepping up shipments to West Europe as well as to satellite industrial centers. Russia may already have concluded arrangements, first proposed in 1961, to build a line through Siberia with Japanese steel pipe that will be paid for by the oil it carries. In addition, supertankers are under construction at various shipyards serving the Kremlin. Yugoslavia alone is building 9 of the 250 tankers which the U.S. Bureau of Mines estimates Russia will have ready by 1965.

Perhaps the State Department is considering steps to offset the Soviet oil surge. Nevertheless no beneficial results are yet apparent. Under the circumstances, the prevailing situation presents an excellent opportunity to test the effectiveness of the Organization of American States. Members of this body should surely be as concerned as we are about any sovereign unit on this hemisphere that would submit itself to Kremlin control, that would place its fuel economy in the hands of the Red assassins. Every member of the OAS should willingly join with the United States in informing Moscow that we on this side of the Atlantic want no part of Russia's oil supplies. The free world has ample stocks that will always be available to all peoples who wish to remain free.

Perhaps the State Department questions the effectiveness of such an appeal. Perhaps it is suspected that some of our pan-American friends do not find it repugnant to be associated in depth with Khrushchev and his gang. If such is the case, certainly there is no logic in spreading American dollars up and down the broad reaches from the Caribbean to Cape Horn if recipients are willing to place their destiny in the hands of the Red gangsters.

Assuming that we will enjoy at least a modicum of cooperation and of program to persuade the OAS nations to shut out the inflow of Red oil, the State Department should then extend its efforts with a similar appeal to NATO and its associated alliances. The endeavor should be undertaken without delay, for certainly there is no excuse for the failure to act in the face of all the evidence that has been building up over the past 2 years.

Without a doubt—

The National Petroleum Council stated—

> Soviet oil is the most important element in the Soviet political-economic offensive in the free world.

Without a doubt, Soviet oil can also be the Kremlin's most important medium of sabotage in a showdown with the free world.

In Opposition to Proposed Breezy Point Ocean Front Park: Any Future Park Should Be Limited to the Land Known as Fort Tilden if Government Ceases Operations There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made in opposition to the proposed Breezy Point Ocean Front Park at a mass rally at Cardozo Junior High School, Edgemere, N.Y.:

> I am as anxious as anyone to expand our public park and recreational accommodations and I agree the teeming city, with its slum dwellings and crowded tenements desperately needs such additional facilities. More Reis Parks, Fire Island Parks, Sandy Hook Parks, Jones Beaches, help solve our juvenile delinquency difficulties and other related city problems and offer respite from the summer heat of the "asphalt jungle."
>
> In selecting these park sites, however, there are many factors that must be considered. Those who advocate turning the 4½-mile stretch of ocean front on the Rockaway Peninsula into a second Jones Beach are apparently unaware of the factors that militate against such a grandiose plan. There is the inordinate cost to the city. This cost would make the proposal unrealistic. It is estimated that it might well run to over $100–$150 million. Even if that estimate is high and the cost would be definitely limited to $100 million, that sum would be unwarranted, considering the present state of the city's treasury. This difficulty could not be overcome even with appropriate aid from the State and the Nation, because the bulk of the moneys would have to come from the city.
>
> Expending these sums now or in the foreseeable future would represent unsound financial planning, especially when the city of New York so desperately needs additional funds for housing, greater police and fire protection, more and efficient school buildings, classrooms and equipment, better salaries for teachers, more up-to-date hospitals and nursing homes, additional subway routes, buses and adequate transit facilities for our growing population, public auto parking space, development of our port facilities, including more and better docks, piers, and bridges.
>
> The narrow Rockaway stretch offers no proper avenues for traffic to the proposed park area. All the Rockaways are already congested with autos and the park now envisaged would greatly exacerbate the already crowded auto transit flow.
>
> The proposed park would balk the building of 6,900 units of middle income housing and related facilities in the 217-acre part of the area bounded by Beach 183d Street above Fort Tilden, Beach 201st Street, Rockaway Inlet and the Atlantic Ocean. The city would incur a loss of $6 million annually in taxes. With such an ambitious park project, an additional bridge would be made necessary from Brooklyn to the Rockaways across the inlet. The cost thereof indeed would not be a bagatelle. Preparation of the land and maintenance of the park would involve more millions. Small wonder Park Commissioner Newbold Morris stated that the park would be too costly and the city could not attempt it.
>
> The city now has 11,000 acres of park land in Jamaica Bay. There is no money available to develop it. It is absurd to talk about another park when this huge bay area is undeveloped.
>
> The city owns over 760 acres of park land with storm damaged ocean beaches on the Rockaway Peninsula. Over 250 acres of this park land are only empty lots and not developed at all because of lack of funds. It is foolish to talk of further park land if we cannot develop what we have at the present time. Robert Moses is opposed to a park at Breezy Point. On October 11, 1961, he stated:
>
> "Eventually Fort Tilden should be turned over to the city as a park * * *. I do not believe that it is necessary to acquire another park at Breezy Point, although this would have been logical years ago when La Guardia was mayor and before values had risen to dizzy heights. As a former city park commissioner, as head of the Triborough and the State park system, I would certainly not advocate the use of State park funds toward acquiring Breezy Point, although I would consider an additional shore front park built in connection with further slum clearance between Beach 73d Street and Beach 55th Street to be desirable."
>
> The real keystone of this arch, as it were, is Fort Tilden. I am informed that the Department of Defense has no present intention whatsoever of yielding this territory either to the city or to anyone else. The Defense Department has never said one word about cessation of its activities there or about ceding title to the city. Apparently, those who propose this huge park are reckoning without their host.
>
> As Secretary of the Interior Udall stated, the conversion of the area into a waterfront park comes rather late. I say that it would have been better if those who are advocating this project had made known their plans a quarter of a century ago before rights of others had jelled. Mayor Wagner, at a news conference, properly stated that the people living in the area would have the city's "first" consideration.
>
> Preliminary stages of apartment construction are already underway. There are 2,600 cottages on property owned by a cooperative. Have these property owners no rights? Are they to be cast aside as untouchables? Are their investments to go aglimmering? Condemnation will not yield them proper compensation. The many intangible values they contributed would be lost.
>
> Some of those who are for a huge Federal Government subsidy to acquire the land and build the waterfront park are usually loudest in their protests against Government spending.
>
> If there is to be any park, I suggest that should the Government eventually cease operations at Fort Tilden and the Government is willing to transfer the land to the city, then a park might well be established in that area. Thus a park could be established without trespassing and treading upon the rights of so many other people. The cost would not be prohibitive and could well be within the range of the city's budget.

Résumé of Activities of the Committee on House Administration, 1st Session, 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, in the 1st session of the 87th Congress 256 items of legislation were referred to the Committee on House Administration. Of this number, 99 were approved by the committee and reported favorably to the House.

During the 2d session 119 items of legislation were referred to the committee, of which 70 were reported favorably to the House. For the 87th Congress a total of 375 items of legislation were referred to the House Administration Committee, of which 169 were approved and reported favorably to the House.

The Subcommittee on Accounts, under the chairmanship of the Honorable

Samuel N. Friedel, acted on funds requests from various committees in connection with studies and investigations. The following table furnishes detailed information as to committees involved and funds authorized:

Committee	Authorizing resolution	Funds resolution	Funds approved	Amount requested	Amount approved	Period (years)	Foreign travel
Agriculture	H. Res. 80	H. Res. 94	Feb. 28, 1961	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	2	Yes.*
Agriculture	H. Res. 86	H. Res. 728	July 25, 1962	25,000.00	25,000.00	1	Yes.*
Armed Services	H. Res. 78	H. Res. 79	Feb. 28, 1961	150,000.00	150,000.00	2	No.
Banking and Currency (Housing)	H. Res. 143	H. Res. 144	Feb. 28, 1961	100,000.00	100,000.00	1	Yes.**
Banking and Currency (Housing)	H. Res. 143	H. Res. 504	Jan. 24, 1962	100,000.00	100,000.00	1	Yes.**
Banking and Currency	Rule XI(4)	H. Res. 200	Mar. 15, 1961	5,000.00	5,000.00	2	No.
District of Columbia	Rule XI(5)	H. Res. 189	Mar. 15, 1961	10,000.00	10,000.00	2	No.
Education and Labor	H. Res. 141	H. Res. 149	Feb. 28, 1961	633,000.00	633,000.00	2	Yes.**
Foreign Affairs	H. Res. 60	H. Res. 61	Feb. 28, 1961	150,000.00	150,000.00	2	Yes.
Foreign Affairs		H. Res. 348	June 29, 1961	5,000.00	5,000.00	2	No.
Government Operations	Rule XI(8)	H. Res. 70	Mar. 1, 1961	640,000.00	640,000.00	1	Yes.
Government Operations	Rule XI(8)	H. Res. 592	May 17, 1962	400,000.00	400,000.00	1	Yes.
House Administration	Rule XI(9)(k)	H. Res. 158	Feb. 28, 1961	20,000.00	20,000.00	2	No.
House Administration	Rule XI(9)(k)	H. Res. 357	June 29, 1961	10,000.00	10,000.00	2	No.
Interior and Insular Affairs	H. Res. 92	H. Res. 128	Feb. 28, 1961	60,000.00	60,000.00	2	Yes.***
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	H. Res. 108	H. Res. 165	Feb. 28, 1961	435,000.00	435,000.00	2	Yes.
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	H. Res. 420	H. Res. 439	Sept. 7, 1961	150,000.00	150,000.00	2	Yes.
Judiciary	H. Res. 56	H. Res. 68	Feb. 28, 1961	200,000.00	200,000.00	1	No.
Judiciary	H. Res. 56	H. Res. 500	Jan. 24, 1962	200,000.00	200,000.00	1	No.
Judiciary	Public Law 86-272	H. Res. 204	Mar. 15, 1961	165,000.00	150,000.00	1	No.
Judiciary	Public Law 86-272	H. Res. 663	June 21, 1962	100,000.00	100,000.00	1	No.
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	H. Res. 98	H. Res. 99	Feb. 28, 1961	75,000.00	75,000.00	2	Yes.
Post Office and Civil Service	H. Res. 75	H. Res. 76	Feb. 28, 1961	100,000.00	100,000.00	2	No.
Post Office and Civil Service	H. Res. 75	H. Res. 705	July 25, 1962	25,000.00	25,000.00	1	No.
Public Works	H. Res. 23	H. Res. 136	Feb. 28, 1961	950,000.00	950,000.00	2	Yes.****
Public Works	H. Res. 23	H. Res. 433	Sept. 7, 1961	150,000.00	150,000.00	2	Yes.****
Science and Astronautics	H. Res. 55	H. Res. 85	Feb. 28, 1961	300,000.00	300,000.00	2	No.
Small Business	H. Res. 46	H. Res. 148	Feb. 28, 1961	580,000.00	580,000.00	2	No.
Un-American Activities	Rule XI(18)	H. Res. 167	Mar. 1, 1961	331,000.00	331,000.00	1	Yes.
Un-American Activities	Rule XI(18)	H. Res. 513	Jan. 24, 1962	350,000.00	350,000.00	1	Yes.
Veterans' Affairs	H. Res. 49	H. Res. 50	Feb. 28, 1961	50,000.00	50,000.00	2	Yes.**
Veterans' Affairs	H. Res. 49	H. Res. 392	Aug. 10, 1961	100,000.00	100,000.00	2	No.
Ways and Means		H. Res. 291	June 13, 1961	25,000.00	25,000.00	2	No.
Select Committee To Investigate Export Control Act of 1949	H. Res. 403	H. Res. 453	Sept. 19, 1961	60,000.00	40,000.00	2	Yes.
Select Committee To Investigate Export Control Act of 1949	H. Res. 403	H. Res. 704	July 25, 1962	10,000.00	10,000.00	1	Yes.
Select Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures	H. Res. 753	H. Res. 756	Aug. 30, 1962	35,000.00	35,000.00	1	No.
Total (studies and investigations)				6,749,000.00	6,714,000.00		
Expenses of the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission, authorized by Public Law 86-650.				387.73	387.73		
Expenses of the Joint Committee on Lost Colony Celebration, authorized by H. Con. Res. 438, 87th Cong.				10,000.00	10,000.00		
Total				6,759,387.73	6,724,387.73		

The House of Representatives has authorized travel outside the United States with the following limitations:

*By subcommittees of not to exceed 5 members.

**To any Commonwealth (of the United States) or possession thereof.

***Territories and possessions of the United States, Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Pacific flag areas of the United States.

****Canada; and 2 subcommittees not exceeding 6 members and not exceeding 2 staff members each, as authorized by the chairman of the committee to do so, are authorized to travel outside the United States in connection with highway conferences.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to legislation providing funds for studies and investigations, the subcommittee considered proposals to provide a residence for pages, adjustments in personnel for various officers of the House, additional office equipment for Members of the House, adjustment in the basic clerk hire allowance of Members of the House, and adjustment in the communications account of Members of the House.

The Special Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Paul C. Jones, inspected improved models and types of office equipment in order to revise the official list of equipment approved for purchase by Members of the House. This subcommittee establishes the general policies relating to office equipment, and approves purchase of equipment for committee use and the specialized items used in the offices of various officers of the House. This group also made adjustments in the amount of office equipment to accommodate the larger districts.

The Elections Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Honorable Robert T. Ashmore, conducted a ballot recount and full-scale investigation into the election dispute in the Fifth District of Indiana. With a spread of only a few votes between the totals for Democratic candidate J. Edward Roush and Republican candidate George O. Chambers the subcommittee was faced with a difficult and time-consuming task which took the group into every county and election precinct of the Fifth District. After several weeks of field studies, including a complete ballot recount, the subcommittee brought all ballots, except those clearly noncontroversial, to Washington for closer study. The group worked day and night through endless meetings to reach a final conclusion which was reported to the House on June 13, 1961, House Resolution 339.

Hearings were conducted in the area of Federal corrupt practices. The House passed a bill by Chairman Ashmore to reduce the minimum sentence for violations of the Hatch Political Activities Act from 90 to 30 days suspension without pay.

A number of bills were introduced to remove the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. These proposals were superseded by Senate Joint Resolution 29, which was referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

The Subcommittee on Printing, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Wayne L. Hays, reported favorably to the House a total of 120 resolutions authorizing the printing of various documents, manuscripts, hearings, and so forth.

One of the most important bills was H.R. 8141 to provide for the revision of the laws relating to depository libraries.

The Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills and Library, under the chairmanship of the Honorable Paul C. Jones, has the responsibility of examining all bills and resolutions to see that those bills and joint resolutions which originate in the House of Representatives are correctly enrolled, and delivered to the President.

There were a total of 1,007 House bills and resolutions delivered to the White House and 39 House concurrent resolutions delivered to the National Archives during the 87th Congress.

Among legislative proposals considered by the subcommittee was a memorial to General Pershing, which was passed over. The establishment of a Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commisson was authorized. The Franklin Delano Roosevelt proposed memorial was rejected and returned to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission for further study. The subcommittee favorably reported resolutions providing for the reappointment of Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, Dr. Caryl P. Haskins, and Dr. Crawford H. Greenewalt, and the appointment of William A. M. Burden as citizen regents of the Smithsonian Institution. The group favorably reported a bill to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, and a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution. A resolution was approved authorizing Arizona to place a statue of Father Kino in Statuary Hall. A bill to amend the act relating to the microfilming of Presidential papers was approved; also a bill to establish in the Library of Congress a library of musical scores and other instructional material for blind persons. Among Senate proposals acted upon by the subcommittee were a bill to provide for indexing and microfilming records of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in Alaska in the collections of the Library of Congress, and a bill to raise the limitation of gifts and bequests to the Library of Congress.

While joint committees do not handle legislation, members of the Committee on House Administration who sit on the Joint Committee on Printing, the Joint Committee on the Library, and the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers, were active in their respective fields.

Legislation To Enable Federal Power Commission To Certify Extra-High-Voltage Electric Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on June 18 I introduced legislation, H.R. 12181, to amend the Federal Power Act to require public utilities, other than those owned by Federal or State agencies, to obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the Federal Power Commission as a condition for construction, extension, operation or maintenance of facilities to transmit electric energy subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission in excess of 230,000 kilovolts. A companion bill, S. 3432, was introduced in the Senate by my colleague, Senator Clare Engle.

There was not opportunity for congressional action on our proposal this year. I intend to reintroduce my bill in January 1963, immediately following the convening of the 88th Congress, and will work for its enactment.

This is significant legislation. It attempts to reach at a problem which affects directly the millions of Americans who are consumers of electricity.

Users of electricity are all too frequently at the mercy of their supplier. Regulation is often ineffective and "yardstick" competition weak or nonexistent. Technical developments have enhanced the ability of large electric utilities to dominate and control dissemination of this vital service. Today electricity can be transmitted thousands of miles via extra-high-voltage lines. A single producer, or several acting in consort, can control the availability and cost of electricity in a way which was not contemplated in 1920 when the Federal Power Act was passed, or even in 1935 when the Federal Power Act was strengthened and extended as a result of the revelation of scandalous actions by many private utility companies.

On the Pacific coast, two companies—the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Pacific Power & Light Co.—seek to create a major regional intertie linking the Northwest and California. Recently the FPC, by a split vote, approved the issuance by P.P. & L. of stocks and bonds which will be used in part to finance this privately owned interconnection. The majority of the commissioners asserted that the FPC does not have authority to determine whether or not such a tie line is compatible with the public interest. My bill would clearly place this power in the hands of the FPC.

I have a strong interest in this question. I witnessed the efforts of the giant P.G. & E. to force the tiny Shasta Dam area public utility district in California into receiving its federally allocated power over P.G. & E. lines, at far greater cost to both the Government and the customer. The House Special Subcommittee on Assigned Power and Land Problems, of which I am chairman, documented this situation in hearings and in a report in 1960—House Report No. 2221, 86th Congress—as a result of which the Interior Department worked out direct service arrangements with the Shasta Dam area PUD that will save millions of dollars for both the Federal Government and the district.

Control of transmission is a key to the control of electricity—and profits. We are not doing enough to insure that consumers, instead of the private power companies, will have a say as to how that key is used. The administration needs to move more firmly in this field. I hope that the administration will give my bill vigorous support in the next Congress.

Last month Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, discussed this problem in the Western States Power and Water Consumers Conference, in Portland, Oreg. He told the conference delegates that—

> Hand-in-hand with full-scale power pooling on a nationwide basis must go certain requirements to insure that consumers share the benefits and that economies are not promoted solely for profit. Super transmission on a regional scale adds a new element to the electric power business—which is a public business and a public utility no matter who owns or operates it. Electricity is an essential of everyday life and we must guarantee that giant power lines do not create a new form of monopoly which will allow a few men to control both the current and the cash register by setting up transmission tollgates.

Senator Morse emphasized the need for legislation, such as my bill, H.R. 12181, which would require utilities seeking to build major transmission lines to go before the FPC and prove that their plans are in the public interest. He also urged effective Federal regulations which will insure common carrier service on extra-high-voltage transmission lines crossing Federal lands, and Federal transmission facilities to link Federal power systems and provide a competitive influence by channeling savings to consumers.

Senator Morse's speech clearly points up the nature of some of our major national power problems and indicates their proper solutions—both in the field of long-distance transmission and other areas. I believe that his speech will be of great interest to other Members of Congress as well as the general public, and I therefore include his speech as part of my remarks:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, WESTERN STATES POWER AND WATER CONSUMERS CONFERENCE, PORTLAND, OREG., OCTOBER 2, 1962

In the field of electric power we face serious problems and hopeful prospects.

By 1980 we will need nearly four times the amount of electric power required today. In this vast increase in capacity and consumption we must insure that the consumer is not overrun by accumulations of capital and control in an industry which already represents 10 percent of all business expenditures for new construction.

Advances in technology have given us exciting new tools to perform the job—ever larger generating units, nuclear power supplies and transmission capable of carrying power half way across the country.

We need high-capacity common carrier electrical interties in this country. The United States is perhaps the only technologically advanced nation in the world which has failed to move forcefully to link its individual power systems effectively for maximum efficiency.

In Canada regional transport of large blocks of power by long-distance transmission is well underway and there is talk of a transcontinental grid. Russian efforts to tie together power sources and systems of its vast territory via extra-high-voltage lines are well known. And Western Europe—an area which we frequently view antiquated and outdated but which has one of the highest rates of economic growth in the world—is interconnected from Sweden to Italy and international exchange of power is increasing at an average annual rate of 16 percent—double the consumption increase.

The Federal Power Commission has embarked on a survey to develop a long-range program to meet the Nation's rapidly expanding electric power requirements through a coordinated and interconnected system. The potential for savings to electric customers is enormous. An improved efficiency of only 5 percent from a fully coordinated power supply system could reduce the Nation's cost of generating electricity almost $300 million a year.

However, this is not just a matter of applying advanced technology. Hand in hand with full-scale power pooling on a nationwide basis must go certain requirements to insure that consumers share the benefits and that economies are not promoted solely for profit. Super transmission on a regional scale adds a new utility to the electric power business—which is a public business and a public utility no matter who owns or operates it. Electricity is an essential of everyday life and we must guarantee that giant powerlines do not create a new form of monopoly which will allow a few men to control both the current and the cash register by setting up transmission tollgates.

I believe that the utilities which seek to build major transmission across State lines should be required to go before the FPC and prove that their plans are in the public interest. Regulations should be in force throughout the administrative agencies of the Federal Government which would insure that when transmission right-of-way is granted across Federal lands, common carrier service is made available to the Federal power systems and their preference customers on a nondiscriminatory basis.

But this is not enough. We need publicly owned lines to provide the yardstick of competition. No regulatory scheme yet devised has long withstood the tendency of the regulators to become captive of those they regulate. Historically, State utility commissions have given way to the wishes of the power companies. From 1946 to 1960, 578 rate increase applications were filed by private power companies in this country and 517 or 94 percent were approved in full or part by State regulatory commissions.

This deficiency at times even permeates the Federal Government. Only a few years ago we witnessed the spectacle of certain Federal Power Commissioners joining in the giveaway of one of the greatest publicly owned resources in America—the incomparable Hells Canyon Dam site. We cannot always depend upon men of the character of Joseph Swidler and Howard Morgan on the FPC.

The Kennedy administration has plans for a 1,000-mile high-voltage interconnection between the Northwest and California. As a common carrier facility controlled by the public, this intertie has tremendous potential advantages for the whole Pacific coast. With two 750,000-volt direct-current lines the benefit-cost ratio is nearly 3.5 to 1. It is a lucrative proposition and the private power companies are eager to exploit it. Consumers will be the losers if they do.

Private power companies, who tell the public that they are ready, willing, and able tq supply all of America's power needs, were before Congress this year asking for an 8-percent tax credit as an incentive to carry out functions they are required by law to perform as public utilities. Private power companies are regulated monopolies which are afforded the opportunity to earn just and reasonable rates of return after taxes. They do not pay taxes in the sense that other enterprises do; they collect them from consumers. They enjoy sheltered markets and virtually risk-free investment.

Yet their representatives came before Congress to urge that they be granted a new tax subsidy—on top of the $1.5 billion bonanza in interest-free loans these utilities have gained as a result of fast tax writeoff. This year Congress ended up giving the utilities a 3-percent tax credit—which can amount to a $3.9 billion windfall tax cut over the next 20 years.

Why should the taxpayers of this country give away a revenue-producing project like the California intertie to special interests who are already heavily subsidized?

Our best bet for availability of an abundance of low-cost power in the United States remains the influence of competition by publicly and cooperatively owned electric systems. That is why I have supported the historic preference clause throughout my career in the Senate. This policy protects the public interest. It helps to assure that consumer controlled utilities have access to Federal power.

But the preference clause—which might more accurately be called the antimonopoly clause—is under new attack. Last year the Congress approved the Delaware River compact without inserting this provision. The Federal Government will be called upon to build the projects involved in this plan for northeastern water resources development and we face a project-by-project fight to provide this essential protection in an area which has some of the highest power rates in the Nation.

An allied principle which is threatened today is the concept of comprehensive development of our rivers throughout multiple-purpose use. The Northwest is a major battleground. In Montana, a private power company is attempting to promote an inferior proposal which will kill Knowles Dam. Montana Power Co.'s plan will provide no flood control and only one-sixth of the power benefits available through Knowles. In Idaho, similar forces have been trying to destroy the proposed Burns Creek project.

On the Middle Snake River between Oregon and Idaho the struggle is between the Nez Perce project and High Mountain Sheep. Nez Perce has been repeatedly found to be the superior project but questions have been raised about ability to protect migratory salmon. The Department of the Interior has embarked on a "crash" program to find answers. At the University of Washington, an internationally acclaimed scientist is developing salmon which can be produced in greater quantity with higher quality in limited water areas. Fish farming work provides new prospects for more and better fish.

We should get all the facts on fish before we throw away 2 million kilowatts of low-cost power on the Middle Snake. Economic hydrosites are limited. What we need is more fish and more power and we should not settle for less of either.

I hold no brief for relief for dam builders from the cost of protecting our fisheries. That is a responsibility incurred as a result of the opportunity granted to construct the project on rivers which belong to the public. But there are questions about the rationale involved in the conflict between fish and power which need much more study.

Atomic power may be the generating field of the future. Economic atomic power is not here yet. Power needs will not stand still while we wait for technological advances in nuclear energy. We must consider now the use of our vast untapped potentials of hydroelectric energy.

Increasing stress must be placed on the role of recreation in multiple-purpose water development.

In 1960, artificial lakes created by the reservoirs behind dams built by the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority received 175 million visitor-days of use. This figure exceeds attendance at national parks and national forests combined. The overall rate of growth in the use of all national reservoirs for recreation has been over 10 percent annually—a doubling of visitor-days every 5 to 7 years.

Economic studies show that availability of reservoirs with significant shorelines boosts an area's population growth, per capita income, annual wages, retail sales, bank deposits, taxes, and investment. We have seen this happen in the Pacific Northwest, where tourism is a major industry.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission noted in its report to the President this year that "most people seeking outdoor recreation want water, to sit by, to swim and to fish in, to ski across, to dive under, and to run their boats over. Swimming is one of the most popular outdoor activities and is likely to be the most popular of all by the turn of the century. Boating and fishing are among the top 10 activities. Camping, picnicking, and hiking, also high on the list, are more attractive near water sites."

In the next 40 years participation in outdoor activities is expected to nearly triple as population doubles. Millions of Americans will seek water for recreation. Water is a focal point of outdoor recreation. Where reservoirs appear, they stimulate recreational activity.

Planning for use of water resources must take this fact into account. Most Americans are not mountain climbers or white water sailors. They are Sunday drivers, weekend walkers, vacationing sightseers, or amateur swimmers. We need to preserve sites where water is an intrinsic part of wilderness or primitive areas for the enjoyment of those who seek out the solitude of nature, and I have supported effective legislation to do just this. But the mass of Americans seek less strenuous outdoor recreation in more accessible locales. And that is why I also endorse the inclusion of recreation as a prime project purpose at Federal multiple-use developments, and why I will continue to advocate maximum recreation development at reservoirs which are the result of investment of taxpayers' funds.

These are some of the areas of the national power picture which I consider significant and of concern to people like you. Some of them are of special importance to the Pacific Northwest. But regional development has a nationwide impact. All projects are local, but each reflects and shapes national policy.

The fight for the Hanford project is a good example. Local forces joined with conservation supporters throughout the country to successfully back the proposal of local public agencies to finance, construct, and build generating facilities at Hanford. They fought to prevent waste of a national resource—and won in the face of bitter determined opposition from those who sought to preserve their own special interests. It was a great victory for the people. I hope that we have more of them.

We need a capital budget to put the whole power picture in proper perspective. Investment in hydroelectric projects represents creation of an asset which will pay back its full cost plus interest. Power is a paying partner in multiple-purpose projects. In the last decade, taxpayers realized better than $1 billion from sale of electricity from Federal projects.

Today we lump self-liquidating costs for power together with governmental operating expenses such as typewriter ribbons and carbon paper. Establishment of a capital budget would be a basic fiscal reform, permitting a meaningful distinction between current and capital outlay.

I have pressed for such a budget since 1947. We are making some progress toward its realization. Recently I received from Budget Director Bell an outline of how the current budget would look in capital budget form.

In summary, he found that total Federal expenditures for Federal, State, and local governmental assets totaled $27 billion of which $8,700 million was for civil programs and $18,292 million was for defense programs.

Mr. Bell expressed the view that special attention needs to be paid to this area of Federal expenditure. While this is a far cry from President Kennedy's outright endorsement of the capital budget before this very group in 1960 there is a prospect that more analysis of this kind will appear in next year's budget.

It will take the continued work and devotion of all of us to press for all the advances and protections for consumers of water and power which I have outlined. I appreciate the great contribution you have made in the past to the achievement of these objectives and I know your work for them will continue in the future.

Résumé of Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, 87th Congress, To Be Printed as a Committee Print

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Printing, the

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries elects to report its résumé of activities during the 87th Congress by means of a committee print rather than by insertion in the RECORD. The résumé is in preparation, and will be ready for distribution to interested persons in the very near future.

Accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to present a summary of the activities of the committee in the 2d session of the 87th Congress. This committee, consisting of nine Members from each House, is unique in several respects. It is the only joint committee with the legislative functions of initiating, reviewing, and reporting bills. In addition the committee has conscientiously fulfilled its statutory responsibility as watchdog of AEC and Defense Department secret activities with respect to nuclear weapons and military propulsion. Of equal importance have been its activities in encouraging the peaceful uses of atomic energy through hearings and other public informational activities.

Through these activities, the Joint Committee, as the representative of Congress and the public, has exercised a creative role in initiating and recommending policies and programs to accelerate the progress of the atomic energy program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the following statement of accomplishments and activities demonstrates the usefulness and vigor of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I look forward to new achievements in the 88th Congress, as the Joint Committee moves into its 17th year of active participation in the atomic energy program.

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN THE 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, 1962

I. LEGISLATION

A. AEC AUTHORIZATION BILL (PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–701)

The Joint Committee, after hearings in April and May, 1962, reported out the AEC authorization bill for fiscal year 1963—H.R. 11974—on June 21, 1962. The bill authorized a total of $159,415,000 for new construction projects by the Atomic Energy Commission during fiscal year 1963, and an additional $3 million for use in the program to develop atomic power in cooperation with private industry. This $3 million authorization could be used, in addition to other funds previously authorized for a new type of design assistance as requested by AEC, intended to stimulate construction by industry of atomic powerplants of at least 400,000 electrical kilowatt capacity. The bill also authorized the sum of $5 million, in addition to the $10 million previously authorized, for use in the cooperative program for research and development with the European Atomic Energy Community.

Among the highlights of section 101 of the bill was a $10 million authorization for Project Rover—the nuclear powered rocket—test facilities and a $20 million authorization for an organic reactor project.

Two projects in section 101 of the bill were especially added by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in order to expedite the AEC food irradiation program: a marine products development irradiator, $600,000; and two mobile irradiators, $700,000. These projects were added as a result of technical data developed during hearings in February 1962 by the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation on the AEC and Army food irradiation programs.

As reported out by the committee, the bill contained no provision for construction or operation of electric generating facilities at the Hanford new production reactor. The AEC had been negotiating arrangements with the Washington Public Power Supply System, under which WPPSS would construct such generating facilities at its own expense. It had been the view of the parties that congressional authorization would not be necessary in order for AEC to proceed with such arrangements. However, on July 6, 1962, the Comptroller General rendered an opinion that AEC could not proceed with these arrangements without further congressional authorization.

In order to decide as to an appropriate course of action, the Joint Committee held 2 days of hearings on July 10 and 11, to thoroughly review the proposed arrangements. The hearings were immediately published along with a Joint Committee print containing all the contracts, opinions, and other documents pertinent to a consideration of the WPPSS proposal. After further consideration, the committee voted to report favorably two amendments to the bill authorizing the AEC to proceed with the arrangements under certain conditions.

On July 17, 1962, the House considered the bill and passed it in the form recommended by the Joint Committee, but adopted a substitute amendment in lieu of the Joint Committee's amendments on the WPPSS proposal. The substitute stated that the Commission was not authorized to proceed with any arrangements for construction or operation of electric generating and transmission facilities at the Hanford new production reactor.

The Senate considered the bill on August 1, 1962, and passed it with an amendment offered by Senator JACKSON identical to the two amendments recommended by the Joint Committee. As amended by the Senate, the bill provided that the Commission was authorized to enter into arrangements with non-Federal entities for the construction and operation of electrical energy generating and transmission facilities at the Hanford new production reactor in accordance with specified program justification data which had been previously submitted by the AEC to the Joint Committee, and considered during the hearings. The Senate amendment also contained three provisos, including one that 50 percent of the electrical output would be offered to public organizations and 50 percent to private organizations on a nondiscriminatory basis.

The House considered the bill again on August 29, 1962, and rejected a motion to instruct the conferees to insist on their disagreement with the Senate amendment. Accordingly, a conference committee was convened on September 10, 1962. The conferees filed their report on September 11, 1962. The conference report—House Report No. 2342—provided that the Commission was not authorized to enter into arrangements for the Hanford electric plant unless and until it made a series of determinations concerning the benefits, the national defense aspects, and the costs associated with construction and operation of the project. The conference report also contained a provision that 50 percent participation should be offered to private organizations, and an additional provision for review by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy prior to consummation of any arrangements.

The House considered the conference report on September 14, 1962, and approved it. On September 18, 1962, the Senate considered the conference report and voted its approval.

The bill was forwarded to the President and signed into law on September 26, 1962, as Public Law No. 87–701. Following the enactment of the law, the Joint Committee held further hearings on the proposed arrangements for the Hanford generating facilities. These hearings are described in section III–K of this report.

B. AEC OMNIBUS BILL, 1962 (PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–615)

In accordance with its regular practice, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy considered and reported out an omnibus bill incorporating necessary amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. In this way the committee assures that the basic legislation reflects any new developments in the atomic energy field.

At the close of the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the Joint Committee had pending before it two important bills affecting the regulatory and indemnity sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. These were H.R. 9244, introduced by Congressman PRICE, concerning indemnity matters, and H.R. 8708 and S. 2419, introduced by Chairman HOLIFIELD and Vice Chairman PASTORE concerning regulatory matters. These bills served as a basis for hearings by the Joint Committee on indemnity and regulatory matters in April.

After further study and revisions of the earlier bills, Chairman HOLIFIELD and Vice Chairman PASTORE introduced clean bills, H.R. 12336 and S. 3491, on June 26 and 29, respectively. The bill was passed by the Senate on August 7, 1962, and by the House of Representatives on August 15, 1962. It was approved by the President on August 29, 1962, as Public Law No. 87-615.

The amendments in the 1962 omnibus bill can be grouped into four general categories:

1. REGULATORY AMENDMENTS

Sections 1 through 3 amend the regulatory provisions of the Atomic Energy Act by authorizing the establishment of one or more atomic safety and licensing boards and by modifying the provisions in the act concerning public hearings and review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, as established by the new law, will consist of three members, two of whom shall be technically qualified and one of whom shall be qualified in the conduct of administrative proceedings. As described in the Joint Committee report, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board is conceived as a flexible experiment in new administrative law techniques. Its major objectives are to bring technical expertise to bear at the decisionmaking level, and to reduce cumbersome and formalized procedures. The committee report encourages the use of informal procedures by the Board to the maximum extent permitted by the Administrative Procedure Act. The law permits AEC to appoint a panel from which it may select Board members, but the committee report anticipates that the Board will become a permanent institution as the reactor licensing workload of the Commission increases.

The amendment also eliminates the requirement for a mandatory hearing except upon the application for a construction permit for a power or testing facility. In addition, it clarifies the scope of review required by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, a group of distinguished scientists who assist the Commission as advisers, on a part-time basis.

In summary, the amendments are intended to encourage the application of technical expertise in decisions affecting the licensing of reactors, and to simplify and improve the AEC regulatory process.

2. INDEMNITY AMENDMENTS

Sections 4 through 7 of the new law amend the indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act to cover incidents occurring outside the United States in the AEC contractor program. This coverage is especially needed in the case of contractors in the nuclear submarine and nuclear rocket programs. It is also of vital importance to U.S. contractors engaged in the construction of military reactors in remote locations, such as Greenland and the Antarctica.

The amendments also incorporate limitations and provisions intended to protect the U.S. Treasury against unreasonable judgments in foreign courts.

3. STANDARD AUTHORIZATION LANGUAGE

Section 8 incorporates into permanent law a number of boilerplate clauses which have appeared each year in the past as part of the annual AEC authorization bill. These clauses concern advance planning and design, restoration and replacement, and substitutions.

4. MINOR DRAFTING CHANGES

Sections 9 through 12 make minor changes in several sections of the act to correct minor drafting errors or omissions.

C. BILL FOR DISPOSAL OF THE LOS ALAMOS COMMUNITY (PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-719)

The Joint Committee in 1962 approved bills to provide for the disposal of the Los Alamos community—H.R. 12718 and S. 3580—in order to terminate Federal Government ownership of facilities and housing in the community and to permit local self-government and private homeownership.

When the atomic energy projects were started in secrecy during World War II, three communities were established at each of three necessarily remote locations: One at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; another at Richland, Wash.; and a third at Los Alamos, N. Mex. In 1955 Congress enacted the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, providing for the disposal of the Government-owned communities at Oak Ridge and Richland. It was decided not to include the Los Alamos community at that time because of its acute housing shortage and the need for continuing stringent security. In February 1962 the AEC submitted a bill to the Joint Committee to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act to provide for disposal of the Los Alamos community under similar terms and conditions.

Public hearings on the proposed disposal were held by the Subcommittee on Communities at Los Alamos on April 23, 1962. Thirty-eight witnesses testified at the hearing, representing the principal Government agencies involved—AEC and HHFA—as well as public officials and private citizens in the community.

On August 1, 1962, the bills were approved by the Subcommittee on Communities and reported out favorably by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The bill was passed by the Senate on August 8 and by the House of Representatives on September 12, and signed by the President on September 18, 1962, as Public Law No. 87-719.

The bill provides the same general framework for disposal as applied at the Oak Ridge and Richland communities. It authorizes approximately $8.7 million for necessary plant additions and modifications to be undertaken over the next several years during the period of predisposal and disposal operations. It also authorizes local assistance payments for a period of 10 years after disposal is effective.

In summary, the bill provides the same opportunity for local self-government and home ownership as previously provided to the atomic energy communities at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash.

II. AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

A. PEACEFUL USES

In accordance with section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, 1 new agreement, and amendments to 12 existing agreements for cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy were submitted to the Joint Committee by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission during 1962. The new agreement was with Argentina, and the amended agreements are with Brazil, city of West Berlin, the Republic of China, Euratom, France, Greece, Israel, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, and West Germany.

On June 25, 1962, the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation held a public hearing to review the proposed agreement and amendments. Following the hearing, at a committee meeting on June 28, 1962, the Joint Committee waived the remainder of the 30-day period in the case of the amendment to the agreement for cooperation with Israel, since the agreement would have otherwise expired prior to the expiration of the 30-day waiting period.

The new agreement for cooperation with Argentina supersedes a previous agreement. The new agreement provides for the sale or lease, as may be agreed upon, of a net amount of 65 kilograms of U^{235}. The old agreement was limited to lesser quantities of material at a lower enrichment.

The amendments to the agreements with the remaining countries, for the most part, extended the terms for an additional 2-year period. New language was also incorporated to facilitate administration of safeguards by the International Atomic Energy Agency over materials and equipment transfered under the bilateral agreements.

The amendment to the agreement for cooperation with Euratom will permit Euratom to lease, as well as purchase, enriched uranium for power reactors under the United States-Euratom joint reactor program. In addition, the amendment made changes to the existing agreement with respect to the indemnity protection, patents, and the use of materials. According to testimony received from representatives of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission, the amendments were consistent with the objectives of the Euratom program and will permit increased cooperation between the United States and the countries of the Western European community in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

B. MUTUAL DEFENSE

A proposed new agreement for cooperation with Belgium for mutual defense purposes was submitted by the President in 1962.

Section 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act requires that proposed agreements for cooperation for mutual defense purposes, as distinct from peaceful uses, must lay before the Congress and the Joint Committee for a period of 60 days while Congress is in session, prior to taking effect. Moreover, they may not take effect if the Congress, during the 60-day waiting period, passes a concurrent resolution expressing disapproval.

The proposed agreement for cooperation with Belgium for mutual defense purposes was reviewed by the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation at executive and public hearings on June

25, 1962. This agreement is essentially the same as agreements which have been concluded since 1959 with a number of other NATO countries. It provides for the transfer of classified information and nonnuclear materials to assist Belgium in the training and operation of its military forces in using and defending against atomic weapons. In accordance with the statute, the agreement does not permit the transfer of any nuclear parts of atomic weapons nor any information to assist another country in the design, development, fabrication, or testing of nuclear weapons.

On June 29, 1962, the Joint Committee filed separate reports to the Senate and House of Representatives on the proposed agreement with Belgium. The report stated that the Joint Committee, after having reviewed the hearings, had no objection to the proposed agreement.

III. INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and its subcommittees held a total of 94 public and executive hearings. A total number of 200 hours were spent in these hearings. The full committee held 32 executive sessions and 13 public meetings. The subcommittees held 20 executive sessions and 29 public meetings. Some 18 publications, consisting of reports, hearings, and committee prints were printed by the Joint Committee during this 2d session of the 87th Congress.

A. STATUS OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY INDUSTRY (SEC. 202)

The Joint Committee held hearings in March on the "Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry." These hearings are held annually in public session pursuant to section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The major focus of this year's hearings was the AEC's goal of achieving economic nuclear power in some areas of the United States by 1968. Among the subjects covered in the 4 days of hearings were the AEC plutonium buy-back program, private ownership of nuclear fuel, and radioisotopes in industry.

B. RAW MATERIALS

On June 18 and 19, 1962, the Subcommittee on Raw Materials held public hearings on the AEC uranium procurement program. These hearings were a followup to hearings held by the subcommittee in Moab, Utah, in November 1961.

During the hearings testimony was received from representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and representatives of the uranium industry. The subcommittee heard testimony concerning the increasing trend toward concentration of the industry in a few large corporations, and considered the implications of this trend for the future. The hearings also pointed up the need for a declaration by the Atomic Energy Commission of its uranium procurement policies after 1966.

At the close of the hearings, Subcommittee Chairman Aspinall stated that the subcommittee would continue to maintain close surveillance over the AEC raw materials program.

C. INDEMNITY HEARINGS

On April 10 and 11, 1962, the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation held its annual hearings on atomic energy indemnity and reactor safety. Testimony was received from representatives of the AEC and the reactor and insurance industries.

In addition to reviewing the AEC's regular annual report concerning indemnity and the activities of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, the subcommittee considered several other subjects of current interest in the insurance and indemnity fields.

Testimony was received on the bills, H.R. 9244 and H.R. 10775, introduced by Congressman Price, chairman of the subcommittee, to extend Price-Anderson indemnity protection to contractors engaged in activities outside the United States. Legislation on this subject was later incorporated in the 1962 omnibus bill, Public Law No. 87-615—see section I-B above.

The subcommittee also considered insurance and indemnity problems arising out of the transportation of radioactive materials across toll roads, tunnels, and bridges.

Representatives of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards also testified during the hearings on current reactor safety problems and the reactor site criteria recently published by the AEC.

D. REGULATORY HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Legislation held public hearings on AEC regulatory problems on April 17, 1962. The hearings covered recent developments in the AEC regulatory field and the bills to establish an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board and make other changes in the AEC regulatory process. The substance of these bills was subsequently incorporated in the 1962 omnibus bill, Public Law No. 87-615—see part I-B above.

E. HEARINGS ON RADIATION STANDARDS AND FALLOUT

The Joint Committee held public hearings June 4–7, 1962, on "Radiation Standards, Including Fallout." These hearings were particularly timely because of increased public concern over the radioactive fallout resulting from the resumption of the nuclear weapons tests by the Soviet Union in the preceding fall, followed 6 months later by the resumption of nuclear testing by the United States in the spring of 1962.

The objectives of these hearings were threefold:

First. To update the information previously developed by the Joint Committee during the course of hearings on fallout in 1957 and 1959 and on radiation standards in 1960;

Second. To review Government policies and organizational problems associated with the administration of radiation standards; and

Third. To consider, in layman's terms, the risks involved in exposure to manmade radiation.

After the hearings, the committee prepared a summary analysis which was published in September 1962. In addition to the highlights of the testimony, the summary analysis includes a comparison of the radiation exposures and biological effects from various sources of radiation including medical and dental X-rays, background radiation, and fallout.

The testimony brought out a difference of opinion concerning the applicability of exposure limits established for the peaceful uses of atomic energy to fallout from nuclear weapons testing. Following the hearings, a significant exchange of correspondence occurred between the committee and the Federal Radiation Council and the Public Health Service to obtain clarification on the applicability of available radiation guides to exposures from fallout.

F. SPACE APPLICATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY

The Joint Committee held a series of hearings on the development of atomic energy for the propulsion of space vehicles and atmospheric missiles as well as the generation of electricity for auxiliary power in space missions.

The first session of these hearings on September 13 covered the Rover nuclear rocket program. In this hearing, testimony was received on the status of the program and plans for flight test of the first nuclear rocket engine. Information was obtained on delays which have been incurred in the program and steps which are planned to accelerate progress in the development of a nuclear rocket engine.

During the second session, the SNAP project—systems for nuclear auxiliary power—was discussed. This program is aimed at the development of nuclear-powered electric generators to provide auxiliary power for space vehicles and satellites.

Testimony was received on the performance of the first SNAP unit used to supply electric power for a satellite. This was the Transit satellite which was launched in June of 1961 and which has been performing satisfactorily to date. Testimony was received concerning the resistance of such power supplies to damage by radiation in space, a difficulty which has impaired the performance of solar cells in similar missions. The testimony brought out the need for giving additional consideration to the development and use of nuclear power supplies for future space missions in order to obtain a more reliable power supply.

The final public session of this series of hearings was devoted to the Pluto nuclear ramjet project. This project is aimed at the development of a supersonic nuclear ramjet engine for the propulsion of space vehicles. It is a joint AEC-Air Force development program and is the only project aimed at the development of a nuclear propulsion plant for vehicles in the earth's atmosphere.

The testimony indicated that excellent progress has been realized in the development of the nuclear reactor portion of the system. It was indicated that the associated engine and vehicle development work is 1 to 1½ years behind the development of the nuclear reactor. The testimony made it apparent that delays in the completion of this development program are imminent if the Department of Defense fails to complete its review and approval of the joint AEC-Air Force program for succeeding phases of the project.

G. DISPOSAL OF THE LOS ALAMOS COMMUNITY

The Subcommittee on Communities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held hearings at Los Alamos, N. Mex., on April 23, 1962, to consider legislation for the disposal of Government-owned properties at the Los Alamos community.

Extensive testimony covered every facet of the proposed termination of Government ownership of the community. In addition, the published record contains an exhaustive collection of financial and descriptive data pertaining to the community.

As noted earlier in this report, these hearings set the stage for further legislative action which resulted in the enactment of the Los Alamos disposal bill.

H. CONFIRMATION OF PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTEES

The Senate section of the Joint Committee met in public session on August 14, 1962, to consider the nomination of James T. Ramey and John G. Palfrey to the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Ramey was nominated to serve the remainder of the term of Mr. John S. Graham until June 30, 1963. Mr. Palfrey was nominated to serve a full 5-year term, to expire June 30, 1967.

The Senate section met in executive session to consider the nominations on August 14, 22, and 23. The nominations were reported favorably on August 23 and confirmed by the Senate on August 24, 1962.

I. U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

On August 2, 1962, the Joint Committee held a public hearing on U.S. policy toward the International Atomic Energy Agency. Special emphasis was given to a report on this subject published May 19, 1962, by an advisory committee to the Department of State.

The committee received testimony from Dr. Henry D. Smyth, U.S. representative to the IAEA, who served as chairman of the advisory committee, and from other members of the advisory committee.

In addition, testimony was received from the Honorable Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, and Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Commissioner, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, concerning plans by the Department of State and AEC for implementation of the recommendations of the advisory committee's report. Mr. Sterling Cole, former Director General of the IAEA, also testified.

At the outset of the hearings, Chairman HOLIFIELD pointed out that the IAEA has now been in existence for 5 years, and that we approach the juncture where the United States must decide whether the IAEA is to be assigned a major role in U.S. policy for development of nuclear power abroad and application of safeguards, or whether these activities will be carried out primarily through bilateral channels. The testimony indicated that a delegation from India had recently visited the United States seeking assistance for construction of a large atomic powerplant in India. Chairman HOLIFIELD pointed out that the question of whether IAEA safeguards would be applied to such reactors in India would be of crucial importance to the future of the IAEA.

The hearings also covered possible ways in which the United States might indicate further support of the objectives of the IAEA.

J. AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

On June 25, 1962, a public hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation on proposed agreements and amendments to agreements for cooperation with other nations in the atomic energy field. Testimony was received concerning proposed amendments to agreements for peaceful purposes with the city of Berlin and the countries of Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, Greece, Israel, Portugal, South Africa, and Thailand, and with Euratom, and a new agreement with Argentina. In addition, testimony was received concerning a proposed agreement for cooperation with Belgium for mutual defense purposes. Following the hearings, on June 29, 1962, the Joint Committee filed reports in the House and Senate stating that it had no objection to the proposed agreement.

K. PROPOSED ARRANGEMENTS FOR ELECTRIC GENERATING FACILITIES AT HANFORD NEW PRODUCTION REACTOR

Following the enactment of the fiscal year 1963 Authorization Act, which included provisions authorizing arrangements for the addition of electric generating facilities at the Hanford new production reactor, the Joint Committee held hearings on September 27 to review these proposed arrangements. The committee also reviewed certain determinations which had been made by the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to the law.

Testimony was received from each of the contracting parties, including the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Washington Public Power Supply System. Following the hearings, Chairman HOLIFIELD in a letter to the manager of the WPPSS, stated the view of the committee that the proposed arrangements submitted to the committee were "in compliance with the terms and conditions of the law."

L. FOOD IRRADIATION PROGRAM

The Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation held hearings March 6–7, 1962, to review the AEC and Army food irradiation programs.

The hearings were held because of concern over budgetary cutbacks in the AEC program which would have curtailed the fiscal year 1963 effort.

The Army is working under a 6-year program utilizing the high dose or complete sterilization method for the preservation of such foods as meat, pork, and poultry for ultimate Army acceptance and use. It was learned that the Department of the Army expected to obtain approval from the Food and Drug Administration within the near future to begin use of its first irradiated food—bacon.

The AEC program consists of low dose or pasteurization of such foods as fish, fruit, and vegetables for ultimate widespread consumption. Notable successes with fish and fruit were indicated.

Expert witnesses from Government, universities, and other sources testified overwhelmingly in favor of continuance of the program because of the outstanding research results.

Following these hearings the Joint Committee added several items in the AEC authorization bill for the fiscal year 1963 to support the food irradiation program. These projects added by the committee were the marine products demonstration irradiator for fish products and two mobile irradiators which could be transportable to various locations for fruit, vegetable, or fish processing on site.

IV. CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES

In addition to the hearings described in the previous section of this report, the Joint Committee conducted an extensive number of hearings on classified matters in executive session.

The subject matter of these hearings proved to be as broad as the worldwide defense and security interests of the United States.

INTELLIGENCE BRIEFINGS

On January 17 and August 14, 1962, the full committee received intensive briefings on late intelligence developments from Mr. John A. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The meetings were a continuation of the regular practice of semiannual briefings by CIA on vital matters affecting the security of the United States.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING

In the area of nuclear weapons testing, the committee in January reviewed the results of U.S. underground tests with AEC officials. In advance of the resumption of atmospheric testing, the committee also received a detailed briefing from officials of joint task force 8 and its commander, Gen. A. D. Starbird, on planned Pacific test operations.

After the initial series of atmospheric tests, the committee held further executive hearings at which test results were reviewed with representatives of DOD, AEC, Los Alamos Laboratory, Livermore Laboratory, and Sandia Corp. Among the key officials who testified were Gerald W. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy; Dr. Norris Bradbury; Dr. John Foster, and Mr. S. P. Shwartz, president of Sandia Corp.

NATO

The problem of nuclear commitments by the United States to NATO continued to be a vital area of committee interest. On March 1, 1962, the committee received an extensive briefing on current and planned U.S. policy with regard to nuclear weapons for NATO. Witnesses from the State Department, DOD, and AEC testified during 2 days of hearings.

Later, in September, the committee met with Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, who had been designated to succeed Gen. Lauris Norstad as supreme Allied commander, Europe. In this meeting the committee had the opportunity of reviewing NATO nuclear weapons arrangements with General Lemnitzer.

DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

During the course of the year, the committee closely followed the progress of disarmament negotiations. Prior to his departure for Geneva, Ambassador Arthur Dean, U.S. representative to the 18-nation disarmament conference, reviewed proposed U.S. policy positions at Geneva with the joint committee. He was accompanied by representatives of the State Department, AEC, and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Upon his return from Geneva, Ambassador Dean, on August 2, 1962, reported to the committee on the progress of negotiations and further U.S. plans in connection with negotiations for a test ban treaty with the Soviet Union.

SECURITY

Finally, the committee continued its watchdog role in assuring the adequacy of safeguards to protect restricted data. The Subcommittee on Security held hearings in executive session to review the adequacy of DOD and AEC procedures for the safeguarding of atomic secrets. Included were reviews and analyses of specific security cases. During these hearings, recommendations were made by the committee for improving Defense Department security practices and regulations. Some changes were subsequently adopted by the Department of Defense.

Current United States-Indonesian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on August 2 it was my privilege to welcome the amicable settlement of the Dutch-Indonesian dispute over West New Guinea—an area to be known henceforth on our maps as West Irian. This was a bitter, though inevitable, decision for the Dutch, who signed the agreement and evacuated their former colony with dignity and good will.

With the elimination of almost all vestiges of colonialism in the Indonesian Archipelago, events in the island republic have truly entered a new stage. Indonesia has staggering economic problems over the short run, as well as bright opportunities if her resources of manpower and material are wisely used and employed. Indonesia enjoys considerable internal stability, although her huge Communist minority poses grave questions for the future. Whither Indonesia? Indeed, whither independent Algeria and scores of other underdeveloped countries whose ability to stand on their own feet is one of the biggest problems facing the world today.

Mr. President, we must recognize the fact that our relations with these new and relatively new countries can affect the course of history for good or for ill. No country, no area of the world, is either to be written off as lost or to be taken for granted as a friend and ally.

For this reason I am pleased to share with my colleagues a study on United States-Indonesian relations which was prepared at my request by Mr. Edward D. Sinaga, a congressional fellow under the sponsorship of the American Political Science Association and a Ph. D. candidate at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. He is also president of the Indonesian Students Association of the United States. The study, entitled "A New Chapter in United States-Indonesian Relations," represents the thinking of one patriotic Indonesian nationalist who believes that the development of mutual understanding between his country and ours is a worthy goal demanding much hard work on both sides. Of course, Mr. Sinaga's specific views and conclusions are his own, but I certainly share his hope for the happy fulfillment of the current new chapter in United States-Indonesian affairs. The study is a significant contribution to this end, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW CHAPTER IN UNITED STATES-INDONESIAN RELATIONS

(A study prepared at the request of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY by Edward Djanner Sinaga, congressional fellow, American Political Science Association)

INTRODUCTION

A new chapter has been opened in the United States-Indonesian relations, now that the sensitive issue of West Irian has been amicably solved between Indonesia and the Netherlands. The United States has played a constructive role in this outcome. A peaceful solution was achieved without having to sacrifice thousands of lives on both sides, and at the same time a serious threat to world peace was avoided.

Aside from United Nations Secretary General U Thant and both the Dutch and Indonesian Governments, the Kennedy administration certainly deserves credit for the achievement of the West Irian solution through the efforts of former U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. Dr. Subandrio, Indonesia's Foreign Minister, having thanked Secretary General U Thant for his "guidance during the negotiations based upon sincerity, wisdom and experience," paid special tribute to Ambassador Bunker in his brief speech before the signing of the Dutch-Indonesian accord.

Subandrio said:

"On behalf of the Indonesian Government and people, I also wish to sincerely thank the tireless efforts and patience of Ambassador Bunker, who never spared himself physically and mentally in order to overcome the difficulties and obstacles which sometimes seem to flood the path toward this agreement. * * * To be frank, without the personal qualities inherent to Ambassador Bunker, it would be almost impossible to formulate an agreement within such a short period."

The United Nations General Assembly approved the text of the Dutch-Indonesian agreement on August 15, 1962, and adopted it as a United Nations resolution.[1]

During his recent visit to the United Nations to sign the Dutch-Indonesian agreement, Dr. Subandrio had a 55-minute talk with Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Coming out of the meeting, Subandrio declared the opening of a new chapter in United States-Indonesian relationships.[2]

A REVIEW OF THE PAST

While entering the "new chapter," it would be useful to review the past chapters of United States-Indonesian relations.

To start with the struggle for independence (1945–49), one would note the active involvement of the United States in the United Nations effort to solve the "war" between Indonesia and the Netherlands. The U.S. Senate adopted a resolution in support of Indonesia's cause. Several Senators, such as Senator Wayne Morse, Senator Brewster, Senator Frank Graham, who served as a member of the United Nations Commission for Indonesia (UNCI), and other Senators made strong statements in support of Indonesia's struggle for freedom from 350 years of Dutch rule.[3] The U.S. Government was ready to apply a sanction in the form of a threat to cut off Marshall plan aid to the Netherlands if the latter did not comply with the resolution. The resolution predicated the transfer of sovereignty over the former Netherlands East Indies[4] from the Netherlands to Indonesia in December 1949, after 4 years of bloody war.

The action of the United States then was regarded in Indonesia as a positive and constructive element in United States-Indonesian relations.

UNITED STATES-INDONESIAN RELATIONS DURING PERIOD OF POLITICAL INSTABILITY, 1950–59

The years from 1950 to mid-1959 were dominated by complex political, social, economic and other factors, rational as well as irrational, in Indonesia's struggle for political stability and her search for a national identity.

It was not easy for American observers to penetrate and comprehend the factors dominating the Indonesian political scene at this period of United States-Indonesian relations. In 1958, this lack of sophistication in understanding Indonesia's political and philosophical problems at this period was reflected in the grave error of tacit U.S. support for the rebellious elements in Indonesia. The rebels used the bait of anticommunism to obtain Western or U.S. support, while proclaiming the establishment of "a state within a state," in the form of what was known as the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Indonesia (PRRI).

Quite understandably, President Sukarno, whose position was analogous to that of Abraham Lincoln in the early 1860's, had to take drastic action against the rebellious elements in order "to preserve the Union," to use Abraham Lincoln's words. After 3 years of internal fighting, President Sukarno granted amnesty to those rebels who voluntarily surrendered. This policy has led to the establishment of domestic tranquillity. Indeed, the Union was preserved. The wisdom of President Sukarno and his Minister of National Security Affairs, now concurrently Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, Gen. Harris Nasution, deserves great praise in solving a very grave national problem, which obviously has had international repercussions.

---

[1] Text of agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands is attached. See Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY'S statement on Dutch-Indonesian Accord in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Aug. 2, 1962.

[2] See Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1962, article written by Warren Unna, "Rusk, Indonesian Talk; 'New Chapter' Hailed."

[3] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[4] The status of West Irian was supposed to be negotiated a year later. After 12 years of dispute, the Bunker formula solved the problem.

A DRAMA IN UNITED STATES-INDONESIAN RELATIONS: THE CASE OF AMERICAN FLIER LAWRENCE POPE

In the course of the rebellion in Indonesia (1958–61), a tragic drama occurred, which had a negative effect upon United States-Indonesian relations. This was the involvement of an American flier, called by the then President Eisenhower "a soldier of fortune," who was generously paid by the rebels to fly rebel bombers. In the course of one such mission he was shot down and captured by the Indonesian troops. After adequate hearings and proceedings, the appropriate Indonesian court of justice sentenced Pope to death. But luck was on the side of Lawrence Pope.

While he was awaiting the execution of his death sentence, a cordial atmosphere was growing in United States-Indonesian relations. In particular the constructive role of the United States in the settlement of the West Irian dispute led to the establishment of this new and cordial atmosphere. Instead of being executed by the Indonesian authority, it was reported that Pope was already vacationing in Florida a few weeks ago. President Sukarno pardoned him. It would have been a sorry page in the chapter of United States-Indonesian relations had Pope been executed. President Sukarno's decision to grant him amnesty certainly contributed to the "new chapter" in United States-Indonesian relations.

THE GUIDED DEMOCRACY CONCEPT

It is important to review the process of political and ideological development in Indonesia as a significant factor affecting U.S. relations. For that reason, we shall review briefly Indonesia's national concept of "guided democracy" and its impact upon Indonesia's political process.

The period from 1950 to 1959 can be regarded as one of parliamentary disorder. There was constant political instability due to the easy fall and rise of short-lived cabinets. It was quite amazing that in the first general election in 1955, 162 political parties and groups participated in the contest for votes. No Western democracy was ever afflicted with so many parties and splinter groups. Quite logically, ultraparliamentary democracy resulted in ultraparliamentary chaos. Even when only 28 political parties and groups out of the 162 managed to secure votes to elect their representatives to the Parliament, that number was still too many. Party maneuvering has consistently caused political instability. The majority in Parliament, or a combination of a few political parties which became a majority, could easily overthrow any cabinet. The result was that within 13 years, 17 cabinets have reigned. The well-known motto, "My loyalty to my party ends when my loyalty to my country demands" was far from being realized. The ultraparliamentary democracy which led to the chaotic situation in this period demanded a solution. A new national concept, rather than the Dutch-style parliamentary system, was needed.

It was in such a situation that President Sukarno proclaimed the concept of democracy with leadership, or as it is often called guided democracy.

Since the concept was new at the time, there were various reactions, favorable and unfavorable, at home and abroad. And as the domestic political situation needed vigorous leadership, as embodied in the person of President Sukarno, there was an increasingly favorable reaction to the new concept. And today, all elements of Indonesian society rally behind the national concept. Abroad, however, there has been insufficent understanding of the new concept.

Let us review the institutional, ideological and other aspects of the concept.

Guided democracy entails the following institutional structure: the Presidency and the Cabinet (almost comparable to the presidential system of the United States); the Supreme Advisory Council, which advises the President at the request of the President or at the initiative of the Council; the National Planning Council, entrusted with the overall national development plan; the House of Representatives, representing the political parties and functional groups; the People's Congress, which includes the House of Representatives and the regional delegates, constituting the highest governmental institution in the nation. Besides these there are autonomous regional governments and also a body of the courts of justice throughout the nation. There is also a national front, led by the President, which coordinates the activities of all revolutionary forces.

As to the ideological aspect of guided democracy, it should be noted that these institutions act according to the official state ideology called the Pancha Sila, which contains five basic principles. These are: Belief in God, humanitarianism (internationalism), national consciousness (nationalism), people's sovereignty (democracy) and last but not least, social justice. Another ideological function is the establishment of a general outline of state policy by the People's Congress. The general outline of state policy is called the Manipol-Usdek (the political manifesto), which sets the main course of the state. It determines the implementation of the guided democracy, the guided economy, the national identity, and Indonesian socialism, all based upon the 1945 constitution.

Significant elements in the implementation of the Indonesian national concept are the principles of Gotong Royong (the traditional "mutual cooperation" principle, inherited from Indonesian history and characteristics in Indonesian daily life; Musjawarah, meaning "consultation" rather than endless debate; Mufakat, which emphasizes the general consensus of opinion containing the principle of unanimity rather than strict majority rule.

One interesting aspect of the guided democracy concept is the existence of 10 political parties, representing the nationalist groups, the religious affiliations—Moslem, Catholic, and Protestant—and the Communist Party. There are five nationalist parties, four religious, and one Communist party. This concept is quite different from that of President Nasser's where only one political party exists, or Nkrumah's of Ghana, or Pakistan's "basic democracy," or Ne Win's of Burma. It differs from the practice of many other countries, in the East or in the West, in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, where only one political party or no political party is allowed to function. There is, however, a growing feeling in Indonesia that the present 10 parties need to be reduced to 5, representing the 5 main political forces.

The notion that guided democracy is a dictatorial system is wrong. Democracy does exist in Indonesia. Indonesia calls it an Indonesian democracy, a democracy with Indonesian ingredients, so to speak. Who guides the democracy, now that it is called guided democracy? Is it President Sukarno? No, President Sukarno himself has denied this. It is the state ideology, the Pancha Sila, which guides the Indonesian democracy and the general outline of state policy (the Manipol-Usdek), which was determined by the highest institution in the nation, the People's Congress. Not many people in the United States realize this fact. The term "guided" seemed to have aroused a prejudice, which actually is unjustified. The Pancha Sila ideology is an official state ideology, incorporated in the preamble to the Indonesian Constitution. Thus, all laws and regulations including the constitution must be derived from the five basic principles of Pancha Sila. Since the democracy is guided by the Pancha Sila ideology, it actually can be called a Pancha Sila democracy or a Pancha Sila-guided democracy.[5]

Most people in the United States who ask about Indonesia are preoccupied with the Communists in Indonesia. Why are they allowed to exist? Some people forget that even in the United States the Communist Party exists. In the Western democracies, which are alined to fight against communism, the Communist Party is allowed to operate, under the basic philosophy of "freedom of expression." Indeed, freedom of expression exists in Indonesia. In England, France, Italy, and other Western democracies, one would find Communist parties. So it is not surprising to find one in Indonesia.

But in the case of Indonesia, as distinct from other non-Communist countries, there is an established state ideology, the official Pancha Sila ideology, which contains the five basic principles of belief in God, humanitarianism, nationalism, people's sovereignty, and social justice. And there is a general outline of state policy, the Manipol-Usdek (the political manifesto). Any political party or group in Indonesia is required to adhere to this state ideology and general outline of state policy. For this reason, President Sukarno and other non-Communist leaders always stress the fact that in an Indonesian democracy, where freedom of expression exists, there is no sense of having a "communistophobia" (fear of the Communists). Indeed, any political party or any group or individual, Communist of non-Communist, which attempts to undermine the state ideology, Pancha Sila, and the general outline of state policy, the Manipol-Usdek, will not be tolerated.

It is therefore up to the non-Communist parties to compete with the Communists in theory and in practice to strengthen the state ideology and to implement the general outline of state policy.

In general, these are the facts. One could go into details on the subject.

The question then arises: How could the Communists accept the Pancha Sila ideology, since the Pancha Sila's first principle is belief in God? This indeed is a valid question. But the Indonesian Communist Party does accept the Pancha Sila, interestingly enough, for the Government requires any political party to accept it as a prerequisite for its survival. But is the Communist Party in Indonesia a "revisionist" party, or has it accepted the Pancha Sila for tactical reasons? These are questions which history will answer.

IMPACT OF THE GUIDED DEMOCRACY CONCEPT IN INDONESIA'S DEVELOPMENT

One very important and very basic achievement under the concept of guided democracy is the fact that political stability has been established. Another, equally important achievement, is that a concrete economic plan, the 8-year plan, has been formulated and is today the basis of Indonesia's overall national development process. Various industrial, agricultural, roadbuilding, and numerous other construction projects have been and are going forward without the fear of possible political sabotage, as was the case under the ultraliberal parliamentary system.

Education, which unquestionably is a factor in the upbuilding of any nation, has been one of Indonesia's greatest achievements since independence. When the Dutch left Indonesia, after a colonization of 350 years, there was only 5-percent literacy among the 75 million people. Today, out of a population of 100 million, 60 percent are literate. At the end of the Dutch colonial period in Indonesia, there was only one university throughout the 3,000 islands. Today, Indonesia has established more than a hundred colleges, academies, universities, both private and Government-owned. Thousands of students, graduates and undergraduates have studied and are currently studying abroad—in the United States, in Western and Eastern Europe, in Australia, in Japan, in India, and in other countries.

---

[5] Attached is a paper on "Pancha Sila an Ideological Contribution to an Ideological Age," by the writer.

In brief, the guided democracy concept has facilitated economic, political, and cultural progress in Indonesia. Further progress and challenges are still ahead.

U.S. ATTITUDE TOWARD INDONESIA'S NATIONAL CONCEPT

Having discussed the guided democracy concept, let us review briefly the U.S. attitude toward the new concept in the context of United States-Indonesian relations. The U.S. attitude should be viewed in the light of the political, economic, and ideological revolution now taking place in various parts of the world.

In this political, economic, and ideological revolution among the developing countries, one common phenomenon is distinctly obvious. That is, the recognition of the fact that a national concept, suitable to the needs and prevailing conditions of the country concerned and suitable to its national identity, has become an absolute necessity. This premise rejects the imposition of any alien concept, be it from the East or West, but does not object to those aspects of both Western and Eastern concepts that are adjustable to the prevailing conditions of the country and useful for its upbuilding.

This phenomenon can be discovered not only in the guided democracy concept, but also in other concepts, such as Pakistan's "basic democracy," Nasser's Arab socialism, Ne Win's Burmese socialism, Nkrumah's Ghanaian socialism, Sekou Toure's concept for Guinea, Nehru's Indian socialism, and other similar concepts. Even in the Communist world, this phenomenon can be found in Yugoslavia's revision of orthodox communism.

In the process of the ideological revolution discussed above, and in evaluating the U.S. attitude toward Indonesia's guided democracy concept, one can fairly say that the United States has become increasingly aware of her past error in adhering to a doctrine of "those who are not with us are against us." The Kennedy administration has reflected this increasing awareness. Indeed, there is a marked change in international outlook between the Kennedy administration and the Eisenhower-Dulles administration. The farsightedness of the present administration in its basic international outlook is being felt and welcomed by the newly independent nations. This is perhaps to be credited to the farsightedness and qualities of internationally renowned personalities such as President Kennedy, Adlai Stevenson, Chester Bowles, Dean Rusk, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Justice William Douglas, Robert Kennedy, and others. Both the Democratic and the Republican Parties have men of international caliber with a farsighted outlook in dealing with the political, economic and ideological revolution discussed earlier.

During his trip to Indonesia earlier this year, President Kennedy's brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, met with President Sukarno and other national leaders and also with Indonesian students. In one of his speeches to the students in Djakarta, Kennedy showed his understanding or his attempt to understand Indonesia's problems and aspirations by citing an Indonesian proverb: "Lain ladang, lain belalang; lain lubuk lain ikan"—"another field, another grasshopper, another pond, another fish."[6]

Since "each country has its own customs and habits," as Robert Kennedy rightly understands it, or to expand it a little bit more, since each country has its own problems, prevailing social, political, economic, and other related conditions, each also has the right to establish its own national concept in order to deal with these prevailing conditions and problems. This is a political interpretation of the proverb.

"A sense of identity and of national aspirations," to borrow Robert Kennedy's words, is being recognized and ought to be recognized by the United States in her dealings with the developing nations. In this connection it is worth noting that the American press in general seems to be a little behind, as compared with the progressive attitude of the administration. Here and there, however, signs of progress have appeared.

INDONESIA'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Having reviewed the guided democracy concept in the context of United States-Indonesian relations, it is significant to discuss briefly Indonesia's economic development and aspirations, which are based upon the concept of guided economy or Indonesian socialism.

Now that the West Irian issue, which has absorbed 70 percent of her national energy, is solved, Indonesia can devote her national effort to the great task of economic construction. She has to carry out short-term economic stabilization and implementation of the 8-year plan. The short-term economic stabilization program aims to achieve self-sufficiency in food and clothing for the people. Also the need to carry out a monetary stabilization program is being seriously recognized. The long-term economic construction program covers the period from 1961 to 1969, i.e., the 8-year overall national development plan, which was planned by the National Planning Council and approved by the People's Congress.

The 8-year plan contains 343 projects in the following fields: culture, education, research, social welfare, public administration, clothing production, food production, industry in general, fisheries, medical development, transport and distribution, finance, oil, aluminum, tourism and specific construction projects. These projects are spread throughout the islands and provinces (including West Irian), so as to make it "overall" and "national," as the plan is called.

The 8-year plan is aimed at increasing the national income per capita, which was estimated to be rupiah 2,500 (or roughly US$56 at the rate of Rp45 per US$1) in 1960, with 1½ percent per annum at the investment rate of 13 percent of the gross national product (estimated to be Rp236 billion in 1960). This is with the calculation of a population growth rate of 2.3 percent (92.7 million in 1960).

The first 8-year plan is meant to establish strong foundations for further 8-year plans in Indonesia's aim to achieve a "just and prosperous society" or a "Pancha Sila society," as President Sukarno calls it.

To bring Indonesia's economic endeavor into the perspective of United States-Indonesian relations, it is significant to note that as a result of an agreement between Presidents Sukarno and Kennedy, a U.S. economic survey team was sent to Indonesia. The economic survey team[7] had five main tasks which, in general, concerned the 8-year plan and general U.S. economic assistance to Indonesia. Point 4 of the defined task of the team was to recommend the ways in which the United States could be of assistance to Indonesia, particularly in regard to the execution of its 8-year plan.[8]

The economic team is convinced that Indonesia possesses all the necessary elements of a stable economy. The team believes that although Indonesia is still in the early stages of economic development, she is moving in the right direction. Indonesia, the team stated, has not reached the period of takeoff into self-sustained growth, but "We predict," the team asserts, "that when the Indonesian economy does take off, it will fly high and fast."[9]

The U.S. economic survey team is certainly justified in stating that Indonesia has a tremendous potentiality and a great future. Some people do not realize that Indonesia is, in fact, the third richest country in the world in terms of natural resources, surpassed only by the United States and the Soviet Union. It is the fifth most populous nation in the world with about 100 million people. The republic consists of 3,000 islands stretching from Sabang, in the northernmost tip of Sumatra, to Merauke, in the western end of West Irian. It covers a territory comparable to the distance from San Francisco to New York or from London to Moscow, lcated between the Pacific and the Indian Oceans. It is not only rich in natural resources, but it is also rich in culture, since her civilization dates back 2,000 years. All these factors certainly lend credence to the prediction of the U.S. economic survey team that Indonesia will one day fly high and fast.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senate majority whip and member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, gave special attention to the report of the U.S. economic survey team to Indonesia. He agreed with the team that "a stable, viable, and independent Indonesia, though following a nonalined foreign policy, will be advantageous to the United States and the free world in the context of world politics."[10]

Senator HUMPHREY stated that "Indonesia is fortunate in possessing more than the rudiments of a modern industrial society" and praised Indonesia's ability to "plan her development with excellent chances for success."

"In line with the recommehdations of the study team," the Senator from Minnesota said, "the United States should help build up the infrastructure of the Indonesian economy—transport, light industry, and so forth—which in turn will provide the basis for heavy capital investment in the future."[11]

THE ROLE OF FOREIGN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE IN INDONESIA'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

In the perspective of United States-Indonesian relations, the writer deems it necessary to discuss briefly the role of foreign private enterprise in Indonesia's economic development. One aspect of Indonesian socialism is that "private enterprises are given an appropriate role," particularly "in the field of production and transportation."[12] Not only Indonesian national private enterprise, but foreign private enterprise as well.

The term "socialism" has erroneously been associated by some people in the United States with communism or with complete state ownership of economic enterprise.

---

[6] See Robert Kennedy, "Just Friends and Brave Enemies," Harper & Row, publishers, New York, and Evanston, 1962, p. 105. Robert Kennedy wrote two chapters in this report of his world tour on his visit to Indonesia.

[7] See "Indonesia: Perspectives and Proposals for U.S. Economic Aid," published by the Agency for International Development, Washington, 1962, p. 1.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Op. cit., foreword.

[10] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Aug. 2, 1962, p. 15479.

[11] Ibid. Senator HUMPHREY incorporated into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Aug. 2, 1962, the summary of the U.S. economic survey team report.

[12] See decision of People's Congress (MPRS) on Indonesian Socialism in "Ringkasan Pembangunan Semesta," Department of Information, Djakarta, 1961.

But some people forget that even in a capitalistic society such as the United States, where main emphasis in any economic endeavor is placed upon private initiative, one discovers enterprises where the Government has full control or ownership. Some examples of this are the Tennessee Valley Authority and the New York Port Authority. The new Telstar satellite enterprise, based on a 50–50 arrangement between Government and private enterprise, might even be labeled "semisocialistic." [13]

The examples mentioned here, which have proven to be successful in the United States, are in fact being practiced in the developing nations which apply socialism in a pragmatic manner. Their bitter experiences under colonial rulers, who practiced the laissez faire system, has led them to associate the free enterprise system with colonial laissez faire exploitation.[14]

"Joint enterprise" between private firms and government—be it national or foreign private enterprise—is a definite element in Indonesian socialism. One interesting feature of Indonesian socialism which has attracted foreign private enterprise is the concept of production sharing. This means that a foreign private enterprise can join with the Indonesian Government or an Indonesian national private enterprise or with a combination of both, in the production of resources, such as tin, oil, nickel, etc. Indonesia has vast natural resources which need exploitation, development and production.

Production sharing, as defined by the Indonesian Government, means that "any credit or loan (from a foreign private company) including costs, is to be repaid with part of the proceeds from the production unit which is financed by the loan or credit." [15]

Thus, "a credit from abroad is to be repaid from the results of the production or of the increase of the production or of the increase of the quality of production." [16] (See attached details and explanation on loans or credits based on production sharing.)

It is interesting to note that as recently as June 15, 1962, the Pan American Oil Co. signed an agreement, based on the production sharing concept with the Indonesian Government. The Japanese Kobayashi group has been working on the basis of the production sharing concept in the production of oil in North Sumatra with the Indonesian National Oil Enterprise (Permina). Discussions are taking place between the Pacific Vegetable Oil Corp. in San Francisco on the "production sharing" of copra with the Indonesian Government. Likewise, the Union Oil Co. is holding talks with the Indonesian Government on the production of oil in Indonesia, based upon the production sharing concept.

The writer merely wishes to point out that Indonesian socialism does have its own unique characteristics. And in the process of economic development in Indonesia, the concept of production sharing is one of the significant factors.

What are the advantages of the production sharing concept? The deputy governor of the Indonesian Central Bank (Bank Indonesia), Dr. Khouw Bian Tie in his remarks concerning production sharing at a meeting of the American-Indonesian Chamber of Commerce in New York on September 25, 1962, gave the following answers to that question:

1. "It will avoid psychological difficulties of classical private foreign investment, and the possible risk of expropriation, since it will be an arrangement freely entered into by the Indonesian side and one in which the ownership of the enterprise will be on the Indonesian side from its inception."

2. "The creditor will be assured of a definite source of repayment since the proceeds will be earmarked for this purpose. These would also be made available without being subject to corporate or income taxes in Indonesia so that credit will be repaid more rapidly."

3. "Since the creditor will retain the proceeds in foreign currency, it will not be subject to Indonesian restrictions concerning the right to retain foreign exchange and, therefore, it will also not be concerned with the applicable rate of exchange or the disparity in the various rates of exchange."

SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

In summing up the various factors in the development of United States-Indonesian relations, one can chart a linear graph of "up, down, and then up again," as both countries enter the "new chapter."

The constructive role of the United States in the United Nations effort to solve the independence war (1945–49) between Indonesia and the Netherlands is an up line on the chart of United States-Indonesian relations. The down line occurred when the previous administration made the grave error, in 1958, of giving tacit support to the rebellious elements in Indonesia. This was worsened by the adventure of soldier of fortune Lawrence Pope, whose bomber was shot down and who himself was sentenced to death. Pope was recently released and is now in the United States. All rebels who have surrendered have also been pardoned. The internal threat to national security has been fully eliminated.

The U.S. attitude toward Indonesia's national concepts was both a downward and upward line on the chart. The previous administration's concept of "those who are not with us are against us" (which in the latter part of the second half of the regime was somewhat corrected), was changed by the much improved attitude of the present administration.

The current up line on the chart of United States-Indonesian relations began with the contribution of the Kennedy administration through Ellsworth Bunker, to the solution of the West Irian issue.

In discussing past, present, and future United States-Indonesian relations, the name of U.S. Ambassador Howard P. Jones in Djakarta deserves mention for his sophisticated approach to Indonesia's process of development. High Indonesian Government circles reportedly gave credit for Jones' diplomatic skill and achievements. Robert Kennedy rightly stated in his book "Just Friends and Brave Enemies" that "Ambassador Jones has performed with dedication and perseverance under difficult circumstances" in Indonesia. Credit is also due to former Indonesian Ambassador to the United States, Mukarto Notowidigdo, now Indonesian Ambassador to India, who has contributed a great deal toward laying the foundations of improved United States-Indonesian relations.

The present Indonesian Ambassador to the United States, Zairin Zain who served as Ambassador to West Germany for 5 years, seems to be winning many American friends already for Indonesia. Zain served in the early fifties as Minister Counselor at the Indonesian Embassy in Washington, D.C. He and Ambassador Jones will undoubtedly help write several pages of the "new chapter" in United States-Indonesian relations. Speaking about the writing of pages in United States-Indonesian relations, the American-Indonesian Society [17] which was recently established does have a role to play. So also does the Indonesian Students Association in the United States.[18]

At the highest level, both Presidents Sukarno and Kennedy, assisted by their very able Foreign Ministers Subandrio and Rusk, certainly have the decisive role in determining the content of the "new chapter" in United States-Indonesian relations. President Sukarno has visited the United States more than once as state and unofficial guest. Thus far, however, no U.S. President has ever paid a visit to Indonesia. A reciprocal visit on the part of the U.S. President to Indonesia would undoubtedly have a favorable impact upon the "new chapter" in United States-Indonesian relations. Personal diplomacy by heads of states has become increasingly prevalent today and has proven to be very effective.

The visit of Attorney General Robert Kennedy to Indonesia earlier this year had a most favorable impact upon United States-Indonesian relations. The writer was fortunate to have had the privilege, together with Indonesian students, of holding friendly discussion and exchange of opinions in late June 1962 with Robert Kennedy at his office on Constitution Avenue. We talked about various issues affecting United States-Indonesian relations. Kennedy told us his experiences during his visit to Indonesia. A prime topic of discussion was the West Irian issue. At that time, the Dutch Government had not declared its willingness to accept the Bunker proposal as a basis for settlement of the West Irian question. The Dutch accepted it only as a basis for negotiation, while Indonesia has very early declared its acceptance of the proposal as a basis for settlement. After repeated questions on the West Irian issue, Robert Kennedy gave us assurance that the Netherlands, too, would accept the Bunker proposal as a basis for settlement.[19]

A few days later, it was reported in the newspapers that the Netherlands Government accepted the Bunker proposal as a basis for settlement of the West Irian dispute.

Indonesians had the definite impression that Robert Kennedy's visit to Indonesia and his understanding and grasp of Indonesia's problems and aspirations as well as his awareness of Indonesia's determination to regain West Irian, had led the U.S. Government to support Indonesia's claim over West Irian. It was after his visit to Indonesia that the Bunker proposal emerged as a way out of the West Irian impasse.

Meanwhile, according to U.S. press reports on the visit of Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver to Indonesia, President Sukarno has reacted favorably to the idea of having Peace Corps volunteers come to Indonesia. This then is a new element in the latest chapter of United States-Indonesian relations. Since the Peace Corps has been welcome in other nonalined nations such as India, Ghana,

---

[13] Some potential Senators, during the heated debate of the satellite bill even strongly recommended that the Telstar satellite enterprise be completely owned by the Government.

[14] See Robert Kennedy's chapter on "Capitalism Is the Dirty Word in the Orient" in his book "Just Friends and Brave Enemies."

[15] See art. IV of the "Explanation on Loans or Credits Based on Production Sharing" issued by the President/Commander in Chief of Economic Operations, issued in Djakarta, Aug. 3, 1962.

[16] See Ibid., art. I, appendix to the statement.

[17] The American-Indonesian Society has its headquarters in Los Angeles. Honorary chairman is former Senator Frank Graham, whose name was mentioned earlier in the discussion of the 1945–49 period on Indonesia's struggle for independence.

[18] The Indonesian Students Association in the United States (Permias) was established in December 1961 in Washington, D.C. It has today 30 chapters in 30 cities throughout the United States. It has about 700 student members, mostly graduate students. Its headquarters is in Washington, D.C.

[19] Tape recording of the discussion between Attorney General Robert Kennedy and the Indonesian students was made by the Voice of America. This meeting was followed by "An Evening With Attorney General Robert Kennedy" sponsored by the Indonesian Students Association (Permias) at the Indonesian Embassy on July 12, 1962.

Ceylon, Malaya, and other countries, there is a possibility of an agreement with Indonesia. However, the final decision rests solely with the Indonesian Government. There has been a lively discussion in some Indonesian newspapers concerning the pros and cons of the Peace Corps coming to Indonesia.

Finally, the writer wishes to point out that Western observers sometimes fail to recognize the significance of "irrational" or "noneconomic" factors, which in Indonesia are often actually determining factors in arriving at a certain historical outcome. To overemphasize rational or economic factors in Indonesia's development can be misleading and can thus harm rather than improve United States-Indonesian relations. One should always take into serious account the rational as well as the irrational factors.

Indeed, relations of two nations is a two-way traffic and thus requires sophisticated understanding on both sides of each other's state of mind. For instance, Indonesia's sensitivity toward any reaction—negative or positive—to the national concept or national identity is a determing factor in her foreign relations.

The attitude of the United States toward Indonesia's national concept has been discussed earlier. In his state of the Union message in January 1962, President Kennedy stated that America's goal is "a peaceful world community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future and their own system so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others * * * a free community of nations, independent but interdependent."

If the United States sticks to this goal in dealing with nations which are determined to be free to choose their own future and their own system—and this includes Indonesia—then peace and progress will fill the pages of the new chapter of United States-Indonesian relations.

EXPLANATION ON LOANS OR CREDITS BASED ON PRODUCTION SHARING

(The following is an unofficial translation of a statement issued August 3, 1962, by President Sukarno on loans or credits based on production sharing.)

In accordance with the decree of the President/Commander in Chief for Economic Operations as stated in his message of May 8, 1962, on the general outline of national economic policy, 1962, the concept of production sharing has become one of the directives of the nation in facing cooperation with foreign investors in the field of production.

In view of this the Government deems it necessary to issue the following explanation:

ARTICLE I

The idea of loans and credits based on the Government's policy of production sharing in relation to foreign parties is based on the following considerations:

(a) The overall development in the framework of using all available national resources needs a large amount of financing in local as well as foreign currency.

(b) The realization of the mobilization of funds and forces should be channeled in the form of a working relation with a third party, either domestic or foreign, according to norms prevailing in the business world.

(c) The execution of the working agreement with a third party must be of a positive character in view of the feelings, desires and opinions of the community and the nation's determination in building a just and prosperous society.

ARTICLE II

The form of cooperation as mentioned above generally prevailing in the business world usually consists of:

(a) Foreign investment in its classical sense.

(b) Loans or credits based on certain credit terms.

ARTICLE III

Foreign investment in its classical sense is not acceptable to the Indonesian Government in view of the decisions made by the MPRS (Provisional National Assembly).

Such a policy generally has been assumed by the newly developing independent nations.

The major reasons for this are—

(a) Such foreign investment would remind newly developing nations of their bitter experiences with such investment in the past, which hampered the development of these countries as a whole. It would always be associated with the colonial period and with methods used to drain colonies of their resources.

Furthermore—

(b) Foreign investment in the classical sense, which implies unlimited transfer of profit, is contrary to the well-being of the nation, since the recipient of the foreign investment would be obliged to transfer forever additional profit, even though the invested capital plus interest had been covered by profit transfer. This practice is unacceptable to the new nations, who desire to develop free nations and to enjoy to the full extent their national wealth. It can be understood, therefore, that there arises a desire and a demand to nationalize enterprises owned by a third party and established through the medium of traditional foreign investment.

ARTICLE IV

The new nations, however, are prepared to receive cooperation from third parties on certain conditions, among them:

(a) That enterprises be owned and managed solely by nationals and that the labor force consist primarily of nationals.

(b) That a never-ending profit transfer shall not be considered.

In essence the working agreement as stipulated in sections (a) and (b) shall be the basis for obtaining credit from a third party, since the enterprise created with the credit would then be owned by the recipient from the very beginning, while the repayment of the loan or credit would eliminate a never-ending profit transfer. The recipient country would be obligated only to repay the loan or credit within the period of time agreed upon.

ARTICLE V

Additional credits or loans in the form described above are not always in accordance with the position or need of the countries concerned. Any credit in its traditional form disrupts the balance of payment of the recipient country, and consequently meeting its repayment and the cost of its operation becomes burdensome.

This means that whenever the needs of a developing country have to be met only through such loan or credit, an enormous amount has to be set aside from the available sources of a foreign receipt, and as a result the freedom of activities of the recipient country in other fields is very limited.

Whenever such loans increase, the major portion of the foreign receipt has to be obligated accordingly to meet the repayment and its operation cost. Undoubtedly a situation such as would arise could not be accounted for.

ARTICLE VI

To avoid an undesirable balance of payment such as described in article V, the Indonesian Government has assumed a policy which, although still based on loans and credits, aims at the elimination of the elements which might directly burden the balance of payment. Loans and credits in the ordinary sense are acceptable; not acceptable are those which have no time limit in connection with the growth of the balance of payment which might be disrupted by the obligations for their repayment.

In shaping this policy, which creates the credit concept based on production sharing, the Government's idea is to receive from abroad foreign currency which in essence is in the form of loans or credits, so that it can secure the national ownership and management of an enterprise or production unit. The principles of the concept of credit based on production sharing are based in the term "production sharing." The term means that any credit or loan, including costs, is to be repaid with part of the proceeds from the production unit which is financed by the loan or credit. Thus the repayment of the loan or credit will not be taken from the already established foreign receipt, but will be taken from additional foreign receipt earned by the new production unit.

Inherent in the concept of credit based on production sharing is the idea that new enterprises or production units be owned by Indonesia or by Indonesian private parties, and that management be in the hands of nationals. This is in accordance with the desire of the nation, which does not accept foreign investment as meant in article III. On the other hand, the consequences of loans and credits not based on production sharing and which might burden the balance of payment or the monetary position of the Government, shall not be acceptable without certain limitations.

By connecting credits or loans with production sharing, the characteristics of foreign investment and of credit or loan without production sharing can be avoided.

SUKARNO,
The President/Commander in Chief for Economic Operations.

Issued in Djakarta, August 3, 1962.

APPENDIX TO THE STATEMENT

ARTICLE I

Objective

Credit based on production sharing should hold conditions agreeable to both Indonesians and foreigners.

1. With credit based on production sharing, Indonesia intends to stimulate its economy with assistance from abroad, without creating any burden to its balance of payment, as was the case with foreign investment in Indonesia.

2. Production sharing is:

(a) A credit from abroad to be repaid from the results of production or of the increase of production or of the increase of quality of production.

(b) Title and management of a project or a unit production should from the very beginning be in the hands of Indonesian nationals.

ARTICLE II

Areas of activity

1. (a) In general, the production areas of the Indonesian natural wealth which have world commercial value shall be open for credit based on production sharing.

(b) In the area of establishing local projects which primarily will supply domestic consumption, production sharing shall also be permitted.

(c) By integrating projects which produce goods for domestic consumption as indicated in article II, paragraph 1, section (b), with projects producing goods for foreign consumption, the financing of the former projects can ultimately be covered by the receipts from export commodities.

ARTICLE III

Use of credit based on production sharing

1. (a) Credit received is to be used to finance capital goods, equipment and other facilities needed to establish a well-run enterprise, including technical know-how, survey, and planning. All equipment imported for the project will become the property of

the project, except equipment on lease which will be based on purchase-sale contract. The prices of equipment granted as credit on a production-sharing basis are to be determined according to the world market price.

(b) In each credit agreement based on production sharing it shall be stipulated in a technical assistance agreement that Indonesian nationals must be trained for the project involved.

ARTICLE IV

Guarantee

The Government guarantees the execution of each agreement based on production sharing.

ARTICLE V

Sales

During the term of the agreement based on production sharing, the creditor will be allowed to participate in the sale of production. The creditor's participation will be regulated in an agreement.

ARTICLE VI

Personnel

In cases where foreign experts are a necessity, Indonesia will provide proper facilities.

ARTICLE VII

Cost

(a) The use of credit based on production sharing shall be supervised by the Government.

(b) The Indonesian side is required to facilitate the local currency financing.

ARTICLE VIII

Duration

(a) Repayment commences after the project starts producing or after the project starts additional production brought about by the use of credit.

(b) The repayment schedule for each project shall be determined in accordance with the nature of the project.

ARTICLE IX

Miscellaneous

By "the Indonesian side" is understood: (1) the Indonesian Government, (2) the regional government, (3) national private parties, (4) joint ventures of (1), (2), and (3).

TEXT OF AGREEMENT

The Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, having in mind the interests and welfare of the peoples of the territory of West New Guinea (West Irian) hereinafter referred to as "the territory," desirous of settling their dispute regarding the territory, now, therefore, agree as follows:

RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENT AND RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Article I

After the present Agreement between Indonesia and the Netherlands has been signed and ratified by both Contracting Parties, Indonesia and the Netherlands will jointly sponsor a draft resolution in the United Nations under the terms of which the General Assembly of the United Nations takes note of the present Agreement, acknowledges the role conferred upon the Secretary General of the United Nations therein, and authorizes him to carry out the tasks entrusted to him therein.

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION

Article II

After the adoption of the resolution referred to in Article I, the Netherlands will transfer administration of the territory to a United Nations Temporary Executive Authority (U.N.T.E.A.) established by and under the jurisdiction of the Secretary General upon the arrival of the United Nations Administrator appointed in accordance with Article IV. The U.N.T.E.A. will in turn transfer the administration to Indonesia in accordance with Article XII.

UNITED NATIONS ADMINISTRATION

Article III

In order to facilitate the transfer of administration to the U.N.T.E.A. after the adoption of the resolution by the General Assembly, the Netherlands will invite the Secretary General to send a representative to consult briefly with the Netherlands Governor of the territory prior to the latter's departure. The Netherlands Governor will depart prior to the arrival of the United Nations Administrator.

Article IV

A United Nations Administrator, acceptable to Indonesia and the Netherlands, will be appointed by the Secretary General.

Article V

The United Nations Administrator, as chief executive officer of the U.N.T.E.A., will have full authority under the direction of the Secretary General to administer the territory for the period of the U.N.T.E.A. administration in accordance with the terms of the present agreement.

Article VI

1. The United Nations flag will be flown during the period of United Nations administration.

2. With regard to the flying of the Indonesian and Netherlands flags, it is agreed that this matter will be determined by agreement between the Secretary General and the respective governments.

Article VII

The Secretary General will provide the U.N.T.E.A. with such security forces as the United Nations Administrator deems necessary; such forces will primarily supplement existing Papuan police in the task of maintaining law and order. The Papuan Volunteer Corps, which on the arrival of the United Nations Administrator will cease being part of the Netherlands armed forces, and the Indonesian armed forces in the territory will be under the authority of, and at the disposal of, the Secretary General for the same purpose. The United Nations Administrator will, to the extent feasible, use the Papuan police as a United Nations security force to maintain law and order and, at his discretion, use Indonesian armed forces. The Netherlands armed forces will be repatriated as rapidly as possible and while still in the territory will be under the authority of the U.N.T.E.A.

Article VIII

The United Nations Administrator will send periodic reports to the Secretary General on the principal aspects of the implementation of the present agreement. The Secretary General will submit full reports to Indonesia and the Netherlands and may submit, at his discretion, reports to the General Assembly or to all United Nations members.

FIRST PHASE OF UNITED NATIONS ADMINISTRATION

Article IX

The United Nations Administrator will replace as rapidly as possible top Netherlands officials as defined in Annex A with non-Netherlands, non-Indonesian officials during the first phase of the U.N.T.E.A. administration which will be completed on 1 May, 1963. The United Nations Administrator will be authorized to employ on a temporary basis all Netherlands officials other than top Netherlands officials defined in Annex A, who wish to serve the U.N.T.E.A., in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary General may specify. As many Papuans as possible will be brought into administrative and technical positions. To fill the remaining required posts, the U.N.T.E.A. will have authority to employ personnel provided by Indonesia. Salary rates prevailing in the territory will be maintained.

Article X

Immediately after the transfer of administration to the U.N.T.E.A., the U.N.T.E.A. will widely publicize and explain the terms of the present agreement, and will inform the population concerning the transfer of administration to Indonesia and the provisions for the act of self-determination as set out in the present agreement.

Article XI

To the extent that they are consistent with the letter and spirit of the present agreement, existing laws and regulations will remain in effect. The U.N.T.E.A. will have the power to promulgate new laws and regulations or amend them within the spirit and framework of the present agreement. The representative councils will be consulted prior to the issuance of new laws and regulations or the amendment of existing laws.

SECOND PHASE

Article XII

The United Nations Administrator will have discretion to transfer all or part of the administration to Indonesia at any time after the first phase of the U.N.T.E.A. administration. The U.N.T.E.A.'s authority will cease at the moment of transfer of full administrative control to Indonesia.

Article XIII

United Nations security forces will be replaced by Indonesian security forces after the first phase of the U.N.T.E.A. administration. All United Nations security forces will be withdrawn upon the transfer of administration to Indonesia.

INDONESIAN ADMINISTRATION AND SELF-DETERMINATION

Article XIV

After the transfer of full administrative responsibility to Indonesia, Indonesian national laws and regulations will in principle be applicable in the territory, it being understood that they be consistent with the rights and freedoms guaranteed to the inhabitants under the terms of the present agreement. New laws and regulations or amendments to the existing ones can be enacted within the spirit of the present agreement. The representative councils will be consulted as appropriate.

Article XV

After the transfer of full administrative responsibility to Indonesia, the primary task of Indonesia will be further intensification of the education of the people, of the combating of illiteracy, and of the advancement of their social, cultural and economic development. Efforts also will be made in accordance with present Indonesian practice to accelerate the participation of the people in local government through periodic elections. Any aspects relating to the act of free choice will be governed by the terms of this agreement.

Article XVI

At the time of the transfer of full administrative responsibility to Indonesia a number of United Nations experts, as deemed adequate by the Secretary General after consultation with Indonesia, will be designated to remain wherever their duties require their presence. Their duties will, prior to the arrival of the United Nations representative, who will participate at the appropriate time in the arrangements for self-determination, be limited to advising on and assisting in preparations for carrying out the provisions for self-determination except in so far as Indonesia and the Secretary General may agree upon their performing other expert functions. They will be responsible to the Secretary General for the carrying out of their duties.

Article XVII

Indonesia will invite the Secretary General to appoint a representative who, together with a staff made up, inter alia, of experts referred to in Article XVI, will carry out the Secretary General's responsibilities to advise, assist and participate in arrangements which are the responsibility of Indonesia for the act of free choice. The Secretary General will, at the proper time, appoint the United Nations representative in order that he and his staff may assume their duties in the territory one year prior to the date of self-determination. Such additional staff as the United Nations representative might feel necessary will be determined by the Secretary General after consultations with Indonesia. The United Nations representative and his staff have the same freedom of movement as provided for the personnel referred to in Article XVI.

Article XVIII

Indonesia will make arrangements, with the assistance and participation of the United Nations representative and his staff, to give the people of the territory the opportunity to exercise freedom of choice. Such arrangements will include:

(a) Consultations (Musja-warah) with the representative councils on procedures and appropriate methods to be followed for ascertaining the freely expressed will of the population.

(b) The determination of the actual date of the exercise of free choice within the period established by the present agreement.

(c) Formulation of the questions in such a way as to permit the inhabitants to decide (a) whether they wish to remain with Indonesia; or (b) whether they wish to sever ties with Indonesia.

(d) The eligibility of all adults, male and female, not foreign nationals to participate in the act of self-determination to be carried out in accordance with international practice, who are resident at the time of the signing of the present agreement and at the time of the act of self-determination including those residents who departed after 1945 and who return to the territory to resume residence after the termination of Netherlands administration.

Article XIX

The United Nations representative will report to the Secretary General on the arrangements arrived at for freedom of choice.

Article XX

The act of self-determination will be completed before the end of 1969.

Article XXI

1. After the exercise of the right of self-determination, Indonesia and the United Nations representative will submit final reports to the Secretary General who will report to the General Assembly on the conduct of the act of self-determination and the results thereof.

2. The parties to the present agreement will recognize and abide by the results of the act of self-determination.

RIGHTS OF THE INHABITANTS

Article XXII

1. The U.N.T.E.A. and Indonesia will guarantee fully the rights, including the rights of free speech, freedom of movement and of assembly of the inhabitants of the area. These rights will include the existing rights of the inhabitants of the territory at the time of the transfer of administration to the U.N.T.E.A.

2. The U.N.T.E.A. will take over existing Netherlands commitments in respect of concessions and property rights.

3. After Indonesia has taken over the administration, it will honor those commitments which are not inconsistent with the interests and economic development of the people of the territory. A joint Indonesian-Netherlands commission will be set up after the transfer of administration to Indonesia to study the nature of the above-mentioned concessions and property rights.

4. During the period of the U.N.T.E.A. administration there will be freedom of movement for civilians of Indonesia and Netherlands nationalities to and from the territory.

Article XXIII

Vacancies in the representative councils caused by the departure of Netherlands nationals or for other reasons, will be filled as appropriate consistent with existing legislation by elections, or by appointment by the U.N.T.E.A. The representative councils will be consulted prior to the appointment of new representatives.

FINANCIAL MATTERS

Article XXIV

1. Deficits in the budget of the territory during the U.N.T.E.A. administration will be shared equally by Indonesia and the Netherlands.

2. Indonesia and the Netherlands will be consulted by the Secretary General in the preparation of the U.N.T.E.A. budget and other financial matters relating to United Nations responsibilities under the present agreement; however the Secretary General will have the final decision.

3. The parties to the present agreement will reimburse the Secretary General for all costs incurred by the United Nations under the present agreement and will make available suitable funds in advance for the discharge of the Secretary General's responsibilities. The parties to the present agreement will share on an equal basis the costs of such reimbursements and advances.

PREVIOUS TREATIES AND AGREEMENT

Article XXV

The present agreement will take precedence over any previous agreement on the territory. Previous treaties and agreements regarding the territory may therefore be terminated or adjusted as necessary to conform to the terms of the present agreement.

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

Article XXVI

For the purposes of the present agreement, Indonesia and the Netherlands will apply to United Nations property, funds, assets and officials the provisions of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations. In particular, the United Nations Administrator, appointed pursuant to Article IV, and the United Nations representative, appointed pursuant to Article XVII, will enjoy the privileges and immunities specified in Section 19 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations.

RATIFICATION

Article XXVII

1. The present agreement will be ratified in accordance with the constitutional procedures of the contracting parties.

2. The instruments of ratification will be exchanged as soon as possible at the headquarters of the United Nations by the accredited representatives of the contracting parties.

3. The Secretary General will draw up a proces-verbal of the exchange of the instruments of ratification and will furnish a certified copy thereof to each contracting party.

ENTRY INTO FORCE

Article XXVIII

1. The present agreement will enter into force upon the date of the adoption by the General Assembly of the resolution referred to in Article I of the present agreement.

2. Upon the entry into force of the present agreement, the Secretary General of the United Nations will register it in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter.

AUTHENTIC TEXT

Article XXIX

The authentic text of the present agreement is drawn up in the English language. Translations in the Indonesian and Netherlands languages will be exchanged between the contracting parties.

In witness whereof the undersigned plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized for that purpose by their respective Governments, have signed the present agreement.

Done at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, on this fifteenth day of August, 1962, in three identical copies, of which one shall be deposited with the Secretary General and one shall be furnished to the Government of each of the contracting parties.

For the Republic of Indonesia:

SUBANDRIO.

For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:

J. HERMAN VAN ROIJEN.

For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:

C. W. A. SCHURMANN.

Racial Harmony in Lebanon, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in these days when racial disturbances and incidents of violence occasioned by school integration are very much in the news, it is encouraging and uplifting to learn of the experience of a Negro school principal in Lebanon, Conn., which for many years was my home.

Mr. Marshall Jenkins, principal of the Lyman Memorial High School, of Lebanon, Conn., recently wrote to me to tell me of the marvelous experience he has had as principal of this high school during its greatest period of change and growth. This experience demonstrates that where attitudes are not preconditioned by prejudice and fear and racial intolerance, people of both races can work together in friendship and mutual respect in improving our Nation's school system.

Mr. Jenkins says:

> The most beautiful part of the entire story is that I am not accepted as a Negro principal but as the high school principal.

I am sure that some day the sentiment expressed in this sentence will be a reality throughout our Nation's school system and I bring the story of Marshall Jenkins to the attention of the country in order that it might serve as an example of what can be achieved.

It is, I think, significant that this exercise in Americanism has taken place in Lebanon, Conn., which is, I believe, a typical American community. Lebanon has played an important part in our history and its background is rich in American tradition.

As early as April 9, 1770, Lebanon freemen, incited by the Boston Massacre, met and drafted a declaration of rights and liberties that preceded the Declaration of Independence by more than 6 years. The document was drafted by

William Williams who was later a signer of the Declaration of Independence. Lebanon early became a key town in Colonial military activity, with Jonathan Trumbull, the town's foremost citizen, a counselor to George Washington, and the only Colonial Governor to espouse the revolutionary cause. When facing a financial or commissary crisis, Washington so frequently said "Let's see what Brother Jonathan can do" that the appelation came to be synonymous with the present term "Uncle Sam."

Across from the Common in Lebanon is the former Revolutionary War Office, which is now a museum. Under Trumbull's direction this building served as the northern business headquarters of the Continental forces and supplied from Connecticut more men and money than were furnished by any other Colony, with the exception of Massachusetts. No call for aid ever lacked response during the entire war. In 1780, when Washington, scarcely daring to hope for further aid for his starving troops, sent to Trumbull for food and the Connecticut Governor replied with a train of ox sleds laden with 1,500 barrels of beef and 3,000 barrels of pork, Washington wrote in his diary:

> No other man than Trumbull would have procured them and no other State could have furnished them.

Washington once said:

> Except for Jonathan Trumbull, the war could not have been carried to a successful termination.

It is in this historic American town that Marshall Jenkins is now making more American history, a testament to the natural ease with which men and women and children of all races can work together productively when prejudice and intolerance are set aside.

What has happened in Lebanon will one day be the rule and not the exception in this country, and I am publicizing this story as best I can in order that its example may hasten the day when all Americans are judged on their merit as individuals and none is deprived of an opportunity to make his full contribution to our national life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter to me from Mr. Marshall Jenkins, of Lebanon, Conn., be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lyman Memorial High School,
Lebanon, Conn., October 10, 1962.
Senator Thomas A. Dodd,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: In the light of our present-day situation in Mississippi and Albany, Ga., and the vast racial problems faced by the United States as she seeks to win the friendship of the ever evolving new nations of Africa and the world, I am compelled to write this letter to you.

I am supervising principal of the Lyman Memorial Junior-Senior High School in Lebanon, Conn. During the time in which I have held this position (the only Negro holding such a position in this State), I have heard comments, read articles, and discussed problems which Negroes may encounter as a result of integration. Comments such as Negroes will not be hired as teachers in integrated schools, or that Negro teachers will lose their present jobs, or that all principalships and supervisory positions will be a thing of the past in integrated systems, are not based on fact. For 7 years, I have been principal of an "all white" school in an "all white" town. In fact, we are one of only two Negro families in Lebanon. Until a month ago, we were the only Negro family in town.

This perhaps in itself is not too significant except that I feel others need to know that in Connecticut democracy is not only a dream but in many areas a reality.

The most beautiful part of the entire story is that I am not accepted as a Negro principal but as the high school principal. Perhaps the most dramatic portrayal of this was the planning, organizing, staffing, and supervising of our new school and its programs. We moved from a 6-teacher high school to a 17-teacher junior-senior high school. Now we have 24 teachers on our staff and plan to increase even more. In fact, we are presently adding six classrooms, a nurse's room, and other special service areas to our present building.

The leadership role I assumed during this process and the vast number of decisions I had to make were never doubted or questioned because of the color of my skin. The people of Lebanon wanted the best education they could get for the money they wanted to spend. They didn't care about pigmentation any more than they cared about separating the rainbow on the basis of color.

All of the 315 students and the 24 faculty members are white. This also has never made any difference and I don't believe it ever will. Good education in a well organized and well disciplined school is the responsibility with which I have been charged over the past 7 years. This I believe is presently taking place in Lebanon.

Lebanon, named for the Bible town, was settled in 1698. "Yet here once flashed the blue and buff of general's rank—the flaming scarlet of the Nation's new gentility—the jewels and gold insignia of foreign friends. Here dreams of liberty once called their stirring martial call to arms which roused the country to its peril." Liberty, democracy, freedom, and equality were inspired here and live on through today.

I am sure that the day is coming when experiences like mine will no longer be news, but will be a common part of the American culture.

Respectfully yours,
Marshall Jenkins.

Hail and Farewell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I shall not be a Member of the House next year, I take this occasion to express my appreciation to my fellow Members for the many kindnesses which I have received from them. The friendships made during my 10 years in the House will always remain my most precious legacy of that period. To the Members whom I am leaving I say "Hail and farewell."

I refer to a question asked by one of our Members. He asked if it had not been hard to make the decision to run for the Senate instead of again seeking election for the House. That was not quite the problem, because ordinarily, under the Massachusetts timetable, a person who fails to receive a nomination at the Republican Convention in June can still run for his House seat in the September primaries. At that time, however, the redistricting had divided my district among three adjoining ones, those of Speaker McCormack, of former Speaker Martin, and of Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., making it as a practical political matter impossible for me to run for the House.

Columbus Day in Newark, 1962, and the Columbian Foundation Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant and joyous of our holidays is that marking the anniversary of the discovery of the New World by Christopher Columbus. This year, in the northern New Jersey area, it was especially joyous, from the very beginning to the end.

In the morning, the annual great parade formed, under the guidance of my dear friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino], who was the grand marshal. Assisting the grand marshal were many of the leading citizens of the Greater Newark area, including Mayor Healey, of Kearney; Mayor Rodgers, of Harrison; Mayor Larson, of East Newark; Mayor Chenoweth, of Nutley; Mayor Laterza, of Belleville; Louis Tonti, executive director of the Garden State Parkway; Nicholas Caputo, clerk of Essex County; Roy D'Aloia, sheriff of Essex County; and Domenick Micelli, assistant business administrator of Newark.

Undoubtedly, the feature of this year's parade was the attendance by our most distinguished and truly great President, John F. Kennedy. In a typically fine, concise, masterfully delivered speech, the President called on all Americans to draw from the example of courage shown by Columbus, in facing the challenge of life today.

> I hope—

Said the President—

> in 1962 all Americans will continue to meet our responsibilities in the preservation of world peace, equal opportunities, and guaranteeing our youth full educational opportunities.

The President also took the opportunity to reveal that he is descended from Geraldinis, who came from Venice. This was not an unpopular revelation to the throng of 150,000 who turned out to honor him and view the parade.

In the evening, the climax to the happy day came at the dinner of the Columbian

Foundation, held in the Military Park Hotel.

The Columbian Foundation was organized in 1941 and is composed of business and professional men of Newark and nearby communities. Its objectives are to promote the economic, cultural, educational, and social welfare of the community, and to engage in works of philanthropy. The foundation has established the Italian Institute of Seton Hall University. It gives aid to Columbus Hospital each year and to youth development organizations. And each year it selects leading citizens who have contributed to the improvement of American life and culture for achievement awards. In the past, the foundation has cited such noted figures as Gen. Leslie Groves, Director of the Manhattan project; Nuclear Physicist Enrico Fermi; Perry Como; and Joe DiMaggio.

This year, the foundation presented four awards—to Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. Doherty, president of Seton Hall University, for his work in education; to the mayor of Newark, and our former beloved colleague, Hugh J. Addonizio, and to his longtime close friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], for their achievements in the field of government; and, in an unprecedented move, to the 12-year-old son of that gentleman, Peter W. Rodino III, for his little-people-to-little-people program, in the field of human relations.

We in this body are familiar with the work of young Peter who has conceived of and worked to develop his correspondence campaign, to spread Americanism and encourage peace throughout the world. Commenting on the award to the lad, Frank Langella, chairman of the Columbian event, noted that this was the first time "that so young a person has received one of our awards, but this young man's program in developing interest among Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and other youth organizations is telling the American story to other young people on both sides of the Iron Curtain. And, it demonstrates that individual achievement can come at any age."

The award to Master Rodino set the theme of the whole evening—a people-to-people program. Our distinguished colleague, and I am sure, rightfully so, proud father, likened the voyage of Columbus to the responsibilities that face us today.

For, 500 years ago—

The gentleman from New Jersey said—

> the great Italian navigator sailed the uncharted seas to add another dimension to the Old World and discovered a new world full of promise where man's highest aspirations might be realized and his fondest dreams fulfilled. He opened up new vistas for those who dared set sail toward the harbor of attainable dreams.
>
> Tonight, five centuries later, those of us who have inherited his spirit look with pride on this symbolic day and on our legacy inspired by his faith—the idea of giving and doing. We, too, have set our hands to the sails, and each in our own way has tried to help steer the ship of human destiny to greater horizons and to ports of great promise.
>
> To each of us has been given a small role to play. Mine has been a small one, too, but what little contribution I have made in helping along the way has given me the satisfaction of receiving so much while I have given so little.
>
> There are yet uncharted seas, greater goals, heavenly horizons for those who will sail in the spirit of Columbus. Perhaps through little people to little people we may yet reach this port of golden promise. And, in so doing, send rays of light to the darkest corners of the earth.
>
> We Americans of Italian heritage have a rendezvous with destiny, but we must accept the challenge of the currents and the shoreless seas to reach our golden tomorrow.
>
> In the time-hallowed custom of civilized men, I tell you these words which are in my heart. And for myself and Peter's mother, I give you my hand in thanks for the great honor you have done me and my son.

Thus our esteemed colleague eloquently pointed out how we today can reverse the role of Columbus. He brought light to the New World. Now we can bring the light of freedom, of security, of peace from the New World back to the old, so ravaged by centuries of strife.

Yes, Columbus Day, 1962, was a memorable one for Newark and its suburbs. And all in this body can be proud of the contribution made by our beloved colleague and his fine son.

Senator Robert C. Byrd's Statement on His Legislative Stewardship for the Year 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I feel it incumbent upon me to give an account of my legislative stewardship during this fourth year of my service in the U.S. Senate.

ATTENDANCE ON ROLLCALLS AND QUORUM CALLS

Throughout my 16 years of service to the people of West Virginia, I have prided myself upon having a good attendance record. During this session, I have answered 220 out of 227 rollcalls for an attendance record of 96.9 percent.

COAL

Some of my activities this year in behalf of the coal industry are as follows:

May 2: I amended, in the Appropriations Subcommittee, the fiscal 1963 interior appropriation bill to include an additional $1,450,000 for the Office of Coal Research.

June 5: Defense Department officials and leaders of the coal and related industries accepted my invitation to a conference which I had arranged for the purpose of examining the economic and national defense aspects of boiler conversions from coal to other fuels which have recently occurred in military installations. I expressed my concern that military installations using residual fuel oil may prove to be weak links in our chain of national defense. I asked the coal industry leaders to prepare recommendations to overcome such possible weaknesses, stating that I would submit them to the Defense Department.

June 14: The Senate approved my amendment to the Interior appropriation bill which provided an additional $1,450,000 to the Office of Coal Research's budget for Projects Gasoline and Bootstrap. One million dollars would be used on Project Gasoline, a process which would utilize a new catalyst to manufacture gasoline and related chemicals as well as char—a form of coke—from high volatile bituminous coal. The remaining funds would be used for Project Bootstrap, a process to develop the production of pipeline gas for industrial and home use from low volatile bituminous coal.

June 25: I addressed a 1-day coal meeting called by Gov. W. W. Barron in Washington where I stated that "the coal industry has become an economic enigma because it has been baffled and perplexed by Government policies and governmental indifferences to its needs."

June 29: I asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to be ready to move swiftly to cut coal freight rates if new and modern railroad equipment and coal handling methods result in lowering handling and transportation costs. The development of an integral train for hauling coal holds promise of lowered costs.

July 16: I denounced the "baldfaced pressure tactics of some importers of foreign residual fuel oil" who are using an alleged shortage of oil for Government buildings in Washington, D.C., as an excuse to destroy the Government's oil import control program.

July 27: The $1,450,000 which I added to the Interior appropriation bill became a certainty as a result of favorable action by the Senate-House conferees on this bill. I was a Senate conferee.

August 14: I submitted a list of recommendations to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, suggesting improvements which should be made in fuel purchasing policies of the Defense Department. These recommendations resulted from the June 5 meeting which I held.

ALLEGHENY PARKWAY

Progress was made this year on S. 1798, a bill which I introduced on May 3, 1961, providing for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway. The proposed 550-mile scenic highland route would begin at Hagerstown, Md., proceed through central West Virginia, western Virginia, and eastern Kentucky, and would terminate at Cumberland Gap National Historical Park.

The proposed parkway would traverse 360 miles of West Virginia's most scenic terrain, opening up heretofore inaccessible West Virginia scenic panoramas to tourists.

To stimulate support for the bill, I held a conference at the capitol in Charleston on February 5, 1962, with members of the West Virginia Legislature through whose counties the parkway would run. A hearing on the bill was held in Washington on May 10, at my request, by the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, following which the Interior Department recommended that a feasibility study be conducted and advised me that $97,000 would be needed for such a study.

On October 4, the Senate Appropriations Committee adopted my amendment to insert language in the committee report on the 1963 supplemental appropriation bill directing the National Park Service to proceed with the Allegheny Parkway study.

The Park Service will immediately undertake this study. When the 1st session of the 88th Congress convenes in January 1963, I will reintroduce the bill on the parkway, and will try to secure the necessary authorization if the survey proves the project to be feasible and justifiable.

COAL RIVER NATIONAL DEMONSTRATION AREA

In another effort to spur tourism in West Virginia, I introduced a bill, S. 3589, on August 1, 1962, for myself and for my colleague, Senator RANDOLPH, which would provide for the establishment of a 30,000-acre national park in the Racine and Coal River area of Boone County, to be called the Coal River National Demonstration Area.

The demonstration area would make available needed year-round outdoor recreational facilities to approximately 2.6 million people living within a radius of 100 miles of the area, and more than 26 million people who live within a radius of 250 miles.

The project is now being studied by the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. I shall reintroduce the bill in January 1963 when the new Congress convenes.

WESTWARD EXPANSION OF MONONGAHELA NATIONAL FOREST

Another project which would stimulate my State's economy through expanded outdoor recreational opportunities and through increased wildlife populations for public hunting and fishing, is the western expansion of the Monongahela National Forest.

The expansion, recommended by the U.S. Forest Service, after conducting a study at my request, would embrace parts of eight West Virginia counties, and would include 550,000 acres of rugged mountain and forest lands, as well as submarginal farmlands.

I amended the fiscal 1963 Interior appropriation bill to obtain an initial $250,000 for this subject. Although the subcommittee, the full committee, and the Senate acted favorably on my amendment, the House conferees succeeded in striking it from the bill.

PARSONS LABORATORY

A Watershed and Forest Management Research Laboratory will be constructed at Parsons, W. Va., as a result of an amendment which I offered adding $150,000 to the fiscal 1963 Interior appropriation bill.

Research in the management of watershed lands for soil stability and streamflow will result in improved water quality of the rivers and streams in the Appalachian region.

BOWDEN NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY

Another important project, the Bowden National Fish Hatchery, located in Randolph County, will be completed as a result of $62,000 I was able to obtain by amending the Interior appropriation bill.

PRINCETON LABORATORY

In the same bill, $150,000 was provided for construction and programing of the timber marketing and utilization center at Princeton. I was able to amend the fiscal 1962 Interior appropriation bill in June 1961 to obtain $450,000 which initiated work on this project.

JUSTICE RESERVOIR

I have been working to secure flood protection in the Guyandot River Valley since early in 1957, when, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I toured the flood-stricken areas of Logan and Man. At that time I introduced a resolution calling for a study by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to determine the best means of flood protection for the area. In February 1962, the U.S. Army Engineers, as a result of their study, recommended the construction of a $60.5 million dam, to be located at Justice in Wyoming County. I immediately urged the Federal agencies, preparing reports on the proposed reservoir, to expedite those reports as quickly as possible so that action could be taken in this session of the Congress to obtain authorization of the reservoir and to procure funds for the initial planning of the project.

On May 25, I called responsible officials of the agencies involved to my office and once again urged haste in processing the needed reports.

In the meantime, objections were voiced to the proposed dam. Among other things, it was said that 57 million tons of coal would be lost forever; that millions of dollars worth of timber and natural gas would be lost.

To determine the validity of these objections, I contacted the Army Engineers, asking for comment. On June 11, 1962, I received a reply stating:

> The various complainants are basing their estimates on misleading or erroneous information.

On August 14, I wrote to Army Secretary Cyrus R. Vance, requesting that "prompt action be taken to proceed with the reservoir." I also had a number of telephonic conversations with Assistant Secretary of the Army W. F. Schaub. On August 23, Mr. Schaub wrote to me stating that the Guyandot River report was being sent to the Budget Bureau with a favorable recommendation by the Department of the Army. On that same day, I wrote to Budget Bureau Director David E. Bell, asking him to "act with all possible speed on the project" so that "a recommendation can be immediately made by the Secretary of the Army to the Congress." At the same time, I informed him that, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I would try to secure initial planning moneys for the reservoir by amending the fiscal 1963 public works appropriation bill.

During the week that followed, I called Director Bell, and I also had three discussions with the White House on the reservoir. I also attempted to meet with President Kennedy on the project, but his schedule did not permit it. I, therefore, wrote to the President on the project.

Approvals were promptly given by the Budget Director and the Secretary of the Army, and the proposal was submitted to the Senate Public Works Committee, which held a hearing on the proposed reservoir on September 20, at which time I presented testimony in behalf of the project. Senator RANDOLPH, a member of the Public Works Committee, presided. The project was authorized by the Senate on October 4. In the meantime, I amended the fiscal 1963 public works appropriation bill in the Appropriations Committee to obtain $150,000 for initial planning. The Senate approved the bill with the amendment included. However, the money was eliminated from the bill in conference between the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Definite progress on the Justice Reservoir has been made this year in that the project has been authorized. The forces opposing the project made every effort to prevent the proposal from being submitted to the Congress before adjournment. Had they been successful, authorization by the Congress might have been delayed 2 years and perhaps indefinitely. When the new Congress convenes in January, I shall renew my efforts to obtain necessary planning moneys for the reservoir.

KANAWHA RIVER BASIN STUDY

I amended the fiscal 1963 public works appropriation bill to add $200,000 to initiate a comprehensive study of the Kanawha River basin.

Piecemeal studies of the Kanawha River basin have been conducted in the past, but the economic growth along the Kanawha, especially in the Charleston complex, has intensified the urgency for an all-inclusive study of the basin's problems. The U.S. Army Engineers will seek to learn what kinds of installations are needed in the basin, where they are needed, and how soon they will be needed.

The public works appropriation bill, which was passed by the Congress, also contained $65,000 to be used to initiate a study of the Burnsville, Steer Creek, and West Fork Reservoirs on the Little Kanawha. I obtained Senate approval of moneys for the three reservoirs last year, but the funds were eliminated in conference between the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Other moneys in the bill for West Virginia included:

For construction or continuation of construction—Belleville locks and dam, $3,200,000; Opekiska lock and dam, $6 million; Pike Island locks and dam, $12,348,250; and Summersville Reservoir, $9,750,000.

For planning and surveys—East Lynn Reservoir, $100,000; Hannibal locks and dam, $100,000; and Racine locks and dam, $395,000. Survey moneys were also included for the Stonewall Jackson Reservoir, Buckhannon, and the Cheat River.

SALTLICK CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT

Earlier this year, I asked Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Subcommittee on Watersheds, to hold a special hearing on the Saltlick Creek watershed project. Senator TALMADGE honored my request, and a hearing was held before his subcommittee on June 6, at which time I testified as to the urgent need for this project in Braxton County. The subcommittee approved the project that very day. I then requested Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, to urge approval of the project by his full committee. I am happy to report that the project was approved.

OHIO RIVER WATER POLLUTION STUDY

When the HEW fiscal 1963 appropriation bill was before the Senate Appropriation Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, I offered an amendment to add $500,000 to initiate a water pollution and water resources study of the Ohio River and its tributaries.

The Appropriations Committee and the Senate approved my amendment. However, when the bill was sent to conference between the Senate and the House of Representatives, only $100,000 was agreed upon by the conferees, but this amount will permit work to start.

Operating out of Wheeling, the U.S. Public Health Service will begin the planning of a concerted effort to reduce and abate pollution in the entire upper Ohio River basin. Eventually, as a result of this study, the PHS hopes to provide this industrial heartland of America with the kind of water quality required for industrial growth and expansion.

MEDICAL RESEARCH IN MINING AREAS

I further amended the HEW appropriation bill in subcommittee to add $520,000 for medical research on pulmonary diseases affecting workers in the mining industry. This amount was agreed to by the full committee and the Senate but was reduced to $100,000 in conference with the House of Representatives. This research will be conducted by the Public Health Service and will be centered in Beckley because of that city's central location in the Appalachian coal region.

BECKLEY WEATHER STATION

When the Commerce appropriation bill came before the Senate Appropriations Committee, I offered two amendments which were adopted by the committee and approved by the Senate.

One amendment, in the amount of $75,000, was for the purpose of establishing a 24-hour weather bureau station in Beckley. Such a weather station will be beneficial to commercial air travel and to the economy of the area in and surrounding Raleigh County.

The other amendment, in the amount of $40,000 would have established a U.S. Department of Commerce field office in Charleston. There is no such office in West Virginia at the current time, and individuals must travel to Richmond, Va., or to Pittsburgh, Pa., to transact business with Department of Commerce officials. I felt this field office would greatly enhance the economy of our State.

Although the Senate approved both of my amendments, the Senate-House conferees eliminated the field office appropriation, but did approve the $75,000 for the weather station.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION FIELD OFFICE

As a result of my specific request to Mr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration, a Community Facilities Administration field office was opened in Charleston in July. This new field office will help speed the processing of applications for Federal assistance in the planning and construction of public facilities, college housing, and senior citizens' housing.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Charleston Youth Community, Inc., was presented a $131,000 planning grant by Attorney General Kennedy to be used to conduct a 16-month study of the sources of juvenile delinquency in Kanawha County. A second grant of $55,000 will be given to CYC in the next fiscal year to complete the program.

Charleston became the first middle-size city and the first southern city in the Nation to receive such a grant. The findings of the CYC will serve as a blueprint for the rest of the State and for other economically distressed Appalachian region areas faced with similar youth problems.

I worked very closely with CYC on this project, and did everything possible to be of assistance in securing moneys for such projects throughout the country and in securing Federal approval of this specific project.

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I learned that the Federal Government was planning to relocate Washington's antiquated National Training School. I discussed with President Kennedy the possibility of relocating the facility in West Virginia.

In continuing discussions with the White House, and with the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, Morgantown was chosen as the site for the school because that city best met the minimal criteria established for such a facility.

The school will accommodate 400 to 500 male juvenile delinquents between the ages of 13 to 19. It will have a staff of between 175 and 200 employees, about 50 percent of whom will be brought in from Washington.

This facility is not a prison, but one in which academic and vocational subjects are taught and in which maladjusted boys who have violated the laws of the United States are motivated to acquire positive attitudes toward society and the responsibility of good citizenship.

PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION PROGRAM

En route to Wheeling, W. Va., on September 27, President Kennedy indicated to me that he hoped the Senate would approve $600 million for his emergency public works acceleration program. The Senate Appropriation Subcommittee on Public Works had only allotted $400 million for the program. Accordingly, when the full Senate Appropriations Committee met the next day to consider the fiscal 1963 public works appropriation bill, I offered an amendment to that bill to allow $600 million for the program. Although the Appropriations Committee did not accept my amendment, it did increase the amount to $500 million. When the item reached the Senate floor on September 29, an amendment was offered to reduce the amount to $300 million. I spoke in support of a $500 million appropriation. Senate and House conferees finally agreed on a $400 million appropriation.

Many hard-pressed communities in West Virginia will be able to initiate work on urgently needed public facilities with funds provided under this program.

MEDICAL CARE TO THE AGED

I wish also to comment on two important Senate votes this year which were of uppermost concern to West Virginians. One of these was Senator CLINTON ANDERSON's medicare amendment. I supported that amendment because I felt it encompassed a reasonable solution to the problem of furnishing much-needed health care for the aged. Today we have over 17½ million people who are over age 65. Those who are over 65 have an average income, if they are single, of about ten or eleven hundred dollars a year. If they are a married couple, their income is about $2,300 annually. Nine out of ten people over 65 will visit a hospital before they die; two out of three people who are over 65 will visit a hospital two or more times before they die. Hospital costs have gone from an average of $9 a day in 1946 to $32 a day now. Thus, at a time in life when their earnings are greatly reduced, the medical needs of persons over 65 become greatly increased. Often the burden of supplying these costly medical needs falls upon the children of the aging parents. In my judgment, consideration must be given to the enactment of legislation which will provide hospitalization and nursing care for our elderly people through a program which they themselves can help to finance during their younger and more productive working careers. Senator ANDERSON sought to make his amendment a part of H.R. 10606, the welfare reform bill, which made possible the extension of the ADCU program in West Virginia and other States. I was vitally concerned about unemployment in my State, but I was assured by Senator HUMPHREY, the majority whip; Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader; Senator ANDERSON, and by administration spokesmen, that legislation extending the ADCU program would be enacted before adjournment. I had already joined in cosponsoring a measure to temporarily extend the program. There was little opposition to H.R. 10606 in either the House or Senate. It was my position, therefore, to support the medicare amendment, and, although it was rejected, I shall again support such legislation when the new Congress convenes in January.

In view of the fact that the vote on the medicare amendment occurred under circumstances which were made more difficult by a parliamentary situation involving other legislation of importance to my State, I wish to include in the RECORD a memorandum supplied to me by the Assistant Parliamentarian of the Senate shortly after the vote was taken stating the various procedures which existed for bringing about the successful passage of H.R. 10606 in the event Senator ANDERSON's medicare amendment had been adopted by the Senate and if subsequent agreement by the House had been found impossible:

MEMO TO SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA RE AMENDMENTS ON MEDICARE TO H.R. 10606

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1962.

Had the Senate adopted the so-called medicare amendment by Senator ANDERSON (and others) to H.R. 10606, the possibilities of the enactment of the remaining provisions carried in the said bill, as reported to the Senate, would be as follows:

1. The bill, as passed by the Senate with the so-called Anderson amendment, would have been messaged to the House and placed on the Speaker's desk.

2. Since the Senate had moved to reconsider the vote by which it passed the bill and laid that motion on the table, a further motion to reconsider the vote on the bill and the adoption of an order to request the House to return that bill to the Senate would not be in order. It could, however, have been done by unanimous consent or by a suspension of rule XIII, on reconsideration, which would require a two-thirds vote. Besides, if the Senate should have permitted a motion to reconsider, and the adoption of an order to request the House to return the said bill to the Senate, the House would still not be compelled to return the papers—that would be at the discretion of the House itself.

3. With the papers on the Speaker's desk it would require unanimous consent in the House to call up the said bill, with the Senate amendments, for further action thereon unless the Rules Committee would grant a special rule providing for such action. In the latter case, only a majority vote would be required. The possibility of receiving unanimous consent to call up the bill with the Senate amendment on medicare would be more likely granted by the House if it had been stated before the request was made that a motion would be made "to disagree to the Senate amendment on medicare and insist on the House-passed version of the bill," because all that this action would involve would be to send the bill back to the Senate.

It would appear that a special rule would have been necessary in order to send the bill with the suggested amendments to conference.

At any rate, if the Senate could have recovered the bill and the papers thereon from the House under either of the two above-suggested conditions, the Senate would then be in a position to recede from the Senate amendment proposed by Senator ANDERSON and others. Or if the bill had been sent to conference, the Senate conferees could have receded from the said Senate amendment, allowing the bill to become law without the so-called Anderson amendment.

4. If the Senate had been unable to recover the papers on H.R. 10606, with Senate amendments thereto, under either of the above-suggested conditions, the provisions of H.R. 10606, as reported to the Senate—exclusive of the so-called medicare amendments proposed by Mr. ANDERSON and others—could have been proposed by any Senator and added to any other tax bill which had originated in the House during the remainder of this session of Congress, when that bill was under consideration by the Senate and prior to its passage by that body. It should be suggested that there will be a number of such bills to come before the Senate before the sine die adjournment of this session of Congress to which such an amendment could be offered.

FLOYD M. RIDDICK,
Assistant Parliamentarian.

PRESIDENT'S TRADE EXPANSION ACT

Another controversial measure of tremendous importance to West Virginia was the President's Trade Expansion Act. I voted for the legislation. The emergence of the Common Market, which has fundamentally altered the old circumstances of international trade, presents a new and vital circumstance that must be considered. The United States, and West Virginia, must have an instrument with which to effectively bargain for foreign tariff reductions, and to successfully compete with the Common Market.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

I cosponsored S. 349, a bill which would provide educational benefits for post-Korean war draftees and volunteers who have served in our Armed Forces for more than 6 months. I feel that the men and women who have served in our Armed Forces since the conclusion of the Korean conflict are veterans of the cold war. I also feel that these men and women should be given the same economic benefits which our Nation so justly provided to World War II and Korean war veterans.

GLASS TARIFFS

I supported the U.S. Tariff Commission's recommendation to President Kennedy that tariffs on imported glass products be stiffened in order to bolster the economy of the ailing glass industry of West Virginia. President Kennedy approved the Commission's recommendation.

FRUIT EXPORTS

Along with 17 other U.S. Senators, I urged the State Department "to take vigorous steps to protect foreign markets for U.S. fruit exports." I asked that adequate safeguards be provided for U.S. fruits and fruit products to protect them from trade restrictions imposed abroad.

The Late Honorable Clem Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the late Honorable Clem Miller, a Representative in Congress, from California.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR METCALF

In the Congress of the United States, where seniority often determines the effectiveness of a Member, it is unusual for a comparative youngster to distinguish himself.

Our colleague, Clem Miller, was unusual. Elected to Congress in 1958, he devoted himself wholeheartedly to learning the intricate legislative process that he might best represent the people of his district, State, and Nation. I knew him as a tireless and effective workman for the conservation, orderly development, wise management, and highest possible use of our natural resources.

Enactment this year of his bill to add the Point Reyes Peninsula area to our national park system climaxed a drive which he started when he first came to Congress. For generations this recreational area will serve as a monument to Clem Miller.

I lost a friend when Clem Miller's airplane went down, and the public interest lost a dedicated and an effective spokesman. But this Nation is the better for Clem Miller's work. And we shared a real privilege who had the opportunity to know and work with this outstanding American.

We Must Aid, Not Hamper, Railroads—Piggyback: The Price of Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the perilous situation in Cuba and elsewhere requires, among other things, consideration of the ability of our domestic transport system, particularly our railroads, to function efficiently in a national emergency.

Some doubt arises about the ability of our railroads to do another superb transportation job such as they did in World War II. Has our national transportation policy, or what some term "overregulation" of our railroads, interfered with their proper and necessary development? This may well be so.

The President's transportation message to the Congress a few weeks ago was a masterpiece and in the interest of modernizing our national transportation policy should be acted upon promptly by the next Congress.

Railroad transportation is at the crossroads. It will go forward to success or it will go into the doldrums. It must go the former route because transportation is essential to the Nation's commerce and industry and security. The backbone of transportation is the railroad common carrier. The railroad moves most of our coal and ores, so essential to manufacturing. It alone has the capacity and the means necessary for mass transportation service. It is indispensable in time of war or emergency for the carriage of troops and military materiel.

The President has been gravely concerned with the plight of the railroads. He called attention to the following:

The railroad industry in 1961 managed to earn only 1.97 percent on its net investment, the lowest return since the depression of 1938.

One of the largest railroads in the East is in bankruptcy, and its ability to continue in operation is seriously in doubt.

Twenty-five class I railroads in 1961 operated at a deficit, while many others barely managed to earn their fixed charges.

Railroad employment is actually far below what it was at the depth of the great depression in 1933.

As recently as 1949, intercity freight traffic in the United States was divided between regulated carriage on the one hand, and unregulated carriage on the other, in the ratio of about 3 to 1 in favor of the regulated carriers. The ratio today is about 2 to 1, and the trend away from regulated common carriage is continuing.

Reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission show that only about one-third of all intercity motor freight traffic is handled by motor carriers under its control; the remaining two-thirds is unregulated.

On inland waterways, only one-tenth of all barge traffic is subject to ICC regulation.

We must, therefore, help, not hamper, our railroads which are so essential to our economy and well being. These railroads afford employment to millions of American citizens. The success of these railroads is the basis of their jobs. We dare not, therefore, be apathetic in the face of the dangers that now beset our railroads.

One comparatively new development in transportation is of extreme importance to the commerce of the Nation and our transportation system. I refer to "piggybacking" and similar services. We must not hurt development in that important field.

Faced with a pattern of declining traffic, the Nation's railroads in 1954 pinned their hopes for the future on so-called piggyback service in which highway trailers are hauled over the rails in special trains between railroad loading points. In the last few years, the growth of this traffic has been nothing short of phenomenal.

The marked expansion of piggyback service, however, apparently caused some consternation on the part of the ICC which last June responded with what it called a broad-scale investigation into so-called piggyback operations. As one eastern railroad executive put it: "I guess we are paying the price of success."

While piggyback operations were not entirely new, their more rapid expansion and general acceptance by the shipping public began in late 1958, following legislation designed to remove what a Senate subcommittee referred to as "overregulation" by ICC. The same subcommittee, moreover, had severely criticized railroad management for its failure to recognize changing conditions, times, and tastes to compete aggressively for business by use of modernized equipment as well as failure to adjust rates to compete effectively for traffic.

Given some measure of freedom in pricing, railroad management immediately demonstrated marked ingenuity in establishing and expanding a number of piggyback services, each of which was tailored to meet particular competitive situations. So-called plan I and plan V rates were offered for use of the truckers themselves, and the latter, given access to high-speed, low-cost intercity rail service, were quick to take advantage of the potential savings by reducing their over-the-highway operations.

When the railroads offered plan II door-to-door service at rates roughly paralleling those of the truckers, the latter were not overly concerned. At that point, of course, the railroads were still operating within the old framework of value-of-service pricing, that is, the more valuable the commodity, the higher the freight rate. In 1958, however, exhorted by Congress to provide some self-help and concerned over the rapid growth of private do-it-yourself highway transportation by shippers, the railroads instituted what is now known as plan III piggyback service.

In order to use these rates, the shipper was required to perform its own terminal trucking service and provide its own trailers just as it did in private operations. The railroad offered only ramp-to-ramp transportation of the shipper's trailers at rates which were comparable to the costs incurred by the shipper for the intercity haul only.

Plan III was quickly embraced by the shipping public, and it appeared that the railroads had at last provided a combination of service and price which promised to stem the tide of private transportation.

By and large then, existing TOFC service contained something for everyone, and, most important, the shipping public had a variety of rates and services from which to choose. Shippers registered their approval of piggyback service, and plan III in particular, both in supporting testimony before the ICC and in actual practice. Between 1959 and 1961, plan II traffic handled on five major eastern railroads rose from 80,000 to 120,000 trailers annually, and during the same period, plan III volume on the same lines rose from 35,000 to 125,000 trailers per year.

After 2 years of litigation instituted by trucker complaints, ICC approved the plan III service. Before the dust had settled, however, another full-scale investigation was underway and will not be concluded until late 1962. Thus, when ICC announced a third investigation in June, railroad management had ample excuse for feeling as Custer must have felt at the Little Big Horn.

The proposed rules issued by the ICC in October give ample cause for concern on the part of the railroads and the shipping public. For while ICC says that the proposed rules are not intended to curtail the TOFC services now in general use, one of the proposed rules would prohibit railroads or their subsidiaries from leasing equipment to shippers for use in plan III. According to one major railroad, this rule would eliminate plan III, the fastest growing piggyback service, from the scene. The fact that ICC was advised of the extensive use of leased trailers by one of its own bureaus and cannot plead ignorance on the subject lends emphasis to the railroads' apprehension.

The railroads may well wonder whether ICC in formulating the proposed rules has given any consideration to the criticisms of railroad management voiced by the Congress in 1958. Congress in turn may well wonder whether ICC intends to reinstate the pre-1958 regulatory shackles. Whatever may be ICC's intent, the proposed rules promise no benefit whatever for the railroads, and for this reason the truckers embrace the new investigation with high glee.

What ICC does here will certainly have a permanent policy effect on the future of railroad industry. The new methods, new services, and new prices required if the railroads are to survive as a principal means of intercity transportation cannot thrive in an atmosphere of constant litigation and turmoil.

In today's buyer's market, only the shippers, not ICC, will determine whether a given service is sufficiently flexible and reasonably priced. Back in the twenties, the railroads attempted a similar container service, but ICC put a floor under the rates which was unacceptable to the shipping public, and the containers were left to rust. A host of artificial proposed rules can be just as deadly.

Dr. Henry E. Kelly, Man of the Year of the National Medical and Dental Association of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, 1962, the National Medical and Dental Association of America elected Dr. Henry E. Kelly, of Cleveland, Ohio, as its Man of the Year. The honor was presented at the national convention at Lake Placid, N.Y. This honor is awarded each year to that member of the association who has made the greatest contribution to his profession as well as to the advancement of the National Medical and Dental Association.

Dr. Kelly for many years has been devotedly concerned in the activities of the National Medical and Dental Association. He is past national secretary, 1933; past president of the National Medical and Dental Association, 1951, 1952, and 1953. He was president for more terms than any other president in the history of the association. He is a past president of the Medical and Dental Arts Club of Cleveland, an affiliate of the National Medical and Dental Association. Dr. Kelly is a fellow of the International College of Dentists. He is a past president of the Cleveland Dental Society, and at present is a member of the board of directors of the society and one of its delegates to the Ohio State Dental Association. He is a member of the Xi Psi Phi, national dental fraternity.

Dr. Kelly, for almost his entire career in dentistry, has been notably active in liaison work between the dental profession and America's children. He embarked on this effort from the moment he was appointed chairman of the Cleveland Dental Society's Children's Dental Health Day Committee in May of 1947. Since that time he is best known in Cleveland and in Ohio for his efforts in dental health education.

Children's Dental Health Day originated in Cleveland in 1941. Dr. Norman H. Denner, then president of the Cleveland Dental Society, was the inspiring force in its creation. The purpose of this activity was intended to be the pinpointing of community attention to the importance of maintaining good oral health in children, to advise parents of the advancement in knowledge gained in dental research relative to the best methods and procedures in home care intended to insure good oral health in children, to advise parents of research findings relative to treatment of oral disease in children, as well as to encourage dentists in the practice of children's dentistry.

From its inception Children's Dental Health Day was an outstanding success in Cleveland. Many Cleveland mayors have supported the activity by issuing Children's Dental Health Day proclamations.

The success which the Cleveland Dental Society enjoyed in its early promotions of Children's Dental Health Day encouraged it to make an effort to induce the American Dental Association to promote Children's Dental Health Day on a national level. As a result of these efforts, the retiring president of the American Dental Association, in his address to the house of delegates in 1946, urged the American Dental Association to investigate the possibility of promotion of Children's Dental Health Day on a national scale.

On his appointment as chairman of the Cleveland Dental Society's Children's Dental Health Day Committee, Dr. Kelly embarked on an intensive program of activity aimed at urging the promotion of Children's Dental Health Day nationally. His first effort was made at the Boston convention of the American Dental Association in 1947. He attended that meeting and, together with other members of the Cleveland delegation, participated in discussions with representatives of the American Dental Association in which the feasibility of a national observation was explored. The proposal was approved in committee and the house of delegates adopted a resolution approving the observation of Children's Dental Health Day on a national level under the auspices of the American Dental Association.

For some time following the Boston resolution, there was great fear in Dr. Kelly's mind, as well as in the minds of others in Cleveland, that National Children's Dental Heath Day would not become a reality. Representatives of the American Dental Association felt that such an activity would require a special promotional effort which would be costly and for which no funds were available. Dr. Kelly met with representatives of the American Dental Association, at which meetings he urged that promotion of the observation be carried out by the already existing agencies of the association at small additional cost. This was agreed to and plans were initiated for the first National Children's Dental Health Day.

From the outset, it was generally felt that great impetus would be given the first observation of National Children's Dental Health Day if it were to be accompanied by a proclamation issued by the President of the United States. Dr. Kelly, together with the Washington representative of the American Dental Association, Dr. Willard Camalier, was assigned the responsibility to arrange for the issuance of a Presidential proclamation. Dr. Kelly requested me to arrange an appointment with the President, at which meeting an appeal could be made for a proclamation. The meeting was arranged and the delegation met with President Truman. The delegation was led by President Sterling Meade, of the American Dental Association, and was accompanied to the White House by the late Senator Murray, of Montana; Secretary Biffle, of the Senate; Congressman McCormack, of Massachusetts, now Speaker of the House of Representatives; Dr. Kelly; Dr. Camalier; Dr. Lynch, of Washington; Dr. H. C. Janke, of Cleveland; Dr. Leon Kramer, of Kansas; and Dr. Bruce Forsythe, Chief of the Dental Division of the U.S. Public Health Service.

The appeal for a proclamation was not successful. Dr. Kelly was advised that the next step for realization of a Presidential proclamation would be an act of Congress. Dr. Kelly immediately appealed to me as Representative of the 20th Ohio District to introduce such a bill. As a result of Dr. Kelly's appeal, I introduced H.R. 184 which requested President Truman to issue a proclamation establishing the first Monday in February of 1949 as First National Children's Dental Health Day.

H.R. 184 was the first public law signed by President Truman in 1949. In the delegation, at the signing of the act by President Truman, were President Adams, of the American Dental Association, Dr. Kelly, who inspired the bill, Dr. McDermott, of Cleveland, and Dr. Forsythe, and I, as author of the bill, H.R. 184.

Following the issuance of the proclamation, Dr. Kelly received a telegram from Past President Sterling Meade, of the American Dental Association, which said in part, "American dentistry owes you a debt of gratitude."

It is refreshing to note that in the past 11 years National Children's Dental Health Day has been expanded into Children's Dental Health Week. It has been widely acclaimed and has proven universally effective as an instrument of acquisition and maintenance of sound oral health in children. Dr. Kelly has remained quite active in the work to which he has so wholeheartedly dedicated his efforts. For 11 years he was chairman of the Dental Health Education Committee of the Cleveland Dental Society. In this capacity he entertained more than 20,000 schoolchildren in Cleveland's Public Auditorium at children's dental parties.

The health and well-being of our children is of paramount importance to all of us, and certainly Dr. Kelly has made an estimable contribution in that direction. The recognition that has come to him is well deserved.

Maximum Opportunity for Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me concerning the status of the urban renewal program.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

One of the key factors in national economic growth is the construction industry. Normally it accounts for more than 10 percent of gross national product. Any time that construction drops below 10 percent of gross national product the danger of depression becomes very real. When construction is more than 10 percent the economy is likely to be on the upgrade.

The Federal Government has been increasingly interested in construction. For more than 25 years it has been fostering national policies designed to benefit the industry.

In 1934 Congress enacted the National Housing Act which created the Federal Housing Administration. The purpose of this act was to establish a system for Federal insurance of home mortgages made by private financial institutions. The effect of this action was to revolutionize methods of housing production in the United States.

Before 1934 the mass production of housing was almost unknown. Subdivisions were being developed but their promotion was being predicated more on the sale of lots than of completed homes. The buyer of a lot had to make his own arrangements for the financing and construction of his house. Usually the mortgage finance company knew who was going to occupy the house, was satisfied with his personal credit, and was basing the loan on the qualifications of the individual as much as on the value of the property. This gave maximum protection to the finance company but was a definite impediment to the mass production of homes.

FHA made fundamental changes in the system. It made commitments to insure houses which were built for the market rather than for preselected individuals. Such commitments enabled builders to arrange financing and proceed with the mass construction of all the homes in a subdivision at one time.

FHA has insured mortgages issued by private financial institutions on more than 4 million dwelling units. It has been highly successful. It has paid back to the U.S. Government, with interest, all of the capital originally advanced for its establishment. It now has extensive financial reserves and is in position to expand its service to the construction industry.

FHA is playing an important part in urban renewal. It has available special forms of mortgage insurance which can be used both within and without urban renewal project areas to help provide housing for families displaced by any governmental action.

The Congress in pursuance of its policy of helping the construction industry wrote into the Housing Act of 1949 and continued in subsequent legislation a national housing policy which included a declaration that "private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can." There can be no mistake about the intent of the Congress.

The experience in urban renewal has not paralleled that of the FHA. Private enterprise participation has not been fully effective. Only about 30 percent of the land that has been cleared and offered for sale for private redevelopment has been bought and put to the intended use. About 20 percent of the projects for which Federal subsidies have been committed have been abandoned before completion.

There has to be some explanation for this failure. In my opinion it will be found, not in any inadequacy of the legislation, but in the administration of the law.

Responsibility for administration of the urban renewal program has been assigned by Congress to the Housing and Home Finance Agency. That Agency has been made responsible for the formulation of the principles and procedures to be followed in carrying out the program. It has to assume a major share of the responsibility for any failure which has occurred.

The HHFA has instituted a procedure in federally subsidized urban renewal projects which is completely different from that traditionally used in private enterprise renewal.

In private enterprise renewal, which continues to constitute the most widely used pattern, only principals are involved. A team of experts is recruited on which the following are normally represented: an architect, a builder, a real estate operator, and a source of mortgage finance. These persons focus their attention on a tract of land which could lend itself to profitable development or redevelopment. Possible uses are considered. Estimates of cost are prepared with respect to acquisition, demolition, site improvements, and the design and financing of new construction. If the facts indicate that a project is feasible, the members of the team make the necessary commitments and try to get options on properties which may be involved. Up to this point there is no publicity. Only after land acquisition has been arranged will there be any public announcement of the project.

A public urban renewal project is operated completely differently. A monopoly on the operation is given to a local public agency which may or may not have on its board or staff individuals qualified in construction. Every step is taken with full publicity. Many individuals and interests become involved in the project development who may have no status as principals.

The key to the federally aided urban renewal project is the urban renewal plan. It is required by law. It must spell out to the extent required by the Administrator "such land acquisition, demolition and removal of structures, improvements, and rehabilitation as may be proposed to be carried out in the urban renewal area, zoning and planning changes, if any, land used, maximum densities, and building requirements."

If private enterprise is to play any full part in a project it must be in on the planning of that project. It cannot wait until a plan has been developed by others and then be expected to come in and build to whatever specifications the plan may contain. It must contribute to the development of the plan.

This reality has been largely ignored by local public agencies. They have been following procedures outlined for them by the HHFA. They have not been warned that they cannot hope to be successful unless they have the full cooperation of the construction industry. They have not even consulted the industry during the planning phases of the program. Instead they have turned almost exclusively to the planners and asked them to formulate the urban renewal plans.

The position of the planners is understandable. They seek the ideal with only limited consideration given to economic feasibility. Their incentive and inclination is to maximize rather than minimize the overhead expenses. The fact that redevelopers will not buy the land and the project may never be completed, is of no great concern to them. By utilizing the advice and experience of the construction industry they might complete a plan quickly, at low cost, and with every assurance that the construction industry would be prepared to buy the available project land and complete the project.

Blame for this kind of planning must rest, not with the planners, but with the local public agencies and with HHFA which established the procedures followed by the local public agencies.

This will be disputed in some quarters. Representatives of the bureaucracy will insist that private enterprise is welcome to participate and that every opportunity is being offered for such participation.

There are two answers to this claim. Each one reveals the unsoundness of the position of HHFA.

The first answer is to be found in the specific requirements of the HHFA as spelled out in the "Urban Renewal Manual," the three-volume set of policies and requirements to which every local public agency must conform if it hopes to remain eligible for Federal financial aid. These procedures delay establishing a price at which the land can be made available for reuse until the urban renewal plan can be completed. This may take a year or several years. And it may result in prices which are based, not on firm offers of entrepreneurs, but on the opinion of planners and appraisers about what the land should be worth when a series of hypothetical plans have been carried out.

Private investment sources cannot afford to wait for all these preliminaries to be completed and cannot accept the assumption that the plan will succeed as the planners have decided that it should. The fate of their investments is determined by the actual real estate market which develops and they must base their decisions on market evidence rather than on planning concepts.

So long as HHFA applies the test of planning rather than of practicality to the submissions of local public agencies, private enterprise will be at a disadvantage and record of completions on projects will be poor.

The second answer is to be found in the Agency reaction to one very specific proposal designed to insure the more effective participation of private enterprise in urban renewal projects. The proposal was made at the Senate hearings on the housing bill of 1961. Senator CAPEHART asked for the official comments on the proposal. Both the proposal and the comments of the Agency follow:

"PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL URBAN RENEWAL STATUTE TO REQUIRE INVITATION FROM PROSPECTIVE DEVELOPERS AND INVESTORS PRIOR TO APPLICATION FOR URBAN RENEWAL FUNDS

"SEC. . The third sentence of section 102 (d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'No contract for any such advances of funds for surveys and plans for urban renewal projects which may be assisted under this title shall be made unless (i) the governing body of the locality involved has by resolution or ordinance approved the undertaking of such surveys, and plans and the submission by the local public agency of an application for such advance of funds, and (ii) the local public agency has, by publication in a newspaper having general circulation in the community, invited recommendations for the development of all or any part of the proposed urban renewal area from any prospective developers or investors having an interest therein, and (iii) the local public agency represents that, in preparing and submitting such application, it has taken into consideration all recommendations made to it within a reasonable time under clause (ii).'

"EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL URBAN RENEWAL STATUTE TO REQUIRE INVITATION FOR URBAN RENEWAL PROPOSALS FROM DEVELOPERS AND INVESTORS PRIOR TO APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL FUNDS

"This amendment would require that before a local public agency submits any application for advance planning funds for an urban renewal project it must invite recommendations for the appropriate development of all or parts of the proposed urban renewal area from prospective developers or investors. Such prospective developers and investors would thereby also receive an opportunity to indicate, if they wished, the types of renewal activities in the project area in which they might be willing to participate.

"The invitation would be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the community. Also, the local public agency would be required to represent that in submitting the application for advance planning funds, it has taken into consideration all of the recommendations received from prospective developers or investors within a reasonable time after the invitation therefor is published.

"The purpose of this amendment is to require that recommendations be obtained from local realtors and other interested persons, which could include city officials, at the initial stage of the planning of the project before the local public agency has, through its planning employees, formulated the urban renewal plan. This would give the local public agency the advantage of having informed advice and recommendations on various types of proposed development in the urban renewal area at a time when they can give adequate consideration to it. Under present urban renewal operations, the urban renewal plan has frequently been completed and the proposed development determined and fixed prior to the time that prospective developers and investors have real opportunity to have their views and suggestions considered. This means that before consideration is given to these views and proposals the project has been carried to the point where it is usually not considered feasible to change it substantially.

"The amendment would in no way restrict the discretion of the local public agency. Rather, it would assure that the urban renewal project is truly a local project arrived at after considering the views of vitally interested business groups."

The comment of the Agency is as follows:

"The second proposal would amend section 102(d) of title I to require a locality to invite recommendations from prospective developers and investors prior to applying for a Federal advance for survey and planning. We would like to point out, first, that such recommendations would be premature if made before a survey and planning application has been submitted by a community. At this stage of a renewal project, only tentative information is available on the exact nature of the blight problem and on the possible solutions, so that any recommendations would have an insufficient basis for reliability.

"Regardless of the timing of these recommendations, however, we believe that to require them by Federal law is both unnecessary and inappropriate. We, of course, favor the general principle evidenced by this proposal—that a community should have sound, practical advice for its renewal project as early as practicable in the planning stage. In a general way the citizen participation element of the community's workable program offers one avenue to secure this advice. We believe that it accomplishes at least a part of the objectives of this second legislative proposal, and we believe that measures designed to obtain the view of potential developers are more appropriate for administrative than legislative action."

The inadequacy of the HHFA response to Senator Capehart is indicated by the suggestion from the Agency that the citizen participation element of the workable program offers one avenue to secure this advice. The citizen participation element is administered by the mayor and has to do with communitywide rather than project activities. Project activities are administered by the local public agency on which the mayor is seldom represented.

I can agree with the views of the HHFA to the extent that it would be preferable to remedy this problem administratively rather than by legislative action. It is the failure of HHFA to act administratively which has brought about the suggestion of legislation. There is no evidence that HHFA will take the necessary action unless compelled to do so. If administrative action is not forthcoming, legislation will be the only course of action.

More than a year has passed since the HHFA submitted its response to Senator Capehart. During that time it has not modified the requirements of its "Urban Renewal Manual" in any significant manner to give private enterprise any greater participation in the formulation of urban renewal plans. Land is still being cleared and allowed to lay dormant because buyers will not accept the limitations which are being imposed by the urban renewal plans. This land is standing idle at a time when private enterprise money is scouring the country looking for good investments. There is serious doubt that some of the land in some of the urban renewal projects will ever be bought by private enterprise so long as the federally approved restrictions on its use remain in effect.

This issue is broader than just the relationship of HHFA to the construction industry. It relates to the entire contribution which construction can make to the gross national product and to the growth of the Nation. HHFA is not encouraging the industry to serve as large a part of the total need as it can. Steps must be taken to correct this situation which is stultifying rather than vitalizing our national economy.

Highlights of Senator Wiley's Activities in the 2d Session of the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, following the adjournment of Congress, I want to report to the people of Wisconsin and the Nation.

I request unanimous consent to have the summary of the highlights of my work to serve our citizen and national interests printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Wiley

THE 1962 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The workload covered a broad range of citizen and national interests.

During the session, I sponsored, cosponsored, and/or supported a variety of legislative proposals for progress and security. My duties, also, included voting against legislation that—in my judgment—would not serve the best interests of Wisconsin and the Nation.

Realistically, also, the extensive committee work involved writing and rewriting, revision, and/or approval on legislation. The committees on which I am privileged to serve include:

1. Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.
2. Foreign Relations Committee, including African Affairs Subcommittee, European Affairs Subcommittee, and Canadian Affairs Subcommittee.
3. Judiciary Committee, including Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights Subcommittee, Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, Refugees and Escapees Subcommittee, and Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

MAJOR CHALLENGES CONFRONTING NATION

In these critical times, the major challenges confronting the Nation—in my judgment—involve:

1. Maintaining the peace, or, conversely, preventing a third world war.
2. Containing, and ultimately diminishing, the influence of communism.
3. Preserving and strengthening the economic and political integrity of our free way of life.

A STRONG DEFENSE

For meeting these challenges, the Congress enacted—and I supported—such legislation as:

1. Creating more firepower for conventional and nuclear defense forces;
2. Strengthening free world alliances in which the United States participates, including NATO, SEATO, SENTO, OAS, and ANZUS;
3. Extending the Peace Corps, created to meet human and economic needs in less-developed countries by (a) giving ideas and leadership; and (b) providing an indirect nonmilitary counterforce to combat communism operating a global ring of Red conspirators;
4. Making moderate improvements in our civil defense program; and
5. Other efforts to provide a deterrent power against military aggression of the Communists; and at the same time to protect United States and free world interests on political, economic, ideological, and other nonmilitary fronts.

MAINTAINING A STRONG ECONOMY

The economy of the Nation must be preserved and strengthened—

If we are to meet the needs of a fast-expanding 187 million populace; and

If we are to meet the threat of communism.

The legislation adopted includes:

1. Adoption of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, created, among other things, to brighten the outlook for U.S. economy.
2. A moderate beginning in much-needed reform of tax laws.
3. Authorization of a manpower retraining program to equip out-of-job individuals in depressed areas for jobs elsewhere.
4. Senior Citizens Housing Act to provide liberalized housing for the elderly.
5. Accelerated civil works program to provide funds for job-creating works projects in areas of high unemployment.
6. Establishment of the mobile trade fairs program.
7. Increase the loan authorization for the Small Business Administration to assist small businesses.
8. Providing legislation for requiring television sets to be manufactured with equipment for all TV channels.
9. Expansion of atomic energy development program.

STRENGTHENING OUR FREE SYSTEM

Other legislation, designed to strengthen our free system, includes:

1. Cracking down on gambling and racketeering, including utilization of mails and interstate commerce for gambling purposes.
2. Tightening up internal security laws.
3. Establishing the Office of Science and Technology to coordinate Federal functions in this field.
4. Strengthening Federal criminal laws relating to briberies, graft, and conflict of interest.

HUMAN PROGRESS

Naturally, the well-being of our citizens merits high priority in national programing, such as follows:

1. Enactment of a voluntary pension plan for self-employed individuals.
2. Approval of liberalized retirement benefits for civil service employees.
3. Establishment of new health safeguards on drug usage by the public.
4. Improvement and expansion of our educational program.
5. Allowing surplus Federal property to be allocated to educational institutions;
6. Liberalization of benefits for veterans, and the dependents and widows of veterans.

CONSERVATION

The conservation, management, and best utilization of our natural resources, too, is essential if we are to meet the needs of the future.

Among other efforts extended during the session are included the following:

1. Carrying forward a program for antipollution of water.
2. Improvement of forest conservation and utilization programs, including expansion of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.
3. Extension and expansion of soil and water conservation programs.

During the session, I was privileged to be appointed by Vice President Johnson as a member of the National Forest Preservation Commission, responsible for policymaking over our national forest lands.

AGRICULTURE

In agriculture, regrettably, legislation held little or no promise for improvement of the economic outlook.

On April 1, 1962—the beginning of the marketing year—the administration lowered price supports of dairy products. I cosponsored legislation for improving the support levels. Unfortunately, the Congress failed to act. Other legislation adopted included:

1. Extension of the special school milk program.
2. Expansion and changing the formula of the national school lunch program.
3. Liberalization of farm loans.

SPACE

The Congress authorized $3.7 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1963.

Generally, this will create additional rocket power for U.S. efforts to explore and utilize space (a) for defense and (b) for peaceful purposes.

Among the practical benefits will be improved radio, telephone, and television communications through Telstar-type systems;

better weather reporting, transportation and progress in other fields.

OTHER LEGISLATION

The Congress also enacted a wide variety of legislation in other fields.

LEGISLATION OF SIGNIFICANCE TO WISCONSIN

As senior Senator of Wisconsin, I naturally have a special interest in legislation of significance to my home State.

During the session my legislative and extralegislative work included efforts to:

1. Expand trade and commerce—for example, through the seaway, established by Wiley-sponsored legislation—to create more jobs and business-industrial activities.

2. Obtain more defense contracts—now one of the biggest businesses in the Nation, for which over $50 billion is earmarked annually.

3. Enact Wiley-sponsored legislation—now getting favorable consideration—for creating an ice age scientific reserve in Wisconsin to preserve our unique, glacially sculptured moraines; conserve more of our outdoor heritage; and expand our attractions to tourists.

4. Further promote tourism—now one of our largest income-producing industries—to make Wisconsin a vacationland mecca for the Nation and the world.

5. Further improve and expand Wisconsin ports and harbors. The St. Lawrence Seaway transformed the Great Lakes into America's fourth seacoast. Strategically located at the western end of the lakes—capable of serving as an outlet of trade and commerce for the lakes-to-the-Rockies region, the challenge now is to transform our once-inland ports into world ports.

6. Expand and improve highway, water, rail, and air service for better commercial and pleasure traffic for Wisconsin and America.

7. Improve the economic outlook for Wisconsin farmers, including better prices, expanding markets, and finding new ways to utilize dairy and other farm commodities for industrial purposes; for example, by expanding research through establishment of a research laboratory in Madison, Wis., as I recommended in Congress.

8. Human progress: Establishment of realistic programs for medical care for the aging; development programs for youth; and further improving our educational system.

9. Conservation: Further expanding conservation programs for preservation, best management, and utilization—and, as possible—replenishment of our soil, water, forest, and other natural resources.

Scientific and Technical Manpower of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is becoming increasingly obvious that our scientific and technical manpower resources are among the most crucial ingredients in the Nation's military strength. It is unfortunate and perhaps dangerous that there should be any gaps in our understanding about the nature and extent of these vital resources. If these gaps in our knowledge are as large as many have claimed, a real threat to our national security might emerge. A shortage of relevant information may be as weakening as the shortage of scientific talent if that gap in information prevents the action necessary to solve the real problem.

It is important that every encouragement and support be provided to those that are gathering and evaluating data on the availability and utilization of such an important national resource. As chairman of the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, I plan to do all I can to provide such encouragement and support to the solution of this information problem.

I have recently written to Dr. Waterman of the National Science Foundation in order to be brought up to date on the important work being done by the Foundation in this area. I ask unanimous consent to insert these letters in the RECORD as a contribution to a wider understanding of both the successes and remaining problems in this matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 9, 1962.

DR. ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director, National Science Foundation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WATERMAN: The problem of obtaining adequate statistics about the availability of scientific and technical manpower will continue to absorb a great deal of my interest in the coming sessions of Congress. For this reason I appreciated the opportunity you recently provided for my representatives to meet with your staff in order to become better acquainted with the fine work being done by the National Science Foundation in this matter.

I am still trying to determine if the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee can play a role in resolving some of the problems that face those that gather or use statistics in this area. This appears to be a large and important problem area about which there is much misunderstanding. A congressional study might clear up some of this misunderstanding even if it could not improve on the statistical work being done by other interested groups, either Government or private.

I would appreciate it if you could provide me with answers to the following questions. This would assist me in determining what contribution my subcommittee might be able to make to the solving of these problems:

1. What Government or private groups are presently gathering statistics about the availability of engineering and scientific manpower? What groups are gathering statistics about the utilization of engineers and scientists? What aspects of the utilization and availability problems are each of these groups specializing in?

2. What unanswered questions provide the focal point of the empirical research being done? What gaps are there in the present statistics which prevent the answering of important policy questions?

3. What have been the results of this statistical effort up to this time? What previously unresolved problems in this area have been answered as the result of the activities of these groups?

4. What evidence is there that the great volume of statistics gathered by all these groups is being gathered in a coordinated fashion? What evidence is there that the evaluation of this mass of data is being done in a coordinated manner? Is there duplication of such efforts and if so is it duplication that serves a purpose?

Some of these questions are prompted by the impression that instead of a lack of statistics and research there may be a lack of coordination and evaluation of the profusion of existing material. Also, the doubt persists that the deficiencies may be in the relevance of the data rather than its volume.

Your answers to these questions will be a great contribution toward advancing the work of the Economics Statistics Subcommittee.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: In response to your request of October 9, the National Science Foundation welcomes the opportunity to report to you on some of the activities which have taken place in the development of adequate statistics on the availability of scientific and technical manpower. The specific questions which you raised and our answers to them are in the attached pages.

This reply has become rather more lengthy than was intended. However, the issues in the area of scientific and technical manpower are complicated ones, involving many programs and groups. We cannot claim that there are no problems of data collection and analysis; however, we do believe that a great deal of progress has been made in the last few years in meeting needs for these data. The enclosures listing NSF publications, publications resulting from NSF support, and projects now in process are illustrative of the remarkable diversity of data requirements.

If you or the Statistical Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee would like further information, we shall be happy to cooperate in any way we can.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN T. WATERMAN,
Director.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION REPLY

Question 1: What Government or private groups are presently gathering statistics about the availability of engineering and scientific manpower? What groups are gathering statistics about the utilization of engineers and scientists? What aspects of the utilization and availability problems are each of these groups specializing in?

Answer: The resources of both Government and non-Government agencies are utilized to meet our national information requirements for engineering and scientific manpower. The following list, although not comprehensive, includes principal groups engaged in gathering statistics on (a) supply of engineers and scientists, (b) employment of engineers and scientists, (c) demand for engineers and scientists, (d) salaries and wages of engineers and scientists, and (e) other data on scientists and engineers.

(A) SUPPLY OF ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS

Bureau of the Census provides at decennial intervals census counts of engineers and selected natural scientists through the Decennial Census of Population. At intermediate periods, occasional sample surveys provide broad aggregate data.

Immigration and Naturalization Service annually makes available (by discipline and country of origin) data on engineers and scientists immigrating into this country. Such immigration constitutes a not insignificant addition to this country's manpower resources.

National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council through its Office of Scientific Personnel maintains an annual series on doctorates awarded in science and engineering.

National Science Foundation through its National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel and cooperating professional scientific societies provides information on the numbers and professional characteristics of more than 200,000 professional scientists at biennial intervals. Data collected include levels of training, scientific specializations, work activities, age, location, etc.

U.S. Office of Education reports each year degrees granted in science and engineering by American colleges and universities. This constitutes a measure of annual additions to the engineering and scientific manpower supply. The same agency provides annual data on enrollments in engineering and in science at undergraduate and graduate school levels.

(B) EMPLOYMENT OF ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS

Bureau of Labor Statistics collects annually data on employment of scientists and engineers in private industry. Less frequently, data are collected on such employment in State governments and miscellaneous nonprofit institutions.

Civil Service Commission is the source of annual data on Federal Government employment of engineers and scientists.

National Science Foundation in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education secures information every few years on scientists and engineers employed in American colleges and universities.

(C) DEMAND FOR ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS

Bureau of Employment Security reports bimonthly the unfilled demand for engineers and scientists as reflected through the nationwide system of public employment offices.

Bureau of Labor Statistics with financial support from the National Science Foundation completed a study of requirements for engineers and scientists, which was published as "The Long-Range Demand for Scientific and Technical Personnel" by the Foundation in 1961. A new study, which brings up to date the earlier volume, is now in process and will be released in 1963.

Engineering Manpower Commission of the Engineers Joint Council conducts an annual survey of manpower requirements for engineers as reported by a selected group of industrial and governmental employers.

Northwestern University conducts a somewhat similar survey of the hiring intentions on local college campuses by large industrial employers.

(D) SALARIES AND WAGES OF ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS

Bureau of Labor Statistics includes selected engineering and scientific occupations in its sample surveys of salary rates.

Engineering Manpower Commission of the Engineers Joint Council reports on salaries paid to engineering faculty and to engineers in industry.

Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory of the University of California conducts an annual survey of salaries paid to research and development scientists by a sample of industry and Government laboratories.

National Science Foundation releases data collected through the National Register on total professional income and salaries of scientists by disciplines, type of employer, and work activity.

(E) OTHER DATA ON SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Numerous other agencies contribute to the pool of data on availability and utilization of engineering and scientific manpower, usually in a more limited fashion. For example, the Atomic Energy Commission is a source of information on engineers and scientists engaged in atomic energy activities; the Department of Defense provides information on scientific personnel employed on some of its programs; several Government agencies are sources of information on fellowships which they provide for graduate study in the sciences. The American Chemical Society and the American Institute of Physics provide information on the professional groups included in their membership. The National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University, the National Merit Scholarship Corp. at Evanston, Ill., the Educational Testing Service at Princeton, N.J., and the Bureau of Social Science Research in Washington are among the private and university-affiliated groups frequently engaged in research studies dealing with scientific and technical manpower. A more exhaustive list of such organizations will be found in chapter III of "A Study of Scientific and Technical Manpower." (Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 2d sess.)

Question 2: What unanswered questions provide the focal point of the empirical research being done? What gaps are there in the present statistics which prevent the answering of important policy questions?

Answer: In 1958 a Special Advisory Panel to the National Science Foundation and the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers reviewed the Government's scientific manpower information activities. As a part of this review the Panel (generally referred to as the Hauser Committee) noted certain important issues for which such information seems imperative. These issues are:

1. The extent to which the scientific and technical talent and skills should be encouraged and developed to increase the supply of scientists, engineers, technicians, and teachers of science.

2. Ways in which the teaching and study of science should be furthered and the means of doing so.

3. Methods which should be used to raise the standards of teaching and training in order to improve the quality of scientists, engineers, and technicians.

4. Development of criteria for military induction, occupational and student deferment, and Reserve screening.

5. Determination of an optimum level of Government-financed research.

6. Determination of levels of compensation of scientific and technical personnel, both civilian and military, and of means of improving prestige and morale.

7. Methods of conserving and utilizing to the greatest possible extent the available scientific and technical manpower.

The issues noted are for the most part equally pertinent today. Such issues are never fully solved and yet are constantly being solved in terms of the Nation's immediate needs.

Despite our wealth of information, there are certain important gaps in our statistical data at this time. Some of the principal ones are: (1) Lack of information on the statistical reliability of our demand data; (2) inadequate measures of manpower utilization effectiveness; (3) insufficient information on the extent of loss of college-trained scientists and engineers to other occupational fields; and (4) insufficient data on the current and future extent of graduate education in engineering and science and sources and amounts of support available to graduate students.

Recent studies of the demand for engineers and scientists point to an approximate doubling of the Nation's requirements in the period 1960–70. These studies provide considerably more information than has been available on this subject in the past, but this information clearly goes beyond statistical precision into uncharted areas where measurements are largely determined by judgment and by their consistency with historical data. Only continuing scrutiny of current trends tempered with an enlightened assessment of future prospects will serve to increase the accuracy of demand estimates. A new report scheduled for publication in 1963 should contribute to our knowledge of this topic. Recent studies have produced a substantial body of information on the deployment of our scientists and engineers in terms of their principal work activities and industrial distribution.

Less adequate is our information on how effectively they are being utilized, the extent to which their skills are underutilized, the character of measures which might generally improve utilization, the effect of Government procurement and research and development programs on utilization, etc. Information on these topics would be most helpful as guides to policy formulation relating to education and training programs, to the optimum level of Government-supported research and development, and to Government procurement practices. The National Academy of Sciences is now engaged in a study of this entire area at the request of the President.

Another serious gap in our scientific manpower information concerns the relationship between education, training, and employment. It is well known, for example, that many college-trained engineers do not subsequently practice engineering, but become employed in a variety of occupations, including sales, management, and research. Conversely, large numbers of practicing professional engineers are not graduates of engineering schools. More extensive information on these subjects would greatly assist in analyzing the extent to which a given supply of college graduates will serve to meet the requirements for a given number of engineers and scientists. A sample study, now in process with joint support from several Government agencies, promises to provide information of assistance in answering many questions of this type in 1963. This survey is based upon a cross section of the population reported in the 1960 census as engaged in a technical occupation or with a college education. Respondents are asked to provide further information (1) on their current work activities, education, and training which qualify them for their occupation, and (2) on other training. The survey results will provide data not now available on occupational mobility, job training, and utilization.

Still another gap in information involves more adequate measurement and analysis of the movement into, and the participation of, science and engineering students in graduate education. Examples of the kinds of questions for which better answers are needed are: What proportions of science and engineering baccalaureates continue their education to the master's degree, the doctor's degree? Do these proportions vary by field and over time? What is the time lapse of entry into and completion of graduation? What are the sources and extent of graduate student support? How many high-ability students do not enter graduate training and for what reasons? To what extent are graduate students involved in teaching and research duties? The Foundation is supporting a study by the Office of Education on the sources and extent of graduate student support. Several private groups are continuing their studies of graduate level education.

Question 3: What have been the results of this statistical effort up to this time? What previously unresolved problems in this area have been answered as the result of the activities of these groups?

Answer: The most important result of this large statistical effort has probably been that the Nation is now, for the first time, in a position in which it can reach national decisions on scientific manpower resource problems on the basis of a growing body of knowledge collected and analyzed in accordance with scientific principles. The framework of a system of national intelligence on our engineering and scientific manpower resources has been developed within the past 10 years. This system is unrivaled among those countries accustomed to freedom of choice of occupation and employment, although probably it is not equivalent to that of some countries where rigid economic and manpower controls are customary.

It should be pointed out in passing that science manpower statistics of themselves resolve no problems, except those specifically associated with lack of information. Such statistics rather provide tools which the policymaker can use in deriving problem solutions in a logical fashion. More specifically, research and survey efforts have produced an awareness of the dimensions of manpower resource problems. Much of the concern with the inadequate numbers of engineers and scientists now being trained can be traced to studies which have provided estimates of the future requirements for persons with such training. An appreciation of the extent to which our scientific manpower resources are committed to Government research and development programs has resulted from information on the work activities of scientists and engineers. The magnitude of the science education effort which will be needed to produce scientists and engineers in the numbers required becomes clearer in the light of estimated manpower requirements. Comparative data on the education of scientists and engineers in foreign countries have become a matter of public concern lest the Nation's position of leadership in this regard be imperiled. Regional and State programs for expanding graduate training in engineering and science are emerging in answer to information showing the concentration of graduate education in a relatively few areas. These are only a few examples of specific problem areas which are symptomatic of the important issues which involve scientific manpower and which provide the justification for a substantial research and survey program.

Question 4: What evidence is there that the great volume of statistics gathered by all these groups is being gathered in a coordinated fashion? What evidence is there that the evaluation of this mass of data is being done in a coordinated manner? Is there duplication of such efforts and if so is it duplication that serves a purpose?

Answer: A high degree of coordination exists among Government agencies collecting scientific manpower data. To a lesser extent, non-Government agencies also coordinate their data collecting activities with those of the Government. Coordination is achieved principally through close communication between organizations participating in these programs, but is aided by interlocking advisory committees and groups and by financial controls. Among Federal agencies coordination is further effected through control of questionnaire forms under the Federal Reports Act.

In general coordination among Government agencies lies in the recognition that funds for survey purposes are limited, and that agency cooperation will greatly aid in stretching resources as far as possible. Thus, agency advisory committees and less formally established groups usually include representatives from other agencies concerned with scientific manpower problems. The National Science Foundation, for example, utilizes an advisory panel which includes in its membership representatives from the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Defense. Similarly, Foundation representatives serve on committees advisory to the Office of Education, Department of Labor, and Office of Science and Technology, and act as observers on other groups, including nongovernmental agencies such as the American Institute of Physics and the National Merit Scholarship Corp.

Also contributing to well-integrated activities in the collection process is the Federal Reports Act of 1942. This statute requires Government agencies, with minor exceptions, to secure Bureau of the Budget approval prior to collecting information from the public. The Bureau, which, through its Office of Statistical Standards, controls the use of questionnaire and other survey instruments has requested the National Science Foundation to serve as the focal agency in the coordination of the Government's program of statistical information on scientific and engineering manpower. This assignment has been important in the Foundation's role of programing, releasing, and publishing information on scientists and engineers. Thus, much of the research and survey work on scientific personnel is initiated or encouraged by the Foundation when its studies reveal serious deficiencies or inadequacies in existing data. Frequently, rather than launch a new effort which would unnecessarily duplicate part of a related survey elsewhere, the Foundation provides substantial financial support to cooperating agencies.

Much emphasis is given to analysis and evaluation of survey data since administration of the manifold Federal programs requires a great deal of specialized information on technical manpower. Detailed information for program guidance is most effective when oriented to the particular problem at hand. For example, an analysis of the utilization of engineers in industry prepared for the Department of Defense with defense procurement implications in mind will probably not be the most useful analysis for an agency considering the desirability of an undergraduate scholarship program to augment the supply of engineers for industry. Similarly, the National Science Foundation in analyzing science teacher qualifications to determine the optimum size of teacher training institute programs will not be concerned with the same analysis as might a department of education developing plans for preservice training of science teachers. This is to say that one should normally expect substantive program administrators to insist upon data analysis adapted to their special purposes. Of course this will mean that data will be analyzed and evaluated for such special purposes by many different agencies. The important point is that the underlying basic data should be consistent, accurate, and timely in order that it may serve as many purposes as possible.

Report by Congressman Laurence Curtis to the People of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as this legislative year draws to a close, I think it is important to review the activities of the session.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

In these days when the Soviet power buildup in Cuba has become threatening, foreign policy is an overriding issue.

I therefore report first on my work as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. That committee is the one which is most closely concerned with cold-war policies. The administration of foreign policy is a constitutional prerogative of the President and the State Department, but the Foreign Affairs Committee authorizes the spending of funds to carry out foreign policy, and proposes resolutions on vital foreign policy issues. This year it passed resolutions on Berlin and Cuba. Vietnam and Laos also present difficult problems.

The Secretary of State and military leaders have kept the Foreign Affairs Committee fully advised about these situations. The committee has supported administration policies and has urged firmness in the face of threats.

My votes in the committee and in the House have been cast in the realization that we are in a period of great danger to our country; that Americans must have stout hearts and steady nerves, and that it may be necessary to risk war in order to avoid certain war; that once a country gives in to threats, only eventual war or surrender and enslavement can follow.

CUBA RESOLUTION

Concern over the Soviet military buildup in Cuba led to the passage by Congress of a resolution expressing the determination of the United States to prevent, by any means necessary, including the use of arms, the creation in Cuba of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States, and to prevent the spread of communism from Cuba to other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The resolution was reported out of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and was passed by the House on September 26 by a vote of 387 to 7. The disapproving votes were largely from those favoring a stronger resolution. The Senate had passed the resolution a few days previously.

The Monroe Doctrine was much discussed during the House debate. President Monroe, in a message to the Congress of December 2, 1823, asserted that the American continents were not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power, and that we should consider any attempt by those powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

The Monroe Doctrine has since been affected by our agreements with other Latin American countries for collective action in support of its principles.

In the House debate it was urged that the resolution should be made stronger, and that the steps already taken in Cuba by the Soviet Government amounted to a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. A motion to amend the resolution and express this point of view was rejected, although House Republicans voted for the motion 137 to 13. I so voted, and in addressing the House I said:

> The Monroe Doctrine inhibits any European power from extending its system to this hemisphere. As I read this resolution, in subsection (b) it prescribes the extension here of a system which creates a military capability endangering the security of the United States. That is certainly a much narrower objective than that of the Monroe Doctrine which aims at preventing any extension by a European power of its system to this hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine does not say that that system must create a military danger to this country.

I felt that this point might become important in connection with our future relations with Cuba.

BERLIN RESOLUTION

Shortly after the Cuba resolution, the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported favorably a similarly worded resolution on Berlin, stating that the United States was "determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms" any violation by the Soviet Union directly or through others of Allied rights in Berlin, including those of ingress and egress.

On October 5, 1962, the House passed the resolution unanimously, and a few days later the Senate passed the same resolution.

During the past 4 years the Soviet Union has been trying to force the Allies out of Berlin, in violation of agreements made at the close of World War II. Mr. Khrushchev has constantly threatened to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany, which he said would have the effect of terminating or gravely impairing Allied rights in Berlin. On more than one occasion his threat was in the nature of an ultimatum, but in each case he backed down in the face of the firm attitude of the United States and Allied countries.

During the deliberations of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I argued and was partly responsible for the inclusion of a clause in the resolution, stating that it was the "purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Germany." I pointed out that the Soviet Union continually reiterated its own objectives, and that we should do the same, even though this particular objective was not immediately attainable.

Shortly before congressional action on the Berlin resolution, Mr. Khrushchev stated that he would postpone further action on Berlin until after the congressional elections on November 6.

I quote from my remarks to the House during the debate on this resolution, and resulting discussion, as follows:

> Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, let us tell the world that the Congress resents the intrusion of the Communist masters in the Kremlin into our internal affairs in this country by the suggestion that Mr. Khrushchev will postpone certain actions and his proposed peace treaty with East Germany until after the congressional elections this November.
>
> Mr. Chairman, let us tell the world that this country's attitude does not depend on the outcome of the congressional elections, and that we regard it as impudent for anyone to make such a suggestion. Let us tell the world that whether the Congress is in session or not, we now, as representing the American people, have taken a stand which we know will meet with their approval, whether we Members are in Washington or whether we are back in the "hustings" conferring with our constituents.
>
> Mr. Colmer. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.
>
> Mr. Colmer. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts upon his stand and upon his statement.
>
> With reference to the question that has been raised about Mr. Khrushchev wanting to wait until after the election, is it not reasonable to assume from that that he is implying that if your party that is now out of power were to come into power in the Congress, you would be pursuing a different policy?
>
> Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman. I think it is an impudent suggestion.
>
> May I add also that in my personal opinion this is not the first time Mr. Khrushchev has tried to intrude into American politics. Such conduct, in my opinion, occurred in the year 1960.
>
> Mr. Frelinghuysen. I should like to compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Curtis] for a very fine statement and to express my regret that he is not going to be with us next year, that he is not running for reelection. I should like to say that I am sure I speak for Members on both sides of the aisle when I say that he has been a very valuable Member of our committee and has contributed in many ways to sensible solutions of some of the delicate and difficult questions with which we have been presented.

VIETNAM AND LAOS

Vietnam and Laos are other trouble spots.

Our Government felt that the loss of Vietnam to communism would threaten the whole Western position in southeast Asia. We have therefore been giving extensive military aid to the Government of Vietnam in its fight against Communist guerrillas. This was done at the request of the Vietnamese Government. Our aid has verged on actual assistance in the fighting, but seems fully justified.

In Laos we supported the formation of a neutralist regime involving an attempted coalition between the more extreme factions on the right and on the left. Laos has a long thin border with Vietnam, and there is danger that its territory will be used as a bridge between the Communists in China and the Communist guerrillas in Vietnam. The attempt to secure collaboration between the Communists and non-Communists was a policy which failed in China, and there is always the danger that in any such arrangement the Communists will end up on top.

FOREIGN AID

This is the subject to which the Foreign Affairs Committee devotes its major attention.

There has been growing opposition to this program resulting largely from past mistakes and unsatisfactory performance. But after extensive hearings, the Foreign Affairs Committee continued to feel that foreign aid is an essential tool of our foreign policy and that the developing nations must be encouraged to make progress in freedom rather than in reliance on the Soviet type of tyranny.

I have supported our foreign aid programs, but felt this year that our foreign aid is now being given too indiscriminately. Over 80 foreign nations are now recipients of our foreign aid. The administration of that aid must be tightened up still further. We must not allow its benefits to be syphoned off by those at the top. It must reach the masses of the people. We must focus more on programs to increase the productivity of the nations which we are aiding. I felt that one way to control waste and taking up of unwise projects was to exercise greater care in the amount of funds to be appropriated.

Our expanded program of economic aid to Latin America faces problems. Some of the countries have been slow in making the internal reforms to which they agreed—improvements in land tenure, taxation, social justice, and the like, referred to as self-help. A difficult question is whether we should continue to go ahead despite this. It is hard for an outsider to tell another sovereign nation how to run its affairs.

The Congress made severe reductions from the amounts requested by the administration. In the providing of funds there is first the authorization by the Foreign Affairs Committee, which sets outside limits, and then appropriation by the Appropriations Committee. The Foreign Affairs Committee made some reductions, but the most severe cuts were made by the Appropriations Committee. It reported a severely reduced appropriation to the House and little attempt was made in the House to increase the appropriation. The administration preferred to rely on the Senate, which did increase the appropriation. But in the final compromise between the two branches, the cuts were more severe than in recent years. If the administration finds them too hampering, it can seek supplementary appropriations next January.

THE MIDDLE EAST

The foreign-aid legislation again reiterated support of policies which have particular application to Arab-Israel relations: freedom of navigation in international waterways, increased economic cooperation and trade between countries, disapproval of discrimination against American citizens based on race or religion. It directed that these principles be supported in the administration of foreign aid.

PEACE CORPS

The Peace Corps has made good, and is to be expanded. The Congress this year with little dissent authorized a large increase in the number of Peace Corps volunteers. They are given intensive training, including training in the language of the country where they are going. They live under hard conditions in faraway places and help the populace in education, farming, sanitation, and other ways.

Foreign countries have found the system good, and want more of it. Young Americans have volunteered in large numbers. This is a form of foreign aid which reaches the grassroots, and shows the world our finest commodity—well-trained, dedicated American youth. The success of the Corps is encouraging to those of us who had faith in and supported the idea from the start.

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

I again attended, as I had the previous year, the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in Paris last November. It is a meeting of delegates from the legislative bodies of the NATO countries. There were committees on military, economic, and political questions.

Discussions before the economic committee, which I attended, stressed the success of the European Common Market, the importance of British relations with it, and the importance of our trade with it.

World prices of raw materials and possible methods of stabilizing them were again discussed. Price changes can cause economic distress, particularly for countries such as some in South America, which depend largely on one crop or product. The discussion again made it clear that the Communist bloc nations use trade not for peaceful commercial intercourse, but as a means of political and economic aggression, and that the free world must find ways of protecting itself from any such practice.

DOMESTIC ISSUES

In my report of last year I said:

> I have cast my votes in the direction which I believe would promote a free economy, sound money, and wise governmental economy * * * avoiding the extremes on either side.
>
> The danger of overcentralization of governmental powers in Washington needs continual watching. Government should be kept close to the people, and local control of local matters is a cornerstone of American democracy. The fight for home rule and against unwarranted Federal interference must be a continuous one. Federal power has a tendency to feed on itself.

I still believe strongly in these principles. Many bills before the House this year aimed at desirable objectives, but went too far both as to spending and as to centralization of power in Washington. I found it necessary to vote for amendments reducing the excesses. My voting record, which will be found below, gives examples of this. In many cases a majority of the House shared that view, and amended or rejected the bills.

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

That part of the President's program which tended to increase the Executive power and which would have involved heavily increased spending met congressional resistance, which led to the defeat or great modification of many of the programs.

The defeated programs included a new cabinet Department of Urban Affairs; standby tax-cutting authority; standby authority to initiate public works; Youth Conservation Corps; education bills. The bill for Federal aid to education for elementary and secondary schools remained bottled up in the Committee on Rules as it was the previous year, and did not come before the House. The college academic facilities bill, providing Federal grants and loans to public and private colleges for construction of academic facilities, was passed by the House; but the House disagreed with later Senate amendments, and refused to agree to a conference committee report, thereby killing the bill.

Important parts of the President's program which were enacted included: the Trade Expansion Act which replaced the old Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and gave the President broader powers in tariff negotiations, having in view negotiations with the European Common Market; the act authorizing the purchase of $100 million of U.N. bonds; increase of postal rates and Federal pay; foreign aid, considerably reduced; the manpower retraining bill, modified by amendments sponsored by House Republicans; the tax bill, also much modified by the Congress. The farm bill was defeated, but a much watered-down version was later enacted into law.

These and other items of domestic legislation are discussed in connection with my voting record, reported on below.

The following issues deserve special comment:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY FINANCED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

The House Ways and Means Committee did not act this year on the administration's bill for the provision of medical care for the elderly under social security. The issue, therefore, did not come before the House.

The subject did come before the Senate by means of an amendment in the nature of a rider attached to another bill. This health care amendment was worked out by Senator Anderson and Senator Javits. It differed from the administration's bill in that it made provision for the medical care of elderly persons not covered by social security, and also included an option under which persons entitled to health benefits could have them paid by a private insurance company which would be reimbursed by the Government. This amendment failed in the Senate by a narrow margin.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The administration was criticized again this year for lack of legislation on civil rights, despite platform and campaign promises. It continued to seek progress through Executive action rather than through legislation, and through enforcement of existing laws protecting minority rights in voting, school segregation, interstate transportation, and jobs with the Government and its contractors.

I believe that the following civil rights legislation is particularly needed: a bill permitting the Attorney General to intervene for the protection of civil rights in general. Such a provision was passed by the House as part III of the 1957 act, but was limited in the Senate to the protection of voting rights; a bill to prevent the unfair use of literacy tests as a means of denying voting rights.

IMMIGRATION

An immigration bill was passed this year to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and relatives of U.S. citizens. It also permits certain aliens subject to deportation, but who had lived in the United States from 7 to 10 years with a good civic record, to remain in the country legally. The Congress again failed to take up the issue of discrimination resulting from the quota system.

MASSACHUSETTS PROBLEMS

Massachusetts problems receive my special attention. Many problems affecting Massachusetts must be handled by the executive departments rather than by legislation. The Massachusetts congressional delegation acts on these problems, and I have joined in those efforts: to see that Massachusetts got its fair share of defense contracts and appropriations for such programs as urban renewal, airport construction, and flood control; relief for railroads and for urban mass transportation; removal of the quota on imports of residual oil; protection of the textile industry; protection and Federal aid for the fishing industry; maintenance of the workload at the Boston Naval Shipyard and Watertown Arsenal.

VOTING RECORD

As the fairest and most impartial way of reporting on the highlights of my voting record at this session, I am listing the votes chosen annually by the New York Times as the key House rollcall votes of the year.

KEY ROLLCALL VOTES, 1962

What follows is copied directly from the New York Times except for the addition under each item of my comments:

1. Urban affairs, February 21, 1962: Resolution disapproving the President's proposal of a Department of Urban Affairs at the Cabinet level. Adopted: Yea, 264; nay, 150. Democrats: Yea, 111; nay, 137. Republicans: Yea, 153; nay, 13.

Curtis voted for the resolution of disapproval. There were several valid objections to the creation of the new Department of Urban Affairs which led to its overwhelming rejection, with only 13 Republicans voting for it. My principal objection was that this bill would add to the overcentralization of power in Washington, with increased dictation from Washington over State and local affairs. Additionally, the bill did not create an effective Department of Urban Affairs. What it really did was to elevate the Housing and Home Finance Agency to a Cabinet level, leaving it without jurisdiction over other important Federal programs affecting cities, such as highways, air pollution, and even some housing programs. My vote against this plan was not in the slightest a vote against the appointee for the new secretaryship which had been proposed by the President.

2. Tax revision, March 29, 1962: Passage of the Revenue Act of 1962. Passed: Yea, 219; nay, 196. Democrats: Yea, 218; nay, 34. Republicans: Yea, 1; nay, 162.

Curtis voted nay. The inclusion in this bill of the provision for the withholding of the tax on interest and dividends was the principal reason for objection to this bill, with only one Republican voting for it. Opponents believe that this withholding tax would be an administrative monstrosity, and that there were other and better ways of insuring collection of these taxes through requiring more detailed reports of payments. The Congress later passed this bill after the Senate had stricken out the withholding tax and substituted the reporting requirements.

3. Debt limit, June 14, 1962: Passage of the administration bill to raise the national debt ceiling from $300 billion to $308 billion. Passed: Yea, 211; nay, 192. Democrats: Yea, 202; Nay, 39. Republicans: Yea, 9; nay, 153.

Curtis was opposed to passage. My opposition to increasing the debt limitation was largely a protest against continued high Government spending. Once the Congress has appropriated money, the Government is free to spend it. If the resulting expenditures exceed the income of the Government, the additional funds are borrowed by the Treasury. But this borrowing process can go on only up to the debt ceiling. This ceiling is, however, somewhat illusory as the Government bills must be paid. Still, the ceiling does act as a brake on expenditures. Only nine Republicans voted to increase the debt ceiling.

4. Farm bill, June 21, 1962: Findley (Republican, of Illinois) motion to recommit

(kill) the administration's first omnibus farm bill. Adopted: Yea, 215; nay, 205. Democrats: Yea, 48; nay, 204. Republicans: Yea, 167; nay, 1.

Curtis voted to recommit—kill—the bill. I opposed this farm bill as representing a continuation of the high support price programs which have worked badly and piled up ever-increasing surpluses. There must be a move toward greater determination of prices in the marketplace.

5. Trade expansion, June 28, 1962: Mason (Republican, of Illinois) motion to recommit the administration's Trade Expansion Act with instructions to substitute a 1-year extension of the expiring Trade Agreements Act. (The administration measure subsequently passed: Yea, 298; nay, 125.) Rejected: Yea, 171; nay, 253. Democrats: Yea, 44; nay, 210. Republicans: Yea, 127; nay, 43.

Curtis was paired against the motion to recommit the bill. The reciprocal trade agreements law was enacted in 1934, and has since been extended 11 times. It permits the United States to enter into reciprocal tariff cutting agreements with other countries. The President this year proposed a new Trade Expansion Act which extends and expands the existing law. It is intended to facilitate negotiations with the European Common Market.

A vote on the motion referred to above would have defeated the new trade bill and would have instead merely extended existing law for another year. I believe that we must be in a position to negotiate with the European Common Market, while at the same time assuring reasonable protection of essential industries. I therefore voted against the motion. Following defeat of the motion the House passed the new trade bill after adding protectionist measures.

6. U.N. bonds, September 14, 1962: Adair (Republican, of Indiana) motion to recommit the bill authorizing the President to purchase up to $100 million in U.N. bonds, with instructions to amend it to bar any payments unless other nations in arrears paid back assessments. (The bill subsequently passed: Yea, 257; nay, 134.) Rejected: Yea, 171; nay, 219. Democrats: Yea, 44; nay, 193. Republicans: Yea, 127; nay, 26.

Curtis was against the motion to recommit. The U.N. found itself in financial straits because of nonpayment of special assessments for military operations in the Gaza strip and the Congo by certain nations which disapproved of those operations. I felt that it was in the best interest of the United States for it to do its fair share to keep the U.N. going, but not more than its fair share. The proposed commitment of the United States had been trimmed down in committee before the bill came before the House. The World Court had also recently issued an advisory opinion which would improve the ability of the U.N. to collect special assessments through denial of voting rights in the General Assembly of nations which were in arrears in payment up to a certain amount. I favored the bill and voted against the amendment referred to above which would have killed the bill.

7. College aid, September 20, 1962: Kearns, Republican, of Pennsylvania, motion to recommit (kill) the conference report. Adopted: Yea, 214; nay, 186. Democrats: Yea, 84; nay, 156. Republicans: Yea, 130; nay, 30.

Curtis voted not to recommit—kill—the conference report. This vote related to the higher education bill providing Federal aid to colleges for construction of academic facilities and for scholarships. There was disagreement between the Senate and the House as to various provisions for grants. These were largely compromised in a conference committee. I felt that the bill was in the public interest, and so disapproved of killing the conference report which would also have killed the bill.

CURTIS BILLS

It is the practice of some Congressmen to file a large number of bills, many of which are repetitions of other bills already before the Congress on subjects of popular interest. I have not followed that practice, but have limited my bills to matters of special interest to the 10th District or to matters which I felt were insufficiently covered.

Legislation which I introduced this year included a bill to tighten the Federal laws in order to cover more specifically illegal acts disclosed in the highway scandals, such as kickbacks and unfair appraisals; a bill to have a survey conducted by the Army Engineers as to the feasibility of opening up a channel or sluiceway at the location of Shirley Gut in order to increase water circulation and help alleviate pollution condition in Winthrop Bay. This survey was authorized in the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act; a number of private bills relating to immigration problems.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

I believe that one of my major duties is to see to it that constituents are fairly treated in all their dealings with the Federal Government. I maintain offices open throughout the year in both Boston and Washington for every possible service to constituents. I conduct periodic meetings with constituents in every section of the district.

My newsletters published in the local press seek to keep people in touch with matters of interest in Washington and report on my activities. I both write these letters and do the necessary research myself.

CONCLUSION

In closing this report, I express my appreciation to the people of the 10th District for the honor and privilege of representing them in the Congress of the United States.

In the Massachusetts redistricting which took place this year following the loss of two congressional seats as a result of population changes, the 10th District was dismembered. The Boston wards, with the exception of ward 21, were added to Speaker John W. McCormack's district. Newton was added to the district represented by former Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr. Brookline and Boston ward 21 went to the district represented by Congressman Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.

As a result it was impossible for me to be a candidate for Congress in the September primaries from any one of these three districts, which would otherwise have been possible in view of the outcome of the Republican Convention in June. It is with keen regret that I cease my happy association with the people of the 10th Congressional District, whom I have represented these past 10 years.

Summary of the Record and Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the legislative record of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 87th Congress in my judgment will compare favorably with that of any period in the entire history of the committee. There is no area of the committee's very broad jurisdiction which has not received attention and there is no major area of the committee's jurisdiction which has not witnessed the consideration and enactment of substantial legislation. The work of our committee has significantly and beneficially touched the lives of millions of American citizens.

To indicate the breadth and depth of the committee's major responsibility in this Congress, a mere listing of some of these measures which were reported by the committee and which were enacted into law is revealing.

In the tariff field, two major legislative landmarks were enacted. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 gives to the President the weapons which he needs to deal with the emerging trade problems of this era. The Tariff Classification Act of 1962 marks the first major revision of tariff classification schedules in over 30 years.

In the field of internal revenue taxes, the Revenue Act of 1962 represents the first major revision action in this field since 1954. Its major provisions include not only incentives to stimulate investment and growth, but also provisions to equalize taxes in some areas and tighten provisions in other areas. Another major tax enactment was the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962. This major enactment is designed to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by self-employed individuals.

In the field of highway legislation, the Highway Revenue Act of 1961 made possible the continued progress in the construction of interstate and defense highways and provided financing which should make it possible to complete that program within the time originally contemplated.

In the social security field, the Social Security Amendments of 1961 provided desirable, sound, long-range improvements in our old-age, survivors', and disability insurance system. The Aid to Dependent Children Act of 1961 made additional improvements in certain facets of our public welfare programs. A third major enactment, and probably the most important of all, the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, represented the first major revision in approach of our welfare laws in approximately 30 years and should become a landmark of legislation in this field. In the area of unemployment compensation, the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961 provided extended benefits to many thousands of individuals who had exhausted their State benefits.

Mr. Speaker, these major measures indicate the intensive activity of this committee in this Congress. But these by no means tell the full story, since many less important but still quite significant measures were considered and reported by the committee during this period of time.

The members of the Committee on Ways and Means have devoted themselves unstintingly to the heavy work of the committee. They have conscientiously and diligently pursued their responsibilities and have been assiduous in applying themselves to the work at hand. Due to the significantly large proportion of the major legislative program of this Congress which has fallen within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, it has been necessary that the committee meet either in public hearing or in executive session practically every day during this entire Congress. The members of the committee have attended the sessions regularly and have carefully and thoughtfully applied themselves to the hammering out of legislation of a highly beneficial and meritorious nature. While we as individual members of the committee have not always agreed on all of these measures, I think all can be justly proud of the record which has been established.

As I have pointed out on numerous past occasions in discussing the work of the Committee on Ways and Means, it is abundantly clear that the nature of legislation falling within the jurisdiction of the committee is quite complex and of vital importance to each and every American citizen and to our Nation as a whole and it is, therefore, necessary that the members of this committee must always proceed with great caution, prudence, care, and statesmanship in carrying out our legislative responsibilities. It is for this reason, among others, that the committee during this Congress has conducted public hearings in every major field of its jurisdiction in order to receive extensive and detailed reaction from the interested public on the proposals at hand.

During the course of this Congress the Committee on Ways and Means held public or executive hearings on a total of 80 days, exclusive of executive sessions, and has directly received testimony from over 850 individuals during those hearings. In addition, comments, recommendations, and statements of views were received for the printed record of these hearings from approximately 1,300 other interested persons and organizations. Twenty-four volumes, covering over 14,000 pages of testimony, were required for the printing of the hearings.

Table 1, which follows, shows the subject and the details of these hearings:

TABLE 1.—*Hearings held by Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong.*

Subject	Number of days	Number of witnesses	Number of pages	Number of volumes
1ST SESSION				
Temporary unemployment compensation and aid to dependent children of unemployed parents	3	31	423	1
Federal-aid highway financing	6	93	731	1
Social Security Amendments of 1961 (executive hearing)	5	5	161	1
President's 1961 tax recommendations	24	217	3,613	4
Temporary increase in debt ceiling (executive hearing)	1	2	27	1
Health services for the aged under social security	9	140	2,281	4
Tariff treatment of shrimp imports	1	22	633	1
Taxation of mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations	2	26	425	1
Taxation of exchanges and distributions pursuant to antitrust decrees	1	13	490	1
2D SESSION				
Public Welfare Amendments of 1962	3	26	697	1
Trade Expansion Act of 1962	20	245	4,233	6
Temporary increase in debt ceiling	2	7	109	1
Extended temporary unemployment compensation benefits	3	29	263	1
Total, 87th Cong	80	856	14,086	24

In addition to the public hearings, during the course of the 87th Congress, the full Committee on Ways and Means met in executive session 199 times.

Of the 15,745 public and private bills and resolutions introduced in the House during the course of this Congress, there was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means a total of 2,114 bills and resolutions, in addition to 68 executive communications. Moreover, 20 messages of the President of the United States were on subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee. Of the total of 2,114 such bills and resolutions, there were 1,147 tax bills, 459 tariff bills, 451 social security bills, in addition to 57 bills of a miscellaneous character falling within the committee's jurisdiction. This represents over one-sixth of all the public bills and resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives in this Congress. Table 2, which follows, sets forth the breakdown of the measures referred to the committee.

TABLE 2.—*Bills and resolutions referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, 87th Cong., by category*

Tax	1,147
Tariff	459
Social security	451
Miscellaneous	57
Total	2,114

During this Congress, the committee favorably reported to the House of Representatives a total of 84 bills, which total breaks down as follows: 34 tax bills, 34 tariff bills, 7 social security bills, and 9 miscellaneous-type bills. It should be noted in this connection that quite often the committee reports omnibus legislation which, statistically, appears as one bill but which in fact may combine the provisions or subjects covered in a large number of individual bills which were pending before the committee. For the further information of the Members, I shall insert at this point table 3, which sets forth the statistics on the status of bills repored by the committee during this Congress:

TABLE 3.—*Status of bills ıeported by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 87th Cong.*

	Tax	Tariff	Social security	Miscellaneous	Total
Reported to House	34	34	7	9	84
Passed House	31	33	7	9	80
Reported to Senate	23	25	5	7	60
Passed Senate	20	25	5	8	58
Enacted into law	19	23	5	8	55

It should be noted that the provisions of 9 bills which had been reported by the committee were adopted as amendments to other bills and became law in that way, and are therefore not reflected in the total of 55 shown in the table above.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members there is presented here a brief summary and digest of all bills reported from the Committee on Ways and Means during the 87th Congress, including a statement of the stage in the legislative process reached by each bill.

TAX LEGISLATION

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1962

H.R. 10650, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-834, SIGNED OCTOBER 16, 1962

This legislation represented a major accomplishment of the Congress in the tax field. The President submitted his recommendations for revision in our Federal tax system early in 1961, and there followed some 18 months of diligent effort on the part of the Congress and the congressional and departmental staffs, during which the various ramifications of the President's proposals were studied in great detail and views and comments from thousands of individuals and groups were received and carefully considered. Although the bill ultimately reported by the Committee on Ways and Means was modified and revised to some extent before its final enactment—that is, the deletion of the provision for withholding of tax on interest and dividend income—the Revenue Act of 1962 constitutes an impressive effort toward making the income tax work more fairly and in a reasonable manner among the 180 million people and nearly 5 million firms in the country. At the same time, through the encouragement it gives to plant modernization and expansion, it will be a significant step in making businesses more competitive here and abroad.

In general, the legislation provides a tax incentive designed to stimulate investment in productive capacity with the revenue loss attendant upon the adoption of this incentive being absorbed by the removal or modification of a number of previously existing preferential tax provisions. A brief summary of the major provisions of the bill follows.

A basic provision of the bill, the investment credit, permits the taxpayer to reduce his tax liability by a tax credit amounting to 7 percent of the cost of depreciable machinery and equipment—but not buildings—which he puts into operation. The full 7-percent credit is allowed only for property expected to last over 8 years, and no credit is allowed for assets expected to last less than 4 years, with proportionate rates of credit allowed for assets with useful lives between 4 and 8 years. The credit will be allowed on only $50,000 of investment in used property a year. Investments in public utility property are given a credit of 3 percent. The amount of credit must be subtracted from the basis on which depreciation allowances are computed. The credit is further limited in that it cannot exceed the tax up to the first $25,000, plus one-quarter of the tax above this amount. Any credit which cannot be used because of this limitation may be carried back 3 years or forward 5 years to offset the taxes of those years.

The act contains a number of sections tightening provisions of prior law which were considered to be unduly preferential. One of these provisions was designed to prevent abuses in the deduction of business entertainment expenses. The act imposes a heavier burden on the taxpayer for substantiation of entertainment expenses, and it also requires that many classes of these expenditures be more closely related to the business than was the case under prior law. Deductions for business gifts are limited to $25 per recipient per year, and travel deductions are limited in some situations.

The new law reduced the preferences that were available to several classes of mutual or cooperative organizations, while in each case care was taken to make adequate allowance for the fact that mutuals and cooperatives are unable to sell stock in order to get the capital necessary to meet business risks. More specifically, the new law, first, makes subject to tax for the first time the underwriting income of mutual fire and casualty insurance companies, but it also allows a deduction for underwriting losses and it allows some deferral to provide a loss reserve; second, provides that all of the income of cooperatives will be taxed once but makes provision for patrons to agree to pay the tax on noncash dividends; and, third, removes the provision whereby mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations paid virtually no income tax and instead provided a loss reserve provision applicable to them which will increase their tax liability, in the aggregate, by some $200 million but still make adequate provision for possible losses.

Payors of dividends or interest are required under the act to report to the Internal Revenue Service on payments, with name and account number of the recipient, of more than $10, in the aggregate, per year to one recipient. It is expected that this will eventually help recover a large part of the nearly $850 million tax liability which is avoided each year due to failure of individuals to report the receipt of dividends and interest. With the new automatic data processing equipment now being installed by the Internal Revenue Service, these information returns can be matched with tax returns and the unpaid taxes can be collected.

The new law tightens up a number of provisions relating to the treatment of foreign income. The exclusion of earned income for permanent foreign residents was limited to $20,000 for the first 3 years of foreign residence, and then to $35,000. The foreign trust loophole was stopped. The excessive foreign tax credit on dividends received from a foreign subsidiary was substantially narrowed, and the foreign investment company loophole was closed. The tax on gains from selling shares in controlled foreign corporations was made more severe, and the foreign real estate exemption in the estate tax area was eliminated, prospectively.

A major item in the taxation of foreign income was the provision for taxing, to controlling U.S. stockholders, foreign "tax haven" profits. Generally, these are profits which do not arise from the operations of the foreign corporation in the country in which that corporation is organized but are diverted to the foreign corporation because its country of organization has a low tax rate.

Another important provision of the Revenue Act of 1962 is that for the future the gain arising on the sale of depreciable machinery and equipment will be taxed as ordinary income, instead of capital gain, to the extent that the gain merely resulted from excessive depreciation. This change made possible the new depreciation schedules adopted this summer by the Treasury. Without the change to prevent a capital gains advantage due to excessive depreciation, the Treasury would not have been able to relax the prior depreciation rules.

The act contains a number of other more or less minor provisions, three of which incorporated the provisions of other bills which had been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means—H.R. 8652, H.R. 10080, and H.R. 12719—and which are discussed separately in this summary.

THE SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS TAX RETIREMENT ACT OF 1962

H.R. 10, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-792, SIGNED OCTOBER 10, 1962

This legislation was designed to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by self-employed individuals by extending to such plans, and the individuals covered thereunder, the advantage of favorable tax treatment similar to that provided in the case of qualified retirement plans established by employers for their employees.

Under this new law, self-employed persons—professional men, small businessmen, farmers, ministers, certain commission salesmen who are not employees for pension purposes, and certain persons who perform services at home for compensation—are given a limited income tax deduction for amounts set aside to fund future retirement benefits under an employees' retirement plan that qualifies for tax exemption.

Annual plan contributions with respect to which self-employed persons may claim a deduction are limited to 10 percent of earned income or $2,500, whichever is the lesser. However, the allowable deduction is limited to one-half of the permissible contribution, or a maximum annual deduction of the lesser of 5 percent of earned income, or $1,250. Plans covering multiple businesses are aggregated in applying these dollar limitations.

Owner employees—that is, sole proprietors or partners owning more than a 10-percent partnership interest—cannot make voluntary contributions unless they participate in a plan which also covers their full-time employees who have 3 or more years' service. Plans covering owner-employees and other employees may, under special rules, be coordinated with social security.

Requirements for qualification of plans and limitations regarding methods of investment are set forth in the act. Generally, distribution of benefits cannot commence before age 60 and must commence by age 70, under the act, and will be taxable as ordinary income except to the extent they are attributable to nondeductible contributions. Special rules are provided in the case of lump-sum distributions.

THE HIGHWAY REVENUE ACT OF 1961

H.R. 6713 (TITLE II), BY MR. FALLON; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-61, SIGNED JUNE 29, 1961

The Committee on Ways and Means transmitted to the Committee on Public Works language for inclusion as title II to H.R. 6713, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, containing highway financing provisions making it possible for the greatly expanded program of Federal aid for interstate highways to be completed within the time originally contemplated, and without the necessity for a stretch-out of the program. These revenue provisions will bring into the highway trust fund an additional $9.8 billion in revenues over the life of the program, in addition to transferring back to the General Fund $2.4 billion in revenues attributable to passenger car and automobile part taxes. Under the legislation, it will be possible for the construction program to be completed in 1972.

The legislation, as agreed to by the conferees and accepted by both the House and Senate, provided for, (1) continuation of the taxes on gasoline, special motor fuels, and diesel fuel at the existing rate of 4 cents a gallon; (2) increases in the taxes on tires for highway-type vehicles and inner tubes to 10 cents a pound, and on tread rubber to 5 cents a pound; (3) increase in the tax on highway vehicles weighing over 26,000 pounds to $3 per 1,000 pounds; (4) dedication of five additional percentage points of the manufacturers' tax on trucks, buses, and trailers to the Highway Trust Fund, received after June 30, 1962; (5) continuation of the Highway Trust Fund for an additional 3 months, to October 1, 1972, with all taxes now dedicated to the Fund continued as Highway Trust Fund revenues at these tax rate levels for the additional 3 months; (6) repeal of the provision of previous law for diversion of 5 percentage points of the manufacturers' taxes on passenger cars, et cetera, and on automobile parts and accessories to the highway trust fund; and (7) provision for payment of the use tax on highway motor vehicles weighing over 26,000 pounds on a quarterly basis and for the exemption of gasoline from tax where it is sold for nonfuel purposes in the manufacture of another article. In connection with the deletion from the bill, in conference, of a Senate amendment relating to compensation of retail dealers of gasoline for tax paid on gasoline lost by shrinkage, evaporation, et cetera, the Treasury Department was requested to conduct a scientific study on this subject and to report the results of the study to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance.

THE TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1961

H.R. 7446, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-72, SIGNED JUNE 30, 1961

This legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, continued for 1 year, until July 1, 1962, certain existing tax rates, including the 52-percent corporate income tax rate and the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, and on general—local—telephone service and the transportation of persons. The extension of these tax rates for 1 more year was recommended by the President in his message on taxation, in which he said:

> Our present revenue requirements make such extension absolutely necessary again this year. * * * We cannot afford the loss of these revenues at this time.

THE TAX RATE EXTENSION ACT OF 1962

H.R. 11879, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-508, SIGNED JUNE 28, 1962

The purpose of this bill was to again continue for 1 year, until July 1, 1963, the 52-percent corporate income tax rate and existing rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, and on general—local—telephone service. In addition, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill provided for a 6-month continuation of the tax on transportation of persons, with the tax on transportation of persons other than by air scheduled to expire on December 31, 1962. The committee bill provided for a reduction of the rate on transportation by air to 5 percent to be effective January 1, 1963, with that tax to expire on June 30, 1963. The legislation was in general conformity to the recommendations of the President, and the action was taken in recognition of the loss of revenue involved in the absence of its enactment.

H.R. 221, BY MR. HARRISON, OF VIRGINIA; PASSED HOUSE SEPTEMBER 19, 1961

This bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House by voice vote, related to the imposition of the manufacturer's excise tax on tires and inner tubes. Under present law, the tax is imposed at the time the tires or inner tubes are sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer. In the case of manufacturers maintaining their own retail stores or retail outlets, this means that no tax is imposed until the manufacturer makes a sale at retail, that is, to the consumer. Thus the retail inventory of the manufacturer maintaining retail outlets enjoys a tax-free status, whereas the independent tire dealer, because the sale to him by the manufacturer, producer, or importer occurred prior to his acquisition of the tires and tubes, can have only taxpaid inventory. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that independent tire dealers may have as much as 15 percent of their inventory investment tied up in these taxes, while their competitors, the manufacturers with their own retail outlets, need make no such investment.

This legislation would remove the competitive discrimination against independent tire dealers resulting from this situation by providing for the imposition of the tire or inner tube tax at the time the tire or inner tube is delivered to a retail store or retail outlet of the manufacturer, producer, or importer.

H.R. 929, BY MR. BYRNES, OF WISCONSIN; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-109, SIGNED JULY 26, 1961

The purpose of this legislation was to conform income tax accounting to more accurately reflect generally accepted accounting principles in the case of prepaid income arising from membership dues. The bill, which became public law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided that prepaid membership dues income of membership organizations may, at the election of the taxpayer, for tax purposes be spread over the period during which there is a liability on the part of the organizations to provide the service, rather than reported in the earlier year in which the income is received. The liability involved must extend beyond the current year but may not extend for more than 36 months. The provision applies only to membership organizations having no capital stock and making no distributions of net earnings to members, and is effective for taxable years beginning with the calendar year 1961.

H.R. 2016, BY MR. GREEN OF PENNSYLVANIA; PASSED HOUSE SEPTEMBER 17, 1962 (SEE H.R. 10620, PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-863)

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that States and political subdivisions which operate retail liquor stores are to be required to pay only one special occupational tax imposed on retail liquor dealers under section 5123(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, each year, regardless of the number of locations at which the liquor is sold within the State or political subdivision. The bill was passed by the House, and later the substance of this bill was adopted by the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 10620 and the provision became law as a part of that legislation.

H.R. 2017, BY MR. GREEN OF PENNSYLVANIA; REPORTED TO HOUSE MAY 9, 1961

This bill would amend the provisions of present law permitting the Federal Government upon request to enter into an agreement to withhold State or territorial tax from compensation paid Federal employees who are employed in the State or territory so as to also provide for withholding of city taxes by the Federal Government, with respect to its employees who are employed in a city with such a tax, if the city has a population of 60,000 or more. The restrictions of existing law applicable to State withholding taxes, designed to limit the administrative burdens of the withholding by the Federal Government and to prevent hardship and discrimination in the case of the Federal employees involved, would also apply to the city withholding taxes, under the bill. Enactment of this legislation is favored by the Treasury Department.

H.R. 2244, BY MR. HERLONG; REPORTED IN SENATE JULY 20, 1961 ,

This bill would have amended the provisions of present law relating to the deduction, for income tax purposes, of charitable contributions. Under existing law, the 20 percent maximum limitation generally applicable in the case of individuals is increased to 30 percent if the contributions to which the additional 10 percent relates go directly to churches, operating schools, or hospitals—or medical research organizations carrying on research in conjunction with a hospital. As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that the additional 10-percent deduction would also be available in the case of contributions to a foundation, and so forth, if the foundation, and so forth, is organized and operated exclusively for the purpose of turning over each year to one or more of these specified categories of institutions its entire net earnings and if any portion of its principal it may distribute may go only to one of these categories of organizations. At adjournment, the bill was pending in the Senate, having been reported with an amendment by the Finance Committee.

H.R. 2585, BY MR. UTT; PUBLIC LAW 87-321, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 26, 1961

This legislation was designed to prevent the imposition of a double tax in the case of the Federal and State unemployment taxes resulting from a technical deficiency in the Federal tax laws arising from a variation in the definition of "employer" between the Federal and State laws. Under the law prior to enactment of this legislation, the predecessor employer, where a trade or business changed hands within the first 20 weeks of the year, was not treated as an employer for purposes of the Federal unemployment tax, but generally was so considered for most State unemployment compensation taxes. As a result, the first employer usually had to pay the State tax in such cases, and then the second employer had to pay the full Federal tax but could not obtain the credit usually available for the State tax paid by the first. This bill corrected the faulty operation of the Federal laws in this situation by making the usual credit available in such cases.

The bill was amended by the Senate in two respects, the first dealing with the effective date of the House bill—to make its application prospective only—and the second adding a provision relating to the percentage depletion deduction in the case of clay and quartzite used in making refractory products. The House accepted the Senate amendments to the bill, and the President approved it in this form.

H.R. 5189, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW 87–29, SIGNED MAY 4, 1961

This legislation, which was enacted at the request of the President as one of various desirable steps intended to improve this country's ability to defend its gold reserves, provided an exemption from tax for income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from U.S. Government obligations, but only if the obligations are not held for, or used in connection with, commercial banking functions or other commercial activities. The exemption is effective with respect to income received in taxable years beginning after 1960, and is expected to have a negligible effect on revenues.

The Senate added to the House bill a provision extending to May 15, 1961, the period in which the spouse of a shareholder in a small business corporation may consent to an election not to be taxed as a corporation, in certain circumstances. The House agreed to the Senate amendment, and the bill became law as thus amended.

H.R. 6145, MR. RIVERS OF ALASKA; PASSED HOUSE JUNE 18, 1962

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would have provided a 1-year postponement of the reduced credit provisions relating to the Federal unemployment tax insofar as they relate to certain past advances to a State under title XII of the Social Security Act. This would have had the effect of preventing the reduced credit provisions from applying to wages paid by employers in Alaska for calendar year 1961. The committee was aware that existing requirements for repayment of costs of outstanding title XII advances post serious problems for a number of States—the reduction of credits provided by section 104 of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 would not be affected by this bill. The committee felt that, because the cost of unemployment compensation in Alaska is extremely high and it was the only State in which the reduced credit provisions would come into effect in 1961, it was desirable to postpone the operation of these provisions pending a more detailed examination of the problem.

In view of the fact that House action was not taken on the bill in the first session, and the reduced credit did become effective, a committee amendment was offered when the bill was brought up for House passage in the second session substituting for the reported bill language which would simply retain for the year 1962 the same rate of reduction in credit as had applied in 1961, rather than allowing the increased reduction provided in existing law to operate. The bill passed the House as thus amended and at adjournment was pending in the Senate Committee on Finance.

H.R. 6352, BY MR. BOGGS; REPORTED TO HOUSE MAY 16, 1961

This bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House would have amended the provisions of the income tax laws which provide an unlimited charitable contribution deduction where in the last 10 years the charitable contributions and income taxes paid by an individual equal 90 percent of his taxable income—with certain modifications—in each of 8 years. The bill provided that this 90-percent test would be considered as satisfied for each of 2 consecutive years where the test is met on the basis of the average of contributions, taxes, and income in the 2-year period. However, the charitable contributions and taxes in each of these 2 years must represent at least 75 percent of the income of that year and no more than two sets of consecutive years may be averaged in this manner, under the bill. It was also provided that the 2-year averaging provision is to be available only where the charitable contributions taken into account are those going to churches, operating schools and colleges, hospitals and related medical research organizations, and certain other educational, charitable, or religious organizations.

H.R. 6371, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–875, SIGNED OCTOBER 24, 1962

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this legislation amended the provisions of prior law relating to the retirement income tax credit. The retirement income credit was designed to give those who have retirement income, but who do not receive tax-exempt social security or similar types of tax-exempt benefit payments, a tax exemption of approximately the same size as that received by social security beneficiaries. A discrimination has arisen gradually, however, as changes have been made in the social security laws over the past several years without corresponding changes in the retirement income credit provisions of the income tax laws, so that the retirement income credit no longer provides equal tax treatment for those who may be retired under Government or private pension systems or may make provision through investment income for their own retirement.

This legislation was designed to again equalize the retirement income credit with the social security program by raising the maximum amount of income which can qualify for the credit to $1,524 a year and by amending the earned income limitation to more closely correspond with the amended provisions of the social security laws.

The Senate in passing the bill adopted an amendment not affecting the provisions of the House bill but adding a section incorporating the provisions of H.R. 13358—discussed separately in this summary—which had previously been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House. The amendment was accepted by the House, and the bill became law in this form.

H.R. 6413, BY MR. KING OF CALIFORNIA; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–682, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 25, 1962

As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that, for purposes of the estimated income tax, fishermen are to be accorded the same treatment as is available for farmers.

Under existing law, taxpayers having income from farming have the privilege of filing the declaration of estimated tax, and paying the estimated tax, by January 15 after the end of the year in question—for calendar-year taxpayers—rather than filing the declaration by the prior April 15 and making quarterly payments, and this bill extended this advantage to those having income from fishing.

The bill passed the House by voice vote, and a Senate amendment to make the provisions of the bill effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962—instead of 1961, as in the House bill—was accepted by the House. The bill became law without further amendment.

H.R. 7057, BY MR. IKARD; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–312, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 26, 1961

As unanimously reported to the House, this bill provided in the case of brick and tile clay and certain other clays that insofar as the holding in the Cannelton Sewer Pipe case departs from the principles previously enunciated in the Cherokee Brick & Tile Co. and Merry Brothers Brick & Tile Co. cases, it is not to be applied retroactively for years beginning before the Supreme Court granted certiorari in the Cannelton case on December 14, 1959. Thus in the case of brick and tile clay and any other clay or shale where the finished product is the first commercially marketable product, percentage depletion for these past years to the extent they are open will be based upon the value of the finished or end product.

An amendment of the Senate providing that for the purpose of computing the percentage depletion deduction with respect to these minerals gross income from the property would be 50 percent of the gross income from the finished product but not to exceed $12.50 for each ton of clay or shale used in the finished product was agreed to by the House, and with this amendment the bill became public law.

H.R. 7757, BY MR. HERLONG; REPORTED TO HOUSE MAY 31, 1962

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that certain charitable and other organizations described in section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are not to be subject to the tax on unrelated business income provided by section 511 of the 1954 code or the corresponding provision of the 1939 code, for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1960, under certain specified circumstances. The bill was pending before the House at the adjournment of the Congress.

H.R. 7859, BY MR. KEOGH; PASSED HOUSE SEPTEMBER 19, 1961

This bill would have amended section 814 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939—providing an election to take a credit against estate tax for estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers—to make it applicable to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1949—instead of December 31, 1951—to make the credit against estate tax available where the death of the first spouse to die occurred within the 3 years, prior to that of the decedent in question but after December 31, 1947—instead of within 2 years of the decedent—and by providing that, where the deaths of the husband and wife occurred more than 2 years apart, the credit for prior estate taxes is to be 80 percent instead of 100 percent.

H.R. 8652, BY MR. KING OF CALIFORNIA; VETOED BY PRESIDENT OCTOBER 4, 1961 (SEE H.R. 10650, PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-834)

This bill provided that in the case of a net operating loss sustained in the years 1953 or 1954, principally as a result of the conversion from street railway to bus operations, this loss, to the extent not offset against income in years before 1960, will be available in the year 1960 and 4 subsequent years as a net operating loss carryforward. The bill was designed to alleviate the unusual hardship existing in the case of the Twin Cities Rapid Transit Co., Minneapolis, Minn. While most transit companies have spread their conversion to buses over many years, affording a sufficient period to absorb the loss against income—present law providing a 3-year carryback and 5-year carryforward for business losses—this company completed its conversion in an 18-month period, while under the management of officers subsequently found guilty of conspiracy to defraud the company, who intentionally disregarded the income tax consequences involved. At the end of the 5-year carryforward period provided under existing law, there remained a $5,200,000 unused loss.

Vetoed by the President on its original passage by the Congress, the bill was adopted in substance by the Senate as an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1962—H.R. 10650—and became law as a part of that legislation.

H.R. 8754, BY MR. FRIEDEL; PASSED HOUSE AUGUST 30, 1962

The purpose of this legislation, as unanimously reported by the committee and the enactment of which, as amended, was favored by the Treasury Department, was to resore the treatment of ground rent payments in Maryland, for tax purposes, to that which obtained under the rules and regulations in effect before they were changed on January 1, 1962, to conform to certain court decisions. Under the bill, which passed the House under unanimous consent and at adjournment was pending in the Senate Finance Committee, for the home buyer the ground rent paid would be treated as a mortgage interest payment and, therefore, deductible by him. The seller of the real property subject to the redeemable ground rent would be treated as if he had sold the property subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent. As a result, the redeemable ground rent would be taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and, therefore, reflected in any gain—or loss—recognized to him.

H.R. 8824, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-768, SIGNED OCTOBER 9, 1962

This legislation dealt with the tax treatment of consumer finance companies, and modified the rules relating to exceptions from the personal holding company tax in that respect. As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill deleted certain requirements relating to lending companies engaged in the small loan—consumer finance—business in order for such companies to qualify for exception from the personal holding tax, and modified others, in order to conform the requirements with the laws enacted in many States in recent years for the regulation of such companies. The bill passed the House and Senate without amendment, and became law as reported by the committee.

H.R. 8846, BY MR. BOGGS; REPORTED IN SENATE SEPTEMBER 29, 1962

The purpose of this bill was to provide involuntary conversion treatment, for income tax purposes, for property other than stock which is disposed of as a result of civil antitrust proceedings instituted under the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act. Thus under the bill, no capital gains tax would be incurred where property is disposed of as a result of a judgment or decree in such a case and the proceeds are reinvested in other property, similar or related in service or use to the property disposed of, but instead the new property, to the extent acquired with the proceeds from the property sold, would have the same basis as the old property. Safeguarding provisions were included in the bill, which passed the House and was reported to the Senate without amendment to the House-passed bill. At adjournment the bill was pending in the Senate.

H.R. 8847, BY MR. BOGGS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-403, SIGNED FEBRUARY 2, 1962

This bill related to the income tax treatment to be afforded the recipients of stock distributed in pursuance of a court order enforcing the antitrust laws. In general, the bill provided that such distributions shall not be treated as a dividend distribution but shall be treated as a return of capital, and that the amount of such a distribution made to a corporation shall be the fair market value of the distribution. As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House, the bill would have had general application to such cases involving antitrust distributions; however, at the request of the administration, committee amendments were adopted in the House at the time of passage of the bill which had the effect of limiting its application to distributions in the Du Pont antitrust case, as well as providing that in order for the provisions to apply, the order pursuant to which the distribution is made shall require the divestiture of stock to be completed within 3 years or less from the date the order becomes final. The Senate passed the bill without amendment, and it became law in the form passed by the House.

H.R. 8876, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-397, SIGNED OCTOBER 5,1962

This bill, which became law without amendment, was designed to improve enforcement and collection of internal revenue taxes. The taxpayer account number system provided for in the bill will make possible a greatly expanded use of automatic data processing equipment by the Internal Revenue Service and will enable the Service to match information returns now filed with tax returns. Taxpayer account numbers are basic to a satisfactory identification system for automatic data processing equipment, through the use of which the Service hopes to develop a single file which would contain, in one place, information relative to all of the tax transactions involving a taxpayer, thus making possible the reaching of objectives in enforcement and collection of the taxes that could only be partially achieved in the absence of this legislation.

The bill provided that persons required to file tax returns may be required to record their account numbers on their tax returns, and persons filing information returns—such as those relating to dividends or interest—are to include the account numbers of persons with respect to whom information is supplied—such persons to supply their numbers to the persons required to file the information returns. The committee requested the Internal Revenue Service to work out a system involving the least possible burden to taxpayers in obtaining account numbers.

Enactment of this legislation, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was recommended by the administration.

H.R. 8952, BY MR. BURKE OF MASSACHUSETTS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-858, SIGNED OCTOBER 23, 1962

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this legislation dealt with the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes. The Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958 provided that in determining the base for the computation of manufacturers excise taxes, a constructive sales price could be used where sales were made to retailers or to consumers if sales were also made at the wholesale level. However, this provision applied only if the normal method of sales within the industry is not to sell articles at retail, to retailers, or to both. As reported and as passed by the House, this bill provided that the latter restriction would not apply in the case of manufacturers excise taxes on refrigerators and related items, on electric, gas, and oil appliances, and on radios and television sets and related items.

The bill was substantially amended in the Senate, and under the conference agreement and as the bill became law, in addition to an amendment to the substance of the House bill providing that the restriction described above is not to apply in the case of any manufacturers excise taxes except those relating to automobiles, trucks and buses, business machines and matches, with respect to articles sold on or after October 1, 1962, new sections were added relating to, first, the limitation on the amount of the deduction for charitable contributions by individuals to make the existing additional 10-percent allowance applicable in the case of contributions for certain State colleges; and, second, the taxation of life insurance companies. This section of the bill amends the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to life insurance companies by: First, removing the termination provisions relating to variable annuities and otherwise revising the provisions relating to segregated asset accounts; second, providing an alternative method of tax in the case of capital gains; third, revising the priority for the application of the limitation on deductions allowed under paragraphs (3), (5), and (6) of section 809(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; fourth, providing that the disqualification from the 8-year operations loss carryover will not apply where a new life insurance company is connected through stock ownership only with a corporation taxable as an insurance company other than as a life insurance company; and, fifth, excepting certain distributions of stock of controlled corporations from the application of section 815(a) of the code.

H.R. 10080, BY MR. YATES; PASSED HOUSE SEPTEMBER 11, 1962 (SEE H.R. 10650, PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-834)

As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that gifts made after December 31, 1961, to nonprofit organizations supporting or opposing the reorganization of the judicial branch of a State government in referendums occurring in 1962 are to be deductible as charitable contributions. The nonprofit organizations involved must be created and operated exclusively to consider proposals for the reorganization of the judicial branch of a State government and to provide information, make recommendations, and seek public support of or opposition to these proposals. The bill passed the House under unanimous consent, and subsequently was adopted in the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 10650, the Revenue Act of 1962. Ultimately, the provision became law as a part of that act.

H.R. 10117, BY MR. CURTIS OF MISSOURI; REPORTED IN SENATE OCTOBER 2, 1962 (SEE H.R. 10620, PUBLIC LAW 87-863)

The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow qualified pension plans to provide for the payment of benefits for sickness, accident, hospitalization, and medical expenses of retired employees and their spouses and dependents, if such benefits are subordinate to the retirement benefits provided by the plan. The substance of the bill was adopted in the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 10620. Under the conference agreement on H.R. 10620, and as that bill became law, the provisions of H.R. 10117 were included and are applicable to both trusteed plans and nontrusteed plans that are funded through the use of insurance.

H.R. 10620, BY MR. BOGGS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-863, SIGNED OCTOBER 23, 1962

The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to raise the ceiling limitations applicable to deductions, for income tax purposes, of medical expenses. As amended by the committee, the provisions of the bill have the effect of doubling the medical expense deduction ceilings which are generally applicable, with increases in the ceilings also provided in the case of taxpayers and spouses who are age 65 and over and disabled. The bill was passed unanimously by the House, and while the Senate in passing the bill adopted numerous amendments, the provisions of the House bill were retained and became law without amendment.

The amendments of the Senate added several new provisions to the bill, and under the conference agreement and as the bill became law, it included the substance of two other bills which had been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, H.R. 2016 and H.R. 10117—summarized herein as individual bills. In addition, under the conference agreement, certain other amendments of the Senate were retained in the legislation as it became law. These related to, first, a new option to expense intangible drilling and development costs; second, rules relating to the alternative methods of computing the tax under section 1341(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 where the taxpayer restores a substantial amount held under claim of right; and, third, authority of internal revenue officers who are charged with the duty of enforcing any of the criminal provisions of the internal revenue laws.

H.R. 12470, BY MR. GREEN OF PENNSYLVANIA; PASSED HOUSE OCTOBER 4, 1962

This bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was designed to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to make the $600 child-care deduction available, on the same basis as for widows, to women who have been deserted by their husbands. Present law requires a married woman to file a joint return with her husband in order to take advantage of this deduction, and in such cases the allowable deduction is reduced $1 for each dollar of income of the husband and wife in excess of $4,500. The income limitation is not imposed in the case of widows. The committee felt that, since a woman who has been deserted is unable to file a joint return with her husband and therefore is precluded under present law from taking advantage of the child-care deduction, the law should be amended to treat such women on the same basis as widows. The bill was passed by the House, and at adjournment was pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 12526, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-710, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 27, 1962

The purpose of this bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to amend section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 7-year net operating loss carryover for certain regulated transportation corporations with respect to losses occurring in taxable years after December 31, 1955. Corporations generally may carry net operating losses back 3 years and, where there is remaining unused loss, forward for 5 years. In his message on transportation in April 1962, the President recommended—among other things—a 7-year instead of a 5-year carry-forward period for the losses of regulated public utilities. This legislation implemented that recommendation of the President with respect to regulated transportation corporations, and takes cognizance of the fact that such companies in general have relatively lower rates of earnings than other companies and therefore require longer periods of time in order to fully offset losses against earnings of other years.

H.R. 12599, BY MR. LIBONATI; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-870, SIGNED OCTOBER 23, 1962

This legislation dealt with the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their railroad shareholders, and as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means provided that where such a corporation offsets a charge for services performed for a railroad shareholder, by crediting railroad terminal income against this charge, the corporation is not to be treated as having received the portion of the charge so offset, nor is this portion to be rendered taxable to the terminal railroad corporation through the disallowance of deductions. The railroad shareholder, under the bill, would not be taxed on the portion of the charge satisfied with the related terminal income nor is it to receive a deduction as having paid such portion. The bill was designed to alleviate certain problems arising as a result of recent court decisions, and was reported unanimously by the committee.

The several Senate amendments to the bill were accepted by the House conferees, and as it became law, additional rules were provided relating to the application of the bill to taxable years ending before the date of enactment, as well as certain technical changes in the provisions of the House bill. In addition, as it became law the legislation included new sections, first, incorporating the substance of H.R. 12030, which had passed the House and is discussed separately herein; second, making a technical amendment relating to the limit on credits or refunds of overpayments determined by the Tax Court; and third, relating to the tax treatment of cooperative banks.

H.R. 12719, BY MR. KING OF CALIFORNIA; PASSED HOUSE AUGUST 30, 1962 (SEE H.R. 10650, PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-834)

The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to provide that awards made under the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act, to persons of Japanese ancestry who were evacuated from the west coast in 1942 during World War II, are not to be subject to Federal income tax. The Treasury Department interposed no objection to this legislation, in view of the special circumstances involved. The substance of the bill, which passed the House under unanimous consent, was adopted in the Senate as an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1962—H.R. 10650—and became law as a part of that legislation.

H.R. 13358, BY MR. MILLS; PASSED HOUSE OCTOBER 10, 1962 (SEE H.R. 6371, PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–876)

This bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House under unanimous consent, provided, in general, that mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, and cooperative banks will not be allowed in any one year income tax deductions for interest payments to depositors—or for dividend payments to shareholders—which are attributable to more than a 12-month period, the provision to be applicable for taxable years ending after December 31, 1962. The bill, the enactment of which was urged by the Treasury Department, was designed to prevent possible avoidance of the new provisions contained in the Revenue Act of 1962 applicable to these institutions by "bunching" in 1963, or a subsequent year, interest or dividend payment deductions attributable to more than a 12-month period.

The substance of this bill was adopted in the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 6371, the amendment was accepted by the House, and the provision became law as a part of that legislation.

FOREIGN TRADE AND TARIFF LEGISLATION

THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

H.R. 11970, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–794, SIGNED OCTOBER 11, 1962

This major piece of legislation in the tariff field has been described by many as the most important legislative proposal to come before the committee in the last decade. The committee spent several months in public hearings and in executive sessions formulating a trade expansion act which would meet the challenges and grasp the opportunities of the future years. The bill which the Committee on Ways and Means reported was adopted in toto by the House, and in substantially identical form by the Senate. While, in general, the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 continue the principles of the trade agreements program which began in 1934, and has continued to date without interruption, the Expansion Act goes further in two important respects. On the one hand for the first time the President is given authority under certain conditions to remove U.S. duties entirely. It was necessary to give the President this authority particularly because of the program of the Common Market which looks toward the elimination of internal tariffs within the next 5 years. If the United States is to be able to sell its goods within this very lucrative market in Europe, then of necessity the external tariffs of that market must be lowered or removed. It was with the realization of the need for striking a meaningful bargain with the Common Market that the Committee on Ways and Means recommended the authority be given to the President to remove U.S. tariffs pursuant to trade agreements negotiated under the Expansion Act.

Secondly, the Expansion Act fills a void in existing law in those cases where imports create a problem with U.S. producers and workers. Under existing law, the sole remedy available to the President is to increase tariff rates and this he can only do in those cases where the imports are adversely affecting the entire industry in the United States. While this basic authority is continued in the Trade Expansion Act, an important new tool to deal with injurious situations has been added. It will now be possible for the President to give financial and technical assistance to individual firms and workers who may be adversely affected by imports even though the industry in which such firms or workers are located is not being injured by imports. It is now possible to reach and remedy even the smallest segment of the U.S. economy which may be seriously injured by imports.

It is expected that with these new approaches to both the tariff authority and the relief provisions of the trade agreements program that for the first time the United States will have a total program which should serve to meet the total needs of the country as well as the individual needs of the constituents of the U.S. economy.

The bill contains specific safeguards and requirements for hearings which should be of material assistance to interested parties and to those who may be adversely affected by action under the bill. If the bill's authority is used properly, we can expect an increase in U.S. exports and a corresponding favorable effect on the balance-of-payments position of the United States.

THE TARIFF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1962

H.R. 10607, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–456, SIGNED MAY 24, 1962

This legislation embodied the first major tariff reclassification in over 30 years and represented the culmination of several years' study and hearings by the U.S. Tariff Commission which had been undertaken pursuant to the directive of the Congress in 1954. This act implemented a complete overhauling of the tariff schedules, establishing schedules that are logical in arrangement and terminology and adapted to the technological, and so forth, changes which have occurred since 1930, eliminating anomalies and illogical results in the classification of articles and simplifying the determination and application of tariff classifications.

H.R. 641, BY MR. BOGGS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–426, SIGNED MARCH 31, 1962

The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and as passed by the House of Representatives, was to provide for the free entry of one intermediate lens beta-ray spectrometer for the use of Tulane University, New Orleans, La., which that university has acquired from abroad to be used in the field of experimental nuclear physics. The committee was advised that this particular type of spectrometer is not available in the United States but can only be purchased abroad from a firm which specializes in the design of such instruments. Under these circumstances, the committee felt that Tulane University should not have to pay import duties on such a highly specialized instrument, which is not available in the United States and is utilized in important scientific projects. The bill was reported in the Senate without amendment, and a Senate floor amendment, not affecting the provisions of the House bill but adding a section designed to permit the deduction, for income tax purposes, of disaster losses in the taxable year immediately preceding the taxable year in which the disaster occurred, under certain circumstances, was accepted by the House, and in this form the bill became law.

H.R. 1877, BY MR. O'NEILL; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–59, SIGNED JUNE 27, 1961

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that the Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund, Boston, Mass., be considered a qualified and exempt trust from the time of its establishment in 1954 to June 3, 1959, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust was not operated in this period in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries. The Senate passed the bill with several amendments, which while not changing the provisions of the House bill, added provisions, first, extending for 2 years the period within which certain stock life insurance companies may make deductible distributions to shareholders in pursuance of a plan of mutualization adopted prior to January 1, 1958; second, reducing the tariff in the case of hair of animals, like the cashmere goat; and, third, relating to the effective date of the qualification as a qualified trust of the pension fund of the slate, tile, and roofing industry in New York City. The House accepted the amendments of the Senate, and the bill became law in this form.

H.R. 3385, BY MR. IKARD; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–95, SIGNED JULY 20, 1961

This legislation, which became law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for the free entry of apparatus utilizing any radioactive substance in medical diagnosis or therapeutic treatment—such as cobalt 60 therapy units used in cancer diagnosis and treatment—and of electron microscopes, when imported for the use of, and not for sale by, nonprofit organizations and institutions, whether public or private, established for educational, scientific, or therapeutic purposes.

The committee was of the opinion that the general public interest would be served by permitting such organizations to import these needed tools of scientific research and educational pursuits without the burden of having to pay the substantial import duties which would apply in the absence of enactment of this legislation.

H.R. 3508, BY MR. BOGGS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–598, SIGNED AUGUST 24, 1962

As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to designate any freight forwarder, authorized to act as such by any agency of Government, as a carrier of bonded merchandise not finally released from customs custody. At the time the provision of the Tariff Act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate carriers of such bonded merchandise was broadened to include freight forwarders, only freight forwarders under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission were authorized to be so designated, the only reason for this limitation apparently being that other freight forwarders—such as airfreight forwarders—were not then as prominent in this field as they now are. The Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that the Secretary of the Treasury should be authorized to extend the privilege of handling bonded merchandise to any freight forwarder licensed to act as such by any agency of the Government. The legislation passed the House and Senate without amendment, and became law as reported by the committee.

H.R. 3668, BY MR. MACK; PASSED HOUSE JUNE 14, 1961

This bill, which passed the House without amendment would have amended section 498 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the extension of the informal customs entry procedure to import shipments not exceeding $400 in value. Present law permits informal customs entry to be made when the aggregate value of the shipment of imported merchandise does not exceed $250, thus obviating within this area the necessity for the more complex and burdensome customs procedures required for formal customs entry. The bill, which raises this ceiling to $400, retained the existing provisions of law giving the Secretary of the Treasury the discretion to establish lower ceilings for certain types of merchandise and transactions when circumstances warrant his doing so.

H.R. 3985, BY MR. KNOX; PASSED HOUSE OCTOBER 4, 1962

The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to provide for the imposition of a duty on imports of certain pan and pan-type loaf bread, at the rate of 7½ percent ad valorem. The bill provided that the duty would not be applicable during any period when the principal supplying country of such bread in calendar year 1961 extends duty-free treatment to U.S. bread of the same kind imported into that country. Having passed the House by voice vote, the bill was pending in the Senate Finance Committee at adjournment.

H.R. 4449, BY MR. MACHROWICZ; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-604, SIGNED AUGUST 24, 1962

As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was, first, to add iconostases to the list of articles for which free entry is presently provided in paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended—providing for the free entry of certain articles for religious purposes; second, to provide for the free entry of adjuncts and appurtenances of the named articles whether to be physically joined thereto or not; and, third, to extend the application of paragraph 1774 to cemeteries, schools, hospitals, orphanages, and similar nonprofit activities staffed and controlled by corporations and associations organized and operated for religious purposes. Granite cemetery headstones, grave markers, and so forth, were specifically excepted from the provisions of the bill.

The committee was advised by the interested Government departments that enactment of this legislation would assist in solving certain difficult interpretative questions which have arisen under the present provisions of paragraph 1774. The House accepted Senate amendments which added marble to the exception from the application of the bill of granite headstones, and so forth, and providing for the free importation of a silver cross for the Christ Episcopal Church of Cincinnati, Ohio. As thus amended, the bill became law.

H.R. 4591, BY MR. MACHROWICZ; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-110, SIGNED JULY 26, 1961

The purpose of this bill , as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to continue for 1 year, to the close of June 30, 1962, the suspension of duties on metal scrap. The limitations and provisos of existing law were continued under the bill. Favorable departmental reports were received on this leglislation, and no opposition to its enactment was made known.

In addition to a technical amendment to the House bill, the Senate added a section providing for the free entry of horsemeat, fresh, chilled, or frozen, when imported in immediate containers weighing, with their contents, 10 pounds or more. The Senate amendments were accepted by the House, and the bill became public law as thus amended.

H.R. 4940, BY MR. WATTS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-47, SIGNED JUNE 16, 1961

This legislation, which became law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was designed to prevent the circumvention of the control by the Philippine Government over the exports of Philippine tobaccos to the United States by providing that U.S. customs authorities shall only admit free of duty under the Philippine tobacco quota such tobacco as the Philippine Government has licensed for export to the United States free of duty under the provisions of paragraph 2 of article II of the Philippine-United States Trade Agreement.

H.R. 5193, BY MR. BAKER; REPORTED TO HOUSE SEPTEMBER 26, 1961

The purpose of this legislation, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to impose sliding scale duties on imports of lead and zinc and lead and zinc articles. The duties would be imposed or removed depending upon the domestic price levels of lead and zinc. The committee concluded that adoption of this formula is desirable, in view of the general dissatisfaction with existing quota arrangements.

H.R. 5260, BY MR. DINGELL; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-859, SIGNED OCTOBER 23, 1962

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would have repealed the 3-cent per pound processing tax imposed by section 4511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and certain derivatives of such oils. The processing taxes involved have been suspended continuously for several years and the committee was advised that no complaints have been received regarding the suspension. Favorable departmental reports were received on the legislation.

The bill was amended in the Senate to provide a 3-year continuation, to June 30, 1966, of the suspensions of tax involved, rather than a repeal. The Senate amendment was accepted by the House, and in this form the bill became law.

H.R. 5700, BY MR. BYRNES OF WISCONSIN; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-854, SIGNED OCTOBER 23, 1962

The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to designate any contract carrier, authorized to act as such by any agency of the United States, as a carrier of bonded merchandise for the final release of which from customs custody a permit has not been issued. Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation, and it was reported unanimously by the committee. Senate amendments to the bill were rejected by the conference committee, and it became law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5852, BY MR. MEADER; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-261, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 21, 1961

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for the free entry of a towing carriage for the use of the University of Michigan, which has a large ship model towing tank used for experimental testing and research on model vessels under simulated sea conditions, frequently under contract for the Maritime Administration and the Bureau of Ships of the Navy Department. The committee was advised that no company in the United States specializes in the design and construction of ship model laboratory equipment, and was of the opinion that it would be in the national interest that the University of Michigan not be burdened with substantial import duties in its efforts to modernize and update its ship research testing facility.

In reporting this legislation to the Senate, the Finance Committee added a provision to the House bill which amended the Tariff Act to allow nonresident visitors to bring up to $100 in gifts into the United States duty free. The House accepted the amendment of the Senate, and in this form the bill became law.

H.R. 6611, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-132, SIGNED AUGUST 10, 1961

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill, which was proposed by the President as a part of his program to counter the unfavorable balance-of-payments situation, provided a temporary—to the close of June 30, 1963—reduction, from $500 to $100, in the amount of articles acquired abroad that a returning resident of the United States may bring into the United States exempt from duty, and waived, in the case of articles acquired in the Virgin Islands, the 48-hour period for which otherwise such resident generally must remain outside the United States in order to be entitled to the exemption.

The Senate amended the House bill to provide that in the case of articles acquired in the Virgin Islands by a U.S. resident arriving directly or indirectly from the Virgin Islands, the exemption would be $200 instead of $100, without regard to the 48-hour requirement. The Senate amendment also would allow such a resident who has remained outside the United States for 48 hours or more an exemption of $200, not more than $100 of which shall have been acquired elsewhere than in the Virgin Islands. Under the conference agreement, the House accepted the Senate amendments, and the bill became law in this form.

H.R. 6682, BY MR. WIDNALL; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-770, SIGNED OCTOBER 9, 1962

As unanimously reported to the House, this bill provided for the transfer from the dutiable to the free list of the Tariff Act articles known as fowling nets. These nets are used to temporarily capture birds, and facilitate quick banding and release of the birds. These activities are carried out by persons and organizations, primarily under the coordination and sponsorship of the Department of the Interior, who are volunteer workers receiving no pay, although supplying their own nets or other equipment. The information and records developed from these activities are used in research by the U.S. Government. The committee was advised there is no knowledge of domestic production of fowling nets, and received favorable departmental reports on the bill, which was passed by the House under unanimous consent.

The Senate adopted amendments to the bill—not affecting the provisions of the House bill, which were retained—and under the conference agreement and as the bill became law, a section was added to the House bill relating to the term "local advertising" for purposes of determining the amount excluded from the selling price on which the manufacturers excise tax is based, amending this term to include advertising which appears in a magazine or is displayed by means of an outdoor advertising sign or poster.

H.R. 7431, BY MR. DADDARIO; PRIVATE LAW NO. 87-572, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 28, 1962

The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass windows imported for use in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn., and in St. Francis Xavier Church and auxiliary buildings in Phoenix, Ariz. The committee was of the opinion that this legislation was meritorious and consistent with prior congressional enactments.

The Senate accepted the provisions of the House bill and added amendments providing for the free entry of certain stained glass for use in the construction of a new synogogue and auxiliary buildings for the Congregation B'Nai Israel of Woonsocket, R.I., and one set of musical handbells imported for the Court Street Methodist Church, Rockford, Ill. The Senate amendments were accepted by the House under suspension of the rules and the bill became law as thus amended.

H.R. 7678, BY MR. TEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA; PASSED HOUSE JUNE 29, 1961

The purpose of this bill was to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to extend the existing free importation provisions for wild animals and wild birds intended for exhibition in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes to wild animals and wild birds imported by any importer for exhibition for any purpose, or imported by a person or firm who in turn would sell them for ultimate use in exhibitions for any purpose. The amendments suggested by the Departments of State, Commerce, and Treasury to an earlier bill on this subject were incorporated in H.R. 7678, and the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7692, BY MR. HERLONG; PASSED HOUSE SEPTEMBER 7, 1961

The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide, first, that when articles, imported in containers required to be marked to show the English name of the country of origin, are repackaged in the United States and offered for sale, the new packages shall be marked to show the country of origin of their contents; and, second, that such containers shall be marked, in addition to the country-of-origin marking, to indicate to any person who repackages such articles that the new packages must be marked to indicate to an ultimate purchaser the English name of the country of origin of their contents.

The committee was of the opinion that enactment of this legislation would provide a comprehensive plan for insuring, in appropriate cases, that purchasers are notified of the origin of imported merchandise, thus greatly assisting in fulfilling the purposes of our marking laws. Penalty provisions for violation were included in the bill, and the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to make exceptions from the marking requirements in certain circumstances.

H.R. 8938, BY MR. BASS OF TENNESSEE; POCKET VETO OCTOBER 22, 1962

The purpose of this bill was to limit the tariff provisions for lightweight bicycles to typical lightweight bicycles and prevent classification thereunder of nontypical lightweight bicycles. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in reporting this bill to the House and it passed the House and Senate in the form reported. A pocket veto precluded the bill from becoming law.

H.R. 9414, BY MR. GREEN OF PENNSYLVANIA; PASSED HOUSE OCTOBER 4, 1962

The purpose of this legislation, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and as passed by the House, was to transfer from the free list to the dutiable list of the Tariff Act of 1930 electron microscopes, and parts or accessories thereof, imported by or on behalf of certain nonprofit organizations. The committee had recommended enactment, earlier in this Congress, of legislation—H.R. 3385, Public Law No. 87-95—which provided for the free importation of electron microscopes, but upon receipt of information to the effect that advancements which have occurred in the technology of the production of these items have had the result that domestically produced electron microscopes are now not essentially different in construction and capabilities from those which are imported, the committee reexamined the subject and concluded that further importations of such articles should be subject to duty. At adjournment the bill was pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 9520, B, MR. KING OF CALIFORNIA; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-567, SIGNED AUGUST 2, 1962

The purpose of this bill, which became law without amendment, was to continue for 2 years—until July 16, 1964—the existing suspension of duty on, first, alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum; second, bauxite, crude, not refined or otherwise advanced in condition in any manner; and, third, calcined bauxite.

The suspension of duty on these articles has been in effect continuously for several years, and all interested Departments and agencies reported favorably on its continuation.

H.R. 9778, BY MR. KNOX; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-455, SIGNED MAY 21, 1962

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to provide for the free entry of certain steel and steel products donated for an addition to the Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., a public, nonprofit hospital. Favorable reports were received on this legislation.

An amendment added to the bill by the Senate, which did not affect the provisions of the House bill and was designed to facilitate the customs clearance of data with regard to business, engineering, or exploration operations conducted outside the United States, was accepted by the House, and the bill became public law as thus amended.

H.R. 10095, BY MRS. GRIFFITHS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-514, SIGNED JULY 1, 1962

The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to continue for 1 year, to the close of June 30, 1963, the existing suspension of duties on metal scrap. The existing limitations and provisos of law relating to lead, zinc, and tungsten scrap and alloys, and so forth, were retained under the bill. It also contained a provision that the exemption from duty of any article under it would not affect the applicability of section 4541 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which imposes an import tax on certain copper bearing ores and concentrates, and so forth. Favorable reports were received on the legislation from the interested departments, and no opposition was made known to its enactment. The bill became law in the form reported by the committee.

H.R. 10852, BY MR. KEOGH; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-602, SIGNED AUGUST 24, 1962

The purpose of this bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to continue for 3 years, to the close of November 7, 1965, the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn. The committee was advised that failure to continue the suspension of duties on these commodities would adversely affect domestic employment and would place the weaving industry at a competitive disadvantage. Favorable departmental reports were received on the legislation.

The House accepted a Senate amendment, not affecting the provisions of the House bill, which added a section authorizing the duty-free entry of a towing carriage for the use of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and the bill thus became law.

H.R. 10928, BY MR. THOMPSON OF TEXAS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-606, SIGNED AUGUST 24, 1962

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of H.R. 10928 was to transfer casein or lactarene—a now obsolete term previously used synonymously with casein—to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930. Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation, and it was reported unanimously by the committee, the committee feeling that the continuous suspension of duties on casein since September 3, 1957, had developed sufficient experience to warrant its transfer to the free list. A technical amendment by the Senate involving a paragraph number was accepted by the House, and the bill became law as thus amended.

H.R. 10986, BY MR. HARVEY OF MICHIGAN; PUBLIC LAW NO 87-497, SIGNED JUNE 25, 1962

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to extend for a temporary period, through June 30, 1964, the existing suspension of duty on certain natural amorphous graphite or plumbago—crude or refined—valued at $50 per ton or less. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, which was reported unanimously by the committee and became law without further amendment.

H.R. 11400, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-607, SIGNED AUGUST 24, 1962

The purpose of this bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to continue for 2 years, until August 7, 1964, the existing suspension of duties on copying lathes used for making rough or finished shoe lasts from models of shoe lasts and capable of producing more than one size shoe from a single size model of a shoe last. The suspension of duties on such copying lathes has been in effect continuously since August 6, 1956, and serves to make available to domestic shoelast manufacturers highly specialized and expensive copying lathes which can only be obtained from foreign sources. Favorable departmental reports were received by the committee on this legislation.

H.R. 12109, BY MR. HALLECK; PASSED HOUSE OCTOBER 4, 1962 (SEE H.R. 12820, PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-878)

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to transfer to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 bleached natural grasses, grains, leaves, plants, shrubs, herbs, trees, and so forth. Foliages of the kind covered under the bill, which are mainly not grown in this country and do not compete with domestic foliages, are principally used ultimately in the making of wreaths and other ornaments by florist supply houses and decorators. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, and it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House. The substance of this bill was adopted by the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 12820, the amendment was accepted by the House, and the provision became law as a part of that legislation.

H.R. 12190, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-790, SIGNED OCTOBER 10, 1962

As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and as passed by the House under unanimous consent, this bill extended for 2 years, until July 1, 1964, the provisions of law permitting the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. The committee took this action in view of the continued presence in many parts of the world of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and Government personnel, and in the realization that the basic legislation is safeguarded from abuse by restrictions contained in the act and by appropriate departmental regulations. Both the Departments of State and Defense recommended the enactment of this legislation, and pointed out the inducement and morale factors involved. In conference, the House agreed to the substance of the Senate amendments to the bill, and as it became law language was included, not affecting the provisions of the House bill, but adding new sections providing for, first, the free entry of monofilament gill nets for use in fish sampling; and, second, the extension of the special deduction, for income tax purposes, allowed life insurance companies of 2 percent of premiums attributable to group accident and health contracts to premiums attributable to individual accident and health insurance contracts, with certain limitations. The conference committee requested the Treasury Department to report to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Finance Committee in the next session of Congress on the problems involved in this area of insurance company taxation.

H.R. 12213, BY MR. SCHNEEBELI; PASSED SENATE (AMENDED) OCTOBER 5, 1962

As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would have provided for a 3-year suspension of duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930 on cork insulation and cork stoppers. Favorable departmental reports were received on this proposal, and the committee was advised that these items are no longer produced in the United States.

The bill was reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee without amendment, but numerous amendments—including the substance of H.R. 12242, which had previously been reported to the House and is described separately in this summary—not affecting the provisions of the House bill, were adopted in the Senate prior to passage of the bill, and at adjournment it remained on the Speaker's table pending House action on the Senate amendments.

H.R. 12242, BY MR. HERLONG; PASSED HOUSE SEPTEMBER 11, 1962

As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the purpose of this bill was to provide for the classification under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, of certain particle board, and was designed to alleviate a problem which has arisen in the customs treatment of such board. The substance of this bill was passed by the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 12213, which at adjournment was on the Speaker's table awaiting House action on the several Senate amendments to that bill.

H.R. 12529, BY MR. O'BRIEN OF ILLINOIS; PRIVATE LAW NO. 87-591, SIGNED OCTOBER 5, 1962

The purpose of this bill, which became law without amendment, was to permit the free importation of one nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometer and one mass spectrometer to be used by the University of Illinois. The funds for the purchase of these scientific instruments were from grants made by the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, and attempts to purchase the instruments in the United States had been unsuccessful.

SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1961

H.R. 6027, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-64, SIGNED JUNE 30, 1961

This legislation provided desirable and sound, longrun improvements in our social insurance system, designed to make the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program more flexible and effective in carrying out its basic purpose. With its enactment, additional purchasing power was placed in the hands of people who very much needed it, benefiting about 4¾ million people within the first 12 months through new or increased benefits amounting to $800 million. The changes made, which were in general along the lines recommended by the President, were fully financed, consistent with policies established by the Congress in the past, and the program will thus continue to be self-supporting and on a sound actuarial basis.

The major provisions of the legislation can be summarized as follows:

First. An increase from $33 to $40 in the minimum monthly retirement benefit payable to persons retiring at or after age 65 and in the minimum monthly disability benefit, with proportionate increases in the minimum benefits payable to dependents and survivors.

Second. Provision for payment of retirement benefits to men beginning at age 62—at their option—with the benefits payable to men claiming benefits before age 65 reduced to take account of the longer period over which the benefits will be paid.

Third. Liberalization of the insured status requirements, so that a worker will be fully insured if he has one quarter of coverage for every year elapsing after 1950—or after the year in which he attained age 21, if later—and up to the year of disability, death, or attainment of age 65 for men—62 for women. Previous law required one quarter of coverage for every three such elapsed quarters.

Fourth. An increase in aged widows', widowers', and parents' benefits from 75 to 82½ percent of the workers' retirement benefit—a 10-percent increase in benefits for these beneficiaries.

Fifth. Liberalization of the earned income limitation to increase from $300 to $500 the area in which only one-half of earnings above $1,200 are treated as excess earnings.

Sixth. An increase in the contribution rates of one-eighth of 1 percent each for employees and employers, with corresponding increases for self-employed persons, thus keeping the system fully self-supporting and actuarially sound.

Provisions were also included in this legislation for an increase in the Federal matching maximum for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled; for the expenditure of Federal funds for temporary assistance to certain U.S. nationals who have returned from foreign countries and are without immediately available resources; extending through December 31, 1962—or, if later, the expiration of 2 years after the date on which coverage was approved for the group which originally elected coverage—the time in which employees who did not elect coverage under a divided retirement system agreement may change their decisions; adding New Mexico to the list of States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems; permitting survivors of ministers or Christian Science practitioners to file a certificate of election for coverage of the minister or Christian Science practitioner, in certain circumstances; and moving up by 1 year, to 1968, the scheduled increases in rates of tax for employers, employees, and self-employed persons.

THE TEMPORARY EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 1961

H.R. 4806, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–6, SIGNED MARCH 24, 1961

This legislation provided a temporary program of, first, extended unemployment compensation to persons who have exhausted their unemployment compensation under State and Federal unemployment laws; and, second, reimbursement to certain States in meeting their cost of long-term unemployment compensation. Enacted as part of the administration's program to help offset the effects of the then current recession on unemployed workers and on the Nation's economy, the bill provided extended benefits for up to 13 weeks of total unemployment to workers who had exhausted their rights under State programs and under Federal unemployment compensation programs for ex-servicemen and Federal employees. Payments could be made to unemployed persons who had exhausted their benefit rights under State programs after June 30, 1960, and before April 1, 1962, for weeks of unemployment starting before July 1, 1962. The bill also provided that, to the extent a State pays unemployment compensation for more than 26 weeks of total unemployment in the benefit year, the State will be reimbursed for the number of weeks it pays in excess of 26, up to a maximum of 13 additional weeks, this number to be subtracted from the potential extended benefit payments under the bill to the individual. The cost of the program is financed by advances from the Treasury to be repaid by a temporary increase in the net Federal unemployment tax of 0.4 percent on the existing wage base of $3,000, for calendar years 1962 and 1963.

Under the conference agreement on the bill, an amendment was adopted relating to reduction in temporary extended unemployment compensation payments in certain cases of retirement pensions and annuities, as well as a provision increasing the ceiling for certain administrative expenses authorized under section 901(c)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act to $385 million for fiscal year 1961 and $415 million for fiscal year 1962; the conferees also accepted the Senate amendment directing the Secretary of Labor to collect certain information related to administering the temporary extended unemployment compensation program.

THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN ACT OF 1961

H.R. 4884, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–31, SIGNED MAY 8, 1961

This legislation added a new section to title IV of the Social Security Act to make available, during the period beginning May 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1962, Federal grants to States wishing to extend their aid-to-dependent-children programs to include needy children and relatives caring for them; of unemployed parents, on the same basis as Federal grants are available to needy children and relatives caring for them, who have been deprived of parental support by the death, absence, or incapacity of a parent. The bill included provisions designed to facilitate the employment of unemployed parents, or the retraining of such parents, if appropriate, and provisions to assure that aid is not provided when the parent has refused employment that it would be reasonable for him to accept. All existing provisions of the aid-to-dependent-children program apply to the temporary expanded program, including, of course, the Federal-State matching formula. The legislation was recommended by the President as a part of his broad program to combat the then existing recession and to relieve resulting hardships.

Under the conference agreement on the bill, certain amendments of the Senate were accepted and/or modified and incorporated in the bill. These included provisions relating to the denial of aid under the program where the unemployed parent is receiving unemployment compensation; extending Federal matching funds under the plan to children placed in foster homes in certain circumstances; extending for 1 year, to June 30, 1963, the authorization for appropriation of sums for training grants for public welfare and increasing the Federal share to 100 percent; relating to the denial of aid, under a State plan, because of the conditions in the home in which the child resides and providing a period for further study of this problem; raising the overall ceiling on grants which may be made to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, to take into account the increased grants which would be made under the bill; and relating to the reimbursement of States for salaries and other expenses of the States' employees temporarily assigned to duty with the Department of Labor. Also included was a provision increasing from $12 to $15 the maximum medical care expenditures in behalf of old-age assistance recipients with respect to which there will be Federal participation.

THE PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1962

H.R. 10606, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–543, SIGNED JULY 25, 1962

An important and far-reaching achievement in the social security field, this legislation represented the most significant revision in the public welfare titles of the Social Security Act since the inception of the act. Through the comprehensive and constructive overhauling of the public assistance and child welfare provisions contained in this act, the States are given new tools for providing more effective welfare programs, with strong emphasis on the need for rehabilitation services and training programs. Ultimately, of course, success in implementing the objectives sought to be obtained by the Congress will depend largely upon the wholehearted cooperation of the States and local governments in fashioning programs which emphasize self-help. The major provisions of the bill as it was enacted into law are summarized briefly below.

Designed to provide incentives to the States to offer more rehabilitative services with a long-range view toward reducing the number of individuals on public welfare rolls, provision was made, effective September 1, 1962, for increased Federal matching for services and in the cost of staff training, so that the Federal share for such services was raised to 75 percent from 50 percent. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was given broad authority to prescribe the minimum services necessary to help applicants and recipients with capacity for self-care or self-support, or to help them maintain and strengthen family life, the services to be provided under State plans for old-age assistance, aid to families with dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

A provision was added to the requirements for the aid to families with dependent children—aid to dependent children—program, effective July 1, 1963, under which each State plan must provide for the development of a program of welfare and related services for each child recipient geared to the child's home conditions and special needs.

To assist the States in encouraging the retention of existing work skills and the development of new ones, recognition is given to community work and training programs by the authorization of Federal financial participation in State expenditures for aid to families with dependent children made in the form of payments for work performed by a relative aged 18 or over with whom a dependent child is living. Safeguards are established with respect to the minimum rates to be paid, the expenses attributable to the work, and so forth.

As another step toward the goal of rehabilitation, the new law requires that the State consider all expenses attributable to employment in determining the need of a recipient of public assistance. Moreover, in the aid to dependent children program, under the new law, the States may permit earned or other income to be set aside for the dependent child's future needs, such as his education.

Provisions are contained in the new law designed to make it possible for the State agency to be assured that aid to dependent children payments are being used for the benefit of the child, without jeopardizing Federal financial participation.

Provision is also made for protective payments under the aid to dependent children program, that is, payment to another person interested in or concerned with the welfare of the child and his relatives. Procedures for and limitations on such protective payments are specified, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been requested to report back to Congress on the administration and operation of this provision by January 1, 1967.

Federal sharing in State expenditures for assistance to a second parent was also provided under the aid to dependent children program, under certain circumstances.

Certain previously enacted temporary provisions were extended or made permanent by this legislation, including the extension of Federal sharing of aid to families with dependent children to include dependent children of unemployed parents, which was extended for 5 years, to June 30, 1967. The provision for foster family care for certain children removed from their homes by judicial determination was made a permanent provision. In addition, the increased ceiling on Federal participation in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, which was scheduled to expire July 1, 1962, were continued to September 30, 1962, at which time a new formula with further increased ceilings on a permanent basis became effective. It was the clearly expressed intention that the increase in Federal sharing should be passed on to the recipients in these programs.

Provisions were contained in the new law to implement the recommendations of the administration for expanding and improving child welfare services, including the authorization for additional amounts to be appropriated for grants to the States for these services. Funds for expanded day care facilities were also authorized. Other provisions were designed to require the States to coordinate to a greater degree all of their programs which touch upon services to children.

Many additional provisions were contained in this extensive legislative revision of the public welfare titles of the Social Security Act. For example, there are new provisions relating to increase in trained welfare personnel; recognition of demonstration projects; the establishment of an advisory council on public welfare; important provisions giving the States an option instead of having separate State plans for the needy aged, disabled, and blind of combining their programs under one plan; and changes were made in the provisions relating to the consideration of earned income in determining need for old age assistance and aid to the blind.

H.R. 7500 (TITLE II), BY MR. MORGAN; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-293, SIGNED SEPTEMBER 22, 1961

The Committee on Ways and Means transmitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs language amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Social Security Act in relation to Peace Corps volunteers and volunteer leaders. The general effect of these provisions is to treat Peace Corps volunteers and volunteer leaders in a manner similar to enlisted men in the Armed Forces for income tax and social security purposes.

These amendments were included as title II of the bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs establishing the Peace Corps, and were accepted by the Senate in conference on the legislation, subsequently becoming law as a part of the Peace Corps Act.

H.R. 8853, BY MR. TUPPER; PASSED HOUSE OCTOBER 5, 1962 (SEE H.R. 12820, PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-878)

The purpose of this bill was to amend title II of the Social Security Act to add the State of Maine to the list of States—making a total of 18—which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen. The bill was passed unanimously by the House, and its substance was adopted on the Senate floor as an amendment to H.R. 12820. Ultimately the provision became law as a part of that bill.

H.R. 12820, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-878, SIGNED OCTOBER 24, 1962

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill was designed to validate the coverage under old-age, survivors', and disability insurance of the employees of certain agencies in Arkansas which have been included, in good faith but erroneously, as separate political subdivisions under the coverage agreement between the State of Arkansas and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The employees of the agencies involved should properly have been covered as employees of the political subdivisions of which the agencies are integral parts. Under this legislation, each of the agencies in question is deemed to have been a separate political subdivision from the time it was included in the coverage agreement through the year of enactment of the bill. Attempts to solve the problem administratively were unsuccessful. In future years, the State's coverage agreement will have to conform to the general requirements of the law.

The Senate adopted amendments, not affecting the provisions of the House bill, which incorporated the provisions of two other bills reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and which are described herein individually, H.R. 8853 and H.R. 12109. These amendments were accepted by the House, and the provisions of all three bills thus became law through H.R. 12820.

MISCELLANEOUS, INCLUDING LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE NATIONAL DEBT AND TO RENEGOTIATION OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

H.R. 311, BY MR. BENNETT OF FLORIDA; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-58, SIGNED JUNE 27, 1961

The purpose of this bill, which became public law without substantive amendment, was to authorize the U.S. Government to accept gifts of money or other property which are to be used for the reduction of the public debt. It provided for the deposit of cash gifts, or proceeds from the sale of other gifts, in a special account on the books of the Treasury, and money in this account is to be utilized to retire obligations of the United States which are a part of the public debt.

Heretofore the Treasury Department, in the absence of specific directions to the contrary, had been treating gifts received by the United States for the purpose of reducing the public debt as unconditional gifts and depositing them in the general fund of the Treasury. The committee felt that those making gifts to reduce the public debt may prefer to have their contributions used for this specific purpose, and further that making this possible may encourage persons to make provision for gifts of this type.

H.R. 4317, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-370, SIGNED OCTOBER 4, 1961

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this legislation was to provide a system of annuities for surviving widows and dependent children of judges of the Tax Court of the United States. Prior to enactment of this bill the Tax Court was the only Federal court without an adequate system of survivorship protection, since the Congress in 1956 provided a survivor annuity system for other members of the judiciary generally.

The Senate amended the bill in several respects, and under the conference agreement, and as the bill became law, the House bill was amended to conform the benefit computation in the case of widows and dependent children of Tax Court judges to the formula provided in the 1956 act relating to widows and dependent children of Federal judges. In addition, a provision was added relating to the taxability of amounts contributed by an employer which is a public school system for annuity contracts for its employees.

H.R. 7677, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-69, SIGNED JUNE 30, 1961

This bill, which became law without amendment, provided for a temporary—1 year—to June 30, 1962, addition of $13 billion in the public debt limitation. The present permanent statutory debt limit is $285 billion; this legislation provided an additional $5 billion temporary increase over the temporary ceiling in effect at the time of its enactment—to $298 billion. Enactment of this legislation was recommended by the administration, the Secretary of the Treasury having advised the committee that this action was essential to the orderly and economical management of the Government's finances.

H.R. 10050, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87-414, SIGNED MARCH 13, 1962

The purpose of this legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to implement the request of the administration for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit of $2 billion to the end of the fiscal year 1962, making the temporary ceiling $300 billion through June 30, 1962. The debt limit had previously been temporarily increased by $13 billion, from $285 to $298 billion through June 30, 1962. The Secretary of the Treasury testified before the committee that the existing ceiling imposed serious operating difficulties and provided no flexibility for market operations and no margin to handle the fluctuations in trust fund investments. This legislation did not deal with the administration's recommendations regarding an increase in the ceiling for the fiscal year 1963.

H.R. 11990, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–512, SIGNED JULY 1, 1962

The purpose of this legislation, which became law without amendment, was to provide a temporary increase in the public debt limit for the fiscal year 1963. Under existing law, the debt limit would have reverted to the permanent ceiling of $285 billion at the end of June 30, 1962. The administration had requested a temporary increase of $23 billion—to $308 billion—for the fiscal year 1963. Under the committee's bill, and as it became law, the public debt limit is increased to $308 billion from July 1, 1962, to March 31, 1963; to $305 billion from April 1, 1963, to June 24, 1963; and to $300 billion from June 25 to June 30, 1963, at which time the ceiling will revert to the permanent limit of $285 billion in the absence of further legislative enactments. This approach was designed to provide a debt limitation adequate for the expected seasonal variation in expenditures and receipts, without providing so much leeway that it can subsequently be used to cover deficit financing.

H.R. 12030, BY MR. MILLS; PASSED HOUSE OCTOBER 4, 1962 (SEE H.R. 12599, PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–870)

The purpose of this bill, which was passed by the House without amendment, was to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to make special statistical studies and compilations and certain other services, to engage in these studies, and so forth, jointly with parties requesting them, and to furnish the results of the studies to the parties requesting them upon payment of the cost involved.

Other Federal agencies have the authority to receive reimbursement for services similar to those of the Internal Revenue Service for which reimbursement would be authorized by this bill, and many States, private research organizations, and individuals have need for the type of information which would be made available under it. The substance of this bill was adopted in the Senate as an amendment to H.R. 12599, and ultimately became law as a part of that legislation.

H.R. 12061, BY MR. MILLS; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–520, SIGNED JULY 3, 1962

In the absence of this legislation, the Renegotiation Act of 1951, which authorizes the Government to recapture excessive profits on certain Government contracts and related subcontracts, would have expired on June 30, 1962. The President in his budget message, the Renegotiation Board, and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation—in its report pursuant to a directive contained in the last extension of the act—recommended that the act be extended. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, this bill would have extended the Renegotiation Act for 2 years, to June 30, 1964, without further amendment. The amendments of the Senate, retaining the 2-year extension but amending the act with respect to review of Tax Court decisions in renegotiation cases, were accepted by the House, and the bill became law as thus amended.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 356, BY MR. WATTS; PASSED HOUSE SEPTEMBER 11, 1962

The purpose of tis resolution, which was reported to the House unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to express the sense of Congress that the appropriate agencies of the U.S. Government should be aware of the fact that bourbon whisky is recognized as a distinctive product of the United States, to the end that such agencies will take appropriate action to prohibit the importation of whisky designated as "bourbon whisky" unless such whisky is clearly labeled to show the country of origin as an integral part of the name. The resolution passed the House by voice vote, and was pending in the Senate Committee on Finance at adjournment.

S. 1750, BY SENATOR MAGNUSON; PUBLIC LAW NO. 87–342, SIGNED OCTOBER 3, 1961

This legislation, which was enacted at the request of the administration as an integral part of its anticrime legislative program, amended the provisions of the Federal Firearms Act by prohibiting the shipment, receipt, or transportation of firearms in interstate or foreign commerce to or by any person who has been convicted of, or is under indictment for, a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year. Prior to enactment of the bill, these prohibitions in the act had applied to any person who was under indictment for, or had been convicted of, a "crime of violence," as defined in the act. The Attorney General advised that enactment of this legislation would aid Federal law enforcement officers in their assault on organized crime. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, identical bills having been introduced by the chairman and ranking majority member of the committee.

Unemployment Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, recently Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of St. Louis County, Mo., published a thought-provoking book called "87 Million Jobs. A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment."

As one who is privileged to serve with TOM CURTIS on the Joint Economic Committee, of which he is the senior House member, I know of his deep interest in and broad knowledge of the major economic problems facing our country. Out of his long study of unemployment, he has come up with a book that makes an important contribution to a solution of the unemployment problem. The book has been well received, and, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert some of the reviews and notes which have appeared in the press, as well as a summary of the book prepared by Congressman CURTIS for Advance magazine, at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Bluefield (W. Va.) Telegraph]

PLENTY OF JOBS

President Kennedy, who in 2 years in office has made not the slightest dent in the U.S. unemployment rate, might profitably apply his speed-reading skill to a new book written by Representative TOM CURTIS, a Missouri Republican.

CURTIS, one of the most respected Members of Congress, has produced a treatise entitled "87 Million Jobs," subtitled "A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment."

CURTIS' theory is, briefly, that there are plenty of jobs to go round in this country, but that unfortunately the millions of jobseekers aren't trained for the jobs that need filling.

CURTIS notes that most newspaper want ad sections generally show a close balance between the number seeking jobs and advertisements seeking technically skilled workers. Unfortunately, the two categories don't mesh.

His solution is a combined public and private drive in the job retraining field, including changes in the American educational system designed to fit young people for the jobs which now go begging in many areas.

CURTIS says such a program will require a vast cooperative effort on the part of both industry and Government to upgrade worker skills, to encourage workers to go where the jobs are, and to stimulate savings and investment on which creation of new jobs depends.

The Kennedy administration has made a stab at a job retraining program, which generally has been a flop. It was a rather crudely conceived and hastily drawn up program which had little chance of success, and it seemed intended only as a form of unemployment compensation in many areas.

CURTIS has attacked the problem in broader fashion, with full realization that there is more to curing unemployment than a massive Federal spending program. That approach has been tried before, and has failed miserably. That has not deterred the New Frontiersmen from attempting the same discredited cure, however.

[From the Washington Post]

CALLED A CAPITAL CRIME—SOCIETY SEEN FAILING TO ALINE UNEMPLOYED WITH OPEN JOBS

(By Frank C. Porter)

"Unemployment is a capital crime which the citizens of an industrial nation commit against themselves," Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, fervently believes.

It is his thesis that there are about as many jobs going begging as there are persons officially classified as unemployed in this country.

The solution, he suggests, is a comprehensive program of job escalation to match these unfilled openings with unemployed workers. And the point of departure for such a program would be a national clearinghouse for the study and classification of the skills of the future, emerging skills of the present, and obsolescent skills of the past.

The Nation's present efforts to relieve unemployment are woefully misguided, the Missouri Republican insists, because they focus on these obsolescent skills. Through make-work projects and massive Government spending, he says, the classic governmental approach has been to create jobs to fit available skills. Instead, we should seek to create skills to fill the jobs.

CURTIS develops his argument in a recently published book, "87 Million Jobs: A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment" (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 126 pages, $1.95).

A member of the Ways and Means and Joint Economic Committees, Representative CURTIS takes a conservative approach to the Nation's economic problems.

Despite his suggestion for a Federal clearinghouse of skills, he feels efforts to reduce joblessness should come mainly from the private sector. CURTIS sides with the "structural" school in its continuing debate with the "demand" school over unemployment.

Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and a leading spokesman for the latter, believes the present high level of unemployment is the result of inadequate demand for goods and services and consequently for labor. If demand can be increased by such fiscal measures as a tax cut and monetary policies such as reasonably low interest rates, he argues, unused labor will be channeled into the most productive areas of activity.

CURTIS quotes Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McC. Martin in rebuttal. Martin contends fiscal and monetary policy is powerless to relieve such structural imbalances as immobility of labor and inappropriate skills, which must be attacked directly.

"We are now persistently resisting the facts of the case in order to make drudgery and unskilled labor economically feasible as a way of life," CURTIS writes. "We ignore the new jobs that a new age has created, and we concentrate angrily, wistfully, confusedly on the jobs at the lower end of the hiring scale that are being eliminated."

The Missouri legislator dismisses emergency relief programs, extended unemployment benefits, work practice freezes, and split-the-jobs hour shortening as either useless or short-lived remedies.

Instead we need to improve our information on unemployment and job skills, improve our schools and update curricula, overhaul tax laws to assist rather than hinder job adjustment, eliminate deterrents to business efforts to restrain its own workers and step up inducements to business investment, he asserts.

CURTIS cites a number of blind tax laws which he claims obstruct the upgrading of our labor force.

The law permits individuals to deduct from taxable income the costs of improving skills in an existing job but not those incurred to qualify for a new and better one.

Property taxes are so drawn that they cut down on labor mobility.

Except under the new Manpower and Area Redevelopment Act, if a person without a job enters a training school, he becomes ineligible for unemployment insurance or the equivalent. CURTIS contends he should be denied jobless payments if he refuses to attend school.

Despite recent improvement, depreciation tax writeoff schedules still are geared to rather than obsolescence and consequently hold back economic progress.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 29, 1962]

PEOPLE AT WORK—JOBS: TOO MANY SQUARE PEGS?

(By Ed Townsend)

NEW YORK.—"We have a serious problem on our hands. We have jobs going begging and we have people unemployed who would like to work."

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri, senior Republican in the House and a member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee and of the House Ways and Means Committee, makes this statement in a book, "Eighty-seven Million Jobs," published this past week by Duell, Sloan & Pearce—the result of 2 years of late evening consideration of a national problem that could become a national crisis.

The book is provocative; it will be debated widely in the weeks ahead. What it outlines as "a constructive solution to unemployment" will find support in some quarters, will be scoffed at or challenged in others. Nevertheless, the book is important. It focuses new and needed attention on the basis of problems too often considered only in terms of statistics.

Unemployment persists at a level of about 5 percent of the civilian labor force. Methods of counting the jobless differ. Unions contend that the Government's figures are too conservative—that if allowances are made for those working only part time, the number idle would be about 6 million and the percentage around 7 percent. Whichever is right, there is almost universal agreement that the total is much too high.

Moreover, long-term unemployment—the kind that really hurts—has been increasing steadily in recent years. Today there are more than 500,000 men or women who have been jobless more than 26 weeks and nearly 1 million who have been off jobs for more than 15 weeks.

Conservatively, there is a large pool of nearly 4 million men and women anxious to go to work, according to Mr. CURTIS, while hundreds of thousands of jobs remain unfilled because properly trained workers cannot be found.

The problem, he says, is one of imbalances. "Many employers, knowing the workers they need are not available, do not even bother to advertise for them," Mr. CURTIS said in a recent discussion of the problem. The openings are for skilled workers, usually for specialists. The jobseekers—the unemployed in today's labor market—are largely unskilled or semiskilled.

For instance, 900,000 more persons could be employed in the field of health services alone if they were available, according to Mr. CURTIS. Many parts of the country are desperately short of teachers and other school personnel. In many cities, it is almost impossible to find competent, fully qualified secretaries.

Moreover, according to a survey by the Missouri Congressman, there is a severe shortage of automobile mechanics, tailors, sales clerks, shoe repairers, officeworkers, social and welfare workers, scientific and technical workers, and other classifications of white-collar and subprofessional workers—shortages that can be found even in areas with long and persistent unemployment.

However, a jobless coal miner or steel worker cannot be fitted easily into any of the shortage jobs. Usually, they lack the basic education and background necessary for retraining. Too often they are not adaptable. And many of them are reluctant about making a new start in an entirely different field of employment.

"Too many people simply don't want to train for the jobs that are available," Mr. CURTIS comments, adding, "There is no magic cure-all for our problems, but * * * we must launch a vast program to upgrade the skills of our people so that they can fill the many new jobs being created in our highly developed and increasingly service-oriented society and leave their old jobs to be filled by others, perhaps today's unemployed with their lesser skills."

This would mean training and retraining programs on a greatly expanded basis—and with attention to developing needs. There is entirely too much stress now on training and vocational programs directed toward skills little needed now or becoming obsolete, says Mr. CURTIS. There is entirely too much thinking in terms of today or the past, too little in the new and challenging terms of tomorrow, he adds.

"The technique of matching idle workers with unfilled jobs is in its infancy. So too, is our system of training and retraining Americans to fill the jobs that must be filled in the future if, as a nation, we are to realize our economic potential," Representative CURTIS states.

The need is for a broad reshuffling to upgrade workers "energetic and ambitious enough to try to improve skills or education." Today's big waste is the underdeveloped worker. Today's wrong technique is to try to train the untrainable—or to pass over him as untrainable. The answer, as Mr. CURTIS sees it, is not to try to retrain the possessor of the lowest skill for newly emerging skilled jobs but to engage in a sweeping retraining program upgrading workers all along the line.

It's not an easy program. It takes considerable cooperation all along the line, from workers and their unions, companies, and governments at all levels. It's only part of a solution. But it's a step that can be taken in a "free enterprise approach to our problems," according to the Congressman.

NEWSLETTER BOOK REVIEW—"87 MILLION JOBS," BY REPRESENTATIVE TOM CURTIS

Representative TOM CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, in a new book, "87 Million Jobs: A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment," (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, $1.95) offers Republicans a fresh and exciting economic program that stands in sharp contrast to the tired-out economic thinking of the Democratic Party. The St. Louis Congressman persuasively disposes of the depression-era idea that more Federal spending can create jobs, prosperity, and economic growth.

CURTIS, who is the senior House Republican on the Joint Economic Committee and a ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, points out that as many jobs are going begging today as there are people out of work; that the problem of providing jobs for our unemployed essentially is one of eliminating labor market dislocations, and that our people must be trained to fill the new, more demanding jobs opening up in our society.

This requires, he says, a vast public and private cooperative effort to upgrade worker skills, as well as more effective efforts to encourage worker mobility and to stimulate greater savings and investment, upon which job creation depends. It is an exciting book, and Republicans can be proud that one of their own has come up with new answers to some of our most troublesome and persistent economic problems.—Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey.

[From the Kiplinger Washington Letter, Sept. 22, 1962]

Unemployment cannot be solved by any massive Government programs. That's the gist of a new book by Representative TOM CURTIS, of Missouri, a Republican. He says the solution lies in business and local action to train workers, improve education to fit the unemployed for thousands of unfilled jobs. Also tax changes to stimulate investment. A point of view, of course, but thought-provoking and worth reading. The title: "87 Million Jobs," published by Duell, Sloan & Pearce. Your local bookstore can get it.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 28, 1962]

LACK OF SKILLS IS HELD KEY TO UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

"The crux of the so-called unemployment problem is not the lack of jobs, but the lack of skills to fill available jobs."

This is the thesis on which Representative Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, of Missouri, has written "87 Million Jobs," a book published today by Duell, Sloan & Pearce.

The title alludes to the fact that by 1970 the American labor force will number 87 million. The subtitle, "A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment," serves to introduce Congressman Curtis' plan for upgrading the work force to fill the higher skilled jobs which he says are going begging today.

His multidimensional plan calls for a nationwide survey of the skills of the future and a national clearinghouse to classify these job opportunities and to disseminate information about them to schools and private employers.

On the Federal level, Representative Curtis wants the unemployment insurance system revamped to give benefits to unemployed workers who train for new skills and deny benefits to those who refuse to start learning a new skill. He also wants tax regulations relaxed to encourage persons to upgrade their skills or to move to areas where employment is available.

Rather than spend Federal money to create jobs to fit available skills, the Government should encourage private business to expand and thereby produce more jobs by granting more realistic and more up-to-date depreciation allowances, the Congressman contends.

[From Roll Call, Oct. 3, 1962]

Book Review—Horse-and-Buggy Economics a Drag on Employment Progress

(Curtis, Representative Tom. "87 Million Jobs: A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment." New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1962. $1.95; Reviewed by Hon. Prescott Bush, U.S. Senator from Connecticut)

Congressman Thomas B. Curtis has written a thought-provoking and penetrating book about a subject close to the hearts of all Americans—their jobs.

A Missouri Republican from St. Louis County, Congressman Curtis, is well-equipped for the task by reason of his keen and searching intelligence and his long experience as the senior House member of the Joint Economic Committee, on which we serve together, as well as a ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The book appears at a particularly appropriate time. Unemployment, which so far during 1962 has not fallen below 5.4 percent of the civilian labor force, actually rose sharply in August to 5.8 percent. Particularly disturbing is the fact that this increase occurred at or near the top of the business cycle. Since the end of World War II, each recession has left us with a higher level of unemployment. Clearly, we are a long way from solving our unemployment problem.

Congressman Curtis offers a fresh and penetrating analysis of how to eliminate this persistent, hard-core unemployment. He rejects the widely and often uncritically held dogma that we can do it by creating jobs for the unemployed through more and more Federal Government spending. Indeed, instead of finding a solution in Federal spending and "depression economic." Curtis believes these nostrums aggravate and prolong our unemployment problem.

The central point of Congressman Curtis book is that in order to eliminate unemployment we must wake up to the fact that we are living in a dynamic and changing economy in which as many jobs, both actual and potential, are going begging as there are people out of work. He sees the solution to the unemployment problem in a shift of emphasis and attention from self-defeating attempts to increase the demand for obsolete skills to the urgent and more rewarding task of filling our job vacancies.

In a dynamic economy, characterized by swift technological advances, Congressman Curtis points out that jobs are constantly being eliminated. But while jobs are being eliminated, new jobs are opening up. He offers striking evidence of this in the shift in employment in recent years from production to service-type, professional, managerial and highly skilled jobs.

Congressman Curtis makes clear that this trend is certain to continue in the future. If we ignore it or if we seek to correct unemployment through the application of horse-and-buggy economics, we run the grave risk of holding back our economic growth and progress. When the Government seeks to create jobs artificially at skill levels that are no longer in demand, it hampers efforts to find a genuine and lasting solution. Congressman Curtis points out that unfilled jobs hold back our economic growth as much as unemployment.

Our inability to fill our job vacancies and to put our unemployed workers back on the job is not, Congressman Curtis believes, because of inadequate demand in the economy. Rather, it is caused by dislocations in the labor market. Very frequently, the unemployed person either does not have the skills to fill the job vacancies or he does not live in, or is not willing to move to, an area where jobs are available.

Congressman Curtis persuasively argues for a vast national public and private program to upgrade the skills, training and education of our people so they can meet the job needs of our modern society. As envisioned by Congressman Curtis, persons high up on the skill ladder move into the new and demanding jobs and thus open up positions which can be filled by persons below them on the skill ladder, and so on down the line. He also advocates measures which would encourage greater worker mobility as well as increase inducements to save and invest, which are essential if we are to accumulate the capital required to create jobs.

In recent years the search for a solution to the problem of unemployment has resembled a cat chasing its own tail—a lot of action but no real progress. Congressman Curtis, who probably more than any other man in Congress has devoted his time and thought to this problem, is due our thanks for introducing a new and penetrating outlook to what had become a stale and unrewarding search for an answer to the serious human problem of unemployment.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 28, 1962]

Curtis Outlines Job Plan

(By Robert Dietsch)

A leading Republican Congressman today outlined a program to upgrade unskilled and semiskilled workers to enable them to fill "the millions of jobs going begging in America today."

In a 126-page book, Representative Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, suggests new tax devices, a national clearinghouse to report on job needs, wider training in schools, better training programs by employers and changes in the Federal unemployment insurance system.

But his accent is always on upgrading workers through private channels.

"I do not rule out government which at all levels has an important role to play in a well-designed program of job escalation," Representative Curtis writes in his book, "87 Million Jobs; a Dynamic Program."

"But Government spending, pump-priming, does not equip a single man with the skills required to take one of the many new jobs created by our advancing technology. It can buy time, but only individual training or retraining can buy any real guarantee of real work and real income."

At another point, Representative Curtis, a member of the Ways and Means and the Joint Economic Committee, said, "we hear little about the important successes in job upgrading being scored by individual business firms * * * not all of them can do as well as International Business Machines which retrains 100,000 workers each year.

"But a number of companies are doing a fairly good job and could do much more under appropriate tax incentives and other government policies."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Sept. 29–30, 1962]

Curtis Calls for Fresh Look at Unemployment

(Reviewed by Patrick J. Buchanan)

"Eighty-seven Million Jobs," by Representative Thomas B. Curtis (Duell, Sloan Pearce). Today as thousands of coal haulers and ditchdiggers are unemployed, newspapers advertise for operators of coaldiggers and trenchers. As millions of Americans sit idle, millions of skilled jobs go begging.

The Federal Government is using antiquated solutions bred by depression unemployed to solve the postwar problem of technological change. Taxpayers' dollars for public works are keeping drudgery and unskilled labor feasible as a way of life.

This is the Congressman's thesis and he occupies the dugout with that team of economists which argues that increased investment capital—not the hiking of aggregate demand by Federal handouts—is the key to full employment. If left alone, the dynamic American economy will create new jobs as it makes the old ones obsolete.

With tax incentives, Government should induce local business and schools to retrain workers for the skilled jobs that are opening, should reward plant modernization, and grant the newly qualified laborer easy access to areas where his talents can be employed.

Today the Government taxes every worker to provide a few with artificially created jobs, rather than encouraging the upgrading of skills to enable them to take on better jobs with a real future. Government seeks to bury the ugly visage of unemployment in a landslide of dollars that unearths the equally repulsive ogre of inflation.

To Mr. Curtis, this is our crime against the future and a hoodwinking of workers, using Federal boodle to buy their votes and keep them toiling in fruitless vineyards.

Congressman Curtis calls for a fresh look at unemployment and urged a single congressional study committee and a modern evaluation as election nears.

Chief shortcoming in the piece is his tendency to shortchange and oversimplify the arguments of a formidable economic school of thought entrenched in "Swampoodle and Foggy Bottom."

Not a bulging text of charts and graphs, but a commonsense study by a principal actor who has stepped offstage to watch the huge cast of players, who, for all their eloquent soliloquies, seem to be moving to a curtain call that will find every American a ward of the state and an apostle of the status quo.

If today's notions prevailed years ago, he argues, men would be working on "cat whiskers" for crystal sets.

Cogent and clear, the work sides with that minority that steadfastly refuses to burn incense at the altar of John Maynard Keynes.

Opposition is anticipated from Washington deskmen and union leaders whose own future is tied to keeping telegraphers, farmers, and coal miners tapping obsolete keyboards, producing grain for Government bins and loading 16 tons.

But these voices are familiar to Mr. Curtis.

Curtis Book on Manpower Gets a Plug

When the committee appointed by President Kennedy to advise on manpower retraining had its first meeting a couple of weeks back, a new book by a Republican Member of Congress got special billing.

The book, "87 Million Jobs," by Representative Tom Curtis, of Missouri, stems from a GOP study of unemployment headed by Curtis earlier this year. Prof. Eli Ginzberg, of Columbia University, committee chairman, brought a copy to the first work session.

Labor Department officials have obtained a batch of copies for their use, though in the book Curtis takes some lusty swings at Democrats.

[From the Washington Post]

Changing Times Department

Back in 1945, when he was Secretary of Agriculture, Henry A. Wallace was hooted and derided for writing a book called "60 Million Jobs." It was a pipedream, they said.

The other day a highly respected Republican Congressman from Missouri, Representative Tom Curtis, published a book with the title "87 Million Jobs." And nobody let out a peep. Not, at least, at Curtis' theme—that with "a dynamic program to end unemployment" the 87-million figure will be reached.

Current employment is just short of 67 million.

[From Republican Report, October 1962]

Curtis Book Proposes 87 Million Employed

When an important Congressman writes a serious treatise on the economics of unemployment without benefit of "ghosts" it is news. When that book proposes to employ a working force of 87 million people while at the same time reducing unemployment to an insignificant problem it represents news which merits serious consideration. Such a treatise has been written by Congressman Tom Curtis, Republican, of Missouri. "Eighty-seven Million Jobs: A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment" has just been published by Duell, Sloan & Pearce of New York.

Curtis, who is neither an economist nor an academician, has written a book which has merited prefaces by three distinguished economists and scholars. The problem of unemployment as he sees it, is not that jobs are unavailable for these millions of workers, but rather that many of these workers are unsuited and untrained for the jobs that the technological revolution continues to create. He points out that newspaper advertisements for technically skilled workers usually balance those from people who seek employment. From this premise, he argues that those who are active in directing the American economy must investigate the field of job retraining. Such efforts must encompass changes in our educational system to aid our manufacturing and labor interests in bringing about such escalation. Furthermore, tax laws must be redrawn to encourage the use of modern machinery to keep the process of automation going so as to provide jobs for those who have retrained to perform them.

REPRESENTATIVE TOM CURTIS

Curtis, who is one of the most respected Members of the House of Representatives, has achieved national recognition as a member of both the Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Economic Committee. He holds degrees from Dartmouth and the Washington University Law School and was elected to Congress in 1950.

In commenting on the book, W. Allen Wallis, dean of the Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago and president-elect of the University of Rochester, said in a preface: "He is a conservative, not in the sense of seeking to preserve the status quo or protect vested interests but—quite the contrary—in the sense that he seeks to conserve the forces of progress."

[From the Troy (N.Y.) Times Record,
Oct. 10, 1962]

Square Pegs

It is impossible to gain agreement on how many unemployed we have. Government figures put the total just under 5 million or more than 5 percent of the work force. Union economists say it is closer to 6 million or about 7 percent. But all agree that the real problem is the great number of long-term unemployed, those who for one reason or another are presently unemployable.

Unions think they have an answer in the 35-hour week. This might only make the matter worse. A more sensible solution may be that offered by Missouri Congressman Thomas B. Curtis, who calls for a revision in our thinking about worker retraining.

In his book "87 Million Jobs," Congressman Curtis says 900,000 people could find work in the health services if they were trained and available. Teachers and school personnel, competent secretaries, mechanics, tailors, shoe repairmen, social workers, and sales clerks are just a few other categories in which the Congressman said there are many openings, even in areas with the most persistent unemployment.

How to solve the problem? Rather than take unemployed coal miners or steelworkers and enroll them in training courses for which they have neither the ability nor the determination. Congressman Curtis calls for a reshuffling of the training system. Rather than try to train the untrainable, or discard him because he is untrainable, for the newly emerging skilled jobs, Congressman Curtis calls for an extensive program which would upgrade workers all along the production line. The solution may be open to argument but the Nation has too many square pegs to reject it without serious study.

[From the Advance magazine]

Better Jobs for More Americans: A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment

(By Representative Tom B. Curtis)

Our dynamic economy has created a demand for so many skills of so many new and different sorts that we have, in amazing fact, developed large labor shortages. This is the crux of the so-called unemployment problem: not the lack of jobs, but the lack of skills to fill available jobs. This is the growing pain of our economy—it is not the fatal sickness of a sick economy, as those who see only the "job wanted" but never the "help wanted" columns of our papers so often say.

Most of the unfilled job requirements are known only in general terms, however.

THE NEEDS

We need many more engineers, in old as well as altogether new fields. We need more doctors, more nurses, more garage mechanics, more lab technicians, more scientists, of all sorts. more teachers with more and varied training, more salesmen with genuine technical expertise about their complex products, more management technicians, more computer operators, more computer designers, more computer programers, more highly skilled production workers. More, more, and still more, as each new wave of skills breeds the machines and the services that demand ever more skills and creates ever more jobs in new fields.

Newspapers are filled with advertising for needed skills. Many employers no longer use such columns because their experience has shown that the necessary skills simply are not available. In such cases they undertake to train people to fill these jobs.

What is more, the skill requirements of our dynamic economy are snowballing. The Department of Labor recently estimated that about 5,000 new job titles will be added to its dictionary of occupational titles in the decade of the sixties. During the same period some 8 to 10 percent of current job titles will become obsolete.

Since technological growth and heads-up, innovating management create a demand for more jobs than they make obsolete, our basic task as a nation is to find the ways to meet such a demand.

The cost, surprisingly in the age of so much Federal spending, is bound to be relatively low and in a sense self-liquidating. Work at higher skills obviously pays more, which enlarges the tax base, other things being equal. Also, success in this endeavor will reduce the incentive for featherbedding, which fear of technological unemployment frequently generates. The resulting greater productivity will also serve to expand the tax base. Then, billions now spent in all manner of Government programs to conceal unemployment in the fog of inflation could be saved and Federal taxes accordingly cut to the bone.

THE CONCEPT

A successful attack on unemployment even gives great promise of increasing a general understanding of the role of government in our society. Government is ancillary, a handmaiden of the private sector. Government is not a copartner of the people. It is their servant, and government jobs are created only when individuals in their private enterprise create a demand for ancillary assistance. This, and not the state concept of government as a big spender, should guide us in the era ahead.

Of all the things that Government might be tempted to do in finding answers to job problems, the most necessary first step is to satisfy requirements for relevant information about emerging skill requirements as well as about the pattern of unneeded skills. We must upgrade skills across the land, but "upgrade for what?"

1. Urgently necessary are answers based on an analytical, nationwide study of the skills of the future, emerging skills of the present, and obsolescent skills of the past. Such answers are needed, negatively, lest we retrain men, as we are unfortunately doing today in some instances, for outmoded or unneeded skills, and, affirmatively, to steer our efforts in the right direction on a time basis.

2. To this end, there should be established a national clearinghouse for the classification of these skills and their needs on a geographic basis. At present, a limited amount of work is being done in this area by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the U.S. Employment Service. But these agencies overlap a good deal, and their operations do not synchronize well with large segments of private activity bearing on the subject.

3. The clearinghouse system should aim to present, on a timely and coordinated basis, all relevant public and private information, bearing mainly on skill requirements in relation to existing and near-term supplies of trained manpower. This information should be suitably classified as to all levels of remuneration by skill categories, length of retraining periods for typical upgrading situations, and the like. Coordination with vocational and other educational institutions would be necessary in order that the various interrelated activities be reflected in the clearinghouse's reports and analyses.

4. Such information, moreover, should be systematically used by the country's Armed Forces, especially in connection with their work in vocational guidance, since these services occupy a strategic position in relation to job escalation and career planning for many young people.

5. The clearinghouse system and cooperative work by many local groups in connection with it should play a constructive role also in education. The point is worth stressing, since the country's increasing emphasis on rapid technological improvement has vast implications for educational policy.

6. Primarily, we should pay relatively less attention to old-fashioned narrow training, and place more emphasis in the schools on fundamental subjects. For it is the basic subjects which provide the future working population with a strong springboard to sound skill in youth plus improvement and occupational flexibility after they have entered the labor force. Much of this is

known, of course. What a skill clearinghouse system could do in particular would be to create a framework within which citizens could more actively cooperate with school authorities in weeding out obsolete courses and programs and in helping to expedite the upgrading of teachers.

A clearinghouse system could also exert pressure on behalf of school administrators who now might lack strong local support for reforms. For instance, in a great number of vocational schools, or the vocational departments of regular schools, students needing discipline are dumped into, say, the machine shop course. This simply disrupts the course, and class effectiveness suffers badly as a result.

Why should disciplinary requirements and methods curtail necessary skill development?

7. At the college level, including both the 2-year junior college and the regular undergraduate institutions, upgrading of curriculums and instruction also seems to be necessary in many cases if the Nation is to achieve a maximum pace of job escalation in technical and professional work. College officials, to be sure, are doing more than before in an effort to improve effectiveness. A functioning skill clearinghouse system could constructively enhance their work.

STRENGTHENING COLLEGES

Especially worthy of study and close attention is the tendency to lengthen college programs in many States, ostensibly to improve the student product. Educational history shows that the usual result is little more than course proliferation, with many low-quality offerings remaining in curriculums instead of being displaced by more substantial and useful ones. With a good clearinghouse system, responsible local pressure can be brought to bear in support of those educators who are fighting within their institutions for stronger courses that genuinely challenge students coming from improved high schools. This work is important and by it nature needs to be done chiefly at the local level. Today's needs for well-educated people are such that a college degree is equivalent in importance, and general need and availability, to the high school diploma of only a generation or so ago.

The significance is well illustrated in a study prepared by Prof. Almarin Phillips, of the University of Virginia. He estimates that no less than 40 percent of the increase in our total national production is associated with technological change. Professor Phillips adds significantly that this change is now more rapid, but not materially different from change in previous periods. The problems developed not so much from the changes as from the failure of business, labor, and government to recognize them at their outset, when merely marginal corrections will suffice to keep skills and needs in step.

THE LOCAL IMPERATIVE

Such corrections, it should be emphasized, can be most effectively made, first of all, at the community level. The measure of their effectiveness, in fact, might well be the degree to which they prevent problems from ascending the scale of complexity to the regional, State, or Federal levels.

Where better, for instance, to spot and prepare solutions for technological changes than at the level of the community in which the changes first begin to affect individual employees and managements? Community educational institutions can be and must be more sensitive to such changes. Management, as it plans ahead, should be a partner in such community efforts—never excluded from them. The responsibility goes two ways, of course. Management must not exclude itself.

For the community that fails in its response to these challenges, preferring to pass the buck to higher, distant levels of government, there is an obvious and terrible fate: dependency, loss of local pride and initiative, and, eventually, loss of citizens and a slow decline to blight.

There are five broad areas in which action should be taken on the Federal level to remove impediments to job escalation in the private sector of the economy.

TAX REVISION

As might be expected, revision of our tax laws must play an important part in this effort. As a member of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I am acutely aware of the importance of tax policy for an effective nationwide program of job escalation. It has been said with much truth that our tax laws are now all but blind on these matters.

The five areas for action, with my specific recommendations in each area, are as follows:

1. Tax laws, for instance, provide no personal incentive for individuals contemplating retraining. Cases are covered in our newspapers constantly showing how tax laws impede the very upgrading process that our country so badly needs to encourage. Note the following press account:

"An Army captain got leave from his post as an artillery instructor to complete courses in psychology, public administration and history. Under an Army plan to encourage higher education of its personnel, he continued to draw his regular pay, but he had to pay the added school expenses himself. The Internal Revenue Service, asked if the captain could deduct these outlays as an educational expense, said no. The law permits a deduction for costs of improving one's skills in an existing job, but not for those incurred to qualify for a new post."

Clearly, this shows that our tax laws work precisely to impede—not help—job escalation. Many individuals who want to improve * * * know that they have to qualify for * * * to get a better one. The tax laws should * * * elementary fact of life. Tax deductions * * * should be given to men and women who want to train for greater skill or competence.

2. Another way in which our tax laws hinder employment is the area of geographic labor mobility. The tax laws were written when only a relatively small percentage of our people owned their own homes, and when few persons sought work far beyond reasonable commuting distance from their normal place of residence. Today, however, it makes no sense to have our tax laws continue to regard a man's "legal residence" for tax purposes as the place where he works, for today nearly 70 percent of our people own their own homes and are not going to pull up family stakes just to enable the breadwinner to accept a challenging but perhaps temporary job 200 miles away. Why should shortages of skills exist in sections of our country when men are prepared to work there temporarily if they are not penalized taxwise? The acceptance of such employment should not require that the workers relocate their entire family near the job site in such cases.

NEEDED: REALISM

A realistic program for job escalation, therefore, would call for more realistic tax regulations defining "place of residence" as the "tax home" of those workers temporarily engaged in an occupation in another part of the country.

Together, these two tax reforms could do much directly to stimulate the more rapid skill development and job mobility that is necessary for the smooth performance of our dynamic economy.

3. The Nation's unemployment insurance system also has a great potential as a vehicle for promoting the upgrading of our labor force. This system is paid for by private employers but administered by the States, with some participation by the Federal Government. It has achieved fairly good results in terms of providing stopgap financial assistance to men out of work, tiding them over the cyclical downswings. But little has been made of the system with respect to the challenge of upgrading the skills of the labor force.

There is a simple key to the needed reform of our unemployment compensation system as far as job escalation is concerned. It is found by answering this question: How is an unemployed person treated at present if he enrolls in a training school to learn a new or better skill? The answer is that he is removed from the unemployment rolls, and thus becomes ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits, in 40 of the 50 States.

This is precisely the opposite of the policy that is called for. An unemployed person should be removed from the unemployment rolls if he cannot get a job in his obsolete skill and he refuses to start learning a skill that is in demand.

State legislation, therefore, should permit those engaged in training and retraining programs to continue to receive unemployment benefits up to normal amounts and limits, as is currently the case in only 18 of our 50 States and the District of Columbia.

EMPLOYER BENEFITS

Moreover, there is a potential for job escalation in the broadening of merit rating in unemployment payments. The cost of unemployment insurance to individual employers varies with the employment record of the firm. In other words, companies experiencing heavy unemployment pay more than those with a record of little unemployment.

There is no incentive stemming directly from the operation of the unemployment insurance system to provide retraining for unemployed personnel. An unemployed worker who may be undergoing company-sponsored retraining is still classified as unemployed, and the firm's merit rating suffers accordingly. Surely this makes little sense in view of the great need for increasing retraining opportunities.

States should broaden merit rating concepts to include on-the-job retraining, to the end that the employer is not penalized for extending this opportunity to his workers. This would be another step in the direction of rapid job escalation.

4. In our rapidly growing economy, machinery becomes obsolete before it wears out. This is the reality of our technological advancement. Do our tax laws reflect this reality? Not at all. We find, on an examination of the situation, that our tax laws are geared to the old economics of wear, not of obsolescence. Such tax machinery simply does not mesh with modern industrial requirements.

In spite of the long-needed recent revision of depreciation schedules, the problem remains. We do not yet know whether these new schedules will be responsive to the needs of the economy. Depreciation schedules must be kept up to date continually to reflect the economic reality of useful life.

It takes more investment money to buy machinery when it becomes obsolescent long before it wears out. For the sake of progress, therefore, one would think that our tax laws would encourage such investment. Yet cutting off such investment is precisely what our tax laws do. The lag in depreciation allowances is now estimated to be some $4 to $6 billion behind replacement needs. Our economic progress is obviously slowed down when a third of our industrial plant is obsolete, as it is today.

Our tax laws must permit more realistic depreciation allowances. We need this not only for the sake of more and better jobs in the United States, but also to keep the American economy competitive internationally and to impart strength to the dollar as a world currency. Today, for example, Britain allows more than 40-percent depreciation on new machinery in the year of acquisition. Germany permits a writeoff of 25 percent for the first year and about 58 percent of the cost in the first 3 years. France does even better. We do only a fraction as well.

DEPRECIATION MODERNIZATION

There are four overriding reasons why we must modernize tax legislation bearing on depreciation. First, we will experience an increase in the annual additions to our labor force in the next decade. Some 3 million new workers will be wanting productive jobs. Second, the investment cost per job—the amount required to create a new position—is rising, and is now between $20,000 and $25,000 per man. Third, there is a high investment cost in generating new products. Sensational as it is in fact, the pace of new product development is little known. Actually, about 30 percent of the goods on the market today were not there only 5 years ago. Finally, our tax legislation respecting depreciation needs modernization to assure that the American economy remains up to date as compared with rival trading nations, especially in Europe.

The needed tax legislation should be in the form of generally applicable rates, known in advance to business management so that it can make the right kind of long-range investment plans. A system lodging discretionary authority with the Government, adjusting depreciation rates or tax credits, in terms of untested theoretical considerations—such as President Kennedy proposed shortly after assuming office—simply will not do the job.

5. Sound employment legislation also demands a well-ordered operation in the Congress of the United States. At present, this is lacking. There is overlapping jurisdiction among congressional committees dealing with employment. Consider, for example, the way the subject of automation is handled in the House of Representatives. It is dealt with by the Education and Labor Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Joint Economic Committee. Knowledge remains uncoordinated, and one committee usually acts without knowing very much about the experience of the other committees.

In this connection, I welcome the endorsement of the House Republican policy committee, for my proposal to establish a new coordinating committee. This would be a standing committee on employment, composed of members from each of the four committees mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Such a standing committee could recommend positive policies in the area of employment, cooperate with State legislatures and city councils throughout the country, and analyze executive branch activities in the economic field.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

With faith in ourselves, and perseverance in job escalation without federalization, we can succeed in attaining a future of full employment. We can do so while strengthening our freedom, not through decisions which trickle down from an apex of authority in Washington but from actions originating in the broad base of the pyramid of America's economic and political strength—in the heart and soul of a strong and free people.

The Community Development Foundation Methods and Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 13, 1962

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, and because of the considerable interest expressed as a result of my recent remarks concerning the Community Development Foundation, I am led to supplement those remarks with a more detailed examination of the methods used by this distinguished organization and the results produced by those methods during the past year. I do this primarily because those methods are so successful—a combination of tested community development principles and a sincere humanitarian concern. They represent an expression of the basic good will of the American people for those individuals, communities, and nations who are struggling to create for themselves an existence where love of freedom, individual enterprise, and national good can be welded into a potent weapon for the establishment of world peace.

In describing the working methods used by the Community Development Foundation, I am drawing upon a talk given by Mrs. Theodora Pantos, the foundation's field director of its Greek program—a talk delivered at the Regional Conference for Community Development held at Chalkis, on the island of Euboea under the auspices of the Royal National Foundation of Greece. It was attended by representatives from the Nomoi of Attica, Phokis, Cyclades, Samos, Euboea, and Boetia. Mrs. Pantos, incidentally, has been the recipient of an award of the Second Order of Merit by the Greek Ministry of Welfare under royal edict for her work on behalf of Greek children and communities through the foundation.

While Mrs. Pantos was speaking for the program in Greece, her description of the methods and goal of the foundation are just as accurate for the programs of the foundation in Lebanon, France, Korea, among the American Indians, or in the southern Appalachian Mountain regions of the United States, as well as in all other areas where the foundation is striving to inculcate new hope, new determination, and new competence in the hearts and minds of people who have long suffered from chronic poverty and despair.

She points out that long before the term "community development" became part of a scientific phraseology, there were many people who were practicing its principles. The village schoolmaster in the isolated community, who used to sit in the village square and talk to the people over a cup of coffee, instilling in them enthusiasm for acting together to build a school or to bring water down from the hills; firing them with the determination to roll up their sleeves, pick up their shovels and go to work to improve conditions for themselves and their children, was doing community development. The priest who talked with the mothers of the village, advising them on their problems, telling them how they could keep their homes clean and care for their children, was doing the same. As Mrs. Pantos said:

> Anyone who loved people and came in contact with them in an effort to help them did community development * * * for the basic rule for anyone who wants to work in this field is a love of people. He must let the village people know that he loves them and in this way win their confidence so that he can help them.

Often the first visits to a village by the community development worker seem unproductive of interest or results, though miracles do happen. With patience, however, even the sleepiest or most apathetic village can be aroused to face realities, and once the first step is taken and a first project proves successful, the resultant pride of accomplishment triggers a desire for further efforts.

As the foundation's French field director wrote in her 1962 annual report:

> In 1956 I walked through the villages, the silent deserted villages. No friendly attitude, no gesture of welcome from an entirely shut up population. I was the stranger. All the trouble came from that. What right had I to enter their village? But in 1962 friends in every village. Villages with community development projects successfully completed. New villages and new projects continually: 35 a year ago; 48 this year; 48 villages with 69 projects. Many others waiting for a visit, having submitted a project and asked to be included in our program.

The stronger a village gets through its own efforts, the less often it is visited by the community development worker. The better the work that is done, the less credit will he take for himself, for the worker who has done real community development is the one who visits a village and leaves with the people the knowledge that they themselves built the school, carved out the road, brought water into the village, repaired their homes, acquired new livestock, planted new and better orchards. Thus, with renewed confidence in themselves, they will go forward toward the consummation of their dream: the establishment of security for themselves and their children.

This is how the foundation starts its work. A road, a well, a better crop, a school, improved strains of livestock; in other words, a dream in the mind of a family or a community. A dream that would remain only a dream and eventually die, were it not for the spark of life poured into that dream by dedicated workers, backed by technical skill, humanitarian understanding, and the support of thousands of individuals and groups from every corner of America; in other words, the cooperative effort that the community development foundation represents.

And what does it accomplish? I am going to give you concrete examples, examples taken from the reports by the foundation's field offices at the end of the 1961–62 fiscal year, so that my distinguished colleagues may judge for themselves as to whether or not the foundation's methods are a powerful weapon for making friends for America and furthering the cause of peace and international understanding.

In Greece, not only were 29 new village projects initiated, but the foundation was also able to expand its program into a new area, the Nomos of Phokis, and at the request of local government authorities, initial steps were taken for further expansion in another three areas. At present, therefore, its village self-help program is operating successfully in seven areas: Attica, Levadia, Euboea, Corinth, Thesprotia, Phokis, with expected expansion into Nafpaktos, Agrinion, and the island of Corfu.

The projects are many and varied, running from improvements in playgrounds, road and bridge building, water supply projects, and projects for the introduction of new and improved strains of livestock or new species of fruit trees.

By means of playground and other school-centered projects, the foundation has assisted the village people to create better educational facilities for their children, turning bare buildings into schools where children can receive an elementary education under decent and healthful conditions; where they will have access to at least a rudimentary library, with a few maps and charts, and so forth. Water supply projects enable parents to bring in an adequate supply of drinking water that will protect their children's health from possible contamination of wells where both people and animals formerly drank from a common source. More plentiful water lightens the task of the housewives, enabling them to keep their homes clean more easily, giving them more time for their children and husbands.

Road and bridge building makes rural areas more accessible to markets, opens up more land for cultivation, lessens the cost of transportation of farm products or fertilizer. Improved breeds of animals and better species of trees make possible increased incomes in areas where the average per capita income is as low as $60 per year. This supplemented income in cash and kind enables parents to provide better diets and more adequate clothing for their children, to say nothing of the luxury of a high school education in many cases.

A total of only $3,682.03 was given out in Greece by the foundation in grants for village self-help projects, against which 32,395 days of man labor was contributed by the villagers. At $2 per day, the value of this labor would be $64,790; in other words, the recipients of the benefit contributed labor valued at over 17 times the amount made available by the foundation.

In Korea, with its large but impoverished population, 116 new community development projects have been initiated by the foundation during the past year. The majority of those projects are concerned with agriculture and land reclamation and with dam and irrigation facilities. Water is Korea's biggest problem—either too much water during the flood season, or not enough, during the growing season. Thus projects for building dams to conserve water and drainage projects to reclaim land that has been flooded are given priority by most villages which are dependent upon the staple food—rice. In Mok Ri, for instance, a dam makes possible a reservoir and the draining of acreage for rice paddies. A grant of $320 was made to this village of 87 families. The villagers pledged 4,500 days of work on the dam and $500 worth of materials. In the next 5 years, the anticipated annual gain is $29,500.

During the Korean war, ruthless cutting of forests created erosion and flood problems. Working under foundation guidance, villagers have set out more than 35,000 pine seedlings and 25,000 young chestnut trees. The seedlings were furnished by the South Korean Government, while foundation grants paid for fertilizer, and foundation counselors provided the guidance and encouragement as well as motivating the people to work together.

Last fall, a miserable village of 320 refugee families huddled wretchedly in a suburb of Taejon, Korea, named Dai Hwa Ri. Since they had not only lost their dwellings but also their means of livelihood, they could not build new homes until a miracle happened. They had been living in miserable shacks built of broken pieces of board and wornout straw matting. The foundation consult in Korea reported:

> We inspired the people to contribute their labor and they began building two decent model homes. The construction took about 2 weeks and the total cost of each house was about $80. When the people realized how much they could accomplish by working together, they embarked upon the project of building 24 more homes. Help was given them by the foundation and by Korean World Church Service as a joint endeavor.

So enthusiastically and hard did the people work that the 24 model homes were actually completed in only 8 days. To the people of Dai Hwa Ri, it was a miracle, but in actuality, it was the result of two organizations encouraging the people to work for community development.

In France, I have already mentioned the 48 new villages with 69 projects. These cover many different types of plans: community centers like the one in Molene where the fishermen gave 6,000 hours of work, setting up the center, installing electricity, organizing educational and recreational facilities. One of the present projects in Brittany on the Finistere coast is that of Auberlac'h, which will benefit 2,000 people. It was started but recently, but promises to be of great value to the whole fishing community. It will keep the fishermen away from the cafes and serve as a meeting place where they can telephone the fishmongers, discuss prices and sales of their fish. There will be storage facilities for fishing equipment; lectures can be held and a library established. Thus it will benefit, not only the fishermen, but also their wives and children.

Once again, there is the problem of water for the housewives, for the cattle. There have been 14 water or shower projects this year. Started by the people of Coet-Bugat and Pourmabon, who were the first to carry out a water project, they were followed by the surrounding villages which, as the men said, "had not realized that a community project would have allowed this, or we would have done it many years ago." Now there are no more heavy pails of water to be carried over and over again from the distant fountain; no more endless hours spent to take the cows to drink from a far-off stream. As the field director said:

> Unless you have seen the strain of the overtired women, you cannot realize the joy and excitement caused in a village when a water project is completed and a tap can be turned for water.

One of the most interesting projects is one that involved three families, totaling eight children, in the Pourmabon area, who joined together in a large guinea hen farm. Started in January 1961, by the end of the year the net profit was $388, to be split between the three families. The farmers agreed that this profit was more than could be earned working all year in their fields. Because the hens were so well cared for, the merchant with whom they had their sales contract asked the leader of the families, Mr. Marivan, to start a breeding project. Mr. Marivan is now in charge of 450 guinea hens which are expected to produce 45,000 eggs during the year, while additional personnel have been employed to handle the collection and shipment of the eggs. Other farmers in the area, stimulated by this successful example, are now planning similar projects.

In Lebanon, the program of the foundation is receiving increasing support from the Government. In many respects, rural Lebanon is still highly underdeveloped. Four consecutive drought seasons have left many villages with an insufficient water supply. Electricity and running water are scarce. Asphalt roads are almost nonexistent, which makes it extremely costly for the people to get their produce to the markets. Schools are not found in every village and those that do exist, rarely have more than the first four elementary grades. Children desiring further elementary or secondary education must walk daily to and from neighboring towns, no matter what the weather. It is not surprising, therefore, that the villagers have welcomed the foundation's program as a rare opportunity to improve their conditions. Increasingly, also, they are realizing that they can help themselves much more effectively than any external agency or organization. It is this spirit that the foundation fosters, for its eventual hope is that it will be unneeded by the villagers.

During the past year, with foundation counseling and assistance, the villagers initiated 17 community self-help projects. Of these, 10 were undertaken by a joint foundation-Government program, while the remaining 7 were under foundation guidance alone. This brought the total number of projects since the inception of the foundation program in Lebanon in 1957 to 112 projects in 51 villages.

The 7 projects under the regular foundation program benefited 128 children and 815 adults. On the joint program set up between the foundation and the Social Development of the Lebanese Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, the 10 projects initiated benefited 1,466 children and 2,954 adults. Every dollar contributed by the foundation was matched with $2 from the Lebanese Government and at least $7 from the villagers themselves, either in each, labor, or materials and supplies. It is indeed indicative of the esteem felt for the foundation's program to hear a Government official state:

> The foundation is the only organization to which the Government delegates the authority to make direct payments to the beneficiaries. For all other organizations, the Government accountant makes such payments.

It is therefore not strange that the Lebanese Government will increase its contribution from $3,333 last year to $15,000 this coming year for the purpose of reaching and encouraging a greater number of families and communities to help themselves.

An illustration of one of the school projects was that initiated in Al-Rihan. In the past, the Rihanians have built 3 classrooms, but the rooms have become overcrowded with the 130 students of both sexes in the 5 lower elementary grades. They were firmly resolved to solve this difficulty and provide a higher level of elementary education for their children. The foundation and the Government made them a grant of $433 and this was matched by a value of $1,330 worth of labor and materials from the villagers. The result: Four additional classrooms have been built. The Government was so impressed that the next higher elementary grade has been started with plans for additional grades in the future. The 130 children are receiving the benefits and the village folk have developed so much confidence in their own ability to meet the problem that they are eager to embark on the project of building four more classrooms.

The village of Kfar Dabach lacked a clean and sufficient supply of drinking water. The present spring is polluted due to rain water seepage carrying human and animal sewage, with the result that outbreaks of disease were frequent. With a CDF-Government grant of $383, the villagers are digging a new well which will be made properly sanitary. The entire village of 175 children and 225 adults will have an ample and unpolluted source of water.

The foundation's program in the United States has been long established and consistently effective. By working out self-help projects with American Indian tribes on southwestern reservations, the dignity of the tribes is protected and the well-being of the children advanced. During the past year, 6 Indian tribes undertook 22 self-help projects, while 23 other projects were continued from former years.

On Apache reservations, women were taught health practices which they used and shared so effectively that participation in health programs increased several hundred percent. Other Apaches engaged in craft programs and have developed ever increasing facilities for marketing their handiwork. Teenage boys and girls who hitherto had presented a problem because of the dissatisfaction and restlessness of youth, have been given an expression for their energy and a stimulus to their initiative through projects for home repair and land clearance. By working together and enjoying the fruits of their efforts, their enthusiasm has been reflected in increased ambition and school attendance.

One of the most interesting projects was that of the Papago girl hospital workers who call themselves the Candy Stripers. Through their service as aids in the reservation hospital, these teenagers are being educated in health, responsibility and the concept of service to their own people. Even more important, each member has been able to carry her new knowledge into her own home—a most important factor on a reservation where approximately 50 percent of the people are unable to read and 40 percent cannot speak English. A public health community worker has stated that of all the projects on the Papago Reservation, that of the Candy Striper is the most valuable.

The Colorado River Reservation has undertaken projects to renovate buildings that now serve as a community center for tribal meetings and industries. A large library was established. Camping facilities and a golf course were developed to increase tribal income through tourism.

Especially interesting was an 8-week summer day camp for 42 teenagers at which they received vocational training. Each camper pledged 100 hours of labor and their work included plastering and painting walls, repairing windows, laying an adobe wall and apprenticeship in learning clothes repair, furniture upholstery, and craft production. There were daily recreational activities, educational classes in good grooming, nursing, and cooking for the girls, and field trips for all. The camp provided not only training and vocational preparation as well as education and recreation, but also provided each camper with funds to meet return-to-school expenses. The reservation received a minimum of 4,200 hours of labor on community improvement.

A clear pattern of decreasing foundation aid emerges as tribal groups assume greater responsibility in project management as a result of experience gained. For example: In 1959, the San Carlos Boys' Camp required a grant of $3,000. In 1962, only $200 was required to assure the success of this year's undertaking. An increasing use of young adult participation in community efforts has been effective on the Colorado River, San Carlos Apache, Pima, Papago, Jemez, and Zia Reservations. This has contributed to the maturity of the young people and given a new impetus to community development projects.

One of the most significant new projects inaugurated by the foundation in its domestic program is the Southern Mountain Self-Help Scholarship Fund for teenagers in the mountain areas of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia. Until recently, a high school education was not generally available for many children. The primitive rural elementary school supplied the only education many mountain children could hope to attain. Today, centralized schools are being built throughout the area.

For the first time in mountain history, young men and women can receive training which should enable them to become self-supporting in their own communities. This, however, does not mean that high school is automatically obtainable. Too many of the mountain young people cannot afford the clothing, the school supplies and the necessary spending money that enables them to go on with their education. Their parents are too poor to help. Through the foundation's plan, boys and girls whose scholastic ability, economic need and the presentation of a plan for service to their school or community make them eligible for help, are given a scholarship to help them stay in school. In an area where more than third of the young people from 16 to 17 are forced to drop out of school, this program is demonstrably valuable.

In the rural elementary schools, the foundation provides funds and encouragement to communities and teachers for installing electricity, painting and repair of buildings, clearing grounds for playgrounds and providing equipment, installing indoor toilets and lunch kitchens where the children may be served hot lunches and thus become eligible for Federal aid. Typical of this kind of project is the Decoy School in a remote area of Kentucky. The 2-room schoolhouse had an enrollment of 38 students in all 8 grades. The parents and community installed running water for the school, started a library, initiated a sewing project and a 4-H Club put a foundation under the school, built a basement and installed a central heating system. In addition, a rug-weaving project was started to raise funds for other improvements they plan for next year.

During the past year, 198 sponsored self-help projects were completed in 135 communities, spanning 55 counties.

From this panoramic picture of the Community Development Foundation achievements during the past year, I believe I can truthfully say, and be joined by my distinguished colleagues, that here is a private, nonprofit, nonsectarian and nonpolitical organization that is most truly representative of what its executive director, Mr. Glen Leet, calls "The practice of philanthropy in the space age." He states an inspiring premise when he says:

> This is a time that calls for a creative and imaginative approach to the concept of philanthropy. Science and technocracy have made miraculous strides in pioneering the unexplored realms of outer space. But we who are striving to seek within the "inner" space of the human heart and mind, cannot be content with a pedestrian approach to the chronic problems that hold man back from the enjoyment of his heritage. There are galaxies and constellations still to be discovered in this realm of the inner space of thought. The extension of our knowledge of humanity and its needs is even more important to the future of the world than is advancement in terms of the physical aspects of outer space * * * the conquest of outer space will bring only an extension of the present mundane problems and fears until men can learn to live together in a climate of peace based upon mutual understanding and respect.

The Community Development Foundation is located at the United Nations Plaza at 46th Street, New York, N.Y.